

April 6, 2018

Memorandum

To: SHA Board of Directors

From: Kelly McClintock

Re: 2018 Spring Zone Meetings

The following is a compilation of the six rural zone meetings recently held over the past few weeks.

A total of one hundred and thirty-nine (139) people representing eighty-five (85) communities attended the six (6) meetings.

The Communities represented were;

Arcola
Carnduff
Carlyle
Midale
Yellow Grass
Radville
Redvers
Estevan
Weyburn
Bienfait
Lampman
Wawota
Kipling
Midale
Milestone
PSMHA
Oxbow
Assiniboia
Avonlea
Cabri
Coronach

Glentworth
Gravelbourg
Gull Lake
Kincaid
Lafleche
Moose Jaw
Mossbank
Shaunavon
Swift Current
Balcarres
Canora
Esterhazy
Kamsack
Langenburg
Melville
Preeceville
Springside
Yorkton
Martensville
Clavet
Dundurn
Rose Valley
Lanigan
Kenaston
Delisle
Watson
Southey
Warman
Nokomis
Humboldt
Holdfast
Muenster
Davidson
Kelvington
Watrous
Viscount
Meadow Lake
Turtleford
Lashburn
Cutknife
Macklin
Unity
Kindersley
Flaxcombe

Maidstone
Battleford
Kerrobert
Eston
Glaslyn
Marsden/Neilburg
Elrose
Hudson Bay
Cudworth
Nipawin
Tisdale
Porcupine Plain
Prince Albert
Kinistino
NEMHL - Melfort
Birch Hills
Melfort
La Ronge
Debden
Ile-a-la-Crosse

The feedback was as follows;

1. What are your thoughts of the SHA Strategic Plan and the six Focus Areas?

Agree

Good

If implemented properly will definitely add value.

Good idea, surprised there hasn't been something like this set up in the past.

Great ideas, need coaches to buy into SHA focus areas.

Agree with scope.

Good Plan

Great start

Good

I am for strategic planning – I would suggest asking for input though from MHA's on some of the topics.

They are a good starting point.

Very good

Positive feedback to Associations as it progresses will be great.

Good long-term goals

The 6 areas are all valuable. Interested to see how each areas success will be measured.

On point; needs to be stressed at the Association level.

Seems to be well on track for what is needed.

Great start to the framework!!

Glad to see focus on developing associations and leagues. Part of our focus too.

Good plan. Definitely needed. Needs to follow through.

Really like it. Would like it to be reviewed with all organizations.

I agree with it fully!

This is great. As an MHA that is "starting fresh" we have a need for a strategic plan and would be great to have correlation and initiatives that roll up to SHA.

Good

Ok

Good idea

I like the idea – good areas to focus on.

They are fine.

Looks good.

Looks good.

Great insight on growing the SHA. Many things can spinoff of this.

Good

They are good.

Looks good, like the idea and gives people new an idea on what to expect.

Very good.

Good. Seems reasonable.
Always nice to see a plan and direction.
The changes should improve the long-term success of SHA.
Great to see a written outline.
I think those are perfect areas to focus on.
Good idea. Excited to see how it is developed.
It's fine, you always need a succession plan.
Ok
Provides direction for Associations to follow.
Good to look into future and start to use and compare other sports.
Good idea lacks detail but is encouraging to know it is being developed.
Well thought out, focus on the enjoyments and retention of players is very important.
Agree on key areas of focus.
Looks good.
Very positive.
Looks good.
Great.
Well thought out and like where SHA is heading.
Ok
Thought it was good.
Like the thought of having a long-term vision.
They look fine, good idea to have bench marks in place to track progress.
For now, it's a good starting point.
Appears reasonable.
#1 for me is the importance of keeping kids involved in the game. Losing too many kids after Peewee.
Like it.
Sounds good.
Absolutely agree.
Too early to tell.
Good 5-year plan.
Like the direction it's going.
Good idea.
I think it is a good place to start.
Love the idea – looking forward to seeing this unfold.
Heading in the right direction.
I am comfortable with both the plan and focus areas.
Nothing to add yet.
I like the plan and will comment more with more ideas
Agree with the direction they are taking.
We definitely need help in attracting and retaining players.
Good, relative to our community.
Like the idea very much and moving in the right direction.

Good strategy going forward.
Seems very vague as of now. Will want to see more then it may seem clearer.
I agree they are important big ideas.
Good
Needs to be done for direction.

2. SHA Minor/Female Committee Proposals

We would like your feedback on the Proposals

Proposal 1 – Vision Statements for Age Groups – Your Thoughts?

Agree
Age groups are good.
I like what is being proposed.
They are strong.
Looks good.
Good reminder for parents. Could be posted around rink.
Like the ideas proposed.
They are appropriate.
Good to hear that exceptions may be granted if a team is at risk of folding. Ex – 17 Bantam Female A and 9 Midget Female A – Move 4 Bantams to Midget or Midget teams will fold.
Developing “clear” vision statements will be important. Creating a common vision statement is good.
I agree and feel like they should be circulated to all Associations, Coaches and Parents.
Excellent – should be distributed.
Support the idea.
Agree, less emphasis on winning in Novice and developing skills.
Agree with most regarding when competitive play should come in but you will always have coaches that shorten benches even when “fun” is the goal.
Good outlines for member to refer to.
Agree
Agree – Play your age group – Are there any discussions on “exceptional status”
Great statements, you have to have goals to strive for.
Agree
Good

I like the idea to have a platform to follow/younger ages do need more development.

Much needed, I like the statements by age group.

Good

Ok

Good – maybe a little wordy

Really like this. Would use to have each of our age divisions use to work towards.

Great statements

Seemed good and lots of thought was put into them.

Believe the statements are accurate but could be moved back 1 step (re: Atom to Novice).

Well done.

They described what you would expect at those age levels.

Good. This will help give coaches and parents a clue on where to start.

Keep girls in appropriate age.

Good, no other comments.

Great

Very good!! I.E. MHA's can post on websites, arenas, etc.

Great stuff. Agree that Novice is intense and almost needs an "Expectations" component i.e. All players will experience playing all positions.

Made sense.

Agree with wording.

Like having something in place to show outside of hockey people our directions and beliefs.

Looks good.

Great

Good

Agree

Good idea.

Agree

Vision statements are sold for age groups, does lay out what hockey is to people that may not know.

It is very logical and practical.

Each one of those statements should be shown to each Association to have the parents read and understand it. Parent ideas...wow!

Good, helps communicate coaching objectives to parents.

Like the specific definitions for each age group and desired outcome.

I agree 100% with these overviews.

Well done – players need to be age appropriate. Give parents guidelines for expectations.

Good to have in writing to show parents.

I love the longer season idea! Our Peewee House team ended their season the 2nd week in February. I also like the idea of having the beginning of the season be more about development!

I agree with them.

They are good but they need to be “explained” to parents – especially some who grew up with “old school hockey”.

I love this. A perfect way to help explain to parents/people who know very little about the game and what is expected from them.

Good starting point for new parents to an age group for expectations. Sounds good.

I would like to see some movement as far as moving up one age group. They all made sense.

I like the direction that this adds and the supports the Association.

I agree on some aspects of statements. Not so much on others.

I like the visions. Gives coaches/organization direction to give parents what to expect for each age group.

Sounds good.

Will help MHA's.

I think this should be imposed.

Great

Age specific is a good idea.

No issues.

Don't know enough about these topics yet, sorry.

Good

Agree with.

Good

Good

Agree

Great idea.

Liked those.

Age appropriate.

Very good.

Fine

Proposal 2 – SHA AA Minor Hockey League – Your Thoughts?

Yes, please.

Good plan with the divisions.

No comments.

Don't know enough about these topics yet, sorry.

I like it. Consistency.

Happy with the proposal of having a central governance.

This is the right step!

Nothing to add.

Agree

Great idea – will be good to have one centre of control.

Agree

Good

In favour, all people I've talked to are ok with changes.

I think it is a positive step.

This appears to be a good model to help with retention. One issue is will AA players who do not make the next division be "content" in A hockey.

Make sure parents understand.

Sounds great.

Doesn't really apply to me.

Great idea.

Good idea, numbers will dictate how many teams need to be.

Should be good. Will be an adjustment to start with but things should come together with proper committee.

Too soon to implement Bantam AA in 2 years.

Like to see the new format.

Sounds good.

Good idea.

Sounds good.

N/A but makes sense.

Good

Great idea, would like more details. AA regular seasons in Pee wee and Bantam are too short.

Good idea. I believe it will promote better hockey.

Would like to see interlock through Bantam and Midget between divisions.

Would like to see all "AA" programs ran like the Bantam "AA" model.

All for having one executive.

Should work.

Love consistency.

Concerned that some teams would not have ice in their community in April. N/A for us in Dundurn.

Good. One league covering the province makes the most sense.

Positive

Seems to be a good way of operating it.

I like the concept for the changes.

None

Makes sense.

One governing body makes things that much easier to manage.

Same rules for everyone – good idea.

Taking control of all leagues makes it easier as then all play by the same rules.

I like the idea of the combined leagues. I DO however like the Bantam Western Championship. If we do have more development then we would be able to compete in this.

Think Saskatoon & Regina should be forced in PW boys to play an integrated schedule even if it is North & South.

Ok

Agree that League should then turn to Provincials.

Nice to see everyone under one group.

Seems like good decisions, more unity and common thought across the province the better.

Good idea.

Like the idea of all being one.

I think it would be great but it could be hard on small rural teams.

Is it necessary? I believe it isn't because we don't have enough A teams.

Good, no other comments.

Agree

As long as it is not just big cities and small towns forgotten.

Will be great adding to communities.

Great idea.

Good if they can be governed all together it should bring uniformity to the leagues.

Like the idea of having one committee.

Make things easier.

Good – will be good to have one set of playing “rules”.

Indifferent as it doesn't apply to our Association.

Good

Do not agree with the Bantam AA removal from Westerns. Any opportunity to showcase abilities in a major tournament is a positive.

Agree

Good

Like longer season for Bantam by removing Westerns.

Agreed

Great idea!!

I'm not in favour of a AA minor hockey league due to it hurts the smaller communities, from taking players away.

Having one league seems reasonable so South/North are the same.

Good structure. Needed to be simplified.

Good ideas, it will be one league now.

I would agree to have it as one.

I like the idea and easier to manage for meetings etc.

Proposal 3 – Sask Female Hockey League – Your Thoughts?

Agree

Yes, good idea.

Should have been brought forward long time ago. Open doors for girls.

Great idea, I don't know if Bantam AA will stray far from Regina/Saskatoon.

Will be tough to eliminate a team if everyone applies again – geographical problems?

Good idea to have less teams with more players.

Make things easier.

Good

Good – again good to have governed by one executive – would like more info on how the executive will be chosen.

Indifferent as it doesn't apply to our Association.

Good

Not sure how removal of AAA team is a good thing. Reduce roster size could be an idea. Losing teams in any community is not good.

Agree

Curious what is going ahead with not allowing rural female players onto urban (Regina/Saskatoon) teams. This can be very detrimental to rural players especially regarding travel time.

Wish they had some options to play hockey where you want instead of being restricted to certain areas (ie: open to go anywhere).

Great idea!!

I think this will grow Female hockey in the right direction, by going in the direction you're going.

I think having players play in their proper age bracket is a great idea.

I like that common structure with Male hockey.

I think it will encourage the growth of Female hockey.

I agree

Good.

Ok

Good – need to look at numbers very closely.

Need numbers – enough for league to provincials – I like this idea.

Keep all under one group, work together.

Like it.

It will help out but as long as they have the option to stay with home teams as long as possible. For example, not pulling female players to all girls at Peewee age as in smaller centers this may make or break the Peewee team.

Excited to see the joining of the two leagues to insure consistency across the province.

Like the idea, should have happened 5 years ago.
To make it work – all girls need to play girls.
I believe we need one to develop Girls Hockey.
Good, no other comments.
It's a great idea – interested to see where it goes.
I think the changes will have a positive impact.
Agree that where/when possible, they perform best with other girls.
Makes sense, 1 Board in North and South.
Same as AA Minor Hockey
Level the playing field – get everyone playing with same rules.
It will be tough to eliminate a Female AAA team and to be age specific
registration is fine as not all players are ready but just there for numbers.
I like it. It makes more sense to have a Bantam AA division rather than a
Bantam player who is skilled move to AA rather than Midget. I also love
the idea of a joint North/South division meeting.
Should help development.
Will take time to develop but probably good idea for Initiation to
Peewee. Encourage girls to play with boys.
Looks good.
Viscount is closer to the city (Saskatoon) the only other Female Hockey
Association. I believe that this decision will adversely affect Female
hockey in Viscount.
Agree with direction.
Good to have consistency.
Excellent direction.
Makes sense.
Makes sense.
Yes!
Interested to see how it works out.
Tonight was my first exposure to this so no opinion yet.
It will take a couple years for some people to accept it but looks like the
right solution.
Positive
Peewee good idea.
Like the thoughts from potentially Peewee and up. Currently we will
likely run exhibition teams in Atom and Novice.
Will be interesting whether there are numbers to support it.
Appears reasonable.
Anything to grow Female Hockey is awesome.
Like it to be the same Province wide.
Good idea.
As a small Association when we get our team set it would be helpful to be
able to have AP's registered for the entire year and playoff to help with
#'s.

Looks good.
Good development model. Girls hockey is on the rise.
Think removing a AAA team is a mistake and the original 8 teams that took the time to make the league should not lose their teams.
Like the decision to include Saskatoon – Regina so more competition.
Sounds good.
Good to see SHA trying to develop Female Hockey.
Looking forward to seeing more Female teams and development.
No thoughts.
Should mirror main stream boy's hockey.
Support the proposal.
All the girls together.
Agree
Need to keep the momentum with the growth of the Female game.
Having the larger centres (Saskatoon, P.A.) take part in the Peewee League would be hugely beneficial to the success of the league.
I think it will be a good change, explanation makes sense.
Agree
Good idea.
Atom – doubt if there is much interest due to travel.
I like the rural players having to stay in rural Sask.
A lot of changes, but good. Need some sooner.
Will help with ease of operations.

Proposal 4 – SHA Female Development Model – Your Thoughts?

Should have some structure as Boy's hockey.
I like the proposal.
Don't know enough about these topics yet, sorry.
Good
Agree
Good
Is needed.
Agree
Very good idea.
Push for Peewee AA ASAP. Tons of girls coming up. Need to stay ahead.
I like the idea of Bantam AA. It is needed for the girls.
Need a focus on goalies.
I agree.
Concern with reducing a team at this time until the lower age divisions/new models are put into place.

This is a necessity to improve/propel girls to excel and improve.
Unsure about dropping a Midget AAA team. Today's current direction with girl retention promotes retention in Bantam and Midget which should promote Midget numbers in the future. Removing a team may be counterproductive. I understand the current logic of Bantam players in Midget, but going forward it may change.

Sounds good.

It seems to be headed in the right direction.

Looks good.

Good.

I'm ok with AA Bantam as long as we limit the teams in the Province but will create huge travel issues.

Like to see local girls getting opportunities.

Sounds good.

Hopefully will work in small communities.

No thoughts.

In favour, the sooner the better. Bantam AA for 18-19 would've been better.

Would like to see guidance, help and encouragement to ALL Associations trying to develop.

AAA Midget girls should logistically have a place to play. I.E. if Melville loses AAA program most of these local girls will not have a place to play?
Good to hear of progressive communities, keep getting the message out.

With the exception of the above answer, the FDM will work.

Agree with direction.

Excellent

Lots of potential with Female hockey.

I like it but would have appreciated a bit more guidance.

Like where it is heading and interested to see how it will work out.

Good to develop.

Good

Positive

Don't know why we need different rules for Male and Female hockey.

Like it, however I still feel that not being able to "Grandfather" in players from rural areas after closing borders to city play is wrong. There may be some players not playing this season as they now have no team to play on.

It is very logical and practical.

More emphasis should be on developing Female hockey at a younger age (if possible).

No real opinion at this time.

Still up in the air for reductions of teams to 7.

There needs to be more development with regards to Female hockey.

Great idea.

No opinion.

Good idea. Excited to see how it is developed.

I like it. It makes more sense to make less teams from areas that have the girls/coaches around them. Question: If a coach wants to AP a player from say AA to AAA and that AA team has a game the same night, can that player opt out of playing up? Are they required to stay down and play with their AA team? I really like the SJHL way and if they call up a player, then it opens a spot on the AAA for a AA player to have the opportunity to play up and it trickles down. It gives more opportunity for players to get used to play in a division higher.

I don't believe Bantams should not be allowed to play AAA if they are good enough. An exemption status will be hard to get passed. I would like SHA to close Regina and Saskatoon in AAA just like every other age group and that would make more players available to struggling teams. I would like that tried before eliminating a team because once they are gone they will never be back in.

Good

Looks good.

Like it.

From an Association with a larger population I am excited for the development model. By tiering Bantam it's allowing the better players an opportunity to develop. It also allows the weaker players more playing time at A. Should keep more girls playing.

Like the plan. I worry a bit about "AA" Bantam and sustaining it through the years. Hopefully we can keep building Female Hockey to support this. In our Zone we do not have enough girls to form all age groups.

Good, no other comments.

Agree

Yes

Great

Good, aligns great with male programs.

More Females that can play together in age appropriate leagues the better.

Good to see more Females sticking with hockey.

Some questions on starting Bantam AA Female early in 18-19 were answered. No

Good

I agree

Good

I do like having structured Female hockey. Having the #'s to support teams. Keeping Bantam age players in Bantam totally agree.

Agree

The Bantam AA, Midget AA, Midget AAA look good, as described.

Midget age to play Midget, as with each age division to maximize use of players. Potentially keep more in the game longer. Optimistic yet curious if the numbers are there for Bantam AA. That age is where a commitment is needed for one sport and if required to choose hockey may lose. Unless a team is local/close we already lose players because travel to practice is a longer distance.

Same as above, wish they had some opportunities to play where they could for their best fit. Let them decide instead of being told. Nice to have all the options.

Female proposals set out is great idea to establish a framework that speaks to the development model. Need to keep an open mind and think outside the box through the process.

Keep going as you are.

Good SHA has been really helpful in developing our Female program Needs support from the SHA to succeed. I like the initial thoughts behind the ideas.

I think it will enhance the growth of Female hockey.

I agree.

3. We want your opinion of the proposed Hockey Canada Initiative to move Novice to cross ice/modified half ice for the 2019/20 season with a transition to full ice after Christmas?

Do you agree with the proposal? If not, why?

Agree

Pros and Cons. Like Initiation level, not sure on Novice.

Yes, focus needs to be on fun and skills, this does that well.

Yes, more touches, more development on skills. People are scared because it's something different.

Yes, we agree with the move. It promotes skill development amongst kids.

Yes

Yes

Yes. Do not give small Associations the option to opt out. All or nothing.

Agree with the proposal – would like clear feedback from SHA on how the games will work to best emulate the “game of hockey”

Yes

I agree, more emphasis on skills. Make sure to include development of officials is included.

Good idea. More puck touches, increased passing. All good.

Yes, I would vote you can play full games after Christmas - no Novice player in full ice can score more than 5 goals.

I think it is valuable for minor Novice, but it worries me that in consecutive years, as the major Novice players resume modified ice at the beginning of the next season, they will be bored.

Do not agree, need major and minor groups to transition from ½ ice in minor than a full year of full ice in major. Agree that tighter situations improve skills but that is what practice is for and real game situations are in full ice with proper lines.

Yes, small area games benefit a larger number of players to develop.

50/50. I agree with skills and touches of the puck but not for the skating development. Tight areas are a part of the game but have heard different comments from others that have done it. Have not been involved in Novice ½ ice as some have.

Agree, I would like to see 2018/19 allowed to be a “transition” year if the Association wants to.

I was not in agreement with this till Kelly talked about it and it made more sense.

Trying it is not a bad idea. Makes weaker kids involved more.

I agree with skills development aspect. As with cross ice I wish for smaller Associations there was some financial assistance for half ice boards or some sort of programs so everyone has the same.

I think it's tough to do a transition back to half ice the following fall. Seems restrictive. I understand skills development.

I like it. It works well with IP and it will transition well with the upcoming Strategic Plan & Focus Areas.

I think that is a good time to do it. I have seen it done in baseball with great success. It makes sense to have greater involvement of all the kids.

Yes

Absolutely 100% agree. I've coached Atom A for 4 years now and have utilized small area situations and games for USA Hockey and Hockey Canada. Just watch the game at higher age levels – its not a north and south game.

I don't mind it but would like full ice started earlier than Christmas.

100 disagree. We have no proof it helps development and its geared for the city where ice time is short. We had enough complaints over it in IP.

I agree with the initiative.

More touches and quicker decision making is good. Wouldn't start full ice any later than Christmas though.

No. I don't agree with games starting Feb. 1. This gives no time to get many games in on full ice. Atom will be too big of a transition learning offside and skating full ice. If you're going full ice after Christmas let it be full ice all year. Here's how I'd like to see a Novice season play out.

1. Practice from beginning to Dec. 1.
2. Exhibition & Tournaments on modified sizes in Dec.
3. “League” games until March 15th.

4. Year end tourney – March 22nd.

Good for development. Have seen huge improvement in IP. I agree with half ice, I wouldn't mind seeing half ice all year long.

I feel this is not needed. If you would the timing is too long as most of our rinks close in March. Our teams with less players get in condition for the big ice and I feel that one month of this would not be enough.

Not in favour. I think if we do a good job of doing small ice drills as coaches in practice those skills will be learned. Then in game pacing and using each other is able to be used.

No! I don't believe there are any local stats to back this up. Let the kids play and have fun. Full ice please!

No, I believe kids need to play games and I believe it should be full ice at Novice age.

Not sold on the idea. There are always stronger players that will control a game full ice or half ice. More statistics needed.

I'd like it to be full ice for Novice age but if it has to be in Novice, I appreciate that it is full ice after Christmas.

Good for development. Allows young officials on the ice to develop as well.

Yes

No, I do not agree because I believe the kids that you want to help are the weaker ones. With less time and space they still won't get the touches you think they will. Full ice is more time and space which will lead to more touches if coaches work well with their teams on passing.

From a Swift Current prospective I see benefits in the cross-ice philosophy.

I like it. I agree with tight areas and more puck touches.

I was against IP cross ice and now I love it. Novice seems like it's too old. Maybe it could work.

Yes

Yes, should work to develop small area skills and confidence as well as improve all hockey fundamentals.

I support it. Wish it would have been proposed for 17/18. 2010 kids left IP cross ice to full ice Novice and now they have to go back.

I agree only because of the Jan. 15 cross over to full ice. Would prefer Jan.1 transition to 100% on Jan. 15.

Yes, agree.

I do. I worry about official development.

I am a firm believer in half ice/cross ice hockey.

It will still be a tough sell for some PARENTS but as long as you have committed coaches it will be fine.

Yes, and hopefully will develop skills better and engage more players.

Yes

At first, I was not a fan of cross ice. My biggest concern was it wouldn't teach the fundamentals of the game i.e.: off sides, icing, face offs etc. However, I have

spoken to many parents in IP that like the cross ice. I agree with the touches and quick decisions the kids have to make in a small area.

Agree, will take some adjustment...suggest to shift focus to the skill development and fun, encourage creativity!

Agree, as for transition period - not necessary. Cross ice for full season would be fine in all Novice.

Good idea, concern over "rogue" teams but it is what it is. Agree.

Yes, I agree.

Full agreement. Would propose not enforcing offside throughout and keep all Novice on same schedule for transition from ½ to full ice.

Agree, I do think it will create a stronger player/game.

Yes. I like the ½ ice for skill development.

Yes. We have seen the improvement in ½ ice practices in that level. It will take a bit of culture change. Need to lead positively.

Yes

Yes

Agree totally. Don't understand why some people don't read literature or research.

Don't completely agree.

I do not agree with this proposal. I feel like it will hurt kid's development. I have come around slowly on the Initiation half ice but do not see the need for it in Novice.

Sort of, understand small ice work etc. but moving second year players back to half ice again for games I struggle with.

Mixed thoughts. If doing it, just make it sooner rather than later. Full ice Jan. 1 would be my preference.

Only disagree with cross ice due to fact of losing opportunity to learn offside and thinking about where they are on ice. Worries it will limit the kids that can skate.

No...you will get unregistered tournaments, coach development, ref development, dressing room requirements, going backwards, all the comments made are need more practice not half ice, not good for natural ice.

Totally disagree. I.E. Associations are organized and have solid coaching at these levels the players will develop. There is a lot of development that can happen on full ice games with a solid practice plan and practice to game ratio.

I don't like the idea of a 2-year program where kids play ½ ice/full ice one year and then back to ½ ice for second year kids in season 2 again.

Yes

IP players coming up only know cross-ice so leave as cross ice for full year in Novice.

Yes, absolutely. The evidence speaks for it's self. More involved, more touches, more skill needed to succeed.

Do it NOW!

I think it is worth it. If we focus on puck touches would it be a good idea to play 4 on 4 and have teams of 8 or 9?

Yes, but as usual we are encountering the usual pushback from parents. The transition is a meeting point.

Yes, like anything it will be a tough sell.

I agree, I think it should be implemented earlier. I coach Initiation and have seen the improvements that come with modified half ice games.

I'm in favor. Sounds like it develops the kids faster.

Agreed!

I agree more touches of the puck. Disagree with skating not up to par. Would like to see the league start Jan 1 and no later.

Yes, I agree modified makes sense for skill development. Go to full ice after Christmas as a transition.

Like the proposal to transition to full ice at Jan. 1. Don't want this implemented until 2019/20.

If they do it, should be before Christmas/after Christmas.

I am not a fan of the transition. I enjoyed cross-ice Initiation and think Novice would be good as well, but all year.

I agree.

Yes, ½ ice till X-mas.

I agree.

Yes, I do.

Mixed feelings. Just don't want the kids who put everything into hockey to feel bad /

"ripped off". Agree with most of it.

I agree with the proposal.

Great idea.

It will be a struggle with some players/parents as we do not tier. Current issue with

better players dominating the games is real though.

Yes

I agree it would be better for development for kids.

I agree.

I only worry about expense.

I agree.

I think for Novice 3 its good.

Yes, but will get bad feedback from parents.

Yes, people will be opposed to changes but it's for the better, more ice, more attention

to skill even with bad coaching.

4. SHA Goaltending Initiative

What are your thoughts of the SHA Goaltending Initiative to train Goalie Instructors for MHA's and did/would you send someone in the future?

Great

Yes, would be interested in participating by sending someone.

I like the concept and would send someone if there is interest. I am not sure if anyone did attend.

Yes. Coaches find they don't know what to do with goalies for most of practices.

Good idea.

Think that sharing one between Associations is the way to go.

We did send someone and it helped some...likely need another as all of our Coaches need help.

Good but hard to find people to volunteer for these things.

We would send someone and need more people to teach.

Awesome idea and we definitely would send someone.

Much needed.

Did not send. Will try in the future.

Great idea.

Very good.

We sent a person and will use him. P.A. Hockey has already had a plan similar to this in place for a few years with positive results.

Think it's a good thing.

Yes, any extra info/knowledge is great.

We didn't send somebody due to time constraints but we did host "Mind the Net" goaltending camp throughout the season every second Sunday for the season.

Good idea.

We didn't send anyone, it was tough to find someone who wanted to do it. Also with Initiation, Novice, 1/2 Atom, 1/2 Peewee, Bantam girls and boys we only had 3 goalies in our Association.

Like it. Make Association more aware earlier in season. Last season was too late to find and send someone to the clinic.

Good way to improve goalies, we had a goalie instructor out to Turtleford this year.

It sounded good and wished we attended but timing did not work.

We have a goal tending program for our players. Would like to start putting our coaches out with them next year.

I like it, we are sending someone in the fall.

We will send someone next year.

Yes, we would.

Good idea. Need to host more so it's not too far to drive.

Our guy was busy but he will go next year. I like the idea.
Great idea, maybe more training/clinics would help. Yes, would try to send.
Very good idea as most teams and MHA's lack skilled goalie coaches.
Good idea, we already do this privately.
Have to get the right people to do it.
We would send someone for 18/19 season.
Yes, please have the training earlier in the year.
I'd like to yes. We need all the help we can get with goalies.
Great program. Run earlier.
We sent someone and we were happy with it.
Great idea...no.
Great idea and yes.
We've got local goalies that come out to work with our goalies. To give up time for coaches is hard to go to another clinic.
Great, I will be the rep for our MHA having sessions in September will help. I was busy this year and missed.
Excellent. We sent one, for next year we will be implementing goalie sessions 4-5 times throughout the season and see what the practice will be.
Positive
We already get guys out to help goalies and mentor coaches.
This is a good initiative, not many coaches know how to coach goaltenders.
It is a good initiative, we would consider sending someone if there was interest.
It is a great idea. We plan to have someone in place for 18/19.
Continue it, I would go.
Have a MHA for our Association need to help to have more resources. Always hear we have terrible goaltenders but the investment is always put on the parents, some cannot afford. Association/SHA need to invest at all levels.
Very good idea – we have one.
We did not send but we had a goalie program that we ran on Wednesdays.
Good and we are trying to put a plan together for next year.
Yes, we sent one last season and would again next season.
Love it! I will be bringing this up at our next board meeting. I will push for this next year.
Like it.
Yes
I think this is great if a community can find someone qualified to do it.
Good idea – will try and send someone.
Need to keep moving this initiative forward. It is critical to goalie engagement and retention.
Good initiative to use. We did not send anyone but we already hired a goalie trainer for our league.
I feel this is very needed. I would like to find someone for this.
Yes, we just could not make this seasons camps work.
Great idea.

It's great. For the most part goaltending is weak. As a coach I admit I'm not good at teaching goaltenders. If each community has someone training them the right way it would be a big help.

Not familiar with this.

It is something we may be interested in in the next year.

Good start, keep building.

We would consider sending some one to the next session.

Yes, as an Association we would like to see this continue.

I like this as we need to develop goalies and need the guys and coaches to do this.

I love it because I'm not a goalie.

Yes, and yes.

Very good, we sent 1 person to Davidson and he has set up goalie specific training times for our past season up to 6 goalies for 4 divisions.

Good, we do it with our goalies in Estevan.

This should be pushed hard for all hockey Associations.

Yes, we used an import goalie instructor in the past year and he made big progress in just a few visits.

Great idea, I like moving the date up before the season starts in most towns.

Like the idea. Could be beneficial for towns to share coach.

Like the idea of developing goalies and yes, we would send someone if the date is earlier than November.

Great idea. Would love to send a person to the clinic

Good

Great initiative – needs better advertising to get more people involved. Consider different dates.

Yes. I approached some of our parents in the past that were interested but had prior commitments.

We didn't send anyone but would send one in future.

We would send someone from our Association. It's definitely an area of weakness in our Association. Positive move!

Lampman will try mentor program this year.

Yes, this initiative is important. We would send someone, but timing and location are imperative.

Yes, the more info and initiatives the better.

I agree and hope it will be available going forward.

This is a huge must!! Will send someone in the future.

Great idea, we would send kids.

Great idea, no one from our Association could go this year but we are hoping they can this year.

Cautiously optimistic. My son is a goalie and it is very technical. Goalie instructor course would have to be very robust and result in very knowledgeable instructors. I see the value in having coaches for Novice/Atom especially. We would send someone.

Very much needed. Yes, we will be sending a couple.
Yes, we would. We have someone in our organization that would be interested.
I would like to send a representative. I think it's a good idea/as we need more focus on goaltenders/building a foundation.
This is great and already have taken advantage of this.

5. SHA Registration Regulations

Your Thoughts on players playing in Age Appropriate Divisions?

Yes, should be.
Agree
This is great, AP program allows for enough "playing up".
Good, too many times kids move up and it hurts their development, let them feel success with their peers.
Strongly agree.
Agree
Keep kids in their own age group.
If team registration is at risk, team must provide flexibility.
It's a good thought but may not be feasible in small centers of Female Leagues.
I think this should be implemented.
Must register in appropriate division.
Our Association supports this.
Agree, put/leave it in the Associations hands.
Guidelines are welcome, but not hard fast rules. There may be times when younger player is needed on a higher age team to make a team and Affiliation may not be adequate.
Registered team trumps AP team. Register for appropriate age only if a team is available of course and AP for up age.
Keep them in correct division unless excelling.
Agree, unless in older division that player can make an impact with the team.
Yes, with the exception of "exceptional status"
Yes, make kids play in their appropriate age divisions.
Yes, should have to register in their division and AP.
Yes, we already have this in our Constitution.
I think it would avoid a lot of conflict. I do see a place for it in smaller centres.
Agree
This should be age appropriate 100%.
Better players should be allowed to play up – it challenges them and helps them exceed as well as it allows the kids that are left on the team without the player moved up to step up and play a key role and touch puck more.

No

Yes

Local Associations should make the decision. Some kids (even at Novice) need to be more challenged.

I don't agree with setting guidelines on this. Small communities that can't tier their teams need their stronger kids to play up to be challenged and stay interested and to develop. If you're not policing overages, you shouldn't police underagers.

As long as there is an appropriate AP rule, this should not be an issue.

I think players should register and play in their appropriate divisions.

I feel they should play their age not being able to play down unless it 's your first year or health issue only.

In favour but with exceptions for elite exceptions.

Agree

Stay at own age.

I believe that kids should play in the appropriate age division unless an exceptional player.

We need to affiliate players in our Association because of low numbers.

Stay in age group.

That they should.

Players should play in appropriate levels unless they are assessed by a committee which agrees to push them down.

Play up yes – down no.

I agree with this in larger centers. Maybe not small towns that need to move kids to make a team.

Must play and develop in their respective group. If exceptional hopefully they can be AP'd.

The higher levels, Bantam, Midget, I can see because of tiered team potential, otherwise no limits.

Have to review case by case to keep player engaged.

Agree for the most part but there are going to be kids that dominate in their age group.

Absolute best.

Should always have been.

We do this.

These divisions were created for a reason.

I agree. However, I do think there should be some room for special players (exceptional) to move up.

Leaving it to each Association allows for the different situations that each one would encounter.

Should leave this up to MHA for various reasons.

Leave it in the hands of the Association, not mandated by SHA.

Need an exceptional player role.

We have a player acceleration policy in place and would prefer to not be dealing with this at all but see how in a certain few instances it can be a good thing. No, in rural hockey I think we should be able to move an advanced kid up. Age appropriate for sure but Associations just need to have better policies. Have policies in place.

Needs to be up to MHA's. Some smaller MHA's may need to do it.

They should play their own division, let kids be kids and be the best for a bit.

I personally like exceptions. Doesn't and shouldn't happen often.

Agree with this to a point.

The kids should stay in age groups unless needed for team numbers.

I think it makes sense unless your MHA needs a player to make numbers work.

Best to leave it to the discretion of each Association. Similar to the "exceptional player" status for female hockey is my preference.

Positive

We only allow a player to move up as exceptional player. One maybe two in last twenty years.

Semi agree. Don't want to put limitations on small towns if numbers are tight.

I think they should play age appropriate but be able to AP as needed for number of players.

Think it's a sensitive issue, smaller communities may rely on moving kids up.

Definitely is a reasonable regulation and solves issues with overzealous parents.

Don't think it would be good to set rules in stone because all Associations are different.

Absolutely unless they are deemed "Elite".

I like having AP's.

Good, but room to move up 1 age group. Register for whole year i.e. peewee signed as Bantam.

Should be up to Associations. There are times when it does make sense.

I think they should unless they are exceptional.

I think top players should be allowed to compete at the highest level they can.

Definitely age appropriate.

We do that already.

Register in appropriate age category.

Leave it to the Associations to govern.

Don't agree. Some should be able to stay down and others need to move up.

They should register in their age group.

Yes, where it works.

Age appropriate should be implemented but open to certain circumstances.

I think in most cases it only benefits the player to grow within his age group.

Yes, agree.

Good idea.

Agree

Good

Good, agree.

Agree

Only play in another division if you don't have the numbers.

Settling by Association.

Should be mandated.

I think we need to be flexible in smaller communities.

Agree

Agreed

Players should only play in their age group.

I think it's fine unless there is a situation where a lack of players in older division requires younger players to form a team.

Your Thoughts on the Affiliation Concepts Discussed?

Numerous Associations in the NE already do this.

No restriction to amount of games played but strict policies in place as to use.

Definitely need policies to govern affiliation.

Good

Agree

We have our own policy and it works well.

Agree

AP is good set by Association.

Agreed

These are fine.

Agree

Need regulations based on each Association's need.

Think this is community sensitive as well.

Up to each Association – good to know would have SHA backing.

Don't think it would be good to set in stone because all Associations are different.

Support Associations with guidelines and no hard rules.

Geography/Communities dictates the need.

No cap.

Good to have discussion.

Like the total number being 25 (registered and affiliates). Leave AA as is.

I like them as long as they are used for the right reasons. We implemented some new policies.

AP's are always important and should be allowed.

We have cap on games. Going to look at implementing only can be used if under a certain amount of players.

Give organization some form of direction and backing around # of affiliates, of games played.

Leave it to the Associations to govern.

Leave to each MHA.

The number of AP's would work best I think.

Again, individual Association decision with support available from SHA.

Again, leave up to MHA's to decide how to regulate. I like the idea of teams not allowed to AP unless i.e. less than 10 skaters.

Leave in the hands of Association not mandated by SHA.

Very good!

We have taken a different approach where we encourage AP's in our association.

Based on injuries and number I feel it is important to allow AP's.

I agree with most said just as long as affiliates are unlimited to move that we are regularly short.

I'd like to see a min # of players before AP's are called up <10 (2 full lines).

Have policies in place.

Never thought of affiliation those ways. Have always seen it as "extra ice" for those bubble kids from tier to tier.

There are always situations that require AP's. We have small teams and like having the option.

It is important to have each MHA develop and be consistent with their AP. I would like to hear more concepts like Redvers.

Leave to discretion of Associations.

Some good ideas to incorporate into our policy if we have issues with teams AP'ing players to often.

Might put in minimum player before you can AP.

Same as above...let the Associations govern AP's.

I think it should be left to Associations to put something in place if needed.

Needs to be up to each Association to decide what AP format is used.

No limits on games played. If the kid isn't challenged in his "appropriate" division we're not doing our job.

Have some in our Bylaws.

I do agree with a game limit in larger centers. Smaller centers don't always have a choice.

Kids and teams need AP scenario to succeed in smaller centers.

We already have policies in place.

Better to leave open for the smaller communities.

Would have trouble with a limited number of games due to the low number of kids.

I like this idea! I don't feel a number of games is necessary. We had 2 players on our Novice team quit and we AP'd an IP player for the entire year. If the coaches are using their AP in appropriate situations (sick, unavailable) then there would be no issue.

Don't like as it would eliminate many of our teams as we need AP's to have teams.

The ratio like 25 total – 18 registered and 7 AP is ok but I think Associations are trying to get SHA to do their dirty work.

We have this issue and need to make a policy.

Same as above – need AP's to make teams sometimes for the numbers.
Leave it alone. Let the coaches decide who and how many they need to help their team. Small towns depend on AP's to field a team in each age group. In rural areas, AP's are in my opinion used on a needs basis so tough to limit this. AP should only be used if you have missing kids off your roster. I feel for our Association this would hurt as some years we need them to make a team or when some go on holidays during a break and we have a game not to be short of players, or if someone gets hurt. I don't think there should be any regulation on games. In small towns their quite often situations where we need then to make a team.

Agree

I agree with Affiliation if numbers are low. I don't agree with taking other kids ice time.

Should have a game limit and if that is surpassed you are to move up to that higher team.

No affiliation

AP the ones that your team needs.

Swift Current Minor hockey has established guidelines for AP's. Certain criteria must be met.

If needed.

Love it. Swift Current Minor hockey has the rules in place for this.

Only if short handed.

I don't think there needs to be any restrictions provincially, each Association can make own policy.

Don't like as it would eliminate many of our teams as we need AP's to have teams.

The ratio like 25 total – 18 registered and 7 AP is ok but I think Associations are trying to get SHA to do their dirty work.

We have this issue and need to make a policy.

Same as above – need AP's to make teams sometimes for the numbers.
Leave it alone. Let the coaches decide who and how many they need to help their team. Small towns depend on AP's to field a team in each age group. In rural areas, AP's are in my opinion used on a needs basis so tough to limit this. AP should only be used if you have missing kids off your roster. I feel for our Association this would hurt as some years we need them to make a team or when some go on holidays during a break and we have a game not to be short of players, or if someone gets hurt. I don't think there should be any regulation on games. In small towns their quite often situations where we need then to make a team.

Agree

I agree with Affiliation if numbers are low. I don't agree with taking other kids ice time.

Should have a game limit and if that is surpassed you are to move up to that higher team.

No affiliation

AP the ones that your team needs.

Swift Current Minor hockey has established guidelines for AP's. Certain criteria must be met.

If needed.

Love it. Swift Current Minor hockey has the rules in place for this.

Only if short handed.

I don't think there needs to be any restrictions provincially, each Association can make own policy.

Not at end of year in playoffs unless injuries occur. Player being pulled up and regular kids not playing.

Agree

Should be a limit at each MHA level.

Small towns need AP's to help out. Let each Association set AP rules.

Agree with the rule of only letting players AP if less than 9 skaters.

AP a player only if coach thinks they are capable and the team has less than 9 skaters.

I like capping the number of AP's and players a team can register.

Huge headache for Weyburn. Must standardize.

Rules around AP's are definitely needed!!

I think this should be implemented

Leave it up to Leagues

Our Association has already had our issues in the AP program. Any structure in AP's is a good thing.

Agree

Guidelines welcome. Small town rinks with teams with small numbers would welcome guidance. This would dissipate over-use of Affiliates and help rationalize use. When to use an Affiliate (re: if less than 9 skaters) would be helpful.

Would ask the Minor Associations to govern accordingly.

Should be able to affiliate and I don't want to see any restrictions.

Yes, to all. Exceptions for small communities granted through concession process.

AP's are needed in small communities to make our teams survive.

Yes, but as a small Association we do need AP's only for numbers aspect.

Caps on games played, # of players could hurt our Association. I also think the manipulation needs to stop so any rules should accommodate Associations with small numbers.

Yes, we already have this in our Association.

Would like it adopted by SHA so local organizations are all doing the same thing.

Agree

6. Playing Rules – Thoughts on the Proposal of changing the Playing Rule regarding the Major Penalty/Injury situation for all of Hockey to match what currently exists in Junior?

Yes, for sure.

This is a must.

Works well in Junior, it is a great idea.

Will be tough for younger officials to keep track of – could work AA Bantam and up – like no change icing.

Great initiative to promote player safety and sportsmanship.

Like the idea to stop the embellishment.

Put it in place.

Good

Positive step.

Yes

Do it.

Don't like it. It's only 5 minutes, not going to change much.

Good idea!

Great addition; could even expand to any player causing a delay in game, even if a major penalty is not assessed.

Agree that hurt player should sit for 5 minutes.

Would like to see the minimum, 5 minutes "sit-out" time for injured player.

Agreed, like the idea to prevent players from diving and duking refs!

Great idea!!

Yes, Yes, Yes, seen too many kinds fake an injury and then are out next shift.

Sounds reasonable.

I think it's a good idea.

Yes.

Yes, I think it would eliminate player laying on the ice to draw a penalty.

Agree

Makes sense

Like it and would like to see time longer than 5 plus refs need to do a better job making sure 5-minute penalties are required.

I love this idea but think penalties should be a 2min and a 10.

Good

I saw it as the "hurt" kid causing a major then really wasn't hurt at all. Giving them, 5 min is a good idea.

Agree with the 5-min major if an injured player is laying on the ice, they should have to sit out for the duration of the penalty served. (5min)

Great idea.

I like the change. I feel the kid should have to sit out not only for creating stoppage but for safety as well for a trainer to have time to look at him fully not just pass if off.

Yes, that be good. I believe I heard something about timing that you should look into.

In favour.

Yes, agree.

I agree with the change.

Agree

It's a good rule.

Great rule.

Like it.

Yes, I believe that this is a good rule.

I think this rule should be implemented.

Good idea.

I like the not playing for 5 min if injured.

Like it.

Support it 100%.

Yes, very good change.

It is a good idea.

I like it. Keeps the kids honest.

Great rule changes.

Good idea.

To me that player if hurt should be sent off for "10" minutes.

Great idea.

Like it – it's basic player safety if he/she is hurt he/she should sit.

I love this rule!

Great idea across all age groups, will need more support for younger officials to have confidence to execute.

100% agree to avoid the embellishment of injury. This will speed up the game and ensure no one is crying wolf!

Great idea.

About time.

Full agreement.

Yes, I believe these rules will do well to discourage flopping and discourage staying on the ice.

Agree, it will give players more accountability to their action. It will reduce the fake injury.

Great idea.

Great idea.

Like it.

Great idea, would hopefully allow coaches to not teach kids to dive.

Fine with this.

Agree!

I agree with these changes.

Great.

Yes, great idea.

Agree.
Good idea.
Like this a lot.
I think it is a good idea.
Agree
I agree with the sit out 5 minutes if the guy is kicked out and assigned a major.
I like it, may be hard to police.
Undecided.
I find if a kid fakes being hurt, he targets himself for retribution from the other team.
Like it. The penalty for the injured player coming on the ice during the power play should be 2 and 10.
It makes sense, might be tough for young officials.
I would support this.
Agree with the changes.
I would like to see a timed penalty assessed as well.
Agree with injured players staying off ice until penalty is served.
No comment.
Agree.
I agree with making the rule apply to minor hockey.
Seems complicated.
Not sure if it is really an issue for Minor in the lower age levels but maybe in older divisions.
I think it is a good idea.
Yes – if they hurt they should sit a few to make sure they are ok. Safety 1st.
Will be difficult to enforce as younger officials will not assess major penalties.
Like the idea but share concerns with others about regulating it.
I see potential, but need to put some additional thoughts into it.
No opinion.
Good rule.
Don't like below Midget.
Do it for Novice and Atom so they don't lay on the ice.
This would work.
Can't comment.
No! Opposed, not enough paper to write down all the cons, and not currently a big issue from what I see.

7. Any Other Comments on any Topic?

Just feel too much is being "bubble wrapped" so just don't want the game to get lost. I feel things are heading in a good direction.
Don't like the head contact penalty. We really need to change it. Things like high sticking, elbows should be called as is, not head contact.
Common sense needs to prevail.

Would like some guidance on hosting area based teams. I.E. Midwest girls with local kids and rural board.

Good meeting, thanks.

All good.

Look at making mandatory rule that no player in Novice can play more than 25% of their games as a goalie. Encouraging more players to start/try to play goalie. Thanks for the update.

I still believe an occasional "full ice" game to see how the kids skate. There is a definite "bump" in speed and agility to compete for the puck by chasing each other at full speed.

CFB – making it easier for officials to make the calls.

I think everything goes back to having good, knowledgeable coaches! We had a situation this year where all the "regular" knowledgeable coach's kids all made AA in Atom. There were no coaches left so thankfully some Dads stepped up, however they had never coached before and there were problems. I think we need to choose our AA teams earlier, and then there be more training for coaches – depending on the level they will coach.

Like anything that will help young officials be confident. Try the card system but train the young ones well to be confident and don't take crap from coaches.

Refs have yellow and red cards into Atom and Peewee age to help with confidence. It is a no-nonsense way for parents or coaches to know if they get this card they are out or close to out and the verbal abuse would maybe stop somewhat??

Amongst SHA there seems to be more initiative to develop elite players that the grass roots type player. Most kids won't become elite let's focus more on them. Develop a card system for young officials to remove disrespectful coaches in Atom and Peewee divisions.

Concerned that a Bantam AA Female team that wins a Midget AA league has the opportunity to play for a Midget AA provincial title.

For IP and Novice, needs to be a "whistle blower"/policing structure to monitor this. I can rattle off 5-10 communities that just don't use cross/half ice the way it is intended.

Need to take away the great big hits in Midget/Bantam House hockey. Elbowing, charging, boarding, hit to the heat etc...

More coach's clinics in our zone.

Can Provincials be moved to start earlier to make scheduling easier around playoffs and Provincial finals.

Reffing needs to be addressed. I have no idea how you go about it, but I see too many refs deciding the outcome of the game.