

Re-evaluation of "1's" (All for "Accuracy" -
No "1's given for "Value")

<u>Doc</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Eval.</u>	<u>SG</u>
97	A			SG1J
90	B		"	"
85	C	Evaluator says "1" is "vague" - info is very general re drug culture	"	"
84	A	Actually A & C given 1's on this one - veto	"	"
72	A	"Right on target" - but no specifics re what that means.	"	"
				SG1J
94	A	High accuracy evaluator may reflect info from readily available press articles		
93	C	" " "	"	"
92	C	" " "	"	"
				SG1I
82	C	I think evaluator had to "stretch" to get a "1"		
81	B	Evaluator's comments would not justify a "1"		
79	C	" " " " "		

Of total evaluations, i.e., $6 \times 33 = 198$, only 157 filled in (need to add 104 & 103 if possible). Of those: 79 V's have no "1's, 78 A's have 10 "1's but 3 are result of ^{repeated} press info (92, 93, 94), 1 is "vague" (85) and 3 are inconsistent w/ evaluator subsequent comments. Only 3 - all from same evaluator however, seem to warrant the marking without (other than ^{possible} evaluator bias to ^{evaluate} see remarks in most positive light)