



LTAD Working Group Minutes
 May 30-31, 2009
 Westin Bristol Place Hotel, Toronto

Present: Ellorie Hanson – President Chris George – Central Region Chuck Dentelbeck - Eastern Region Bryon Johnson – Eastern Region Kim Noxon – Eastern Region Kevin Hanlon – Western Region Janet Logan – Western Region	Carolyn Mountjoy – VP Communications Tammy Jesson – Central Region Rob Hanson – Eastern Region Doug MacQuarrie – Eastern Region Nick Sirenko – Eastern Region Michelle Kemper – Western Region Karla Romphf – Tech Program Director
--	---

Agenda	Comments/Discussion/Motions
Introductions	
Overview of LTAD	Carolyn Mountjoy
Powerpoint Presentation	Ellorie Hanson
Breakout Groups	We split into three groups to discuss topics in different LTAD stages.
U7, U9, U10 (Janet Logan, Michelle Kemper, Kevin Hanlon, Chuck Dentelbeck)	U7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn to Skate stage: brand new skaters learning how to skate • expectation is fun • learn the skills, not necessarily the rules of the game • get players ready for the next step: skill development testing – when the player passes the requirements for this stage, they move to the U9 stage • the needs of a small association vs a medium association vs a large association are different: it is difficult to come up with a process that fits all • join with another on-ice sport – use skilled skating instructors from other sports • end of the year fun day of games and activities • “soccer swarm” after the ring type games • no officiating at U7

- recommendation: establish who is responsible for doing the “report cards” for skill testing

U9

- expectation is fun
- should U9 exist? stage for strong U7 and weak U10 (or new players) - flexibility to move players to U10
- maintain status in U9 but can get some additional development help in U7; U10 can get additional development help at U9; etc.
- meet RC criteria, then move up a division once skills are attained
- skill testing and game testing
- coaches need to make fun drills
- coach mentors are important
- modified games
- players rotate through all positions

U10

- pass U10 skill testing to move to U12
- examine the need for full vs half-ice games
- introduce modified games; modified/partial rule set
- small associations are already stratified due to numbers (some small associations have number issues that make an even playing field more difficult); larger associations with rec/house league teams and travel teams need to stratify but those that select teams evenly will find the transition easy
- pilot project – need to see an overview of what the pilot would look like – then go back to regions, e.g. Western, to try and sell the pilot – maybe try small pockets this season and spread it to the whole region and province the following season
- recommendation that the development to competition ratios be set at 50-50% 2009-2010; 66-33% 2010-2011; 100% development 2011-2012 (RC compliance)
- recommendation that we schedule one or two fun days (3-4 hours) per region to

	<p>“market” the vertically stratified teams with on and off ice activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>recommendation</u> that we schedule one or two fun days (3-4 hours) per region to “market” options for better utilization of ice with on and off ice activities (sharing and playing well with others) • <u>recommendation</u> that we work with the schools to identify students who need volunteer hours, to “coach/mentor” with the younger age groups • <u>recommendation</u> that ORA produce a “fact sheet” about other sports and their plans/adherence to LTAD for marketing purposes <p>U7, U9 and U10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • methodology for creating U7, U9, U10 teams – select teams based on skill and vertically stratify • <u>recommendation</u> that we produce a methodology for forming teams at each level from U7 through 18+ responding to LTAD objectives
<p>U12 (Carolyn Mountjoy, Kim Noxon, Tammy Jesson, Byron Johnson, Rob Hanson)</p>	<p>U12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pilot project – Skill Development in Eastern Region – ORA partnering with RC • skill testing three times during the season starting September 2009 • eventually used for tiering at a provincial event • RC is looking at having a skill testing/vertically stratified teams event as part of the pilot for Eastern teams in January 2010 • seeding options for 2010 provincials could be formula based, “ranking events” based or based on the outcome of skill testing • RC must define tiering: compliance for 2010-2011 - no tiering at U12 • 2010-2011 Skill testing of individuals in September, build teams based on the testing where players of different skill levels are split among the teams evenly – equitable division of players – vertical stratification • do you leave the team that way until January and then move players (divide the season into two) or leave them alone for the whole season: as this is a team sport • it is the coach’s responsibility to coach all players on the team • critical to have coach recruitment and training reflect the LTAD focus

- consider pairing strong and weak players
- consider grouping by age, i.e. first and second year players
- new players at U12 could play at U10 based on skill development – move them back up when they have acquired the skills
- recommendation that we would like to see teams formed for the entire season
- tournament limits could be based on distance rather than region (cross border)
- provincial festival(s) for 2011; tiering based on outcome of skill testing; we need sponsors
- 2 or 3 events throughout the province - have associations/regions bid for hosting – rotate hosts within the areas
- can be held in conjunction with a tournament; schedule with other events (fairs, etc.), sporting events, school events
- costs would include ice, officials, lunch, jerseys/t-shirts, activities
- option for U12 events - invitational for players – players pay individually – play with new people and meet new friends
- option for U12 events - teams stay together and play at the festival – team registration
- tiering for both options depends on the results of skill development testing
- maximum 3 local/regional tournaments including year-end tournament
- are festivals classified as tournaments: define the terms (festivals have no semis or finals, no awards based on outcome, activity and fun based; tournaments recognize the results)
- definition of local/regional – not necessarily our provincial regions – could be based on travel distance
- recommendation that we use the formula system for U12s for one more year but change it for the 2010-2011 season – change must be identified as soon as possible

U14, U16, U19

(Ellorie Hanson,
Doug MacQuarrie,
Chris George, Nick
Sirenko)

U14

- introduction to tiering for U14 teams: select teams for regional play in a vertically stratified format; composite teams for other competitions - open, invitational – for a few events; different composite teams for different events; no “select” teams; player loyalty to “core” team; similar to baseball
- not called AA or A
- outcome of U12 will determine where we go with U14
- call-ups to U14 from U12 – pay attention to skill testing on who should be called up
- “eastern event” – multi-tiered: teams go to “eastern event” based on skill testing which would be done at Provincials; not everyone goes - include all U14 teams that qualify and want to go to an “eastern event”
- change the name of “eastern event” – include more teams – participating teams go as their local association team – timeline would be two to three years
- U14 is far too competitive with too many “bells and whistles”, i.e. Ontario team uniforms (on and off ice); winner represents the province, etc.; no provincial designation for any team at “eastern event” – no Team Ontario uniforms
- U14 needs to be less competitive – experience friendship, travel, bonding, etc.
- Officiating will be impacted by having two events, with increased numbers and levels
- recommendation split U14 and Easterns into two events due to competitive levels
- recommendation U14 teams would represent their association, not the province
- recommendation establish the number of teams at the National and eastern levels, with a reasonable ceiling
- recommendation incentives to participate at all events at the U14 “eastern event” or “challenge”
- recommendation – name brand accordingly

U16, U19

- early and on-going assessment of a team’s placement – associations cannot have more than one team at the same level without approval

- don't wait until December to move teams – can be started after tryouts
- normalize two team contracts
- AA teams notify their intent to attend (or not) CRCs with their registration in November and still need to qualify
- if we increase the number of events, we'll need more hosts – but smaller associations could have more opportunities based on size of events
- events – ranking of teams could be based on 1) AAs, As and Bs; 2) Apples and Oranges; 3) Elite, Competitive and Regional; or 4) a combination of the first three options – define and establish any necessary criteria
- ranking “apples and oranges” – cons – teams could improve and change their intent but wouldn't have competed in ranking events;
- ranking all-inclusive but with “intent” - cons – teams could improve and change their intent (they would be wait-listed for a chance to go to Provincials); pros – all teams would attend ranking tournaments, intent would be submitted with team registration in November, all teams would be tiered and ranked after Provincials for Nationals (Easterns); if enough teams don't submit an intent but are of calibre, sanctioned play would be the “carrot” for declaring
- allocate funds for teams attending CRC based on outcome of Provincials
- ORA would commit to a minimum number of teams that would participate at CRC
- increase of teams at Easterns over time – include U16A, U19A and 18+A according to RC compliance schedule
- levels vs age for creating provincial events – e.g. all skill based teams or all age-based teams at same event – have to look at availability of officials: if levels based, a con would be the number of required officials at the high levels; if age based, the pros would be older players can ref younger age events, it would be easier to develop officials, “B” could be easily added to the event, and ice activities can be geared to age appropriate activities
- recommendation that events be age oriented and tiered according to skill levels/testing; and, that we meet the RC timelines for all inclusive provincials and nationals

Further Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we are allowing our current program to cloud our thinking: this new LTAD system challenges us to think about the sport differently • communication and promotion is important: create opportunities for membership to be exposed to elements of LTAD • ensure that LTAD is introduced in schools parallel to being introduced in sports • use the ice differently to allow more participants • think of collaborating with neighbouring associations when using ice • run the ice as a camp – on the ice for 20 minutes, then Frisbee off ice, then back on the ice, etc. • at the younger age levels, the purpose of games are developmental – when small associations play other associations, maybe combine players so teams are more equal in skill • be creative, do something different • coach with other coaches, not against • think of different strategies in order to keep kids engaged • skill testing – report card – how is that information being given out – how will coaches use that information to coach the players • coaches must change their focus to a broad consideration of players rather than team based • in speed skating, the participants get badges/pins for each level they pass • Officiating requirements will be different at all age levels: ORA must ensure that the LTOD program meets the timelines of the LTAD • <u>recommendation</u> we have a working group meet annually to review the past year’s progress and formalize the next year’s plan based on input from as many sources as possible. • <u>recommendation</u> that CTR be used to recruit based on the objectives of LTAD and physical literacy • <u>recommendation</u> that we identify the skill requirements for ringette as a team game (strategy 101) in addition to skill requirements for individuals • <u>recommendation</u> that “two-team contracts” be allowed between all skill levels in each
--------------------	--

	<p>age group to encourage the development of all players; exceptionally skilled players may be considered for a higher age group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>recommendation</u> that there be a standardization of the application of rules concerning the two team player contracts so that the policy is applied the same province-wide • <u>recommendation</u> that a special committee be formed to deal with the seeding of teams; and, that the seeding of teams be an all year round process rather than to wait for December/January • <u>recommendation</u> that a system similar to the Western Region’s player tracking system be used in each region (provincially) to track players for input to placement • <u>recommendation</u> that regions have an all inclusive policy, either using vertically stratified teams or “C” teams (“Rec” as required) - note: Southern Region doesn’t register “C” teams – lower-end players could play on vertically stratified teams under LTAD and players will be kept in the game • <u>recommendation</u> that players can be placed at a lower age group by a skill instructor as developmental and moved back to their age level when they pass the skill testing • <u>recommendation</u> that the “chosen association” policy be piloted as per ORA policy • <u>recommendation</u> that along with the LTAD program committee, an implementation monitoring group should be formed • <u>recommendation</u> that practices at different age levels be all inclusive, for both player and coach development • <u>recommendation</u> that all recruiting issues be directed to the ORA Board rather than the regions
Adjournment	