

Committee on Competitive Equity

Meeting Summary

October 1, 2014

Co-chairs Sandy Freres and Patrick Mans welcomed the committee and reflected on the committee's progress. Committee members were thanked for their time and efforts. The representation on this committee and the voices are very important to the entire state. Meeting facilitator Drew Horwick previewed agenda.

UPDATE ON SEVEN AREA MEETINGS

Wade Labecki and Todd Clark, WIAA executive staff members, were in attendance for this portion of the meeting.

Committee members that presented at the Area Meeting in their district relayed the following observations:

- PowerPoint was very well put together, and seemed to answer a lot of questions people had.
- Majority of the questions were questions that this committee kicked around.
- Not a lot of discussion.
- Questions about the reducer and how the data is going to be audited, kept confidential, etc.
- Concerns about the timeframe placed upon this committee.
- How do special needs students fit into the free and reduced category.
- Disappointed with the turn out in some areas.
- Some were concerned that there are too many private schools on the committee.
- Like how the minutes of the committee are being shared.
- Committee is doing good job with a very difficult task.
- Not much contentiousness.
- Thanked numerous times.
- Far more discussion about seeding than about this committee's discussions.
- People are waiting to see exactly what the proposal is going to be and how it will affect their school. We will hear more feedback then.

Comments from Wade and Todd:

- People were very respectful and this committee did a great job on presenting and answering questions.
- Geography piece confuses people a bit.
- Several did ask about status quo.

We need to remind ourselves that we are doing all the work in collecting the data, but it is really going to be up to the membership to decide.

It was clarified that if the plan that is proposed to the membership does not pass, we would then remain "status quo" on this issue.

The 1.65 proposal, as it was in its form at the 2014 Annual Meeting, is dead. Unless we bring it back up as our proposal, it is not going to be voted on at the 2015 Annual Meeting.

REVIEW OF THREE POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

At the last meeting, three potential solutions were identified to address the perception of competitive inequity. Committee members volunteered to explore each of these options and then brief the full committee on what they learned. During the discussion, committee members were encouraged to present their remarks by what they find ATTRACTIVE about this solution, what CONCERNS them about the solution, or QUESTIONS they have about the solution. Comments were recorded on paper for all to see. Below is a summary of the discussion about each.

REDUCER

Follow the Minnesota plan using free and reduced lunch numbers where 40% of the current enrollment count be reduced. For example, if there are 100 students on free and reduced lunches, 40 are subtracted and 60 students count.

Competitive Equity Committee

Page 2 of 4

What is attractive:

- It could be applied to everyone.
- Based on data.
- Addresses “haves” and “haves not”. Sees the public perception that in different pockets of the state the pool of potential athletes is different.
- Never been challenged legally.
- People in Minnesota are content with their plan.

What is of concern:

- No defensible/logical basis on coming up with 40%.
- Access to data is changing.
- Federal policy change would affect this.
- Minnesota high school executive director has indicated that the reducer has made no tangible difference.
- Private and public school data is incomplete.

Questions:

- The impact of choice and Chapter 220 schools.
- What is Minnesota doing with the changes in the hot lunch program?
- Can we get data about those students on free and reduced that actually participate in athletics?
- What would be the criteria for not allowing Division 1 schools to move down?

GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARY

Radius of ten miles then take 2% of population and that would be added to your student population. For example, school located outside of large school district would use 2% of that assessable population and add that to their enrollment. Ten-mile radius and 2% are numbers that could be adjusted.

What is attractive:

- Applied to everyone
- Addresses open enrollment.
- Better than 1.65

What is of concern:

- Cannot apply equally to everyone in the state
- Difficulty in defining the boundary.
- Too complicated.
- Cannot develop a model to evaluate.
- No consistency in the boundaries.
- Uncertainty about feeder schools.
- Urban schools have large boundaries.
- Hurts rural schools.

Questions:

How does this look with feeder schools?

LONG-TERM SUCCESS FACTOR

Four points were awarded for schools who won the state championship, 3 points to those who lost, 2 points to those who made it to state and 1 point to schools who won the sectional game. Anytime a team exceeds 6 points on the scale they will be moved to the next higher division until their points fall to 6 or below in a three year period. There is a waiver provision where a school could move down to the previous division, but if the school continues to earn points, it would stay at the moved up division. There are a lot of variables that could change in this model.

What is attractive:

- Directly relates to WIAA sponsored tournaments.
- Addresses outcomes from the court/field.

Competitive Equity Committee

Page 3 of 4

- Follows criteria.
- Data is clear.
- Easy to explain.
- It addresses the concern “they win too much”.
- Rewards successful schools with a challenge.

What are concerns:

- Doesn't apply universally. Large Division 1 schools will not be affected.
- This is punishing success.
- How are the teams going to feel when they are moved down.
- Restricts 7-8 graders opportunities because of the success of 11-12 graders.

Questions:

- Need specifics - years and determinations of scores.
- How do schools move back up?
- How do schools move back down?
- What happens if you continue to dominate, do you continue to move up?

OTHER OPTIONS/COMMENTS

Could we do something for poorer schools, not necessarily using free and reduced? Could you do something using the average family income? This information could be gathered from the Department of Revenue.

In addition to any of the proposals why not offer the opportunity to schools districts that are under 300 in enrollment unlimited coaching contact at all times with their athletes.

In a small school you need your athletes to be multi-school athletes. This may hurt the three-sport athletes.

Year-round contact with athletes is not the issue in the small, rural schools – it is simply an issue of access to athletes.

Does taking the ultra elite, long-term champion and moving them to the upper division solve the issue that got us here?

There really isn't an answer. How come football is not a topic of discussion? Is it because not all teams make it to the playoffs? Do we take a look at the football model for all sports?

Struggling with competitive equity and rural/urban issues. Do any of these proposals do enough? Maybe conference realignment is the bigger issue and that is where we need to start when it comes to competitive equity.

Being sensitive to the social-economical issues with private/public and rural/urban we are punishing success and that hurts the young students.

Isn't the success factor the only proposal that closely resembles the 1.65 reducer that started all this?

At this point of the meeting, Dave Anderson joined to answer some procedural questions:

When this committee makes a recommendation to the Board of Control, will or can the Board alter it? This is a membership directive. When it was moved to committee it was a directive to come back with a recommendation. It will not be altered.

Will the Board of Control send it through committee structure starting with the coaches advisory committees? It will go to Sports Advisory, Advisory Council and Board of Control. It will not go through the coaches advisory committees. This is a membership directive to the Ad Hoc Committee. Sports Advisory, Advisory Council and Board of Control will have the opportunity to advance with support or advance without support to the Annual Meeting.

Competitive Equity Committee

Page 4 of 4

When a recommendation comes through, there has to be an implementation date given as it will have implications on other things such as tournament assigning, conference alignment, etc.

Will what this committee recommends require changes to the WIAA Constitution and/or Bylaws? Yes.

If this committee believes they have zeroed in on some type of proposal, it has been asked that the executive staff be involved in discussions to make sure that it is a reasonable and do-able solution, and with an implementation date that is determined so that staff resources would be or can be made available.

WADA district caucuses will have on their agenda review of Competitive Equity Committee discussions.

At the next meeting of this Committee a proposal will be drafted.

The next meeting will be October 28, 2014 at the WIAA office starting at 9:30 a.m.

Meeting ended at 4:28 p.m.