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MR. BEIGHLEY: Good morning, everyone.

I'd like to call this meeting to order and welcome each of you to today's annual meeting of the WIAA.

As of yesterday, registration for this meeting included 521 individuals from 416 schools. It's truly great to see so many folks engaging in your association.

And I strongly encourage you to actively participate in the meeting today. All too often, many of us leave this meeting with a large number of unspoken things, unshared thoughts, or unstated opinions. This is not healthy for our association, nor is it healthy for some of the small groups that are created throughout the state. We must be able to engage in a passionate, yet respectful, discourse if we are to navigate through the issues like we have on the agenda today. Please don't leave here with things left unshared or unsaid, only to discuss them in the hallway afterwards or complain once you get home.

For those of you that don't know, my name is Mike Beighley. And in addition to being this
year's Board of Control president, I'm the superintendent of schools in the Whitehall School District.

As the vast majority of you know, each of these annual meetings is important to the oldest interscholastic athletic association in the country. This year is certainly not an exception. Unless one is living in a deep cave or under a big rock, it's hard -- not hard to see that we have challenging times on many levels. If -- if the same vision and passion that were used to create this association over a hundred years ago are used today, we will continue to demonstrate the unprecedented success that has become both an expectation and the norm.

I've had the pleasure of serving on the Board of Control for the past four years. And during that time, I've developed a much deeper understanding of the interworkings of both our association and the world of high school sports. Certainly not everything one sees is positive, but I can tell you, at least from my perspective, the good dramatically outweighs the bad. And it's not close.

I've also developed an even greater expect -- or appreciation and respect for the staff that serves us at the WIAA. I will introduce them to
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you in just a minute, but I would be remiss if I didn't commend them for the valuable and all too often unpopular work that they do every day. Whether you agree with their perspectives or like the decisions they have to make, I will tell you that what you have is a group of extremely honest and passionate folks that have nothing but the best interests of our youth today in their -- in the forefront of their thoughts each and every day. The staff has proven worthy of the responsibilities they hold time and time again. My hope is that we all can live up to the same standards today.

These times that are -- we are faced with today, like those that have undoubtedly been present in the past, require honest decisions and an unprecedented amount of communication. We cannot allow ourselves to be governed by procedural games, logistical maneuvering, or other strategies that are all too often involved in other aspects of governance. We must make our work about doing what is right, not simply doing what is popular. We have worked -- we have to work together and share the thoughts and perspectives that are necessary to our continued success.

As a sign of these times and this day,
we'll share with you in more detail in this report, just yesterday, the Board of Control suspended dues and fees for our member schools for a period of two years. This is a great example of the different thought processes that have to take place in modern society. This decision amounts to approximately $400,000 that member schools will keep in their budgets in each of the next two years. It's a significant undertaking and one that certainly we don't take lightly, but it just -- at times, difficult times call for difficult measures. Things are changing. But we also can't rush to judgments or decisions that may prove to be incorrect or damaging simply because we don't like the reality of today.

With that being said, I wish us all luck as we make our way through our work today. And I have a tremendous amount of faith that we will, indeed, have a great and successful meeting.

Before we begin our formal business, you'll notice that our meeting materials include the following. You have an annual meeting brochure. Each of you should have one of those. Your official school delegate will also have your school voting ballots. If any of you don't have those, please see the folks at the registration table in the back, and
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they'll get you what you need.

At this time, I'll also introduce you to the folks that are up here at the front table.

To my left are executive director, Dave Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. BEIGHLEY: President-Elect of the Board of Control, Corey Baumgartner.

And Treasurer, Pam Foegen.

MS. FOEGEN: Good morning.

ALL: Good morning.

MR. BEIGHLEY: To my right are Deputy Director, Wade Labecki.

DR. LABECKI: Good morning.

MR. BEIGHLEY: WIAA legal counsel, Gerald O'Brien.

MR. O'BRIEN: Morning.

MR. BEIGHLEY: And also joining us again is our parliamentarian, Dr. Chris Sadler from UW-Stevens Point.

Monica Hunkins -- Hunkins from Willette Court Reporting will also record the meeting minutes. She is down here to our right.

During the course of the open forum,
Board discussion of the proposed amendments, if you do have any written statements, please make sure that at least one copy gets brought up here so we can include it in the official record.

It's now my honor and privilege to introduce you to the Board of Control and the WIAA staff that are with us today.

In those -- addition to those already mentioned, we have Brad Ayer from Clear Lake.

If you'd stand, Brad.

(Applause.)


We also have with us our liaisons to the Board of Control, Mike Thompson from DPI and Jim McCloy from WADA. John Ashley is also one of our liaisons.


Staff with us today, I believe somewhere around the room you'll see them. Deb Hauser, Associate Director.
Where is Deb?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Out in the hallway moving chairs.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Out in the hallway moving chairs. There she is.

Tom Shafranski, Assistant Director, is here as well as is Marcy Thurwachter, Assistant Director. Todd Clark, communications director is here. Joan Gralla.

Where is Joan? There is Joan right over here.

Eric Dziak, our technology coordinator is here as well as administrative assistant, Candace Ostertag, who is Deb's assistant. Julie Kage is down here to our right. She is our administration coordinator. You also, at the registration table, probably noticed Kassie McGettigan, our ticket coordinator. Deb Lepak, administrative assistant to Tom. And Hydie Laidlaw, assistant to Wade.

So I thank all of them for coming tonight and spending -- or today and spending a day with us.

At this time, I'd like to ask also folks that are part of the Advisory Council to stand to be recognized, please. If you are part of the
Advisory Council, please stand. It's great to have so many of you here today. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Also with us are many members of our Sports Advisory Committee, if we can have them stand and be recognized, please.

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: I also have the honor of welcoming Mr. Doug Chickering, Director Emeritus of the WIAA.

Where is Doug?

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: I assume that all of you heard also, but Doug is our newest Wisconsin member of the National Federation of High School's Hall of Fame. Please join me in welcoming and congratulating Doug. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: A number of the media are also joining us. Please welcome Mark Stewart from the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel. These folks are located in the back. Nick Dettmann from West Bend Daily News, Tim Knoeck from the National Federation of High School Sports Network and his crew, Jason Cox from Eau Claire Leader-Telegram, Doug Ritchay from
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Fox 11, Rob Hernandez and Art Kaveleski (phonetic) from Madison.com, Ben Meyer from WJFW, Channel 12.

Are there any others that I missed?

Wonderful. Thank you for joining us today.

Now on to the official work of our annual meeting. In your -- you'll notice that the minutes of the 2004 annual meeting are found in the WIAA website and also in the yearbook. These 2014 minutes were approved by the Board of Control at our May meeting of 2014.

(Cell phone ringing.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: That's a good reminder. If everyone would silence your cell phones, that would be greatly appreciated. We won't call out whoever that was, but if you'd do it, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

I would now welcome to this -- or to the podium this year's Board of Control Treasurer -- Treasurer, Pam Foegen, as she shares this year's Treasurer's report.

MS. FOEGEN: Again, good morning.

If you look in your program, please, we're on page 20. Page 20, 21, and 22 show you the financials for the past year but also for the last
three years.

We have had a good year this year.

That is in -- due to the work and the fiscal responsibility that our staff have shown in working towards your benefit for the membership.

If you look again, it's been a good year. You see that our income has given us some flexibility in things, which is also what has made us look at the membership dues and fees issue that will be addressed later on today.

If you have any questions, feel free to let us know. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Would anyone like to make a motion to approve the Treasurer's report?

MR. THOMAS: Jeff Thomas from Laconia.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Jeff Thomas from Laconia. Thank you.

Second?

MR. BAGSTAD: Second. Lance Bagstad, Clintonville.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you very much.

All those in favor of approving -- approving the Treasurer's report, please say aye.

ALL: Aye.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Opposed, same sign.

(No comment.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Treasurer's report is approved.

I would now ask Joan Gralla to come forward to join us and present the most recent election report.

MS. GRALLA: Good morning, everyone.

The election report for our recent election to the Board of Control and Advisory Council.

District 2, Scott Winch, superintendent of Stratford, was elected to a three-year term.

District 5, Luke Francois, Mineral Point superintendent, was elected to a three-year term.

Gender At-Large representative, Pam Foegen, pupil services director from Regis, was reelected to another three-year term.

And the Advisory Council, Large, Roger Rindo, superintendent, Oconomowoc, elected to a three-year term.

Nicholas Been, assistant principal, River Falls, elected to a three-year term.

Medium schools. Scott Bleck,
superintendent, Weyauwega-Fremont, reelected to a three-year term.

Small schools. Patrick Olson, district administrator of Prairie Farm and Dennis Birr, superintendent of New Lisbon, both reelected to three -- to a three-year term.

Gender At-Large. Colleen Timm, district administrator of Mishicot, elected to a three-year term.

Nonpublic School At-Large. Melinda Skrade, president, Pius the 11th, elected to a three-year term.

At this time, I'd also like to make you aware that there will be a special election this fall for a medium school representative on the Advisory Council. It will be a two-year term, and it's to finish off the term of Scott Winch's.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Joan.

If any of those new folks are here, if you'd please stand, let's warm welcome to their new service.

(Appplause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: All right. As we did last year, we will now move to the open forum section
of our meeting. This is an opportunity for each of you to share thoughts you have, either specific to items that will come on the agenda or any other topics that may be part of the membership business.

If you wish to share anything, please step to one of the microphones. Please clearly state your name and your -- and the school you represent so that an accurate record may be kept. And I apologize if I interrupt you, but -- but based on some experience that we've had, we're going to make sure that -- that both the reporter and -- and Julie have your name and school. So I apologize ahead if I have to interrupt someone today. It's essential that we hear what's on your minds and in your hearts as it pertains to high school sports in our state.

The floor belongs to all of us.

MR. SLACK: Good morning, everyone.

Good morning, everyone. Terrence Slack, district administrator, School District of Wisconsin Dells.

Thank you for the opportunity for the floor, Mr. Beighley.

Recent DPI information shared at the 2015 Federal Funding Conference reveals a number of considerable shifts and challenges in Wisconsin schools systems.
In 2001, one-third of our districts were in declining enrollment.

In 2012, two-thirds of the districts in the state were in declining enrollment.

Today, 75 percent of the students in Wisconsin schools are located in just 30 percent of district statewide.

This translates into rural school districts having fewer kids and greater poverty.

Now, this spring enter a growing publicly-funded voucher program, and the aforementioned shifts and demographics are only going to widen.

Now we're likely to see schools that will accept vouchers be able to create niche market -- markets for specific athletic programs, again, leading to further competitive balance inequalities that have been historically discussed, largely ignored, with no resolve.

Today I would expect that a great deal of discussion among the membership items, it is likely evident there will remain division among the membership because of growing unrest with these issues that have gone unresolved for so long.

I want to take a few moments to applaud
the tiny in size, yet mighty in spirit, Six Rivers
Conference administrators and principals for the
calling of the question of the elephant-in-the-room
issue last year.

I am disappointed in the outcome of the
Ad Hoc Competitive Equity Committee. Strayed so very
far from the number of criteria set by the committee
in order to create change with the current divisional
placement of membership schools. The committee
failed to address rural and urban issues. The
proposal fails to be equitable as it addresses only
seven sports. It is not universally applied to all
sports.

Furthermore, the success factor will,
indeed, punish future athletes because of their
predecessor's accomplishments. And I find that
hardly equitable.

So I think it's definitely time to
consider moving past the antiquated head-count model
that has been in place for well over a hundred years.
It's time to develop some alternative members to
develop a more refined and equitable head count.

Later on in the agenda, the Minnesota
model that will be addressed does some of that. This
is but an initial step in leveling the competitive
equity field and is not construed to be a magic cure
or a magic bullet that will address all of the very
complex issues that have been discussed and again
ignored for the past ten plus years.

   It appears that, moving forward, the
membership is left to resolve these unresolved issues
among growing competitive equity issues at the annual
meetings today and in the future.

   I hope we do what's right for students
and vote down the success factor and give
consideration to a multiplier or the Minnesota model,
a step in the leveling of the playing field.

   Thank you for your time.
   
   (Applause.)

   MR. BEIGHLEY: Do you have a -- do you
have a copy of that that we could enter into the
record? Thank you.

   Yes, ma'am?

   MS. OLSON: Good morning. Linda Olson,
Freedom High School.

   I have five points I'd like to bring
forward for discussion and address these issues for
the appropriate coaches' Advisory Committees to
discuss and bring forward recommendations through the
committee process.
The first one would be baseball reduce the number of games from either -- from 26 to a suggested 22.

The second would be softball reduce the number of games from 26 to a suggested 22.

The third point would be having the baseball committee discuss starting the season one week later.

The fourth point would be softball starting the season one week later.

And the fifth point would be for the wrestling Advisory Committee to start discussing reducing the number of weight classes to 10 or 11, if not Division 1, then for Division 2 and 3.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Who's next?

MR. LUEDTKE: I am Kyle Luedtke, the district administrator of Benton School District, and I also served on the Ad Hoc Committee for equity this summer.

Benton School District will not be supporting the success factor. It does not directly address the issue at hand that we took on this summer.
When we met as a committee, we set up our guidelines. And two of the things we were concerned about was legislator involvement and legislator involvement and lawsuits. So we treated everyone equal. In treating everyone equal, we had two unequal groups to start with. When you apply something to everybody, you still have two groups that are unequal at the end of the day.

So I support either the multiplier factor coming back or the Minnesota reducer plan.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KOSEY: Hi. Ray Kosey from Superior.

I'd just like to briefly speak a little bit about the three-point shooting contest at the state tournament for baseball. We fortunately had a girl's basketball player and came out in the top two when it first was reported. She ended up being third.

We really feel her attention to that three-point shooting contest affected her team play. Her game changed. She started playing different. Wouldn't take the shots she normally would. I have a concern that --

And I -- I applaud the WIAA for trying
to do things to bring attention to the state
tournament, and I'll support them more, but I guess I
feel basketball is a team support. And when we're
doing individual things that are affecting the team
play at the end of the season, we have to be very
cautious about that.

    If we want to do a three-point shooting
contest, maybe it's better served at the Wisconsin
Basketball Coaches' Association all-star game. Bring
them in there.

    But again, I just feel it affected our
team at the end of the season because of her position
on the three-point shooting.

    Also have a little concern if that
student were to go, there's no funding for that. It
put us in some good conversations with the parents
about, would we send our coach; would we support it
financially as a school or just tell the parents,
congratulations, you have to bring your -- your
daughter down there. So I know there's no
reimbursement.

    So just want to get people thinking
about that. I truly do believe it affected our --
our season at the end of the season.

    Thank you.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SCHARBARTH: Good morning. Don Scharbarth, Lakeland-Union High School.

I would like to ask the WIAA to consider putting together an equity committee that looks at girls' high school hockey co-ops. Right now the couple stand-alone teams with enrollments of 400 to 700 are playing co-ops with enrollments of 4 to 8,000. Once we get to the state tournament series, it's not fair. So we're asking, maybe look at a two-division state tournament where the 4 to 700 schools will be playing schools of maybe 2,000 rather than the great, big, giant co-ops.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Other thoughts?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Then we will move on.

We will now continue to move on to the proposed amendments for the WIAA Constitution. Wade Labecki will outline procedures for using -- or for change -- used for changing the Constitution Bylaws and Rules of Eligibility. Provisions will be read. Rationale offered, the positions of the Sports Advisory, Advisory Council, the Executive Staff, and Board of Control are included in your meeting
materials.

More importantly, again, in past years, we're going to ask again -- again each delegate wait to be recognized and then clearly state your name and school prior to speaking.

All votes will be in writing on the color-coded ballots that each of you have.

In addition to the amendments -- if we have amendments offered from the floor, in your packets, you have additional ballots. I believe there are four of them. The first one is golden rod, and the others are labeled A, B, and C. If we need additional ones after that, I'm sure we can come up with something.

Delegates have been appointed to serve as ballot collectors. And they, with the help of the WIAA staff, will conduct the vote count. This year's ballot collectors are Brian Miller from Ashland, Lee Ann Kitchell from D.C. Everest, Joe Eisenhuth from Eau Claire North, Mike Stock from Green Bay NEW Lutheran, Dave Haugen from Abundant Life Christian, Melissa Gehring from Beaver Dam, and Sara Unertl from Franklin.

Before Dr. Labecki begins, I'd like to admit that I'm certainly not an expert in
parliamentarian procedure. So please don't be
offended and, honestly, please don't think less of me
if I just walk down to Dr. Sadler and ask him to
handle this. Okay? We want to make sure that
procedural issues do not come into play in the
important business that comes with us today. I truly
hope we don't get wrapped up in those gamesmanship
type things to circumvent discussion and -- and
reality. Let's talk about what we need to talk about
and do what we need to do for the kids of this state
of Wisconsin.

    Thank you.
    Dr. Labecki?

DR. LABECKI: Good morning.

    I would refer you to page 5. And on
page 5, you'll see the committee organization
structure that we have for our association.

    Remember, there are three types of
rules.

    The first set of rules are NFHS playing
rules that govern our sports. We have input on
those, but those are determined at the national
level.

    We have season regulations that are
determined by the committee process. And ultimately,
the Board of Control has the final say on those. And that's what Linda was referring to.

Today we are going to discuss the Constitution Bylaws and Rules of Eligibility. Those are determined by the votes here today by the membership.

Also on page 5 you'll see our procedures that we are going to use today. First, we start with Robert's Rules of Order, and Dr. Sadler will be our expert on that.

The authority of the Const -- or the authority of this meeting here is given to you by the WIAA Constitution and the Board of Control. You were notified via e-mail of this meeting 40 days before it was to occur.

Today we will have ten amendments plus editorials. And all motions should be in the affirmative. If a motion is seconded and recognized by the Chair, then it will be discussed, and the -- the -- the Chair will recognize you for your discussion. The debate on the floor will be established by the Chair and can be terminated by the Chair.

Resolutions brought to you today are brought to you in four different ways.
One is first, the Advisory Council.

Second, the Board of Control.

Third, it can be brought here by the membership with a vote of 50 percent. If a -- if a petition is brought here today, it would be voted on. If it receives 51 percent, we would bring it back next year; it will not go into effect this year.

And then finally by petition when we have 10 percent of our members. And as we are aware, we have one of those, No. 3.

All votes will be on the written ballot. Mike will tell you the color. And then we will pass those over. And then our ballot counters will go to those.

So turning to page 6, the first amendment is a Constitutional item. This was brought forth through the committee process. And this change would require that a member school maintain at least one stand-alone sport.

When you see the amendments, the shaded areas are new text. If you see a line struck through them, then those are removal of text.

This amendment -- this amendment came through the membership through the Sports Advisory and was advanced through the annual meeting 14 to
nothing, and it was supported by the Sports Advisory Council. The Advisory Council also discussed it. It was advanced 14 to nothing and also supported unanimously. The Board of Control discussed it. It was advanced 11 to nothing and the support was 11 to nothing.

Over the last week, as people have reviewed this amendment, some concerns have been brought forward about some of our member schools who only co-op and they do not have a stand-alone program. Because of those concerns, the discussion with the Board of Control and among the staff is that we would entertain a motion to postpone this amendment and not to bring it forward.

MR. BEIGHLEY: So, again, the suggestion from all of us, quite frankly, is to postpone this amendment at this time.

Is there a motion anyone would be willing to make?

Please -- go ahead. Please step to the microphone, though, if you would. I -- I know that's going to be troublesome a little bit, but we're going to have to make sure we get it. Okay? Thank you.

MR. WALSH: Ron Walsh, Elk Mound.

I move as suggested.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay.

MR. NETT: Dan Nett.

And I -- I appreciate the WIAA's new view on this. Directly impacts rural schools. And thank you. So I second the motion.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

I have a motion and a second.

Is there any other discussion on this item?

MR. KNUDSON: Mr. Beighley or Dave or Wade, just a piece of clarification.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kevin, hold on. We know who you are, but please tell --

MR. KNUDSON: Kevin Knudson, Barneveld.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

MR. KNUDSON: Just maybe going backwards, a little clarification on the process that's going to be taking place here today.

Under old business of the multiplier that we're going to bring forward, could someone explain to us how this is going to work under old business? Will we do the new business first and then bring -- we have a chance to bring back old business; is that correct?

MR. BEIGHLEY: When we get to --
MR. KNUDSON: So people understand.

MR. BEIGHLEY: When we get to that issue, we will explain that, Kevin, absolutely. We're -- right now we're just dealing with Item No. 1. Okay?

MR. KNUDSON: I understand that. I just want to make sure people knew that that's going to --

MR. BEIGHLEY: That will be next on our agenda. We'll -- we'll make sure everybody understands where we're going.

MR. KNUDSON: Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

So we have a motion and a second. We will use the green ballot. It will be Constitution No. 1.

Do we need to change that then?

Okay. All right. So a motion has been made and seconded to postpone this amendment. The yes vote would mean we would postpone. Okay?

The green ballot. If you would, mark your ballot and then hand them to the center aisle. I've just been notified, if this were to fail, then we would have to vote on the original motion.
While you're collecting votes, we'll move on to No. 2.

DR. LABECKI: Okay. We are going to move on to No. 2. No. 2 is on page 7 of your pamphlet. It deals with the classification of schools for divisional placement. And this change would add a success factor to determine the divisional placement of the member schools for competition, including the tournaments of the WIAA, where necessary.

So under Article 3, Membership, Section 3, Classification, on page 15 of your senior high handbook, the shaded areas would be added.

In paragraph A with exceptions as noted below, paragraph 1 would then be added, that "Beginning in 2016/'17 school year, for competition (including tournaments, where necessary), a success factor will be calculated to determine divisional placements for the sports of soccer, volleyball, basketball, softball, and baseball. Placement in divisions will first utilize the success factor. The success factor will be defined in the Season Regulations for Tournament Assignment and will be utilized where appropriate in advance of enrollment placement considerations."
And then the existing paragraphs would be renumbered two, three, four, and five.

You'll note down below that this was advanced to the annual meeting by the Sports Advisory 11 to 3. Advisory Council, 14 to nothing. And the Board of Control, 10 to 1. The Board of Control elected to have no position.

This year we've added in the rationale so you can see what the rationale of the Board of Control is. That is that the Competitive Equity Committee came about as a result of the action at the annual meeting, 2014. The committee conducted a broad and thorough review of various options considered in other states and, after seven months of work and deliberation, advanced this amendment.

On the following page, on page 8, you see an example in baseball of how the success factor would be applied. So that entire paragraph A would be added to the sections for those seven sports. In addition, in paragraph B, paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 would be added. So that is an example.

Hopefully you've had time to look at that. We've had that on the website for the last three months, and it was e-mailed to you three months -- or 40 days ago. So hopefully you've had a
chance to look at that.

To answer Kevin's question, first, we would need a motion on this amendment and a second on this amendment to bring it to the floor for discussion. If someone wanted to go ahead and bring another amendment or last year's proposal, that would be -- would have to be brought forward as an amendment -- amendment to this. Okay?

So you would have to go ahead, Kevin, and strike this, bring forward the language that you want, and then you would have to have a second. That would then be voted on as an amendment to replace this. Okay? And there would be a discussion after the second before it would be voted on.

Also keep in mind that you can amend the amendment. Now it gets confusing at that point, so we will have Dr. Sadler earn his paycheck. But you can have an amendment to the amendment. Okay?

There will always be discussion before the vote.

If an amendment is proposed and it fails, we come back to this proposal, discuss it, and then we would vote on this. Hopefully that's clear. Okay?

But first, we need a motion on this to
bring it to the floor and a second. We would have
discussion. And then if somebody were to propose an
amendment, then we would follow the same process on
the amendment.

Eventually we will get to a vote.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Is there a motion
for this Item No. 2?

MR. FRIZZELL: John Frizzell, Chippewa
Falls, move to approve.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

MR. KNUDSON: Kevin Knudson, Barneveld.

Second.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Motion and a
second.

Discussion?

MR. KULLAND: Lee Kulland,
superintendent at Cassville.

And I would like to amend the success
factor and replace it with the multiplier from last
year's annual meeting. We feel that our needs were
not met from the rural areas, so I'm asking that we
can amend this amendment.

MR. BEIGHLEY: We're going to need more
specific information. Do we have a copy of last
year's -- wonderful. It's almost like that was ready
to go, wasn't it?

Okay. So, Wade, do you -- do you want me to just read this?

DR. LABECKI: First, we'll need specifics. We'll need to strike the language that was proposed.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. So we would need to strike the language that was proposed and -- and get a second on that. Okay?

MR. KULLAND: I make an amendment to strike what is proposed and replace it with the multiplier from last year's annual meeting that was --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. I'm going to read the gray section out loud. So it would be Item No. 2, Section 3 -- or Article 3, Section 3A, sub 2, for Nonpublic Schools. "The previous year's enrollment on the third Friday in September would be multiplied by 1.65."

And that would need a second to be moved forward.


MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We have a motion and a second.
Now we can discuss. Only the amendment is what would be discussed now. That's what's on the table.

MR. HAVEL: Paul Havel, St. John's Northwestern Military Academy.

Is this the time to make an amendment to the amendment, sir?

MR. BEIGHLEY: It is.

MR. HAVEL: It is? I would like to make an amendment to the amendment that the 1.65 multiplier not be applied to single gender schools who already have their enrollment doubled.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay.

MR. HAVEL: Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: That would require a second as well.

Yep. Let's leave the mikes on.

MR. MCCABE: Phil McCabe of Saint Lawrence Seminary. I second the motion.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We have a motion and a second.

Now we'll take discussion simply on that amendment.

Did I mention I'm not a parliamentary procedure expert here?
Motion -- or we have discussion on that motion alone -- or on that amendment alone. The multiplier, as stated, would not apply to single gender schools is what this amendment is.

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Hearing no discussion, we will use the bright pink ballot at the end of your packet labeled A. Okay?

So this would be specific to the amendment to not apply the multiplier to single gender schools.

And we have to pause while this vote is taken before we can move forward. Okay?

Okay. While we're collecting ballots, I will take you back to Constitutional Item No. 1 to postpone Item No. 1. That motion was supported 399 to 32. So that amendment has been postponed.

All right. We have the results of the second amendment to not apply the multiplier to single gender schools. That amendment was approved 271 to 161.

So what we are now talking about is the amendment to strike the language on the success factor and replace it with the language from the annual meeting last year of a multiplier being
applied to nonpublic schools of 1.65 with the
exception of single gender schools who will remain at
2.0. Okay?

Okay. We'll have further discussion at
this point on this amendment only.

MR. KNUDSON: Kevin Knudson, Barneveld.

I'd like to call the question.

DR. SADLER: Robert's Rules is very
clear. A call of a question motion is actually only
a suggestion to the Chair to move things along. If
somebody moves the previous question, that is a
motion that needs a second. If that receives a
second, you then take a vote. No more debate.

Two-thirds of this group would have to say yes. If
you moved the previous question, ending debate,
two-thirds of you agreed, there would be absolutely
no more discussion on the amendment that is before
you. Is that clear?

It basically ends debate, but it
requires the super majority because Robert's Rules
wants to make sure that everybody who wants to speak
to a motion on the floor has that opportunity to do
so.

MR. BEIGHLEY: All right. While I
appreciate your suggestion, we will have discussion.
MR. FLOOD: Tim Flood, Green Bay East.  
My question is, how does this vote affect the next -- the -- the -- the free and reduced lunch vote? I mean, is that -- if this one passes, do we not vote on the next one? How does that all work?

MR. BEIGHLEY: No. They are completely separate.

MR. FLOOD: Okay.

MR. BEIGHLEY: So if this passes, then we take up the next item on the agenda. And if that passes, it goes into play as well.

If this fails, we go back to the success factor original proposed amendment. And again, the same would apply.

Discussion on the amendment to strike the success factor and apply the 1.65?

MR. SMITH: Brian Smith, Waunakee.

Quick question. Does this start this spring or next -- would this start next fall?

MR. BEIGHLEY: Fall.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KNUTSON: Ted Knutson, Aquinas High School.

I just ask everybody to -- to think
about this. The -- the multiplier applied to all
private schools and all programs just isn't right, 
nor is it fair. And if there's issues that need to 
be discussed, if there's reducer plans that need to 
be looked at, success factors, but as it is, a 
multiplier for all schools, all privates, all 
programs is just not right. And to ignore open 
enrollment isn't right either.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ted.

Yes, sir? In the back.

MR. BIEBEL: Good. My name is Bob 
Biebel. I'm representing Lourdes Academy.

At this point, to call the multiplier, 
especially the 1.65, I think is not the right thing 
to do. There has been no study on this. We are 
finding Illinois principles, which have proven not to 
work. There are other multipliers out there. There 
are other things going on across the country. So to 
make a blanket statement on 1.65, why multipliers 
exist, without a healthy discussion on this --

Even going to the Missouri 1.35, that 
was basically set up because there are two major 
cities. Kansas City and St. Louis are border cities, 
which you have a lot of athletes going over.

There is a lot of discussion that needs
to be made. And if we are going to make a decision
that affects student athletes, regardless if they are
private or public, I think it is our responsibility
as administrators, as educators, to thoroughly debate
that topic and make the best decision possible.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Other discussion?

MR. COFFMAN: Nat Coffman from The
Prairie School.

If the goal of this whole amendment is
to treat -- is to create equity, to be equal for all
students, treating some students as more than others
is fundamentally unfair. A student is a student.
Every student in this state has the opportunity to
attend public or parochial or independent schools
through the choice programs, through open enrollment.
And treating them differently is the exact opposite.
If our goal is equity, it's the exact opposite of
that.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KULLAND: Lee Kulland, Cassville.
I've been in four different states.
Wisconsin is my last part because I am retiring at
the end of the year. But in every state, we've had
this issue. And it's not particularly fair to the rural areas. Maybe it is a rural versus urban situation, but it -- it is a problem. And I don't see how you can necessarily say everything has to be fair because there is a very good article in the paper about the difference between Mineral Point and Dominican, 965,000 compared to 16,000 in the whole county. That is why the 1.65 multiplier at least is a good discussion point.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. TARRELL: Josh Tarrell, Highland Schools, principal.

I believe the multiplier is the avenue that we need to take. It was brought up earlier about, we need lengthy discussion on this. We had a year of discussion since last year at this very meeting, and they came out with the success factor from the Ad Hoc Committee that's just not fair. That's not right to punish people or programs that are successful. I believe we need to add the multiplier, put it to a vote. And if there's changes that need to be made after that, so be it. But to stay where we're at now and have the competition the way it is today is not fair. It's not fair between public and private schools. We've seen that. We saw
that when you look at the statistics and you look at the success factor. At state tournaments, it's not fair. So to say that we need to go back and have more discussion, we've had enough discussion. It's been there for a year. It's time to vote.

I'm in favor of the multiplier.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

MR. BIEBEL: Bob Biebel again.

I don't know if I'm allowed to speak, but in regards to the rural/urban factor, my feeling is that the committee erred in not looking at the Florida model because the Florida model distinctly addresses that situation. There are models out there that give credence to that difference.

And if you look at the Panhandle of Florida and how they are -- have to compete against the big counties of Miami/Dade and Broward County, they have a distinct plan on there.

I think they're all -- there are alternatives to this, if we give it good thought and true discussion. And that, to me, is why to just come out and say --

Most of you probably are not aware of the Florida plan. You're probably not aware of the
Belhanda (phonetic) plan in Pennsylvania. There are alternatives to multipliers which create better competitive equity.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Other discussion?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We will use the bright yellow labeled B to vote on this amendment, which would strike the success factor language and substitute that with the 1.65 multiplier. And that -- that provision would not be applied to single gender schools that already have an enrollment multiplier of 2.0.

And again, we will pause to see the outcome of this vote before we move forward.

Folks, if you want to stand up and stretch for a minute, it's going to be, I'm sure, a couple minutes before get the results back.

That was about -- that was about a minute and a half quicker than I thought you'd all get back to your seats, so I apologize for that. I'll take that under advisement if we do this again so -- we just don't quite have the results yet.

Okay. That amendment was approved, 231
to 202. That is now the main motion. Okay? So the main motion would be --

    MR. RAVIZZA: Point of order. Point of order. Could you repeat the -- the tally on the votes?

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Supporting the motion, 231. Denying the motion -- or the amendment -- excuse me -- 202.

    MR. RAVIZZA: Then I would request a roll call vote on -- on that election.

    I just -- I think it's important for us just to step back here. This is extremely important votes that are going on. And to change the entire system, okay, of sports in the state based on an amendment, I think -- I think something -- something is quite -- quite wrong here. Okay? And I think we -- we're all smart people. Okay? We all care, and we're passionate about our work. But I think the way that this is proceeding -- okay. I care a lot about this state. Okay? I don't think this is -- this is what we have in mind. We all represent a lot of constituents. And I'm not sure this represents the best of the state of Wisconsin as far as the debate and the discussion. And so I'm concerned about where this is going. I also think it's
important that schools go on record. Okay? I think this system of voting that we're using I think is questionable and somewhat flawed. And when you have an election that's extremely close, I think it's important that schools go on record and so we know who's voting and who's voting and in the favor.

MR. BEIGHLEY: So you're making a motion for a roll call vote?

MR. RAVIZZA: Yes. John Ravizza, principal of Notre Dame Academy in Green Bay.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. So a single person may ask for a roll call vote, I'm being -- being suggested to, and we will take it. We have talked a little bit about the protocol for this, and I'll let Wade explain it.

DR. LABECKI: I have a list of schools. When I read off the name of that school, I will ask you for a yes or a no.

MR. CHAMBERS: Doesn't that motion have to be seconded?

DR. LABECKI: No. One member may request a roll call vote, and then we have to do that.

I will call off the name of the school. You will say yes in support of this amendment or no
that you do not. If the school that I call off is not present, then we will move on to the next school on that list.

MR. BEIGHLEY: All right. If we are ready to go -- again, as Wade said, we'll read off the name of the school.

MR. WALSH: Is there room for discussion before that?

MR. BEIGHLEY: We are not allowed under Robert's Rules of Order.

MR. WALSH: How about a point of order? I can understand where you'd have a roll call vote requested before a vote, but the vote was taken. There was an outcome to the vote. There's a very good chance that now a roll call vote, you're going to get a whole different outcome to the -- to the vote. So is it true that it has to be voted on, or is that before a vote that it -- that that -- that's the method of voting?

DR. SADLER: A single person can ask for a roll call vote either on the amendment or once the main motion is voted on. It could actually happen twice. So a single person in a body this size can say they want people to go on record for voting yes or no. And so right now you need to take the
vote because the request was made.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you want to explain that in the microphone so we can all hear that?

DR. SADLER: Again, Robert's Rules wants to make sure that public meetings like this -- everybody is informed about the votes and the discussion on each side of an issue. When a person asks for a roll call vote -- a single person can ask for that vote to be taken. It's especially common when you hear yays and nays by voice vote and then people are asked to stand or raise their hands yes or no. This person requested a school-by-school, which is within their prerogative. Again, it does not require a second. I just checked the Robert's Rules Bible, and it does not require a second. So we need to proceed, not debatable. Need to proceed with a roll call vote on the amendment, as requested.

MR. HARNISCH: My point of order is that this is voting to amend the original motion. We will still then vote on the motion which at that point will be the multiplier, should this pass?

DR. SADLER: Yeah. Actually, the amendment did pass. This is -- this -- the multiplier passed. So this is simply a roll call
vote on that. And then that becomes the main motion, still open to debate and further changes.

    MR. HARNISCH: But what I'm -- what I'm asking is that the multiplier is not right now in the Constitution. That will -- that is our next vote? That's our subsequent vote?

    DR. SADLER: That is our next vote, correct.

    MR. BEIGHLEY: So everybody -- everybody understands, this -- this roll call vote is on the amendment only.

    MR. SOBRILSKY: Tyler Sobrilsky, Brookfield Central.

    Mike?

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes?

    MR. SOBRILSKY: So, again, I'm -- we -- the amendment to the amendment that we just did the paper ballot on passed? We're not voting on that again? Or we are?

    MR. BEIGHLEY: We are voting on that again based on the request for the roll call vote after the fact, yes.

    MR. SOBRILSKY: That just does not seem right. We've already voted on that.

    DR. SADLER: Actually, no. Because
what you've done is, you brought in the multiplier. That then becomes the main motion that is still open to further debate and further change. Again, wanting to make sure that everybody has a chance to vote what they want to on the vote.

MR. SOBRILSKY: I understand that the main motion, if it is the multiplier now where we'd have a roll call vote, that I -- I understand that. But I don't understand after the fact going back and having to roll call vote on something we already voted on.

DR. SADLER: That's actually how it works. Because you take the vote -- and right now it is not a public vote. It was basically requested that people's yes or no votes become public. Again, that is allowed by Robert's Rules and at the single -- at the request of a single member.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Everybody understands where we're headed? This is on -- this is a roll call vote on the amendment to strike the mult -- or the success factor language and replace with the multiplier. Please stand and give a yes or a no when we call your school's name.

MR. CURRAN: Point of order. They've got to state their name and school district?
MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes. We're going to ask you to state your name and your school district and your yes or no.

Everybody understand?

All right. Here we go.

Abbotsford?

MR. WELSH: No. Reed Welsh, superintendent, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Abundant Life Christian?

MR. HAUGEN: David Haugen, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Please stand, though.

MR. HAUGEN: David Haugen, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Adams-Friendship?

MR. GROSHEK: Shawn Groshek, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Albany?

MR. DOESCHER: Derik Doescher, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Algoma?

MR. ROBERTSON: Dave Robertson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Alma?

MR. GRISSEN: Larry Grisen, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Almond-Bancroft?

MR. BRADLEY: Andrew Bradley, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Altoona?

MR. HAYDEN: Scott Hayden, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Amery?

MS. CHAPEK: Renee Chapek, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Amherst?

MS. HUSTON: Pam Huston, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Antigo?

MR. ZAMZOW: Tom Zamzow (phonetic), yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Appleton East?

MR. ZACHOW: Tim Zachow, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Appleton North?

MR. HERRLING: Kevin Herrling, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Appleton West?

MR. MCCLOWRY: Jim McClowry, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Aquinas?

MR. KNUTSON: Ted Knutson, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Arcadia?

MR. SCHWEISTHAL: Bruce Schweisthal, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Argyle?

MR. ERICKSON: Travis Erickson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Arrowhead?

MR. FLEGNER: Kevin Flegner, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Ashland?

MR. MILLER: Brian Miller, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Ashwaubenon?
MR. SINGER: Nick Senger, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Assumption?

MR. BIRKHAUSER: Joe Birkhauser, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Athens?

MS. GAUERKE: Juli Gauerke, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Atlas Preparatory?

Auburndale?

MR. ENGEL: Aaron Engel, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Augusta?

MR. ANDERSON: Ron Anderson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Badger?

MR. KLUGE: Jim Kluge, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Baldwin-Woodville?

MR. SELL: Jason Sell, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Bangor?

MR. CHAPLIN: Josh Chaplin, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Baraboo?

MR. LANGKAMP: Jim Langkamp, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Barneveld?

MR. KNUDSON: Kevin Knudson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Barron?

MR. BAUMGARD: Ky Baumgard, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Bay Port?

MR. CHAMBERS: Otis Chambers, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Bayfield?
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1  Beaver Dam?

2  MS. GEHRING: Melissa Gehring, yes.

3  MR. BEIGHLEY: Belleville?

4  Belmont?

5  MR. MICHALKIEWICZ: David Michalkiewicz, yes.

6  MR. BEIGHLEY: Beloit Memorial?

7  MR. SEILS: Chuck Seils, no.

8  MR. BEIGHLEY: Benton?

9  MR. DROESSLER: Jeff Droesler, yes.

10 MR. BEIGHLEY: Berlin?

11 MR. BRANDL: Joe Brandl, yes.

12 MR. BEIGHLEY: Big Foot?

13 MR. COLLINS: Tim Collins, yes.

14 MR. BEIGHLEY: Birchwood?

15 MR. SENN: Blane Senn, yes.

16 MR. BEIGHLEY: Black Hawk?

17 MR. MILTZ: Corey Miltz, yes.

18 MR. BEIGHLEY: Black River Falls?

19 MR. RUFISHOLM: Jim Rufsholm, yes.

20 MR. BEIGHLEY: Blair-Taylor?

21 MR. STORLIE: Randy Storlie, yes.

22 MR. BEIGHLEY: Bloomer?


24 MR. BEIGHLEY: Bonduel?
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1 Boscobel?
2 MR. MARTIN:  Joey Martin, yes.
3 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Bowler?
4 MR. DEPERRY:  Jeff DePerry, yes.
5 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Boyceville?
6 MR. ROEMHILD:  Brian Roemhild, yes.
7 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Brillion?
8 MR. SCHLENDER:  Jeff Schlender, no.
9 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Brodhead?
10 MR. KAMMERER:  Brian Kammerer, yes.
11 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Brookfield Academy?
12 MR. KAHLE:  Jon Kahle, no.
13 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Brookfield Central?
14 MR. SOBRILSKY:  Todd Sobrilsky, yes.
15 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Brookfield East?
16 MR. MARTIN:  Jeremy Martin, no.
17 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Brookwood?
18 MR. CLINTON:  Ken Clinton, yes.
19 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Brown Deer?
20 MR. NOVAK:  Mike Novak, no.
21 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Bruce?
22 MS. WEINERT:  Joni Weinert, no.
23 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Burlington?
24 MR. PLITZUWEIT:  Eric Plitzuweit, no.
25 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Butternut?
Cadott?

MR. SEKEL: James Sekel, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Cambria-Friesland?

MR. QUADE: Stu Quade, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Cambridge?

MR. NIKOLAY: Bernie Nikolay, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Cameron?

MR. GERBER: Dave Gerber, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Campbellsport?

MR. GRIESEMER: Tom Griesemer, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Carmen High School of Science & Tech?

MR. BORRESEN: Erik Borresen, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Cashton?

MR. FRIEBERG: Bill Frieberg, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Cassville?

MR. KULAND: Lee Kulland, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Catholic Central?

MR. ALDRICH: Tom Aldrich, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Catholic Memorial?

MR. GAMALSKI: Greg Gamalski, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Cedar Grove-Belgium?

MR. MAYER: Brad Mayer, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Cedarburg?

MR. PENETEK: Dave Pentek, no.
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1. MR. BEIGHLEY: Central Wisconsin Christian?

2. MR. VANDER WERFF: Mark Vander Werff, no.

3. MR. BEIGHLEY: CEO Leadership Academy? Chequamegon?

4. MR. PATTERSON: Daren Patterson, yes.

5. MR. BEIGHLEY: Chetek-Weyerhaeuser? Chilton?

6. MR. BEHNKE: Corey Behnke (phonetic), no.

7. MR. BEIGHLEY: Chippewa Falls?

8. MR. FRIZZELL: John Frizzell, no.

9. MR. BEIGHLEY: Clayton?

10. MR. SCHRADLE: Mike Schradle, yes.

11. MR. BEIGHLEY: Clear Lake?

12. MR. ROSEN: Dale Rosen, no.

13. MR. BEIGHLEY: Clinton?


15. MR. BEIGHLEY: Clintonville?


17. MR. BEIGHLEY: Cochrane-Fountain City? Colby?

18. MR. HAGEN: Jim Hagen, no.

19. MR. BEIGHLEY: Coleman?
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1  MR. BRONSON:  Jeff Bronson, yes.
2  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Colfax?
3  MR. YINGST:  Bill Yingst, yes.
4  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Columbus?
5  MS. SCHUMACHER:  Terri Schumacher, yes.
6  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Columbus Catholic?
7  MR. KONIECNZY:  Joe Koniecnzy, no.
8  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Cornell?
9  MR. SONNENTAG:  Greg Sonnentag, yes.
10  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Cornerstone Christian Academy?
11
12  Crandon?
13  Crivitz?
14  MR. MANS:  Pat Mans, no.
15  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Cuba City?
16  MR. PUSTINA:  Jeff Pustina, yes.
17  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Cudahy?
18  MR. HEMPHILL:  Clayton Hemphill, no.
19  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Cumberland?
20  MR. FULLER:  Mark Fuller, no.
21  MR. BEIGHLEY:  D.C. Everest?
22  MS. KITCHELL:  Lee Ann Kitchell, no.
23  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Darlington?
24  MR. COHEN:  Kurt Cohen, yes.
25  MR. BEIGHLEY:  De Pere?
MR. BYCZEK: Jeff Byczek, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: De Soto?

MR. KING: Scott King, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Deerfield?

MR. POLZIN: John Polzin, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: DeForest?

MR. MCHUGH: Mike McHugh, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Delavan-Darien?

MR. JOHNSON: Hank Johnson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Denmark?

MR. MILLER: Bill Miller, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Destiny?

Oh. Go back to Denmark. We missed your name.

MR. MILLER: Bill Miller.

MR. BEIGHLEY: And Bill Miller, yes; correct?

Destiny?

Divine Savior Holy Angels?

MS. BRAUN: Peggy Braun, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Dodgeland?

MS. MODAFF: Marcia Modaff, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Dodgeville?

MR. TOLZMAN: Scott Tolzman, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Dominican?
MR. GRADY:  Joe Grady, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Drummond?

MR. PIEHL:  Aaron Piehl, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Durand?

MR. TERPSTRA:  Barry Terpstra, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  East Troy?

MR. STOCKOWITZ:  John Stockowitz, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Eastbrook Academy?

MS. BUDNOWSKI:  Marty Budnowski, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Eau Claire Immanuel Lutheran?

MR. GULLERUD:  Joel Gullerud, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Eau Claire Memorial?

MR. KOHLHEPP:  Trevor Kohlhepp, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Eau Claire North?

MR. EISENHUTH:  Joe Eisenhuth, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Edgar?

MR. SINZ:  Jordan Sinz, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Edgerton?

MR. LODAHL:  Craig Lodahl, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Edgewood High School?

MR. ZWETTLER:  Chris Zwettler, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Elcho?

MR. SHARPE:  Brandon Sharpe, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Eleva-Strum?
MR. KULIG: Cory Kulig, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Elk Mound?

MR. WALSH: Ron Walsh, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Elkhart Lake-Glenbeulah?

MR. BROWN: Jim Brown, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Elkhorn Area?

Ellsworth?

MS. ANDERSON: Ann Anderson, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: You have -- sorry. You have to go a little louder.

MS. ANDERSON: Ann Anderson, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Elmwood?

MR. BIRTZER: Mike Birtzer, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Evansville?

MR. CASHORE: Brian Cashore, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Faith Christian?

MS. PECOR: Karen Pecor, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Faith Christian Academy?

Fall Creek?

MR. STORLIE: Rick Storlie, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Fall River?

MR. DOCTER: Jim Docter, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Fennimore?

MR. PROCHASKA: Jim Prochaska, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Flambeau?
Florence?
MR. UREN:  Jim Uren, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Fond du Lac?
MR. DEERING:  Kevin Deering, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Fort Atkinson?
MR. BOYER:  Josh Boyer, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Fox Valley Lutheran?
MR. HILL:  Shawn Hill, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Franklin?
MS. UNERTL:  Sara Unertl, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Frederic?
MR. WINK:  Troy Wink, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Freedom?
MS. OLSON:  Linda Olson, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY:
Gale-Ettrick-Trempealeau?
MR. WAGNER:  Mark Wagner, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Germantown?
Gibraltar?
MS. TANCK:  Peggy Tanck, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Gillett?
MR. KACZMAREK:  Mike Kaczmarek, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Gilman?
MR. PHELPS:  Brian Phelps, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Gilmanton?
MR. POZARSKI: Todd Pozarski, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Glenwood City?

MR. GRETZLOCK: Patrick Gretzlock, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Goodman?

Grafton?

MR. PARSONS: Scott Parsons, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Granton?

Grantsburg?

Green Bay East?

MR. FLOOD: Tim Flood, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Green Bay NEW Lutheran?

MR. STOCK: Mike Stock, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Green Bay Preble?

MR. RETZKI: Dan Retzki, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Green Bay Southwest?

MR. MATZ: Brian Matz, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Green Bay West?

MR. MURNANE: Josh Murnane, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Green Lake?

Greendale?

MR. POLLEX: Mark Pollex, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Greenfield?

MR. LAUER: Trent Lauer, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Greenwood?

MS. MAYENSCHEIN: Jenni Mayenschein,
yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Gresham Community?

MR. ZOBECK:  Jeff Zobeck, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Hamilton?

MR. GOSZ:  Mike Gosz, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Hartford Union?

MS. STOlobber:  Jill Stobber, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Hayward?

Heritage Christian?

MR. BLACKMORE:  Thom Blackmore, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Highland?

MR. TURTLE:  Josh Turtle (phonetic),

yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Hilbert?

MR. SWEERE:  Tony Sweere, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Hillsboro?

MR. ZIMMERMAN:  Greg Zimmerman, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Holmen?

MR. ENGLERTH:  Mark Englerth, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Homestead?

MR. MANGAN:  Ryan Mangan, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Hope Christian?

MR. BIESTERFELD:  Chad Biesterfeld, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Horicon?

Hortonville?
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2. MR. BEIGHLEY: Was that a yes?
3. MR. TIMM: Yes.
4. MR. BEIGHLEY: Sorry. We had coughing up here. So I apologize.
   Howards Grove?
6. MR. SCHMID: David Schmid, no.
7. MR. BEIGHLEY: Hudson?
8. MS. DEVOS: Steph DeVos, yes.
9. MR. BEIGHLEY: Hurley?
10. MR. KOLPIN: Dean Kolpin, yes.
11. MR. BEIGHLEY: Hustisford?
12. MR. FALKENTHAL: Glen Falkenthal, no.
13. MR. BEIGHLEY: Independence?
15. MR. BEIGHLEY: Iola-Scandinavia?
16. MR. KOBS: Walt Kobs, yes.
17. MR. BEIGHLEY: Iowa-Grant?
18. MR. GOTTO: Chris Gotto, yes.
19. MR. BEIGHLEY: Ithaca?
20. Janesville Craig?
21. Janesville Parker?
22. Jefferson?
23. MR. WILHARM: Dan Wilharm, yes.
24. MR. BEIGHLEY: Johnson Creek?
MR. VOGEL: Cale Vogel, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Juda?

MS. DAVIS: Traci Davis, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kaukauna?

MR. SCHLEIS: Kyle Schleis, yes.

Kenosha Bradford?

MR. SULKO: Adam Sulko, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kenosha Christian Life?

MR. POWELL: Steve Powell, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kenosha Indian Trail?

MR. CORBETT: Eric Corbett, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kenosha Reuther —

Reuther? Sorry.

Kenosha St. Joseph?

MR. WITTHUN: David Witthun, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kenosha Tremper?

MR. KNECHT: Steve Knecht, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kettle Moraine?

MR. FINK: Mike Fink, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kettle Moraine Lutheran?

MR. COLLYARD: Len Collyard, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kewaskum?

MR. PITTMANN: Jason Pittmann, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Kewaunee?

MR. ROETS: Nate Roets, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Kickapoo?
Kiel?
MR. GEIGEL: Pat Geigel, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Kimberly?
MR. MCGINNIS: Ryan McGinnis, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Kohler?
MR. BOCCHINNI: Doug Bocchinni, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: La Crosse Central?
MR. BERAN: Joe Beran, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: La Crosse Logan?
MR. HOLE: Steve Hole, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: La Farge?
Lac Courte Oreilles?
Laconia?
Ladysmith? Oh, I'm sorry.
MR. THOMAS: Jeff Thomas.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Jeff Thomas. I'm sorry.
What was the vote?
MR. THOMAS: Yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes?
Ladysmith?
MR. VOLLENDORF: Rick Vollendorf, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Lake Country Lutheran?
MS. BAHR: Janet Bahr, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Lake Holcombe?
MS. MILLER: Cindy Miller, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lake Mills?

MR. SANDERS: Dean Sanders, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lakeland?

MR. SCHARBARTH: Don Scharbarth, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lakeland Lutheran -- or Lakeside Lutheran? I'm sorry.

Lancaster?

Oh. Sorry. No?

MR. HAHN: Gerald Hahn, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: I apologize for messing up the name.

Lancaster?

MR. HOCH: John Hoch, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Laona?

MR. CHRISTMAN: Mike Christman, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lena?

MR. TORZALA: Jim Torzala, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lincoln?

MR. JANSON: Paul -- Paul Janson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lincoln Hills?

Little Chute?

MS. MAASS: Anna Maass, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Living Word Lutheran?

Lodi?
MR. BRYANT: Jeff Bryant (phonetic), no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lomira?

MS. LITTERICK: Angie Litterick, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Lourdes Academy?

MR. WOHLPACK: Jeff Wohlpack (phonetic), no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Loyal?

MR. LAMBRECHT: Michael Lambrecht, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Luck?

MR. CARLEY: Toby Carley, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Luther?

MR. BABINEC: Joel Babinec, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Luxemburg-Casco?

MS. BANDOW: Jenny Bandow, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Madison Country Day?

MR. CLEMENTS: Jeremy Clements, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Madison East?

MR. KAPP: Dave Kapp, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Madison La Follette?

MR. PORTER: Kevin Porter, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Madison Memorial?

MR. SCHLITZ: Jeremy Schlitz, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Madison West?

MR. LIPP: Mike Lipp, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Manawa?

MR. ZIEMER: Nate Ziemer, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Manitowoc Lincoln?

MR. STEAVPACK: Dave Steavpack, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Manitowoc Lutheran?

MR. UHLHORN: Dave Uhlhorn, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Marathon?

MR. BERANEK: Dave Beranek, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Marinette?

MR. GUNDLACH: Kurt Gundlach, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Marion?

MR. BENA: James Bena, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Markesan?

MR. BARK: Duane Bark, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Marquette University?

MR. HERMAN: Bob Herman, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Marshall?

MR. KLEINHEINZ: Matt Kleinheinz, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Marshfield?

MR. DELANY: Nathan DeLany, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Martin Luther?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Jon Schneider, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mauston?

MR. GYLLIN: Randy Gyllin, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mayville?
MR. WONDRA: Joel Wondra, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: McDonnell Central?

MR. SHERBINOW: Archie Sherbinow, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: McFarland?

MR. ACKLEY: Paul Ackley, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Medford Area?

MR. HRABY: Justin Hraby, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mellen?

MR. MORELAND: Don Moreland, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Melrose-Mindoro?

MS. CRAIG: Connie Craig, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Menasha?

MR. GRABLE: Rick Grable, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Menominee Indian?

MR. RAASCH: Chuck Raasch, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Menominee Falls?

MR. ANDERSON: Ryan Anderson, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Menomonie?

MR. BOETTCHER: Bart Boettcher, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mercer?

MR. MILLER: Adam Miller, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Merrill?

MR. BONNELL: Rick Bonnell, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Messmer?

MR. KLATKIEWICZ: Ken Klatkiewicz, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Middleton?

MR. JOERS: Bob Joers, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milton?

MR. HAMMIL: Brian Hammil, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milwaukee Academy of Science?

Milwaukee Arts?

Milwaukee Bay View?

MR. GADDIS: Jeff Gaddis, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milwaukee Bradley Tech?

MR. BOETTCHER: Greg Boettcher, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milwaukee Career & Technical?

Milwaukee Hamilton -- Hamilton? Excuse me.

MS. NICHOLS: Kay Nichols, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milwaukee Juneau Complex?

MS. SCHENK: Amanda Schenk, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milwaukee King?

MR. NICHOLS: Jeremy Nichols, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milwaukee Lutheran?

MR. KALOUS: Keith Kalous, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Milwaukee Madison Academic?
MR. FULLER:  Alonzo Fuller, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  What was the vote?

MR. FULLER:  Yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Yes.

Okay.  Milwaukee North?

MR. BLY:  Robert Bly, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee Pulaski?

MR. CZEKALSKI:  Derek Czekalski, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee Riverside University?

MR. JOHNSON:  Rick Johnson, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee Ronald Reagan?

Milwaukee Samuel Morse?

MR. WHITE:  Dennis White, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee School of Languages?

MS. HUGIN:  Kathie Hugin, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee South?

MR. MOSELER:  Ty Moseler, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee Vincent?

MS. DINGMAN:  Lori Dingman, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee Washington?

MR. BOYD:  Marlon Boyd, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Milwaukee Wisconsin Conservative -- or, sorry. Conservatory. I -- I
have a period. Conservatory.

Mineral Point?

MS. DAHL: Vickie Dahl, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mishicot?

MR. GORDON: David Gordon, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mondovi?

MR. PONGRATZ: Randy Pongratz, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Monona Grove?

MR. SCHREINER: Jeff Schreiner, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Monroe?

MR. HIRSBRUNNER: Dave Hirsbrunner, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Montello?

MR. LLOYD: Don Lloyd, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Monticello?

MR. BROKOPP: Al Brokopp, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mosinee?

MR. ZEBRO: Zach Zebro, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mount Horeb?

MR. BERANEK: Mike Beranek, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mukwonago?

MR. TRUDELL: Andy Trudell, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Muskego?

MR. KUGI: Scott Kugi, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Necedah?
MS. SAYLOR: Kris Saylor, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Neenah?

MR. WERNER: Nate Werner, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Neillsville?

MR. GAIER: John Gaier, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Nekoosa?

MR. BECKER: Jason Becker, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: New Auburn?

MR. PLUMMER: Jamie Plummer, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: New Berlin Eisenhower?

MR. FITZGERALD: Kevin Fitzgerald, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: New Berlin West?

MR. NAPOLI: Jordan Napoli, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: New Glarus?

New Holstein?

MR. STEINER: Steve Steiner, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: New Lisbon?

MR. BIRR: Dennis Birr, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: New London?

MR. YERKEY: Brian Yerkey, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: New Richmond?

MR. ECKARDT: Casey Eckardt, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Newman Catholic?

MR. DELIKOWSKI: Jamie Delikowski, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Niagra?
MR. TREVILLIAN: Scott Trevillian, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Nicolet?

Norris?

North Crawford?

North Fond du Lac?

Oh, I'm sorry. North Crawford is here?

MR. BERGUM: Dave Bergum, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: North Fond du Lac?

MR. MCDOWELL: Michael McDowell, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Northland Lutheran?

Northland Pines?

MR. MARGELOFSKY: Brian Margelofsky, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Northwestern?

MR. SCHERZ: Dennis Scherz, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Northwood?

MR. ZAMZOW: Curt Zamzow, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Notre Dame de La Baie Academy?

MR. RAVIZZA: John Ravizza, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Oak Creek?

MR. HOLLER: Scott Holler, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Oakfield?

MR. RICKERT: Corey Rickert, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Oconomowoc?
MR. RADUKA: Scott Raduka, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Oconto?
MR. SHERMAN: Rick Sherman, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Oconto Falls?
MR. MOYNIHAN: Jerry Moynihan, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Omro?
Onalaska?
MR. IHLE: Charlie Ihle, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Oneida Nation?
Oostburg?
MS. HENGST: Molly Hengst, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Oregon?
MR. CARR: Mike Carr, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Osceola?
MR. NELSON: Scott Nelson, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Oshkosh North?
MR. LIEDER: Craig Lieder, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Oshkosh West?
MR. JODARSKI: Brad Jodarski, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Osseo-Fairchild?
Owen-Withee?
MR. LEWISON: Brad Lewison, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Ozauckee?
MR. BALDWIN: Lee Baldwin, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Pacelli?
1  MR. RAFLIK:  John Raflik, no.
2  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Palmyra-Eagle?
3  MR. BLAKELEY:  Mark Blakeley, yes.
4  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Pardeeville?
5  Parkview?
6  MR. SUEHRING:  Shane Suehring, yes.
7  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Pecatonica?
8  MR. LANCASTER:  Aaron Lancaster, yes.
9  MR. BEIGHLEY:  Pembine?
10 MR. MCLAIN:  Chris McLain, yes.
11 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Pepin?
12 MS. MOLINE:  Kacey Moline, yes.
13 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Peshtigo?
14 MR. WICKMAN:  Bill Wickman, yes.
15 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Pewaukee?
16 MR. MALTSCH:  John Maltsch, yes.
17 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Phelps?
18 MS. KNUDSON:  Annie Knudson, yes.
19 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Phillips?
20 MS. KNUDSON:  Oh. That was Phillips.
21 Sorry.
22 MR. BEIGHLEY:  That was Phillips?
23 MS. KNUDSON:  That was Phillips.
24 MR. BEIGHLEY:  Is there someone from
25 Phelps?
(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. So we got that?

Phillips.

Pittsville?

MR. SANKEN: Todd Sanken, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Pius XI?

MR. GALANTE: Jerad Galante, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Platteville?

Plum City?

MS. MURRAY: Nanette Murray, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Plymouth?

MR. SLAGLE: Mike Slagle, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Port Edwards?

MR. CRANDALL: Justin Crandall, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Port Washington?

MR. GABRIELSE: Thad Gabrielse, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Portage?

MR. HAAK: Tim Haak, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Potosi?

MR. SIEGERT: Mark Siegert, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Poynette?

Prairie du Chien?

MR. BANASIK: Andy Banasik, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Prairie Farm?

MR. ANDERSON: Cory Anderson, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Prentice?
MR. BERGMAN: Randy Bergman, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Prescott?
MR. IGOU: Kyle Igou, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Princeton?
MR. LIND: Mark Lind, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Providence?
Pulaski?
MS. BATTEN: Janel Batten, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Racine Case?
MR. SYVRUD: Eugene Syvrud, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Racine Horlick?
MR. WENDT: Joe Wendt, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Racine Lutheran?
MR. BLOCK: Jason Block, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Racine Park?
MR. O'MALLEY: Bill O'Malley, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Racine St. Catherine's?
MR. SCHEEL: Corey Scheel, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Randolph?
MS. TORRISON: Deb Torrison, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Random Lake?
MR. DEBROUX: Jim DeBroux, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Reedsburg Area?
MR. YAGER: Bryan Yager, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Reedsville?

MR. MCCULLEY: Ryan McCulley, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Regis?

MR. ALLEN: Terry Allen, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Rhinelander?

MR. PAULSON: Brian Paulson, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Rib Lake?

MR. WUDI: Mike Wudi, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Rice Lake?

MR. SALISBURY: Steve Salisbury, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Richland Center?

MR. FOLEY: Mike Foley, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Rio?

MR. HINKEL: Cory Hinkel, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Ripon?

MR. BUNGE: Rick Bunge, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: River Falls?

MR. HALL: Rollie Hall, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: River Ridge?

MR. WINKERS: Wade Winkers, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: River Valley?

MR. BRIEHL: Eric Briehl, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Riverdale?

MR. SCHMIDT: Jon Schmidt, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Roncalli?
MR. MUELLER: Dave Mueller, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Rosholt?

MR. SCHOOLS: Steve Schoofs, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Royall?

MR. GRUEN: Mark Gruen, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Ambrose?

Saint Anthony?

Saint Croix Central?

MR. KERG: Jeremy Kerg, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Croix Falls?

MR. RANDOLPH: Paul Randolph, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Francis?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mike Lewandowski, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Joan Antida?

Saint Lawrence Seminary?

MR. MCCABE: Phil McCabe, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Mary Central?

MR. BATES: Adam Bates, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Mary's Springs Academy?

MR. KRUEGER: Kyle Krueger, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Thomas Aquinas?

MS. CHILCOTE: Julie Chilcote, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Saint Thomas More?

MR. HOCH: John Hoch, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Salam from Milwaukee? Sauk Prairie?
MR. BRAUND: Aaron Braund, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Seneca?
Sevastopol?
MR. NEWTON: Tim Newton, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Seymour?
MR. ZAHN: Mark Zahn, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Shawano Community?
MS. SCHREIBER: Charmaine Schreiber, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sheboygan Area Lutheran?
MR. HOLZHEIMER: Al Holzheimer, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sheboygan County Christian?
MS. VAN DRUNEN: Deb Van Drunen, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sheboygan Falls?
MR. MAY: Aaron May, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sheboygan North?
MR. STENGE: Dan Stengel, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sheboygan South?
MR. HEIN: Chris Hein, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Shell Lake?
MR. CAMPBELL: Jim Campbell, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Shiocton?
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1. MR. SPAULDING: Ryan Spaulding, yes.
2. MR. BEIGHLEY: Shoreland Lutheran?
3. MR. TREDER: Tim Treder, no.
4. MR. BEIGHLEY: Shorewood?
5. MR. RIDGEWAY: LeVar Ridgeway, no.
6. MR. BEIGHLEY: Shullsburg?
7. MR. MATYE: Scott Matye, yes.
8. MR. BEIGHLEY: Siren?
9. Slinger?
10. MR. KARIUS: Dan Karius, yes.
11. MR. BEIGHLEY: Solon Springs?
12. MR. AHLBERG: Nate Ahlborg, no.
13. MR. BEIGHLEY: Somerset?
14. MR. WALSH: John Walsh, no.
15. MR. BEIGHLEY: South Milwaukee?
17. MR. BEIGHLEY: South Shore?
18. Southern Door?
19. MR. BRYLLA: Nick Brylla, no.
20. MR. BEIGHLEY: Southwestern?
22. MR. BEIGHLEY: Sparta?
23. MR. SANDERS: Bob Sanders, yes.
24. MR. BEIGHLEY: Spencer?
25. MR. ENDREAS: Mike Endreas, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Spooner?
MR. LUCIUS: Matt Lucius, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Spring Valley?
MR. DUCKLOW: Matt Ducklow, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: St. John's Northwestern
Military -- Military Academy?
MR. HAVEL: Paul Havel, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Stanley-Boyd?
MR. KOENIG: Jeff Koenig, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Stevens Point?
MR. DEVINE: Mike Devine, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Stockbridge?
MR. HANKE: Tom Hanke, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Stoughton?
MR. DOW: Mel Dow, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Stratford?
MR. WINCH: Scott Winch, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sturgeon Bay?
MR. BLIZEL: Pat Blizel, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sun Prairie?
MR. NEE: Eric Nee, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Superior?
MR. KOSEY: Ray Kosey, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Suring?
MR. LECHLEITNER: Greg Lechleitner,
yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Tenor?
The Prairie School?

MR. COFFMAN: Nat Coffman, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thorp?

MR. BRAYTON: Aaron Brayton, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Three Lakes?

Tigerton?

MS. SMITH: Glenda Smith, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Tomah?

MR. CURRAN: Tom Curran, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Tomahawk?

MR. SAARI: Shane Saari, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Tri-County?

MR. MARINACK: Tony Marinack, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Trinity Academy?

Turner?

MR. COLDREN: Andy Coldren, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Turtle Lake?

MS. SCHRADLE-MAU: Mary Schradle-Mau,

yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Two Rivers?

MR. LA TOUR: Matt La Tour, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Union Grove?

MR. PETTITT: Dave Pettitt, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Unity?
University Lake School?

MR. DOHERTY: John Doherty, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: University School of Milwaukee?


MR. BEIGHLEY: Valders?

MS. ISSEL_MANN: Kelly Isselmann, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Valley Christian?

MR. ABEL: Larry Abel, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Verona Area?

MR. KRYKA: Mark Kryka, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Veritas?

Viroqua?

MR. ANDERSON: Eric Anderson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wabeno?

Washburn?

Washington Island?

Waterford?

MR. BLAIR: Michael Blair, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Waterloo?

MS. THOMPSON: Nancy Thompson, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Watertown?

MR. DANIELS: Mike Daniels, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Watertown Lutheran Prep?
Waukesha North?

MR. SCHLEI: Brian Schlei, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Waukesha South?

MR. DOMACH: Dan Domach, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Waukesha West?

MR. LEMIEUX: Kyle LeMieux, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Waunakee?

MR. SMITH: Brian Smith, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Waupaca?

MR. EGGEBRECHT: Carl Eggebrecht, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Waupun?

MR. MILKOWSKI: Keith Milkowski, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wausau East?

MR. HARVEY: Greg Harvey, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wausau West?

MR. HEIN: Dan Hein, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wausaukee?

MR. DESCHANE: Jared Deschane, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wautoma?

MR. MARANELL: Mark Maranell, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wauwatosa East?

MS. VITRANO: Linda Vitrano, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wauwatosa West?

MR. GABRIELSEN: Jeff Gabrielsen, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wauzeka-Steuben?
MR. GILLITZER: Brad Gillitzer, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Wayland Academy?
MR. TALLMAN: Phil Tallman, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Webster?
MR. HETFELD: Josh Hetfeld, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: West Allis Central?
MR. MACKENZIE: Chip MacKenzie, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: West Allis Nathan Hale?
MR. KRAMSKY: Elliot Kramsky, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: West Bend East?
MR. HANSEN: Shane Hansen, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: West Bend West?
MR. STIER: Scott Stier, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: West DePere?
MR. EGGART: Scott Eggart, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: West Salem?
Westby?
MR. HULST: Andy Hulst, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Westfield Area?
MR. RUGG: Sam Rugg, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Weston?
Westosha Central?
MR. LINDH: Jon Lindh, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Weyauwega-Fremont?
MR. BLECK: Scott Bleck, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: White Lake?
MR. FIGUEROA: Tyler Figueroa, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Whitefish Bay?
MR. GUSTAVSON: John Gustavson, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Whitehall?
MR. HENRICKSON: Dave Henrickson, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Whitewater?
MR. BEHRENS: Jeff Behrens, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Whitnall?
MR. BRUENING: Scott Bruening, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Wild Rose?
MR. MURPHY: Jeff Murphy, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Williams Bay?
MR. COOLIDGE: Mike Coolidge, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Wilmot Union?
MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Herm Christiansen, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Winnebago Lutheran Academy?
MR. BENDIX: Brad Bendix, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Winneconne?
MR. WHITFORD: Tim Whitford, yes.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Winter?
Wisconsin College Prep?
Wisconsin Dells?
MR. MACK: Aaron Mack, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wisconsin Heights?

Wisconsin Lutheran?

MR. SITZ: Jeff Sitz, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wisconsin Rapids Lincoln?

MR. RASMUSSEN: Ron Rasmussen, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wisconsin School for the Deaf?

Wisconsin School for the Visually Handicapped?

Wisconsin Valley Lutheran?

MR. BERINGER: Dave Beringer, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wittenberg-Birnamwood?

MS. BACON: Tina Bacon, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wolf River Lutheran?

Wonewoc-Central -- or Center? Excuse me.

MR. NEEDHAM: Tory Needham, yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wrightstown?

MS. ADAMS: Erin Adams, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Xavier?

Oh. I'm sorry. I cut you off. I'm sorry. Please say that again.

MS. ADAMS: Erin Adams, no.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Sorry.

Xavier?

MS BATES: Kathy Bates, no.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Young Coggs Preparatory?

Youth Initiative?

Is that everyone?

Excuse me, folks. I've just been made aware, I need to clarify that the voice vote will supersede the written ballot. Okay? The voice vote that you just took will supersede the paper ballot.

All right. We have results already, and they are exactly the same.

(Applause.)


So the amendment has been passed with the 1.65 multiplier replacing the success factor language with the exception of single sex schools, which will remain at 2.0. That is now the main motion.

Open to further debate.

MR. HARNISCH: We would like to offer an amendment to the motion.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Make sure you give us your name.
MR. HARNISCH: Chad Harnisch, Sauk Prairie.

A new paragraph at the end of the current text should read, "The WIAA shall collect an amount equal to the '14/'15 membership dues from all public schools in our membership to be held in reserve as a legal defense fund to address potential litigation arising from the implementation of this multiplier."

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Do you have a copy of that written, Chad, anywhere?

If that is to move forward, it would need a second.

I'll read it here as soon as he brings it up, just to make sure everybody is clear.

Once again, "WIAA shall collect an amount equal to the '14/'15 membership dues from all public schools in our membership to be held in reserve as a legal defense fund to address potential litigation arising from the implementation of this multiplier." So that has been moved.

Is there a second?

MR. KNECHT: Steve Knecht, Kenosha Tremper.
Second.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Steve Knecht from Kenosha Tremper seconds.

MR. AYER: Question, Mike. You said all public schools?

MR. BEIGHLEY: That's what the -- that's what the language says.

MR. AYER: All schools?

MR. BEIGHLEY: It says all public schools. Is that the intent?

MR. AYER: Or all member schools?

MR. HARNISCH: The intent of the amendment is that all public schools shall pay for a legal defense fund. It did not seem to be appropriate that private schools, where the litigation will likely come from, would be paying for the defense against their own litigation.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Understand.

MR. HARNISCH: Since we're willing to treat members separately in how we apply a multiplier, it feels like we should also treat them separately in how we financially penalize them for any future litigation.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. So we have a motion and a second.
Discussion? On this amendment only.

Yes. Perfect.

MR. SEKEL: James Sekel, Cadott.

I don't know if Dave or Wade could address this or maybe legal counsel. Could you summarize possible litigations and costs at other -- at other states?

DR. LABECKI: Well, we are aware that California has spent $9 million over the last seven years defending a public/private debate. That is California. Because they've now moved to an elite division. So that is one case that I can give you as a fact from our legal meeting last year.

Oklahoma was recently sued.

MR. BEIGHLEY: So the conversation up here was, there are other states that are undergoing, but it would be hard to place some specific information on it.

So we have a motion and a second.

Any discussion?

Okay. We'll use the light blue C ballot to vote on this amendment -- proposed amendment. It's going to establish a legal defense fund.

All right, folks. If we could have you
take your seats.

All right. The proposed amendment for
the legal defense fund fails 117 to 309. So that
amendment was denied.

So we are back to the main motion as
amended, which would be to strike the success factor
language, add the 1.65 multiplier to -- for nonpublic
schools. A previous year's enrollment on the third
Friday in September would be multiplied by 1.65.
This provision would not apply to single gender
schools that already have enrollment multiplier of
2.0.

So other discussion is appropriate at
this time. Again, please step to the microphone,
give us your name, your school district, and we'll
discuss this issue.

MR. MANS: Hi. Patrick Mans, school
district of Crivitz.

It was my pleasure to serve as co-chair
of the Ad Hoc Committee on competitive equity. And I
just want to say that I had the privilege of doing
that and serving with some very, very fine
individuals that just care about kids athletically,
academically, and just as community members.

Now, we were tasked with coming up with
an alternative to the status quo. That was our task. 

We were not tasked with, nor was it our job, to 
advocate for a solution or possible solution that we 
came up with.

The success factor is what we came up 
with based on hours and hours and hours of study on 
this topic that we're discussing, we're talking about 
right now. We looked at virtually everything that's 
been talked about so far in detail. We had access to 
the programs and applications of multipliers and 
reducers throughout the nation. We had access to 
legal guidance. Any question that we had, we were 
able to get answers. Okay?

Now -- and again, keep in mind, I'm not 
up here advocating the success factor. That wasn't 
our job. What I am up here advocating for is that 
the multiplier, as it was brought up last year and 
brought up again in its identical form this year, is 
not the answer to this solution. Okay?

You are taking a sledgehammer and 
trying to deal with something that requires a 
scalpel. This is a complicated issue. Just looking 
throughout the nation at how other states have dealt 
with this problem, this is a very complicated issue. 
Okay?
When I first got on that committee, I approached Dave after last year's annual meeting, which was my first annual meeting, by the way, ready to bang my fist on the table and argue for a multiplier when I got to the first meeting.

After that first meeting, in talking to the individuals that were there - and it was a broad spectrum of individuals that represented all of you on that Ad Hoc Committee - my mind was changed after that first meeting when it came to a multiplier.

What is not being considered here? What about the small private schools or private schools in general that historically are not successful in athletics, never have been, probably never will be? You apply this, and you are going to bump them up by a factor of 1.65. Okay? Has that been brought up? This is the first I've heard it discussed here. We discussed it on the committee. Okay?

My other question, I guess, is for those that brought the amendment. Where does 1.65 come from? Is that just plucked from another state? What statistical research did you do to base that 1.65 on? Where does that come from?

And I guess I would ask the Chair
perhaps to ask those folks if they have some
statistical research to back the 1.65 and where it
comes from, to give it some basis for why you're
going to ask this group now to vote on something,
which, I caution you, if you pay attention to the
politics in this state currently, if you pass this
amendment in its current form, you are inviting the
state legislature to get involved in our
organization. And whether or not we, as members, are
allowed to participate in the WIAA and still receive
state aid, mark my word, that's a consideration that
you should take before you vote on this amendment.

    All right. Again, if the success
factor is not your thing, that's fine. We understand
that as a committee. We weren't there to try and
talk you into voting for that. We were tasked with
coming up with an alternative to the status quo.
That is what we came up with based on the research
and all the time that we put in. Vote it down if you
don't like the -- the success factor. That's fine.
But this is not the answer to that.

    Thank you.

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. And I'm going to
add just a little bit of clarification to that based
on the -- the counsel I've gotten up here. Folks
need to understand that, as this has proceeded, the success factor no longer exists.

This is now the main motion. The 1.65 multiplier is the main motion.

The success factor, as proposed, no longer exists. Okay? Just so everybody is clear as we move forward.


And to build upon what was previously just said, I think it was a disrespect to that Ad Hoc Committee to not have voted on that success factor for the very reasons that gentleman stated. They spent hours and hours and hours of time and study and discussion and dialogue, much more than most of us in this room. And for us to just negate that vote, I -- I think we should have at least voted on that.

Since we're not now, I would like to -- to speak out against the 1.65 multiplier for some of the reasons the gentleman stated, one of which was -- is the very small nonpublic schools are going to be -- their athletic programs are going to be just completely annihilated by this.

Also, I would assume, if this 1.65 multiplier passes, that would also affect football.
And I think that's -- then you're looking at a danger safety factor.

An additional thing for people to consider, and many of our public counterparts may not realize this, our school population of 500 some kids has 50 foreign exchange students, none of whom really contribute anything to our athletic programs. And I understand that my public counterparts have many students who do not participate in athletics, but at least they would be allowed to. That's not always the factor with our foreign exchange kids. And that's something to keep in mind as well.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. COLLYARD: Len Collyard, Kettle Moraine Lutheran.

First of all, I'd like to urge those schools -- those people that are here who perhaps do not understand nonpublic schools to do a better job of trying to find out more about those schools. Some of the inaccurate perceptions that are thrown out in various conversations need to be supported by fact and not by just a false opinion.

I'd like to speak against the motion
again. There was no rationale presented for 1.65 as
was -- has been pointed out. We are now looking at
transferring an inequity, a perceived inequity, from
one group of our membership on to another. So we are
not solving the inequity issue.

If we want to consider another amend --
amendment, I'd propose one, but I'll wait for some
additional conversation.

MR. BEIGHLEY: That's good because
we're down to our last ballot. We do have more
coming.

Barry in the back.

MR. SCHMITT: Barry Schmitt,
Independence.

Basically I stand by my statements that
I made last year is that I think a multiplier is too
simple a solution to a complex problem. I do believe
there is competitive inequity. I'm not necessarily
in support of -- of the multiplier.

I am more in support, because it is
such a complex problem, that this broken down,
sport-by-sport, criterias are set for each sport.
And if schools meet those criteria, whatever they may
be, free and reduced lunch, success, urban/rural,
whatever they may be, if they meet that criteria,
then they are promoted. But I don't think you can
just put a blanket number on every school that isn't
public and solve this problem. Because of the open
enrollment issue, because of the -- all the other
factors, it's just too complex for a simple solution.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Barry.

MS. HAUSER: Stephanie Hauser, Stevens

Point.

Just tailing off of Kathy's comment and
question, please clarify before we vote on this if
it's all sports or just the sports that were listed
in the success factor amendment.

MR. BEIGHLEY: All sports.

MR. PAULY: Bob Pauly, president, Notre

Dame Academy.

After listening to Patrick, who was one
of the leaders from Crivitz, it started out --
just -- just to give you a little history, everybody,
it started out rural versus urban. And Patrick,
being from Crivitz, was the champion of all the rural
schools that are in this room that are voting for
this multiplier. He was the champion. He stood up
against everything that was being, first of all,
proposed.
The more we got talking about it, we were looking at what was fair for everybody. Because I told him that Saint Thomas More High School up in Marinette is going to be crushed, that Saint Joan Antida in Milwaukee is going to be crushed.

Now, that's a grave responsibility that all of you who feel like you have been crushed, well, then it's their turn to be crushed. I know how it goes in competition. Let them know how -- now they'll know how it feels. Well, the problem is, they already know how it feels because they don't win as it is.

Now, this is a grave injustice. And this is something that somebody needs to stand up and say, stop right now because this is all wrong.

The 1.65 multiplier nationally does not work. So why would we assume something that nationally has been proven not to work and leads to $9 million in lawsuits in California -- that is immoral to spend money that should be used on kids to be given to lawyers and to be spent in courtrooms. That's ridiculous.

These are all -- we're all reasonable people in here, and we all care about kids. We all do. And most of us in here are just trying to
protect our turf. And I get it. I get it when you're coming from Barneveld, and I get it when you come from Cassville. Unless you have Sam Okey who wins you a state championship because you had a stud coming through, it's going to be tough.

And I appreciate the challenges there, but I also appreciate the challenges of small schools, schools that start with Faith Christian or other schools that you've never even heard of because they're not Dominican. They're not a school that has ticked you off for about five or ten years. Let's get real. It's not Pius. It's not schools that are winning the SHA. Those are the ones that anger you. But why punish a small school like Saint Thomas More up in Marinette that is barely hanging on by a thread? Why punish Saint Joan Antida which is almost all Latinas who just want to play equitably? They're only one. This should count for one. Because even as one, they're not competing.

Now, I'm afraid to let this go to vote because so many of you came in here with your minds made up. It's damn the torpedos; I don't care what anybody says. So I'm -- I'm afraid, having been on that Ad Hoc Committee with 21 incredible people that put all partisanship aside to try and come up with an
equitable solution for the state of Wisconsin -- and we did it in good faith with tremendous research and extensive discussion. And you guys all think that it was somehow the -- the private schools had too many on it so it doesn't count. Well, that's unfair, and it's inaccurate. So I'm afraid to trust this group.

230 to 202. Is that what it's going to be for this final thing if we get into a 1.65 multiplier that I know isn't going to work? It's going to lead to lawsuits. And that's ridiculous.

So now I'm going to have to come up with another ridiculous thing. I'm going to come up with an amendment to the amendment to the amendment. I'll -- because 1.65 is totally arbitrary, I'll come up with another totally arbitrary number. How about 1.25? Let's start there.

Last year, it was proposed in here we start at 1.65 as a starting point for discussion. What happened to the discussion? And who knows what the number is? Is it 5.63? Is -- is it 0.12? None of us in here know the number.

So I will make an amendment to the amendment that it be 1.25 multiplier instead of 1.65. Let's start there. And if it doesn't work, then we go up to 1.30. But you don't just go from 1.00 to
1.65. So I would like to make an amendment to
scratch the language for the 1.65 multiplier to make
it a 1.25 multiplier.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Motion made to
change the language on the multiplier proposed
amendment from 1.65 to 1.25. That would require a
second.

MR. COFFMAN: Second. Nat Coffman from
Prairie School.

MR. BEIGHLEY: That motion has been
seconded.

Now we're at discussion.

We are -- any further discussion on
that?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Otherwise, we will use
our golden-rod colored extra ballot with no letters
on it. It would look like this. Please pass those
ballots into the middle.

MR. HAVEL: Hold on. Paul Havel, St.
John's Northwest Military Academy.

So if this now replaces 1.65, does that
affect the single gender?

MR. BEIGHLEY: They changed the number
in the proposed amendment.
MR. HAVEL: Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We are voting.

Continue with your vote.

All right, folks. I'd ask you to take your seats.

All right. That amendment to change the number 1.65 to 1.25 fails on a vote of 134 in favor, 297 against.

Back to discussion, if anybody has any.

MR. BLOCK: Jason Block, Racine Lutheran.

I don't know how many other math teachers there are in the room, but those of us that are are probably feeling pretty sick with all the mental calculations that are just coming out of nowhere.

I think we've had several requests now for why is the rationale of 1.65 there? And we haven't ever heard it.

There -- I mean, you can fault the committee on what they did. You may not like their proposal. But they went through data and they actually studied in detail what was really happening and what wasn't and what the effect would be on schools and on kids. And we have not heard any
rationale and -- to this point on what any data would show that 1.65 does anything and where that number came from.

If you want to look at any data that we've gotten so far today, which is where we're just kind of voting off of today, if you look at the roll call vote, I think it will -- it shows that this is our rural/urban issue. If you look at the schools that voted for versus against, it is a rural/urban issue. That's what the data is showing today.

And I hope that we're not just stealing this number from somebody else. And I, again, request that we -- we understand or get addressed where this number comes from and what -- what calculations were made for it.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes, sir?

MR. COLLYARD: Len Collyard, Kettle Moraine Lutheran.

Again, I speak against the motion. 1.65 has not been substantiated. I believe that rural schools are not helped by this to the extent that they might believe.

And so I would propose another amendment. This is the amendment. That open enroll -- enrolled students in public schools be
counted double for enrollment purposes.

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. That is another
proposed amendment. As we have done on several
occasions, that would require a second.
    In addition to; correct?
    Sir, in addition to the proposed
language is your motion?

    MR. COLLYARD: In addition to.
    MR. BEIGHLEY: Not a replacement.
    Is there a second?
    MR. HAHN: Second.
    MR. BEIGHLEY: Stand up, please, and
give your name.

    MR. HAHN: Jerry Hahn, Lakeside
    Lutheran.

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Discussion on
that proposed amendment? Any discussion?
    Ron?
    MR. WALSH: Ron Walsh.
    MR. BEIGHLEY: Excuse us. Hey, we need
to keep moving.
    Ron?
    MR. WALSH: Ron Walsh, Elk Mound. I'm
just wondering if we couldn't do a voice vote on
that. Can we do voice votes versus paper ballots?
MR. BEIGHLEY: I've been told I can call for that. If it's close, obviously we'll have to go to paper but --

MR. LAMBRECHT: Just a question on that. Is that net students, or is that anyone you get in, not subtracting who goes out? What is that?

MR. BEIGHLEY: I think that's part of the issue with a lot of the things we're talking about today.

MR. LAMBRECHT: That's why -- my question.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Maybe we could ask for clarification.

Len, any?

Could we have your name back there, sir?

MR. LAMBRECHT: Mike Lambrecht, Loyal.

MR. COLLYARD: Probably my amendment is a little facetious because I do not have any data to support why it's two. It could be four times. I don't know.

MR. ANDERSON: Are you withdrawing it?

MR. COLLYARD: I am not withdrawing it, but I am just telling you that that's why this is such an issue.
MR. BEIGHLEY:  Okay.

MR. COLLYARD:  And I do not have any way to clarify the question that was just asked.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Thank you.

MR. HARNISCH:  Just a point of clarification to address that, if I could.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Yes.

MR. HARNISCH:  Chad Harnisch, Sauk Prairie.

I was on the Ad Hoc Committee. I led a project group working on a geographic multiplier, so this was an area of our research. My understanding would be that currently students who open-enroll out are not counted in your enrollment number anyway.

So to answer the gentleman's question in the back, students who open-enroll out do not count for your enrollment now in terms of WIAA divisional placement. So the multiplier that is proposed, as I understand it, would only apply to students who come in because those are the only students who are counted in enrollment.

MR. BEIGHLEY:  Yes. We would agree up here as well.

So we have a motion. Is there a second?
Oh. We had one. I'm sorry. A motion and a second.

Other discussion?
Okay. We will take a hand vote.
No?
Yeah. So we'll just --
The hand count will simply replace the voice count. And if it's close, we'll have to ask for clarification. Okay?
One per school please, remember. One per school.
All those in favor of the amendment, please raise your right hand.
Okay. All those against?
The amendment fails.
Folks, as we move forward, remember, this is -- we need to -- to get back to focusing on what we need to do. I think we've heard some pretty powerful things already today in terms of whether or not we have data, whether we have information, whether we have enough information. I think it's important in the opening remarks you heard and many comments that you've heard so far, we need to focus on kids and we need to focus on what the business is and what it isn't. If we have things to say, let's
HEARING IN RE 2015 WIAA ANNUAL MEETING - April 22, 2015

1 get them said. Okay? But this is the type of
2 gamesmanship that does nothing but -- but take time.
3
4 Okay?

5 So where are we? We are back to the
6 main motion as amended, which is the 1.65 multiplier
7 to nonpublic schools with the exception of single sex
8 schools, which will remain at 2.0.

9 Discussion?

10 MR. BREUNIG: Yeah. Vince Breunig from
11 Lodi.

12 I would speak out against the
13 amendment. I agree with the gentleman earlier who
14 said this is like taking a sledgehammer to something
15 you need a scalpel for. I think there is an issue,
16 and I appreciate the work the Ad Hoc Committee did.
17 I don't know if I agree with the -- the solution they
18 came up with, but I know they put a lot of time and a
19 lot of effort into it. I just think we're taking a
20 sledgehammer to something that needs more delicate
21 work. And I think we are having some significant
22 impact on some kids that we really don't want to have
23 that impact on. I know there's some certain programs
24 that some of us are -- run up against to and are
25 concerned about, but I think it -- we have to keep in
mind all the kids that are in the WIAA and look
forward to that.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. LEWISON: Brian Lewison, Owen-Withee.

So we're going to have a vote on the 1.65, and then we'll have a vote on the reducer, right --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Correct.

MR. LEWISON: -- regardless of what --

If you pass one or both of these, you better have the success factor in there because there are public dynasties that need to be dealt with also because, let's be honest, that's what this is all about, public versus private. It's just wrong.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes, sir? In the middle there.

MR. SCHLITZ: Jeremy Schlitz, Madison Memorial.

Looking through -- you guys want to look at page 4 of your program. The mission of this 119-year-old institution or association that we're a part of, the third pillar of it says to promote uniformity of standards, interscholastic athletic
competition, and prevent ex -- exploitation by
special interest groups. The uniformity of standards
and to prevent ex -- exploitation by special interest
groups is the discussion we're currently having,
which goes against 119 years of this wonderful
association. Consider that as you make your comments
and you make your decisions.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. ZWETTLER: Chris Zwettler, Edgewood
High School.

I was on the committee as well.

Jeremy beat me to it.

This will divide the membership. It's
already divided. It will divide the conferences that
we've worked so hard to build the last ten years.
This will divide what's going on, and it will not be
uniform.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Other discussion?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Just to be clear,
if we are hearing no more discussion, we will move
forward to vote on the 1.65 multiplier. We will use
the blue Constitution No. 2 ballot. Okay?
1 Understand that if this is approved, 
2 the 1.65 multiplier goes into play. There is no 
3 success factor. Okay? If it fails, status quo is 
4 what we have. 
5 
6 I'm going to reread the entire motion. 
7 "For nonpublic schools, the previous year's 
8 enrollment on the third Friday in September will be 
9 multiplied by 1.65. This provision would not apply 
10 to single gender schools that already have an 
11 enrollment multiplier by 2.0." Okay? 
12 
13 Again, cast your ballots to the aisles, 
14 please. 
15 
16 All right, folks. We will move on to 
17 No. 3. 
18 
19 DR. LABECKI: No. 3 is on page 9 of 
20 your brochure. No. 3 is a classification. This is 
21 the result of a petition 60 schools brought a 
22 petition for. Therefore, it was certified by the 
23 Board of Control, and it is before the membership 
24 today. This change would utilize a reducer to member 
25 schools' third Friday of September enrollment figure 
26 for competition (including tournaments, where 
27 necessary). 
28 
29 In Article 3 of the membership, Section 
30 3 of Classification, on page 15 of your handbook, No.
2, paragraph 2 would be added. "If a school submits by October 1st the appropriate form to verify its free and reduced lunch statistics as of the third Friday in September of each year, the school shall have its enrollment for purposes of classification calculated using the following formula: X minus,"
parentheses, "Y times 0.4," parentheses, "equals Z. X is the total enrollment. Y is a number of free and reduced lunch students. And Z is the enrollment for classification. Upon request, the school must provide additional verification from the state and/or federal government of the figures included in the form submitted by the school for purposes of this calculation."

The existing paragraphs would then be renumbered to 3, 4, and 5.

Notice, this came by petition. It came after the Sports Advisory Committee and Advisory Council met. So the Board of Control did discuss this and advanced it 11 to 0. They did not offer an opinion based on the fact that it was brought forward by the membership.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Do we have a motion?

MR. BAGSTAD: Lance Bagstad, Clintonville.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay.

MR. MATZ: Brian Matz, Green Bay Southwest. I will second that motion.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Discussion?

MR. PHIL MCCABE: Not a discussion.

Phil McCabe, Saint Lawrence Seminary.

Just a question and a clarification.

As a single sex school, when -- in the formula of X, Y, and .04, is X before it is doubled, before we are doubled, or would that be our raw number?

DR. LABECKI: X is going to be your doubled figure. This is your enrollment as it is adjusted.

MR. MCCABE: So that's 200 students that are added to our -- it would double from 2 to 400, who the -- before -- how do we count those? There's no free and reduced lunch for them. There's nothing to apply to because they don't exist.

DR. LABECKI: Correct. So you would have 200 minus X, which is 0 times .0 -- or 0.4, which means that it's 200 minus 0 equals 200. So your enrollment would be -- remain the same if you do not have free and reduced lunch.

MR. MCCABE: Well, we do.
DR. LABECKI: If you do, then it would be 200. And say you have ten kids --

MR. MCCABE: Okay.

DR. LABECKI: So --

MR. MCCABE: Well, that was my question.

DR. LABECKI: So if you have -- I'll provide an example for you. If you had an enrollment of 200 --

MR. MCCABE: Yep.

DR. LABECKI: -- and you -- Y is the number of free and reduced kids. If you have ten free and reduced kids, you multiple ten times .4, which equals 4.

MR. MCCABE: Right.

DR. LABECKI: So you're going to have 200 minus 4, your adjusted enrollment after free and reduced lunches, not 196. And that's used to put you into your divisional placement.

MR. MCCABE: And then that -- then that's doubled.

DR. LABECKI: Oh.

MR. MCCABE: Single sex schools.

That's --

DR. LABECKI: I would tell you X is
your doubled enrollment for single sex schools at Saint Lawrence --

MR. MCCABE: Okay.

DR. LABECKI: -- before --

MR. MCCABE: Okay. Let's just back up.

Okay. Are --

DR. LABECKI: Are you asking if your free and reduced is doubled too?

MR. MCCABE: Okay. Yeah.

DR. LABECKI: X is the starting enrollment that you are -- used to be placed into your division today. Okay?

MR. MCCABE: Okay.

DR. LABECKI: Does that make sense?

MR. MCCABE: I don't think you're talking the same thing. Our enrollment is 200 students.

DR. LABECKI: Okay.

MR. MCCABE: We take out ten free/reduced -- we get ten free/reduced lunch. It goes down to 190 -- 190. Then it is doubled because we're a single sex school.

DR. LABECKI: No. It's doubled at X.

MR. MCCABE: It's doubled at X. Okay.

So we're at -- so I have 200 boys. We're doubled to
400 for enrollment.

DR. LAHECKI: 400. X is 400.

MR. MCCABE: Okay. That's fine.

Where -- but our free and reduced lunch -- that's 200 people we're not even going to count as free and reduced because they don't -- they don't exist.

DR. LAHECKI: Uh-huh.

MR. MCCABE: Okay. You -- you answered it, and now I can see.

DR. LAHECKI: I know you don't get it, but yeah.

MR. MCCABE: No, I understand it now.

I don't agree with it is what I'm saying.

DR. LAHECKI: That's what I'm saying too. I understand you don't agree with it. But your 200 is going to be X. And you multiply that by 2 for single sex. So X is going to be that starting figure. And then you will do the calculations for free and reduced lunch.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes, sir?

MR. CLINTON: Ken Clinton, Brookwood.

I guess I have two questions.

First, what happens if the previous amendment passes and this amendment passes?

MR. BEIGHLEY: They are both in
place.

    MR. CLINTON: Okay. Well, even though
I'm from a rural public school, that would be
double -- doubling everything that we're dealing with
here.

    MR. BEIGHLEY: We'll get an answer.
Here comes our vote on the first one so -- but --
    MR. CLINTON: Okay.
    MR. BEIGHLEY: -- your question is
well-intended.

    MR. CLINTON: Okay. That was my second
question. Should we wait until the --
    MR. BEIGHLEY: All right. On
Constitution No. 2 as amended, supporting the motion,  
141; denying the motion, 293. That -- that
Constitutional amendment fails.

    So back to discussion on the No. 3.

          (Applause.)

    MR. KNECHT: Steve Knecht, Kenosha
Unified Schools.

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Quiet, please.
    MR. KNECHT: Just a point of clar --
clarification. We are back to where the rules are as
they read right now; correct?

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Correct. At this point,
with that vote that was just announced, we are at 
status quo and taking up No. 3.

MR. BIEBEL: Bob Biebel, Lourdes 
Academy.

In regards to the reducer factor, the 
reducer factor comes from Minnesota. It was also a 
reducer fact that went through in Kansas. Kansas 
determined in 2012 that roughly 40 percent of their 
students were free and reduced lunch. They 
determined that there was a 12 percent difference in 
participation. We are following the Minnesota model, 
which says there is a 40 percent difference in 
participation. Those numbers are not substantiated.

I would also maintain that part of the 
problem with lack of participation with low economic 
students is a participation fee. So obviously it is 
harder for students to participate because they are 
charged for participation in many areas.

I would also maintain that there are 
other factors. There are numerous studies, such as 
the Bridge The Gap study, which says there is a 
greater correlation between the number of sports 
facilities that a high school has in determining the 
number of participation.

To look at simply free and reduced
lunch or SEC, socioeconomic status, is just part of
the issue, and it is larger.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Yes, sir? Right in the middle. Yep.

You can stand up.

MR. MCCABE: Okay. Thank you. Phil McCabe, Saint Lawrence Seminary.

Then I would like to propose an

amendment.

It's a simple one, please. I -- I have

another meeting to go to after this too so --

For single sex schools, the formula

will read X minus Y times .8 will equal Z. That will
account for the doubling of our enrollment.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. So we have a

motion.

Is there a second?

MR. SCHLITZ: Jeremy Schlitz, Madison Memorial. I will second that. It's mathematically

sound.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Perfect.

Discussion on that proposed amendment?

MR. HARNISCH: If I could, I would like
to propose a friendly amendment to that amendment.
My argument would be, wouldn't it be easier to do the
doubling of Z; right? That way, it's the same rule
for everybody and doubling happens at Z instead of
having the doubling happening first. That would be
what I --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Is that acceptable to
the person who made the motion and the second?

MR. MCCABE: Yes.

MR. SCHLITZ: Yes.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes and yes?

Okay. Further discussion then?

Yes, we're going to use a hand vote.

So any discussion?

All those in favor of that amendment,

please raise your right hand.

All those opposed?

Carried.

Okay. So now we are at -- back to the
original with the amendment which says, right, X

minus -- or X minus in parentheses Y times .4 equals

2 Z for single gender. Otherwise, it's the same.

Okay? Everybody clear on that? Or at

least clear as mud?

Yes, sir, in the back.

MR. MATZ: Are we still at the
MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes, we are, sir.


Just a comment regarding the participation fees. In the four -- four Green Bay public high schools, our free and reduced number is above 50 percent of our total population, and we do not have participation fees. So we are not in any way limiting our participation number for those families. And I can't -- certainly can't speak to the other districts, but that would not be a factor as to why we have a large number of those students that don't participate.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. MILLER: Brian Miller, Ashland. Speaking in favor of this amendment. And I just -- I just wanted to speak again to the issue of disparity in terms of poverty in schools.

Our district is at 65 percent free and reduced lunch. And there is no factor as we've done surveys for our participation numbers in Ashland that has any more effect on the number of kids coming out
for sports than the poverty level. And we live in
the poorest county in Wisconsin, Ashland County.

We have an amendment coming up about
unlimited contact. That just complicates this. My
kids have to travel. They can't afford to travel.
The playing field does not equal when we do not
consider poverty as part of participation.

So I'm in favor of this, and I
appreciate folks taking a good look at it.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Yes, sir, in the back?

MR. BABINEC: Joel Babinec, Luther.

Just a question or clarification on the
appropriate form. I'm assuming that's some
government form that puts you into the free and
reduced thing. So the only way that you would do
this is if you're in the free and reduced government
program.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Correct.

MR. BABINEC: Is there -- you know,
some schools, I know, do not choose to be in it for
various reasons. Is there any application for
schools like that who would still have people within
their conference that would fall within those
financial guidelines?

    MR. BEIGHLEY: To our knowledge, it is not included in this proposal.

    MR. BABINEC: Thank you.

    MR. HARNISCH: Sorry if everybody is getting sick of hearing me talk.

    Chad Harnisch, Sauk Prairie.

    Speaking against this amendment. My rationale for this is that, on the surface, it seems like a really good idea. At one point, I was in favor of it until I learned that some of my assumptions about the numbers of free and reduced lunch students attending private schools were wrong. The impact of vouchers in urban areas has led to what you might be surprised to learn is that many of the dominant powerhouse schools that we're talking about that was the issue at -- at -- at -- at -- was the issue at debate here -- right? Those schools would likely go down in division as a result of this as it's written because their free and reduced lunch numbers are just as high as Ashland's are. That is an assumption, I think, we're making that is inaccurate. I just wanted to be clear. That's why I'll vote against this amendment.

    MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay.
MR. GUNDLACH: Kurt Gundlach, Marinette.

Having been in two completely different districts throughout my career, one on both ends, now at 50 percent free and -- free and reduced at Marinette, I can tell you that it significantly impacts participation. And I would vote in favor.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

MR. MANS: Hi. Pat Mans, Crivitz.

Speaking against the motion.

If I could just ask the Chair, if the Chair could ask for clarification from the bringers of the petition and subsequent amendment, what are their thoughts on what's going to happen with schools that are 100 percent free and reduced lunch under the federal program? I don't see anything in here that deals with that. Will they basically take their entire enrollment and multiple it by .4?

MR. BEIGHLEY: That's how it would be applied up here. But if we have anybody that would like to present information -- again, this is a member-driven petition.

MR. MANS: Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes, sir?

MR. MANGAN: Ryan Mangan, Homestead
High School.

I was on the committee. And I -- just to follow up on somebody else's response earlier, I take no offense to the competitive equity being voted down. We were trying to look for the best solution, knowing that there wasn't one.

My concerns with this option is, again, like Mr. Harnisch referenced, we don't have all the data in this situation in terms of making those assumptions. And, you know, it's just -- it's -- we're -- we're assuming that that will affect competitiveness. And it does -- there is research saying it does affect who participates, but we're talking about competitiveness. And in the sports at question, when we looked into this as well as every other option we looked into, we did not find a direct -- direct correlation. And we also couldn't verify the data in terms of who would fall under free and reduced lunch. The information that's been sent out, it still doesn't, you know, give that accurately in terms of public and private and who's on free and reduced lunch.

And that's why I'm not in support of this, just like the previous one. We don't have all the data in this. And we're trying to -- we're
trying to vote on something that has major ramifications before we know all -- how it would affect all the schools in our membership.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Dave?

MR. HENRICKSON: Dave Henrickson, Loyal High School.

Just calling -- and I don't know if -- probably too simple for this whole thing -- because I don't think there's any perfect answer to any of this. I'm not in favor of any of the amendments. I think there's no proven rationale, data, that's supporting all these different things. And you can see there's a problem within this room, within this state, with the equity of competition.

But I think, keeping things simple, you play at your own divisions.

And if we had schools within a school --

I know Ted -- Ted is from Aquinas. We've talked about the boys' basketball program. That is sort of their powerhouse at La Crosse Aquinas. The rest of their programs, this 1.65, which I'm glad did fail here, in the long run, I think it -- we needed this problem to get festered a
little more, which it has right now. But like Ted
said, the rest of his programs at Aquinas would
really struggle with this here. And I think all, you
know -- Marinette -- talking about those, that this
would put them back further and further.

What we need of each school is to be
honest within your own programs. You know if you
have a powerhouse program in your school and you need
to -- we have to have a -- we need a deadline that
you know the upcoming year if you need to play up one
division, like Dominican this year, or two divisions.
You are honest with that program. Welcome that
challenge. And we don't have this public/private
controversy here. Because it is going to create a
big problem within the state at the public/private.
And we don't need that. We need equity. We need
honest people. And I know this is too simple of a
solution, but I think it comes down to calling a
spade a spade. If you're a powerhouse program, step
up and let people know that we are going to be
playing in a division above because we have this good
of program, this good of athletes, this good of team,
and we want a challenge.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.
Tom? Yes, sir.

MR. CURRAN: Tom Curran, Tomah.

Just a clarification. I hope Ted doesn't take offense. But reading the La Crosse Tribune on the way up this morning, La Crosse Aquinas' baseball team is ranked number one in Division 3.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: What was the clarification?

MR. CURRAN: From the previous statement.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Anybody else?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We are on to the yellow, light yellow, whatever this is called, canary yellow. We do have an amendment that was attached dealing with single sex schools, basically doubling their enrollment after the reducer is applied at Z. That number would be doubled. So yellow, please.

Cast your ballots and send it to the middle -- or to the aisles.

As soon as the ballots are collected, we'll move on to No. 4.

DR. LABECKI: Okay. We're going to
move on to No. 4, which is on page 10. No. 4 was discussed at last year's annual meeting during the editorial changes. We could not go ahead and move it forward as an amendment because it was out of order during the editorial changes, so we have brought it forward at the request of the member school.

And this is -- No. 4 deals with penalties that are available to the Board of Control. And this change would remove the restitution penalty provided to the Board of Control in the Constitution.

So under Article 6, Powers and Duties of the Board of Control, Section 3, Penalties, on page 19, No. 5 would be stricken, and it would be removed. And in paragraphs 5 and 6 -- or the following paragraphs would be renumbered to 5 and 6.

At the Sports Advisory Committee, it was advanced to the annual meeting to you here at a -- at a 12 to 2 vote. And they did not choose to take a position. Advisory Council was 10 to 4. And their position -- they did not support it 0 to 14. The Board of Control advanced it 6 to 5. And again, there was no support. It was a vote of 0 to 11.

And the rationale for the Board of Control's support vote was that it was advanced at the request of a member school, but it was not
supported by the Board of Control because restitution is considered an appropriate potential penalty should times and circumstances warrant its use. It was voted in by the membership in 1924 and has been there since.

MR. BEIGHLEY: So do we have a motion to get things started?

MR. WERNER: Nate Werner, Neenah.

Motion.

MR. BEIGHLEY: We need a second.

MR. SEKEL: James Sekel, Cadott.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Jim, thank you.

We have a motion and a second.

Discussion on this item?

Mary?

MS. PFEIFFER: Good morning, everyone.

My name is Mary Pfeiffer, and I'm the Neenah Joint School District superintendent.

You know, they say practice makes perfect. And you have had an opportunity to make perfect amendment opportunities today.

What was stated by Wade is really contrary to an e-mail that I received from Dave Anderson in May.

Last year I stood before you requesting
changes to editor -- an editorial changes -- or
so-called editorial changes. And overwhelmingly in
this -- this membership passed that. It was, like, a
300 to 100 vote.

    In an e-mail that he sent to me on May
13th, he acknowledged that this should have been
brought up last year. He said, "I must speculate
that, with our focus on the editorial changes, your
Constitutional amendment got swept up in the
clarifying discussions that took place." So from
what I learned, it should have been voted on last
year. And thank goodness it's brought forth this
year.

    There are a couple of things I'd like
to share about this restitution piece. And one is,
as I told you last year, I sought legal counsel
regarding this, and they highly recommended that we
support removal of this language as a membership.
The WIAA, with the way it's written, could engage in
any investigation, seek reimbursement in any amount.
So it could be $10; it could be a million dollars.
And nothing is specified, and basically there's an
open checkbook.

    Many of us belong to organizations,
WADA, WASDA, ASA (phonetic). All of those are
represented in this room. Not one of those
organizations has, at least to the best of my
knowledge, a restitution expectation.

In an e-mail Mike Beighley sent to
superintendents last week, and you heard it again
today, since 1924, this language has never, never
been used. It's because of you as members that you
act appropriately. If it's not been in -- if it's
not been used in 91 years, why would we keep that
language in? 91 years, we've not used it. Yet,
they're hanging on to something, and I don't know
what it is. We deserve more than that masked
legitimacy. Just to suggest it's been in place for
91 years, I feel we deserve better than that.

Lastly, and most importantly, by
removing this language, we will assume our rights
again. The WIAA will not be able to fine us for any
investigation, nor will they be able to seek any
reimbursement for costs they and they alone deem to
be in violation unless they use the same process that
we are expected to use through the court of law.

The WIAA administration claims to be
one that supports its members. My biggest wonder is,
when will they be the one that trusts its members?
We have often heard, we are you and you are the WIAA.
And you have heard that repeatedly. You haven't heard it yet today. But if those statements were true, then the removal of this restitution language would not be in question. If you trust our members and within this organization -- and this organization matters, if common sense matters to you, you have to vote yes.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Other discussion?

MR. REYNOLDS: Terry Reynolds, district administrator for the Pittsville School District.

I -- I am not in favor of this amendment at all. As a member, a part of this organization, I feel it's -- it's directly important that we have such language in to protect our association to make it whole, and I really strongly believe that it would be a mistake for our association to take this out.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Other discussion?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We will use the red ballot to cast your vote. Constitution No. 4.
All right. While we're completing the ballot casting, we do have the results for Constitution Amendment No. 3. That would be the reducer as amended. That motion has failed with a supporting vote of 167 and 265 to deny. So the proposed Amendment No. 3 has failed. Status quo will reign at this point.

Okay. We'll move on to No. 5.

DR. LABECKI: No. 5 has to do with the Constitution, and it is in the Petition area.

Remember, there are four ways to bring amendments forward to your body here at the annual meeting. And this change would designate a date in which amendments may be brought to the membership via petition to allow discussion and committee review prior to the annual meeting.

So under Article 9, Amendments, Section 1, the Origin of Amendments on page 22, the shaded language would be added to paragraph 4 that, "By petition in writing by the administrator or high school principal of at least 10 percent of the member senior high schools. The petition must be submitted by the first Friday in January prior to the next annual meeting."

The Sports Advisory Committee
recommended this to be advanced and supported it to nothing. The Advisory Council recommended to advance and support the Board of Control recommended to advance 11 to nothing on both of those.

So this does not eliminate the members' ability to petition. What this does is it allows time for members to review and consider and allows for review by the Sports Advisory and Advisory Council.

If you miss the deadline, it would be applied to the succeeding annual meeting, not to the next one.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Is there a motion?

MR. DELANY: Nathan DeLany, Marshfield.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Is there a second?

MR. PLITZUWEIT: Eric Plitzuweit, Burlington.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Any discussion? Going once. Twice.

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: It would be the orange ballot, Constitution No. 5.
DR. LABECKI: Okay. The next amendment proposal is No. 6. It's in the Bylaws, and it deals with coaches' qualifications. This change would require all coaches at all levels to complete and maintain certification in First Aid, CPR, and AED usage.

So in Article 8, Coaches' Qualifications, on page 29 in your handbook, Section 8 would be added in its entirety. Section -- or paragraph A would read, "Beginning with the 2017-'18 school year, all coaches, whether paid or unpaid, shall be certified and will maintain certification in First Aid, CPR, and AED operation. Beginning with the 2016-'17 school year, this requirement must be met before coaches start their second year of coaching."

Sports Advisory advanced and supported it 14 to nothing. Advisory Council advanced it 14 to nothing, supported it 12 to 2. And the Board of Control advanced and supported it 11 to nothing.

In addition, we did receive a letter from the Wisconsin Medical Society, and they do support this as well.

And the rationale by the Board of Control is that the coaches are increasingly
recognized as First Responders. This proactive approach affords best protection to students, coaches, and member schools.

MR. BEIGHLEY: All right. Do we have a motion on the floor?

MR. FRIZZELL: John Frizzell, Chippewa Falls, to approve.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Is there a second?

MR. DOW: Mel Dow, Stoughton.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Can we get that one again, please?

MR. DOW: Mel Dow, Stoughton.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Discussion?

MR. MATZ: Brian Matz, Green Bay Southwest.

I'd just like to amend that to strike volunteer coaches from that amendment.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We have a motion to --

MR. MATZ: Unpaid coaches, I guess.

Clarification.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. The clarification would be that there's a motion to amend to remove "or
unpaid" from the proposed language.

Is there a second for that?


MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Discussion on that?

MR. SMITH: Brian Smith, Waunakee.

I just want some clarification on, what kind of maintain certification is this? Is it Red Cross? Is it the NFHS course? It's up to the local school?

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Each school decides how they certify their coaches or whatever they're comfortable with?

MR. BEIGHLEY: Each school would just make that determination based on their local ability.

MR. SMITH: However they get it. Okay.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay? Other discussion? This will be on the amendment?

MR. COLLYARD: Len Collyard, Kettle Moraine Lutheran.

There's obviously a financial impact that is of concern. Might -- rather than the
amendment of unpaid, might it be more appropriate to
talk about a head coach at each level at least as a
starting point for adding this kind of requirement to
coaches?

MR. BEIGHLEY: Right now we're -- we're
only dealing with specifically the amendment of
striking "or unpaid."

MR. COLLYARD: And that's why I'm
just --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

MR. COLLYARD: -- pointing that out --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yep.

MR. COLLYARD: -- because I don't agree
with the amendment.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Got it.

Any other discussion on the amendment
itself?

We'll take a hand vote.

Those in favor, please raise your hand.

Sorry. Strike -- this is simply
striking "unpaid." Sorry for any confusion.

Okay. All those against?

The amendment will pass.

So now we are back to discussing the
amended, which will deal with simply paid coaches.
It will read, "All paid coaches shall be certified."

Any discussion?

The question up here, if I could just for a second, is -- is just to consider if there are any schools that have all volunteer coaches. It's just simply a question. So go ahead, sir.

MR. SAARI: Shane Saari, Tomahawk.

Just for discussion, wondering, with athletic budgets and some of us in pretty tight constraints, who would be responsible for paying this? Would WIAA help in regards to that, or would it be on the school districts in and of themselves to pay for this? Because I know that my particular budget would probably struggle in order to pay for that.

And then secondly, who's going to police this? Is it going to be the WIAA that ends up policing it? Is it local control? And what happens if a coach doesn't go through and doesn't get that? Are they fired? Are they not paid? How does that --

There's just a lot of information that's missing on that.

MR. BEIGHLEY: I'm going to -- I can address the first one for you in terms of the financial cost. That was certainly one of the things
taken into account when we eliminated dues and fees yesterday. So that part, in particular, is -- is part of the -- the conversation there is understanding that there were some things coming today.

And -- and school administration would be responsible for all of the oversight. Okay? Much like we talked about. And the same with the -- what the expectation would be. Okay?

MS. HAUSER: Stephanie --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes, ma'am?

MS. HAUSER: Stephanie Hauser, Stevens Point.

Would you please clarify for those of us who have middle level WIAA schools, does this apply to those coaches as well?

MR. BEIGHLEY: All member schools.

MS. HAUSER: Okay.

JIM: Jim (inaudible), Eau Claire Immanuel.

We have all volunteer coaches, and they are all trained.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Jim.

Other discussion?

Okay. That's it. We are at the bright
orange Bylaws, No. 6.

Okay. While we're collecting ballots, I do have the prior two results for you. Constitutional Amendment No. 4 dealing with removal or striking of the monetary fine. That motion has failed on a vote of 164 to 269. Again, that vote was 164 in favor, 269 against.

Constitutional No. 5 dealing with first Friday in January, that motion is supported on a vote of 385 in favor, 43 against.

On to No. 7.

DR. LABECKI: We will now move into the Rules of Eligibility with No. 7. No. 7 affects nonschool participation during the season in the same sport. This change would allow any individual athlete to participate in up to two nonschool contests during the regular season of that school sport in the same sport with school approval. It will count against the athlete's maximum participation limit. This change neither affects nor alters the exceptional athlete provision in Note No. 2 that's down below.

So in paragraph A underneath Article 6, Nonschool Participation, Section 1, In-Season, page 37 of the handbook, paragraph A, the shaded text
would be added: "Athletes may compete in not more than two nonschool competitions with school approval during each regular sport season. The contest or contests will count against the individual maximum for that athlete in that sport. Nonschool competition will not be allowed during the WIAA tournament series in a sport."

In addition, in the succeeding sentence, we would add the shaded area, "A student becomes ineligible for a sport for the remainder of the season for competing in more than two nonschool games, meets, or contests in the same sport during the season of practice and competition established by the school."

The Sports Advisory voted to advance this 8 to 6. Did not support it 6 to 8. Advisory Council advanced 6 to 6. Did not support it 0 to 12. The Board of Control advanced 11 to 0. Supported it 10 to 1.

The rationale for the Board of Control's support was that the requests for nonschool competition continue to rise and therefore to diminish the exceptional athlete provisions. This amendment comes as a result of the member schools' frequent and persisting request for relief from this
rule.

MR. BEIGHLEY: All right. Again, this is Item No. 7. Do we have a motion on the floor?

MR. GRUEN: Mark Gruen from Royal.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Mark Gruen from Royal.

Is there a second?


MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Sandy.

Discussion?

Yes, sir?

MR. LIPP: Mike Lipp, Madison West.

The first sentence in A appears to say it correctly. This change appears to be oxymoronic and violates the first sentence. We're opposed to this. We don't want our athletes playing outside of the high school -- during the high school season with other activities, so --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LIPP: -- we think it's wrong.

MR. FLOOD: Tim Flood, Green Bay East.

My question is that we've talked about how we are against -- or we're always fighting AAU and club sports and those type of things. Doesn't this promote it, saying, hey, go play in an AAU team
at -- or AAU tournament in Las Vegas over Christmas vacation; and you've missed two games from your sport. I just find this -- that it's -- it's going against what we've talked about the last couple of years about how we are trying to struggle to keep our kids in our programs with our coaches and not go with the AAU coaches and the AAU programs. So I'm against this.

MR. BEIGHLEY: If -- if that's an -- if that's a question in there, certainly I -- I think the -- the issue is as Wade stated. The number of requests that the staff and/or Board see for exceptional athletes is increasing dramatically, so we put it forward to let you folks decide what you want. Okay?

Other discussion?

MR. BELL: Greg Bell, Wisconsin Dells. I would not be in support of this. I understand that there are requests all the time. I think it puts it back in the schools' hands. You -- you say they need approval. Is that prior approval? Is that, oh, that was going to be okay?

I just think it just makes a mess for us administratively.
I think we want our kids committed to the programs that we have.

And as I said, I would be against this.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. ADAMS: Jason Adams, Poynette High School.

A question I have for clarification is, if a student is academically ineligible on that 15th school day, would they still be deemed ineligible if that nonschool contest -- if they wanted to participate in one of those too?

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wade would say yes.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Other discussion?

Okay. Clarifying. The discussion up here is that that would apply for school competition, not nonschool participation.

Okay. So however the question was phrased, they would be ineligible for school competition, not be -- they would be eligible for nonschool. We don't have any governance over that.

Okay?

Otherwise, any other discussion?

(No response.)
MR. BEIGHLEY: We will move to whatever color this thing is, No. 7.

Okay. We have the results for coaches' certifications, Bylaw No. 6. Supporting that motion was 260. Denying, 167. And that was as amended for paid coaches. Okay?

Move on to No. 8.

DR. LABECKI: Continuing with Rules of Eligibility, No. 8 is nonschool participation during the season. This change would allow students to participate in skills contests during the season in the same sport.

So in paragraph A, underneath Article 6, Nonschool Participation, Section 1, In-Season, on page 37 of your handbook, a note would be added. The note would read: "With the approval of school administration, a student may be allowed to participate in" -- "as an individual (not part of a team) in contests which isolate separate sport skills outside the traditional competition setting, as an example, shooting, passing, kicking contests. Such skill contests or events may not include physical contact with another participant or contain similar risks for serious injury or extreme fatigue as the actual sport competition. There is no such coach" --
or "there can be no school involvement. The approval of the school may be granted on the basis that such participation will not impair or alter the student's eligibility, as an example, amateur status or other membership rules."

Sports Advisory voted to advance and support 14 to nothing. Advisory Council, 12 to nothing to advance and support. And the Board of Control, 11 to nothing to advance and support.

This is the same rule we had in place at our middle schools.

What this means is is that, should this pass, your freshmen could now participate in Punt, Pass & Kick during August and September and not be ineligible for the rest of the season. Your Knights of Columbus free-throw contest in January, your -- your freshmen girls and boys could participate in that and not be penalized. With the newest addition of the Drive, Chip & Putt at the Master's, your -- your athletes would be able to participate as they probably did in August at University Ridge for the regional competition, which was final at the Master's.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Do we have a motion?
MR. BAGSTAD: Lance Bagstad, Clintonville, to approve.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.
Is there a second?

MR. CHRISTIANSEN: Herm Christiansen, Wilmot.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Thank you. We have a motion to second.

Any discussion?

MR. SMITH: Brian Smith, Waunakee. Fun Runs or -- during track and cross country season, are they competitions? Because they --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Wade is saying they're competitions.

MR. SMITH: So those type of things are competitions, not a specific --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Not skill-based.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thanks.

MR. BEIGHLEY: And they deplete kids is the clarification up here as well.

Other discussion?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Otherwise, we're going to use pink, No. 8.
DR. LABECKI: Okay. We are moving forward to No. 9, which is also in the Rules of Eligibility. No. 9 would allow basketball instructional coaching contact. This change would allow basketball coaches to provide an hour of individual instruction for up to six basketball players at one time in the gym using school resources.

This is Article 6, Nonschool Participation, under Section 2, Out-of-Season, on pages 37 and 38. Underneath paragraph C, underneath paragraph 2A, subparagraph 2 would be added. And it would state in the shaded area: "In addition to the five unrestricted school coaching contact days during the summertime, basketball coaches may provide basketball instruction to individual athletes."

A) "Contact may take place between June 16th and July 31st on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday."

B) "Athletes may not receive more than one hour of basketball instruction per day."

C) "No more than six athletes in a group may receive instruction at a time."

Notice, D was removed at the Advisory Council, and the Board also voted to have D removed.
So then E would be renumbered to "Three-on-three drills are allowed."

F would be renumbered to E, "No basketball instructional coaching contact by anyone may take place during the week of 4th of July."

And then the subparagraph 2 would be renumbered to 3, which is -- deals with football acclimatization.

Sports Advisory voted to advance this to 13 to 1, supported it to 8 to 6. Advisory Council, 13 to nothing to advance. 11 to 2 with the amended version of D removed. 12 to 1 to support. The Board of Control advanced it 7 to 4, but did not support it 0 to 11.

Their rationale, it's advanced at the request of basketball coaches, but it's not supported by the Board due to the fiscal impact on the member schools.

Notice, this is underneath "Unrestricted." School resources may be -- be used for this basketball instructional contact.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Is there a motion on the floor?

MR. ZWETTLER: Chris Zwettler, Edgewood High School.
MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

We have a motion. Is there a second?

MR. RASMUSSEN: Ron Rasmussen,

Wisconsin Rapids Lincoln.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

We have a motion and a second.

We're -- we will be open for discussion.

Going once.

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Gray ballot, No. 9.

As you're passing in ballots, we have results for Rule of Eligibility No. 7. This would be two nonschool contests. That motion failed on a vote of 44 in favor, 383 against.

Okay. One more time. Rules of Eligibility No. 7. The results supporting that motion were 44. Denying, 383.

DR. LABECKI: Moving on to No. 10, No. 10 is also a coaching contact. The difference here is this is nonschool coaching contact. So No. 10 is coaching contact, and this change would open unlimited nonschool coaching contact to all sports except football for the period between the last day of school to the first day of school. Key is nonschool.
So under Article 6, Nonschool Participation, Section 2, Out-of-Season, on pages 37 and 38, down underneath Section 2, Out-of-Season, paragraph C, subparagraph 2, subparagraph B, "Unlimited Nonschool Coaching Contact." We would strike the word "the" in "the sports." And it would read "Coaches in all sports except football have been afforded unlimited nonschool coaching contact beyond the five unrestricted days that is permitted to continue throughout the summertime when the school is not in session from the last day of school to the start of school in accordance with the Bylaws as described in Section 2A and C1 of this section."

Sports Advisory advanced 14 to nothing, supported 12 to 2. Advisory Council advanced 12 to 1, supported 12 to 1. Board of Control, 11 to 0, supported 11 to 0.

The rationale by the Board of Control was this amendment responds to the memberships' requests for more uniformity in summer coaching contact provisions. This will allow basketball coaches in the summer to coach an AAU team, just like your baseball coaches right now can coach your American Legion team. This would allow your volleyball coaches during the summer to work with
their kids in a nonschool organization program club
during the summer. Ice time, if you can afford it --
hockey could now have, you know, a summer league.

But this is summer contact. It's
nonschool. No school funds. No school
transportation would be allowed to be used.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Do we have a
motion?

MR. TREDER: Motion to approve, Tim
Treder, Shoreland Lutheran.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Tim, thank you.

Is there a second?

MR. WENDT: Second. Joe Wendt, Racine
Horlick.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Motion and a second.

Any discussion?

Yes, sir?

MR. MATZ: Brian Matz once again,
Southwest High School.

I'm certainly in support of this. I
would just simply like to amend to have the unlimited
contact end on July 31st as opposed to the first day
of school.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We have a little
bit of a discussion here. I'll let Wade or Dave handle this one.

So there is a motion at this point. Is there a second? And then we'll start from there.

MR. STEAVPACK: Dave Steavpack, second, Manitowoc.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Dave.

Now we can discuss. And would you like to hear from Wade and Dave? Okay.

MR. ANDERSON: One of the concerns in limiting the July 31st has to do with the other nonschool programs, such as Legion baseball and others that -- that do, in fact, go beyond that date. And what the July 31 amendment would do is, again, create differences and -- just so you're aware of that. Part of the reason for the proposal as it is -- is in response to what we heard from members over the years, wanting them all to be more alike. And so there are a number of programs in the summer that have this unlimited. Baseball is one. Softball, another. And so on. Probably aquatics and swimming. We know that there's a number of golf competitions around the state that go right up until just before the season begins and so on.

Wade, anything to add?
DR. LABECKI: No. And I was going to add that I believe the Madison swim meet is the first week of August. And that's one of the reasons we have that.

Remember, two years ago, we removed the July 31st cut-off for unlimited boys' soccer to make it the same as these. So you have competitions. Dave brought up the American Legion. So we would then be pulling those coaches out.

Also, a reminder. We do have a dead period for fall sports. So fall football, you can't have contact after July 26 this summer so the -- the kids are allowed a period of time off.

MR. MATZ: I -- I would withdraw my amendment to that based on that information.

MR. STEAVPACK: Second as well.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Second as well?

Okay. Thank you.

MR. KOSEY: Ray Kosey from Superior.

Maybe, Wade, just a question to you.

Why -- why is it only nonschool? That way, I guess, I understand the way this is written, you're going to be able to coach your kids through an outside organization. It still would not allow that basketball coach to just bring the kids in or that
hockey coach to come in to an open skate and just
coach their kids through the school; is that correct?
It has to be through an outside youth organization?

    DR. LABECKI: Correct. We don't want
to mix open gyms and open ice and open-school-run
items with this. There are -- there's no -- no
instruction at all at open gyms. So we don't want to
mess with that.

    If your basketball coach wants to go
ahead and meet with the kids, check out the gym via
the Booster Club, that's a nonschool organization.
He can do that, and then they can do their
instruction.

    We also would tell you that as far as
when this came up two years ago in a similar way,
that we would allow you to use your community ed and
your -- your recreation department to check out your
facilities. So that is not a hindrance to you. So
all the schools are in the same level of uniformity.

    But we would not allow you to use
school funds. Therefore, your coaches won't be able
to ask you to be paid for their summertime work. We
felt that that was a very important piece.

    We also didn't know how, if you use
school resources, the Affordable Care Act would be --
become involved in this. So we felt it very
important that it had to stay nonschool.

MR. KOSEY: Okay. Thanks. I just -- I
think I could do that in Superior, but I'm thinking
some schools might not have those Booster Clubs or
youth organizations that they might be able to run it
through and it might not help them.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: A parent would be
constituted as nonschool. Okay?

Others?

Yes, sir?

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Mike Lewandowski,
Saint Francis.

Would the school district be able to
waive the fees of the use of the facility if it's
in -- if it's a youth organization?

MR. BEIGHLEY: As long as that would be
following district policy.

MR. LEWANDOWSKI: Thank you.

MR. BAGSTAD: Lance Bagstad,
Clintonville. Lance Bagstad, Clintonville.

A point of clarification on the parent.

A parent could actually reserve the facility and a
coach could come and coach?
MR. BEIGHLEY: Yep.

MR. BAGSTAD: Perfect. Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Yes, sir?


I'm speaking against this amendment from two perspectives.

One, as an administrator, I'm afraid I'm going to lose some coaches because there's going to be a lot of pressure on them over the summer to be spending extra time.

I see Jason here from Poynette.

Poynette's coaches are doing it. Parents in Lodi are going to find out about it. And the Lodi parents are going to be expecting that our coaches are spending extra time doing these things.

Secondly, as a parent of high school kids, they are stretched thin enough over the summer. If we as athletic directors and principals continue to complain that we don't have three-sport athletes but then we put stuff like this in place, that doesn't allow three-sport athletes. Because my kids like to play football, like to play baseball, and like to play basketball. They might not be good at any of them, but they like to play in them. And if they're not showing up at these events, it's
impacting their playing time. It's going to and -- and -- down the road because they're not having that opportunity. So they're going to have to make choices.

And right now in Lodi we have coaches who work really well together at spreading out that time. But again, you know, those coaches won't be there forever, and someone is going to come in and say, nope, I want basketball players; I want you all the time. It's going to impact baseball. It's going to impact other things.

So I speak against that amendment.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Other discussion?

MR. FRIZZELL: John Frizzell, Chippewa Falls.

My clarifying question is, where it says the start of school, in my school district, two days after the school year ends, we start summer school where kids can take classes for the following year and get credit so --

MR. BEIGHLEY: Tradi -- traditional school year would be September 1 --

MR. FRIZZELL: Thank you.
MR. BEIGHLEY: -- for public schools.

Excuse me.

Okay. Other discussion?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. We're at the purple ballot.

While you're doing that, I do have results for you from No. 8, which would be nonschool participation during the season in skill-based activities. That motion was supported by a vote of 332 to 89. So No. 8, yes votes were 332. No votes, 89.

Also, we have Rules of Eligibility No. 9 dealing with school contact. That motion was not supported by a vote of 141 in favor, 284 against. Okay? 141 against -- or I'm sorry. 141 in support, 284 against.

Now we'll move to editorial changes.

DR. LABECKI: Okay. On page 17, we have editorial changes.

And it's important to note that editorial changes are not rule changes. Editorial changes are attempts to clarify existing rules without making any change in the interpretation of that rule. In some instances, the change may be
merely a word or words or the addition or deletion of a sentence while, in other cases, it may change -- the change may reflect the Board of Control interpretation on its membership wishes.

So starting in the Constitution under Article 5, Board of Control Organization, Section 1, Membership, under page -- on page 15, we would add a clarifying note that candidates for the Board of Control must be full-time employees.

In addition, Advisory Council, under Article 7, Section 1, under Membership on pages 20 to 21, in order to represent your school on the Advisory Council, you must be full-time. So that's a clarification.

On page 18 in the Bylaws on page 29 under Coaches' Qualifications, the rule reads about rules exams and rules videos. So we're just clarifying the heading by adding the word "rules" in front of meeting and exams requirement. That's just summarizing what the entire rule is about.

On page 8 -- or on -- on Rules of Eligibility under Article 5, Attendance and Scholarship, under Section 1 of the Senior High, page 39, we are clarifying in paragraph 3 that a student may not participate in practice and/or compete in a
sport in more than four different seasons. We were asked which one it applied to. So we're clarifying that it applies to both.

And the same with paragraph C, that you may not participate — and participate means practice and/or compete — in a sport in more than one season each school year.

On page 19, in the Rules of Eligibility, under Health and Behavior and Compliance, we are adding a clarification that "any player who, in the judgment of an official intentionally" -- we're adding that language and then striking "intentionally and aggressively" So it's just a clarification that those are separate parts.

Under Conference Realignment on page 42, we are adding in the language that is shaded that a designee by the board of education or governing body may ask for conference realignment and then working meetings may be made available when requested.

So if you are involved in a conference realignment process, then you would notify Deb and request that there's working meeting.

The Board of Control did vote to advance these editorials 11 to nothing and supported
them 11 to nothing.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Do we have a motion on the editorial changes?

MR. ENDREAS: Mike Endreas, Spencer.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Mike.

Is there a second?

MR. WINCH: Scott Winch, Stratford.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Scott.

Any discussion on the editorials?

MR. SLACK: Terry Slack, Wisconsin Dells.

I would like to see the words "full-time" struck from the language received today. I think of Mr. Kulland, representing Cassville School, is a part-time administrator. He took the time to come from Cassville, some probably three or four hours away. They have a K-12 principal in the school district. As you know, being a 9-12 principal is a full-time job, let alone being a K-12 principal. So the fact that Mr. Kulland couldn't serve on the Board of Control, I think, would eliminate good people from that. I often think of the late Gary Nice (phonetic), who represented Pecatonica schools, who was a part-time superintendent but an excellent sports-minded. He too could have contributed to the
Board of Control.

So for those reasons, I would like to see the words "full-time" struck from the language today.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Is that an amendment -- motion for an amendment?

MR. SLACK: Yes, sir.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

We need a second on that.

MR. KNUDSON: Second. Kevin Knudson.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay, Kevin. Kevin Knudson.

Okay. Discussion on the amendment to start with?

MR. NETT: Dan Nett, Niagra.

I would fully support that motion as well, but I would like to ask, what is the intent of the full-time piece?

And then in terms of language component, should we just put minimally part-time instead of full-time? Because I -- I agree fully with what the gentleman just said as well.

DR. LABECKI: It's just a clarification that the expectation was that they were to be a full-time employee of their school district. So
we're just clarifying that.

When the question came up, there was a potential retirement on the Board and whether or not they would be part-time, the discussion led to this, being that our -- our representatives are full-time. So it's just a clarification of what we currently have. Okay?

MR. NETT: Okay. And I, you know -- again, in terms of rural schools, the inability to have full-time capacities and every administrative role is a challenge. So I appreciate the comments.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: We're going to get some clarification on this, how we're going to operate here.

Okay. Here's where this is going to go. Okay? The interpretation has been that this is how we are operating right now. So if this wants to be changed, it would come back in the forum of an -- an action or a rule change at the next meeting. So next year's annual meeting, it would come back as a proposed change to the structure. Everybody clear on that? Because it's an editorial change, simply clarifying how things are being interpreted right now, it would take a rule change.
DR. LABECKI: Right. Terry would have to make this motion. We would have to second it. We would need 51 percent of this group to vote for that. Then we would bring it back at next year's annual meeting.

That's where we had this issue, you know, last year, what I'm -- what I'm talking about. These are what the current practice is. These are clarifications.

So if Terry wants to allow part-timers -- if Terry wants to allow part-timers, that's fine, but we need to go through the rule process. Okay? So we would do this editorial. Keep in mind that Terry could stand up as soon as we vote on editorials and make the proposal that this comes back next April.

Does that make sense?

These are only clarifications. Right now the concept is, you have to be a full-time employee. If you want to change that, we need to change the rule.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Is this amendment still proposed then, or are we going to go through the rule change, Terry?

MR. SLACK: Then I would go through the
proposal then and then --

MR. BEIGHLEY: As you -- as you stated?

MR. SLACK: (Inaudible.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. So any discussion on the amendment? We'll take a vote on the amendment even though it will not change the impact of the rule unless it comes back at next year's annual meeting.

Okay. We'll do it on hand. All of those in favor of the amendment, please raise your hand.

Okay. All those opposed?

That one carries. So that's the amendment.

So now we move to the editorials?

Any other discussion on the rest of the editorial changes?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Hearing none, we'll use the purple ballot. And again, complete those, send them to the aisles, please.

Terry, did you want to make that --

All right. Before we get going, I do have results of Rule of Eligibility No. 10. That motion was supported 230 to 196. So 230 to 196 to create uniformity in nonschool coaches' contact.
So at this point, we are willing to entertain a motion to discuss looking into create something with full-time?

MR. SLACK: I would move that we consider part-time employees be able to participate in the Advisory, Board of Control, established by the WIAA.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Is there a second?

MR. KNUDSON: Second.

Mike -- Mike, before you close this, can I have word?

I'll second this, Mike.

And I wondered if, before we go to the next, I could say a thank you in my own ways to the group after we get done with this and we close out this session.

MR. BEIGHLEY: There will be time for announcements when we get done, you bet. Okay?

So we have a motion and a second to consider this for next year's annual meeting.

We'll do it on a hand vote. All those in favor, please --

Sorry. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is the
motion?

MR. BEIGHLEY: The motion is --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We never heard it.

MR. BEIGHLEY: The motion is to consider and study full-time, part -- or full-time being stricken and adding including part-time folks to the Board of Control, Advisory Council, Sports Advisory Committee.

Correct, Terry?

MR. SLACK: Correct.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay? Everybody clear?

Okay. Raise your hand if you're in favor, please.

Okay. Opposed?

Thank you. We will bring that back.

All right. We'll announce the editorial change after we get done.

The next order of our agenda is to invite to the podium our executive director, Dave Anderson, for his annual report.

(Applause.)

MR. ANDERSON: I appreciate the round of applause on behalf of Mike and the others at the head table that took count, Dr. Labecki, our
parliamentarian, Dr. Sadler, for -- for helping us through that.

Most importantly, I want to thank and congratulate each and every one of you for making the time and investing the energy into this conversation.

Athletics is a field that is -- that is ripe with adrenalin and emotion. It is always charged in that manner.

As I was listening to the debate from the floor this morning, I recall comments that are at least attributed to Winston Churchill in the House of Commons in 1947 when he said, "Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others."

I appreciate -- we all appreciate your willingness to engage in the conversations.

So let me begin. First off, I'd like to, again, welcome all of you to the 120th annual meeting of the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association, all of you are members.

And to those of you who are guests, we appreciate your year-around and ongoing efforts on behalf of the student athletes in the state of Wisconsin. And we appreciate -- we recognize your culture of caring, which brought you here today.

There are a number of topics under old
business. And as I read and reworked my initial
draft, we made some changes to it.

And the comments will go along this
line: My addition -- my initial drafts of this
report included more extensive comments on the girls'
40th and the boys' 100th state basketball
tournaments. There was also commentary on the WIAA's
soldier official recruitment program. And I mention
this at this point in time in order that those topics
will be entered into the record, but I will not talk
further about those initiatives at this time. There
were -- there are a number of other topics that I
will invoke that -- that same degree of liberty. All
of these comments will be provided in their entirety
in the published text of the director's report.

But out of respect for your time, I
would like to simply identify what those topics of
old business might be. You know them. We've talked
about them throughout the course of the year. And
this is usually just treated as -- as an update or a
report card. There is one that I will go into.

There are a number of topics that the
Board and staff have addressed over the month since
our last annual meeting. Certainly in the minds of
some, there were none more important than the work of
the Ad Hoc Competitive Equity Committee. Your
collective voice and your votes earlier today
responded in one way to their efforts. At this
point, whether one liked or supported this
committee's recommendations and findings or not, I
believe it's appropriate that the effort and
sacrifice that they put forth on behalf of this
membership be recognized. The 21 individuals
sacrificed and gave under the direction, under the
request of -- of all of you. So at this time, it's
appropriate, I believe, to all who volunteered, to
the 21 who served, to Mr. Drew Howig (phonetic) who
facilitated the discussions, to Joan Gralla of our
staff and Julie Kage who reported and supported the
committee's work, it is right that our gratitude is
known. If you volunteered for that committee, would
you quickly raise your hand for us, please.

(Applause.)

MR. ANDERSON: If you served on that
committee, would you stand.

(Applause.)

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

Items that will be covered in the full
text of the -- of the published directive --
director's report will include an acknowledgment of
the work of our Sport Medical Advisory committee and
the soccer and football coaches who implemented this
past fall for the very first time a uniform
structured practice model that paid attention to
acclimatization, overuse injuries, and those sorts of
things.

The football coaches took it a step
further and, working with our Medical Advisory,
outlined a plan that limits the number of live and/or
player-on-player contact over the course of practices
throughout the week. And those -- and that was a
model that, when they adopted it, was as conservative
as any in the country and has been used as the model
and, quite honestly, kind of the target by a number
of states who have developed their programs since
that time.

We talked with you last fall about ref
ranking and our transition from that to our new
provider, Athletics. At that time, we made it clear
that the important component of ranking officials was
something that we wanted to bring back inhouse. It
has been a target of our attention and our energies
throughout the course of the year. And it will be
operational back under the control of WIAA by this
fall. I acknowledge -- we acknowledge there will be
some relearning one more time. But in the long-term
best interests, the most stable place for that
program is inhouse, and it will be coming back home.

Over the course of this past year and
as a part of old business, I had talked again about
the conversations that we have heard regarding
expanding seding. And we had those conversations and
laid out what we hear from the general public as to
their -- their interests from coaches and the desire
to expand and increase. And we talked about some of
the impacts of time and travel and -- and those
things related to what the landscape would look like
if exceeding -- if seding were to expand. We took
that conversation, not only to all of the area
meetings -- and we acknowledged that in two of the
seven area meetings. We heard some support for
expanding seding. In five of the seven, there was no
support. The conversation was carried across
committees, our standing committees. It was carried
into all of the CESA meetings that we had been
invited to attend this year. And we hear little or
no support at the levels beyond coaches or the
general public.

So from that, we draw two impressions.

First, coaches need to talk to local
administration. Local administrators need to provide some direction on the topic of sedan. We're hearing different conversations depending on -- and different messages depending on the source of that interest.

So that was our observation regarding sed -- sedan and the -- and the expansion.

There is one topic -- and as we go forward into the new business, we will take some time, but there is a topic that -- as we transition from old business into new business, that really has a place under both of those tents. And it's been a topic that's been talked about extensively for the past 18 months and a topic that continues to be current and of considerable interest to quite a number of you. Our hope in talking about it here today, making you aware that, as a result of the rapidly changing demands and attitudes and expectations that come as a result of the carousel of changing coaches, ADs, principals, and district administrators, conference realignment is becoming unwieldy. Our hope is that we can plant the seeds for a more robust conversation on this topic throughout the coming year. From our perspective, the current model for realigning conferences, if not broken, is, at best, unable to keep up with the
demands and expectations that are being placed upon it. In every realignment, we recognize there are enough seeds of discontent and enough residue of hurt feelings to almost assure that the next conference realignment is but a year or two away. In some instances, quite honestly, under our current model, there isn't an available solution. You're not being ignored; you're not being disrespected. There isn't an available solution short of disrupting another 40, 50, or 80 other members.

I'd ask Deb Hauser to come up and share a few observations and insights since she's battling the front lines of -- of this challenge. The insights are becoming more apparent as we attempt to fulfill this responsibility.

Deb?

(Applause.)

MS. HAUSER: Thank you.

A couple things continue to constantly change as we look at the variables in -- in conference realignment.

Enrollments obviously are a factor, but now we have people saying what their face value enrollment is isn't really where they should be placed in a conference.
Competitiveness. I think we've dealt with that earlier today.

Administrative changes. We've had schools that have been suggested to move to a certain conference only to come back and say, yeah, you know what; you were right; we probably should have been moved. But it took a change in administrative leadership to get to that point.

Obviously we all have good runs of athletes. And then sometimes we have runs where our kids aren't as talented. Our coaches sometimes are very good at getting a lot out of our kids.

So these are all variables that go into playing, whether or not you want to get moved or are willing to move.

A new one is starting to crop up, and that's safety and concussions in football. Our kids aren't safe. I've had data given to me now that we've -- we had kids hurt when we played bigger schools, so now we want to move to a different conference.

I think there are some things that never change in conference realignment requests, and that -- and one of those is that you all want to finish first. You all want to be state champs. We
understand that, but we also need to be realistic in
that that isn't what's going to happen. I also
clearly understand that you need to and will always
be an advocate for your school.

I have to be the advocate for all
schools. So when realignment is being discussed,
when I meet with groups of people who can only look
at their school and how it affects them, it becomes
very difficult to get any consensus. I'm still
looking for that perfect realignment plan that
everyone agrees to. And I don't know that that will
ever be found.

What is hard now is that when one or
two schools want to go somewhere different for very
legitimate reasons, but now that, in turn, upsets
two, six, seven, eight other conferences -- because
the dominos just roll. And where do you cut that
off?

So last year, you heard us talk a
little bit about maybe this idea of an eight-year
plan where obviously the first year, it's going to be
a little bit, you know, turning things upside down in
some areas. But that may be the only way to fix
those areas. You would stay in that group for eight
years. When we got to the sixth year, we'd look at
it, reevaluate it, and say, what changes need to be made? That's something we want to have a conversation with you about this fall. Because if we can -- we continue in the current course, there are going to be many of you that are not going to be happy and -- and, therefore, continue to say, what about me; we need to move our school, and we want it now. That just isn't realistic either.

I think another big piece in this is eight-player football and what schools are going to make that change because now I have conferences going out and seeking members because somebody chose to go to eight-player. So now we've got a void in our schedule; let's go find somebody quick to fill that void for scheduling purposes. So at the area meetings this fall, we want to have that conversation with you on what is the direction we need to go with realignment? Is there interest in this eight-year idea, or should we continue to have school after school after school in this carousel of, what are you going to do for me and when are you going to do it now?

We have to get some sense of -- of where we're going with conference realignment. And if anyone has thoughts in that, please feel free to
1 share those so that we can have a really good
2 conversation this fall.
3 Thanks.
4 (Applause.)
5 MR. ANDERSON: Thanks, Deb.
6 Let's jump into new business. There's
7 a couple topics here that -- as I said, all of this
8 will be included in the published report. But
9 let's -- let's look at a couple of things that we see
10 on our nearer horizon.
11 First off, the WIAA will be bringing a
12 couple new faces into our family here in July. With
13 retirement of Marcy Thurwachter, the executive staff
14 is in the midst of the search to find the best
15 possible candidate we can identify and recommend to
16 the board. Over two dozen applicants responded to
17 the posting. Among them were veteran athletics
18 directors from both in and outside of Wisconsin.
19 There were school administrators and sports
20 administrators with collegiate backgrounds and two
21 with law degrees. Staff has already pared that list
22 down and expects to begin interviewing candidates
23 over the next couple of weeks and bring a
24 recommendation to the board at the May 15th meeting.
25 And as soon as that search winds down,
staff will be considering how best to fill a position that will come with the July retirement of our bookkeeper of over 39 years, Debbie Tork. While Ms. Kassie McGettigan is ready and prepared to step into the role of bookkeeper, other discussions and considerations to identify the remaining operational needs, the future, and future directions of our organization, how best to meet them when filling this vacancy.

I would also make you aware that, in recent months, the Board has recently approved the development of a WIAA intern program. And it will be launching this summer with a pair of interns with Wisconsin ties. Mr. Chad Strehlo (phonetic), originally from Suring, Wisconsin, will be joining us from South Dakota State University. Also joining us for the summer will be Ms. Stacey Markham (phonetic) from Eastern Tennessee State University. And Stacey is originally from Merrill, Wisconsin.

We've begun reaching out to in-state universities and technical colleges to identify young people who might benefit from this type of experience as well as contribute specific skill sets to our growth and efforts in membership service.

Over the course of this past year,
we've been engaged in negotiations with -- for the WIAA's tournament broadcast rights, and those efforts recently culminated with the Board's approval of new six-year agreements with the Quincy News Organization for our state basketball and our state hockey championships. And with Tim Icourse's (phonetic) new production company, Rush Media, Rush Media will be producing our state football, volleyball, soccer, baseball, and softball finals. At the end of the day, we're pleased in that we believe we've been able to sustain both the scope and the quality of exposure you, our members and WIAA sport fans, have come to expect and enjoy and still work with production teams who know and respect the WIAA's interests.

Beginning in area meetings, we're going to be looking for your input on a variety of other topics. Some of them are old, and some of them are new and familiar topics besides conference realignment. One of those will be co-op teams and student eligibility -- two of those themes, co-op teams and student eligibility.

For the past couple of years, girls' hockey co-ops, we heard it mentioned earlier, have been drawing criticism from some of our stand-alone single school girls' programs who believe that the
large multi-school co-ops hold a competitive advantage.

We've also seen attempts to manipulate hockey co-ops and hockey co-op relationships in order to create opportunities for female hockey players to access boys' teams, but the co-op discussion needs to be broader than just hockey.

As new charter schools emerge and seek membership, one of their key ambitions is to be able to say they offer WIAA sport opportunities. It's very attractive. At times, we register concern that some seeking membership desire the programming but lack the interest in committing to administrative engagement and ownership. And those are essential in an organization like ours.

As some of our smaller schools continue to see enrollments and budgets shrink, co-ops are becoming more important than ever to preserve the opportunities for their students and communities.

Given these and all of the co-op related concerns that we hear, we believe it's time for a comprehensive review and discussion of this topic. So please be prepared to share your thoughts, your perspectives, going forward. Don't wait until the 11th hour. Get up at those area meetings and
help us understand.

   With respect to student eligibility, it's one of the hot topics that we see across the country. As we see state legislatures pass laws limiting or eliminating transfer restrictions as in the case of California or as in the case of Florida where assembly legislation has passed -- and now, if it gains support in their state senate, the Florida High School Association will cease to exist. It will dissolve. We believe we should be as proactive in our discussions of student eligibility and opportunity as we can possibly be. Where and how can we be more inclusive without fracturing a membership? Shall we reconsider nonvarsity eligibility for transfers? Is 365 days of ineligibility too long? Might students who transfer with no previous sport history at their former school be provided opportunities at their new school?

   In recent years, we've brought forward ideas regarding nonschool competition. What other thoughts and ideas might be worth examining more closely while it's still within our ability and our authority to do so? We need to be prepared to engage in this conversation in the coming year as well.

   I need to make you aware that this past
November 29th, the Illinois High School Association was named as a defendant in what is being described as a class action suit by the attorney who's brought the action. The suit was filed on behalf of a former IHSA high school football player. And though the suit is not seeking upfront compensation for damages, the scope of its demands are being described by some as threatening to signal the end of small school high school football because, among the demands, the suit aims to require the IHSA to establish medical monitoring for all high school football players from the year 2000 - so it's retroactive - going forward throughout the lives of the players. The suit also seeks to require an M.D. or an athletic trainer at every high school football practice and game and require baseline testing of all Illinois high school football players. The attorney in this case has stated he intends to bring similar action in all 50 states.

In response to this action, the WIAA Board of Control authorized our joining along with the NFHS and approximately 40 other state associations in signing on to the common defense agreement along with a show of support for the IHSA.

The legal -- the agreement provides for a two-way
flow of legal information and ideas relative to this case.

But without question, this is an important case for all state associations, for all high schools that offer sport programming, and quite frankly, for all youth sport providers as its scope and implications will impact upon more sports than just football.

Heard about our first cross country concussion soon -- last week.

And it will impact on more youth sport providers than just high schools.

Obviously we will continue to keep you well-informed as this case unfolds.

One of the other topics that is important because of its timeliness for you to be aware of that we had been having staff discussions on in kind of the predevelopment cycle of -- of how we go about business received a lot of attention and -- at this most recent National Federation legal meeting last weekend. And the topic was drones. And not what I'm doing up here, but UABs, unmanned aerial vehicles. We are aware of growing interest in use of drones outside the military by recreational users, by coaches for scouting and filming, by sport and news
gathering organizations, as well as by sales, advertising, and marketing agencies. Most of you have likely heard or seen of Amazon's hopes of using drones for small package delivery.

Well, the reason for mentioning this topic is twofold.

First, to make you aware that the WIAA will be developing a position and policy to bring to the Board regarding their use at member tournaments. You can rest assured.

Second is to advise you, as members, it is a topic you should be prepared to have a local position on soon. The challenges in responding to the use of UAVs in and around schools and school sporting events is, in part, due to the fact that most are looking to the FAA for guidance, which, as of yet, hasn't occurred.

Additionally, among the concerns, many are pointing to privacy-related concerns. They're putting cameras on those little UAVs. Concerns for operator licensing and training, proof of insurance and for injury liability.

The Kentucky High School Association is perhaps the first of state associations to take an official position on their use, simply banning them
in and around all Kentucky high school events.

    Now, the WIAA is going to continue to
research and information-gathering a while longer
before bringing a policy recommendation forward to
the Board. But you need to be aware of these now
and -- and begin to think and talk about what you're
going to do when someone wants to operate that --
that drone around your stadium for your first home
football game next fall.

    The last topic under new business is
about member dues and fees. As our president,
Mr. Beighley, has shared, the Board took action after
meeting yesterday to suspend for two years all member
dues and fees. This action is within their
Constitutional authority for providing temporary
relief and was acted upon for a couple of reasons.

    The history of this conversation goes
much further back than might be understood or -- or
recognized. Five or six years the conversation has
been taking place within our office, but the time is
especially right in the minds of the Board.

    And first and foremost, this action
will save each member school a few dollars, maybe,
like, your tax cut return. Individually, that may be
only several hundred or, at most, a couple thousand
dollars. But collectively, it will be a membership savings of more than 4 -- more than $400,000 along with the fact that the WIAA office will continue to provide you with complimentary rule books for each sport you sponsor is probably going to put this just shy of the $500,000 mark.

But the Board believes that, regardless of the amount, they are dollars that can be used locally and directly to impact kids and school programs and coaches' education. And if it's 400,000 in one year, it's 800,000 over two. It's not to be -- it ought not to be seen or -- or the concern for giving back to members ought not to be overlooked. It is a genuine piece of this.

But admittedly, as well, along with the straightforward savings dimension of this action, the Board recognizes, as have most neighboring states like Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Michigan, and Missouri, that there is a potential strategic benefit for taking such actions. And that's realized when the state association must defend itself or a position in front of the state legislature for receiving public tax dollars and for being identified as a state actor in a court action. We believe, as do those other states who have taken this step already several years
ago, that this is a good business decision for our organization. And it's a good decision for the WIAA at this time and in this legal and political climate.

The WIAA's financial position is presently strong and stable. The executive staff have continuously sought ways to spend wisely and expand relationships to increase royalties and grow revenue without raising tickets. And I will add that there are no predetermined ticket price increases that are built into this action.

The Board has had a broad and in-depth conversation before taking this action. What are the ways out in an emergency and what -- but as we go into this, there are no predetermined ticket price increases built into this action. We expect to be able to sustain operations and services without diminishing them in any way.

Of course, the Board's duty is to monitor, and they will monitor closely. And should financial health of the association require an adjustment or attention, the Board will act accordingly.

The Board is authorized to provide temporary relief only. If, after two years, the membership wishes to make this action permanent, it
must be approved by vote at the 2017 annual meeting.

The new membership agreement forms will be edited to reflect this change and will be on their way to you very, very soon.

In closing this report, I want to ask each of you to ask yourself the question, which was asked of me many years ago, many, many years ago, by a wise, much loved, and respected graduate school advisor. He asked -- he asked me -- we were sitting down at his desk in his office. He leveled his eyes on me. Just started back to grad school. He said, David, why are sports in schools?

Quite frankly, as a 25-year-old, that question took me aback. I don't believe I had ever really given much thought or considered why sports were in schools. They just were. And in my short life to that point in time, always had been and I assumed they always would be. They just were.

The years and experiences since then make it clear that school sport isn't just there because it is. 120 years ago, Wisconsin school leaders recognized a need for the coordination of sport between schools and recognized a potential benefit for their students who took part in school sport. And in every year since, men and women, just
like all of us here today, have continued to pour
their time, their energy, their passion, their
resources, their blood, sweat, and tears into
preserving education-based athletics for the good
that they can provide children, schools, and
communities.

While some may take for granted, like I
did as a naive 25-year-old, or choose to view school
sport as their personal service or their entitlement,
for the rest of us as educators, we must continue to
lead, to educate, to protect and preserve school
sport for what it was and is intended to be.

Our predecessors recognized that sport
and competition were not the end unto themselves.
Our Constitution points out our only reason to exist
is to support the greater learning that takes place
in your buildings. Not an end unto itself, they
recognized participation was good for kids and
connecting kids to school-based programs was good for
kids.

For all the reasons every piece of
research has time and again verified, being involved,
participation, is good for kids. And sport is our
vehicle. And it's an incredibly economical lesson
and experienced delivery system and alternative
learning opportunity.

And I hope that you will give question -- I hope you will give the question of why are sports in school some very serious thought as you travel home today. Drill down. Ask why five times.

And then please don't ever, ever allow anyone to discourage children from engaging in your school's sport and activity programs. Participation in them is as good for kids today as it was 120 years ago.

I really appreciate those of you that were able to stay.

Mr. President, that concludes my director's report. The full text will be provided, as I said, in the published and on our website.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Okay. Just quickly, editorial results that -- editorial -- those editorial changes were approved on a vote of 403 to 9.

So before we move on to the announcements, please allow me just to take one more minute of time. As you may or may not be aware, one of our valued staff members is leaving at the end of
the year. Back in 2002, 13 years ago, Marcy Thurwachter joined the association and, since then, has provided tremendous support and service to our membership, to its kids, and to the programs that she hosts. In addition to that, as you know, Marcy is well-respected around the state and the country. And I simply felt that after talking with -- with Mr. Anderson, that it would be appropriate that we recognized her here today.

So, Marcy, where are you?

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Congratulations and good luck.

(Applause.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you for allowing me to do that.

Are there any announcements that need to come before --

I believe, Kevin, you had one right away?

MR. KNUDSON: I just had a quick one. It was to thank you, Mike, for the good job you did tonight -- or today.

And thank everybody up at the table for everything that you guys did.
And I'd also like to say to both sides, because I do agree with what Chris said, we're in a position right now that we are kind of divided. We don't want it to be that.

As a spokesman for the Six Rivers Conference, when we put this all together and brought these amendments forward, we were looking out for the best for the kids, and we also were thinking about the little private schools.

I have great respect for Joe, Chris, everybody, a lot of people that are private school people. And Abundant Life School that we play now and then, I didn't -- we didn't want to see them get punished.

The gentleman that talked from Notre Dame hit it on the head. The schools -- the -- the public schools that get hit by a Dominican, that's our problem.

So what I'm asking -- and I'm thanking both sides for standing up today and speaking because it did show by the vote we do have a problem.

And so what I hope that -- I ask the Board of Control, the executive staff, Dave, to continue looking at that problem because that going
back to status quo, we all know we're all going to go
back home and continue complaining. So what is it
that we can come together with to make it fair for
everybody? That's really my intent of the whole
thing when we started our discussion.

Because a great friend that was brought
up here, Gary Nice, who was killed in a car accident,
was a district administrator at -- from Benton
started this whole conversation. And I think he's
looking down at us today saying, at least they're
discussing it.

So that was my point. Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you, Kevin.

MS. FRERES: Sandy Freres from The
Prairie School.

On behalf of all of us, I do think we
do have one thing in common, and that is how we feel
about young people and our caring for them and
education-based athletics.

The last two days I had the opportunity
to read 18 scholarship essays that were submitted by
athletic directors, students, or their children. And
one thing I know that is for certain, regardless if
we're talking about state championships or not, the
message that they sent through their essays was the
celebration of participation in high school athletics and the lessons that they will learn for a lifetime. And it wasn't about a state championship, but it was about involvement, frustrations, obstacles, and how it would prepare them for their future.

So for that, we should celebrate the WIAA.

Thank you.

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you.

Any other announcements?

If there is no other business to come before the Board, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. SANDERS: Bob Sanders, Sparta High School, move to adjourn.


MR. BEIGHLEY: Anybody approve -- All those in favor?

ALL: Aye.

Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. BEIGHLEY: Thank you very much for your attendance, folks.

(Proceedings concluded at 1:20 p.m.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>champion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>champion (2)</td>
<td>101:21:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103:4:202:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>championships (2)</td>
<td>187:6:201:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187:6:201:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>champions</td>
<td>182:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changing (4)</td>
<td>5:12:21:180:17:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel (1)</td>
<td>10:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapek (2)</td>
<td>50:2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplin (2)</td>
<td>51:16:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charged (2)</td>
<td>122:18:175:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie (1)</td>
<td>75:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine (1)</td>
<td>81:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charter (1)</td>
<td>188:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check (2)</td>
<td>161:10:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checkbook (1)</td>
<td>135:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checked (1)</td>
<td>46:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chequamegon (1)</td>
<td>55:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chetek-Weyerhaeuser (1)</td>
<td>55:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickering (1)</td>
<td>9:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chien (1)</td>
<td>77:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcote (2)</td>
<td>80:23:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children (3)</td>
<td>197:5:198:7; 201:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilton (1)</td>
<td>55:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip (2)</td>
<td>87:7:152:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa (4)</td>
<td>32:8:55:12:141:6; 164:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice (1)</td>
<td>39:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choices (1)</td>
<td>164:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choose (3)</td>
<td>126:22:133:18; 197:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTIANSEN (4)</td>
<td>88:16:16:153:5:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christman (2)</td>
<td>66:16:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas (1)</td>
<td>149:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck (2)</td>
<td>52:8:69:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Keyword</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ky</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labellecker</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeled</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladysmith</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlaw</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake-Glenbeulah</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland-Union</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambrecht</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landevo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laona</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lechleitner</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledig</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaisons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litterick</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lind</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motions (1)</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multipliers (4)</td>
<td>38:17,19,42:2; 95:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiply (1)</td>
<td>120:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-school (1)</td>
<td>188:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murnane (2)</td>
<td>61:18,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy (2)</td>
<td>88:12,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray (2)</td>
<td>77:10,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskego (1)</td>
<td>72:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must (11)</td>
<td>2:18:4;20;116:10; 135:7;138:22; 140:14;166:9;13; 194:21;196:1;197:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>necessary (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive (1)</td>
<td>197:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named (1)</td>
<td>190:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy (1)</td>
<td>85:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanette (1)</td>
<td>77:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoli (2)</td>
<td>73:13,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat (3)</td>
<td>39:9;84:4;105:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate (5)</td>
<td>64:25;68:2;73:3; 82:12;13:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan (3)</td>
<td>68:20;87:8;139:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation (3)</td>
<td>75:9;95:11,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National (4)</td>
<td>9:15;23;23:22; 191:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally (2)</td>
<td>102:16,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigate (1)</td>
<td>2:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays (1)</td>
<td>46:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearer (1)</td>
<td>185:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necedah (1)</td>
<td>72:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessarily (2)</td>
<td>40:4;100:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEE (2)</td>
<td>83:21,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need (58)</td>
<td>6:1;2;12;23:9;10; 28:17;31:25;32;23; 33:4;5;7;20;38:3;4; 40:14;15;20;22;41:3; 45:25;46;16;17;90;8; 91:14;98:1;199:23; 108:20;111;17;18;23; 24:11;12;13;14; 131:6;9;10;16;16; 16;134;10;149;21; 169:9;171:3;12;20; 179:25;180;1;183;1; 31:8;14;17;17;19;23; 25;19;3;16;96;22; 199;17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed (1)</td>
<td>130:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needham (2)</td>
<td>89:19,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs (7)</td>
<td>32:20;36:12;38:25; 102:14;112:19; 186:7;188:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neenah (3)</td>
<td>73:2;134:8,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negate (1)</td>
<td>98:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiations (1)</td>
<td>187:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighboring (1)</td>
<td>194:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neillsville (1)</td>
<td>73:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither (1)</td>
<td>146:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nekoosa (1)</td>
<td>73:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson (2)</td>
<td>75:15,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net (1)</td>
<td>109:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nett (5)</td>
<td>27:2;2;169;15;15; 170:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network (1)</td>
<td>9:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New (30)</td>
<td>13:5;20;21;22;20; 25:21;27;3;22;61;11; 73:8;10;12;14;15;17; 19:21;91:3;178;18; 180:8;10;182;16; 185:6;12;187;3;6;18; 188:8;189;18; 193:10;196:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newer (1)</td>
<td>72:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newerly (2)</td>
<td>9:14;152:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman (1)</td>
<td>73:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News (3)</td>
<td>9:23;187:4;191:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton (2)</td>
<td>81:6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next (26)</td>
<td>5:8;18;17;25;7; 28:9;37;3;5;11;20;20; 45:2;47;6;7;138;23; 139;13;40;1; 170;20;21;17;4;16; 172;7;173;15;21; 174;19;181;4; 185:23;193:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFHS (3)</td>
<td>23:20;142;10; 190:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara (2)</td>
<td>73:25;169:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice (2)</td>
<td>168:23;201:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche (1)</td>
<td>15:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas (1)</td>
<td>12:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols (4)</td>
<td>70:16,16,21,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick (3)</td>
<td>9:22;51;1:82;19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolet (1)</td>
<td>74:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolay (2)</td>
<td>54:6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (4)</td>
<td>99:6;104:20; 172:18;176:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonpublic (8)</td>
<td>13:10;33;17;36:1; 94:7;98:21;99:20; 112:6;115:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonschool (30)</td>
<td>146:14;16,24; 147:2;5,11,21; 150:11;18;22;15;9; 14;154:9;156;13;20; 22:25;157;1;5,8; 158:1;5;159;12; 160:21;101;11; 162:2;10;165;8; 172:25;189;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonvariety (1)</td>
<td>189:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nope (1)</td>
<td>164:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor (5)</td>
<td>2:16;38;3:95;2; 136:18;146:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm (1)</td>
<td>3:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normally (1)</td>
<td>19:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris (1)</td>
<td>74:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (11)</td>
<td>22:20;50;10;58:15; 71:5;74;4,5,6,8; 75:16;81;19:66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern (3)</td>
<td>34:5;74;14:83:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood (1)</td>
<td>74:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note (6)</td>
<td>30:3;146:21; 151:15;16;165:21; 166:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted (1)</td>
<td>29:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice (5)</td>
<td>5:20;10;7;116:17; 154:24;155:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notified (1)</td>
<td>8:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify (1)</td>
<td>24:14;28:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify (1)</td>
<td>167:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre (4)</td>
<td>44:10;74:18; 101:15;200:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novak (2)</td>
<td>53:20;20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November (2)</td>
<td>190:1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowhere (1)</td>
<td>106:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (37)</td>
<td>2:14;9;19;14;23; 16:7;18;2;5,13; 101:2;104;15;20;21; 105:24;106;7;107:2; 12,14;11;14;116;8; 117:11;18;12; 122;22;24;125;7,10; 13,25;132;6;20; 149:1;159;19;22; 175:25;176;12,22; 178:9;14;180:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers (4)</td>
<td>122:13;125;24; 127:12,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous (1)</td>
<td>122:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(22) plucked - providing
| **provision (4)** | 187:11 | questionable (1) | 44:3 |
| **Provisions (3)** | 127:9,130:12; | 133:23,140:24; | 146:21 |
| **public (25)** | Quick (3) | 147:20,155:15; | 160:25 |
| **public/private (3)** | 157:18 | RAVIZZA (6) | 175:10 |
| **published (4)** | 43:3,9,44:9,9; | 74:20,20 | receive (4) |
| Pulaski (2) | raw (1) | 97:10,140:21; | 154:20,23 |
| **put (14)** | Ray (4) | 134:23,168:13; | received (3) |
| **putting (2)** | 19:12,55:19,83:23; | 191:19 | receives (2) |
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