

April 16, 2014

(Proceedings commenced at 9:00 a.m.)

MR. SANDERS: Good morning. Try it again. Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. SANDERS: I welcome you all today to the Wisconsin Interscholastic Athletic Association's 119th annual meeting. My name is Dean Sanders. I'm the Board of Control president. I'm the district administrator in Lake Mills. And I welcome all of you here.

We do know that we will have some people coming in late who are coming from the north and seem to be enjoying the spring, if that ever comes.

Our registration today, just so you know - we've been trying to figure out why this might be - but the registration is the highest it's ever been at an annual meeting, which means that we have over 500 people here from at least 390 schools, if not more with registration this morning.

You have -- you have a meeting materials packet. In that packet is an agenda. There are the ballots. There are all of the editorial, constitutional, and amendments written out in there for you. I think there's a pen and a name tag.

We would ask at this time that any of you that have your cell phone on, you would silence it so that we're not -- anyone is being interrupted as they speak at the mike by anyone's phone.

At the head table, I would like to introduce the people who are up here with me. To my left, Corey Baumgartner, who is the treasurer of -- this year for the Board of Control. Mike Beighley, the president-elect. We were hoping this would happen next year for him, but we'll take care of that, you know. Dave Anderson, our executive director.

MR. ANDERSON: Morning.

MR. SANDERS: Wade Labecki, the deputy director. We have Dr. Chris Sadler. Dr. Sadler is our parliamentarian here from UW Stevens Point. And Jerry O'Brien, who is the legal counsel for the WIAA.

One thing we would ask this morning, if anybody comes to the mike and has a written statement that they read, we would like it that they turn that in up here at the front table so that it can become part of the record and we make sure we get it word for word as we're doing that. So if you do have a written statement, please drop that off at the front table as you're done.

At this time, you can find in your -- in your handbook -- or in the meeting agenda the 2013 annual meeting minutes. These minutes were approved by the Board of Control last year at their May meeting. The minutes of today will be approved at our meeting in May of this year. So, again, those are there for your perusal.

At this time, I would like to have Mr. Baumgartner come forward to go through the treasurer's report, at which time when he's finished, we'll take a motion on that.

MR. BAUMGARTNER: Good morning, everyone. If you would be so kind to turn to page 16 in your booklet, there you'll find our treasurer's report for this annual meeting. Take a look starting with the results of the 2013 audit that was provided by the Grant Thornton firm. You will see that it was a favorable year for the association with an overall increase in the unrestricted net assets of \$776,112. This is primarily due to revenue gain from greatly increased attendance at our state tournament events. The overall unrestricted net assets for that year was \$3,816,894. Take a look at the projections of 2013/14. Provided for the association was a balanced budget which is showing -- anticipating a slight net increase, once again, due to the unrestricted net assets. Though the fall tournaments have proved to be favorable, the winter was a little bit less than our

2013 season. But overall, it looks to be another great year for the association. I would entertain any questions at this time.

MR. SANDERS: At this time, I would take a motion to approve the treasurer's report.

Please give me your name and school.

MR. THOMPSON: Jeff Thompson, Laconia High School.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Jeff.

Second?

MR. MCLOWERY (phonetic): Jim McLowery, (inaudible).

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Jim.

Any other discussion or questions?

We're going to do this one by roll call, voice vote. All in favor of the treasurer's report, please signify by saying aye.

THE AUDIENCE: Aye.

MR. SANDERS: Opposed, same sign.

(No response.)

MR. SANDERS: Ayes have it.

At this time, we're going to -- we have elections that are going on in the Board of Control and the Advisory Council. I'm going to ask Joan Gralla to please come forward and to give those results to you.

MS. GRALLA: Good morning, everyone.

The results for the Board of Control election:

District 3, Mike Beighley, superintendent from Whitehall, was reelected for his second term.

District 4, Corey Baumgartner, principal of Kiel, was reelected for his second term.

The ethnic at-large position, Eric Coleman, student services coordinator from Milwaukee, was elected for his first term.

The Advisory Council:

Large schools. Todd Sobrilsky, athletic/activities director at Brookfield Central, and Dave Steavpack, assistant principal/athletic director at Ashwaubenon, were both reelected for their second term.

Medium Schools. Ty Breitlow, principal at Chilton, was elected for his first term. Barry Rose, superintendent at Cumberland, reelected for his second term.

Small schools. Mark Gruen, district administrator at Royall, elected for his first term.

And ethnic at-large. Mark Holzman, assistant superintendent, Sheboygan Public Schools, was elected for his first term.

There's one other thing I would like to mention to you at this time. If you look on the back page of the packet that you have -- we recently had a middle level junior high survey. Those results are on the back side. If you have any questions or if you have any questions about WIAA middle level membership, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Joan.

At this time, I would like to take the opportunity to introduce your Board of Control members. These are the people representing each of your areas in different ethnic, gender, private school functions. So starting -- Brad Ayer from Clear Lake.

If you would, stand and wait until they're all introduced.

Brian Busler from Oregon. Pam Foegen, La Crosse. Steve Knecht from Kenosha. Ted Knutson from Aquinas. Keith Posley of Milwaukee. Terry Reynolds from Pittsville. And Bill Yingst is our WASB representative from Durand.

Give these guys a round of applause.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: Staff members other than the people at the front table today -- and they're all over the room. I know that if I an-

nounce your name, just please wave. Deb Hauser, associate director. Tom Shafranski, assistant director. Marcy Thurwachter, assistant director. Todd Clark, communications director. Joan Gralla, office manager. Eric Dziak, technology coordinator. Candace Ostertag, administrative assistant. And Kassie McGettigan, ticket coordinator.

As you'll know, we have two new people. I think their jobs have been very important, technology and ticketing. And they've done a real nice job. So if we could give them a round of applause, we appreciate it.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: At our Board meetings every month, we have the opportunity to hear from a couple liaisons who come in and talk to us from -- for a perspective of what's going on in different parts of the state that we may not hear, and I'd like to recognize them today.

I know John Ashley is not here from the WASB, but he brings a wide plethora of -- of ideas and -- and information to our meetings.

Mike Thompson from the DPI. I know Mike is here. If you would, stand so you can be recognized. And then -- yeah, please.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: And Greg Harvey.

Greg - if you could stand up - is the WADA rep to the Board this year. So if you could, give him a round of applause.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: At this time, I would ask that any member of the Advisory Council who is here, please stand so you can be recognized.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: And then we have Sports Advisory Committee members. If you are here, please stand and be recognized.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: And we have one other guest. Our past director, Doug Chickering, is here today with us. We will tease him that we made him get out of bed early this morning to get up here, but we are very happy he is here.

Doug, if you're here, if you could stand.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: We also have a number of media people here, and I have a list of them. And I've got to believe that that's changed and there is additions to that.

So if anybody is here from the media, would you please stand so we can see where you're at. We would greatly appreciate that.

They're all in the back.

Thank you very much for coming. We appreciate that very much.

(Applause.)

MR. SANDERS: This year is different than any other annual meeting. We are putting the open forum before the votes. We had -- open forum is so that people have the opportunity to say what -- what they wanted to say as they came here on any topic that they want to speak on. We thought that that was important so that we didn't go right into the votes. And I'll be very honest with what I'm going to say. We didn't go right into the votes -- on the amendments, somebody stands up and tables it before anything else happens, and nobody gets a chance to speak on it. So we believe that it's a better idea to have the open forum first this time before we vote, and we would appreciate your -- your -- the opportunity to hear what you have to say.

When we get to the vote today, you're going to vote on two constitutional changes, one bylaw change, two rules of eligibility

changes, and one editorial change. So we will be voting on six different things unless there's something else that comes up.

You have packets, again, and ballots in your -- in your -- in your yellow folder.

During the open forum, I would ask that you come to the mike. I would ask that you state your name and your school clearly enough so that our -- our reporters can get that into the minutes. And then talk on whatever subject that you would like to do.

Ground rules, if there are any this morning, I think they're very, very simple. Be timely. I don't need to hear a 30-minute report. You don't want to give a 30-minute report. Say what you need to say. Secondly, be respectful. We are -- you can take it for what it's worth. We are the WIAA. We are the family. Say what you want to say, but be respectful when -- when you say it. And I think that that's important. And lastly, please be heard. There are issues today that we've been dealing with for 14 years. It's been since 2006 before we heard anything about them. So I'd rather you say it in here than out there when we're done or back in some meeting where nobody knows what you have to say. So please be heard. Go to the microphone. Say what you need to say. I think that's important. And I think that's why there's as many people here today as there are.

The last thing that I would ask that we do is -- I know multiplier is going to take up some time. So I would like to say that we're going to spend the first part of this open forum on anything but the multiplier.

So if you've got anything that you want to say, please go to the mike. I will try to recognize you from here. I'm going to go Mike 1 through 4. 1 in the front; 4 in the back. I'll try to do it as you get there. I may mess that up a little bit, but I apologize upfront for doing so.

And please wait until you are recognized to speak.

When we get to the amendments, we get to the voting part, Mr. Labecki will explain those. And again, I will take the motions. And I would ask that, this year, to give a motion, please go to the mike. Again, it's much easier for our reporters to try to do it that way.

So at this time, a mike is open, and we are open for, again, probably any topic other than the multiplier so it doesn't dominate what goes on.

Mary?

MS. PFEIFFER: Good morning. My name is Mary Pfeiffer, and I am the superintendent of the Neenah (inaudible) School District. And I'm not sure what the process will be, Dean, so I'll ask for clarification after I say what I've come to say.

I'm very concerned about what Mr. Anderson and ten of our Board members have deemed to be editorial changes for consideration. I communicated this with Mr. Anderson as well as the Board of Control and strongly disagree with adding any legal action -- that by adding legal action is merely an editorial change. To my fellow members, I corresponded with your superintendent last week, so you should be aware of this change. Article 6, page 19. In the materials we received, it's on page 12 in your book. Letter A, No. 5, as well as Article 1, Section A, Letter A, are the areas that I will focus on. In essence, what's being proposed is that the WIAA Board of Control has the power to collect fines, fees, and reimbursements from member schools who take action against the WIAA. Conversely, we, as member districts, have no recourse of a similar action. The WIAA is suggesting we accept something that no one in this room would allow in their contract. This claimed editorial change would position all districts to relinquish our rights to what could be arbitrary and

capricious claims by the WIAA for reimbursements or money of their time or now legal action. Having reviewed this with our legal counsel, it's imperative that we do not support this change.

I will be making an amendment. Would you like that now or later? Later?

MR. SANDERS: We'd like it at the time that we're voting on it. Thank you, Mary.

Anyone else on any topic that's not on the agenda for today that we need to be looking forward to? Please, again, this is the time.

Thank you.

MR. ZWETTLER: Morning. Chris Zwettler, athletic director, Edgewood High School, Sacred Heart.

A lot of time and effort was put in a couple years ago putting forward a basketball out-of-season contact amendment. It was brought forth by the WBCA in January and February by the Board there and sent to Mr. Labecki and Deb Hauser. I was expecting to see it on one of the amendments at this meeting today. And I'm just curious, after a couple of years of discussion about it, why it was tabled or chosen by the Board of Control to not be on -- not -- not be offered as an amendment to the membership. Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: I would tell you that it was brought up at the March meeting, of which I was not present at, but I know it was -- it was voted on there. And it was not voted to move it to here, just so you know that.

MR. ZWETTLER: And the question was, why was it voted not to?

Yeah. I got that. I understand it was decided in March. I'm just curious as to why it was not.

MR. SANDERS: I will -- I will have to ask someone else to help you with that --

MR. ZWETTLER: Okay.

MR. SANDERS: -- since I was not there.

MR. ZWETTLER: Okay.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you. Yes.

MR. LABECKI: We had two amendments that were brought forward. One was for volleyball, to have ten days of summer contact unrestricted. And the basketball, which was the unrestricted with contact with the various limits and -- and hours. I believe, if I'm summarizing for the Board, at that meeting, that they did not want to increase the time that we are taking away from families with the kids, and they did not want the schools to be associated with that as far as requirements. It was an unrestricted school contact, which could have had ramifications as far as funding and as far as what the schools could require with kids. And that would be my summary. If I'm incorrect, I would ask for (inaudible) --

MR. ZWETTLER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

With that - I don't see anybody else sprinting up to the microphone - so we'll open up discussion of the amendments that are there today, either one. We have one on realignment, one on multiplier. So please, the mikes are open at this time to speak to either one.

MR. PAULY: My name is Bob Pauly, president of Notre Dame Academy in Green Bay.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Bob.

MR. PAULY: And I do have a written statement, which I will present to you gentlemen at the end.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

MR. PAULY: I've worked in Wisconsin high school education for 28 years, all of them in Catholic high schools. I've worked in five different schools in both Milwaukee and Green Bay. And I've observed many things during my 28 years in education.

I have watched as some private and public schools have dominated in some sports due to the work of legendary coaches creating legendary programs that attracted legendary athletes. I have watched as some private and public schools have benefited from their ability to draw outstanding athletes into their schools from outside their areas. I've also watched as some private and public schools have languished with programs that have rarely experienced the thrill of a state championship due to the limited number of quality athletes that were available to them and the kinds of coaches they were able to attract and the kinds of programs they were able to create. I believe I have some credibility on this topic because I've experienced both sides of the won/loss ledger.

In Milwaukee, I worked for 13 years at St. Thomas Moore High School situated on Milwaukee's south side. It currently has a large Hispanic population, many of whom require a great deal of financial assistance. It is a school that was not a big-time winner in sports, but was tough and competitive nonetheless. In my 13 years, we never played for a state championship in football nor in basketball, though we had great coaches and great athletic directors. And once in a while, we had an exceptional athlete or two who would provide us with an exciting run in a particular year.

For the past four years, I've been at Notre Dame Academy in Green Bay. We are the only Catholic high school in the greater Green Bay area and consider it an exceptional private school. We have won a number of state championships in my brief time here. We have great coaches, great programs, a great athletic director, and a good pool of talent from which to draw.

In this debate, one size does not fit all. It does not fit all private high schools, and it does not fit all public high schools. There are some private and public high schools that do have some advantages that other private and public high schools do not.

This is a very complex topic and one that should be looked at and discussed by a group of fair-minded individuals who have the best interests of all student athletes from around the state in mind. Let these fair-minded folks meet to discuss this complex topic and make a proposal that will not leave a bitter taste in the mouths of those who would leave this meeting immediately wanting to begin costly legal action, wasting hundreds of thousands of dollars on a topic that I believe fair-minded, intelligent people could have brought to an equitable conclusion through meeting and discussion. Let their discussions factor in, not only private schools' ability to attract students from outside their areas, but public schools' ability to do as well as through open enrollment. Factor in special needs kids who are truly unable to participate in athletics. Factor in certain schools dominating a particular sport for several years and possibly moving them up to play competition on par with their own. We really want schools to play to their competition level, not their enrollment number. Factor in also the number of international students that come to a number of private schools who need those numbers so that they can balance their budgets. Discuss the topic of a multiplier, but discuss what seems fair and equitable instead of randomly borrowed from the State of Illinois where it is enforced differently than it would here and where it is currently found to be lacking and ineffective.

I expect that many of you have come here with marching orders and that your minds may be made up. You may be (inaudible) the belief that there is too much winning for the private side and not enough winning from the public side. This could be your opportunity to level the playing field, and then all will be well in your world of athletics. But all will not be well in your world of athletics. Some schools who are currently suffering will suffer even more. The small

private high schools, which can barely keep their noses above water and compete as it is, will drown. And some will close. And every public school in this room will walk away from these meetings knowing that there is a strong seg -- segment within this room that will leave this room resentful, believing that they were dealt an unfair hand without due process and proper discourse. They will begin talks of lawsuits and litigation and government intervention, and bad blood will flow through -- throughout the state that all of us will have contributed to. I do not believe any of us really want that. Marching orders can be changed even at the 11th hour because it's the right thing to do.

This topic can be tabled so that fair-minded folks can discuss it and weigh all of the multiple factors that come into play and propose -- propose a plan that's equitable and fair for the vast majority. Then, at the designated time, let us come together once again for a vote after due process has been given time to work and move ahead with the plan that most people can agree upon. That is the best course of action for each school representative in this room.

And I thank you for your time and your consideration.

MR. SANDERS: I was a little nervous how far you were coming up now.

MR. PAULY: I'm coming all the way up to you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.

Anybody else? This is your time.

Thank you. Please go ahead.

MS. FRERES: My name is Sandy Freres, and I'm the athletic director at The Prairie School.

In 1973, I had the opportunity to open my teaching and coaching career in Green Bay, Wisconsin. As a new 21-year-old teacher and coach, I was excited to start a volleyball - excuse me - volleyball and basketball program. A friend of mine from college was teaching at a neighboring school. We got together and made the decision that we would play each other. Mid-way through September, I received a phone call from her in which she said to me, we cannot play you. We were just getting women's athletics started. I said, why? And she said, because you're a private school. At 21, I had no clue what she was talking about. I had no history, and women's athletics was just starting.

Somewhere around 1977, the superintendent -- brand new superintendent of the Green Bay schools came forward and said, why are my schools traveling so far to play nonconference competition? What I've admired most about this decision was the fact that he asked the athletic directors of the schools in Green Bay, public and private, to come together, together, to solve our differences and figure out a way that we could play and compete against each other.

Fast forward to 1996/97 in which Governor Tommy Thompson had similar issues. He said, if you guys can't get together and solve this, I will. And the process of a three-year coming together of public and private schools under the leadership of Doug Chickering and all the factors in the state of Wisconsin came together, together, to form new public and private WIAA membership. It was a process in which the most important thing that happened together is -- was rumors or things that were not factual were studied and dispelled. Facts were put on the table and a cooperation and partnership was formed.

As we move forward, my greatest hope is that, not to dismiss concerns of our membership, to hear them much like we did in 1977, much like we did in 1997, that we come forward again to work together to, not cause problems within the WIAA, but to forge forward and make the WIAA a much stronger organization.

I hope that you all join me, hoping that we can table this and also to look forward to having a strong, sound, and fair-minded

group of people working together to solve our problems, as we do, as one membership of the WIAA.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

Anyone else? I'll say it three times. Anyone else? There we go. Please.

MR. SCHMITT: Barry Schmitt, Independence High School.

I took your words literally, that if I'm going to say something, I'm going to say it here instead of other places. And I wish other people who I've heard talk would -- I would challenge you to have the same opportunity.

I commend those schools who have come forward with the multiplier, not that I necessarily think it's the right solution, but that they are saying that they feel that there is a problem and an issue with -- with some of the processes and procedures that we currently have for classification of schools.

I've been a principal the last three years. And in that time, a couple of -- of slogans or cliches have been used a lot in my school. One is, fair is not always equal. And the other one is, everybody gets what they need; not everybody gets the same.

When I look at the public and nonpublic schools, we have one in our conference that I think is a good fit. In that same city, we have another nonpublic school that would not be a good fit in our conference. Although, I think at some -- in some sports, they are in our classification. That isn't -- I have no criticism of those schools. I think they're both great organizations. In fact, our private grade school feeds into one of those schools; so I've had a number of students and families and friends that I know who send their children there. It's a great school.

In the same respect, the students of those schools are very different than the students in my school. And I don't think it's so much athletic ability. I have some great athletes in my school, but not all of them have a -- have the -- or some of them have more obstacles to deal with to participate in athletics, be it culture, be it poverty, be it family support. So I do believe that they're not -- the students in those schools are not necessarily equal. I'm not saying that they're poor students or anything of that sort. They're great kids. But things are not the same.

When I look at it from an administrator's perspective, to me, it's similar to what we do for our gifted and talented students. We all start with all our students in the same grade level. And then we set some criteria to find out goals that are the gifted ones, the ones that should be moved ahead and moved forward.

I would think that this organization could do something similar to that, be it based on free and reduced, be it based on past history, be it based on special education. There has to be some criteria out there in which our gifted and talented schools get moved up through the competition level that best fits them just as we do with our students. If this is an educational-based institution, I think we should use educational-based practices.

Fourteen years ago, I kind of thought the solution to the classification was too simple. I think this multiplier -- I have the same feeling. It's just too simple for a complex problem.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Barry.

Anyone else, please.

Yes?

MR. LAPOINT: Good morning. My name is Brad LaPoint from Fall Creek. Thank you.

I totally convinced myself that I would not do this today, but -- but the issue that I have this morning is the opportunity to speak,

and -- and I feel, in some ways, that opportunity has been limited. And when I look around the room, there's a lot of people that I -- I wish would get up and speak to this issue, but I know that they won't. So I will.

I view this as -- this issue has been around for a long, long time. And for some of us, we haven't had that ability to speak about what we really feel about this. In the area of meetings, open forum starts the meeting; it doesn't finish the meeting. I appreciate the format today. I think it's of value. During our WATA conventions, we haven't had open forum. It has not existed at all. Have you had an opportunity to voice your opinion about what you're concerned about? No. That's my issue. Can I table this today? Sure, I can. But this should have been talked about a long time ago. It shouldn't come down to a meeting today where the vote is on the menu. All of us can agree -- agree on this much, I believe. This should -- we really want the competition to happen on the courts and not in the courts. I think we can all agree upon that. But I think that if we're going to speak out and have the opportunity, you need to seize the moment.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.
Please.

MR. MCCABE: Phil McCabe. Phil McCabe, athletic director of St. Norbert's Senior Area High School.

While looking at the amendment in here, my principal had a couple questions. And one that he needs me to bring back (inaudible), Part 2 deals with the multiplier. Part 4, though, deals with single-sex schools being doubled. The question that we have, as an all-boys school, are we doubled and then multiplied, or are we just doubled and left at that? There other single-sex schools in the state. And that's a question that doesn't apply. Is there an answer? (Inaudible.)

MR. SANDERS: I don't -- I don't believe that we, as a Board, were able to -- to discuss from that standpoint what the answer of that was because the amendment came as the amendment came. We did not -- we did not make the amendment. It was brought to us. We discussed that. And we would tell you -- or I would tell you, I don't believe there's an answer to that at this time. I'm sorry. I wish I could give you a better one. But with the amendment the way it came, there was nothing that spoke to single-sex schools.

MR. MCCABE: Well, just reading it as it's printed in the handbook here, Part 2 is -- was the multiplier. Part 4 says we double.

MR. SANDERS: Right.

MR. MCCABE: So they seem to be in conflict with each other.

MR. SANDERS: No disagreement to that.

MR. MCCABE: Well, when I go back, that's going to be -- that's the question he's going to ask me.

MR. SANDERS: Okay. Wade, do we have anything other to that?

MR. LABECKI: You're right. At this point --

MR. SANDERS: Can somebody make sure that's in the minutes? Wade and I have known each other for 30 years. He's never told me I was right.

MR. LABECKI: That's because he was a football official, and I was a football coach.

I would tell you that, reading through there, if you go by the rules step-by-step, you will multiple. Then you will go to Step 3. And then you will get to Step 4, and you will multiply. In order to be uniform and consistent, we will go down through the rules, and we will apply them as they are in order.

MR. MCCABE: I just need to know the answer when I go back.

MR. LABECKI: So you will be 1.65. And then you will be 2.

MR. SANDERS: Yes, sir. Please.

MR. SITZ: Jeff Sitz, Wisconsin Lutheran.

I would respectfully request that you would consider in your vote putting this to a discussion, an honest discussion.

As we head back to 1997, as Sandy said before, as happened many times in the state, we need to sit down, I believe, and talk about this. There are a lot of things -- there are a lot of issues on the table. I can't for a minute begin to appreciate the concerns of the schools that have brought forward this issue because I have not walked a mile in their shoes. And so I need to sit down, and I need to fully understand the issues that cause them to bring forward this amendment. It obviously is very moving to them and very pertinent to them, and I appreciate that. And I'd like to understand more about it so that I can appreciate that and so that we can have that discussion.

One of the things that I thought was ironic in our district meetings that just happened coming from the WIAA, which I assume means it came from the membership, was, we were asked at the District 7 meeting - and I'm sure everyone else was as well - to talk about a new proposal to consider having the, quote, unquote - now, this was the term used - the best teams at state tournaments instead of the current WIAA model of regional representation. Now, I'm certainly not a rocket scientist, and you all know that, but that would just seem to make this problem that we're discussing today even worse of having more teams represent at the state tournament. Yet, that came from someplace in our membership. And so there are feelings of some people in the room today that we need to change the model of the state tournaments so that the, quote, unquote, best teams, whatever that means, get there and not just people from all regions of the state.

It would seem to me that we have a lot of issues to talk about. And we -- we -- I would respectfully ask that we could sit down and discuss those rather than throwing something up against the wall, hoping it sticks, and then dealing with the results.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you. I think a clarification to one of the things that you stated was, the motion can be tabled, but the motion also can be sent to committee, which is, to me, what they call a higher motion than being tabled. So a motion that could come from the floor today could be sent to committee, not to be tabled. So just so you're aware of that part.

Anything else? Anyone else? That's No. 3.

Okay. We're going to move to the -- oops. I'm sorry. Thank you very much.

MR. NETT: Hi. Thank you for letting us speak here today. And I'd like to thank the WIAA for all the tough decisions that they have to make. And I would prompt everyone in this room to take this opportunity to speak as well. It's a hard thing to do; but, hey, we can do this and be a team.

So I want to thank the WIAA --

MR. SANDERS: Introduce yourself, and give us your school.

MR. NETT: Oh, I'm sorry. Dan Nett, Niagara, Wisconsin, superintendent.

I'd like to thank the WIAA for the proposed language on the conference alignment. Specifically to our student athletes for four plus events per sport, with the old language, they would be going - - traveling one and a half hours one way per event. This takes our student athletes' time away from their studies. I think you guys know what it's like to be on that yellow school bus for almost two hours. And you guys in this room, everyone, is aware of the tight -- tighter financial constraints on our school districts. This legis -- this -- these new bylaws allow us -- allow us to align our conferences as we see

fit locally. And I think that's a huge step in the right direction for rural schools and all kids in Wisconsin. The new conference alignment that we're in is going to cost us thousands and thousands of dollars more in a time when our revenue is backing off. I felt that the previous conference alignment system was prohibitive to student learning. If we are here for academics first and athletics second, I would say that we support that language.

In terms of the multiplier, it's a solution. Our current system, we all recognize, could be better. The multiplier system could be better. It could be better. But I don't have to mull over data when I see scores of 88 to 8 in the first round of a basketball tournament. And you have to ask yourself, okay, what are we going to do to make this better? It's not good for the WIAA. It's not good for any kids on any team, private or public, when you see scores like that. I don't think it's going to help revenue for the WIAA if you have scores like that in a tournament.

So thank you for your time. Thank you for allowing me my input. Have a wonderful day.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

Todd?

MR. FISCHER: Todd Fischer, Greenwood, principal/athletic director.

Dean, if I could get just one clarification. When you said the committee, is there a clarification to what that committee would consist of?

MR. SANDERS: No. That would have to be set up. It would have to be set up probably on a precedent, like the football ad hoc committee, getting -- getting representation from all groups.

MR. FISCHER: Because I think the concern I have here is, I haven't really heard the points that the people that did bring this forward -- I haven't heard that. I feel like I don't have enough information to vote on it. I have ideas, my own opinions, and I've stated those at our conference meetings. Just like everybody else probably in this room, conference meetings, AD meetings, principal meetings, have been heated or have had the discussions, but the people aren't saying it in this format because, again, speaking in front of 400 people is just kind of an uncomfortable situation.

You know, I guess, as far as how you make that amendment, if you make the amendment to have that go back to committee so that there is discussion and that all parts are heard, everybody is heard from, everyone gets to say their piece -- because I think everything needs to be said, laid on the table, before you can have a vote in this short of notice.

I mean, I've been a part of the Advisory Committee for six, seven years, and we've had the discussions, and I was in the early parts of the discussions. So I have some background information, some information, that's there as to the reasons why and why not. But I think it's important that it really needs to be heard more. I mean, four or five people have come forward.

But I think this is a very difficult decision, a very impact -- a historical decision that we would make that could impact WIAA as we go forward. But I just feel that it's really important that we go to some form of committee that has, you know, everybody in (inaudible) - public, private, nonprivate, small schools, big schools, statewide, using our districts, whatever. But it takes time to have that time. So I would be agreeable to going to, you know -- tabling this amendment, actually tabling it and sending it to a committee so that it can be studied and then brought back at the end of the year's time to then have that vote so that we have an educated vote.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Todd.

When we get to the amendments, I will have Dr. Sadler here come up and explain the different motions that can be made just so that we're clear with all of those.

Yes, sir. Please. Thank you.

MR. RUFSHOLM: My name is Jim Rufsholm. I'm the activities director for Black River Falls School District.

And we were one of the school districts that did sign the amendment to come forward. The purpose for me having our superintendent sign that document was for this discussion on the issue, knowing that that probably was not the best solution, but that would get us moving forward so we could have -- have a better solution for our -- and more competitive state tournaments at the -- at the appropriate level.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

Kevin?

MR. KNUDSON: Kevin Knudson, Barneveld. Thought he was going to ask for a school.

Having served on the Advisory Council and on the Board of Control, I'm passionate with the work the WIAA does. I'm also passionate -- the people I have gotten to know through the -- being an athletic director, principal, superintendent, whatever.

Let's not bury our heads in the sand. This issue has been on the table or in discussion for a long, long time. That already (inaudible).

Six Rivers conference has been taking a lot of heat in a lot of places as the ones that put this forward. I signed the petition. I was on the Board of Control. I go to the state basketball tournaments. I see people at other tournaments. Bottom line is, you hear it all the time - bitching, bitching, bitching. And like the guy from Fall River said, we all stand out in the hallway, and we talk. Here is the time to talk, get the message out there that you want something done.

The Six Rivers conference -- and I'll tell you, I helped develop that petition. I wasn't the one that wrote it. But we all worked together on it because it's an issue ongoing. We don't believe that the 1.65 is the right answer. I think there's other answers out there.

I'll personally say that I think it's more of an urban/rural issue and that the example I'll use, yes, Barneveld has been very successful. And Mr. Chickering always said when he was in his -- his spot -- he always talked about some (inaudible) and mentioned that good programs, great coaches, and all that helps successful programs. But I'll use Barneveld as an example versus an urban situation. You can talk all you want about open enrollment and everybody that is open enrollment is an athlete. It's not happening. Barneveld has been very successful in girls' basketball. We have River Valley, we have Wisconsin Heights, we've got Mount Horeb, (inaudible), and Dodgeville right in the center. We're in the center. We've had two open-enrolled kids come to our schools in my 20 years there going backwards. One is the coach's son -- girls' coach's son whose wife teaches. He gets a ride there. So, yeah, you could call him an athlete that we're stealing from (inaudible). And one other girl that did not -- open enroll, but was not an athlete.

But then you have the urban area. I'll use Wausau. You've got Wausau sitting out there. You've got Wausau Newman sitting there. Those kids don't have to drive. They could ride a bike. They can roller skate, whatever, that school -- go to that school. Then you've got Athens 40 miles down the road, 30, whatever. They're not going to be able to get those same kids that they get.

So I think there's a bigger issue out there and other ideas out there. And I think -- our Six Rivers said, at least this gets it on the table for discussion. So if a committee situation would come forward and you could promise that within a year that something gets done and something -- not just keep putting our heads in the sand and say

nothing is going to get done, but prove with the great group of people that something will be done within a year, not two years, not three, I think that's what people are here -- I think they would change their mind on the 1.6 if they knew something would happen and they could be guaranteed that that would take place.

So, yes, I supported that, but I don't really think it's the right answer, but something needs to be done. And as I quoted in the paper yesterday, that we all want quality for our kids. And we've all talked about sports is an extension of the classroom. It is. And so let's do what's best for our kids. Be fair with them and make it as equal as we can because bottom line is, we're not going to make everybody happy. I don't care what you change it to. Everybody is not going to be happy.

But I know a lot of people sitting out here that complain to me too that are not coming up here and voicing that. So the Fall River guy said, get up here and say what you've got to say. Don't be afraid.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

Bob?

MR. HOUTS: Bob Houts, superintendent, Owen-Withee School District.

I should have run a little faster because I've got a lot of the same things that Kevin had to say.

I too signed the petition. I applaud the Six Rivers conference for bringing this forward.

I guess my point is that, yes, to me, to us, it's a rural versus urban issue. It's not necessarily who wins state championships, win/loss records, things like that.

And -- and again, I applaud the Six Rivers conference for bringing this forward. This has been a problem that we, as members of the WIAA, have known about since 2000 when we joined private and public schools together, but it was put off. It was delayed so that we could think about it, we could see how the process went. In 2006, at this annual meeting, it was stated that this needs to be addressed. That was eight years ago, and it hasn't been addressed yet. So I applaud the -- this forces the hand.

If it's going to be sent to committee, I'm sure hoping it doesn't die. Because I don't think this problem is going away. I think the problem needs to be addressed. I think private and public schools coming together -- they're coming up with some kind of understanding of what the problem is and to come up with some kind of solution that we can live with.

1.65, that got pulled out of Illinois. I'm not sure I agree with a lot of stuff that comes out of Illinois. So -- thank you.

But, you know, it needs to be discussed, and something has to be come -- something has to be come up with to at least let the rural schools, the smaller schools, understand that they've been heard. I think that's what you need to hear is that they don't feel they're being heard. This is one way to get heard, bring the amendment in here and have it talked about and have it voted on or tabled to next year. But I think you need to understand that it needs to be dealt with soon.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you, Bob.

Yes, sir?

MR. MORELAND: Don Moreland, athletic director from Mellen.

(Inaudible) smaller northern schools, you want things that (inaudible) a little bit. I think we see it more as an opp -- issue of opportunity than anything else. We're located in the middle of nowhere basically up north. You've got the -- the private schools and the biggest cities where the kids are getting the programs. They're within

walking distance to a gym five minutes away. They're going through Division 1 programs all the way through to Division 1 competition with the kids. And all of a sudden, they're in 9th grade; they're playing Division 5, 4, whatever. And the kids up north, they have to get in a car and drive 20 minutes to get to their own school, which half the time the gym won't be open because they can't afford to put somebody in the school anyhow. So I see it more as an issue of opportunities. I think they have more of them in the big cities. They've got the AAU and everything else to go through them where our kids would have to travel a tremendous amount just to get to a gym.

And I do -- I think the solution here, the best solution -- the multiplier, I don't think that's the perfect solution either. But I think it's more of a location, where the schools are at, than anything else. If you put a private school in Birchwood, (inaudible) Springs, or (inaudible) without a multiplier.

But I do think the number one fear is, if it's voted no, it's just going to go away, we're going to hope it goes away, like we have for the last 14 years; we use our imagination and we won't talk about it anymore. Or if we vote to table it, that it will just die in a committee somewhere. It's just -- something has got to be (inaudible) with it, has got to be done with it. I think we're here more out of frustration than anything else because it hasn't been brought up enough. And just because it hasn't been discussed at all these meetings doesn't mean the frustration isn't out there.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

In the back?

MR. MILLER: Brian Miller, (inaudible) director at Ashland High School.

I appreciate my neighbor down in Mellen, and I do know where Mellen is.

MR. SANDERS: So do I.

MR. MILLER: I came here today really not knowing which way I was going to vote. I -- I stand here because I don't think the multiplier is the answer to a very complex issue. I think what drives participation and ultimately numbers have a big affect on how well our programs do. In my district, it's related directly to poverty levels, free and reduced lunch, students on special services. And I think that's really at the heart of equity that we're looking at. Simply multiplying in enrollment (inaudible) may not be the best answer.

I have a concern that if we voted yes today, that the membership would say, fine, we did something about what we agree on is inequity and it stops there. I'm also afraid if we vote no, it will never come up again. I'm afraid if it goes to a committee, it will die in a committee.

And I think it's an issue that is so important to any kind of equity in that membership that it's going to take a lot more discussion. It's going to take looking at some of the real factors in our kids participating in athletics, much like the DPI does when it filters school progress, academic progress, based on factors like special services and free and reduced lunch.

Let me just point one example out. My district has had success in the sports of soccer and in gymnastics. Those two sports in the community of Ashland do not represent the demographic of the larger community. It's a community within a community. They don't tap as high on the free and reduced numbers. They don't tap into the special services numbers as high. They have strong familial support. And those sports are able to compete statewide. When I go outside that demographic and I begin to draw kids from those other things, I cannot compete.

I think that's at the heart of the -- of the -- the equity issue. I would like much more discussion on it.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

Please.

MR. MCDOWELL: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Mike McDowell. I'm from the school district of North Fond du Lac, not the Fond du Lac school district. Often times, we're confused.

And I guess there's a myriad of issues we can take a look at here. And I think we can all take a look at our school districts and -- and our population, those that are free and reduced lunch and those that are on special ed programs. Our school district in North Fond du Lac is a school of 400. We roughly have about 130 students that come into our enrollment and about the same number that -- that go to other schools. In our Wisconsin Flyaway (verbatim) conference, which is a shout out to my other athletic directors, you know, we have a relationship, public and -- and private. You know, for me, I look at that as -- as a greater issue.

We have several co-op sports that we have, you know, one being wrestling. We co-op in soccer with both public and private. Concern is how our co-ops are going to be impacted by the 1.65 multiplier and if that's going to have an impact on us and the kids from St. Mary's Springs Academy that we get for soccer, that we also get for wrestling, to come to our school. Is that going to move our school up to a Division 1 school for wrestling now?

I think we look at a larger issue too, and that's the moral fabric of the family today, the reason why we don't see, you know, success in individuals and why we see free and reduced lunch programs.

And I get the urban and the rural for a school district of 5,000 people. We butt up against a school district that has, you know, 40,000 people in it. I don't know where we'd be considered.

To me, I look at myself -- and I've often said this. And I know it's maybe naive, being a newer assistant -- or being an AD, is that I've got to bring successful programs to my school. I'm not putting Mr. Krueger on the line here, but I'm just stating, you know, he's got a successful program where Bob Highland (phonetic) has created, you know -- with football. Our -- our division, you know, we play against his team on a regular basis in our conference. They've created a successful program. For me, I've got to look internally and -- and -- and looking at how I can make my program successful.

One of the ideas we've looked at is -- is co-opping and how to be successful through co-opping and adding students to that. Several schools that don't offer the sports that we offer or we go, in converse, to other schools that do offer sports. Hockey would be another example.

My concern is, when you do a cookie-cutter, you know, one-size-fits-all -- I think we can take a look at both public and private. And I think we need to maybe look at it in a different fashion rather than pitting public and private is that there are several school districts that have been successful that are in different divisions. It doesn't make a difference. And we've seen throughout history, using Illinois and other school districts as an example, just because we bump up a school district two divisions doesn't mean they're going to be any less successful. We're just kicking the can down the road. Yeah, sure, they're out of my district now; somebody else can deal with them. But in the -- in the reality of things, we need to look at, what is equity? What's going to be equitable to all - to urban, to rural, to public, to private? And I'm sure we can get here, yeah, we lose kids. And I'm sure private can say, well, we lose kids just as well to larger school districts. So I would hope that we take a look at this, not as a one size fits all, not as the public pitting against private, but that we take a look at how we can make things more equitable to make things more competitive.

I don't want it to become a situation where I can get rid of all the private schools so we can, you know, have a paper championship. If you want to be the best, you've got to be the best. And I know that sounds naive, but, you know, if you put a feather in a cap of -- of young people that get to beat St. Mary's Springs and win the conference title, you know, I mean, how much more proud can a kid be of that situation. That's something you can take on.

We've had success in our programs. And you have (inaudible); you have ups and downs. And I understand people's angst and anxieties about how they can make things better. But just adding, you know, more value to a group of kids doesn't make your kids any less valuable. And by adding that multiplier, all you're doing is kicking the can down the road for some other school district that's going to have the same complaint. Division 3 football or basketball is just going to be glutted once again. And then they're going to come up and say, hey, I don't like this; let's do something different.

So I would hope that we would take a look at making it more equitable. Taking a look --

And I think everybody has spoken very eloquently today about the differences that we do have and looking at the broader picture other than just saying, hey, it's private versus public.

Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you very much.

Please.

MR. UDOVICIC: Ante Udovicic, athletic director at South Milwaukee High School.

Just two quick points in terms of just listening to what everybody is saying about the multiplier. It seems to me that nobody really knows what the multiplier is supposed to do because all we keep hearing is it's a private/public disparity, it's a rich/poor disparity, it's a rural/urban disparity. I mean, there's so many factors to it that I think that it does lend itself as most people seem to be saying, that there needs to be a lot more discussion to get to the root of the situation and see what can be done and what should be done, if -- if anything.

But then second, just to piggyback on something that was said earlier regarding the second amendment regarding realignment, I -- I think we ought to be very cautious about taking away oversight. And I know it would make Deb's life a lot easier. But I think we want to be very cautious about taking away WIAA oversight over the conference realignment. As somebody who was really neck deep in conference realignment multiple times in the Woodland conference, just opening it up to say local control and let areas decide how they want to do it, I think that's opening up a huge can of worms and I think the -- the potential of a lot bigger problems. By opening it up to a local discussion and instead of having WIAA oversight would be a really bad idea.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

Yes, sir?

MR. SCHLITZ: Jeremy Schlitz, athletic director at Madison Memorial.

A couple of issues that, I think, haven't been brought up that I want to make sure came to -- to fruition here.

We've devalued the state tournament. By that, I mean we've added more divisions so that there are more state championships already. So I think we have done some things to look at increasing the opportunity at that level. In our district meeting, we talked about how this wouldn't really affect the conference, but it looks at the state level accomplishment. And I think we've -- we've already done something to address that. And maybe that hasn't worked. So I'm not sure that this would be something that would work as well.

And also, the intent of this and the intent of the sport -- when I use the example of Union winning the national championship in hockey over Minnesota, there is something wonderful about that story. And that's what's wonderful about sport is the fact that it isn't always a level playing field, but you still can accomplish something great.

Just some things to consider. Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

Seeing no one else is coming to the microphone, I'm going to close the open forum, and we will move to the amendments.

Do you want, Dr. Sadler, just to talk about what the motions are going to be at this point in time?

MR. SADLER: Good morning. Just a brief reading out of the school's (inaudible). And one of the things it says is that, in the United States, the motion to table is often times misused. A simple explanation. When there's a motion on the floor, table actually means table just for a little bit. So let's imagine you talk for a long time about a motion. Everybody is squirming and needs to go to the bathroom. You motion to table so everybody has a chance to go do what they need to do. Then they come back, and you take it off the table. A motion to table requires a second. It is not debatable, it is not amendable, and it doesn't say anything in terms of what you want to do while it's laying on the table. That's why you're hearing advice that the best thing to do in this situation would be to refer to committee. That is available, and it is amendable. So you can then get suggestions about how this group needs to proceed with the issues you've been talking about.

Any questions about that?

(No response.)

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

As we vote, Wade will read the amendment. And I would ask for a motion to -- first to approve and the second. If you would, come to the mike so, again, we can hear you here. We will then take discussion. We will vote.

Ballots will be collected by the people who are in the back. The delegates have been appointed as ballot collectors. They will, with the help of the WIAA staff, count the ballots. Those people are Ky Baumgard from Barron, Kris Johnson from Goodman, Jennifer Butzler from Cashton, Steve Steiner of New Holstein, Cory Milz of Black Hawk, Gregg Zonnefeld of Central Wisconsin Christian, and John Hoch of St. Thomas Moore just so that you know who -- who's coming around.

I don't know, Deb, if you've set up to come down the outside or the middle or you want it sent to the outside.

MS. HAUSER: Both ways. We don't have a middle (inaudible).

MR. SANDERS: All right. We'll have people coming down the outside and the middle. So just kind of decide where you're sitting and send it that way.

So the first on the agenda will be a yellow ballot.

Yes, I do know that one is yellow.

I'm color blind. So they're up here telling me that in my ear, what color these are. So if I mess it up, don't blame me. I don't have a clue.

The first one will be a yellow.

And, Wade, would you read that, please.

MR. LABECKI: If you'd please turn to page 5, the annual meeting procedural rules state that we will use Robert's Rules of Order as long as it is consistent with the WIAA Constitution.

And the WIAA constitution empowers the Board of Control to designate today's date and time for this meeting for the purpose of conducting the business of your association.

And a written notice was provided to you via e-mail to each of our superintendents, principals, and athletic directors.

Each school is entitled to one vote at this meeting, and this vote must be cast by either the district administrator, chief executive officer, principal, or other person designated by the local Board of Education or recognized governing body.

And the constitution states that the president of the Board of Control will chair this meeting.

All motions shall be made in the affirmative. If you don't want to vote for that motion, you can always vote against it, but the motions shall be made in the affirmative and seconded.

Remember that your motion must be recognized by the chair.

A delegate may speak by going to the microphone, being recognized by the chair, giving his or her full name, and the name of the member's school.

Once that motion has been made and seconded, the chair has the authority to establish time limits on the individual presentation so that the representative positions can be stated.

As you look through our various amendments that came forward, they can be brought forward by one of the four reasons stated on page 5. 1, at the annual meeting.

If you have a motion here at the annual meeting, you must come forward. And it must be voted on. 50 percent must vote yes, and it will come back next year.

Any -- any amendments proposed here today will not be voted on and inactive today. They will be brought forward next year.

The Board of Control may bring forward amendments. The Advisory Council may bring forward amendments. Or you may have a petition by the membership which is at least 10 percent of the membership.

Proposal #1 – Classification Multiplier Constitution – Article III, Section 3, A2

I'm going to turn to page 6 and go to our first amendment. The first amendment, No. 1, is a classification multiplier. This amendment was brought forward by the members of the association and will multiply or (inaudible) multiply the enrollments of all member schools by 1.65 for the tournament placement purposes. This was brought forward by 10 percent of the membership. 73 schools signed the petition. It was brought forward to the Board of Control. The Board of Control reviewed it and designated that it did meet the qualifications to be brought to this body. So in Article 3 under "Membership," Section 3, "Classification," on page 15 of your senior high handbook, in the "Constitution" section, No. 2 would be added. And all added areas are shaded. No. 2 would be added. "For non-public schools, the previous year's enrollment on the third Friday in September would be multiplied by 1.65." Then they would renumber the additional sections to 3, 4, and 5.

MR. SANDERS: And this will be the yellow as we go.

I will take a motion.

MR. FISCHER: Todd Fischer, Greenwood.

Just a clarification, point of clarification. If I wanted to make an amendment to this motion, is this the time? Is that my understanding?

MR. SANDERS: No. The motion has to be on the floor before we can make any kind of amendment.

MR. FISCHER: I'll make the motion -- make the motion to approve.

MR. SANDERS: All right. Do I have a second?

MR. DELANY: Nathan DeLany, second, Marshfield.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

I have a motion to approve and a second to approve the constitutional amendment as written.

Any discussion?

Please.

MR DELANY: I'd like to make a -- refer this motion to committee. An ad hoc committee should be created to gather data and present a final recommendation to the executive staff and to the Board of Control by December 1st of 2014 regarding the placement of (inaudible) competitions. The ad hoc committee shall also have possible recommendations to the executive staff by September 1st, 2014, so that those recommendations can be further discussed at area meetings. The final recommendation that comes in December will go through the committee process and will be advanced back to this meeting in 2015 to go into effect for the 2015/'16 school year.

MR. SANDERS: All right.

MR. LABECKI: He needs a second.

MR. SANDERS: Yes. You would need a second --

MR DELANY: Yep.

MR. SANDERS: -- to that.

MR. FISCHER: I'll second that.

Todd Fischer, Greenwood.

MR. SANDERS: All right. So we need to vote on the amendment first.

MR. SADLER: No. It's debatable.

MR. SANDERS: It's -- it's debatable. All right.

MR. SADLER: Yes.

MR. SANDERS: Any questions on that?

MR. SADLER: This is actually a motion to refer to committee, not an amendment.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

As I was just told, it's a motion to refer to committee, not an amendment.

Please.

MR. SCHMITT: Barry Schmitt, Independence.

Could you please clarify what was all in that amendment? I didn't hear it very well.

MR. SANDERS: Absolutely. I would, absolutely.

As written that was given to me, it says, "I move and refer the motion to committee. An ad hoc committee will be created and shall be charged with gathering data and presenting a final recommendation to the executive staff or Board of Control by December 1, 2014, regarding a school's enrollment for placement within divisions for state tournament competition. The ad hoc committee should, if possible, write recommendations to the executive staff prior to September 1st so that they can be on the agendas for the area meetings to help foster discussion and direction. The final recommendation will go through the committee process and will be advanced back to the 2015 annual meeting to the membership for a vote that could be effective at the start of 2015/'16 school year."

Is that understandable?

Yes, sir?

MR. FREIBERG: Bill Freiberg, athletic director, Cashton High School.

Who is on the ad hoc committee, and who decides who is on the ad hoc committee?

MR. SANDERS: Well, we don't have a committee; so I don't know who would be on it at this time.

I think, looking at any ad hoc committee that I've been around with the WIAA, it's usually a volunteer. They would let -- let this gentleman know or Wade know, and then they try to pick very heavily from all of the different sections of the state from large, small, rural, urban, private, public, charter, whatever we would need to do. I -- I don't think that we would try to load that with anybody. It's

usually -- I know in the football committee, when I sat on that one year, that's exactly what that was. It was people from every level and all around the state.

And I think this would be by September 1. And if this passes, we would make a decision at our main meeting or even before we leave today as to when and how people could volunteer for that meeting.

I don't know if I've answered your question. If I have not, I apologize.

I think you can -- you can also understand that, if this goes through, the gentleman to my left and I would probably have to tag team and make sure this happens. And he and I will do that. To my friend from Barneveld who's known me for a long time, we will make sure it comes back here.

Any other discussion?

Please. In the back.

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

Just wondering if I could ask the maker of the motion if he would accept a friendly amendment to the motion to change the word of the last sentence from "could" to "would?"

MR DELANY: (Inaudible.)

MR. SANDERS: You're all right with that?

MR DELANY: (Inaudible.)

MR. SANDERS: Yes, he would. Thank you.

MR. MANS: Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Do you have (inaudible) motion? Do you want me to read that last sentence then again? Go ahead. If you're going to go to the mike, go ahead. Then I'll read it after you're finished.

MR. COLLYARD: I understand the motion. We have --

MR. SANDERS: Do you want to state your name and school, please?

MR. COLLYARD: Sorry. Len Collyard, Kettle Moraine Lutheran.

I've heard the motion -- or the amendment. My concern is, we've talked about how complex this issue is. It will take a while to formulate a committee. And have we set a timetable that is maybe too aggressive? I -- I understand that people want to be heard, and they want this to be dealt with, but maybe the time frame is too aggressive.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

The last sentence would then read by the change, "will not be advanced back" -- "will be advanced back to the 2015 annual meeting for the membership for a vote that would be effective at the start of the '15/'16 school year." That's the change to that.

Any other discussion?

I was just informed by the parliamentarian that, I think, in response to your question is, the committee could come back and ask for more time even though the amendment is written in that -- in that manner. If they have not been able to come to a decision, they have that right.

Yes, please.

MS. FRERES: My name is Sandy Freres, Prairie School.

You may have answered my question, but when we formed the WIAA public/private school, it took us three years.

MR. SANDERS: Yeah.

MS. FRERES: And it was, you know -- we're talking three months to solve a major issue that is so important to all of us - public, private, rural, urban. It -- it doesn't matter. And I -- I agree that, if the committee understands that - and I think we all do - that three months for potential athletic directors and administrators to clear

their table to really invest in something that will change all of our lives is very important.

MR. SANDERS: Thank you.

All right. With that, we're going to close the discussion. You're voting on the yellow. The vote is on the -- as amended, meaning that it would be the start of a committee. So vote yes if you're in favor of the committee; no if you're not. Yeah. The motion -- the committee -- we're -- it's -- it's closed. I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't we have to vote on the amendment?

MR. SANDERS: No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have to vote on whether to accept the amendment first.

MR. SANDERS: No. You vote on -- you vote on it this way first is what I've been told.

MR. SADLER: Dean, I think I can interject.

(Simultaneous speech.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have (inaudible) advisor when I was in school (inaudible) would really disagree. I do remember these from Robert's Rules of Order. You have to first vote on the amendment. Then once the amendment is voted on, then you can vote on a --

MR. SADLER: A motion to refer to committee is not an amendment. It is taking the main motion. It is replacing it and saying, we don't want to deal with the main motion right now; we want to send it back to committee. So it's not an amendment. It is a separate motion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because one vote is -- one -- my vote is very dependent upon whether it goes to committee or not.

MR. SADLER: If -- if you don't want to send it to committee, you certainly don't have to. And if it doesn't go to committee, then it comes back to the floor for a debate and a vote of up or down.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So why would you put it on the sheet then? Why would we put it on a sheet?

(Simultaneous speech.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't we put it on a different sheet?

MR. SANDERS: We can. It's not a big deal. (Inaudible.)

(Simultaneous speech.)

MR. SANDERS: All right. Let's go to -- you've got some green ones in your packet. We'll use Green A. So vote yes or no on the Green A. Pass them to the outside.

Yes, sir?

MR. HARNISCH: Just a point of order.

Chet Harnisch, Sauk Prairie.

There seems to be quite a bit of discussion around the room about what exactly we're voting on. Could you just, one more time, for clarification's sake, state the motion (inaudible)?

MR. SANDERS: I can read the motion again, yes.

The motion is, "Refer to motion" -- "I move to refer the motion to committee. An ad hoc committee created shall be charged with gathering data and presenting a final recommendation to the executive staff or Board of Control by December 1st, 2014, regarding a school's enrollment for placement within divisions for state tournament" -- "tournament competitions." Excuse me. "The ad hoc committee shall" -- "should have possible recommendations to the executive staff prior to September 1 and on the area meeting agendas to help foster discussion and direction. The final recommendation will go through the committee process and will be advanced back to the 2015 annual meeting to a membership for a vote that would be effective at the start of the 2015/'16 school year."

Does that help?

MR. HARNISCH: Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: All right. The vote is going to the outside. Maybe we can tally them and maybe -- and brought back -- results will come back.

Note: The #1 motion was moved to committee by a 352-77 vote.

Wade, do you want to read the next one?