

## Peter Weber

---

**From:** Dan Kaplan [dan@run-down.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 20, 2009 11:36 AM  
**To:** Peter Weber  
**Subject:** Re[2]: OSAA reclassification  
**Attachments:** OSAA Reclassification - proposal.xls

Hi Peter,

I'm guessing my suggestions (below) got lost in the flood of feedback at last week's meeting. So, I spent the weekend fleshing out the ideas I had outlined previously. Attached is the resulting proposal.

I can also send it as a PDF, if preferred.

The feedback I've received thus far has been mostly [strongly] positive. I am awaiting more input to see if additional adjustments can improve things further. There is a Notes/Benefits page on the second tab which explains various aspects of the proposal.

Dan Kaplan

Wednesday, November 26, 2008, 1:57:00 PM, you wrote:

- > Dan,
- > Thanks for the input. I'll pass your thoughts on to the committee.
  
- > Have a great Thanksgiving,
- > Peter
  
- > -----Original Message-----
- > From: Dan Kaplan [mailto:dan@run-down.com]
- > Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2008 1:54 PM
- > To: Peter Weber
- > Subject: OSAA reclassification
  
- > Thank you for making the new proposal on the reclassification process
- > available for review. I appreciate the difficulty in coming up with a
- > system that works equally well for everybody. A few thoughts:
  
- > Looking at the proposed leagues, why is Newberg in with the Central
- > Valley Conference? They are much closer to the Metro schools, and
- > moving them there would make the leagues 8-7 (Metro-CVC) instead of
- > 7-8, so it would not alter the balance. Travel time/cost would be
- > minimized. The only reason I can think of for the proposed placement
- > is if a new 6A Metro school is expected to open within the next
- > classification cycle?
  
- > "adjustments in the current cut-off points may ultimately be necessary
- > in order to create viable leagues."
  
- > In the previous reclassification cycle, it was my hope that fixed
- > cut-offs would not be used, as they complicate things geographically.
- > A sliding scale would solve a lot of problems. For example, instead
- > of 5A being 851-1520 and 6A being 1521+, something like the following
- > would allow a great deal of placement flexibility:

## 5-Class Proposal with Overlapping Ranges

*by Dan Kaplan, with contributions by Josh Davis*

**Objective #1:** Place schools where it makes the best sense geographically (reduce travel time & cost, missed class time, and winter travel safety issues). The other Jan. '09 proposals create anew as many geographical problems as they solve, plus add tricky State qualifying processes in the hybrid league systems.

**Objective #2:** Keep similarly sized schools together.

**Objective #3:** Develop balanced league sizes (8-9 each for 5A, 5-7 for 4A, and 8-10 for 3A and 2A) for equal competitive opportunity.

**Objective #4:** Balance the number of leagues within comparable classifications (8 each for 5A & 4A, 5 each for 3A & 2A), making State qualifying more even.

**Objective #5:** Balance the size of each classification as much as possible.

Method: Use overlapping ranges for determining classifications, instead of the typical fixed cut-off points. This system also ensures flexibility for future classification cycles, as it does not have the limitations inherent in fixed cut-offs and constantly changing school populations. Ranged cut-off points can be adjusted instead of moving schools between leagues. As such, traditional rivalries should be easier to maintain over time.

Minimal changes were made to 1A-3A, as those schools have reportedly been fairly happy with the current classification structure.

The ranges for each class look rather extreme, but there are only a few schools within each that necessitate the wide range. The goal is to place schools within the middle of the range for their respective class, but geographical exceptions take precedence. Examples are the very spread out Eastern Oregon League and the wide range of school sizes within a small area such as the IMC or Southwest Conference.

One nice side effect of the large ranges for each class is, there's no need for "opting up" notation. This eliminates one of the common debates, i.e. whether schools should be allowed to opt up and if doing so defeats the purpose of reclassification.

The original goal of this range-based proposal was a 6-class system, but it quickly became evident that 5A would be too small, as the distinction became too blurred between 5A and 6A schools. Basically, several areas such as the SWC have too few schools to support both a 5A and 6A league, but are too geographically isolated to be part of surrounding leagues and have too wide a range of populations to be one or the other with fixed cut-off points.



