

**Kansas State High School Activities Association
Classification Study Committee Report
to the
Executive Board**

January 11, 2017

On January 11th the Executive Board voted to send the KSHSAA Classification Study Committee's final recommendations on Annual Classification and Football Classification to the KSHSAA Board of Directors as separate agenda items for their April 28, 2017 meeting. Revisions to the proposals reflect feedback gathered in the October regional meetings.

In accordance with Bylaw Article XII, Section 4, if the Board of Directors approves a proposal by a majority vote, a separate ballot for each will be provided to member schools in the appropriate classifications. Ballots would be cast by principals of each member senior high school.

**Article XII
Classification of High Schools**

Sec. 4...*Any proposal, before it becomes effective, shall be approved first by the KSHSAA Board of Directors, and second, by a majority of all schools affected and a majority of all Classes affected...*

Please refer to the information which follows for specific details for each sport and activity.

Recommendation #1:

Annual Classification – All activities but football (Would require a vote by all schools in all (6) six classifications):

6 Championships

6A – 36 schools

5A – 36 schools

4A – 36 schools

3A – 64 schools

2A – 64 schools

1A – Appx. 117 schools (Class 1A would utilize Regional and Sub-State format in Volleyball and Basketball)

Recommendation #2:

Football Classification (*Would require a vote by all schools in Classes 4A, 3A, 2A and 1A. Schools playing either 11-man or 8-man football would vote on this proposal*):

8 Championships

6A – 32 schools

5A – 32 schools

4A – 32 Schools

3A – 48 Schools

2A – 48 Schools

1A – Appx. 35 Teams

8-Man Division I – Appx. 50 Teams

8-Man Division II – Appx. 49 Teams

Continue 2 year classification cycle

No team would play three games in ten days

8-Man championship would be same Saturday (SCW #21) as 11-man

The following activity specific postseason formats are recommended by the classification committee to the Executive Board:

Baseball

Based on 2016-2017 schools indicating they will participate.

Class 6A – 36 schools

Class 5A – 36 schools

Class 4A – 38 schools

- 36 teams – Divide into two groups – 18 schools in each group. Seed each half of state 1 through 18.
- Seeding done on Wednesday SCW#45
- Divide those 18 into two groups of schools
- On Monday – play in games 16 vs. 18 and 15 vs. 17 to get into the bracket – played at highest seed.
 - Winner of 16 vs. 18 plays #1 seed
 - Winner of 15 vs. 17 plays #2 seed
- Second tournament day – Tues, Wed, Thurs. at highest seed to group. (total 3 games at site)
 - 1 vs. 16 (play-in winner); 8 vs. 9; winners play same day
 - 4 vs. 13; 5 vs. 12; winners play same day
 - 2 vs. 15 (play-in winner); 7 vs. 10; winners play same day
 - 3 vs. 14; 6 vs. 11; winners play same day
- All games played at higher seed (Seeds, 1, 2, 3, 4 would host – 3 games – 1 day.)
- Host schools must secure registered umpires for all regional games. Three umpires per game.
- If 4A has 38 schools the 19th team will be added into the bracket where needed.
- Classes 3A & 2-1A postseason format would remain the same.

Seeding Manager would distribute:

- Tickets, balls and trophies to higher seed.
- Determining one seeding manager for 18 schools means there could be some driving involved.

Tie-breaking procedure:

1. If teams played each other the one defeating the other the greater number of times will receive the higher seed.
2. Average fewest number of runs allowed. Add together runs allowed for all regular season games and divide by the number of games played.
3. Average most number of runs scored. Add together runs scored for all regular season games and divide by the number of games played.
4. Coin flip

Basketball

Class 6A, 5A, 4A – 36 schools in each

Proposal to move forward to Executive Board

- 36 teams – Divide into two groups – 18 schools in each group. Seed each half of state 1 through 18.
- Remember in all scenarios there are actually two tournaments taking place a boys and girls
- Seeding done on Wednesday SCW#34
- Divide those 18 into two groups of schools based on geography.
- Play in games 16 vs. 18 and 15 vs. 17 – to get into the bracket.
 - Winner of 16 vs. 18 plays #1 seed
 - Winner of 15 vs. 17 plays #2 seed
 - Play in games would be on Saturday, Monday or Tuesday at higher seed.
- Bracket play
 - 1 vs. 16 (play-in winner); 8 vs. 9;
 - Winner of these games play for opportunity to go to state at higher seed.
 - 4 vs. 13; 5 vs. 12:
 - Winner of these games play for opportunity to go to state at higher seed.
 - 2 vs. 15 (play-in winner); 7 vs. 10;
 - Winner of these games play for opportunity to go to state at higher seed.
 - 3 vs. 14; 6 vs. 11
 - Winner of these games play for opportunity to go to state at higher seed.

- All games played at higher seed
 - May have challenges in class 4A due to number of officials needed and the travel distance.
 - If not all games played at #1, #2, #3, #4 seed so officials can work two games a night.

Seeding

Seeding shall be based strictly on percentage of wins and losses. The team with the higher percentage will receive the higher seed. BYES in regular season games/tournaments ARE NOT to be counted.

Tie-breaking procedure if teams have identical percentage.

1. If teams played each other the one defeating the other the greater number of times will receive the higher seed.
2. Lowest average defensive points allowed during the year. Add the number of points allowed and divide by the number of games played.
3. Highest average offensive points scored during the year. Add the number of points scored and divide by the number of games played.
4. Coin flip.

Challenges

- Getting the officials assigned after seeding because you have no idea where the games may be.
- I'm not sure we have enough officials in the areas needed to cover all games if they are at higher seed on Wednesday and Thursday.
- Getting tickets to higher seed
- Trophies would be distributed to #1, #2, #3, #4 seeds – if they lose must pass on.
- Currently Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday are also tournament game nights for KCAC, Heart of America, NJCAA Men and Women – we lose approximately 25 of our better officials to these games.

Class 2A & 3A – 64 schools in each

- Schools are placed in groups of 8 based on geography.
- Seeding on Wednesday SCW#34
- 8 teams in a group are seeded.
- Quarterfinal games are played at higher seeded team on Monday/Tuesday
- Semi-final games are played at host site on Thursday and Friday.
- Final games at Host site – Girls and Boys
- Monday and Tuesday - This requires 192 officials – as games are played on Monday and Tuesday at the higher seeded team. In most cases sub-state managers are given 12 officials names – they assign the games after seeding is finished based on mileage. In cases where travel could be a challenge as teams may be 2-3 hours apart – I wait until after seeding on Wednesday and then assign the officials based on the pool of officials I have left.
- Six officials assigned to work Thurs/Fri/Sat. at each site, one game each night, three nights in a row.
- 8 teams qualify for state.

Class 1A – 117 schools (not counting cooperative teams)

There would be 108 teams that need assignment.

Use the regional format previously used, regional games played during SCW#34

- 16 regional sites – four in each quadrant of the state.
- Seeding done on Wednesday of SCW#33
 - 27 schools per quadrant
 - 3 regionals of 7 and one of 6 in each quadrant.
- Quarterfinal games played at higher seeded team – SCW #34 (Monday, Tuesday)
- Semi-final and Final games played at Host school – SCW #34 (Thursday, Friday, Saturday)
- Top two teams qualify to two Sub-States from each regional in a quadrant.
- Sub-States at a neutral site – hopefully located somewhere near the middle of the quadrant of the state.
- #1 and #2 from a regional are sent to the opposite sub-states.
- Sub-State tournaments – SCW #35 – games Thursday, Friday, Saturday (girls and boys championship)
- Four boys teams and four girls teams at each sub-state.
- 8 teams to state – same format as we currently do.
- Would need to find 2 neutral sites (schools) to host the sub-state games on Thursday, Friday, Saturday.

Cross Country

Class 6A – 36 Schools

- Final Proposal
 - 9 schools per regional site (total of 4 sites needed)
 - 3 teams from each regional qualify for state
 - Top 10 individuals and if there are not 5 non-team qualifiers in the top 10 – go until we have 5 from non-qualifying teams. (current procedure)
 - This will qualify 12 teams to state plus individuals – at least 20

Class 5A – 36 Schools

- Final Proposal
 - 9 schools per regional site (total of 4 sites needed)
 - 3 teams from each regional qualify for state
 - Top 10 individuals and if there are not 5 non-team qualifiers in the top 10 – go until we have 5 from non-qualifying teams. (current procedure)
 - This will qualify 12 teams to state plus individuals – at least 20

Class 4A – 36 Schools

- Final Proposal
 - 9 schools per regional site (total of 4 sites needed)
 - 3 teams from each regional qualify for state
 - Top 10 individuals and if there are not 5 non-team qualifiers in the top 10 – go until we have 5 from non-qualifying teams. (current procedure)
 - This will qualify 12 teams to state plus individuals – at least 20

Class 3A – 64 Schools

- 16 schools per regional site (total of 4 sites needed)
- 61 boys and girls schools based on 2016 participation.
- 3 teams from each regional qualify for state
- Top 10 individuals and if there are not 5 non-team qualifiers in the top 10 – go until we have 5 from non-qualifying teams. (current procedure)
- This will qualify 12 teams to state plus individuals – at least 20

Class 2A – 64 Schools

- 16 schools per regional site (total of 4 sites needed)
- Based on 2016 participation – 59 Boys and 56 girls schools
- 3 teams from each regional qualify for state
- Top 10 individuals and if there are not 5 non-team qualifiers in the top 10 – go until we have 5 from non-qualifying teams. (current procedure)
- This will qualify 12 teams to state plus individuals – at least 20

Class 1A – 117 Schools

- Based on 2016 schools participating of the 117 schools we would have:
- 74 boys schools (not teams – schools that may have only one or two runners)
- 66 girls schools (not teams – schools that may have only one or two runners).
- 3 regionals
 - 24 or 25 schools per regional site (similar to track now)
 - 4 teams from each regional qualify for state.
 - Top 10 individuals and if there are not 7 non-team qualifiers in the top 10 – go until we have 7 from non-qualifying teams. (current procedure)
 - This will qualify 12 teams to state plus individuals – at least 21

Football

- Class 6A - 32 Teams - Open scheduling Week 1 - 8- No Districts
- Bracket play on Week 9 (Seed 1 - 16 East and West)
- Class 5A - 32 Teams - Same as Class 6A
- Class 4A - 32 Teams - Same as Classes 6A and 5A
- Class 3A - 48 Teams - Open scheduling Weeks 1 - 3
- District games on Weeks 4 - 8
- Bracket play on Week 9 (6 teams per District)
- Class 2A - 48 Teams - Same as Class 3A
- Class 1A - 35 Teams - 8 - 4 and 5 Team Districts
- 2 Teams from each District advance to playoffs
- 8 Man I & II - No changes at this time!!

48 TEAM CLASSIFICATIONS

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Week #1 = Open Scheduling | Week #8 = District Game |
| Week #2 = Open Scheduling | Week #9 = Bracket Game |
| Week #3 = Open Scheduling | Week #10 = Regional |
| Week #4 = District Game | Week #11 = Sectional |
| Week #5 = District Game | Week #12 = Sub-State |
| Week #6 = District Game | Week #13 = State |
| Week #7 = District Game | |

Week #9 Games – 48 Team Scenario

<u>Bracket Games</u>		<u>Non-Bracket Games</u>		
District 1 - #1	vs	District 2 - #4		
District 1 - #2	vs	District 2 - #3		
District 1 - #3	vs	District 2 - #2		
District 1 - #4	vs	District 2 - #1		
District 3 - #1	vs	District 4 - #4		
District 3 - #2	vs	District 4 - #3		
District 3 - #3	vs	District 4 - #2		
District 3 - #4	vs	District 4 - #1		
District 5 - #1	vs	District 6 - #4		
District 5 - #2	vs	District 6 - #3		
District 5 - #3	vs	District 6 - #2		
District 5 - #4	vs	District 6 - #1		
District 7 - #1	vs	District 8 - #4		
District 7 - #2	vs	District 8 - #3		
District 7 - #3	vs	District 8 - #2		
District 7 - #4	vs	District 8 - #1		
		District 1 - #5	vs	District 2 - #5
		District 1 - #6	vs	District 2 - #6
		District 3 - #5	vs	District 4 - #5
		District 3 - #6	vs	District 4 - #6
		District 5 - #5	vs	District 6 - #5
		District 5 - #6	vs	District 6 - #6
		District 7 - #5	vs	District 8 - #5
		District 7 - #6	vs	District 8 - #6
Odd District host on odd years				
Even District host on even years				

Golf (Boys) – based on 2016-17 schools participating

No change recommended to current format

6A – 35

5A – 32

4A – 33

3A – 52

2A – 43

1A – 43

Golf (Girls) – based on 2016-17 schools participating

6A – 33

5A – 27

4A – 21

3A – 30

2A – 14

1A – 2

Total = 127

The issue here is the imbalance of regional fields and if done traditionally there would be 67 teams in 4-1A class.

Option 1:

Quasi-team 40/60 rule:

6A and 5A would keep the 36 schools that compete in girls golf:

6A – 33, 5A – 27

Of the 67 schools remaining; take 40% = the next 27 largest schools would be 4A followed by the remaining 40 schools would be 3-2-1A. More schools in 3-2-1A is better for regional play since the likelihood of school not sending full teams increases.

Likely move to three regionals in girls golf if needed.

Scholars Bowl

6A – 26 Teams

2 Regionals of 13

2-pools of 6/7

State – top 4 from each Regional – 1 pool of 8 at State

In 6A state tournaments a single pool of eight (8) teams will be conducted. At the end of the round robin pool play competition, the top four (4) schools in the pool will advance to the championship final bracket competition. The first-place team will meet the fourth-place team, and the second-place team will meet the third-place team (see sample bracket). The winners in each bracket will meet to determine first and second place, and losers will meet in the consolation for third and fourth.

5A – 34 Teams

2 Regionals of 17

2-pools of 8/9

State – top 4 from each Regional – 1 pool of 8 at State

In 5A state tournaments a single pool of eight (8) teams will be conducted. At the end of the round robin pool play competition, the top four (4) schools in the pool will advance to the championship final bracket competition. The first-place team will meet the fourth-place team, and the second-place team will meet the third-place team (see sample bracket). The winners in each bracket will meet to determine first and second place, and losers will meet in the consolation for third and fourth.

4A – 30 Teams

2 Regionals of 15

2-pools of 7/8

State – top 4 from each Regional – 1 pool of 8 at State

In 4A state tournaments a single pool of eight (8) teams will be conducted. At the end of the round robin pool play competition, the top four (4) schools in the pool will advance to the championship final bracket competition. The first-

place team will meet the fourth-place team, and the second-place team will meet the third-place team (see sample bracket). The winners in each bracket will meet to determine first and second place, and losers will meet in the consolation for third and fourth.

3A – 63 Teams

4 Regionals of 15/16

2-pools of 7/8

State – top 3 from each Regional – 2 pool of 6 at State

First, second and third-place teams in each pool advance to the championship round robin competition. Advancing schools will draw by lot their competition order (A, B, C, D, E or F). Tiebreaking procedures for the championship final round robin competition will use the championship final round robin matches only, not the pool play rounds.

2A – 62 Teams

4 Regionals of 15/16

2-pools of 7/8

State – top 3 from each Regional – 2 pool of 6 at State

First, second and third-place teams in each pool advance to the championship round robin competition. Advancing schools will draw by lot their competition order (A, B, C, D, E or F). Tiebreaking procedures for the championship final round robin competition will use the championship final round robin matches only, not the pool play rounds.

1A – 110 Teams

8 Regionals of 13/14

2-pools of 6/7

State – top 2 from each Regional – 2 pool of 8 at State

First, second and third-place teams in each pool advance to the championship round robin competition. Advancing schools will draw by lot their competition order (A, B, C, D, E or F). Tiebreaking procedures for the championship final round robin competition will use the championship final round robin matches only, not the pool play rounds.

Softball

Class 6A, 5A, 4A – 36 schools in each

Based on 2016-2017 schools indicating they will participate.

Class 6A – 35 schools

Class 5A – 34 schools

Class 4A – 37 schools

Final Proposal

- 36 teams – Divide into two groups based on geography
- 18 schools in each group. Seed each half of state 1 through 18.
- Seeding done on Wednesday SCW#45
- Divide those 18 into two groups of schools
- On Monday – play in games 15 vs. 18 and 16 vs. 17 to get into the bracket – played at highest seed.
 - Winner of 16 vs. 18 plays #1 seed
 - Winner of 15 vs. 17 plays #2 seed
- Second tournament day – Tues, Wed, Thurs. at highest seed to group. (total 3 games at site)
 - 1 vs. 16 (play-in winner); 8 vs. 9; winners play same day
 - 4 vs. 13; 5 vs. 12; winners play same day
 - 2 vs. 15 (play-in winner); 7 vs. 10; winners play same day
 - 3 vs. 14; 6 vs. 11; winners play same day
- All games played at higher seed (Seeds, 1, 2, 3, 4 in each half of state would host – 3 games – 1 day.)
- Host schools must secure registered umpires for all regional games. Three umpires per game.

Seeding Manager would distribute:

- Tickets, balls and trophies to higher seed.
- Determining one seeding manager for 18 schools means there could be some driving involved.

Seeding

Seeding shall be based strictly on percentage of wins and losses. The team with the higher percentage will receive the higher seed. BYES in regular season games/tournaments ARE NOT to be counted.

Tie-breaking procedure if teams have identical percentage.

5. If teams played each other the one defeating the other the greater number of times will receive the higher seed.
6. Average fewest number of runs allowed. Add together runs allowed for all regular season games and divide by the number of games played.
7. Average most number of runs scored. Add together runs scored for all regular season games and divide by the number of games played.
8. Coin flip

Class 3A – 64 schools in each

- Based on 2016-17 numbers we would have 62 teams
- Schools are placed in groups of 8 (2 groups of 7) based on geography.
- Seeding on Wednesday SCW#45
- 8 teams in a group are seeded.
- Format for quarterfinals and semifinals is left up to the host site. Sometimes because of travel and umpire availability it is easier to have all schools come to host site to play.
- Some play quarterfinals at higher seed and then semi-final and final at host site (3 games).
- We have allowed some flexibility in the format during the week based on umpires, site availability, graduations, promotions, etc.

Class 2-1A – The rest of participating schools

- Based on 2016-17 numbers we would have 60 teams
- Schools are placed in groups of 8 (4 groups of 7) based on geography.
- Seeding on Wednesday SCW#45
- 8 teams in a group are seeded.
- Format for quarterfinals and semifinals is left up to the host site. Sometimes because of travel and umpire availability it is easier to have all schools come to host site to play.
- Some play quarterfinals at higher seed and then semi-final and final at host site (3 games).
- We have allowed some flexibility in the format during the week based on umpires, site availability, graduations, promotions, etc.

Soccer (Boys)

6A – 36 Teams

2 Regionals of 18

1 2 3 4
8 7 6 5
9 10 11 12
16 15 14 13
17 18

5A – 36 Teams

2 Regionals of 18

1 2 3 4
8 7 6 5
9 10 11 12
16 15 14 13
17 18

4-3-2-1A – 33 Teams

2 Regionals of 16/17

1 2 3 4
8 7 6 5
9 10 11 12
16 15 14 13
17

6A & 5A

Regional 1 -Team #1 will play the winner of Team #16 vs. Team #17; Team #8 will play Team #9
Regional 2 -Team #2 will play the winner of Team #15 vs. Team #18; Team #7 will play Team #10
Regional 3 -Team #3 will play Team #14; Team #6 will play Team #11
Regional 4 -Team #4 will play Team #13; Team #5 will play Team #12

4-1A

Regional 1 -Team #1 will play the winner of Team #16 vs. Team #17; Team #8 will play Team #9
Regional 2 -Team #2 will play Team #15; Team #7 will play Team #10
Regional 3 -Team #3 will play Team #14; Team #6 will play Team #11
Regional 4 -Team #4 will play Team #13; Team #5 will play Team #12

Soccer (Girls)

6A – 36 Teams

2 Regionals of 18

1 2 3 4
8 7 6 5
9 10 11 12
16 15 14 13
17 18

5A – 35 Teams

2 Regionals of 17/18

1 2 3 4
8 7 6 5
9 10 11 12
16 15 14 13
17 18

4-3-2-1A – 22 Teams

2 Regionals of 11

1 2 3 4
8 7 6 5
9 10 11

6A & 5A

Regional 1 -Team #1 will play the winner of Team #16 vs. Team #17; Team #8 will play Team #9

Regional 2 -Team #2 will play Team #15; Team #7 will play Team #10

Regional 3 -Team #3 will play Team #14; Team #6 will play Team #11

Regional 4 -Team #4 will play Team #13; Team #5 will play Team #12

4-1A

Regional 1 -Team #1 will play the winner of Team #8 vs. Team #9

Regional 2 -Team #2 will play the winner of Team #7 vs. #10

Regional 3 -Team #3 will play Team #14; Team #6 will play Team #11

Regional 4 -Team #4 will play Team #5

Swimming & Diving (Girls)

6A – 34 Schools

State Qualifying/Consideration 6A standards will stay the same. We take at least 3 full heats for individuals and relays (24 entries) if they hit qualifying and/or consideration times

5-4-3-2-1A – 43 Schools

State Qualifying/Consideration 5-1A standards will stay the same. We take at least 3 full heats for individuals and relays (24 entries) if they hit qualifying and/or consideration times

Swimming & Diving (Boys)

6A – 31 Schools

State Qualifying/Consideration 6A standards will stay the same. We take at least 3 full heats for individuals and relays (24 entries) if they hit qualifying and/or consideration times

5-4-3-2-1A – 37 Schools

State Qualifying/Consideration 5-1A standards will stay the same. We take at least 3 full heats for individuals and relays (24 entries) if they hit qualifying and/or consideration times

Tennis (Girls & Boys)

- Leave 6A & 5A as is
- 4A = 40% of the remaining participating schools
- 3-1A = The remaining participating schools (60%)

Track & Field

Class 6A, 5A and 4A – 36 Schools

- 9 schools per regional site (total of 4 sites needed)
- 3 entries per individual event, per school at regionals
- 1 relay entry per school at regionals
- No qualifying standards will be used
- There will be 4 qualifiers from each event to the state meet, from each regional

Class 3A and 2A – 64 Schools

- 16 schools per regional site (total of 4 sites needed)
- No change to the current structure

Class 1A – 117 Schools (115 approximately)

- 28 to 29 schools per regional site (total of 4 regionals needed)
- 2 entries per individual event, per school at regionals
- 1 relay entry per school at regionals
- Semi-Finals would possibly be used at regionals in the 100, 200, 100m (110m) hurdles.
- There will be 4 qualifiers from each event to the state meet, from each regional.

Volleyball

- Single Elimination (Sub-state Tournaments)
- Pool Play & Bracket (State Tournaments)

- Classes 6A, 5A, 4A = 4 groups of 9 placed into 2 sub-states (1, 8, 9, 4, 5) (2, 7, 3, 6)
 - Winner of each sub-state advance to state (8)
- Classes 3A, 2A = 8 sub-states of 8;
 - Winner of each sub-state advance to state (8)
- Class 1A = Divide state equally into 4 sections
 - NOTE: Cooperative Agreements will diminish number of schools (117)
 - Each section conducts 4 regional tournaments on the Tuesday before SS Saturday
 - Top 2 teams from each regional advance to their section sub-state (placed in opposite brackets)
 - Play 2 sub-states of 4 teams each per section
 - Winner of each sub-state advance to state (8)
- Winners of all sub-states advance to state play (48)

Wrestling

(222 wrestling schools)

1. Class 6A = 36 schools
 - 18 schools per Regional (2 Regional sites)
 - Wrestle out to 8 places
 - 8 individuals advance to the State Tournament per Regional

2. Class 5A = 36 schools
 - 18 schools per Regional (2 Regional sites)
 - Wrestle out to 8 places
 - 8 individuals advance to the State Tournament per Regional

3. Class 4A = 60 schools
 - 15 schools per Regional (4 Regional sites)
 - Wrestle out to 4 places
 - 4 individuals advance to the State Tournament per Regional

4. Class 3-2-1A = Remaining schools (90)
 - 22-23 schools per Regional (4 Regional sites)
 - Wrestle out to 4 places
 - 4 individuals advance to the State Tournament per Regional

FINE ARTS INFORMATION

Based on the 36-36-36-64-64-117 proposal

Music

State Solos and Small Ensembles

- 6A Could be a major issue with the number of entries added to this classification. KSHSAA already has difficulty finding 6A host sites due to not enough rooms and space. Universities have failed in the past to host and to do an adequate job due to the number of entries and the date of our State event. Washburn Rural HS is our current host site and they are very close to capacity.
- 5A Could be an issue with the number of entries added to this classification. Emporia is our current host site and they can possibly absorb the increase of entries unless the amount of entries takes a larger increase than what is anticipated.
- 4A Should not be an issue.
- 3A Should not be an issue.
- 2A Should not be an issue.
- 1A Could be an issue with the number of entries added to this classification. Hesston College (first time host in 2017) is our current host site and they can possibly absorb the increase of entries unless the amount of entries takes a larger increase than what is anticipated

Regional Solos/Small Ensembles and State Large Groups

Should not an issue for any classifications.

Piano Should not be an issue.

Debate

4 Speaker Regionals

Should not be an issue for any classifications.

4 Speaker State

- 6A Possibly adding 4 more teams, should not be a problem.
- 5A Possibly adding 4 more teams, should not be a problem.
- 4A This change will help in 4A due to less entries. The current format makes the 4A a very large tournament.
- 3-2-1A Should not be an issue.

2 Speaker State

- 6A Possibly adding up to 16 teams and could be a problem with rooms. We can probably make it happen.
- 5A Possibly adding up to 16 teams and could be a problem with rooms. We can probably make it happen.
- 4A Changes will help in 4A due to less entries. The current format makes the 4A an extremely large tournament.
- 3-2-1A Should not be an issue.

Speech

Regional and State Festivals and State Champs

There should be positives in every classification for both festivals and champs.

Spirit

Should not be an issue. "KSHSAA Game Day Cheer Showcase" is in its infancy stage, so there is really no way to project school participation numbers at this time.

Proposed Classification for Fine Arts: Debate/Speech/Drama/Music

2016-17 Classes		2017-18 Proposed Number of Schools Per Class for All Fine Arts
1A	96	100
2A	64	72
3A	64	64
4A	64	56
5A	32	32
6A	32	32

	2016 Music S&E Reg. Entries	2016 Music State S&E Entries	Estimated Music State S&E Entries w/ New
1A	748	316	330
2A	986	381	400
3A	1287	527	550
4A	1910	787	650
5A	1548	546	580
6A	2338	1022	980

	Reg. Debate 4 Speaker 2016	Estimated Projections w/ New
1A	3-2-1A	
2A	3-2-1A	
3A	19	21
4A	27	23
5A	17	20
6A	19	18

State Debate 4 Speaker	Does not change (we only take 8 or 9 teams per Class to State)
------------------------	--

	State Debate 2 Speaker	Estimated Projections w/ New
1A	3-2-1A	3-2-1A
2A	3-2-1A	3-2-1A
3A	20	25
4A	72	65
5A	58	60
6A	78	73

	State Speech Champs 2016	Estimated Projections w/ New
1A	201	220
2A	302	330
3A	366	375
4A	500	425
5A	308	325
6A	335	310

KSHSAA Classification Study Committee Meeting Summary, December 19, 2016

The KSHSAA Classification Study Committee met at the KSHSAA office on December 19, 2016. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School; Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School. Absent: David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School.

Today's meeting was convened in response to a directive from the Executive Board at their November meeting. The Board requested the committee meet to discuss and address questions raised at the Fall Regional Administrator and Board of Education meetings as well as issues and questions that have been brought up by the wrestling, tennis and golf coaches' associations.

There were no representatives of member schools or leagues requesting to speak during the public forum. After the initial welcome and gallery introductions, reports from the fall regional meetings were shared with the group by the members who represented the committee and reported at each of the seven sites. The primary issues and questions related to the classification proposal brought up at the regional meetings were:

1. What would the postseason structure look like in all of the activities under the new proposal?
2. Size of the 4-1A girls and boys state tennis tournaments under the new proposal.
3. Size of the 3-2-1A state wrestling tournament under the new proposal.
4. Size of the 4-1A girls golf championship under the new proposal.
5. How would the 3A and 2A football districts and postseason be structured under the new football proposal with 48 teams?
6. Should 1A schools remain split into divisions in certain activities?
7. Public school vs. private school competitive balance.

Feedback and questions from the Kansas Wrestling Coaches Association, Kansas Tennis Coaches Association, Kansas Golf Coaches Association as well as the recent KIAAA and KASB meetings were also shared which included the topics listed above.

Randall Forbes, KSHSAA legal counsel met with the committee to discuss Article XII of the KSHSAA Bylaws regarding classification voting if there would be a separate vote on the football classification proposal. Mr. Zuzelski raised the question to the committee of whether the football classification proposal should be a separate vote, or included in a vote for a single, comprehensive classification proposal. **The committee voted to recommend the football classification proposal and the general classification proposal be combined into one proposal in its final recommendation to the Executive Board.**

As requested by the committee prior to the meeting, KSHSAA administrative staff prepared detailed postseason format options based on the classification proposals under consideration. The committee broke into small groups to discuss these options in depth with the respective KSHSAA administrator. The committee of the whole then reconvened to review the information collectively. **Several fundamental principles of postseason formats came up across all activities which the committee addressed with the following recommendations:**

1. It was agreed that all schools, no matter their seed, will be included in the postseason playoffs in all activities. This will require play-in contests for several activities in classes not divisible by eight.
2. The seeding format for Class 4A (36 schools) will be the same as classes 5A and 6A (east/west format, seed 1-18).
3. In quasi-team/individual sports and activities, schools will be classified separately from pure team sports. In these quasi-team/individual sports and activities, postseason classifications will be established based on enrollment, school and student participation in each specific sport or activity.

Discussion and Comments

2016 Regional Meetings

Classification Study Committee Proposal

Location: KSHSAA Office

- Classes 6A & 5A
 - Concerns:
 - Tennis is now a two-day tournament with additional teams
 - With 9 teams in SFB and BSB, there were concerns for overnight trips and weather challenges with regional tournaments
 - More details were wanted for sub-state VB with a possibility of 9 teams for the tournament
 - If this doesn't pass, will 3A and 2A request to split as well?
 - Seaman asked that all of the play-off details were spelled out in advance.
 - Without details in advance of play-off system, what would the executive board and staff do with the play-offs?
 - Increased travel time and increased loss of school time with some of the unknown play-off details.
 - Plus: Addresses 4A concerns with ratio and other perceived inequities with the classes
- Classes 4A & 3A
 - FB Pros
 - Not games in 10 days (3A)
 - Ratio equality (3A & 4A)
 - League scheduling not much different (3A & 4A)
 - 6 team districts will make for quality play off brackets (3A & 4A)
 - FB Cons
 - Loss of league scheduling (3A & 4A)
 - Seeding criteria of new 4A. Will it be what is currently used or will it follow what 5A & 6A have?
 - What will be the ripple affect with officiating assignments in the playoffs if we have everyone playing on Friday night vs the current 3 games in 10 day for 3A (Thurs/Tue/Sat). (3A & 4A)
 - All Activity Pros
 - Keeps things the same. (3A)
 - Good divisible numbers. (3A)
 - Good ratio, simple, meets criteria. (3A & 4A)
 - All Activity Cons
 - Concern for student numbers in 3-2-1A Championship events. (3A)
 - The group was very impressed and thankful with the amount of information that the Classification Committee had processed and deliberated during their meetings.
- Classes 2A, 1A and Jr. High/Middle Schools
 - There were 10 schools present at the meeting. It was agreed that they were very appreciative of the committee's work.
 - 5.89 range is misleading. If you take the bottom 2-4 schools out. The Ratio looks a lot different.
 - This should help travel time with 1A.
 - This will help with water downed records at the state competition.
 - Like continuing the Regional and Sub state setup for 1A.
 - One school was happy to see they will no longer be on the 2A-1A bubble.
 - It was mentioned that this may create more coop agreements.

- I believe the classification presentation helped minimize any red flags or concerns. For the most part, there were no objections. However, the group is curious on the schools in the western part of the state and how they feel about the recommendations.

Location: Salina

- Classes 6A, 5A & 4A
 - We did have the athletic director from Wamego that brought up the concerns that have been sent out involving wrestling and tennis for postseason play.
 - The concern is with 3A-1A combined together would produce only around 26% on to the state level creating a much more difficult time to advance *This is compared to 4A that would have about 64% advancing, 5A around 55% and similar for 6A.
 - He was concerned about a very strong and competitive 4A becoming very watered down with the 20 teams that would be leaving that level.
 - The increase load would be a concern at the Regional level with larger numbers of schools involved putting about 4 to 5 more wrestlers in each bracket.
 - I also have one 6A school, two 5A schools, and another 5 4A schools present. They brought up the following:
 - The postseason play even though not part of the actual vote is a real concern *With the new classification system starting would this mean that 6A, 5A, and 4A would convert to all being the same in the postseason. This could include the ranking of the teams to get the best teams matched up in the post season to possibly get the best team to win. They were not as concerned with travel. There was a push for consistency.
 - They do like the ratio balance and that the committee did follow the guidelines set forth from the Regional meeting last year.
 - It is human nature to think about the movement for schools that are effected moving up and down.
 - The topic of public and private came up again but was clarified with not being able to do any multiplier with state statute that it must be by student attendance.
 - Question of who would decide the postseason if a committee would help in that process or is it just by Executive Board *Another concern was the ability for local teams to host regionals in sports with such large numbers added and not having the facilities to do so taking away from a local event, economy, etc...
- Classes 3A & 2A
 - There are concerns with what happens with post-season wrestling format as proposed...I believe the few comments raised were in accordance with the proposal that was floating around the state from the Kansas Wrestling Coaches Assoc.
 - There are those who don't care for any comparison to 6A and 1A, they feel that it is not an apples to apples comparison, so quit bringing it up
 - Will 4A be able to continue to have state tournament format with only 36 teams considering not all school have ALL activities, should the classification committee consider adding a few off the top of 3A?
 - Football-NO Complaints
 - 1A very concerned about 117 in their class
- Class 1A & JH/MS
 - I heard a lot of comments about too many teams in 1A and not having two divisions. There was a little discussion on lowering the number of 100 to be eligible for 8-man football also. Many small schools don't like the bigger schools (2A) competing in 8-man. I think too many people are just looking at what it does to them and are not looking at the big picture. I know that Stan Boggs is getting a lot of feedback through the KCA and I am sure he might be willing to share

that with you if you want. We are going to try to meet in December (I think the 17th) to discuss those items and do some other business.

Location: Dodge City

- Classes 6A, 5A & 4A(DI)
 - Football proposal is a no-brainer – since it has no impact on these schools.
 - They didn't ask for the change – so...what would be their motivation to increase their number of schools.
 - IF this benefits everyone – they would consider, but it doesn't seem like there is a consensus at any level for this proposal.
 - IF ratios are the driving force for the change – this committee did an excellent job of coming up with a solution.
 - This does nothing to address the private vs public discrepancies.
 - In the end... "bigger schools" are not concerned with how many trophies the smaller schools are handing out.
- Class 3A
 - Football proposal is a no brainer.
 - Concerns about some post-season tournaments becoming 4A-1A, which was an issue in the past?
 - This is the solution to ratios! Also, this solidifies more schools from bouncing up/down from 3A to 4A, etc.
 - *Group moderator opinion – Not a lot of support or opposition from this group – which seems surprising since they are the most impacted?*
- Classes 2A & 1A
 - I just wanted to let you know that I thought that the reclassification looked great. Our girls and boys both qualified for state last year and the girls felt that it was too easy and was not exciting to qualify for state. They said we had to win two games to qualify for state and of those two games one was against a 3 win team that we beat by 50 points. The other game was another blowout game that was close to running clock. I would like to go back to having regionals so when a team qualifies for state, then it means something.

Even at state, we only had one team that we considered to be difficult. It is too watered down and the excitement is just not what it should be. This is just my opinion, but I did want to share it with you.

- Regarding comments, I just want to reiterate that 1A administrators have voted twice in the past seven years to have two divisions. It seems disingenuous to me when it's said that everyone has a voice in the process when the 1A schools have clearly "spoken" twice about wanting two divisions and yet the new classification proposal puts 1A schools back into one division.
- I feel very strongly that putting 1A back together is a mistake. The ratio is higher in 1A than any other division. I understand it is not the over 5 number in the presentation.

If the worry was watered down State Championships that can be fixed by not hiding behind geography for substates. We are looking at a 5 hour trip for football if we win the Tuesday game. Where is the concern about travel there? I find it hard to believe that any school board would vote against extra miles for an equal opportunity at a state tournament.

If the worry was paying for too many sites for state championship competition, I would argue that if all schools paid the same entry fees, then 1A would actually be funding the other classes since 1/3 of the all schools are from 1A.

If the worry was too few teams in a specific sport, for example sand greens golf, then put a minimum number of teams necessary to recognize a sport as a KSHSAA Championship event. If the number falls below that drop it at the state level. I understand a 200 score is not state level achievement.

I understand there is no perfect formula. And I also understand if you split 1A then eventually 2A, 3A will want the same thing and we will be right back where we started. I just believe that in 1A for example, Cunningham at 38 is not a fair match with Kiowa County at 105. And that would be true in about any competition about any year.

Those are just a few ideas. Thank You for your time.

- Maybe I should have expressed concerns earlier, however I was under the impression that our last vote by 1A schools at the 2014 Fall Regional Administrator's meetings would logically result in 1A continuing with two divisions. Here is how that was reported in the "Minutes" of the KSHSAA Executive Board meeting of November 2014:

Question 8. General: (Class 1A Only) Following the 5th year of experience in 2014-15, should the KSHSAA return to a single championship in Class 1A in volleyball, basketball and scholars bowl state tournaments? Tournament formats in volleyball and basketball would revert to the regional and sub-state format previously used. YES 16 NO 37

I do not have a big concern over the new classification proposal until we consider 1A going back to one division. I could maybe accept our classification growing to 117 schools, with 6.8% being represented in the state tournaments, if 6A, 5A and 4A had a similar percentage represented at the state tournaments. The obvious inequality of 6A, 5A and 4A having 22% going to the state tournament compared to 12.5% in 3A and 2A, and 6.8% in 1A is not even close to being fair to all students in Kansas schools. Even with 2 divisions in 1A the percentage would be less than 14%. A more equitable scenario would be for 6A, 5A and 4A to have only 4 teams represented at the state tournament. As absurd and highly unlikely as that sounds, it is an accurate comparison. Perhaps another consideration, if we have a classification with 117 schools, would be to have 16 schools qualify for the state tournament. That is nearly as absurd as the previous scenario.

Adding 22 additional larger schools to 1A is already a considerable challenge to those of us 1A DII schools. But then compounding the situation by eliminating the 2 divisions creates a classification hardship that is unprecedented. **We should continue with the two divisions in 1A as the vote by our 1A schools indicated** (by more than a 2 to 1 margin). That information should have been a major consideration shared with the classification study committee. The voting results by member schools at our fall regional meetings warrant major consideration.

I know the task of developing a new classification system is a major project. I know that not all will be happy with the system. The larger schools in a class will like it much more than those

smaller schools in a class. That changes each year. Many of those in the lower half of 1A will likely remain in that position for many years.

Regarding the argument that we have “watered-down” state competition...

It should be no surprise that in 1A DII, the smallest classification, season records will naturally be lower because these schools always compete with schools in the same classification or higher; while schools in every other classification have some contests versus schools in a lower classification. Also, 6A schools will never play schools in a higher classification. In just one example, last year the SPIAA league had 4 schools in 2A, 4 in 1A DI, and 4 in 1A DII. A high percentage of the 1A DII schools games were vs. schools in higher classifications. Understand that over time, considering all classes, there will always be a team or two who make the state tournament with a weak record*. However, if we look at the final 4 teams in the 1A DII state tournaments they are quality representatives of 1A DII.

**In 2011, there were two 6A state basketball qualifiers with records of 8-14 and 9-13 and two 5A state basketball qualifiers with 11-11 records. This season in 4A D1 volleyball there is a state qualifier with a record of 11-28 and a 6A state qualifier with a record of 16-20.*

I have been involved with KSHSAA activities for all 43 years of my educational career. Most of my career has been as a teacher, coach (football, basketball and track), athletic director, and administrator in 2A and 3A schools. However, my last 10 years have been working as a HS/JH Principal and Athletic Director in a 1A school. With 1/3 of all Kansas schools in the proposed 1A classification, the proposal will certainly impact this classification more negatively than any of the other classifications. Class 1A should remain in two divisions for volleyball, basketball and scholars bowl.

- *Group Moderator* – The following are comments that I noted during the meeting:
 - Why 6 classifications? Why not 5 or 7?
 - More concern over the postseason format than changing classifications; combining two regionals or sub-states to seed like 5A-6A
 - Benefit of the regionals is the possibilities of two strong schools in the same area both advancing to state.
 - Only 8 out of 117 go to state compared to 8 out of 36 or 64; doesn't seem equitable between classes
 - 33% of all schools will be in class 1A
 - Concern over losing a week of scheduling with the addition of regionals in VB and BB
 - Can 1A be at least split for VB and BB?
 - Concern of possible 3-2-1A wrestling all in one classification; would this allow the possibility of 3A being separated and 2-1A having there own classification?
 - Very little discussion over the football proposal as it doesn't impact the schools that were present.

In summary, I believe much more of the vocal discussion was against the classification proposal. However, after the breakout session, much more positive talk about the proposal was expressed to me by others. One person expressed to me that they didn't want to speak up in favor of the proposal because they didn't want to create a disagreement. We did not take any straw ballot type votes at this session.

Location: Oakley

- Classes 6A, 5A, 4A, 3A & 2A
 - Obviously, there must be substantial dissatisfaction in the current classification to cause a major two-year study. In response, it appears the ad hoc committee did an exceptional job studying pros and cons of the many alternatives.

With that being said, we are in support of the proposed plan. However, we feel there is a very good case that wrestling should be “tweaked” so the 3-2-1A tournament might change to one 3A tournament and a 2-1A tournament. It has been brought to our attention that if one compares the regional brackets at the various levels, the 5A and especially 6A brackets had more incomplete brackets than 3-2-1A brackets.

Hays High School Administrators
Martin Straub, Principal
Chris Michaelis, Athletic Director – Assistant Principal
Tom Albers, Assistant Principal

- Brad McCormick, Principal - Scott City High School:

We are in favor of it. We do think that if it does pass, then we could address the wrestling and tennis regionals. I think that ultimately it is an improvement from where we are, with the understanding that it will not appease to all programs. KSHSAA will have our vote on it.

- Kristy Eberle, Principal - Oakley High School
Just passing this along on feedback I received:

1. 3-2-1A Wrestling - by adding 20 schools to the classification, it becomes enormous. The 20 new schools in the class would probably have full rosters. That means 13 more kids per school, times 5 schools per regional is 65 more kids. Plus their parents, family, friends and administrators all trying to cram into already over crowded buildings. One solution would be to split 3A out on its own, but then 2-1A would suffer and probably be too small. I know the wrestling coaches have a proposal, and that may be the way to go.
2. 1A is too big. 117 schools (and we could be one of them) in one classification would create some scheduling issues in basketball and volleyball. If we are 2A one year, we might schedule games in the week before substate. Then we move to 1A the next, and the regional games would be during that week. Rescheduling is always a difficult task, as you would have already committed to the dates with the other teams and the officials. Also, the ratio of schools in 1A would be a problem. 5 to 1 (largest to smallest) would not be out of the realm of possibility. The Cheylins, Golden Plains', and Triplains' of the world would not be happy having to compete in a regional tournament with us. A split of 1A as in the current system seems appropriate.
3. Doesn't affect us, but Tennis would be a problem. Currently there are 31 of 32 6A schools in girls' tennis. 28 of 32 in 5A, 40 of 64 in 4A and 42 in 3-2-1A. If all the schools moving up a division have girls' tennis, the new divisions would be 35 of 36 in 6A, 32 of 36 in 5A and 74 schools in the new 4-3-2-1A. That's too many. Too many for regionals, and too many in one class.
4. Girls golf would look similar to girls' tennis. New system would have 34 of 36 schools in 6A, 34 of 36 in 5A and 68 schools in the new 4-3-2-1A. Again, that is too many for regionals and too many in one class.

- Corey Burton, Principal - Ellis High School

We like the classification recommendation for football. Our coach would like KSHSAA to consider lowering the number of 9th-11th grade students that determines if you can play 8-man. This may pull a few schools up to 11 man 1A. Maybe the number goes to 95 or 90.

We don't have an issues with the classification recommendation for all other sports, that are stand along sports (not combined into one state series). The ratio's look good.

We agree that the enrollment ratio is very most important. This needs to be kept in mind for those sports who combine for state series events (wrestling/tennis).

We don't feel a 1A or 2A team will realistically be able to compete against a school of 300 plus students. The enrollment ratio and number of participants needs to be considered here.

If they don't want to classify each sport in a separate manner, which I understand, they may need to split state series.

In wrestling, this may mean having the following state events: 6A (36 teams), 5A (36 teams), 4A (36 teams), 3A (?? Teams), and 2-1A (?? Teams). When I did a rough count on this, it looked like 51 2-1A school would participate in wrestling. This would create 5 state wrestling events. I think this would water down the current 3-2-1A state tournament, but I don't know another way to split it without classifying wrestling teams differently than other sports.

- Andy Kenny, A.D. - Phillipsburg High School

Here is a start to the vast amount of emails you will receive on the new classification proposal.

Lets start with wrestling. I put in some attachments. I will be sending more.

I don't like the current proposal. I do like this better:

- 6A - 36 schools (same)
- * 5A - 36 (same)
- * 4A - 48 (proposed by KWCA) *
- 3A - 48 (proposed by KWCA) *
- 2A - 64 (same)
- * 1A- 121 (basically the same) *
- Total = 353 schools (same)

Tennis coaches are meeting this month and talking about the situation. We don't like combining 4-1A together. Cutting a state championship and placing all those tennis teams and players together would be a mess. Plus the location of the 4A schools and the advantage they will have over the smaller schools.

- Marty Lehman, Goodland High School

I tried to listen to the proposal with an open mind not wanting to see how it will affect Goodland High School. I truly believe that the committee did a great job of doing the same. I was working for someone on that committee during this time and he did a great job for the state of Kansas, not his school. One of them at the regional meeting stated that what they made here

was a new foundation. I couldn't agree more! Our foundation of the present is broken and needs replacing. Is the new one going to be perfect? No. But it is better than what we have at the present time and it is a foundation we can build on. For example, wrestling is not set up perfect, but it is something we can fix after the foundation is laid. By voting for this proposal, I feel we put to rest a great deal of frustration that we have all been dealing with the last few years. Will it need adjustments? Sure! But it puts KSHSAA on a solid foundation that can be worked on for many more years. Goodland will be voting for the proposal if given the opportunity.

- Jeremy Samson

I feel the change is needed, but I'm afraid if we pass this proposal it will have an adverse effect on wrestling in particular. That is an activity that is near and dear to me. I understand what they are trying to do and know we have to start somewhere. My fear is that if we pass this it will lock us into something that we could change to improve individual activities. You and I both know the system KSHSAA uses right now for wrestling works great, but with the change proposed I feel it would have an adverse effect on both the 321a and 4a classifications.

- Gary Johnson, Principal - Hoxie High School

I am sure that Hoxie will vote to support the new classification proposal. Classification for a 1A school needs to be only one division. We need to do away with the 2 divisions.

Location: Maize

- Classes 6A & 5A
 - Raising the number of schools for 5A/6A that would already increase the greatest number of students involved. Bill – have to give a little at the top end to balance out better the 3A and 4A. Something had to give.
 - Discussion of Wrestling Coaches Association comments. Should committee look at each individual sport such as wrestling?
 - Does it add more missing time from school for 6A and 5A? Probably will with going from 16 to 18.
 - Could you look at dropping off seed 17 and 18 from the play-offs to make it 16.
 - BC brought up speech entries. No room for added entries for 2A.
- Class 4A
 - There was a short discussion to see if any 4A administrator had any questions regarding the proposal presented.

There was a question about what would a 48-team football post-season format would look like. Those that spoke agreed that eight districts (six-teams each) made sense. A format that had district games in weeks five through nine and only advancing two schools to the playoffs was not supported by anyone that spoke. The format of playing district games in weeks four through eight, with the top four teams crossing districts to play week nine to start the playoffs was much better received.

The building principal from a northeast Kansas school was in the 4A discussion. He thanked the committee for their work, but stated that the biggest classification concern from his area of the state was the private school issue. He said that he favored some type of a multiplier system for private schools. He listed his concerns with Topeka Hayden controlling their enrollment for classification purposes and also St. James Academy for recruiting wrestlers from other schools as concerns.

When one of the Wichita area athletic directors questioned about how he knew these things and what facts his comments were based on, he did admit that he had no proof of those allegations.

A question was asked about the Wrestling Coaches Association proposal and the wrestling coaches concerns with the committee's proposal. It was mentioned that it was unfortunate that the Wrestling Coaches had not brought their thoughts and concerns to the committee earlier so that those items could have been discussed at that time.

There was some concern mentioned regarding the potential number of wrestlers at the 3A-2A-1A state wrestling tournament.

It was stated that every school needs to understand what each proposal says and what they are voting on if the schools are asked to vote. A question was raised on why the 6A and 5A schools would vote on the football proposal since their classification of 32 schools would not change. There was also a short discussion on the advantages and disadvantages regarding league football schedules if the football proposal would pass.

Following the regional meeting, one of the athletic directors sent me an email with concerns about a potential post-season tennis and golf format. They were very much in favor of keeping class 4A a separate classification in tennis and golf and not create a 1A-4A classification in those sports. They felt that a 1A-4A state format would involve too many athletes for the tournament format.

- Class 3A
 - Those present were in support of all Committee Recommendations. Some discussion took place on the procedure for post season football. Everyone liked the thought of 6-team districts and district play being completed in Week 8 leading to Week 9 as the beginning of the playoffs.
 - *Group moderator opinion – My group was very complimentary on the classification study process and confident in that process.*
- Classes 2A & 1A
 - Everyone seemed to be highly informed of the issues/concerns we planned to discuss. There was very little discussion on most topics.
 - All were glad to hear of the 8-man playoff format changing, and they understood the reasoning regarding not playing on Black Friday in Newton.
 - Administrators are also looking forward to the pitch count rule taking effect this season.
 - Probably the most discussion occurred regarding the classifications on recommendation #3. There are a few smaller schools that really like 1A split into 2 divisions for VB and BB. Mainly because of the opportunity to qualify for a state tournament. The reality of making a State tournament is a realistic goal, but quickly diminishes when all 117 schools are in the same division.

Location: Blue Valley

- Class 6A
 - Notes: Tim Brady and Bill Faflick available to answer questions
 - 6A- principal- I've been the 30th team & I've competed for state champ; we've also taken our lumps.... Want our kids to experience state playoffs like anyone else.
 - Agree with Kent - everybody wants to receive feedback like what are the Challenges of 4a or 3a vs 6a
 - Question: what is the Biggest impact 6A--- reshuffling with classifications when we made the change for 4A- we got bounced out of Emporia. Also concerned about increased budget,

Officials and venues are much important item to address in the middle but not sure classification is the best way to address it. There are other ways to handle it...

- Who is this helping? Who is driving this change? Is this a 4A solution? 3A solution? Why should 6A take the hit to help other classifications? I know there are 46 - 2A schools that are not happy they now have to play Silver Lake and Rossville (perennial 3A powers). If private schools are the issue (moving Miego out of 4A), then why are we changing every school in the state to appease 4A schools?
- why stand in the way of helping kids...I feel I am being Emotionally manipulated... I go back to my statement 1000 kids impacted vs 200 impacted. Did anyone address or account for this when discussing classification.
- Fall meeting -survey and the feedback was that ratio was the most important thing; Dr. Poss took notes and things that didn't make the list we were concerned with. KSHSAA is telling us of these 4 which do you deem the Most critical?
- Regarding Football classifications- how did you come up with 6 state championships- arbitrary?
- 8 is an arbitrary number? I can make an Argument for 10... that we need to look at total picture?
- Wyandotte 37 countries & 57 languages spoken - classification- challenge- why we are really talking about this? Assumptions care about kids... manipulate the system-- I have to worry about keeping my kids safe- getting on the bus...Please keep in mind the Peripheral- schedule for 2 years ; some people can't or don't want to play you for valid reasons.
- My biggest concern is in football we are willing to Recognize- 8 change=ces but only 6 in other sports. I remember when I was Coaching girls swimming - one grand state championships- split that out to recognize more kids...
- Question: Was there any way to classify by sport?
- Reponse: Keep things simple; we wanted something easier and cleaner
- Statement: in Sports like football, basketball, adding more schools but recognizing fewer kids
- Statement: In Golf- not really against 32 more like 25 in 6A maybe that needs more schools in it to maintain competitive balance
- Statement: yes we went to 2 -16 team to get competitive balance- in wrestling
- We had a wrestler go 0-20 and still went to state... by sport - wrestling needs four more teams... However, bb probably doesn't Question- are you advocating for that?
- Statement- I'm sharing my thoughts.
- 6a- is tough- competing against pro's; I'm the principal of parochial school, adding teams in 4- make it very easy for them. In Western KS - putting FS west- need to expand 6a much larger- 40 or greater- make it more difficult for all schools. You don't have to be accountable for the areas of representatives??
- Mr. Ortman-correct me if I'm wrong but in MO they classify by sport;
- Country club sports in MO? Competitive group that would participate- every year by sport...
- Debbie K spoke very highly of this option.
- Statement- we have this in Kansas we have this in 4a in football, BB and
- 6a regional assignments- example: soccer- regional in fall boys sent to different in region vs the girls in the spring
- Statement: You're voting for your school for a # of years; state of KS;
- Please make sure you see the Big picture
- Statement: go back to original statement- very difficult for State championships and venues - best guess what postseason looks like... it may be easier for postseason but not regular season.
- When a student athlete Wins state championship they are super excited. I am sure they don't say we are only 1 of 6 or 7 other state championships.
- Our kids in this part of the state- west of Lawrence they don't think of east vs west. I was at regional XC OS girls - comment on Sat, "wouldn't it suck to ride 20 min on your bus home?"

- What does the rest of our state want to do? We can't sit here and speculate - hear directly from those folks. How is this helping your school? We need to gather more information to make more informed decisions
- That's been across the room; other areas have the same questions....
- Statement: Please remember you're representing the families of MS and elementary kids... This is a long-term decision. It's an important decision and we should be using Technology-skype/google hangouts- tech to communicate within the state.
- Statement: I need a story - how is this going to help Jeff West? Wichita Trinity?
- Statement- we have the Pros and Cons from around the state and we have been transparent - we have shared all of these documents on KSHSAA website.
- What are the other classifications saying in meetings? Basically what is 6A thinking?
- Statement: Again, we came up with this classification to address the ratio in all sports and consolidates the # of classes; reduce 2 division in one classification. We had to Draw the line somewhere.
- Question- what was the process? Can we change or make a different proposal?
- Statement: We started from scratch- state statute to abide by. Decision and recommendation.. Making it simple and easy to explain - board table, grocery store.
- Main thing: Don't do multiplier & Don't do multiyear classification
- We felt like we addressed ratio - 4A; reduce from 8 to 6...
- Where is the push coming from? We looked at all of them and as a committee we felt 6 was the right number - based on geography, constraints in terms of officials, facilities, etc.
- This is the Proposal; we are using this sites to get feedback- will that mean changing it? As a committee we will have a Discussion; You are the only group that said you want more than 6 state Championships (depending on the sport... ie: football - multiple games have been and can be held at one site.)
- Statement: This is like trying to decide between Trump and Clinton
- You let everyone know what's at stake for the entire process...
- How deep is KSHSAA in this? Comment- deep; you have a proposal and they've spent 18 months looking at this... Okay across the state- if we're all in this deep - attend all these meetings- this is the proposal we are looking at - there is no backtrack... You are KSHSAA-we are KSHSAA - this is our organization.
- Sports- BV- all for competitive balance and 16 vs 1 compared to hosting regionals where all top teams are in another regional; is an absolute or artifact- constraint of how we've done it in the past; competitive balance doesn't mean we have to take students out of the classroom. At the same time some of these settings- were taking all 16 together and putting them in 4 team pools for Substate and regionals.
- Statement if we move to two - 16 team brackets please remember how this will not only impact Travel & budgets but time out of class- instructional time- for our association that has always been a priority for us; this would impact or affect instructional time.
- Classes 4A, 3A, 2A & 1A
 - Pros
 - Process was as fair as it could be based on constraints.
 - Cons
 - 5 of 6 ratios increase with current proposal.
 - Football being separated does not provide simplicity.
 - Byes in every sport save for football.
 - New solution is merely a tweak to the current system.
 - Does not address the level playing field created by schools that have greater control of enrollment totals and quality of athletes.
 - Questions

- Have HS football coaches been surveyed about current proposal as to how it will affect them and their athletes?
- Was there any discussion in the committee about altering the state statute to allow KSHSAA additional flexibility in providing a solution that is best for kids in Kansas?
 - Is the state statute handcuffing KSHSAA from crafting such a solution?
- Why are we walking on eggshells? KSHSAA is scared of doing anything due to potential legal challenges. Competitive balance does not exist when one school dominates a division based on advantages outside of enrollment numbers.
- Will KSHSAA officials be on hand at KIAAA workshop to answer questions?
- Comments
 - Football
 - 3 FB games in 10 days fits within new contact guidelines.
 - In the 36-team divisions, 4 teams in those divisions would play 3 games in 10 days.
 - No data suggesting 3 games in 10 days is related to additional injuries.
 - Many players who play both JV/V or Fr/JV now play 3 games in 10 days each week.
 - 4A ratio would actually decrease slightly with the introduction of a larger high school.
 - ADs are frustrated that some schools have a clear and distinct advantage that puts a strain on being competitive (“the elephant in the room” mentioned on more than one occasion).
 - It requires heavy lifting to establish a system where all schools have equal opportunity (does not exist at present).
 - Analogy: public schools play by Babe Ruth league rules (geographic boundaries), while private schools play by USSSA rules (find the best players you can and play similarly competitive teams). Current rules require public schools to play with Babe Ruth rules in the top-level USSSA divisions against private schools who play with the USSSA rules.
 - Other proposals
 - Wrestling Coaches Association Position Statement

Attention Wrestling Coaches and School Athletic Directors:

On Monday, October 10th, the Kansas Wrestling Coaches Association (KWCA) released a position statement that was still in DRAFT format. We apologize for any confusion the memo and the unfinished PDF file had within your school community.

The Board of Directors of the KWCA, representing over 200 member coaches, would like to express that their concern is not with the Football Reclassification Proposal that is being presented to the KSHSAA member schools. The football proposal stands-alone and does not impact other sports in the different classifications. It needs to be discussed on its own merits and voted on accordingly.

However, the KWCA does not support the Reclassification Proposal for All Interscholastic Activities (except Football) as it is being proposed. We have provided a 1-page PDF file of talking points that addresses the negative impact we believe the current proposal will have on wrestling specifically, and we believe will have a similar impact on other activities that compete in a multi-classification post-season structure.

Take a look at the negative impact that the All Interscholastic Activities reclassification proposal would have on Regional Wrestling Tournaments and the percentage of State Qualifiers, by classification, if the new proposal was adopted. This is based on the actual 2016 Regional Entries by school based on the new All Interscholastic Activities classifications:

- 6A - 425 Wrestlers/36 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 51.4%*
- 5A - 402 Wrestlers/36 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 55.7%

- 4A - 347 Wrestlers/36 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 64.5%
- 321A - 822 Wrestlers/108 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 26.7%
 - * Percent of Wrestlers qualifying for State out of total Regional Entries

The numbers in the list above represent a huge discrepancy from the top 3 classes compared to the combined 321A classification for wrestling.

The KWCA recommends that either the proposed All Interscholastic Activities reclassification proposal be voted down for its negative impact on activities that compete in multi-classification post-season structure or "modify the reclassification proposal" to have Class 4A at 48 schools and Class 3A at 48 schools. This alternative concept is addressed at the bottom of the 1-page PDF file. Please feel free to address this with an of the coaches listed below.

Respectfully,

Pat Kelly, President (pkelly@usd345.com)

Nate Naasz, Vice President (nate.naasz@usd273.org)

Doug Vander Linden, Treasurer (dvanderlinden@usd244ks.org)

Lars Lueders, Secretary (lueders.lars@usd443.org)

Wrestling Participation numbers under NEW KSHSAA Reclassification Proposal

(Based on 2016 Regional Rosters analyzed by school)

- 6A - 425 Wrestlers/36 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 51.4%*
- 5A - 402 Wrestlers/36 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 55.7%
- 4A - 347 Wrestlers/36 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 64.5%
- 321A - 822 Wrestlers/108 Schools at Regionals/224 State Qualifiers = 26.7%

** Percent of Wrestlers qualifying for State out of total Regional Entries*

Bill Johnson of Norton High School a Veteran Wrestling Coach comments:

The new classification proposal does a good job at compromising the number of schools in each class. And it would work well for single class State Championships. However, I do not believe it will work well for combined Class State Championships like 3-2-1A Sports. By adding 20 schools to the 3-2-1A Class, it would overwhelm these regional tournaments. The numbers listed above show how it would affect the 3-2-1A regional tournaments. These number even shocked me.

Take an example, outside of wrestling, the 2016 3-2-1A Regional Tennis Tournaments. The Wakeeney Regional had 11 schools, and each school can enter 2 singles players and 2 doubles teams. There were 21 singles players (only one of the schools did not enter 2 players), and 22 doubles teams. If this proposal were to go into effect the 20 new schools would add 5 teams to the 4 regional Tournaments just like it would in wrestling. So now this Wakeeney Regional Tournament could possibly have 32 Singles players and 32 Doubles teams, but only 6 get to qualify for state for just under 19%.

Doug Vander Linden of Burlington HS a Veteran Wrestling Coach comments:

As coaches we have worked to grow the sport of wrestling at the local, regional and state level for many years. We are concerned that this proposal would serve as a setback for many of the smaller schools in our state that have worked hard to build participation and bring the benefits of wrestling to their student-athletes and their school's athletic programs.

KWCA RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE TO RECLASSIFICATION PROPOSAL

Reclassification Proposal

- 6A- 36 schools
- 5A- 36
- 4A- 36
- 3A- 64
- 2A- 64
- 1A- 117
- Total = 353 schools

KWCA Alternative Idea

- * 6A - 36 schools (same)
- * 5A - 36 (same)
- * 4A - 48 (proposed by KWCA)
- * 3A - 48 (proposed by KWCA)
- * 2A - 64 (same)
- * 1A- 121 (basically the same)
- * Total = 353 schools (same)

Only 8 schools would move down from the current 2016-17 Class 4A group to Class 3A under our Alternative Idea/Proposed Amendment. This is in comparison to the 20 schools that would move down under the All Interscholastic Activities reclassification proposal. This alternative would go a long way towards balancing the inequity that was presented above between Class 4A state qualifiers and Class 321A state qualifiers.

- Will the Exec Board and the Board of Directors accept alternate proposals from member schools or leagues?

- Gentleman & Lady,

Wanted to right a follow-up to the discussion we had yesterday in our break-out session. Believe some good honest discussion is always healthy when dealing with uncomfortable topics. By no means do I take anything personal when it comes to the topic of 'competitive balance' within our state activities. I believe all teams should have the SAME opportunity to represent their community in a positive manner. The new classification proposal is fine start but by no means is the finished product. Believe the committee did a good job in trying to see all sides of the topic of that, but to not have anyone in the actual 'dogfight' was an oversight, my opinion. Once this proposal is passed/rejected we still need to address transfer rules, open enrollment, recruiting, etc. It was mentioned about forfeiting games, this I don't agree with but understand for 'safety concerns' such a 'buzz' word for the committee. If our schedule allows, we will always try to schedule other 4A schools outside of our league due to post season considerations and giving my students/parents the opportunity to realize we can compete with anyone. The perception is that we cannot. This is ingrained due to practices of overwhelming defeats, state tournament appearances, state titles, and unfound allegations by those schools.

As also, stated we are not PI's and cannot investigate every transfer within our schools but a better system needs to be addressed. Do we all have stories about this? Yes. Can some claim they have evidence, ??? Hope this clears somethings up that 'competitive balance' amongst schools is the main goal.

Thanks for letting me speak yesterday,

Doug

(I did not know the person the right of Mr. Bressler and left of Mr. Hitchcock, if someone could forward on that would be great)

Doug Key
Piper High School Activities Director

- I appreciate you and others speaking up about this issue yesterday. It was needed.

I have no doubt that the classification committee members worked diligently to offer a proposal to member schools. However it falls short of fixing anything. In fact the #1 issue in the survey last year was addressing the size ratio within classifications. The committee is offering a plan that actually ***increases the ratio in 5 out of the 6 classifications*** which is the exact opposite direction of what member schools wanted.

The best analogy I have thought of is this:

The new proposal shuffles the same deck of cards we have always been playing with, but even after the shuffle we will still have the same pre-determined winners in many activities and classifications.

It's time to start thinking outside the box. I, for one, will continue working with the legislature to cause real change in school classification. I have had others reaching out to me today, some not even at our meeting yesterday, asking how they can help.

Secondly, if truly modifying the classification system is to daunting of a task then the next step will be to look at transfer rules, out of state student participation and a litany of other things to create competitive balance.

Change is coming one way or the other.

Jeff T. Hines

Paola High School

Location: Fort Scott

- Classes 6A, 5A, 4A
 - Everyone seemed to be highly informed of the issues/concerns we planned to discuss. There was very little discussion on most topics.
 - USD 248's thoughts in the proposal.
 - 1.) I think it is imperative that we have the playoff format decided before this comes to a vote.
 - 2.) As you are aware, there is a loud rumbling in the state about private vs public school athletics.
 - We understand what the KSHSAA legal representation has stated about classifying schools and the potential lawsuits. If put to a vote, do you think that the KSHSAA member schools would be willing to go to the legislators and propose a change? I do. Would KSHSAA support this? I do not believe that the legislature would discuss this without KSHSAA being present.
 - **Osawatomie High School** would like to share the following concerns with the KSHSAA Classification Proposal.
 - 1) The lack of a proposed plan for post-season play being included in the Classification Proposal. We feel these two items should be linked together before a vote should be taken.
 - 2) If a plan for postseason play is developed for classifications that include a number of schools not divisible by 8, we do not favor play in games or bye games. We would rather that seeds past 8th simply stayed home and did not participate in sub-states regionals in team sports. The impending pitch count rule in baseball makes play-in games especially troubling in that sport.
 - 3) The proposed classification changes does not address the problem of the advantages that private school athletic programs have over public school athletic programs. If this issue cannot be addressed, then we do not see a need to act on classifications.
 - For these reasons, we could not offer support of the current proposal.
 - **Burlington High School's** thoughts regarding classification proposal
 - We appreciate the work the committee has done to try and solve the on-going problem with the state classification system as school demographics continue to change across the state. We believe there process and proposal has some merit and agree it is a move in the right direction to diminish the large ratio difference that exists in Class 4A. I believe that we could support the proposal provided:
 - KSHSAA addresses the disproportionate representation in state level competition qualifiers between classes in "quasi-team" sports (cross country, golf, wrestling and track)
 - If the current system remains in place – separate 4A in all levels of KSHSAA performance based activities (band, scholars bowl, golf, cross country, track and wrestling)

- We have created a system that team sports have a perceived higher distinction separating into two divisions than “quasi-team” sports and activities.
 - Those students involved in non-team activities have a harder path to state level competition than those in team sports. Not truly focused on “all kids”
- If 4A moves to 32 or 36 school grouping – seed sub-state team competitions similar to 5A and 6A
- Address the private vs. public school debate
- There are certainly more individual issues but these are the most pressing to Burlington as a school that moderates between 3A and 4A.

From: [Gary Musselman](#)
To: [Mindy Nichol](#)
Cc: [Bill Faflick](#); [Mike Kastle](#)
Subject: FW: State Girls Golf question
Date: Tuesday, November 08, 2016 10:36:43 AM

Mindy:

Please include this feedback from Cheney High School on girls golf, in the support material for the Executive Board and the Classification Committee when we send to them.

Gary Musselman
Executive Director
KSHSAA
601 SW Commerce Place
Topeka, KS 66601-0495
(785) 273-5329
(785) 271-0236 (fax)

From: Jeremy Holaday
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2016 10:21 AM
To: Gary Musselman <GMusselman@kshsaa.org>
Subject: RE: State Girls Golf question

Gary take a look at the scenario below.

Are we allowed to format classes like this?

Jeremy Holaday
Assistant Executive Director
Baseball, Boys & Girls Golf
Communications/Sports Info.
KSHSAA
PH: 785.273.5329
Fax: 785.271.0236

 [@KSHSAA](#)

"You win a few, you lose a few. Some get rained out. But you got to dress for all of them." - Satchel Paige

From: Randy Leroux [<mailto:rleroux@usd268.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2016 10:14 AM
To: Todd Hague <thague@usd268.org>; Jeremy Holaday <JHoladay@kshsaa.org>
Subject: Re: State Girls Golf question

Jeremy and Todd:

Roughly the numbers

6A - 31 teams for state girls golf

5A - 25 teams

4A - 20 teams

3A - 1A 44 teams

Combining 4A with 3-1A would put 64 teams competing for 12 state spots



Combining 5A with 4A would place 45 teams competing for 12 spots roughly the same as 3A - 1A

On Tue, Nov 8, 2016 at 9:58 AM, Todd Hague <thague@usd268.org> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Jeremy Holaday** <JHoladay@kshsaa.org>

Date: Tue, Nov 8, 2016 at 9:49 AM

Subject: RE: State Girls Golf question

To: Todd Hague <thague@usd268.org>

The information shared with the committee showed that there would only be 18 in 4A that participate in girls golf. You need at least 24 to have a state championship. So the other in 3A, 2A and 1A would all have to from a championship with 4A.

Jeremy Holaday

Assistant Executive Director
Baseball, Boys & Girls Golf
Communications/Sports Info.

KSHSAA

PH: [785.273.5329](tel:785.273.5329)

Fax: [785.271.0236](tel:785.271.0236)

 [@KSHSAA](#)

"You win a few, you lose a few. Some get rained out. But you got to dress for all of them." -
Satchel Paige

From: Todd Hague [mailto:thague@usd268.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2016 8:35 AM
To: Jeremy Holaday <JHoladay@kshsaa.org>
Subject: State Girls Golf question

Jeremy,

Under the proposed reclassification system, it shows that Girls Golf could go to just 3 classes. Have you looked at exactly how many golf schools under the new system would be in each class? 6A? 5A? 4-1A?

I haven't taken the time to put golf schools into classes under the new system am curious. Would think there would be enough to still have 4 classes. How many golf schools does it take to warrant a State tournament?

If you've got this information, great. If not, I'll do some digging. Thanks,

--

Todd Hague
Cheney High School
Cheney Middle School
Asst Principal / Activities Director

[Statement of Confidentiality](#)

This e-mail message and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and intended solely for addressee. The information may also be legally privileged. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or phone and delete this message and its attachments, if any.

NOTICE: This E-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2520-2521, is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please reply to the sender if you have received the message in error, then delete it. Thank you.

--

Todd Hague
Cheney High School
Cheney Middle School
Asst Principal / Activities Director

[Statement of Confidentiality](#)

This e-mail message and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and intended solely for addressee. The

November 15, 2016

KSHSAA Executive Board,

The members of the Kansas Tennis Coaches Association would like to express concern over the recent proposal by the Kansas State High School Activities Association Classification Study Committee which recommends 321A combine with 4A in tennis, therefore reducing State tournaments from four to three overall. Based upon the following reasons, the KTCA recommends that KSHSAA continue to play 6A, 5A, 4A, and 321A State tennis events based upon any classification designations created for its member schools.

The CSC recommendation would reduce the overall number of student-tennis athletes in Kansas qualifying for the State tournament from 288 to 216, it would require additional school time missed for the 4-1A and 6A groups that would each need an additional day to complete a Regional event, and it would make securing Regional sites for the 4-1A events a significant, if not impossible, challenge. Furthermore, the proposed change would, based upon current Kansas teams with tennis, increase the ratio of the smallest school within a classification to the largest from 4.13 currently in 321A to 11.09 in the proposed combined 4-1A classification. Simply stated, student-tennis athletes should not be put into a position to compete in post-season play against others from schools with over 11 times the enrollment.

Reducing the number of tennis State qualifiers from 288 to 216 eliminates 72 Kansas student-athletes from the experience of post-season play. Furthermore, based upon the geography of most 4-1A school locations, these 72 student-athletes would be from areas where tennis opportunities are already limited compared to larger metropolitan areas. The KTCA cannot support eliminating a post-season opportunity for 72 student-tennis athletes. Additionally, combining 321A with 4A in tennis would require three days to complete a Regional tournament, and the four additional teams in 6A would then require two days, thus creating an additional full day of class time missed for 492 student-tennis athletes in 4-1A events and 216 in 6A. The KTCA cannot support eliminating an additional day of academic experience for over 700 student-tennis athletes. Finally, securing adequate tennis facilities to host a minimum of nine 4-1A schools, but possibly 20 in one event, would be a major challenge. Based upon the geography of most 4-1A schools, it will be difficult to find facilities with at least eight courts. Furthermore, based upon these limited options, those few sites would need to be used nearly every year, thus eliminating a true rotation of venues.

In conclusion, the KTCA cannot support the KSHSAA Classification Study Committee's recommendation that 321A combine with 4A in tennis. The change would eliminate academic and athletic opportunities for hundreds of student-tennis athletes in Kansas, and it would more than double the ratio of smallest to largest schools competing within one classification event. The KTCA recommends that KSHSAA continue to support post-season tennis in 6A, 5A, 4A, and 321A, regardless of the new classification designations created for its member schools.

Sincerely,

KTCA Representatives

(over)

Kansas Tennis Coaches Association Committee Members

Aaron O'Donnell of Arkansas City High School

John Anderson of Maize High School

Jon Renberger of Olathe South High School

Kathy Schulte of Kapaun High School

Mike Goll of Salina Central High School

Matt Irby of Emporia High School

Donna Jarvis of Phillipsburg High School

Chris Bellar of Conway Springs High School

Eric Anderson of Ellsworth High School

Brian Aufdengarten of Wellington High School

Andrew Groene of Bishop Miege High School

Matt Babcock of Buhler High School

From: [Gary Musselman](#)
To: [Mindy Nichol](#)
Subject: FW: KIAAA - Notes from my round table discussion
Date: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 9:07:35 AM
Attachments: [KIAAA - Notes from my round table discussion.docx](#)

Gary Musselman
Executive Director
KSHSAA
601 SW Commerce Place
Topeka, KS 66601-0495
(785) 273-5329
(785) 271-0236 (fax)

From: J Means (AMAC) [mailto:jmeans1@usd259.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 8:34 AM
To: Gary Musselman <GMusselman@kshsaa.org>
Subject: KIAAA - Notes from my round table discussion

Gary,

I was talking to Bill yesterday and he said he was in Topeka today for Executive Board meeting to discuss the proposal so I wanted you to have this feedback from the KIAAA workshop. I have not heard from two of my folks but since you are meeting today wanted you to have the responses I have so far.

Thanks and have a great day.

J. Means, CAA
District Athletic Director
Wichita Public Schools
316-973-4476

- Notes from my round table discussion are:

Discussion on why do volleyball and basketball not mirror football. All three team sports and the competitive equity is important in all.

- 3A members liked the fact that they don't change much.
- Much concern for wrestling and tennis.
- Some discussion on how it will affect music. It may create appropriate sized host site shortages because of number of kids attending in some classes.
- Negative impact on volleyball scheduling for 1A schools and for upper class members that my schedule them.
- Most telling comment made was that what we have isn't perfect but we know what the post season looks like. Now we are being asked to pass a proposal that one committee co-chair called not perfect and we have no idea what the post season looks like. What the post season will look like is as or possibly more important than the number of schools in each division.

T.O.

Terry Ostmeyer, CAA
Wheatland High School

The comments listed below reflect the main discussion points in group one at the KIAAA workshop on Monday, November 7, 2016.

- Some feel that the state is pretty fragmented. It seems that 6A and 5A do something and then over time it trickles down to the other classes. Those people feel like we need more consistency in how we administer programs through KSHSAA
- Many people in the group felt like this was a great improvement over what we have now...especially the piece which requires 3A to play 3 games in 10 days
- Class 1A (one person in group) can see both sides to the change. She said some people like the system because they have a chance to win state titles in the second division. Others feel that 1A gets "watered down" pretty fast with two divisions.
- KSHSAA needs to show us what postseason will look like BEFORE we vote on this issue. Some schools will base their vote on how this looks
- Wrestling concern and multi-class sports concern. In wrestling should they pull out 3A and do them as their own class?
- Some members wanted to know if the KSHSAA staff supported the plan
- Larger schools were indifferent. They did not feel like it impacted them as much as other classes and wanted to know how the smaller classes felt about the change
- Although I did not hear it at this setting, I have heard several times that 5A is concerned with all of the larger private schools being in their classification
- Most everyone in the group felt like some kind of change needed to occur
- Travel could be a concern during postseason

Ken Stonebraker

Athletic Director, CAA

- The talk was mostly positive and in favor of the new proposal by all represented at the table. Here are the comments or challenges mentioned:
- Classification by sport? What if schools were classified that way? A school could be a 4A volleyball team, but a 5A tennis team, etc, etc. Would be a way to ensure even distribution of schools.
- Can teams in all sports be seeded or distributed more evenly to avoid "loaded" groups in one area and lesser groups in another?
- What would this do to League Football? The group seemed to think that leagues would have to work with it on an individual basis. May work for some, not for others. Kind of happens now already.
- 5A and 6A may not like the proposal due to the baseball play in game and pitch count limitations.
- Private Schools and controlling their enrollment to remain in their desired class. (A comment since the beginning of time!)
- Would like to see that Regional/State structures in all sports are tweaked in an effort to maintain similar opportunities for advancement as currently exist.

Todd Hague

Cheney High School

Notes from Classification – **Matt Ortman**

- The entire group supported the Football proposal
- Initially most of the 1A-4A supported the proposal but after looking at postseason implications wanted to get more details. They were concerned that with only 36 in 4A in some of the smaller sports they would be included with 1A-3A so that instead of having 4 classifications there would only be 3. Tennis and Golf were the main examples.
- 6A/5A schools were split on whether the new proposal is good for Kansas or not.
- All groups wanted to see more about what post season would look like.
- 3A is concerned that if football isn't passed that they will want to create divisions.
- The east/west split was a concern for 5A/6A but that is a concern regardless of the new classifications
- Talked some about doing classifications by sport and enrollment similar to Colorado.
- Schools like the new ratios with the proposal

- Our group had no issue with the football classification proposal – unanimous
- In regards to proposal for 6 classes in all other sports....
 - Look at classification differences for each sport based on numbers of schools participating
 - Who does this benefit was a question asked a bunch.....although ratios were address, nobody likes the proposal because of the numbers in each classification and what will take place regarding post season play
 - Group 3 proposes the following for all other sports except football. We understand this will perhaps skew the #1 priority being ratio...but it seems like the more this is discussed the postseason is the top priority and how that works in an effective/efficient matter. We would like the classification study Committee to propose multiple options regarding classification for all other sports instead of a just one or none approach.
 - 6A – 32
 - 5A – 32
 - 4A – 32
 - 3A – 64
 - 2A – 64
 - 1A – remaining schools
 - Can you build district play into other sports other than football??

Matt Westerhaus, CAA

Athletic Director – Junction City High School

From: [Rod Wittmer](#)
To: [Gary Musselman](#)
Cc: [Busch, Kathy](#); [Crouch, Mike](#); [Flax, Tom](#); [Gonzales, Annette](#); [Hart, Britton](#); [Ostmeyer, Terry](#); [Perez, Juan](#); [Perez, Rudy](#); [Administrative Staff](#); [Mindy Nichol](#); [Brady, Tim](#); [Davis, Charlotte](#); [Ediger, David](#); [Faflick, Bill](#); [Hubka, Mike](#); [Kastle, Mike](#); [Koelsch, Greg](#); [Mellen, Bob](#); [Rosenhagen, Greg](#); [Sheets, Alan](#); [Swenson, Carol](#); [Zuzelski, Paul](#)
Subject: Re: FW: Thoughts about classification proposal
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 3:46:11 PM

In much simpler terms and less text, this is the feedback from our BIG 7 meeting.

1. Collect Items of Concern from the BIG 7
 - a. Class 3-1A number of wrestlers compared to # of state qualifiers compared to other classifications.
 - b. FB coaches prefer 4 teams advance with cross bracketing.
 - c. FB coaches and majority of league administration are in favor of proposals and future changes.

Rod

Rod Wittmer, Principal
Holton High School
School: 785-364-2181
Fax: 785-364-5360

Follow the Holton Wildcats on Twitter: @WeAreHolton

NOTICE: This E-mail (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2520-2521, is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please reply to the sender if you have received the message in error, then delete it. Thank you.

From: [Gary Musselman](#)
To: [Mindy Nichol](#)
Subject: FW: Competitive Balance/Transfer Rules
Date: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:43:01 PM

From: Gary Musselman
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:40 PM
To: Key, Doug <DKey@piperschools.com>
Cc: Administrative Staff <AdministrativeStaff@kshsaa.org>
Subject: RE: Competitive Balance/Transfer Rules

Doug:

Thank you for attending the regional meeting in Overland Park and for taking time to put down your thoughts in your email. Since the Executive Board is meeting tomorrow and Regional Meetings and Classification discussion is on their agenda, I will provide a copy of your email to them as well as to the members of the Classification Committee.

Without question, the discussion at all seven regional meetings was healthy and wide ranging. One of the items you suggest (1 year transfer rule vs. 18 weeks) was actually on the regional meeting agenda just a few years ago and did not gain significant support. That is not to suggest that the Transfer Rule could not be reviewed and alternatives considered.

Again, thank you for giving us your thoughts.

Gary Musselman
Executive Director
KSHSAA
601 SW Commerce Place
Topeka, KS 66601-0495
(785) 273-5329
(785) 271-0236 (fax)

From: Key, Doug [<mailto:DKey@piperschools.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 1:27 PM
To: Gary Musselman <GMusselman@kshsaa.org>; Fran Martin <FMartin@kshsaa.org>; Mark Lentz <MLentz@kshsaa.org>; David Cherry <DCherry@kshsaa.org>; Brent Unruh <BUruh@kshsaa.org>; Jeremy Holaday <JHoladay@kshsaa.org>; Cheryl Gleason <CGleason@kshsaa.org>; Craig Manteuffel <CManteuffel@kshsaa.org>
Cc: Malaschak, Jason <JMalaschak@piperschools.com>; Nguyen, John <jnguyen@piperschools.com>; Key, Doug <DKey@piperschools.com>
Subject: Competitive Balance/Transfer Rules

KSHSAA Executives,

I would like to commend you all on putting together a study of classifications for the state of Kansas; I believe some good discussion was needed on this subject. I was wondering if other ideas every came up during those meetings? Many ideas have come across my desk and I would like to present them to you all.

1. Competitive Balance

- a. I was thinking about what happens when a school dominates in an activity in their class. Is this fair to them, to win championships over inferior opponents? And vice versa, if a larger enrollment school cannot compete within their class, is it tough to build the program?
- b. Can we look over dominant teams of history and assume going up a class would be more viable? Kansas State legendary Coach Bill Snyder used the opposite approach to build the best college football turnaround in history.

2. Transfer Rules

- a. I believe the parochial schools are doing what is correct under the rules that are stated. But what could happen if we looked at the NCAA model? If a student enrolls in a high school, they need to stay at that high school for four years or risk sitting out one calendar year of competition. If they are actually moving to another area, then a full release would be granted. We cannot stop parents wanting what is best for their children, but can we deter them from school shopping?
- b. In the KC Metro area, families have several options of schools to choose from. If a family chooses a private/parochial school before enrolling, then nothing happens (believe many would be fine with this). It is the changing/shopping schools after a year in HS that causes the angst amongst schools in the area.

These are some suggestions to think about, or ideas that have come my way. I realize this comes at the time of year where emotions run high about this subject, but good/honest discussion is healthy. I believe we all want what is best for schools and communities. The classification study is a start, but by no means the end. I do not want to discourage the committee, but I believe a wider area is needed for discussion.

Thank you for your time,

Doug

Doug Key
Piper High School Activities Director
913-548-9562
dkey@piperschools.com
@PiperPirates
www.kawvalleyleague.org

KSHSAA Classification Study Committee



REPORT TO

**EXECUTIVE BOARD
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

SEPTEMBER 14, 2016

Study Committee - Who



TIM BRADY, OLATHE
CHARLOTTE DAVIS, KANSAS CITY
DAVID EDIGER, CIMARRON
BILL FAFLICK, WICHITA
BRITTON HART, EMPORIA
MIKE HUBKA, BISHOP MIEGE
MIKE KASTLE, SOUTHERN COFFEY CO.
GREG KOELSCH, SMITH CENTER
BOB MELLEN, CLEARWATER
GREG ROSENHAGEN, CHENEY
ALAN SHEETS, REPUBLIC COUNTY
CAROL SWENSON, MCPHERSON
PAUL ZUZELSKI, SYRACUSE

Committee Composition



391 YEARS OF SERVICE
TEACHERS
COACHES
SPONSORS
ATHLETIC DIRECTORS
PRINCIPALS
SUPERINTENDENTS
BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS
PARENTS
RURAL/URBAN/SUBURBAN
ALL CORNERS OF KANSAS - N/S/E/W
SMALL TO LARGE

The Charge



**TO EXAMINE THE CURRENT
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND CONSIDER
ALTERNATIVES.**

**RETURN TO KSHSAA EXECUTIVE BOARD
WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR WHAT IS
BELIEVED TO BEST CLASSIFICATION FOR
KSHSAA MEMBER SCHOOLS.**

Process to change classification



KSA STATUTE - KSA 72-130(5)

**EXECUTIVE BOARD
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MAJORITY OF MEMBER SCHOOLS
MAJORITY OF IMPACTED CLASSES**

The Focus



KANSAS KIDS

&

**MEMBER
SCHOOLS**

KSHSAA Mission



**THE
KANSAS STATE HIGH SCHOOL ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATION
SERVES STUDENTS
BY PROVIDING LEADERSHIP FOR
THE ADMINISTRATION OF
EDUCATION-BASED
INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES.**

KSHSAA Belief Statements



WE BELIEVE...

- **MEMBER SCHOOLS ARE THE KSHSAA**
- **THE KSHSAA IS A STUDENT-CENTERED ORGANIZATION.**
- **THE KSHSAA IS THE RECOGNIZED STATE AUTHORITY FOR INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITY PROGRAMS.**
- **OUR ASSOCIATION IS STRENGTHENED BY EQUITY AND DIVERSITY.**
- **EACH SCHOOL CHOOSING MEMBERSHIP IN THE KSHSAA IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT AND HAS A DIRECT VOICE IN GOVERNING THE ORGANIZATION.**
- **KSHSAA IS BEST GOVERNED BY MEMBER SCHOOLS AND ITS AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS.**

KSHSAA Belief Statements



WE BELIEVE...

- **EACH KSHSAA SPONSORED ACTIVITY IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT.**
- **STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITY PROGRAMS AND COMPETITIONS IS A PRIVILEGE.**
- **PARTICIPATION IN INTERSCHOLASTIC PROGRAMS PROMOTES STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.**
- **PARTICIPATION IN INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITY PROGRAMS PROMOTE POSITIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY RELATIONS.**
- **SAFETY, QUALITY, AND FAIRNESS IN INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITY PROGRAMS ARE ESSENTIAL.**
- **FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY BY THE KSHSAA BENEFITS MEMBER SCHOOLS.**

KSHSAA Belief Statements



WE BELIEVE...

- **PARTICIPATION IN INTERSCHOLASTIC PROGRAMS PROMOTES GOOD CITIZENSHIP, IMPROVES LIFE SKILLS, AND BUILDS CHARACTER.**
- **HONESTY, INTEGRITY AND SPORTSMANSHIP ARE FUNDAMENTALS UPON WHICH ALL INTERSCHOLASTIC PROGRAMS ARE BUILT.**
- **ALL PROFESSIONALS THAT ARE IN CONTACT WITH STUDENTS SHOULD BE KNOWLEDGEABLE AND PROPERLY TRAINED.**

How we did this work



MEETING DATES

JUNE 24, 2015

SEPTEMBER 23, 2015

NOVEMBER 23, 2015

JANUARY 25, 2016

MARCH 29, 2016

JUNE 13, 2016

JULY 13, 2016

June 24, 2015 Meeting 1



MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- ❑ **FOCUS**
- ❑ **MISSION**
- ❑ **EXPECTATIONS**
- ❑ **BACKGROUND INFO**
 - ❑ **HANDBOOK BYLAWS AND RULES,**
 - ❑ **KSHSAA TIMELINE**
 - ❑ **PUBLIC -PRIVATE**
- ❑ **REVIEW OF OTHER STATES CLASSIFICATION**

September 23, 2015

Meeting 2



MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- ❑ **COMMITTEE PRIORITIES**
- ❑ **FOCUS ACTIVITY IDENTIFIED TOP 4 FACTORS (IN ORDER):**
 - ❑ **ENROLLMENT RATIO**
 - ❑ **TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSES**
 - ❑ **NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PER CLASS**
 - ❑ **SIMPLICITY**
- ❑ **REQUESTED FEEDBACK FROM REGIONAL ADMIN MEETINGS**
- ❑ **REVIEWED MODELS FROM OTHER STATES AND CONSIDERED NEW OPTIONS FOR KANSAS.**

Regional Admin/BOE Meetings



**TASK OF THIS COMMITTEE WAS
PRESENTED IN EACH CORNER OF THE
STATE**

**VIA ATTENDANCE AT ALL SEVEN
REGIONAL ADMINISTRATORS MEETINGS**

STATUS REPORT

SURVEY

CONCLUSION

Regional Admin/BOE Meetings



RESULTS

DATA SAYS:

ADMINISTRATORS ATTENDING RANKED CLASSIFICATION FACTORS IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE AS

- 1. ENROLLMENT RATIO IN EACH CLASS**
- 2. TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS PER CLASS**
- 3. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSIFICATIONS**

COMMENTS: ALL COMMENTS REVIEWED AND PROCESSED BY COMMITTEE

November 23, 2015

Meeting 3



MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- ❑ **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF CORRESPONDENCES AND FEEDBACK FROM REGIONAL ADMIN MEETINGS; PROCESSED DATA AND COMMENTS; CONFIRMATION OF RATIO AS NUMBER ONE ITEM OF FOCUS**
- ❑ **ESTABLISHED COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL FOR FUTURE COMMITTEE MEETINGS TO INCLUDE OPEN FORUM**
- ❑ **REVIEW OF MODELS**

Model Considerations



FACTORS DISCUSSED

- ❑ ANNUAL VS MULTI-YEAR CLASSIFICATION
- ❑ CLASSIFICATION ON ACTIVITY-BY-ACTIVITY SPECIFIC BASIS
- ❑ ENROLLMENT RATIO
- ❑ NUMBER OF STUDENTS/CLASS
- ❑ NUMBER OF SCHOOLS/CLASS
- ❑ NUMBER OF CLASSES
- ❑ POST-SEASON FORMATS

Proposals/Comments Received



RUSSELL BALDWIN, DERBY

PARKER CHRISTENSEN, GOLDEN PLAINS

RICHARD COX, SCANDIA PIKE VALLEY

TOM DAVIS, COLLEGIATE

TODD HAGUE, CHENEY

KIT HARRIS, BALDWIN

JEFF HINES, PAOLA

ALAN JAMISON, CALDWELL/SCBL

BRUCE KRASE, HEART OF AMERICA

January 25, 2016

Meeting 4



MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF MODELS**
- **REQUESTED STAFF TO DEVELOP POST-SEASON IMPACT FOR TOP THREE MODELS**

[36 , 40, AND 48 SCHOOLS IN TOURNEY FORMAT]

Models Considered



45 POSSIBLE CLASSIFICATIONS CONSIDERED



- **64-64-64-64-97 (49-48)**
- **56-56-56-56-56-73 (37-36)**
- **55-60-110-129 (4 CLASSES BOTTOM #: 800, 300, 125, REMAINDER)**
- **48-41-44-60-49-111 (6 CLASSES BOTTOM #: 1000, 500, 250, 150, 100, REMAINDER)**
- **48-56-64-64-121 (61-60)**
- **48-48-48-48-48-113 (57-56)**
- **48-48-48-64-64-80 (COX)**
- **48-48-48-48-48-112 (56-56) (HAGUE)**
- **48-48-64-64-53-54 (BALDWIN)**
- **48-47-75-106-68-9 (SET RATIO 2.3)**

Models Considered



- **46-41-64-106-97 (5 CLASSES BOTTOM #: 1000, 500, 230, 101, REMAINDER)**
- **45-47-62-97-83-19 (SET RATIO 2.2)**
- **44-43-48-89-97-32 (SET RATIO 2.1)**
- **42-38-37-80-98-58 (SET RATIO 2.0)**
- **40-48-56-64-72-73**
- **40-48-48-48-64-105 (53-52)**
- **40-40-48-__-__-__ (HARRIS)**
- **40-40-48-48-64-113 (57-56)**
- **40-40-40-64-64-105 (53-52)**
- **40-40-40-56-56-121 (61-60)**
- **40-40-40-48-48-137 (69-68)**
- **40-40-40-40-40-153 (77-76)**

Models Considered



- **39-49-44-61-49-111 (6 CLASSES BOTTOM #: 1200, 500, 250, 150, 100, REMAINDER)**
- **39-39-34-69-61-111 (6 CLASSES BOTTOM #: 1200, 600, 300, 175, 100, REMAINDER)**
- **39-21-38-67-77-111 (6 CLASSES BOTTOM #: 1200, 800, 400, 200, 100, REMAINDER)**
- **38-37-28-78-78-94 (SET RATIO 1.9)**
- **37-33-28-56-69-130 (SET RATIO 1.8)**
- **36-48-48-48-48-125 (63-62)**
- **36-44-48-48-64-113 (57-56)**
- **36-40-48-64-64-101 (51-50)**
- **36-40-48-48-64-117 (59-58)**
- **36-36-48-64-64-105 (53-52)**

Models Considered



- **36-36-48-48-64-121 (61-60)**
- **36-36-36-64-64-117 (59-58)**
- **35-30-28-33-68-159 (SET RATIO 1.7)**
- **32-48-48-48-48-129 (65-64)**
- **32-40-48-48-64-121 (61-60)**
- **32-40-40-40-40-161 (81-80)**
- **32-32-64-64-64-96 (48-48) (CURRENT)**
- **32-32-64-48-__-__**
- **32-32-36-64-64-125 (63-62)**
- **32-32-32-64-64-64-65**
- **32-48-48-48-48-128**
- **32-40-40-40-40-160**
- **31-24-26-20-53-199 (SET RATIO 1.6)**

March 29, 2016 Meeting 5



MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- ❑ **REVIEWED IMPACT OF VARIOUS MODELS IN POST-SEASON COMPETITION**
- ❑ **POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES OF EACH MODEL (THREE MODELS PLUS CURRENT)**
- ❑ **FOOTBALL FORMAT DISCUSSED**
- ❑ **SENATOR ABRAMS CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING SENATE BILL 464**

June 13, 2016 Meeting 6



MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- ❑ **NARROWED TO TWO MODELS PLUS CURRENT**
- ❑ **REVIEWED EACH MODEL ON ACTIVITY SPECIFIC BASIS (POSITIVE/NEGATIVE/NEUTRAL UNDER PROPOSAL)**
- ❑ **LIST OF FINALISTS**
- ❑ **FOOTBALL DISCUSSION AND DATA REQUEST**

July 13, 2016 Meeting 7



MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

- ❑ **UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT UPON CLASSIFICATION PROPOSAL**
 - ❑ **FOOTBALL AS STAND ALONE CLASSIFICATION**
 - ❑ **ALL OTHER ACTIVITIES UNDER COMMON CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**
- ❑ **NEXT STEPS IDENTIFIED**
- ❑ **COMMUNICATION PLAN DEVELOPED**

Summary



7 MEETINGS

42 HOURS MEETING TIME PER COMMITTEE MEMBER

546 TOTAL HOURS TOGETHER

APPROXIMATELY 16,380 MILES DRIVEN

AT LEAST 50 PROPOSALS REVIEWED

PERSONAL RESEARCH AND REVIEW

STAFF ENGAGEMENT AND RESEARCH

COUNTLESS SUGGESTIONS

**YOU DON'T WANT TO KNOW HOW MANY REAMS OF
PAPER GIVEN FOR THE CAUSE**

Conclusions



MAINTAIN:

**CLASSIFICATION FOR FOOTBALL
EVERY OTHER YEAR**

ALL OTHER ACTIVITIES CLASSIFIED ANNUALLY

SIX CLASSES

EVERY STUDENT COUNTS

EVERY MEMBER SCHOOL HAS A VOICE

Conclusions



FOOTBALL

1. FOOTBALL IS UNIQUE IN SCHEDULING OF GAMES IN TWO-YEAR CYCLES AND IMPACTS REGULAR SEASON SCHEDULING
2. FOOTBALL CLASSIFICATION SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE BASED ON THE ENROLLMENT COUNT FOR 9TH, 10TH AND 11TH GRADE STUDENTS
3. DUE TO THE NATURE OF THE SPORT, FOOTBALL PRESENTS PLAYER SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS ON A GREATER SCALE THAN OTHER SPORTS
4. PRIORITY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE ENROLLMENT RATIO OF SCHOOLS COMPETING WITHIN EACH CLASSIFICATION
5. COMPETITION OCCURS IN TWO DIFFERENT FORMATS (8-MAN & 11-MAN)
6. RETAIN THE 8-MAN DIVISION ENROLLMENT CAP AT 100
7. STUDENT SAFETY WAS A HIGH PRIORITY OF THE COMMITTEE IN DEVELOPING A FOOTBALL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM THAT WOULD ELIMINATE THE NEED TO PLAY THREE (3) GAMES WITHIN THE INITIAL 10-DAY PLAYOFF PERIOD.
8. COMMITTEE WANTED PLAYOFF SYSTEM WITH NO BYES
9. SEEK TO MAINTAIN TWO DIVISIONS IN 8-MAN

Recommendations



PROPOSED FOOTBALL CLASSIFICATION

CLASS	SCHOOLS/TEAMS	*ENROLLMENT	RATIO
6A	32	1796-1123	1.60
5A	32	1052-595	1.77
4A	32	590-320	1.84
3A	48	304-179	1.70
2A	48	176-119	1.48
1A	35	119-63	1.89
8-MAN I	50	99-60	1.65
8-MAN II	49	59-27	2.18

* BASED ON ENROLLMENT IN GR 9-11 FOR 2015-16 SCHOOL YEAR

Comparison of Current vs Proposed



FOOTBALL CLASSIFICATION

CLASS	SCHOOLS/TEAMS	RATIO	*STUDENTS
6A	32 vs 32	1.60 vs 1.60	43,617 vs 43,617
5A	32 vs 32	1.77 vs 1.77	25,401 vs 25,401
4A	64 vs 32	2.89 vs 1.84	22,098 vs 14,568
3A	64 vs 48	1.71 vs 1.70	10,061 vs 10,531
2-1	40	1.95	3,897
2A	48	1.48	5,705 vs 7,060
1A	35	1.89	vs 3,352
8-MAN I	50 vs 50	1.58 vs 1.65	3,799 vs 3,712
8-MAN II	49 vs 49	2.03 vs 2.19	2,383 vs 2,372

* BASED ON ENROLLMENT IN GR 9-11 FOR 2015-16 SCHOOL YEAR

Recommendation



ALL INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES (EXCEPT FOOTBALL)

CLASS	SCHOOLS	* RANGE	RATIO	* STUDENTS
6A	36	2292-1296	1.77	61,951
5A	36	1280-691	1.85	33,490
4A	36	677-317	2.14	17,303
3A	64	315-187	1.68	15,525
2A	64	185-107	1.73	9,071
1A	117	107-19	5.63	8,031

*** BASED UPON GRADES 9-12 ENROLLMENT FOR 2015-16
SCHOOL YEAR**

Comparison of Current vs Proposed



ALL INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES (EXCEPT FOOTBALL)

CLASS	SCHOOLS	RATIO	*STUDENTS
6A	32 vs 36	1.62 vs 1.77	56,560 vs 61,951
5A	32 vs 36	1.75 vs 1.85	32,971 vs 33,490
4A	64 vs 36	2.92 vs 2.14	28,914 vs 17,303
3A	64 vs 64	1.64 vs 1.68	13,264 vs 15,525
2A	64 vs 64	1.66 vs 1.73	7,612 vs 9,071
1A	97 vs 117	4.95 vs 5.63	6,050 vs 8,031

*BASED UPON GRADES 9-12 ENROLLMENT FOR 2015-16
SCHOOL YEAR

Positives

36-36-36-64-64-117



ADDRESSES RATIO

STABILITY AT 4A

ALL CLASSES SUPPORT RATIO COMPRESSION

NO DIVISIONS IN 1A

6 CHAMPIONSHIPS (VENUES, OFFICIALS)

QUASI TEAM SPORTS

TEAM SPORTS

SIMPLE

**LARGER 1A POPULATION FAVORABLE FOR
SCHEDULING**

POSSIBLE DECREASE IN 5A/6A PLAYOFF TRAVEL

Challenges

36-36-36-64-64-117



- NO DIVISIONS IN 1A**
- NO DIVISION PROPOSALS IN 2A AND 3A**
- 5A AND 6A RATIO INCREASES**
- RATIO CREEP IN 4A**
- NOT ALL CLASSES DIVISIBLE BY 8**

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



BASEBALL

- ❑ **6A, 5A, 4A – 36 TEAMS EACH**
 - ❑ East/West 18 team brackets
 - ❑ Four groups of each 18 team bracket
 - ❑ single elimination
 - ❑ May create play in game

- ❑ **3A – 59 TEAMS DEPENDING UPON CO-OPS**
 - ❑ 8 Regionals
 - ❑ single elimination

- ❑ **2-1A – 60-70 TEAMS, DEPENDING UPON CO-OPS**
 - ❑ 8 Regionals
 - ❑ single elimination

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



BASKETBALL

- ❑ **6A, 5A, 4A- ADVANCING 8 TO STATE TOURNEY**
 - ❑ Groups of 9
 - ❑ Play-in game on Monday or Tuesday for 8 v. 9
 - ❑ Remainder of week per current protocol

- ❑ **64 SCHOOLS**
 - ❑ 8 groups of 8 geographically grouped
 - ❑ Mon/Tues at higher seed
 - ❑ Thurs-Sat at Primary site

- ❑ **1A – 117 SCHOOLS (NOT COUNTING CO-OPS)**
 - ❑ Week 1 for Regional play
 - ❑ 6 or 7 teams per regional, top two advance to sub-state
 - ❑ Week 2 for Sub-state play

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



BOWLING

- ❑ **NO CHANGE**
- ❑ **WOULD MAINTAIN TWO CHAMPIONSHIPS
6A AND 5-1A**

What does Post-Season look like...



CROSS COUNTRY

- ❑ **36 SCHOOLS PER CLASS – 12 TEAMS TO STATE**
 - ❑ 3 regionals of 12 schools, top 4 teams to state
 - ❑ 4 regionals of 9 schools, top 3 teams to state
 - ❑ Same individual qualifying protocol

- ❑ **64 SCHOOLS PER CLASS – 12 TEAMS TO STATE**
 - ❑ 4 regionals with teams divided evenly, top 3 teams
 - ❑ Same individual qualifying protocol

What does Post-Season look like...



GIRLS GOLF

- ❑ **CURRENTLY HAVE 4 CLASSIFICATIONS**
- ❑ **DEPENDING UPON 4A PARTICIPATION, MAY YIELD ONLY 3 CLASSIFICATIONS**
 - (WOULD HAVE 4-1A GROUP)**
- ❑ **36 SCHOOLS PER CLASS – 12 TEAMS TO STATE**
 - ❑ Regionals evenly distributed (4 regionals of 9, top 3 qualify)
 - ❑ Maintain individual qualifying procedure
- ❑ **64 SCHOOLS PER CLASS – 12 TEAMS TO STATE**
 - ❑ Regionals evenly distributed
 - ❑ Maintain individual qualifying procedure
- ❑ **IN 4-1A, POSSIBLE FOR EITHER**
 - 6 REGIONALS OF 10-11 SCHOOLS, OR**
 - 4 REGIONALS OF 15-16 SCHOOLS EACH**

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



BOYS GOLF

- ❑ **CURRENTLY HAVE 7 CLASSIFICATIONS INCLUDING SAND GREENS**
- ❑ **EXPECT MINIMAL CHANGE**
- ❑ **36 SCHOOLS PER CLASS – 12 TEAMS TO STATE**
 - ❑ Regionals evenly distributed (4 regionals of 9, top 3 qualify)
 - ❑ Maintain individual qualifying procedure
- ❑ **64 SCHOOLS PER CLASS – 12 TEAMS TO STATE**
 - ❑ Regionals evenly distributed
 - ❑ Maintain individual qualifying procedure

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



❑ **BOYS (105)**

- ❑ 6A – 36 Teams, 2 Regionals of 18 teams
- ❑ 5A – 36 Teams, 2 Regionals of 18 teams
- ❑ 4-1A – 33 Teams, 2 Regionals of 16 & 17 teams

❑ **GIRLS**

- ❑ 6A – 36 Teams, 2 Regionals of 18 teams
- ❑ 5A – 35 Teams, 2 Regionals of 17 & 18 teams
- ❑ 4-1A – 22 Teams, 2 Regionals of 11 teams

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



SOFTBALL

- ❑ **6A – 35 TEAMS, 5A – 33 OR 34 TEAMS, 4A – 36 TEAMS**
 - ❑ East/West 18 team brackets
 - ❑ Four groups of each 18 team bracket
 - ❑ single elimination
 - ❑ May create play-in game
- ❑ **3A – 59 TEAMS DEPENDING UPON CO-OPS**
 - ❑ 8 Regionals
 - ❑ single elimination
- ❑ **2-1A – 60-70 TEAMS, DEPENDING UPON CO-OPS**
 - ❑ 8 Regionals
 - ❑ single elimination

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



SWIMMING & DIVING

- ❑ **NO CHANGE TO STATE MEET FORMAT**
 - ❑ **BOYS** (68)
 - ❑ 6A - 31 schools
 - ❑ 5-1A – 37 schools
 - ❑ **GIRLS** (77)
 - ❑ 6A – 34 schools
 - ❑ 5-1A – 43 schools

What does Post-Season look like...



TENNIS

- ❑ **3 CLASSIFICATIONS/STATE TOURNEYS
CREATES 4-1A GROUPING**
- ❑ **IN 4-1A REGIONALS – OPTIONS
6 REGIONALS WITH 9-12 SCHOOLS OR
4 REGIONALS WITH 14-20 SCHOOLS EACH**
- ❑ **NOTE: 2 DAY REGIONAL FOR GROUPS WITH MORE
THAN 32 SCHOOLS**

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



TRACK & FIELD

❑ REGIONAL

- ❑ 6A, 5A, 4A
 - ❑ 9 teams each
 - ❑ Additional heats may be necessary
- ❑ 3A, 2A, 1A
 - ❑ No change to current format

❑ STATE MEET

- ❑ No change to current format

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



VOLLEYBALL

❑ IF 36 IN CLASS, 4 SUB-STATES OF 9 EACH

Pool play at Sub-State; Qualify top team from each to state, bracket play at state

❑ IF 64 IN CLASS, 8 SUB-STATES OF 8 EACH

Qualify top team from each to state; pool play Friday. bracket play on Saturday

❑ CLASS 1A – VARIES DUE TO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

❑ Propose Regionals week before Sub-state

❑ State divided into 4 sections, 4 tournaments per section

❑ Top two at each regional tournament qualify for different sub-states

❑ Play two 4-team sub-state tournaments with winners advancing to state (8)

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



WRESTLING

❑ REGIONAL

- ❑ 6a, 5A, 4A
 - ❑ 9 teams each
 - ❑ One day Tourney
- ❑ 3-2-1A
 - ❑ 4 Regionals of equal number of teams
 - ❑ 2 day tourney

❑ STATE TOURNAMENT

- ❑ No change to current format

What does Post-Season look like...



DEBATE

▣ REGIONAL 4 SPEAKER

- ▣ 6A – 21 entries (increase of 2)
- ▣ 5A – 21 Entries (increase of 4)
- ▣ 4A – 17 Entries (decrease of 10)
- ▣ 3A-2A-1A – 17 Entries (no change)

▣ STATE 4 SPEAKER

- ▣ No change from current format

What does Post-Season look like...



DEBATE

▣ STATE 2 SPEAKER

- ▣ 6A – 84 entries (increase of 6)
- ▣ 5A – 65 Entries (increase of 7)
- ▣ 4A – 49 Entries (decrease of 23)
- ▣ 3A-2A-1A – 25 Entries (no change)

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



MUSIC

- **NOT AFFECTED -**
 - Music Regionals
 - State Large Group Festivals
 - Regional Piano
 - State Piano

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



SCHOLARS BOWL

■ BASED UPON 325 PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

- 6A – 26 teams, 2 regionals of 13 each, pools of 6 or 7 each
- 5A – 34 teams, 2 regionals of 17 each, pools of 8 or 9 each
- 4A – 30 teams, 2 regionals of 15 each, pools of 7 or 8 each
- 3A – 63 teams, 4 regionals of 15/16, 2 pools of 7 or 8 each
- 2A – 62 teams, 4 regionals of 15/16, 2 pools of 7 or 8 each
- 1A – 110 teams, 8 regionals of 13/14, 2 pools of 6 or 7 each

What does Post-Season look like...



SPEECH

▣ **STATE**

- ▣ 6A – 367 Entries (increase of 32)
- ▣ 5A – 365 Entries (increase of 57)
- ▣ 4A – 315 Entries (decrease of 185)
- ▣ 3A – 368 Entries (increase of 2)
- ▣ 2A – 338 Entries (increase of 36)
- ▣ 1A – 259 Entries (increase of 58)

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



SPIRIT

- ▣ **NO CHANGE**

What does Post-SeasOn look like...



STUDENT ADVISORY TEAM

- ❑ **NO CHANGE**
 - ❑ Two Representatives from each class

Implementation Timeline & Next Steps



INPUT FROM EXECUTIVE BOARD (9/14)

INPUT FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS (9/14)

FALL REGIONAL ADMIN/BOE MEETINGS (OCTOBER, 2016)

FORMAL EXECUTIVE BOARD RECOMMENDATION TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS (SPRING, 2017)

BOARD OF DIRECTORS VOTE (APRIL 28-29, 2017)

MEMBER SCHOOLS VOTE (MAY, 2017)

(MUST PASS MAJORITY OF SCHOOLS AND MAJORITY OF IMPACTED CLASSES)

BEGIN FOR 2018-19 SCHOOL YEAR FOR ALL ACTIVITIES

Next Steps



RECOMMENDATION 1

- ❑ **REFER TO ADMINISTRATOR AND BOARD OF EDUCATION REGIONAL MEETINGS FOR DISCUSSION ONLY**
- ❑ **ANTICIPATE IMPLEMENTATION WOULD BE IN 2018-19 SCHOOL YEAR**

Next Steps



RECOMMENDATION 2

❑ **FOOTBALL CLASSIFICATION:**

- ❑ 8 Championships
 - ❑ 6A – 32 schools
 - ❑ 5A – 32 schools
 - ❑ 4A – 32 Schools
 - ❑ 3A – 48 Schools
 - ❑ 2A – 48 Schools
 - ❑ 1A – Approx. 35 Teams
 - ❑ 8-Man Division I – Approx. 50 Teams
 - ❑ 8-Man Division II – Approx. 49 Teams

❑ **CONTINUE 2 YEAR CLASSIFICATION CYCLE**

❑ **NO TEAM WOULD PLAY THREE GAMES IN TEN DAYS**

❑ **8-MAN CHAMPIONSHIP WOULD BE SAME SATURDAY (SCW #21) AS 11-MAN**

Next Steps



RECOMMENDATION 3

■ ANNUAL CLASSIFICATION – ALL ACTIVITIES BUT FOOTBALL

■ 6 Championships

- 6A – 36 schools
- 5A – 36 schools
- 4A – 36 schools
- 3A – 64 schools
- 2A – 64 schools
- 1A – Approx. 117 schools

(Class 1A would utilize Regional and Sub-State format in Volleyball and Basketball)

Next Steps



QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

**KSHSAA Classification Study Committee
Meeting Summary, July 13, 2016**

The KSHSAA Classification Study Committee met at the KSHSAA office on July 13, 2016. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School; Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School. Absent: Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School.

There were no representatives of member schools or leagues requesting to speak during the public forum. Mr. Rod Wittmer, Principal, Holton High School, Mr. Matt Renk, Athletic Director, Atchison High School and Mr. Jake Lebahn, 580 WIBW Radio, Topeka were present as guests to observe the meeting.

Mr. Kastle and Mr. Faflick reported back to the committee on their report to the Executive Board on June 15th. They reported that the models the Committee had been evaluating and considering were shared with the Executive Board. Mr. Faflick reported one member of the Executive Board asked the Committee to consider the possibility of shifting schools down from class 2A to maintain a constant number or minimum number of schools in class 1A on a sport by sport or activity specific basis. The committee discussed the pros and cons of this concept at length and were unanimous in their decision not to incorporate such a change. The Committee's desire is to develop a final report to be presented to the Executive Board at its meeting on September 14th. If approved by the Executive Board, the proposal would go to KSHSAA Fall Regional Administrator and Board of Education meetings for feedback from member school administrators and board of education representatives. Depending on feedback, a proposal could potentially go to the Board of Directors for a vote at the spring 2017 meeting. If approved by the Board of Directors, the proposal would then need to be voted on and approved by a majority of all member schools and a majority of all current classifications. (*Refer to KSHSAA Bylaw Article XII – Classification of Schools*) At this point the Committee projects the earliest any potential new annual classification system could go into place would be the 2018-19 school year.

Two email correspondences from representatives of member schools were reviewed. Superintendent Alan Jamison of Caldwell USD 360 had sent an email regarding issues pertaining to classification of schools in the sport of football and issues related to 8-man and 11-man football that impact small enrollment, rural schools. Richard Cox, cross country and track and field coach of Scandia-Pike Valley High School submitted a proposal for the Committee's consideration which would classify schools as follows: 6A-48 schools, 5A-48 schools, 4A-48 schools, 3A-64 schools, 2A-64 schools and 1A-80 schools. The Committee read and discussed both communications at length. Committee members elected not to add the model proposed by Mr. Cox to the four models currently under consideration.

The Committee reviewed and discussed at length five (5) proposals for classification of schools in the sport of football. During the evaluation of each model, it was the Committee's position that classification in the sport of football should remain separate from the annual classification of schools in other sports and activities. Rationale for continuing that philosophy includes:

1. Football is unique in scheduling of games in two year cycles and impacts regular season scheduling
2. Football classification should continue to be based on the enrollment count for 9th, 10th and 11th grade students
3. Due to the nature of the sport, football presents player safety considerations on a greater scale than other sports
4. Priority should be given to the enrollment ratio to range of schools competing within each classification
5. Competition occurs in two different formats (8-man & 11-man)
6. Retain the 8-man division enrollment cap at 100 students

The Committee placed high priority on developing a football classification system that would eliminate the need to play three (3) games within the initial 10 day period of playoffs. In addition, the committee wants to avoid use of byes in football playoffs and seeks to maintain two divisions of play in 8-man competition.

Next the Committee evaluated four proposed models for annual classification including the current classification system. After narrowing to the top two proposed new models, the Committee asked KSHSAA staff to explain on a sport/activity specific basis what changes would be necessary if each new model was implemented. Options for six and seven classifications were evaluated. Many factors were considered including impact on students, impact on school travel, scheduling, postseason structure, postseason facility availability and availability/scheduling of officials. In its final action of the day, the co-chairs identified a sub-committee to prepare a final report for the upcoming Executive Board meeting to be presented on September 14th.

**KSHSAA Classification Study Committee
Meeting Summary, June 13, 2016**

The KSHSAA Classification Study Committee met at the KSHSAA office on June 13, 2016. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School; Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School. Absent: David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School.

There were no representatives of member schools or leagues requesting to speak during the public forum. Mr. Rod Wittmer, Principal, Holton High School, Mr. Bill Keeley, Superintendent, USD #395-La Crosse and Mr. John Webster, Athletic Director, La Crosse High School were present as guests to observe the meeting.

Mr. Kastle and Mr. Faflick reported back to the committee on the reports shared with the Executive Board and Board of Directors on April 29. The models the committee had been evaluating and considering at that time were shared with the Executive Board. A general overview of the history and purpose of the study committee as well as an overview of the process the committee was currently undergoing was shared with the Board of Directors. A common question coming from the Board of Directors was the timeframe of when a potential classification proposal would be released and voted on by the Board of Directors. At this time the committee feels a reasonable timeline goal would be to have a specific proposal to the Executive Board at the September 2016 meeting. If approved by the Executive Board, the proposal would go to Fall Regional Meetings for feedback. Depending on feedback, the proposal could potentially go to the Board of Directors for a vote at the Spring 2017 meeting. If approved by the Board of Directors, the proposal would still need to be voted on and approved by a majority of all member schools and a majority of all current classifications. At this point the committee feels the earliest any potential new classification system could go into place would be the 2018-19 school year.

Two email correspondences from representatives of member schools were shared with the committee. Kit Harris, Head Wrestling Coach, Baldwin High School submitted a proposal on a change in classification structure for wrestling only. Russell Baldwin, District Athletic/Activities Director, USD #260-Derby submitted a proposal for football, volleyball, soccer, wrestling and basketball. At this point the committee is continuing to look at multiple models which would all impact these activities.

Next the committee evaluated three proposed models and the current classification structure by dividing into small groups with each group listing pros and cons of each model under consideration. Based on the results of this exercise, two of the proposed new models were selected as the leading choices by the committee at this time. These two proposals were then thoroughly evaluated on an activity by activity basis (excluding football) with consultation from the KSHSAA staff. Many factors were considered as part of this evaluation including impact on students, impact on school travel, scheduling, postseason structure, postseason facility availability and availability/scheduling of officials.

The committee also evaluated in more detail an eight class football model introduced at the previous meeting. The committee asked Mark Lentz to prepare a summary for their next meeting of how football would be impacted if it was classified the same as the two general classification models the committee is currently evaluating.

The committee asked to see a summary of a general classification model based on a 32-32-36-64-64-125 breakdown. They also requested to see a detailed breakdown of a descending order list of schools showing difference in size between one school and the next largest to evaluate where natural enrollment breaks seem to be occurring.

All meetings of the committee are open meetings. An open forum session is offered at the beginning of all Classification Committee meetings, based on the following criteria:

1. Speakers must represent a member school or league.
2. Speakers must pre-register with the KSHSAA Executive Director.
3. Written materials must be submitted electronically to co-chairs Mike Kastle (mikelindakastle@gmail.com) and Bill Faflick (bfaflick@usd259.net) at least 24 hours prior to a scheduled meeting.
4. Presenters shall bring 25 printed copies to meeting for distribution to committee members and KSHSAA staff.
5. Member schools will have 5 minutes to present.
6. League representatives will have 10 minutes to present.

The next meeting of the Classification Study Committee is scheduled for July 13th at 9:00 am at the KSHSAA office.

KSHSAA Classification Study Committee Meeting Summary, March 29, 2016

The KSHSAA Classification Study Committee met at the KSHSAA office on March 29, 2016. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School. Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School was absent.

There were no representatives of member schools or leagues requesting to speak during the public forum. Mr. Musselman shared various articles which have appeared in the media since the committee met in January regarding the KSHSAA classification system and specifically Senate Bill 464. The committee next reviewed and discussed at length, a letter to Mr. Musselman from Senator Steve Abrams regarding the KSHSAA classification system and Senate Bill 464. The committee believes at this time it is best to continue working towards a proposal that meets the criteria of the current state statute. Mr. Faflick and Mr. Kastle also indicated this was the directive from the KSHSAA Executive Board when they updated that body on the committee's progress at the March 22, 2016 meeting.

KSHSAA activity administrators provided the committee detailed proposals and analysis for postseason formats based on three different classification models. The committee spent over three hours analyzing in detail various postseason formats for each potential classification model. Many factors were discussed and considered, including availability of officials, seeding models, location of contests (primary site vs. higher seeded team), number of schools qualifying for state events, number of classes at state sites, state event bracket design, school travel demands and impact on instructional time. Mr. Lentz also provided the committee a separate football classification and postseason model for consideration. The committee requested Mr. Lentz provide previous years' enrollment ratio data based on this model.

At this point the committee feels all three classification models developed as well as the current classification system should remain under consideration. Mr. Faflick and Mr. Kastle requested all committee members consider in detail, the pros and cons of all classification/postseason models being evaluated as they prepare for the next committee meeting.

Mr. Musselman will provide an update on the committee's work to the KIAA at their annual meeting in April. On April 29, 2016, Mr. Faflick and Mr. Kastle will update both the KSHSAA Executive Board and Board of Directors on the committee's progress. The Board of Directors will be provided a timeline as to the progress of the committee to this point and information will be provided regarding the three proposed models currently under consideration.

All meetings of the committee are open meetings. An open forum session is offered at the beginning of all Classification Committee meetings, based on the following criteria:

1. Speakers must represent a member school or league.
2. Speakers must pre-register with the KSHSAA Executive Director.
3. Written materials must be submitted electronically to co-chairs Mike Kastle (mikelindakastle@gmail.com) and Bill Faflick (bfafllick@usd259.net) at least 24 hours prior to a scheduled meeting.
4. Presenters shall bring 25 printed copies to meeting for distribution to committee members and KSHSAA staff.
5. Member schools will have 5 minutes to present.
6. League representatives will have 10 minutes to present.

The next meeting of the Classification Study Committee is scheduled for June 13, 2016 at 9:00 am at the KSHSAA office.

KSHSAA Classification Study Committee Meeting Summary, January 25, 2016

The KSHSAA Classification Study Committee met at the KSHSAA office on January 25, 2016. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School, Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School. David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School was absent.

There were no representatives of member schools or leagues requesting to speak during the public forum. One correspondence was shared with the committee from Bruce Kruse, the Commissioner of the Heart of America League, sharing the league's concern about the future of 2-1A 11-man football. League schools are concerned about the declining number of schools participating in this division and the ability of schools to find a full schedule of regular season games. Ms. Davis indicated she met with the USD #500 athletic administrators in December and updated them on the progress of the classification committee. She indicated the district continues to have concerns about socioeconomic status impacting participation rates in schools.

Mr. Faflick updated the committee on his report to the Executive Board via conference call on January 13, 2016. He reported the committee is continuing to look at different classification models and continuing to review fall regional meeting feedback. He reported the committee agrees that even though feedback from the fall regional meetings indicated enrollment ratio was the most important aspect to consider in a classification system, it doesn't stand in isolation. Other factors such as number of schools per class and total number of classifications must still be considered, especially as they relate to postseason competition structure. He reported there is no timeline currently in place as to when the committee will have a proposal to report to the Executive Board. Mr. Hart indicated the KIAAA is also requesting feedback and updates from the classification committee when appropriate. It was consensus that any proposal would be shared with the membership using numerous avenues.

Next the committee reviewed the classification models they had requested staff prepare. Mr. Swenson also provided additional models for the committee to evaluate. The committee was primarily looking at how the different models affected the enrollment ratio in each class. Various potential postseason competition formats in all athletic (except football) and non-athletic activities were discussed based on the models being evaluated. The committee discussed the concept of classes having less than 48 teams advancing four to the state event site, while classes with 48 teams or more would advance eight. The committee felt this may ensure better quality of competition at state event sites and make the goal of advancing to the state site a greater accomplishment for classes with fewer than 48 teams. The committee also discussed how teams could be seeded in different activities based on the various classification models. Discussion was held on seeding schools in classifications with fewer teams (less than 48) in an east/west format, while continuing to seed schools in classifications with more teams (48 or more) based on a more traditional geographic model.

The committee agrees that potential postseason competition models may impact any decision on a classification proposal. The committee requested KSHSAA staff provide detailed potential postseason competition format and seeding models in all activities (except football) based on 36 and 48 team classifications.

All meetings of the committee are open meetings. An open forum session will be offered at the beginning of all Classification Committee meetings, based on the following criteria:

1. Speakers must represent a member school or league.
2. Speakers must pre-register with the KSHSAA Executive Director.
3. Written materials must be submitted electronically to co-chairs Mike Kastle (mikelindakastle@gmail.com) and Bill Faflick (bfaflick@usd259.net) at least 24 hours prior to a scheduled meeting.
4. Presenters shall bring 25 printed copies to meeting for distribution to committee members and KSHSAA staff.
5. Member schools will have 5 minutes to present.
6. League representatives will have 10 minutes to present.

The next meeting of the Classification Study Committee is scheduled for March 29th at 9:00 am at the KSHSAA office.

KSHSAA Classification Study Committee Meeting Summary, November 23, 2015

The KSHSAA Classification Study Committee met at the KSHSAA office on November 23, 2015. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School; Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School.

After a welcome and committee mission review, members were asked to share take-away messages from the KSHSAA Regional Administrator and Board of Education meetings conducted across the state in October. Common items shared by committee members were concerns with the current 3A football playoff structure (the potential for three games in ten days), the continued public school/private school discussion, the need for consistency in playoff structures across classes and a lack of understanding of smaller school classification challenges by those working in larger schools.

The committee reviewed correspondences shared by member schools on the classification issue since its September meeting. As part of this review the committee discussed the public/private school concerns and socioeconomic factors affecting participation rates and whether or not these issues can be considered by the committee. The committee concluded based on K.S.A. 72-130 (and KSHSAA legal counsel opinion), which requires the classification of member schools to be based on attendance, that other factors beyond enrollment should not be considered by this study committee.

Next the committee reviewed the survey data from the regional meetings. Member school administrators attending the regional meetings ranked the three classification factors surveyed in order of importance as follows:

1. Enrollment ratio of largest school to the smallest school in each class
2. Total number of schools per class
3. Total number of classifications

Based on the survey results the committee identified their focus should be on using the enrollment ratio as the prime strategy to get to a set number of schools per class. Based on this strategy the committee looked at several different classification models and held discussion with KSHSAA staff on how the various classification structures would impact postseason competitions. The committee requested the KSHSAA staff continue to evaluate postseason competition implications based on two of the classification models discussed. KSHSAA staff will also provide the committee a 5-year historical breakdown on these two classification models.

All meetings of the committee are open meetings. The committee determined an open forum time at future Classification Committee meetings will be offered to member school administrators and leagues. The following criteria were set for future open forum sessions:

1. Speakers must represent a member school or league.
2. Speakers must pre-register with the KSHSAA Executive Director.
3. Written materials must be submitted electronically to co-chairs Mike Kastle (mikelindakastle@gmail.com) and Bill Faflick (bfafllick@usd259.net) at least 24 hours prior to a scheduled meeting.
4. Presenters shall bring 25 printed copies of written materials to the meeting for distribution to committee members and KSHSAA staff.
5. Member schools will have 5 minutes to present.
6. League representatives will have 10 minutes to present.
7. Open Forum will be offered at the beginning of all Classification Committee meetings.

The next meeting of the Classification Study Committee is scheduled for January 25th at 9:00 am at the KSHSAA office.

KSHSAA Classification Study Committee Meeting Summary, September 23, 2015

The second meeting of the KSHSAA Classification Study Committee took place at the KSHSAA office on September 23, 2015. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School, Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School.

After welcome comments and a review of the KSHSAA mission statement by the committee co-chairmen, the group was given the opportunity to review and discuss the various classification data breakdowns provided by the KSHSAA which had been requested by the committee at the previous meeting. The group also discussed the feedback from a classification model survey of eleven state associations similar to the demographics and geography of Kansas. Mr. Swenson submitted additional classification data breakdowns for the committee to review as well. Several topics of discussion came from this information including the impact of postseason tournament formats based on the different models, the concept of classifying on one or two year cycles, classifying by sport/activity and whether or not all classes within the same sport/activity should have the same postseason tournament formats.

Mr. Faflick then led the group through an exercise to narrow down what the committee felt were the most important aspects to consider in a classification model. The top four considerations noted by the committee:

1. Ratio of enrollment of largest school in class to smallest school
2. Total number of classes
3. Number of schools/class
4. Overall simplicity of the classification system

The committee then determined they would like to update and receive feedback from school administrators at the upcoming KSHSAA Regional Administrator and Board of Education meetings. It was determined Mr. Musselman would provide attendees at the regional meetings an overview of why the Executive Board requested the classification study committee be formed, a history of the KSHSAA classification system and current Kansas Statute that governs KSHSAA school classification. At least one member of the Classification Study Committee will be present at every regional meeting and will provide key points from the two meetings already completed and explain a survey which will be distributed to all regional meeting attendees before the classification breakout sessions. The survey will explain the top three considerations identified by the committee in forming a classification model and ask attendees to rank the three options based on level of importance. There will also be an opportunity for regional meeting attendees to provide feedback on the survey. The committee expects feedback from this survey will assist them in developing a recommendation for a classification model which will meet the needs of the KSHSAA member schools and meet requirements set forth in Kansas Statutes.

Committee members attending regional meetings:

- October 19, Topeka-KSHSAA: Britton Hart
- October 20, Salina-Central HS: Alan Sheets
- October 21, Oakley HS: Greg Koelsch
- October 22, Dodge City USD 443-The Learning Center: Paul Zuzelski and David Ediger
- October 26, Blue Valley USD 229-Hilltop Facility: Mike Hubka, Charlotte Davis and Tim Brady
- October 27, Fort Scott HS: Mike Kastle
- October 28, Maize HS: Bill Faflick, Bob Mellen and Greg Rosenhagen

The next meeting of the Classification Study Committee will take place at the KSHSAA office in Topeka on Monday, November 23 at 9 a.m.

KSHSAA Classification Study Committee Meeting Summary, June 24, 2015

The initial meeting of the KSHSAA Classification Study Committee took place at the KSHSAA office on June 24, 2015. Bill Faflick, Assistant Superintendent, USD 259-Wichita and Mike Kastle, Retired Superintendent, USD 245-Southern Coffey County served as committee co-chairmen. Other committee members in attendance: Tim Brady, District Director of Athletics & Activities, USD 233-Olathe; Charlotte Davis, Retired Athletic Director, USD 500-Kansas City; David Ediger, Assistant Principal/Activities Director, Cimarron High School; Britton Hart, Principal, Emporia High School; Mike Hubka, Associate Principal/Athletic Director, Bishop Miege High School; Greg Koelsch, Principal, Smith Center High School; Bob Mellen, Principal/Athletic Director, Clearwater High School; Greg Rosenhagen, Principal, Cheney High School; Alan Sheets, Principal, Republic County High School, Carol Swenson, Retired Athletic Director, McPherson High School; Paul Zuzelski, Principal, Syracuse High School. All KSHSAA administrative staff members were also present.

After introductions, the group was reminded the committee was formed at the request of the Executive Board and charged to make any recommendations regarding the KSHSAA classification structure back to the Executive Board. Items mentioned as reasons the Executive Board requested the formation of this committee were quality of competition at state level events, travel, an overall negative attitude among member schools regarding classifications and a desire to reevaluate the classification structure from top to bottom. All committee members gave their perspective on the current classification structure and their beliefs on the role and purpose of the committee. Common themes expressed by members were to ensure the committee remains focused on what is best for all students, the desire to learn more about challenges faced in other classes and the need to see the big picture in how the classification structure impacts all schools-not just the level(s) the committee members are familiar with.

Mr. Musselman reviewed historical information relevant to the committee. He explained current Kansas Statutes governing classification of schools and the requirement basing it on student enrollment. He also reviewed KSHSAA Bylaw Article XII which defines how school classifications are structured and the process and procedures required for change. An historic timeline was provided to the committee detailing what has taken place regarding school classification since March 2006.

Mr. Kastle reviewed the KSHSAA Mission Statement and Belief Statements, emphasizing to the committee to keep both in mind as the group moves forward. Mr. Faflick briefly reviewed historical classification data provided to the committee by KSHSAA staff.

The committee moved into a time of discussion of potential changes the committee may want to consider and evaluate moving forward. Topics discussed included an every other year classification, classification by activity, classification based on ratio to range, whether or not there is a necessity for classes to be divisible by eight and the significance of overall enrollment numbers by class. Extensive discussion was also held regarding the impact of the classification structure on championship formats and whether or not there is a need to consider changes in some state tournaments.

The committee requested to see several different classification scenarios using different criteria based on 2014-2015 enrollment numbers. Criteria include scenarios based on number of schools per class, different ratios to range and using school total enrollment number cutoffs to determine classifications. Brent Unruh from the KSHSAA staff will prepare this information for the committee's review. The committee also wants to review classification models from other states in the region and other states with a similar population and demographics. KSHSAA staff will work to provide this information.

The committee agreed it would be beneficial to develop a summary of this initial meeting. The committee identified the following items:

1. The committee reviewed the mission and belief statements from the KSHSAA Strategic Plan.
2. The committee reviewed history of classifications and demographic data with emphasis on 1979 – present (6 classes).
3. The committee reviewed Kansas Statutes and KSHSAA Bylaws which govern classification procedures.
4. The committee was created by the Executive Board and charged to evaluate current classifications and to evaluate what is best for all students in Kansas.

The next meeting for the KSHSAA Classification Study Committee is Wednesday, September 23, 2015.