

efficiency of 93.4% as compared with 89.1%.

The data show that for each score point the visitors earned 17.2 evaluation points and Kansas earned 22.2 evaluation points. By deducting the 5 evaluation points for each score point one sees that 12.2 evaluation points were earned as compared with 17.2 for Kansas. While Kansas had the ball earning the extra evaluation points it is certain that the opposition was not scoring. However, as pointed out previously, the various styles of play may effect the total number of evaluation points, but the style should not have a great deal of effect on errors in ball handling.

In making direct comparisons between specific teams, a summary table made up from the evaluation summaries shows much the same facts as the totals between Kansas and the opposition.

TABLE IV.

Summary from Evaluation Chart:

Team	Score	Goals	% of goals	Free Throws	% of Free Throws	Personal Fouls	Errors in Ball Handling	Total passes and catches	% of Errors in Ball Handling	Recovery of Rebounds	Player's Efficiency
Kansas	48	17	33	14	77	13	18	623	2.8	39	91.3
School A	33	12	16	9	56	15	18	441	3.9	41	91.4
Kansas	35	16	35	3	37	5	27	738	3.5	43	91.9
School B	33	15	29	3	60	8	26	326	7.4	24	86.6
Kansas	56	23	31	10	63	9	10	680	1.4	66	96.6
School C	36	12	20	12	51	13	13	325	3.8	20	89.1

School A played the home team fairly even on most of the comparisons except that they could not hit the goal, making only 16% of their field goals while Kansas was making 33% of their attempts.

School B played the closest game from the score standpoint. Their loss can be credited to a poorer shooting percentage than Kansas