

Question From Julie VanHartingsveldt - There is a reported \$21,000 deficit. What exactly caused that shortfall, and what specific steps are being taken this year to prevent it from growing?

Answer: The deficit reported in 2024 of \$20,753, was reported to the membership during our 2024 AGM, by our previous treasurer. **Below is the explanation provided by our previous treasurer of where that loss occurred.**

Our profit / loss for the year was (\$20,753), indicating a loss.

However, this 'loss' should be viewed as one component, with the two tournament proceeds removed from it. We held two successful tournaments again this year, and each had a profit. The total profit for both tournaments was \$45,143. If we deduct this from our 'loss', we see an operational loss of \$85,896.

This loss however is actually a **reflection of two elements**: the first spending against 'One Time Budgets', these are annual budgets that utilize previous years profits, largely coming from these profitable tournaments. One Time Budget spending this past fiscal allowed us to have the following:

- Mental Toughness training for the Rep program
- Software to support Rep Tryouts
- Boardroom refurbishment
- Funding HL Goalie discounts and Subsidizing the player fees in HL
- Queen of the House entry fees for the top HL teams, and end of year celebrations for HL programs
- Running the First Shift program
- Significant Accounting works
- Legal support

One Time Budget spending was \$52,447 against a budget of almost \$66,000.

The second element to the overall 'loss' represents a revenue shortfall in HL. In years where teams have less than the budgeted volume of players, we result in a revenue shortfall, and the remaining \$13,000 and change is a result of where spending could not be adjusted enough to account for this shortfall. We are working on steps to account for this in future and mitigate its effect.

Summary: the Board worked diligently with its established Budget, and the result is a net loss in the fiscal year within our cash flow position. We maintain a positive cash flow, allowing us again to plan for One Time Budgets to invest back into our association.

Question From Julie VanHartingsveldt - Rep fees went up \$300–\$400 per player this season, but team development dropped from \$7,000 down to \$3,000. Where is the extra money going?

Answer:

Not all teams experienced a \$300 - \$400 increase in fees this year. The following outlines the reasons for this season's changes:

1. Fee Structure Adjustment:

In previous seasons, REP fees were calculated by averaging costs across teams. This allowed similar divisions to pay the same, for example 13BB paid the same fees as 15BB. This approach led to some teams overpaying while others underpaid relative to their actual costs. To improve simplicity and transparency, the Association moved to a team-specific cost model. Teams seeing a greater increase this year is partially because they were underpaying in previous years.

2. Ice Time Billing Risk:

In previous seasons, additional ice time purchased by REP teams beyond what was budgeted, was paid upfront by the Association. The Association would invoice teams in December and at the end of the season. This is a significant risk to the Association as it relied on teams to maintain sufficient account balances. Over \$60,000 was invoiced at the end of last season to recover these costs.

3. Budget Realignment for 2025-26

To mitigate this risk, the Association reviewed last year's total ice hours (budgeted plus additional time purchased) and increased the ice time allocation within the budget. To maintain registration fees similar to last year, we offset this increase by reducing the development costs. Within each REP team's budget, we encouraged teams to reduce

their budget for additional ice (now covered by Association fees) and increase their budget for development.

Question From Julie VanHartingsveldt - Your financials show revenue over \$1 million. Under ONCA that requires a full audit, not just a review engagement. Why wasn't an audit done?

Answer:

A review engagement was completed for the 2024–25 fiscal year based on a motion passed at last year's Annual General Meeting (AGM) and in keeping with our historical practice. Following further review of the Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act (ONCA), we consulted our Accountant, who provided the following clarification:

“As a non-public benefit corporation with annual revenue exceeding \$500,000, you are permitted under ONCA to conduct a review engagement instead of a full audit, provided that members pass an extraordinary resolution to waive the audit requirement.”

Review engagements offer a moderate level of assurance through analytical procedures and inquiries, and are less extensive and costly than audits. The review engagement for 2024–25 was completed at a cost of \$7,345. A full audit would likely cost twice that amount due to the additional work involved.

To continue with a review engagement in future years, members must approve an extraordinary resolution—meaning at least 80% of votes cast at a duly convened members' meeting must support waiving the audit, or all members must consent in writing.

Please note: If a full audit is required in future years, the additional cost will be reflected in increased registration fees to ensure the organization can meet its financial obligations while maintaining transparency and compliance.

Question From Julie VanHartingsveldt - I've reviewed the minutes, and there's no record of any budget planning or. Has a 2024–25 budget actually been approved, and if so, when?

Answer: The 2024-25 budget was approved on May 14, 2024 by the CGHA.

Question From Julie VanHartingsveldt - Teams are billed for about 130 hours of ice. If those hours aren't delivered, will families be refunded or will unused ice just get dumped at the end of the season when it doesn't benefit the players?

Answer: Remaining ice will be allocated starting in January and continue through the end of the season for all teams up to provincials. The association will make every effort to allocate the full amount of ice time within the approved budget. This may include booking ice outside of Clarington facilities if necessary.

Standard seasonal rules remain in effect: once ice has been assigned, it is the team's responsibility to find alternate users if they choose not to use it.

In the event that the ice portion of the association fees cannot be fully utilized, the unused amount will be refunded to the team account - minus any outstanding fees owed to CGHA, if applicable.

Question From Julie VanHartingsveldt - In the past year's minutes, I didn't see a single declared conflict of interest, even though decisions directly affected teams where board members' kids play. Why aren't conflicts being declared or documented?

Answer: We want to clarify how our organization handles conflicts of interest at the board level.

When a board member has a conflict of interest — for example, when a decision directly affects a team their child is involved with — they do not participate in the vote. These members are marked as having abstained in the meeting minutes.

That said, we recognize that simply recording abstentions doesn't fully reflect the nature of the conflicts. To improve transparency, we've created a **master list of declared conflicts**. This list is maintained by the secretary of the CGHA and helps ensure that all conflicts are clearly identified and managed in a consistent and accountable way.

We are committed to continually improving our governance practices and appreciate your trust and engagement.

Question From Kyle Brown - Is there any movement on non parent that are highly qualified proper payment

DW U15AA \$50,000

Scarborough U15AA- \$40,000

Just wondering if Clarington plans attracting high quality coaches with payment such as those teams/centres?

Answer: The Clarington Girls Hockey Association (CGHA) is committed to providing a high-quality development environment for all athletes. As part of that commitment, the CGHA has recently introduced honorariums and expense coverage for non-parent coaches at the competitive (AA) level.

While we recognize the value of experienced, qualified coaches, the compensation figures being referenced from other centers are believed to be overstated, based on discussions with those associations. To date, there is no verified information confirming that individual head coaches at the U13AA, U15AA, or U18AA levels are being paid \$40,000–\$50,000 by any single division.

At this time, Clarington does not offer compensation at that level. Instead, we focus on:

- Providing reasonable, board-approved compensation based on qualifications and team level
- Ensuring funding comes directly from parent/player fees, not general association operating budgets
- Maintaining a balance between attracting strong coaching talent and keeping programs financially accessible for families

The CGHA will continue to review its coaching support model annually, with the goal of enhancing program quality while remaining fiscally responsible.

Question From Boris Witlarge - We're interested in knowing what work is being undertaken by the Flames to ensure diverse representation and opportunities for all, in alignment with the Hockey Canada report released in 2023 titled EDI: path forward, our commitment to action. There appears to be a current policy in place that references various gender and sexuality identities but little mention of other protected grounds such as race.

Answers:

The CGHA is deeply committed to fostering equity, diversity, and inclusion throughout our hockey community. As part of our evolving EDI strategy, we are actively working with key community partners to ensure that our BIPOC athletes are empowered with the tools, mentorship, and visibility they need to thrive both on and off the ice.

We are currently in discussions with **Black Girl Hockey Club** to host a **special event exclusively for our BIPOC players**, as well as players from other local associations aimed at creating a safe and inspiring space for development, connection, and mentorship. This initiative will serve as a platform for our athletes to learn from others who have navigated similar experiences within the hockey world, helping them build confidence and a sense of belonging.

In addition, we are exploring **mentorship opportunities** that connect our players with **racialized and underrepresented athletes** who can share lived experience, guidance, and encouragement.

Looking ahead to the **spring and summer season**, we are looking at opportunities with both **Black Girl Hockey Club** and **Hockey Equality** to provide players and families with valuable resources and information about their ongoing programs — including training opportunities, development pathways, and access to broader support networks.

Through these partnerships, CGHA reaffirms our commitment to creating **inclusive and representative hockey spaces**, where all players — regardless of background — can feel seen, supported, and empowered to reach their potential.

Question From Brad Cooper - Curious if there has been any discussion at the OMHA about eliminating the 2 year age cohort?

Answer: There has been no information provided by the OWH, which governs the CGHA about eliminating the 2 year age cohort.

Question From Sean McMahon -How can we build an association to help families make hockey house league and competitive hockey more affordable. I understand buying red helmets and gloves and new jerseys etc is part of the rep program but is there a way to provide affordability to this change.

Answer: Hockey is a wonderful sport, but we recognize that it comes with significant costs—from equipment to ice time and programming. As an association, we are always looking for ways to make hockey more affordable and accessible for our families.

The CGHA is a non-profit organization and does **not** make money from our players' registration fees. All funds collected go directly toward the cost of operating our hockey programs, which include both House League and Representative teams.

To provide some transparency, here are a few key examples of the expenses involved in running the CGHA:

- **Ice Costs:** Approximately **\$700,000** for the current season.
- **Insurance:** Roughly **\$8,784 per team** (House League or Rep), covering players and staff.
- **Team Entry Fees:** [Insert amount or explanation here.]

These are just a few of the essential costs required to deliver a safe, organized, and competitive hockey experience for all our participants.

House League Program

We are actively pursuing sponsorship opportunities to help **offset the overall cost** of our House League programming. In addition, we are working closely with vendors to reduce the cost of **skill development sessions**, so that we can continue to provide **high-quality training** at a more manageable price point for families.

Representative Program – Uniform Transition

When the Board made the decision to transition to **red helmets, gloves, and jerseys** for our Representative teams, we did so with **careful consideration** of the financial impact on families. That's why the change will not be mandatory until the **2026–27 season**, giving teams a full year to plan and prepare.

While some teams have already chosen to adopt the new look this season, many have used **fundraising initiatives** to help cover the associated costs.

Our Ongoing Commitment

Affordability remains a top priority for the CGHA. We are committed to exploring every possible avenue to support our families, reduce costs, and eliminate barriers to participation—because every child deserves the opportunity to play.

Question from Sean McMahon - I have a question about invites to Show Cases for our Rep players/teams. Can you touch on how this works and how certain associations get chosen to attend over other associations and stipulations on why and how this works?

Answer: For the most part, showcase tournaments sanctioned by the OWHHA and held during the regular season are designed for AA-level Rep teams, specifically at the U13AA, U15AA, U18AA, and U22 Elite levels. These tournaments are limited in number and are intended to provide exposure for players to provincial, national, college, and university scouts and coaches.

Entry into these showcase events is highly competitive. Many of the available spots are filled by the same associations year after year, making it challenging for new or returning teams to gain access.

Once our AA coaches are named, the CGHA reaches out to the organizers of these showcase tournaments to introduce the coach to the tournament director. From there, the head coach or team manager expresses interest in participating and submits an application or request.

Selection criteria can vary significantly between tournaments. In some cases, it may seem unclear why certain teams are chosen over others. In others, organizers may prioritize:

- Associations with a history of prior participation
- Strong team or program performance
- Competitiveness relative to the rest of the tournament field

Many showcase tournaments also have long-standing waitlists, which adds another layer of difficulty for teams trying to gain entry—especially if they’ve lost their spot from a previous season.

We remain committed to pursuing every opportunity to showcase our AA-level talent and will continue to advocate for our teams’ participation in these valuable events.

Question from Steve Farmer - I heard 1/2 ice was being reconsidered, is that still the case?

Answer: At this time, Hockey Canada has not issued any direction—through our governing body, the OWHa—that they are moving away from the U9 Pathway model, which includes the use of half-ice play.

We continue to follow the U9 development guidelines as outlined by Hockey Canada and the OWHa, which are designed to support age-appropriate skill development, increased puck touches, and overall engagement at the grassroots level.

It is our understanding that the OMHA has applied for special permission from Hockey Canada to only participate on half ice until November for their U9 program, in an effort to prevent losing players to the “outlaw leagues”, where they do not follow the Hockey Canada pathways. Further, we have received no direction from the OWHa that they have looked at applying for any special permission.

Question from Aaron Pudlis - What are you doing to attract new goalies into the association at all levels?

Answer: We have seen a decrease in goalies, not only within the CGHA but across our neighbouring associations.

These are some of the ideas that the CGHA currently have in place or looking at implementing.

1. Lower the Barrier to Entry

- **Advertising our free goalie gear programs:** We currently have multiple sets of goalie equipment that can be loaned out to players who want to try the position without a big financial commitment.
 - **"Try Goalie" days:** Host events where players can put on the pads and get a feel for the position in a no-pressure environment.
 - **Reduced registration fees:** Offer discounts or incentives for new goalies in our house league program.
-

2. Specialized Training & Development

- **Dedicated goalie coaches:** Ensure goalie development is taken seriously at all levels with access to trained goalie coaches.
 - **Goalie-specific clinics:** Offer free or low-cost clinics to develop skills and build confidence.
 - **Early exposure:** Introduce goaltending fundamentals during early development programs (e.g., U7/U9) so more kids can explore the position.
-

3. Recognition and Retention

- **Mentorship programs:** Pair younger or new goalies with older, experienced ones to build confidence and connection.
-

4. Clear Development Pathways

- **Transparent goalie pathways:** Show how goalies can progress through the association, from grassroots to elite levels.
 - **Exposure to higher levels:** Bring in junior, college, or pro goalies to speak or run clinics, helping younger goalies see the future possibilities.
-

5. Culture and Support

- **Coach education:** Train team coaches to better understand goalie development and integrate goalies into practices effectively.
 - **Parental engagement:** developing a focus group of our current goalie parents to improve on the importance of the position and how to support goalie development.
 - **Mental skills training:** Provide resources for the mental side of goaltending — confidence, resilience, and focus.
-

Question from Aaron Pudlis - Can the houseleague evaluations be provided to head coaches once all numbers are tallied for transparency?

Answer:

The CGHA supports the provision of providing structured skater evaluations to coaches, delivered in a controlled and confidential setting to ensure that all players are protected and treated equitably.

These evaluations are intended to:

- Provide constructive feedback that supports player development,
- Maintain transparency and consistency in player assessments,

- Protect players from unnecessary pressure or public comparison, and
- Support coaches in making informed decisions in alignment with CGHA's values.

Evaluations will not be shared publicly or discussed in open forums. Coaches can receive this information through designated channels and in formats approved by the association to maintain player privacy, dignity, and psychological safety.

Question from Kate Nolte - What is the league's policy regarding mouth guards? Is it the same as the OMHA?

Answer:

The Ontario Women's Hockey Association (OWHA) does not currently mandate the use of mouthguards. However, at CGHA, we fully support any parent or guardian who chooses to have their player wear a mouthguard as an added layer of protection.

While we do not have an official mouthguard policy in place, players are welcome to wear one during practices and games. If a player chooses to wear a mouthguard, it must be worn properly — securely in the mouth and not hanging out or being chewed on — in accordance with game regulations. Improper use may result in a penalty at the discretion of the officials.

We encourage families to make the decision that feels right for their player's safety and comfort.

Question From Stephen Guluzian - Why do we allow some parent coaches to coach every season their daughter is in hockey? I understand that all potential coaches are 'interviewed' for the position but wouldn't it be in the associations and player's best interest to change it up so that all players (especially the ones in the ones in the same age group as the coaches child) have an opportunity to experience different coaching styles and for further development? Why isn't there a limit to the number of years a parent is allowed to coach as there have been limits placed on other parents volunteering their time in other areas?

Answer:

The CGHA selects coaches through an application and interview process each season. All coaching candidates, including parent coaches, are evaluated based on their qualifications, experience, commitment to development, and how well they align with the values and goals of the association.

Here's why some parent coaches may be selected year after year:

1. **Consistency and Development:** Consistency in coaching can be beneficial for team development, especially if the coach has a proven track record of fostering player growth, good team culture, and positive relationships with families.
2. **Volunteer Commitment:** Coaching is a significant time and energy commitment. Many parent coaches go above and beyond, attending clinics, planning practices, and investing in their coaching development. That dedication can weigh heavily in their favor during selection.
3. **Fair Selection Process:** Even when a parent coach has served multiple years, they must still reapply and be evaluated against other candidates each season. If they continue to be selected, it's usually because they remain the strongest candidate for the role at that time.

Why There Isn't a Term Limit on Parent Coaches

While some volunteer roles may have term limits to allow broader participation, coaching is often approached differently. Unlike committee positions, coaching directly impacts player safety, development, and game performance. Limiting a coach's involvement based solely on tenure could mean losing someone highly skilled without a better alternative in place.

That said, we agree it's valuable for players to experience different coaching styles. The association encourages assistant coach development, mentorship, and ongoing evaluation to support diverse coaching perspectives and succession planning where possible.

Terms conditions, typically on the boys side of hockey is for both parent and non-parent coaches.

What We're Working On

The CGHA continues to explore ways to make the coaching selection process more transparent and to build a deeper bench of future coaches—especially non-parent volunteers—so that all players benefit from a range of experiences and coaching philosophies.

We welcome constructive feedback and invite parents interested in coaching or volunteering to get involved in shaping the program for the future.

Question From Gavin Campbell - Why was a complete team from Whitby allowed to come to Clarington? Does this not go against the import policy of 3-4 for a t3 u18 team? Why were they not at any of the tryouts outside of u18B but then not selected for that team but a team that did not exist on the Clarington page but was already made prior to tryouts? Would it not been better served to stay loyal to current players and add additional rep teams such as at u13 for resisters to play and adjust older age times to compensate. This is part of the reason so many players have left as their loyalty is challenged and have no other choice but to look else where to get a fair shot at the level they should be playing at.

Answer:

We understand that recent changes have led to frustration and confusion, especially for long-time CGHA families who feel a strong sense of loyalty to our association. Please know that your concerns are heard, and we remain committed to clarity, fairness, and the continued development of all our players.

When the idea of adding another U18 team was first brought forward, it was not a decision made lightly. As an executive board, we carefully considered several important factors:

- **Impact on our current players**
- **Availability of ice time**
- **Our association's capacity to support another team**

After thorough discussion and consideration, we agreed to move forward with adding not just one, but **two U18 teams**. This decision was rooted in our desire to avoid displacing any existing CGHA players while also managing the ongoing challenge of ice allocation—especially for late-night slots that are difficult to assign under current OWHA guidelines.

In making this decision, we also voted to make a **one-time exception** to allow a full team to join our association. These players will remain import players for the 2026-27 season. This was done to help balance ice use and minimize disruptions to our current teams.

We have worked tirelessly with the Municipality of Clarington and our Youth Organization Partners to advocate for earlier and more balanced ice times. While we've made progress, we still face limitations that directly impact our ability to expand, particularly at younger age levels. Unfortunately, the lack of consistently available ice at the right times prevented us from adding teams in our younger age groups this season without negatively affecting the teams already in place.

Despite these challenges, we are proud to currently roster a minimum of three teams at most age levels, with the exception of U9. With open borders in girls' hockey, some player movement is inevitable. During this season's tryouts, we saw a large number of players from other organizations, outside of this group of players, which did displace some players. However, what we *can* do is focus on what makes CGHA a place where players want to stay and grow:

- **High-quality coaching**
- **Strong player development programs**
- **Meaningful opportunities for advancement and growth**

Question: We had **several members** ask a variation of the question- is CGHA considering a Junior Team and further about a previous draft proposal that was sent to Oshawa Girls Hockey Association (OGHA) to consider an amalgamation. Is there still an intention to pursue it?

Answer:

It is the understanding of the current CGHA Executive that a draft proposal involving an amalgamation with the OGHA took place prior to 2023, before the majority of the current board members began their terms. This matter has **not** been a topic of discussion between the current Executive and the OGHA. Additionally, we have found no documentation related to these previous discussions. However, we are actively reaching out to former board members to gain clarity and better understand what, if anything, was agreed upon at that time.

The previous CGHA Executive had begun exploring the possibility of establishing a Junior program and had taken initial steps in that direction. We have since been informed by the OWHHA that they are currently reviewing and restructuring the requirements for Junior programs, with updated criteria expected to be released later this season.

As your current Executive, we remain committed to this goal and are continuing the work toward preparing a strong and successful bid for a future Junior program within CGHA.