Re: FW: Football Classification

1 message

Tackett, Julian <jtackett@khsaa.org>   Thu, Jun 1, 2023 at 9:26 AM
To: Tom Keating <tkeating@iahsaa.org>

Tom,

I sent you a reply to this, but today found it in my outbox. Apparently never went. Apologize profusely. This information
was very helpful. It gave our board something to think about for the future. They didn't act on it at this time, but who
knows what the future will hold as they continue down this road.

See you in Seattle.

On Mon, Jan 23, 2023 at 10:02 AM Tom Keating <tkeating@iahsaa.org> wrote:

Good morning, Julian.

Our situation in Iowa is unique in that we schedule regular season football games for our
schools. Schools have been urging us to find a classification and scheduling model which would
allow them to "play schools like them." Quite frankly, the easiest way to do that is to have
schools schedule their own games. However, our schools have resisted for a couple of reasons:

- Schools on the borders only have three directions to go to find games.
- Successful programs have a difficult time getting teams to play them.

For our schools, the "play schools like us" translated to socioeconomics. It really comes down to
two challenges for schools in more poverty impacted areas: participation and resources. Our
classification committee reviewed what many states do and landed on the model Minnesota
uses.

The short explanation of the model is:

School Enrollment (as submitted to State Dept. of Ed.) minus 40% of the number of students
qualifying for Free and Reduced Lunch.

I've attached some information that might be helpful:

- Summary of the Process – this includes the actual language for the amendment to our
  Articles of Incorporation which would allow us to use the FRL count as an adjustment to
  enrollment (BEDS – enrollment submitted by schools to state department of education)
  when determining football classifications.
- Responses to State Board of Education Questions – Since ultimately, the State Board of
  Ed had to approve the amendment, they posed several questions regarding it. These are
  the responses I prepared.

- <u>FRL Model</u> – Our schools asked us to run a model of the impact this would have on our schools. The orange highlights are schools that would move up; the green highlights are schools that would move down. I did not include any 8 player schools moving up since we likely won't force that. It's important to note that this model considered what it would have looked like if we had implemented for our most recent scheduling cycle (2021 and 2022). The impact on this next cycle will have some differences.

Probably the most important piece of information is that based on our calculations (using NFHS participation survey numbers from our schools and FRL percentages from the Department of Education), the average participation rate in football is considerably lower in schools with 50% or more students on FRL (13% of enrollment participate in football) than those schools with less than 50% FRL (20% of enrollment participate in football). At first glance this looks like just a 7% difference. However, when you consider that 13% is .65 of 20%, you realize that those schools with 50% or higher have about 35% less participation in football than schools whose FRL is less than 50. Our classification committee felt rounding up to 40% made sense since not all high school students who qualify for FRL complete the paperwork.

Please feel free to reach out with any questions you may have. If you need to call, my cell is 319-361-4336.

Sincerely,

Tom

Tom Keating
tkeating@iahsaa.org
Executive Director

Iowa High School Athletic Association
515-432-2011 ext. 225 | www.iahsaa.org
1605 S. Story Street, Boone, IA 50036

From: Phil Joyal <phillip.joyal@ncsuvt.org>
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2023 7:23 AM
To: Tom Keating <tkeating@iahsaa.org>
Subject: Football Classification

Hi Tom

My name is Phil Joyal and I am an AD from Newport, VT. I recently saw a Twitter post announcing that the Iowa Board of Education approved the IHSAA amendment that would include socioeconomic status (FRL) as part of football classifications.

I think this is just what we need in Vermont, not just for football, but all sports.

Would you be willing to share any information that might help me put something together to present to the VPA and VSADA?

Thanks in advance for your time.

--

Phil Joyal

Athletic Director

North Country Union High School

209 Veterans Ave

Newport, VT 05855

802-334-7921 ext 3025

--
Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Today's Challenge - Be a Leader!
"Ultimately, a genuine leader is not a searcher for consensus but a molder of consensus. And on some positions cowardice ask the question is it safe? Expediency asks the question is it politics? Vanity asks the question is it popular? The conscience asks the question is it right? And there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe nor politics nor popular but he must do it because conscience tells him it is right." —Dr. Martin Luther King
Julian Tackett, Commissioner
Primary Sports Event Contact- Boys and Girls State Basketball, Football
Playing Rules Interpreter – Basketball, Football
jtackett@khsaa.org
859-299-5472 (phone)
@jtackettkhsaa

2021 2022 Football Classification Model Using FRL Calculator

School	New Count w/FRL and Coop FRL	BEDS Used for 2021 & 2022 Cycle	2021 & 2022 Position	2021 & 2022 FB Class	2020-21 School FRL	2020-21 FRL Count	40% of FRL Count	Adjusted BEDS	Adjusted Position	Adjusted FB Class	Change in FB Class	Up/Down	No of Spots Moved	Co-op School
Valley, West Des Moines	1854	2141	1	5A	34%	717	287	1854	1	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Johnston	1594	1727	3	5A	19%	331	133	1594	2	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Linn-Mar, Marion	1524	1666	4	5A	21%	355	142	1524	3	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Southeast Polk	1455	1642	5	5A	28%	467	187	1455	4	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Ankeny Centennial	1341	1395	9	5A	10%	134	54	1341	5	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Ankeny	1301	1378	10	5A	15%	209	84	1294	6	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	Ankeny Christian
Des Moines, Lincoln	1260	1807	2	5A	76%	1367	547	1260	7	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Cedar Falls	1206	1318	11	5A	21%	283	113	1205	8	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	Valley Lutheran
Des Moines, Roosevelt	1200	1543	7	5A	56%	858	343	1200	9	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Waukee Northwest	1186	1260	13	5A	15%	184	74	1186	10	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Prairie, Cedar Rapids	1168	1302	12	5A	26%	335	134	1168	11	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Pleasant Valley	1136	1183	19	5A	10%	117	47	1136	12	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Waukee	1103	1171	21	5A	15%	171	68	1103	13	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Cedar Rapids, Kennedy	1081	1248	14	5A	33%	417	167	1081	14	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Waterloo, West	1078	1423	8	5A	62%	883	353	1070	15	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	Waterloo Christian
Bettendorf	1078	1218	17	5A	29%	357	143	1075	16	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	Morning Star
Des Moines, East	1070	1595	6	5A	82%	1313	525	1070	17	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Dowling Catholic, West Des Moines	1063	1063	30	5A	0%	0	0	1063	18	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Dubuque, Hempstead	1032	1204	18	5A	36%	431	172	1032	19	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Iowa City, City High	996	1181	20	5A	39%	464	185	996	20	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Davenport, Central	974	1242	15	5A	54%	670	268	974	21	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Iowa City, West	956	1113	24	5A	35%	393	157	956	22	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Ottumwa	938	1007	33	5A	17%	176	70	937	23	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	Ottumwa Christian
Muscatine	928	1111	26	5A	41%	457	183	928	24	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Urbandale	927	959	36	5A	8%	79	32	927	25	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Ames	924	1054	31	5A	31%	325	130	924	26	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Dubuque, Senior	918	1078	29	5A	37%	401	160	918	27	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Sioux City, North	892	1240	16	5A	70%	871	348	892	28	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Sioux City, East	872	1135	23	5A	58%	658	263	872	29	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Marshalltown	852	1162	22	5A	67%	775	310	852	30	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Cedar Rapids, Jefferson	844	1112	25	5A	60%	670	268	844	31	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Davenport, West	834	1090	27	5A	59%	640	256	834	32	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Iowa City, Liberty	787	886	38	4A	28%	249	99	787	33	5A	YES	UP	5	NONE
Davenport, North	774	997	34	5A	56%	558	223	774	34	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Council Bluffs, Abraham Lincoln	768	1016	32	5A	61%	620	248	768	35	5A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Indianola	737	814	42	4A	24%	192	77	737	36	5A	YES	UP	6	NONE
Norwalk	711	768	45	4A	18%	141	57	711	37	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Des Moines, North	710	1088	28	5A	87%	946	378	710	38	4A	YES	DOWN	10	NONE
Sioux City, West	694	993	35	5A	75%	748	299	694	39	4A	YES	DOWN	4	NONE
Cedar Rapids, Washington	689	874	39	4A	53%	463	185	689	40	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
North Scott, Eldridge	681	750	47	4A	23%	172	69	681	41	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Mason City	662	817	41	4A	47%	388	155	662	42	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Fort Dodge	660	823	40	4A	50%	407	163	660	43	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Clinton	650	783	44	4A	45%	354	142	641	44	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	Prince of Peace
Epworth, Western Dubuque	647	717	49	4A	24%	175	70	647	45	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Dallas Center-Grimes	646	683	51	4A	14%	92	37	646	46	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Council Bluffs, Thomas Jefferson	643	939	37	4A	79%	741	296	643	47	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Lewis Central	613	717	50	4A	36%	261	104	613	48	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Burlington	575	725	48	4A	52%	376	150	575	49	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE

2021 2022 Football Classification Model Using FRL Calculator

School													
Waterloo, East	568	813	43	4A	75%	613	245	568	50	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Newton	560	668	52	4A	40%	269	108	560	51	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Clear Creek-Amana	517	556	57	4A	19%	105	42	514	52	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	Hillcrest Academy
Pella	517	544	59	4A	13%	68	27	517	53	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Waverly-Shell Rock	515	555	58	4A	18%	101	40	515	54	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Des Moines, Hoover	513	755	46	4A	80%	605	242	513	55	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Xavier, Cedar Rapids	505	505	63	4A	0%	0	0	505	56	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	Isaac Newton
Mount Pleasant	493	580	55	4A	41%	239	95	485	57	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	Danville
Storm Lake	492	647	53	4A	64%	417	167	480	58	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	Storm Lake St. Mary's
Bondurant-Farrar	479	520	61	4A	20%	102	41	479	59	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Spencer	475	560	56	4A	38%	212	85	475	60	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Marion	472	522	60	4A	24%	125	50	472	61	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Carlisle	459	511	62	4A	26%	131	52	459	62	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Denison-Schleswig	437	600	54	4A	68%	408	163	437	63	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
LeMars	436	483	65	4A	24%	118	47	436	64	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Boone	433	491	64	4A	30%	146	58	433	65	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Oskaloosa	406	469	67	4A	34%	159	63	406	66	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Fort Madison	397	480	66	4A	48%	230	92	388	67	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	Holy Trinity
North Polk, Alleman	395	412	76	3A	11%	43	17	395	68	4A	YES	UP	8	NONE
ADM, Adel	394	421	75	3A	16%	66	27	394	69	4A	YES	UP	6	NONE
Decorah	392	431	71	4A	23%	97	39	392	70	4A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Gilbert	391	402	77	3A	7%	29	11	391	71	4A	YES	UP	6	NONE
Carroll	382	422	74	3A	24%	101	40	382	72	4A	YES	UP	2	NONE
Glenwood	381	446	69	4A	36%	162	65	381	73	3A	YES	DOWN	4	NONE
Webster City	379	457	68	4A	43%	195	78	379	74	3A	YES	DOWN	6	NONE
Winterset	376	436	70	4A	34%	149	60	376	75	3A	YES	DOWN	5	NONE
Bishop Heelan Catholic, Sioux City	376	376	85	3A	0%	0	0	376	76	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Solon	375	389	82	3A	9%	36	14	375	77	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Center Point-Urbana	349	364	92	3A	10%	37	15	349	78	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Keokuk	345	422	73	3A	46%	193	77	345	79	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Assumption, Davenport	342	342	101	3A	0%	0	0	342	80	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Perry	337	422	72	4A	51%	214	85	337	81	3A	YES	DOWN	9	NONE
Sergeant Bluff-Luton	336	369	90	3A	22%	82	33	336	82	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Benton Community	336	375	86	3A	26%	98	39	336	83	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Fairfield	333	395	80	3A	39%	155	62	333	84	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Knoxville	333	385	83	3A	34%	131	52	333	85	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Ballard	331	354	97	3A	16%	57	23	331	86	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Grinnell	331	370	88	3A	27%	98	39	331	87	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Delaware, Manchester	326	365	91	3A	27%	98	39	326	88	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Creston	323	400	78	3A	48%	193	77	323	89	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Humboldt	322	371	87	3A	33%	121	49	322	90	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Charles City	322	397	79	3A	47%	187	75	322	91	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
MOC-Floyd Valley	321	357	95	3A	25%	89	36	321	92	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Harlan Community	317	363	94	3A	31%	114	46	317	93	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Burlington/Notre Dame	316	336	102	3A	21%	70	28	308	94	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Wahlert, Dubuque	316	316	111	2A	0%	0	0	316	95	3A	YES	UP	16	NONE
Mount Vernon	304	322	107	3A	14%	46	18	304	96	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Independence	303	353	98	3A	35%	124	50	303	97	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Maquoketa	301	370	89	3A	46%	172	69	301	98	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Vinton-Shellsburg	299	346	99	3A	34%	117	47	299	99	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Nevada	299	345	100	3A	33%	115	46	299	100	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Washington	296	364	93	3A	46%	169	68	296	101	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Algona	294	335	103	3A	30%	102	41	294	102	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Central DeWitt	286	392	81	3A	67%	264	106	286	103	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE

2021 2022 Football Classification Model Using FRL Calculator

School													
Clear Lake	284	315	113	2A	25%	79	32	284	104	3A	YES	UP	8	NONE
Sioux Center	282	328	104	3A	35%	115	46	282	105	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Boyden-Hull/Rock Valley	282	384	84	3A	41%	159	64	320	106	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	Boyden-Hull
South Tama County, Tama	275	356	96	3A	57%	203	81	275	107	3A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Iowa Falls - Alden	270	319	109	2A	38%	123	49	270	108	3A	YES	UP	1	NONE
Crestwood, Cresco	269	316	112	2A	37%	117	47	269	109	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Anamosa	268	309	114	2A	33%	103	41	268	110	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Williamsburg	268	293	119	2A	22%	63	25	268	111	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Clarke, Osceola	264	319	110	2A	43%	139	55	264	112	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Atlantic	259	322	108	3A	49%	157	63	259	113	2A	YES	DOWN	5	NONE
Spirit Lake	258	283	123	2A	22%	63	25	258	114	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Greene County	257	302	117	2A	36%	110	44	258	115	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	Paton-Churdan
Hampton-Dumont-CAL	253	324	105	3A	55%	177	71	253	116	2A	YES	DOWN	11	NONE
Monticello	251	282	124	2A	27%	77	31	251	117	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Davis County, Bloomfield	248	305	116	2A	47%	142	57	248	118	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Saydel	246	324	106	3A	60%	194	78	246	119	2A	YES	DOWN	13	NONE
Albia	246	288	121	2A	36%	105	42	246	120	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Estherville Lincoln Central	245	307	115	2A	51%	156	62	245	121	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Des Moines Christian	244	244	136	2A	0%	0	0	244	122	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Sheldon	239	277	127	2A	35%	96	38	239	123	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Central Lyon/George-Little Rock	238	276	128	2A	33%	91	37	239	124	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	George-Little Rock
Clarinda	236	281	125	2A	34%	96	39	242	125	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	South Page
Centerville	234	289	120	2A	48%	137	55	234	126	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Okoboji, Milford	229	263	130	2A	32%	84	34	229	127	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Roland-Story, Story City	229	248	135	2A	19%	48	19	229	128	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Mid-Prairie, Wellman	227	252	134	2A	24%	62	25	227	129	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Oelwein	227	288	122	2A	53%	152	61	227	130	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Unity Christian, Orange City	227	227	148	2A	0%	0	0	227	131	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
New Hampton	223	260	131	2A	36%	93	37	223	132	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Waukon	222	265	129	2A	40%	106	43	222	133	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Forest City	222	255	132	2A	32%	83	33	222	134	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Union, LaPorte City	220	244	137	2A	24%	59	24	220	135	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Liberty	219	298	118	2A	66%	197	79	219	136	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Tipton	219	242	138	2A	24%	58	23	219	137	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Chariton	217	278	126	2A	55%	152	61	217	138	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Marshall, State Center	215	238	143	2A	24%	57	23	215	139	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Kuemper Catholic, Carroll	215	215	157	1A	0%	0	0	215	140	2A	YES	UP	17	NONE
Cherokee, Washington	214	253	133	2A	38%	97	39	214	141	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
PCM, Monroe	211	234	145	2A	24%	57	23	211	142	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
North Fayette Valley	207	240	141	2A	34%	82	33	207	143	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Western Christian, Hull	207	207	160	1A	0%	0	0	207	144	2A	YES	UP	16	NONE
Garner-Hayfield-Ventura	204	230	146	2A	28%	65	26	204	145	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Columbus Catholic, Waterloo	204	204	161	1A	0%	0	0	204	146	2A	YES	UP	15	NONE
Treynor	203	213	158	1A	12%	26	10	203	147	2A	YES	UP	11	NONE
Central Lee, Donnellson	202	241	140	2A	40%	96	39	202	148	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Lyon, Inwood	202	221	151	2A	22%	48	19	202	149	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Southeast Valley, Gowrie	198	242	139	2A	45%	110	44	198	150	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Jesup	198	217	156	2A	22%	48	19	198	151	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Eddyville-Blakesburg- Fremont	197	221	152	2A	27%	59	24	197	152	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
OABCIG	197	238	144	2A	43%	103	41	197	153	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Beckman Catholic, Dyersville	196	196	168	1A	0%	0	0	196	154	2A	YES	UP	14	NONE
Northeast, Goose Lake	194	222	150	2A	31%	70	28	194	155	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Red Oak	193	239	142	2A	48%	115	46	193	156	2A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Van Meter	190	197	165	1A	9%	18	7	190	157	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE

2021 2022 Football Classification Model Using FRL Calculator

School														
Camanche	189	220	153	2A	35%	76	31	189	158	1A	YES	DOWN	5	NONE
Osage	188	218	155	2A	34%	74	30	188	159	1A	YES	DOWN	4	NONE
Underwood	186	197	166	1A	13%	26	11	186	160	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Interstate 35, Truro	183	201	163	1A	23%	46	18	183	161	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Clarion-Goldfield-Dows	180	226	149	2A	51%	115	46	180	162	1A	YES	DOWN	13	NONE
Denver	179	190	173	1A	14%	27	11	179	163	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Pella Christian	179	179	191	1A	0%	0	0	179	164	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Shenandoah	177	229	147	2A	56%	129	52	177	165	1A	YES	DOWN	19	NONE
Dike-New Hartford	174	190	174	1A	22%	41	16	174	166	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Woodward-Granger	173	184	183	1A	15%	27	11	173	167	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Mediapolis	172	194	169	1A	28%	54	22	172	168	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Pocahontas Area	172	220	154	2A	54%	119	48	172	169	1A	YES	DOWN	18	NONE
Regina, Iowa City	171	171	198	1A	0%	0	0	171	170	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Emmetsburg	169	202	162	1A	41%	82	33	169	171	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Eagle Grove	168	208	159	1A	48%	100	40	168	172	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
East Marshall, LeGrand	167	194	170	1A	35%	67	27	167	173	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Central Valley, Stuart	166	197	167	1A	40%	78	31	166	174	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Wilton	165	189	176	1A	31%	59	24	165	175	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Aplington-Parkersburg	165	187	180	1A	29%	54	22	165	176	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
South Hamilton, Jewell	164	180	186	1A	22%	40	16	164	177	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Louisa-Muscatine	163	190	175	1A	35%	66	27	163	178	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Sumner-Fredericksburg	161	181	185	1A	27%	49	20	161	179	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Manson Northwest Webster	161	180	187	1A	27%	48	19	161	180	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Sigourney/Keota	160	189	177	1A	35%	66	26	163	181	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	Keota
Central Springs	159	179	192	1A	27%	49	20	159	182	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Sibley-Ocheyedan	159	194	171	1A	45%	87	35	159	183	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Cardinal, Eldon	157	199	164	1A	53%	105	42	157	184	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Branch	157	169	203	1A	18%	31	12	157	185	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
South Central Calhoun	156	188	179	1A	43%	80	32	156	186	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
MFL MarMac	154	175	194	1A	31%	54	21	154	187	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
East Sac County	153	189	178	1A	48%	91	36	153	188	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Hinton	153	169	206	A	24%	41	16	153	189	1A	YES	UP	15	NONE
Sioux Central, Sioux Rapids	152	178	193	1A	37%	65	26	152	190	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Panorama, Panora	152	180	188	1A	40%	71	28	152	191	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Cascade, Western Dubuque	151	172	197	1A	30%	51	21	151	192	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
ACGC	151	175	195	1A	35%	61	24	151	193	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Grundy Center	149	167	208	A	27%	44	18	149	194	1A	YES	UP	12	NONE
Nodaway Valley	149	186	182	1A	48%	89	36	150	195	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	Orient-Macksburg
Ridge View	148	180	189	1A	44%	80	32	148	196	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
MVAOCOU	148	194	172	1A	59%	115	46	148	197	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Durant	147	170	200	1A	33%	56	23	147	198	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Belmond-Klemme	147	183	184	1A	50%	91	36	147	199	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Sioux, Hawarden	146	187	181	1A	55%	103	41	146	200	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Pleasantville	146	169	204	1A	35%	59	23	146	201	1A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Missouri Valley	145	168	207	A	34%	58	23	145	202	1A	YES	UP	3	NONE
Alburnett	144	157	215	A	21%	33	13	144	203	1A	YES	UP	N/A	NONE
Wapsie Valley, Fairbank	142	155	218	A	21%	33	13	142	204	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Hudson	142	161	211	A	30%	48	19	142	205	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Ogden	141	158	214	A	27%	43	17	141	206	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Lawton-Bronson	141	152	223	A	19%	28	11	141	207	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Van Buren County	140	174	196	1A	49%	85	34	140	208	A	YES	DOWN	14	NONE
South Hardin	140	170	199	1A	45%	76	30	140	209	A	YES	DOWN	18	NONE
Bellevue	138	157	216	A	31%	48	19	138	210	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Colfax-Mingo	137	164	209	A	41%	68	27	137	211	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE

2021 2022 Football Classification Model Using FRL Calculator

School														
Lake Mills	136	154	221	A	29%	44	18	136	212	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Alta-Aurelia	136	162	210	A	40%	64	26	136	213	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Earlham	136	147	230	A	19%	29	11	136	214	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Pekin	135	159	213	A	38%	60	24	135	215	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Logan-Magnolia	134	148	229	A	24%	35	14	134	216	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
South Winneshiek, Calmar	134	152	224	A	30%	45	18	134	217	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Madrid	133	149	227	A	26%	39	16	133	218	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Monona, Onawa	133	169	202	1A	54%	91	36	133	219	A	YES	DOWN	18	NONE
IKM-Manning	132	153	222	A	34%	51	21	132	220	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Mount Ayr	132	169	205	A	53%	89	36	133	221	A	NO	N/A	N/A	Diagonal
Southwest Valley	131	155	219	A	39%	60	24	131	222	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
St. Albert, Council Bluffs	131	131	250	A	0%	0	0	131	223	A	NO	N/A	N/A	Heartland Christian
Newman Catholic, Mason City	131	131	251	A	0%	0	0	131	224	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Central Decatur, Leon	131	179	190	1A	67%	121	48	131	225	A	YES	DOWN	35	NONE
North Linn, Troy Mills	131	136	239	A	10%	13	5	131	226	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
AHSTW, Avoca	131	155	220	A	39%	61	24	131	227	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Clayton Ridge, Guttenberg	129	152	225	A	38%	57	23	129	228	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
North Cedar, Stanwood	128	157	217	A	46%	72	29	128	229	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Fork, Sheffield	127	149	228	A	37%	55	22	127	230	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn	126	150	226	A	39%	59	24	126	231	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
North Union	126	161	212	A	55%	88	35	126	232	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
BCLUW, Conrad	124	139	235	A	27%	37	15	124	233	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Lisbon	123	134	244	A	21%	28	11	123	234	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Maquoketa Valley, Delhi	122	142	233	A	35%	50	20	122	235	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Westwood, Sloan	122	139	236	A	31%	42	17	122	236	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Starmont	122	144	232	A	38%	55	22	122	237	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Woodbury Central, Moville	121	135	242	A	26%	35	14	121	238	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Grand View Christian School	121	121	262	8P	0%	0	0	121	239	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
South O'Brien, Paullina	121	139	237	A	33%	45	18	121	240	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
North Butler, Greene	121	133	245	A	23%	31	12	121	241	A	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
St. Edmond, Fort Dodge	120	120	264	8P	0%	0	0	120	242	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Tri-Center, Neola	119	139	238	A	35%	49	20	119	243	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	5	NONE
Lynnville-Sully	119	130	252	A	21%	28	11	119	244	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	8	NONE
AGWSR, Ackley	119	142	234	A	41%	59	23	119	245	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	13	NONE
Akron-Westfield	118	132	247	A	27%	36	14	118	246	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	1	NONE
MMCRU	117	133	246	A	31%	41	16	117	247	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	1	NONE
West Hancock, Britt	116	136	240	A	36%	49	20	116	248	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	8	NONE
Martensdale-St. Marys	115	126	257	8P	23%	29	11	115	249	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Highland, Riverside	114	127	255	A	26%	33	13	114	250	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	0	NONE
Iowa Valley, Marengo	114	132	248	8P	35%	46	18	114	251	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Saint Ansgar	113	124	260	A	22%	28	11	113	252	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	8	NONE
Newell-Fonda	113	136	241	8P	43%	58	23	113	253	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Columbus Community, Columbus Com	112	146	231	A	59%	86	34	112	254	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	23	NONE
East Buchanan, Winthrop	111	135	243	A	44%	60	24	111	255	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	12	NONE
Nashua-Plainfield	110	128	254	A	34%	44	18	110	256	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	2	NONE
New London	110	132	249	8P	41%	54	22	110	257	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Wapello	108	126	258	A	37%	46	18	108	258	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	0	NONE
Gehlen Catholic, LeMars	107	107	280	A	0%	0	0	107	259	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	21	NONE
North Mahaska, New Sharon	106	127	256	A	41%	52	21	106	260	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	4	NONE
Woodward Academy	105	106	283	8P	2%	2	1	105	261	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Sidney	105	130	253	A	48%	62	25	105	262	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	9	NONE
Riverside, Oakland	104	122	261	A	37%	45	18	104	263	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	2	NONE
Postville	102	170	201	1A	100%	170	68	102	264	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	63	NONE
East Union, Afton	102	125	259	8P	47%	58	23	102	265	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE

2021 2022 Football Classification Model Using FRL Calculator

School														
Easton Valley	100	117	265	8P	36%	42	17	100	266	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
East Mills	99	115	267	8P	35%	40	16	99	267	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Belle Plaine	98	114	271	A	34%	39	16	98	268	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	3	NONE
Southeast Warren, Liberty Center	98	110	276	8P	27%	30	12	98	269	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
English Valleys, North English	98	115	268	8P	38%	44	18	97	270	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	Ruthven-Ayrshire
Bishop Garrigan, Algona	98	98	295	8P	0%	0	0	98	271	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Baxter	98	107	281	8P	22%	24	9	98	272	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Harrison/Whiting	97	113	273	8P	35%	40	16	97	273	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Northwood-Kensett	96	115	269	8P	41%	47	19	96	274	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
B-G-M, Brooklyn	96	114	272	8P	39%	45	18	96	275	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
GMG, Garwin	96	116	266	8P	43%	50	20	96	276	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Wayne, Corydon	95	121	263	A	54%	66	26	95	277	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	14	NONE
Gladbrook-Reinbeck	95	107	282	8P	29%	31	12	95	278	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
CAM, Anita	94	113	274	8P	46%	52	21	92	279	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	Whting
Graettinger-Terril/Ruthven-Ayrshire	93	115	270	8P	48%	55	22	93	280	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Edgewood-Colesburg	93	109	277	8P	37%	40	16	93	281	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Lone Tree	93	106	284	8P	31%	33	13	93	282	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Kingsley-Pierson	91	102	291	8P	26%	27	11	91	283	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Collins-Maxwell	91	103	288	8P	29%	30	12	91	284	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Midland, Wyoming	90	112	275	8P	48%	54	22	90	285	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
WACO, Wayland	90	109	278	8P	44%	48	19	90	286	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Central, Elkader	89	103	289	8P	33%	34	14	89	287	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Montezuma	89	104	286	8P	36%	38	15	89	288	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
North Tama, Traer	89	108	279	A	44%	48	19	89	289	8P*	YES*	DOWN*	10	NONE
Bedford	85	105	285	8P	47%	49	20	85	290	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Central City	85	100	292	8P	37%	37	15	85	291	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Springville	85	93	305	8P	22%	21	8	85	292	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Audubon	84	97	298	8P	34%	33	13	84	293	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Fremont-Mills, Tabor	83	95	301	8P	30%	29	12	83	294	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Dunkerton	83	96	299	8P	33%	32	13	83	295	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Griswold	83	99	294	8P	41%	40	16	83	296	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Colo-NESCO	82	98	296	8P	40%	40	16	82	297	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Calamus-Wheatland	82	96	300	8P	36%	35	14	82	298	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Stanton/Essex	81	100	293	8P	36%	36	14	86	299	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	Essex
Lenox	81	104	287	8P	56%	58	23	81	300	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Woodbine	80	94	303	8P	37%	35	14	80	301	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Winfield-Mt. Union	80	103	290	8P	56%	58	23	80	302	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Moravia	79	95	302	8P	43%	41	16	79	303	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Rockford	78	94	304	8P	43%	40	16	78	304	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Seymour/Moulton-Udell	78	98	297	8P	54%	53	21	77	305	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	Moulten-Udell
North Iowa, Buffalo Center	77	86	309	8P	25%	22	9	77	306	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Tripoli	75	92	307	8P	45%	42	17	75	307	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
River Valley, Correctionville	75	93	306	8P	48%	44	18	75	308	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Turkey Valley, Jackson Junction	75	88	308	8P	37%	32	13	75	309	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Boyer Valley, Dunlap	74	86	310	8P	35%	30	12	74	310	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Kee, Lansing	71	82	312	8P	34%	28	11	71	311	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Harris-Lake Park	70	78	315	8P	26%	20	8	70	312	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	N/A
Janesville	70	75	317	8P	17%	13	5	70	313	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Bend-Mallard	69	82	313	8P	39%	32	13	69	314	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Exira Elk Horn-Kimballton	68	83	311	8P	45%	37	15	68	315	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Coon Rapids-Bayard	68	80	314	8P	39%	31	12	68	316	8P	YES	N/A	N/A	NONE
Meskwaki Settlement School	66	66	322	8P	0%	0	0	66	317	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Melcher-Dallas	66	77	316	8P	37%	29	11	66	318	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Don Bosco, Gilbertville	65	65	323	8P	0%	0	0	65	319	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE

2021 2022 Football Classification Model Using FRL Calculator

H-L-V, Victor	61	71	318	8P	36%	26	10	61	320	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Lamoni	59	71	319	8P	43%	30	12	59	321	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Twin Cedars, Bussey	58	70	320	8P	44%	31	12	58	322	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Riceville	57	67	321	8P	36%	24	10	57	323	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Glidden-Ralston	57	63	324	8P	23%	15	6	57	324	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Siouxland Christian	57	57	329	8P	0%	0	0	57	325	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Clarksville	56	63	325	8P	28%	17	7	56	326	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Murray	51	62	326	8P	44%	27	11	51	327	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
St. Mary's, Remsen	49	49	331	8P	0%	0	0	49	328	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
West Central, Maynard	48	58	328	8P	42%	24	10	48	329	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Tri-County, Thornburg	48	59	327	8P	45%	27	11	48	330	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Mormon Trail, Garden Grove	41	52	330	8P	53%	28	11	41	331	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE
Ar-We-Va, Westside	34	41	332	8P	44%	18	7	34	332	8P	NO	N/A	N/A	NONE

8P* indicates would move to 8 Player Football Class only if currrent cap of 120 is maintained.

The Iowa High School Athletic Association (IHSAA) requests that State Board of Education approve the proposed amendment to its Articles of Incorporation. The proposed amendment is the result of countless hours of discussion and research. The proposal was overwhelmingly approved by our member schools.

It is important to note that the IHSAA and its member schools have been discussing the issue of classification and the consequences that arise as a result, for years. Iowa is not unique in dealing with concerns about opportunities for participation of students in education based activities. These issues have been the subject of discussion and litigation at the national level.

Under the current Article, schools are classified in accordance with their BEDS numbers. It has become clear that participation by students was lower in schools which had higher numbers of students that faced socio-economic challenges. Lower participation translates into a challenge to be competitive with schools in the same classification that had higher participation rates.

The original IHSAA classification committee was inactive after 1992. The committee in its current form was convened in 2008 at the request of member schools. The committee consists of two members of the IHSAA Board of Control, representatives from member schools, and IHSAA staff.

The IHSAA understands that the Board has questions about the proposed amendment to the IHSAA Articles of Incorporation The IHSAA has attempted to respond to those questions to the best of its ability.

1) Specifically define the problem the proposed recommendation would solve?
- A number of our schools' football programs have experienced a number of winless seasons and/or have experienced significantly lopsided results in many of the games they have played. These schools have expressed that the two main factors for these results are participation and resources.
- The allocation of resources by a school to its activity programs is local issue and not within the purview of IHSAA.
- Schools who regularly have winless seasons and/or lose by lopsided scores are faced with the challenge of keeping students engaged.
- The participation challenge creates safety concerns when schools are using freshmen and sophomores to compete against another team's juniors and seniors. The socio-economic factor, when applied, will place some schools in a smaller classification, giving them the opportunity to play teams with a more comparable number of participants, coaches, facilities, and equipment.

2) Tell us about the process, research, etc. that were undertaken to come up with the proposed solution/recommendation.

- The IHSAA reviewed data regarding participation rates of schools based on their FRL percentages to identify any potential correlations.
- The IHSAA reviewed data regarding win/loss percentages and FRL percentages to identify any potential correlations.
- The IHSAA staff researched various models utilized by states around the country to address competitive equity by adjusting enrollment numbers. These models fall into three major categories:
  - <u>Socio-Economic</u> – This model applies a factor using the percentage of students in a school who are on free and reduced lunch. This model attempts to account for the lower participation in activities by students who are on free and reduced lunch.
  - <u>Success</u> – This model assigns "points" to a school's success in a sport in the postseason. When a threshold of "points" is reached, the school's program is moved up one classification.
  - <u>Multiplier</u> – This model multiplies the number of students in a school by some factor (e.g. 1.5) to increase a school's enrollment number, thus making it more likely they will move up a class. This model is predominantly used with non-public schools and is intended to address the disproportionate success of those schools.
  - Public and Non-Public Leagues: This model segregates public and non-public schools into separate leagues or have separate tournaments. .

3) Were there any other factors that contribute to the defined problem besides varying levels of poverty? If so, what were those factors? If so, were there any reason(s) why these factors were not included in the recommendation?

- Other than resources and participation, the major factor that contributes to football success include coaching experience and expertise. Recruiting and retaining quality coaches is a local school responsibility.

4) To what extent would the problem be solved if the proposed recommendation were implemented? What is the basis and/or relevant data to support this response?

- By implementing this model, some schools with high FRL percentages will move to a smaller classification, pairing them with schools that have more comparable number of participants.

5) Would there be any unintended consequences if this recommendation were approved and implemented? If so, what would be those consequences?

- As with any strategy, possibly. We have a few schools with a high FRL percentage which have been successful. There is a possibility that one or more of those schools could move down a classification as a result of this plan. Those schools, as all schools have been able to, could choose to remain in the higher class. Conversely, some schools with a low FRL percentage have experienced limited success. One or more of those schools might move up a classification.

- Additionally, traditional rivalries may be impacted and travel for some schools may increase.

6) If approved, what evaluative data does IHSAA plan to collect, study, and report out so that stakeholders know how well this recommendation solved the defined problem?
- We will compare participation numbers of schools based on FRL percentages prior to implementation of the model to those following our first two-year scheduling cycle.
- We will compare win/loss percentages of schools based on FRL percentages prior to implementation of the model to those following our first two-year scheduling cycle.
- We will survey our member schools to solicit feedback on the impact of the model.

7) If approved, what message(s) would this send to students/athletes who qualify free or reduced lunch, and to schools/communities that would be impacted by a change in classification?
- The message we hope to send is that IHSAA is willing to provide a more equitable opportunity for success by pairing your school with opponents who have more comparable numbers of participants.

8) Is this plan intended to make schools more competitive by lowering their enrollment by a percentage of FRL students? I understand it. It is currently being used in MN.
- That is correct.

9) Does open enrollment have any effect on this situation?
- In the sense that some student-athletes are attracted to successful programs, some are choosing to open enroll into a school with a more successful program, compounding the challenge of schools will less competitive programs.

10) What metrics have been used or will be used to determine if this works?
- See answer to question 6

11) Lowering a school with arguably "less" resources may not necessarily make them more competitive. There are schools with many resources in the lower classes already.
- This is true. However, from a participation perspective, moving to a smaller class has the potential to match teams of similar squad sizes.

12) I've seen some anecdotal information, but not any study on this. Are there any?
- We have reviewed participation data and win-loss data using FRL percentages.
  - The football participation rate in schools with 50% or greater FRL is 13%
  - The football participation rate in schools with less than 50% FRL is 20%
  - The 6 year average win/loss percentage for schools with 50% or greater FRL is 32%
  - The 6 year average win/loss percentage for schools with less than 50% FRL is 68%

13) Is this happening as quickly as it seems it is happening?

- No. We have been studying, surveying, collecting data, researching models and running potential impact of a variety of models since 2019. Once the Classification Committee made its recommendation, the IHSAA Board of Control reviewed the Committee's work and unanimously approved the recommendation. The Board directed the iHSAA staff to move quickly in order to allow for implementation during the 2023 and 2024 football scheduling cycle.

14) So far, this is just about football, right? Any indication it will expand to other sports?

- The overwhelming majority of communication from our members regarding concerns with competitive equity was related to football.

-

- Football is on a two-year cycle so the committee felt it best to address it first. We will study other sports in the future to determine if this model should be applied. Additionally, football is the only sport in which the regular season is scheduled by the IHSAA. In all other sports, individual schools (through conference affiliation or their non-conference opponents) determine their own regular season schedules.

15) Are there other alternatives that can be explored to "balance competition?"

- As mentioned in the answer to question 2, success factors and non-public school multipliers have been used by some other states to address competitive balance.
- Additionally, we have discussed having schools schedule their own football games, either through their conferences or independently. This would allow schools to choose their own opponents, increasing the likelihood that they would play teams more similar to their own. Our athletic directors have not been in favor of this strategy for a few reasons:
- Our border schools have a limited number of potential opponents compared to schools closer to the middle of the state, making it more difficult to fill a schedule.
- In other sports (e.g. baseball, basketball), schools are more willing to play schools in a classification different from their own than they are in football.
- Our most successful football programs believe they would have a difficult time filling schedules because few teams are interested in scheduling with them.

Summary of Process to Amend
The Iowa High School Athletic Articles of Incorporation

Proposed Amendment

Article VII, Section 5

Section 5. Classifications. The schools of this Association shall be classified as follows:
   a. The BEDS enrollment for grades nine (9), ten (10), and eleven (11) as provided to the IHSAA from the State Department of Education, and represents the students served by the member or associate member school. The previous year's BEDS enrollment figures will be used in making this determination.
   b. There shall be two classes of high school membership. The 64 largest schools based upon their actual enrollment on the second Friday in September in their top three grades will be classified as "AA" schools. All the rest of the membership will be regarded as class "A" schools.

Add:

   c. *Classifications in the sport of football will be determined by applying the following socio-economic adjustment to each school's BEDS enrollment as defined by subsection a. of this article:*

   BEDS enrollment minus 40% of the number of the school's students on free/reduced lunch (as determined by school Free and Reduced Lunch percentage reported to and published by the Department of Education.)

Classification Committee Work
The IHSAA Classification Committee includes representation from IHSAA Representative Council, IHSAA Board of Control, IHSAA Administrative Staff, and other principals, superintendents, and athletic directors. The committee meets twice per year. For the past three years, the IHSAA has been asked by some of our member schools, to explore the possibility of applying a socio-economic factor to enrollment to determine classifications, particularly in the sport of football.

The committee studied a variety of models used in other state to adjust school enrollments to determine classifications. These included using free and reduced lunch percentages, using success calculators, or using non-public school multipliers. The committee reviewed models of each of those and how each might impact classifications in Iowa.

At its November 29, 2022 meeting, the Classification Committee agreed to submit to the IHSAA Board of Control a recommendation to apply a free and reduced lunch adjustment to each school's enrollment to determine classifications in the sport of football. The adjustment, explained above, is similar to the model used in Minnesota.

Board of Control Action
At a special meeting on December 5, 2022, the IHSAA Board of Control approved the recommendation and approved putting the proposed amendment to the member schools of the IHSAA.

Notice of Membership Vote
On December 6, 2022, IHSAA Board of Control Chair Dave Wiebers gave notice to our member schools regarding the vote on the proposed amendment.

Membership Vote
On December 16, 2022 at 9:00 a.m., member schools were sent a link (via Electionrunner.com to vote yes or no on the proposed amendment.

On December 22, 2022 at 3:00 p.m., the membership vote on the proposed amendment closed.

The results of the membership vote were as follows:
Number of member schools voting "Yes"   211
Number of member schools voting "No"   52
Total number of member schools voting   263

The number of member schools voting yes represents 58% of the total membership.
The number of member schools voting yes represents 80% of those schools who voted.