In our experience in the past 20 years we had numerous studies and evaluations of our own State department functions and our overall State efforts but they have never been successful when they were disassociated with the State agency.

We have completed this internal study which was done cooperatively to a great extent. We call it a cooperative study and practically instituted. The advances are moving on with the exception really we have eliminated to some extent our planning function because of not being able to finance it at this time.

Mr. MEEDS. I don't think there is any disagreement with anyone at the table that a comprehensive planning, State planning of education is a laudable role. Is there any disagreement with this?

Mr. FULLER. This has been done in so many States and from State to State the last few years that I am surprised and amazed that anyone would raise the question.

It seems to me that the States have gone overboard if anything on long-range planning, middle-range planning and short-range planning.

Mr. MEEDS. Enough comprehensive planning has been done by the State educational agencies at this time.

Mr. FULLER. Yes, and even in this third year considering the amount of money to be expended a larger percentage was expended for planning.

Mr. MEEDS. Then you disagree with the gentleman from Kentucky when he says he needs more funds?

Mr. FULLER. I don't disagree with that at all. I say that the States want to do planning and have been doing planning to the extent of their capacities.

Mr. MEEDS. My next question is, do you think enough has been done?

Mr. FULLER. No. I think it is a continuous process.

Mr. MEEDS. Are we agreed more needs to be done?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. MEEDS. Then it is just a question of methodology, is it not?

Mr. FULLER. Largely, and administration.

Mr. MEEDS. Would you have objection—and we are just talking here—would you have objection to a plan under which the so-called section (b) of title V were incorporated in title V, the additional money given under title V, and earmarked for the specific purpose of planning on this comprehensive basis?

Mr. SPARKS. No objection unless it is put under a different agency that has nothing to do with the operation of education. This is our concern. I am afraid you won't achieve your ends if you put it under an agency that may have conflict with the State department of education.

Mr. MEEDS. I don't know that I entirely agree with you. You know, if I can by analogy, I don't know that Congress would be the best one to determine what makes Congress tick sometimes either.

You know, we hire outside consultants to tell us how to modernize our effectiveness or how to make ourselves more effective. Sometimes it is good to have a shot from the outside.

I understand your concern with this. I was trying to bring out that I didn't think you had any objection to the allocation or authori-