

leadership, it seems altogether unlikely that, whatever its inclinations, the center would have found it politically possible to take a major part in the project.

The Tufts Medical School is planning a curriculum revision to reflect, among other things, a greater concern for the delivery of health services and for the social conditions contributing to ill-health. Its senior-year students as well as some of its faculty will be taking part in its health center projects. Each student will be assigned to a family health care group, an interdisciplinary team (a pediatrician, an internist, a social worker, and community health nurse) responsible for the care of certain families. The team will meet daily to pool information and make a diagnosis of fundamental family health problems.

Tufts expects such innovations as the family health care groups and the extensive use of nurses and other health workers for all tasks not requiring a physician's special skills to permit high quality of care at reasonable cost. "It's cheaper," Geiger says, "for health workers to teach mothers how to avoid contamination of water and food supplies than it is for a doctor to stay up all night giving intravenous fluids to a moribund infant with infectious diarrhea."

Thus, a prospectus for a breakthrough in comprehensive health care for the rural poor of the Deep South has been drawn up. Variations of the Mound Bayou project, and probably some markedly different formulations, will have to be tested before OEO develops a health program flexible enough in concept and execution to succeed in a variety of rural situations.

In some rural areas the force of habit and the influence of conservative local physicians will be such that attempts to launch even mildly innovative health programs will meet with difficulties. Indeed, a few years ago four counties in eastern Kentucky were excluded from a more or less conventional diagnostic screening program by the U.S. Public Health Service because of opposition or lack of cooperation from the local medical societies.

The success of even the best-planned programs for delivery of health services in poor rural regions will depend partly on an infusion of federal funds to bring about stronger networks of regional hospitals and satellite facilities. The Appalachian Regional Commission is supporting a program in Kentucky and eight other states to provide comprehensive care by improving facilities and reorganizing services along lines of regional cooperation. Similar efforts

are likely to be needed elsewhere. New Social Security and public-assistance programs, such as Medicare and Medicaid, should make it possible for doctors to practice in poor rural areas and still enjoy large incomes. For example, the lone private practitioner in the village of Hyden, Kentucky, saw his taxable income increase from about \$5000 in 1962 to \$35,000 last year. His case is exceptional only in that most doctors of Appalachia were earning substantially more than he was in 1962 and many are earning more than he is today. Given the improved financial incentives and the growing federal efforts to overcome the national shortage of physicians, rural areas should soon be attracting and holding more doctors.

But while new facilities and more physicians are vitally needed, the experience of the cities has demonstrated that, unless the delivery of services is improved and made more responsive to the needs of patients, magnificent hospital buildings and well-trained staffs do surprisingly little good for large numbers of the poor. In its programs in Mississippi and other states, OEO is trying to show that the health needs of poverty areas of rural as well as urban America can be met.

—LUTHER J. CARTER

## Federal Paper-Work Explosion: New Form Bothers Universities

A new federal questionnaire produced a stormy meeting between university business officers and National Science Foundation representatives in Washington on 7 June. "I am almost livid about the proliferation of these government questionnaires," one business officer stated after the meeting. "As far as I am concerned, this is the straw that breaks the camel's back."

Another business officer who attended the meeting said that the new questionnaire had reinforced his feeling that "the universities are like swimmers surrounded by sharp-toothed piranha fish which keep nibbling away at us. In time, these government agencies will

leave our bare bones at the bottom of the river."

The document which originally initiated this heated reaction was an innocuous-appearing memorandum sent by White House science adviser Donald F. Hornig to college and university presidents announcing the "new government-wide reporting system on federally supported academic science and engineering." The system is sponsored by the interagency Federal Council for Science and Technology (FCST), which Hornig heads, and was developed by FCST's Committee on Academic Science and Engineering (CASE). Leland J. Haworth, director of the National

Science Foundation (NSF), is chairman of CASE. Responsibility for the new reporting system has been assigned to NSF.

Universities are supposed to start keeping records relevant to the CASE system on 1 July, although they will not be asked to file their first report until the autumn of 1968. Beginning at that time, NSF will annually provide each university with a list of federal projects active at each institution during the past federal fiscal year (1 July to 30 June). NSF will compile the list from information supplied by individual government agencies. A university will be asked to supply the requested manpower information within 2 months and to return the relevant part of the list to the agency which supplied the grant or contract. Among those grants which will require reporting are: project awards for basic and applied research and development at universities (excluding Federal Contract Research

Centers), manpower development grants (fellowships, traineeships, and training grants for individuals or groups of individuals), and "general support for science awards." In the first category of awards for research and development, information will be required on the actual number of principal investigators and other individuals, by manpower category, who received support from the project. The manpower categories that will appear on the CASE listing are: principal investigator(s) or administrator; faculty member; post-doctoral; nonfaculty professionals—other; graduate students; professional school students; pre-baccalaureate students; pre-college students; and individuals who do not fit in the above categories but who are judged to be "continuing" to expand their professional knowledge.

#### Questions To Be Answered

Although NSF officials do not seem to have been especially detailed in explaining the purposes which the compilation of this information will serve, they have listed the following questions as ones which can be "answered for the first time by reference to a continuing statistical series":

- "How is support for a given field of science . . . distributed among individual colleges and universities? How are patterns of support changing?

- "In what universities are postdoctorals in given fields located?

- "How many full-time-equivalent graduate students in given fields are federally supported and at what colleges and universities are they located?"

In an interview, NSF's William G. Rosen, who serves as CASE's executive secretary, emphasized that the governmental agencies will be responsible for much more of the work connected with the survey than the universities will. Rosen said that the required information could be provided by a university's business office and would not require the time of faculty members.

When Rosen and another NSF official, J. Richard Mayer, met with the 19-member committee on governmental relations of the National Association of College and University Business Officers, they encountered the somewhat angry protest mentioned at the beginning of this article. "This is getting to be an idiotic situation," one business officer said after the meeting. "These

questionnaires take too damn much time of important people, not just the time of clerks." The officers made it clear that they thought that CASE had a perfect right to request information from universities, but questioned the methods and manner which CASE had adopted. (The business officers interviewed requested that their names not be given because of their institutions' delicate relationship with the federal government.)

A nonmember who attended the 7 June meeting, John F. Morse, director of the Commission on Federal Relations of the American Council on Education, also expressed his skepticism about the new questionnaire. Morse said that he gave CASE "an 'A' for effort, but a 'D' on achievement." Morse added, "If the form is taken seriously (and if it is to be done at all, it should be taken seriously), it will involve an enormous time outside the business office; it will take up lots of faculty time." Morse emphasized a point also made by the business officers in attendance: "What I object to most strenuously is that they can give no assurance that it will replace any of the requests of individual agencies."

#### A Torrent of Questionnaires

One of the business managers interviewed said that he favored "forceful action" by the universities to impede the stream of new questionnaires. The business officers have felt especially put upon by Office of Education and NDEA questionnaires in recent months, and also list NSF as a leading producer of burdensome forms.

The memorandum sent by Hornig to the nation's university presidents states that "needs for certain additional detailed manpower information . . . will continue to exist within certain agencies. Thus, some agencies will continue to request such needed data. However, it is expected that the new CASE reporting system will lead to a reduction in existing agency reporting requirements for manpower data." The business officers complained that CASE could not guarantee that there would be any such reduction.

Those who explained the CASE system did not convince the business officers that CASE really needed the information it will be requesting. "This seems part of the government's fascination with forms and data gathering," one business officer said. "There is no

thought about how all this data will affect decisions."

The business officers expressed their belief that the information wanted by CASE was already in the files of the separate agencies, if the government would only bother to compile it. They also wanted CASE to work on clearer definitions of which people it wanted listed in various manpower categories, such as "faculty member" and "post-doctoral."

Additional complaints of the business officers were that the academic community should have been consulted before the CASE system was approved and that the system was being implemented too quickly. The business officers said that the CASE system would involve them in greater expenditures of time and money, and they were unhappy that CASE could provide no funds to help pay for the cost of filling out the forms. One officer estimated that it would probably cost a major university more than \$10,000 to fill out the CASE report annually. Another explained that computers would be of little use in answering the CASE request and that it "would have to be eked out by hand."

#### Three Meetings Scheduled

University officials who want further information from the government on the new CASE system can attend one of a series of three meetings to be held next month. The first will be held on 10 July at the General Services Administration Auditorium in Washington at 2:00 p.m., the next on 13 July at 10:00 a.m. in the Student Center Building on the University of California campus at Berkeley, and the third on 14 July at the Center for Continuing Education of the University of Chicago at 2:00 p.m. If the meeting with the business officers' committee is an accurate indicator, these sessions are likely to provide some spirited questions.

Whatever disagreement is raised, it is almost certain that the universities will fall in line in complying with the CASE request. The country's institutions of higher learning are ill-organized to act in concert to oppose any federal request, even if they disagree with it. More importantly, universities are unlikely to make strong protests about the actions of the governmental goose as long as it continues to dispense those coveted golden eggs.

—BRYCE NELSON