

## **CGHA Response to Motion 1: Transparent Criteria and Documentation for Rejection of Team Officials**

### **Motion Summary:**

Motion 1 proposes that CGHA adopt a formal policy requiring clear, written justification for the rejection of any nominated team official (e.g., Assistant Coach, Manager, Trainer, Co-Signer, Room Parent). The policy calls for transparency, consistency, and protection against personal bias, and it appropriately excludes Head Coach roles, which are governed by a separate, formal selection process.

---

### **Board Position: Motion Supported in Principle**

The CGHA Board supports this motion in principle and recognizes the importance of ensuring that:

- Coaches are supported by qualified, trusted individuals.
- Volunteer decisions are made free from personal bias and grounded in policy.
- All team staff receive clear, timely communication regarding their status and eligibility.

This motion aligns with our commitment to fairness, transparency, and volunteer recognition — and we appreciate the call to formalize practices that protect both our members and the integrity of the association.

---

### **Current Practice & Identified Gaps**

In practice, CGHA already follows many of the standards outlined in the motion. We:

- Require police checks, Respect in Sport certification, and any applicable qualifications.
- Disqualify individuals with documented disciplinary action or those failing screening.
- Define conflicts of interest that may compromise team oversight.
- Expect Board votes to be recorded and decisions to be communicated appropriately.

However, we acknowledge that not all of these practices are currently captured in a formal written policy, especially following past bylaw revisions. We agree that this should be addressed.

## Next Steps & Implementation Plan

To uphold the intent of this motion, the CGHA Board will take the following actions:

### 1. Formal Policy Development

We will draft and adopt a clear, standalone policy that includes:

- Published eligibility criteria for team officials (to be posted annually by April 1);
- Defined grounds for disqualification, including:
  - Documented disciplinary action;
  - Failure to meet screening, certification, or legal requirements;
  - Conflicts of interest (e.g., financial or inappropriate personal relationships);
- A standardized rejection notification process, including:
  - Written rationale citing CGHA, OWHA, or OHF policy;
  - Confirmation of a formal Board vote recorded in the minutes;
  - Written notice provided to both the Head Coach and the nominee within 5 business days.

### 2. Immediate Application for the 2026–2027 Season

As stated in the motion, these principles will be applied to all team official nominations for the 2026–27 season. Where applicable, we will also align with the motion's intent for the 2025–26 season, ensuring fairness and clarity in any pending staff decisions.

---

## Our Commitment to Volunteers

Volunteers are the heart of our association. This motion helps strengthen our commitment to:

- Consistency in how decisions are made;

- Transparency for those offering their time and skills; and
- Protecting the integrity of team operations and oversight.

## **CGHA Response to Motion 2: Establishment of an Independent Disciplinary Review Committee (IDRC)**

### **Motion Summary:**

Motion 2 proposes the creation of an Independent Disciplinary Review Committee (IDRC) to oversee formal complaints involving CGHA members, coaches, and volunteers. The committee would be composed of non-Board members, with authority to review complaints independently, and to make recommendations to the Board based on applicable policies and procedures.

---

### **Board Position: Supported in Principle**

The CGHA Board supports this motion in principle and acknowledges the importance of strengthening trust, fairness, and consistency in how complaints and disciplinary matters are managed. We appreciate the thoughtful structure, clear mandate, and intent to ensure impartiality and transparency is maintained in CGHA processes.

We agree that this motion addresses a critical area of governance and member confidence — and are committed to working toward a model that balances independence with legal responsibility and operational feasibility.

---

### **Key Considerations for Implementation**

While the Board supports the spirit of the motion, several practical and legal components must be addressed before implementation:

---

#### **1. Selection & Election Process**

Electing members “from the floor” at the AGM may not ensure the most qualified or available individuals are appointed. We recommend:

- A member-wide call for applications
- A neutral screening process (including non-Board members)
- Final ratification by member vote, ensuring transparency and trust

---

## 2. Legal & Compliance Requirements

As an incorporated nonprofit governed by ONCA, and a sanctioned member of OWHA and Hockey Canada, CGHA must ensure that all complaint-handling processes:

- Comply with legal standards
  - Align with insurance and risk management requirements
  - Protect both the complainant and respondent's rights
  - Adhere to policies already established by CGHA and our governing bodies
- 

## 3. Training & Confidentiality

IDRC members will be tasked with handling sensitive and high-stakes matters. As such, CGHA would require:

- Mandatory training in conduct review, procedural fairness, and confidentiality
  - A signed Conflict of Interest Disclosure
  - A Confidentiality Agreement
  - A defined Code of Conduct specific to IDRC participation
- 

## 4. Final Authority & Accountability

We respectfully disagree with limiting Board discretion. However, we believe that disciplinary oversight should be a partnership — one that meaningfully includes general members through an independent and clearly defined review process.

As per ONCA and OWHA policies, the CGHA Board must retain final legal responsibility for any disciplinary or conduct decisions. This is a legal and fiduciary obligation.

That said, we fully support the requirement that if the Board does not accept an IDRC recommendation, a written rationale must be provided. This rationale must be based on:

- CGHA, OWHA, or Hockey Canada policy
- Legal or insurance-related advice

- Transparent and documented reasoning

This approach ensures:

- Accountability from the Board
  - Inclusion of member voice
  - Transparency in how decisions are made
- 

#### Next Steps: Collaborative Implementation Plan

To ensure this motion is implemented properly and in alignment with our obligations and values, the Board recommends the following timeline:

##### By October 15, 2025: Form a Working Group

- Call for members to participate in working group
- Comprised of CGHA members, Board reps, and external advisors
- Mandate: Refine the structure, process, and policies governing the IDRC

##### Benchmark & Consult

- Review models from other sports organizations
- Consult legal and OSHA advisors to ensure compliance and reduce liability

##### By December 1, 2025: Present Final Proposal for Member Vote

- Via Special General Meeting (SGM) or secure electronic vote for the make up of the IDRC, which will be made up of Members of the CGHA and Board Members
- Includes finalized terms of reference, training requirements, and structure

## **CGHA Response to Motion 3: Review of Fourth U18 Rep Team**

### **Motion Summary:**

That the approval of the fourth U18 representative team be immediately paused pending full transparency and compliance review.

### **Conditions for Pause:**

- Disclosure of:
  - Board motion and vote count approving the team
  - Coaching selection process documentation
  - Tryout/evaluation process details
  - Compliance with CGHA import and tryout policies
  - Statement on ice availability and potential impact on existing CGHA teams

### **Approval Restrictions:**

No further roster or bench staff approvals shall proceed unless:

- A transparent review is completed
- Members confirm all policies were followed
- It is demonstrated that no existing CGHA teams or players will be displaced

### **Contingency (if team remains in CGHA):**

- Must retain original designation (e.g., U18 BB2)
- No retroactive reclassification (e.g., BB to A) without member approval

### **Restriction:**

- Team shall not have voting rights at CGHA member meetings for two seasons

---

### **Background: How This Team Joined CGHA**

The CGHA did not initiate the formation of this fourth U18 team. The team was brought forward by an outside coach who had a group of players who wished to stay together and approached multiple associations, looking for a place to play. CGHA was the only one in a position to consider their request.

The Board undertook internal discussions to evaluate feasibility, impact, and policy alignment. The priority throughout was to protect CGHA's current players from displacement, while providing a home for athletes seeking a team.

---

## What Was Approved by the Board

After extensive discussion, the CGHA Board approved the following:

### 1. Formation of a Second U18A Team (U18A-2)

- Roster composed of 17 import players.
- Team included to avoid displacing CGHA players during tryouts.

### 2. Appointment of the Head Coach

- Vetted by the Board and approved through a majority vote.
- Presented qualifications, season plan, and aligned with CGHA values.

### 3. One-Time Tryout Exception

- Players were not integrated into tryouts to protect CGHA athletes.
- All players registered, purchased tryout passports, and participated in an evaluation skate.
- Players will be considered imports for the 2026–27 season.

### 4. Ice Allocation Considerations

- Ice priority remains with CGHA teams.
- Team was informed only one guaranteed weekly session would be available initially and that ice time would be a late start.
- 45% of their ice is in late-night slots (9:30–11:00 PM), compared to ~20% for other U18 teams.
- 70% of all ice times are 830pm or later starts



- Only 8.5 ice hours total for the entire season being start times prior to 830pm which are when other CGHA teams have scheduled tournaments.
  - Their use of returned/tournament-conflicted ice helped prevent late-night shifts for existing CGHA teams.
- 

## Policy Compliance

While a one-time exception was made for tryouts, all actions followed CGHA governance procedures:

- Majority Board vote
  - Import policy evaluated and approved
  - Registration and passport purchase required
  - Evaluation skate held
  - No CGHA player were displaced as a result of accepting this team
- 

## Impact on CGHA Teams and Players

Our primary goal was to protect CGHA players from losing roster spots or practice time. Rather than integrating this new team into the general tryout process, we accepted the team as a unit, placed them on late ice, and ensured no disruption to scheduled CGHA teams.

Additionally, the selected coach has agreed to follow CGHA's development model, which encourages the use of affiliated players to provide development opportunities across divisions.

This team has been a valuable and positive addition to the organization, both in terms of operations and team culture:

- Supportive of Scheduling Needs: This team has consistently stepped up to take 9:30–11:00 PM ice slots, including those declined by other U18 teams. Their willingness to be on the ice multiple times per week—knowing they won't get home until midnight before school days.

- Positive Team Culture: The *coaches and managers* have been consistently *respectful, professional, and appreciative* in all communications, treating the board and members with integrity and kindness.
- Promoting Inclusion and Development: The team has created space for more players to continue competing at the U18 level, supporting our goals of player development, retention, and opportunity for all who are committed.

In summary, this U18 team has filled key scheduling gaps, demonstrated excellent character, and strengthened our overall program. *Limiting them would be counterproductive and misaligned with the values and goals we've worked to uphold this season.*

As an association, we are committed to promoting and empowering females in sport. Taking away opportunities for dedicated young women to compete at the level they've earned does not align with that mission. *We should be building them up—not contributing to the systemic challenges that continue to limit female athletes.*

---

## Classification and Voting Rights

We reject the idea that this team should be denied the opportunity to be reclassified to an appropriate level (e.g., BB to A) if their performance supports it and the CGHA Board and coaches are in agreement. Our policy clearly states:

6.1 CGHA, in collaboration with coaches, determines team classification based on skill, evaluations, and exhibition games.

6.2 Multiple teams may compete at the same level if deemed appropriate.

Other associations routinely have multiple teams at the same level. LiveBarn review supports that this team can compete at the A level. Their classification does not displace the original U18A team, which remains designated as U18-A1.

We believe that CGHA can support two A teams, which will help build an overall more competitive program and support our u18AA team, as well provide more development opportunities for our U18BB and U18B teams.

We also strongly oppose any motion to deny voting rights to this team or its representatives. Participation in CGHA requires representation, accountability, and inclusion — all of which are supported by our constitution.

---

#### Final Position

We, as a board, do not support:

- Disallowing the team from participating under CGHA
- Removing the team or blocking roster approvals
- Denying voting rights to the team or its coaches
- Restricting fair reclassification processes when policy is followed

The addition of this team was made with integrity and in the best interests of CGHA's players and programs. We remain committed to:

- Open communication
- Fair governance
- Providing development opportunities for all CGHA athletes

## **Motion 4: Adoption of a Fair and Transparent Ice Allocation Policy**

Motion Summary: CGHA develop and adopt a formal Ice Allocation Policy by September 15, 2025, to be approved by the membership.

The policy shall include:

1. Equity Across Age Divisions: Ice shall be equitably distributed from U9 to U22. Late-night slots

(post 8:30 p.m.) must be shared proportionally across U15, U18, and U22. U15 teams shall carry fewer late practices.

2. Balanced Allocation: All rep and house league teams shall be treated equitably.

3. Late Ice Return: CGHA shall return or avoid accepting weekday ice from 9:30 to 11:00 p.m., wherever possible, to support age-appropriate scheduling.

4. Arena Rotation: Arenas shall rotate fairly, based on this hierarchy:

- First - Garnet B. Rickard Pads A & B

- Second - South Courtice Pads A & B

- Third - Darlington and Newcastle and others as they are secured by the CGHA

5. Academic Consideration: When feasible, weekday ice slots scheduled before 5:00 p.m. shall be prioritized for U18 and U22 teams, recognizing that players in these age groups often have earlier school dismissal times. This approach helps minimize disruptions to the academic schedules of younger divisions, who would otherwise be required to leave school early for practices.

6. Conflict of Interest Safeguards: Board members with children on CGHA teams must declare conflicts and may not finalize schedules for their child's team. A summary of each team's ice times, with the number of preferred and not preferred arenas and times be summarized to the board for final approval ensuring general fairness.

7. Team Input: Managers will be invited to a meeting for the purpose of consultation of the draft schedule, keeping in mind the goal is balanced, not perfection.

8. Public Posting: The full schedule (team, time, location) shall be posted on the CGHA website by August 1 annually.

Interim Application: These principles shall guide all 2025–2026 allocations until formal policy is adopted.

Rationale: Equitable ice access is foundational to fairness, development, and trust. This motion promotes transparency and consistency.

## CGHA Executive Response to Motion 4: Adoption of a Fair and Transparent Ice Allocation Policy

---

### 1. General Position on the Motion

While we support the underlying principles of equity, transparency, and accountability, we must balance these goals with the operational realities, municipal constraints, and volunteer capacity that shape our ability to schedule ice effectively and equitably.

We welcome ongoing feedback from members, but we also must ensure that any policy or process introduced is both practical and sustainable, and does not undermine or unduly burden the volunteers, including the Ice Scheduler, who dedicate significant time to ensuring that our players receive quality ice and programming.

The Executive recommends that Motion 4, as currently written, not be approved by the membership due to its impracticality, overreach into operational matters, and the unintended consequences it could create.

---

### 2. Concerns and Counterpoints to Specific Clauses

#### Clause 1: Equity Across Age Divisions

- **Current Practice:** CGHA already considers equitable distribution of ice across all age divisions, recognizing developmentally appropriate needs.
- **Issue with Mandate:** A fixed proportional distribution of late-night ice fails to account for team numbers in each division, availability of players, and arena schedules set by the municipality.
- **Operational Impact:** Younger divisions (e.g., U9 to U11) are already largely protected from late-night ice allocations due to Ontario Women's Hockey Association (OWHA) guidelines, which discourage scheduling practices or games for these age groups during late evening hours.

Mandating that U15 teams carry an equal or greater share of late practices as U18 or U22 divisions introduces significant compliance and logistical challenges. According to OWHA regulations, U15 teams must be scheduled to return home no later than 10:30 p.m., including travel time and a reasonable post-game change period. This is the same guideline for our U13 and U11 Teams. Increasing the number of late-night practices or allocating ice after 8:30 p.m. would jeopardize CGHA's ability to host U15 home games, particularly on weeknights, and could place the association at risk of violating player welfare standards.

From a developmental and academic perspective, U15 athletes are primarily in Grade 8 and Grade 9, often reliant on parent transportation and still adjusting to the demands of secondary school. In contrast, U18 and U22 athletes span Grades 10 through post-secondary, and in many cases can drive themselves, self-manage their sleep and study schedules, and handle later evening commitments with greater independence. Per the OWHA guidelines, U18/U22 divisions allow for the teams to arrive home by 11:30pm.

Therefore, assigning late ice based solely on proportional equity without considering developmental appropriateness, OWHA limitations, and age-specific needs would not only hinder operations but may also compromise player welfare and scheduling compliance.

#### Clause 2: Balanced Allocation

- Clarification: House league and rep programs have inherently different requirements, particularly for rep team development and gameplay.
- Concern: “Equitable” cannot always mean “equal” due to differing program demands and player commitments.

#### Clause 3: Late Ice Return

- Real-World Constraint:

While the intention to avoid late evening ice (9:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.) on weekdays is well-meaning, it does not reflect the operational and logistical realities of ice access in Clarington.

Currently, there are only six ice surfaces in the Municipality of Clarington, with five managed directly by the municipality. The CGHA must compete for access to these rinks alongside five other youth user groups, including boys' hockey, Eagles, figure skating, and other recreational programs.

According to the Municipality of Clarington, prime-time ice is defined as 5:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. on weekdays and 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. on weekends. These hours represent the

most desirable—and heavily contested—times for all youth and adult programs in the region.

Due to this high demand and limited supply, declining or returning late-evening ice simply is not a viable option. Doing so risks losing that ice permanently to other organizations. Once ice is forfeited, it is rarely, if ever, returned to CGHA's seasonal contract. As a result, enforcing a policy that prohibits or limits use of late ice may result in fewer total hours available for CGHA teams, ultimately reducing development opportunities and compressing schedules further.

- **Strategic Recommendation:**

Simply put, there is not enough ice to go around. No internal policy within CGHA can change the broader issue of facility availability in the municipality. The true long-term solution lies in expanding access to more rinks and advocating for increased infrastructure.

We strongly encourage all members to take a proactive role in supporting the Municipality of Clarington's Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan, which includes consideration for arena capacity and future recreation needs. You can learn more and participate in this important civic planning process at: <https://www.claringtonconnected.ca/>

By collaboratively advocating for new or expanded arena infrastructure, CGHA families and volunteers can help ensure that future generations of hockey and figure skating participants are not forced into late-night scheduling due to facility constraints.

Creating a rigid policy within CGHA that seeks to restrict late ice will not change how the Municipality allocates prime-time ice, and may ultimately harm the association's flexibility and ability to meet the needs of our programs.

- **Financial Consideration:** CGHA is fiscally responsible for securing enough ice to meet programming needs. Turning away usable hours without guaranteed alternatives is not feasible.

#### Clause 4: Arena Rotation

- **Operational Reality:**
- While the proposed motion outlines a specific hierarchy of arenas (e.g., Garnet B. Rickard first, South Courtice second, etc.), this ranking does not reflect how ice is allocated by the Municipality of Clarington, nor how CGHA receives or manages its seasonal ice.
- The Municipality does not distinguish between its arenas in terms of priority, quality, or status—all municipal arenas are considered equal in value and function and are

charged at the same hourly rate. As such, the CGHA is not afforded the luxury of “choosing” where ice is allocated. We are assigned ice based on availability, historical usage, and overall community demand, and we must make use of what is provided.

- Imposing a rigid arena rotation policy within CGHA would create unrealistic expectations and could lead to inefficient scheduling, forfeited ice, or unfair distribution to teams in areas with fewer options. Further, it would unfairly burden the Ice Scheduler and may not reflect the travel preferences or convenience of all families across Clarington.
- Current Municipal Ice Allocation (2025–2026 Season)

Below is a breakdown of the percentage of ice allocated by the Municipality of Clarington to CGHA by location this season:

- Garnet B. Rickard (Pads A & B): 52%
  - South Courtice Arena (Pads A & B): 19%
  - Darlington / Newcastle / Others: 28%
- This data demonstrates that CGHA already does receive most of its ice at Garnet B. Rickard and need to allocate specific divisions there based on the bumper/board’s availability first to Fundamentals, U7 and U9 programs for both House League and Representative teams first and then naturally our representative rotation will balance the use of Garnet B Rickard accordingly.
  - Unfortunately, after that the CGHA cannot realistically prioritize the order of preferences suggested as the “third preference” is where the CGHA holds majority of our ice at 28% of the total allocations. Any attempt to mandate such a preference would be disconnected from how ice is allocated municipally and risks putting the CGHA at odds with our ice provider.

#### Personal Preference vs. Association Need:

It should also be noted that this proposed arena hierarchy appears to reflect the personal preferences of the motion's author, rather than a standard recognized by the Municipality or supported by objective data. There is no operational benefit to enforcing a preference for Garnet B. Rickard, and doing so would come at the cost of flexibility, fairness, and practical scheduling.



CGHA will continue to use all available arenas equitably and strategically to support all programs and age groups, while advocating for additional ice time across all facilities—not just those deemed more desirable by a few individuals.

#### Clause 5: Academic Consideration

- Current Practice and Efforts:

The CGHA Executive acknowledges the importance of considering academic schedules when assigning weekday ice, particularly for older divisions like U18 and U22, whose players may face different educational demands than younger age groups.

Where ice before 5:00 p.m. is available, CGHA has made efforts to assign it to age groups that can reasonably accommodate it. In the 2025–2026 season, the scheduling successfully placed a U18 team on a 3:30–5:00 p.m. ice time at Garnet B. Rickard Pad A—a time slot and location referenced in the motion as a "preferred" option by its mover. This reflects a sincere effort to align ice scheduling with the stated priorities of fairness, academic support, and neutral arena usage.

- Key Considerations:
- However, it's important to note that:

Not all U18 teams request or prefer ice before 5:00 p.m. These earlier times can conflict with family or coaching schedules, transportation needs, or personal routines.

U22 players typically follow post-secondary academic schedules, which do not conform to high school hours. Many university or college students attend classes throughout the afternoon and evening, making pre-5:00 p.m. scheduling impractical or even exclusionary for this group.

For these reasons, while CGHA considers earlier weekday ice as a useful option, it is not universally suitable for all teams or divisions. Flexibility and communication with coaches and team managers remain critical in ensuring ice times meet both developmental and academic needs, without forcing a one-size-fits-all approach.

- Conclusion:
- Scheduling decisions must reflect both ice availability and actual team needs, not just theoretical preferences. The CGHA will continue to work with teams to find the best available solutions within our municipal constraints, while supporting academic balance where appropriate and is practiced during the scheduling survey that is sent out to teams prior to building the schedules. A practice that was maintained already this season.

- Additional Limitation: Prioritization for U18/U22 cannot be consistently implemented without negatively impacting U13/U15 competitive programs.

## Clause 6: Conflict of Interest Safeguards

### Governance Standards:

The CGHA operates under a strong governance framework in alignment with Ontario Not-for-Profit Corporations Act (ONCA) standards and best practices. All Board members are required to act in good faith, in the best interest of the Association, and must not act in any capacity where a real or perceived conflict of interest exists.

This includes, but is not limited to, refraining from influencing or participating in any decisions—such as ice allocation—that could directly benefit their child’s team in a disproportionate or unfair manner.

### Current Practices:

The current CGHA Board operates in good standing, and no such conflicts have impeded our ability to schedule ice fairly or transparently. All scheduling decisions are based on team needs, availability, and equitable distribution—not personal relationships or affiliations.

The motion’s proposed requirement to submit a report detailing each team’s “preferred” and “non-preferred” time slots and arena use for full Board review—while well-intentioned—would introduce a burdensome, redundant process that suggests a lack of trust in the very volunteers elected to serve. The current system already provides adequate checks and balances, including:

- Collaborative scheduling with multiple board members consulted.
- Transparent documentation of allocations.
- Open communication with coaches and managers to address concerns.

### Conclusion:

Board members have a duty to act ethically and without bias. The current Executive has upheld that standard and will continue to do so—ensuring that personal involvement with any team does not interfere with fair and balanced operations across the Association.

## Clause 7: Team Input

### Current Engagement Process:

The CGHA values input from coaches, managers, and team staff in the scheduling process. In fact, a team survey is distributed prior to scheduling each season to collect detailed information about team preferences, coach availability, tournament plans, and any special considerations that may affect scheduling needs.

This proactive approach ensures that the Ice Scheduler and Executive Committee are aware of team-specific requirements well in advance of finalizing the schedule, enabling the creation of a schedule that is balanced, thoughtful, and reflective of real-world needs.

#### Built-In Feedback Loop:

There is already an existing feedback and input loop in place. Teams are encouraged to:

- Provide preferences and constraints via the annual scheduling survey.
- Raise concerns through their division leads or directly to the Ice Scheduler.
- Participate in discussions around adjustments once initial schedules are released.

While perfection in scheduling is not always possible due to external constraints (e.g., limited municipal ice availability, travel considerations, shared facilities), the CGHA strives for fairness, balance, and responsiveness. We believe in open communication and continue to refine our processes to reflect the evolving needs of our teams.

#### Conclusion:

The proposal to mandate a formal consultation meeting may appear constructive, but in practice, the existing system already captures team input effectively and efficiently. Adding formal meetings may delay schedule finalization and introduce unnecessary logistical burdens during an already compressed planning window.

Our focus remains on creating a fair, responsive schedule through timely, inclusive, and data-informed practices.

#### Clause 8: Public Posting by August 1

- **Unrealistic Expectation:** Ice is allocated by the municipality over the summer. Final ice contracts are often not confirmed until mid to late July as of the recent season. To hold a policy to this nature where the Municipality of Clarington holds the permits is unreasonable.
- **Alternative:** CGHA aims to post schedules as early as possible, typically by mid to late August. A rigid August 1 posting deadline is not feasible and could result in inaccurate or incomplete information being shared. The CGHA would like to call out that this season, the final ice permits were received mid-July and published within 1

day of finalization, which is an achievement not seen in prior years under the leadership.

---

### 3. Historical Context and Governance Improvements

It is important to provide context regarding the past and present approaches to ice allocation within the CGHA.

The member bringing forward this motion previously held a leadership role, including influence over ice scheduling, for multiple seasons. During that tenure:

- The CGHA did not operate under a documented or transparent Ice Allocation Policy.
- Equity and consistency were not reliably applied. Teams were, at times, reportedly penalized in scheduling based on the preferences or personal opinions of those involved in the process, particularly when conflicts existed with team staff.
- Despite advisories from prior Ice Schedulers, ice was picked up in bulk at Garnet B. Rickard on a single day, without strategic review or regard for cost-efficiency. This created imbalanced schedules and led to underutilized or congested weekend ice blocks with inability to fill ice surfaces.
- Decisions to accept or reject ice were made with little financial consideration, often increasing costs to the association unnecessarily.
- Most notably, under the previous leadership of Julie, who previously oversaw this process, the full-season ice schedule was not produced or distributed until late September—a delay that impacted planning, team operations, and overall confidence in the process.

While we acknowledge the efforts of past volunteers, the association has made clear and measurable improvements in how ice is allocated, communicated, and managed. It is therefore concerning that a motion calling for structure, fairness, and transparency is being brought forward by someone whose own practices did not reflect those standards when in a position to implement them.

In contrast, under the current Board's first year managing ice allocation:

This season, our scheduling team prioritized structure, development, transparency, and fairness across all age groups. Key actions and outcomes include:

1. Consistent Ice Access

We established a *balanced schedule*, ensuring each team had access to the ice a *minimum of 3 times per week*. This created a consistent rhythm for players and coaches while supporting long-term development.

2. Enhanced Development Opportunities

Recognizing the need for quality over quantity, we secured *multiple 1.5-hour practice slots* within each 8-week cycle—allowing coaches time for meaningful, skill-focused sessions.

3. Age-Appropriate Scheduling

To support younger players and their families, we *minimized early weekday ice times (before 5:00 PM) to just one per week* for U9–U13 teams—improving both attendance and performance as we also have to allocate late ice to those who can reasonably use them.

4. Fair Late-Ice Distribution

We *equally distributed the 9:30–11:00 PM slots for U18 teams, with only 3 late-night slots assigned to U15s in an eight week cycle*, in order to allow for game scheduling compliance with OWHA guidelines and based on age-appropriate planning.

5. Improved Weekend Game Flexibility

We *offered both Saturday and Sunday game slots* to all teams—helping other centers schedule with us more easily and reducing pressure on our team managers as we experienced last season.

6. Guaranteed Game Opportunities

We ensured that *each team had a minimum of two game slots per week*, supporting development, competitiveness, and preparation.

7. Early and Transparent Scheduling

For the first time, the *entire season schedule was completed and published by mid-July*, giving teams, families, and coaches ample time for planning, coordination, and team preparation.

8. Data-Driven, Collaborative Decision-Making

Ice allocation decisions are now *guided by budget considerations, arena availability, historical usage patterns, and feedback from key program leads*. This ensures decisions are made with full context, not in isolation.

#### 9. Checks and Balances in the Process

Unlike in the past, the current process involves *collaboration and oversight*, with *no one individual holding sole discretion* over scheduling. This promotes accountability, fairness, and transparency throughout.

#### 10. Municipality Engagement & Advocacy

We met *multiple times with the municipality* to advocate for:

- *Balanced weekend ice allocation* across all youth groups
  - *Equitable distribution of 9:30–11:00 PM slots* among all local organizations
  - Clearer communication channels for long-term planning
- 

#### Conclusion

These actions demonstrate a clear shift toward professionalism, accountability, and player-first planning. We've moved away from the ad hoc, siloed approach of the past and built a collaborative system that values fairness, development, and transparency. We are proud of the progress made this season and are committed to continuing this elevated standard in future years.

We welcome ideas for further improvement but encourage the membership to consider the progress already achieved and support approaches that build upon that momentum rather than introduce undue burden, contradiction, or micromanagement.

---

#### 4. Interim Application Clause

- While the intention is appreciated, applying the principles in advance of a formally vetted and approved policy risks premature enforcement of processes that have not been tested or approved, and that may disrupt current operations.
- 

#### 5. Proposed Path Forward

In the spirit of collaboration and transparency, CGHA will continue the following strategies:

- **Volunteer Protection:** Ensure that volunteers, particularly the Ice Scheduler, are not subject to undue scrutiny, public criticism, or additional burden that could deter participation.

- Education & Communication: Commit to continued communication about scheduling processes, constraints, and timelines so that all members better understand how decisions are made.
  - Annual Review: Ice allocation processes will be reviewed at the end of each season, and improvements considered before the next scheduling cycle.
- 

## 6. Final Recommendation

The Executive recommends that Motion 4, as currently written, not be approved by the membership due to its impracticality, overreach into operational matters, and the unintended consequences it could create.

## **CGHA Response to Motion 6: Governance Reforms and Conflict of Interest Policy Enhancements**

### **Motion Summary:**

This motion proposes updates to CGHA's governance structure and transparency practices, including stricter rules on executive team involvement, required governance training, enhanced conflict of interest disclosures, and publishing of Board meeting minutes.

---

### **Board Position: Supported in Principle with Clarifications**

The CGHA Board supports the intent of Motion 6 and shares the belief that strong governance, transparency, and clear policies are essential to the health and credibility of our organization.

We offer the following responses and clarifications for each component of the motion:

---

#### **1. Executive Role Restrictions**

##### **Current Policy:**

Under existing CGHA bylaws, Officers of the Association (President, VP, Treasurer, Secretary) may not serve as a Head Coach, Team Manager, or Co-Signer on any CGHA team. This is to ensure appropriate separation of duties and avoid conflicts related to financial or operational oversight.

##### **Board Position:**

We acknowledge the intent to go further in restricting executive members from any official team role, including assistant coach, trainer, other bench staff or room monitor.

However, volunteer engagement remains a challenge. Many teams rely on experienced individuals who also serve in leadership capacities at the association level. In smaller associations like ours, flexibility can be necessary to fill roles effectively.

We believe a balanced approach is best:

- Maintain strict financial and decision-making separation for Officers
- Allow limited participation on a team only at the discretion of the Head Coach and with clear conflict safeguards



- Continue review of our policy to reflect both integrity and operational needs

---

## 2. Mandatory Governance Training

### Board Position:

We fully support annual governance training for all current and future Board members and other key volunteers. This includes:

- Understanding of ONCA requirements
- Fiduciary duties and responsibilities
- Conflict of interest protocols
- Roles of governance vs. operations
- Transparency in decision-making

We are actively pursuing a qualified, cost-effective training provider that understands both nonprofit governance and the realities of volunteer-led youth sports.

### Next Step:

We commit to formalizing governance training and will publish confirmation of completion for all directors upon request by members in good standing.

---

## 3. Conflict of Interest Disclosures

### Board Position:

We take conflict of interest seriously and support improved documentation and transparency.

### Currently:

- Members with a conflict are expected to disclose and recuse themselves from votes and discussion

- Some instances have shown that interpretation of what constitutes a conflict can vary.

#### Commitment to Improvement:

To provide greater clarity and consistency, we are taking the following steps:

- Standardizing conflict thresholds, including clearer definitions related to teams, divisions, and personal or professional relationships
- Maintaining a Conflict Log, reviewed annually by the Board
- Recording all declared conflicts in Board meeting minutes
- Updating our minutes format to clearly distinguish abstentions due to conflict from other types of abstentions

---

#### 4. Public Board Minutes

##### Board Position:

We support posting Board minutes to the CGHA website as part of a transparent and open communication strategy.

##### Our plan:

- Post approved monthly minutes within 30 days of approval
- Include: motions, votes, attendance, and key decisions
- Clearly note in camera items as confidential, while ensuring their occurrence is documented
- Balance transparency with the need to protect member privacy and sensitive matters

This is consistent with good governance practice and aligns with our values as an association.

---

#### Conclusion

The principles outlined—transparency, fairness, and accountability—are foundational to good governance, and we are committed to building a more open and member-informed culture.

The CGHA Board will move forward with:

- A review of current bylaw and policy language
- Implementation of governance training for all directors
- Updates to conflict of interest tracking and documentation
- A plan to begin posting Board minutes regularly during the 2025–26 season

These changes reflect our shared goal of a stronger, more transparent, and community-driven organization.