

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

<u>Doc</u>	<u>RV</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Final Accuracy</u>	<u>SG</u>	<u>Evaluator</u>
97	A			SG1J	LU 1
90	B		"		LU 2
85	C	Evaluator says "1" is "vague" - info is very general	"		LU 3
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	"	"		
82	C	I think evaluator had to "stretch" to get a "1"		SG1I	
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 ^{repeating} 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)

This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are
responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages
released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>