



MRFMHA Player Evaluation Policy and Procedures

Last Updated: May 2022

Purpose:

This policy and procedure is intended to support Meadow Ridge Female Minor Hockey Association (“the Association”) players in appropriate team and division placement. The goal and purpose of the Association is to place players on teams that the player will have the greatest opportunity for success. This is intended to develop a lifelong love of the game and to foster continued involvement in the game beyond the player’s minor hockey years.

The Association’s evaluation process is **tiered** and is governed by Pacific Coast Amateur Hockey Association (PCAHA) and female hockey selection and evaluation processes are different from larger, integrated hockey associations, where non-A level teams may be expected to be balanced. As a result of the tiering processes, the Association is charged with ensuring that the tiering is appropriate and that players are provided the best possible opportunity for success.

Scope:

This policy applies to all divisions that follow a tiering process and currently includes U11 to U21 (all players, all levels - A and C).

1.0 Evaluation Governance Structure for both A and C Hockey

- 1.1 The Evaluation team may be comprised of a combination of external evaluators, Association Coaches, Association Volunteers and Association Board and Executive Staff.
- 1.2 General Oversight of the evaluation process rests with the Association Risk Manager, or an approved delegate appointed by the Association Board. The assignment of oversight to this role is necessary to ensure that the appeal process is aligned with the Association’s appeal and discipline committee structure. Members of the Association’s Board and Executive Team may assist the Risk Manager, or delegate, with the implementation of this policy.
- 1.3 Appeals around player placement, must be made within seven (7) days of the placement decision and are to be directed in writing to risk@barracudashockey.ca.
 - a) Appeals are to include the specifics of the appeal, based on the evaluation dimensions captured below.
 - b) Appeals will be reviewed based on the evaluation frameworks outlined in the following section, as well as discussions with Association staff to understand subjective elements of on-ice performance, mitigating factors that may have affected on-ice performance among other relevant factors.
 - c) Appeal decisions will be delivered in writing to the family.
 - d) If the family feels that the decision is not satisfactory, the family may appeal, in writing to the President of the Association. The appeals process is outlined in Section 8.0



2.0 Evaluation Format

- 2.1 The evaluation format is the same for both A and C hockey players. All players in divisions U13 and higher will declare a primary position during the registration process.
- 2.2 The evaluation structure is delivered on-ice. There is currently no off-ice fitness or other dryland assessment of player ability.
- 2.3 Evaluations are broken into two general categories
 - a) Technical skill; and,
 - b) Subjective performance, such as coachability, hockey sense, effort on-the ice and attitude.
- 2.4 Technical evaluations are based on a criterion rating system of 1-5 for each skill, with one (1) being poor and five (5) being outstanding skill demonstration. These rubrics are readily available through the Hockey Canada website and may include, but are not exclusive to, technical skating, puck handling, shooting and other foundational skills required for evaluations. These skills are assessed during on-ice sessions by the evaluation teams.
- 2.5 Subjective elements are evaluated on-ice where possible (i.e., effort/hockey sense) or with conversations with Association staff and amongst the evaluation team. Subjective elements are rated using the 1-5 scale as noted above.
- 2.6 On-ice sessions may be configured in several different ways, from practice style sessions to fulsome scrimmages.

3.0 Evaluation Teams

- 3.1 Evaluation Teams are comprised of at least three persons for any given session. These evaluators may, or may not, be the same for each evaluation session.
- 3.2 Each Evaluation Team is comprised of two persons that are not involved and do not have children involved in the age/division being assessed. These evaluators are deemed independent. For example, U13A may be evaluated by two persons that are involved in U13C, U15 or higher or U11 and below.
- 3.3 At least one person on the Evaluation Team will be involved in the age/division being evaluated or is deemed to have sufficient prior knowledge of the players being evaluated. This is to provide an element of context and familiarity with the players in the given division. This representative should be able to provide insight into some of the subjective elements of the assessment.
- 3.4 When more than three evaluators are present, the minimum two-thirds independence ratio will be maintained.
- 3.5 Decisions of the teams are based on a two-thirds majority during selection and placement conversations and evaluation document review.



3.6 Due to unforeseen events, the minimum number and composition of Evaluation Teams outlined above may not be possible for all ice sessions.

4.0 Selection and Placement

The goal for the selection and placement of players is to ensure that players are placed on the right teams, in the right divisions to enable to best opportunity for success. This is equally true at the team level. A player's primary position may be considered in the selection and placement process.

- 4.1 Initial placements are based on the scores from the above evaluation format. Players are ranked from highest score to lowest score, for each team in the division, both A and C. Beginning with the highest tiered team and moving to the lowest tiered team.
- 4.2 Players that are selected for a team based on the initial round of selections are deemed to have "made" that team.
- 4.3 Once it has been determined that a player's skill is not at the minimum level required for the given level, the players will be reassigned to the evaluation group for the next level (i.e. 15A to U15C1; U15C1 to U15C2). Reassignments can happen at any point during the evaluation process.
- 4.4 Within an age division, there will be players that are "on the bubble", meaning that the player could be selected for a higher or lower division team. (i.e., a player with scores at the lower end of U15C1 team selections may be selected for C1 or C2.)
- 4.5 A discussion within the Evaluation Team for bubble players may also include the bench staff, where identified, to determine the best placement for the player. Final recommendations for placement of bubble players, including rationale, are made by an Evaluation Team or committee, which may or may not include input from the team Head Coach. All recommendations will be reviewed, approved and documented by the Risk Manager, or delegate.
- 4.6 This process repeats itself until all players in an age division have been selected for a team. All notifications regarding assignment/reassignment and team placements will be provided by a member of the Association's Board or Executive Team.
- 4.7 Once the initial placement process has been completed, player movement may occur at the Association's discretion. Due to the potential disruption to the players and teams involved, player movement at this stage is expected to be infrequent. All proposed player movements must be reviewed and approved by the Association's Board and must occur before October 15th. All player movements after October 15th, must be approved by the Association's Board and the family of the player(s) involved.
- 4.8 Player assignments may include decisions to assign players to a given team to ensure that Coaches or team numbers are adequate within a given division. This is intended to support the purpose of this Policy and Procedure, at a team level.



5.0 Injuries Prior to Selection or During Evaluations

Return to play must follow Hockey Canada, BC Hockey and Association guidelines on medical clearance for return to play, and those guidelines may be different for differing categories of injury, and includes medical documentation for return.

- 5.1 If a player suffers an injury that prevents the player from participating during the evaluations, the family must notify the Risk Manager of the injury, particularly if the player is intending on A evaluations, to determine whether an accommodation for the injury can be made to allow for participation.
- 5.2 Accommodations may be alternate ice-time evaluations or participation in an ice-time of the tier at which the player played at last season; or, if A evaluations, such an accommodation may result in participation with the selected team to determine goodness of fit, under both the technical and subjective evaluation criteria.
- 5.3 If the injury prevents an accommodation, the Association will determine the best placement for the player, if returning, to identify the best placement opportunity. If the player is a new player, the initial placement may be based on the player's last season played at the tiered level that player participated at. This means that if the player is a second year U15 player and previously played on a U15C1 team, the Association may place the player on U15C1. Placement decisions in these settings are at the discretion of the Association.

6.0 Coaching Staff Selection

- 6.1 For all age divisions that have more than one team, Head Coach Selection will be made based on the following process during evaluations:
 - a) If the parent of a player that has clearly "made" a given team and is a qualified Head Coach within the Association, the Association Head Coach may appoint the Head Coach before or during evaluations. The same process may be followed for Assistant Coaches, if applicable.
 - b) The Head Coach, if identified before or during evaluations, may or may not be involved in selection discussions.
 - c) For those teams without a clearly identified Head Coach, bubble player decisions will be made at the discretion of the Association.
 - d) Coaching qualifications are identified on both BC Hockey and Association Websites, and may be different for different age or competitive teams (i.e., A teams have additional coaching qualifications that are not required for C teams).

7.0 Conflict Resolution

- 7.1 As the Association is a volunteer association, there is inevitably potential for conflict of interest. If the Evaluation Team, Risk Manager, members of the Association's Board and Executive Team, or other Association Members involved in evaluations find themselves in direct conflicts of interest, that member may recuse themselves from the decision-making process. In the case of the President, the decision-making authority will be delegated to the Vice President or another Board Member, as required. In the case of the Risk Manager, the decision-making authority will be delegated to either the Association Head Coach or the Vice President.



7.2 A perception of conflict may exist during team selections and such potential conflicts of interest will be clearly identified, in writing to the Risk Manager. If the Risk Manager determines the conflict is of significance, then the Risk Manager may recuse the member and identify a suitable alternate decision-maker. This does not mean that simply because a Head or Assistant Coach is also an Association Board or Executive Member, that the Head or Assistant Coach will be immediately recused. A determination of the significance of the conflict in question will be assessed by the Risk Manager, and recorded with the Evaluation and Selection documents to clearly declare the perception and the rationale for either absolution of the potential of conflict or the acceptance of the conflict.

8.0 Appeals

- 8.1 If a family feels that a player's placement is in some way incorrect, the family may appeal to the Risk Manager, in writing within seven (7) days of the placement. If an appeal is not received within seven (7) days, the placement is permanent, and no appeal will be accepted.
- 8.2 Evaluation documentation is generally available to appellants during this process, but will be deidentified to ensure that both the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* stipulations around privacy and confidentiality are complied with, but also that this process can unfold in accordance with Hockey Canada, BC Hockey, PCAHA and Association policies around respectful member and Association conduct.
- 8.3 The Risk Manager will review the selection criteria, discuss with the Evaluation Team and the Association Head Coach on whether an additional assessment is required to determine the goodness of fit for the initial selection decision. If the determination is made to accept the placement of the player, under the initial evaluation process, then the family will be notified within five (5) days of the review completion. These reviews will be conducted as quickly as possible. If the Risk Manager or Head Coach is a member of the coaching staff for the team under appeal, their role in the review process will be assigned to the Association Vice President or another Association Board Member, as required.
- 8.4 If a secondary evaluation is required, the Risk Manger will notify the family, and a new evaluation team will conduct the assessment. Based on the result of that evaluation, the placement may or may not change and the player will be selected for the appropriate team. This will be communicated in writing to the family as soon as the decision is made.
- 8.5 If the decision of the initial team is accepted, the Risk Manager will notify the family in writing of the placement decision. Should the family feel that the decision is unsatisfactory, the family may appeal this decision within five (5) days of the decision to the President of the Association (president@barracudashockey.ca).
- 8.6 The President will review the available information that underlies these initial decisions and may chose to strike a committee of three Association Board of Director or Association Executive Members to determine if the placement decisions were appropriate.



- 8.7 The decision of the President will be communicated to the family, in writing and those decisions are final. No further appeals will be accepted.

- 8.8 Association Members that wish more information on the resolution of perceived conflicts may write to the Risk Manager for details around the steps taken to resolve the matter. Personal information or specifics may not be available to third parties to the conflict, given *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* compliance.