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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

CAMPUS AS HOME: AN EXAMINATION OF THE IMPACT OF STUDENT HOUSING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

This dissertation explores how student housing impacted the college campus of the University of Kentucky in the Progressive Era. Student housing has long been part of the college ideal but lacked full engagement by many administrators. Through three examinations, housing will be shown to have directly influenced the administrative, social, and staffing elements of the college campus. The role student housing played in the interaction of political, rural, and sociological changes on the campus during the time period allows exploration in detail while addressing the changes within those areas of the state as well. While housing was an afterthought by the administration due to oversight and lack of funding throughout much of the examined history (1880-1945), its consideration was still an essential part of student life and part of the college ideal. Housing was a place wholly of the student – while administrators set policies and the government had a concern for it at various times, it was also a place where, originally, a “boys will be boys” mentality slid by, unapproved, but unthreatened. However, how did the politics of the state shape the college and its housing experience? How did the addition of women students, the first of many major additions that were foreign to the original student population of mostly rural males, change the campus and its structures? Originating in the “environment” of student-centered housing – be it boarding houses, Greek houses, or dormitories, the students who populated these facilities would cajole, alter, and sometimes force the campus through both intentional and unintentional engagements and interactions. This dissertation shall establish an understanding of how the administration, particularly the presidency, viewed student housing. Following the introduction, three sections shall detail instances of housing influencing the campus climate in ways previously understudied. First, an examination of the political climate of the state interacted with concerns about student housing as a key factor in ending the presidency of Barker. The second section will show how a judicial ruling created new forms of student services – granting in loco parentis control but also creating the need for the diversification of services beyond what had existed previously. The third section will denote, in detail, how housing women changed the college campus – expanding its borders and the need for services. Through such examinations, a previously unexplored role of student living quarters as affecting the growth and development of the University of Kentucky into the institution it is now shall become apparent.

KEYWORDS: University of Kentucky, Student Housing, Student Affairs, Living Quarters, Student Diversity
James William Thomas

April 15, 2017
CAMPUS AS HOME:
AN EXAMINATION OF THE IMPACT OF STUDENT HOUSING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

By

James William Thomas

Dr. John Thelin
Director of Dissertation

Dr. Jeffrey Bieber
Director of Graduate Studies

April 15, 2017
Date
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In 1987, Owen Connelly’s study of Napoleon’s military campaigns was published with the title *Blundering to Glory*. Arguing that Napoleon’s approach was less strategy than adaptation, the book is still relevant to the study of many historians today. More than the book, though, the title is relevant to me. I have used the title to sum up my own academic experiences more than once and I feel that is still very much accurate. The truth is, by statistics, I should not have made it this far. My father went through unemployment and underemployment for several years when I was young. My mother was never given the opportunity to finish high school traditionally, instead earning a G.E.D. later in life. I was once told the chance of me entering a doctoral program was less than three percent and the chance of me finishing one would be less than one percent given a host of factors. I do not know if these were true statistics, but being in an academic setting, I granted them some truth. Yet, I “blundered” on – through job changes and working full time through all of my master’s and doctoral work – I tried to find success and put my passions – many discovered on the way but cemented with permanence now in my core thoughts – on full display. None of this would have happened nor would I have had any success if not for many people. If the glory I have found is to be had, it is owed to them; I will take credit for the blundering that also occurred. I ask that you forgive me this long acknowledgment, but it did, indeed, take a village to raise me.

First, thank you to my committee. Richard Angelo was a key element in my pursuit of a doctoral degree. His frank conversation with me after I finished my master’s work and continued to take classes due to interest helped me beat back my impostor syndrome long enough to apply and be accepted as a doctoral student. While his retirement ended his time
on my committee, I would not be here if not for his conversations, his dedication, and his teaching that challenged, engaged, and at times flustered me – all for the better. John Thelin I sit in awe of – his classes engaged and enlightened and his critiques and recommendations were cornerstones on which much was built – not one recommended book or article did not have an impact somewhere. Karen Tice provided eye-opening thoughts – whether it be from classes that looked at reality television as gendered commentary or a well-placed recommendation to try and define “gender” even when dealing with a system that considered it as a dyad, she readily provided thoughts on context that the work needed. When I first spoke to Rebekah Epps regarding connecting rural elements to educational research, especially because of Shelby Elam’s memoirs about being a rural student coming to Lexington, she connected me with Julie Zimmerman. In reading Dr. Zimmerman’s book and meeting her in person, I knew, again, that there would be a wealth of new thoughts and considerations with which to engage and I was not disappointed. Jane Jensen served on my master’s committee, and her willingness to mentor and return following Dr. Angelo’s retirement is just one small indicator of her tireless dedication to students such as me. The committee has, literally through years, read early works of mine, many of them having read rough papers for classes, examinations of things I found interesting, etc. They recommended books, shared quotes, and pushed as needed. They emboldened in me not only a love for the field of education, but also a primal interest in the history and impact thereof. They did not just teach me, they helped me find myself in a field that I cherish and I am deeply indebted to them all.

I am forever grateful to those who work in the University of Kentucky Special Collections Library. Deidre Scaggs found the transcript of the testimony from 1917 that
was lost after I initially read it for my Masters work. The staff provided resources, support, and even encouragement to find things that seemingly were unconsidered for this topic and helped shape the contemplation of the interplay between various state and college elements that are present in this work. No institution should be without a special collections and archive of its history and no institution can have a staff more dedicated as the University of Kentucky.

Professionally, I was encouraged by a host of supervisors, colleagues, and friends met originally in professional settings. Dr. Ruth Beattie, my current supervisor, checked in with frequent encouragement and is, most likely, just as ready for me to finish as anyone else. Former supervisors and colleagues Marcia Shrout, Steve Stauffer, Jim Wims, Joe Lewis, and Abby Webb all engaged me in this work in some way – not required of their position by any means, but such was their interest in me as an employee and moreover as a person. Lara Hillenberg worked with me developing classes but paused to inquire, “Will you have time?” in consideration of my need to work on the dissertation. Dr. Barnaby Pung, a former supervisor and good friend sent me encouragements and jokes in equal measure to keep me going and is as trusted an ally as one in education could desire. The aforementioned Joe Lewis, a dear friend, listened to excited discoveries which had no impact on him and frustrated tirades and both were met with accurate, “Well, you can’t quit now, can you?” responses which were much needed even when greeted by a sarcastic response.

My family deserves much and I shall work long and hard to thank them for their love, patience, and faith. Dana Nash Thomas, you said if I helped you through law school you’d get me through my PhD – I think I had the easier side of that deal as we added children
long before I entered this closing phase. To Amelia, my beloved daughter – you never have known a time in your seven years when Daddy was not in school. To Silas, my beloved son, who in five years has many conscious memories of Daddy writing “his big paper.” For you both, what comes next will be exciting – I hope to be around more but we will also all know that I have tried to reach the pinnacle of education that I could – because that was one thing I hope will make me a better father. I missed many moments with you both, but I did so to hope to create many more. Dana, I return in this dedication to you because you not only stood by me, watched the kids, read terrible drafts, told people I didn’t suck, and so very much more, but you actually believed in me. Even when both of us hit the wall from working all the time, trying to parent, and still pull this all together, you never let me doubt your belief in my ability when I doubted it often. My mother, Pamela Thomas, never let me go without a book in my hand if I wanted one, filled our house with journals and magazines, and encouraged me to be unafraid when she knew I frequently was and sometimes had reason to be. She worked tirelessly and selflessly, and I cannot wait to give her the opportunity to say “My son, the doctor…..” My father, James Everett Thomas, in my early years worked odd jobs, substituting as a teacher, and eventually commuting three hours a day and working sixty hour weeks so I would have it a little better. He quoted things, posited odd questions, and did things in my youth to make me think differently and it mattered. The love my parents had for one another and for my siblings (Dorrah Catherine and Everett Michael) and I stood up to strain and I owe them all for showing me what determination meant. My siblings deserve mention as well; we are all very different, and that helped me throughout my life and I am thankful to them. My hope is this begins new trends for my family life.
This doctoral work took time and I lost a few family members before I could thank them for what they did through the years by encouraging and believing in me. Some were lost before the journey began in earnest – stories of my grandfathers who died near my birth inspired me. Some family members passed as I grew older, including my Uncle Charles, an uncle through marriage, but who I found I had common interests with and still shaped me as the time went forward. My dear Aunt Glenda always encouraged me to go for this – and she left before I even finished my graduate work for my masters. Her husband and my uncle Andy Martin joined her in 2015. 2015 also saw the passing of my paternal uncle, Glen M. Thomas, and a maternal aunt, Shirlene K. Abbott. Most recently, my grandmother, Opal Inez Erwin Wilcox passed away in December 2016. I cannot express the impact that these family members had on me in their time, and their encouragement aided me even after their passing in finishing this work. Sitting with them in the hospital, often with a book I was reading for this work, was worth it. *Familia mea, firmamentum meum.*

This process has been difficult, but also empowering. I would like to close by thanking every educator who helped me along the way, from Stacy Adrian Evans who “forced” me to read Moby Dick as a high school sophomore to Linda Pennington who let me be a TA for her and made me think there may be a place for me in education. To all the countless people who taught me, engaged me, questioned me, and educated me – you changed everything and I hope to continue to work in education to pay your work forward.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................ iii

List of Tables .................................................................................................................. ix

List of Figures ................................................................................................................ x

Chapter One: Camus As Home: An Introduction and Literature Review ............... 1
  Challenges in Defining Student Housing Options ................................................. 5

Chapter Two: The Impact of Housing in an Administrative Transition ............ 20
  Land Grant Leadership: Understanding the State Politics of Kentucky 1900-1920 ................................................................. 21
  A Region of Change: Southern Schools in Transition ..................................... 26
  The Business of the College: Efficiency and the Call to Order on Campus .... 33
  Organization under Fire: The Trials of Judge Henry Stites Barker as President .......................................................... 38

Chapter Three: Chaotic Control and the Role of In Loco Parentis in Modernizing
  Affairs in Housing ................................................................................................. 82
  Creating a Parental Environment: The Rise of Housing Staff Due to In Loco Parentis ................................................................. 93
  Separate Genders and Divided Positions ............................................................... 96
  The Dean of Men and the “Modern” Staff Member .......................................... 98
  Matron, Bondservant, and Creator: The Dean of Women In Loco Parentis .......... 105

Chapter Four: The Outsider of Education in the Progressive Age: Housing
  Women at the University of Kentucky ................................................................. 124
  A Fiscal Need, A Promise Kept, A Dream Delayed: Admitted but Neglected Women ................................................................. 133
  The New Dormitory for Women – A Distanced Home Away from Home ........ 143
  Growth and Change in and Beyond Dormitories .............................................. 150

Postscript: The Ongoing Effects of Housing and a Call for Further Research
  Considerations ...................................................................................................... 158
  Considerations for Historical and Social Studies Related to Student Housing .............................................................................. 159
  Consideration for How this Research May Influence More Current Studies .............................................................................. 163

References .................................................................................................................... 170

Vita ............................................................................................................................... 176
LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Growth of Accredited Schools.................................................................51
Table 4.1: Locations where women lived with KSC men or students from other colleges ..................................................................................................................................140
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1: Enrollment divided by reported gender, 1880 -1904 ......................147
Figure 4.2: Women students enrolled versus available dormitory space.........148
Chapter One

Campus as Home: An Introduction and Literature Review

The collegiate way is the notion that a curriculum, a library, a faculty, and students are not enough to make a college. It is an adherence to the residential scheme of things. It is respectful of quiet rural settings, dependent on dormitories, committed to dining halls, permeated by paternalism. (Rudolph, 1965, p. 87)

Rudolph, in his classic *American College and University, a History*, argues the importance of the dormitories as fundamental to the successful college in an ideal situation, yet despite this “dependence” on dormitories, historically most universities have failed to provide sufficient housing for students, leaving the actuality distant from Rudolph's ideal. Indeed, John Bowman, the first regent of the future University of Kentucky, spoke passionately about the need to have an accessible education but never talked about where students would live as they obtained it.

“I want to build up a people’s institution, a great free University, eventually open to the poorest boy in the land, who may come and receive an education practical and suitable for any business or profession in life. I want to cheapen the whole matter of education, so that, under the broad expansive influences of our Republican institutions, and our advancing civilizations, it may run free, as our great rivers, and bless the coming millions.” – John Bowman, 1865 (Irvin, 1965, p. 12)

With grand words and ideas, John Bowman founded an educational institution and served as regent of the early agriculture and mechanical college that would become the University of Kentucky. While his goals seemed sincere and laudable, his work to make education more accessible, to create a “people's institution,” was a troubled endeavor. Despite wanting to serve the “poorest boy in the land,” there was no mention of how the boy himself would live – the basics of his living status did not appear in any of Bowman's
speeches, nor did, of course, the concept that the student might not be a boy. This oversight is not to slight Bowman, but rather to begin to illustrate a point. Throughout the history of higher education, there have been few studies of student living quarters, yet for any campus that desired to be residential; dormitories were one of the first things constructed. Even for the future University of Kentucky, when it moved to its current location, initial construction was of three structures – the Administration (or Main) Building, the dormitory, and President Patterson's house. How did this status come to be – the necessity of such an endeavor paired readily with a lack of concern for such once construction finished?

Several sources are informative on the history of higher education, but often housing is considered solely a structure, not an element that engaged and affected the campus proper or had any lasting effect. As aforementioned, the dormitory was a mandatory structure, and it did perform a function for the institution as, again, the classic

_The American College and University: A History_ demonstrates:

> The first requirement of the country college was the dormitory. It was one instrument often employed by the urban college as well, and it was the one legacy which a one-time country college would hold onto long after it had been engulfed by the city. The often crude rooming arrangements, lacking in privacy or comfort, which these dormitories provided were the setting in which the collegiate way took form. For the dormitory held young men to a common experience. It took them from the bosom of a sheltering home and placed them under the same roof, where they might share the experiences which made men of boys. The dormitory made possible - so the argument went – the supervision and parental concern of the faculty for the well-being of young charges. (Rudolph, 1965, p. 96)

Rudolph continues to state that there was a belief that those in the dormitory would pick up strong traits from one another, that “revivals” could occur, “everywhere the dormitories went up – because it was the tradition, because students had to be housed, and finally
because people actually believed the dormitory rationale” (96). In this way, Rudolph gives a historian’s view about why dormitories came to be, but then the conversations primarily turn to the behavior that followed in such structures. Rudolph links the dormitory system to early campus violence, misbehavior, and immoral acts, but that is largely the extent of the conversation on the topic. He casts it as a necessity but does not frame it as an impact for good, instead paralleling it as a concern. There is little to no mention made about how student housing affected rural or metropolitan settings and its impact on student development is undeveloped outside of its essentiality.

Through a series of analyses, this dissertation will address this oversight. While doing a holistic, all-encompassing overview of how housing impacted administration, student society, and aspects of integration would be a work of volumes, by analyzing the role housing played in influencing administrative, social, and staffing policies at one institution, currents and impacts at other institutions can be indicated. By examining how a housing struggle affected the upper administration, staff development, and expansion of power at the University of Kentucky, the topic comes into the forefront of conversations where it served as a footnote previously. Through examining distinct periods and situations, student housing stands as indicative of other challenges to various educational institutions. For a better understanding of this, however, continuing a literature review is of importance as Rudolph provides a strong example of the view of housing, but further information is required to frame the varied elements of focus.

Contemporaries of Rudolph writing on the subject of residence halls would likewise struggle with determining where campus housing fit into the discussion of campus life. In attempting to posit science and reason to the rush of students following World War II and
the structures needed on campus, one author sought to determine what the American tradition of the dormitory could be said to be. Struggling with the concept, he finally resolved:

> What, then, is the American tradition? Diversity in higher education makes any generalization difficult, as well as inapplicable to particular situations. However, in the broad sense, the basic American tradition is that the residence halls perform the function of control over student living and conduct. Superimposed is the newer tradition that the hall is a place where extraclass life may find more wholesome expression. (Riker, 1956, p. 37)

Even those who would try to study the “science” of student dormitories would readily admit that the field was too ill studied. A 1932 study of what was problematic about campus housing stated: “While dormitory life has long been recognized as a necessary part of many types of educational institutions, until recently there has been little study made of organization for dormitory living and of the conditions in which school dormitories are maintained” (Lyford, 1932, p. 1). In her historical analysis, Lyford notes that examples are limited. She cites such sources as an 1894 study of students' diets in dormitories, a 1929 home economics study similarly themed, a 1915 summary of alumnae feedback from Wellesley College, a 1920 bulletin from Miami University in Ohio, and finally, reports from the Bureau of Education and the Federal Board for Vocational Education. She offers the few studies as parallel on modern student housing which she could uncover.

Gregory Blimling, the author of multiple works regarding the import and use of residence halls, admits struggling to define their history as well. In one instance, he appeals to a 1934 article by W.H. Cowley, later president of Hamilton College, in which Cowley attempts to show parallels between the middle ages and modern student housing. Blimling then quickly moves on to modern struggles in student living, easing quickly into the “early
twentieth-century American residence halls” and the like (17). There is some issue, then, in defining the full context of student living quarters and their role on campus. Deemed in many sources a necessity, once constructed, it rarely appears in a historical context or form of study that would focus on the nature and structure of the dormitory itself. While later time periods offers sociological or anthropological views of how students actually created the culture of dormitory living, such as *Coming of Age in New Jersey* (Moffatt, 1989), Blimling’s skipping ahead is not without justification – there is a sense that there is a gap in the history of student housing.

**Challenges in Defining Student Housing Options**

If the study of the history of campus dormitories and, later, residence halls, poses a serious research concern, it pales in comparison to tracking and examining other forms of student housing that were popular during the Progressive Era. While most institutions of higher learning had policies or procedures on where students could live, often mandating that students live on campus, the truth is that there were simply not enough living quarters on most campuses for students. As one study noted, not even the land grant institutions could hope to meet the needs of their students, “In a survey of 44 of the 52 land-grant institutions by the Office of Education in 1931, housing facilities existed for approximately 15 percent of the 136,000 students” (Blimling & Miltenberger, 1990, p. 23). While some students undoubtedly lived at home with family, that still left a large number of students unaccounted for regarding living quarters. One of the earliest academic mentions of the impact of this dates back to 1909:
In the foundation of the newer colleges outside of New England, the custom of building dormitories has not been constant. In fact, most state universities have declined to accept special responsibility for the domestic interests of students. These men and women have been left in no small degree to shift for themselves. Funds given by the state or by the individual have been required for the erection of libraries, laboratories, and other halls. The ordinary home has opened its door for students, glad to avail itself of the means of increasing income, and students have not been loath to accept it. (Thwing, 1909, p. 34)

In this manner, Thwing introduces the use of student boarding houses, but again, there has been very little historical research on the use of boarding houses as student living options. Wendy Gamber wrote an informative book on the topic of boarding houses, claiming they were a nineteenth century creation and were largely an American concept. Despite this work, she does not demonstrate or detail their role in student life, rather just establishing them as a standard, common living option prior to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century appeals for “home” over simply living quarters. In *The University of Kentucky: A Pictorial History*, there is a brief mention that “The boardinghouse, a nineteenth century institution, has virtually disappeared from the American scene. Students who did not live in the dorms often boarded around the area of campus as late as the 1920s…” (Cone, 1989, p. 47). The feeling tended to be that boarding houses, then, were, for the most part, an outmoded concept, yet they were something students readily utilized into the late 1920s at least, yet they remain largely unstudied in their impact on the institution.

To the residence halls *nee* dormitories and boarding houses, another student housing option mandates addition, and this one perhaps much better researched and examined. Fraternity, and later sorority, houses offered students another living option. Though initially less studied, more studies that are recent have provided interesting
examinations of the role fraternity houses had in affecting the environment of institutions. Of particular note is *The Lost Boys of Zeta Psi*, a work that applies archaeological research methods and a parallel to one of the famous theater pieces of the time, *Peter Pan*, to the structure and function of a fraternity house:

> Although generally ignored in academic research of late, Greek letter societies, or social fraternities, hold an extraordinary place in this history. In an increasingly sexually integrated campus world, fraternities became enclaves where men could, under the guidance of tradition and alumni, navigate and respond to the changing social landscape while actively creating new masculine identities. (Wilkie, 2010, p. 2)

Wilkie’s research frames the concept of the fraternity house as separate and very distinct from either the dormitory or the boarding house of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as it allowed a level of control that white males felt they had or were losing within the framework of coeducation, administrative oversight, and increasing minority populations. If men felt the need to have some sphere of power, the fraternity house created that sphere. As the power was not present in the university controlled dormitory, nor was it available through boarding houses that were typically run by women, then the response from being excluded from fraternities by men would give women an opportunity to frame their own argument and organization based on such exclusion:

> Fraternities were about brotherhood, and women obviously could not be brothers. Further, the presence of women on campuses was seen by many men as unnecessary and offensive; to allow them admission to fraternities would be to imply approval of their place at college, something many fraternity men would not countenance. Some women reacted to this by founding women’s fraternities of their own, later called sororities at the suggestion of a Syracuse University Latin professor. The first of these was Kappa Alpha Theta at Asbury University in Indiana in 1870. Writing in 1907, Ida Shaw Martin, an early sorority woman, explained the need
for sororities, especially in coeducational colleges: “Misunderstood in the classroom, shut out from participation in the literary and debating societies organized by the men, unrecognized in the social life that crystallized around the fraternities, the few who were courageous enough to brave outspoken ridicule or veiled slur were sadly in need of the moral support that the sorority could give.” Like the “minority” fraternities, women in sororities banded together when excluded from the life of the college as it was already constituted. (Syrett, 2009, p. 173)

Thus, the rise of fraternity and sorority houses are better studied than the dormitory, the boardinghouse, or, in many cases, even the modern residence hall.

The early studies on the diverse student living structures that do exist tend to focus on the impact on academic outcomes linked to each student living status. One study, The Relation of the Housing of Students to Success in a University, included the statement: “The comparison of the housing groups on the gross measures of university success has shown that the residence hall groups of men and women were the most successful” (Walker, 1935, pp. 73-74). Joining Walker’s initial research, another similarly timed study also found that for women students, contact with the dean of women had a positive impact on retention and success. In so doing, the study found that contact with the dean of women was directly related to the student's living condition, whether it be in the residence halls, sorority house, boardinghouse, or another living arrangement (Acheson, 1932, pp. 21-32).

In these initial studies, the idea of campus student living was examined solely on what impact it could have on the academic success of students with minimal analysis done to how the enterprise of student living was supported nor how little attention was paid to any impact housing might have had on the rest of the institution.

A surge in interest in student housing would happen during the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s, largely due to the increase in veterans using the benefits of the
Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, or more commonly, the G.I. Bill. With increasing enrollments, more complicated issues with additional students having families or special needs, universities had to study dormitories and other student housing options in new and different manners, but this increased housing need did not exist in a vacuum exclusive to colleges and universities. A 1958 architectural study entitled *Apartments and Dormitories* actually found housing of all forms in increased demand and in increased quality. The report begins by stating, “Americans now own, are building, or are renting more housing of larger area and of better materials and equipment than at any time for the past 20 years” before also discussing the expansion and need for architects and construction of dormitories and their need to warrant “nearly one quarter” of the book itself:

> With the college population expanding rapidly, there is every reason to feel confident and assume that the volume of such building will increase steadily and assume unprecedented proportions in the near future. Thus, the considerable material on college housing seemed appropriate and should likewise prove valuable to the architects, builders, and campus executives who will be carrying this large volume of work forward. (V). *(Apartments and dormitories, 1958)*

This work attempted to provide the architects with an idea of student identities. It asked why they opted to be someone who “shunts aside temporarily – and sometimes forever – the accepted goods of financial return, domesticity, and gregariousness” while also being “no different from the boy who becomes a truck driver or mechanic, no different from the girl who marries or becomes a salesgirl” (176). The examination claims that older dormitories failed because they failed to be domestic, being instead “cells.” It readily discusses the need to provide places for a community but to eschew multi-purpose rooms, as those made students aware of “unclear planning” which had no place in college. The
work examines previously undiscussed considerations in planning colleges: the non-academic, questioning elements of the new, varied population, before finally asking the question, “Should a university supply dormitories?” This discussion leads to the identification of five reasons that a “good residential system” must be supplied by a college which includes facts such as the absence of housing contributing to lower academic performance, increased “divisionism” among students, and the presence of such fostered the creation of a common life among students. Thus, the residences of campus created a better focus on the benefits of college life, and the increase in incidental financial benefit by building alumni loyalty. The work then examines the various “new” forms of dormitories that needed and provides examples, including family housing at the University of Michigan and the University of Arkansas, college faculty housing at Dartmouth, women's dormitories, and dormitories with classrooms and social rooms incorporated. Throughout all elements of the review of the current and recent construction, parallels are made to the fact that previous campus housing options were vastly ill-suited to the modern college student because the early dormitory architects failed to consider “the scholar’s need for privacy, domestic scale and identification with a small environment” (176). Of course, it was not only the architectural firms seeking to examine the dormitories for construction.

Many researchers took note of this concept of where students lived and realized the growing import of studying its use to increase efficiency. Harold C. Riker, then Director of Housing at the University of Florida seems, in retrospect, to have become somewhat of an authority on the rise of demand for student housing and the related impact. In 1956, he authored a work entitled Planning Functional College Housing, which attempted to build in more modern elements to student housing, trying to not only maximize space, but also
to consider elements beyond design such as the institution’s educational philosophy and elements such as social psychology, psychology, and the like. In reviewing these elements in the study, Riker would emphasize realizing the social aspects, as well as the physical environment, was essential for three reasons:

The development of an effective campus environment for student growth is an objective of the college, and the hall can contribute materially to this environment; the particular environment of the hall is one excellent means for providing worth-while learning experiences and this environment is capable of influencing for better or worse the growth of students and their reaction to not only other college experiences but also to those of later life. (Riker, 1956, p. 61)

To this end, then, Riker says that involved planners can be more successful if they discuss what elements make a residence hall different from apartments and thus to consider the long-term effects on the students (62). Riker then posits how different institutions will view and construct housing if it is an “auxiliary enterprise” and therefore a business activity, a “social-recreational center” to develop the “extraclass” life of students, or a full “educational community” that is more “theoretical than real” (62-63). Whatever the case, Riker says that community will be an essential element of the success of the endeavor as there was admittedly “limited experimental evidence” from the study of housing yet what did exist said that group formation and belonging was affected by proximity and the very structure of the living arrangement:

Within a women’s hall at Indiana University, for example, it was found that proximity facilitated friendship development and that friendships tended to form along the same floor of the hall rather than between floors. It seems entirely possible that the frequency of involuntary personal contacts is a factor in the probability of friendship and group information. Hence, the arrangement of interior building space and the
resulting traffic patterns assume a significant importance for planners and for student residents. (68)

Riker’s early application of studies such as this is informative of the lack of existing studies. As he laments the “limited” evidence, he attempts to apply, with some significant success, academic studies with a focus on sociology, psychology, and the like to the campus living quarters. Exterior to that, his discussion of construction in this work results in medical analysis – the results of poor lighting, poor color schemes, and the effects of noise on health. Thus, much of the analysis of housing performed by Riker at this point was attempting to apply exterior studies looking at social, psychological, and even biological elements to the understudied hall in the hope that those would run parallel as he had few other studies on which to rely.

In 1961, Riker returned with another publication to analyze student housing and the trends that were affecting it anew. In continuing previous concerns of inadequate housing, Riker called the book to order by noting:

The most pressing problem of college housing is that there isn’t enough. At the moment, housing is available for roughly one-fourth of a college population of just under four million. By 1970, that population will have mushroomed to more than six million. And as much as 40 per cent of it will have to be housed on campus. (Riker & Lopez, 1961, p. 6)

In this work, Riker applies less of the psychological and sociological research, but instead often points to numbers and population factors. More students would put more demand on space, leading to small group discussion and more classrooms being needed in the residence halls (7). He examines how buildings will have to grow up instead of out as land and space are at a premium (10). Perhaps most important in this work, Riker and Lopez attempt to predict the need to change the dormitory to meet new populations, issuing
information from population predictions such as “Women, for example, are becoming an ever larger minority of the campus population. By 1970, the ratio of men to women enrolled is expected to shift from 63:37 (in 1960) to 58:42, and the ratio of men to women housed from about 55:45 (in 1960) to 50:50” (17). The study goes on to examine how, traditionally, “housing units” for women have allowed more space as women “demand – and even deserve – the luxury of more space.” While much of this argument devolves to gender stereotypes of women needing room to “entertain their dates,” and so forth, the general study of housing did show women receiving more room at that time. Riker also explores the need for another subsection of the population, examining how housing needs for freshman must be changed as they need more support and thus facilities with more access to staff, indicating that housing should be altered to meet the needs of the student population and their experience or lack thereof in a collegiate setting (18). The role of the coming “foreign students” is predicted and the need to consider their housing needs concerning their “special diets” is covered briefly, as is the role that fraternity and sororities can play by aiding in housing students (18). While the work then goes on to consider graduate and family housing, it soon returns to the study of another population factor – large numbers of students in small areas as buildings were built up and not out. This construction style meant concerns mandated consideration for fire safety and newer building codes that could dictate the location and number of fire exits required. Other elements discussed were more technical; the need for lighting to be high intensity, this time not to address eyestrain, but because of research that indicated it aided structure:

For studying and other close tasks, the Illuminating Engineers Society recommends high-intensity lighting accompanied by the elimination of glare, which requires a minimum of highly polished surfaces. Excessive contrast is
also discouraged, suggesting that work surfaces be light in color. General room lighting has different requirements: intensity need not be so great, and somewhat more contrast is permissible. Even so, “hot spots” of light – bare light bulbs, reflections from mirrors, and reflected glare from polished or high gloss paint – are likely to be especially disturbing in students’ rooms and should be avoided. (57).

As this indicates, Riker’s second examination of student housing is no more an analysis of what the enterprise did or could do for a campus, but rather becomes even more about who and what must go into student housing. It is largely devoid of even the social and psychological analysis of the earlier work, perhaps due to the realization many campuses developed that housing was about maximizing space and that development would have to adjust to the standardized space, a theory easily borne out by examining the campus buildings of this period.

In general, as these examples show, there has not been a thorough examination of the impact housing had on a college campus. Many examples exist of works studying the history of higher education, but often these works, perhaps justifiably, focus on how the teaching of courses and to what population; administrative and political shifts; or how curriculum, town and gown relations, or other elements were shaped. Few studies exist on how housing, with its changes in population, import, expense, and so forth, formed the campus by its own right. While navigating areas where there is admittedly limited information, the goal of this work shall be to provide, across three time periods, indications of when student housing actively and directly impacted the campus. Through looking at history at the University of Kentucky, one can note how housing changed the campus proper and had impact on administration, staffing, and policy development.
One more note of some merit – one challenge to conducting research on and writing about student housing is the various wording used to examine the numerous living options students had both historically and currently. Already throughout this introduction, there have been different words used to apply to the residence halls such as the dormitory, student quarters, and so forth. It would be beneficial if the name changes were simply a function of time solely in that the old idea of a college gave way to a dormitory, which eventually was a residence hall, but unfortunately, the name does not follow such a linear or temporal approach. Indeed, the term dormitory itself elicited concern in some sections even when it began to be the common term as this article from 1909 explains its origin and current use:

The word “dormitory,” in its present meaning, is a new word in academic language; in its present meaning, it stands for a building used by a college for housing students. Mullinger, the historian of Cambridge, uses the word in contrast with “study” in speaking of a student of his university of about the year 1550. The present meaning was formerly taken by the word “hostel,” or “college” or “hall.” The hostel of the English universities of three hundred years ago was a lodging house under the charge of a principal, where students resided at their own cost. This word never transferred to America, but it has been transferred to India, Japan and China, and there is in quite as good usage as the blessed institution itself. The word “college” as applied to a building, has been the favorite word in American academic usage. Williams College began in a building long known as West College. The brick row at Yale of eight buildings was composed of colleges, though “hall” was the term applied in the earlier time to the first. “Hall” is still used, and to it have been added “house” or “cottage” or “halls of residence,” especially as applied to women’s colleges. “Dormitory has, within fifty years, come into good use. It can hardly be called a fitting word except for those who wish, in their earnestness or wit, to represent the college life as torpid. (Thwing, 1909, p. 34)

In that lengthy excerpt, it is apparent that the phrasing applied to student housing on campus has and continues to shift through many names. The terms do not consistently denote size,
feature, or other such elements. By the latter 1910s, the term “residence halls” came into function more often, appearing as but one example in a 1917 speech by Edmund J. James, yet the term dormitory has never fallen completely out of use. The term “dorm” continues despite many student affairs professionals frowning upon its use as it implies learning does not occur within such facilities because it owes too much to the Latin dormire, “to sleep,” and thus discounted the academic value of campus living. Residence halls and their varied names are mirrored in the concerns of what one should call student boarding houses. In the analysis provided in *The Boardinghouse in Nineteenth Century America*, there is an informative excerpt about how flexible the language was to be in describing these institutions:

To be sure, there was considerable overlap between these various sorts of institutions. The same building might be described as a small hotel by one observer, as a large boardinghouse by another. Some landladies accommodated both boarders and lodgers. Conversely, the proprietors of otherwise private boardinghouses welcomed “day boarders” who slept elsewhere. And, as we shall see, boarders and boardinghouse keepers drew infinite flexible distinctions between public and private establishments, between taking in boarders and running a boardinghouse, between living in a boardinghouse and boarding with a private family. (Gamber, 2007, p. 8)

Language to describe rooming options was flexible and proprietors of boarding houses, normally women, would often use various names to make their establishment sound more suitable or of higher quality. Indeed, in just the April 1, 1900 edition of the Lexington Leader, institutions which promised room and board were billed in the following ways across eight separate advertisements: “Boardinghouse”, “first class accommodations with board”, “furnished rooming house with board”, and “Room furnished with or without board with private family”. Gamber also illustrates that the language became more fluid as other
terms, such as lodging house, entered into lexicons and could or could not mean the same thing as a boarding house or a variation thereof: “It was, as its name implied, properly termed a lodging house. It was not even a boardinghouse, for it offered one, not three meals, a day…” (159). Other “lodging houses” actually did function like boarding houses though and chose that term believing it sounded better than a boarding house to whatever clientele the proprietors hoped to attract. Rooming, in theory, meant no board, though some listings of “rooming houses” mention meals as a benefit of their locale. The entire process was flexible and complicated. To live in a boarding house could be the same as a lodging house or rooming with a private family depending on how the proprietor set it up. Some boarding houses catered to working classes, varied populations, or other elements and did not serve three meals a day either or did other things which varied how one could interpret their title as cataloged in works such as *The Physiology of New York Boarding-Houses* (Gunn, 1857). In trying to define the differences in women in boarding houses, Mary Bidwell Breed wrote in 1909 that there developed too many variables in boarding houses:

As long as the women were few, they could easily be cared for by the families closely in touch with the University; and in these sheltered homes, women students dwelt through the Arcadian era of co-education. But after a time, though there remained happily, a few of the older homes for girls (as for instance at Missouri), there grew up, in response to the demand of the rapidly increasing numbers of women, the boarding-house, or rooming-house. The old order changed when first some thrift matron built a few extra rooms in her new house so that she could earn a little pin money by “taking girls” as lodgers. All things became new when first some widow with four children to educate, moved to the seat of the University, rented a large house, and “took girls” to board and lodge, so as to make her expenses. (Breed, 1909, p. 60)
Given these factors, the terminology used in this work shall match with the sources as appropriate or shall use the terminology most found in that period for the subject for both residence halls and, when elements do not allow for differentiation, boarding houses. As will be demonstrated, much of language was flexible and catered to clientele or perceived marketing trends.

Further, in discussing issues of sex and gender, student housing at the studied times existed in the male/female dyad. While undoubtedly there were gender differences that existed outside of this dyad, the institution focused solely on what sex one was designated at birth as a focus of these conversations. The third section focuses on how women served as the “other” and how that role, in part, allowed them to become a force of impact, but it is limited by the fact that all designation of gender or sexuality in records available at the time is based on the university record, which viewed students as either male or female. While there would be a great benefit in recording the history of students who lived outside the socially standard view of the gender binary at the time, there is, unfortunately, little cogent data that may be obtained to support the study at this time.

Given the previous statements, it becomes apparent that the impact of housing remains understudied when one considers that the data that does exist focuses more on how students were affected by housing or how campus growth affected approaches to housing. Student housing stands as an essential element of campus life, linked to both the actual implementation as well as the college ideal in most cases. With such a sense of essentiality, it stands understudied for its impact on the college campus, but through examining the housing trends at the University of Kentucky, one can more readily see that student housing
had a direct impact on many elements of the college campus during the period of the Progressive Era and immediately thereafter.
Chapter Two
The Impact of Housing in an Administrative Transition

The idea of housing changing an institution of higher learning's administration may seem of minimal correlation at first, but housing was one of the key topics in a series of testimonies that would shake the University of Kentucky and lead to the alteration of the institution in 1917. Indeed, transitions were happening around the country and, while there were elements unique to the changes in Kentucky, there are other factors to consider. First, it will be informative to consider the state of Kentucky politics in connection to its land grant institution's transition, as this serves as a series of transitions in its own right. Second, many colleges and universities around the country were finding that their status and very nature had to change as the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth century, and many southern institutions faced similar concerns. Third, in correlation or sometimes even in opposition to the changes other southern institutions were experiencing, the very idea of the structures required for academic institutions was changing to mirror the efficiency of the American industries of the time. Effectively, the stabilized politics and previous rural or agrarian focus of many southern states were changing, causing a more divided system at southern institutions once found to serve agricultural and mechanical agendas.

It is important to note that Kentucky felt itself comparable predominantly to southern schools, as indicated by how it advertised its structures in the University Bulletin, stating in the 1904-1905 edition and for several editions after that, “Probably no educational institution in the South affords a more attractive home…” (Bulletin of the State College of Kentucky, p. i). Some attention, then, should be made to the transitions, growth, and changes happening to higher education in the region and the nation as various pressures honed in on the American educational system. Having established these framework pieces,
one can more easily examine the role that student housing had in the first primary administrative transition of the University of Kentucky.

**Land Grant Leadership: Understanding the State Politics of Kentucky 1900-1920**

The University of Kentucky in 1917 also had to contend with the political climate of the state and the stabilization of it that had begun in the early 1900s, which is informative of many elements of what would follow for the flagship state institution. As much of what will be used to show the role student housing played in the transition of the college administration originates in a governor-requested inquiry into the management of the university, it is vital to consider the political landscape of the state leading up to such an issue. Kentucky politics and government, historically, influenced the institution as the governor had a controlling interest in the Board of Trustees. It is of some note that, in 1900, the much-contested democratic governor of Kentucky was assassinated, having served only three days in office. William Goebel was a man who highlighted the rift between Democrats and Republicans through the state and his assassination almost plunged the state into civil war. In his rise to political power, he was not known as an orator, but was partially successful due to “his knowledge of developments in other states” and his ability to distance himself from the dishonesty and distrust of politicians that was engendered when the well-liked state treasurer disappeared with a large amount of public funds (Klotter, 1977, p. 24). Goebel was a complicated character, having killed a man with whom he had a political difference in the street, but he also stood as a reformer for the working poor and women. Some of his reform measures centered on his work to aid education. He sought to make textbooks more affordable by ending a monopoly on access while also working to allow women to have more access to control over education – “One of his proposals sought
to make women eligible for the office of school trustee, for membership on the Board of Education, and for voting for these offices” (Klotter, 1977, p. 43). His assassination changed the tone of state politics and, in some manner, slowed progress. The scandal of the state treasurer absconding with state funds had already damaged politicians in Kentucky, and Goebel’s assassination further caused issues as tempers and threats flared up throughout the state. Passage of time would not easily alter the feeling of many in the state about dishonest politicians and political parties.

Goebel’s assassination and the fleeing of his political rival, who had also been sworn into office, left 31 year old J.C.W. Beckham to transition from Lieutenant Governor to Governor. Beckham realized that the state was in disarray and wisely assumed office under an air of quiet:

His more liberal suggestions, which caused no ferment in the legislature or business community, included the development of additional roads, more concerns with charitable and penal institutions, and improvement of the quality of education. (Lowell Hayes Harrison, 2004, p. 138)

Beckham sought to use education in a way his murdered predecessor had used the railroads; to stir popular opinion and draw himself in a separate light from rivals as “he supported the establishment of Eastern State Normal School at Richmond and Western Kentucky Normal School in Bowling Green in 1906” (Lowell Hayes Harrison, 2004, p. 139). It is, perhaps, because of his focus on education that Beckham was able to ease the contention between Democrats and Republicans within the state and more readily facilitate the progression of the state, as it would have been difficult to assail someone who sought to better the state’s youth and educators.
If Beckham had found success through education, the next governor would find little success in following suit. Augustus Everett Willson was a Republican governor, the first elected following Goebel's assassination. Indeed, during the campaign, Hager, his political opponent, “often resorted to waving what had become the bloody shirt of Kentucky politics, the assassination of William Goebel” (Lowell Hayes Harrison, 2004, p. 142). Perhaps due to the work of Beckham, this did not sway enough voters on the evils of the Republican Party, and Willson won office. However, he met a Democratic majority and found most of his efforts stopped, including, oddly enough, one that Goebel himself had championed, school suffrage for women. One contribution he made, relevant to later discussion, is that he championed the appointment of Judge Henry Stites Barker as the President of the State College when it transitioned from its first president, President James K. Patterson. Outside of this, Wilson faced partisan politics, negative national press, and indifference in voters that are all credited with the lack of progress during his term. His successor would be the one to shape the administration of the University of Kentucky.

Democrat Augustus Owsley Stanley was elected, finding some success; “…the governor rejoiced at the passage of virtually all of his program, which included a corrupt practices act, an antitrust law, a workman’s compensation measure, and a convict labor bill” (Lowell Hayes Harrison, 2004, p. 147). Moreover, Governor Stanley also managed to do something else which proved a boon to education in the state of Kentucky:

In a special session, the solons created a State Tax Commission, set up for the first budget, and modernized the revenue system, shifting the burden from property taxes to other forms of taxation. Given more funds, the legislature then appropriated needed fiscal support for education and government. (Lowell Hayes Harrison & Klotter, 1997, p. 286)
Stanley’s interest in funding education might have been a natural extension of his own experiences – he had served as a teacher in various Kentucky locations before he began working in law in Flemingsburg and was admitted to the bar in 1894. Whatever the cause of his interest in funding education, it would be Governor Stanley who would appoint the committee that would conduct the investigation that would end with Barker’s departure.

While it may seem of little consequence to know the political interactions in play, it is important to consider the political and social climates of the time to understand the back and forth that would play out at the University of Kentucky and the testimonies related to that institution. A Republican had backed Barker's ascent into office, and the earlier issues would still have been well remembered. In many ways, Kentucky was still viewed as a violent state, and its institutions likewise bore that mark, from the unsolved assassination in 1900 of the governor to other times when the state and its agencies were involved in controversial means. Within families, politics, and communities, Kentucky's government and their agencies seemed readily tied to a tradition of violence and revenge. Often, political careers were formed in encounters and connections through family or profession, but so were plots, murders, and attempts to wrest control away from certain entities. A political slight could quickly cause issues, often not immediate, for multiple parties. It is within this framework that the political history is informative on how the the University of Kentucky campus and housing would be used within political maneuvering and to the benefit of elements within the state.

In 1916, the Board of Trustees at the University of Kentucky authorized Governor Stanley to appoint a committee to investigate elements at the University of Kentucky. President Barker had submitted a proposal to combine the three schools of engineering and
had raised the ire of some of the faculty, particularly Dean Rowe of Civil Engineering. Under such issue, the Board of Trustees enlisted the Governor, an ex officio Chairman of the Board, to select people to serve on the committee. While the committee had been assembled to consider the engineering programs issue, it soon was also tasked with investigating “other conditions causing or tending to produce discontent“ (Ramage, 1968, p. 210). Within this framework, there was some indication that the political elements and battles between parties above quickly intruded into the framework:

One close observer believed that Stanley engineered Barker’s removal in retaliation for a Kentucky Court of Appeals decision which the latter had written after the November, 1905, Louisville election, nullifying a democratic victory. (Ramage, 1968, p. 210)

Such political dealings would not have been too hard to imagine, as one of Barker’s earliest supporters was the aforementioned Republican Governor Willson (Ellis, 2011, p. 241). Moreover, the issue of the merging of the engineering colleges had been discussed previously in 1911, though the Board of Trustees had vetoed it at that time, so why did the proposal cause such further ire? Adding to the political speculation of this time, Governor Stanley was considered a progressive and “was one of McVey's most crucial allies,” lending some credence to the political motivations of removing Willson’s chosen president from the state institution (Moyen, 2011, p. 98). Further indications of political concern can be found in Ramage’s allusion to a 1950 article in the Courier-Journal in which Stanley claimed that he “had brought about a reorganization of the University of Kentucky by obtaining the resignation of President Barker” (210). The governors from 1900 until this time had influenced or attempted to impact state education in various ways, but there was always elements of the political in their educational maneuverings, causing one political
revolution of sorts as his own institution effectively put President Barker on trial. In a state where the political battleground was along party lines and there was a history of government in violence and violence in government, the University of Kentucky could be seen as just another battleground.

**A Region of Change: Southern Schools in Transition**

If the state politics were one issue that impacted the University of Kentucky, its place among other institutions was another of note. Patterson's long term as president had left the institution perhaps on solid enough ground, but it had not been one of innovation. A quick review of just a few other states and some changes that were occurring within the context of those institutions should be sufficient to highlight trends in higher education as the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth century. However, simply looking at education within the framework of other states would be an oversight, as the period between 1910 and 1917 would see not only the aforementioned political changes in the state of Kentucky but also an educational landscape that began to change with the increase in state-supported institutions. Review of this growth shall also help shape the discussion of how matters came to be in 1917 at the University of Kentucky.

Other institutions easing into the early period of the twentieth century were going through transitions, some of which were eerily similar to what the future University of Kentucky would face. Indeed, it could be said that the early twentieth century was when the campus ideal was reconfigured and administrators started seeking the concept of a more modern campus. This rebirth could have an ownership located in the south. To the south of Kentucky, the campus that would become the University of Tennessee was facing a similar transition:
As the new century began, [President] Dabney issued a call for new buildings to replace those antedating the Civil War. “The original buildings, constructed when the board has very little money, were of a very plain and simple character and are now rapidly approaching that condition in which repairing is expensive and, indeed, almost impossible,” the president declared. Especially needed, Dabney said, were a new central academic building and more dormitories. (O'Steen, 1980)

While Dabney's concern focused on the money required for repairs, it also mentions that the structures were constructed when there was not much money to build, leaving them “simple” – the buildings did not fit into the visuals needed of the modern college. Similar to what would happen in Kentucky, it would be another president, Brown Ayres, who would finish the attempt to modernize the campus.

Arkansas saw modernization as well but under controversy. Fearing the loss of youth to cities, “the Farmers' Union overcame opposition and controversy between 1906 and 1909 to push a bill [that] created a state agricultural school in each of four districts” (Silva, 2009, p. 442). The largely agrarian area wanted to professionalize agriculture, as a way of ensuring both men and women would stay in the area. Students need not be part of the large percentage of people relocating to cities and the north, thus “Contracts were let in June 1910 for the construction of two men's dormitories, two women's dormitories, a dining hall, and a heating plant” (Silva, 2009, p. 443). It is interesting to note that both the men's and women's dormitories were built to accommodate the same number of students, uncommon for a period when facilities for women were often significantly less available than those for men. Still, for Arkansas's agrarian focus, it would be vital that institutions exist in a way that seemed local. In this way, local plans of education were formatted to
meet the needs of the state populace, even those who were not located near the original land grant institution within the state of Arkansas.

Likewise, 1907 would see a change to another southern institution of higher learning. The state legislature of Alabama had passed an “act to Provide for the Better Equipment and Support of the University of Alabama, and to Appropriate Funds therefore,” but the funds arrived with a few caveats; “Not only did it provide funds, but it also specified and ranked the first four buildings to be erected” (Mellown, 2013, p. 19). As Mellown recounts, the alumni actively hoped some funds would be allowed for a gymnasium, but the legislature ranked buildings for natural sciences, engineering, general academics, and finally a female dormitory. The legislature agreed with the president, who was seeking to de-emphasize athletics at the institution. Still, for some schools, this was a time of increased state involvement in the structuring of campus. If the role of extracurricular activities, housing, and the structure of priorities were any indicator, Alabama was facing struggles that would be familiar to Kentucky within less than a decade.

Within the state of Kentucky, transitions were also happening at an increased speed. As the twentieth century began, Kentucky as a state lagged behind in education, and one area to blame became apparent, “At the turn of the twentieth century, when Teachers College of Columbia University had become the premier trainer of teachers in America, only two states, Kentucky and Arkansas, did not have publically financed normal schools” (Ellis, 2005, p. 22). The State College, the future University of Kentucky, had established a Normal Department to train future teachers for public schools. President Patterson was known to clash frequently with Dr. Ruric Nevel Roark, the director of the Normal, with Ellis citing that the issue could have been due to Patterson’s description as “‘Elderly, aloof,
and somewhat cantankerous’ by one historian” but also noting “a distinct generation rift” between the two men (23). The clash at the time would set the stage for future arguments between the two men. Whatever the reason for the initial disagreement, the Normal Department was not viewed in high regard and remained little considered. Logically, with such a gap in the state’s educational access, by 1906, there was a move to provide more normal training within the state:

In 1906, the Kentucky General Assembly established two normal schools for the state of Kentucky, one in the Eastern district and the other in the Western district, for the purpose of training teachers for the classroom, especially in the isolated rural areas of the state. The legislation, passed as the Normal School Bill (HB 112), also provided for the establishment of model training schools. A special commission decided to locate the schools in Bowling Green for the Western district and Richmond for the Eastern district. (Couture, Whalen, & Hill, 2006, p. 7)

The growth of the endeavor in Richmond would be notable as Dr. Roark resigned in 1905 from the Normal Department of State College and aided in campaigning for the state-supported normal schools, eventually being named the president of the Richmond campus. During the 1907 academic year, the new institution had enrollments of 214 male students and 536 female students (Report of the Commissioner of Education 1102). The institution had continued growth throughout the 1910s through increased appropriations in funding and expanding the campus border. The endeavor also saw success on the western side of the state as Herman Lee Donovan, a nineteen-year-old who had been teaching previously, sought to gain a credential in such and ended up being the first student formally enrolled in the western normal school:

On a January morning in 1907, Dean Kinnaman was experimenting with the new registration cards when he saw Donovan outside the door. He called Donovan in, registered
him as a test case, then noted across the face of the card that
H.L. Donovan was the first student enrolled in the Normal
School. (Lowell H. Harrison, 1987, p. 19)

Similar to their eastern counterpart, the western normal school boasted an enrollment above
seven hundred students in its first year. To put that into perspective, the total enrollment at
the state institution was 477, though it is notable that these numbers did not include any
form of summer sessions (Gillis, 1956, p. 20). Gillis’ information also denotes that, at the
height of the State College’s Normal Department, enrollment was never higher than thirty-
two men in 1900-01 and twelve women in 1894-95, and total enrollment in the department
had not exceeded twenty students total since the 1902-03 academic year. The rapid
enrollment and the increase in women in programs must have come as a shock to many
and caused no small amount of ill will between institutions that were now vying for both
students and legislative funds.

If Patterson and Roark disagreed over the role of the Normal Department at the
State College, then the ire between the two only increased as Eastern Kentucky State
Normal School began to flourish. By the time it seemed that the normal schools might
influence enrollment at the State College, the situation had become a feud:

After the passage of the normal school law, Patterson referred to his “old nemesis Roark” in very
uncomplimentary terms. “Instead of a loss,” the crusty
president told a correspondent, “we have gotten rid of an
incubus” who retarded the growth of the State College
normal department. (Ellis, 2005, p. 24)

Ellis also details the returned ire of Roark who actually believed that he was not empowered
to engage the normal department as needed and believed that his new institution could and
would, indeed, challenge the State College for student enrollment. He would share this
opinion with others, including Thomas Crittenden Cherry, the first president of the Western
Kentucky State Normal School in Bowling Green:

To Cherry he warned: “I am still very distrustful of our friends in Lexington …. By so much that they get, by that much we lose.” A short while later Roark had not changed his mind. “I am certain that President Patterson and all under his control will seize and use any advantage they may get, no matter how slight, to block the State Normal schools now or at any other time.” (Ellis, 2005, pp. 24-25)

According to Ellis, though no quotes are available, Cherry did join Roark in suspecting Patterson’s involvement in at least one occasion, “When Governor Augustus O. Willson, a Republican, slowed the rate of funds flowing to the normal, both Roark and Cherry suspected the ominous hand of Patterson in it all” (27). By 1910, the situation had changed – Patterson was transitioning the State College over to Henry Stites Barker, Roark had died in 1909, with his wife became the extremely affective acting president, and only Cherry remained of the “original” presidents. Again, Ellis is informative, providing evidence indicating that, if Roark and Cherry had entrusted each other to better address concerns from Patterson, the eventual next president of Eastern State Normal School, John Grant Crabbe, would find the situation different; “Crabbe’s effort to raise Eastern to [a four-year teachers college] would be tested by a stingy legislature and competition with State University and Western where wily President Cherry proved to be a crafty rival” (29).

Thus, by the beginning of 1911, it readily appeared the three institutions were staking claims to different things and had slipped into a solid standing as rivals in many ways, and seemed only to be confederates when the general theme of education and the state funding for such was challenged.
These few examples are indicative of several trends that were ongoing and paralleled the issues of the intersection of the housing of students and administrative concerns of the University of Kentucky through indicating shifts in focus, climate, and need. Discussion of women student housing, the power of alumni opinions, the need to modernize a campus, and the idea of increasing access to normal schools to serve the needs of an area ran through several of the stories of higher education institutions between 1900 and 1917. These small-scale challenges amplified over time, creating fractures in the thought that the University of Kentucky could still be seen as modern, thus driving demands that the institution improve. Though the University of Kentucky was not dramatically different, it seemingly arrived late to the concept of change in many ways. The challenge it had was that it had, for better and worse, two existing presidents who were engaged in administering the state’s land grant college in two different manners while a long history of state politics played out around them.

The State College did not exist in a vacuum. As a state institution, there was a dependency on politics for stability. Other state institutions’ growth and push for modernization, as well as the need to establish regional schools mirrored the drive for Kentucky institutions to create schools, such as the normal schools, to meet the needs of the state. With the growth of the normal schools, there was a need to understand the changing role of the State College of Kentucky. Further, the very concept of college, including Patterson's strict disciplinarian ways, were changing across the country. Indicative of this are other institutions even prior to the birth of Kentucky's land grant institution, “A more relaxed view had been developing, however, and before the nineteenth century was half over, many of the leading institutions had abandoned the strict discipline
and the extended code of laws which had characterized so many of the colleges” (Rudolph, 1962, pp. 106-107). The more relaxed methodology and student focus would then be Barker’s calling card compared to Patterson’s despotism. With the early twentieth century seeing two normal schools join the competition for students and the history between Patterson and President Roark of Eastern State Normal School and President Barker and Governor Stanley, the understanding of the aforementioned changes will aid in understanding the role housing would play in the administrative transition to come.

The Business of the College: Efficiency and the Call to Order on Campus

If politics impacted education in the state, so did new elements of industry and business. Education must reflect and reproduce the culture of the society in which it exists. In considering the American educational system, one study maps public schools as serving the purposes of assimilation between 1900 to 1920, denoting that, during this time of increased immigration, the schools had to be sure to “Americanize” students. The American economy would need education to instill “higher levels of literacy and numeracy and the habits of punctuality, teamwork, and accommodation to institutional structures, each of which was considered a ‘virtue.’” (Graham, 2005, pp. 13-14). While Graham structures this argument within the framework of addressing immigrants, it becomes apparent that those were also skills well set to transfer to the workplace and to support the American industry. Moreover, the argument that the idea of efficiency was not only being taught by schools but that the idea of business efficiency was being forced upon schools is also documented. In the period leading up to the testimonies regarding the administration at the University of Kentucky and its effectiveness, many elements of business impacted Barker’s administration that would have been less discussed in Patterson’s. In the study
Education and the Cult of Efficiency, the indication that this idea of business practices impacting schools was not only an issue in K-12 education but also in higher education is plainly stated and supported by articles of the time:

The commercial-industrial influence was, of course, not limited to the elementary and secondary school but was felt in high education as well. Business pressure upon these institutions from 1900 to 1910 was, in fact, greater than it was on the lower schools, although it appears that the higher institutions were better able to defend themselves and that the business influence on higher education was not as great. Even so, the Atlantic Monthly stated in 1910, “our universities are beginning to be run as business colleges. They advertise, they compete with one another, they pretend to give good value to their customers. They desire to increase their trade, they offer social advantages and business openings to their patrons.” (Callahan, 1962, p. 7)

Callahan's comments mirrored the competition that Roark and Patterson seemed to suspect of one another. In 1910 the National Society of College Teachers of Education devoted their conference to the “problem of university work in administration” (Callahan 190). Tellingly, the presenter, Frank Spaulding, “was not on a university faculty and had neither given nor taken a course in educational administration,” yet was invited to give a speech which included these lines:

The administration of public education is grossly inefficient; it is the weakest phase of our educational enterprise. In its present state, school administration is not the live product of clear, far-sighted vision, and keen insight; it is the sluggish resultant of tradition, habit, routine, prejudice, inertia, slightly modified by occasional and local outbursts of spasmodic, semi-intelligent, progressive activity. … In school administration, there is little thinking and leading, but much feeling and following, with faces turned more toward the rear than to the front. (Callahan, 190).

This presented the idea that schools and their administrations were starkly inefficient compared to the American economy and industrial works of the time, which praised
efficiency, fast movement, action, and innovation. Later in the speech, he would state that education and the administration thereof would be substantially served by “the simple, business principle of efficiency” (192). If the growing industries of America were seen as the future of the country, then, he argued, should not the educational system function in the same manner?

1910 also saw the rise of Frederick W. Taylor, the seeming father of efficiency. As introduced in his study, Callahan states that Taylor entered into the discourse at a critical time for education, stating:

The dominance of businessmen and the acceptance of business values (especially the concern for efficiency and economy); the creation of a critical, cost-conscious, reform-minded public, led by profit-seeking journals; the alleged mismanagement of all American institutions; the increased cost of living: all these factors created a situation of readiness – readiness for the great preacher of the gospel of efficiency, Frederick W. Taylor, and his disciples. (18)

Scientific management became known as the Taylor Method, and Taylor and his associates, for their part, “claimed that his principles could be applied to all institutions” (Callahan, 24). While there was much enthusiasm for the work and the concept of the process, it was not without some detractors, with Taylor himself eventually saying the concept had become “very much overdone” (Callahan, 24). Some academics, such as A.G. Webster of the Physics department of Clark University readily decried how the idea of scientific management had seemingly stopped being rooted in science and had been made too broad by people who did not understand it, leading him to write a letter to the Nation:

“I am tired of scientific management, so called. I have heard of it from scientific managers, from university presidents, from casual acquaintances in railway trains; I have read of it in the daily papers, the weekly papers, the ten-cent magazines, the thirty-five-cents magazines, and in the
Outlook. Only have I missed its treatments by Theodore Roosevelt; but that is probably because I cannot keep up with his writings. For fifteen years I have been a subscriber to a magazine dealing with engineering matters, feeling it incumbent upon me to keep in touch with the applications of physics to the convenience of life, but the touch has become a pressure, the pressure a crushing strain, until the mass of articles on shop practice and scientific management threatened to crush all thought out of my brain, and I stopped my subscription.” (quoted in Callahan, 24).

Still, if academic critique was meant to derail its progress, it would have little impact as it not only began to affect all organizations in America but became globally of interest:

Within two years after its publication by Harper and Brothers in 1911, his Principles of Scientific Management has been translated into French, German, Dutch, Swedish, Russian, Lettish, Italian, Spanish, and Japanese. As a few years later it was translated into Chinese. The Taylor system was introduced into French war plants during 1918 by order of Georges Clemenceau. In France, also an endowed foundation was established to promote the investigation of scientific management and the Taylor system through courses in higher technical schools, through public lectures, and through sending young French engineers to America to study the system in operation. In Austria, a periodical devoted to the Taylor system, the Taylor Zeitschrift, was established. In the Soviet Union, Lenin, in an article published in Izvestia in April of 1918, urged the system upon the Russians. (Callahan, 23-4).

Its global spread matched with Taylor's belief and Webster's rebuke that even university presidents discussed it. There was a sincere belief that there was a correct and meaningful way to manage any structured organization, including a university.

By 1911, the idea of standardization in practice, of a hierarchy, and of a rigid structure had gripped the nation. The idea of “scientific management” and “efficiency” was posited as a natural way to organize and effectively administer not only a business, but a family, a church, an institution of education, or seemingly any other endeavor worth
pursuing. One of the harshest indictments of the way business practices were entrenching upon education would naturally be found in a Marxist examination of this time. Regardless of political stance, it does present a historical analysis of what was occurring and describes how business organizations were the approved structure for other entities to be considered a success in a capitalistic society:

Public education has been radically altered by the historical development of capitalism. Its development in the United States has been structured by needs emanating from the economic organization, with changes in the latter reverberating to affect and shape the schooling enterprise. When capitalism in the United States continued its evolution and began to break up an agrarian-commercial economy and to create the era of industrial capitalism, and then monopoly capitalism, the internal structure of society also underwent substantial changes. At the roots of this revolution were changes in the methods of production. The economic base of society moved from one of small independent manufacturers, from a commercial trading society based largely on independent farming enterprises to a society organized upon highly mechanized monopolistic mass production necessitating a huge urban proletariat. The change from a rural, primarily agrarian society to an urban-industrial capitalist society can be truly described as radical. Culture, family structure, distribution of property, class divisions, demographic distribution, and system of education underwent profound alterations. (Gonzalez, 1982, pp. 53-54)

Though Gonzalez writes to describe how the economic factors lead to organizational changes that established the progressive movement and to interpret them through a Marxist view, these statements are well suited to demonstrate the rise of Callahan’s interpretation of education being impacted by the “Cult of Efficiency.” The establishment of various educational endeavors, the rise of the study of organizations, and the changes in structures left education in a unique and vulnerable position – it was a public good, granting everyone a sense of ownership, yet it was also large, expansive, and far reaching in that it required
multiple backgrounds and areas of expertise. The belief that one system could universally manage it was a challenge, but it was something many people wanted to believe, that if a business could be run and that America itself was a business in form, then surely the universities, colleges, and schools of the country could be treated as such. Further, if at least one purpose of schooling, especially in the fields of engineering and the like, was also going to benefit industry, education should be structured as if it were an industry.

Into this realm of structure and scientific organization across the country, the administration of the University of Kentucky would find itself in a time of change. President Barker had attempted to engage his students as clients and empower individual offices to make their own decisions. While this showed elements of trust and professionalism, it was problematic to code such activities within the idea of structure. As the testimonies began, one of the things the 1917 committee would surely note was that the institution had redundancies and inconsistencies. While previous investigations may not have explored the meaning of this, the investigation of 1917 appears more influenced by the studies of the period. Concerns about double standards, reporting structures, and the idea of the effectiveness of the institution created investigations that were more thorough. By this time, the idea of scientific management had been a conversation across multiple fields by this time. Politics, structures, and change interwove to ensure that the 1917 testimonies would readily show inconsistencies.

**Organization under Fire: The Trials of Judge Henry Stites Barker as President**

To understand the merging of these social changes in the Progressive era is to understand better the multiple times that Barker would face inquiries about his presidency and thus why housing played such a pivotal role. To comprehend fully that process, one must
understand James K. Patterson. President Patterson is a complicated figure in many ways, lauded for saving the institution and then referred to as a despot, often in the same examination. One such work that does so, for instance, is *Hail Kentucky!: A Pictorial History of the University of Kentucky*, published for the institution’s centennial. In a section called “The Patterson Era” it readily recounts the noble, seemingly tireless dedication of Patterson and the risks he took when the institution separated from what is now Transylvania University:

Halfway through construction, the money ran out. Work stopped. Patterson could not appeal to the legislature because the problem had to be kept secret, for the denominational colleges, already on the attack, were waiting for a chance to destroy the new college. Patterson lent the feeble institution money for which he risked his savings as collateral. The buildings were finished in 1882. (Irvin, 1965, p. 21)

Perhaps it was that risk and the fact he had personally invested not only time and effort as an employee but also had risked his wealth, which emboldened him to feel that the institution was his and would be run as he accorded. He also was credited with saving the institution again, as Irvin again recounts, “In 1881 he discovered that the church-affiliated schools were planning an all-out attack to destroy the A. and M. College's tax support. A long bitter fight followed, and Patterson won” (17). Having risked financial ruin and battled church-backed institutions, he became regard as a “despot who ran the college as if was personally his” (17). Some people regarded him as frugal while others stated he was miserly. Often faculty felt underpaid when compared to colleagues elsewhere. If one doubted that he cared for the institution above the people in it, one could consider what Judge Henry Stites Barker, his eventual successor, would say of him when asked to speak for the Trustees upon news of his retirement:
In the courts, in the halls of the General Assembly, in the columns of the press, and on the hustings, he met and vanquished all opposition. He literally lifted up the moribund institution which seemed about to expire from the anaemia of starvation, and, holding it close to his own great, loyal heart, warmed it back to vitality and life. (Barker & Gillis, 1956, p. 29)

Patterson took a great ownership of the students. In a matter that was somewhat ironic given his later charge against Barker, “He was a friend to poor boys seeking an education” as Irvin states, sharing his statement that, “No one was ‘ever…turned from this institution for lack of ability to pay the tuition fee’” (Irvin, 17). Patterson was a complicated figure, defensive and supportive of the population he felt were his wards, yet strict, stern, and overall unyielding and unchanging in his “41 years of benevolent despotism” (43).

Henry Stites Barker was not academically qualified to follow Patterson as the new president of the State College, and he admitted as much. As the testimonies would later show, Barker did not want the presidency nor did he actively seek it, nor did Patterson want him to be the president, but fear of whom else might occupy the position soon led the Board of Trustees to choose Barker. Some felt that as he was connected through his experience as a judge and thought, as a friendly man, he could aid in popularizing the institution. Others were sure he could maintain a secular element to the institution like Patterson had. Barker also had served on the Board of Trustees, which served as evidence that he had some understanding of the institution. Barker, however, also had another connection. While new to the legal profession, he had volunteered to aid the institution:

In the first lawsuit, instituted more than thirty years ago, for the purpose of obtaining a judgment declaring the tax for the benefit of the A. & M. College unconstitutional, I, then an unfledged lawyer, had the honor, without fee or reward, to in part represent the interests of the school. The fight then begun lasted in the courts, in the General Assembly, in the
Constitutional Convention, until within twelve months last past, it has been finally settled by the judgment of the court of last resort in the State that the Legislature has the right to make any appropriation to the College it deems proper for its maintenance. I shall always remember with pride that I, who thus began my career as a lawyer trying to uphold the right of the legislature to support the State College, had the honor, as a Judge of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, to aid in establishing by final adjudication the State’s constitutional right to maintain this great institution for the education of its young men and women. (Barker & Gillis, 1956, pp. 29-30)

To some, this might bear the mark of some form of inefficiency. Regardless, Barker had a sincere interest in the institution despite his lack of experience. Still, his selection also was mired in politics as Ezra Gillis recalled, “Patterson is believed to have favored President F. W. Hinnitt of Centre College, but because of Cassius M. Clay’s known opposition to having a clergyman in the presidency, the committee adjourned without coming to any agreement” (5-6). Barker was then asked by members of the Board of Trustees to consider the position, but he rebuffed them, stating he did not want the position. His name was later submitted again, with Patterson’s support. Gillis notes this was largely because Patterson heard that Melville Amasa Scovell and F. Paul Anderson were the others being considered and, “Both Scovell and Anderson were known to be unacceptable to Patterson.” As president, Barker’s approach would be drastically different than Patterson’s despotic approach had been. Whereas Patterson viewed students as his wards and took a parental tone, Barker referred to students as “my clients” (Irvin, 1965, p. 47). Barker often sided with students, even in his position on the Board of Trustees; it was in the winter of 1901 that students petitioned the Board of Trustees to use the gymnasium for a hop and “Upon motion of H.S. Barker, the petition was granted, and social life at the school ‘took on a brighter hue.’” (Hopkins, 1951, p. 179). He encouraged sports and activities from which
Patterson had distanced his administration. Perhaps due to his willingness to engage the students as he did clients, there was a change in the view of the President as “…students liked him, whereas they stood in awe of Patterson – which accounts for their tendency to satirize Patterson but not Barker” (Cone, 1989, p. 52). Likewise, Barker empowered his staff more than Patterson had which allowed more advancement suitable to the situation of the individual needs of the various colleges, schools, and offices, well shown by Gillis recalling his first encounter with Barker:

Barker, on his first visit to my office after he moved to Lexington, said, “You are the Registrar. I will support you in everything that you do. If you succeed, your stock will go up; if not, it will go down.” I soon discovered that it was his policy to give guidance and assistance when called upon, but to leave me free to organize my work in my own way. Patterson had looked after the smallest details in my department as in others; he interviewed all students during registration and personally supervised all schedules. When a member of Patterson’s staff learned that I was to be in charge of registration, he said to me, “Who ever heard of a registrar being in charge of registration? That will make you bigger than the president that day?” (Barker & Gillis, 1956, p. 11)

Barker, then, differed much from Patterson in the way he supported the institution, viewed the students, and provided administration; in short, he was an entirely different form of president than what the institution had known. While some hail McVey, Barker’s successor as the first Progressive Era president, Barker brought a sudden, more student centered focus than what Patterson offered. Further, he empowered specific offices to serve their functions in ways that previously Patterson had handled more directly. Barker, then, in some ways did make the institution more progressive in approach than what Patterson established as the norm.
Despite an outlook more modern than Patterson’s had been, Barker's administration was plagued with issues. First, Patterson engaged in acts that were often obstructive to his successor, serving on the Board of Trustees, remaining on campus, and often conferring with people on the state and national level when the institution's president should have been in such a role. Second, and more telling, was an ongoing series of investigations which the institution's administration faced on at least three occasions, including 1912, 1914, and finally in 1917. It is through the 1917 investigation that housing stood in question as a way to mandate the modernization of the administration, but the previous two investigations provide insight into why housing had to play such a role.

Barker faced multiple investigations at the State College before his departure, and archival material fully illustrates that there would be multiple occurrences of such until the 1917 investigation which called for his retirement. The first investigation would be early in Barker's presidency, occurring in the spring semester of 1912. As the February 8, 1912, article in the student newspaper, *The Idea*, noted:

The committee from the Legislature to investigate the rumors that the affairs of this University have been and are being mismanaged, has been appointed and the investigation was begun Tuesday night at Frankfort. The authorities at this University announced that they were ready at any time and that they welcomed the investigation, knowing before hand that the committee can not do otherwise than vindicate them and that the institution will eventually be the better for the investigation. We do not know what specific charges will be brought against the University authorities, but we believe, and not without good reason, that this whole affair was brought about by certain malevolent individuals and for purely selfish, personal and malicious reasons. (The Legislative Investigation)

As the student paper terms it, the matter was treated as rumors and the students, judging at least by the paper, felt that the matter was not accurate and that there was an air of
unfairness about the proceedings. It appeared that the investigative committee would agree as two days after this report appeared in the student newspaper of the time, the results of the Senate Investigation were presented to the General Assembly as *The Final Report of Special Joint Investigating Committee of State University*, finding, in part, the following:

We beg to report that the University, according to the weight of the testimony offered and received before the committee, is in the hands and under the direction of capable, efficient, and faithful officials, who are bending their best energies to the single-hearted object of the success of the University as an institution of learning. We believe that in the present incumbent of the Presidency of the State University the Commonwealth of Kentucky is to be congratulated in that the head of this institution is a man, who is combining superior executive ability with tireless and well-directed industry in the management of the State’s chief educational institution with result that its progress and rapid advancement is a condition that is so apparent as to be beyond question.

The report goes on to state elements that will be used in the 1917 testimony that would cause the “retirement” of Barker, including such accusations as students receiving a county appointment which entitled them to attend the institution free of charge:

We find that the present management of the University has been criticized with regard to its policy of admission of students to the privileges of the institution. In this connection we felt impelled to advise, that the policy and methods of the present management under the administration of President, Judge Barker, is not materially different, or a substantial departure from the policy there before pursued by the management of the institution. We find that the criticism of the methods of admission of students to the University, and especially that class of students designated as “County Appointees,” results from the difference in the construction of sub-section 7 of section 4636a of the Kentucky Statutes, John D. Carroll Edition 1909.

One other element that the 1912 investigating committee would note would be the need to end annuities to President Emeritus Patterson and other staff members, as states in the
report by the *Lexington Leader* ("State University Probe Committee Makes Its Report" 2). Many of these controversies would continue to swirl around the institution and give further cause for future investigations as these issues did not materially change following the release of the investigation. Thus the 1912 investigation found that the University of Kentucky continued to run much as it had before without any significant change from the manner in which President Patterson had previously facilitated the institution. In this, it is informative to note Patterson and Barker, despite vastly different approaches and methodologies, were both found by the state to have had some form of equal success, at least within the eyes of the investigating committee.

By 1914, however, there are indicators that, again, the state appointed a special investigative committee to question the running of the land grant institution. Still, the investigative committee found Barker to be equal to the task of serving as an administrator, noting various points where he had begun to exceed the status of his predecessor: “We are thoroughly impressed that the discipline that the University is much too lax, but we are glad to say that in our opinion, it is better than formerly, and it is constantly improving” (Senate Investigation of the University, 441). The committee made several general recommendations to aid in further improving the institution such as mandating uniforms, stabilizing salaries, and the like, but also recommended that the state consider repealing one element of the law. This challenge was concerning guaranteeing county appointments, stating, “We believe that the law should be so amended as to require students to pay their own traveling expenses, thus saving something like $10,000 per year…” (442). This situation would again seem to justify that President Barker was serving the institution well. As Gillis indicates, the 1913-1914 academic year did see an enrollment of 826, the highest
enrollment to date and a higher income than any of Patterson's years with an increase in year to year growth of “Fees, Sales and Service” from $94,676.31 in 1912-1913 to $150,374.06 in 1913-1914 (22, 30).

The investigation of 1917 would prove different, separating itself from what came before in its impact, and make Barker’s tenure considerably shorter than his predecessor or successor. By 1917, a special investigation committee recommended Barker retire from the position of President, stating:

While the committee has reluctantly reached the conclusion that it is necessary for the best interests of the University that Judge Barker retire, yet be it said to his credit that no stigma has attached to his administration, and it is clear that in his work here has never been actuated by any but the highest motives. The reasons which have been assigned by the Survey Commission for the conclusions in this particular are concurred in by this Committee, and the many creditable things which they have said about Judge Barker in their report likewise have the hearty approval of this Committee. (Report of the Investigating Committee, presented to the Board of Trustees June 7, 1917. Report of the Survey Commission, 1917, p. 102)

Barker resigned from the office, but was his “want” of qualifications such that this was necessary? The previous investigations had found that he was well qualified in that the student behavior had improved and the institution was running as efficiently as or more so than it had under Patterson. Gillis demonstrates that funding and enrollment was increasing. It would appear that something new happened to warrant this shift, as Barker and his administration survived the two previous investigations as shown. So what elements came to attention in the new investigation that were previously unaddressed? How were the recommendations for change altered from the previous investigations?
Hypothetically, the issue at hand was the concept of merging the three engineering schools, but as aforementioned, the issue had been addressed in 1911, and vetoed by the Board of Trustees. The resurrection of such a concept was enough to ignite strong passions and create a series of events that would lead not only to Barker’s departure, but also the loss of faculty and staff. This investigation differed greatly from the 1912 and 1914 examples as shorter time limit shaped how the investigation functioned, but this new investigation was extended an opportunity to have much more time to collect testimony from various campus populations including department heads, staff, and students. Separating itself from prior “investigations,” this dialogue was not just between informed stewards and high-ranking officials, but extended to janitorial staff and students who had a history of violating honor codes. This more far-reaching investigation proof of change that had never happened before at the university, and resulted in a dramatic change in the administration of the university.

If the idea of the merger of the engineering programs had a history, it would be the idea of determining what other issues produced discontent. Among those issues was student living quarters. Housing was a complicated issue for the institution. Although it admitted women in 1880, it had not constructed housing for women until 1904. On the other hand, the two male dormitories, originally Old Dormitory and New Dormitory, and later White Hall and Neville Hall, were in poor repair. To make matters more complicated, the University of Kentucky had an agreement to let a county appointee from each of the Kentucky counties have room and board on campus. As previously established, enrollment had increased, and behavior had stayed the same or improved despite such growth. It is useful to note that President Emeritus himself charged Barker with placing the University
of Kentucky at risk, and, in his testimony read the law and his opinion thereof into the record:

Each legislative district in the State shall, in consideration of the incomes accruing to the College under “An act for the benefit of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Kentucky,” approved April twenty-nine, one thousand eight hundred and eighty, be entitled to select and send to said College each year one properly prepared student, free from all charges for tuition, matriculation fees, room rent, fuel and lights, and to have all the advantages and privileges of the College and dormitories free, except board. (“Testimony Taken by Special Investigating Committee,” pp. I, 17)

Patterson further maintained that the act was essential as it lowered the discontent of those outside of the Bluegrass Region of the state, allowing them to feel their tax dollars funded something that benefitted their counties. Informative of how this act was interpreted is the explanation in the Annual Register of the State College of Kentucky that outlined what students had to be able to do to be considered for a county appointment:

Each Legislative Representative District is allowed to send, on competitive examination, one properly prepared student each year, to this College, free of charge for tuition. A statement for the guidance of County Superintendents: 1. If a count forms one or more than one Legislative Representative District, each district is entitled to keep four students in the College and four in the Normal School free of tuition. 2. If a Legislative Representative District embraces more than one county, each county is entitled to keep four students in the College and four in the Normal School free of tuition. Beneficiaries are appointed on competitive examination. A Board of Examiners is appointed for this purpose by the County Superintendent of common schools. The results of examination are reported to the Superintendent, who, from the data furnished, selects the appointee. (Annual Register of the State College of Kentucky, 1898, p. 90)
Having established the law, its definition within the *Register* of the college, and why Patterson felt it was a required consideration, he stated how he felt the administration of his successor had violated the act and endangered the institution:

Now what happened under the new administration. I suppose the intention was to increase the number of students, for I have to reason to suppose that any other motive was paramount. The administration issued instructions to the County Superintendents that they might discard the feature of competitive examinations in making their appointments – they might discard that, and if they were satisfied that a candidate was qualified, they could be appointed and come here and enjoy all of the benefits set forth in the act. The consequence was, that between these two elements, that is to say, the traveling expenses for these appointees, and the rental of houses for their accommodation, somewhere between twelve and twenty thousand dollars that year was expended – taken from the Treasury wrongfully and illegally. (Book 1, 179)

Patterson alleged that the University of Kentucky was thus at risk as it could not handle the extra expenses of students that attended due to the test being waived. Despite the fact that he had often exceeded the county appointee allotment himself, he felt that the full exclusion of the test was a danger to the stability of the institution.

Leaving the testimony for just a moment, Patterson did have a valid point which one can see impacted the student housing situation by looking at student memoirs. If modernization is indicated by forced change, then one student shows that modernization in how the appointment functioned as a split from his previous understanding. Shelby Elam wrote in *Kentucky through Thick and Thin*, how his “county appointment” was not able to provide him what he had been promised:

My County appointment entitled me to free room rent in one of the men's dormitories, but I was informed that there was no vacancy, and it would be necessary to room in a private home until a vacancy existed. I was then assigned to a home
where I saw a bathtub with running water, and electric lights, for the first time. (Elam, 1955, p. 126)

Whether caused by Barker’s decision, an administrative change, or general misinterpretation, Elam’s memoir is indicative of the expense that Patterson mentioned – his reference to being “assigned” to a home indicates it was an administrative process. Elam’s memoir also gives insight into other areas of concerns expressed throughout the testimony such as the ability of the university to access and examine issues of student behavior. Elam finds transition assistance not with the university's staff aiding his transition and exposure to the culture of both campus and the community but rather relied on both a roommate and the housemother of his boardinghouse. Patterson's administration had developed over one hundred policies, so the increasing reliance of students experiencing the community removed from university control was a major concern for Patterson, a clear departure from his administration's intent to treat students as wards.

For his part, Barker responded in a seemingly reserved manner to Patterson’s claims of his wrongdoing, inquiring only for evidence of Patterson’s assertion that a suit was filed against the University in the following exchange. In truth this policy was just an indicator that student housing, along with the rest of the institution, was transitioning from Patterson’s benevolent despotism of the nineteenth century into the twentieth century through a rise of student outreach and other services that would become the modern system of student affairs. In 1909, for instance, before the end of Patterson's tenure, Walter K. Patterson had spent several years forming and running the Academy, the preparatory efforts of the State College, but by 1911, it had been disbanded. The connection to modernization here is mirrored in the removal of using the admission test to grant student scholarship, but the removal of the Academy is likewise indicative. These changes in protocol separated
the way in which students were admitted, and the growth of other institutions and opportunities freed up the institution from some of the responsibility that it previously maintained. First, the sheer numbers of students had grown: “Between 1890 and 1918, the high school student population grew at a rate more than 10 times the growth in the regular population, 711% vs. 68% respectively” (Linn, 2001, pp. 29-30). Thus, the admission of more students following the logical increase in population that were eligible for attendance is an issue that neither Patterson nor Barker directly address, but would be relevant to Kentucky State College’s duty as a land grant institution. With such a booming population eligible, the institution did not have the means nor the space to address the processing and housing of so many students. Even the University of Kentucky itself began to denote in official publications that schools that were eligible to be recognized as “accredited” by the university had grown:

Table 2.1: Growth of Accredited Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(“Catalogue of the University of Kentucky 1916-1917,” p. 78)

The state was growing, as was the list of schools that considered fully eligible to send students to the University of Kentucky. Patterson may have wished the institution to run as it had during his tenure, but the state, government, and sheer population changes made this
untenable. His previously held “stable” structure no longer existed, replaced by a new frame of modernization as Kentucky's public school system increased available institutions.

Furthermore, this was also a time when admission testing was coming under increased scrutiny and concern as shown by A Historical and Critical Discussion of Admission Requirements, which examined the problematic history of localized tests and recommended a more national test for the following reasons:

Two advantages are plain to see. The work of the board relieves college professors from the humdrum task of framing and correcting examination papers. It also avoids much of the dispute between high-school teachers and college officials as to whether this or that boy was fairly rejected. (Broome, 1903, p. 143)

Though Barker never cites any reason for why his administration might have dismissed the test as a requirement, the impact is apparent – the college enrollment, finances, and related elements increased beyond the former capacity, growing to include increased administration, a formal registrar, deans, and other staff beyond what Patterson’s institution knew. Indeed, in reflecting on Barker’s unappreciated nature in 1956, Ezra Gillis, the aforementioned former registrar, noted that Barker’s role had been one of establishing a more modern approach as the Progressive Era impacted the campus:

The office of the dean of men was established and the office of the dean of women was made full time. A business agent was appointed to organize a department that heretofore had hardly existed. A former member of the Board of Trustees testified in 1911 it was impossible to obtain the financial standing of the University from the business officer was not exaggerating. (Barker & Gillis, 11)

Thus, Barker transitioned various elements of the University and was key in the transition of services for students living on campus as well as in the community by connecting the
administration and creating services related thereto that would create both residential and community student living more in line with the structures of a twentieth century college and college town.

If Barker had been challenged on the admission of students, the behavior of students, and the like upon at least two previous occasions and received positive reviews, then what made this testimony different enough to warrant his impeachment? This testimony zoned in on another element barely mentioned in the previous results – the dormitories and student housing in general. Much of the testimony returned to various questions of student housing – who should supervise such an endeavor, how was discipline in the dormitories handled, how did it relate to academics, and various others. The housing testimony was instrumental in the bulletin that was presented and would make more suggestions than any of the previous investigations. An examination of the way dormitories were mentioned in the testimonies will be helpful in considering how they impacted the presidency of the institution.

The dormitories were mentioned in the Book 1 of the testimonies and the focus of the mention first turned to the idea that funds that were meant for the upkeep of the dormitories were being misappropriated. A senior in the Department of Civil Engineering, George H. Hill, Jr., was called before the investigative committee due, in part, to his involvement in a letter petitioning the President, Board of Trustees, and others to not join the three engineering departments into one college. While much of his testimony focused on the matter of his involvement or lack of involvement in getting a letter of protest around campus and the community, his testimony is also telling of a student concern for the dormitories:
MR. GORDON. You said something a moment ago about the students making some sort of request about the expenditure of funds which was not granted – what do you mean by that – what sort of a request was it and what funds?

A. That was what I had told me. I knew nothing of it except what was told me. I think they had requested that the disbursement of the athletic funds be published in the Kernel – how they were expended – they wanted it published in the college paper – they pay $15.00 each and they wanted to know where it was going. It would not effect me, for I had no kick on that because I think that $15.00 is well spent – I think it is very reasonable, but a lot of them seem to think that the money they paid did not go for work on the dormitories – they are not kept very good and they thought the $15.00 should keep them in much better condition. It was understand that was to go for the upkeep of the dormitories, but only a very few repairs were made, and some of them did not understand it. (Testimony, Book 1, p 180-181)

Hill is one of the rare students who appears in the testimony, but he addresses some concern about the dormitories directly from the point of view of a student. His concern about the dormitories being in poor repair and only the slightest work being completed to maintain the student living quarters introduced a concern that the committee had not anticipated. While they were concerned about both the letter that had been shared and with the discipline of campus, upon conversations first drifting toward the concept of dormitories in general, Mr. Gordon, a member of the committee, initially dismissed the concern, stating simply, “Alright, I think we are drifting far afield” (181). If a student addressing it would not initially be met with concern, a later mention of the dormitories would be shared by someone more relevant to the institution.

Captain John C. Fairfax, assigned by the U.S. Army as an officer to serve as commandant to the University of Kentucky, also had concerns about the dormitory. As a long term officer with almost thirty years of service, he had served in his post as commandant only a year when called to testify, and as the committee had asked about the
general condition of discipline, amongst other topics, he, too, would feel that the
dormitories were of concern to this topic. In recalling the types of events he witnessed, he
recalled, “There are a lot of things that go on on the campus that I cannot stop, like shooting
pistols out of the windows at night. When I get there, of course, it is too late and there is
no chance of detecting the guilty person. That is nothing, of course, but a school boy’s lark,
no disrespect intended” (Book 1, 243). While he dismisses this as a light sided offense, he
does say that the regulations barring drinking, smoking, and gambling are hard to enforce
because of “the way things are in the dormitories” (244). He details that while he does have
absolute control of students in drill and military related matters, he had little control over
the dormitories nor does he want control unless he has absolute control over the facilities.
When the inquiry is made about the status of the buildings, he admits that it is in need of a
“good disinfectant” and “that there is a strong uric acid smell,” but he feels those are the
major issues with the structure itself, but his ire is raised by the fact that he feels the students
in the dormitories live in a manner that would not be legal in the military:

…I want to say something else, something which is an absolute crime. There are three boys living together in triple
[sic] decked bunks in one room here. We would not think of
putting soldiers up in such conditions. It is very unsanitary
and it is a crime and a shame. It would be better to fire them
out, even under the little supervision that we have here,
because if a disease ever gets a hold here, it is going through
like fire. I spoke about it when I had to take one of the boys
out with pneumonia about Christmas time. It is one of the
worse things at the University – two men to a room should
be the absolute limit, and the poorest boys should be
assigned to the dormitories. An investigation should be made
as to their financial ability to board down in town. I think
above everything else is the most crying shame of this
University. We don’t even treat our prisoners in the army
under such conditions as that. We only put two of them in a
double decked bunk – that is all the law allows. (Book 2,
248)
The commandant’s critique of the male dormitories was greeted with more questions rather than just a dismissal.

Dean C. H. Melcher, the Dean of Men and Professor of Modern Languages, would also later testify before the committee and would echo some manner of Fairfax’s concerns. His exchange with the committee concerning the dormitories is indicative of the fact that there was an administration in charge of the students, but no real administration of the facility:

…The condition of the dormitories – have you been in them?  
MR. GORDON. Yes.  
A. I won’t explain then. I think if we had better dormitories, it would be much better in that respect.  
MR. GORDON. Who is responsible for the bad conditions of the toilets in those dormitories?  
A. Well, I don’t know who has charge of the buildings. I don’t think any one has. I think at one time Judge Lafferty had supervision of them, but I don’t know if he has now or not. As to the sanitary conditions, I think that Dr. Pryor looks after that phase of it. (Book 1, 299)

The fact that the dean of men, often seen as a disciplinary figure, had little knowledge of who or how the facility itself was cared for was another concern. If Barker ran the University by allowing each office to function without his involvement as he had explained to Gillis, then this left concerns for the investigating committee to sort out over how departments that were interdependent on one another could be held responsible when connections and responsibilities changed between people and there was not communication.

By the end of the first book of testimonies given before the committee, the dormitories and student living status had integrated themselves into the conversations more than they had in the previous investigations. There was an acknowledgment of concerns
about smells, disease, structure, and supervision and they originated across elements from students, faculty, and administrators. By the second book of testimonies, it was a question that entered into the rotation for many individuals interviewed and linked not only to questions of student conduct but also to general living standards.

In the second book of testimonies, Mister Hywel Davies was called to testify before the committee, and his condemnation of the dormitories may be one of the best indicators of issues. He had served as a business agent for the University of Kentucky before 1916, and his view on the situation of the dormitories was notably negative, questioning if they should even be called dormitories:

You know the students of the University of Kentucky have always been treated with that real spirit of chivalry, and they have always been placed a good deal on their honor. Personally, I think that is a great mistake. Not to take distinct supervision and not to have proper regulations of the students. However, you have to recognize that we are in very bad shape for dormitories. Those places that we call dormitories where the boy students live you could not call anything but the worst. They are poorly supervised. I know when I was out here the night were made hideous by up until the small hours by the boys making noise over there. I think it really would be a godsend if those dormitories would burn down to the ground. They are a crying disgrace to the University. (Book 2, page 56)

When asked about concerns that students could be living out in town with prostitutes, Davies replied that he felt that people “can’t blame [a student] for going astray,” but he speaks much less about those concerns than he did about the status of on-campus living. When one of the investigating committee, Mr. Turner, asks about the status of the women on campus, he says the problem is opposite there, that there is perhaps too many restrictions:
I think Patterson Hall will compare favorably with any girls’ college in the country. If anything Miss Hamilton is too strict. She has not been able to discriminate between girls who are freshmen and who are seniors and juniors. I think if anything Miss Hamilton is too strict. (Book 2, page 57)

In this, the problem is rephrased – the women are expected to live on campus at all times, but his repetition that Miss Hamilton is too far reaching in policies establishes that there was a split. In this way, Davies in some manner summed up the issues that current student housing had engendered – the concern that on-campus housing was unsafe and unsupervised for men, that off-campus housing was subject to creating a brothel culture, and that women’s housing did not allow student maturation because it treated all women the same.

If Davies questioned Hamilton’s regulations, Hamilton also testified about issues in the dormitories, both women’s and men's. Hamilton began her testimony by stating that she was, in fact, performing a “double duty” at the University, stating, “part of the time I put in as Dean of Women, and the other part of my time as Associate Professor of English” (169). When asked if she had “charge” of Patterson Hall, she detailed that the duty had been hers, but that, due to the expansion of students, they had reintroduced the board of managers to assist with that duty. When pressed about the control of Patterson Hall again, she stated:

Yes, I teach and in addition to that I have charge of Patterson Hall. I also supervise the town women, but it is mostly in the Hall where I come in contact with the women here. Since I have been here conditions have been very much improved at the Hall. When Mrs. Barker and myself first came here we had very little equipment there, and one thing we did not have and that was a system of book-keeping. There was no books kept there at all. (172)
She is then asked by Mr. Gordon, as a member of the investigating committee, about the role that Judge Barker played as he lived within Patterson Hall and she reveals the reason that he was asked to live within the facility at her request:

I might say that Judge Barker and Mrs. Barker came to the hall on my request, because I thought with all those women there it would be of great moral benefit to have a man in the house. We had some burglaries even right next door and there was an attempt at some time, I understand, to enter the Hall. For that reason we were very anxious to have Judge Barker and Mrs. Barker there. At that time there was plenty of room, because the third floor was not occupied. Since then, however, the school has grown so much that we can not take care of the girls we have now. Just last year we had to put a partition in the gymnasium hall to make additional rooms which took care of twenty-two more girls. (173)

If Hamilton breached the issue of overcrowding, she also would readily breach the issue of insufficient funding to support student housing for women. She detailed that the behavior of students was monitored by a clerk, but that the clerk, due to budget, had to be one of the older women students, stating, “You see, we charge them three dollars and seventy-five cents a week and when you take into consideration what all [they] get for that, we don’t have much left” (174). If managing the discipline of the students necessitated the use of a clerk to help record their behavior, then her thoughts on the male dormitories were that they needed at least a similar system, “I think the dormitories for boys should have more supervision. I think they ought to be put under military regulations and handled that way” (176). She was a proponent of moving the fraternities back into the campus proper, in a separate dormitory, so they could also benefit from structured living. She also felt that students would benefit if the dormitories could run like barracks. When the topic turns to whether President Barker had the support of the faculty, she briefly states that she feels that he does not get as much support as he should. When asked for specifics why, she returns
that “President Patterson is still on campus,” but then one of the investigating committee members, Mr. Lyle, returns the conversation to dormitories, and the following exchange is illustrative of how the dormitory concerns became more prevalent throughout this testimony:

MR. LYLE: Only a very small percentage of the students lives in the boys’ dormitory?
A: No I should say that the dormitories are full and that they always have a waiting list. I couldn’t tell you what percentage of men live out there, because I don’t have anything to do with that.
MR. LYLE: I don’t believe that as many as half the boys live in the dormitories.
A: You may be right. I know that sometime ago when the boys were coming in so rapidly, they rented a lot of cottages, but they found out that it was rather expensive and it didn’t work out very well.
MR. LYLE: The boys living on campus, in private homes and fraternity houses, have you heard anything about their general behavior – do you know anything about the morals of most of those boys?
A: Well, I can cite an instance. When I first came here we had a little social affair out here and the boys were serving lemonade. It turned out that during the evening the lemonade was spiked. Some of the girls reported to me and I went to one of the professors and had him empty it out. Since then we do not even allow frappe at our dances. (177-178)

Hamilton did not even fully blame the students or the institution, but rather posited that the intersection of the institution’s location and the natural inclination of temptation:

You see Lexington is an unusual place. We have the largest tobacco market, race track and also saloons. We also have the largest distilleries in the world, and there is many a temptation here for the young man, and that is why I suggested the dormitories be put under military supervision. The University situated here as it is, it would be much better off, in my opinion, handled in that way. I have the same problems with the girls. (179)
In her testimony, then, Hamilton frames several issues that perhaps gives insight to why housing played more roles in the testimony of 1917 than it had previously.

Lexington was a place of change during this time, and the community mirrored concerns about behavior with a focus on vice and improper behavior in the town. There was an active vice investigation committee, and the chairman, George R. Hunt, was among those who testified before the investigating committee and discussed how trained men from the American Social Hygiene Association of New York, conducted the research. The vice committee investigation, according to Hunt, found that, before December of 1915, “28 of what they call parlor houses outside of the restricted district and twenty-seven in. Of course, there were assignation houses in addition to those found” (Book 2, 220). Most would argue, historically, that Lexington would have a reason for concerns – one of the most notable brothels was run by Belle Brezing. Belle Brezing, whose real name was Mary Belle Kenney, would respond to the vice commission by maintaining her operation during the time of the investigation, or as one recollection states, “Belle keeps her brothel open in spite of […] the city's anti-vice ordinance. Convincing Belle to close her house would take an army” (Tattershall, 2014, p. 38). Hamilton’s claim, then, that Lexington was different than most of the state is made more believable.

In addition to that, Hamilton frames the idea that perhaps policies had been in transition too often for the liking of the committee. In stating that the military should have control of the dormitories, she does not seem to clearly state to the investigating committee how it is managed currently. She also frames the concerns of drinking and misbehavior at an official university social while discussing housing, implying that the behavior connected to campus living. If Hamilton's testimony linked discipline issues to dormitory life, then
the head of the Department of Education would provide how a discipline committee would
interact with housing.

J.T.C. Noe testified regarding his experiences with students in campus housing and
how student discipline worked in the dormitories. While he does not provide the details of
the case or why the committee to which he was appointed was asked to investigate, his
recollection reinforced the issue that disciplinary standards and consistency in housing was
an issue:

I was put on a committee here some three or four years ago,
I think it was four years ago, to investigate a case in the
dormitory. We investigated the case and reported that the
boys should be removed from the dormitory and suspended
from school. That was the last I ever heard of it. That is what
I have in mind, for there is a feeling that there is considerable
looseness about the enforcement of discipline. Whenever a
case comes up and the faculty decides it and takes a stand,
the first thing you know it’s all passed over. (182)

As the committee asked him to explore this concept further, he states, “I think the year
following that a similar thing occurred in the dormitory, and we made the same
recommendations that were not carried out” (182). The matter in the earlier case, which he
was asked to recall, was one related to hazing in which “A young fellow by the name of
Chapman was stripped of his clothing and made to go out and make a speech and run
around the yard” (183). This recollection leads to Noe recalling that the matter came to the
attention because Chapman had become ill due to the experience, but that it also was
something that created concerns about a secret society that seemed to have links to other
issues:

We made an investigation and found that they had a society
up there, a kind of fraternity, called the Tap-Keg of Beer
fraternity. The facts were very clear and we thought we had
a good case against them and recommended this action. Nothing was done. The year following that, I think, a very similar case occurred, and if I am not mistaken, the same people were mixed up in it. (183)

Noe’s testimony, then, highlighted inconsistency, bad behavior, impropriety, and a host of other issues that underscored by a lack of respect for faculty.

While the testimonies primarily centered on the dormitories for men, the committee did interview the Committee of Patterson Hall which included “Mrs. Harrison, Mrs. Smith, and Mrs. Harbison” (263). The Board had been reconstituted as aforementioned and Mrs. Harrison establishes how they were appointed, succinctly stating, “This Board of three ladies was constituted some time ago by the Legislature, but there was an interval wherein there was no Board, but last November the Executive Committee reappointed this Board and named we three” (263-264). After recounting that the dean of women held control when there was no board, Mrs. Smith then recounts what they discovered once they began having control of Patterson Hall:

When we first took over the management of the Hall, we decided to first look around and study the situation carefully to see just what changes could be suggested. We found that the Hall was considerably crowded, and in order to take care of the increased number of girls each year it was necessary to turn the recitation, or recreation room, rather, into sleeping rooms to accommodate the overflow. There are some rooms which contain three girls in the same room. The rooms have only one window, and there is no transom to allow the ventilation to pass through. The rooms are very cheaply furnished with no closets, and the girls have to pile their stuff up in the corner on trunks and things of that sort. The partitions between rooms are very thin, and the result is that you can hear the conversations going on in most any of these rooms. We consider this very destructive to study and not the best for the girls, and besides that we found that there were seven or eight girls that could not be accommodated in the Hall at all, and had to go elsewhere. (266-267).
With the student population overflow being an issue, a member of the investigating committee quickly inquired about what role President Barker had in contributing to that factor, questioning as to how many rooms the Judge used as he resided in Patterson Hall as well. While they responded that, at the time, he used two rooms, at previous times he had used four or five, but that his presence and the presence of others contributed to issues as well with discipline and so forth:

Another point we wish to make is that there are five heads at the Girls’ Dormitory, President Barker and Mrs. Barker, Miss Hamilton, Miss Pickett, and Miss Hopper. This is a bad condition, and as we feel that taking everything into consideration, it is not best for the discipline and management of the hall to have so many heads there. We understand that the biggest reason for Judge Barker being in the Hall is he feels that there will be some protection to the girls while he is there. This can be taken care of by the employment of a night watchman. We took the matter up with Judge Barker, and gave him our views and told him it was best for all interests for him to move out of the Hall, but he came and told us his reasons for remaining, and said he had been requested by the Head of the Hall to stay there for protection, and we insisted and again requested him to give up the rooms he had in the Hall so that the girls not being given rooms could get them there, and he told us then that we were exceeding our authority, - that we had no authority to tell him to do that. (Book 2, 267-268)

Mrs. Smith goes on to state, however, that this issue was resolved. The Executive Committee had already agreed with the reasons that the Committee of Patterson Hall stated and thus President Barker would be moving out between the end of the term and June, but that the matter must be held in “absolute confidence” (268). Mr. Gordon goes on to inquire if there were any additional reasons to remove Barker from the facility that had not yet been discussed, and again Mrs. Smith supplies information, this time more fiscal in nature:

There were one or two other reasons that we didn’t go into with Judge Barker, and one of them was just the economical
reason in connection with the management of the Hall. The money allowed them for the upkeep of the girls is not very large, and it is a pretty close fight to supply a proper table with the present food prices. The Judge here, and having frequent visitors, it was always necessary to provide some additions, which was a bad precedent, taking everything into consideration. We felt that was unfair to the other girls, and we think that is one very good reason why the Judge should not be here.

With the acknowledgment that President Barker would be leaving and that the economic situation may ease, the Committee of Patterson Hall was asked about their plans for the facility. Again, they directly address their plans to facilitate more direct, streamlined administration and supervision of the students, first reiterating the issue and then proceeding to the plans they had for the future:

MRS. HARRISON. […] Our present plan is to reconvert the dormitory space, which was made out of the recitation or recreation rooms, make that a recreation room again. We want to put into effect the student government, which we think will be of great benefit to the girls, for it would teach them self reliance and broaden them. We think this will help greatly with discipline, and be of great moral benefit to the women there. We want to centralize and unite the government of the Hall. The present condition whereby five distinct heads is not very productive of satisfactory government, and causes more or less friction. We want to have some ultimate head to take charge.

MR. GORDON. I understood that the Dean of Women had supreme authority.
A. She says she has no authority whatever. You see under the present condition, Miss Hamilton is there, and the matron is there, and the book keeper is there, and Judge Barker is there and Mrs. Barker is there, and they all, more or less, give orders to the girls. One of the troubles there is that there is no real co-operation or organization. Everybody is kind of working separately and there is nobody to supervise the whole thing. The book keeping and the housekeeping and all that should be so co-ordinated [sic] that the head would know just exactly what is what, and what is going on there.

MRS. SMITH. Yes, under the present system it is pretty hard to tell just what is going on.
MRS. HARBISON: I have here the set of rules that are in effect in Patterson Hall which might be of interest to you gentlemen to read, concerning the government there.
MR. GORDON: Suppose you read them, Mr. Lyle.
(Mr. Lyle reads the Patterson Hall rules.)
MRS. HARBISON: Miss Hamilton made no reports until this committee was appointed, no provision was made for her reporting to the head of the institution just what was going on. They had nothing of the kind there.

Again, there is the specter of a lack of administrative organization as officials seemed to be required to run their operations, yet there was not always communication across the spectrum. Given this structure, elements of discord were set in place at both the male dormitories and Patterson Hall.

After the expression of these sentiments had been echoed by others about different aspects of the university's housing system, late in the third book of testimonies, the investigating committee called Mrs. Sara R. West Marshall, the inspector of the male dormitories. Her testimony stands as strong evidence that this investigation had shifted away from the areas of previous study and that there were increased concerns about how the administration was not always appropriately connected. The concerns became apparent in regard to how the transition played out and one sizable area of note was student living. Though lengthy, the comments exchanged show many issues with the administrative control of student housing that was indicative of larger issues at play. From considerations of the living quarters of the inspector to the differences in the administration of the University, Mrs. Marshall's testimony covers many elements.

Q. Do you live on campus?
A. No, I live at the corner of the experiment farm, about ten or fifteen minutes walk from the campus.

Q. What are your duties in connection with the dormitories?
A. Well, I have an office in the building that is known as the new dormitory, and I am there in the morning by nine o'clock,
and I stay in the office until eleven, in order to receive the students, if any need attention or any help of any kind, or if there is any complaint. They come to me during that time. Then I go into every room every day and make an inspection, I go sometime during the day, not always in the morning, because I think it a very good plan to go through the dormitory at different hours of the day, so that I know exactly what is going on. I allow the boys privilege of relaxation on Saturdays and Sundays.

Q. How do you mean “privilege of relaxation”?
A. Well, you see I am pretty strict, and I require that they shall keep their rooms in order; that is, that the students themselves sweep and dust their rooms and put it in order, and when I go through the dormitory I inspect the rooms and see whether they have done it, seeing that their clothes and shoes are in order, and all things like that. Then I want to make them as much at home as we can, for that is home to most of them, so I want to have them happy and satisfied as they can be, therefore I am willing for them to sleep on Saturday morning, and if they want to go to Sunday school on Sunday morning, not to expect them to clean up their rooms on that morning.

Q. In other words, you don’t make any inspection on Saturday and Sunday?
A. No, I am very often at the University on Saturday, so that they can come to me if they wish.

Q. Is Saturday a holiday?
A. It is with some of the classes.

Q. Do you ever have any trouble with the boys making them live up to the requirements?
A. I am the proudest person who ever lived in this world over my boys. When I came to this University it was an experiment, for they had never had anything but inspection from the military, and we didn’t know how they would take inspection from a woman. I came to work under the latter part of President Patterson’s administration, and the duties which he required of me were of a very – of a nature very hard for the boys, I thought, and it was hard for me too. He required that I should look into their trunks, prying into their private affairs in that sort of way. I did it, but I told the boys that I was only doing it because I had to, and that the only reason that I was doing it. Not one man complained, and they were as gracious as they could be. That order has been repealed since Judge Barker came, and I only make a regular inspection of the rooms now.

Q. Do you do any other kind of inspection?
A. No.
Q. What was old man Patterson looking for?
A. I don’t really know. I don’t know why he wanted me to look in their trunks. It was for me to do it, and I never could understand why it was necessary. I am very proud of my boys over there and I would like to tell you of a little incident that occurred when I first came here, which made me know from that time that I would be alright here with the boys. It was about the time of the opening of school, and there was a good deal of confusion with all the trunks coming in and all that sort of thing, and I was in one of the buildings, when some express men came up, and were outside using very abusive and insulting language in their work. Some of the young men heard it and saw that I was nearby and it didn’t take them a minute to go out there and stop it.

Q. What janitor services do you have in those buildings?
A. One janitor to each building, and I require that those janitors shall thoroughly clean the rooms, and they can’t get around once every two weeks. They are good negroes [sic], but it is too much for them. They get around to a room about twice a month to thoroughly clean it. They clean the toilets and the bathrooms every day, and occasionally we get some extra help to do some generally cleaning, like the windows, etc.

Q. What are the sanitary conditions around the bath and toilet rooms?
A. I think as good under the circumstances as they could be.

Q. Thoroughly washed out every day?
A. Yes. We ought to have new bath room fixtures, for they are pretty well worn out. Then there should be more ventilation in the toilets. What we need is some money to get some improvements over the buildings, with running hot and cold water.

Q. Yes, that seems to be what is needed in all the departments, some money.
A. I ask them every year for hot water in the old dormitory, and I think we ought to have it. These boys ought not to have to go the Y.M.C.A. to get a bath.

MR. LYLE. Do you see any indications of gambling in going through the dormitories?
A. Not very often, and Mr. Lyle I am able to know pretty well what those boys do, I can tell pretty well. Here is what I do, if I find a young man in bed when I inspect, I inquire of him what is the trouble, and if he says he has a headache, I tell him that I have to send for Dr. Pryor, and that will tell whether he is sick or not, or whether he has been out late the night before. I think there is very little drinking going on, and sometimes I might suspect somebody, but I never find any empty bottles.
There was one time, when the Board of Trustees let all the restrictions down, and that big bunch of boys came here, and we even had outside houses rented, and I had to inspect those, it was then that we had a pretty rough bunch of boys, and there was some drinking then, but this year and last year I don’t think we had any of it. We had one boy to leave and that is all. When I see something like that I go to them and tell them that I will have to report them if I see it again, and it is hardly every necessary to say anything more to them.

Q. When you report anything of that sort to the President does he take any action on it?
A. Oh, my, yes. He takes those problems and solves them; he has them before him and he handles them/

Q. You get all the support you could ask?
A. Oh, you bet he supports me, and Mr. Lyle I never would have been able to have accomplished what I have accomplished here with the boys, if the President did not back me up so finely. I tell you gentlemen, many a time Judge Barker has gone down in his pocket and given me money to help some poor young fellow over in the dormitory who did not have a cent to get something to eat with. There is many a thing he has done out of the goodness of his heart that has never been told, but I know, and the boys he has helped knows. He has many a time gone to his office and written a check for some boy that was right up against it. Oh, he has done some fine things, gentlemen, some things that I know. He is such a big hearted man.

MR. LYLE. What do you think of the discipline on the campus?
A. From what I hear and what I see, it must be improved just wonderfully. I am not here at night, so I don’t know about that, but I do know this that the discipline of the boys is much better than it used to be.

Across the many testimonies, perhaps it is appropriate that the last and longest originates from the inspector of the male dormitories. In her statements, she shows that the institution's troubles were often mirrored in housing: issues with staffing of sufficient number and credential, buildings well suited to increasing numbers, and a host of other issues are highlighted. Also the issues of Patterson's administration versus Barker's more free handed system of enabling individuals to run the department. In considering the
differences between these two administrations, problems become apparent with both systems.

Given the more common nature of questions on student housing, it becomes clear that the concept of student campus accommodation and its administration was readily affecting the view that the investigating committee had on President Henry Stites Barker and his administrative control of the University. One should denote an influx of societal changes that emboldened the investigative committee, while likewise, the administrative variations caused by the transition of Patterson to Barker proved insurmountable in many facets. In examining the Report of the Investigating Committee, presented to the Board of Trustees June 7, 1917, the impact becomes even more prevalent. This publication, published as the report of what the investigative survey commission found following the testimonies included further information pulled from other areas. While the books of testimony included “in all 150 witnesses,” the resulting Report of the Investigating Committee, presented to the Board of Trustees June 7, 1917 included the results of a questionnaire “sent to the sixteen hundred alumni of the University” and “also sent to about six hundred representative citizen of the State of Kentucky, including members of the legislature and other public officials and prominent business men” (4-5). Thus, the report went above the previous investigative committees and provided more recommendations beyond the testimonies. The recommendations were numerous and expanded well beyond the success of the administration, touching on multiple elements of the university, and eventually totaling close to seventy recommendations for issues needing to be addressed.

The impact of the line of questioning about housing was apparent in many elements of these recommendations. As the testimonies showed uncertainties about which offices
provided what services within the dormitories, the committee determined that this was prevalent in the entirety of the University of Kentucky. Their statement on the matter was direct, stating, “The Survey Commission has been forced to the conclusion that many of the difficulties in which the University has found itself have resulted from a maladjustment of the central legislative and administrative machinery…” (10). This statement demonstrates that, as practices and policies gave way to more current practices, there had not been a consistent practice of the executive board or the board of trustees addressing such an issue or creating a set of rules or policy to best govern such changes. Indeed, if Patterson had been ever present and Barker trusted offices to follow their internal protocol, this rampant change would have been disconcerting. In a later recommendation, the committee notes that this confusion of structure was widespread:

In the past there has evidently been some confusion in the minds of many officers of the University as to the channel which official communications should follow. Sometimes the head of a department has sent his recommendations to the dean of his college; sometimes directly to the President, ignoring the dean, and sometimes directly to the Board of Trustees or the Executive Committee, virtually ignoring the dean and the President. It has not appeared that there has been slight or evasion in these cases; they have resulted from the lack of a clearly formulated and published order of procedure. (15)

If one recalls the testimony regarding Barker’s place in Patterson from the Patterson Hall Committee or the testimony from Mrs. Marshall regarding her inspection of the male dormitories, this was an element of the testimony from housing. Mrs. Marshall stated that, upon finding a violation, she addressed it internally, effectively warning the student that, should it reoccur, that she would alert the President's office. Such a process allowed an inconsistency of discipline as the only way in which a student would be reported and
considered for sanction by a disciplinary committee would be if he effectively violated the policy twice. In the testimony of the Patterson Hall Committee, we learn of the issues the committee had with Barker still being in residence but can see that, when Barker himself heard their statements, he still defended staying there, which caused the committee members to go to the Executive Board as to go around him. While the investigating committee does not give direct examples of why they recommended these policies, there is a decided parallel to this recommendation and some of the issues in the administration of the dormitories, the lack of a reporting structure effectively generated inconsistency and a sense of mismanagement of the facilities.

In the segment of the report regarding the recommendation to terminate the presidency of Judge Barker, more issues linked to housing became prevalent. The committee, in the report, actually states that many factors covered in the report fall to the fault of President Barker. However, they also defend him as not being able to have success as he was not the person for the position from the first day. They note that one could “cite almost the entire series of items discussed in this long report,” including housing and its administration, as things President Barker failed to do that should be considered essentials of a university presidency (18). The committee then goes on to state that this issue was not about President Barker not being a learned man or a strong professional, but rather that the University itself is much more than just classes and buildings:

No discredit attaches to President Barker for not perceiving these points. He could no more be expected to see into and unravel this rather knotty educational problem than, let us say, Ex-President Eliot of Harvard could be expected to solve a knotty legal tangle – which Judge Barker would have worked out in a few days. The result which has occurred could have been foreseen from the beginning. The whole trouble came from the failure of the Board of Trustees and
of Judge Barker himself to recognize at the time of the fact that the position of university president cannot be filled by a man who knows little about universities, however eminent he may have been in other professions.

Barker’s failure, then, was reflected not in academic shortcomings, for enrollment and wealth, as shown by Gillis, increased. Nor did he fail to modernize the institution on a surface level as other southern schools had tried to do or fail to engage in maintaining the status of support as he had made the dean of women a full-time position and likewise enabled the creation of the dean of men position at the University of Kentucky. However, the testimonies lead to the recommendations reflecting a different form of concern for Barker – that his real failure was not to realize what those offices and structures would need. The dormitory system echoed this point clearly. Merely maintaining Mrs. Marshall’s inspection of the dormitories for men or enabling Ms. Hamilton to run or have a committee that ran Patterson Hall was insufficient if it did not have a university structure behind it. As the testimonies show and as the recommendation maintains, one of the greatest challenges then for Barker was that he enabled growth, but he did not enable or require an administrative support system to maintain that growth and to provide consistency and communication amongst stakeholders and divisions at the institution. Amid political and administrative changes beginning in the era, he failed to be aware of staffing and management needs that would have better served the institution.

In continuing with their discussion of the faculty, the committee again discuss many elements that originate in the conversations regarding student housing. The committee states that “It is further provided that ‘the University shall transact as much of the general business as possible through the following standing committees […] who shall report their findings back to the Faculty for approval” (21). The report states that while they find this
element, at least in theory, to be “excellent,” it is also more likely to be efficient if it is aided by “a more careful delimitation of powers” as “it is assigned administrative as well as legislative functions” and thus they find that the faculty are “rather heavily burdened with administrative work” (21). The committee lays the confusion of structure and of responsibility for discipline, student welfare, student fees, student organizations, building and grounds, and a host of other features, which, by policy, the faculty councils were to address, on the administration. The committee states that the failure of the overall administration to integrate deans into the process has caused the perceived decline in on-campus behavior, stating, “In this situation, the ‘Committee of Deans' has inevitably tended to handle some of the business which under the existing regulation belong to the faculty, and dissatisfaction and conflict of authority have resulted” (22). In the end, the recommendation they set forth is to allow the council to be tasked with the administration while the faculty function as the legislative power on campus. In doing this, the committee sought to make a recommendation that would create the structure that was lacking – it would not be the charge of those working outside of the faculty and board to make policy, but rather their duties would be to enforce the policies. Such a policy would allow a more structured process, something that many of the individuals working with students, either through the dormitory or other manners, seemed to imply was lacking in their testimonies.

In the first student testimony, there was the mention of funds not going to repair the dormitories as needed. While this does not receive direct mention, the committee does address the fact that there is a dire need to address the fiscal concerns of the administration of the University of Kentucky. Citing numerous inconsistencies, the committee reports that the business agent is unable to speak directly to all budgets, so much of the business office
is ineffectual. Among the biggest offenders, the committee singles out two areas, stating, “For illustration, when all the Investigating Committee had an audit made at the University business office, the work was completed without the accountant having seen the books connected to the College of Agriculture at all, or the books of Patterson Hall” (26). The enterprise that sought to provide housing for all female students was one of the least monitored fiscally. The committee then heard testimonies showing inconsistencies in supervision or monitoring in various ways as the students had too many administrators actively working within the facility, providing evidence in the report that there was also no significant sharing of the fiscal operations of that form of student housing. Housing, then, was in some way run as an unmonitored auxiliary service, and its involvement as such would be among the reasons that the committee would report a need for more monitoring.

The *Bulletin* did address the issue of student housing and funding scholarships for such directly in an area entitled “Scholarships and Dormitories” (33). Despite what Patterson had stated during his testimony, the committee found little actual fiscal damage from the admission of students. The promised student load could lead to 1,344 such enrolled students, assuming 336 newly appointed students each year – one regular scholarship and one for each county solely to benefit those in the department of education, but the actual use for the preceding academic year was only 92 (33). The committee expressed the difference in expense possible versus what actual expense like this:

The cost to the University of these students, above that incurred in providing instruction for all students, was approximately $5,500. About $2,000 of that was paid out in refunds for travelling expenses; the remainder went for the maintenance of the men’s dormitories, in which practically all the appointees are provided with the rooms, fuel and lights required by the statute. It will be seen that the cost is almost exactly $60.00 per student. If the possible 1,344
scholarship holders had been in residence, the cost at the same rate would have been $80,640. A plan of appointments which is taken advantage of by only 92 out of the 1,344 possible appointees and out of a total enrollment in the University (for 1915-16) of 1,171 students can hardly be said to be working especially well, to be really equalizing the advantages of the University to the various parts of the State, or to be very necessary to the maintenance of a student body of satisfactory size. (33-34)

If the committee found the numbers ill-suited to the intent or spirit of the law, they still felt the law had too many drawbacks for the institution as it situated the institution within the political sphere. Many appointments had political connections, created ill will or lowered enrollment as those students who were denied the county appointment might harbor ill will or turn their back on the flagship college. Further concerns included that this factor created dissatisfaction between the other state colleges and the denominational colleges, created fiscal issues even with low enrollment, and finally, it forced the university in one final manner particularly relevant to the housing impact on campus. “So long as the scholarships remain, the University must keep open its men’s dormitories, which at the present time can only be characterized as an eyesore and a disgrace to the institution…” (34). Citing those reasons, the committee recommended that the Trustees should endeavor to have the provisions for such scholarships repealed.

To the point about the dormitories, they added several more comments, wholly evolving it into an entire segment on men’s dormitories listing a veritable litany of reasons that the dormitories were the shame of the institution. Their statement is detailed and questions the effects such structures must have on the health, mental state, and discipline of the men:
To any one who has ever walked through the men’s dormitories, little need to be said about them. They are bare, ugly, dilapidated, untidy, unsanitary, ill smelling. On a warm day, it is even unpleasant to pass along the road that runs past these buildings, because of the odor from them. It seems doubtful whether without large expense they can be put into or kept in any better condition than they are in at present; but certainly the effect upon the taste and manners, if not the morals and health, of young men who spend four of their most impressionable years in such quarters cannot be other than disastrous.

Just as the fiscal side of it was of merit, the health and wellness of those students were of concern – not only their physical stability, but also how the structures would influence their morality, interests, and understanding became a noted concern. Again, harkening back to concerns about the presence or access to vices within Lexington, this concern was relevant to the committee and the Board of Trustees. Indeed, there were undercurrents of why such ideas of morality, taste, and manners were relevant, as there was a study of why ethics were so vital in youth for college, “Moral enthusiasm bent on the suppression of vice in all forms of life increases efficiency; and conversely, the increase of efficiency eliminates immorality” (Conklin, 1911, p. 421). This idea of suppressing vice as a means of efficiency merges with the idea that the “cult of efficiency” had a decided impact on education, melding with the argument the committee made. The dormitories' concerns regarding morality impacted efficiency as stated in one study directly, “Whatever its source, the influence was exerted in the form of suggestions or demands that the schools be organized and operated in a more businesslike way and that more emphasis be placed upon a practical and immediately useful education” (Callahan, 1962, p. 6). This idea of the dormitories being unorganized would have been seen, at this time, as a risk of inefficiency at a time when colleges were expected to be more businesslike. As evidenced by Callahan quoting an
article from *The Atlantic Monthly* in 1903 which stated: “The management of school affairs is a large business involving in a city of 100,000 inhabitants an expenditure of probably $500,000 annually; the same business principles should be employed here” (6). Both the economic and morality issue in the aspects of student housing would collide to impede further the argument for the efficiency of President Barker's administration.

This concern leads to another element of the recommendations of the committee that directly deals with the concept of efficiency and echoes the administration of the dormitories. The section which followed the dormitory recommendations was entitled “Internal Organization.” Stating that the principle of internal organization in a university is one of balance, granting “enough independence and freedom to enable them to do their work” while also ensuring that the departments are “so related to the University as a whole as to be under the direction of the University and to have their staffs and facilities available, within reason, for team work,” the committee would make many suggestions and the dormitories would not be excluded in this area either (36). The section is focused solely on the concerns of Patterson Hall and begins directly:

That there has not been trouble over the control of Patterson Hall is an evidence of much discretion on the part of the officials involved. The duties and authority of the different officials concerned in the control of Patterson Hall have not been enough specified to insure against conflict. The President, as the representative of the Board, is the final authority among the officials of the University. The Dean of Women, next to the President, under certain regulations of the faculty, is authority in matters affecting the young women. The Matron is the person in charge of the ground at Patterson Hall. The Financial Secretary seems to be practically independent, even of the Business Office, in the financial management. Then there is the Board of Control, composed of women not otherwise connected with the University, with full authority over Patterson Hall. The situation is complicated further by the fact that the President,
Dean of Women, Matron and Financial Secretary are domiciled in Patterson Hall. (45).

The report then details, through citing a report of the Executive Committee, the conflict amongst the different roles in their established duties. Both the dean of women and the Board of Control had duties related to the management and had to “superintend” and manage all aspects of the halls. In looking at these issues, the committee finally came to the conclusion that there lacked any form of efficiency and that the format had to be within the University, not outside of it, and further that it should be clear in writing. Their justification for this is simple, “There cannot safely be divided responsibility in the government of these young women students” (46). In considering the problems with the organization of the University, the committee detailed the issues in college organization, but the issues suggested by Patterson Hall is most indicative of the need for organization as it covered the management, structure, and issues in general that the administration faced.

In the end, the investigation conducted in 1917 provided a much more detailed “trial” and its inclusion of housing and student living gave further insight into administrative concerns. As the University of Kentucky grew to meet additional academic needs, social desires, and even governmental elements, Barker, as argued by Gillis, managed to ensure it grew in numbers and structure, but not in administrative regulation. The growth, perhaps too quick, would have challenged many administrators, and with President Barker readily admitting that he was not a “college man” nor expressing interest in the role, it is natural that he would not have been able to structure the administration of the college effectively. While some may have decried Patterson as a despot, he ensured a level of efficiency as he watched over all aspects, inserting himself into all offices and functions. Perhaps neither were meant for the presidency in this new Progressive Era, with
a focus on business life efficiency, striking a politically pleasing tone and having to
transition an institution from a nineteenth-century college into a competitive twentieth-
century university. In the end, the role of student housing played a direct role in detailing
the lack of consistency, structure, and policy in place for the administration of the campus.
As such, it played a role in the outcry to change the administrative structures which
attracted the next long-term president of the institution, Frank L. McVey.

For Barker’s part, he seemed to be magnanimous in his departure as Gillis recalls
that he returned “good for evil” in his departure, wishing the institution the growth and
development it deserved, as noted in his last address to the Board of Trustees:

I came to the University relying more upon the wisdom of those who elected me than upon my own. When I leave in September, 1918, it will be with no bitterness of heart and no wound of spirit. It will always be my sincere desire to forward this University and its interests in every way possible. I shall rejoice in its successes without regard to who causes or promotes that success. I shall ever be ready to give every man the credit that is due without envy or jealousy that his work has been superior to mine.

Barker had been a force of change in his own right as Gillis argues – perhaps more modern
than Patterson, yet lacking in the Progressive mindset of McVey- but he failed to modernize
within the framework of efficiency. The line of questions from the investigative committee
revealed issues of mismanaged housing, resulting in the end of the presidency of one man
and the beginning of McVey's progressive presidency. If elements of where the Progressive
Era would lead the University required “evolutionary social change” as defined by Irwin,
Barker tried to cleave too closely to Patterson's structure. When he did engage in changing
the institution, it was not in line with the changing needs and structures of more progressive
efficiency. In a time of efficiency, his oversight to evolve housing or divide it from what it had before lead to a more modern institution at the expense of his presidency.
Chapter Three
Chaotic Control and the Role of In Loco Parentis in Modernizing Affairs in Housing

In loco parentis, the legal doctrine that stated that schools, including universities and colleges, acted in place of the parent and with the same authority, played a significant role in how student housing developed and changed throughout the country. In loco parentis, effectively gave any educational institution a form of lasting control over the student population in a legally binding way – though it did not make them responsible for the actions of the student, giving the institution control, but not liability, and leaving students with few recourses if they felt that they were being wronged or poorly served by the system. Moreover, this level of control did not stop at the schoolhouse gate, so to speak, but extended with the students themselves into the community. As such, they played a notable role in the idea of off-campus student housing and student living in general, most notably between 1917 and 1940. Indeed, in loco parentis and its intersection with the elements of student housing in the community would engender the rise and full empowerment of many elements of the college life during the Progressive Era. The dean of men and dean of women are examples of how this policy set the stage for the field of student affairs as we know it today. In effect, then, the legal recognition of in loco parentis developed much of student affairs in the early days of the institution as the Progressive Era’s legal rulings impacted campus climate.

The idea of in loco parentis was not exactly new within the system of schooling. It owed its origins to the English legal system, but the way that it developed between that time and the 1917 case that made it applicable to colleges and universities is worth noting. The very concept connected to the process of education from earliest reference, as Bickel and Lake denote in their legal study of education, The Rights and Responsibilities of the
Modern University, wherein they examine the earliest references to *in loco parentis*. Their studies find that the term was seemingly coined by Sir William Blackstone, who they refer to as someone of note; “considered to be one of the greatest historical English legal commentators ever (an Oliver Wendell Holmes type)” (Bickel & Lake, 1999, p. 19). However, when Sir Blackstone coined the term, it is important to realize that the college age pupil was not his intended student for such a policy to address:

> Just a few years before the revolutionary war, Blackstone commented on English law to the effect that: the father “may also delegate part of his parental authority, during his life, to the tutor or schoolmaster of his child; who is then *in loco parentis*, and has such a portion of the power of the parent committed to his charge, viz. that of restraint and correction, as may be necessary to answer the purposes for which he is employed. (Bickel & Lake, 1999, p. 19)

This was a father’s power then, under English law, and Bickel and Lake’s historical analysis of the formation of the term is important in that it establishes the precedent that the student possessed neither power nor place in the system – the power extended directly from parent to the institution of learning. In considering this, it is also important to remember that the parent gave this power and privilege simply by sending the pupil to such an institution. Moreover, Blackstone phrased it as something better aimed at elementary or secondary school students and did not necessarily consider it part of the role of the college. His stance on the age could be due to the various roles he had served at Oxford before his statements on *in loco parentis*, such as bursar, steward of manors, assessor of the Chancellor’s Court, and the first lecturer on English law. If his intent was that *in loco parentis* should expire at a certain age or degree, it does not appear that he specified it as such (Holdsworth, 1932, p. 261). Whatever Blackstone’s intent, the idea quickly took hold
that all institutions of education acted *in loco parentis* and thus the idea entered both the American and English statutes for consideration in legal cases.

In a more modern America, almost one hundred years after Blackstone had spoken about the concept, the idea would become more structured as it encountered the American legal system and went through various courts. While there had been earlier cases which had argued whether professors acting within the classroom or in an administrative role were or were not allowed to act in a parental relationship to students, there would be two cases which would have lasting impact on the role that the doctrine had in higher education. The first case, which, of course, would inform and serve as a structural precedent for the latter case, was the 1866 case of *Pratt v. Wheaton College* in the Illinois Supreme Court. This particular case addressed the life of the student outside of the classroom and exterior to the direct realm of the administration as it addressed whether or not students had the right to freely join secret societies. In the case, Edwin H. Pratt was expelled from Wheaton College because he had violated the student policies by joining a secret society, which was expressly banned by the College policy. His father took the matter to court, attempting to receive an order from the court to compel the institution into granting his son readmission. The father and son would both find the court unmoved when it released these comments as part of the opinion:

> Among the rules they have deemed it expedient to adopt, is one forbidding students to become members of secret societies. We perceive nothing unreasonable in the rule itself since all persons familiar with college life know that the tendency of secret societies is to withdraw students from the control of the faculty and impair to some extent the discipline of the institution. Such may not always be their effect, but such is a general tendency. But whether the rule be judicious or not, it violates neither good morals nor the law of the land, and is therefore clearly within the power of
the college authorities to make and enforce. A discretionary power has been given them to regulate the discipline of their college in such matters as they deem proper, and so long as their rules violate neither divine nor human law, we have no more authority to interfere than we have to control the domestic discipline of a father in his family. (Hoekema, 1994, p. 169)

This legal opinion is informative for one primary reason as it is the first to provide a direct parallel within the statement of the court’s official opinion which directly paralleled the role of in loco parentis and the idea that a college was similar to a father disciplining his family. The decision of the Illinois Supreme Court in this case fully applied Blackwell’s concept of in loco parentis to the systems in place at colleges and universities. Still, while this case did set a precedent for future cases, Hoekema states that it was not nationally binding as the case never faced appeal to the United States Supreme Court. Thus it would only be binding within that district.

The latter case that would use the precedent established in Pratt v. Wheaton College and would further set and universalize the extent, reach and power of colleges and universities to engage in in loco parentis administration was the 1913 case of Gott v. Berea College. The decision in Gott would be more applicable to student boarding houses and related activities as it addressed the ability of a college to forbid students from frequenting a restaurant with the penalty being immediate dismissal, thus establishing the institution's right to regulate what businesses a student could use. The case centered on the appellant, J.S. Gott, who operated a restaurant in Berea, Kentucky and made the claim that Berea College “unlawfully and maliciously conspired to injure his business by adopting a rule forbidding students entering eating houses…”(Areen, 2009, pp. 807-808). The case
finding, decided by the Court of Appeals in Kentucky, supported Berea College’s authority as J. Nunn wrote, in part:

College authorities stand in loco parentis concerning the physical and moral welfare, and mental training of the pupils, and we are unable to see why to that end they may not make any rule or regulation for the government, or betterment of their pupils that a parent could for the same purpose. Whether the rules or regulations are wise, or their aims worthy, is a matter left solely to the discretion of the authorities, or parents as the case may be, and in the exercise of that discretion, the courts are not disposed to interfere….

(quoted in Areen 809)

Whereas the Pratt decision held in loco parentis as relevant, it addressed only the permissibility of a student joining a secret society on the campus, but the Gott decision expanded this control dramatically. The university could regulate what businesses and services that a student could use and, as the opinion also established, the business owners had no manner to find redress for these concerns:

...even if it might be conceded that the rule was an unreasonable one, still appellant Gott is in no position to complain. He was not a student, nor is it shown that he had any children as students in the college. The rule was directed to and intended to control only the student body. For the purposes of this case the school, its officers and students are a legal entity, as much so as any family, and like a father may direct his children, those in charge of boarding schools are well within their rights and powers when they direct their students what to eat and where they may get it; where they may go and what forms of amusements are forbidden.

(Areen 810)

With such an expansion, institutions of higher education could not only regulate and oversee student activities and community involvement including housing, boarding, and access to other services, but had more than enough justification and power to do so. Moreover, the Gott v. Berea decision was held as legal standing outside of Kentucky as it
was cited in decisions by other legal districts and the Supreme Court, making it applicable across the country. Furthermore, the impact it had on the concepts of boarding houses and renting rooms was dramatic as homeowners were similarly not students nor did they have any stake in the institution as parents. Effectively, Gott v. Berea was applied not only to private institutions but also public; it left room for the colleges and universities to enact policies that reflected a role that presidents and boards of trustees at various institutions could argue was parental and for the betterment of the students.

If the boarding house and homeowners who served students felt left without power, that was secondary to what Gott v. Berea College meant to students. As Bickel and Lake argue, if the parents had given the university a contract of control, they had left out one key actor that should have had legal rights in the matter:

First, the power in loco parentis was one to discipline, control and regulate. Second, the power was paternal – by analogy to the family and directly as a function of the delegation of parens patriae (the paternal power of the state.) Third, the power was a contractual delegation of authority among state, trustees, and officials: students were not contracting parties but were subjected to, and governed by, the contract. (23)

In effect, students would not be able to make many choices without the consent of the university acting as an authority. In this manner, the scope of power granted to the university would effectively mean that the choice of living quarters, meal options, and so forth was a matter of university discretion and that students would hazard disciplinary sanction including expulsion if they attempted to defy the choices of the universities and colleges which they attended. The decision in Gott v. Berea College effectively removed from the student population any choice through the sense of a contract of control that would govern their education.
These legal changes did not mean the college had a consistent duty. In loco parentis, indeed, was freeing for the institutions of higher education as it removed them from the recourse students would have if the colleges had a “duty” or obligation to the students that attended their institution. That is to say, the duties that the University addressed under in loco parentis created a university that featured “insularity from judicial scrutiny” (Bickel & Lake 31).

In its heyday, in loco parentis located power in the university — not in courts of law, or in students. In loco parentis promoted the image of the parental university and insured that the university addressed problems within the university, by the university, and often quietly. The most important feature of in loco parentis was to place a blanket of security and insularity around university culture such that disputes were not justiciable and university life was not predominantly juridical. Under the blanket, a university was free to exercise disciplinary power — or not — with wide discretion and little concern for litigation. (Bickel & Lake 17-8)

Bickel and Lake were not the first to make this statement. Though their more recent analysis can draw on more records, one can find many sources making such claims. One such work from 1924 begins by pointing out how minor an infraction could be used to sanction a student, Alice Tanton, from a “state owned educational institution”:

A recent decision of the Michigan Supreme Court upholding the expulsion of a girl student for cigarette smoking adds additional weight to the general rule that school authorities in general have practically unlimited power over students under their control so long as they exercise a “reasonable discretion.” […] The relation between student and college is a contractual one and the rules and regulations of the college as to government and discipline form a part of the contract. One may be a “student” without being matriculated, as where he attends recitations and lectures and is under the government of the institution [...] Once admitted as a student, the individual is, one might almost say, at the mercy of the school authorities. (Sloan, 1924, p. 187)
Miss Tanton was one of seventeen women students expelled from the Michigan State Normal School and she took the matter to court asking to be reinstated, but the institution was unwilling to waver, and President Charles McKenney responded when asked to testify by stating that “I have learned from the school superintendents, editorials, W.C.T.U. women and from the opinion of school men throughout the state who have told me they would not hire a girl who smoked” (Mann, 2014, p. 89). The argument would then be that the institution was only looking out for her welfare as she would be unemployable as a teacher and a detriment to other students who could teach. In the end, the decision of Michigan State Normal School was upheld and, even when Miss Tanton’s attorney appealed to the Supreme Court of Michigan. The result left Miss Tanton stating that she most likely would not be able to teach: “I feel at present that there is no use in my trying to study further for the teaching profession in another college, since the record against me at Ypsilanti will always be there to prejudice school boards against me” (Mann 91). The counterpoint one should make to this legal freedom is that of implied duty and parental expectation, but institutions quickly found a way to address this concern, creating a new form of administration.

If in loco parentis largely protected the school, it also required them to impact students by dictating the options that received approved status as appropriate for student life. If Bickel and Lake are correct and it empowered the institution, and Tanton’s case demonstrates that the students had little recourse, it still meant that the institutions had to provide a system, at least somewhat organized, by which to engage in the in loco parentis control mechanisms the courts granted them. With most faculty time already taxed or spoken for during the period, few faculty members would readily volunteer to inspect
student living quarters on campus, let alone within the community. Institutions across the country developed staff or relatable positions to perform these duties and ensure the betterment or at least control of student living options and these positions became the foundations for modern student affairs officers and deans. As one study of the history of higher education shows, the creation of such offices was decidedly removed from the academic:

The student-affairs staff emphasized the enforcement of regulations. Most likely, college administrators had an uneasy sense that the expanded numbers of students had put the institution in a precarious situation – namely, one of increased responsibility for student conduct and decreased ability to control it. (Thelin, 2011, p. 221)

Another educational historian places the argument at the time of the University of Kentucky engaging in in loco parentis administrations, arguing that the period after World War I included a mandate of sorts for the life of the mind outside of the classroom:

Among the most important changes to occur on college campuses nationwide throughout the first half of the twentieth century (and most especially in the twenties and thirties) was the increasing attention paid to students’ extracurricular life. By the time of World War I, academic leaders were becoming persuaded that athletics, social clubs, Greek-letter societies, theater groups, campus newspapers, and student magazines – all the features of college life that seemed to occupy an increasing share of collegians’ interests and time – were evolving without the benefit of adequate coordination and supervision. Nonacademic activities, it was argued, carried with them a potential for substantial benefits. In terms of making students more well-rounded, forming character, encouraging socialization, and so forth, such activities could be a good thing if guided and directed into constructive channels. Perhaps it was time to revive the old-time collegiate attention to the non-intellectual side of a student’s development. Besides intellectual training, colleges and universities needed to give more attention to students’ social, emotional, and physical development. Closer supervision of students’ off campus housing,
including rooming houses and fraternity and sorority chapter houses, was required. On campus student housing needed to be expanded, refurbished, and placed under closer surveillance. Dormitories needed to be made more attractive. (Lucas, 2006, pp. 211-212)

While Lucas provides the “why” of the creation of student personnel services or student affairs, he never explains the “how” – much enabled by the rule of in loco parentis. The ability to insert university policy into situations, provided they affected students, more readily enabled the institution to engage in the activities and lives of students, even when removed from the campus proper. The rise of student numbers and the needs of faculty to take on increasing academic loads and duties may have created the student affairs field, but it was largely empowered by the legal decision of Gott v. Berea College.

If in loco parentis may seem natural to elementary and secondary educators as those populations are still minors, the reasons it persisted in higher education are varied and linked in part to the presence of student affairs professionals. As recently as 1947, a legal case, Niewiadomski v. U.S. affirmed that adults, including college students, were subject to the policies of in loco parentis (Harms 12). While some argued that the concept died away in the 1960s (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1996, p. 241), others proclaimed that elements of it continued to be resurrected. One 1970 analysis begins effectively with this proclamation, “‘The King is dead, Long live the King!’ has long been a slogan which emphasized the continuity of government – even an oppressive one” (Harms, 1970, p. 11). Harms presents a unique thought as to why certain elements of in loco parentis have lasted within the college system, stating the following as reasons indicative of the situation in colleges and the courts:
As a general rule, the courts have upheld the position as long as powers of control, restraint, or disciplinary action were not unreasonable or arbitrary. Often, the courts have required that all administrative avenues of redress be exhausted prior to appealing to the courts. This more or less affirmed the inherent authority of the institution and, in those cases which did reach the courts, the judicial decisions were slow to disturb the rules and regulations that the institution had prescribed for the students. The records show that the courts quite consistently upheld the actions and, although it may sometimes appear that courts seem to condone what may be described as arbitrary action, there seems to be an attitude of providing wide latitude to the interpretation of these actions. Quite often the courts recognize that the necessity to control large numbers of students may require more restraint than might be allowed in other settings. (Harms, 1970, pp. 2-3)

Harms furthers this discussion by citing legal cases well into the 1960s that show elements of in loco parentis, such as Landwehr v. Regents of the University of Colorado in 1964, Woody v. Burns in 1966, Goldberg et al. v. The Regents of the University of California in 1967, and discusses how these cases changed the understanding of in loco parentis but did not completely disregard such (13-7). Even more recently, in loco parentis was mentioned in a legal case involving MIT when a lawsuit was filed by the parents of Elizabeth Shin. Shin committed suicide while in her residence hall room, and as the parents' case claimed, “the MIT employees failed to act as ‘in loco parentis to the deceased’” (Peril 349). While the Massachusetts Superior Court did clear MIT of any wrongdoing, it did not immediately clear the employees, saying that “the four psychiatrists and two administrators could proceed to a jury trial as their knowledge of Elizabeth Shin’s mental state constituted a ‘special relationship’ with her…” (Peril 349). In the long run, these cases illustrate the needs of colleges to provide expanded services that enlarged the staff of the institutions to better regulate, control, and analyze the student populations. For the University of Kentucky, much of this growth was due to the need to monitor the housing of students.
Creating a Parental Environment: The Rise of Housing Staff Due to In Loco Parentis

He shall also be charged with the general oversight of the morale of the students, and shall provide such rules for the regulation of the Dormitories as may appear most beneficial for the occupants of same. With the advice of the President he may provide such means for the enforcement of the rules of discipline as may appear most advisable. […] He shall secure and keep on file a list of approved boarding houses in the City of Lexington in which students may secure board, or board and lodging. The list shall set forth the locations, price, and other facts that may appear to be necessary to enable the students to make selections, and he shall render them all reasonable assistance to secure comfortable and congenial location. He shall also have the records show the location of each student and at proper intervals visit the boarding house and see to the welfare of the students. (“Board of Trustee Minutes,” 1848-1940)

So began one of the earliest mentions of how housing would shape the creation of new staff as the University of Kentucky declared on April 14, 1908, that it would be the duty of the comptroller, then William T. Lafferty, to control and know of student living quarters. Lafferty already had a sufficient workload as Dean of the Law School at the University, but he carried these inspection and cataloging duties only a short time. The growth of the institution would not allow this duty to rest for too much time in his hands.

By 1911, Mrs. Sarah Marshall, the person hired to inspect the male dormitories, would find her job expanded, with a slight raise to her salary, provided she inspect other forms of student housing that the University of Kentucky had leased to house overflow students. As aforementioned, the county appointees who were guaranteed spaces would sometimes arrive to find the dormitories full. Thus, as the September 23, 1911 Board of Trustees Minutes states, her duties were readily expanded to involve such inspection:
That the salary of Mrs. Marshall be fixed at $600, per year, for which [sic] she will perform the duties heretofore required of her, and in addition perform the same duties in the houses rented by the University that she is required to perform in the dormitories upon the campus, and that she give such time as is necessary for such purpose to both the dormitories upon the campus and the houses rented by the University. (“Board of Trustee Minutes,” 1848-1940)

Seemingly, Mrs. Marshall would have this duty until 1917, as she was part of the testimony involving President Barker, but soon after that, upon the arrival of McVey, there would be another change in policy that would more logically reflect the 1917 trial of Gott v. Berea College.

On December 10, 1917, the Board of Trustees met for one of their earliest meetings under the presidency of McVey, who had just taken the position in September. In this session, they reviewed and set forth the various duties of different positions. President McVey appears in the minutes showing that there was a need to address the organization of the institution based upon the recommendations of what he terms the “Probe Committee,” referring to the Investigative Committee. McVey praises the progress made in short time, but expresses concern about the organization of the institution:

Of the sixty-nine points made in the report of the Probe Committee, twenty-four have been accomplished. Some of the points were admonitions, so that the number remaining to be worked out is not so large as would be indicated by the figure given. One of the points of that report was the organization of the University under a constitution. A committee was appointed to work this out, and after study of the constitutions of other institutions, a tentative constitution was presented to the Council and finally, after some modifications, brought before the University Faculty. (“Board of Trustee Minutes,” 1848-1940)

In the same meeting, statements expressing expectations of duties regarding how different offices and positions would operate were established. Herein, the responsibilities for
inspecting living quarters were divided among the dean of men and dean of women, as their duties are stated as follows:

1. **The Dean of Men**
The Dean of Men has supervision of the welfare of all the men students of the institution. He has frequent personal interviews with them, and corresponds with their parents on matters of their conduct. He has oversight of rooming and boarding houses for men, including the dormitories on the campus, and the fraternity houses. He inspects these houses and in cooperation with the President, approves or disapproves such houses and sees that proper discipline is maintained in them.

2. **The Dean of Women**
The Dean of Women is charged with the general supervision of all the women students of the institution, including those in Patterson Hall (provided that the legislature amend the statutes to this effect). The Dean will aid and advise with women students in their institutional life. (“Board of Trustee Minutes,” 1848-1940)

While the duties of the dean of women does not blatantly outline the transfer of such a duty, this post-Gott v. Berea College reaction of the University of Kentucky shows that, now, the inspection of all housing was something the dean of men and the dean of women would be expected to accomplish. Both positions had previously been in a state of flux. President Barker had only recently made the dean of women a full-time position and created the dean of men position at the institution (Barker and Gillis 11). Thus this statement was meant to address the seeming disorganization which existed under President Barker.

If the need to inspect housing required the positions of the dean of men and the dean of women to be better defined, it would also lead to an increase in the need for support staff to better aid these officials. The minutes of the Board of Trustees meeting on
December 10, 1918 included an analysis of the need for the dean of women to be “relieved of a considerable part of her present teaching schedule, and provided with clerical and stenographic assistance that should make for more time to look out for conduct, welfare, and guidance of the women students…” (“Board of Trustee Minutes,” 1848-1940). While the point made in the minutes is that this has been slow to happen, it is demonstrative of the growing need to create the support structures of a growing educational institution in the Progressive Era.

**Separate Genders and Divided Positions**

For the sake of examination of how in loco parentis, housing, and the related duties expanded the role and number of staff at the University of Kentucky, the deans of men and the deans of women between 1917 and 1930 provide sufficient indication of the growth. During this time they established that their duties included the inspection of housing options. To enable better this discussion, it will be necessary to divide the investigation of their history between the two positions as the titles had different natures from almost their beginning.

While, as established, the rise of in loco parentis intersected with the rise of dean of men and dean of women, if the dean of men felt expectations of in loco parentis control in some manner, it was decidedly reduced from what dean of women faced. In his article, “The Rise and Demise of Deans of Men,” Robert Schwartz provides insight into why this distinction may exist. The dean of women position, as interpreted by Schwartz’s article, provides more insight into the impact of in loco parentis. This is due in part to the role being both a precursor to the dean of men in many institutions as well as the fact that it was
established to address an element that faculty had not previously addressed, the women student population:

Most presidents were comfortable managing money, trustees, faculty, and competition; but students, especially the newly arrived women students, were more troubling. In response, college presidents appointed women faculty to be deans of women to oversee female students. The decision was made several years later by the appointment of male faculty to be deans of men. (R. A. Schwartz, 2003, p. 217)

Prior to the admission of women and the “dawning” of the Progressive Era, the system was built for males, but elements of the male system did not feel immediate comfort with the addition of a female populace. Thus, the addition of women and the fact that women were not as present prior to the Progressive Era naturally meant the roles would be different in some way. For instance, Schwartz denotes that deans of women had a focus on research, given that many of them had membership in the Association of College Alumnae (later the American Association for University Women) and that deans of women formed regional associations by 1903 (218). He indicates that deans of men did not view the academic side as much in detail, but rather saw the deanship as a “calling, as a minister or priest may be called to a pulpit” (219). In this statement, he does not imply that the deans of men were uneducated, as many were faculty members, but rather that their personality was the essential element and their training in what would be known as student affairs was secondary. He would expand on this concept in his later book, *Deans of Men and the Shaping of the Modern College*:

As Stanley Coulter, the Dean of Men at Purdue, remarked in a speech on “The Function of the Dean of Men in the State University,” it is utterly impossible to tell what the function of the Dean of Men may be. He is a personality, not an officer.” Codified through the national association, deans of men, both young and old, believed that a man’s personality
was the key element in becoming a dean. (R. Schwartz, 2010, p. 8)

Thus, the deans of women more often prized academics, research, and writing as their basis of power within their field, while most deans of men viewed their position as a calling that matched their personality.

If the deans of women prove better study for in loco parentis for the above reason, Schwartz goes further to posit another reason as well by pointing out that, to state universities, male students were established and essentially served by everyone, but administrators did not know how to address women:

Deans of Women, by contrast, had been in office as early as 1892, if not earlier, under titles such as matrons or chaperones. In 1892, Alice Freeman Palmer and Marion Talbot were officially named dean of women and assistant dean at the University of Chicago. Women were a new and troubling population for most college presidents, a fact precipitated the appointments of deans for women. Male students were a part of the natural order, so deans for men were not appointed with the same urgency. (R. A. Schwartz, 2003, p. 221)

Given these distinctions and the presence of data in Special Collections that supports these theories, it will be necessary and useful to divide the dean of men and dean of women into separate examinations. Thus, in examining how they approached the information, their positions are demonstrative of how housing impacted the staffing of the University of Kentucky.

*The Dean of Men and the “Modern” Staff Member*

In December of 1917, the dean of men’s position, as aforementioned in the Board of Trustees Minutes, was designed to be in communication with parents and students and
to ensure proper living quarters available both on and off campus. Columbus R. Melcher had assumed the position of dean of men beginning in 1914, but following the push by President McVey for more organization and the control granted by in loco parentis, there exist many public examples of Melcher's role of supervising students both on and off campus. While many students lived off of the campus proper, Melcher was able to ensure that those in fraternities, social groups, classes, or other such elements were required to detail their plans for the year by leveraging the control of recognition and access to resources. A notice published in the October 3, 1919 *Kentucky Kernel*, the student newspaper, illustrates:

> Last spring, at the request of President McVey, representatives of every organization, society, fraternity, club, and class at the University were called together for the purpose of perfecting a body to be known on the campus as the Student Social Committee. A representative of each of these organizations were elected and these members constitute the committee. R. Smith Park was elected chairman. The following is a notice that will be of interest to every student in the University. All fraternities, societies, clubs, classes, and similar organizations who desire to give social functions during the present year are requested to secure application blanks from Dean Melcher not later than October 8, 1919. It is absolutely necessary that those desiring a date for any activity make immediate application for same as the social calendar for the entire year is to be arranged on the above named date. (“Organization Notice to All U.K. Students,” 1919)

Should that fail, he also ensured that students attended chapel as a means to monitor the student condition, using the *Kentucky Kernel* and other methods of public notice such as the following:

> Freshmen are reminded that attendance at chapel every week is compulsory. Failure to attend will henceforth be dealt with by the discipline committee. Seat numbers are found on the bulletin board near the chapel door. (“Freshmen,” 1923)
Further, he used in loco parentis control to monitor what occurred on campus, requiring students working jobs, especially jobs which might impact other students, to register and carry a “recognition card” saying they were permitted to perform such a job. Evidence such as the February of 1919 notice requiring any student selling magazines or articles register shows the policy and explains the requirement of registering, stating that this was “absolutely necessary as a number of frauds have been detected.” Though few full communications remain from Melcher’s tenure as dean of men, his notices provide insights into his use of in loco parentis – he was able to mandate that all students involved in any manner of endeavor, from work, clubs, organization, or so forth register. Through such registration he could catalogue such information as well as using his control to mandate chapel as a way to document student whereabouts and concerns on a consistent and ongoing basis.

Melcher also ensured an in loco parentis-style control of students in the committees on which he served. If one reviewed the Kentucky Kernel on November 12, 1920, one would find that Dean Melcher was readily named to multiple committees by the senate, all linked to his in loco parentis-empowered role. He served as the chairman for multiple committees linked to monitoring students and their welfare, such as the Chapel Exercises Committee, the Student Social Affairs Committee, and the Discipline Committee, while also having a noted role in the Student Welfare Committee and the Rules Committee (“University Senate Names Committees,”). Such growth in committees was a response to an increasingly varied and diverse student body. If Dean Melcher was to monitor all male students effectively, his involvement in these committees would only be logical as they would keep him abreast of who was absent from required events, what groups were being
active or inactive, and allow him to address directly the men who violated such policies. His supporting roles in the Student Welfare and Rules committees would also be natural – he would surely need to know what challenges and risks there were to student safety, morality, and the like and would further need to be aware of new rules or rules that were ruled to be errata in the more modern university. Melcher would, however, not allow only his committee work to structure his tenure as dean of men, but also would expand a method of increasing student and faculty interaction through Student Government.

In campaigning for the growth of the Student Government system, Melcher readily admitted this idea fell in line with increased student monitoring. While Kentucky and one other state school in the “Middle West” region at the time lacked a “student self government” organization, the goal of such an endeavor was not as clear as the title suggested. Melcher himself dismissed the concept of it being a way for the students to dismantle the campus, instead positing it as a way to better ensure that faculty and other councils could more directly sway student standing, as he expressed in the *Kentucky Kernel*:

> Dean Melcher said, “The term, student self government, is usually misunderstood. It is not really a self government, but a co-operative government in which both students and faculty take part. The chief function of the student self government system is to co-ordinate the efforts of the various college councils and to serve as a medium for expressing and influencing student opinion…” (“First Steps Taken to Establish Student Government System,”)

In considering Melcher’s many roles, the idea of many modern positions in student affairs comes to mind, ranging from his work within housing, student services, and so forth, but it is important to note his attention and focus on maintaining connectivity to students as well. While he played the role of disciplinarian, he also sought to find manners of
processing students that were in line with his position's stated expectation to make frequent
communications with all male students while also ensuring the discipline, control, and structure
of the same population.

If Dean Melcher’s approaches to the position were effective, he was readily
recognized for his success. By 1925, his success in managing the duties of monitoring and
controlling the male population of the University of Kentucky had placed him in enough
regard that he was named the President of the Association of College Deans. At the
Kentucky Convention of Colleges in 1928, he presented information on student success
that was relevant to the rural student population which made up a good number of his
constituent. His presentation, entitled “Is Student Employment a Menace to Scholarship?,”
was a work he had created through examining twenty different schools and his own
research at the University of Kentucky. His findings, particularly relevant to much of the
population at UK, was that within reason employment was not detrimental, yet he did note
“the standing of unemployed men is considerably higher than that of employed men
(“Kentucky Convention of Colleges Meets Here,”). Melcher managed to address the
growth of the position by establishing support systems and modes of study that enabled
him to better connect with students in a manner that seemed nonintrusive while readily
using systems of in loco parentis control.

If Melcher established a system wherein the use of registration was one in which
student whereabouts and behavior were tracked, his replacement, Dr. Theodore T. Jones,
did not seem overly ready to change the status quo. Still, upon Melcher’s resignation in
1933, his duties would be seen as significantly expanded to require not simply a
replacement, but a replacement and an assistant for that replacement. Dr. Jones was
designated the new dean of men in the Trustee minutes of June 23, 1933, but another appointment was made as Lyle B. Croft was named Assistant dean of men. The duties of monitoring a growing student population's housing, social activities, and so forth necessitated the growth and expansion of offices, further creating the expanded role of student support staff within the University of Kentucky. Still, Jones did not merely mimic the success of Melcher. He viewed the dean of men as fundamentally linked to education. As he had been both a teacher in the public school system and a professor of Latin at the University, he readily sought to speak on the issues that faced incoming students and to be a steward, a counselor, a teacher, and an engaged administrator.

Dr. Jones kept much of the registration processes the same – student groups were required to register for consideration of recognition, students interested in holding offices had to have a show of support, et cetera – but he expanded other services as a means of being aware of student challenges and issues. Both Jones and his wife were commonly cited in the Kernel as attending or even chaperoning most campus events, ranging from fraternity and sorority dances to campus plays. He made sure that he kept a high profile appearance. He often appeared at events in common with the dean of women to show unity in the control of campus, but also it was common for both he and the Assistant dean of men to speak at events that required all female students to attend (“Women to Have Mass Meeting,”). At the same time, he expanded control over the “student self government” when President McVey required that the Dean of Men be allowed to appoint one student of his choice to be “a representative of the men's dormitories.” Such a change granted the institution not only the control of communication but also a manner to influence student opinion that Melcher praised, (“Men's Student Council Will be Reorganized by President's
Order,“). The policy then was not the only element of change at hand, but rather a cultural shift in student support that Jones valued.

As dean of men, Jones sought to expand not only control but also assistance to those students at risk. Though he rallied and spoke about the lack of good training available in high schools (Winer), he also sponsored students in need and arranged drives to ensure their degree completion. Speaking to a student reporter, Jones observed, after four years of supporting such students, his philosophy was simple if not gruff, “In spite of the hardships, these students are here and there’s nothing we can do except make the best of it” (Steele). The reporter goes on to state that Dean Jones believed these students to be of high value, “They are not only willing to suffer for a chance – they are eager to do so.” In the Board of Trustees Minutes from September 19, 1933, Dean Jones was named to another committee, though he served on many of the same ones as his predecessor, in which he would be involved in the administration of grants to students (“Board of Trustee Minutes,” 1848-1940). In acknowledging the work of this committee, the Minutes state that, “The old system was chaotic and unsatisfactory while the procedure this fall has been orderly, systematic, and helpful.” In many manners, this early support system is exemplary of the future support systems of counseling, fiscal assistance, and so forth that would populate the duties of future student support personnel.

If the growth of housing control under in loco parentis added more duties to male positions and created more support staff through that area over time, the growth of female housing provides more indicators. As there had not been a long history of women at the University of Kentucky, the growth of enrollment, inadequate facilities, gender stereotypes, and a host of other issues made the in loco parentis control of female housing
vital. Women's housing on campus at the time was more demonstrative of the role the merging of in loco parentis and student housing would have on the modernization of the institution. These interactions created a status of support and engagement that had not previously existed and would be more demonstrative of the control in loco parentis engendered in housing that would serve as a reason to create and expand the blooming field of student affairs. As previous systems had long been established to support male students, women students and their expanding presence created more needs that had not been previously addressed. This fell to the dean of women.

(Matron, Bondservant, and Creator: The Dean of Women In Loco Parentis)

Deans of women may have predated the deans of men as colleges and universities did not know how best to handle women students as Schwartz proposes, but the powers and responsibilities placed upon the position of the dean of women at the University of Kentucky would be sufficient to define various future duties across the campus. In examining the history of the position, the time before in loco parentis in the case of Gott v. Berea College was essential to the formation of the position, “between 1900 and 1916, dedicated deans of women began transforming a nonstandardized job into a legitimate profession” (Bashaw, 1999, p. 3). The University of Kentucky would be no exception to this process of change. As Bashaw acknowledges Sarah Gibson Blanding as one of the premiere deans of women in the South in her examination, the duties of the dean of women at the University of Kentucky began in large part with housing but also immediately included other duties as shown by historical documents.
Deans of women faced the need to address various issues from the beginning. The positions were unstandardized, but early studies of the risks of coeducation were able to provide some expectation of what the dean of women were to address at their institution. When the University of Michigan considered the concept of coeducation, they asked institutions who were coeducational to give them advice on the risks and benefits thereof. President Hopkins of Williams College responded that it was an issue of social structure:

There are difficulties and embarrassments connected with it…. The difficulty would be social; if the students out of classes, aside from study could be properly regulated it would work well. That would depend on the arrangements which you might make, and on the tone and sentiment of the community. (Quoted in L. H. Holmes, 1939, p. 6)

Horace Mann, as president of Antioch College, also responded to the concern over where women would live by stating, “If, for instance, they must be permitted in a city like yours to board promiscuously among the inhabitants, I should prefer that the young women of that age should lose the advantages of an education, rather than incur the moral danger of obtaining it in that way” (Quoted Holmes 6). President Finney of Oberlin College said the only way to make it work is to have “a wise and pious matron with such lady assistants as to keep up sufficient supervision” (Quoted in Holmes 7). The terminology was already that, then, of the home – a matron with experience in the domestic to run the affairs of the women students to maintain them in a family structured like society and to serve as a constant watch for their behaviors. The idea persisted that the challenge for women was that they needed the establishment of the routine of the home and that to remove that population from the structure of home was detrimental to their livelihood.

If the experts in education that Michigan consulted had concerns about coeducation, other professions were quick to make arguments against coeducation from their point of
view. Some people claimed that the colleges were preying upon the women population to increase fiscal benefits, that there had been no demand for coeducation or else Oberlin’s attendance would have been much improved by their place in coeducation (Van de Warker, 1903). Van de Warker also expands his economic argument into one of politics, stating:

The purpose of the act of 1862 is expressed in the following preamble: “To teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the Legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.” There was evidently no intent to found the present coeducational college with uncontrolled social relations as a coordinate department of the training. (Van de Warker, 1903, p. 4)

Van de Warker goes on to quote an article from *Popular Science Monthly*, in which the colleges of the West are decried as increasing, but are “weak and doing poor work in poor ways” and going on to link this to the coeducational nature of such endeavors (5). If Van de Warker made a claim based on economics and politics, others would make it based on medical claims. Leading this charge had been Dr. Edward H. Clarke, who warned that medically coeducation would be the end of the New World:

It is not asserted here that improper methods of study, and a disregard of the reproductive apparatus and its functions, during the educational life of girls, are the sole causes of female diseases; neither is it asserted that all the female graduates of our schools and colleges are pathological specimens. But it is asserted that the number of these graduates who have been permanently disabled to a greater or less degree by these causes is so great, as to excite the gravest alarm, and to demand the serious attention of the community. If these causes should continue for the next half-century, and increase in the same ratio as they have for the last fifty years, it requires no prophet to foretell that the wives who are to be mothers in our republic must be drawn from trans-atlantic homes. (Clarke, 1882, pp. 62-63)
In a time of concerns about immigration and keeping some sense of America as being its own entity, Clarke used his medical expertise as a former Harvard Medical School educator to meld his expertise with the prevalent fears of society to create a medical proof against coeducation. His primary claim, that people of all types only had so much blood flow that could be directed, allowed him to show how in his studies (only six in total) he found educated women more likely to be unable to bear healthy children. He posited that this was due to the blood being removed from its “proper” place in reproductive needs and redirected toward thought in a male themed academic setting. He stated that the male-centered academic world did not allow time for women to “rest” or process their development, decrying that girls transitioning into maturity were already in secondary education and that this was problematic without adding higher education:

Mothers are, or should be, wisely anxious about the first passage for their daughters, and women are often unduly apprehensive about the second passage for themselves. All this is obvious and known; and yet, in our educational arrangements, little heed is paid to the fact the first of these critical voyages is made during a girl’s educational life and extends over a very considerable portion of it. (34-5)

Though Clarke was quickly countered in the press and through various examples, his arguments would still be referenced for some time. Through arguments such as the ones presented by Clarke and Van de Warker, coeducation was considered embedded in concerns for the economic, political, and medical interests of women students, positing a unique role for the dean of women from before and well into the reign of in loco parentis.

Horace Mann’s statements framed an ongoing argument for a matron to supervise the housing of women and to serve a motherly role and, to the greatest extent possible, ensure much of the home like situation remained to support the women students. Oberlin
College had long tried to provide housing for its students, and when that failed by 1907, they would engage in business that would mirror what would follow Gott v. Berea College:

The Deans of Women evolved a system which was reasonably effective. The Matrons of these houses had to be approved by the Deans, and they were responsible to the Deans for the conduct of the students in their houses. In 19100-11, Dean Fitch referred in detail to her efforts “to insure wholesome and happy home conditions in each of the forty or more boarding houses.” (L. H. Holmes, 1939, p. 44)

The duties outlined by the Board of Trustees minutes allowed the dean of women to supervise any element of the female student, and it would not be uncommon for any dean of women to have a significant and lasting level of impact both on campus and off for the student population.

These discussions frame what the dean of women would be like at the University of Kentucky in the early period of in loco parentis. The dean of women and, later, those who worked in her office, was expected to handle all aspects of the women attending the University of Kentucky, including their living quarters, social life, security, health, nutrition, discipline, and academic development. While Bickel and Lake argue that the in loco parentis ruling empowered institutions, the dean of women position speaks against this argument. As the lingering concerns of coeducation held some attention and as gender bias was prevalent, the result, as the following documents will show, is that the deans of women had more duties than the deans of men. These additional duties extended to in loco parentis concerns and that, in this way, the need to supervise the housing of women actively pushed the more progressive ideas of student services on to the campus.

First, as perhaps the primary focus, the dean of women had to address the housing issue. As the needs of housing women were complicated historically since the University
of Kentucky became coeducational in the 1880s yet did not have an on-campus housing situation for students until the opening of Patterson Hall in 1904, there stands a history of the dean of women having a duty to women's housing needs. Ensuring the quality was one of the key elements of contact for the dean of women, and such contact was considered a valuable and meaningful element of the work (Acheson, 1932, pp. 21-43). At the University of Kentucky, the dean of women kept various records on women and their living status. Of course, there were records and rosters of the students who lived on campus, but there was also full reports on students who resided off campus. One undated record found in the dean of women's papers for the 1920s and 1930s included a list of students spread over eleven pages labeled “Living in Town, Commuters, and Graduate Students” (Klotter, 1977). It denotes various elements that would be of import to assuring a quality of housing for students ranging from their method of arriving on campus (commuter, etc.), undergraduate or graduate status, home address, marital status, who ran the home in which they lived, and in many cases if they were employed and how so. In another report from 1934, prepared by Sarah B. Holmes for Dean Sara Blanding, details of not only where but why students were permitted to live in certain locations in town were set forth:

I have divided the students who are living in town into four groups:
1. Those who must live on less than what it costs them in the hall
2. Those who prefer a private home to a residence hall
3. Those who live with relatives other than parents
4. Mother’s helpers
Of the mother’s helpers, not one of the group would be able to pay as much as five dollars a week for room and board. Practically all of them are getting along on the little edge of nothing. Hazel Allison, Mary Elizabeth Earle and Mabel Lowry are doing CWA work as well as the work in the home in which they live.
All the students who are living with relatives are living with near relatives with the exception of Sue Ammerman and Gladys Medley who are living with cousins. Sue is paying her cousin twenty dollars a month for room and board and Gladys is living at Greendale with a cousin who is an officer there. All the other girls are living with relatives who are so closely related that it would appear that the reason they are here is because they can make their homes with near relatives while they are in college.

Of the students who say they cannot afford to live in the halls, it might be said that Margaret Drucker, Ezra Mae Gaul, Marcella Holtzclaw, and Elsie Reasor could not afford to live in the hall at any cost. All the others, twenty in number, could pay something for room and board, possibly up to five dollars a week.

[...] If the thirty-three students who are living in town now had lived in the hall this year, it would have meant an additional income for the halls of $8,580.00. (S. B. Holmes, 1934)

This report, while detailing housing, also shows some of the other elements of the dean of women's duties. The mother's helpers were a form of connective assistance in which the dean of women would work with members of the community to place women students within homes in the community that had children and were willing to provide room and board and sometimes a modicum of pay to students who would assist in running the house.

References to this often indicate that it was the preferable way for women with a fiscal need to find homes in the community as it placed them within the realm of a family while addressing their need for work and other duties while still allowing them to attend courses. The report also showcases, again, the level of information that Dean Blanding was keeping including the fiscal, family connections, and other information.

One element that does not receive as much attention in the report is the control the dean of women had on student living options and access to businesses. While few direct examples of this can be found, there are elements that are covered in some detail in brief
letters. A letter addressed to Mrs. F.F. Webb from Sarah B. Holmes on January 23, 1930 states that the University will not allow women students to live in her home, yet does end by saying, “I hope that you will be able to find enough men students to fill your home” (Dean of Women’s Papers, 0000ua 257:23:3). A set of letters from six years earlier regarding the boarding house of Mrs. Emily McMeckin Honaker is more direct and indicative of the issues that boarding house operators faced. While both letters were marked June 3, 1924, one is labeled to the students and is very direct that they will have to find new accommodations for the fall semester as this living arrangement is no longer approved:

Beginning with the fall semester of 1924, women students of the University will not be allowed to live in Mrs. Honaker’s. I regret that this action has become necessary and I am sure you are grateful to Mrs. Honaker for having furnished you attractive and well kept rooms. (“Dean of Women’s Papers, Folder: Housing Off Campus 1924,”)

If the lack of description or explanation to the students strikes a modern reader as odd, the letter dated the same day to Mrs. Honaker herself is perhaps doubly concerning:

My dear Mrs. Honaker:
I feel that it is only fair to let you know that the University has taken your house from the list of approved residences beginning with the fall semester 1924. I assure you that I am exceedingly grateful to you for having made it possible that so many girls came to the University who otherwise might not have been able to get accommodations. It is with regret that the University has come to this decision; however, I am sure you will have no trouble in renting your rooms to townspeople. (“Dean of Women's Papers, Folder: Housing Off Campus 1924,”)

This lack of information about the concern or the cause of action mirrors what many other boarding house operators faced across the country. While there exist no records of what was required of a boarding house keeper in the eyes of the University of Kentucky,
knowing the dean of women was heavily involved, they shared connections to other professionals in other institutions. If such connections included sharing of policies and procedures for best practices, they perhaps had heard of policies such as this one, established at Eastern Michigan University:

4. Students may expect the following accommodations:
   a. Usual bedroom furniture; also table, chair (3), waste basket, bookcase, closet space
   b. Change of bed linen every week. The rest of the bedding should be clean.
   c. A thorough cleaning of the room each week by the landlady, unless other arrangements are made
   d. Bath privileges
   e. Reasonable parlor privileges
   f. Suitable light for evening work.
   g. Adequate heat for comfort
5. A room proper in its appointments for receiving callers should be accessible to our women students in houses in which they room. Under no circumstances should callers be entertained in the rooms of women students. A folding bed or a sanitary couch does not transform a bedroom into a reception room.
6. Young women may receive callers on an average of once a week on Friday or Saturday evenings, or on Sunday. Such callers should never stay after ten o’clock.
7. Young women are expected to observe the rule of propriety which prescribed that they shall not go out of the city evenings accompanied by young men, automobiling, canoeing, or to entertainments unless chaperoned. (Mann, 2014, pp. 78-79)

Through this excerpt, the duties dictated by the university to any woman running a boarding house becomes clear – it was a full-time job to clean, monitor, and report and it was not so simple as just having an extra bedroom to let, but required additional rooms for social conventions. While again there seems to be little documented feedback from Kentucky, Mann's work provides some statements from boarding house operators that may be informative to what their Kentucky counterparts faced. Speaking to the duty of requiring
inspections, one landlady said of these policies, “I feel I shall have no privacy in my own house,” while another said that the expectation that the boarding house “landlady” would chaperone the girls in town caused undo hardship, “What is one to do if one student wants to go canoeing and another wants to go automobiling and another wants to go out of town? She can’t be everywhere at once” (81). Others spoke of issues of trying to maintain the proper parlor culture the institution imposed as it seemed to imply proper entertainment and how this increased food expenses. While perhaps not informative of what cost Mrs. Honaker’s place on the University of Kentucky’s list of approved student rooming places, this parallel case is indicative of how universities dictated the role and responsibility of a boarding house operator if they hoped to serve and profit from the institution’s students. In the end, whatever the cause, the ruling of the deans was final and Mrs. Honaker’s home at 218 East Maxwell would not appear as a student address any longer under her ownership. Despite this, the dean’s words proved true as she did not seem to have left the boarding house trade. In the 1940 Census, her home at 218 Maxwell still showed nine lodgers in residence, though decidedly older than the college crowd with ages ranging between twenty-five and sixty and the gender of these lodgers being mixed.

If the deans had the power to remove or bar students from using facilities, this also placed them in a unique town and gown relation as another incident illustrated. The issue originated when someone delivered a letter stating there were concerns about Dr. Garr, the former spouse of Mrs. Garr whom apparently operated a boarding house. Dr. Garr’s alleged behavior was cause for some concern. The letter gives the reason that the author, unnamed, says that “Mrs. Holmes” needs to be addressed:
The question in our minds is this:

1. Is it dangerous for University students to live with Mrs. Garr? In a conversation with Dr. Vestermark, I asked him what physical danger there was to University students. He said that in case Dr. Garr attempted to hurt anyone, it would be Mrs. Garr.

2. If some tragedy were to happen, the attendant publicity would be disagreeable for the University.

3. Mrs. Garr seems to have a difficult problem as well. She is doing a good job for us and my judgment is that for the time being, we allow the students to continue to live there. She has leased the house from the first of September for a year. Her only means of support is the income she gets from the five university students who are living in her house. (Ramage, 1968)

This issue is indicative of the ongoing issues the dean of women must have addressed, but it also shows the issues extended off of campus and required consulting with professionals, such as Dr. Vestermark, in the community. The decisions of the dean of women would also, as this illustrates, have far-reaching repercussions – had Dean Blanding opted not to allow women students to live in the house Mrs. Garr provided, she would have deprived her of her sole source of income.

It was also not uncommon for the dean of women to be required to exert control over a student regarding housing in a manner that was not congruent with parent wishes. A 1938 letter exchange between Sarah B. Holmes as Assistant Dean of Women and Mrs. Sam Ellison is demonstrative of this as it reads in part:

I have been somewhat concerned in regard to Ruth, who has been registered at the University of Kentucky this summer. She has lived with Mrs. Mullins in town and I understand that Mrs. Mullins is a personal friend of yours. I have absolute confidence in Mrs. Mullins and realize that she has had a very personal interest in Ruth, but because of the fact that Mrs. Mullins keeps University boys during the regular school year, it has not been possible to give Ruth permission to live with her this fall. (S. B. Holmes, 1938)
The letter further goes on to state that the dean’s office has concerns that the student is “leading a rather gay social life” and has been “going out so constantly.” The letter ends with a requirement that Ruth is to report to the dean of women and, included for her mother’s review, is a copy of University regulations. This is illustrative of how the dean of women regulated where students could live, not only in the absence of the parent, but sometimes in place of the will of the parent. A similar example would be a 1932 exchange between Mrs. R.E. Bell and Sarah G. Blanding. On July 18, 1932, Mrs. R.E. Bell wrote a letter that ended with a definitive explanation of where she expected her daughter to live:

I understand that freshmen are supposed to stay in Patterson Hall, but I want my daughter in a private home. I have engaged a room for her with Mrs. Sam Castillo on 315 South Lime. I want her in this home because Mrs. Castillo is a friend of mine and some of Goldie’s school mates are going to room there. I do not want her move [sic] from where I am putting her. (Bell, 1932)

The response from Dean Blanding is direct and to the point:

I am sorry that I shall interfere with these plans. We have a rule in the University forbidding women students from living in residences where there are also men students. Mrs. Castillo [sic] has always kept boys in her home and if she expects to have men students this year I shall not be able to let Goldie room there. (Blanding, 1932)

Through these two examples, the role of the dean of women concerning determining student housing becomes more apparent. The dean of women determined housing assignments and permissions regarding where students could live, even having the authority to override parental wishes and the will of the property owner to establish to whom the owner could let the rooms or provide board.

The discovery of a similar instance was found in the archives regarding the need to close an eatery due to concerns about it being appropriate for students demonstrates the in
loco parentis power and growth of the Deans. While it is chronologically later, it does emphasize the continued role of the dean of women having duties and control expanding out from the responsibility to serve all women students. In 1954, Dean Sarah B. Holmes wrote a letter to Miss Frances Kendall, the dietician for the University, warning that it would soon be required that students no longer frequent the eating establishment, the Chat and Nibble. Her wording is direct and purposeful:

Last year I received numerous reports that the Chat’Nibble [sic] was unsanitary and at times filthy. On two visits to the place I found this report justified. I intended to talk to you about it before the end of the semester, but forgot to do so. If the place is to be open next year it will have to be spotlessly clean and sanitary, and the person who is supposed to do it must be held to a strict account for doing so. (S. B. Holmes, 1954)

Dean Holmes, much like Berea College had in the legal case that empowered in loco parentis, issued the letter as a form of warning that the students could be banned from the restaurant. If such a ban occurred, it would be possible for that action to lead to the closing of that establishment which was, as Gott’s eating establishment had been, dependent on students as customers. Moreover, the ability to send such a letter to an eating establishment was an element of the Dean’s duty to monitor and protect the health and wellbeing of students.

If monitoring students’ dining options for cleanliness was part of the dean's engagement, then so was their general health. While many records are not available, there exist some examples of the monthly reports provided to the dean of women regarding the students in residence. At different times a nurse, a team of nurses, or a doctor would visit the female dormitories or residence halls in an established infirmary. For instance, an undated pamphlet entitled “The Residence Halls for Women of the University of
Kentucky” lists Anna Fisher and Geneva Smith as nurses in “Staff of Women's Residence Halls”. The process of providing this service was to ensure the health of the students and to ensure that the dean of women was completely aware of every students’ health concerns and status. In 1918, the University of Kentucky, like many other places, was impacted by the flu epidemic which struck the country and is still cited as a historical reason for the vaccinations against the flu by the U.S. government (“The Great Pandemic - The United States in 1918-1919,” 2015). From this point forward, enabled by the ruling of in loco parentis, the dean of women was able to access information about student health to attempt to prevent future outbreaks. Well into the 1940s, reports were generated for the dean of women to show all potential health concerns that were presenting themselves in the hall. Generally a nurse would submit the report to the dean of women and it would list the following information: total number of treatments and calls, analysis of treatments, upper respiratory infections subdivided into sore throats, head colds, sinuses, and headaches, eyes, ears, toothache, chest, gastro-intestinal disorders subdivided into constipation, nausea and vomiting, and diarrhea, abdominal issues, dysmenorrhea, skin issues, injuries, temperature or pulse concerns, and miscellaneous areas not covered by other areas. The reports not only gave the number of each reported malady, but also listed individual names divided by residence and the number of treatments, days in the infirmary, and so forth so more predictive planning might be used if there was any risk of an outbreak.

While the physical health concerns might be traced back to the need to prevent an outbreak of illness amongst students, the dean of women also readily had filed an ongoing list of students who were found to be at risk for psychosis. One artifact that is indicative of the dean of women’s responsibility to monitor and address such students was found in a
report among her papers entitled, “Report of the University Unit of U.S. Public Health Service for Field Studies in Mental Hygiene, Second Semester 1936-37” (“Dean of Women's Papers, Folder: Student Correspondence.”). The report is divided by where the student lives and lists the mental problem the students has, a diagnosis, and in some occasions, advice on how to best address the student. The problems listed for those students in the female residence halls of Boyd and Patterson are varied, including nervousness, suicidal ideation, confusion, stuttering, financial mismanagement, and a host of other issues. The diagnoses left for the dean of women to address were equally varied, ranging from “emotional immaturity” to “Constitutional reaction type psychotic personality schizoid type.” As the dean also had the duty to monitor off-campus students, a full report was made of the mental state of those students and, perhaps unsurprisingly, mental concerns were just as common among those who were placed in the community as those placed within the hall. The standard duty this set for the Deans (a male list was also attached, but unmarked in the dean of women’s file) is important as it shows that not only did the duty extend to the academic, social, and physical wellbeing, but that the Deans also had the mandate to catalog and examine the mental status and concerns of students in order to better function as stewards, guardians, and to effectively control the student population.

Finally, the dean of women had often to report about the social habits of the women students on the campus. In the dean of women’s papers in the archives, individual student reports have a section on each report labeled “Who the girl goes with,” often listing male names, but in many cases listing female names if they were students the dean of women was closely watching. This is not overly shocking to discover as there was a concern about the social lives of women students, “Another ‘objection to coeducation to be considered,’
wrote an observer in 1905, was ‘summed up in the word ‘love-making’” (Peril, 2006, p. 43). Feeding into these concerns were the expectations of the female student within the structure of the coeducational university – a system caused in part by the “desire to pattern the educational institutions of the New South along the racial, gender, and class divisions of the Old,” demonstrating the “paradoxical character” of such policies (McCandless, 1993, p. 302). If the Dean felt the need to monitor who was “going” with whom, she had a good reason as the archives have a wealth of correspondence between the dean of women and parents regarding students who had married without the University's knowledge. Demonstrative of this situation is this letter:

My dear Mrs. Arthur,

I tried to call you Tuesday afternoon to tell you that Edna Lee had left the campus and had not returned by Tuesday afternoon. In the meantime I had learned that she had married and I did not know whether or not you had been informed of her marriage so I felt that I should call you.

(Sarah B. Holmes, letter to E. Arthur, 1952, Dean of Women Collection)

These letters demonstrate the role of the dean of women to ensure that social conventions were followed or at least documented. As Peril argues in examining the concerns about coeducation along these conventions at the time, “Parents worried that a daughter might make an unsuitable match with a young man she met on campus” (43). These letters show that the institution not only supplied educational guidance and structured elements to housing, but that the dean’s duty extended to structuring protocol to ensure parental expectations and, when that failed, often had to be the one to alert the parent of the breakdown of such expectations.

The dean of women and the dean of men, then, held various duties in relation to the students and were empowered by in loco parentis. Many of their duties began in relation
to their responsibility, as outlined initially in the Board of Trustees minutes, to monitor student housing. This would lead to the expansion of their roles and, eventually, the creation of new positions and the growth of the field of student affairs at the University of Kentucky. As the student population increased and in loco parentis continued to allow the deans to exert control, there began to be a need for not only increased positions but increased efficiency. As the deans had been able to control living options for students through the requirement of having to approve of off-campus housing in either boarding houses, rooming houses, or letting a place in town. Through the deans, the University would exert the established methods of control in the days of in loco parentis. One example of such control is found in the January 7, 1938 *Lexington Leader* that announced that there were plans to bring together boardinghouse, rooming houses, and other such student housing operators in an article entitled “House Mothers at U.K. May Form Association” which states that over “1,000 University of Kentucky students” room in the community. A Lexington Leader article published five days later announced over sixty “house mothers” attended a gathering to launch the initiative. Several other meetings were held and indicators that many attendees ran boarding houses and did not just let rooms were indicated in the topics of the meetings. For instance, a December 3, 1940, meeting of the group featured a presentation on “Menu Planning and Food Purchasing” for student groups and also featured a presentation by Miss Marietta Eichelberger, who presented information about the nutrition needs of the college student and sanitation in living environment. The extension of the deans’ involvement with the local community to ensure housing supervision and a direct connection to housemothers was a new phase in town and gown relations and in many ways can be read as the apex of in loco parentis. For the University,
this was a way of cataloging and verifying those homes in a new way, but for the
housemother, it removed a nadir of control – since the University could inspect and forbid
students from living within a boardinghouse, it behooved a housemother to join so she
could be a part of the process and the University might more quickly recommend her home
to a student looking for such an opportunity, and thus her membership could be conscripted
in some form. The role of in loco parentis control bears merit in a conversation about the
modernization of campus culture as it leads to increased administration, including the dean
of women as a primary example. Indeed, Carolyn Terry Bashaw’s conclusion to Stalwart
Women: A Historical Analysis of Deans of Women in the South posits that historians should
ask how “academic women” were “agents of change in the development of higher
education – surely one of the benchmarks of modernization” (129). Thus, from the time of
the mention of the duties being required of a university official through the 1960s there is
substantial evidence such as the aforementioned to demonstrate in loco parentis control
was a major element of student housing patterns off campus. As the role of administrators
grew, it was the role of housing which lead to modernization.

As much as the dean of men and the dean of women owe their existence to the
expansion of services to students, so too did policies created out of the Dean’s offices
indicative of the Progressive Era leading to the rise of student affairs and student service
staff. As the deans of men and deans of women were called upon to monitor housing,
provide academic counseling, monitor health threats that could spread across campus,
communicate with parents and other administrators, and so forth, it became apparent that
other support staff would be needed and that the growing campus would need
diversification. What began with the idea that the comptroller could monitor housing
quickly expanded to two positions, the dean of men and the dean of women, monitoring
housing and serving in roles empowered and, seemingly, required by in loco parentis.
While Bickel and Lake argue that it insulated the universities and colleges from
repercussions and kept them free of a seeming form of legal duty, the expansion of staff
that came to include housemothers, nurses, academic advisors, and a host of others were
engendered based on what the deans were originally meant to address. In loco parentis and
the expectations of the University meant that monitoring housing would lead to creating a
wider system of student services and student outreach that would emerge in the Progressive
Era and continue into current times.
Chapter Four
The Outsider of Education in the Progressive Age: Housing Women at the University of Kentucky

The higher education of woman has ceased to be a conundrum. Woman has solved it. Statistics refute almost every objection raised against her high intellectual development. [...] The quota of women at the great co-educational colleges is constantly increasing, while Yale, John Hopkins, and the Universities of Pennsylvania and Chicago now offer her equal privileges. Room, more room, is the cry of every woman’s college, while the number following post-graduate courses increases yearly, substantiating the assertion of their preceptors that woman’s colleges are founded on the old Hellenic idea: “Culture for culture’s sake.” (McCabe, 1893, pp. 1-3)

McCabe’s statements are strong and supportive to be from an 1893 work, but there would still be much that would need to be done before the real victory could be declared. True, some women had found access and had proven their merit in the academic realms, but most campuses did not yet provide a real sense of access including equality in facilities, outreach and the like. For as much as McCabe hailed the increasing “quota of women,” others argued that the colleges that were transitioning into the twentieth century would face issues unique to their roles as being historical and revolutionary:

Clinging to many antique customs and traditions, the college is singularly conservative, yet it is in the forefront of the civilization’s progress, and contains the elements of the bloody revolutions as well as of the peaceful victories of righteousness. It is an historical product and a maker of marvelous history. Gathering the wisdom of the ages, it is centripetal, but it is centrifugal in throwing out dynamic and fruitful ideas. [...] The principles that underlie and enter into the formation of character have been the same in all ages, but to adapt these principles to the genius of each generation, without moral compromise, is a constantly recurring problem. (Millar, 1901, pp. 97-98)

Women were, in many ways, left caught between the reality of McCabe’s work, but the college structure that Millar presents. The universities and colleges were structured to be
historic and constant, for there was a seeming permanence and thus value in being so, but the institutions were also tasked with being modern and outreaching. Previously the college served many masters and that showed throughout course offerings and community settings, but those masters had always been male and the “genius of each generation” to borrow from Millar was readily shown to include women as proclaimed by McCabe.

If this was to be true, then the catering to the new generation should have included catering to women students, but this clearly was not the case. One very significant element was that women consistently lacked housing on most campuses, telling because dormitories linked to the experience of college life, indeed to the very college ideal. However, unfortunately for women students, their struggles to find housing between 1880 and 1930 would have a lasting effect and, on college campuses like the University of Kentucky, start undercurrents of change and adaptation in facilities, policies, and a host of other areas. It is important to pause here and note that the women students were, again, caught in the landscape of Millar's discussion of colleges holding to ancient ideals and also trying to be modern thus women could be said to fall readily into being the “other”, the “outsider”, or the “foreigner” in a sociological sense:

When survival is uncertain, cultural diversity seems threatening. When there isn’t “enough to go around,” foreigners are seen as dangerous outsiders who may take away one’s sustenance. People cling to traditional gender roles and sexual norms, and emphasize absolute rules and familiar norms in an attempt to maximize predictability in an uncertain world. (Inglehart & Baker, 2000)

If housing for students was already problematic for the institution, the addition of women and even the suggestion of finding them housing would have been enough to further cast them as an outsider as many institutions already felt the burden of not having “enough to
go around.” Therefore, while 1893 may have been too premature to declare victory, McCabe was correct to celebrate as the situation had advanced far from where it had been one hundred years earlier, yet not far enough to make women the campus other or the outsider.

But, till more equality be established in society, till ranks are confounded and women freed, we shall not see that dignified domestic happiness, the simple grandeur of which cannot be relished by ignorant or vitiated minds; nor will the important task of education ever be properly begun till the person of a woman is no longer preferred to her mind. For it would be as wise to expect corn from tares, or figs from thistles, as that a foolish ignorant woman should be a good mother. (Wollstonecraft & Pennell, 1891, p. 277)

In 1792, the publication of Mary Wollstonecraft’s *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, quoted in part above, followed her earlier works such as *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters* and *A Vindication of the Rights of Man*. While the work was often translated and caused conservative minds of the time to view her as a threat, she was hailed by many as an important voice. Her arguments that women could reason independently from men and that this would be to the benefit of both genders were noteworthy. As one analysis places the conversation, “Even as she appropriated the Enlightenment's philosophy of men's rights for women, she claimed Rousseau's philosophy of the education of boys and men for her own sex” (Palmer, Bresler, & Cooper, 2001, p. 71). Wollstonecraft would be hailed by more modern works as an essential element in the history of education, with one text studying her, *Mary Wollstonecraft: Philosophical Mother of Coeducation* (Laird, 2014), while various other texts ensure that her place in the argument for coeducation is mentioned (Fletcher, 1982; Manus, 1993; Peril, 2006, etc.) Writing in 1792, she focused more on access for all women to a basic education and for it to be similar to
the education boys received, and she crouched it in the idea of being, in part, effective mothers.

If Wollstonecraft was the initial appeal for coeducation, she would not be the last. Coeducation, according to one argument, would gain increased attention and debate in the Victorian era both in the United States and abroad. There was a sense that there must be a balance of sorts between the natural roles of women that were based more on the perceived nature of mothering and the domestic and that higher education may damage such a balance, and as one author states, “Victorian sensibilities were relatively universal on either side of the Atlantic, because they were based on similar codes of morals and religion” (Myers, 2010, p. 29). Myers states that factors such as understanding the “sphere” of domesticity, the effects of the industrial revolution, the need for middle-class daughters to work, and the feeling that the female population was rising helped create a feeling that coeducation was perhaps a logical component to consider. If the Victorian shift was indicated by the Industrial Revolution then the first quarter of the twentieth century easing toward the Progressive Era was a tipping point for coeducation in America:

In 1897 56 percent of all undergraduates, and 60 percent of undergraduate women, were enrolled in coeducational institutions. Coeducation varied considerably by region in 1897, with the Northeast educating just 29 percent of its undergraduates in dual-sex institutions, the South 40 percent, and the Midwest and West around 86 percent. Much changed with regard to coeducation in the next quarter century. In 1924 almost three-quarters of all undergraduates were in coeducational settings. Even in the Northeast 52 percent were in coeducational setting and 60 percent were in the South. (Goldin, Katz, & National Bureau of Economic, 2010, p. 3)

The numbers in 1897 were impressive considering works such as Edward H. Clarke’s Sex in Education, or A Fair Chance for Girls had been published in 1873 and was a bestseller
that assured the public that the idea of coeducation would inflict biological harm on female students. Coeducation may have been originally championed in part by Wollstonecraft in the latter part of the eighteenth century, but when it actually began to happen at the University of Kentucky in the 1880s, it would be a far cry from a true sense of equal access, especially in housing. Still, much of the expansion of the campus owes to the early presence of women students and their need for housing.

Despite hesitation in some sectors, in reality, coeducation and housing were linked in the thoughts of many educators, politicians, and other interested parties. Early conversations about coeducation emphasized the need to consider where women students would call home, and among those engaging in the conversation, one would find such notable individuals as the educational reformer, politician, and President of Antioch College Horace Mann, who wrote in an 1858 letter:

> Strongly, therefore, as I am in favor of the joint education of the sexes I should first demand to know what security can be furnished for moral protection. And until this question shall be satisfactorily answered I should not dare vote in favor of my own side of the question and should make such inquiries as these: Can the sexes have separate lodgings? Can they take their meals together and then be separate? For it is well that they should eat together. Can they have opportunities for meeting each other say once a fortnight or three weeks, in general company as people moving in the same circle meet each other at ordinary parties? This is a great safety valve and should be properly provided for. […] We also have a boarding-house for the young ladies. I should deprecate exceedingly turning our young ladies into the street for their meals. (Regents proceedings, with appendixes and index: 1837-1864, 1915, p. 789)

Mann’s letter readily calls for great consideration of housing, board, and the related elements essential to the success of the college and says that it is required that this is considered so as to avoid tragedy. Near the end of his letter to the Regents, he states readily
a comment that seemingly predicts the need that would be realized for the dean’s support of the initiatives of various institutions' housing efforts; “We have never had here the happening of one of those events mildly called accidents, but it is only because of our constant sleepless vigilance” (790). Mann’s concerns echo out of a need seemingly to preserve the safety and value of women students, but university housing or even organized housing options were found to have far more impact than just the conversation about safety.

Despite Mann’s concerns, however, there would not always be a form of constant vigilance or even accurate record keeping. As Helen Lefkowitz Horowitz readily states, most universities and colleges initially had a laissez-faire attitude about supervising living arrangements:

Initially many of the coeducational institutions did not supervise the living arrangements of their students, male or female. They let them board in town, making private arrangements with local landladies. For the venturesome early generation, some of whom had been on their own as school-teachers, this freedom fit their expectations. (Horowitz, 1987, p. 201)

However, the culture was not ready for the idea that students, particularly women students, should not be supervised. Such beliefs were also fanned by theories such as those of Charles Richard Van Hise, President of the University of Wisconsin, who issued the theory of “sex repulsion” which stated that men fled courses if the majority of those who took the courses were women, and he used as a concept to recommend gender segregation in courses and areas of campus (Peril 45). Even fiction of the time paralleled the idea that a parental impact could be welcomed on campus. The novel Her College Days (1896) tells of Lois Darcy who brings her widowed mother to school with her (referred to in Peril 60-61). Reviews of the work highlighted how it kept the purity of the college present, and stated, “The
strongest, most pathetic picture, one which is dramatic and almost becomes tragic, is that of the mother love shown by Mrs. Darcy” (O'Loughlin, Montgomery, & Dwyer, 1900, p. 862). The book ends, however, with marriage and not the protagonist receiving a degree. Horowitz’s first generation of uninterrupted students able to enter into their own housing agreements would end quickly under arguments from people such as Van Hise and the like who sought to control, alter, and regulate how many women could be on campus and where they could be.

A key element in most college experiences, regardless of the timeframe in history, is the access to social opportunities. In institutions across the country, there was a need to consider that campus culture, including the collegiality generated by student housing, was of vital import. As John D. Rockefeller helped create the University of Chicago, a letter his secretary sent to President Harper of that institution shows such a concern, saying that his son, a student of the institution, found something wholly missing from the campus; “He complains a little of the lack of what he calls ‘college spirit’ and what I should prefer to call cohesion and communal social and intellectual life among students” (Bachin, 2004, p. 81). The letter goes on to detail that “this feeling was most likely a result of the quarter system, combined with the fact that many of those who lived on campus were graduate students, and many undergraduates were from Chicago and lived at home” (81). While Harper argued back that some “student spirits” actually had no place at college, he did want a “spirit of scholarship” and he “hoped that the creation of a housing system of college residence would alleviate these feelings of alienation among students” (82). If male students needed things to embolden college spirit, some would argue that such an enterprise would be as vital or more so to the women students. As many women students were forced
to board due to a lack of housing options, there was a direct impact, “Students forced to board found themselves isolated from social life” (Horowitz, 1984, p. 245). Indeed, many women found their first experience of being ostracized in academics to be in the matter of housing, as shown by Olive San Louie Anderson's fictionalized recollection of her experiences as one of the first women students at a historically all-male college:

She thought that everybody was delightfully kind, and that going to college was one of the jolliest things in the world. At Mrs. Hodges’s, No. 94, a little girl came to the door, and, on being asked if her mamma had rooms to let to students, she went to speak to that lady, returning with the reply that “mamma don’t want girls.”

“Well,” said Will, with just a little sinking of the heart, “your mamma’s prejudices should be respected.”

The next was the Myers mansion, in Thompson street, where the lady of the house came to answer the bell herself. “I could not think of taking a lady-student, it’s so odd, you know; we can’t tell what they may be like,” and the door was closed without further ceremony.

Will’s spirit fell perceptibly at this, but she determined to try once more, so she rang at 59 Jefferson Avenue. A little colored servant-boy came to the door, and, after the usual question was put and carried to headquarters, he came back with a grin, saying, “She hathe not a good opinion of ladieths who wanths to come to a boyths’ college.” (Anderson, 1878, pp. 36-37)

Such rejections and concerns about finding proper living quarters would, of course, shape many students ideas about how the social life of college would be, but there were many who argued that these was an essential element which was at a coeducational institution that aided the socialization of all students. As a matter of fact, one defender of coeducation actually pointed to the essential nature of coeducation in helping both genders in the society of 1905. The argument centered on the concept of societal norms of the time, saying that for men the society of women would provide “social inspiration” and the “quickening of finer impulses and graces,” while women needed coeducational society to prevent “the
invasion of priggish intellectualism, which develops in the natural process of evolution into critical snobbishness” (Parsons, 1905, p. 386). He argues that the removal of such social connection prevents the positive outcomes of education in which both genders benefit and says that institutions should discourage “intimate relationships” but readily “permit such companionships as are natural, accidental, and courteous, upon the street, in the homes of friends, in the broad light of everyday society in which full safety lies” (387). In such arguments, the necessity of housing that would allow women students to reap the benefits of college life become apparent and, despite not often being delivered upon, relevant.

One final element of why it is vital to consider what housing options existed for female students is perhaps the most relevant in a historical study of an educational institution – the housing that was or was not provided to students was found to have a direct impact on academic success. In the 1935 work *The Relation of the Housing of Students to Success in a University*, the impact of where a student lived on academic success was studied, and the findings supported the need to consider how one housed students, with women students struggling especially in one housing option:

The residence hall has been found to have the highest correspondence with success in the university. This association was apparent whether the success was measured by the gross averages of the criteria of success, by the quantitative comparison of the types of housing through regression equations, or by the relation of change of type of housing to university success. The home was second by the same standards for measuring the relationship of housing to university success. The rooming house and the chapter house had the lowest correlation with university success. The poor success of women in the rooming house was especially apparent. (Walker, 1935, p. 75)

Indeed, Maslow, whose hierarchy of needs included housing, also conducted a study on the “dominance-feeling (self-esteem) in college women.” In this, he notes that the test by
which he measures self-esteem could aid deans of women, stating, “The test may be used by deans of women. Students scoring low in the test should be selected out for social encouragement, social training, etc.” (Maslow, 1940, p. 265). Maslow’s study is relevant when compared to another study on the effectiveness of the dean of women which found that women who were identified as having more contact – and therefore more assistance and counseling from – the dean of women had higher success rates and social interactions, but the population which had access to their dean of women most frequently was rather surprising:

It is interesting to note that each of the 632 women [in the study] living in dormitories has an average of 10.3 contacts with her dean which is a larger average than that in any other group. […] Contrary to the belief commonly held, the 804 students who live at home have more contacts per student (an average of 6.3) than any others except those living in dormitories. (Acheson, 1932, p. 25)

In reviewing the chart Acheson provides, there is a telling decline in the contact a female student can expect if she lives in an “off-campus rooming house,” with the number of contacts with their dean of women declining to 4.5, less than half their campus residential partners. With these studies being demonstrative of the necessity and impact that student housing and access there unto, the process in which women students found living quarters would have had an impact and should have been meaningfully considered.

**A Fiscal Need, A Promise Kept, and a Dream Delayed: Admitted but Neglected Women**

Women first arrived at the University of Kentucky when it was still the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Kentucky in 1880. While the future University of Kentucky admitted women, other local institutions would prove more hesitant as, “Kentucky University (now Transylvania University) had been an all-male institution since its
founding in 1780. Transylvania was slightly more resistant, but ultimately opened their doors to women in 1889” (Scaggs, 2005, p. 81). It is also important to note that the admission of women was not met easily by the administration nor did it provide equal academic footing:

The Board of Trustees was reluctant. Many citizens believed that women were all right in their place, but that place was certainly not State College. However, when the Normal Department was opened in 1880 for the benefit of the state’s teachers, President Patterson argued that since so many of the teachers were women, it would be very difficult to exclude them from the Normal. The trustees finally agreed. Forty-three women enrolled in the teachers’ school right away. They were still second class citizens, not eligible for degrees, but the way was paved for them to enter other classes. (Irvin, 1965, p. 31)

While Irvin paints Patterson as the champion of the admission of women, another source shows a different side of the issue. An Educated Difference: Women at the University of Kentucky through the Second World War provides a more lengthy narrative, quoting Patterson’s unpublished biography which stated he was initially “an innocent bystander, which is perilous enough” (Birdwhistell, 1994, p. 16). Birdwhistell quotes Sophonisba Breckinridge, one of the early women students, who felt her father deserved more credit than Patterson did for influencing the coeducational nature of the institution:

W.C.P. Breckinridge and “several gentlemen” deserved most of the credit for accomplishing the “miracle” of admitting women. She explained that “They managed to insert a clause [into the normal school legislation] giving the women the benefit of the Normal Department and then very cunningly made it a law that any student in any department should have the privileges of the others. Breckinridge considered the strategy to be “pretty foxy, for it thereby entitled a girl student to the whole educational layout.” (16).
Despite this, Birdwhistell details that the admission was not a pure admission, and that “a trial of thirty days would be granted them” to ensure that the experiment of coeducation could work at the State College (17). While there are not details per se about what would have violated the tenets of the thirty-day trial, it evidently was sufficient that the women performed as they did and the institution became coeducational. Further, the truth may be that Patterson viewed the admission of women not just as a way to meet local demands for women’s education, but as a fiscally necessary element, “Likely the primary reason that Patterson supported the admission of women stemmed from the need for additional students and the revenue that they would generate for the struggling college” (Birdwhistell, 1994, p. 17).

As for the women themselves, the majority of them were, logically, from Kentucky, with many having rural upbringings. The import of noting this element is telling in that during this time, and to some extent still today, there was an expectation on rural women that their education would benefit not only their future but that they would contribute to the rural family still at home, as argued in the 1935 work, *The Girl in the Rural Family:*

> Many families who had little regard for higher education sent their daughters to college with the idea that the girls would thereby be able to make more than had been spent on them. [...] Unhappy situations often arise when she leaves her home environment and cannot find her place in other groups of people. (Miller, 1935, pp. 2-3)

Though dated, Miller’s work seeks to fill in the view of what expectations a rural female student in a society based on her family point of origin, be it in mountain farming, coal mining, tobacco farming, and a host of other “types” of rural families. As she studies the different families in diverse rural occupations, she closes the book by noting several elements of rural family expectations that would clash with college activities. She denotes
that women who went to college were often expected not to form social connections as they were often believed to be there only to learn, noting “If a girl expected to get married at an early date the family saw no need of higher education for her” (94). Indeed, Miller’s writing is informed by the Depression and rooted in the gender stereotypes of the time, but can be tempered by another view that provides modern historical analysis:

Focusing on the home meant that women’s relationships with (and participation in) the world beyond the home was mediated by the household and their role within it. This relationship not only brought the science of business into the organization and running of the home, it also meant being an efficient consumer… (Zimmerman & Larson, 2010, p. 35)

While rural women found opportunities to use the household as a means of considering other fields, they were also faced with both the reality of the expectations of the time that Miller expressed as well as the expectations of what it meant to be a woman at an institution which considered itself to be southern. Considering the population of women students as rural and the expectations upon them and that they themselves carry is also informative of how they can be seen, going forward, within the framework of the campus in the Progressive Era.

While Birdwhistell’s aforementioned work is readily considered an essential document for examining the presence and effects of women students, administrators, and faculty on campus, it does not paint a complete picture of how women’s housing intersected with the process of the institution becoming a modern coeducational institution. If women students met this fiscal need by enrolling, very little funding was initially returned to see to their basic needs as students, particularly regarding student housing. In outlining the needs for a women’s dormitory and the struggle to have one built, Birdwhistell shows both the necessity of female students living in the community and sets the stage for the argument
that student housing changed the environment and features of the campus in the Progressive Era. First, without a campus home for women, there was the early question of where the women students could gather on campus:

Still, the environment for women on the State College campus remained less than ideal. The absence of a woman’s dormitory naturally limited their enrollment. Moreover, the women students had no real space to congregate for casual conversation or for formal socializing. Outside of class men students gathered in White Hall, the men’s dormitory, and on the parade grounds during cadet drills. Between classes college officials required women students to report to a “well-appointed study room” next to President Patterson’s office on the southwest corner of the Main Building where they were “under the constant and strict supervision of the Monitress.” (30-I)

Birdwhistell further details that women on campus had insufficient restrooms, with only one available in 1897 (31). In striking notice of what they did not have and what was lacking, Birdwhistell sets the stage for asking how did they respond and the answer is through the use of the community, forming connections and having interactions so that women students would need to be successful, because there would be a sizable delay in finding campus lodgings for women.

There were no plans in place nor desire it seems, initially, to build a dormitory on campus for women when they were admitted in 1880. It would be some time in waiting for them to receive such a facility, but it was not something that went unnoticed. In an 1899 article in *The Kentuckian*, an unknown author quipped in calling an article “Are Girls Citizens?” as the case was stated about how the lack of privileges such as a dormitory caused undo expense and difficulty to the women students:

The U.S. Constitution says they are; the State of Kentucky, through its representative college, does not seem to think so. Girls have just as much right to come to the S.C. as boys.
They are entitled to the same privileges, but they do not get them. It costs a girl near twice as much to attend the school as it does a boy. The boys have two dormitories, have work given them, and can live for almost nothing, while girls are not encouraged at all. It really is not right. A boy hustles around and makes money in most any way, while a poor girl has few or no advantages. A boy can come here and work his way through, while girls could not think of such a thing. (“Are Girls Citizens?,” p. 232)

The expense of housing and the requirement that, when not in class, all women students be in the study room with the monitress left little recourse for women students, and the article ends shaming the College, saying that when women have a dormitory and access to work their way through like the male students, then there shall be a feeling of equality, but until then, there shall not, as the last line states, “When this is done, the College will have carried out the intention of the powers that brought it into existence” (232). The article readily states one of the main elements of discord for women – the lack of a place to live on the college campus and the fact that such a loss puts them at an extreme disadvantage.

If there was no dormitory and, in these early times, no dean of women readily assigning the students to homes with approved families, where did the early women students who did not live locally reside in town? While there are few sources left that provide much insight, one that is immensely informative is a 1902 directory that, for the first time ever, published a section entitled “College Students” stating that the listing was “a complete list of the students in the various colleges, for the current year, entered prior to the first of October” (The “Blue grass” directory of the city of Lexington, Kentucky, 1902, p. 941). The listing showcases many situations that would be shocking under the later in loco parentis control but were acceptable at the time, perhaps because the institution was simply unaware of the matter or, if aware, could provide no other means to address it.
if the administration was aware. Eleven different boarding houses housed women students from Kentucky State College while also serving either male students or students from other institutions (see Table 4.1). Lexington at this time was home to not only Kentucky State College, but also Kentucky University (the once and future Transylvania University), Hamilton Female College, the Kentucky Bible College, the Lexington Business College, the Sayre Female Institute, and the School of Phonography. For example, Nancy Bell Buford, who would graduate in 1904 with an A.B. in English, lived at 308 South Limestone, where there were five male Kentucky State College students in residence. Jane Eyre Jones called 226 North Upper as her home, as did George C. Montgomery, a student at Kentucky University. Naomi Lowell lived at 224 East High along with Walter and Mabel Brice who attended the Lexington Bible College. In effect, the aforementioned comments that Horowitz made about the adventuresome early generation of female students held to be true at the University of Kentucky as women students found themselves interacting with male students and students from other institutions in their boarding houses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Women Students from KSC</th>
<th>Other residents / institution attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>368 S. Limestone</td>
<td>Eunice Adams, Bess Shaw</td>
<td>William D. Chambers / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308 S. Limestone</td>
<td>Nancy Belle Buford</td>
<td>G.G. Candill / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.P. House / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles B. House / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herman C. Robinson / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James B. Sprake / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 S. Broadway</td>
<td>Florence G. Cobb,</td>
<td>Joseph Morrison Coons/ Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May Kendrick,</td>
<td>George P. Edmonds / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fannie P. Render</td>
<td>George P. Edmonds / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 S. Limestone</td>
<td>Fannye R. Gfroerer,</td>
<td>Herbert P. Jupiter / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marion Campbell</td>
<td>Edward P. Kelly / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403 S. Limestone</td>
<td>Carroll H. Gullion</td>
<td>Henry P. Darling / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will D. Gray / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226 N. Upper</td>
<td>Jane Eyre Jones</td>
<td>George C. Montgomery / Kentucky University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 E. High</td>
<td>Naomi Lowell</td>
<td>Mabel Brice / Lexington Bible College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walter M. Brice / Lexington Bible College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 Constitution</td>
<td>Bessie Monson, Lucia H.</td>
<td>George C. Bradford / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norvell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>829 S. Limestone</td>
<td>Rachel O. Tye</td>
<td>W. Edgar Thomson / Kentucky State College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While little data is available about the commonality of this early coeducational living option, there is some evidence that it was not isolated entirely to institutions like the University of Kentucky. Other institutions, including the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, begrudgingly realized that they had to allow similar living opportunities:

There was usually enough housing available, but it might not be for women only, a characteristic that many female students and their parents required. When possible, officials tried to help students find single-sex accommodations, though President Angell admitted that sometimes men and women wound up having to take “rooms in the same house and take their meals at the same table” as each other. (Myers, 2010, pp. 99-100)
Myers details, however, that Kentucky was different than some other schools located in the
south in that this did occur, noting that, for instance, Mississippi required the students to
live either in their homes or to find a room in the home of a member of the faculty (100).
With University of Kentucky women students being dependent on the boarding houses or
living at home, their impact and presence in town resulted in some changes to the
community that should be noted.

Still, if some of the boarding houses of the time allowed the mingling of genders,
there were still many boarding house owners who would not cater to women. Olive San
Louie Anderson’s Will would have been turned away from many doors in Lexington as
well. For instance, one advertisement from the April 1, 1900 *Lexington Leader* showed the
challenge a single female student might have in procuring a room and board, “BOARDERS
– MRS. MARY B. BUCKNER, 61 Market street, would rent with board a beautiful front
room suitable for couple or two gentlemen.” Mrs. Buckner was an example of how
Anderson’s fictionalized account of her own experiences looking for board would have
played out in Lexington as well. Another advertisement on the same day ran the same way,
“For rent – large, nicely furnished front room, on lower floor, with board, bath, hot and
cold water; suitable for two gentlemen or man and wife; 181 South Mill.” On April 15,
1900, a large boarding house would have many rooms available, but expressed no interest
in women, stating simply, “Wanted – Four or Five gentlemen boarders. Call at Mrs. James
B. White’s, 172 East Main st.” The 1902 Directory stands as proof that some boarding
houses or places with rooms to let would take women, but it is important to consider that,
in many ways, those who provided room and board, much like the campus itself, were not
desirous of making a place for women students. The idea then that, even in off campus options, a woman student found living options readily was erroneous.

As time went on, there were many who began to champion the cause of women students. Laura Clay was one such champion, the daughter of the abolitionist Cassius Clay. Laura Clay was well traveled due to her father’s connection with Lincoln and her travels greatly impacted her desire to see equality for women:

When General Clay was appointed ambassador to Russia by Lincoln in 1861, twelve-year-old Laura spent a year in Russia. She watched European women vote and work the jobs their husbands left behind when they went off to war. Such day-to-day activities left an impression on Laura, who had developed an interest in careers in teaching and law. (O’Malley, 2012, p. 82)

By 1881, Laura Clay had become the president of the Kentucky Woman Suffrage Association and would oversee it becoming the Kentucky Equal Rights Association. Access to education and a sense of ownership became part of Laura Clay’s primary focuses and as president of the organization, she ensured that “KERA spent its efforts lobbying Frankfort for the protection of married women’s property and wages, incorporating female physicians in state female insane asylums, and admission of women into male colleges” (O’Malley 83). KERA also benefited from having a president who was from a prominent family:

Clay’s socially prominent family name offered her access to speak on women’s rights at the 1890 Kentucky Constitutional Convention floor, over which her cousin, Henry Clay, presided. In addition to her role in KERA, Laura served as an officer in the Women’s Christian Temperance Union, the Kentucky Federation of Women’s Club, and the Fayette County ERA. Using her skillful oratory, Laura was able to fold these three organizations’ efforts into KERA by advocating legislation that awarded appropriations for a female dormitory at the University of Kentucky, established
juvenile courts and detention centers, and raised the age of consent from twelve to sixteen. Clay and her colleagues at KERA were able to increase female appointments to school boards and co-guardianship of children for divorced or separated parents. (O’Malley 83).

As it is stated elsewhere, “Responding to the groups’ pressure, the legislature appropriated money for a women’s dormitory at the University of Kentucky…” (Kleber, 1992, p. 499). Showing the likelihood that it would not have happened without the legislative funding, one campus history summed it up best, “the first women’s dormitory and the only one built entirely at state expense” (Cone, 1989, p. 21). Even with the appropriation from the legislature covering the entire expense of building, the June 3, 1902 minutes of the Board of Trustees express dismay that they could not spend the money elsewhere or that funding was designated solely for that purpose, “It is a matter of much regret that appropriations were not made for other much needed buildings.” Despite their twenty-two years of presence, many felt that women students still did not need a place on campus, but the funding had been established solely for that purpose so that the institution would proceed along those lines. Sadly, money alone would not build the dormitory for women students.

The New Dormitory for Women – A Distanced Home Away from Home

In 1900, an advertisement for the State College of Kentucky closed with a simple line, “Appropriations made by last General Assembly for a Gymnasium and a Dormitory for girls. These buildings will be erected as soon as expedient.” Despite the advertisement, the Board of Trustees minutes from December 11, 1901, show that there had been no real progress on constructing the facility:
We recommend approved after the action of the Executive Committee set forth in the Presidents report concerning the purchase of site for girls dormitory, and the refusal of the committee because of inadequacy of existing appropriations, to further proceed in execution of authority the Board of Trustees for erecting of the building completed, by Act of the Legislature.

Beneath this statement is a recommendation to start charging $5 to all students except county appointees to cover and better enable the employment of instructors for the gymnasium, which has been able to begin being built. It would be at the June 4, 1902, meeting of the Board of Trustees when Judge Barker would make a motion to allow for “reconsideration of former resolution fixing site of Girl's Dormitory,” and then there was the “motion for the Pepper prop. to be selected as site for Girl's Dormitory. It is moved that it is the sense of this Board of Trustees that we purchase the Pepper property, and to erect the Female Dormitory thereon.” Construction did not begin quickly as, again, the Board of Trustees minutes from December 9, 1902, is the first mention of a resolution to speak to the city about the sewer needs of such a building. One year later, with the plans to finally open the hall in 1904, December 9, 1903, saw a resolution to establish a Matron for the Female Dormitory, which allowed a sum of $40 per month but also an allowance that, should she have children, they too could live in the facility. By June 10, 1904, the Board heard its first report from the “Board of Lady Managers of the Girl's Dormitory.” As shown in the Board of Trustees minutes, there time from the appropriation to the opening of the facility was longer than had been hoped, especially given that the institution had been promising the facility in advertisements since 1900.

If the institution had been slow to construct the first women’s dormitory, named Patterson Hall, it was still very proud of the structure itself. The 1904-1905 Bulletin of the
State College of Kentucky wasted no time in highlighting the new facility, placing the information about the structure even before the contents page. The announcement detailed how this facility was superior to the older dormitories, stating, “The building is heated by steam, lighted by gas and electricity, and supplied with the purest of water. It has a roomy front porch of 12 by 70 feet, wide halls, a closet in every bedroom, and thirteen bath rooms.” Further, for those with lingering fears that a college education would harm the physicality of women, it boasted, “an inviting place for exercise, for which ample provision has also been made on the extensive grounds, with a tennis court, in the rear, as well as in the large gymnasium.” Speaking near the end as to the expense, the Bulletin does cover that this facility can be covered as part of a county appointment, stating that is such a way Patterson Hall “is brought within the means of any young woman who earnestly desires to fit herself for a life of usefulness.” For the grandeur of such an announcement, men looking for the equivalent description of their options would find that on the fourth page of the Bulletin, there was the following statement, “The Dormitories – The two large dormitories on the campus afford lodgings for the students who wish to lessen expense in this direction.” Women had seemingly finally found a place on the campus proper or at least the bulletin made it seem that they had.

In truth, the location of Patterson Hall was considered off campus at the time and was kept from the campus by a body of water. It was “an excursion beyond the original campus” and while it would later be “the nucleus of women’s dorms,” in its original state it further sent the message that women were not yet part of campus proper (Cone, 1989, p. 21). Indeed, the Board of Trustees minutes from 1902 indicate such a decision, as Henry Stites Barker proposed the use of the Pepper property for the endeavor. Reflecting on it for
the Sesquicentennial, one author notes that the true campus was surrounded by four roads, Limestone, Graham, Rose, and Winslow (later Avenue of Champions), but does note that three buildings existed outside those confines – a greenhouse, the Department of Agriculture (due to a need for unused land), and, most relevant to this discussion, Patterson Hall, “constructed a far distance from main campus to keep the women students isolated from the men” (Hale). The 1907 Kentuckian yearbook, when recounting a story involving Patterson Hall’s likelihood to attract male students, even humorously notes that “No street car line” was available near Patterson Hall. Further, the location was also troubled by not having a clear access line to campus as the Testimony shows when Mr. George B. Carey is interviewed regarding the need to create a direct walkway to Patterson Hall:

It was also thought that it would be of great benefit to the Patterson Hall girls and require them to go out on the street, inasmuch as right at that point there is a very thick negro settlement, and it was thought it would be of decided advantage not to have the girls go off campus to get from the University to Patterson Hall. (Testimony 2: 216)

Though a brief mention, Carey's testimony is relevant in framing how, though there was some provision of campus-sponsored housing, it was placed in an area that would have then been considered undesirable as well as distanced from the true campus area of the time.

The facility was attractive, modern, and new, if ill-located, but the problem would soon be that it simply was not big enough. In Gillis’ essential The University of Kentucky: Its History and Development, the growth of enrolled female populations can be readily charted. For ease of consideration, these have been divided into two charts, one detailing 1880 through spring 1904, the other providing data showing fall 1904 until 1935; in this manner, one can note the campus population of women before and after Patterson Hall.
opened. The chart showing 1880 until 1904 shows that, during this timeframe, women were still the minority on campus, as paralleled to the male population.

Figure 4.1: Enrollment divided by reported gender, 1880 -1904

This would seem to be a logical scenario as there were little to no facilities for women as there were no dormitories and even restrooms were an area of concern for female students. Still, even with the advent of Patterson Hall opening to serve female students, the following chart will show that while it did serve as a precursor to increased female enrollment, it was not a long-term solution to the housing of women.

With a housing capacity originally intended for 139 women, by 1912 any plan to require all women to live within the hall would have been impossible to enforce.
Moreover, by 1910, the University of Kentucky had put an end to any of the previously existing coeducational boarding houses as the comptroller would keep a list of such approved homes as were available to University of Kentucky students. While this shows a transition from a perceived lack of concern for a sense of control, it is also important to know that women students were also the first to be displaced – be it during time of war when the military used Patterson Hall for soldiers or just a time when male housing was more at a premium.

Further complicating the narrative was the fact that there were still voices recommending not only that women students should continue to be ostracized or at least isolated, but that there was still merit in coeducation being reversed. An editorial from another newspaper came to the attention of The Idea, the student newspaper that predated the Kernel, that recommended that the “co-ed” no longer have a place on campus, which caused the newspaper to respond on February 16, 1911 defending coeducation and, seemingly through jest and sarcasm, mocking the original editorial:
Some few days ago, as we were casually glancing over the various college papers on our exchange table, we came in contact with an editorial which not only produced much amazement but has caused us to ponder, ever since the reading thereof, over the shortsightedness, untactfulness, and general folly of man.

The article goes on to critique the essay, saying that the editorial was entitled “Should or should not co-education be abolished?” and that the author obviously leaned heavily toward the belief that it should be barred as the women students would only lure men away from studies and the like as the impending spring semester came. After stating that The Idea preferred coeducation, the author listed alternatives to the loss of coeducation in hyperbolic fashion:

Let earthquakes shake this puny orb from pole to pole. Let mighty storm sweep over the continent in endless succession. Let the withered hand of famine lay its blighting touch upon everything that creepeth upon the earth, let all these things come to pass, but preserve co-education. Far better should the sun swoop beyond the horizon forever from the sight of man, the stars become dead in the heavens and all lapse into the dreamless depths of unmeaning chaos.

In this response, the students seemed to rally behind the continuation of coeducation, but the other side of the issue for women is that such editorials and conversations even continued to exist.

Male students generally did not appear to view the coeducation as an issue, though they did bring with them expectations that women students would perform normal gender roles. In quoting a Kentuckian article, the male students would often turn to the women’s dormitory in hope of food, performing serenades in hope that the women would have access to more food than they did, for, “The seventeen boys [were] dormitory boys and therefore especially hungry” (Irvin, 1965, p. 35).
For their part, even if cut off from living on the campus proper, women found ways to integrate themselves into the existing cultures of campus or, at the least, set up parallels of their own. Women had, even before having a home on campus, set out to carve a culture of their own, establishing the Philosophian Society, the women’s literary society, “at the same time that Patterson began to preside over faculty meetings at the new college building in 1882” (Morelock, 2008, p. 92). This early group not only allowed for connections denied by the lack of formal housing for women, but it also allowed women to speak back to the institution in a seemingly approved way as their debates often mirrored their issues with campus; “one debate topic was “Resolved, that a Monitress is unnecessary to the welfare of the young ladies of the college” (Irvin, 1965, p. 31). Women’s basketball would predate men's basketball at Kentucky State College, and a host of other ways to try to create a college experience would be created by sheer persistence by women. However, the ongoing housing challenges of needing housing would only become more complicated as time progressed and further frustrate the idea of a true coeducational institution.

**Growth and Change In and Beyond Dormitories**

Students of both genders faced issues with campus problems beyond their control, largely that the campus was just becoming insufficient across the board. By the late 1910s and into the 1920s, the campus would face overcrowding not only in dormitories but in general spaces. The January 8, 1926 *Kentucky Kernel* summed up how the growth of the University population had outpaced the ability of the campus to handle it:

> With no auditorium to seat more than 250 students except the gymnasium, with no recitation room seating more than 50 students, office space for only one professor though several in a department are forced to use the same room, the university is sadly handicapped for lack of room and proper
administration not only of class work and laboratory work, but departmental activities.

The year before this article was published, women saw the opening of the second women’s dormitory, but as the chart above shows, this additional housing still did not allow rooms for all women students, creating no major change for women on campus and still secluding them to the far side of campus. For his part, President McVey readily pointed out the growth and essentiality of the campus, with the *Kernel* saying that he was “forceful and graphic” in his illustrations that “The University of Kentucky is next to the largest of the 13 state universities south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, outranked only by the University of North Carolina, though its income falls far shorter than the other institutions.”

The *Kernel* demonstrated that McVey as an administrator had increased enrollment from 970, adding over 1,400 more students to that number in his short time at the institution while keeping required student spending to an “estimated $600 a year”. Still, if Boyd Hall did not address women students’ overcrowding issues, it did not make the institution any more interested in expanding further immediately as the *Kernel* states the University’s plan to reach out to the state would only be to fund “a men’s dormitory, a hospital, library, auditorium, commons [which were] all sorely needed if the institution of higher learning is to properly function for the state’s betterment…” Amid the plea for more funding through the legislature, the issue became apparent – an overcrowded campus with a need for facilities was not going to rapidly expand to include opportunities for women’s housing.

Attempts to find housing for women would continue to be frustrated as funds and needs were given focus, but the dean of women was an advocate for women students. Thus, if there were a vital impact and need for student housing as time progressed, especially for
women, one of their early champions, Sarah Blanding, Dean of Women, would be the first to attempt to address it, but she would fail:

…Blanding failed to obtain adequate on-campus living space for her charges. While the number of women living in dormitories remained constant, approximately 30%. An additional 30% lived with parents or other relatives while the rest lived in boarding houses, sorority houses, or the homes of relatives. (Bashaw, 1999, p. 46)

If Blanding failed to find housing on campus, she did not fail as an advocate for all women. She continued to work within the community, finding opportunities for students in town, and even expanding these opportunities through new initiatives. Realizing that housing would be an issue and that the lack of availability would affect the numbers of women given access, she readily found ways to create opportunities for women. As an undated memorandum sent to the Lexington Leader in the dean of women’s papers shows, she tried to engage the community in showing that students could be beneficial in residence to expand the options for women to find a place in the community, and while the dean of men, T.T. Jones, stated in the initial portion of the memorandum that he sought to have “Lexingtonians to list desirable rooms” in the area desirable for University men, “south of Main Street and East of Broadway,” Dean Blanding had a much more creative plan to ensure homes for women students:

Dean Sarah G. Blanding also asks for those citizens who have available jobs for women students communicate with her office at once, as there are a great many girls who will not be able to attend the University without financial assistance.

Women students at the University are willing to serve as companions for sick people, give music lessons, read to invalids, care for children or live in a private home, devoting four hours each day to house work and care of children in exchange for room and board. The rate paid University
students for care of children is 25 cents per hour or 75 cents an evening from 8 until 12 o’clock.

Such initiatives would become integrated into the plans for the university to address the needs to house women students. Even as more dormitories for women began to open, this initiative took the title of “Mother’s Helper” and would extend well into the 1950s under largely the same understanding as a letter to Miss Mereda Jean Davis from Janes Haselden, the Assistant Dean of Women on July 3, 1956 shows:

I have talked to Mrs. Pelfrey, with whom you are going to live and work as a Mother’s Helper. The girls who work with private families for room and board are expected to do active work for the householder for three and one-half hours a day. For any type of baby sitting or work where the girl may study, up to six hours may be done to fulfill the daily requirement. In other words, the girl will be doing her own work but would help the householder by being available on call.

The lack of student housing for women forced the dean of women and female students to think creatively. While the women were often left doing work that was stereotypically viewed as “women’s work,” it was not without some benefit to them in creating access the institution would have otherwise denied. Harkening back to the early article in the Idea, the approach may have left them doing less than ideal tasks, but it decreased their expense to live off campus, ensuring, to the best of the Dean’s ability, as equal access as could be given.

Women’s housing also quickly took the form of what would later be called a living learning program, an opportunity to unite women pursuing a similar field. Again, this uniting element often took the form of following in stereotypes that the all-male Board of Trustees would find acceptable, but from this came the Home Economics Houses. Seen as a “lab” environment for those students studying home economics, the University of
Kentucky would have a few examples of these throughout the years beginning in 1918. The concept was not original to Kentucky; several institutions would engage in the creation of such an institution, with the concept still being presented in films showcasing various schools applying the method such as _The Home Economics Story_ (Centron, 1951) and _Why Study Home Economics?_ (University of Iowa, 1955). Still, in 1918, Kentucky began its work with such an endeavor when the Home Economics program “rented a house on Harrison Avenue” (Phi-Upsilon, 1960). As Phi Upsilon’s “short history” goes on to detail, the “Home Management House” would eventually move to Bonnie Brae Court, with an additional one being established at an address on Conn Terrace. Later home economics laboratory houses would be on Maxwelton Court, adjacent to the campus. Besides being a residential learning program that seemed to be the precursor of modern living-learning programs, these houses also modernized the reach of the campus, placing the University of Kentucky in the business of buying or renting properties adjacent to campus, some of which would eventually be permanently purchased and expand the campus itself.

Moreover, if, as previously discussed, many students who attended the University of Kentucky were rural, the need better to serve this population would result in further partnership and the creation of an outreach effort to a specialized population previously unseen on the state campus. A house, dubbed Shelby House, was referred to in the papers of President McVey, when, in an undated memorandum to Thomas Cooper and Sarah Blanding, he stated, “I discussed with Colonel Graham the construction of cooperative houses. […] No money is to be gotten from the PWA funds for cooperative house construction. […] The location is probably not quite clear.” Though the memorandum states his hope to find $25,000 to build a house for female students along with a cooperative
house, instead the same means were accomplished by investing in a home that previously
had been used as a boarding house. While little details are available, President McVey's
papers do include a report that details how, with the aid of the 4-H organization that
advocated for such an enterprise to assist rural girls, the endeavor was achieved:

A cooperative housing project for girls was started by the University of Kentucky September, 1934. A partly furnished
sixteen room house with four baths and a three room rear
cottage at 609 Maxwellton was rented for $80.00 a month from
C.N. Manning. [...] The house was opened for occupancy to
twenty girls on September 10, 1934 with Mrs. E.B. Beard, the
housemother, in charge. The girls chosen to live in the house
were all 4-H Club girls. 4-H Club girls were selected for two
reasons: one, because they had some training and experience in
household duties and, two, they all lived on farms and could
bring some food from home to help defray expense.

In this manner, the University seemed to embark on an early form of population-specific
outreach, not completely unlike more modern efforts such as the Robinson’s Scholars
program or the First Generation Initiatives, programs that are created to recruit and retain
at-risk populations. Given the examination of Miller’s family dynamic for “rural girls,”
this program would have addressed some concerns that rural parents would have had about
the affordability and approachability of such an educational endeavor.

Student directories also show other manners in which women students’ pursuit of
housing created a system of programs and locations for those who were from similar
backgrounds or pursuing similar educational goals. According to student directories, in
1935, twenty-eight students, predominantly women, were listed as residents in properties
owned by the Good Samaritan Hospital, with several of these students living in a property
that, by 1945, would be listed as the Nurses’ Home. This was not unique just to Good
Samaritan, which held the majority of the population due to locale, but the directories also
show that, by 1945, the Veterans Hospital housed four students and St. Joseph Hospital listed housing options for ten residents (Student Directory, 1945). In this way, women students further linked the idea of education and career, forming communities of learners despite being held out of more traditional campus housing. Through working to find a place in the community, often unaided, the women student populations more readily created methods of support, engagement, and even professional development that would not be seen again in formal college outreach until the latter parts of the twentieth century.

Women’s housing, then, was a feature of what impacted the university and its structure in the Progressive Era that has been previously unconsidered. While the women had to create opportunity and forge coeducational living habitats in the early times out of essentiality, they would be the precursors of what would come later. Further, they tended to band together with women in similar fields of interest, logical since they would have been in course work together, but also allowing for a certain academic interest, seemingly a precursor to the living-learning programs. The dean of women sought to provide opportunities to students who could not afford the increase in expense, creating a more modern form of town and gown relations than had previously existed, but also providing a service that later student grants and loans would address for these students. While any of these were unintentional gains, made of necessity, they did modernize elements of student service. Finally, by the very nature of segregating the women students, the University of Kentucky actually established a history of expanding their borders. This would continue as it began to use other housing options for women in that area, eventually buying many of them, but initially leasing houses on the modern day northern side of campus to be rooms for women such as the Dillard House, Smith Hall, the Lydia Brown House and so forth
throughout the 1950s and 1960s. While the intent of this study was only to explore until
the 1930s, much of what was set in place during this time would echo forward for many
more decades. In their role as outsiders or the campus “other,” women students, often
through intent and perseverance, crafted systems of adaptation which the University of
Kentucky would seemingly echo in future endeavors and allow for many definitions of
what made the Progressive Era relevant to campus life. The ability of women to find
housing in the community and other such locations would be echoed repeatedly when the
construction of campus housing slowed following the 1960s construction boom.
Repeatedly the campus would turn to renting off-campus facilities, pairing people with
community partners, similar tactics they used during the period following the 1940s when
the University of Kentucky leased the Phoenix Hotel at one point for women students when
housing proved insufficient in the 1960s.
Postscript
The Ongoing Effects of Housing and a Call for Further Research Considerations

For the purpose of this study, housing was examined within the context of how it altered the University of Kentucky in the Progressive Era. Examination of the testimony that impacted the administration in 1917, within the context of how the concept of in loco parentis created positions that would become student affairs, and how women used housing and the lack thereof to create unique connections within the community were all elements vital to this consideration. While these are relevant and compelling in their own right, housing has always had an impact on the growth and development of the University of Kentucky and other colleges. Rudolph’s inclusion of the dormitory in the campus ideal was not by accident – it was often considered, as it was at UK, one of the first three buildings required – administration building, classrooms, and housing were the cornerstones of initial campus structures. With such a position in the creation of a campus, it is curious that, once built, the housing enterprise of a college was often treated as an afterthought. However, the ongoing changes to campus can be reflected in housing initiatives throughout the history and current times of the University.

While the examination herein sought to address and engage the ways the varied forms of student housing interacted with the development of the University of Kentucky in the Progressive Era, many elements could still be explored. Social stratification, gender, structures, and purpose could still be explored in future studies that would further impact the understanding of housing and its purpose and impact in creating a more “standard” student culture, thus this postscript shall consider what research still could benefit an understanding of this history.
Considerations for Historical and Social Studies Related to Student Housing

The gender related matters are relevant and still need to be explored in more detail and could be explored in a host of ways. While records did readily show the structured nature that was enforced on women, more details about how women students lived would allow a better sociological or even anthropological study of how women students lived at this time. To that end, any examination of rule books for women which would, during this time, cover the “sign in, sign out” process required should a woman student wish to be out of a university facility would provide a valuable starting point. Historical reference discovered during this research related to women students having their social life examined, their medical information reported, and so forth implies a high level of control of women students. Historically, before the first women’s dormitory opened, when not in class they had to go to the office of the monitress for observation and to ensure social expectations of behavior were met. Yet, by the same token, the first basketball team from the institution was the women’s team. Women students did engage in literary societies separate from the men. Photographs from the James H. Wells glass negatives collection in the Special Collections of the University of Kentucky show a diverse set of images of women student engaging in varied activities – reading and playing instruments, but also humorously eating bananas and soap, putting on plays, etc. These various factors point to the need to continue to explore the social and gender politics of the era in their impact on women students as obviously there seemed to be a dour outer life with women not being permitted to ride in cars without permission or to go to college games without signing in and out or even, in some cases, appealing to the Dean of Women, yet there is a rich line of
information pointing to a hidden social life based on elements such as Wells’ glass negative collection.

Extending even further into potential study is how gender was performed in the days prior to officially recognized coeducation in student housing. Again, Wells’ negatives prove indicative as the women students seemingly in costume for performance includes one photograph where two women appear to be wearing mustaches. Other indicators, such as student scrapbooks, indicate that some women in sorority houses would have events such as mock weddings and the like wherein one group of students would assume the masculine identity, often performing in Groucho Marx style mustaches and male clothing. In a campus strongly segregated by gender in the time period, what role and social purpose did this serve for women and how was it interpreted by the college in general? If one complaint heard during the 1917 Testimony was that women students were too regulated, then how did events like this occur and to what end? Further studies of the role and purpose of these social events could further give insight into gender construction and performance on the campus during the Progressive Era and better shape an understanding of student housings impact in the social and gendered areas.

Joining the social elements of the gender study that could grow out of this existing research is also the need to consider the idea of the rural population. Patterson, very early on, expressed his concern that people beyond the “Bluegrass region” of the state did not view the institution as their own. This concern for how the rural population viewed the state college, which they aided in funding, is relevant as a topic of exploration for future study as well. Elements of note there could be linked to how this view was impacted over time by what the University of Kentucky did in elements ranging from education to
community outreach to athletics. A historical study of how the rural population viewed the institution over a progression of time could readily show the transitions of the institution itself. While works have explored what the institution was like before it became known nationally for athletics (an example, Before Big Blue: Sports at the University of Kentucky, 1880-1940 by Gregory Kent Stanley), more could be said about how it was viewed as other statewide elements began to grow from the land grant institution. The examination of how the institution was viewed as it grew and added agricultural extension offices, health outreach, and other elements throughout the state could provide more social understanding for the structures, changes, and challenges of the institution throughout its history by showing the diverse views of the institution in different regions.

Even in its attempt to appeal to different students and learning plans, there are still elements that would be worth studying that this research has begun to address. One such element would be the early precursors to the modern living learning programs and communities such as the Home Economic Houses and the cooperative houses sponsored by 4H. To that end, a thorough exploration of how those became gendered and political locations would be of note in examining the social structures of the campus and its treatment of women. As many women who lived in those facilities had rural origins, how did that affect the processes? Knowing that many rural women the state had been raised in farming communities, how did that influence the teaching therein or was that matter neglected? Did the Home Economic Houses teach things that would be useful to the women if they returned to an agrarian life such as plucking a chicken or preparing livestock for slaughter and storage as food or was the rural student instead exposed to a Home Economics House steeped in more urban definitions? Questions such as these would
expand the understanding of the role that gender, social standing, and so forth played in the development of these outreach opportunities. Considering how students were left to reconcile their knowledge of living in a home based in rural agrarianism and what they were exposed to as students in a more urban Home Economics program could provide indications of not only gender politics but also how rural was defined, used, or disavowed in the state college that was trying to claim service to the whole state. Information gathered from studying course expectations, outreach, and structured activities in the houses would then be of use in determining the political and social connections or disconnections students faced.

One more element of note is the need to study whom housing did serve and if it had a political or social focus. For example, as discussed in the course of the paper, Shelby Elam was a student and we know he received a county appointment, yet his memoir recalls that he arrived to find no room at the dormitories, so he was “assigned” to a boarding house. As we know that the county appointees were much smaller in number than what they could be, as shown by the examination from the Investigating Committee in 1917 which found the fiscal impact was minimal, why was his guaranteed spot unavailable? The Commandant also states that in his opinion, they should make a change and only allow the “poor boys” to live in the dormitories because they are in such disrepair, but the fact that he says this would be a change implies that there was a social structure issue at play in the early dormitories. Between the commandant’s comments and Elam’s experience, the question of who did live in the on campus dormitory and how was the social structure, point of origin, and social class of those students different from those “assigned” to the community becomes relevant for consideration and study. Further study of who did live where and
what their point of origin, social status, and family origin was could provide a much richer analysis to the campus living environment and the social life of on and off campus life. Further, it could also allow for an analysis of early town and gown relations if the majority of students “assigned” to the community were less fiscally or socially connected. This consideration does merit further study if one wishes a more complete view of the institutions impact in developing their student population.

**Consideration for How This Research May Influence More Current Studies**

Housing continues to be commonplace on college campuses and still stands as part of the college ideal, yet it is rapidly changing in modernity. At the University of Kentucky, for instance, one of the first key enterprises of the campus to become privatized was the housing operations. Citing years of delayed maintenance that could no longer be delayed but had become too costly to effectively mitigate, the University of Kentucky signed a deal with the Educational Realty Trust (EdR), a publically traded company. The contract centered on plans to replace and build new halls to bring the institutions on-campus undergraduate housing from approximately 5,750, a number which meant overcrowding and being unable to meet demands, to over 9,500 in 2012, citing a five-phase process. This move toward privatization was shocking to many and while UK maintained that they would keep the Office of Residence Life, a division of student affairs, in the halls to represent the University, the structures would be built, maintained, and effectively run by the for-profit business. This left many people concerned with what the long-term effect would be. Other institutions began to respond, with Vice President Lou Marcoccia of Syracuse University positing one question, “The question is, how can EdR put up the capital and operate it and make a profit, and why couldn't UK do the same thing? If it's such a good idea, why isn't
everyone doing it?” (Blackford). In the same article, UK spokesperson Jay Blanton states that the University of Kentucky had very little choice, as only “600 of its current beds could be considered modern.” In July of 2015, the University of Kentucky agreed to phase five of the plan, but the housing agreement will extend to be a seventy-five-year ground lease according to the contracts. Critics have argued that this shackles future administrations to such a deal and will eventually lead to the halls being overpriced for some constituents in Kentucky with EdR answering to shareholders and needing to generate a profit. EdR has seen its shares grow and profits increase since the UK deal, but the same critics point to the three percent increase annually through 2017 that EdR has proposed on all their campus properties. The institution claims that the barring by various governors through the decades have not allowed bonds to be sold to maintain or construct enough new facilities, but the modernization now occurring is one of privatization. As students until 2016 had the option of remaining in the older halls at a reduced rate, news that these may all close for the fall of 2016 has some worried the campus is becoming exclusionary, leaving low-income students in state at a disadvantage and failing to hold up as a land grant institution. Further, some worry that this move toward privatization has started a domino effect as the institution quickly followed this by privatizing dining, another troubled area for the institution, with many dining facilities facing the same issues of delayed maintenance. If the trend holds true, some expect that the institution will shortly privatize its parking and transportation enterprises, as they are one of the final pieces that are quickly becoming dated and, much like housing, have not had luck receiving government approval for bonds to be sold. Should this come to pass, the housing institution of the University of Kentucky
will have also established another trend in the current modernization of campus, that of privatization.

With elements of privatization has also come elements of what many students consider luxuries. Once dormitory living meant sharing living quarters and developing plans and interactions to meet multiple parties in community living. However, newer construction has created facilities with a common “living room” but private sleeping areas, etc. Just as previously dormitories and Greek housing were considered at least in part the sphere of the students, the newer construction has allowed it to become, largely, the sphere of the individual. The historical analysis of the Progressive Era demonstrated, in part, how student interaction, pressure, and community allowed impact on campus, but as there is increased space and luxury for the individual, what will that mean to the social and negotiation skills once inherently part of the learning of the residence halls? How will that change the study or impact of the residential community on campus and within the community? To what extent does the increase in luxury and the accompanying expense mirror the same process that left poorer, perhaps rural students like Shelby Elam’s historical case, left to go find housing elsewhere, but this time without a guiding housemother? Alternatively, what impact could this have on town and gown relations – within recent memory, students moved out of the residence halls into apartments often citing the need to find amenities more in line with their budget and interests. With the rise of these more private, luxury enriched facilities, what will that do to student expectations of apartments within the community and will it influence town and gown relations? The study of what happened in the Progressive Era pulls at some of these same strings in that time period, but also show that the modern time are not without similar questions. Any
studies of the impact of the modern facilities could readily show cultural and social impacts of privatization that would speak to student life and connectivity just as readily as the campus climate and gendered housing did in the Progressive Era.

As women were once the outsiders in housing, that trend has also continued as other groups worked to impact and modernize their housing needs. African American students, once segregated in housing, briefly reinvigorated the boarding house world. Indeed, in an email exchange, Lyman S. Johnson, Lyman T. Johnson’s son, shared that his father was barred from many places in the city, so he had room and board with Lucy Harth Smith. Smith, an essential voice in procuring African-American history books in Kentucky public schools, was principal of Booker T. Washington Elementary School and president of the Kentucky Negro Education Association. Though few records were maintained about this process, oral histories show that early African American students had challenges finding restaurants, campus eateries, and even libraries that would cater to their needs in their early days at the University. Sadly, if elements of the challenges women faced seem to play out again for the African American population, it seems to be still continuing to this day. The narrative of the exclusion may have changed, and it may not be as immediately transparent, but two core groups of students are showing in studies and their own statements a sense of exclusion from campus housing. Various religious groups have started to state that the average American residence halls, and their accompanying staffs, are ill-suited to their needs or do not allow the full integration of their religion (Bryant, Wickliffe, Mayhew, & Behringer, 2009; Calkins et al.; Roberts, 2006; Temkin & Evans, 1998). Also growing is the concern for how housing may need to modernize and adapt itself to many students who do not identify as cisgender, falling into statuses often referred to as transgender or along
other lines, who are beginning to question the construction, use, staffing, and policy of residence halls on campuses across the country (Bailey, 2015; Garvey & Rankin, 2015; Nicolazzo & Marine, 2015; Wentling, 2015). The University of Kentucky just recently opened an office and initiated a protocol to allow students to discreetly move based on how they identify gender and to change pronouns in the system as needed as well. This process, though hopefully more beneficial than the historically gender and racially biased processes, also leaves room for study and consideration on how this will impact and be impacted by housing options on campus. While these populations of religious and gender identities may be statistically smaller than the excluded groups of women and, later, African Americans, the impact that they can have as they interact and effectively alter student housing will be interesting to observe. Future studies on these populations and others that have historically had to adapt to housing issues may also show how housing continues to shape policy, opportunity, and academics for various student populations.

In the end, housing does not seem to be weakening at the University of Kentucky or many other institutions. While some regional schools have reported decreased enrollment, still campus housing construction seems to be, for the time being, a noted priority until, just as previously, construction is complete and it fades into the background, waiting on the next building cycle to be a priority anew. Often, housing is, when convenient, hailed as a vibrant part of campus life by administrators and hailed by many parents and older students as either a rite of passage or the true purpose of attending a residential college. It has shown since Walker's initial study to have a positive relation to academic achievement and a feeling of social fit on the campus. Parents often prefer their students to live on campus, especially their first and sometimes the second year to enable
them to transition from home and because of their belief that it is more regulated. Still, housing is always going through transitions to meet the needs of the population, and in so doing, it has a lasting, impactful way of modernizing the campus and its climate. The future of this modernization, which may include increased privatization and regulation could prove to be cyclic in nature. Thus, the value of considering the impact of housing and the students who seek it out is relevant, impactful, but woefully understudied among those who need to be the most aware of these realities.

This study is indicative and parallel to many changes at many institutions. While the University of Kentucky and the various changes that have defined its shifts into modernity are used, other institutions faced similar challenges. As one 2003 article states:

Over the past few decades, universities have had to cope with the dual problems posed by rapid expansion and a transformation in the processes of funding. Growth has meant that the number of students has increased rapidly and that they have had to be accommodated in an enlarged and diversifying tertiary system. Simultaneously the new budgetary realities have forced universities to be less reliant upon grants from the state and increasingly dependant on private funds. Moreover, funds that do come from the state now come with greater demands of public accountability and an expectation that regular audits will demonstrate a commitment to quality and excellence. What were once relatively small, elite and autonomous institutions have been subjected to a series of challenges that have forced a re-examination of the role that universities can play in contemporary society. One of the consequences of this re-examination has been a new approach to the provision of student housing. This, in turn, has had a range of implications for the communities that surround universities. (Macintyre, 2003, p. 109)

The article cites several elements that further show elements of study consideration like those stated above – the need to be seen as a competitor in an educational market place, the as well as the desire to attract, retain, and graduate diverse students in an increasing
number. There are challenges inherent in viewing housing as one part a recruitment tool and one part a liability is the more modern element, but the role of housing in impacting how modern and vibrant a campus can be is still of note. Institutions who seek to have long-term success have need to look at how not only their housing but other student-focused services have impacted the modernization of the campus. These campuses must have climates that can respond to and create new systems and process to respond to future policies and needs. Just as universities historically addressed such shifts as in loco parentis and political responses to challenges against the cultural and societal fitness and strength of the institution, ongoing studies of history and current trends in housing can benefit the understanding of the health and progress of the university as a whole. As colleges and universities across not only the United States but the entire world try to spot these shifts that seemingly mandate new ideas of modernization – often linked more recently to concerns about victimization, behavioral concerns, diverse learning needs for varied population, town and gown relationships, and the like – there is an increased need for studies such as this one. In the future, universities would be well served to focus studies on provisions where administration, educational mission, and student life intersect to better see the overlapping nature of elements – how political, social, legal, and educational changes can trigger system changes in areas that may not seem of immediate note, but that enforce a sense of ongoing, student driven change on institutions.
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