

funds and 20 percent of the positions and for fiscal year 1967 the applications had reduced the personnel for planning function to 14 percent and 18 percent of the funds.

The only thing that amazes me in the testimony of the Commissioner is that the planning function has received as much attention in the States as it has. My secondary surprise is almost as great. That the States would maintain that pace after building up a planning agency and doing planning with a fifth of all of the money for the first 2 years.

Mr. MEEDS. I think it would be fair to assume that the heavy end, so to speak, of the planning would be in the first year.

Mr. FULLER. That is right.

Mr. MEEDS. Because that is when we attempted to get some of these innovative programs off the ground.

Mr. SPARKS. In line with that in our organizational plans we had permanent arrangements for permanent groups to continue in planning but when we finally received our allocation we were reduced approximately one-third; we had to operate and we even had to roll back vacancy credit under which we could continue to operate the programs because we had planned in terms of—in conducting in terms of a \$450,000 appropriation, and we finally had to operate under a \$308,000 allocation.

So we had to eliminate this from our plan and had to revise our own plan with the U.S. Office. So, we would have spent more on planning but we had to maintain our existence. Planning had to go. If it were incorporated under title V without title B, I think we could do an excellent job there.

Mr. MEEDS. If I might ask a couple more questions of Mr. Gordon.

In line with your testimony this morning of, one, finding some long-range objectives or a goal to attempting these things and, two, then evaluate what you are doing, do you think enough of this is being done by State education agencies at this time, Mr. Gordon?

Mr. GORDON. No, I think very few if any have developed any long-range planning. The money, that has been spent for the reasons pointed out I am sure are urgent but just planning consists of a lot of different things.

There is a considerable amount of simple short-range planning necessary, for example, to get the Federal programs going as Mr. Christian pointed out; they needed to plan in the State educational agency in Florida to provide assistance to small counties to get the money they were entitled to get under title I, and I presume, under title II, and I presume, even under title III.

It is the setting of a long-range goal over a longer period of time and trying to fit program objectives into the long-range goal that seemed to me to be the emphasis.

Mr. MEEDS. The comprehensive goal for education in the State, is that correct?

Mr. GORDON. In terms of our own planning we had instituted such a study. We had come out with an overall purpose of continuous planning but we were unable to institute it with the shortage of funds.

Now our feeling is that planning ought to be closely related to operation. If they are divorced you are going to have academic exercise outside the area of education.