

## **AGENDA**

### **Stonewall Minor Hockey AGM Monday, April 4, 2016**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Approval of minutes from last years AGM**
- 3. Business Arising from minutes**
- 4. Presidents address**
- 5. Reports from – Treasurer, Booth Convener, Ice convener**
- 6. Other board members reports**
- 7. Capital expenditures**
- 8. Motions**
- 9. Elections**
- 10. Adjournment**

## **SMHRA AGM Minutes**

Thursday, April 9, 2015 at 55 Plus

Signed in attendance: 75 members, including executive

### **1. Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order by Pete Mandryk @ 7:35

### **2. Approval of minutes of last Annual General Meeting**

Motion to approve submitted by Dave Underwood, seconded by Bryan Sangster

### **3. Business arising from the minutes.**

No business or concerns brought forward

### **4. President's Address.**

### **5. Reports**

- a. From Treasurer -Stu Brown presented financials including booth report.
- b. Booth Convenor – not present
- c. Ice Convenor – Dave Underwood – reported on ice availability and overall rentals including rentals outside SMHRA activity

### **6. Other Reports – nothing was submitted**

### **7. Motions**

Please note for motions each member had as many votes as they had children in the program.

Not all members voted on every motion

## **7.1**

### **Motion from Stephen O'Neil:**

"I, Stephen O'Neill put forward a motion to the SMHRA that the canteen services that we currently have in place at both rinks be entirely revamped so that they can become somewhat profitable ." Two other possible solutions would be to rent out the space to a business or close the canteen entirely and replace it with vending machines.

Motion was discussed but ultimately not passed. It was determined that this motion was not something the board or membership could address as the booth space is owned by the Town and is being run by SMHRA.

### **General comments:**

The main concern of the membership was the 75 dollar canteen fee that each member had to pay per child in the program. Members had concern that the membership was subsidizing the canteen, and if that was the case the canteen should be closed and alternative delivery services considered.

It was explained that the canteen fees were in fact being allocated to the association for operational use through the season. The confusion lies in the fact that the 75 dollars is being called canteen fees when it should in fact be referred to as association fees.

Moving forward consideration will be given by the board to changing this fee structure/name from canteen fees to association fees.

## **7.2**

Motions from:

Andrew Kirk

Scott Myers

Bryan Sangster

Jason McIvor

This motion was put forward by these four individuals. It was determined that a motion could only be put forward by one individual. Scott Myers put his name forward to submit the motion, it was seconded by Mark Kinsley

Revised Motion:

Scott Myers

### **Motion #1**

Vote on our Novice and Atom Boys age groups to be entered exclusively into the Interlake Minor Hockey Program. We would like this motion to be in place for a 4 yr period if passed.

The motion was revised to remove the time requirement of 4 years. It was determined that a motion is allowed to be submitted at any AGM so a time commitment in any motion is not binding.

**Vote: 48 in favor, 28 Opposed**

**Motion Passed**

### **Motion #2**

Vote on our Pee wee boys age group to be entered exclusively into the Interlake Minor Hockey Program. We would like this motion to be in place for a 2 yr period if passed.

This motion was revised to remove the time requirement for same reasons as above.

**Vote: 29 in favor, 51 against**

**Motion defeated**



### **Motion #3**

Vote on our Bantam boys age group to be entered exclusively into the Interlake Minor Hockey Program. We would like this motion to be in place for a 2 yr period if passed.

This motion was revised to remove the time requirement for same reasons as above.

**Vote: 13 in favor, 35 against**

**Motion defeated**

### **Notes**

- as per SMHRA constitution all teams shall be split up evenly for Interlake Minor Hockey League play
- as per IMHA constitution all teams shall enter the provincial play downs as a tiered team. These teams can be divided up before Christmas and are eligible to play one tournament and 2 exhibition games before the provincial playoffs. These teams shall not interfere with minor hockey play.
- Having our kids in the Interlake we would like to see all age groups have a more competitive year and the chance to extend SMH season by being more competitive in the Interlake minor hockey playoffs, as well as having the chance to go to the Provincial play downs and tournament. In closing we feel bringing our teams back to the Interlake will give our organization a more competitive and enjoyable minor hockey experience as a whole.

## **7.3**

### **Motion from Cory LeClair:**

I, Cory LeClair, put forward a motion to the SMHRA to have coaching for goalies provided as part of the regular season practices. Goalies do not receive the same coaching as the regular players do, nor do the coaches necessarily know how to properly coach a goalie. It would be a benefit for the teams, as well as for the goalies, and help our teams to be more successful.

This is not something the Board can address – any additional coaching/schooling is the responsibility of the player parent.

As an association we can look at providing ice time as an association and setting up a goalie school

### **General Comments:**

The SMHRA Board does not have the resources to provide goalie coaches for all levels of the program. The board did however commit to exploring the option of providing ice time dedicated to goalies and seeking out instructors to help facilitate practices.

This motion was not voted on

## **7.4**

### **Motion from Jason McIvor:**

I'm submitting a motion that any kid(s) registered in Stonewall Minor Hockey must have one parent attend the annual AGM. Parents that don't attend will have \$50 added to their SMHA registration.

If the parent of the kid(s) attends the AGM they won't have the extra \$50 added to registration.

E.g. AGM is in April, will have a list of attendees and parents to sign in.  
For those that don't attend, they will have \$50 added onto their child's registration come August.  
Maximum \$50 for parents with multiple kids registered

The purpose of this motion is to get parents involved and informed. If they don't want to get involved and don't attend the meeting, SMHA will make \$50 for every parent that has a child registered in SMHA.  
This motion is to get parents involved, not about making money for SMHA.

This motion was not debated. It was explained that the SMHRA Board cannot invoke a rule or by-law forcing members to attend a meeting, nor fine them if they do not attend. As such this motion was not voted on.

## 7.4

### Motion from Geoff Reimer:

Hi Scott and Pete

Below is my proposed motion for consideration at the AGM.

#### Background

The SMHRA Board and Executive have positions in place in order to provide a proper avenue/liaison with the different agencies that govern hockey and Ringette in Manitoba. There is an established protocol where concerns with either program are to be brought to the board member specific to area of concern.

Over the past several years parents, coaches, managers and board members have been circumventing the board and contacting these different agencies - Hockey Manitoba, Hockey Winnipeg, Interlake Minor Hockey, Manitoba Ringette Association - directly. These agencies have expressed their concern to the appropriate board members that members of our organization are contacting these governing bodies to tell these bodies that they disapprove of what the governing bodies are doing, telling these governing bodies their programs and ideas are stupid/don't like the decision of the agency/their mandate is ill intentioned/hurting their kids development etc.

This conduct not only undermines the SMHRA Board and associated positions, it also jeopardizes the SMHRA programs within these organizations. We need the good will and cooperation of Hockey Manitoba, Hockey Winnipeg, Interlake Minor Hockey and Manitoba Ringette Association to facilitate program development, and to help players and teams when help is needed.

Rogue parents, coaches and board members have put the SMHRA program in the cross hairs on a number of occasions over these past few years. The actions of these few have the potential to harm the SMHRA board and program as a whole.

This behaviour should no longer be tolerated, and a deterrent needs to be established.

As such I put forward a motion as follows:

#### Motion

Any member of the SMHRA - parent, coach, assistant coach, manager, board member or executive found to have contacted any governing association without the consent, knowledge or approval of the affected board member or executive is subject to:

- If the offender is a player parent - the player may be suspended for up to 2 games. Punishment doubles for repeat offenders
  - If the offender is a coach/assistant coach/manager or other team official the offender is suspended from their team related duties for up to 2 games. If the coach/assistant coach/manager or other team official has a child on the team their child may also be suspended for up to 2 games as well. Punishment doubles for repeat offenders
  - If the offender is a Board Member in SMHRA then the Board Member may be relieved of his/her position. If the board member has a player in the program the player may be suspended for up to 2 games. Punishment will double for repeat offenders.
- It is understood that perhaps not all members are aware of proper protocol when it comes to airing complaints or dealing with concerns. It is the intent of the SMHRA Board to educate its members on how to properly vet their concerns within SMHRA.

This motion was not debated or voted on. Membership was advised that there are existing rules within the SMHRA by laws that can address the behaviour this motion was intended to address.



## 7.6

### Motion from Greg Safiniuk

I, Greg SAFINIUK put forward a motion to the SMHRA that all teams registered in SMHRA remain in the Interlake Minor Hockey League. That all teams in each category weather it be Novice, Atom, Pee wee, Bantam and Midget levels be split into two, three or four teams of equal strength to each other.

---

### Motion from Greg Safiniuk

I, Greg SAFINIUK put forward a motion to the SMHRA that in the event we SMHRA combine community clubs with one or more clubs, ie Warren, Stony Mountain or Teulon that the Members of this group be allowed the option to place a Team in the Winnipeg Minor Hockey Association and that in order for this to take place it must be voted on by all parties within the group before the selection camp.

This motion essentially duplicated the motion put forward by Scott Myers. There was some further debate on the Bantam program, however the bantam age group was voted on previously. This motion was not voted on.

## 7.8

### Motion from Brad Harmacy

I, Brad Harmacy, put forward a motion to the SMHRA that individuals holding a current position of the Executive are unable to put forth a motion. The primary reason for this is to create some distance between the Executive and their motions set forth for personal gain. The Executive has a high influence to promote their own motions since most members are also coaching staff.

This motion was not voted on. SMHRA Board Memebbers also have kids in the program, and are thus allowed to put forward motions. When asked to do so Mr. Harmacy did not present any evidence that SMHRA board members had in any way benefitted or obtained personal gain as alleged in his motion.

## Elections

Pete Mandryk informed the SMHRA Board and Memebership he was stepping down as president.

### President

Scott Myers was elected president. His name was put forward by Lee Devereaux, and seconded by Gord Ledyka.

No other members put their name forth for president.

### Vice President

Liam Wheddon was re-elected Vice President – his name was put forward by Pete Mandryk and seconded by Bryan Sangster.

### **Communications**

Scott Hunnam was re-elected to the Communications position. His name was put forward by Liam Wheddon, and seconded by Geoff Reimer

### **Equipment Co-ordinator**

Clayton Brown was re-elected Equipment co-ordinator. His name was put forward by Bryan Sangster and seconded by Dave Underwood.

### **Referee-In-Cheif**

Ralph Nespor resigned as referee in cheif. No one put their name forward for this position.

### **Secretary**

Geoff Reimer was elected Secretary. His name was put forward by Bryan Sangster and seconded by Len Epp.

### **Interlake Rep Ringette**

Larry Furkalo was elected Interlake Rep for Ringette. His name was put forward by Geoff Reimer, seconded by Bryan Sangster.

### **Head Coach – Girls Hockey**

Len Epp was elected Head Coach of Girls Hockey. His name was put forward by Andrew Kirk, seconded by Scott Myers.

### **Head Coach – Girls Ringette**

Jeff Morden was elected head coach of girls Ringette. His name was put forward by Chris Godin, seconded by Liam Wheddon.

Lenn Epp moved for meeting adjournment at 9:12, seconded by Andrew Kirk.



Motion #1  
Niel Kaczorowski  
Jason McIvor

From: **Niel Kaczorowski** kaczorowski@hotmail.ca  
Subject: Fair Play motion  
Date: March 14, 2016 at 9:28 PM  
To: scott.myers@smhra.ca, scott.hunnam@smhra.ca, scott.hunnam@gmail.com, Scottmyers2011@hotmail.com  
Cc: Jason McIvor jmcivor@mymts.net

Scott,

Please accept the following motion submitted by **Niels Kaczorowski** and **Jason McIvor** to institute a new **Equal and Fair Ice Time Policy in SMHRA**. Attached is an Equal Ice Time Policy that we drafted up. This proposed policy would apply to all teams, competitive and recreational, in SMHRA. Should this policy be accepted, SMHRA executive could use this policy or use it as a template to draft their own policy.

Picture the following scenario: Time is running out in a tied or one goal game in a minor hockey game. As the chance of winning shrinks with each tick of the clock, should the bench shrink with it? Should a team send out only it's best players in an effort to win while any perceived "weak links" remain on the bench?

The answer? No

Too often in minor hockey coaches play "**to win at all cost**" even if it means limiting the ice time to certain players. Winning has become way to important in a lot of cases in minor hockey and specifically our own association. Kids want to play on a team, and winning or losing is not as important to the kids. It's not why they play. It's about experience and participation. Parents all pay the same fees for their children to play and as such each and every coach has the duty to ensure that players receive equal opportunity. Parents, no matter the level, want to watch their children play the game; they do not pay to have their children receive less opportunity then the stronger players on the team. In saying this yes there may be times when a child misses a shift due to discipline etc. but only getting a few shifts a game because a coach shortens the bench trying to win is wrong and is not what Minor Hockey is about. Minor hockey should not be in the business to win games, this is left to junior and professional hockey. The core values of minor hockey are to expose children to the great game of hockey and to learn valuable life skills that they hopefully take with them into adulthood. Our sport does not win when we have adults that play to win at all costs. In the end we all lose as children who are not treated equally leave the sport due to not having fun! SMHRA has an obligation when they accept a parents money and place their child on a team that that player is allowed equal opportunity to play and coaches that fail to follow this philosophy should be disciplined.

In closing, we have both grown up and played minor hockey in Stonewall ourselves. We know that instituting this policy will improve SMHRA for all players and parents while helping further the development of all players in our program. The intent of a fair ice policy is not to prompt parents to begin scrutinizing the number and length of every shift. Guidelines will need to be drawn up to ensure that the policy is properly understood and applied as required.

Best Regards,

Jason McIvor



# FAIR AND EQUAL ICE POLICY

## Equal and Fair Ice Time Policy

The SMHRA values player development over individual game results. We want our players to look back at their time spent with SMHRA with fond memories. Players play for fun and would rather get equal and fair ice time on a losing team than sit on the bench of a winning one.

It is impossible for all players to receive the exact same number of shifts or minutes of play time in a single game. Many times the shift length depends on whistles or what end the puck is in. **Equal Ice Time** means that, on average, all players in the same general position will be on the ice the same amount of time.

**Fair Ice Time** recognizes that game situations present opportunities for coaches to ice specific lines; for example, power play or penalty kill. **Fair Ice Time** means that over a season coaches will afford all players the opportunity to play in these situations.

**As a coach**, you have the responsibility to encourage players to be the best they can be, and provide equal opportunities for them to develop self-esteem and hockey skills. When you play your talented athletes more often, you make other players feel less important and deny them the chance to improve their skills.

**As a Parent**, you have the responsibility to understand the challenges of equal and fair ice time and speak up if you feel it is abused. Give our coaches some latitude and consider your position over a period of at least three games. Please do not bring a stopwatch to the game.

This policy assumes that all players are eligible to play in every game. Any review of player ice time, formal or informal, should average playing time over multiple games and must take into account penalties, injuries, absences and or suspensions.

Motion #2

Scott Myers

To SMHRA Executive and Membership

I would like to revise my original motion submitted to SMHRA

**Coach Conduct with Officials**

Throughout all levels of Stonewall Minor Hockey there has been a notable increase in the number of instances where coaches have verbally abusive towards referees.

There have been recent instances where coaches from our organization have been ejected from games and suspended by hockey's governing bodies for abuse of officials.

This behaviour not only casts SMHRA in a negative light, it is also a reason why the organization is losing officials on a yearly basis.

Without officials we cannot play games

This trend cannot continue.

It is with this in mind that the following motion is submitted.

This motion proposes that:

If any member of SMHRA - parent, spectator or coach observes a coach (or any other member of the bench staff) of one of Stonewall's minor hockey league teams abusing an official and formally brings their observations to the SMHRA Board's attention the SMHRA Board will formally investigate the allegations.

Presently through existing by-laws the SMHRA has the ability to set up a Discipline Committee.

Depending on the seriousness of the allegation, and history of recurrence of the allegation, the Discipline Committee will address the coach or team official behaviour accordingly.

Although not formally established yet, the SMHRA is developing a formal complaint process to deal with allegations of coach/management/player misconduct. The complaint process will detail how an investigation takes place, and what scale of punishment will be associated with a particular offence. The intent of the complaint investigation process is to mirror Hockey Manitoba and Hockey's Winnipeg's approach to dealing with these types of incidents.

The Motion also allows for SMHRA to match - in length of games suspended - any suspension to coaches levied by Hockey Manitoba, Interlake Minor Hockey, Hockey Winnipeg or any other sanctioned body governing hockey that is recognized by any of the previously mentioned organizations.

Scott Myers

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott Myers [mailto:scottmyers2011@hotmail.com]

Sent: March-24-16 3:56 PM

To: Reimer, Geoff P (CWS)

Subject: Re: Revised AA Motion

Sure tidy it up if you want.



Motion #3  
Liam Wheddon

### AA Interlake Program

- to start a AA program at Bantam and Pee wee age levels in the Interlake. The program would be a feeder system for the AAA bantam and Midget Interlake teams
- Falling behind other regions that already have both programs or are starting next year. Eastman already has a AA bantam program with teams from Pembina Valley included in the league as well. Eastman is believed to have started a AA Pee wee program entering the City, not confirmed as of yet. Portage, Brandon have AA pee wee teams and Pembina Valley has pee wee AA caliber teams.
- Bantam program can be set up either as 13 and 14 year olds or as Minor Bantam program entering the Eastman League next season. Pee wee AA would consist of 11 & 12 year olds.
- Taking the top 2-4 players from a town would bring parity to the Interlake league. Realize some towns or regions of the Interlake taking that 1-2 players could hurt them from having a team, but there are many communities at all age levels that have to combine to make teams. Work together to make sure both towns rinks are being used to develop with the advantage of having more ice to use.
- Starting this program at pee wee will help development not just to feed the AAA program, but help develop all skill levels throughout the Interlake
- AA pee wee program we realize cannot enter city next year, hopefully entered for 17/18 but lets start with full time travelling team next season playing exhibition, tournaments and entering AA provincials



## Plan and Cost of AA PeeWee

Practices- 1-2 times a week, can be moved around-Teulon, Gimli, Arborg, Stonewall, Warren, Stony etc

-Games will most likely to be played Warren, Stony or Stonewall, but being exhibition games could be moved to Teulon or Gimli

-Tournaments would include Kenora, Portage, Brandon, Regina, Winnipeg .

-Play in AA PeeWee Provincials

-Practices 4-5 per month	25x\$150	\$3750
--------------------------	----------	--------

-Tournaments	4x\$1200	\$4800
--------------	----------	--------

-Misc/Apparel	17x\$300	\$5100
---------------	----------	--------

-Ref	10x\$75	\$750
------	---------	-------

-Game Ice	10x\$150	\$1500
-----------	----------	--------

Total Expenses		\$15900
----------------	--	---------

### Income

17 players x \$750	\$12750
--------------------	---------

Tryouts \$100x30	\$3000
------------------	--------

Sponsorship/Fundraising	\$3000
-------------------------	--------

Total	\$18750
-------	---------

Expenses and Income numbers will vary

## Stonewall PeeWee /BantamOptions if AA Program

-Losing 5-7 kids obviously will affect being competitive in 12A1, so options would be

A team playing in the Interlake or 12A2 or travelling team

B team playing in Interlake or city 12A2/A3

If 3 teams then a C team would be put in 12A3

Interlake is moving in the direction of a AA Pee wee team in the next year or year after so if there are other options please feel free to discuss. We would still be entering a team into the city be it 12A2 or 12A3. Again would be a year to year basis as the board sees fit to enter teams into the best competitive league for the teams.

Bantam again would have to be looked at every year as well as we would lose players to AAA and AA, so A team would have to go to Interlake but B team would go to A2 or possibly A3.