A BACKWARD GLANCE

A Report on Duke University, 1960-1963

By Deryl Hart

I am making this report to review briefly the major goals and resultant developments of my thirty-eight-month administration as President of Duke University. Since it would be manifestly impossible to discuss every aspect of Duke, I shall not apologize for selecting particular areas for discussion and neglecting others. It is my hope, however, that those subjects I have included will be broad enough to suggest a representative image of Duke University during my tenure, and to indicate the course along which I believe some progress has been made toward the Duke University envisioned for the future.

This report focuses on the specific objectives chosen or carried on with increased priority during my administration, rather than on educational philosophy or policies. I deal with these in the belief that the long-range goals of the University are, for the present, revealed most accurately not by a general, theoretical, abstract statement but by the immediate aims we have pursued within the limitations of our available resources, and by the ways we have attempted to achieve them.

It seems proper, nevertheless, to mention briefly some of the specific educational objectives which have served as basic guidelines to my administrative colleagues and me during this period.

First, there has been a sensitivity to our heritage from the founders and successive leaders of Trinity College and Duke University. The history of this University has been consistent in its emphasis on developing in students depths of intellect and basic religious needs in order to produce, in the words of President Kilgo, “the highest and noblest type of man.”

To this end, Trinity College and Duke University have from their beginnings established time-tested and trustworthy standards of behavior and work as a way of life for faculty, administration, and students alike. These have not been considered to constitute an ultimate goal, but rather have served as a constantly improving foundation on which to build; and we have continued to hold this tradition as basic in all areas of University life.

Another aspect of our sensitivity to the past has been recognition that Duke in its origins was, and at its core should remain, a liberal arts institution, emphasizing the disciplines which for centuries have kept the minds of men “free to think, to reason, and to explore.”

Responsibility for passing on to students in a few short years a substantial academic foundation based on man’s accumulated knowledge has been accepted, but with the addition of strong emphasis on training for a continuing lifelong education and contribution to knowledge. This does not mean that the proper role of extracurricular activities in the University has been minimized, but rather that the primary purposes for which Duke was founded have been emphasized. In his Indenture of Trust, Mr. Duke indicated his broad purpose by a request expressed in very few words: “that this institution (Duke University) secure for its officers, trustees, and faculty, men of such outstanding character, ability, and vision as will insure its attaining and maintaining a place of real leadership in the educational world, and that great care and discrimination be exercised in admitting as students only those whose previous records show a character, determination, and application evincing a wholesome and real ambition for life.”

Another guideline has been Duke’s belief in equality of opportunity for all persons of comparable ability and need, regardless of race, creed, or national origin. This principle was affirmed during my administration in an amended admissions policy.

The principal body of this report describes some of our efforts and accomplishments in the advancement of Duke University.

A COHESIVE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

When I took office on July 1, 1960, there existed at all levels within the University disruptive uncertainty and anxiety. My first task, therefore, was to assemble a cohesive administrative staff composed of individuals who were truly representative of broad sections of the faculty, who collectively were knowl-
edgeable of all areas of the University, and who individually and as a group commanded the confidence and respect of the entire University family. During my first two and one-half months in office, my spare time was devoted largely to conferences with available members of the faculty and staff who were considered leaders by me and by a group of people whose opinions I valued and sought. The results of this endeavor exceeded my expectations. The administrative group which I was able to assemble worked with me in complete harmony—with, in my opinion, the wholehearted support of faculty, students, alumni, and trustees—and produced a basic satisfaction throughout the University. Nothing substantial could have been achieved without such effective support; for I want to give full credit early in this report.

The major reorganization of the academic administration resulted in the appointment of the "Provost Group," initiated in September 1960. The merit of this was the placement in policy-making positions at Duke of a group of able administrator-teachers who, by maintaining their professional function, were particularly attuned to the academic needs of the University. The Provost Group has since been composed of the Provost, three Vice-Provosts, an Assistant Provost, and the Dean of the Graduate School. During my administration these posts were held by six full professors:

- **Provost**: R. Taylor Cole, James B. Duke Professor of Political Science.
- **Vice-Provost**: Marcus E. Hobbs, Dean of the University and Professor of Chemistry.
- **Vice-Provost**: Barnes Woodhall, Dean of the Medical School and Professor of Neurosurgery.
- **Vice-Provost**: Frank T. deVuyver, Chairman of the Department and Professor of Economics.
- **Assistant Provost**: E. H. Hopkins, Vice-President for Institutional Advancement and Professor of Education.
- **Dean of the Graduate School**: first, Allan M. Carter, Professor of Economics; and later, Richard L. Predmore, Professor of Romance Languages.

This group of six, which met regularly at weekly sessions which I frequently attended, assumed collective responsibility for making many recommendations regarding academic policy. In addition, this group along with other administrators representing divisions of the University (particularly the deans of the schools) formed the Committee on Educational Administration, which met monthly to discuss general problems of broad concern.

As a part of the emphasis placed on the decentralization of major responsibilities, suggestions from faculty members regarding the administration of Duke University were continuously encouraged. Under the authorization provided in the new University bylaws of 1962, the general faculty reorganized itself in order to establish a more effective means for participation in decisions related to broad institutional policy, general modes of current operation, and planning for future institutional development. The result was the formation of the Academic Council, consisting of forty-eight members of the University faculty, elected by the major divisions of that faculty so as to insure representation for each of the schools, colleges, and major divisions. In the fall of 1962, the first Academic Council was elected; Professor William B. Hamilton was chosen as chairman.

To establish a closer liaison with the administration, the Academic Council suggested the creation of a University Policy Advisory Committee, to consist of the President of the University, such other officers of the administration as the President might wish to appoint, and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (the chairman, vice-chairman, secretary, and four others elected by the Council). I heartily accepted the suggestion, and in January 1963 appointed as members of the committee the Provost Group and Mr. G. C. Henricksen, Vice-President for Business and Finance. The University Policy Advisory Committee met monthly during the remainder of the 1962-63 academic year.

Faculty participation in policy formation was strengthened through one other important committee. By the summer of 1962, the Long-Range Planning Committee, which had functioned effectively since 1958, felt the need to redefine its goals. Consequently, the name of the committee was changed to the University Planning Committee, with Provost Cole as chairman. Since the scope of the committee was broadened to include immediate as well as long-range planning, three subcommittees (besides the Agenda Committee) were appointed to investigate areas for improvement. These were the Committee on Educational Facilities (Frank T.
de Vyver, chairman), the Committee on Educational Goals and Objectives (Harold T. Parker, chairman), and the Committee on Graduate Affairs (Arlin Turner, chairman). The appointment of these committees has in no way affected the freedom given to the faculty of each school and division to study and make appropriate recommendations in regard to its own areas of primary responsibility, in my opinion a basic requirement for utilization of our available talents for most effective institutional advancement.

Through each of these reorganized or newly instituted organs of the administrative apparatus, much has been achieved to bolster morale and to insure a cooperative effort for the development of Duke. There now exists a closer liaison between faculty and administration, and between faculty and trustees (through such committees as the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and the Trustee-Faculty Liaison Committee). Students also have made their contributions to the University administration. In an unprecedented dinner meeting with the Board of Trustees in March 1963, student leaders presented most impressively their views on University goals, policies, and needs.

Reorganization also occurred in certain non-instructional administrative areas. The Registrar's Office experienced its greatest expansion to date, assuming responsibility for the records of all but three of the nine schools and colleges of the University (exceptions, the Divinity School, the School of Forestry, and the Law School). The Business Office was strengthened by the appointments of G. C. Henricksen as Vice-President for Business and Finance, John M. Dozier as Business Manager, and S. C. Harward as Comptroller.

In order to give his full time to the business affairs of Duke University, Mr. Dozier resigned his position as Secretary of the University and was succeeded by Professor Richard L. Predmore. When Professor Predmore was appointed Dean of the Graduate School, succeeding Professor Allan M. Carter, he in turn resigned the position of Secretary and was succeeded by Prof. Craufurd D. Goodwin.

With the greatly increased demands for legal advice, Professor Edwin C. Bryson, Counsel for the University, was relieved of part of his teaching assignments in the Law School in order to participate more actively in legal affairs in the administration of the University.

Professor James L. Price was appointed University Marshal to succeed Professor Charles H. Liven good, who was on a leave of absence.

In September 1961, decentralization of another most important University responsibility was effected by the establishment of the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, directed by William L. Brinkley, Jr. (Previously, admissions had been a function of the Registrar's Office.)

Still another significant administrative development occurred in September 1961, when E. H. Hopkins became the first Vice-President for Institutional Advancement. This position was created to provide a focal point for all those engaged in efforts to advance public understanding and financial support of the University. At the same time, as part of Mr. Hopkins' responsibility, Duke created an Office of Development under the direct supervision of Frank L. Ashmore. This office broadened and invigorated considerably the University's public relations and fund-raising programs.

The years of my administration also saw many changes in administrative personnel of the individual schools and colleges. Dean Florence Brinkley, who had served as Dean of the Woman's College since 1947, retired in August 1962, after helping to make this college one of Duke's most distinguished units. Dean Ellen H. Huckabee served ably as Acting Dean of the Woman's College for the academic year 1962-63. In July 1963, Dr. M. Margaret Ball, formerly Ralph Emerson Professor of Political Science at Wellesley College, assumed the duties of Dean.

Alfred S. Brower retired in August 1961 as Treasurer of the University, having held this post since 1955. Mr. Brower, who had served the University capably in various capacities since 1937, was succeeded as Treasurer by Vice-President G. C. Henricksen.

Dean of the College of Engineering Walter J. Screley retired in August 1963. A member of the faculty since 1925, he had guided the Engineering College since 1953. Dr. James L. Meriam, former Professor of Engineering Mechanics at the University of California (Berkeley), became Dean in September 1963.

Professor Charles E. Ward, who had served as Dean of Undergraduate Instruction since September 1958, resigned from that position in August 1960.
to return to full-time teaching and research as Professor of English. In September 1960, Professor Robert Dickens became Assistant to the Dean of the University, assuming some of the duties formerly performed by Professor Ward. Professor Dickens later became Assistant Dean of Arts and Sciences.

In June 1962, Professor Richard E. Predmore was appointed Dean of the Graduate School to replace Professor Allan M. Carter, who resigned to become Vice-President of the American Council on Education.

After a decade of invaluable service as Dean of the Graduate School and later as Dean of the University and Vice-Provost, Professor Marcus E. Hobbs, who from the beginning of my tenure had expressed his desire to return to full-time teaching and research in the Department of Chemistry, retired at the end of the academic year 1962-63. He was replaced in September 1963 by Professor of Physics Harold W. Lewis, who assumed the title of Vice-Provost and Dean of Arts and Sciences.

In order to recognize the increased responsibility of the deans of Trinity College and the Woman's College, these administrators were given the additional title of Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences.

Another modification in administration occurred in the Medical School. Dr. Barnes Woodhall, who as Vice-Provost of the Medical Center, Dean of the Medical School, and Professor of Neurosurgery carried a heavier load than should be expected, was joined in September 1963 by Dr. William G. Anlyan as Associate Dean of the Medical School. Dr. Anlyan was expected to become Dean (responsible to the Vice-Provost) as soon as the areas of primary responsibility for the Dean and the Vice-Provost respectively had been designated.

With this change it was possible to place the administration of the entire Medical Center under the direct supervision of Vice-Provost Woodhall. Reporting to him would be three administrative heads—the Dean of the Medical School, the Dean of the School of Nursing (who formerly had reported to Vice-Provost deVuyver), and the Superintendent of the Hospital. This in turn made possible the coordination essential for the satisfactory operation of these closely related units, each dependent in part on the efficient functioning of the others.

Numerous administrative changes have been made within the various departments. The Chairman of Civil Engineering, Robert Rowe, resigned from the University in the spring of 1960 to become Dean of the School of Engineering at Vanderbilt University. He was succeeded in September of the same year by Professor Earl J. Brown. In the spring of 1961, Professor Walter M. Nielsen resigned the chairmanship of the Department of Physics and was succeeded in June 1962 by Professor Henry A. Fairbank, who came to us from Yale University.

In 1960 the Department of Aesthetics, Art, and Music was separated into the Department of Music, chaired by Professor Allan H. Bone; and the Department of Art, chaired by Professor Ransom R. Patrick. In August 1962, Professor Patrick resigned to return to full-time teaching; Professor Earl G. Mueller became executive officer of the department.

Conversely, in September 1962 the Department of Latin and Roman Studies and the Department of Greek were combined into the Department of Classical Studies, with Professor Robert S. Rogers as chairman.

Other shifts occurred in the Department of Botany, where Professor Terry W. Johnson replaced Professor H. G. Oosting as chairman in the summer of 1963; and in the Department of Psychology, where Professor Eliot H. Rodnick resigned and was succeeded as chairman in September 1961 by Professor Karl E. Zener.

In the Medical Center, Dr. Thomas D. Kinney replaced Dr. Wiley D. Forbus as Chairman of the Department of Pathology in 1960. Dr. Clarence E. Gardner, Jr. replaced me as Chairman of the Department of Surgery in 1960. In 1961, Dr. Daniel C. Tosteson replaced Dr. Frank Gregory Hall as Chairman of the Department of Physiology and Pharmacology.

To each of these people lost from an administrative position by retirement, resignation, or advancement, I am indebted for a job well done. To all those in the administration with whom I have worked so closely for three years, I want to express my sincere thanks for their support and cooperation.

**An Excellent, Stable Faculty**

Redesigning the administrative apparatus and providing for more extensive participation by the faculty in recommendations as to policy and planning were
but the first steps in my administration, though in themselves they created a favorable climate in which to operate and to examine fundamental values. A basic principle in our thinking has been that major advances are not determined by financial resources alone, but by how such resources are used to meet the immediate and long-range needs of the institution. The first essential and basic element of a university is an excellent and relatively stable faculty to instruct and guide. The next immediate aim of my administration, therefore, was to establish and provide conditions for maintaining and strengthening such a faculty: adequate compensation, efficient and pleasant working and living conditions, and stimulating associations.

It was obvious not merely to those concerned with Duke but to all concerned with higher education that faculty compensation must rise if we were to attract and retain the best minds. In the period 1961-1963, with the aid of grants of $1,200,000 from the Duke Endowment matched by the University with equal amounts, salaries and fringe benefits have been significantly increased. Both average and minimum compensation at all faculty levels for both 1961-62 and 1962-63 for the first time exceeded the “A” rating set by the American Association of University Professors. The budgeted salaries for 1963-64 maintained this rating. Such a rating was achieved by only three other institutions in 1961-62 and by only six others in 1962-63. Chart 1 illustrates the increases in salaries and fringe benefits during the three-year period, with 1952-53 and 1955-56 as reference points to show the change in rate of increases.

The greatest increases in fringe benefits have been for retirement and health. Free tuition up to the amount of Duke’s tuition has been added for the undergraduate education of qualified children of faculty and staff members at any approved undergraduate college. Also, sabbatical leaves have been made available for the first time to the educational administrative staff, all of whom have continuing teaching responsibilities.

One of the best ways to honor and give credit to outstanding faculty members is to appoint them to named professorships. In 1959-60 there were fourteen James B. Duke Distinguished Professors; in 1962-63 these were increased to twenty-two, and provision was made to add ten more over the next five years. Similarly, an effective method of attracting distinguished, mature scholars who may be needed to provide stimulating associations, to strengthen areas of weakness, or to add prestige to a department or college is to appoint them to professorships named for those who have made significant contributions to the institution in the past. To this end, eight such professorships were authorized during my administration and made possible by the generosity of the Duke Endowment, the Mary Duke Biddle Foundation, and Miss Doris Duke. These posts and the professors named to them at varying times are as follows:

- **William R. Perkins Professor of Law**: Brainerd Currie, since fall 1961.
- **Visiting Mary Duke Biddle Professor of Music**: Iain Hamilton, since spring 1962.
- **Visiting William Preston Few Professor of Psychology**: Fritz Heider, for the academic year 1962-63. Currently unfilled.

James B. Duke Professor of Russian Affairs: Wladyslaw Kulski, since fall 1963.

Visiting Benjamin N. Duke Professor of Art: Ibram Lassaw, for the academic year 1962-63; Justus Bier, for spring 1964.

William H. Wannemaker Professor of Romance Languages: Bruce W. Wardropper, since fall 1962.

Robert L. Flowers Professor of Physics: still unfilled.

The growth in distinguished professorships from eighteen in 1960 to thirty-six in 1963 is an indication of the emphasis placed on increasing the quality of our faculty and of our intention to strengthen it by major additions.

Another indication of the change in our present faculty may be found in Chart 2. While showing a modest total increase in the number of faculty members, it also reveals the fact that during these years Duke has had an increase in the professorial ranks and a decrease in the number of instructors. These increases, although small, decreased the average number of students per teacher from 8.6 in 1952-53 to 8.0 in 1962-63.

It is axiomatic that quality, not quantity, is the criterion by which to judge scholarly research. However, readily measured quantity is of some value in determining the productiveness of the Duke faculty. Professor John Tate Lanning, Chairman of the University Research Council, reported that "the yearly average of 774 articles and 25 books for 1960-62 has been a striking... increase over the annual average of 405 articles and 15 books published over the preceding twenty-two years of the existence of the Council." In this connection, too, it might be pointed out that the Duke University Press has increased its production and its staff, has grown from a small to a medium-sized university press, and has moved to larger, separate quarters on the East Campus.

During my tenure, the faculty sponsored two stimulating major symposia. The first, in October 1961, honored Dr. Wilburt Cornell Davison on his retirement as first Dean of the Medical School (1927-1960), James B. Duke Professor of Pediatrics, and guiding head of the Medical Center since its inception. This symposium, entitled "The Commonwealth of Children," was international in scope, featuring addresses and panel discussions by physicians and medical personnel from various parts of the United States, from the United Nations, and from a number of foreign countries.

The second symposium, "Crosscurrents in Contemporary Life: A Commentary by Women," was sponsored by the Woman's College in the spring of 1963. It honored Dean Emeritus Florence Brinkley, introduced Dean-elect M. Margaret Ball, and provided a forum for such eminent women as Mrs. Leslie Ahlander, art critic for the Washington Post; Germaine Brée, literary critic; Mary Bunting, President of Radcliffe College; Eleanor Dulles, diplomat; Margaret Mead, anthropologist; Nancy Hale, author; and Nancy Roman, program chief of astronomy and solar physics of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
Competitive salaries and fringe benefits, sabbatical leaves, named professorships — all these, plus the intangible “spirit” of a university, the dynamic quality and character of an institution, are inducements which my administration emphasized in order to attract and hold an excellent and relatively stable faculty, the basic requirement for a leading university.

**INTERESTED STUDENTS OF HIGH INTELLIGENCE**

A second essential need of a university is a body of enthusiastic students of high intelligence with motivations and goals worthy of their abilities. Let us examine certain evidence of the improving quality of Duke students and take note of their contributions to the University in the years 1960-63.

A passage from a recent report by Alan K. Manchester, Dean of Trinity College, may well be applied to each of the colleges and schools within the University:

The most noteworthy feature in the development of Trinity College during the past three years has been in the intangible area of academic climate. In the course of these years there has been a notable improvement in the academic quality and performance of the undergraduates. . . . There has also been an accompanying elevation in the general area of student life. It is becoming increasingly evident that we are experiencing the impact of an improved product.

Tangible evidence of this “improved product” is shown in Table A:

**TABLE A**

**MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST SCORES OF ENTERING FRESHMEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathematical</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman's College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathematical</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathematical</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proof that Duke's reputation as a leading educational institution has spread is shown also by the number of winners of National Merit Scholarships (representing an evaluation with a national perspective) who have enrolled in the University during the past three years. In 1962-63, Trinity College enrolled twenty-one. For the two years 1961-62 and 1962-63, the Woman's College ranked second in the nation in the number of Merit Scholars in attendance at colleges for women; it has maintained this position for 1963-64.

**CHART 3**

**GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS, FALL 1962**

![Map showing geographical distribution of students, Fall 1962](image)
Proof of the quality of graduates from Duke's undergraduate colleges is furnished by the Woodrow Wilson Fellowships (another group representing evaluations with a national perspective). The Duke winners of these fellowships for the academic years from 1959-60 through 1963-64 numbered six, nineteen, thirteen, and fourteen. ¹⁴ For the academic year 1963-64, twenty-one Woodrow Wilson Fellows are enrolled at Duke for graduate study. In addition, Dean Predmore reports that there are also enrolled in the Graduate School for 1963-64 ten NASA Fellows, nine National Science Foundation Graduate Fellows, six National Science Foundation Cooperative Fellows, forty-six NDEA Fellows, four Lilly Fellows, three G. Harris Kearns Fellows, and over a hundred others either on private foundation or industry awards or with support from various government agencies in the form of fellowships, traineeships, and research appointments.

Also, evidence of the interests of a student body drawn from around the globe (as shown in Chart 3) is manifested in other, less tangible ways. University Librarian Benjamin E. Powell reported, for example, that in 1962-63 book loans from the libraries were 24% higher than three years earlier, and that the lending departments of the General and Woman's College libraries are constantly establishing new records. Furthermore, the students' intellectual bent has been revealed by the activities they have sponsored through the Student Union: expanded art exhibits; the Young Artists' Series, which brought to the campus classical guitarist Rey de la Torre and the Phakavali Dancers of Thailand, among other artists; and the Speaker Series, which included Adlai Stevenson and Sir Patrick Dean. In 1959 students launched an annual symposium, inviting highly respected authorities in various fields to discuss major issues of American life. Since that time, the topics of these symposia have included "Post-Christian Man," "Power Structures: Context for Creativity?" and "Dimensions of Defense."

In these and other ways, the students have exhibited initiative and excellence. It has been the obligation of the University to develop programs which recognized and utilized their abilities and stimulated their activities. One of these, the Advanced Placement Program (placement at least at the sophomore level in the subject tested), permits outstanding freshmen to enroll in upper-class courses in those areas in which they have demonstrated high proficiency. In 1960, twenty-five; in 1961, forty-six; and in 1962, seventy-five students qualified for advanced placement.

Also designed for superior students is the Honors-Masters Program. Initiated in 1961 with a grant from the Ford Foundation, the program has permitted undergraduates who are training to become college teachers to follow an accelerated schedule including graduate courses. This has enabled the student to earn a Master's degree after one year of graduate study. An important feature of the program has been participation by students from other institutions—currently Washington and Lee University, Furman University, Davidson College, and Sweet Briar College. Thirty-two students entered the program in 1962-63, and fifty-six were accepted for the academic year 1963-64.

¹⁴The selection, after the four-year period, of nineteen Woodrow Wilson Fellows from Duke for 1964-65 indicates a continuation of this upward trend.
The standards for continuation in college were raised on the recommendation of the Undergraduate Faculty Council. Freshmen, for example, must now earn a quality point ratio of 1.3 rather than 1.2 to be eligible for the second year of study. The Council also made major revisions in the curriculum requirements; as one example, a greatly expanded and regularized program of independent study was introduced for juniors and seniors. Furthermore, in order to give recognition for academic excellence, Duke University in the spring of 1962 initiated an Awards Convocation to honor students having high academic standing.

The worldwide distribution of Duke University alumni is shown in Chart 4. Duke alumni numbering almost 35,000 are located in each of the fifty states and in our overseas possessions, while over 800 are located temporarily or more permanently in many countries around the world.

Despite these several promising developments, complete candor compels me to quote the substance of a paragraph from a report by Provost Cole, made to me on June 2, 1962, regarding the “academic climate” for the undergraduate students:

While improving, it is not satisfactory in our view. The provisions for more adequate physical facilities in the dormitories, classrooms, and library will help; appropriate additions to the instructional staff will contribute; the improvement in the quality and organization of the student body will play a part; experimental dormitories have been mentioned; and there are other developments, including honors programs, advanced placement, etc., to which reference has been made. But withal, we are still seeking to provide that environment and stimulation which will make Duke University one of the universities whose undergraduate barter economy on the campus is the exchange of ideas.

**Problems of Policy: Admissions**

To meet the challenge of an “improved product” is a stimulating and rewarding task, but problems of policy are involved. From its founding, Duke University has emphasized quality rather than quantity; this emphasis has limited the size of the student bodies. During my tenure, the administrative officers and trustees accepted an undergraduate enrollment of approximately 2400 men and 1200 women, not including the School of Nursing, as within our resources and in keeping with our objectives. Entering freshman classes thus have been restricted to about 1200 students (approximately 550 for Trinity College, 340 for the Woman’s College, 150 for the College of Engineering, and 95 for the School of Nursing).

Because of the decision not to dilute our academic offerings by admissions in excess of our resources, and because of the increasingly large numbers of applicants presenting ever higher academic qualifications, with a resultant, constantly diminishing attrition, it has been necessary to limit admissions drastically. During the three years of my administration, despite the excellent qualifications of an increasingly large percentage of those seeking admission (see Table A), we have been able to admit only one-fifth of the applicants for the Woman’s College and one-fourth of those applying for the other three undergraduate colleges. As a result, it has been necessary to reformulate our criteria for student selection, and to try to meet satisfactorily the resultant increasing number of problems in public relations.

According to William L. Brinkley, Jr., Director of Undergraduate Admissions, the factors deciding admission are no longer purely academic, as there are more academically qualified students seeking admission than places for them. The standards now used relate to combinations of intellectual capacity with character, motivation, industry, and creativity. Criteria include the ultimate goals of the applicant, the ability of the University to accommodate students with such goals, and the promise of distinguished achievement after college as well as of adequate performance in college.

Admittedly, the above criteria are somewhat flexible and intangible, but so is the “spirit” of the University. “In other words,” Mr. Brinkley explains, “we are seeking to attract and admit students with good minds and intellectual promise, coupled with good character and stability, who represent in the total composition of the freshman class a range of particular attributes, interests, and backgrounds.”

Race, creed, and national origin are not criteria for evaluating potential students. Duke believes in equal opportunity for all individuals of comparable ability and need. An amended admissions policy affirming this principle was applied to the graduate and professional schools in 1961 and to the undergraduate schools in 1962. In 1962-63 eight Negro students were in attendance; sixteen were admitted for 1963-64.

The University Admissions Committee holds that “lack of sufficient finances should never prohibit
the admission and matriculation of a good, competitively acceptable student who is well qualified to gain from and contribute to the undergraduate life of the college." But the increasing costs of education in all areas—tuition, fees, room rent, food, and other expenses—have made it more difficult to provide adequate funds for student aid. Chart 5 shows that financial aid to students has risen sharply in the past three years; this very fact makes the search for new sources of funds more urgent. (See Table B.)

PROBLEMS OF POLICY:
BALANCE BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE EMPHASIS

Another problem of policy frequently brought to my attention is the concern expressed by alumni of Trinity College that the graduate and professional schools, a necessary part of a university, not be developed at the expense of the undergraduate colleges. This question of balance between undergraduate and graduate emphasis was given much consideration during my administration.

In regard to the number of students, I have prepared as a matter of record Chart 6, which presents in compact form, for those who care to take the time to study it carefully, the distribution of students by
schools and major divisions for the years 1950, 1955, 1960, and 1962. The changes have not been striking nor the trends significant, except for rapid expansion of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in recent years. However, the view of my administration on this matter was voiced by Provost Cole, quoting President Clark Kerr of the University of California from the Godkin Lectures presented earlier this year: "The only certainly wrong decision is that the balance of today must be preserved for tomorrow."

Regarding finances, there has seemed to be no serious imbalance. Several factors have been of importance in maintaining such balance. First, the cost of faculty in the undergraduate and the graduate schools of arts and sciences cannot be separated, since one faculty is responsible for all instruction. Second, all students pay tuition. Third, certain special funds have been given for the support of the graduate and professional schools. Fourth, the activities of the faculty at the graduate level are responsible for attracting many unrestricted gifts and most of the gifts and grants for construction, research, and training. And fifth, some of the costs of operating the graduate and professional schools are covered by special grants from which the indirect costs collected go into the general funds of the University.

All of these support my opinion that the graduate and professional schools do not constitute an inappropriate demand on the endowment resources of the University. Finally, it would be impossible to maintain a distinguished faculty in a university without distinguished graduate and professional schools; and much of the instruction at the undergraduate level is given by such distinguished professors, who add greatly to the quality of the instruction.

**Problems of Policy:**

**Costs of the Medical Center**

More specifically, many alumni have questioned the costs of developing and operating the Medical Center, fearing a detrimental effect on the other parts of the University. An impression of the undue "drain" by the Medical Center on University resources has been intensified perhaps by the development of facilities in this area during the past three years and by the knowledge that other development is scheduled for the near future (see Charts 12 and 13, page 23). However, the relative cost to the endowment income of Duke University for operating and developing the Medical Center, particu-

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>4,470</td>
<td>4,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAL CENTER</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>5,972</td>
<td>6,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 88 students registered in the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences work in the Medical Center.
larly in recent years, has been limited by certain general policies:

1. Tuition in the Medical School has been higher than in any other school.

2. The staff members of the clinical departments have supported themselves largely from private practice.

3. By its own initiative the clinical staff has made available for the development of personnel and facilities in the Medical Center a substantial part of the collections by the private clinics for professional services to patients rendered by the practicing physicians.

4. The hospital has been provided with much revenue-producing space, frequently at relatively little or no cost to Duke University or the Duke Endowment; see Charts 12 and 13. ("Revenue-producing space" refers to clinical facilities, which bring in room rent and fees for service to patients; and research facilities, which bring in grants not only for construction of the facilities but also to finance the training and research programs which have been carried on. Also, a percentage of research grants has been paid into the general funds of the University to cover in part the indirect costs incurred by these research programs.)

The hospital has always been operated both for instruction of students and for service to patients, at a yearly cost during the past three years of from approximately $5,700,000 to $7,000,000. Most of this cost has been covered by charges for service to patients. The cost to the educational budget for this facility, operated primarily as a teaching laboratory in which nearly one-sixth of the students enrolled at Duke University receive some of their instruction, has been as follows:

1960-61: $66,483
1961-62: $162,118
1962-63: $224,808

It is anticipated that this cost will continue to rise for about two to three years, after which time one hundred much-needed additional private beds will become available for medicine and surgery. (See Chart 7 for the financial results following the addition of approximately the same number of private beds in 1957.)

Chart 7 shows that, as a result of the aforementioned policies, the cost to the general funds of the
University for the operation of the Medical Center has varied over the past eleven years between 12.5% and 24.5%. The great drop in 1958† and the lower percentages since then resulted from the utilization of additional revenue-producing facilities constructed during 1956 and 1957.

Chart 8 provides more detailed information on expenditures and sources of funds for operating and developing the Medical Center from 1955-56 through my administration. This complicated chart is not intended for casual inspection, but is to be used for careful study by those persons who want to learn the source of funds and the costs of developing and operating this large segment of Duke University. In summary, it shows that for the past eight years, Duke University paid out of its general funds (income from endowment and indirect costs recovered from grants) an average of 12.6% of the costs of the Medical Center (Medical School, School of Nursing, and Hospital). The highest yearly cost was 17.6%; the lowest, 8.75%. For the three years covered by this report, the costs paid from these general funds averaged less than 12%.

**Areas of High Prestige**

Duke University's goal of excellence—the desire for maintenance of a reasonable balance between undergraduate and graduate education and of the desired ratio of facilities, faculty, and students—has determined its enrollment. The University currently offers academic programs in nine schools and colleges (four undergraduate and five graduate and professional). It has been my policy not only to work for improvement in the fields of study already established, but also to encourage the opening of new areas of potential distinction which, as a result of support from outside the University, usually could be developed with very limited cost to the University's unrestricted funds and without curtailing existing activities.

Special and stimulating activities of certain departments have added to the tone of the University.

**CHART 8**

MEDICAL CENTER EXPENDITURES AND SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures for:</th>
<th>Sources of Funds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Medical School</td>
<td>general funds*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Medical School</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Hospital</td>
<td>general funds*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Construction</td>
<td>general funds*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Special Projects I-V**</td>
<td>private clinics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Millions of Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total of income from endowment funds and from grants and contracts for sponsored programs to cover the costs of their administration. The clear spaces with the arrow at the bottom of Columns II indicate the amounts paid from the grants and contracts into the general funds. The remaining funds shown in Columns II were used to finance specified sponsored programs.

** Columns V show the amount of funds originating in the private clinics and going to Duke University for developing the Medical Center. These were used for a variety of projects included in Columns I, II, III, and IV, not all of which, before 1961-62, could be traced accurately as to numbers and costs. Therefore, the question marks are shown to indicate incompleteness.
To illustrate, mention might be made of the departments of Music and Art, which have received recognition for their programs of visiting lecturers, artists, and musicians, made possible by grants from the Mary Duke Biddle Foundation.

Language laboratories have been established on both campuses with the aid of a grant from the Duke Endowment and furnished with the most modern equipment to strengthen the instruction given by the modern language departments. Courses include Spanish, French, Italian, Portuguese, Hindustani, Russian, and German, as well as English for the benefit of our foreign students.

The Commonwealth-Studies Center, involving members of the departments of Political Science, Economics, and History, was established at Duke University in 1955 with a grant of $350,000 from the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which subsequently renewed the grant for 1959-1964. During 1960-1963 the Center engaged in several major activities. It awarded fellowships to twenty-three graduate students from Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. It sponsored annually a joint seminar relating to certain political, social, and economic developments within the Commonwealth. It published six additional volumes in its Commonwealth-Studies Series. It arranged conferences related to Commonwealth problems. A major expansion of the Center's activities occurred in 1961, when the Ford Foundation awarded it $200,000 to develop a research and graduate training program relating to the Commonwealth countries of southern Asia. A subcommittee was appointed to supervise this new phase of the Center's activities, and the program has been effectively implemented.

Among other areas of increasing prestige, I must also mention the following:

The College of Engineering has been developing its area of graduate instruction. In June 1963 the first Ph.D. in this school was granted in Electrical Engineering.

The School of Forestry has attained a rank among the top forestry schools in the country.

The Law School, which occupied its new building in 1962, has strengthened its faculty and has increased its enrollment by about 36% during the three-year period covered by this report. During this development this school has maintained increas-
ingly high standards for admission based on the Law School Admission Test.

The World Rule of Law Center, established within the Law School in 1958 with a director and one secretary, has experienced rapid development. In 1960, it had a staff of seven with twelve auxiliary workers; these were increased to nine and seventeen respectively by 1963. It has published or has in process eight books, four of these during the past three years. Its current research projects increased from two in 1960 to more than two dozen in 1963. In 1962, it moved into the new Law School Building, with an increase of over one hundred per cent in its office and work area. During the period covered by this report, it received $267,580 in payments on gifts and grants.

The Divinity School is another area increasing in prestige, aided by several factors. A tuition program has been established which puts the Divinity School in line with other institutions of its rank and assures a more stable economic base. A program for physical expansion is well advanced, with the imminent renovation and combination of the Divinity School and Gray buildings as one unit ($450,000 available), to house the Divinity School and the Department of Religion. A major new building program for expansion of facilities is under way, with $350,000 already available. The recent acquisition of the Frank Baker Library of Wesleyan and British Methodism gives to the Divinity School the distinction of possessing the greatest collection of this kind outside the British Isles. The School's enrollment shows a continued upward trend, exceptional to the national decline in ministerial students.

Perhaps the development of newer programs has been even more dramatic than improvement of established ones. Through support from the National Science Foundation, the Marine Biological Laboratory, with activities limited to the adjacent coastal region, in July 1962 established a program in oceanography. It thus extended its activities to the high seas. A contract has been let for an ocean-going research ship, 117.5 feet in length and costing approximately $1,200,000, for use in this program. The ship will be the first such vessel specifically designed and built in the United States with National Science Foundation support for a program in marine biological and physical sciences. Continuing support for this program will be sought from the National Science Foundation.

Another significant program now under development at the Medical Center is in hyperbaric research. The program is supported by National Institutes of Health grants and follows pilot studies extending over a year and a half. During 1962-63, we received from the National Institutes of Health and from funds originating from the private clinics approximately two million dollars for the construction and equipment of an additional clinical research building (to be designated as No. 2). This will supplement the clinical research building (No. 1) which was completed recently. Together these will contain a research ward to accommodate twenty-one patients undergoing diagnostic studies and/or treatment considered to be in the experimental stage, in addition to a wide variety of research laboratories for use by the five clinical departments. The new equipment will include three pressure chambers for patients, to be used for diagnostic studies and for medical and surgical treatment utilizing high atmospheric pressure to increase the oxygen saturation of the body. Among the many research projects already under way and to be expanded are the problem of immunity in organ transplantation, perfusion for kidney insufficiency, and hyperbaric therapy for conditions varying from anaerobic infections to cardiac insufficiency. The research ward and most if not all of the laboratories have been and probably will continue to be supported largely if not entirely by gifts and grants.

Several interdisciplinary programs also have been established or strengthened during my tenure. For instance, the Center for the Study of Aging, though located in the Medical Center, has stimulated programs and attracted funds which have resulted in the participation of departments in the area of arts and sciences. To cite one example, research on aging sponsored by a Ford Foundation grant led to the publication in 1963 by the Economics Department of a significant volume entitled Employment, Income, and Retirement Problems of the Aged. Another cooperative effort has been the program in cytology, the branch of biology which considers the structure and functions of cells. Begun in January 1961, it has been conducted by the Department of Pathology in cooperation with the departments of Anatomy, Botany, and Zoology.

**NEW AND RENOVATED FACILITIES**

To develop areas of distinction, to seek students of superior intelligence, and to build an excellent,
stable faculty were important aims of my administration. It was apparent that the achievement of these aims would require provision of new and improved facilities of high quality.

As I have stated, my basic assumption has been that major advances are made not by financial resources alone, but by the use made of those resources at the appropriate time in meeting the needs of the institution. Hence the use of funds for increased faculty salaries, for scholarships and loans to attract able students who could not otherwise matriculate, and for the development of facilities through a major program of renovation and new construction. A good academic administrator must master the art of spending money wisely. It is my hope that time will prove that some wisdom was used in these expenditures.

Despite some new construction over the years after the completion of the original building program, the rapid development of Duke University since its founding in 1924 resulted in a serious shortage in the space available for teaching, for research, and for living accommodations for students. Moreover, since 1930 new developments and changed concepts as well as actual deterioration had made much of our original space and equipment obsolete.

Much has been done during the past three years to alleviate the resultant deficiencies. In addition, plans have been made and funds secured to provide for further relief. (See Chart 13, page 23.) The new construction and major renovations in our building program have been so extensive and have supplied the needs of so many schools and departments that only by enumeration can the magnitude of the improvement and its widespread impact on schools and departments be suggested.

**NEW CONSTRUCTION (BUILDINGS OR MAJOR ADDITIONS) COMPLETED OR FUNDED AND CONTRACTED BEFORE SEPTEMBER 1963**

The Biological Sciences Building ($4,715,000), financed by Duke University and aided by grants of $234,500 from the National Science Foundation and $155,000 from the National Institutes of Health, was begun in 1959 and completed in 1961. It provides completely new quarters on the West Campus for the departments of Zoology and Botany and the School of Forestry.

The Law Building ($1,650,000) on the West Campus was completed in 1962; it houses the Law School including the World Rule of Law Center.

The Infirmary for the Woman’s College ($357,600), completed in 1961, provides modern facilities for ambulatory and up to twenty-four bed patients. The old Infirmary has since been used to give more adequate facilities to the Duke Press.

The Married Graduate Students’ Apartments ($2,662,800) were completed in 1963. Financed by a Federal Housing Administration loan, the buildings contain 224 apartments ranging from one-room efficiencies to two-bedroom units.

The U. S. Army Research Office — Durham — Building has been doubled in size with an addition ($520,000) completed in 1963. It is leased to the U. S. Government as the national headquarters for the administration of basic research contracts in the physical sciences and mathematics for the Army.

The Radiation Therapy addition to the hospital ($371,150), completed in 1961, was financed by the North Carolina Medical Care Commission and the Duke Endowment. It contains the most modern equipment available.

The Howland Pediatric Ward was renovated and doubled in size by a new addition located above the Radiation Therapy Unit ($430,000). It was made possible by grants from the North Carolina Medical Care Commission, the Duke Endowment, and others.

The Gerontology and Diagnostic and Treatment Building is actually one building, though its units are considered separately since they were separately financed. Grants from the National Institutes of Health and Reynolds Tobacco Company supplemented $562,000 provided by Duke University to make available $1,000,000 for facilities for the study of aging (gerontology). A grant from the North Carolina Medical Care Commission, matched by Duke University from funds originating in the private clinics, provided $1,100,000 for diagnostic and treatment facilities for ambulatory patients. The total cost of this building, which was completed in June 1962, was $2,225,718.

The Clinical Research Building No. 1, which is connected at two points on all floors to the Gerontology and Diagnostic and Treatment Buildings, provides laboratories, offices, and fifteen beds for research studies on patients by the clinical departments. Completed in April 1963 and costing
$1,842,000, it was financed entirely by a grant from the National Institutes of Health and by Duke University using funds originating in the private clinics of Duke Hospital.

The Clinical Research Building No. 2 (approximately $2,000,000), referred to on page 15, is funded; plans are being drawn; and it is expected that the contract will be let during the next year. This building, Clinical Research Building No. 1, and the Gerontology and Diagnostic and Treatment Building are constructed as one and function as one. This makes it possible to place in close proximity, if not actually contiguously, related activities (which from the nature of supporting grants must be housed in different units): for example, the study of aging, the care of ambulatory aged patients, and research involving or affecting the care of the aged patient (such as hyperbaric treatment for coronary occlusion).

The Hospital Rehabilitation Unit and Brace Shop development ($710,000) expanded and improved the facilities for Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy, and for making and fitting prosthetic and orthopedic appliances. Contributors to this expansion, completed in 1962, included the Duke Endowment, the North Carolina Medical Care Commission, and Duke University (using funds originating in the private clinics).

The original Biology Building was completely renovated and air-conditioned, with the addition in new construction of 15,000 square feet of space. Costing $1,262,700, it was financed by grants from the National Science Foundation and the Duke Endowment. It was completed in 1963 and now houses the departments of Psychology and Sociology.

The Physics Building expansion and renovation is now in progress and should be ready for use by the summer of 1964. It has been financed by grants ($1,250,000) from the Duke Endowment and the National Science Foundation. This building will provide improved and badly needed new space for teaching and research.

Major Renovations

The original Law Building ($328,899) has been renovated and air-conditioned throughout with the aid of a grant from the Duke Endowment. It was occupied during the summer of 1963 by the foreign language departments; one of the two language lab-
oratories is housed here (the other being on the East Campus). These laboratories, containing $140,000 in equipment, are among the most modern in the nation.

The Social Sciences Building on the West Campus ($460,000) was renovated and air-conditioned using grants from the Duke Endowment and the National Science Foundation. It was scheduled to be ready for occupancy by March 1964. This building provides facilities for the departments of Economics, Naval Science, and Air Science.

Approximately half of the original Medical School Building has been or is being renovated ($640,000). This section, with a small area of new construction, is now air-conditioned. It provides space for the departments of Physiology, Pharmacology, and Pathology, and for the Hospital Store.

In the Hospital most of the older private wards ($300,000) and four of the original operating rooms ($310,000) have been renovated, and the Welch Ward for Surgical Children ($120,000) is in the process of renovation. All are using funds provided by the Hospital section of the Duke Endowment and by Duke University from funds originating in the private clinics. These areas are now air-conditioned, with modern equipment.

The Duke Marine Biological Laboratory facilities at Beaufort, North Carolina, have been improved by the construction of a sea wall, a new dock, a new laboratory, and a new dormitory ($85,000). Additional water and electricity have been made available. The new program and equipment for oceanography have already been mentioned.

Renovation of all the original dormitories and Few Quadrangle on the West Campus, for which $1,500,000 has been made available, was begun in the summer of 1962. Nine had been completed by the summer of 1963, at a cost of $500,000. The modernization of the living areas, the diminution of noise, and the provision of common rooms, study rooms, and resident counselor suites have provided a significant improvement in the living and study conditions for undergraduate men. This program is to continue each summer until all dormitories have been renovated. Also, funds have been made available (from Duke University and a Federal Housing Administration loan), the site has been selected, and plans are being prepared for two new dormitories to house four hundred students. These will relieve existing and anticipated overcrowding, brought about partly by some slight increase which has occurred in the undergraduate student body (due chiefly to a declining attrition rate) and by displacements resulting from the renovations. These two units do not provide for any appreciable increase in the student body; however, to provide for this possibility, adjoining space is being reserved for a third unit and a dining facility.

Renovation of the dining halls and cafeteria has been partially completed ($286,000).

In the School of Engineering, the high voltage laboratory has been renovated ($52,000) to create additional offices and more library space.

Finally, the campus roads, parking lots, and lighting have been vastly improved, at a cost of $624,000.

Such an extensive program of building and renovation has required and will require thoughtful planning. To that end the University Planning Committee initiated efforts to develop a Campus Master Plan. From 1959 through 1962, Olmstead Brothers, the landscape architects who laid out the original West Campus, were commissioned by Duke to create a general plan for future land use with the physical growth of the University. To aid in plans for renovation and new facilities, Duke added Henry D. Mayfield, Jr., to its staff in July 1961 as full-time Supervising Architect.

Two firms were authorized in 1961 to formulate plans for developments in the Medical Center. Booz, Allen, and Hamilton first made a program study on its long-range development. E. Todd Wheeler and Perkins and Will, architect-engineers, completed a detailed and comprehensive planning study including drawings for two new buildings. Finally, early in 1963, Caudill, Rowlett, and Scott were commissioned to make a study of the entire University campus. This study was to be exclusive of but correlated with the Medical Center and was to include a design study as a guide to future architectural planning.

It is not my purpose in this report to discuss future projects. However, since my administration was so actively involved with long-range planning, institutional development, and construction of the physical plant, I should like to mention certain buildings for which studies have been completed, and for which funds are already available or have been pledged in whole or in part.
FINANCES

The accomplishments which have been detailed have necessarily made heavy demands on accumulated University funds. For the three-year period of this report, most of the current unrestricted income was used for academic improvement and yearly operating expenses. It was therefore necessary to use part of the accumulated unrestricted funds carried as “funds functioning as endowment” for construction or renovation in order to improve the physical facilities. As a result, these funds have been reduced from $10,625,385 to $2,471,776 at market value, a drop of $8,153,609. Approximately $6,000,000 of this was expended or committed for new construction, and approximately $2,000,000 which was previously invested has been placed in pooled cash of the current funds. Note the increase of over $6,000,000 in current funds. (See Table B.)

All other resources have increased as given in the following summary taken from Table B:

1. All endowed funds: by 21.1%, from $63,161,276 to $76,719,003.
2. Current funds (pooled cash and securities): by 98.5%, from $6,632,573 to $13,065,021.
3. All cash and securities (restricted and unrestricted): by 16%, from $82,655,093 to $95,723,468.
4. The value of the physical plant, including funds committed to it: by 37.5%, from $64,185,083 to $88,286,090.
5. The total resources of the University (exclusive of support received from the Duke Endowment): by 22%, from $126,701,263 to $154,636,208, for a net gain during my tenure of $27,934,945.

Chart 9 varies somewhat from the figures in Table B, since it shows the cost rather than the market value of endowment and was not made from final audited figures.

Even though the funds functioning as endowment were reduced by over $8,000,000, the market value of the regular endowed funds increased by a larger amount (Table B). Even with such a large withdrawal of funds from investments, and with the acute depression, there was over the three-year period an appreciable increase in income from every major source; this is shown in Table C.
### TABLE B
#### CHANGES IN RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total income at end of fiscal year</th>
<th>June 30</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Funds (Total income at Market Value)</td>
<td>$ 63,161,276</td>
<td>$ 73,667,682</td>
<td>$ 66,674,442</td>
<td>$ 76,719,003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Functioning as Endowment</td>
<td>10,625,385</td>
<td>8,533,178</td>
<td>5,378,052</td>
<td>2,471,776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds (Current, Restricted, and Agency)</td>
<td>2,235,859</td>
<td>3,734,836</td>
<td>3,464,131</td>
<td>3,467,668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled Cash and Securities (Current Fund)</td>
<td>6,632,573</td>
<td>9,574,431</td>
<td>11,197,963</td>
<td>13,065,021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Value (Including Fund Balance)</td>
<td>64,185,083</td>
<td>70,713,514</td>
<td>79,849,103</td>
<td>88,286,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total—All Resources (exclusive of support received from the Duke Endowment)</td>
<td>$126,701,263</td>
<td>$134,877,632</td>
<td>$145,609,681</td>
<td>$154,636,208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from yearly, audited financial reports to indicate trends.

For complete and balanced figures, see annual financial reports.

### TABLE C
#### MAJOR SOURCES OF INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income at end of fiscal year</th>
<th>June 30</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational and General—From Endowment*</td>
<td>$ 6,262,305</td>
<td>$ 6,432,238</td>
<td>$ 6,123,053</td>
<td>$ 6,692,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants for Research Programs</td>
<td>5,477,516</td>
<td>5,910,092</td>
<td>8,050,286</td>
<td>7,688,885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants for Training Programs</td>
<td>1,283,156</td>
<td>1,393,491</td>
<td>1,611,862</td>
<td>1,754,154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts for Current Expenses</td>
<td>339,623</td>
<td>586,734</td>
<td>845,088</td>
<td>1,242,099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees</td>
<td>3,984,324</td>
<td>4,479,363</td>
<td>5,038,497</td>
<td>5,272,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal—Educational***</td>
<td>$16,088,715</td>
<td>$18,666,399</td>
<td>$20,947,353</td>
<td>$24,275,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Revenue for Operation From Services to Patients</td>
<td>5,012,480</td>
<td>5,665,461</td>
<td>6,262,127</td>
<td>6,763,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Educational Budget</td>
<td>319,242</td>
<td>66,483</td>
<td>162,118</td>
<td>224,808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises Revenue above Expenditures</td>
<td>292,998</td>
<td>324,442</td>
<td>278,126</td>
<td>316,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Educational—For Fellowships, Scholarships, Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,102,970</td>
<td>1,425,239</td>
<td>1,540,455</td>
<td>2,085,507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Funds—From Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>1,291,343</td>
<td>1,108,284</td>
<td>2,718,208</td>
<td>3,170,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Income</td>
<td>1,586,521</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>3,200,000</td>
<td>758,697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Functioning as Endowment</td>
<td>267,917</td>
<td>279,090</td>
<td>371,299</td>
<td>302,985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.H.A.Loan—Self-Liquidating From Auxiliary Enterprises (to be used for renovation and modernization)</td>
<td>24,036,416</td>
<td>29,710,810</td>
<td>37,017,289</td>
<td>41,107,372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes regular income from the Duke Endowment.

**This table is given to show the trend in large items. Small items and transfers of funds are omitted, so figures are not balanced.
During the three years covered in this report, student enrollment increased by 10%. Expressed in terms of resources per student, endowment decreased by 9%, physical plant value increased by 25%, and total resources increased by 10%. Table D correlates resources with enrollment for the past eight years.

As previously indicated, the three-year period was marked by a rapid physical plant expansion; the resources for this are presented graphically in Chart 10 and shown in Tables B and C. Expenditures for construction and renovation more than doubled between 1959-60 and 1960-61, and 1962-63 expenditures for these purposes were more than double those for 1960-61.

Great emphasis has been placed on securing, whenever possible, outside resources to help meet our present needs. While accomplishments seldom equal one's desires, my hope has been partly realized, as I shall show presently in detailing gifts and grants (Charts 17 and 18, pages 25 and 27) and as I have already shown in listing sources of funds for the building and renovation program and for faculty improvement. During these years, there have been substantial increases in every category of expenditures, but particularly for educational and general needs. In order to emphasize the primacy of the educational program, those expenditures used primarily for faculty improvement and exclusive of sponsored research are shown separately in Chart 11.

![Chart 10](chart10.png)

*(See Chart 11 for educational and general budget excluding sponsored research.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE D</th>
<th>CORRELATING RESOURCES WITH ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of students</td>
<td>5,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment per student</td>
<td>$6,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant cost per student</td>
<td>9,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resources per student</td>
<td>$16,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 12 shows, separately for the Medical Center and the remainder of the University, the cost of most of the new construction and renovation of which I spoke earlier, and the proportion of unrestricted University and Duke Endowment funds required to meet these costs. All of the facilities completed or under construction as of June 1963 have been funded.

* An additional $624,000 has been expended by Duke University for general purposes such as roads, parking, lighting, and electrical systems.

Chart 13 shows that for those facilities planned but not yet constructed, over $20,000,000 is either available, pledged by private sources, or is assured by grants already approved by government agencies. (Some of the government grants for the Medical Center still require matching funds in the amount of approximately $2,000,000.)

+ In addition, $2,000,000 has been allocated for a general heating plant for the West Campus.
++ Confirmed before September 1, 1963.
Duke, like other universities, has three main sources of revenue for educational needs: endowment, tuition, and gifts, grants, and contracts. (See Chart 14.) I have already commented on endowment, but will give further information in regard to the other two.

Although tuition and fees were increased substantially in 1958, and further increases were authorized for 1963-64, tuition and fees still supply only about 25% of the general revenue of Duke University for the educational program (Chart 14). The last increase authorized in 1962 for 1963-64 amounted to $237 per undergraduate student per year, and will provide more than one million dollars in additional yearly revenue. It has also been approved as policy that charges for meals and room rent be adjusted each year in keeping with the costs of these services. Such a policy was necessary to meet the rising costs of operation and maintenance. Even with these increases, the costs to the student will not exceed—and may be lower than—the cost at the private universities with which we are most often compared.

Chart 15 shows tuition and fee increases over the years, in undergraduate colleges only. Although tuition and fees were also increased in the graduate and professional schools, they have varied too widely to permit incorporation in this chart. For example, in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, tuition charges approximate those for undergraduates, depending on the work taken. Tuition in the Medical School has always been highest. In the Law School, it is being adjusted upward to the undergraduate level. In the Divinity School, fees though
not tuition were charged; but beginning with the 1963-64 academic year, Divinity students are to pay tuition at one-half the rate for the undergraduate students. Chart 16 presents the percentage of the educational costs for the different areas as compared with the percentage of students enrolled in each.

The greatest source of additional revenue has been government grants and contracts, and grants from foundations (Chart 17). Individuals and industry also have made substantial contributions.

By comparison with 1961-62, gifts and grants for 1962-63 show increasing support from most sources. The slight drop in the funds from the Mary Duke Biddle Foundation, as shown by Chart 18, apparently does not mean a lessening of support but rather a variation in the timing of its grants. See the footnote to Chart 13 (page 23) for the additional funds which were expected from this foundation and which were approved before September 1963.

Over the years, the total of grants from "other foundations" has also been upward. Subsequent
grants would indicate that the slight drop for the one year does not indicate a reversal of the upward trend.

It has long been evident that the future strength of this University, like that of other private universities throughout the country, will depend increasingly upon gifts and grants from private sources. It was for the purpose of recruiting such aid that the Office of Institutional Advancement was established in September 1961. The complex and time-consuming task of planning and organizing a major capital gifts program is now well under way. This program should provide additional resources for the continuing progress of the University toward its goals and objectives.

Although government grants have made possible much of the construction during my administration, these have required matching funds. Such funds have been made available largely by the Duke Endowment, by Duke University from funds functioning as endowment, and from funds originating in the private clinics of the Medical Center. The amounts from each of these sources during my tenure have been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>1960-61</th>
<th>1961-62</th>
<th>1962-63</th>
<th>Totals for three years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke Endowment</td>
<td>$711,523</td>
<td>$811,818</td>
<td>$2,084,468</td>
<td>$3,607,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University from Funds Functioning as Endowment</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$758,697</td>
<td>$5,858,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University from Funds Originating in the Private Clinics</td>
<td>$184,660</td>
<td>$1,153,323</td>
<td>$765,956</td>
<td>$2,103,939*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Totals</td>
<td>$2,796,183</td>
<td>$5,165,141</td>
<td>$3,609,121</td>
<td>$11,570,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These clinics have assumed obligations for over $2,500,000 additional funds over the next five to seven years during projected construction (see Chart 13).

Without these resources our building efforts would have been greatly handicapped.

A special word must be said about the Loyalty Fund. With a few minor exceptions, since its inception in 1947-48 it has increased steadily (Chart 19*) not only in total amount given but also in donors, percentage of participation, and average amount of gift. We are gratified to find such devotion to Duke among friends and alumni, and are very grateful for their generosity. We particularly appreciate their enthusiastic response in 1961-62 to the Duke Endowment's challenging grant of $1,000,000, which was matched by the University and used to improve faculty compensation. This higher level of giving by the alumni was not only maintained but also increased in 1962-63.

Duke's Position in American Education

In the long run, Duke University's reputation as an institution devoted primarily to teaching and research will depend not on the efforts of its supporters to present it in the most favorable light, and not on the impressionistic and inherited biases of segments of the popular press. It will depend upon the impersonal evaluation by our professional colleagues in other institutions in this country and abroad. I have presented in this report a record of consistent progress, but one which will not support any attitude of complacency. We still have far to go to reach that national and international recognition and that select academic companionship which we are seeking. Until we have attained these goals, we shall be failing in our obligations to our state, our region, and our nation. I have stated repeatedly my
CHART 18

Government Agencies *
- Loyalty Fund
- Church
- Other Foundations
- Mary Duke Biddle Foundation
- Duke Endowment
- Industry
- Individuals, Organizations, Groups

Sources of Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1961-62</th>
<th>1962-63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Gifts for Plants and Equipment
1961-62: 3,378,570
1962-63: 2,703,170
Decrease: 675,400
Increase for yearly operation: 915,902

CHART 19
LOYALTY FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of Donors</th>
<th>Percentage of Donors</th>
<th>Average Gift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>5,810</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>$20.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>6,541</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>6,590</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>7,953</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-52</td>
<td>7,842</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>26.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-53</td>
<td>8,066</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>26.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-54</td>
<td>8,928</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>25.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>10,392</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>24.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-56</td>
<td>11,075</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>25.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>12,095</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>25.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-58</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>27.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-59</td>
<td>13,008</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>28.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59-60</td>
<td>13,606</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>37.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-61</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>37.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>37.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-63</td>
<td>14,080</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>37.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $150,000 yearly credited to Loyalty Fund from Development campaign.
conviction that the "Golden Age" of Duke University lies ahead, and expressed the hope that it never be reached, regardless of the position Duke attains and the acceptance it receives. Rather I hope that such an age will ever recede as future generations of scholars attain for Duke University ever greater quality, wider recognition, and more universal acceptance.

MY SINCERE APPRECIATION

In closing, I want to give special recognition to those individuals and groups that have contributed so greatly to our financial resources: the Duke Endowment, Mrs. James B. Duke, by bequest, Miss Doris Duke, the Mary Duke Biddle Foundation, the alumni, the Church and the many other individuals, foundations, and business groups which have provided such an increasing part of our resources for operation and development.

Also, I want to express my sincere appreciation for the cooperative support and understanding given by the faculty, the students, the alumni, and the trustees of Duke University and the Duke Endowment. Harmony, hard work, cooperation, and enthusiasm within a group can make any administrative work easier, more pleasant, more rewarding, and more effective. Credit for any worthwhile accomplishments of the past three years must go to all members of the administrative group who worked with me, and to all those members of the University family who in a variety of ways have given aid and support.

THE MOST IMPORTANT SINGLE ACCOMPLISHMENT

Finally, I want to emphasize what I consider to have been the most important accomplishment during my administration: the selection of Dr. Douglas Maitland Knight to succeed me as President of Duke University. As outgoing President, naturally I had no part in his selection and can claim no credit for his coming—unless possibly his decision could have been influenced, even in a small way, by the assurance of a wholehearted welcome and by the presentation of Duke University to him, with pride in her accomplishments and enthusiasm for her potential.

When I accepted the appointment as Acting President, expecting it to be for only a short period, I stated that I would consider my efforts of little avail if the time of my tenure was not utilized to secure the best possible man for President. While one always wishes that his accomplishments had been greater, I was gratified by the expression of approval given me by the trustees when in March 1961 they removed the "Acting" from my title, retroactive to the time of my appointment. I now derive real satisfaction from the feeling that my major objectives have been accomplished: namely, securing the harmony and cooperation within the University family, with minimal interruptions in the progress of Duke University; and providing the time needed and the academic climate suitable for obtaining the most desirable man for President.

I now, with great pleasure and with high expectations for the future of Duke University, welcome the opportunity to return to my lifelong Medical School activities.

[Signature]