

CHAPTER TWELVE

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

Commonwealth & College Come of Age

☆ ☆ ☆

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC TRANSITION

The beginning of the second decade of the new century marked a new era for the state. It was a time of changing conditions and leadership in politics, business, and education. The decline in population and the growth of tenancy, along with specialized and mechanized production, indicated that the frontier conditions and opportunities were gone. New industries were seeking local adjustment. The 1917 *Bomb* was appropriately dedicated to the "Greater Iowa." At the same time the progressive movement was creating a demand for corporate control and social welfare activities. Amidst these changes and agitations, there was an awakened consciousness of education—a desire for better schools and for a more direct availability of higher education. The period marked the rise of federal grants-in-aid as an encouragement to instructional, investigational, and extension activities. The experimental work and the extension service were bringing the State College to popular attention and creating a demand for its services. As never before there was a desire that education should serve society; education for efficiency was the counterpart of the similar movement in business. In both realms the effort was often made in a short-sighted manner, but the aim was essentially sound and wholesome. The executive chosen to direct the College at this dynamic stage was a fitting repre-

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

sentative of the new age. He was, as knowing observers remarked, a new type of president for the state.

THE NEW LEADER

The Board of Education, recognizing the unusually determining significance of their choice both for the modernizing of the College and for their own plans for a state system, and feeling that the institution would be safely cared for by Stanton, had been deliberate and thorough in their search, in spite of growing criticism at the delay. Their consideration came to center on the retiring state commissioner of agriculture of New York, R. A. Pearson. He was endorsed by representative leaders in education and affairs in that state, including trustees and the president of Cornell, the New York State Commissioner of Education, the heads of the New York Agricultural Society and the state Grange, and the president of the New York Central Railroad. Justice Hughes, under whose governorship he had served, was consulted and gave full commendation.

At an interview with the Board in Cedar Rapids in March, 1912, Pearson indicated that he was greatly interested in the position but was undecided between it and an offer in the East. A few days later in a letter to President Trewin, he expressed his personal reactions very frankly. After their conference he had inspected the College, visited relatives in Humboldt County, and conferred with Henry Wallace. He was so strongly impressed with the opportunity the institution offered that it would require unusually strong inducement to keep him in the East. There were, however, certain matters that he desired to have clearly understood before committing himself. The chief uncertainties grew out of the pending proposals for consolidation. The principal lines of the College, he assumed, were to remain agriculture, engineering, and veterinary science, supported by such literary subjects and fundamental sciences as were necessary for their proper de-

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

velopment. The future of home economics was to be determined. It was understood that necessary steps were to be taken to qualify the College for the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation pension system. Other proposals were suggested by the reports of the waning executive authority during the past administration under the operation of the divisional system. The president, he stipulated, was to have full freedom in carrying out policies. This was essential to the firmness that had been suggested as needed in the incoming president. The president was to initiate all appointments and removals, and he was to be the intermediary between the Board and the staff. Salaries should increase where necessary to retain the strongest men, and it was understood to be "the intention to considerably increase the salary of the President at as early a date as is practicable." Trewin replied with some personal reservations and suggested that the other members might have additional ones. The location of the engineering work was still unsettled. The requirements of the Carnegie board should not interfere with the special needs of the state. The Board would probably object to any fixed salary scale. On the other matters there was apparent agreement.

Following this exchange of personal opinions the differences were readily adjusted. Pearson replied that he had not sought to suggest new policies but rather to have a clear understanding as to those that were established. He added significantly for his future attitude, "I should like to think of the institution at Ames as the great technical school of the state, and, in its service to the state and in its relative standing with other institutions, comparable with such well known institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Boston, and John Hopkins University at Baltimore." He was especially concerned at the uncertainty over engineering. He would not wish to head the College if that were taken away. Other matters he was sure could be satisfactorily adjusted. On April 3 the Board wired that it was now their avowed policy to develop engineering at the State College

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

and that the president's salary would be "increased in due time." Two days later Pearson wired his acceptance. He was given leave until September to complete a survey of agricultural organizations in Europe.

Raymond Allen Pearson was born in Indiana in 1873 and was thus only thirty-nine when selected for this great responsibility and opportunity. He had graduated from Cornell University in 1895 in dairy industry and subsequently received a master's degree. He had been awarded an LL.D. by Alfred University in 1910. Upon graduation he became assistant chief of the dairy division of the Department of Agriculture. After ten years of service there he was appointed manager of a dairy laboratory in New York City, from which he was called to the professorship of dairying at Cornell. His appointment to the state commissionership, with the strong support of the leading farmers' organizations, followed, and he served with conspicuous success until displaced by a change of party control. His commission to investigate agricultural organizations in Europe came at the end of this service and resulted in a substantial report. His family was distinguished in education and business. One brother was an outstanding veterinary scientist and the other a prominent railroad executive. Professor George W. Jones, who after his service at the Iowa Agricultural College had a long career in the mathematics department at Cornell, was his uncle. Pearson had enthusiasm, energy, a pleasing manner, and a good platform presence. From boyhood residence on an uncle's farm in Humboldt County and frequent later visits, he had a familiarity with the state. He had agreed with the half-serious suggestion of a member of the Board that his bachelor status was a handicap for the position and promised to alter it. This he did three years after coming to Ames. His marriage to Miss Alice Dunsford of Avon, New York brought a charming and cultured mistress to the presidential mansion and a gracious and understanding participant in campus society.

At the beginning of his administration President Pearson

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

made a most favorable impression. He appeared affable and democratic in his contacts with faculty, student body, townspeople, and state gatherings. Openly at any rate, he sought to ignore past factional differences and to recognize institutional and local traditions and prejudices. In his address at the opening convocation he paid a gracious tribute to Stanton's service and added that he had not come to displace the veteran but to labor with him as a teammate in the common cause. He showed his appreciation and goodwill for his predecessor more substantially by recommending that he be made vice-president.

No less heartily the new President joined in the homecoming recognition of Secretary James Wilson on March 12, 1913. The event, including a mid-day convocation and an evening banquet, was a fitting recognition of a man who had gone from the College to the position of most distinguished leadership in national agriculture. Governor Clarke, ex-Governor Carroll, Henry Wallace, and D. D. Murphy, president of the Board, were among the participants. Pearson referred to the fact that the Secretary had been kept on the faculty roll through the years of his service in Washington and assured him that the administration and staff still felt that he was one of them; and Wilson in reply pledged his remaining years to the service of the College.

TWENTY-FIVE YEAR CLUB FOUNDED

An equally appropriate and fitting tribute was the recognition, two years later, of the members of the staff who had served for at least twenty-five years. General Lincoln, Treasurer Knapp, and Professors Stanton, Bennett, and Pammel were so honored in a convocation which marked the establishment of the "Twenty-Five Year Club." Benjamin H. Hibbard, '98, of the University of Wisconsin, gave the main address, and greetings were brought by President Thomas H. Macbride for the State University, President Homer H.

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

Seerley for the Teachers College, and President D. D. Murphy for the Board of Education. Friends and fellow workers from the leading universities, research institutes, and government bureaus sent letters of felicitation. Dean Stanton responded feelingly for the honored group.

A BROADENED PROGRAM

In addressing agricultural and business gatherings the energetic head of the State College evinced an earnest desire to deal with the agricultural and industrial problems of his adopted state in the most thorough and modern manner. He endeavored to speak the language of the farmer and of the business man and to meet them on their own ground with no academic inhibitions. He told the state dairymen, in particular, that he had started his career in life in that occupation and he planned to return to it when his present service had ended. Most of his audiences and visitors would undoubtedly have agreed with the editor of the *Student* who at the beginning of the second year of the popular administration urged the alumni to "Shake Hands with Prexy" and assured them that "Though he came to us from the east, President Pearson is a true type of the friendly westerner."

At the same time, while conscious of the practical occupational instruction to be provided and the direct services to be rendered, the new executive kept his aim, forecasted in his negotiations with the Board, of a broad technological institution. This emphasis was made both as a constructive development of the true program of the land-grant college and as a defense against future threats of consolidation and a fear which was to become something of an obsession with him of the subordination of the State College to the University, in program, support, and the dignity and standing of the administration. The main policies of the alert and ambitious administrator in this period of stress and strain in a modernizing technological institution were motivated by these hopes and

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

fears. In line with these aims, during the first two years collegiate administrative organization was completed and the experimental and extension services were strengthened.

A GRADUATE DIVISION

The plan for graduate instruction marked an especial advance. The catalogue of 1912-13, anticipating official authorization, made the promise that "the administration of all graduate work will be placed in the near future in a separate division to be known as the Graduate College. The new division will be presided over by a dean." The term "college" at this time, before divisional status had been attained, while premature, indicated the high goal being sought. On May 22, 1913, the general faculty, acting upon a report by the Board of Deans, recommended to the Board of Education the establishment of a graduate division. The latter Board responded on July 15 with the adoption of a motion made by Roger Leavitt, a member from Cedar Falls, that such a division be established with a dean and that the president should serve in that position "for the present."

During the fall and winter, plans were made for the organization and program of the Division. The committee on organization consisted of President Pearson as chairman, Dean MacKay of Home Economics, Vice-Deans Beach, Beyer, and Dimock from Agriculture, Engineering, and Veterinary Medicine, respectively, Professor Pammel from Industrial Science, and Professor Summers, member at large. Elaborate suggestions regarding standards of work and the appointment of scholars and fellows were received from the graduate committees of the Agricultural and Industrial Science divisions, and the latter made an extensive survey of the practices of leading graduate schools in the selection, service, and compensation of stipend holders.

The recommendation of the agricultural graduate committee on the dean-ship was significant and revealing: "The

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

committee recommends and urges that a strong, capable man, qualified for the position of Dean of the graduate work, be selected during the coming year, and that the man chosen for this work be a man of recognized standing and ability as a scientist; a man of broad character and training, and one who is specially in sympathy with the application of science to industrial work, particularly in the field of agriculture. Emphasis is placed upon the agricultural work for the reason that during the past ten or twelve years approximately three-fourths of the students enrolled in graduate work have been agricultural students, and there is every reason to believe that this number will very greatly increase if the work is properly recognized and put upon a good basis."

Sub-committees of the organizing committee were appointed to survey the departments of the various divisions as to their availability to offer courses for the master's or doctor's degrees for the coming year. The assignments by the President were: Home Economics, Dimock and Pammel; Industrial Science, Beyer and MacKay; Engineering, Summers and Beach; Veterinary Medicine, Beach and Summers; Agriculture, Pammel and Beyer. The committees made detailed investigations of each department as to personnel—training, experience, membership in learned societies—publications, and departmental equipment and facilities, and on these findings made specific recommendations.

At the completion of the survey the investigators concluded that "the most important immediate difficulties in the way of the organization of an efficient Graduate Division including all of the departments in *Pure and Applied Sciences* are:

- "1. Instructors at the present time are fully occupied with undergraduate courses and routine work of the department.
- "2. Instructors are permitted, expected or required to give instruction in too many subjects; in some cases the subjects taught are not closely related.

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

- “3. Space available is only sufficient, or even inadequate for present classes.
- “4. Inadequate library facilities, especially technical works in other than the English language.
- “5. Absence of research atmosphere.”

Though these difficulties were serious, the investigators were confident that none of them was insurmountable. The teaching handicaps, in particular, they felt, might be overcome by more efficient divisional and departmental organizations. The library needs could be met only by a marked and systematic increase in the collections of reference books and sets of scientific reports and journals.

The recommendations for the various divisions are of historical interest as a cross-section contemporary judgment of the status of the various departments. In the Agricultural Division, agronomy, animal husbandry, the agricultural chemistry administered in the station, and horticulture were qualified to give the doctorate in certain lines, while agricultural education and dairy industry were prepared for master's work. All of the main engineering departments, including physics, which was still classified in that division, were equipped and staffed for instruction for the master's degree, and economic geology was prepared for the doctor's. In the science group, bacteriology, botany, and zoology were developed to the doctorate stage, and chemistry was expected “at an early date . . . to meet the full requirements.” Economics and mathematics could provide major work for the master's and minor for the doctor's degrees. The combined department of history and psychology was fitted for minor work toward an M.S. Veterinary Medicine with an enlarged staff might do work leading to the master of science in anatomy and histology, pathology and bacteriology, and physiology and pharmacology. The recently created Home Economics Division aspired to the M.S. in two fields, textiles and foods and nutrition, but the inspecting committee felt that the new

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

division's efforts should be confined to minor work for the present.

During 1914-15 the graduate committee completed the details of organization and procedure. The graduate faculty was to be composed of the heads of departments offering graduate work and all instructors of graduate subjects. The first meeting, presided over by the President, was held on November 11, 1915. The event marked the completion of a distinct divisional organization and inaugurated the systematic graduate study. The Board was asked to make provision for at least five each of scholars, teaching fellows, and junior and senior research fellows with stipends fixed for the prospective grades at \$200, \$400, \$300, and \$500. The degrees provided for were master of science and doctor of philosophy in course, with the professional degrees continued on the existing basis. Five years before, during the investigation of higher degrees, there had been considerable sentiment in the Agricultural Division for conferring in course the technical degree doctor of scientific agriculture (D.S.A.), but the prevailing trend was found to be toward a uniformity of degree at the doctorate level. Meanwhile, with competent staff, adequate facilities, administrative organizations, and a more perceptible "research atmosphere," the time was ripe, in certain fields, for conferring the highest degree.

THE FIRST PH.D.'S.

The years 1915-19, while showing an increased and continuous award of masters' and professional degrees in the technical and the pioneer science departments, were marked by the first awards in bacteriology and physics (with one exception in each) mathematics, and economic science. But the period was especially notable for the conferring of the initial doctorates of philosophy. In 1916, Leslie A. Kenoyer, B.A., Campbell College, and M.A., University of Kansas, received the Ph.D. in the department of botany. The follow-

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

ing year Charles W. Davis, of the University of Tennessee, and Paul Emerson, of the University of Delaware, earned the degree in soil bacteriology. Ada Hayden's award in botany in 1918 completed the roll for this period.

To aid the President in administering the Division, Professor George A. Chaney, Department of Mathematics, served as assistant from the spring of 1916 to the winter of 1919. He entered upon the task with great energy and enthusiasm. His first report in May, 1917, contained a remarkably frank statement of his views of the graduate and research situation and a most ambitious proposal for future developments. The immediate material needs, he felt, were a graduate student center, systematized graduate placement work, and a separate divisional budget. The College's participation in the World War, which was to cut the graduate enrollment 40 per cent, made such a program unthinkable. The vision of a real graduate college long held by certain administrators and scholars awaited the educational reorganization and expansion that came in the post-war years.

GENERAL SCIENCE CONTROVERSY

Meanwhile, before the modern organization could be fully effected, there was a final internal functional struggle over the place and status of the general courses administered in the division of Science as Related to the Industries, still under the temporary direction of Dean Stanton. With the growing professional and occupational consciousness within the institution and the pressure for consolidation without, a general division was forced as never before since the formative years to show positive justification for existence. To meet this situation the divisional faculty in May, 1913, adopting what was regarded as the simpler and more expressive name, "Industrial Science," presented revised curriculums of a four-year course in industrial science, five-year courses in science and agriculture, science and engineering, and science and home economics,

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

and a six-year course in science and veterinary medicine. The industrial science course provided for major work in one of the science departments as then constituted. A maximum of twenty-four hours might be chosen from another division. The main functions of the division were held to be the furnishing of instruction in the basic sciences underlying the industries and professions taught in the technical divisions and to qualify students for "certain industrial scientific work." All of the offerings were held to be in full accord with the specific provisions of the Morrill acts.

When the proposal was first presented to the general faculty, consideration of the program was postponed. At the next meeting it was referred back to the divisional faculty for further consideration. Finally on May 15, the revised plan was presented by Dean Stanton. In opposition to the plan of organization and instruction a brief was presented for the division of agriculture by vice-Dean S. A. Beach, '87. In reply a brief was presented for the science division. The agricultural forces presented six opposing allegations: first, the name was inappropriate and misleading, being designed to give the course a standing to which it was not entitled since it did not require a student to connect his work with any industry or any phase of industrial work, but on the contrary the student was left free to elect work that had no industrial relations or significance; second, in spite of claim that the new general course avoided all appearance of offering liberal arts work, they believed that it afforded "greater opportunities. . . to elect work bordering on Liberal Arts than have ever before been presented in any course offered in this institution"; third, a science student might elect courses in agricultural education sufficient to acquire a state certificate "without reference to the relation of educational work to agriculture, as required in the educational work in this institution"; fourth, such a course would be discrediting to the high standards in technical agricultural instruction which had

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

been built up at the College—a combination of “science and agriculture” would mark a backward step to such a repudiated combination of former years; fifth, such a course was lacking in other land-grant colleges and was to be found only in state universities in which the agricultural divisions were forced to provide their own basic science training; and sixth, the true function of the science work in a land-grant college was to support and sustain the agricultural and engineering work and the subjects should be specialized and adapted to that end, and it was “no secret that the science work in this institution as at present organized does not fully meet these requirements.” As a substitute plan the agricultural division proposed a system of specialization in the general sciences in connection with the senior college and graduate work in agriculture. These courses would be coordinate for the agricultural division with industrial chemistry for that of engineering.

The representatives of the division, termed “science” pending more definite designation, replied specifically, elaborately, and somewhat ardently. On the matter of designation it was the conviction of their faculty that the sciences in a technical institution should have the point of view and, as far as practicable, subject matter illustrations of the industries and professions of the student taught. This made the emphasis “industrial.” As to the charge of liberal arts trend, their course, emphasizing the sciences mentioned in the second Morrill act in distinction to the “cultural subjects,” was a far cry from a former course that awarded the B.L. without question. Furthermore, the proposed course was much less “liberal” than the existing one.

The alarm over teacher training was held to be not only unjustified but contradictory and inconsistent. Agricultural teachers in the schools were teaching the general sciences in larger numbers than science majors were teaching vocational subjects. Furthermore the agricultural division was announcing its educational course as designed for teachers “in the

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

general sciences and agriculture," and in the summer term especial appeals were made for high school teachers to prepare for agricultural teaching. The training of science teachers was a great public service and in turn a boon to the College, for there could be "no stronger force back of an institution than an army of loyal alumni teaching the boys and girls of the High Schools of the state. . . . From the standpoint of strength to the institution we *need* our Science students in the High Schools of Iowa."

The science division, it was urged, had no desire or expectation of deflating or discrediting the high standards and achievements of the agricultural division. All that was sought was a reciprocal agreement by which the latter division, like the other divisions of the College, would be open to students without divisional registration. There was no intent of their students to pose as technical students, and while two cases had been cited of the discrediting effect of vocational teaching by science students, others could be cited of equally discrediting failures by those of full vocational training. The science faculty was willing to break precedents if need be to advance the interests of the College, but it found directly pertinent and sustaining ones in the practices of several outstanding institutions. There was a denial that the sciences had their only mission and function in giving support to the technical divisions; they had their own particular and proper field in addition. If the supporting work was inadequate or to some degree incompetent, the responsibility was mainly with the agricultural division that permitted no representation of the serving departments in their faculty meetings and no voice in the planning and adapting of courses. The substitute plan was held to be inadequate, impracticable, and superficial. The agricultural courses did not provide the requisite foundation in the junior college for advanced science study, either in the senior college or in graduate study.

In conclusion, it was urged that the division was essential

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

to a "complete industrial institution." The division, "proud of its connections," sought only an opportunity to render its service most adequately and to develop its particular field. "It does not want to be abolished or smothered. It wants to be a worker among its peers, serving and being served. It has a mission to perform. It is willing to meet every demand made upon it in the line of scientific work required by the other Divisions. It wants in addition a little elbow room to do needed work that will redound to the credit of the College, give standing, courage and inspiration to its workers and attract to and retain in the service of the institution the highest type of scientific men. It proposes to make scientific experts, investigators and educators, who, having thorough knowledge of science in some particular, and having had touch with its specialized application shall be ready to render service of greatest value to industry."

Following a resolution to adopt the new science course of study, Dean Curtiss moved a substitute resolution for the agricultural faculty that it was the sense of the general faculty that "the science work as related to the Industrial, Veterinary, and Home Economics courses in this institution should be put on the strongest possible basis and every facility offered for its development and closer relation to that work, but that the best interest of the institution as a whole would be promoted by discontinuing the four-year course in Science, and that no similar course should be offered beyond a period long enough to permit students now enrolled in this course to complete their work." The substitute motion was lost by a vote of eighteen to twenty-seven, whereupon the motion to adopt the course of study was approved. At the next meeting a recommendation of the board of deans that each divisional faculty have the privilege of sending three representatives to the other faculties as "advisory members" was adopted. And soon afterward Dean Stanton reported for record a resolution of the "Faculty of the Division of Science" that "the subjects taught by them and required in other divisions of the College be

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

specifically outlined in the fullest cooperation with the respective departments for which such subjects are taught." A modus vivendi was becoming an entente cordiale and was on the way, in spirit as well as form, to full federal union.

DIVISIONS COMPLETED

Divisional organization was now completed. In 1913 Dean Stanton resumed his teaching and direction of the junior college, and Professor R. E. Buchanan was appointed the first dean of Industrial Science. In the same year, Home Economics, now with its own separate plant, was given divisional autonomy. Catherine J. MacKay, a graduate of Drexel Institute and of Columbia University, became the first dean. The resident instructional program was now fully organized according to the most advanced conception of a land-grant college. There remained the commensurate development of outside interests and contacts through the experiment stations and extension services.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

The work of the agricultural experiment station was systematized and the range of investigation extended. The purchase of the agronomy farm gave added opportunity for crop experimentation. The soil survey work was of increasing interest, and Professor W. H. Stevenson's contribution in this investigation was recognized in his appointment as vice-director in 1913. The addition of a bacteriology section concerned largely with food problems and sanitation, and one of farm management, which gave particular attention to tenancy, were indications of new lines of interest. The inauguration of research fellowships and the publication of research bulletins gave a marked impetus to the research program.

EXTENSION SERVICES

The extension service, after an embarrassing interlude of personal controversy came to equally assured institutional

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

establishment. The "department" created in 1906 with a superintendent responsible to the dean of agriculture, in 1912 was made a separate service with a director responsible directly to the president. W. J. Kennedy as director, with his pronounced supporters and opponents, proved a storm center both in college administration and among the farmers, and finally, in May, 1914, Pearson demanded his resignation which was promptly presented. Kennedy maintained that he was the victim of unfriendly agricultural papers which brought a pressure upon the Board to which it finally gave way. He claimed that he had personally built up the largest animal husbandry department in the world and that the extension service had flourished greatly under his direction. Without questioning his marked competence and popularity as a teacher, his promotive energy, and wide and enthusiastic following, the Board and the President pointed out that, apart from the charges brought against his judging methods, he had created an impossible situation by failing to cooperate and work in harmony with the administration.

After temporary direction by Paul C. Taff, of the extension division, a former member of the staff was made director. Ralph K. Bliss, '05, as a student had made an outstanding record in scholarship and student leadership, especially in stock judging. He had been an associate of Holden, whom he succeeded temporarily in 1912. That year he was called to the University of Nebraska as head of the department of animal husbandry. His recall to head the work in the year of the passage of the Smith-Lever Act inaugurated auspiciously the modern extension service. By the spring of 1916 he could report seventeen dairy testing associations, farm crop demonstration plots in eighteen counties, effective results from boys' corn clubs, and over 500,000 people reached in some definite way within the year. This was a most gratifying showing for the first decade of organized effort. But it proved to be but the small beginning.

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

Meanwhile, in 1913 the engineering extension service was founded to provide information and training for the leading trades of the state. The service functioned largely through short courses for different groups of workers held at convenient centers about the state as well as at the College.

In resident instruction, in addition to a variety of short courses in different fields of agriculture, in home-making, and the trades, there were added to the agricultural two-year course, similar non-collegiate courses, open to eighth-grade graduates, in home-making and in trades and industries. With the station findings made known through popular bulletins, with the organized extension efforts, with the resident short and non-collegiate courses in all lines of interest to the people of the state, the modern state-wide, inclusive-interest program was launched—with its great possibilities and perils.

STUDENT COOPERATION

No less than this instructional and research program, student attitudes, interests, and “activities” reflected the modern spirit. In various ways student-faculty cooperation was encouraged and promoted. During his first year President Pearson introduced the faculty adviser system under which all entering students were assigned to staff members for counsel and advice. The assistance of a group of upper-classmen provided a more mature faculty-student contact. Though a far cry from freshman week and the later counselor and personnel system, the plan was a commendable beginning. The interest that the plan aroused in the Association of Land-Grant Colleges indicated that it was a pioneer venture. The resulting social mindedness of the freshmen was indicated by the pledge of the class of '16 in May, 1913, to refrain from molesting the entering class but instead to aid the freshmen in making adjustment to college life. The President thought this action “the most constructive and far-reaching ever taken by any class.” The classes of '17 and '18

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

maintained the lower class goodwill, and in the biennial report for 1914-16 the wishful hope was expressed that junior college peace had become an established tradition. Cooperation was further sought by student representatives selected by the various classes on college committees and councils concerned with matters of general institutional interest—grounds and buildings, moral welfare, publicity, public health, public safety, public service, athletics, and music.

There were various other occasions of student participation and expression. The student repair fund was administered jointly. The President consulted with the heads of organized houses. The Cardinal Guild sought to accomplish a number of useful things, including a more satisfactory adjustment of the Christmas vacation period, a referendum on campus smoking, in which, after a record vote, the practice was decisively banned, the inauguration of a point system for activities, as well as premature efforts to institute a blanket tax, and the perennial agitation for a more effective system of student government.

The committee on moral welfare under the chairmanship of the chaplain, Dr. Cessna, took its responsibilities most seriously. The pre-war years marked an earnest effort to retain the old moral restraint and direction under modern conditions. Daily chapel was continued, and the best faculty talent was drafted to keep up the interest. In cooperation with the Y's, special religious meetings were held each year. Faculty supervised movies were shown on the campus, and efforts were made in cooperation with the Ames ministerial association to keep downtown amusements within both the letter and the spirit of the law.

MODERNIZED ACTIVITIES

Extra-curricular cultural opportunities were extended. The best of musical talent was brought to the campus and the College activities increased. Following an investigation and

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

report by Professor Louis B. Schmidt in 1913, the music work for the first time was organized as a regular college department. Lecture and dramatic features were in accord with changing taste and interest. The period marked the climax of the old-type contest debate and the last serious work of the literary societies. Modern trends in student journalism were indicated by the holding of the first gridiron banquet of Sigma Delta Chi in 1914 and the founding in the following year of the humorous quarterly, the *Green Gander*. In 1912-13 the Cardinal Guild started a vigorous agitation for a blanket tax to finance more adequately and securely the varied student activities. The faculty for the most part tended to view with alarm such high financing of student enterprises, and the attorney general finally ruled that the levy would be illegal as a compulsory regulation. A trial on a voluntary basis proved ineffective, and this effort at institutional unity in support and participation was to prove premature by a quarter of a century. The main objective of the proposed financial system—before other activities had come to coordinate position—was the assured support of a full athletic program.

A "BIG ATHLETIC POLICY"

With increased enrollment, enlarged curricula, and extended contacts, students and alumni were demanding a "big athletic policy." In accord with prevailing collegiate usage, the real test of such a policy was a winning football team, which necessitated a "great coach." Pearson sympathized with the ambition as a desirable adjunct if not an indispensable feature of an aspiring college, particularly in appealing to the younger alumni, who since the fall of 1912 had been attracted to the campus for the "homecoming" game. He gladly furthered the search for a top-notch football mentor, and in the spring of 1913 the choice was made of Charles W. Mays, of Franklin and Marshall College, whose record was

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

most impressive. Clyde Williams was continued as director with a staff of seven, including special coaches for each of the four main sports. The new gymnasium and State Field accommodated the full athletic program and made possible the definite organization of the department of physical education. Well might the *Student* laud the vision of the Athletic Council and exult that the coming season would "put Ames athletics on the big university basis."

AGITATION FOR "UNIVERSITY" DESIGNATION

The "big university" idea in these years was not confined to athletics and to student sports writers. There was a persistent agitation among alumni, staff, and students for a more definite and distinctive name; many suggested, in view of the enlarged and extended scope, the substitution of the designation "university." The discussion was encouraged by the current use of varied and inconsistent labels. In 1911 a former student wrote that the *Alumnus* had referred to the College in seven different ways. Sports writers and journalists in general, more frequently than not, referred to the institution as "Ames." Songs, yells, and letter awards used this name. In some quarters, through carelessness or design, the original anachronistic and unbalanced designation was employed. When Governor Carroll in his founder's day address in 1911 lauded the great achievements of the "agricultural college," he was accused of deliberately slighting engineering and the other divisions. Certain officials of the sister institution were over-effusively condescending in paying tribute to the "greatest agricultural school in the land." Even the finance committee of the Board of Education recorded in their minutes for February, 1913, that "President Pearson of the College of Agriculture was present . . ." Alumni sentiment generally favored the name Ames, either as college or university. Student opinion was divided on the name but was generally committed to university status. A *Student* editorial in 1914

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

quoted the opinion of a "prominent faculty member" that the institution was really a technical university and exhorted the student body to get away from the small college point of view and acquire the more liberal university outlook, and as a start in that direction the *Bomb* of that year headed the general section "university." Ex-President Taft, during his lectures in 1916, whether by courtesy or inadvertence, spoke of his host institution as a university, and the editor felt that "he should know."

PEARSON AND THE BOARD

The President was known to share these aspirations of alumni and students, particularly as they concerned the coordinate position of the College within the state system of higher education. He was finding his position in relation to the centralized administration hampering and unsatisfactory in various ways. In 1915, when he received an invitation to return to the New York commissionership, he wrote the president of the Board frankly and specifically in respect to his grievances and stated that the Board's reaction to them would determine his continuance in Iowa. These complaints and stipulations indicated a feeling of the lack of harmonious adjustment of the Board and its finance committee with the administrations of the different institutions, at any rate with that of the State College.

To begin with, Pearson insisted, his position as chief executive and administrator of the College should be recognized with full implications. Since he was not a member of the Board he should be given an opportunity to discuss every financial or educational policy. He should be informed and made a party to any investigation of the affairs of the College. He should be consulted by the Board on every item of the budget and be associated with the finance committee in presenting the askings to the legislature. Regarding a particular expenditure, he suggested that the Board's intent on

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

the president's salary be made more definite. All college matters presented to the Board should come through him and he should be entrusted with the carrying out of policies. Appointments and dismissals, in particular, should be made only upon his recommendation. All questions having to do with instruction should be left to the president and the appropriate members of his staff. Finally, most significantly in view of past and pending discussion of institutional jurisdiction and emphasis, he reminded the Board that while it was a great privilege to develop the extension, experimental, and sub-collegiate work, it was "also clearly our duty to develop our special lines of work on a full collegiate basis fitting the needs of the state."

Evidently the Board's response was reassuring, as a week later it was announced that the eastern offer had been declined. The faculty asked the deans to present resolutions expressing their appreciation of his leadership and their gratification that he was to remain. The *Student* rejoiced that with an energetic, far-seeing president, an enthusiastic faculty, and a loyal student body future progress was assured. For the agricultural interest of the state *Wallace's Farmer* brought hearty congratulations, "We are happy that he is to remain with us." During his brief service, the editor observed, internal harmony and loyalty had been established and the College had reached a higher degree of service than ever before. Pearson, he added, had grown steadily in the esteem of the people of the state and enjoyed the full confidence of the Board.

SURVEY BY BUREAU OF EDUCATION

The Board, however, had the other institutions to consider as well, and if intramural conditions were relatively harmonious, the inter-institutional ones were increasingly strained. Instead of the cooperative, coordinate adjustment that the Board was expected to establish, there was a competitive

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

rivalry attended with mistrust and jealousy. The feeling, the culmination of a decade of strained relations, extended to the students of the two leading state institutions, especially in their athletic contests, which were attended with increasing bitterness and charges of bad sportsmanship. These disruptive influences, together with the lingering hope of securing moral support for consolidation that would overcome local opposition, led the Board to institute the first general institutional "survey" as contrasted with the periodical legislative investigations. To give the investigations and the consequent recommendations all possible authority and prestige, the Federal Bureau of Education was called upon to sponsor the undertaking.

In February, 1915, the Board, in suggesting the possibility of such aid, disclaimed any intent to reopen the old question of coordination as it involved the consolidation of engineering and home economics, but desired to know whether "without resorting to such radical action" it would be possible "to reduce duplications." At a meeting with Commissioner Claxton in Des Moines in the following May, a formal request was made for an inquiry on certain specified matters: duplication in education and psychology between the University and State College; the status of journalism training and the desirability of a school; the status of graduate work and the possibilities of preventing duplication; the feasibility of consolidating the extension work of the three institutions; the adequacy of buildings and future needs and the advisability of new lines of work.

Impressed with the Bureau's responsibility for an investigation that was certain to attract nation-wide attention, the Commissioner appointed a distinguished and fairly representative commission: James R. Angell, dean of liberal arts, University of Chicago; Kendric C. Babcock, dean of arts and sciences of the University of Illinois and collaborator with the Bureau; Liberty H. Bailey, ex-dean New York State College of

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

Agriculture; Henrietta W. Calvin, home economics specialist for the Bureau; Hollis Godfrey, president of Drexel Institute; Raymond M. Hughes, president of Miami University; and Samuel P. Capen, specialist in higher education for the Bureau, chairman.

The commission organized in July and during the fall collected preliminary information. As a background for the study, letters were sent to presidents of chambers of commerce, heads of granges, newspaper editors, superintendents of schools, and "certain other citizens of distinction" inquiring if in their judgment each of the three institutions was performing fully and effectively its peculiar function of support that should be given; whether new ones should be developed and, if so, what ones are needed. Letters were received from one hundred forty-one institutions addressed, and most of them were "conscientious." The commission felt that this information and the reports provided an "atmospheric setting" and a background for the study of educational needs.

Eleven days—November 8–19—were devoted to visiting and inspecting the institutions—four at Iowa State University, Cedar Falls, and five at Ames. Plants were inspected, and were examined, and hearings held with presidents and heads of leading departments. Stenographic reports taken of the hearings and later checked by the commission. Conferences were also held with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the State Board of Education. The final report was organized and printed in Cedar Rapids and submitted to the Bureau for publication in 1916. It appeared as a bulletin of the Bureau, containing tables, charts, and graphs to 223 pages.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With the agreement of the Board, the commission had decided not to limit its investigation and recommendations to

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

the specific issues at first suggested, but to consider the entire problem of the higher education of the state. The extensiveness of the inquiries and deliberations was indicated by a list of fifty-two more or less specific recommendations on matters ranging from the basic principle by which division of the educational field should be determined to football relations between the student bodies at Ames and Iowa City.

The central problem was held to be the existence of three state institutions similar in standards, seeking coordinate status. The unifying solution the commission offered was to regard the institutions together as constituting one great state university with the lines of study and investigation and the fields of service activity divided among the constituent members. Obviously the rub was to make and maintain an apportionment of the total enterprise of a great modern university so as to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort and to secure cooperation and harmony rather than competition and discord. The investigators believed that they had found the guide to such effective and harmonious division of labor in the adoption and application of the principle of major and service lines of work. In general, the commission felt that the classification of subjects in the different institutions on this basis could be readily made. Overlapping subjects, especially in the basic sciences essential to all technical study, could be best adjusted, the members were convinced, by a conference committee made up of representatives of the faculties concerned and of the Board.

The main existing cases of unnecessary duplication were found in the parallel engineering courses at the University and the State College, the senior college work at the Teachers College, and the overdevelopment of certain general subjects at the State College. The commission regarded the continuance of the two engineering schools in their existing form as "uneconomical and indefensible." The most desirable plan—in view of the dual obligation of the land-grant colleges—

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

would be a concentration of all the engineering work at the State College. But if this settlement was adjudged impracticable of application, "considering the present condition of institutional and popular sentiment in Iowa," there were these alternatives: a horizontal division between graduate and undergraduate instruction, which was not feasible at the existing stage of technical training in the state, and a vertical or topical division of the engineering branches. The commission believed that the latter plan, if worked out in consultation with a group of impartial, expert engineers, would be the most effective solution.

If, in the commission's view, the University duplicated in the technical field, the other two colleges did in the general. The last two years of the course at the Teachers College were held to be unjustified by the demand for additional liberal arts work and distracting to the true function of elementary teacher training. A much controverted question was begged and a disproportionate emphasis given to the whole matter by devoting an entire chapter of the report to "Liberal Arts Work in the Iowa State College." Applying the principle of major and service courses, in accord with the strictest construction, it was held that general courses were justified in this institution only to the extent that they provided an essential, clearly-established support to the major technical lines. This test seemed to indicate that economic science, geology, mathematics, and physics were offering superfluous courses. But most serious was the charge "frequently . . . made and widely believed" that this institution was endeavoring to build up "a curriculum in liberal arts and sciences, leading to a non-technical degree either in general science or in arts." Though the commission accepted the protestations of the college officials against any such design and the assurance that only such liberal subjects were taught as were essential to a balanced curriculum in the technical divisions of the College as a true statement of present intent, the members felt that there had

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

been such an aim in the past and that the non-industrial basis of the required major work in the division of Industrial Science might lead to the equivalent of the objectionable general course. They recommended accordingly a revision of the requirements in that division "to render it impossible to secure the degree except on completion of industrial and professional courses (in contradistinction to liberal arts courses) equal in amount to those required in technical curricula."

Graduate study at the State College, the commission recommended, should be encouraged and developed within the institution's own major fields of concentration; in other fields instruction at this level should be offered only as essential supporting work. Doubtful cases, involving possible duplication, should be considered by a committee representing the Board and the two institutions.

In the survey of institutional administration, the pertinent findings for the College had to do with the danger of encroachment by the finance committee upon the essential financial prerogatives of the presidents and an observation on the unwholesome inter-institutional sentiment as reflected in athletic and other relations. In view of existing criticism and future possible complications, the "strict definition of the powers and functions of the finance committee was recommended." It was further recommended that the presidents be made *ex officio* members of the Board.

Institutional hostility brought a scathing rebuke for "the unfortunate bitterness which characterizes the attitude of the partisans of each of the state institutions toward those of the others. The tendency to regard with suspicion the acts of a sister institution, to impute unworthy motives to its officers and adherents—this is the principal cause of the State's educational woes. It is not an expression of generous rivalry or of wholesome competition. It represents rather a devastating blight fastened upon the whole educational system of the State. That all three of the institutions should have made such

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

genuine progress and should have attained such commanding rank among the collegiate institutions of the country in an atmosphere so hostile to true educational advance is testimony of an amazing innate vitality. The fact indicates that fundamental organic weaknesses are lacking and that Iowa's difficulty is largely a state of mind." The commission could not believe that the citizens would long tolerate such a retarding influence and "permit petty institutional jealousies, founded for the most part on the merest illusions, to defeat even partially the state's educational purpose." Even the most partisan should recognize that the interest of the state was above that of any institution, and a student or alumnus who put alma mater's claims above that of his state was an enemy to both.

But the commission recognized the "tenacity of existing animosities" and the slight effect of exhortations upon them, and as one means of relieving a tense situation recommended that football and perhaps baseball games between the University and the State College be suspended for five or six years. The annual game was "the occasion of the revival of feuds, charges, and countercharges, the reassertion of differences and criticisms which at best have had only poor reasons for existence." There was lacking that wholesome, generous sportsmanship which characterized athletic contests at their best. An enthusiastic, reasoned loyalty on the part of alumni and friends was held to be one of a college's greatest assets, and occasions which aroused such true loyalty should be promoted, "but occasions which engender misunderstandings and antipathies, with their consequent disintegrating and harmful effects, are to be avoided. That form of loyalty which finds its chief incentive and expression in hostility toward another creature and servant of the same State cannot of itself and in the long run be a good thing for the State or its institutions."

That this principle applied to all other relations and to all

EDUCATION FOR EFFICIENCY

of the members of the institutions was made clear in the final exhortation: "The substitution of cooperation for competition is one of the largest and most outstanding needs in the adjustment of the relations of the two institutions. An earnest and progressive desire to cooperate by the alumni, faculty, and students of both the State College and the University should take the place of the factional and oftentimes exaggerated rivalry which has hitherto characterized their relations in general. To magnify and perpetuate old antagonisms and fictitious differences under the guise of cultivating loyalty is to prevent the most efficient accomplishment of the State's purpose in creating these institutions."

ESTIMATE OF THE REPORT

Such exhortations were wholesome, if not highly effective, so long as the aggravating influences continued, and a clearer determination of the relations of the presidents and the Board was to the advantage of both. The efforts to down the spectre of duplication were more dubious. The determining "principle" ignored at times both historical background and existing trends, and the advocacy of more normal schools was directly opposed to the aim of consolidation. The limitation placed upon the scope of land-grant college study was contrary both to the Morrill act and to the state act of 1884 restating the aims and emphasis. A more determining, if less logical, "principle" was that of social need and availability. This was recognized by the members of the commission themselves in the recommendation that no restrictions be placed on the training of teachers for vocational subjects until the needs were met—regardless of major and service distinctions. Apparently neither the experts nor their correspondents and advisers foresaw the near approach of a time when in all lines the facilities of all the institutions would be strained to meet the demands of mass higher education.

The reaction to the report at the time concerned mainly

HISTORY OF IOWA STATE COLLEGE

the implications for the programs and consequent opportunities of the different institutions. The future of the State College, in particular, depended more upon popular opinion as determined by service to the state than upon expert judgment as to its proper function. There were abundant evidences of growing public favor. Enrollment had shown an increase of over 800 within four years. The state support fund had more than doubled, in spite of the pressure for economy and lack of effective inter-institutional cooperation. A modern chemistry building was completed, a women's dormitory system started, and other major buildings were projected. As compared with the influential professional groups among alumni of the University, the College was making a host of contacts through its short courses and other extension services. In the spring of 1916, about the time that the survey report appeared, a country paper commented, "The Iowa State College at Ames comes the nearest to being a college for the people of any school in the state. . . . It is a school for boys and girls and for men and women of any age." With such a constituency, support was assured and the future had never looked brighter. Along with a greater Iowa, there was developing a greater Iowa State College.