

of resources, goals, and methods of meeting goals must be carried out. Evaluation is impossible unless reliable information concerning the effectiveness of the education provided to our children is obtained and analyzed.

Some State and local educational agencies are making a real effort to implement planning programs. For example, certain agencies have hired personnel whose primary job is to plan and develop projects assisted with Federal funds and to coordinate those projects with the State and local educational programs.

Those agencies which have been able to hire personnel for this purpose are fortunate. All too often those areas which need independent planning and evaluation systems are the least likely to have them. Qualified personnel are not always available. Few agencies have the funds to hire them. Federal funds are available for this purpose only in very limited circumstances.

State educational agencies have been called upon for technical assistance for planning—assistance seldom available because the State agencies are overburdened with the responsibilities placed upon them by State and Federal education programs. Although most of the Federal programs do provide for payments to State agencies for administrative expenses, those payments ordinarily do not cover the cost of hiring or providing personnel for long-range planning.

To be sure State departments of education have grown considerably in the last few years; but this growth has been affected by Federal education programs to the extent that most of the growth is directly related to growth of Federal programs. State personnel hired to work on Federal programs are almost entirely associated with the administrative and curriculum supervision functions of the agency. They are not in positions which would provide the planning and technical competencies which are needed to mount a coordinated attack throughout the State on the major weaknesses of the schools as identified by detailed analysis and information-gathering.

Aware of the lopsided growth of State agencies, as I have already stated, Congress enacted Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, under which the States are taking constructive steps to correct the imbalance. The provisions for grants to strengthen State departments of education gave these agencies the means to reinforce weak places in their structures, especially in those areas not related to Federal programs.

In writing Title V, the Congress suggested 10 areas in which the State agencies might be strengthened. The very first is "educational planning on a statewide basis, including the identification of educational problems, issues, and needs in the State and the evaluation on a periodic or continuing basis of education programs in the State." The response was dramatic. Based on a first-year appropriation of \$17 million, the States applied for funds to cover some 1,800 new positions. Twenty-five percent of the funds and 27 percent of the personnel were expected to work in the planning and evaluation areas.

The States recognized the need and took steps to meet it. However, by the end of the fiscal year, the States had amended their applications to reduce the planning function to 19 percent of the funds and 20 percent of the positions.

For Fiscal Year 1967, the applications have reduced this function still further: less than 18 percent of the funds requested, and 14 percent of the positions budgeted are to be used for planning.

The State departments of education have not lost interest in planning. Far from it. Other concerns were more pressing. In order to secure funds authorized by some 15 pieces of new Federal legislation before the end of the fiscal year, they had to mount new programs immediately. There were other pressures as well. Local education agencies had urgent needs for the improvement of instruction. The State agency had to improve its general administrative capacity. Capacity to deal with the masses of educational data emanating from all sources had to be developed.

The growing responsibilities thrust on them by the growing Federal programs of aid to education require all their existing resources, and more. They cannot afford to plan. Yet, they cannot afford not to.

Even if all local educational agencies could obtain the services necessary to carry out a systematic program of planning and evaluation, the effectiveness and efficiency of those programs would be limited by the fact that the scope of the project would be confined to one school in one area.

The effectiveness of the planning and evaluation processes is improved by the comparison of a number of approaches to similar problems in an area-wide or statewide context. At the same time, those processes must be carried out