



Coordinator

Name Matthew Traugber

Planning

Team Paul Bauer

Program Description

Purpose or Mandate

The purpose of this initial report is to present the results of district performance on 2014-15 school year Missouri School Improvement Plan (MSIP) metrics, focusing on state assessment results. These data will be presented in the context of accreditation requirements and the district goal of minimizing performance discrepancies across racial and socioeconomic subgroups. The subsequent Disaggregated Data report will analyze MSIP results in greater depth.

Summary Description of Program

The Disaggregated Data report analyzes the performance of the district based on the indicators comprising the MSIP Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR is the instrument by which district accreditation is determined. The Disaggregated Data report provides analysis of the metrics that contribute to accreditation.

Which specific CSIP goals and PCF processes does this Program support?

CSIP 1.1 Ensure achievement for all students.

Who are the Customers/Stakeholders?

- Students
- Parents
- Staff
- Administrators
- Board of Education
- Taxpayers
- Other Missouri DESE

What are the Customer/Stakeholder requirements?

Stakeholders require that the results of state assessments and other MSIP indicators be reported annually. Customers require accurate data, analyses that addresses the needs of students, and clear interpretation of the analyses. It is expected that SSD maintain full accreditation. It is expected that performance on MSIP metrics will improve year over year. It is also expected that the district will make progress in reducing discrepancies across subgroups. Stakeholders anticipate that initiatives and strategies will be developed to address opportunities for improvement identified through the MSIP review process.

What is this program expected to accomplish?

Reporting and analysis of SSD performance on MSIP metrics allows for identification of district strengths and opportunities for improvement. It is expected that the district's continuous improvement process will result in improved MSIP performance and meeting accreditation standards.

Briefly describe how this Program works

In the initial report, student-level data that contribute to MSIP review are analyzed by school, test format (i.e., MAP vs. MAP-A), ethnicity and socio-economic status. Indicators of progress towards meeting MSIP accreditation requirements are reported. In the second report, data is analyzed in greater depth.

What resources (type and quantity) are required to execute this plan?

Resources required for this report include the supporting data files from DESE that accompany the MSIP report, along with any data tools DESE provides (e.g., the Excel spreadsheet developed for the purpose of calculating MSIP points). SSD administrators review and validate preliminary data released by DESE in order to

ensure accuracy. Evaluation and Research Department staff complete required data analyses and generate the Disaggregated Data initial and final reports.

Action Plan Summary

Previous Cycle Goals and Measurable Objectives

2013-2014 Overall Goals

Goal 1: Show Progress on State Assessment.

Goal 2: Make progress on reducing gap between subgroups.

Goal 3: MAP and MAP-A scores will be comparable.

2013-2014 Objectives

1.1 Comparison of state assessment scores for three years as measured by MSIP 5 index for State, District, and Schools will show improvement.

2.1 Comparison of score differences for three years as measured by MSIP 5 Index for race and for free or reduced lunch status will show improvement.

3.1 Comparison of MSIP 5 index scores for three years will show comparable scores for MAP and MAP-A.

Current Cycle Goals and Measurable Objectives

2014-2015 Overall Goals ¹

Goal 1: Stakeholders will be provided with a summary and analysis of SSD student performance on state accountability assessments.

Goal 2: Stakeholders will be provided with a summary and analysis of subgroup performance on state accountability assessments.

Expected Measurable Objectives ²

1.1 Report change over time at the school and district level by MSIP Index score.

1.2 Report change over time at the school and district level by MAP and EOC Achievement Levels.

2.1 Report comparisons among African-American students vs. White students on the state accountability assessments.

2.2 Report on the performance of students designated as Free and Reduced Lunch status on the state accountability assessments.

¹ Note that wording in the goals and objectives has been modified from the prior cycle to reflect the fact that this summary represents a data report rather than a targeted evaluation of any particular program. School and district leaders should use the data and analyses presented in the report to inform school improvement efforts.

² A new state assessment (that developed through the Smarter Balanced test consortium) for grades 3-8 was administered in 2015. For this reason, caution should be taken in comparing 2015 results with those from prior school years.

Current Cycle (2014-15) Action Plans

Short-term (within the next school year)

The factors associated with each area of MSIP scoring will be analyzed to coordinate efforts to retain full accreditation. Analysis of cohort and factors related to achievement gaps will be reported in the Disaggregated Data Analysis report.

Medium-term (1-2 years)

The Evaluation and Research department will engage in deeper analysis of factors related to student success using data mining and data analytic methods.

Long-term (3 years and more)

Evaluation and Research will assist in gathering and analyzing strategies and interventions that best produce student learning in the attempt to develop a "Science of SSD."

Evaluation Plan Summary

Program Evaluation Authority

Disaggregated data reporting is required by the Board of Education.

Qualitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used

- What are the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
- How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?
- What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?
- How well-aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?
- What is the level of deployment of this program's services?
- How should resources be changed to improve this program?
- How should goals be changed, added, or removed?
- Additional (if any)

Quantitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used

- What is the status of the program's progress toward achieving its goals?
- What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to planned costs?
- What is the estimated actual benefit-cost or cost-effectiveness of this program?

Quantitative Measures – Criteria for Evaluation

Measure to be used	2015-16 Targets
State accountability assessments (MAP, MAP-A, EOC) and MSIP Index	Report performance on measures in reference to accountability standards. Report change in performance on measures over time. Report comparisons of performance on measures across subgroups.



Coordinator Name
Paul Bauer

Planning Team
Matthew Traugher

Evaluation Summary

Purpose or Mandate

This report summarizes state accountability assessment results and trends for the 2014-15 school year. Data are presented in the context of accreditation requirements and the district goal of minimizing performance discrepancies across racial and socioeconomic subgroups. A subsequent Disaggregated Data report presented in the spring of 2016 will analyze Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) and Annual Performance Report (APR) results more comprehensively.

Program Description

The Disaggregated Data report analyzes the performance of the district based on the academic assessment component of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) accountability framework. The report is based on preliminary data provided to the district by the state Department of Education.

What were the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?

Reporting and analysis of SSD performance on MSIP metrics allows for identification of district trends, accomplishments, and opportunities for improvement. It is expected that the district's continuous improvement process will address opportunities for improvement and that the district will meet criteria for maintaining accreditation per DESE standards.

How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?

Inadequate Approaching Satisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

What is the general level of customer or stakeholder satisfaction with this program?

Not at all Satisfied Somewhat Satisfied Very Satisfied Completely Satisfied

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?

Not applicable. This report does not evaluate any specific program.

Evaluation Results

What is the status of the program's progress toward achieving its goals?

Goal 1: Stakeholders will be provided with a summary and analysis of SSD student performance on state accountability assessments.

Measurable Objective 1.1:	Report change over time at the school and district level by MSIP Index score.
<p>Figures 1 (English Language Arts and Math) and 2 (Science and Social Studies) display change in MSIP Index Score¹ over four school years at the levels of school/site and SSD overall. For comparison purposes, averages for the state of Missouri are also included. See Appendix A for tables displaying counts of students taking each test.</p> <p>In 2015, students in grades 3-8 completed entirely new accountability assessments in the areas of English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics that were developed through the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. In addition, a new Alternative MAP assessment (in the form of Dynamic Learning Maps²) was introduced in 2015 for the content areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics. Furthermore, achievement level cut-scores in the ELA and Math were entirely reconfigured.³ Therefore, although test results from 2015 appear alongside those from prior years in the figures provided, readers should interpret cross-year trends with caution given the significant changes to the assessment system. Tests in the areas of science and social studies, along with End-of-Course (EOC) exams, remained unchanged in 2015 from prior years.</p> <p>Keeping the above caveats in mind, MSIP Index scores fell dramatically in 2015 in the content areas of ELA and Math. With the exception of North Technical High School (though note that only 13 North Tech students had reportable EOC scores in math), Index scores for SSD students fell well below state averages in those two content areas. As was true at the state level, MSIP Index scores were lower for Math than for ELA.</p> <p>In contrast to performance in the content areas of ELA and Math, SSD students performed relatively well in the content area of science, both in relationship to the prior year's score and the 2015 state average. This more positive trend is likely due, in part, to the continued use of the previous years' MAP science assessment (and related cut scores), along with that of the MAP-A Portfolio assessment for science, which might be said to "inflate" proficiency rates in this content area. For example, while 97% of students taking the MAP-A science test ($n=119$) scored proficient or advanced in 2015, only 10% of students taking the regular MAP science test ($n=70$), and 55% of students taking science-related EOCs ($n=166$), scored proficient or advanced.</p> <p>Results in the area of Social Studies are based solely on the Government EOC, and thus elementary schools will have no data in this content area; in addition, several secondary schools had no reportable scores for Social Studies in 2015. Scores in this content area have been variable from year to year, possibly a result of fluctuating examinee pool sizes (for instance, from 2013 to 2015, there were reportable scores from 92, 321, and 178 students, respectively). Regardless, where data exists, Social Studies scores generally fell well below the state average in 2015. The MSIP Index for North Technical High, whose students completed 72% of all Government EOC tests taken last year, fell slightly in 2015, and has experienced a gradual downward trend over 4 years.</p>	

ELA and Math MAP Index Scores by School/Site, District, and State 2012-2015




Figure 1. MSIP Index scores for SSD schools/sites, the district overall, and the state overall in the content areas of English Language Arts and Mathematics. MAP Index scores range from 100-500. Only the 2015 score is labeled. The scores reported represent combined performance across MAP, EOC, and MAP-A test formats, though students attending North Technical and the Juvenile Detention Center took only MAP and EOC tests in 2015. See Appendix A for student counts from each school.

Science and Social Studies MAP Index Scores by School/Site, District, and State 2012-2015




Figure 2. MSIP Index scores for SSD schools/sites, the district overall, and the state overall in the content areas of Science and Social Studies. MAP Index scores range from 100-500. Only the 2015 score is labeled. The Social Studies MSIP Index is based solely on the Government EOC, and thus scores appear only for secondary schools. JDC and Southview High had no reportable Social Studies scores in 2015. See Appendix A for student counts from each school.

<p>Measurable Objective 1.2:</p>	<p>Report change over time at the school and district level by MAP and EOC Achievement Levels.</p>
<p>See Figures 3 (elementary schools and external sites) and 4 (secondary schools and the Juvenile Detention Center). As cross-year change in achievement levels mirrors MSIP Index score trends, only 2015 data are reported here. Please see comments under Objective 1.1 regarding new testing requirements implemented in 2015, along with other caveats regarding interpreting assessment results.</p> <p>A relatively low percentage of SSD students met proficiency standards (i.e., state test scores falling in the proficient or advanced range) in the content areas of English Language Arts and Math last school year. In total, 30.5% of SSD students scored proficient or advanced in ELA (vs. 59.7% statewide), and 10.4% scored proficient or advanced in math (vs. 44.8% statewide). 73.1% of SSD students scored in the Below Basic range in the area of Math (vs. 25.7% statewide). 48.4% scored in the Below Basic range in ELA (vs. 17.1% statewide).</p> <p>SSD students met proficiency standards in Science at a higher rate (63.3%) than did students statewide (57.1%). 66.5% of students attending North Technical High (all of whom take EOC science tests) scored proficient or advanced in Science.</p> <p>The overall proficiency rate for Social Studies (as a reminder, this content area is comprised entirely of the Government EOC test) was 28.8%, which falls well below the statewide rate of 63.4%.</p> <p>Figure 5 illustrates a supplementary analysis comparing trends in test performance for students taking the grades 3-8 MAP against those taking the MAP-Alternative assessment. As is apparent in the figure, the distribution of scores across achievement levels was quite different in 2015 in comparison to 2014 for students taking the MAP-A. In 2014, MAP and MAP-A achievement level distributions were essentially opposite (i.e., most students scored in the proficient or advanced range on the MAP-A, while most scored in the basic or below basic range on the MAP). In 2015, however (corresponding with the introduction of the Dynamic Learning Maps assessment), proficiency rates for the MAP and MAP-A tests were relatively comparable. Given that many SSD students are assessed via the MAP-A format (e.g., 42% in ELA, and 50% in math, in 2015), the ostensibly more demanding standards of the new alternative assessment had a marked impact on district achievement results overall in 2015.</p>	

State Test Achievement Level Percentages by Content Area
Elementary Schools, External Sites, SSD Overall, and State Overall
2015 School Year




Figure 3. 2015 Achievement level percentages for SSD elementary schools and students attending external sites, by content area. Results for SSD overall and the state overall are also displayed. See Appendix A for student counts.

State Test Achievement Level Percentages by Content Area
Secondary Schools, JDC, SSD Overall, and State Overall
2015 School Year




Figure 4. 2015 Achievement level percentages for SSD secondary schools and students attending JDC, by content area. Results for SSD overall and the state overall are also displayed. See Appendix A for student counts.

A Comparison Between MAP and MAP-Alternative Achievement Level Percentages in Years 2014 and 2015
English Language Arts and Math (Excludes EOC, Science, and Social Studies Tests)




Figure 5. A comparison of achievement level categorizations for students participating in the MAP vs. the MAP-A test format. EOC, Science, and Social Studies assessments are excluded. Note that while achievement level distributions of scores between the two tests were nearly opposite in 2014 (with high proportions of students achieving proficiency on the MAP-A), in 2015, the distributions were comparable, illustrating the significant difference in student performance on the new MAP-A (Dynamic Learning Maps) assessment vs. that in years past. Achievement level distributions in the area of science were fairly consistent across the two years (as might be expected given that the tests in this area remained unchanged in 2015). There is no MAP-alternative assessment for social studies.

Goal 2: Stakeholders will be provided with a summary and analysis of subgroup performance on state accountability assessments.

Measurable Objective 2.1:	Report comparisons among African-American students vs. White students on the state accountability assessments.
<p>See Figure 6. African-American students, as a group, received a higher MSIP Index score than did white students in 2015, in both ELA and Math content areas. In contrast, The MSIP Index for white students had exceeded that for African-American students in 2013 and 2014.</p> <p>In the content area of Science, the group MSIP Index score among white students has exceeded that for African-American students by a similar degree in each of the last three years. The Social Studies MSIP Index was higher among white students in 2015, which represents a reversal of the trend seen the two prior years.</p>	

Measurable Objective 2.2:	Report on the performance of students designated as Free and Reduced Lunch status on the state accountability assessments.
<p>See Figure 7. For the content areas of ELA and Math, students designated Free and Reduced Lunch status had a higher group MSIP Index score over two years than students who were not designated Free and Reduced Lunch. The opposite trend has been observed in the content areas of Science and Social Studies.</p>	

MAP Index Scores for African-American and White Students by Content Area
2013-2015




Figure 6. Three-year trend of MSIP Index scores for white students and African-American students. Data include results from MAP, EOC, and MAP-A test formats.

MAP Index Scores by Free and Reduced Lunch Status
2013-2015




Figure 7. Three-year trend of MSIP Index scores for students who do and do not qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch status. Data include results from MAP, EOC, and MAP-A test formats.

What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?

Strengths

- *Student performance on the Science assessments both improved over 2014 and exceeded the statewide average (though note caveats in the text above regarding interpretation of those results).*
- *The MSIP Index for African American students compared favorably to that of white students in 2015 in the areas of ELA and Math.*
- *The MSIP Index for Free and Reduced Lunch students compared favorably to that for non-Free and Reduced Lunch students in 2015 in the areas of ELA and Math.*
- *North Technical students as a group exceeded the statewide MSIP Index in science and scored equivalent to the statewide MSIP Index in ELA.*

Opportunities/Weaknesses

- *Coinciding with the introduction of Dynamic Learning Maps, proficiency rates among students taking the Alternative MAP assessment declined sharply in 2015 in the areas of ELA and Math.*
- *Achievement levels for SSD students fell well below statewide averages in ELA, Math, and Social Studies.*
- *Large proportions of students performed in the Below Basic range in the content area of Math in 2015.*

How well aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?

Not applicable

Deployment Level of Program Services

- Little or no deployment of program services.
- The program services are in the early stages of deployment in most areas or schools.
- Services are deployed, although some areas or schools are in early stages of deployment.
- Services are well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or schools.
- Services are well deployed, with no significant gaps.
- Services are fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or schools.
- Not applicable.

Should resources be changed to improve this program?

Yes

No

If Yes, describe changes.

Not applicable

Should goals be changed, added or removed?

Yes

No

If Yes, describe changes.

The authors of this report welcome ideas from stakeholders regarding additional goals, objectives, and analyses that might further inform district improvement efforts.

Evaluation Implications

What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to budget?

This and subsequent sections pertaining to costs are not applicable, as the report does not evaluate any specific program.

Total Annual Expenditures:	\$ _____	Total Annual Budget:	\$ _____
Staff	\$ _____	Staff	\$ _____
Technology	\$ _____	Technology	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____

What are the major sources and amounts of funds?

How many customers (students) are served by this program? _____

What is this program's annual cost per customer (student)? \$ _____

Estimated Cost Effectiveness

- Mandated program; costs cannot be significantly reduced.
- Mandated program; costs could be reduced (include in Action Plan, below).
- Benefits greatly outweigh costs.
- Benefits outweigh cost, but improvement appears possible (include in Action Plan, below).
- Costs outweigh benefits (include in Action Plan, below).
- Not applicable.

General Recommendation Resulting from this Evaluation

- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Continue the program as is with specific action plans for improvement.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.
- Other: Not applicable.

Action Plans

Review of Action Plan progress since last report.

Action Plan 1 (Short-term plan)

Opportunity for Improvement

Further and more in-depth analysis of MSIP results.

Action Plan

The factors associated with each area of MSIP scoring will be analyzed to coordinate efforts to retain full accreditation. Analysis of cohort and factors related to achievement gaps will be reported in the Disaggregated Data Analysis report.

Progress on Action Plan

A more complete analysis of all MSIP scoring factors will be provided in the second disaggregated data report (as was the case in 2014-15). The value of cohort analyses is minimized given the introduction of a new state assessment in 2015 (along with the adoption of another different assessment in 2016).

Action Plan 2 (Medium-term plan)

Opportunity for Improvement

Further and more in-depth analysis of MSIP results.

Action Plan:

The Evaluation and Research department will engage in deeper analysis of factors related to student success using data mining and data analytic methods.

Progress on Action Plan

A more extensive level of analysis and visualization of data is provided in the current report (e.g., multi-year patterns of performance, a comparison of MAP-Alternative and MAP results, etc.).

Action Plan 3 (Long-term plan)

Opportunity for Improvement

Study of factors that contribute to district student achievement trends.

Action Plan Evaluation and Research will assist in gathering and analyzing strategies and interventions that best produce student learning in the attempt to develop a "Science of SSD."

Progress on Action Plan

Evaluation and Research continues to collaborate with administration and instructional leaders to investigate and understand factors that relate to programming effectiveness and student achievement.

What specific actions are needed in the next evaluation cycle?

Short-term (within the next school year)

Conduct further study of the 2015 MAP-Alternative assessment (Dynamic Learning Maps) results for the purpose of identifying trends and developing strategies for improvement.

Medium-term (1-2 years)

None

Long-term (3 years and more)

None

Notes

1. The MSIP/MAP Index calculation is based on individual student achievement level. Students are assigned an achievement score based on their achievement level for each content area test taken, as follows: Below Basic=1, Basic=3, Proficient=4, Advanced=5. Using those scores, the formula for calculating the MSIP Index for a student group, building, or district is:

$$(\text{Sum of Student Achievement Scores}/\text{Number of Students}) * 100$$

The minimum MSIP/MAP Index Score is 100, and the maximum score is 500. Note that the current MSIP5 formula essentially "penalizes" Below Basic scores. Per the MSIP 5 user guide (revised September 2015), "Assigning one (1) point to the Below Basic achievement level and three (3) points for the Basic achievement level supports Missouri's expectation of placing every child on a path towards Proficiency. The additional point spread is designed to recognize, through year-to-year improvement in the MPI, the movement of students from this least desirable achievement level." To illustrate the impact of this formula, the Index score for a group of 60 students whose scores are equally divided among the categories of Below Basic, Basic, and Proficient, would be 2.67 (not 3.0, which may seem like an intuitive "median" score for this distribution).

2. Per the Missouri DESE website, "The Dynamic Learning Maps™ (DLM) project offers an innovative way for all students with significant cognitive disabilities to demonstrate their learning throughout the school year via the DLM Alternate Assessment System. The traditional multiple choice and status collection of data in a portfolio methods of testing do not always allow students with significant cognitive disabilities to fully demonstrate their knowledge. By integrating assessment with instruction during the year and providing a year-end assessment, the DLM system maps student learning aligned with college and career readiness standards in English language arts and mathematics." Note that the DLM achievement categories of Emerging, Approaching the Target, At Target, and Advanced differ somewhat from the traditional state assessment achievement categories of Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced. Further information about DLM can be found at <http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/missouri> and <http://dese.mo.gov/college-career-readiness/assessment/map-a>.

3. Information on the process by which the Smarter Balanced assessment achievement levels were set can be found at <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/achievement-levels/>.

Appendix A

Reportable Test Score Counts

Counts by Test Type and Overall Across Three School Years

Test Type	Year	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies
EOC	2013	181	60	179	92
	2014	198	56	178	321
	2015	160	69	166	178
MAP	2013	121	119	50	n/a
	2014	150	148	68	n/a
	2015	172	171	70	n/a
MAPA	2013	251	244	133	n/a
	2014	231	240	111	n/a
	2015	241	239	119	n/a
Totals	2013	553	423	362	92
	2014	579	444	357	321
	2015	573	479	355	178

Counts by Free and Reduced Lunch Status (FRL)

	2013		2014		2015	
	FRL	Non-FRL	FRL	Non-FRL	FRL	Non-FRL
ELA	316	237	339	240	363	210
Mathematics	222	201	241	203	287	192
Science	216	146	230	127	240	115
Social Studies	60	32	236	85	129	49

Counts by Race (African-American and White)

	2013		2014		2015	
	White	AA	White	AA	White	AA
ELA	198	248	203	263	196	233
Mathematics	176	142	189	141	193	148
Science	115	194	102	214	106	191
Social Studies	28	53	37	260	30	127

Counts by School and Test Type for 2015

School	Test	Content Area			
		ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies
ACKERMAN	MAP	41	41	16	--
	MAPA	81	81	26	--
	EOC	--	--	--	--
	Total	122	122	42	--
EXTERNAL SITES	MAP	42	41	19	--
	MAPA	5	4	4	--
	EOC	11	6	6	7
	Total	58	51	29	7
NEUWOEHNER	MAP	--	--	--	--
	MAPA	15	15	15	--
	EOC	7	10	7	13
	Totals	22	25	22	13
JDC	MAP	9	9	7	
	MAPA	--	--	--	--
	EOC	17	20	1	1
	Totals	26	29	8	1
LITZSINGER	MAP	44	44	19	
	MAPA	50	50	20	
	EOC	--	--	--	--
	Totals	94	94	39	
NORTH TECHNICAL	MAP	--	--	--	--
	MAPA	--	--	--	--
	EOC	98	13	130	129
	Totals	98	13	130	129
NORTHVIEW	MAP	--	--	--	--
	MAPA	20	20	20	--
	EOC	21	15	21	27
	Totals	41	35	41	27
SOUTHVIEW ELEM	MAP	36	36	9	--
	MAPA	57	56	21	--
	EOC	--	--	--	--
	Totals	93	92	30	--
SOUTHVIEW HIGH	MAP	--	--	--	--
	MAPA	13	13	13	
	EOC	6	5	1	1
	Totals	19	18	14	1