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1. Introduction

The MIT/NILECJ EVAL system is a special-purposed computer program designed for the research project "An Empirical Study of Methods Used in Criminal Justice Evaluations". A sample of about 200 evaluation reports published by various organizations is read and a questionnaire for each evaluation report is filled out by a member of the research group. The purpose of this computer program is to maintain on-line all the project's records and each of the 200 evaluation reports. In addition, it allows a user to search all these reports and questionnaires according to such variables area of work, focus of evaluation, data sources, and methodologies, and generates analysis report based on the information. This system is currently implemented on the Multics Operating System at MIT.

EVAL stores each evaluation report in a separate file. Each file consists of a fixed set of information about the evaluation report, for example, the author of the report, date of publication, organization that publishes the report, etc., followed by a questionnaire for this report. A 6-digit number number is assigned to each report and its questionnaire. The first two digits of this 6-digit number (called the report ID) denote the subject code of a report; the second two digits are the entry number in a subject code as specified in the first two digits of the report ID. The last two digits are the agency code, the agency or organization that publishes this report. Table 1 lists all the subjects represented in the subject code. Table 2 depicts the organizations or agencies represented in the agency code.
In addition to the subject code and the agency code, EVAL also uses five additional codes. See Table 3, 4, 5, and 6 for the meaning of these codes. By specifying a combination of these codes, EVAL allows the user to search reports of particular interests. For example, question like "I want to have a list of all reports funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration about Patrol Strategies" can be handled easily by EVAL. See the description for "search" command in the command description section (Page 20) for detail.
2. Gaining Access to Multics

EVAL operates under Multics Operating System. In order to use EVAL, a terminal must be connected to the Multics computer. This section presents the basics of how to conduct a terminal session under Multics: how to login and logout Multics, the characteristics of the DEC Writer II terminal, how to invoke and use EVAL. The sequence of activities typically associated with a EVAL session are as follows:

* Making the physical connection between your terminal and Multics.
* Logging-in Multics
* Invoking EVAL
* Conducting your terminal session once EVAL is invoked.
* Logging-out Multics when your terminal session is completed.

Using the Dec Writer II computer terminal

Before connecting the terminal with the computer, set all switches in front of the keyboard in the "up" position. Then press the [300] and [HDX] switches down. Make sure the [CAPS LOCK] key is up since Multics only recognizes lowercase letters.

Entering a line

When communicating with Multics and EVAL, the terminal keyboard is used to type a line of input, for example, a EVAL command or a line of user input. The signal to Multics
that designates the "end of input line" is the keyboard carriage [RETURN] key.

Sometimes you can save a little time by entering two or more commands (or input) in succession without waiting for system responses. There is a drawback to this. If you make a mistake in one of the commands, Multics or EVAL sends you messages telling you of your mistake, and then it cancels the remaining commands you have entered. After you correct the error, you have to reenter the other commands.

Correcting typing errors

There are two special symbols for correcting typing errors, the character delete and the line delete. These symbols may vary, but generally the number sign (#) is the character-delete symbol, and the commercial at sign (@) is the line-delete symbol.

The character-delete symbol "erases" one previously typed character, space, or tab when typed directly after the error. The line-delete symbol "erases" every character previously typed on the line, including spaces and tabs. Examples of both symbols are given in the login command lines below. Each line is interpreted by Multics as --login TKWong.

```
login TKWong
loosen T###in TKWong
loosen TKW@login TKWong
log@lose@lose#in TKWong
```
Establishing the terminal, Multics connection

The procedure to establish a physical connection between your terminal and Multics is described next.

* Turn the terminal power on.
* Make sure all switches in front of the keyboard are set correctly.
* Press the "TALK" button on the modem, dial x8-8313 (outside MIT, dial 617-258-8313). When you hear a high pitched tone, press the "DATA" button and place the receiver in the cradle of the modem. Press the keyboard carriage [RETURN] key a few times to initiate the LOGIN process.

Logging in Multics

After establishing a physical communication link, the Multics "login" command can then be used to start the terminal session.

Multics acknowledges that a communication link has been established by typing the following messages:

```
Load = 29.0 out of 85.0 units; users = 29
```

Now type the login entry as follows:

```
login TKWong
Password: rosedale
```
The password you typed will be masked to avoid it being exposed to others in order to maintain security for your work. If the login is successful, Multics will print greeting message which identifies the time and date of the current session, number of users using Multics, and date and time of your last terminal session. Once the message is completed, Multics is ready to accept your next command.

You are protected from preemption.
TKWong SumLab logged in 11/27/78 0031.1 est Mon from ASCII terminal "none".
Last login 11/27/78 0030.4 est Mon from ASCII terminal "none".

Invoking EVAL

If you just log in Multics, you will be asked the following question:

Do you want to enter the MIT/NILECJ EVAL System? -->

A "yes" reply will invoke EVAL automatically. A "no" reply will keep you in the Multics command level, where Multics commands are accepted and executed. If you want to invoke EVAL in the Multics command level, you have to type:

eval

EVAL will print greeting messages to notify that EVAL has successfully been invoked.

Welcome to the MIT/NILECJ EVAL System.
Type "help" for information.
At this time, you can begin your EVAL session, entering EVAL commands and input data.

Logging out Multics

To end a terminal session, you would issue the "logout" command. This command will be accepted both by the EVAL and Multics System. The command and system responses are as follows:

Enter a request.
--> logout
Good Bye. Have a nice day.

TKWong SumLab logged out 11/27/78 0130.1 est Mon
CPU usage 40 sec, memory usage 847.8 units.
hangup

Do not turn off the terminal power immediately after you typed "logout". It is important to wait for the "logout" messages before you turn off the terminal power. Turning power off before EVAL responds will leave some useless files in EVAL, and lead to a higher storage cost charged to your account.
3. EVAL Messages

There are five types of messages in EVAL:
+ Broadcast messages.
+ Memo
+ System messages.
+ Prompting Messages
+ Information messages.

Broadcast messages.

Broadcast messages are messages of general interest to EVAL users. Broadcast messages are sent by the system programmer or by the project administrator. For example, the system programmer can send the following messages to EVAL users:

*********************
* SYSTEM NEWS *
*********************

Because of a bug in the EVAL system, comment of problem 19(b) was written on problem 20(b), and problem (31) was written on problem (30). This bug was fixed at 10/14/78. Please correct all questionnaires entered before that date.

Memo

EVAL allows users to send memo to other EVAL users. For example, you may send the following messages to other EVAL users:

Memo: from tom 11/27/78 0128.1 est Mon

To dawn: please call me on Monday 11/27
System messages

EVAL records the name of the user, date, time, and report ID when a report is added, modified, or deleted by the user. When you invoke EVAL, these messages will be printed on your terminal:

```
System Messages:
Report no: 00-00-00 was added by tom 11/29/78 06:30.1
```

EVAL stores these system messages generated within the past 7 days. You can type "m" or "message" to retrieve these messages if you desire.

Prompting messages

A prompting message tells you that required information is missing or that information you supplied was incorrectly specified. A prompting message asks you to supply or correct that information. Prompting messages can be recognized by the "---> " after the message. For example, the "print" command requires a report ID or IDs as operand, if you enter the "print" command without that operand, EVAL will prompt you for a report ID and your listing will look as follows:

```
Enter a request.
---> Print
Enter 6-digit report ID. -->
Incorrect input.
Please try again or type "help" for information.
PRINT: Enter the 6-digit report ID. -->
```
You can stop a prompting messages sequence by entering the required information or by typing a "c" or "cancel" as input to abort the command. If you cancel the command, EVAL responds with the following messages:

Enter a request.
---> p  
Enter 6-digit report ID. --> c  
SYSTEM: Cancel command accepted.  
SYSTEM: Print command processed.

Information messages

An information message tells you about the status of EVAL or the result of the EVAL command you issued previously. For example, an information message can tell you that your previous command has been completed successfully. Unlike prompting messages, information messages do not require a response or action from you.

SYSTEM: Cancel command accepted.  
SYSTEM: Print command processed.
4. Command Descriptions

Six EVAL commands are described below. These commands are all you need to know to analyze the information stored in EVAL. Detail descriptions of all EVAL commands can be found in the EVAL SYSTEM USER'S GUIDE.

List (l) command

The list command lists all reports that are stored in the EVAL system. For example, if you want to know how many reports that have report ID from 00-00-00 to 05-00-00, you type:

```
list 000000 to 050000
```

EVAL responds by printing all reports with report ID in between 00-00-00 and 05-00-00, together with their representation codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report ID</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>ENT NO</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>EXEMP</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>METH1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-12-99</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-12-99</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If no such report exists, EVAL responds by printing the message "LIST: Report(s) not found."

```
Enter a request.
--> 1 035599
LIST: Report(s) not found.
List command processed.
```

If you do not specify any report ID, the default is to list all reports in the system.
A special option is available to reduce the amount of printing on your terminal when you use the "list" command. Typing a "*" after the "list" command instructs EVAL to print only the report IDs, without the representation codes associated with the report ID.

Enter a request.
--> list 000000 to 050000 *

Report ID
03-12-99
04-12-99

SYSTEM: List Command Processed.

If you type "list *" without specifying any report ID, EVAL tells you only the number of reports in the system. To use the star option to list all reports in the system, you type:

Enter a request.
--> list * 000000 to 999999

Print (p) command

The "print" command prints a report or reports on your terminal. If you want to have the report with report ID 02-13-99 printed on your terminal, you type:

Enter a request.
--> print 02-13-99

You can also print a list of reports on your terminal, thus, the following requests are legitimate:

Enter a request.
--> print 000000 to 050000

Enter a request.
--> print 12-17-52, 122152, 080170

Enter a request.
--> print 121752, 200000 to 098700, 081700
If you fail to provide a report ID or report IDs, EVAL sends you a prompting message asking you to supply it. You can either supply a report ID or IDs, or abort the "print" command by typing a "c" or "cancel". If the "print" command is cancelled, EVAL responds by printing the message "SYSTEM: Cancel command accepted.", and waits for your next command.

Enter a request.
--> print
Enter 6-digit report ID. --> c
SYSTEM: Cancel command accepted.
SYSTEM: Print command processed.

If the report ID you provided does not match with the report IDs in the EVAL system, EVAL responds with the message "PRINT: Report(s) not found.", and waits for your next EVAL command.

Enter a request.
--> print 000000
PRINT: Report(s) not found.
SYSTEM: Print command processed.

A special "star" option is also available to users who only want part of the reports printed. For example, if you want to print question number 17, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30 of the questionnaire associated with the report ID 02-13-99, you type:

Enter a request.
--> print 021399 *
SYSTEM: Special options in effect.
Enter question number(s). --> 17,23,24,28 to 30

The "*" in the above example invokes the special option of the "print" command, and EVAL responds "SYSTEM: Special options in effect." EVAL then requests you to supply
question numbers. Note, a question number must be in between 8 and 31. The "*" can be typed anywhere in the command line after the keyword "print". The following example also invokes the special option of the "print" command:

```plaintext
Enter a request.
--> print * 021399
SYSTEM: Special options in effect.
Enter question number(s). -->
```

The speed of your terminal is very slow, about 30 characters per second. It is therefore unwise to have a large number of reports printed on your terminal, since this may take hours to be completed. EVAL allows users to send a large volume of output to MIT IPC (Information Processing Center) where a high speed line-printer is available. See the "dprint" command for detail.

Write (w) command

The "write" command is essentially the same as the "print" command except that the output from the execution of the "write" command is stored in a file (to be named). This allows you to retrieve information stored in a file anytime you want. For example, if you want to group all reports with report ID from 50-00-00 to 60-00-00 in a file, you type:

```plaintext
Enter a request.
--> write 500000 to 600000
```
If you do not provide a file name, EVAL sends you a prompting message asking for it. A file name is a string of alphabets from a to z (upper case or lower case) and numbers. A file name must not have more than 16 characters. Since there will be many such files stored in EVAL, the name should be chosen so that it is meaningful to you.

In addition to the file name, you also have to specify the file attribute. The file attribute of a file takes either one of the following values, "new" or "old". If the file attribute of a file is "old", the output from the execution of the "write" command will be appended to the file. If the file attribute is "new", the output will direct to a new file. If it happens that a file with the same name already exists, the old content of the file will be replaced by the output evoked by this "write" command.

Enter a request.
--> w 031299
WRITE: Enter the name of the output file, --> tom_09
WRITE: Enter the attribute of the output file, --> old
Report Number 31299 was written at 11/27/78
WRITE: tom_09, output appended, at 11/27/78 0049.0 est Mon
SYSTEM: Write command processed.

Enter a request.
--> w 5000000 to @w 000000 to 100000
WRITE: Enter the name of the output file, --> tom_09
WRITE: Enter the attribute of the output file, --> new
WRITE: tom_09, output already exists.
WRITE: Do you wish to delete the old copy? -->

In the above example, the user is asked whether he wants to delete the old copy of the output. A "yes" reply will delete the old copy, and create a new file that
contains the output from the execution of this "write" command. A "no" reply will abort the "write" command, and EVAL is ready to accept another request.

You can supply all required operands of the "write" command at one time, any missing operand will be requested by EVAL. However, if you choose to supply all required operands at one time, the file name and the file attribute in that order should be immediately following the "write" command. If a file attribute is after the "write", the file attribute will be taken as the name of the output file, and a file attribute will then be requested by EVAL. In such case, you should type a "c" or "cancel" to abort the "write" command.

Note: special option for the "write" command is also available. This option allows only part of the questionnaire be written. Like the "print" command, this special option can be invoked by typing a "*" in the command line. For example:

```
Enter a request.
--> w filename new 000000 to 9999999 *
```

```
Enter a request.
--> w *
```

Files created by "write" commands can be printed on your terminal by using the EVAL "print" command. For example, if "tom_09" is the name of a file created by a "write" command, you can get the output on your terminal by typing:

```
Enter a request.
--> print tom_09
```
Files can also be printed by the high speed line-printer. See the "dprint" command for detail.

If you want to delete a file, the EVAL "delete" command should be used:

```
Enter a request.
---> delete tom_09
```

If you want to know how many files were created by the "write" command, you should use the Multics list command as follows:

```
Enter a request.
---> EXEC ls *.output
Segments = 1, Lengths = 0.
```

```
r w 0 tom_09.output
```

**Dprint (dp) command**

The function of the "dprint" command is essentially the same as the "write" and "print" command, except that the output generated by this command is printed by a high speed line-printer at the MIT IPC in stead of your terminal. Usually, the printing speed of your terminal is very slow, about 30 characters per second. If you want to have a fairly large number of reports, say 10 reports, to be printed on your terminal, it may takes hours to finish the printing. By using the "dprint" command, only a few minutes are needed. Thus, the saving of time is particularly obvious if you want to print a large number of reports. For example, if you want
to have a listing of the content of all reports in EVAL, you type:

```
Enter a request: 
---> dprint 000000 to 999999
```

Or, if you want to print a file created by the "write" command, you type:

```
Enter a request: 
---> dprint tom_09
```

where, of course, "tom_09" is the name of the file created by the "write" command.

If EVAL successfully locates the files or reports you specified with the "dprint" command, EVAL will ask you how many copies you want to have.

```
Enter a request: 
---> dprint tom_09
Dprint: How many copies do you want? --> 5
1 request signalled, 22 already in printer queue 3
```

In the above example, five copies will be printed.

You can abort the "dprint" command by typing a "c" or "cancel" if you desire.

Each issuance of the "dprint" command will create a new printout, separated from the printouts generated by other "dprint" command. You should try to issue one "dprint" command to print all reports that are of interests to you. Using more than one "dprint" command to print reports will separated the printouts in different "chunks". Alternatively,
you can use the "write" command to collect all relevant reports in a file, and use the "dprint" command to get the printout.

For example, if you want to have the printout of the following reports (03-13-99, 10-00-00 to 20-00-00, 40-00-00 to 50-00-00, and the file named "tom_09"), you type:

Enter a request.
--> dprint
DPRINT: Enter the 6-digit report ID. -->
031299, 100000 to 200000, 400000 to 500000, tom_09

Alternatively, you can also use the "write" command to store all the reports in a file (named "tom_10" in the following example), and then use the "dprint" command to print the file.

Enter a request.
--> write
WRITE: Enter the name of the output file. --> tom_10
WRITE: Enter the attribute of the output file. --> new
WRITE: Enter the 6-digit report ID. -->
031399, 100000 to 200000, 400000 to 500000, tom_09

WRITE: tom_10, output created at 11/27/78 0100.1 est Mon SYSTEM: Write command processed.

Enter a request.
--> dprint tom_10

The difference in the above two examples is that the "write" command will create a new file name "tom_10", whereas the "dprint" command will not.
All evaluation reports in EVAL are numerically coded for easy sorting and searching purposes. Eight codes are used by EVAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>MIN VALUE</th>
<th>MAX VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subj</td>
<td>subject of the evaluation report</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ent_no</td>
<td>entry number in a particular subject</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency</td>
<td>agency or organization that publishes the evaluation report</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nep</td>
<td>national evaluation program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exemp</td>
<td>exemplary project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus</td>
<td>focus of evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>data</td>
<td>data sources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meth</td>
<td>methodology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By specifying a combination of these codes, EVAL is able to locate reports that satisfy the searching criteria.

For example, if you want to search reports that are "funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration about patrol strategies", you first have to look for the agency code for LEAA, which is 52. Subject codes for police patrol strategies are 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55. Then, you should issue the search command by typing a "s" or "search".

Enter a request.
---> search
SUBJ 2 digits
Enter a number.
---> 50 to 55
ENT NO 2 digits
Enter a number.
---> 50 to 55
AGENCY 2 digits
Enter a number.
---> 52
NEP 1 digit
Enter a number.
--> 
EXEMP 1 digit
Enter a number.
--> 
FOCUS 1 digit
Enter a number.
--> 
DELTA 1 digit
Enter a number.
--> 
METH 1 digit
Enter a number.
--> 
Search: 3 are found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report ID</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>ENT NO</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>EXEMP</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>METH1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52-02-52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-05-52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-10-52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SYSTEM: Search request processed.

Note: Typing only a carriage [RETURN] has the same effect as providing no searching criterion for a particular code; all reports are assumed to satisfy the criterion. Consequently, typing only a carriage [RETURN] on all questions asked by the "search" command has the same effect as listing all reports in EVAL.

The questions asked by the "search" command are in the order as depicted in the above example. Four sub-commands under the "search" command are provided to alter the sequence of these questions asked. This allows you to go back to re-answer previous questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Search Sub-command</strong></th>
<th><strong>Function</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cancel (c)</td>
<td>aborts the current &quot;search&quot; command and returns to system command level where EVAL waits for your next request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skip (s)</td>
<td>skips to the next number of question you specified. For example: <code>skip 2</code> instructs EVAL to skip the current and the next two questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jump (j)</td>
<td>jumps to the question number you specified. A question number must be provided. Example: <code>jump 1</code> instructs EVAL to go back and starts asking the first question again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop (stop)</td>
<td>stop asking for searching criteria and starts searching immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following example illustrates the use of these sub-commands to set the searching criteria for the "search" command:

```
Enter a request.
--> search
SUBJ 2 digits
  Enter a number.
  --> 50 to 55
ENT NO 2 digits
  Enter a number.
  --> skip
AGENCY 2 digits
  Enter a number.
  --> 52
MNP 1 digit
  Enter a number.
  --> stop
```
The output from the "search" command is a list of reports. The "print" command can then be used to further study any interested reports.

**Stat command**

The "stat" command provides a frequency count for the answers of each question in the questionnaires. For example, if you want to know the frequency counts for question number 17, you type:

```
Questionnaire Analysis 12/23/78 0428.8 est Sat

Total no. of Reports in the System is: 200
Total Number of questionnaires is: 199

Question number 17: 195 answered.
Focus of Evaluation: number
Narrative Case Study 40
Input Evaluation or Audit 15
Process Eval with measures 14
Process Eval w/o measures 8
Outcome Eval 29
Outcome Eval: experimental 17
Outcome Eval: quasi-experimental 42
Outcome Eval: statistical 3
Outcome Eval: formal 1
Comprehensive Eval 25
Not applicable 1
suitability:
max: 7 min: 1 average: 4.3
```
You can specify as many question numbers as you want, however, the question numbers must be in between 8 and 31. For example, if you want to analyze question number 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, 28, and 31, you type:

```
> stat 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, 28, 31
```

If you do not provide a question number in the `stat` command, a complete analysis of the answers of all questions in the questionnaires will be performed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>General Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Evaluation Manuals: General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Evaluation Manuals: Specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Methodology: Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Methodology: Experimental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Methodology: Time Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Methodology: Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Methodology: Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Methodology: Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Technical Assistance Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In-house R&amp;D or Planning Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Training Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other Specialized Administrative Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Corrections: Incarceration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Corrections: Probation and Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Corrections: Juvenile Diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Corrections: Program for Drug Abusers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Corrections: Other Alternatives to Incarceration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Police Community Relations: General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Police Community Relations: Street Safety / Crime Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Police/School Relations Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Police/Community Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pre-Trial Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Jury Management Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Court Scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Patrol Strategies: Patrol Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Code</td>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Patrol Strategies: One/Two officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Patrol Strategies: Dispatching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Patrol Strategies: Sector Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Patrol Strategies: Response Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Patrol Strategies: Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Team Policing: Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Team Policing: Decentralized Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>AVM Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>CAD (Computer Aided Dispatch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Information System: Statistical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Information System: Geographical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Resource Allocation: Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Resource Allocation: Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Code</td>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>New Jersey SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Minnesota SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>California SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Connecticut SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Pennsylvania SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Michigan SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Hawaii SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Oregon SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Virginia SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>North Carolina SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Georgia SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>New York SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Missouri SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Washington Criminal Justice Education and Training Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Urban Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ABT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Assistance Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Nation Council on Crime and Delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>The Rand Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>System Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Los Angeles Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Kansas City Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Seattle Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>New York City Rand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>MITRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>American Bar Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Public Systems Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Police Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: Nation Evaluation Program (nep) Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEP</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Evaluation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>State Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Impact Anti-Crime Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4: Exemplary Projects (exemp) Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXEMP</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exemplary Validation Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5: Focus of Evaluation (focus) Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Narrative Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Input Evaluation or Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Process Evaluation with Performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Process Evaluation w/o Performance Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outcome Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Outcome Evaluation: experimental design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Outcome Evaluation: quasi-experimental design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outcome Evaluation: statistical models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Outcome Evaluation: formal models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Comprehensive Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6: Data Sources (data) Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Informal Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Administrative Records already available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Administrative Records gathered esp. for the eval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Observational Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Questionnaire Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interview Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Written Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7: Methodology (meth) Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METH</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Qualitative Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Content Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Statistical Inference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regression and ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Time Series Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Factor Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Formal Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other or Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Name</td>
<td>Short Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cancel</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cancel</td>
<td>cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delete</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dprint</td>
<td>dp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eval</td>
<td>eval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC</td>
<td>EXEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>list</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logout</td>
<td>logout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memo</td>
<td>memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modify</td>
<td>md</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Name</td>
<td>Short Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>print</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quit</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stat</td>
<td>stat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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   ___ quasi-experimental design
   ___ statistical models
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19. Evaluability—CAN OUTCOMES BE ATTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO PROGRAM ACTIVITIES?
   (a) __________________________________________________
       __________________________________________________
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       __________________________________________________

   (b) Evaluability—IS THERE A THEORY LINKING PROGRAM ACTIVITIES TO THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES CHOSEN?
       __________________________________________________
       __________________________________________________
       __________________________________________________
20. ARE PROGRAM ACTIVITIES CLEARLY DESCRIBED IN THE EVALUATION?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

21. Describe feedback between program staff and evaluation staff. If policy changes or unexpected results cause a need for changes in the evaluation design, was the design flexible enough to account for this?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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- [ ] Informal Material
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________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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   (a) **ACTUAL DECISION-MAKING?**

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

   (b) **COULD THIS TYPE OF EVALUATION BE ADAPTED FOR USE IN PERIODIC REVIEW?**

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
30. WOULD THIS REPORT BE ACCESSIBLE TO THE AUDIENCES WHO WOULD FIND IT USEFUL?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

31. IS THERE A DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS MET IN IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION PLAN?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

FINAL COMMENTS: ____________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
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An example of a storage record in EVAL
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0315.5 est Thu

Reader & Date: Cheryl, June 21

NCJRS Number:

Report Title: Evaluation of the Massachusetts Police

Author & Organization: Arthur D. Little Institute
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Funding Organization: Massachusetts Committee
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Abstract:

End of Report.

SUBJ 3

ENT NO 12

AGENCY 99

NEP 0

EXEMP 0

FOCUS 9

DATA 3

METH 0

METH2

METH3

An Empirical Study of Methods used in Criminal Justice Evaluations.

8.

9. not answered.

10. not answered.

11. not answered.

12(a). during

12(b). during

13.

14(a). no

COMMENT:

Not explicitly, though certainly they spelled them out in great detail.

14(b). yes

15(a). yes

COMMENT:

Evaluators questioned whether the program should serve smaller police departments primarily and whether they in fact did so.

15(b). yes

16(a). yes

COMMENT:

They considered in their discussion of program implementation, in specific cases they reviewed. Evaluators did not directly address this issue.
16(b). yes
COMMENT:
It seems to be. There is not enough discussion of overall trends in the program to be able to tell easily.

17. Comprehensive Evaluation
SUITABILITY OF EVALUATION FOCUS: 6
COMMENT:
Evaluators had both a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation in the form of a quasi-experimental design. There was an interesting use of a quasi-experimental design to do a qualitative, process-oriented study of a large program containing many projects. They used a randomized, stratified sampling for the experimental group. It was a quasi-experimental design because the control and comparison groups were chosen from a different population. They could not do a strict experimental design because the evaluation was done after the inception of the program. However, the groups were very carefully chosen and randomization was employed whenever possible. They chose as the population for their control group those police departments who had requested assistance from MPI but had not yet received it. While they had performance measures, these were specific to particular parts of the overall program—certain tangible criteria the evaluators felt to be measures of the program's overall success.

18. yes
COMMENT:
On the whole quite good. Evaluators were careful to consider that satisfaction of clients only a partial measure of the program's success and that impact in behavior, concrete outcomes, were the most important measures.

19(a). yes
COMMENT:
Evaluators were careful to look at what activities resulted in what outcomes.

19(b). yes

20. yes
COMMENT:
Not simply a general overview of a typical program activity but actual historical accounting of how activities unfolded in different projects.

21(a). yes
COMMENT:
Yes in sense that program staff objected to or questioned certain feedback which the staff then elaborated as a result. This implies, if not continuous feedback, some interval feedback before the final report.
21(b). yes
COMMENT:
Design flexible because interview questions, the major data source, were flexible and designed to elicit program-specific responses. Also apparent in the ingenuity with which evaluators constructed experimental and control groups.

22. no
COMMENT:
Not really resting a hypothesis. However, the program they are evaluating is a very large one which has many smaller projects under it.

23. Observational Data
SUITABILITY OF DATA SOURCES: 6
COMMENT:
Rather informal telephone interviews but structured in that there is a definite set of questions as a base. The basic questions, give in the appendix, seem quite thoughtful—investigative reporting style which is important to unearth the police chief's perceptions of what really happened. While there is no direct observation, the interviews are not simply standardized surveys but are designed to get a rich, situation-specific response. While main data source was interview data, evaluators used administrative records for a determination of the organization's cost-effectiveness.

24. Qualitative Analysis
SUITABILITY OF METHODOLOGY: 6
COMMENT:
Notes about this in final comments.

25. yes
COMMENT:
They give examples of responses as well as evaluator's interpretation and aggregation.

26. no
COMMENT:
Telephone interviews are stated as the only form of data gathering but probably information was gathered from MPI files and perhaps some observation of on-going programs as well. (This should not under question 25.)

27. yes

28. yes
COMMENT:
They particularly listed those which potential clients said they felt would be useful.

29(a). no
29(b), yes
COMMENT:
Rather efficient because use of telephone interviewing and process oriented rather than oriented solely to measuring impact on long-term goals.

30, yes
COMMENT:
Executive summary. First sections of report confusing but overall fairly readable and results informative.

31, no

FINAL COMMENT:
This is one of the most interesting evaluations I have seen. It combines features of a process evaluation -- while done on aspects of the program completed before the evaluation took place -- and features of an experimental design which allows you to look carefully at a small sample in a systematic way and feel relatively confident your findings can be generalized to the larger population you are actually interested in. The evaluators were faced with looking at a multi-faceted program which had been in operation long before they arrived on the scene. They could not examine, with any depth, all of the things the program had done yet they wanted to evaluate the program overall. Their solution was quite creative. They carefully chose a stratified random sample of police departments who had made use of the MPI. These were matched, randomizing where possible, with a control group of clients awaiting services from MPI and a comparison group of police departments who had never made requests. (Why they chose the former as a control group is unclear and a bit problematic to me.) They then did structured telephone interviewing of subjects in various groups. Where "treatment" had been given, they probed not only for the attitudes of subjects but for documentation as to what had actually changed in their departments as a result of the treatment. While this "investigative reporting" method of data collection does not substitute for direct observation, the interviewing was situation specific enough (as revealed by reported subject responses) to go beyond the initial subjective responses of the clients. One problem which casts some doubt on the evaluators interpretations of data is that they did sound a bit too anxious to praise the project staff where they could.

End of Questionnaire.