

Evaluation will continue to be one of the most difficult problems for title III as well as for the other ESEA titles. This overview has taken a strong position favoring more and better evaluation but it has also cautioned against looking to evaluation as the mecca that it itself will solve problems.

We could become evaluation happy, viewing this diagnostic and remedial tool as the program itself, or we could tend to ignore those programs that do not lend themselves to present methods of evaluation.

Paul Brandwein one of the 20 special consultants, noted that the 3-C's of most large science projects are confusion, comprehension, and clarity—and the confusion stage may last quite awhile.

Title III needs to stay as clear as possible of political entanglements and this will not be easy. The future growth of PACE should rest upon what it does to improve the quality of education. Increasing pressures will be applied on OE title III officials to develop priorities that advance this or that cause many of which have strong political overtones. Some political problems of course cannot be escaped, and these will need to be confronted, but many others can and should be avoided by keeping the focus on the basic purposes and intentions of PACE.

The matter of priorities has been touched upon several times thus far, and it is a major problem that OE policymakers must wrestle with, within the framework of congressional legislation.

For example, have too many arts and humanities projects been approved and too few in ways of achieving organizational flexibility? The overview section has taken this position. Also too few projects creatively and courageously attack urban and metropolitan problems—particularly those relating to racial problems.

Any time priorities are altered, flak can be expected. Those groups recommended for deceleration have been given unfair treatment and those recommended for acceleration have received due consideration. OE officials may minimize criticism if criteria are developed for determining priorities and if these are determined in connection and in cooperation with its National Advisory Board.

The project directors themselves have some views on future developments of PACE, as given in their responses to this question: What idea and suggestions would you offer for future developments of title III?

The need for more money and for greater dissemination are future needs mentioned most often by project directors, with construction funds and consultant help following. Taken together, more funding in general—and for construction in particular—account for over 16 percent of the responses.

Creative use of PACE project directors as consultants and advisors can be a strong plus to American education. This reservoir of talent needs to be applied toward other types of projects and programs. In the next few years several thousand educators will have had PACE experience. More thought needs to be given to how this resource might best serve education.

Based upon carefully conducted interviews with 1,634 parents, the Gallup study concluded that educators have not appreciated the extent