

The IESA appreciates all of the work and time committed to the Ad-Hoc State Tournament Structure Committee by the following individuals:

Ken Baker, Toluca Fieldcrest West  
Jim Campbell, Colfax Ridgeview  
Margurette Carter, Rantoul Eater  
John Coon, Metamora  
Jeff Elder, Gibson City G.C.M.S.  
Cheri Godek, Grayslake  
Lindsey Hall, Mahomet-Seymour  
Greg Leigh, Bismarck-Henning  
Chris Long, Kansas  
Jeff Meek, Minooka  
Dot Melvin, East Peoria Central  
Tom Mikelson, Hartsburg-Emden  
Beth Pugh, Tuscola East Prairie  
Lyman Scharr, Media Southern  
Bill Seifert, Wenona Fieldcrest East  
Steve Severson, Bradley Central  
Curt Simonson, Pittsfield Pikeland  
Jack Small, Hanna City Logan  
Jeff Stephens, Concord Triopia  
James Weiss, Altamont  
Larry Wilcoxon, Tampico  
Sue Zartler, Chatham Glenwood  
Al Zuber, Paris Crestwood

# *IESA Ad-Hoc State Tournament Structure Committee*

## **Why the Committee was appointed.**

The IESA has continued to receive recommendations from its various Advisory Committees and individual member schools regarding the improvement of the state tournament structure and the assignment of member schools to a specific class. Over the last several years, the number of proposals for change have increased. Thus, the IESA Board of Directors recommended the formation of an Ad-Hoc Committee to investigate the possibility of alternate state tournament structures and class assignments in the activities of Baseball, Softball, Cross Country, Girls' Basketball, Boys' Basketball, Wrestling, Volleyball, Track, and Scholastic Bowl.

The Board of Directors directed the Ad-Hoc State Tournament Committee to:

1. Study the number of teams that advance to the finals in each sport and the corresponding tournament playing dates.
2. Study the split between classes.

The mission of the Committee was to examine the state tournament structures and assess the sufficiency of the current systems in light of present membership needs.

## **The Committee Itself**

A total of 23 members were selected from 13 of the IESA Board Division areas. The Committee was comprised of coaches, athletic directors, past Board of Director members, principals, and superintendents. These members were representative of a wide range of school size and state tournament experience.

The Committee met in May, July, and October to discuss the various issues. Minutes of the Committee meetings have been included.

## **Committee Recommendations**

The IESA Ad-Hoc State Tournament Committee recommends to the Board of Directors:

1. That no changes be applied to the advancement of teams to the state tournament. The structure that the Committee is recommending is a continuation of the current state tournament structure- 16-team advancement in the sport of Volleyball, Girls Basketball, and Boys Basketball; 8-team advancement in Baseball and Softball.

### **Committee Reasoning:**

- a. ***Participation.*** The Committee felt that participation was an extremely important aspect of the IESA state tournament series. By decreasing the number of participating teams, fewer students would share the state tournament experience.
  - b. ***Travel.*** Travel concerns affect a small minority of teams. For instance in girls' volleyball, eight teams per class would be traveling two days, four teams per class would be traveling four days.
  - c. ***Scheduling and facility availability.*** There may be some difficulty with adjusting the calendar to a more compact schedule. Additionally, the more compact schedule may make it more difficult to secure state tournament sites.
  - d. ***Financial concerns.*** The Committee also felt that the financial impact of fewer teams in the state tournament series would result in higher entry fees applied to all participating schools.
  - e. ***Survey results.*** The Committee was also committed to adhere to the sentiment of the member schools.
  - f. ***Additional material.*** Arguments for and against a change in advancement can be found within this packet of information. Additionally, results of the survey have also been included.
2. That no changes be applied to the current system of classification.

### **Committee Reasoning:**

- a. The Committee felt that any "across-the-board" adjustment to the split may not serve to benefit or be appropriate for each particular activity.
- b. The Committee was committed to adhere to the sentiment of the member schools.
- c. Results of the survey have been included in this information.

## ***Appendix A: Survey Results***

### **Survey Results**

- All 60-40 splits refer to 60% of the teams classified as Class A and 40% of the teams classified as Class AA.

<b>Team Advancement and Split Preference</b>	<b>Votes Received</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
16 Teams w/ 50-50 split	63	32%
16 Teams w/ 33-33-33 split	47	24%
8 Teams w/ 50-50 split	34	17%
8 Teams w/ 33-33-33 split	25	13%
8 Teams w/ 60-40 split	18	9%
16 Teams w/ 60-40 split	13	7%

<b>Team Advancement Preference</b>	<b>Votes Received</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
16 Team Advancement	125	62%
8 Team Advancement	77	38%

<b>Split Preference</b>	<b>Votes Received</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
50-50 Split	98	48%
33-33-33 Split	75	37%
60-40 Split	32	16%

<b>Team Advancement and Split Preference by Class*</b>	<b>Votes Received</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Class A 16 Teams w/ 50-50 split	36	31%
Class AA 16 Teams w/ 50-50 split	27	29%
Class AA 16 Teams w/ 33-33-33 split	25	27%
Class A 16 Teams w/ 33-33-33 split	22	19%
Class A 8 Teams w/ 50-50 split	20	17%
Class A 8 Teams w/ 33-33-33 split	18	16%
Class AA 8 Teams w/ 50-50 split	14	15%
Class AA 8 Teams w/ 60-40 split	9	10%
Class A 8 Teams w/ 60-40 split	9	8%
Class AA 8 Teams w/ 33-33-33 split	7	8%
Class A 16 Teams w/ 60-40 split	8	7%
Class AA 16 Teams w/ 60-40 split	5	5%

\* Class was determined by the enrollment information provided on the returned surveys. The split between Class A and AA was set at 140. Those surveys that reported an enrollment of 140 or less were categorized as Class A.

## Appendix B: Survey Comments

School	Enrollment	Teams	Split	Comments
Stew-Stras	75	8	50/50	Create a super-sectional and reduce the number of teams to the state tournament. Thus, reducing the number of bus trips to the tournament.
Beardstown	165	8	33/33/33	16 teams if the split is 60/40 (a/aa)
Blue Mound Meridian	180	16	33/33/33	The expansion to 3 classes would allow more schools/students to experience the honor of "going to state".
Roanoke Benson	90	8	60/40	Sending 16 teams to state is very unnecessary and costly in time and dollars. Also gives false expectations for high school performance. Doesn't mean much to go to state with 16 teams.
Pittsfield Pikeland	214	16	50/50	To go to three classes will extend the playing area for our district and further tax an already strained budget.
Gridley	52	16	50/50	I can't speak for softball since it's being split for the first time (which we greatly appreciate). But, the other state tournament series' seem to be going well.
	35	16	33/33/33	If a 60/40 split is approved you would be effectively cutting out the chances that the lowest 1/3 of the participating member schools have of reaching a state final. The disparity between the top and bottom with a 50/50 is too great.
Manhattan	202	16	33/33/33	A school of 200 should not have to compete against a school of 800+.
Bismarck	130	16	60/40	A 60/40 split in track may cause problems in the small school division. It will help every other sport.
	136	16	33/33/33	The cut-off number for us is always at the bottom of the large school classifications. We cannot compete with the AA schools that have the number and quality of athlete- our main goal is to win the SVC because our chance in the IESA is "0". Unless, we have an exceptional group- which we usually don't.

Minooka	319	8	50/50	I would also prefer a Friday/Saturday format for the above. It would possibly bring more fans and be less of a disruption to the educational process.
Georgetowne	145	16	33/33/33	As one of the smallest Class AA schools in the state, we find it encouraging to think of the possibility of a 3 class system. The benefits of increased participation in state tournament competition will be seen very quickly! Thanks for allowing us some input.
Germantown Hills	180	16	60/40	The more teams that can experience a state tournament the better
Mt. Pulaski	75	16	50/50	Adding more classes would significantly water down the tournament. I don't think it would have as much sense of accomplishment.
Central	135	16	60/40	Please do not add the triple jump to track
	58	8	60/40	Either one in #4 is better than what we have now.
	431	16	50/50	I would be in favor of a 3 class system if 16 teams went to state.
Parkview	147	8	50/50	With 16 teams, the students are out of school too many days.
Warrensburg-Latham	180	16	33/33/33	We often find ourselves in the middle in school size. Having a middle class would be nice.
Herscher	180	16	33/33/33	We are among the smaller schools in AA. We would like to see it changed because of the wide range of size in AA- some schools with 800-1000 students.
Metcalf	100	8	60/40	IESA closely resembles IHSA. However, the classification of class does not. Why is that?
	34	16	33/33/33	We favor the 50-50 split over any 60-40 system. Having a 7 & 8 grade enrollment of 34- yes we would favor a 3 classes. A 60/40 system would not be fair to the small schools.
	420	8	50/50	We have 6th grade students on our 7th grade teams. Enrollment of 6,7,8 is 625.

# AD-HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MEETING MINUTES

July 18, 2001

The following were present for the meeting: Ken Baker, Wenona Fieldcrest West; Jeff Elder, Melvin G.C.M.S.; Greg Leigh, Bismarck-Henning; Chris Long, Kansas; Jeff Meek, Minooka; Dot Melvin, East Peoria Central; Steve Severson, Bradley Central; Curt Simonson, Pittsfield Pikeland; Jack Small, Hanna City Logan; Jeff Stephens, Concord Triopia; James Weiss, Altamont; Larry Wilcoxon, Tampico; Sue Zartler, Chatham Glenwood; Al Zuber, Paris Crestwood.

The IESA Ad-Hoc Committee, in its meeting of July 18, 2001, discussed the following:

1. The meeting focused on the discussion of the arguments for and against both an 8-team and 16- team state tournament format. The arguments have been condensed and are enclosed. An informal vote was taken at the end of the discussion. At that vote, the Committee voted 9-4 in favor of a 16- team state tournament format.
2. The Committee discussed the agenda for the next meeting. The items on the agenda for the next meeting are:
  - A. Closing the discussion on the number of teams advancing to state. This will require a brief presentation of both issues followed by a formal vote of the Committee. The Committee will then be able to make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on this issue.
  - B. The Committee will also discuss the manner in which the activities are split. After the discussion of the issues, the Committee will then decide if a formal vote can be taken or if the issues warrant further discussion.
3. A survey has been developed and will be distributed to all member schools in August. The survey will ask for a response on the issues of the number of teams advancing to state and the manner in which the activities are split. The results of the survey will be distributed at the October meeting.
4. The Committee will meet again on October 17, 2001.

# AD-HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MEETING MINUTES

October 17, 2001

The following were present for the meeting: The following were present for the meeting: Ken Baker, Toluca Fieldcrest West; Margurette Carter, Rantoul Eater; John Coon, Metamora; Jeff Elder, Melvin G.C.M.S.; Lindsey Hall, Mahomet-Seymour; Greg Leigh, Bismarck-Henning; Chris Long, Kansas; Jeff Meek, Minooka; Dot Melvin, East Peoria Central; Tom Mikelson, Hartsburg-Emden; Beth Pugh, Tuscola East Prairie; Bill Seifert, Wenona Fieldcrest East; Steve Severson, Bradley Central; Jack Small, Hanna City Logan; Jeff Stephens, Concord Triopia; James Weiss, Altamont; Larry Wilcoxon, Tampico; Sue Zartler, Chatham Glenwood; Al Zuber, Paris Crestwood

The IESA Ad-Hoc Committee, in its meeting of October 17, 2001 discussed the following:

1. A review of the previous meeting information.
2. Information regarding the survey returned by member schools was distributed and discussed.
3. The discussion was closed on the subject of team advancement. A vote by the Committee was taken on this issue. The Committee voted 12-8 to advance 16 teams to the state tournament. The Committee will recommend to the Board of Directors that the state tournament series continue to advance 16 teams to the tournament.
4. Discussion was initiated regarding the classification of schools. The Committee closed the discussion on this item and voted. The Committee voted 11-7-2 to split the activities 50-50. The Committee will recommend to the Board of Directors that the activities continue to be split by a 50-50 method.

This is the last meeting of the Committee.

# 16 Teams

## Appendix D: Committee Pros & Cons

Arguments For	Arguments Against
More kids involved.	Travel
Contributes to the overall education of the student	Unrealistic goals set for students and parents as they go into high school.
Students in favor of keeping the 16 teams.	Time and travel impacts the borderline student with regard to school work.
Greater revenue for hosts and IESA.	Fewer student fan busses.
t-shirt sales and concessions	Limits hosting opportunities of hosting to those schools who are central, have a large enough volunteer pool, and have a facility that can be freed for several days.
More students involved in the experience.	Weather considerations
Experience outweighs the travel	Reaching state should have a certain degree of difficulty.
Number of schools that are affected by the travel is limited to four schools per class. Thus, the total number of schools travelling is very small.	Success in IESA does not guarantee success in IHSA.
Schools may be willing to add sports to their athletic programs if they feel they have an opportunity to succeed at the state level.	More scheduling conflicts: officials, volunteers, facilities.
	More teams traveling on school nights
	Can be financial burden for some schools.
	Difficulty finding suitable sites for tournaments which last for four days.
	Increased travel times and expenses for the teams who advance to the finals.
	It may be difficult for a junior high athlete to maintain an "edge" when they have to travel and compete for four days (fatigue factor)
	It may be difficult to maintain the State Tournament atmosphere.
	Decrease in student attendance because of the number of late nights schools must compete during the week.
	Added expenses for spectators (travel and admission)
	It may be more difficult for parents to attend all four days of games because of job responsibilities.
	Athletes may find it difficult to fulfill their academic requirements when asked to be out late on three school nights in one week. The students who struggle with grades may end up failing for the week and this may effect their overall grade point average for their grading period.

# 8 Teams

## Arguments For

Instills a greater sense of pride since it is harder to achieve state level success.

May be a possibility of more schools volunteering to host a smaller tournament.

Consistent with the structure of the IHSA tourney.

Fewer officials/volunteers needed.

Tournaments could be completed in two days.

Decreases travel times and expenses for schools and their spectators.

May increase student attendance if the state is held on Friday/Saturday. Parents may be more willing to let their children attend if they do not miss a considerable amount of school.

Reduce the number of late school nights experienced by athletes.

Sectional revenue would increase because of the increased number of teams within the sectional complex.

May be an increase in the number of schools willing to host a sectional because of the increased revenue.

Using the 2 day format is more like a "March Madness Experience"

Less time away from school.

Possibility for centralized and permanent sites.

Two day format would increase the number of hosts.

Two day format would allow the possibility of moving the tournament to a small college or university setting.

Larger sectionals would be a possibility for increased merchandise revenue.

Less travel for the schools.

Opportunity to add an overnight stay into the experience.

## Arguments Against

Not as financially beneficial to the host school/IESA.

Fewer opportunities for participants/memories  
May be fewer hosts because of finances.  
Increases expenses for sectional hosts

It may be more difficult for smaller schools who compete as large schools to advance to the state tournament.

Financial impact on host schools and the IESA.

Fewer kids with the "state experience"

Would require a change in the tournament schedule/arrangement/structure.

Finding time in the schedule for a larger sectional complex.

College or university setting would require kids to play on a larger court.

Would require teams to stay overnight and would increase their expenses.

Financial impact on host schools and IESA.

Fewer kids with the state experience.

Change whole tournament schedule/arrangement.

Finding time in the schedule for a larger sectional complex.

## *Appendix E: Theoretical Split Information*

### **Various Splits Applied to the 2000-2001 School Year**

- all numbers represent the top of the lower class

Activity	Actual 00-01 Split	60-40 Split	Top 128 Teams
Baseball	115	138	105
Softball	132	157	NA
Cross Country	365	271	NA
Girls' Basketball	150	181	177
Boys' Basketball	118	154	176
Wrestling	390		
Volleyball	121	156	166
Scholastic Bowl	129	157	153
Track	144	174	223



## 2001-2002 STATE TOURNAMENT STRUCTURE SURVEY

At various times during recent years, some suggestions have been received from member schools about changes to the state tournament structure. The recently formed Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee and the IESA Board of Directors have discussed these changes. The Board has authorized this survey to determine what the membership thinks about these various issues. The results of the survey will help guide the Advisory Committee and the Board of Directors in deciding the future of the state tournament structure.

All administrators are asked to discuss the issue with their coaches before completing the survey. Although only one survey per school may be completed, it is important your coaches share their thoughts with you on these issues.

**When answering the survey, please keep in mind—one of the goals of the IESA has always been, and will always be, encouraging participation.**

Your opinion does matter!! These are issues that affect nearly every member school. Please take a moment to discuss these with your coaches and return them via fax (309-829-0625) to the IESA Office no later than Oct 1, 2001. Thank you for your time.

---

1. **Approximate 7-8 Enrollment of your school:** \_\_\_\_\_

2. **The following number of teams should advance to the state finals in girls basketball, boys basketball, and girls volleyball:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **16 Teams**

\_\_\_\_\_ **8 Teams**

The following questions address the current state tournament series in the following activities: girls softball, boys baseball, boys and girls cross country, girls basketball, boys basketball, girls volleyball, scholastic bowl, and boys and girls track and field.

3. **Currently, classification of schools is as follows: the smallest 50 percent of member schools is Class A and the largest 50 percent of member schools is Class AA. Do you favor this current classification system?** \_\_\_\_\_ **Yes**  
**No ( If no, please answer question 4)**

4. **Answer only if you indicated NO above:**

**I favor the following classification system: (choose only one)**

\_\_\_\_\_ **60/40% (A/AA)**

\_\_\_\_\_ **3 classes- 33/33/33%**

**Comments:**

**PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN THE SURVEY VIA FAX BY OCT. 1, 2001**