

Children's Ringette in Alberta: Review and Recommendations

Submitted to Ringette Alberta



Report Prepared By:
Tim Berrett (Ph.D.)



www.caminata.ca

14027 105 Avenue, Edmonton AB T5N 0Z1

Tel: (780) 982-1528

tim@caminata.ca

5/10/2020

This report assesses the current (2019-2020) and proposed (2020-2021 and beyond) implementation of Ringette Canada's Children's Ringette programming in the province of Alberta.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE:

Ringette Canada's guidelines for structuring Children's Ringette are in the process of being implemented across Canada. Included in this restructuring is a proposal that players under the age of 10 should not play on a full ice surface and should play under modified rules and with small goal nets. Ultimately, Ringette Canada plans to move from an age-based development model to one that accounts for differences in skill development, with new skaters having a variety of 'on ramps' to the sport before being placed in the FUNdamentals or Learn to Train contexts.

As part of its efforts to understand the potential impacts of transitioning toward reduced-ice and modified rules for developing players, Ringette Alberta contracted *Caminata Consulting* to conduct primary research to ascertain the implications for players, coaches, officials, parents, and local associations. The research was coordinated with initial investigations being conducted by Ringette Canada.

FINDINGS:

- There is currently good awareness of the current U10 Step format, which offers players three steps of development between Active Start and U12 play. Similarly, there is good awareness that it is not a requirement for players to progress sequentially through the three-step program in consecutive years. (For each of these two elements of the program, more than 90% of survey respondents were aware of the current protocols).
- Although not quite as well understood, some 83% of respondents indicated that they were aware that teams can be constituted differently from year to year in order to accommodate differences in skill development.
- Three primary areas of skill mastery were identified as being important for players prior to moving to full-ice play: skating, ring skills, and team play skills. However, there was considerable resistance to the notion that skill levels can be objectively measured in order to determine whether a player is 'ready' for full-ice play.
- Skill development was deemed less critical (on average) by Active Start coaches than U10 coaches in determining when a player is ready to progress to full-ice play. However, even among U10 coaches, there is limited support for Ringette Canada's proposal to keep U10 players at half-ice beyond U10 Step 1.
- As with coaches, parents of developing players are not entirely convinced of the benefits of U10 players developing their skills on a reduced ice playing surface area.
- Among local associations, there is generally stronger support for improved skill development at the U10 age. However, concerns were expressed around player retention if they play three years at U10 on a reduced ice surface.
- Local associations are more in favour of mini-tournament play for half-ice than is the case for parents and coaches. The latter, it appears, require further education as to what these mini-tournaments would entail.
- Almost a quarter of officials assigned to half-ice games were first year (which is not recommended under current Ringette Alberta guidelines). Similarly, less than one third (31.8%) reported consistent 90 second shift times (which is the current Ringette Alberta recommendation). However, over three quarters (76.7%) of half-ice officials reported that they explain penalty calls (as is recommended).
- Coaches reported that a number of other Ringette Alberta recommendations for half-ice games are not being following consistently: almost three-quarters (72.6%) reported that they changed goalies during games, and fewer than one fifth (19.6%) reported consistent 90 second shifts. A number of reasons were

given as to why this was the case including, difficulty with programming the timer, agreement between coaches at games that a longer shift was preferable, and players taking too long to change shifts.

- Two games (one U10 Step 1 – half ice; one U 10 Step 2 – full ice) were selected at random for a detailed observation and subsequent analysis. Although not statistically significant because of the small sample size, in the games observed, compared with their full-ice peers, the half-ice players were observed to have 25% more touches, 25% more shot attempts, almost twice as many shots, and 43% more possession after controlling for playing time.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Proceed as planned in 2020-21 (U10 S-2 half ice) to align with Ringette Canada plans, but with more consistent application of the guidelines that are currently in place for U10 S-1 (notably regarding shift lengths, and goalie changes).
- Work with members to improve key logistics and consistent application of guidelines
 - Athlete placement guidance
 - Team size
 - Shift length
 - Game restart procedure
 - Goalies
- Continue liaison with Ringette Canada research team that is conducting a nationwide review of Children's ringette.
- Urge Ringette Canada to clarify transition from age-based to skill-based progression (development / implementation of Athlete Development Matrix).
- Continue efforts to educate and communicate with coaches, parents, and local associations as to rationale behind the proposed changes.
- Consider trial of mini-tournaments (with increased education about possible benefits) for half-ice play.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Purpose:.....	1
Findings:.....	1
Recommendations:.....	2
Acknowledgements	4
Introduction and Background.....	5
Current Situation and Preliminary Proposals	6
Research Objectives	8
Research Methodology.....	9
Stakeholder Surveys	9
Game Observations	9
Responses.....	10
Results	11
Overall Responses.....	11
Awareness of Current Format	11
Skill level proficiency to progress from half to full ice.....	11
Skating lessons and Other Sports	11
Support for Mini-Tournament Format	11
Responses from U10 Coaches	12
Responses from Parents	12
Responses from Officials	12
Responses from Local Associations	13
Game Observations And Playing Conditions	13
Summary of Concerns.....	15
Summary of Support.....	15
Recommendations to Ringette Alberta Board.....	16
Appendices	18
Appendix 1 – Children’s Ringette Survey (Coaches, Parents, Local Associations).....	18
Appendix 2 – Children’s Ringette Survey (Officials)	28
Appendix 3 – Children’s Ringette Survey (Officials’ Assignors)	33
Appendix 4 – Game Observation Template (Master Coding).....	37
Appendix 5 – Open Ended Question Responses.....	39

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared by Caminata Consulting for Ringette Alberta. In large part, the data used were collected and analyzed by Caminata Consulting. However, the research was conducted in coordination with a broader investigation of Children's Ringette across Canada that is being led by Dr. Veronica Allen of York University. Ringette Alberta staff provided logistical support (notably in video recording of selected Children's Ringette games for subsequent analysis), and (under Dr. Allen's direction) students at Queen's University conducted video analysis of games played in Alberta. The analysis and overall results were produced independently of Ringette Alberta to ensure objectivity and impartiality. Caminata Consulting assumes responsibility for results and recommendations made in this report.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Children's Ringette refers to the format for players aged under 10 years of age. It comprises Active Start (split into two stages) and U10 (consisting of three steps). In the first of these (Active Start) informal cross-ice games are played and small nest are used. For U10, small goal nets are used, but (in Alberta) in 2019-20 only Step 1 played half-ice (and three skaters, plus a goalie), while Steps 2 and 3 played full-ice (and five skaters, plus a goalie).

The Ringette Canada rationale behind Children's Ringette's modified games and formats is that they provide improved opportunity for skill development (as compared with progression to a full-ice surface before fundamentals are mastered). The purported benefits of playing on a reduced ice surface area with smaller teams and goals include:

- Faster pace of games;
- Players show more creativity on a smaller ice surface and with fewer team-mates on the ice;
- Decision making in tight spaces is improved;
- Skill development and mastery are both improved and achieved more quickly;
- Passing and handling are superior;
- More competitive games (closer scores); and
- Greater engagement in play for all players.

Underpinning these advantages is the notion that players need to "slow down to go faster" (i.e., take the time to learn basic fundamentals that will help them to progress in the game more quickly). This entails the following key elements:

- There should be a greater focus on what matters most in the short term;
- The right things, in the right sequence, at the right time
- Better athletes. Sooner.

Also, there is a wealth of empirical evidence and data that indicate that a modified version of the game is superior for player and skill development. This is the case both for other team and individual sports (such as hockey, soccer, and athletics), as well as for Ringette in other parts of the world (most notably in Finland).

In order to provide context specific data in the context of Ringette in Canada, Ringette Canada is coordinating its own research (being conducted independently of the national federation) to inform its decision making. Ringette Alberta has also determined that data-driven and informed opinions will be critical in guiding its own adoption of (or variances from) Ringette Canada's proposals. The underlying objective is to ensure that decisions will be made that will help the most players develop skills most effectively and efficiently, which will (ultimately) lead to their improved enjoyment of, and long-term involvement in, the game.

Various responses have been presented to the question '*when should ringette players progress to full-ice?*' The theoretical answer is 'when the individual player is ready' (with 'readiness' being extrapolated from the Ringette Essentials / Athlete Development Matrix, Ringette Canada's guide for placing players). However, in terms of practical application and administrative convenience, the current practice is to determine full-ice readiness by division and level of player. The downside of this approach is that the development of players does not fit into this model and approach.

Progression to full-ice ringette is predicated upon proper athlete placement (based on skill) rather than a gut feeling that players are 'ready' for full-ice. However, there are currently no consistent criteria to determine such readiness,

and assessments are administered inconsistently. If players truly are ‘ready’, they may currently be placed in divisions/levels that offer full-ice play.

CURRENT SITUATION AND PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS

The current (2019-2020) offerings for Children’s Ringette in Alberta are summarized in the following table.

	Active Start	U10 Step 1	U10 Steps 2 &3
Ice	Cross	Half	Full
Nets	Small	Small	Small
Rules	Modified*	Modified	Adult

* Only if games played (not recommended at Active Start)

It is Ringette Canada’s current intention to implement modified game play for all players aged 9 and under by 2021-2022. However, in the longer term (the timeline for which had not yet been determined), Ringette Canada intends to move from an age-based development system to one that focuses on skill. The future will feature ‘on-ramps’ for new skaters, with two stages of FUNdamentals development (both featuring half-ice games), and two stages of Learn to Train (both featuring full-ice games). Neither FUNdamentals nor Learn to Train would accommodate new skaters.

RINGETTE CANADA – PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL (2021-22)

	Active Start	U10 Steps 1-3	U12 +
Ice	Cross	Half	Full
Nets	Small	Small	Large
Rules	Modified*	Modified	Adult

RINGETTE ALBERTA PROPOSAL (2020-2021)

Based on Ringette Canada’s intentions, and on development currently observed, Ringette Alberta announced its intention to add an additional stage of U10 at half-ice in 2020-2021 (predicated on proper athlete placement), as depicted below:

- Cross Ice
 - Active Start
- Half ice
 - U10-1
 - U10-2
- Full ice
 - U10-3

- U12

RECOMMENDED FORMAT FOR CHILDREN'S RINGETTE (REDUCED ICE)

The recommended format for Children's Ringette is summarized as follows:

- Half Ice
- Small nets
- 3 v 3 (+ goalies)
- Must pass over ringette line
- 10-player roster (9 + goalie) (or 7, or 13)
- Goalie rotates between (not during) games – goalie equipment optional
- Equal ice time
- Game sheets (only to record attendance)
- No scores announced or posted (including tournaments)
- No standings
- 5-minute warm up
- 90 second shifts (buzzer)
- Referee (2+ years' experience)
- Continuous play (after goal, infraction, etc.)
- No penalties (education only)

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the research conducted in Alberta in the spring of 2020 can be summarized as follows:

- To identify current practice in Children's Ringette and determine the extent to which guidelines are being followed.
- To gather information and opinions from coaches, parents, administrators, and officials regarding current and proposed Children's Ringette formats.
- To provide Ringette Alberta with information and recommendations that would assist it in determining whether or not to proceed with plans to modify Children's Ringette in the 2020-2021 season and beyond.

In the initial stages of the research being conducted in Alberta, Ringette Canada announced that it was conducting its own nation-wide research program (led by Dr. Veronica Allen of York University) to determine how to proceed with implementing and promoting appropriate athlete development across the country. The objectives of Ringette Canada's research were identified as follows:

*"The purpose of the proposed research is to evaluate the impact of Ringette Canada's newly introduced guidelines for structuring Children's Ringette. These guidelines are in the process of being implemented for all programs involving children under the age of 10 years who are being introduced to ringette for the first time. In partnership with Ringette Canada, the research team will use the RE-AIM Framework to evaluate the Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance of the following mandate: Beginning in the 2019-2020 season, all games for players under the age of eight years (U8 category) should be played on an area that does not exceed half the ice surface (i.e., small-area games). This change will be introduced at the U9 and U10 levels in 2020-21 and 2021-22."*¹

In order to ensure coordination of research efforts, Caminata Consulting collaborated with Dr. Allen in the design of the current research protocols.

¹ Allen, V., Fraser-Thomas, J., & Martin, L. "Evaluating the Impact of Small-Area Games in Children's Ringette" SSHRC Research Proposal, December 2019.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Information was obtained on all aspects of Children's Ringette in Alberta in 2019-2020, targeting the following stakeholder groups via online surveys.

- Coaches
- Parents
- Officials and assignors
- Local association board members

In addition to the online surveys, a limited number of game observations were made.

STAKEHOLDER SURVEYS

A total of 1,789 invitations to complete the stakeholder survey (see Appendix 1) were sent to coaches, parents, and local association board members who were included in the Ringette Alberta database as part of their 2019-2020 registration process. It was subsequently pointed out that some local associations had not submitted email addresses for all parents / coaches as part of the registration process. In order to provide those individuals with the opportunity to complete the survey and provide input, a web-based link to the survey was provided and made available for circulation.

A total of 399 officials who were registered in the Ringette Alberta database were contacted by email to complete the officials' survey (see Appendix 2). Similarly, a web-based link to this survey was also provided and made available for circulation.

A total of 22 local association officials' assignors who were registered in the Ringette Alberta database were contacted by email to complete the officials' assignors survey (see Appendix 3). A web-based link was also provided for those who were not contacted directly.

In each instance, several follow-up reminders were sent to individuals who had not responded, or only submitted partial responses. These reminders were sent over a four-week period in March-April of 2020, thus ensuring ample opportunity for stakeholders from across the province to provide input.

GAME OBSERVATIONS

Game observations were conducted at a Children's Ringette tournament that took place on February 14-15, 2020 in Spruce Grove, Alberta. It was originally intended to conduct additional game observations later in the season (in March), but the events at which these were to be completed were cancelled as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

One observation was made of a U10 Step 1 game, and one observation was made of a U10 Step 2 game. At the targeted games, GoPro cameras and a larger tri-pod mounted camera were used to record the on-ice play. Coaches and parents / guardians were informed about the research being conducted via on-site direct contact. Signs were posted around the tournament venue stating that games would be video-recorded. All video recordings were uploaded to a password-protected computer, with each file being encrypted with a password (for data security reasons). A Ringette Alberta representative was identified and available at the event who could be contacted by coaches, parents, and guardians if they had questions or concerns about the recordings.

Analysis of the game play was conducted by graduate research assistants at Queen’s University in Ontario. The protocol used is outlined in Appendix 4.

RESPONSES

- Overall, a total of 1,117 responses were received from coaches, parents, and local associations. Of these 827 were complete responses (i.e., answered all relevant questions). Based on this response rate, results can be considered accurate to within at least +/- 2.5% nineteen times out of twenty.
- For officials, a total of 226 responses were received, of which 114 indicated that they had officiated at least one half-ice game in 2019-2020. Of this number, 86 provided complete responses. Based on this response rate, results can be considered accurate to within at least +/- 8.0% nineteen times out of twenty (assuming that 200 officials in the province officiated at least one half-ice game).
- For officials’ assignors, 9 responses were received, of which 6 were complete. No statistical inference can be drawn from the results of this survey. However, a number of local associations provided input on questions that were asked of officials’ assignors.

The following numbers of responses were received for identified groups of stakeholders.

- Active Start (cross ice) – 159 responses (coaches and parents) – no game observations
- U10 Step 1 (modified game) – 193 responses (coaches and parents); 1 game observation
- U10 Step 2 (adult game) – 294 responses (coaches and parents); 1 game observation
- U10 Step 3 (adult game) – 140 responses (coaches and parents) – no game observations
- Local Association Board Members – 100 responses
- Officials’ Assignors – 6 responses
- Officials – 114 responses

Player Year of Birth	# of Responses	Percent
2009 or earlier	18	2.4%
2010	198	25.9%
2011	210	27.5%
2012	189	24.7%
2013	103	13.5%
2014 or later	46	6.0%
Total	764	100%

Responses by Player Age

Division / Level	Number	Percent
Active Start	123	16.1%
Step 1	193	25.3%
Step 2	294	38.5%
Step 3	140	18.3%
Other / Unsure	14	1.8%
Total	764	100%

Responses by Player Division / Level

RESULTS

This section provides a summary of the results of the analysis of the survey data. More detailed data were provided to the Ringette Alberta board in the form of links to mini-presentations that segmented the sample into a variety of subsets (e.g., U10 Step 1 coaches, U10 Steps 2 and 3 coaches, Active Start coaches, etc.)

OVERALL RESPONSES

AWARENESS OF CURRENT FORMAT

- 90% awareness of current format (Step 1 half ice; Steps 2 & 3 full ice)
- 90% awareness of ability to progress non-sequentially from season to season (e.g., Step 1 to Step 3)
- 83% awareness that team make-up can change from season to season (to accommodate differences in skill development)

Overall, there is good awareness of the current format and the ability of players to move non-sequentially through the U10 Steps. However, some respondents from smaller local associations indicated that it might be difficult to accommodate players who are proficient enough to 'skip' a step if that means that there would be insufficient players at a level to form a team.

SKILL LEVEL PROFICIENCY TO PROGRESS FROM HALF TO FULL ICE

- 16-20% had insufficient knowledge to assess
- Of those that indicated what was required to progress, the most important skills cited were:
 - Skating skills
 - Ring skills
 - Team play skills

However, a number of respondents indicated that trying to assess skill levels objectively in ringette had proven difficult in the past. Also, a number of respondents questioned whether it was appropriate to identify proficiency of certain skills as a prerequisite for progression to full ice. Some noted that even U19 players did not consistently display proficiency at basic skills.

SKATING LESSONS AND OTHER SPORTS

Approximately 30% of the 930 parents of U10 and Active Start players who responded indicated that their child took skating lessons outside of ringette team practices. Meanwhile, over 50% of the same number of parents who responded indicated that their child played other team sports. The majority of these other team sports (e.g., soccer, baseball, basketball, softball) employed some form of modified rules for players of this age.

SUPPORT FOR MINI-TOURNAMENT FORMAT

Mini-tournaments, modelled on the experience in Finland in which four teams play a round-robin three game tournament over a two-hour ice time, were suggested as a way for U10 half-ice games to be less time-consuming and involve less travel. When asked the extent to which they were likely to support mini-tournaments, parents and coaches responded as follows:

- 9.0% Very Likely
- 22.7% Likely
- 23.9% Neutral

- 18.6% Unlikely
 - 25.6% Very Unlikely
- Although just under one third of respondents were generally supportive of trialing a mini-tournament format for half-ice games, almost a half (44.2%) were not supportive. In large part, this lack of support appears to be attributable to a misunderstanding of what mini-tournaments might entail and how they could result in less travel and time commitment for players and parents.

RESPONSES FROM U10 COACHES

A total of 222 Coaches of U10 or Active Start (including 2 non-parent coaches) submitted responses. Of this number, 51 were U10 Step 1 coaches. The responses from these coaches indicated the following:

- Some local associations appear to be reluctant to keep players in same Step for consecutive years;
 - Certain skills (carrying / passing) are more critical than others (backhand / protecting / backward skating) for progression to full-ice play;
 - Skill development is deemed less critical by U8 (Active Start) coaches than U10 coaches for player progression to full-ice play;
 - Many coaches believe that players learn full-ice game by playing it; and
- Overall, there is limited support among coaches for Ringette Canada proposals for half-ice for U10, especially after Step 1. The general consensus among coaches (and particularly those at U10) is that any more than one year at half-ice will lead to players losing interest and not being sufficiently prepared to progress to full-ice play once they are in the U12 age group. However, some U10 coaches did see the benefits associated with half-ice play in terms of skill development.

RESPONSES FROM PARENTS

A total of 681 non-coaching parents of Active Start and U10 players responded to the survey. Of these, 294 had a child who played either half- or cross-ice in 2019-2020 (i.e., Active Start or U10 Step 1), and a further 387 had a child who played full-ice (i.e., U10 Step 2 or 3). The key findings were as follows:

- Many parents feared that players will lose interest in the game if they play on half-ice until they begin U12;
- Transition to full-ice at U12 considered 'too late' by many parents;
- An oft-cited mantra among parents (particularly those currently in U10 Step 1 who played half-ice in 2019-2020 and, even if they progress to Step 2 in 2020-2021 would, under the current proposals, remain at half-ice) is 'why change?'
- There was little acknowledgement that a player who is deemed 'ready' for full-ice can currently play U12 even if they are still U10;
- Many parents remain unconvinced that half-ice games offer benefits for development when skill levels are not highly advanced. Clearly, more education and research-based evidence are needed on 'benefits' of half-ice games for development.
- Why change?

RESPONSES FROM OFFICIALS

A total of 224 officials responded to the survey, of which 113 (50.5%) officiated half ice in 2019-2020. The respondents reported the following:

- 25.6% of half-ice officials were first year officials (which is not recommended under current Ringette Alberta guidelines);
- 25.6% of half-ice officials had officiated at least 5 years;
- Only 31.8% reported consistent 90 second shift lengths (the recommended time) for half-ice games;
- The vast majority (90.7%) used the free play line to mimic the blue line during half-ice games (as is recommended under current guidelines);
- Over three quarters (76.7%) explained penalty calls to players (as is recommended).
Officials reported that they observed improved skill development in players during half-ice games, as compared with players of similar skill level in full-ice games.

RESPONSES FROM LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS

A total of 47 local association board members provided responses. Local associations from all regions of the province were represented. In general terms, local associations reported the following:

- There is strong support for improved skill development at younger ages as is promoted by cross-ice and half-ice games prior to progression to full-ice play;
- Board members expressed similar concerns to those identified by both parents and coaches about half-ice for U10 Steps 2 & 3 (especially around player retention);
- However, local associations illustrated more support (than parents / coaches) for trialing the ‘mini-tournament’ format for half-ice games.

GAME OBSERVATIONS AND PLAYING CONDITIONS

Comparisons were made between players on two randomly selected teams each of a half-ice (U10 Step 1) and full-ice (U10 Step 2) game. While circumstances did not permit a more robust sample size in the 2019-2020 season, preliminary findings indicate strong support for the notion that half-ice games encourage more touches, more shot attempts, more shots, and more possession of the ring as compared with full-ice games of players of similar skill levels. The results of the analysis show that (after controlling for playing time of each skater) there were 25% more touches, 25% more shot attempts, almost double the amount of more shots, and 43% more possession for half-ice players. These results are summarized in the following two tables.

	Events / minute playing (controlling for playing time)			
	Half-Ice		Full-Ice	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Touches	1.26	0.47	0.97	0.43
Pass Attempts	0.57	0.24	0.54	0.23
Successful passes	0.35	0.26	0.35	0.21
Unsuccessful passes	0.22	0.13	0.19	0.10
Shot attempts	0.41	0.24	0.31	0.24
Shots	0.30	0.24	0.17	0.20
Missed shots	0.11	0.12	0.07	0.08
Possession / Playing time	10.3%	6.0%	7.2%	3.5%

Observation	Difference
Touces	25% more for half-ice
Shot attempts	25% more for half-ice
Shots	Almost double for half-ice
Possession / Playing time	43% greater for half-ice

Two aspects of half-ice game play (roster size and game format) were assessed from the survey responses to determine the extent to which Ringette Alberta guidelines were being followed during the 2019-2020 season.

ROSTER SIZE (U10 STEP 1)

The following were reported by coaches of U10 Step 1 teams:

- 43.2% of teams had 10 or fewer players;
- 3.9% of teams had more than 16 players;
- An average of 10.2 players dressed per game;
- Team roster size was between 9 and 16 players, with an average roster size of 11.3.

These findings align closely with Ringette Alberta guidelines.

GAME FORMAT (U10 STEP 1)

The following game formats were reported by coaches of U10 Step 1 teams:

- 72.6% played all games 3 v 3;
- 11.8% played all games 5 v 5;
- The average game length was 46.2 minutes;
- The average game ice slot for games was 59.3 minutes;
- Only 19.6% of coaches reported consistent 90 second shift lengths;
- Almost two thirds (64.7%) of coaches reported at least 75% of all shifts were 90 seconds;
- An average of 18.2 games were played in 2019-2020 (recommendation is 10 league games + 2 tournaments, which if each tournament involved four games would be in line with the overall recommendation);
- An average of 29.0 on-ice practices were held in 2019-2020 (the recommendation is 20);
- An average of 7.1 practices were held before first game (recommended minimum is 3);
- Almost three quarters (72.6%) changed goalies during games (i.e., between shifts) (the recommendation is not to change during games, but to rotate goalies between games).

While many of the current Ringette Alberta guidelines (particularly regarding game length, roster size, number of players dressed for each game, and number of games) are being followed, it is notable that neither the 90-second recommendation for each shift nor the recommendation to keep the same goalie for the entire game are not being applied consistently. That over one in ten U10 Step 1 coaches reported having played full-ice (5 v

5) games further highlights that not all Ringette Alberta recommendations for this step are being followed consistently across the province.

SUMMARY OF CONCERNS

Taken as a whole, several concerns were expressed by coaches, parents, local associations, and officials with the current format and proposed changes to Children's Ringette in Alberta. These can be categorized as follows:

- Player retention is seen to be an issue if players feel that they are being 'held back' by playing on reduced (cross- or half-) ice for 'too many' seasons before progressing to the full-ice game. It is suggested (by both coaches and parents) that players may lose interest in ringette if they are not allowed to play the 'real' game. It should be noted that no attempt was made in the current research to obtain feedback directly from developing players. However, the Ringette Canada investigation of Children's Ringette does aim to generate such data.
- Delaying the transition to full-ice may result in challenges when the change is finally made as players will be experiencing a different game format later in their development. However, it is generally acknowledged by all stakeholders that players who are deemed to be 'ready' to progress to the full-ice game before they are ten years of age (under the current age-based format) are permitted to play on a U12 team.
- Smaller associations were seen to be at a potential disadvantage in dividing players based on their stage of development. This is because there is generally a greater variability of skills within teams. Local associations must then determine which format is most appropriate, which results in the game played by some players not aligning with their level of skill development (i.e., some players with demonstrably advanced skill levels will play half-ice in order for a local association to form a team, and vice versa).
- Despite considerable efforts made on the part of Ringette Alberta in explaining the rationale for the current and proposed formats of Children's Ringette, there is a need for more education of stakeholders regarding the benefits of reduced-ice play at earlier stages of development. Evidence from other sports and ringette in other countries of modified games to enhance skill development is not seen by many stakeholders as being sufficient to support the current direction being taken by Ringette Alberta and Ringette Canada. However, both the current study and the broader analysis of Children's Ringette across Canada will help provide the data that either supports or refutes the arguments in favour of reduced-ice play.
- A number of stakeholders are operating under the assumption that the previous full-ice approach to ringette development is appropriate and that there is little reason to change.
- Perhaps supporting the current opposition by some stakeholders to the half-ice game is the fact that current guidelines are being inconsistently applied. This makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions regarding the benefits of the approach.

SUMMARY OF SUPPORT

While a number of concerns were expressed by stakeholders, it should not be concluded that there is no support for Children's Ringette (either in its current format or for proposed changes to its delivery). Numerous comments were submitted by parents, coaches, and local associations that collectively indicate that there is general agreement that game modifications (such as reduced ice, fewer players on the ice, and small nets) are beneficial for ringette development. There is little, if any, argument that Active Start and early stages of U10 game play should be conducted on reduced ice. The concerns (as outlined above) appear more to be around when it is appropriate for players to progress.

The limited empirical data on comparisons between half-ice (Step 1) and full-ice (Step 2) play seem to support the notion that the purported benefits of increased player involvement are evident in reduced-ice play. Although lacking statistical rigour, the game observations and subsequent analysis do appear to corroborate the conclusions of the research that has been conducted on other team sports. There is little reason to suggest that ringette is unique in this regard.

The concept of mini-tournaments for half-ice games appears to merit further investigation and possible trial. The benefits seen elsewhere (which include reduced time and travel costs, and more efficient use of ice-time) are likely to be evident in Alberta. However, the concept must be explained more clearly to stakeholders in order for the perceived negative aspects of such a format (too long a period for young children to be active, a sense that the format is "too chaotic", the increase in time commitment as compared with single games, etc.) to be addressed.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO RINGETTE ALBERTA BOARD

Based on the input received from stakeholders, along with a review of research on athlete development in other sports, as well as the limited empirical observations of game play, the following recommendations are made to the Ringette Alberta board of directors:

- Proceed as planned in 2020-2021 (U10 Step 2 half-ice). While there is considerable resistance to this among stakeholders, it aligns with Ringette Canada's longer-term plans to move to reduced-ice for all players aged 9 and under by 2022-2023².
- Review the 2020-2021 season experience (particularly relating to the move to U10 Step 2 to half-ice) prior to making any decisions for the 2022-2023 season.
- Reinforce the notion that players who are deemed 'ready' for full-ice can opt to play U12. This will require the continued cooperation of local associations. In order that players be appropriately placed, Ringette Alberta could consider the development of 'athlete placement guidelines' that are based on any available Ringette-specific research.
- Continue liaison with the Ringette Canada research team that is conducting a nationwide assessment of Children's Ringette.
- Urge Ringette Canada to clarify the timelines and details of the proposed transition from age-based to skill-based progression (specifically, the development and implementation of Athlete Development Matrix that will be used to guide appropriate player placement).
- Continue and redouble efforts to educate and communicate with key stakeholders (coaches, parents, local associations, and officials) regarding both the current proposals and future direction of Children's Ringette.
- Consider the trial of mini-tournaments for half-ice play during 2020-2021 (with increased education about possible benefits).
 - For example, as a trial, the regular season of ten games could be reduced to six-eight games with the addition of two mini-tournaments (one before the new year, and one later). The former would result in the same number of games being played as is currently recommended, while the latter would result in the same amount of game ice-time as is currently recommended.


² Along with other timeline-based recommendations, this assumes that ringette will return to 'normal' in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. If this is not the case (e.g., if a return to play is delayed for the 2020-2021 season), the proposed timelines will need to be adjusted accordingly.

- Work with members (local associations, coaches, and officials) to improve key logistics and consistent application of current Children's Ringette guidelines (particularly as they relate to team size, shift length, goalie changes, game restart procedures, and use of experienced officials).

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Children's Ringette Survey (Coaches, Parents, Local Associations)

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey

 Caminata Consulting

Your role(s) in Ringette in 2019-2020


You may have a number of roles in Ringette during the current season. Your answer(s) to the following question(s) will direct you to questions specific to your role.

All responses will be confidential and reporting to Ringette Alberta will only be in aggregate format

* 1. Did you coach a U10 or younger team (or teams) during the 2019-2020 Ringette season?

- Yes
 No

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey


 Caminata Consulting

Your role in Ringette in 2019-2020

* 2. Were you a parent / guardian of a U10 or younger player (or players) during the 2019-2020 Ringette season?

- Yes
 No

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey

 Caminata Consulting

Your role in Ringette in 2019-2020

* 3. Were you a local association board member during the 2019-2020 Ringette season?

- Yes
- No (see below)

Please identify your role if you were not a local association board member in 2019-2020

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey



Coach Questions

Please answer the following questions about your experience as a coach of a U10 or younger team during the 2019-2020 Ringette season. If you coached more than one team, please answer only for the oldest team that you coached.

* 4. What was the roster size (total number of players) for the team that you coached?

* 5. What is your best estimate of the average number of players (including goalie) on your team who dressed for each game this season up to March 1, 2020.

0 20

* 6. For each of the following formats, what proportion (to the nearest whole percentage) of games did your team play in 2019-2020 up to March 1, 2020?

	100%	75-99%	50-74%	25-49%	1-24%	0%
3 on 3 (plus goalie)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 on 5 (plus goalie)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 7. What was the length (in minutes) of the majority of games your team played up to March 1, 2020 in the 2019-2020 season? (only include actual playing time: e.g., 2 x 25 minute halves is 50 minutes playing time, 3 x 15 minute periods is 45 minutes playing time, etc.)

0 Minutes 60

* 8. What was the length (in minutes) of the ice slot allocated for the majority of games your team played up to March 1, 2020 in the 2019-2020 season?

0 Minutes 100

* 9. Up to March 1, 2020, how many games did your team play in the 2019-2020 season?

0 Games Played 30

* 10. Up to March 1, 2020, how many on-ice practices did your team have during the 2019-2020 season?

0 Number of on-ice practices 50

* 11. How many on-ice practices did your team have prior to the first game of the 2019-2020 season?

0 Number of practices before first season game 25

* 12. For the majority of games, did your team have the same player as goalie for the entire game?

- Yes
- No

Comment (optional)

* 13. What proportion (to the nearest whole percentage) of games this season so far have involved the following shift lengths?

	100%	75-99%	50-74%	25-49%	1-24%	0%
90 second shifts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
120 second shifts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other length shifts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 14. In addition to being a coach, did you also have a child (or children) who played U10 or younger Ringette in 2019-2020?

- Yes
- No

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey



Parent / Guardian Questions

Please answer the following questions about your child's experience with U10 or younger ringette in 2019-2020. If you had more than one child playing U10 or younger ringette, please answer only for the child identified in the invitation that was emailed to you to complete this survey.

* 15. With which Association was your child registered with in the 2019-20 season?

* 16. In which year was your child born

- 2008 or earlier
- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016 or later

* 17. How many seasons has your child played ringette?

- This is their first season
- 2 (including this season)
- 3 (including this season)
- 4 (including this season)
- 5 or more (including this season)

* 18. In which Division / Level did your child participate during the 2019-20 season?

- Active Start 1
- Active Start 2
- U10 Step 1
- Other (please specify)
- U10 Step 2
- U10 Step 3

* 19. This season (2019-20) did your child play...

- All cross ice games (i.e., less than half ice)
- All half ice games
- All full ice games
- A combination of cross ice, half ice, or full ice games
- Other (please specify)

* 20. Did your child take skating lessons this season in addition to playing ringette?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

* 21. Does your child play other team sports?


- Yes (please specify below)
- No
- Unsure

If yes, please identify the other team sports

* 22. In addition to being a parent / guardian, were you also a local association board member in 2019-2020?

- Yes
- No

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey



Administrator, Coach, and Parent / Guardian Questions

A 2018 Ringette Canada [Competition Review and Restructuring Report](#) recommended the implementation of small-area games for developing participants (i.e., approximately ages 5 to 10 years) as a crucial next step for Children's Ringette. The report cited evidence from other sports that suggests that small-area games have the potential to provide benefits for Children's Ringette participants.

The ensuing national guidelines for Children's Ringette stipulated that, beginning in the 2019-2020 season, all games for players under the age of eight years should be played on an area that does not exceed half the ice surface. By 2021-22 these national guidelines will be extended to players under the age of 10.

The following questions are seeking your opinion on the appropriateness of different formats of play.

* 23. Are you aware that the current (2019-20) format for Alberta Ringette players in U10 is as follows:

U10 Step 1 - Half Ice

U10 Step 2 - Full Ice

U10 Step 3 - Full Ice

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Comment on the current format for U10 Ringette in Alberta (optional)

* 24. Are you aware that it is not a requirement for players to progress from Active Start to Step 1 to Step 2 to Step 3 sequentially (in other words, it is possible to play Step 1 in one season and then Step 3 the following season, or remain at the same step for consecutive seasons)?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

* 25. If an individual is ready to transition to full ice, but their team-mates are not, it may be more appropriate for that player to join a different team at a higher level. Are you aware that team make ups may change from year to year to accommodate differences in skill development?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Comment (optional)

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey



Transition from cross-, to half-, to full-ice

The following questions seek to identify your understanding of the skills required for players to progress through different formats of Ringette.

* 26. How proficient should a player be with the following skating skills to show they are capable to transition to a full ice game (i.e., on what proportion of attempts can the player successfully perform this skill)?

	Less than 25% of the time	Between 25% and 45% of the time	Between 46% and 65% of the time	Between 66% and 85% of the time	More than 85% of the time	Don't know enough to have an opinion
Acceleration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stop (both directions)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tight turns	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pivots	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Backwards skating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment (optional)

* 27. How proficient should a player be with the following ring skills to show they are capable to transition to a full ice game (i.e., on what proportion of attempts can the player successfully perform this skill)?

	Less than 25% of the time	Between 25% and 45% of the time	Between 46% and 65% of the time	Between 66% and 85% of the time	More than 85% of the time	Don't know enough to have an opinion
Carrying the ring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Protecting the ring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Passing – forehand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Passing – backhand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading the receiver (passing anticipating where the receiver should be)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stabbing / receiving the ring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Forehand shot	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Backhand shot	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment (optional)

* 28. How proficient should a player be with the following team playing skills to show they are capable to transition to a full ice game (i.e., on what proportion of attempts can the player successfully perform this skill)?

	Less than 25% of the time	Between 25% and 45% of the time	Between 46% and 65% of the time	Between 66% and 85% of the time	More than 85% of the time	Don't know enough to have an opinion
On ice positioning (open space, spread out, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Passing across the line	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment (optional)

29. Research in other team sports has shown a number of benefits associated with smaller playing surface for developing athletes. To what extent are you willing to forego the following reported benefits in order to move a child to a larger playing surface?

	Definitely Not	Probably Not	Possibly	Probably	Very Probably	Definitely
Increased pace of games	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promote creativity and experimentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Encourage quick decision-making	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enhance skill development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach passing and handling in tight situations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Make for a more competitive game	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased time engaged in the play	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comment (optional)

30. Some logistical issues have been identified for teams playing on reduced size ice. Please offer any suggestions for dealing with the following...

Dressing room congestion

Goalie changes

Other (please specify and comment)

* 31. In order to reduce travel and ice costs, one option for half-ice Ringette is to establish four-team mini round-robin tournaments involving 2-hour ice slots (in which each team plays 3 x 25 minute games with free skating in between games while goalies change).

How likely would you be to support such a change?

- Very likely
- Likely
- Neither likely nor unlikely
- Unlikely
- Very unlikely

Please elaborate on your response

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey



Additional comments about Children's Ringette

The final section of the survey asks you provide any additional comments about the proposals for Children's Ringette in Alberta beyond 2019-2020.

32. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding Children's Ringette

Appendix 2 – Children's Ringette Survey (Officials)

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey - Officiating



Your role(s) in Ringette in 2019-2020

You may have a number of roles in Ringette during the current season. This survey relates specifically to your experiences as an official in 2019-2020.


All responses will be confidential and reporting to Ringette Alberta will only be in aggregate format.

* 1. Did you officiate at least one game that was not played on full-ice (i.e., was half-ice or cross-ice) during the 2019-2020 Ringette season?

Yes

No

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey - Officiating



Officials' Questions

Please answer the following questions about your experience as an official of half-ice or cross-ice games (i.e., U10 Step 1, or younger) during the 2019-2020 Ringette season. If you officiated both full-ice and reduced-ice (half-ice or cross-ice) games, please provide answers only for your reduced-ice officiating experience.

* 2. In which Local Association(s) did you officiate reduced-ice games during the 2019-20 season? (check all that apply)

Airdrie

Beaumont

Black Gold Rush

Bow View

Calgary East

Calgary Northwest

Calgary Open (including Olds)

Central Alberta Sting

Central Alberta Wiggers Open

- Cochrane
- Drayton Valley
- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues Ringette Association
- Edmonton Ringette Club
- Foothills
- Fort McMurray
- Fort Saskatchewan
- Hinton
- Hussar
- Indus
- Lacombe
- Leduc
- Lethbridge
- Medicine Hat
- Mighty Peace Ringette
- Northern Alberta Women's Ringette Association
- Peace Country Ringette (Grande Prairie)
- Pembina
- Red Deer
- Ringette Calgary
- Riviere Qui Barre Open
- Rockyford
- Sherwood Park
- South Calgary
- Spruce Grove
- St. Albert
- Strathmore
- University Ringette
- Women's Ringette Association of Calgary

* 3. How many years have you been officiating in Ringette (include the current season, and include ALL formats of Ringette, not just reduced-ice)?

- 1 (this was my first year officiating)
- 2-4
- 5-10
- 11-15
- 16 or more

* 4. What is your best estimate of the number of reduced-ice games that you officiated during the 2019-2020 Ringette season?

- 0 (I did not officiate any reduced-ice games)
- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21 or more

* 5. For each of the following formats, what proportion (to the nearest whole percentage) of reduced-ice games did you officiate in 2019-2020 up to March 1, 2020?

	0%	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-99%	100%
3 on 3 (plus goalie)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5 on 5 (plus goalie)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 6. What was the length (in minutes of playing time) of the majority of reduced-ice games you officiated in the 2019-2020 season?

- 45 minutes
- 48 minutes
- 60 minutes
- Other (please specify)

* 7. What proportion (to the nearest whole percentage) of reduced-ice games in 2019-2020 that you officiated involved the following period lengths?

	0%	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-99%	100%
3 x 20 minute periods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4 x 15 minute periods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4 x 12 minute periods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3 x 15 minute periods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3 x 12 minute periods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (specify below)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other (please specify)

* 8. What proportion (to the nearest whole percentage) of reduced-ice games in 2019-2020 that you officiated involved the following shift lengths?

	0%	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-99%	100%
90 second shifts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
120 second shifts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other length shifts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. For the majority of games that you officiated on reduced-ice, did you use the free play line from full ice games to mimic the blue line (over which players must pass to a teammate)?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please comment on your use of this rule modification

10. For the majority of games that you officiated on reduced-ice, after calling a penalty, did you explain the reason for the penalty to the offending player?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Please comment on your use of this rule modification

11. Please outline any advantages of reduced-ice that you noticed from an officiating perspective

12. Please outline any disadvantages of reduced-ice that you noticed from an officiating perspective

13. What impact do you think reduced-ice games will have on officials' development?

14. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding Children's Ringette

Appendix 3 – Children's Ringette Survey (Officials' Assignors)

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey - Officials' Assignors



Your role(s) in Ringette in 2019-2020

You may have a number of roles in Ringette during the current season. This survey relates specifically to your experiences as an officials' assignor in 2019-2020.

All responses will be confidential and reporting to Ringette Alberta will only be in aggregate format.

* 1. Did you assign at least one game that was not played on full-ice (i.e., was half-ice or cross-ice) during the 2019-2020 Ringette season?

Yes

No

Ringette Alberta Children's Ringette Survey - Officials' Assignors



Officials Assignors' Questions

Please answer the following questions about your experience as an assignor of officials of half-ice or cross-ice games (i.e., U10 Step 1, or younger) during the 2019-2020 Ringette season. Please provide answers only for your reduced-ice officials' assigning experience.

* 2. In which Local Association(s) did you assign officials to reduced-ice games during the 2019-20 season? (check all that apply)

Airdrie

Beaumont

Black Gold Rush

Bow View

Calgary East

Calgary Northwest

Calgary Open (including Olds)

Central Alberta Sting

Central Alberta Wiggers Open

- Cochrane
- Drayton Valley
- Edmonton Federation of Community Leagues Ringette Association
- Edmonton Ringette Club
- Foothills
- Fort McMurray
- Fort Saskatchewan
- Hinton
- Hussar
- Indus
- Lacombe
- Leduc
- Lethbridge
- Medicine Hat
- Mighty Peace Ringette
- Northern Alberta Women's Ringette Association
- Peace Country Ringette (Grande Prairie)
- Pembina
- Red Deer
- Ringette Calgary
- Riviere Qui Barre Open
- Rockyford
- Sherwood Park
- South Calgary
- Spruce Grove
- St. Albert
- Strathmore
- University Ringette
- Women's Ringette Association of Calgary

* 3. Did you provide any information to your officials before they went on the ice for reduced-ice games during the 2019-2020 Ringette season?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

If you answered 'yes' what type of information did you provide (e.g., a Ringette Alberta handout or other instructions)

* 4. For each of the following experience level of official, what proportion (to the nearest whole percentage) of reduced-ice games did you assign to officiate in 2019-2020?

	0%	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75-99%	100%
First year officials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Second to Fourth year officials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fifth to tenth year officials	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Officials with more than ten years experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Please outline any challenges you experienced in assigning reduced-ice officials in 2019-2020

6. What impact do you think restricted-ice games will have on officials' development?

7. Please outline (in point form) any feedback you received from parents about the reduced-ice format

8. Please outline (in point form) any feedback you received from officials about the reduced-ice format

9. Please outline (in point form) any feedback you received from your local association about the reduced-ice format

10. Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding Children's Ringette from your perspective as an officials' assignor

APPENDIX 4 – GAME OBSERVATION TEMPLATE (MASTER CODING)

Ringette Canada Master Coding Sheet

Outcomes

Playing Time

- 'Playing time' will be recorded as the amount of time a player spends on the ice during regulation play. In the case of a penalty shot, the time recorded from the commencement of their penalty shot until the referee stops the play will be added to 'playing time'.

Time Engaged in the Play

- The 'time engaged in play' will be recorded as the length of time a player has control of the ring. In addition, 'time engaged in the play' will account for the length of time a player has intention of gaining control of the ring within the distance of one stick length from an opposing player with control of the ring.

- For a goalkeeper, the 'time engaged in play' will be recorded as the time where the opposing team is in the free play zone and on the offensive.

o Rationale: In either of these zones, an attacking player could attempt a shot on net.

Possession Time

- 'Possession time' will be recorded from the instance a player gains control of the ring via their stick, or by intentionally kicking or batting, and until they lose control of the ring.

Number of Touches

- A 'touch' will be coded if the player gains control of the ring. A player gains control when a skater places their stick into the ring, propels the ring with the stick or bats or kicks the ring with intention (1).

o Batting the ring is when a player intentionally moves the hand, arm, or head to make contact with the ring while in motion (1).

o Kicking the ring is when a player intentionally moves the foot or leg to make contact with the ring while in motion (1).

- A 'touch' will constitute the entire time the player has control of the ring. If the player loses control of the ring without an opponent or teammate gaining control, another 'touch' will not be recorded if control is regained by the original player.

- A 'touch' for a goalkeeper constitutes when the ring is prevented from entering the net by the goalkeeper and comes to rest inside the goal crease. A 'touch' will also be recorded if the ring is propelled using a stick or is batted or kicked to prevent the ring from entering the net by a goalkeeper¹.

- Deflections by or off a player are not considered having control of the ring and therefore, are not a 'touch' (1).

Handling

- The 'handling' metric will be recorded as the successful control of the ring when an opposing player challenges or is checking to obtain control of the ring. A challenge is considered when an opposing player is within one stick length from the player with control of the ring and has intention to steal possession.

Passing (Passing Attempt, Successful Pass and Unsuccessful Pass)

- A 'passing attempt' will be recorded as the delivering of the ring with the use of a stick, or by kicking or batting the ring from one player to a specific teammate with the intention. A 'passing attempt' will not be recorded if there is no intention of delivery of the ring to a specific teammate and a teammate gains control of the ring.
- A 'completed pass' will be recorded if the player intended to receive the ring gains control of the ring via a 'pass' (2).
- An 'incomplete pass' will be recorded if the intended teammate does not gain control of the ring after a teammate delivers them a 'pass' (2).

Shots on Goal

- A 'shot on goal' is defined as when a team in possession of the ring legally propels the ring towards the goal and a combination or one of the following outcomes occurs (1):
 - o The ring enters the net
 - o The ring contacts a goal post or the cross bar
 - o The ring contacts the goalkeeper or acting goalkeeper within the goal crease
 - o The ring contacts the goalkeeper outside the goal crease and that contact prevents the ring from entering the net
- A 'shot on goal' will not be recorded if a goal is awarded to the player who 'touched' the ring due to an opposing player scoring on their own net.

Attempted Shots on Goals

- An 'attempted shot on goal' will be defined as any 'shot on goal' or any intentional movement of the ring towards the net that does not make contact with the net, the goalkeeper or the acting goalkeeper.
- An 'attempted shot on goal' will not be recorded if a player 'passes' the ring to their own goalkeeper or delivers a 'shot on goal' at their own net.

References

1. Ringette Canada. Official rules of ringette 1989-1991. Toronto, Ont.: Ringette Canada; 1989.
2. Gyarmati L, Stanojevic R. QPass: a Merit-based Evaluation of Soccer Passes. ArXiv160803532 Cs Stat [Internet]. 2016 Aug 8 [cited 2020 Mar 25]; Available from: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1608.03532>

APPENDIX 5 – OPEN ENDED QUESTION RESPONSES

Q21 Does your child play other team sports?

Answered: 930 Skipped: 187

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes (please specify below)	52.58%	489
No	46.45%	432
Unsure	0.97%	9
TOTAL		930

IF YES, PLEASE IDENTIFY THE OTHER TEAM SPORTS

community basketball

Tball

outdoor soccer

Basketball

SOCCER, DANCE

Lacrosse

Dance

Rugby

Soccer, TBall

Fastball

Soccer in spring/summer

Competitive Swim

soccer

soccer

soccer

Baseball

Basketball

Ball

Soccer, baseball

Soccer

Volleyball

Hockey

Softball

Swim, gymnastics

lacrosse

Dance

Dance

Soccer

Soccer

basketball, inja warrior, other school sports

Ball

Swimming

Lacrosse

Soccer

Lacrosse, soccer, power skating, triathlons

Baseball

Lacrosse, Ball hockey

Soccer

Gymnastics

fastball

Lacrosse

Lacrosse

Softball

Outside of the ringette season. Softball/swimming

Lacrosse

Not anymore. Was supposed to be ball and soccer

Soccer

Baseball

Soccer

Lacrosse

has played soccer

Soccer in spring

soccer

soccer

Fastpitch softball

spring soccer (not during ringette season)

soccer

soccer and cheerleading

Lacrosse

soccer, golf

soccer

Soccer

Lacrosse

Softball

soccer, basketball

Soccer

Soccer
Basketball
Gymnastics
Baseball
Soccer, Rugby
soccer, dance
Soccer
She will be playing softball in the spring
gymnastics and cross country running
Soccer, Dance
Baseball, golf
Fast ball
Ball
Archery
Volleyball
Soccer
Soccer
Soccer
Dance
Field Hockey, softball
Not during ringette. We only play 1 sport/season.
soccer
Soccer
Soccer, Baseball
soccer
Hockey
Soccer
Soccer
soccer
soccer

Baseball
Baseball soccer dance
Baseball
Baseball/softball
Soccer in spring
Volleyball, field hockey
Soccer
Lacrosse, softball
Soccer
Girls fastpitch
baseball
Lacrosse
Soccer
Baseball
Swimming
Soccer
Baseball and Dancing
soccer
Softball, soccer
Soccer in spring
Soccer
Soccer
Soccer, fastball
Soccer
Soccer
Softball
Soccer (outdoor)
Has played soccer and is starting fastball
Soccer dance
Baseball

Soccer, baseball

Gymnastics and Rodeo

Lacrosse

Soccer

Hockey and baseball

Hockey

T-ball and soccer

Competitive swimming and soccer

Dance

Softball in the spring

Softball

Fastball, gymnastics

Dance connection

Baseball

dance

Lacrosse

Karate

Soccer

soccer & volleyball

Fastball

Ski racinf

Lacrosse

Softball

Dance

Soccer, gymnastics, swimming

Basketball

softball

Soccer

Soccer, baseball

Soccer

Softball
Soccer. Previously played hockey
Ball hockey, soccer & hip hop dance
Baseball
Soccer
Soccer
Fastball
Ariel yoga, music
Tee ball, soccer
Baseball
Soccer
Soccer
Baseball, dance
Soccer
Basketball and soccer
Cheerleader
Baseball
Hockey Baseball
Box Lacrosse
Soccer
Soccer
Basketball
Soccer, competitive swimming
Dance, soccer
Softball. Musical theatre dance
Handball intermurals at school and community outdoor soccer
Baseball
Lacrosse
Soccer
Basketball

Lacrosse

Ukrainian dance

Soccer

Fast pitch

(She is going to play floorball in spring)

Basketball

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Fast pitch

Fastball

Soccer

Lacrosse

Soccer

Softball

Soccer

Baseball

Soccer

Soccer

Baseball

soccer, basketball and gymnastics

Soccer, softball

Baseball

Acro

Soccer, floor hockey

Soccer

Soccer

Swimming and Karate

Soccer and gymnastics

soccer / baseball (nothing during Ringette season)

Soccer, baseball

soccer and player 3 years hockey previously

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Karate

Dance

Coach pitch

soccer, field hockey

Baseball

soccer, snowboarding, parkour

Basketball, ninja gymnastics, swimming

Soccer

Soccer

Softball, soccer

soccer

Lacrosse in the spring

soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer

this year we added basketball as I didn't want her to know only 1 sport

Hockey

Baseball soccer

Basketball, softball, lacrosse.

Soccer

Soccer

soccer, baseball

Fiwld Hockey

Lacrosse
Soccer
Softball
Soccer
Lacrosse, Hockey, Softball
soccer
Softball
Lacrosse
soccer
Soccer
Softball
soccer
Soccer, Field Hockey
Lacrosse
basketball
Soccer
Soccer
soccer
Gymnastics
Dance ball
Soccer
Baseball
soccer
basketball
Softball
ball
Cheerleading
ball
Soccer
Soccer

Soccer

Girls Fastball

soccer in the spring

hockey

Lacrosse

Soccer

baseball

Soccer

baseball, dance

Track and field

Lacrosse

Softball

Gymnastics

Rage fastball

Fastpitch and curling

Soccer

Rugby

Soccer and basketball

Soccer

Aoccer

Rugby

soccer

Soccer

Softball, gymnastics

Cheerleading

Competitive swim

Floorball/Rugby

Soccer

Fastball

Baseball, soccer

Soccer
lacrosse, soccer
Soccer
Soccer
Baseball
Baseball, Basketball
Softball
Basketball, soccer, dance, swimming
Soccer
Soccer
Soccer
soccer in spring
Softball
soccer in summer
Field Lacrosse
Soccer, lacrosse
Soccer
Soccer, rugby
Soccer in the spring
Outdoor soccer
Softball
Fastball
Baseball, soccer, basketball
Lacrosse
Softball
Soccer
Soccer
Soccer
Gymnastics
Baseball

Soccer, basketball, volleyball
Soccer
Rugby, volleyball
Soccer and dance
Soccer
Softball
Swimming
Soccer
Soccer
Fastball in the spring
Baseball
Soccer
Club Soccer.
Lacrosse
Volleyball
Soccer
Outdoor soccer
Soccer
Outdoor Soccer
Fastball
Soccer
Swimming and dance
Fastball
Soccer, gymnastics, swimming
Soccer
Fastball
Soccer
Lacrosse
Soccer
Indoor soccer

She plays soccer in spring

Soccer

Soccer, swimming, dance

Soccer

Soccer

Soccer

Basketball soccer fastball

Soccer

Lacrosse

Sledge hockey

Dance. She also played hockey for 2 year before joining ringette.

Cheer

Soccer / Dance

Soccer

Soccer, volleyball

Soccer

Hockey

Soccer

Soccer, Lacrosse, Softball

Fastball

Field hockey

Soccer

soccer, baseball

She did 12 weeks of indoor soccer with her daycare

Ultimate Frisbee & Baseball

Fast ball

Lacrosse

running, basketball, soccer, swimming

Soccer

Baseball, lacrosse

Softball
Lacrosse, soccer
Soccer
Soccer
Soccer
Softball
Baseball (spring)
Lacrosse
Soccer
Softball
Soccer
Dance, swimming
Fastpitch
Soccer
Soccer.
Soccer
soccer
Softball
Softball/Tball
Gymnastics, skiing, swimming
Volleyball
Dance
Soccer
Softball
Rugby
Soccer
Dance
Acro
Ball Hockey
Soccer - but in the spring season (no other sports during ringette season)

Soccer
Fastball
Soccer, ball hockey
Soccer
Cheerleading
Fastball
Soccer
Lacrosse, track (relays)
Baseball, soccer
Softball
Soccer
Soccer
Lacrosse, rugby
Baseball
Lacrosse last year
Basketball , lacrosse, softball
Acronaire gymnastics, barrel racing,
Softball
Soccer
gymnastics
Rugby (Summer Months)
Soccer, swimming
Lacrosse
Soccer
Soccer
Baseball, swimming
Basketball
Soccer
Soccer
Softball

Baseball, field hockey
Lacrosse
Softball
Swimming
Baseball
Soccer
Spring soccer
Gymnastics, swimming, dance
Baseball
Dance
Triathlon, lacrosse, soccer
Baseball
Girls fastball
Swimming
Soccer and lacrosse
Dance
Soccer
Lacrosse and soccer
Soccer
Soccer
Rage Fastball, Taekwondo

Q23 Are you aware that the current (2019-20) format for Alberta Ringette players in U10 is as follows: U10 Step 1 - Half Ice U10 Step 2 - Full Ice U10 Step 3 - Full Ice

Answered: 995 Skipped: 122

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	90.15%	897
No	7.24%	72
Unsure	2.61%	26
TOTAL		995

COMMENT ON THE CURRENT FORMAT FOR U10 RINGETTE IN ALBERTA (OPTIONAL)

I do not believe that we should be having to play on 1/2 ice if that is changed. These girls have played in full ice since they have started.

Disappointed with the FMM ringette association’s organizational skills and coaching this year.

I love that step 3 is full ice. The players development throughout the season is measurable and prepares them well for the transition to U12. We are seeing much more interest in players wanting to develop as goalies. I believe full ice for step 3 is pivotal at this stage. The introduction of half ice in step one had its hiccups but the feedback has been positive. I still feel that having shared dressing rooms has taken away some of the team camaraderie and team feel on game days.

I believe this is the right structure regarding the graduation from half to full ice and the development of their skills around positioning in the game. It should also be noted that the child's ability at different positions should be a factor in the Step they play at versus just moving them up to the next step year after year as has been in some cases.

It is NOT ideal for small associations. It does not allow for house league type play in small centres.

Full ice is always preferred but I understand why

AS and step 1 and 2, this is absolutely appropriate. My problem is that there is no flow into the higher, tiered levels for these girls afterwards. They go from small nets and no shot lock and small games to all of that right away at u12. It's ridiculous to expect athletes and parents to get accustomed to that AND be tiered all once

Keep it full ice

Terrible idea. If this was how it was when my girls started playing I would have put them in hockey. Excellent way to encourage hockey instead of ringette!

And I'm disappointed that u 10 step 2 is half ice next year.

Personally, I REALLY don't like 1/2 ice got the U10 age group. My daughter, and everyone else on her team seemed bored. They can't keep track of the score because there's two games going on but the kids want to keep track, they're ready and excited to be a little competitive. I'm also concerned that my 2010 daughter will now go into U12 having never played full ice and not knowing all the rules

Full ice is a must for step 2 and 3.

I think this format is good and I believe that it works well. U10S1 gives weaker 2nd year players and new 1st year players the opportunity to touch the ring more and focuses less on play making and more on ring keep away skills. U10S2 is a great combo of great 1st year players, good second year players and weaker or new 3rd year players. Full ice is the right size for this group because the new or weaker 3rd year players are typically better skaters or advance their skating skills quicker and they are really can focus on gaining speed in addition to ring skills. Plus since they are bigger, it is a more appropriate ice surface length than half ice. When I say 1st, 2nd or 3rd years, I'm referring to the year number in U10 not number of years in ringette.

I have received conflicting information about this throughout the season.

I found step 3 to be better

I don't want my daughter to go to half ice and neither does she.

Half ice develop of player was almost non existent

Looks good

I like the half ice ice format. The players touch the ring more and are more engaged in game play. Big improvement from when my kids played U10

Julia played a couple of full ice and much preferred it. She also preferred shift changes on the fly.

At the step three level all the girls currently who played were competitive, able to be involved in 3/17/2020 6:32 PM all areas of the game and gained valuable fitness and cardio training from playing on FULL ice.

I believe in order to be able to transition to full ice U10 Step 3s or the most competitive u10 group should play on full ice for as much of the season as possible.

Step 1 should be the only half ice play. The girls in step 2 are far beyond half is games.

Highly recommend to keep the same.

I'm happy we will never play the half ice.

Being a first year parent /coach at the step 1 level. I highly recommend it. Much more beneficial for the players.

Having an older daughter in ringette for the past 5 years...the season of half ice games seemed like a waste of the amount of money paid . No scores were kept. The games didnt feel real . We played a handful of full ice and the girls loved those games and did well

I agree with that format.

I'm ok with the format.

Good.

I feel full ice is good for Step 2 and 3.

I feel that the current format is very appropriate, half ice for Step one proved to be an excellent way for all players to be engaged in the play, and for them to have equal opportunity for development. I feel strongly, that moving forward, ringette Alberta should continue the format from 2019-20. I have daughters in U10 step3, U10 step 1, & active start 1, each girl has played at every level leading up to their current designation. I feel that we have been able to adequately experience each level of development and are confident that the current format meets the needs of all the players development, inclusion, and enjoyment of ringette.

Extremely disappointed that our association did not grandfather kids to playing on full ice if they have played the last two years playing on full ice. Kids should not be moved backwards from full ice to half ice. This was definitely the wrong decision.

I think the half ice games are valuable and I agree with the change. However, I believe the girls that have played full ice, should not be required to go back to half ice.

Developing skaters benefit from half ice because they aren't moving quick enough to cover great distances and therefore the half ice gives them appropriate space to feel confidence to get the ring and stay engaged. As soon as players are developed enough to skate freely or quickly, half ice suddenly becomes a real challenge. The space isn't big enough to create distance and there are too many log jams in a sport that requires open ice to move and skate freely. At this point, we need skaters to have access to the full ice to learn the game and start to grow their potential.

I really don't like the half ice idea. I was going to pull my daughter if she was on half ice after playing full ice for 3 years prior. I am very unhappy with U10 step 2 next becoming half ice.

My daughter played full ice her first year in U10 and half ice in her 2nd year. I thought the full ice experience was way more productive and exciting for her and her team. She had to unlearn the rules of Ringette and get her head wrapped around the idea that the half ice version was a completely different game. Every child on the team wanted (and did) keep score, but it was never posted and frustrating for them. The dressing rooms were super crowded and it was such a stark contrast from the year prior where the team had a chance to meet, review goals, and build each other up.

My daughter would have trouble playing full ice at 7 yrs old. She would hate ringette as she already has a hard time keeping up in active start, many of the other players are faster than her (many of them have rinks in their backyards) and she is the slowest 6 yr old on the team. I would hope she'd make the step 1 next year to have half ice. Players have more time to actually stick check and shoot and pass when they're not chasing the puck. More ice just means the strongest skaters always get to improve, the slow ones never get a chance at the ring.

I am happy my daughter plays on full ice

We did not like the less than half ice for Active start. We would have liked half ice.

I like the half ice but the shift change buzzer is disruptive to the flow and their understanding of the game. I understand the need to equalize play but these constant stoppages do not help

This is a fantastic improvement to the game. I coached Step 1 last year and half-ice play would have benefited the small majority of the players while only hindering the development of 3-4 players. This year in Step 2 every all but 2 of our players benefited from full-ice play and half-ice play would have hindered a small majority of our team (although our team is an exception having only two girls who are still developing their skating skills, most teams we played and many girls whose skating was quite a bit behind the average skating ability of our team).

This should be kept the same. The Step 2 and Step 3 teams should be playing full ice

I like step 1 half ice

Think Step 2 should still be half ice

i'm good with whatever the coaches think best

I think it's a really bad call if they plan to keep team sizes as they are. I think we are looking at a huge reduction in the number of players moving on to next level with Ringette because of how poorly the change was executed at AS and U10-1 level. There needs to be really clear communication and support of coaches and scheduling staff for efficiencies that would eliminate stress on coaches, players and parents.

I've been aware of the changes to Novice/U9 hockey recently so I looked up how U10 ringette works.

half ice is perfect for Step 1

I enjoyed the half ice format for step 1

I think the current format is great. However, there are a lot of girls that have played active start and step one that would really benefit moving to full ice. Maybe a 2 year max on half ice? Like anything new, I think there are some kinks to work out. The games and tournaments seemed chaotic. Stressful for the coaches. Do we need to go to smaller teams for step 1? Or maybe we need to consult hockey CALGARY on their Novice format. It never seemed chaotic when my son played have ice. Every game had only two teams that were split in half. Home team switched ends after the first frame. 99% of the girls on our step one team this year can and should play full ice next year.

I think the current set up is positive.

I fully support this formatting.

does not apply to me

I think this is good for these 3 steps in U 10

Step 1 was terrible total waste of time and money it was a joke and my fault that it was to late to register for a different sport. After 2 daughters playing step one in years past my third daughter got ripped off this season for her experience. The rules were all wrong for what little amount of games we played because of the rules the whole year was basically face offs and line changes. My daughter was one of the highest skilled on the team and seeing them play at the end of the year they were no where close to the skill of my other 2 daughters that played under the old format. With a minimum 32 face offs and 32 line changes our last game score was 28-7 so that was another 35 face offs. For ringette to have a future they better go back to full ice. When both my other daughters played there were 60+ kids in step 1 alone this year there was 18 with more kids choosing other sports for next year with step 2 also going half ice my kid included. Half ice hockey works with a much faster game and the kids get to break a sweat or it will be indoor soccer. It's too bad because I do really like the game of ringette and maybe I will bring her back in U12 if she wants to give ringette another try. If there is 100% confirmation that u10 step 2 will be full ice before the opportunity to register for another sport I would re

register my daughter next season in ringette. If step 2 goes half ice or no 100% confirmation on full ice by the time we have to register for other sports my daughter and several more minimum from last season will not be playing ringette next year.

Seems to work well

I don't think U10 should be half ice. Kids can attend active start to age 7 and then progress to the U10 division or maybe there should be a U8 division that is half ice. Step 2 and 3 should stay full ice.

Teams are very uneven

These half ice surfaces are fine with me but efforts should be made to identify lines to promote passing as this is part of the game.

I feel Ringette Alberta should not drop the Step 2 and Step 3s to half ice.

I am aware, however I do or agree with half ice for Step 1. Coaches are trying to teach completely different games between active start, step 1 and step 2. Without a true blue line, it is not really ringette that we are building on. I coached active start last year, and the kids benefited greatly from having the actual blue line as a reference. Even if the ice was split lengthwise and ran from ringette line to ringette line, this would be much more beneficial and allow for better progression of skills and the game. New players would learn the rules and strategy earlier. Note advanced players would still be able to develop and skip levels if appropriate.

Personally I think there should be another division. Every division increases by 2 except u10. Its to wide open. Everyone from active start up is painted with same brush, while afterwards there 2 years per division. I know everything comes at a cost but I think there should be a u8, u6

I think it's ok that step 1 is half ice, but I think step 2 and 3 should stay full ice.

Half ice is fine for Step 1 but by Xmas the kids are skating well enough it should warrant moving to full ice. Regardless step 2 and 3 will be fine to remain full ice.

And Step 2 should remain as full ice going forward

My daughter has only ever played full ice in Step 1 last year and then again this year in Step 2.

The growth that her entire team had this year was outstanding . It would truly be a shame to put U10 Step 2 to half ice and then the following year Step 3. I feel this will hinder the girls when they reach U12. They truly won't know they game of ringette . Whereas my daughters team knows the game and all the rules.

I agree with current format. Pushing the half ice to 9 year olds will result in decreased numbers. Kids that are good skaters are already bored with half ice at step 1. It is a fast game, and it is easier for skaters to control a ring than a puck. They still need to feel a sense of competition.

Step one is good to have as half ice. There were many girls first year on the team. They all improved.

While I understand the change from a player development standpoint, I was concerned initially that my daughter would be picked back to half ice after playing on full ice. I was glad that was not going to happen. I still remain concerned about how the players will learn the game without the lines.

I think half ice is great for step 1.my daughter is excited to move to full ice next year

Our issue with half ice is the dressing rooms. They are so full, it's tough to assist in dressing if needed

Think it's ridiculous for players who have already played u10 on full ice last year.

Watched and it looked good

U10 full ice

I found the half ice to be a good format for the s1. However I struggle to imagine s3 at half ice.

Same as above.

I like half-ice for step 1, but I think it should not go on any longer than the first month or two of step 2.

I think it should stay this way

My daughter enjoyed ringette much more this year. She played step 1 last year and barely touched the ring. Only the older and more experienced players touched the ring. This year more players are involved and There's less standing around. She enjoys contributing to the team.

I was told that Step 2 was going to be half ice.

I think the current format works well. I have a second child playing step one and have found the half ice has been good for keeping all players involved. I do find though as the season is coming to an end and the girls skating has developed that they are ready to move up to use the full ice.

I serve on the board in a development capacity for SCRA and previously was in a similar role with hockey during the implementation of small area games into Initiation/Novice, hence have familiarity with this. One observation is that similar to other sports, age groups should only be 2 birth years for U10. While I'm in favor of small area games, I would recommend the following: AS for 5-6 yr olds (cross ice), a new U8 division for 7 yr olds and 6 yr olds that evaluate high at the start of the season (half ice), Step 2 and Step 3 for 8-9 yr olds (full ice) as it is today. This structure allows players to develop through small area games with appropriate transitions to higher skill and larger surfaces. Full ice is important to ringette at a certain age, and I believe that 8-9 years have the ability to learn the game.

It should stay this way

We as a board have witnessed Step 1 games and overall the change to half ice is positive with most parents and coaches.

This is inappropriate. At this level all games should be full ice. Given the rules of ringette and the requirement for a proper crease, blue lines, ringette lines, and free pass circle to learn how the game is played, a half-ice game is a complete waste of time. This is what they do with hockey and it is completely unengaging for 85% of the players. We have thus far been grateful that our daughter in active start does not have such a set-up. It devalues the game and is enough to drive a child away from the sport because they are very aware that they are not playing "real ringette." It seems like this is an attempt to cut costs at the expense of the child's experience and honestly at the expense of the survival of this sport.

If my daughter goes to half ice it will Completely deter her from playing

It seems to me that ringette is simply profiting from these changes. Half ice means half the cost. But prices went up. We chose ringette because of the full ice. I despise half ice for step levels. The kids clustered into one area. Step 3 needs to be full ice. The kids can skate and learn the game.

I would scrap the idea if half ice at the U10 level and keep all levels at full ice - active start could remain full ice.

I only see the half ice for u10 step 1 and 2 but I do not see it for step 3 !!! I think we are moving backwards in player development. The cost to these programs needs to be lowered.

ARA got feedback from parents, and other board members. The consensus is that the half games for Step 1 worked great (as well as the 3 on 3). There were more ring touches and less ring races. 3 on 3 encouraged athletes to work together as 3 person offense and defense as is the case for adult ringette.

I think that this has worked well but don't recommend half ice past Step 1

For my daughter who has been skating since she was 3, at age 7 for (2020/2021 upcoming season) she is more than capable to play full ice. She also affiliated with the S2 which was a great opportunity and fit in well related to skill, game sense and skating ability. Some S1 would have benefited from full ice in the 2019/2020

season. Associations need to place players where they will develop and according to skill/ability. Not necessarily based on age.

I live this format. Step 1 helps develop skills for the skaters, and Step 2 is almost like a transition year for full ice before they hit Step 3.

I think step 1 being half ice was great in developing the skill base for ringette.

This is a good format, I'm aligned with how the current system is setup

Please keep this format. I have another daughter born in 2011 who played U10 Step 3 this year and i don't feel it would be advantageous for this skill level. I couldn't imagine watching a half ice step 2 game either (after watching our local step 2 team play). I have watched other step 2 teams play to make my own opinion as to whether there would be value to switching the current step 2 format and I find it hard to to see the pros . Just my opinion.

I am happy with the current format for U10 Ringette in Alberta

I feel that Half ice for the U10 Step 1 program is valuable. I was against it at first, but after seeing the program in action I can agree that there is benefit to it. I think there need to be some changes to the rules and the format of the game. I also see that as the season progressed the girls are getting much more confident able to play, I also see them getting board. As a board member I also have gone to watch our Step 2 team play and my fear is the girls who are not moving up to U12 next year will be going backward. The amount of growth our step 2 team has had over the season is unbelievable and I am concerned being a small association that we will not have the numbers to make a step 3 team.

I was a bit unsure of the new changes to U10-1, but after having seen a few games, it does provide a good intro.

Concept of small area games is much needed, however there doesnt seem to be consistency from association to association. It seems that Ringette Alberta left the Associations to their own accord to figure out team and ice dynamics with no mid season follow ups or season checkups.

Fine the way it is...my daugther has played 4 seasons all step 2 and if forced to go to half ice after playing 4 years full ice we will go to hockey. Indus did not have step 3 and unsure if they will next year

It makes no sense. You are taking away from the ringette rules.

It was a good format. A bit of a straggle on roll out but mainly that's just the kinks being worked out.

Our Association starts at U14AA so not taken much notice.

I think it's great the way it is

I would have preferred to play the full half ice (active start) rather than below the ringette line. At the beginning of the year I understand why smaller ice surface is better but towards the end of year the skill level is probably better for full half ice

For step 1 half ice is a great way for them to learn key rules. However step 2/3 I feel should be played full ice.

The half ice format made sense at the beginning of the U10-step 1 season. However, the second half of the season (January Onward) I believe the players were ready for full ice. Their skating ability had progressed beyond needing the half ice. We want to keep the players challenged and their ability to skate well had quickly made the half ice too small. Another year of half ice could be detrimental to their excitement to play, especially since the players have seen the Step 2 players on full ice this season. Please consider keeping Step 1 half ice for the year (or possibly only the first half), but allowing Step 2 and 3 remain at Full Ice. Players that need to stay in Step 1 will benefit from more time on half ice, but if a player is strong enough to move up to Step 2 or 3, she is ready for Full Ice and the challenges that will bring.

I think this worked out ok, especially for the first half of the season but some of these players would have benefitted by playing full ice with the coach on the ice by the second half of the season. Also there should still be a 3 goal maximum.

I really enjoy the half ice for the kids this year. I think it helped them "all" improve significantly. I also reffed the U10 step 2 this year and I believe they would have seen more benefit and improvement to "all" their players at half ice as well. As for the step 3 I'm undecided on that one because those kids beat my U12 b team so they were definitely ready for full ice.

I feel that it should stay this way. Our kids learned alot being on half ice but most are ready to make the jump to a full ice game.

U10 Step 2+ should remain as full ice for the 2020 - 2021 season. Research supporting player development in "small area" games should be conducted on ringette and not used haphazardly to make conclusions on a sport that is not hockey. Leave Step 1 for learning; reward Step 2 players with the actual game of ringette with all its intricacies (2 lines for passing; 3 in etc)

I was not happy with this year playing half ice.

It should all be full ice in U10, only active start should be half ice. People are already talking about leaving the sport because their daughters are bored and they still have 1 -2 years left in U10

U10-step1 worked out great as half ice. Developed our players and I think it's a good format

I cannot imagine my daughter play half ice. I believe, She would not have the skill, understanding of the game or skating abilities if she had. They are fully capable at full ice.

Would like to see it remain the same for next year

I believe I'm with all the coaches when I say 1/2 ice is a travesty to the sport of Ringette at least for the second 1/2 of the season in Step 1. Step 2 and 3 must absolutely be full ice. If a Step 2 player can't handle full ice they should be in Step 1. Our girls are bored already and just skate around the opposition zone with the ring for almost the entire shift. It may work for hockey but Ringette is not the same sport. We are having girls complaining about boredom since about February 1st. Also for games it is a fire hazard having upwards of 50 people in a tiny dressing room. The goalies trying to get pads are going to lose a finger or hand one of these days...

Many new skaters benefit from 1/2 ice format in step 1 & 2 but are ready for full ice by step 3

Yes I did know that half ice is only used for U6 and U10 step 1

I believe the current format works - Step 1 Half Ice and Step 2 & 3 Full Ice. I believe the half ice in step 1 can teach the kids offensive and defensive positioning in front of the nets, passing, shooting, and skating. Step 2 is a good start to full ice and continued into Step 3. As a coach, I believe the kids would get bored at half ice in Step 2 and 3

Half Ice did not provide more ring time as argued when changing the format for Step 1. This kids that dominate, dominate no matter the format. Our children started Ringette as the full ice was an advantage over hockey, that advantage no longer exists and we will likely make the switch. Our local Association also handled the transition to half ice very poorly.

My daughter also played full ice for the 2nd half of her Active Start games 2018-19; which was her first year of ringette

My child had a lot of pressure to make step 2 so they weren't "punished" with half ice for the season.

U10 should all be full ice.

While half ice for Step 1 may be beneficial, I recommend step 2 and step 3 should be full ice. This allows for speed, anticipation and passing development necessary for the move to U12.

kids need full ice to be challenged, skilled in game play and rules. No more participation medals in a competitive sport.

The half ice games should be kept to step 1. Ringette is a full ice game

This current format works well for children ages 8 and up as they are more than capable of skating on a full ice. This also prepares them to understand the game as the blue lines are crucial in ringette. I had girls on the team this year just start off skating in the step 2 full ice and they thrived and ended the season with better skating and knowledge of the game. Some kids only get this time for physical education and it's a good way for them to be active.

This was my daughter's third year playing ringette. She played U10 Step 1 (second time). She went from playing full ice Ringette to half ice and reduced ice times. We were not allowed to participate in our home tournament and had to pay full fees (equal to other U10 Step 2 and Step 3 teams) regardless of the decreased ice times and half ice format. The rule changes to U10 Step 1 were rolled out poorly by Alberta Ringette.

I think this is a good format. My older daughter played full ice for U10 and it seemed okay. I do agree that younger children should be smaller format.

Half ice is a good idea for step 1 but should NOT be continued in step 2 or 3.

Loved it! The girls learned the game and improved so much. A great step for when they get to U12.

Step 2 + 3 needs to maintain Full ice. Fits the same development phases as Hockey with Adom age group.

Our daughter has played 2 seasons full ice. If ringette Alberta decides to switch the U10 Step 2 to half ice our daughter will not play. Ringette in Medicine Hat is already suffering due to the

executive board and their ego's. Switching these children to half ice will be the straw that breaks the camels back for ringette in Medicine Hat.

I'm okay with step 1 being half ice. But I am not okay with step 3 playing with small nets and no shot clock. My daughter had played 4 years of ringette, by the time she was playing U10-step 3 I felt the small nets and no shot clock really was unnecessary. Would really like to see this change for step 3s in the future

I believe the current format is acceptable, however believe half ice should not apply to Step 3, and possibly not step 2. I think it is appropriate for Step 1. Step 3 is highly competitive, and the players are strong enough to handle full ice. Ringette is different than hockey, and does not translate as well to half ice. Given no ice time is saved with the teams splitting into 2, this move is not appropriate.

It may be beneficial to have a U8 division.

I love full ice for my daughter. It has helped her skating skills so much, and understand the game and the rules in a way I don't think have ice could.

Players who have played full ice shouldn't be taken down to half ice

this is a good format for ice; leave it alone

Our organization advanced any players to step 2 that had played full ice previously no matter what their skill level was and this provided too much skill deviation within the step 2 teams

Our daughter would not want to have to start playing half ice at this point

This is my daughters 3rd season of ringette. Her words to me at one point in the season "mum I don't play real ringette - when will I play real ringette?" I coached active start 2 (kids were 5 to 7 years and this being their first, second or third season of ringette. In my opinion they are ready for more space on the ice. Next season they will move to half ice but these girls will spend another 2 or more seasons at half ice 3 vs 3. I'm worried they will begin to lose interest. They are good skaters now. What is the plan for children that are under 10 but have played multiple seasons.

U10 Step 2 full ice is good.

Half ice for Step 1 was fine. It should be full ice for Step 2 and 3. They need to learn the proper way to play the game.

I think U 10 step 2 is ready for full ice half ice good for step 1

This works well

I agree at this level (step 1) for it to be played on half ice. It has help the team grasp the concept of the game on a smaller scale. I don't think Step 2 should be half ice. The ages of Step 2 are not going to benefit from restricting them to half ice. I also don't understand why my registration fee was the same this year from last year step 1 (which was played on full ice). We had fewer games and only using half ice (shared expense) but I had to pay the same amount of registration fees?!?!

Unsure about half ice games for step 1. I see benefits to it. However I cannot imagine step 2 players on half ice with the speed st which some of them can play. Ringette is after all supposed to be the fastest game on ice.

I not a big fan of the whole u10 set up covers to big of a gap in age levels. We are to worried about skill levels. Having 9 year old playing with 6 year old based on skill is ok. Socially poor dynamics on the team.

Seems fine

I can safely say as an organization I am utterly disappointed with how this change was managed— lack of direction from RAB. For example, the length of time of shifts was too short, poor officiating, rules not clarified— free ring after every 90s, was apparently incorrect it should have been a " free for all " leave the ring an the kids would change. I am unsure if RAB fully comprehended how this change was to be received, my guess is there will be decrease of enrolment next year if this continues to step 2. On my team alone 3 players will not be continuing as a result of this program.

I believe half ice is a good idea for U10 step 1 but as the players get more experience and bigger it would be too small of an area and too drastic of a jump to full ice in U12.

The current format makes sense to me as most children in their first year would greatly benefit from the smaller play area. It also makes sense to me that as they move up stages they start to build on their current skills to transition to full ice.

I feel this current format is appropriate - Step 2 & 3 should not be played on half ice.

It has worked really well the way it is.

Greatly disagree on the format

I agree with a half ice format in step 1 but not step 2. Would like to see a U8 division as half ice and U10 as a full ice program.

I do not agree with any U10 team playing half ice... we will lose players

I think this format is appropriate. There are edge cases that complicate matters but I assume I will be able to comment later on the holistic approach.

You need to re-implement U8. 6 year olds should not be playing on the same team as 9 year olds. U8 should be half ice and u10 full ice. We have 6 year olds playing stage 2 because they are good enough skaters and they didn't want to play half ice but maturity wise there should be a division.

Not sure if we will register our daughter in Ringette again next year. Half ice was difficult with 17 players. Thinking will try a new sport and bring her back when she can get a better experience in Ringette and play full ice.

I believe that full ice is required to teach the rules of ringette. Moving from active start to U10 was difficult for my daughter as she was asked to play certain positions during tryouts and without her lacrosse experience would have had not idea what the positions were. Playing half ice may allow some players to have an opportunity to have the ring, but our experience has is that half ice bores our daughter as she would take the ring and not work on the skills required to be part of the team

I think it's perfect. Allows skaters who aren't as skilled to get touches on the ring in step 1, but full ice at step 2 and 3 allows them to develop their skating skills further.

Step 3 needs to be full ice so the transition to u12 will be easier

All u10 levels should be full ice. My daughter played full Ice step 1 in 2018/2019. Her and her team had zero issues with full ice. I would not change U10 step 1 to half ice.

We don't have steps here just U10. I didn't know what that meant when I picked it at the beginning... sorry

Being her 4th year in ringette, she would not have liked to go to 1/2 ice, she would have felt this was a step backwards. I suggest half ice be reserved for players in Active Start and step 1 only. I also think there should be a U8 age category as there is a big skill difference and maturity level based on age and size of her teammates.

I love this configuration!

I believe the current 2019/20 format is well suited for strong development.

Half ice is ridiculous and should not be used at the U-10 level at all.

I think the role of half ice in Step 1 was good and we saw a huge improvement in stabbing and passing. However, but this point in the season the team is wanting to move to something more challenging.

I am in agreement for Step in Half ice. I can not comment as to the benefits of half ice beyond step 1

I like it and my child has enjoyed the format as well.

I am of the opinion that Step 2 should not move to half ice in the coming year as planned. Being an on ice helper this year it was easy to see that kids were more then capable of skating the entire ice (exception of 1 player who could not skate but was put in Step 2 due do her age) and

for the most part all equally handled the ring and all girls scored goals. All were well aware of the rules and made crisp precise passes. If the kids I helped coach this year were to play half ice I personally think it would not have only impeded their development but also reduced their enjoyment of the game. Further the difference in the skill and speed of the game from the beginning of the year to the end of the year was incredible. Again, I think if the girls were forced to play on half ice, that level of improvement and development would not have happened. Personally, I am pretty confident my daughter would likely have lost interest part way through the year like her friend did who played Step 1 if she played on half ice.

This year felt like active start part "b", not U10. Our kid's skating didn't improve with it being half-ice

Half ice teaches nothing about the game , over crowded unsafe dressing rooms , same fees , players are bored, half ice must NOT be moved to step 2&3

Step 2 half ice would be good

I coach U10S2, playing half ice at this level next year is waste of a season's worth of game development, it's a swarm mentality during a game, may as well play shinny on the weekends.

I think Step 1 & 2 should be half ice. At Step 3 it would be more appropriate given the skills and abilities to move to full ice.

I appreciate the rationale for half ice but I don't want my child to have play half ice after two seasons of full ice.

I would like step 2 and 3 to stay full ice.

I like the current format.

I think half ice is OK for step 1. I think it becomes a problem when the girls have already played on full ice. I think that step 2 and 3 should remain full ice so that the girls know the rules and game play when they move to U12.

I think modelling ringette after hockey is foolish. This isn't a game where one player can hold the puck for extended periods of time and learning how to pass while skating is a critical skill needed for ringette.

I like this current format. Step 1 allows them to learn and touch the ring more frequently. Step 2 full ice allows them to start to learn and implement blue line passes and offensive and defensive zones. By Step 3, it should be full competitive with ensuing penalties that occur for loss of possession such as 4 in, passing across the line to oneself, and so on.

Don't play half ice for step 2 or above in 2020 / 2021

Looking forward to full once in step 3. My daughter and some teammates have out grown the half ice.

U 10 Step 2 and 3 should remain at full ice

This seems appropriate as it aligns with similar sports (e.g. hockey where U8 players are restricted to half ice. (Since many step 1 in our association would be 8 or less).

The U10 Step 1 Format has some advantages but overall, I feel like it only benefited the younger girls, or the girls that are weaker skaters. Now that we are well past the half way mark of the season I can honestly say all the kids are bored with the format (which by the way, does not appear to be very clear to some organizations in terms of what happens after a buzzer, i.e. race to the ring, or free pass). With only two real positional rules in the game (crease, and passing across the blue line) the girls tend to shoot the ring back and forth down the ice. It is rather difficult to teach/coach a structured game with only half ice. It might be better for ALL the players if the season was half ice for the first half, and full ice for 2nd half of the season. Half ice for step 2 is a ridiculous idea, don't even think about it. The girls at that level are far too good to only play on half ice.

our step 2 players flourished with their development this season and are very excited to come back and play ringette again next season. If they are asked to play half ice next year - in their 4 or 5th season of full ice ringette, there will be some players development that will become stagnant.

With a nine year old in her first year, the half ice puts her at a severe disadvantage next year as

players she will be playing with will have experience in full ice. By half way through the year the three first year nine year olds were dominating play should have been step 2 or more. Half ice is great for learning the skills, but with it not in all the steps, when she moves up next year she will be behind again.

As help as half ice is for development, full is more fun for player and parent. We all LOVED when we would get a random full ice game.

Thought half ice was great for this year to have more touch points (worked out really well), would recommend changing to full ice for step 3 to prepare players for future. They will be at the skill level where full ice is required.

Agree with current format

My daughters skating has gotten worse rather than better this year. She has gotten lazy as she did not have to skate far to go over the blue line.

I believe this is a good format

I think this format is great

I love it

Makes sense for Step 1 only. Children over the age of 8 are too big for half ice.

Step 2 should remain full ice.

I think age should be considered when putting on teams. My child is in U12 next year and it will be like starting from scratch. Step 2 would have been ideal. Also my child is big and never really got to full speed on 1/2 ice compared to the little ones.

Did not take into consideration grandfathering No associations were consistent with how they evaluated and made teams

I think at at step one and up they should play full ice

I didn't realize there was a difference. Does it affect their speed and endurance versus better ring handling /stopping at half ice? My child suffered a concussion possibly due to speed where's if she was in half ice would that have made it less of a risk?

My belief is that step 2 and step 3 should remain at full ice.

I do not agree with u10 step 3 playing half ice in the future.

We are in U10 Step 2 Full Ice

This was Tegan's first year of Ringette and she had no problem catching onto the rules and loved the full ice.

Love it! Rules are coming together. This format works well with smaller associations like Pembina

There has been mixed communications as to what the U10 format is going to look like from the association.

I find the half ice does make sense for AS and step 1. By step 2 the passing game is critical and I wonder if there's enough space.

Luckily my daughter will move up before the half ice/cross ice changes were made. If not, I would not register my daughter in ringette. I feel these changes are detrimental to player development, progress and would make U12 too intimidating considering all that would have to be learned within that year.

Love it! Makes so much sense developmentally for them to play this way

90 second shifts are too short! U10 step 1. Should be 2 minutes.

Like this format. Step 2 girls are generally better skaters and can benefit from full ice. When we lost to out of town teams those teams never shared ice for practice. Had full ice practice and beat us with speed and skating

Fine - honestly I have no issues with the changes it was the implementation that could of been

better

Hoping for step 2 to stay full ice next year

Games were full ice, practices were half ice (should've been full)

Q25 If an individual is ready to transition to full ice, but their teammates are not, it may be more appropriate for that player to join a different team at a higher level. Are you aware that team make ups may change from year to year to accommodate differences in skill development?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	83.82%	834
No	12.06%	120
Unsure	4.12%	41
TOTAL		995

COMMENT (OPTIONAL)

I am aware that team make ups can change based on the UAA scores of each group of players every year. As half ice has only just been introduced in step 1 this year, it has not been shown what criteria would make a player ready to move to full ice and at what age. This question feels off in its implication. It's too ambiguous. Our Step 3 players are very ready to play full ice (ages 8-9) as most have been playing ringette for at least three years possibly 5! I feel that step 2 should start out as half ice for the first half of the season and that it could change to full ice in the second part of the season to match development of the players and accommodate skill development.

Almost 100 percent of these rules we have an awareness of but are unable to fulfill as we don't have a dedicated U10/U12 team etc.

Yes, but I would say since girls want to be part of a group or team first, it would be detrimental to their development to move them to another team at a time that was not the normal or defined cadence for creating new teams. I am not aware of any league that split their U10S1 program into 3 month blocks as recommended by Children's ringette. If they would have, they may have found that they could split S1 into A and B and A could then "graduate" to full ice for the second half of the season and B could remain at half ice. But this did not happen. And this should not happen unless all teams within Alberta are doing so, so there is enough other teams doing the same so there are teams to play against.

Skill is not the only variable you need to measure . You also need to assess the maturity of the athlete. Having a 7 year old playing step 3 with 9 year olds could be counter productive

I wasn't fully aware of this but I think it's a good idea in order to maintain programs and ensure athletes are still growing.

This approach will work for the larger centers where they have numbers and multiple teams. The smaller centers will not benefit from this approach as there is only limited teams in the organization there are no higher teams available.

But some kids are too imature to play with 9.5 year olds. Are team this year had some 9.5 year olds and some just turned 7 year olds. The difference in maturity level was obvious and made for poor team bonding. If a player is 9 they can't go to step 1 (go to step 2 automatically) so if a player is 7 they should not be allowed in step 3.

But that did not happen within our league this year. The skill levels were all over the place. Not proper tiering at all. Big gaps in skill levels.

Believe this practice should be continued

Daniella moves from step 1 in her first year to step 3 in her second year. Mostly due to the fact that she participated in quite a bit of skating lessons and ringette camps during the summer of 2019. I wish ringette Alberta would do more to attract or develop summer ringette activities. We travelled to Calgary for one week, Chestermere for another week, and olds for part of a week. Nothing in red deer for summer training is disappointing,

I did not realize this. Strange for team dynamics.

When I drafted my Step 1 team, I could see that some players were ranked high with a "Step 2" score. These players were strong and could have easily moved up to Step 2 at some point in the season. This was not offered as an option to my team in Calgary. I encouraged these players to affiliate with Step 2 teams to promote their development and they did - they frequently attended practices and full-ice games on Step 2 teams. It may have been more appropriate for them to change teams altogether so they weren't held back by the brand-new players on our Step 1 team who were still learning basic skating skills.

Our association did not place all kids who were new to ringette in step one. I think that was a poor decision. If a child is new to ringette there should be a requirement for them to start in step one and move through the steps in progression.

my understanding was that the roster for each team is sent to RAB in December at which point players couldn't switch divisions anymore.

I'm unsure if that means the player would switch teams partly through the year, or from year to year.

I think you mean that a player will not always play on the same team??

I know now based on that question and the one before it...

This is the benefit of the objective evaluations. This year and last year I had a distinct separation between the skating and game sense abilities of a few of the players on the team. In these cases I believe the association had moved some players up too quickly. Last season this was due to weird numbers of registrations and some girls who should have been Active Start were moved up. This season I think two players were 'grandfathered' up to Step 2 so they wouldn't need to adjust to half-ice play.

Coaches should be made aware of who to contact about this and the rules about it at the beginning of the season. Their input should be seeked out for these decisions.

We have been put on different teams based on our daughters skill level. We are in a competitive sport and are well aware that teams/friends may not be the same in the following year. I would rather my daughter be evaluated at her skill level. And also be put on a team where her skills and development will grow. If kids/parents want teams based on friends they should not be in a competitive sport.

i'm ok with whatever the coaches think best

I don't understand the relevance of telling parents this when all players have to evaluate and this decision is out of parent's hands.

Our kids have different teammates every year in hockey and baseball, so I have no expectation that the teams would stay exactly the same in ringette from year to year.

This makes perfect sense. Every player develops at a different pace.

But it is a huge jump from half ice to Step 3, even to Step 2.

However we also look at the maturity and social component along with skill and age as they all have factors when considering a player moving up.

Question 22 and 23 SPRA did u10 step 1&2 and for the most part step 3 100% by age and where they played last year. 2 kids on our step 1 team would have been middle to top skill of the step 2 team but were forced to play step 1 even with going to SPRA and voicing our concerns. This did not help there development at all. They did what they want with the ring because they were not challenged and development was more bad habits then good skills. on my other daughters step 3 team there were several girls that should not have been there and did not have a good year because they just could not keep up with the play and hardly touched the ring. They played step 2 last year and there for had to play step 3 this year because of SPRA and how they pick there teams. We did bring up affiliates this year and they would have fit in our team nicely but were not given a chance because they played step one the previous season.

There were lots of no ringette playing experience children and not same skills/level of my daughter in the team this season. She was one of the fastest and highest skills skater in the team, and sometimes she didn't have enough development practice through the year. I didn't understand why my daughter was not able to play higher level which was step 3.

This underaging is very difficult to address with children at this age. Being a board member and sometimes part of evaluating and creating teams, this can create many issues of extreme sensitivity. Smaller associations are especially susceptible to this scenario.

If I was aware of this I would have tried to move my daughter up to Step 2 and play full ice since she played full ice last year and dropped to half ice this year.

While this may be true, the game at cross ice vs. half. ice vs. full ice is not the same. The rules and strategy are not the same. To move ahead of the true blue line does not exist until step 2, so an active start or step 1 player will not know this. Three in the zone does not exist until full ice, so again the game does. It translate between different ice formats.

There are kids on our team that should be up a level and there are also kids on our team that obviously shouldn't be there yet

Not sure what kind of metrics would be used to determine if one players 'skill level'. At what level would this be? At u10 Step 3?

Is there a way to move kids up mid season? This year several kids were not challenged in Step 1 and likely could've regressed.

This becomes a real challenge for smaller associations. All of your recommendations work if you have a large population base but when you have small numbers, it makes it even more difficult to have teams of similar skill level that can have some game success.

Yes I am aware of that but some of those decisions seem political.

Then we move up kids to an older age but then there is a big age gap socially - Ringette or any team sports is just not what is played on the ice it is also all off ice activities from change rooms to hotels and social activities with an older team

The evaluation process is flawed and misses placing both good players on proper teams as well as players needing further development in game sense on proper teams. There is such a wide range of abilities on teams that good players don't have the opportunity to develop as much as other players.

This year my daughter went from Step 1 to Step 3

Our daughter already did 2 years at s1 as she was not ready to progress. It is good for those players to gain confidence ca forcing them along

Changing all of U10 to half ice then prevents the younger player to moving up to full ice. I would never want my 7 or 8 year old playing in a u12 division because she was skilled enough socially she would Not be appropriate for that age group. And I would not want her exposed to older kids dressing room talk etc.

In smaller Associations this is more difficult because there is typically only enough players to make one U10 team and then they would need to jump all the way up to U12

Our teams change every season based on skill level (and readiness) of players

This model is ideal for urban but does not help rural teams. Rural teams don't have the option to put there kids up a level because there are limited number of kids. The experienced players either have to play up a division (u12) to feel challenged or they stay down with with the u10 until the rest of the team catches up. Step 1 half ice is a perfect progression into the game. Step 2 should be either half ice for half the year and then full ice the other half. That way the parents are happy with their kids progressing and we will keep our players instead of losing them to other sports because they don't think their minds are making progress. Also have the refs make the calls for the regular rules of ringette, just whistle it down and tell the players its illegal and they would have gotten a penalty in the real game. Give the possession to the other team. E.g. high sticking Step 3 should definitely be full ice for a smooth transition into u14.

I am aware but I do believe there is a physical development as well as a mental development. I find that physically the girls skating may indicate that they are ready to move up to a bigger playing surface but by step 3 most of the girls are advancing in both aspects and the current format allows for that continual development

This is a joke. We had a child in step 1 who was purposely held back. Was rated In assessments as step 2 and still was put into step 1 for what we were told were "team size" considerations. We are still livid about this. If the child is ready, they should not be held back. It seems the director can make up any excuse they want and when we email about it then it gets ignored.

Trouble is having some athletes playing 3 years at step 3 level with no where to go, while some u10 step 2 ladies do the same and are not able to see step 3 level.

I understand that we have some flexibility with players but moving a 8 year old up to U12 is not doing that athlete any good either

My 8 year old played u12 because the only level our rural association could make numbers for was step 1 and she has already played full ice for 4 years. I do not like the new half ice now for step 2. You are forcing younger kids to play up in rural communities.

This is more difficult in a small association where registration numbers do not always fall in line with team size requirements

This is unavailable in Hinton currently, as we do not have enough players.

I have no evidence to suggest higher skilled players are moved up mid-season to accommodate their needs as suggested above. How exactly would a player join a different team when evaluations determine what level a player is placed at? Catering ringette levels to the lowest common denominator using research from other sports without defined findings is a dangerous game and ringette Alberta is risking losing a significant amount of players by accelerating the mandated schedule.

This season has been extremely challenging as too many players were pushed up at step 2 and 3 levels so they could maintain playing 'full ice'. It's been a detriment to their skill development as well as the rest of the players on the team

Yes but in a small town with limited players this is not possible.

It is also difficult when there are not enough players to make up a team of the same level. For example, my daughter was assessed to be a U10Step 2 player. She is on a team with people who are Step 2, and Step 3. There are players on her team who played Step 3 last year, but there were not enough to make a Step 3 only team. She has grown in her game sense and play amazingly well. I believe it is because she had higher level players on her team, as well as great coaching to be able to adjust to all the player levels. She is playing a team that has U12 players that tower over her, but because it is their first year, they can drop to U10, and they also don't have a lot of players to make a team. I was concerned about the difference in size, but with full ice, they have enough room to move around and the size difference is okay. It's when they are playing in close quarters that it is worrisome.

The only difficulty I see with this is that teams are already overcrowded so adding one more to a higher level team might not be an option.

Our association is small and by following this format we take away the competitiveness of the teams. We also find that the kids who go from Step 1 to Step 3 quit because they are not ready. I am a believer that the kids should go together through Step 1 and 2, and after Step 2 decide where they are at. I also believe that the our league should look at a U6, U8, and a U10 model just based on the declining participants in our association.

In our association, politics play a larger part in this than actual skill of the players.

Most coaches will avoid breaking up their team. I don't believe this is something that would be practiced in "the real world". Coaches -and more specifically the team coordinators work very hard to make sure girls bond before games begin.

This is my concern. My 6yr old daughter is in her second year of active start. Her first year they played full ice for the second half of the season. This year is entirely cross-ice. She has become bored and uninterested. She is ready for U10 step 2 next year but I am concerned it will be half ice next year and she will lose interest again.

However this approach requires consensus across all associations to ensure teams have a similar skill level. Certain associations advanced all Step 1 players last year to Step 2 or higher this year to avoid issues with parents and kids viewing having to stay at the same level as a negative issue versus being necessary for skill development

Would that not be the same if we had a child on the team that step 2 was too advanced for her skill level and she should have been kept in step 1 but because of other circumstances she was left on the team but then didn't show up for three quarters of the season. As coaching staff it was difficult for us to work with her to help improve her skills as she was not there on a consistent basis.

This was clearly an issue with our team as there were was a wide variety of levels of experience and even though by the end of the season the players were all fairly equal, it was a real tough year with our team only winning one game.

I am aware that weaker players with equal level of experience may also be held back resulting in decreased ice times and half ice format when they had already been playing full ice Ringette for a year. My daughter was the only member of her team held back in U10 Step 1 and our appeal of this decision was not given the consideration it deserved. U10 Step 1 should not be full fees for Active Start level of ice time and not being allowed to participate in the home tournament. Ringette Alberta will see a decrease in participation at the U10 level due to these format changes and the way they have been addressed. Many from my daughter's team will be switching to hockey.

That is interesting and not something that was followed in our association.

I like this idea, I was unaware that we could make changes...The only unfortunate thing is which girl needs to drop down a level when she is not progressing...that is a tough conversation...

Our association puts way to much effort keeping the girls within their age group and not their skill group. Which again really slowed the Development off skills for the top half of the team. Trying to get the bottom half caught up, which is frustrating and not fair to the other kids. All tearing should be based on skill level, kids will make friends with new teammates. They don't need to play with same group just because they are same age from year to year. More important they push the skill development of the player. You so this when they play with older players.

It may benefit to have a U8 division

My daughter is in her third year of ringette and was put on a step 1 team where 6 of the 10 girls were new and learning to skate. She went from full ice to half ice and did not develop this year. I believe it was because she is 7 which is step 1. My experience is that evaluations and step levels are age based and not skill based. Same is true for a friend who's daughter is 8 and new to skating, she was placed on a step 2 team because she is 8, again aged based and not skill based evaluations.

This question doesn't make sense. If a player was to move up but their team mates aren't, this wouldn't happen mid season? So they would just have new teammates when they were re evaluated the next year? Our daughter has had different teams every year, this would be no different?

This is not what is being done in practice by associations from what I have seen. If the intention is to have children under 10 play in smaller ice surface - what does that mean for kids who started at 4 or 5 and have played up to 6 seasons of ringette before they turn 10

We found that some associations/parents in those associations seemed to push up their players from active start to step 2 to avoid the half ice requirement of step 1. As a result, our step 2 team, who had all played at least step 1 (full ice) last season, dominated and would beat most teams by at least double the amount of goals (ex. 20-2; 16-4). This was fun for our team, but wasn't great for the other teams' morales and I think our team got an inflated sense of their actual abilities. So when we played more even teams in tournaments, we'd often lose as we weren't used to being challenged.

I would hope that my child's placement is always based on her individual ability. If she qualifies for a higher level, I would hope she would be placed there regardless of how previous team mates have done.

That is a poor idea. Team dynamics and friendship are the key drivers to sport. Making new teams in-season is poor. Eg. That kid is better than you. So she gets to play on a different team now.

Yes but a 7 year old shouldn't play with 9 year olds (grade 4 girls/ grade 2 girls) is socially a big difference.

I don't understand the question. Are you saying that my daughter won't play with the same 13 teammates next season? Yes, I know that. Are you saying that my daughter may switch teams mid-season if she's advancing faster than others? If so, then no, I did not know that.

Ideally this would be great because in a small association there aren't always enough kids in one age group to play the higher levels successfully.

I think all kids at the U10 level can handle and develop at full ice

I know that teams can move up or down within the black gold league but I didn't know individual players could change teams. That is news to me.

I feel that it would be counterproductive to my daughter(played step 2 the last 2 seasons) or any players development for them to have played full ice this season and or last and then go to 1/2 ice for the 20/21 season.

Unfortunately being from a small rural town we only have one team in each age category. I find this to be a challenge as we don't get the numbers to register more teams and some girls tend to move up levels when they are not ready.

I was not aware of this. I was aware that teams have affiliates as we had a two who played on our team. Both were more than capable of keeping up and likely should have been moved up to aid in their development.

Unfortunately we have not seen accommodations in our association for differences in skill sets as sometimes age trumps the decision to move a player up to match skill set.

My daughter was a top goal scorer on her team last season as did not go forward with other girls to step 3 - I believe these factors were the reason and I believe she missed out this year on her level of development - she seems board this season.

Yes, but this has not been happening in our association (our daughter has been held back on multiple occasions due to her young age, even though she evaluated at those higher levels)

But evaluations are subjective, and if you move a girl up based on them, and the rest of her team do not move up, she may not enjoy the sport as much, especially if all the other girls know each other.

However I think social development is also important. This year my 9 year old ended up on a team with lots of 7 year olds and it was a terrible year

But I also agree in keeping kids close in age together. At this age it's more about peer relations.

Yes however I disagree with 9 year olds being placed on step 2 team when they are new to the game. They tend to get placed with peers the same age when they aren't ready for that level

Just wondering on if the age group structure would exist, or where that would stop. If a more developed child could be bumped up to U12, for example, due to development, would it work in reverse where a older child be bumped down. If so, weres the fairness in that ?

Teams and steps should be make up of skill level with age as a secondary consideration. They are both important though due to maturity and game sense.

This was never offered in our association. There was a question about moving the entire team up, but that wouldn't have fair to the 7 year olds.

Perfect

We live in a small community where that might not be possible.

In Fort Sask, U10 teams are formed on evaluations and UAAs. We've had players be weaker skaters but still make S2 or S3 teams because of skill. In talking to other associations, it seems kids are grouped purely on UAA scores, then evaluated.

Our board still has players that going late and skipping evulations

Seems rational

According to what I have been told by our association, players are made to play according to the sequential steps in order, step 1 first year, then 2 the next and 3 the 3rd year; regardless of age or ability. In our association, many players, like 8 players, who played step 1, and who scored higher on UAA and definately better players, did not move to step 3. Our director and organization kept all those girls in step 2 becuase they said they need to play in order of steps. Also, the teams are not made up of like abilities or level.of players. Both of our 2 step 3 teams had equal amounts of high, medium and low players. This made it very difficult for the team to play and be successful and for player development. When my daughter is on a line with poor skaters, players with no drive, and players with poor ring skills, this hinders my daughters success becuase she cant play up to her high level because her line mates could not pass the ring or skate quick enough to make it up to the play.

I certainly hope this is the way it will be. Especially in small association that will never have the opportunity to have a step 3 team.

From what we noticed this year is that children are placed in the specific levels based on their time trials.

Player placement should be based on skill alone

This is what should be done, however, the majority of parents in our association are frustrated with the process and results teams using the UAA's as teams are often NOT made fairly resulting in our teams being weaker than the others in the league.

My daughter went from Step 1 to 3

South Calgary does not follow that guideline - they say u can't be greater than 1 yr difference in age I.e. they will never put a 7yr old in step 3

Q26 How proficient should a player be with the following skating skills to show they are capable to transition to a full ice game (i.e., on what proportion of attempts can the player successfully perform this skill)?

	LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 25% AND 45% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 46% AND 65% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 66% AND 85% OF THE TIME	MORE THAN 85% OF THE TIME	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH TO HAVE AN OPINION	TOTAL
Acceleration	1.44% 12	11.27% 94	21.94% 183	30.34% 253	15.35% 128	19.66% 164	834
Stop (both directions)	3.36% 28	16.67% 139	19.54% 163	24.10% 201	17.99% 150	18.35% 153	834
Tight turns	6.24% 52	20.50% 171	23.62% 197	23.26% 194	7.31% 61	19.06% 159	834
Pivots	7.07% 59	21.70% 181	23.38% 195	20.86% 174	6.47% 54	20.50% 171	834
Backwards skating	10.19% 85	19.42% 162	23.74% 198	19.54% 163	8.51% 71	18.59% 155	834

COMMENT (OPTIONAL)

Not sure - I think the players will learn the skills whether they are on partial or full ice, but in order to play full ice, they need the endurance and ability to skate the longer distances.

I do not believe that any player should be held back due to skill, progression will happen when watching and learning with your peers. At the early stages of the game if the emphasis is skill to progress vs equal opportunity and most importantly fun then I believe the wrong message is being sent

Keeping them at half ice will lessen their skating skills and endurance

I feel if you play half ice, then it's easier for smaller teams to preform as well This may help grow the sport.

You have to take into consideration of positions etc. Every child learns differently too and in different time. Also will limiting to half ice effect endurance in long term? Also in our community I don't think their are enough registrants in the U10 to make all the tiers successful.

These % metrics are ridiculous

All players have a strong & weak side for skating skills.

All the above skills are required to be used more in a half ice situation then a full ice situation.

Backwards skating isn't developed until full ice

I don't feel that these skills are an appropriate means to measure the advancement to full ice. With proper coaching & instruction players will develop adequately on both half & full ice. I do feel that step one is an extremely important development year and th ehalf ice option prepares them well for full ice in step 2.

Playing on 1/2 ice definitely improves the kids passing plays and touches on the ring but it does not improve their skating skills as quickly.

As these are children we are dealing with, improvement does happen at a rapid pace. Percentages will change as the season progresses.

I feel that every year the child will improve on their skating skills. I don't feel that my daughter has improved in her skating much but in her ringette skills she has.

Perhaps it should be based on whether they want to or not, then assessed based on that. Many people know where they're at athletically and would love or hate full ice

this is a very hard question to answer.

This doesn't make a lot of sense to me. Would a U14 new player who can't do these skating skills be turned away from playing a full ice game?

I think it takes more than this to show if they are capable to play full ice. Team bond, level of team and other players during a game has alot to do with it too.

I'm a trainer of High Five PHCD for Sport. Keeping players in the challenge zone is key to their continued progression, participation and mastery as well as feeling of competency. All these skills except seeing the game outcomes of acceleration can be taught in a small space.

This question is relevant if one is transitioning but if a player has already been playing full ice, it is difficult to accurately answer this question. The player who has always been on full ice would have progressed through the above percentages while playing on full ice.

These should be for the people that do evals

This question is very misleading. As a parent I don't know % based on skill level. All I know is that my daughter has been playing full ice for all seasons of U10. And she has a high level of the skills needed to play ringette. If she had to play 1/2 ice at Step 3 (and possibly Step 2) we would have put her in hockey.

Skating skills are the end all to transition. Game understanding is also a big part.

i'm not fussy about this. my kid likes playing and i trust the coaches to figure this out

I don't like the above ratings. How do you rate someone on acceleration? If they are starting from a standstill and then are moving - they would be accelerating. In addition the above ratings don't take into consideration, their knowledge of the game, their desire/competitiveness, or their vision on the ice (anticipating or seeing the play develop). The step 2 players have already shown they are capable of transitioning to a full ice game.

I don't really think any of these skills have anything to do with full ice play. You're going to get players that are brand new to ringette who are 10 years old still playing U10-2 or 3 with no skating or technical ability if you want to attract new players.

Our older daughter hasn't moved to full ice yet so I have no basis for having an opinion on this.

I sit on a AA ringette board and have been away from Children's Ringette for a while but I believe we should see a higher level of success with these skills prior to moving to full ice. Some skills are still in development, in my mind, for example, tight turns, even at 12A. The better the skater's skills, the greater their success and enjoyment/fun with full ice.

Tough question. I do think it is more important to base evaluations for full ice on skating rather than knowledge of the rules and strategy.

I do feel they will learn faster playing at full ice games than transitioning them to half ice at Step 2.

Once the basic understanding of the game is made, the skating progress will be accelerated by being on more open ice. Once the kids skating reached a certain level progress slowed dramatically ie the greatest improvements were at the start of the season, by Xmas most kids plateaued and did not improve much further.

These questions are way to generic. All these skills are constantly worked on throughout Ringette. I do not understand the acceleration question? Is this in general? Is this between zones? These generic questions do not help get any points across

After year of coaching and instructing girls in ringette and other sports, I have found that they need more room and space to practice their skills. If kids see boards in front of them, they aren't going to accelerate to their top speed in case they don't stop. Kids won't backwards skate is they are scared they are going to run into boards everywhere. When they have more room to skate faster/stop/etc. they will push themselves. Otherwise, they hold themselves back in case they get hurt.

Skating skills are developed over time. I think it will be difficult for evaluators to determine a percentage with the time they have. That is an unrealistic expectation.

They need to have been exposed to these skills but it is not a requirement to play full ice. Many of our team learned these skills in practice and games while playing full ice.

Is it coaches who determine their proficiency?

I think safety should be the primary consideration.

I'm not sure of this question. Acceleration is the one of the most important skill in forward skating however it is not taught well at younger ages, hence the small area games provide this benefit. Acceleration however is also developed in when players are hustling back to get into their zone (defensive triangle positions) in full ice or accelerating up the ice. Similar with pivots, players at younger ages are able to spin around protecting the ring from checkers (i.e., pivots), however the applicability to transitions on full ice is the next gradual step. Backwards skating also would be less used in small areas given it is a later developed skating technique - if used by certain players, it would essentially be a pivot with a few strides backward. Skating skills need to be developed gradually and it shouldn't be expected that they need 85% or higher in each of the above to move to full ice.

Cutting down to half ice is dumbing down the game and will drive away players. Far too much of this sport is dependent on the ice markings (lines/circles) to cut to half ice without turning it into a totally different game. Half ice provides no benefit in the transition to full ice in the sport of ringette.

Depends on the child and if I understand the question. At the beginning of the year? During the year?

A player will always get better skating full ice when they are doing it all the time. What I mean is if a player always plays on half ice they will find full ice hard until they start playing full ice.

Should have the basis of skating skills to transition to full ice. Ie stopping, starting and can turn.

My concern are for girls coming up from Active Start potentially going into a Step 2 or 3 situation and not having a grasp of rules, but are moved up because they have a strong staking skill level. What impact will that have on them when they are still fairly young.

How are these skills tested. What is Acceleration? is it when they fall and get up and go. All of these skills Improve as the kids are exposed to more situations that they need to use them

A player's skating skills will improve during the season therefore I do not believe that skating skills are the main factor that should be considered for a player's transition to full ice game. I would also take into account the player's age and ringette experience.

There are u19 players that can't perform some of these skills more than 25% of the time

I believe a good grasp of skating skills is essential in early development as these skills can harder to acquire at later stages of development.

progression to full ice should be when the player can keep up with the pace of play. backwards skating can be taught...although it is usually a good indicator of skill

This was confusing as not sure what degree they need to preform these skills to be considered proficient as well as practice vs game play when performing these skills

I think its important to note that all children develop skills at different intervals of time, my question to you would be how damaging is it to athlete development to keep able players on small ice and with less developed players that will actually hinder development and interest. There seems to be a hard line drawn supporting half ice up to Step 3. You teach a game incorrectly for the first 3-4 years and then expect them to transition without issue with your only supporting documentation being other countries are trying it and having success. Very foolish approach considering most of those making decisions do not have children playing in those age brackets. The association has so many other obvious holes in it but you choose to create holes to fill rather than focusing on more appropriate deficiencies

Our experience has been that acceleration, stopping and backwards skating improved significantly because of all the practice skating our daughter had while playing full ice.

I have trouble with this question, because I know the correct answer from what the research shows, but I have seen full ice work to develop players' skills with the right group dynamic and coaching. It's a hard question to answer. My daughter couldn't stop both ways, but after playing the year on full ice, now can. It all depends on so many other factor as well - coaching, group dynamics, individual player confidence, etc.

What I find is that Step 2 at full ice is a turning point for all of these skills for the kids. I always see drastic improvement in Step 2 with these certain skills

U12 & U14 on full ice has new players that can't skate so this question is irrelevant.

Skating skills are essential in ringette. All players should receive power skating instruction to develop and gradually improve all of skills.

I don't understand the question. Most first year players progress within the first 3 months to skate a full ice game.

Broad grouping players based on these statistics can be limiting. Players with higher level athletic abilities off the ice with a competitive mindset will go from walking on the ice at the beginning of the season to being the fastest skater on the team.

My daughter started out without a lot of skills but learned them quickly because of the full ice games and now loves the game.

It is not just skating skills and edge work. It is the mental capacity to understand team play and competition.

These numbers are arbitrary, and the UAA has proven a poor predictor of success - game play and knowledge of the rules, strategy etc are probably more important at this age

Difficult question to answer. The player should be able to keep up with the other players around them. So I would put heavy emphasis on the ability start fast and turn with the play.

You should not take kids who played full ice one season to half ice.

I feel that the larger surface allows the player more space to confidently attempt to navigate the skills practiced and therefor will continue to advance their skills once they advance through the u10 stages. The cross ice has shown to be the right size for the u6-Active start as the area is small enough to keep the kids engaged in the play.

Our daughter has played full ice for 2 yrs. Maybe at the beginning but I dont know what the point would be now. Whether she backwards skates 25% or 85%

Skating skills will always need to be continued to improve in every season. If the child can complete forward, backwards, turns and stops while moving around the ice and not tiring (unexpected level Of tired) over a 1 hour practice than they are ready for more space in my opinion.

My daughter has played on full ice for 3 seasons - I can't imagine her and her teammates being confined to half ice at age 9 and 10. She is a weaker skater and she can manage full ice just fine.

I feel full ice assists girls in developing their skating skills more than half ice does. I also feel that they need to play full ice in Step 2 in order to learn how to play the game properly. Passing is a huge part of ringette and this is lost on half ice.

Is it easier to learn to ride a bike in a small space or a large parking lot?

Step 2 and Step 3 athletes perform these skills currently.

I'm not sure if this criteria is currently being used or how it's being measured (certainly not using UAAs from the beginning of the year) but there were a number of edge cases that "graduated" to full ice not being able to do many of these skills because a) they played full ice in step 1 last year and shouldn't "move backwards", b) first year playing with much more limited skill set but have to graduate to U12 next year so were "graduated" to step 2 anyway. c) No UAA completed and just assigned to a team.

Hard to answer with a percentage.

My daughter has played full ice since active start is a very good skater. Her development each year has huge gains.

My daughters first year she couldn't skate a lick she plays full ice and that's perfectly fine she's learning as she goes.

I don't know what is being asked here. There are many factors of the child's ability that will change from day to day, practice to practice that could either benefit or hinder the child. If these questions asking when should a child show they are ready to advance to a higher, more challenging level of the game, the when the child is able to show full participation in their team during both practices and games 100% of the time. Every player should come wanting to participate, not forced to participate.

At the beginning of the year most of the girls on my daughters team were not proficient at stopping, tight turns, pivots and backward skating but could skate forward reasonable well. Based on the work we did with the girls (15 mins of pure skating drills at the beginning of each practice) all are now very capable skaters both forward and backwards and can do the tight turns and pivots and demonstrate these skills regularly in games.

These skills will develop when being challenged and actually taught the game instead playing whatever you call half ice

These are skills you will learn by doing - the full ice gives them space to learn these more freely

If the child can perform these basic skills at the beginning of the season they should have every opportunity to play full ice for that season

I think all of these skills are very hard to assess and the kids learn and excel throughout the season. We had 18 practices before our first game which really helped the players improve their skating skills in an actual game. Skating is fundamental to the game of ringette and produces many of the top skaters I have ever seen.

My daughter started on full ice in Step 1 and could not skate at all. She was assisted by coaches and junior coaches as she got better with skating. I don't believe they need to be expert skaters to be on the full ice as all of the kids learn together.

I'm not going to pretend to be an expert in this field but in watching my daughter's U10S3 BGL Black Wind-Up, hard to imagine these girls on half ice. Minus the Butterfly Drill, lots of these girls skate at a U12A/B level, based on UAA spreadsheet. I'm not sure if RAB observed these games, but I hope they did.

The problem with half ice, is there is less skating so evaluating skating skills and using as a measure stick for whether a kid belongs on half ice, or full ice is counter intuitive.

The half ice game doesn't give much of a chance for acceleration or backwards skating skill development

Kids learn to skate very fast. Half ice did not make my child improve any faster than one that played full ice.

My 8 year old daughter tried ringette for the first time this year. She enjoyed it, was able to touch the ring a lot and participate a great deal in the play in the 1/2 ice format. She wouldn't have had as positive an experience had it been a full ice format. I hope she is in 1/2 ice again next year

These are the specific skills that can be best learned on FULL ice.

From having older children in ringette and being involved in other sports at a high level, once a child is "sooo close" even 50-60% at the beginning of a season, it takes no time at all for them to catch on. Because ringette is such a long season, to lump girls with achievable realistic potential with girls who are brand new or at an obvious level, is not a realistic or positive choice for anyone. It causes a lot of discouragement.

I think the first few years should be focused on skating and skating skills. I personally love the new concepts of 3 on 3 for the smaller kids.

With 3 daughter who have played for years, I am yet to see a child that is not capable of playing on full ice. I have, however, seen many injuries when attempting to play the game on half ice when children are older than 7/8

I don't know enough of the bio mechanics and science behind these findings but I find it very interesting the question is being asked and would like to know more .

My daughter is currently in Step 2, I would not like to see her moving to half ice since her last 2 years have been on full ice.

We honestly don't know what the magic percentage is as we have not been made aware of it.

I think that step two should be played on full ice, that the girls do not have enough room to play a proper fun game on half ice. It is not challenging enough

After 3 years of full ice is it okay 100% of the time to make them go backwards to half ice.

Q27 How proficient should a player be with the following ring skills to show they are capable to transition to a full ice game (i.e., on what proportion of attempts can the player successfully perform this skill)?

Answered: 834 Skipped: 283

	LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 25% AND 45% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 46% AND 65% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 66% AND 85% OF THE TIME	MORE THAN 85% OF THE TIME	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH TO HAVE AN OPINION	TOTAL
Carrying the ring	2.28% 19	12.47% 104	15.35% 128	27.10% 226	25.42% 212	17.39% 145	834
Protecting the ring	5.04% 42	16.91% 141	25.90% 216	26.02% 217	8.27% 69	17.87% 149	834
Passing – forehand	2.64% 22	12.11% 101	21.22% 177	27.10% 226	18.94% 158	17.99% 150	834
Passing – backhand	10.19% 85	20.14% 168	24.94% 208	20.62% 172	5.76% 48	18.35% 153	834
Leading the receiver (passing anticipating where the receiver should be)	8.03% 67	20.38% 170	26.26% 219	21.46% 179	5.16% 43	18.71% 156	834
Stabbing / receiving the ring	4.56% 38	17.99% 150	29.62% 247	22.18% 185	7.67% 64	17.99% 150	834
Forehand shot	5.40% 45	17.87% 149	22.18% 185	25.42% 212	10.55% 88	18.59% 155	834
Backhand shot	11.39% 95	23.38% 195	23.86% 199	17.99% 150	4.92% 41	18.47% 154	834

COMMENT (OPTIONAL)

Not sure - I think the players will learn the skills whether they are on partial or full ice, but in order to play full ice, they need the endurance and ability to skate the longer distances.

I believe the kids develop and progress their skills as they move up the Stepped divisions.

All the above come with practice "practice makes perfect" parents play a roll in this you don't need ice to practice the above skills

Checking should be added to this list. By far both protecting the ring and checking the ring would be the biggest advantage to keeping players at half ice play.

As there is more passing in a full ice game due to the two blue lines, passing skills would be more important in a full ice game.

When the kids are playing 1/2 ice their should not be a three goal limit. This was extremely restricting for some of the kids on our team. My daughter would literally score three goals in the first ten minutes and would spend the rest of the game passing gliding around the ice. If they are re-evaluating and changing the game this also needs to be looked at.

Some of these are very important and need to be developed, but they don't create the criteria for the limitations that half ice provides. It's mostly skating related, in my opinion.

I disagree that the half ice format is more beneficial. Ringette is a sport that requires skating and passing. These skills do not get honed to the same extent in the half ice set up, I do not believe that the research is fully conclusive. Ringette is a Canadian sport- not a European sport. If the move to half ice is to increase the number of children playing with reduced rink space or to keep operating costs down, please be honest about it. Parents will understand that, please do not spin it into an argument that it is "better for the child".

The tricky part with these percentage based statistics would be that if opportunities did not present themselves, the kid could not show the skill. Subjective assessments from experienced ringette people would make more sense than objective statistics that might not be compiled properly.

I think it takes more than this to show if they are capable to play full ice. Team bond, level of team and other players during a game has alot to do with it too.

Another benefit of small space play is the players won't be overwhelmed with the rules of blue line, two line pass and four in violations and become inhibited, anxious players. Being that the 'age or reason' is understood in most literature to be age 9 (and younger for girls in my experience), but as young as 7 in some cultures, I think girls who are 8 and 9 are ready for all the rules of the game. Step 3 must remain full-ice in my opinion and I think there is research to support this progression in our sport where the rules and strategy become more advanced at full ice play.

See last answer

I believe that Step 2 and FOR SURE Step 3 players should be playing full ice regardless of skill level. Going into U12 without having full ice experience gives the players a huge disadvantage.

see other comments

I feel these don't make sense either. 25% of the time they can do a backhand shot? Score on a backhand shot? Is this on their own or under pressure? How successful is the average Step 1, 2, 3 player at stabbing the ring? There is not enough Info.

My U10-3 player isn't consistently proficient at these skills and plays full ice.

Same comment as above.

I feel these skills are continuously in development at every level and will be throughout the use of full ice. I think the skating skills are more important for full ice movement.

I am an assist coach for active start

Same as comments above

Questions way too generic. What does carrying the ring even mean?

These skills are important. However, understanding the rules and strategy of the game are much more important than simple skills. The best skater on the ice doesn't isn't effective unless they know where to skate to. The best backhand shot is not efficient unless a player can understand when to use that shot vs. a forehand shot

The biggest advantage for half ice is the ability to catch a pass.

Again I think this will be very difficult to determine over two or three icetimes that are given for evaluating. Full ice should depend on age not necessarily skill set.

Again. Many of these skill are acquired throughout the year whether it is full ice or half ice. Lead passing and back hand pass is quite high level which will progress with time regardless of the size of the ice they are playing on.

Many of these ring skills progress quickly throughout the season. I don't see ring skills as a reason to hold a player to half ice.

Similar to the last question, these skills will continue to be developed and full ice will provide those opportunities. Full ice will also improve ring skills as there is more space and time to carry the ring, pass the ring.

Again is this during Evals? A re-assessment?

I feel having two children go though ringette, the oldest in the u6, u9, u10, u12 program that it worked well. The child had 2 years in each level with your friends and each level was a different cost. Children just want to have fun with their friends. When you guys brought in active start and put everyone in u10 step 1,2,3. I felt it was expensive and not really needed for the majority of players to be able to play higher etc... If a child needs to play higher why can't it be on a case by case basis. My second child was caught in the change to u6 to active start. No one knew about active one and two. So my 4 year old was put playing 8 years olds and all the 4 years olds came off ice crying. It was a awful experience for my child and she didn't want to play anymore. I feel this change is not needed and I feel we are going to lose players.

All of those skills will come with experience, I see no value in half ice being beneficial to stabbing the ring or backwards skating.

I believe that there is not enough space with half ice to really develop some of these skills. On half ice a strong skater may not need to accelerate as they would in full ice since the space is much smaller. Also passing and anticipating a pass would be learnt much better on full ice with two blue lines than with one blue line.

A lead pass is a hard skill to master. Having that as a prerequisite to move to full ice is not applicable. It is not seen more than 85% of the time at the B level in U14 or above. I have watched AA games where the lead pass does not happen.

Again, these skills will improve throughout the season so I would not be as concerned with where the player is starting at the start of the season.

Some of these skills aren't learned until u12 or higher, I would not expect a u10 player to be able to learn these on half ice

I think its important to note that all children develop skills at different intervals of time, my question to you would be how damaging is it to athlete development to keep able players on small ice and with less developed supporting players that will actually hinder development and interest. There seems to be a hard line drawn supporting half ice up to Step 3. You teach a game incorrectly for the first 3-4 years and then expect them to transition without issue with your only supporting documentation being other countries are trying it and having success. Very foolish approach considering most of those making decisions do not have children playing in those age brackets. The association has so many other obvious holes in it but you choose to create holes to fill rather than focusing on more appropriate deficiencies

I watched a u19 aa game and they didn't stab the ring every time so should they play half ice?

What I find is that Step 2 at full ice is a turning point for all of these skills for the kids. I always see drastic improvement in Step 2 with these certain skills

Again, U12 & U14 full ice have new players in the C division that do not possess these skills.

I don't understand the question. Most first year players progress within the first 3 months to skate a full ice game. Ringette is a full ice game and should be kept as such.

Above comment for this as well

These are all skills that can be taught at step 3. They girls just need to be able to have fun and have engaging practices, not just a list of drills to run through.

These skills are less important in transitioning to full ice then skating and positioning

Players that can pass while moving, pass ahead or into open ice, check others and protect the ring are ready for more space

Given the situational nature of the game, it's hard to give a percentage of when players should have proficiency with all these skills. In some games, a backhand shot might not be taken at all, especially at step 2, and in other games, the girls are attempting lots of backhand shots, for example. Seems restrictive to have a formula for many of these.

All these skills are developed more easily on full ice. Development of many of these skills is not accomplished on half ice. The girls are ready for all of this on full ice in Step 2.

Skill development is based on challenge. These skills are developed from exposure to the game and challenge.

Developing these skills on the move in a full ice scenario have been picked up and progressed for all Step 2 and Step 3 players.

I feel the kids will loose interest if they are forced to play 1/2 ice until U10 step 3, very hopeful this will be reconsidered.

These skills did not seem to factor into team placement. All that seemed to matter was UAA score.

Again, difficult to award a percentage to this one. Our experience with hockey being half ice is that the higher skilled players dominate and the lower skilled players don't touch it at all. From watching ringette the same thing is happening. If the whole team is equal then it's fine but when you have a high skilled player they still dominate. It is more important to re-implement U8. Having 6, 7, 8 and 9 years olds potentially on the same team is frustrating to everyone involved. The 9 year old's parents are upset that their kid is the same 'caliber' as the 6 year olds and the team bonding doesn't occur because they are not at the same stage maturity wise.

When reduced to a smaller area the kids will not know what to do when playing full ice. The idea of playing ringette in half ice is a horrible idea. You are going to kill the game. Whomever idea this is obviously had never played.

I've coached U10 before and they learn so quickly! It's amazing to see their progress from Sept to January, and then even more from Jan-Mar! I believe if they have the basic skills, they will adapt quickly to full ice!

These are questions for coaches.

I don't know what is being asked here. There are many factors of the child's ability that will change from day to day, practice to practice that could either benefit or hinder the child. If these questions asking when should a child show they are ready to advance to a higher, more challenging level of the game, the when the child is able to show full participation in their team during both practices and games 100% of the time. Every player should come wanting to participate, not forced to participate.

Again these are all skills that we worked diligently on with the girls, if the basics are there the girls can be taught and will catch on quickly. I would argue that all the girls on my daughters team have moved into the more than 85% category with the exception of the backhand pass, the girls seem to struggle a bit with that one.

Don't believe that playing half ice is more beneficial to development of ring skills than playing full ice. If anything, an athlete will develop proper ring skills with ringette rules on full ice quicker (i.e. passing over blue lines, stabbing the ring on long passes).

Again with age strength and skills will develop with practice

I don't know that ice size has a determination on passing .. in fact the opposite as in full ice you learn transition on lines - half ice there is none of that so hard for them to truly learn that

Most of the step 2 team my kids are on this year can barely do any of this. It has been a mess.
Most kids should have been step 1 (my kid included)

Again, ring control is extremely important but as my daughter has only played or transitioned into full ice for her 3 years playing ringette - I'm uncertain what skills are needed to move from half to full ice. The step 1 games I have watched are extremely different than the step 2 games throughout our season. The girls are still learning to receive a good lead pass as well as make a good lead pass. Those skills are constantly being worked on and only improve with constant exposure.

Again, not a subject area matter expert on these stats, opinions based on what's seen.

First year with ringette and not familiar with rules

Playing the half ice game with much younger players passing attempts as the younger ones have difficulty understanding the concepts of team play.

My child has not improved any more than I child they played full ice

Lo!, these are tough to answer. I think as they progress they will get better

Not sure that any of this should apply to decisions relating to full ice or half ice. Good coaching will improve these skills in all players. Ice size will not.

In my opinion these skill are obtained just as well on full ice

My daughter is currently in Step 2, I would not like to see her moving to half ice since her last 2 years have been on full ice.

Once again! We do not know what the magic percentage is as we were not made aware of it.

Q28 How proficient should a player be with the following team playing skills to show they are capable to transition to a full ice game (i.e., on what proportion of attempts can the player successfully perform this skill)?

	LESS THAN 25% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 25% AND 45% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 46% AND 65% OF THE TIME	BETWEEN 66% AND 85% OF THE TIME	MORE THAN 85% OF THE TIME	DON'T KNOW ENOUGH TO HAVE AN OPINION	TOTAL
On ice positioning (open space, spread out, etc.)	5.64% 47	17.51% 146	26.86% 224	23.86% 199	8.39% 70	17.75% 148	834
Passing across the line	4.08% 34	9.23% 77	13.55% 113	26.74% 223	29.62% 247	16.79% 140	834

COMMENT (OPTIONAL)

Not sure - I think the players will learn the skills whether they are on partial or full ice, but in order to play full ice, they need the endurance and ability to skate the longer distances.

Again, these are kids with minds that constantly learning.

Passing across the line is not a great measure in my opinion. It takes a player about 1 game to figure this out and execute it. As well, on ice positioning (triangle, 3 in, forward and defence positioning) is really not going to be taught until they are on the full ice because half ice is really just about checking and protecting the ring, not necessarily strategic positioning. I agree with open space and spread out concepts however.

They need to play full ice to learn these skills

Playing 1/2 ice makes it a lot more difficult for the kids to understand positioning of the game.

I feel that understanding ice positioning comes from playing full ice.

These questions don't fit active start teams. We didn't do much in terms of these fancy skills

I think it takes more than this to show if they are capable to play full ice. Team bond and level has alot to do with it too.

We want them in the challenge zone to learn these skills, so they can be better challenged and master them in full ice play when they are having success about half the time.

As above

I believe that Step 2 and FOR SURE Step 3 players should be playing full ice regardless of skill level. Going into U12 without having full ice experience gives the players a huge disadvantage.

What is the current average for the various levels? I don't have enough info.

I don't know how they would learn without being full ice.

Same comment as above.

They will learn their ice position and game play over full ice learning. It will allow two levels of game positioning before they enter U12 and addition of more rules and skills

These are critical skills to learn in ringette. At age 8,9,10 Girls are too fast and know the game well enough it would be a step back to play half ice. Also they Need to play on full ice to actually see the lines/pass using the boards and learn the rules of the game.

Again, they can't be proficient at these skills as each level now has a different set of rules of what "the line" is.

It will be hard for players to learn these skills when only playing half ice.

As a parent how would we know these questions?

On ice positioning should be learned when on full ice. Can't expect someone to know positioning on full ice 5v5 relative to 3v3 half ice. Also, passing across the line is a simple concept for the players. My daughter played full in AS and Step 1 and the concept of passing over the blue lines was learnt immediately.

Without full ice participation this is kind of an irrelevant question. How can they learn where to be and where to go on half ice? You could show them on half ice for sure, but would it really be effective?

Again, all of this comes naturally with experience and maturity, half ice or full ice makes no difference

If on full ice, teams must be capable to maintain a flow to the game.

If players don't progress and begin learning the full ice game skills early enough in U10 there is concern that the jump to U12 with larger nets, shot clocks and full ice rules is going to be difficult.

Tough question to answer and not really fair to ask. Some players may not have full ability in these areas but they learn the skills throughout the season by playing in the full ice setting. Its

difficult to learn passing across the blue line if you don't spend time on the full ice with the blue line in play.

By playing small area the ability to spread out and find open ice is a lot more limited than full ice. I would be interested to see how the athletes react to playing full ice with ample space compared to small area games.

How can they be proficient at these skills when they're not taught or played on half ice. The games are played 3 on 3 there is only the Ringette line to pass across. I find these questions are not really appropriate for the level of half ice. So if they can't be taught on half ice why is the question being asked.

Would be more difficult to improve on these skills on half ice game so not sure how proficiency is required prior to moving to full ice

When the players have had the opportunity to skate on a full ice surface, I have noticed their ability to perform these skills more often. However, at this point in their season, the half ice is not enough space to work on some of the above skills. When we have Power Skating (provided by the league), the players are on full ice for the entire hour and they are more than able to keep up with the speed of these lessons. It also allows for them to practice how to move throughout the ice surface.

I think it's important to note that all children develop skills at different intervals of time, my question to you would be how damaging is it to athlete development to keep able players on small ice and with less developed players that will actually hinder development and interest. There seems to be a hard line drawn supporting half ice up to Step 3. You teach a game incorrectly for the first 3-4 years and then expect them to transition without issue with your only supporting documentation being other countries are trying it and having success. Very foolish approach considering most of those making decisions do not have children playing in those age brackets. The association has so many other obvious holes in it but you choose to create holes to fill rather than focusing on more appropriate deficiencies

In the half ice games I have observed, there are no lines to pass over.

These are important skills that the girls learn so well while on full ice, as opposed to half ice.

I'm unclear how players will learn about passing across the line, and positioning if they are not practicing on full ice. I saw the difficulty my daughter had going from Active Start to U10, and I'm not sure that having half ice will just postpone it and affect the players development into U12.

Hard for them to prove they can do it if they never have. The transition will take a couple practices/games to get use to

What I find is that Step 2 at full ice is a turning point for all of these skills for the kids. I always see drastic improvement in Step 2 with these certain skills

These two items require full ice to be taught properly - or a miniature ice with all of the proper ringette lines.

U12 & U14 full ice have new players in the C division that do not possess these skills.

I don't understand the question. Most first year players progress within the first 3 months to skate a full ice game. Ringette is a full ice game and should be kept as such. Players who play half ice don't understand the pass over the blueline. Our step 2 team called up a half ice player who could not participate because he did not know to pass over the blueline.

Hard to asses positions/open space, when you don't really teach that in half ice games. this is something that would be taught at the full ice practice.

These skills are tough to learn in cross ice.

Those skills are easily taught in 2 practices. I totally agree with Half ice, but we will loose girls interest if they play half ice for 3 straight years - Active Start, Step 1, Step 2 - If we do not have an interested audience, they will stop learning. I think the majority of girls need to play half ice for 2 years, and then transition into Full ice. The game at this level is really just mini 3 on 3 games in a small area.

This should be very important given the way the full ice game needs to be played

With half ice you don't learn positioning other than just spreading out and being on the other side of the line. Can't teach offence or defence or the real rules of ringette

What line? We play cross ice; not in their wheelhouse.

In step 2 the girls still swarm the ring on more occasions than not. Game sense, like moving to open space, comes at different rates for different players in the same step.

The girls are ready for full ice in Step 2. It is a more realistic way to learn the skills.

How do you learn these skills in a game where lines and space do not exist? What is the optimal age for kids to learn the rules and strategy of a sport? I would argue that the transition to full ice should be based on maturity, size and skill not purely skill.

Athletes even at an Active Start level were demonstrating these skills by half way through the season.

Unless the true lines are mandated then the kids wont learn the proper techniques of passing over the blue line. Playing on a proper ice surface is needed to learn the fundamentals of the game.

On ice positioning is the skill that requires the most instruction when transitioning from half ice. That's "the game". I do not expect much understanding of that skill for a player playing full ice for the first time. 100% of my players were able to pass over the blue line nearly 100% of the time because they played by that rule in Active Start last season.

If a player has only been exposed to half ice games they would not have the experience but kids learn so quickly so we can expect them to develop as they go, as I did when I was a child...can't hold them on half ice bc they don't know blue lines, that's a mistake at the league level and we can't punish athletes.

How are they supposed to learn positioning and 2 line passes when the game is half ice?

Making ringette into half ice is the dumbest thing I have ever heard of. How are the kids supposed to learn the game. It is a full ice game. The rules that are specific to ringette are full ice. These kids are going to be confused when they have learned for 5 years they are supposed to pass on the ringette line and then all of a sudden it's the blue line.

I don't know what is being asked here. There are many factors of the child's ability that will change from day to day, practice to practice that could either benefit or hinder the child. If these questions asking when should a child show they are ready to advance to a higher, more challenging level of the game, then when the child is able to show full participation in their team during both practices and games 100% of the time. Every player should come wanting to participate, not forced to participate.

On ice positioning can be taught and is obviously significantly different between half ice and full ice (3 players vs 5 players) These are all skills the girls can be taught. On my daughter's team this year we had 3 girls that had never played the game before but could skate. All were able to pick up the game and have had great success this year and are ready for U12 next year. More importantly they are all going to play again next year.

Again, these skills can be developed quicker on full ice than half ice.

Beyond step 1 they should understand to pass across the line 100% of the time but I don't know how that would be evaluated with no line true blue line to pass across

Same as above - lines change with full ice

U10 is the girls' first real exposure to positions and the 3 in rule. And half ice means they will not even be doing that - leaving 9/10 year olds moving up to U12 with a huge disadvantage with so many new concepts being thrown at them. Ice positioning and knowing the concepts of the game (seeing the ice) comes with maturity and consistency.

The goal of being on full ice is to teach the transitions and passes.

How can you properly teach full ice rules on half ice? This doesn't make sense.

How are they going to learn ice positioning when they are only playing 3 on 3 (other than the triangle) which they learn in active start.

How are they supposed to learn positioning when they're playing 3 vs 3? It's completely different

This is difficult as the spacing is not something that half-ice players will have had experience with. I'm not sure that it's a fair question to ask in regards to proficiency in order to move to full ice.

None of these skills can be demonstrated proficiently in a half ice format so not convinced they should be used as markers for half vs full ice.

Cross ice and half ice play does not allow for either of these skills to develop. Full ice is needed

How do you play ice position on half ice the whole point of ringette is to pass over the blue lines. It should always be full ice for all u10 levels

Once again! We do not know what the magic percentage is as we were not made aware of it.

Questions are strangely phrased

They can learn to pass over the line until Given the opportunity to play a game with a line

Q29 Research in other team sports has shown a number of benefits associated with smaller playing surface for developing athletes. To what extent are you willing to forego the following reported benefits in order to move a child to a larger playing surface?

	DEFINITELY NOT	PROBABLY NOT	POSSIBLY	PROBABLY	VERY PROBABLY	DEFINITELY	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Increased pace of games	8.14% 60	17.91% 132	29.31% 216	19.00% 140	12.48% 92	13.16% 97	737	3.49
Promote creativity and experimentation	7.01% 50	21.18% 151	26.93% 192	20.90% 149	13.04% 93	10.94% 78	713	3.45
Encourage quick decision making	7.28% 52	20.87% 149	28.99% 207	22.55% 161	10.78% 77	9.52% 68	714	3.37
Enhance skill development	11.92% 85	21.46% 153	22.16% 158	20.20% 144	12.62% 90	11.64% 83	713	3.35
Teach passing and handling in tight situations	9.56% 68	20.82% 148	25.32% 180	21.38% 152	10.55% 75	12.38% 88	711	3.40
Make for a more competitive game	8.57% 61	20.08% 143	27.81% 198	20.08% 143	9.97% 71	13.48% 96	712	3.43
Increased time engaged in the play	12.09% 88	21.43% 156	26.10% 190	18.27% 133	9.89% 72	12.23% 89	728	3.29

COMMENT (OPTIONAL)

I feel that cross ice in AS and half ice in Step and half of the Step 2 season would work really well in increasing the pace of games, promoting creativity. Having a smaller playing surface in Step 1 and half of Step 2 enables players who are moving up from AS and Step 1 the chance to continue their learning on a small surface as well as introducing new players (ie our 9 year olds who start in step 2 within BVRA) the chance to learn or continue to develop for half a season before moving on to full ice all season in Step 3.

I agree with a smaller ice surface which encourages more touches of the ring.

Every child is different and learns at a different rate but from what I can see kids learn best with they're peers

These questions are very leading. By answering them the way they are written, it makes it clear the writer's stance on what they WANT us to answer. I believe we can have it both ways. Play with the ringette rules we should be playing with, but make the girls practice 3v3 and give them small ice games to practice on.

Again, this is a terrible idea that will discourage parents from putting their kids in ringette. Good job!

These options are not fair and/or whole, they are leading. 1. Skill development: I agree that some skills will not be developed as fully, but there are other skills that will not be developed with half ice play (skating speed, endurance, defensive positioning, etc) 2. Time engaged in the play: In some/many cases, there is less time engaged in play where a team has 12 players and is playing all players on one half. This means that children only get to play 1 shift out of every 3 where the concept of half ice was to have 2 "lines" so that the children were able to play 50% of the time because they shouldn't be as tired because they were not skating the full length of the ice. playing only 33% of the time is less than full ice teams that on average would get to play 38% of the time (5/13 but depending on how a coach runs the lines it could be 33 or 40% of the time) I would like to see full ice teams have a bit less players, down by 1 to 2 to encourage more playing time, however, it is difficult if the team is not committed, like mine was this year and last.

Question 17 is misleading. It infers that all half ice skill development trumps any full ice

I feel half ice playing exceeds in all expectations. This has been research and proven for a very long time. I'm happy to finally see it in sports. But I know that many parents do not understand the benefits. I just happen to have an education degree that allowed me time to understand it all. Just the simple fact that when kids can touch the ring more often they learn more.

Having older children who passed through full ice from a very early age I am seeing the main aspect of SKATING as being the primary skill required in ice sports... all of the other elements are great but you pick those up along the way... sacrificing skating for close area play is a massive mistake in my opinion... I have kids who played full ice and ones that played half. The ones played full ice are farther ahead.

I don't know enough to comment.

This question is poorly worded, not sure I've interpreted correctly. There is very little skill development worth giving up for the sake of larger ice surface.

I don't believe half ice makes for a more competitive game, improves passing, skill development or critical thinking. I can see how it would keep everyone engaged.

That's a real Unfair question asking if you are willing to give up every benefit to keep kids in half ice.

I like the small ice

I really don't know enough to answer these.

A couple of these categories were hard to answer.

I don't understand the question. Could you have written this question in a manner that was easier to understand?????

players getting used to skating full ice will allow them to start understanding positional play and strategy far more than half ice. U10 Step 2/3 players are mentally capable of understanding

strategy and positional play and need to start learning at this age. U10 Step 1 - half ice is sufficient at this age group.

Large ice is beneficial to learn passing and stabbing - better for step 2 u10 and greater

I agree that there are benefits to using a smaller playing surface, but this is a leading question. I wish you had asked what are the benefits that I have personally noticed as a parent and as a coach with the new format this year.

I feel that the number of years that the child has played is more important for what level they are currently playing than their age. If a child has played for three years I don't see any benefit to them playing on half ice. I saw a large improvement in skill level of the girls that had never played ringette before. I did not see improvement of the girls that had played ringette before.

Depends on the child

don't know

This is a poorly worded question. Disengaged players is a serious challenge and smaller ice creates better engagement for players who are struggling with staying engaged, which makes the skills/competition/creativity difficult to develop. As soon as players are engaged and develop, they need to be moving to full ice. This might be more of an issue related to movement of players and parent management with regards to expectations.

I don't feel you are not foregoing these benefits by moving to full ice

This question is not clear.

Smaller ice = better Plus that way more teams can share the ice = cheaper and more playing opportunities

this section is a terrible questions. Me saying that I am willing to forego a more competitive game if my child moves up to full ice makes no sense to me. How can a full ice game be less competitive than a half ice game? and what does that even mean..."More competitive".

We all have taken surveys and evaluations and ticked what we know needs to be ticked. I understand to an extent, U6, U10 step 1, but I really feel after that it should be full ice. I came from a sport which had a lot bigger of a playing field than the size of a hockey arena and it thought endurance

Time involved in the play is in my opinion the number one reason Step 1 and 2 need to become half-ice. Some girls are stagnating when they are trying to play full-ice and not being involved in the play. I don't think a faster paced game necessarily benefits female athletes who like to plan their next move and feel confident they will be successful. Promoting experimentation is also top priority for me as a coach as I have seen girls become inhibited because there were too many rules when they were trying to learn the basics. That being said 8 and 9 year old girls are perfectly ready to learn all the rules and take one more step in their mastery of the game in Step 3 before moving into shot clocks and larger nets at U12. It would be a mistake to make Step 3 half ice.

Step 1 should be half ice and above that full ice

I can see having U10S1 kids playing half ice, but I think anything beyond that is not reasonable. These kids in Step 2 and Step 3 are generally 8-9 years old. I could not imagine sharing a dressing room or bench with another team at this age level. I believe the above questions are not applicable either as no coach would be willing to forego skill development.

Exercise is just as important to me...I feel that 10 years olds on half ice (like my daughter this year) after having skated for 4 years would have been a joke. She would not even have broken a sweat playing half ice.

As above

I am not sure what this question was asking

My daughter loves ringette and has had zero disadvantage by playing full ice. Full ice is how games are played. When I told her of the changes that were possibly being brought in she was very unhappy. She told me if she had to play 1/2 ice at Step 2 (and Step 3) she would have quit ringette. And I would have supported that choice and moved her to hockey. I think the girls are developing fantastic game play. Also..this question is very misleading in that you are telling me that my child (and many of the kids ahead of her) have missed out on some benefits because of

the playing full ice. Which I very much disagree with. My daughter's skill levels have developed exponentially since she joined ringette. And part of that is due to the fact that they are able to play full ice. And get plays going. And have a feel for the entire ice that is theirs to play on. Having 1/2 ice for Step 2 and Step 3 will cause development in the above skills to be lowered. I also think you will lose a lot of ringette players to hockey.

These are all leading questions that assume the smaller ice surface will lead to better outcomes.

Is there any research based on ringette? Do any hockey teams play half ice with 8 and 9 year olds with positive results? Is there any proven benefit? I'm all for half ice in Active Start. I'm not convinced it's the right thing for U10. According to the Canadian Long Term Athlete

Development program there are two critical times to build speed in girls, between the ages 6-8 and again at the ages of 11-13. If you cut their ice in half I feel you will be slowing them down in this first important window. Are the sports that have been researched on foot? The glide if the skate covers so much more distance than you would on foot playing sports such as lacrosse or soccer.

This is a leading question and a challenging one for people to answer as it's asked.

Smaller surfaces makes sense. There's less time spent skating long distances after the ring, the faster kids don't always have the ring to themselves, and the slower kids have more opportunity to actually touch the ring.

I agree with the smaller playing surfaces and think that the benefits to young athletes far outweigh the fact that we don't use full ice. Smaller ice leads to more touches of the ring, better shot chances, creative use of the ice, team play, fun and engagement of players. These are all things we want for young players to build success.

I feel that transitioning step 2 and 3 to half ice actually will hinder their skill progression. They gain so much experience over the season working at full ice. It also helps the game play moving into U12 when adding the shot clock and competition.

U10 Level 2 and higher need full ice to learn the game and get the benefits above you say they 'will not' receive. I don't agree with you analysis.

These benefits can be taken advantage of in a practice setting. We play 3 on 3 cross ice in our practices to promote all of the skills/benefits.

Appreciate the study but my elder daughter played full ice step 1 and none of these things were issues.

I am sorry but I do not understand exactly what is being asked. I cannot give an opinion on what I do not understand is exactly being asked

Ringette cannot be compared to hockey. Ringette is a skating game with possession and with cross ice and half ice, there is no room to skate. Hockey requires close contact because the puck is not held. Ringette ends up in inefficient ting drops that require players to stop skating, which is not quick decision making. Open ice allows for passing that is more effective. Small ice in ringette leads to gridlock of the ring and skaters.

Step one half ice makes complete sense as one pass is enough! Step two does have some strong players especially come second half that full ice can be quite good and the skaters are quite strong. Maybe a progressions of half first half to full second half? Or have tiers within the steps so it's more competitive. In hockey they don't keep score and it's not as exciting and the kids notice it. Step 3 is too skilled and fast to be half ice in my opinion! But maybe you have fewer teams if you want to develop kids. Maybe adjust evaluations for larger associations?

Honestly these questions are extremely confusing and way too technical for the average parent. I used to play ringette, have been a bench mom and manager and I am a professional marketer who regularly used surveys like this to gain insights. And I still can barely navigate these questions!! They are way too technical and specific.

Having had three daughters play ringette now, and all have been on full ice since step 1, I don't think these benefits are foregone by playing full ice.

This is a very poorly worded question. It feels as though you are trying to mislead the person filling it out. The reported benefits are not specific to ringette, and ringette is unlike any other game. You are not comparing the same skills and sport.

Smaller ice surface does improve all the aspects of the game. You questions are not worded very well to be able to give a clear answer.

Players playing 1/2 ice games are not able to develop past a certain point of skill. Speed and agility skating peaks, As well as pass speed and range. It was clear this season that there was not enough space for players to reach top capability of play

I understand what half ice is but must realize that stops at a u10 age even in hockey. I think step 1 is prefect for half ice.

Small areas just create dog piles of kids who can't skate that trip kids who can. On the small surface no one is skating or learning to skate because there is no need to skate because the ring is always there.

Terrible questions

This is a very poorly worded question. I do not think that moving all age division U10 to half ice would do what you are describing above. Step 1 to half ice is good because it allows those players a progression from active start or as a new player. However, these young players must be allowed to progress in skills and ice surface and team play. Step 2 and step 3 should remain full ice to allow players to use the skills they learned in step 1 and progress.

Enjoyed watching increased engagement at s1. However watched some phenomenal games at s3 where I feel the players would Be bored at half ice.

All for 1/2 ice.

I found this question extremely confusing and misleading. I would still work on all of these skills on a larger ice surface

I wouldn't want to sacrifice most of these for a larger ice surface

Half ice is perfect for step 1. There needs to be an incentive for the step 2 players to work towards otherwise they will loose interest and quit.

Where and whose research is the definitive decision or standard that these benefits would be foregone with a full ice game. What is saying or assuming that research is 100% correct? I would like to see the research that shows or proves these skills and benefits are lost simply by going to full ice games. We played with active start girls last season on full ice on occasion (esso golden ring) and even then the girls loved it and did well. It was modified to only concerning with blue line passes but it did not affect all girls being part of the play even at that level. I don't agree with having to answer all these percentage questions above on the notion that this "research" is the foregone conclusion.

For 8-9 year olds, they should be playing full ice. I would forego all these skills because they can be developed in small areas in practices. There needs to be more development of coaches and resources that are up to date to teach coaches how to develop athletes.

I totally agree with half ice and cross ice in step 1 and active start. I think it is fantastic and should be kept for skill development. Having said that, I think that's where it should stay. My daughters play for a small association where there was Two U10 step 2 Teams. The age range was anywhere from 6 year olds to nine year olds. Most of the players development would have been hampered by the half ice. Our mix is too good for half ice, too young for step 3 is what I'm trying to get at. The bigger associations have a greater advantage in numbers right? They can disperse their athletes it the more appropriate categories. As a parent watching our girls with some great coaching and skill development are playing some good action, higher skill games than at the start of the year. We beat a team today 4-3 that beat us by 10 the first game of the year. Maybe half ice in step 2 until Christmas and then expose them to full ice in the new year. I think the sport is growing? Putting half ice in step 3 would be a very bad decision. I ask RAB what is the end game for half ice in U10? Why?

Ringette is no longer ringette when cut down to a half-ice surface. You are short-changing the players and it seems as though it is a way of cutting costs at the expense of a proper playing experience. They already do this in hockey and frankly the half ice or one-third ice games are a complete waste of time. It is enough to Drive someone out of the sport. I would consider changing to girls hockey if half-ice were implemented. The congested dressing rooms, as we have seen with hockey, completely remove the team feeling and the kids don't know each other

at all. It creates a feeling that the kids are treated like cattle and the sense of team and friendship is thrown out. It becomes a glorified power skating experience at best and is certainly not worth it. We will be moving to another sport if half-ice is implemented.

Again, it will deter my daughter to go from full ice to half ice

Increased time engaged? There's also no mention of learning the rules of the game.

I am all for teaching players what they need to know in each level so when they move forward to another level they are aware of what they have learned and know that they will need more off for the next level. This works if your coaching staff have key rules, game play and skills to make sure your players are learning what they need.

I feel like this question is very poorly worded. It's hard to ascertain what you're asking.

What????

I do agree that Active start and Step 1 should continue with half ice games but I do feel we are stunting the growth of the game for player moving into u12 when u 10 is all half ice. There are too many rules changes and a larger learning curve pushing it all to u12.

I think with proper tiering to place correct ability teams in the right divisions and good coaching you can manage these concerns and create games and practices that are competitive, fast paced develop small area skills etc. while still learning the full ice rules and strategies.

Skating should place priority over ring development. Having coached from Active start to U12B I am amazed at the limited skating skills of the girls. More emphasis should be placed on this skill development. Full ice enables the younger girls to push their skating as a opposed to standing in one spot while the more developed girls skate circles around them.

I don't think you forego all of these benefits by going to full ice.

I think a lot of the skills really vary from each player but what is more of a deciding factor to go from half ice to full ice games, will be their confidence. They don't need to be overly skilled to have full ice games but they should at least be confident in their abilities to be able to handle it.

Increased pace of game- I find our kids are getting more skilled and are getting bored with the game especially if they have to play a full second year of it.

I do think the age and ringette experience would contribute to the benefits received (e.g. 5/6 year olds playing 1-2 seasons vs 8/9 year olds playing 4-5 seasons)

Step 2 and above should be full ice.

Would be a joke to change...when you are trying to grow sport and get more girls to play the sport...when they go to u12 and are expected to know full ice rules and shot clock (would be a shit show).

I'm not against smaller ice surfaces, but we have to remember that the examples shown are from Finland where they play on an Olympic sized ice surface. In Canada and Edmonton specifically our ice surfaces aren't even NHL regulated sizes. Some are extremely small. If the ice surface size was comparable I would be 100% in favor.

I don't necessarily agree that a large surface has to decrease the pace of games or make them more competitive. a large part of ringette is skating and the larger the surface the more skating involved...definitely younger groups like active start and the following step should be half ice but after that it should be full ice. but I would go on skill level vs age to determine full ice vs half

Ringette is different from other sports and is more inclusive of all the players on the ice by nature of it's game format (with blue lines and restrictions on players in zones) I do not think that changes should be made based on evidence from other sports.

I find the wording of this question difficult and misleading. Of course, I am not willing to forego any of the above benefits. However, I feel depending on where a player is developmentally should be what is considered. Moving to full ice for U10 players who are ready will also show benefits in the above areas.

Research has shown this works in the first year or two, not up until almost 4 years in a game. It doesn't promote creativity playing with players that can't keep up, amateur volunteers guessing during evaluations on a child's ability today and 6 months from now is the weakness in this philosophy

In the half ice games I have observed, there were no lines to pass over. Having played/coached basketball, there is a fine line between a smaller playing area for younger kids, and a playing

area too small to gain any benefit from it.

Show us this holy grail of research;

I find this question to be worded in a very odd way that is leading the response towards people replying they don't want to give up any positive outcomes listed.

Again, I think it depends more on the group dynamics of the team and the number of players. We had a team with 10 players this year and they definitely got a tonne of ice time and were able to develop their skills very well. If we had a larger team, they still have less ice time regardless of the size of the ice surface. I'm not sure how to answer these questions without thinking about those other factors as well. My daughter went from Active Start to U10Step 2. I was very concerned about all of the skills listed above. She learned quickly though and I found the size of the ice surface not to be a barrier to her learning the skills needed to play the game.

No one wants half ice at step 2 except ringette Alberta. You will lose a lot of players if you go through with this

Not sure I completely understood the question... but I see many more benefits to full ice. Someone should educate parents on the evidenced based research, should they try to create half ice games. People tend to push back less when they are educated on the subject matter and are aware of the evidence behind it.

I think the .17 could have more details and be worded properly to get how parents feel. I think maturity should also play a role. We had a few players on our team that I strongly believe half ice wouldn't make a difference for. As their efforts (whether good or bad) carry on to off the ice. Someone that tries hard to improve and comes focused will do well with all of the above whether is half or full ice. And because our associations evaluations only look at scores and not the individual players we seem to build our teams differently than other associations so it is really hard to gauge. There are certainly some 9 year olds in step 3 that would possible be better in half ice as the competitiveness and effort aren't there. This is probably more of an internal problem but our evaluations for U10, U12 (especially) and U14 were a circus this year. Worst I have seen it. I think Spruce parents would have an easier time with this survey if we had some consistency with evaluations.

I was originally against half ice and was surprised when we ended up in Step 1. I allowed the process to happen and have been converted to a half ice believer. I have seen the girls gain more skill this year (in my opinion) compared to last year at full ice.

weird question. To what extent are you willing to forego the benefits ???? We want the athletes to develop and progress and grow.

I believe after about 6 years old all of the above mentioned items will increase with full ice. 1-2 years of 1/2 ice is all that is needed to gain the skills required to play full ice. We played full ice last year in Active Start and it was great...

This question is confusing and appears to be leading. If I am reading the question correctly, if I select "Probably" for increased pace = I would forego half ice even though it is reported to have an increased pace ?? I selected the neutral 'possibly' for all. Provided the player played half ice last year, then I would typically support half ice and the benefits above.

Having been a part of Ringette more many years, I didn't see any benefit to the half ice play as mentioned above. Would we like to see it, yes, does it work in reality, not necessarily.

I would need to review the studies to make an informed decision. Having coached for several years and from watching and speaking with current year Step 1 Coaches I'm not currently convinced of the merits of half ice for U10. I might have a different perspective if U10 was broken into 2 groups consisting of U8 and U10 players in which case having U8 play on half ice and U10 on full ice

I believe the game is meant to be played on full ice.

I don't like these questions. I don't understand what the resulting data of opinions will be useful for other than to confuse the decision makers on this matter.

The U10 Step 1 format does not make for a more competitive game, as they do not keep score.

Step #1 half ice was OK, not in favor of Step #2 half ice

I generally think they younger kids should be on smaller ice surfaces. You lose them if the have

to make it across the big surface. Full ice is much to big for kids under 8 who do not yet have the skill level to accommodate it.

this is a trick questions. Just because they are in a larger ice surface doesn't mean I would have to forego the above options. do kids learn better on a smaller ice surface yes, but once they have learnt those skills they need to be able to grow use them. I found by the end of the season in U10 step one, almost all the kids were to advanced for half ice, and when we played full ice games they enjoyed way better and complained when we went back to half ice.

My daughter would not have gotten so well or have loved the game as much if she was half ice. And because of this, my youngest daughter wants to play ringette the upcoming season but wants to play full ice and she will be u10. I believe they develop so much when put into those situations since they strive to be better. I am answering the questions based on how my daughter started out since now she has learned so much and keeps wanting to get better.

The question wording seems very skewed

The girls need half ice to develop, but understand that if they play more than 2 seasons at half ice we will lose interest.

Starting new players with half ice would benefit the Players skill development. Expecting players who have already played on full ice to switch to half ice will cause players to quit.

Ringette is a PASSING game. I have a child in novice hockey as they have transitioned to half ice. There are benefits such as goalie improvement, puck handling, and a smaller surface for smaller kids. It has cut down on breakways and puck hogs. but ringette is a PASSING game and a SKATING game. My daughter would have been extremely bored and would have quite the sport if she would have had to play half ice this year. She is 9 and fully capable of skating the entire ice. I wish I could put her directly into U12 next year because you have also taken away the competitive side by not having playoffs or provincials, etc. ALL Sport is competitive!! It is fine to have different levels of within the competition so all athletes have a good experience, such as Tiering the teams.

I'm okay with step 1 doing half ice

I disagree that many of these would be sacrificed on a move to full ice, and in fact quite the opposite, these skills would be enhanced on full ice. Half ice will further highlight the difference between the more skilled and less skilled players, as the skilled players will dominate ring possession with less requirement to pass.

We need to promote skill development and small area games is the way to teach that.... many other sports have proved this throughout the world and in Canada it seems we are late to the party on this aspect.

This is a very confusing question for such an important topic. We had to reread it twice and discuss it to try and understand what you were asking. Because it is asked in such a confusing way people may not answer it correctly. Simple answer- we want full ice.

I do like the skills being developed in the half ice game and strongly support it for step 1. The issue that I saw this season is that as some girls progressed in skating, passing and other skills, they still overpowered their team mates even on the small ice. To keep these kids from playing a full ice game next year, would be detrimental.

This question's wording was difficult. I see many merits to smaller play area and fewer plays on at a time. I think the complexity of the line passing is important but difficult to teach in a modified area. I'm happy with the smaller play area, disappointing that we aren't using half ice rather than the cross ice.

I think these ideas make sense but should be started with new kids into U10 step 2. I don't think kids who have already had full ice games will want the restriction

From Step 2 games I have watched this season I have noticed the skill level grow from the start of the season to the end.

I don't agree that these are all benefits of half ice in Step 2. Step 2 players should transition to full ice.

Have never seen a half-ice game. And since we won't be in U10 anymore. It doesn't really matter to us. If it is better than sure - do half-ice. But you MUST have smaller net at all arenas then.

This question is VERY biased. A smaller ice surface would not increase the pace of a game or increase creativity. It is very focused on the offensive benefits but fails to mention any advantages for defensive development. I would be interested to know what the other sports the question is referring to. Have these studies been tested with Ringette or are we going to take Hockey Canada's word for it.

I do not like how this question is worded. With each reported benefit, when the game is played on full ice they still learn these skills. It makes it sound like if they play on full ice they forego any chance to learn.

These are the most important questions right here.

Currently at the U10 S3 level. All of the above was accomplished with full ice.ots of skating, passing, positioning and creativity.

I strongly disagree with the wording of the above questions, they are leading and presumptuous and clearly written by individuals who do not currently have athletes in U10. Step 2 and Step 3 athletes have not forgone development but have grown exponentially because of the use of full ice.

Im willing to forego all reported benefits as this game has benefits to having full ice.

90 second shifts is also way too quick, especially with straight time. Either stop the running time or increase shift lengths

They are not true games as compared to full ice. No one keeps score for half ice. We have another girl in U12 so have been involved for many years. The development we have found less this year because of half ice. Anything past step 1 at half ice will hinder skating development for sure.

The question is framed as only allowing me to choose what I'd be willing to forego. I am looking at the question from the perspective of pace of play that I witnessed in the back half of this most recent season, where every player was able to play full ice without issue. I cannot imagine those players playing half ice.

This question was difficult to answer. I feel that at stage 3 the kids actually have these benefits playing full ice. I dont think they are missing out on development. If you put in U8 and then do u6 cross ice, u8 half ice and u10 full ice it provides a nice progression in development rather than a HUGE change at u12. They already have to adapt to big nets and shot clock. Having to build endurance on top of that is going to be a huge challenge.

I don't agree that the cross ice games will lead to the above benefits.

I believe in ringette full ice play is essential to learning the game properly as all of the lines on the ice surface are essential to game play. The earlier a player can move to full ice the earlier a player can develop into a complete player

Should add two rings to the game. Full ice. They have room to skate , utilize blue lines with Ringette concepts. More ring touch for everyone with two rings.

I find that selection of which step a player makes is largely dependent on skating speed (based on personal experience with my daughter making step 1 for 2 yrs in a row). I don't think 1/2 ice allows for acceleration and improving speed as distance travelled is short. If 1/2 ice improves handling and stabbing the ring, passing, positioning, and learning rules of the game, then I am for it. But I think 1/2 ice is better for U8 and not for U10 as previously stated.

Passing across the blue line forces team Play in ringette. And prevents solo play. Plus having 3 in a zone setups even playing time and space. These aspects are missing from a half ice game.

Me commenting probably will not make any changes as you guys pretend to care about what people think but don't in reality.

I agree with U10 step 1 at half ice, learning the game and ring handling but U 10 step 2 needs to be full ice. At the end of 1 year of half ice, these kids are bored. A second year of half ice in step 2 and they won't want to play. My daughter has played full ice in step 1 and step 2. She is 7 years old in step 2. She has tried a half ice game once and has said that she would quit if she had to play half ice, that it would be boring.

I think the game of ringette as it is now has all of these skills so to say they would lose them from not playing half ice when they are young does not make sense to me.

I don't feel that changing step 2 ringette to half ice realizes the benefits mentioned above. In step 2 the players are typically engaged in the play and faced with making decisions and performing passing and handling skills in tight situations. When teams are selected correctly the play is fair and engaging for all involved.

I just selected all probably. These are questions for coaches not parents. I don't even know what kind of ice size we play on I put her gear in and she goes and plays.

This chart is very leading as you are giving examples of all things we are hoping our children will achieve in their time in U10, however, the way this is laid out suggests that the only way to do these things is to play smaller ice. There is no consideration given for smaller centres who don't have teams to play against or options to progress skills (coach development and mentorship) and ice size over the course of the season. I think you have an opportunity to be creative and innovative by accomodating larger cities with multiple leagues and smaller centres that no one is willing to travel too but who would like to grow the sport and their association. Suggestions would be welcome for keeping players and parents engaged when we play the same 3 teams all year (except if we incur more costs of registration, travel and hotel) to participate in multiple tournaments. It's not sustainable.

This is a tough question as I feel not all of these may be applicable to ringette. If a player in Step 1 is a strong skater in comparison to other players they usually dominate the game and score their three goals and then are encouraged to let other players handle the ring (right idea to be a team player but not good for that players development). This is precisely why my daughters friend lost interest. In step 2 on my daughters team if a player scored 3 goals they were rotated back to defence where they still played a meaningful role on the team, handled the ring, still had skill development and further and perhaps most important, they still felt as if they were contributing to the team and felt part of the team.

It tinnier for me the concern I have is the transition from U10 to U12 will potentially be a massive change management for the young athletes if the half ice is implemented for all U10 teams....hence my 'possibly' response above. I'm assuming this has been discussed along the way so maybe a solution in place already?

I'm not willing to give up skill development of players so parents can feed their ego and say their kids play full ice. Skill development and being engaged in the game are what matter most at these formative years.

Have you watched 1/2 ice ringette or hockey? Players just swarm the ice, it's a terrible game to watch.

Wording of questions assume that these skills cannot be created in full ice conditions

I believe my daughter has learned those skills quite well on full ice and if she were on half ice she would need to relearn them at faster speeds and greater distances - half ice gives false positive

U10 step 2 - the girls in this age group are too big to play half ice. They Should also already have the skill to play full ice.

I feel if the children already have played a year or two on full ice and spent valuable coaching time to learn full ice play, then going to half ice or smaller surface play would only confuse and possible deter kids from wanting to play as it may become confusing to re-learn game play with a smaller area or half ice.

If a child has already spent a season playing full ice they should not have to go back to half ice to play in upcoming season

None of this- half ice makes sense

I couldn't answer this question without my top answer being changed. Looks like can only choose one answer for all the questions

A. I cannot choose every skill as a bullet point on this survey question so that is problematic B. I am a little shocked these are reported benefits. The half ice games did not allow for any of these to happen. The shift for each player was extremely short and there was minimal opportunity to develop any of these

You survey does not allow me to select "probably not" for more than one question. The question presumes that each item will be sacrificed if we move to a full ice surface which is not the case for ringette. All of the above categories are required for full ice just as they are for half ice

This question doesn't make sense. And I can't answer the same answer for each question.

There is a very slim chance that any team or association has said that the game on a half ice surface has become more competitive. The score isn't counted and kids don't feel the intensity that comes with a full ice game prior to the changes. This question seems to be geared towards hockey and the changes with minor hockey. But there are no 9/10 year old players playing half ice in novice. They are all moving up to atom (u11) and playing the game of hockey.

The survey in this portion is not working on my computer. For the age of my child, full ice last year and this year has been more than appropriate for her development of skating and of skills. The game has been very competitive and engaging for her. She has excelled in all areas of play with equal playing time along with her teammates.

I'm truly converted to having younger players on half ice, especially S1 where the majority of players are only 1 or 2 years in. Would like to see S2 half ice until Xmas, then full ice after, leaving S3 at full ice. At S3, players have generally been on the ice for three to four years.
Again, basing my opinion on watching the 7 "best" BGL U10S3 teams.

I don't believe that playing on a smaller surface is better

Ringette is a different sport than hockey so where are the studies on Ringette that it will benefit ALL Ringette players?? There is no thought put into this question except to push a fake narrative. Also, the selection forces me to pick answers I don't want. So this is not a proper way to obtain opinions. Fix the answer selection options

The survey doesn't let me select more than one category through the answers. I can only select on "probably" etc. As a player who quickly became a faster more skilled player, development became limited quite quickly.

Survey is broken only allowing 1 check mark in a category. My answer is "definitely" in all categories because I do not agree with any of the assumptions on there study. My daughter played half ice in hockey and we moved to ringette because of that very reason. They claim more puck touches which is true, however it's very misleading because the quality of the puck touches are considerably worse, meaning they may whack it before it's taken away. In full ice they are given an opportunity to posses the puck and actually control it for a period of time which is not found in half ice unless they are the best. Also, in half ice a child will never reach there top speed in a game, in full ice this happens all the time. There is a lot more energy consumed by the player in full ice resulting in shorter and more exhausting shifts. Positioning utilized and understood in full ice, none in half ice. Overall game understanding is far greater in full ice, half ice confuses them, it's more like shinny and really just a free for all mess from what I've seen. Hockey Alberta sold the parents a false promise that turned out to be a failure in my opinion. No structure, no quality puck touches, lack of game knowledge, boring to watch, lack of speed development, no positioning and really just hurt the game of hockey. The only real result that I saw was that it opened up more ice for more players. However the price was not reduced meaning it is just a money grab and meant to get more money off of more kids off less ice.

I don't care about how quick my child develops and I have yet to find a parent that does. You cannot select multiple line as definitely. I would be willing to forgo all benefits for full ice play.

Buttons don't work correctly therefore answers won't poll correctly.

While I have seen and support the research, in our specific case, we have been playing and teaching full ice for almost the whole time we have been playing ringette. It seems counterintuitive to now go to half ice. However, for active start and step 1 - cross and half ice makes sense. By the time they reach step 2 and 3, they should have their skills developed enough to progress to full ice play.

Unsure

I don't get what this question is getting at

1) you've given me 6 rank options for 7 reported benefits, not allowing for duplication. 2) this is dependant on the player. I would sacrifice a lot of these elements for the first month or so in order to keep an older child engaged and learning. Later in the season, after a rapid learning pace at the start, they would not necessarily be sacrificing any of these elements. It is very difficult to find the balance in absolutes when you are a small association.

I'm having glitches with the system. I do not want to forgo any positives to move to larger ice.

This question wouldn't let me answer ie 'possibly' more than once

I am willing to forego all. I don't agree that any of these items will be give up if things stay at full ice for kids above 8 years old.

I am willing to forego all of these potential benefits in order to allow my child to continue playing on full ice (as she has already done so the past 2 seasons). This question will not allow me to click "definitely" more than once.

It won't let me select all definitely. I Am for full ice 100%. I can understand 1/2 ice for step 1 but beyond that I feel like we are ruining the sport.

I find this question hard to answer. In relation to my player I don't think u10 step 3 should ever be half ice. These girls need to learn on full ice before going to u12. Do I think some of these are beneficial in the lower levels, absolutely. But as a step 3 parent Snd heir athlete is moving up. I feel I can't answer this.

I prefer for kids to be safe and better developed athletes than pushing them through to full ice. If I had known it was an option, I would have advocated for step 2 to be on half ice as it sounds like better development in the long run and safer

My daughter is currently in Step 2, I would not like to see her moving to half ice since her last 2 years have been on full ice.

It wont let me select more than 1 option so some of my selections arent accurate...

I think it should be full ice for all u 10

These questions would not keep my answers for previous answered questions. Therefore there is only the last one answered.

This is a terrible question, misleading and easily misunderstood! That and the radial vote buttons seem broken! Half ice at step 1 when kids are learning is understandable. Step 2 should be a transition to learn Ringette rules and how to adjust and use the full ice, by step 3 kids should be learning to increase their pace and thought process.

All of these can still be developed on a larger playing surface. This question is not fair & objective. It is biased.

It wouldn't let me select more than one of the same answer across all questions so these aren't accurate responses

I would personally choose definitely for most responses but unfortunately this survey forces me to choose one in each category

I disagree with this study

There is an issue with this question - it keeps deselecting the selection. None of these answers are accurate on my survey.

What benefit is it to move a child from 3 years full ice to half ice for 1-2 years and then back to full ice?

If game play is on a full ice surface, then practice should be the same to encourage full play development for game play

This is poorly written question. Not clear on what the ask is. Also, can't select an answer per line.

Q30 Some logistical issues have been identified for teams playing on reduced size ice. Please offer any suggestions for dealing with the following...

Answered: 394 Skipped: 723

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Dressing room congestion	86.29%	340
Goalie changes	67.01%	264
Other (please specify and comment)	29.95%	118

DRESSING ROOM CONGESTION

Dressing rooms congested

dress as much as possible at home

don't use arenas with small dressing rooms

I don't see a solution to this unless parents continue to dress players at home. Having larger teams that split into smaller teams for games would help so that opposing teams don't have to share the same space, but I have heard positive feedback from coaches on the benefits of smaller teams at the young ages.

We are ok sharing a change room, but it should never be shared WITH the team you're playing.

At a young age maybe get half dressed before arriving

Stagger ice times by 15 minutes.

1team per dressing room

Stagger ice times: e.g. 1:15 ice time, but 1:00 for each side

Have kids dress/undress at home and only tie skates at the rink

Usually only 2 dressing rooms are given and not a lot of space to have 2 teams changing

Staggered times for teams to enter dressing room

Should not be a problem if teams are 18 skaters and the team splits in half for each half of the game. It is a bit congested, but at least it is players that are used to being around each other for the whole season.

Smaller bags (stand up bags are too large)

Have similar team sizes which is critical. If one team of 18 plays one team of 10 kids it defeats the purpose of trying to give the kids more playing time. Ie, 20 kids per team, each Team gets a dressing room. When they go onto the ice divide both teams in 10.

Stagard start times by 15 min

Staggered ice start times

None

Somehow limit amount of people in changerooms

I don't see how this is a problem at most of the arena's we played at.

Should only be 1 team per dressing room

Stagger time of locker use

Restrict parents / siblings. That's a big part of the congestion. Cap team sizes to 10 players.

Staggered start times

No parents or siblings allowed in dressing room past the first few games. Players need to learn to dress themselves. parents can come in near the end to tie skates

No ideas

Designated sides of individual rooms

This is a mute point. Every community is strapped for facilities. One of the biggest negatives for a kids experience with this format

Don't believe much can be done

could use more rooms if available... this was an issue

Not sure. Some rinks have more dressing rooms which helps.

have all arenas put benches in hallways and wasted space

no siblings and only one parent

Too many players per parent in the dressing room. Have a active start in arenas with bigger dressing rooms. Have time slots for the teams to get ready and enforce the best we can

Only have 2 teams per ice time

Reans usually have addional rooms - we need to use them

This was an issue but I feel like parents could have done a better job encouraging independence for their players to get dressed by themselves. Many parents would contribute to the congestion in the rooms and also allow siblings in the rooms.

No obvious solution

Expand rink use .. many new or renovated arenas have better sized rooms

Not applicable

Parents adjust to this and work together smoothly

Come dressed to rink

Asking only one family member per player in the dressing room

Go back to full ice

Tell parents limit to one parent per player rather than the whole family and siblings

Book rinks with the larger dressing rooms when they know larger teams are booked

give guidance to parents to NOT feel like they have to be in dressing room with kids. Give guidance, even U10 step 1 that coaches can make decision to exclude parents from room if they choose, and ringette alberta will support decision.

Either go with a larger team and split the group or sort out with the city using an increased number of dressing rooms. It's currently not manageable.

More change rooms available

Good luck with this, it's tight for tournaments as it is

This can be accommodated, girls spending time with their teammates instead of arguing with mom and dad is better anyway. Less room in the dressing room means less parents in the dressing room.

Don't go to half ice beyond Step 1

more like dressing room confusion. The associations need to send more detail to the arena facilities on their ice bookings to clarify how and where the teams dressing rooms will be. Most often I found the arena staff didnt know that there were 4 teams playing on one ice and how to arrange the dressing rooms. the associations should be clearer here to avoid more confusion

not schedule 2 games for the same time or stager the start/finish times. If team 1 & 2 started at 9am and used dressing rooms 1 & 2 then teams 3 &4 could use dressing rooms 3 & 4 and start their game at 930. then teams 1 & 2 would be done by 10 giving their 2 dressing rooms to the next team/group that could start at 1030/1045

Keep full ice for Step 2 and Step 3.

1 parent only permitted per child

Not much can be done, only so many rooms, can maybe limit team sizes to less than 12

Each team takes a side of the dressing room

No suggestions on this but I do think this has been the biggest challenge/pain point for the year

Reduce team sizes

one parent only (no siblings)

This was not ideal especially in smaller rooms

two teams per room

Go to full ice and have on team per room

separate dressing rooms per team. 15 mins different time slots

One game per sheet of ice. Larger teams so two games can be played at one on opposite sides of the rink, like they do with novice hockey.

There can only be two teams. It's impossible to accommodate 4 teams. Even if they are smaller.

Book two dressing rooms

Not sure what can be done about this...being part of what was deemed a large team helped as we got our own dressing room and didn't need to share with another team

Dressing before games at home.

Stop putting 2 teams in at the same time

???

It's chaos keep track of equipment or you will not see it again.

One team per dressing room

Huge issue, need only one team for cohesion; supports performance

Move to full ice, or stagger dressing room times, limit parents to one per child, enforce kids must dress them selves

Older arenas have no solutions unless funding is available

We were in current format Step3. It is a good transition to u12. We had done the hockey timbits in the past. It requires a newer large format rink with large dressing rooms. The old 1960's rinks were terrible. This was one our factor's to moving from hockey to ringette.

If two teams need to share a dressing room, stagger the start times. There is not ability to team bond when multiple teams are in the room. Team bond is especially important for female athletes.

Gear up in lobbies or at home

Have larger rings accommodate these games or have alternate teams in dressing rooms. This situation will never be ok unless they create mini rinks and mini dressing rooms.

There is no way to change this when sharing a dressing room. It is also very awkward sharing a room with a team after the game if one team really outplayed the other.

Staggered dressing times (team 1 dresses for 20 while team 2 warms up with ring toss)

Despite half ice, still only have two teams playing at a time

No parents in the changerooms

Model team sizes comparable to novice hockey. Larger teams split in to active games only require two dr's

Don't go to half ice.

Would make for really tight dressing room changes

Give a 15 minute head start for one team?

Dont put the teams playing each other in the same room.

Unless there are open rooms. Very little can be done.

Not sure how to fix it but it's an issue for sure. To many kids/parents in rooms meant for smaller numbers.

N/a

Team size increase slightly and play split squad

Red deer has rinks with bigger rooms, but ringette always plays in the smaller older rinks which is behind the times with spacing. Why is hockey always in the newer larger room rinks.

Use rinks with more available rooms

Encouraging players to come dressed in abase layer for quicker dressings

Maybe 1.5 ice slots and stagger start times. Ex, game #1 is played from 8:00-9:00 and game #2 is played from 8:30-9:30. This would allow the 2 teams sharing a dressing room to be in and out at alternating times

Change room time scheduling for each team

Very tight

Staggered arrival times

It was horrible with 19 players on Active Start .. Plus there usually parents who have younger kids . I am one of them and I had to bring them in too .

Don't have 4 teams on the ice surface...

Yep

Have small teams.. Eg 10 skaters only.

Limit the number of players on teams

Fewer adults. Players come out to tie skates.

have teams remove items from the dressing rooms, and offset ice times by 30 minutes

We made it work I don't see it as an issue. Parents don't need to be in the room once their child is dressed this needs to be a rule before and after the games that is enforced so coaches can talk to the players. Also just common courtesy of not taking up three bench spots with siblings that aren't even playing. Again common courtesy that isn't so common.

Dressing rooms are already congested

To counter what will probably be suggested - getting ready at home and traveling in gear is

NOT a safe solution and should not be endorsed by ringette Alberta

give them another dressing room and they enter the box by going through the other home team's dressing room

Yes, for many associations, this is not feasible for older players.

Have only one group per room. Slightly larger roster with split squad for games. Ensures adequate numbers for practices and mixing of peers for games.

Dress at home

Less parents and siblings in room with athlete

limit one parent per child in the dressing room

Keep team sizes small (10 max)

Full ice

Two large teams of 18-20 split into teams of 9-10. The players at these ages are smaller than teens/adults so can be accommodated. Need to avoid more than one team sharing the dressing rooms. By having one large team, they can still enjoy the social aspect of the sport.

Hockey teams play half ice, they get their own rooms. Is it because these are girls?

There are none.

Small team sizes help this issue, 10 or 11 players per team

i don't have a suggestion

Not sure

Come dressed to games (Dress at home)

Don't do half-ice games

You need more space.

None - this reduces both team bonding and room for players to learn to equip themselves before games, especially at the level that requires parental help.

I believe dressing rooms are crazy and if you want 1/2 ice for u10-1 then moving to smaller teams like only half of what they have would work. 2 teams of 7 would be ok to share.

Scrap half ice games!

It's an inconvenience only, deal with it

Not much you can do hear, it's a function of the facility, so unless more dressing rooms are available this isn't going away.

Less players per team/less parents and siblings allowed in the change room

Larger teams so they can be split on the ice so there is only one team per dressing room.

Ensuring teams take a half.

Not space for two teams to share.

Come to rink already dressed in equipment

This is a huge concern that can't be overcome

Two teams in one room can get pretty tight. Depending on the rink. Sometimes with opposing team, sometimes with a team playing on the other half. It makes it difficult to have chats before games, extra awards for players etc, and sometimes the children get upset if it's the other team and not them. It is also awkward when the game didn't go so well for one team to gear the others talk about it after.

Limit team sizes to 10/team.

Avoid scheduling in older arenas that have small dressing rooms.

It really isn't that bad as long as you aren't in a hurry

None

Staggered dressing room times mixed with the free skating warm ups/cool downs (reduces the time between games but makes for easier transitions) - in the below mentioned scenerio

staggered start times

Tight changing areas, sharing rooms with opposing teams

Rooms were too full with 2 full teams in each dressing room causing issues before and after games.

This is a great challenge as some teams are comprised of 15 girls. The rooms are shared between 2 teams. At this age, many children require their parents assistance which adds to the congestion. Not sure how to fix this one outside of making larger rooms or adding rooms to the arenas.

longer ice times with staggered changing periods

If teams of 18 are made and then you could play 9 a side and then they 18 members from each team are all from one association

Do not book more than 2 teams per ice slot (e.g. 2 large teams that split into 2 smaller teams to play 2 half ice games simultaneously; this ensures that only 1 team is occupying a dressing room at a time)

On hockey it's ridiculous

have 2 dressing rooms available

Has not been an issue for us we carry small teams

Smaller team sizes to make it easier to share one dressing room.

One parent per child in the room, have players come dressed, although this isn't always an option

Depends on the facilities the room is at. Some arenas can accommodate while others are not ideal.

Cap team size for 1/2 ice games.

one parent per child...not much else you can do

Have on team get ready first and then another?

Thank you for recognizing that this has been a major issue this season. It does not promote team bonding and feels very unsafe. I am sorry, other than letting each team have their own dressing room I do not have any suggestions for improvement.

Do you have any idea what the city bylaws are regarding dressing room capacities? 11 girls per team, 11 parents and possible young siblings x 2 teams is a massive liability issue you don't want to take into account

Dressing rooms are already too small for two teams

Encourage associations to keep teams 7- 10 players.

Two teams in one dressing room is tight.

Open up more rooms

Make the kids dress themselves and parents only in room to tie skates, then leave room.

No clue - Don't forget the fire hazard associated with having 22 kids and 20 parents in each dressing room on game days

Na

Can't really avoid this

Only 1 parent allowed in dressing room, no siblings. Teams each have a side.

Players come dressed or partial dressed

Cards made to ensure each kid has a spot, equal space between teams

Only one parent in the room per child.

1

Showing up early for the games 30 min prior I start of right before

Limiting the size of player bags, staggered dressing times get dressed go out in the hall way then allow others get dressed. Reduce the number of parents in the change room. Only team staff helping.

Time slots. Home team ready 10 mins early.

Minimize "extra" people in the change rooms (e.g. only one parent/caregiver per child, allocate a dressing room for coaches and helpers, etc.

Don't play in rinks built in the 60s or play in rinks with 6 dressing rooms

have only 2 teams on an ice surface full ice

not sure

seperate dressing rooms would be helpful - we had girls changing in the shower rooms and hallways. I think for team bonding,team building, pre and post game talks it would be nice to have that seperation

don't have 3 cross-ice games at the same time. EVER. reduce number of players on the half/cross ice teams.

Don't book half ice games at Kinex

Someone is going to get hurt or worse due to overcrowding in the dressing room. All that can be done is to only use arenas with large dressing rooms. As none have emergency exits 50 people in a room is extremely dangerous.

no issues, players came dressed or did pre game chat outside on bench to create space

split squad games only (similar to Novice Hockey); have teams of 16-18, which you would split into 8-9 per side, per game. Makes a LOT more logistical sense, and eliminates the shared dressing room issue.

Rules for no siblings or multiple parents.

If the rooms are small we could maybe spread out to three instead of just two rooms or borrow a ref room.

Don't have teams....just practice and shiny

not an issue for us

Smaller team size

nothing

This is a problem in some rinks, but not all. The team dynamic that is built in the change room was not there however.

Make smaller roster sizes

No more than 16 players on a team. 16 players gives you 3 full lines including the goalie.

Keep it to two teams and play split squad games.

One parent only per family in the room

Hard to create a team atmosphere with so much congestion. Also too much congestion with bags, parents, siblings, players, coaches etc. Not as much fun in locker room with no space for team spirit/fun/strategy

don't change to half ice for Step 2-3 (teams don't bond in mixed dressing rooms)

encourage players to dress themselves as much as possible and strongly encourage parents to limit the number of family members entering the dressing room. It's really not that bad

Keep teams under 12 kids

We haven't had any issues this year. If a dressing room is too small only a few parents come in and the others just wait outside. We would help the athletes with tying of skates.

No idea but I've heard it's crazy

Go to full ice

Choose arenas that have more/bigger dressing rooms

Shared dressing room and shared bench could be congested

no suggestions, just no half ice for Step#2

The congestion is ridiculous. 4 teams paying for ice should mean 4 dressing rooms.

offset start times by about 15 minutes so one group goes on the ice 15 minute earlier

Smaller team sizes and look at scheduling games at larger dressing room arenas. Making a larger size team of 15 divide team into 2 for games then each team can have their own dressing room.

only allow one parent per child in dressing room

Reserve more dressing rooms. This is important. It's a time to bond as a team and have talks with the coach off ice.

Part of a team sport is bonding with your team. If there are 2 teams in a dressing room this will not happen as often.

We had 2 dressing rooms for all practices and games so this wasn't an issue

Girls asked to change at home and then just put skates on at the rink.

Congestion is the down side of increasing the number of players on the ice

Asking people to limit the amount of folks that are in the dressing rooms while getting their children ready. I realize it's not always possible, but there are times where it's 4 or 5 people in the dressing room getting kids ready. Not something that could likely be enforced, but would be good to at least make it known it is causing issues.

Larger teams by association that split into 2 teams for the 2 half-ice games. That way at least it is one association per dressing room. Reduce family members and siblings in dressing rooms.

No comment

This is brutal by the time you add 2 teams and parents into the room. It is way too much to handle.

1 dressing room per team as coaches should still make it game day experience with a coach talk

This is dependent on arena. 2 - 10 girl teams was manageable but large teams would have an issue. Team size should be somewhere between 8-10 girls roughly

Smaller teams

Dangerous to have over 20 kids, plus coaches plus parents etc in one small change room.

Each team needs their own changeroom. Also can't have coach talks due to the noise

Very much a problem. Staggered ice times to 15min may prevent the mass congestion of everyone in the dressing room at once but the ice slots potentially will not accommodate for

1.5hr if there is 3 games cross ice

don't do half ice for U10 step 2 and above

Don't play on reduced ice sizes- seems ridiculous to stagger changing times in dressing rooms. A lot of team bonding happens in the dressing room prior to a game.

Limit 2 teams per ice session

Each team needs their own dressing room. Rooms are congested and there is no opportunity for pre-game team bonding or team talks.

not allow more than one parent per child, or even no parents in dressing room at U10

Decrease the number of players / lower enrolment

Teams going in assigned rooms instead of wherever they want

Too hard to manage in tournament settings (too many teams) and some arenas are just smaller or older and have fewer changing rooms

Some rooms are small. I can't imagine 4 teams on the ice at one time which means 2 teams per dressing room.

This was utter chaos...26 kids in one room, I encourage kids to dress at home

Every facility is different sized dressing rooms.. Ban grit bags

Full ice

Only large teams which split into two play against each other. More dressing rooms booked at a time.

Dont allow extra family in change room. 1 immediate family member only.

Only schedule ice at arenas with large enough change rooms for 20+ players.

have more dressing rooms, less games at the same time.

One team per dressing room

No idea what to do about this issue. It is a major concern and worse in small rinks

Limit parents and children in dressing room

Make teams extra large (20 players) and play split squad games, with one team in each room.

It is very difficult. We experience this in hockey and it is nearly impossible to get changed. When the kids are even bigger it will be very difficult. Kids in u10 generally still require parent assistance.

It's crowded but manageable

This was a major issue and concern. This also affect team building and bonding which is a significant reason kids play ringette.

Only have two teams on the ice surface at a time. Split the team into two and play the games this way. Both teams would have to dress 2 goalies per team. It works extremely well in house league hockey

Yes. Frustrating. Takes the enjoyment out of going to the rink.

1/2 ice requires 2 teams to share a dressing room. That is very crowded.

Never heard this was an issue.

Arrive half dressed. Smaller bags

Having full ice games so each team has their own dressing room.

Not only congestion but he coaches can't have pre game discussions with the other team in the room, you deal with it by not sharing a dressing room.

In small rinks, ask half to come 30 mins early and half to come 15 mins early. Bigger rinks use 4 seperate dressing rooms.

Haven't had to deal with this as she's always played full ice

1 team in 1 room but split them onto 2 benches for 2 games

Each team needs their own dressing room.

not so bad

This is a issue!

It is crazy packed, no coaches pregame conversation.

Individual rooms

This is always a concern but due to current rink opportunities I am unaware of an outcome that is more suitable unless of course the rink can accommodate added change rooms

This is far from ideal. Not sure how to do this when you only have 4 dressing rooms

It's been a struggle for us to get changed due to lack of space

Hard to talk to your team while Sharig with other teams

Make smaller teams since there's less kids on the ice with a half ice game

1 team 1 room

Make 1 team per dressing room. This is where the team bonds, get to know each other, play music prior to game

Each team requires its own room. Mimic Tim bits hockey team logistics

Only a problem on game days. Putting one club in one room and the other in a separate room is fine.

We definitely enjoyed arenas where it was possible to have separate change rooms as it created better team bonding. However we understand it isn't always possible

Keep 1 parent per child and once they have their equipment on, parents should be out of the room.

Don't go 1/2 ice

This is a very challenging issue. May be follow similar format to Timbites and divide team into two and play two half ices. Keeping the need for dressing room.

Full ice

More rooms available as they are crowded already just with one team.

Two large teams split into 2 groups each (so each "team" has their own dressing room)

Establish rules that all teams must follow on game days that include: only 3 adults per team allowed in the rooms (they help the girls or girls go to the hallway if they need help), one team must leave the dressing room 10 mins prior to game time (allow for pre game chat), no parents in the room after a game for at least 10 mins (coaches help untie skates and have a post game chat), no siblings in the change room

encourage parents to stand instead of sitting to help their child dress and leave the dressing room as soon as possible

Dress at home

Never dealt with this

Set stagger arrival times for shared teams

"Teams" should consist of 16 plus players that split in half with one half of the team playing at each end of the ice. This allows "one team" to share a dressing room and be cohesive as a team. It also reduces coaching resources required and maximizes use of half ice practices.

N/a

Only run two teams at once vs four

Use ref rooms and female change rooms. Come to the rink partially dressed. Tie skates on bench.

staggering ice times 15 minutes

?

It's an issue. Teams are piling into hallways so coaches can talk to players causing more congestion in arenas. Local hockey is wasting that other half to have both teams in dressing rooms. We don't have that luxury and having RAB telling everyone to deal with it, is not a solution.

Stay at full ice

Do what they do with novice hockey and only have 2 teams playing 2 games at a time. Then it's only one team per dressing room, they split once on the ice and play half against both teams

It is what it is.

It's a nightmare

It is hard to be with the other team to get ready before the game. It was challenging to have team discussions and bond. I don't have the answer, but it would be ideal for teams to have their own dressing rooms.

Full ice would eliminate this

Not a concern, has been done in minor hockey for years

Home teams and away teams have to share

Na

Smaller teams

1 parent per child in the change room to help with dressing. Skate tying outside the locker room

Big Issue. Limit parents and siblings.

Only a few parents to help tie skates

Don't do half ice.

Not having two separate associations in the same dressing room. Limiting the parents in the dressing rooms to skate tying only. Requesting younger children arrive with most of their gear already on.

Scheduled times in room 15 min apart if the room is small.

When possible, playing half or cross ice without any other teams on the ice.

None. Dressing rooms are far too small as it is.

This is the worst. I highly recommend keeping step 2 full ice just for this alone. We shouldn't have to have our girls changing in rooms with strangers.

Absolutely ridiculous. At this age parents are still assisting children so halls and lobbies are full as two teams can not fit in a single change room

Dressing are overfull

?

I have no suggestions for helping this. But I could not imagine sharing a bench/dressing room with another step 3 team. These girls take long enough to get comfortable with each other. Let alone changing in front of another team. Also these games can get heated with coaches. Bad idea all around.

Staggered start times first 10 minutes is practise for one game set

Smaller team sizes

Go into hall if room once done changing

I don't understand why

Hallway or shifts

It is way too crowded in the dressing rooms to have two different teams in there. IT IS A SAFETY ISSUE!! The organization needs to come up with something different and look at the possibility of using all 4 dressing rooms.

Discouraging for players and parents, tough to bond as a team

Smaller team sizes

Offer more rooms

Make games full ice

Staggering half ice game times

More organized times- or having a 15 minutes earlier start and end time. Not having U10 or active start at kinex arena it's too small

Only 2 teams on the allocated ice time, then the teams are split into an A and B team on each side of the side.

We had 10 players and it was tight.

Dress in shifts, place to put players who have finished

Schedule only one half ice game at a time!

Teams should have their own dressing rooms.

Staggering ice times hence staggering changing times

Dressing rooms are very congested as is. I don't know how you could accommodate more players in the same time slot.

Have larger teams or make teams (19 and one change room) or much smaller ie 6-8 kids for

AS

Altered start times

Add additional room

Na

GOALIE CHANGES

Be a goalie for the whole game or don't wear pads

I think having stop time play would be easier than run time. This would allow goalies to swap just like other players. Having goalies hand stick over to new goalie prevents the delay in the player spending the entire minute trying to pick up the stick at the net.

no goalie changes between periods

use street pads which come on and off easier

If the teams have two sets of pads it should be easy to do. We used to do this in hockey.

I am disappointed in this category, my daughter did not get a chance to play goal during a game where as all her team mates got to play goal at least once.

Should only need a stick. If they want pads, that's what half time is for.

No issues

only use 1 goalie per day

Don't do a goalie change....pretty simple. Novice hockey seems to have figured this out.....Follow their model.

No need to dress a goalie at step 1 and even step 2 level. Rotate players every shift, similar to hockey .

No goalie

Longer break between period

Goalie changes should be halfway through the game

None

Maybe other teams did it differently, but at the age's and skill leveling we're talking about, do they really need to do Goalie changes during the game?

Once per icetime

No pads, rotate position

Goalie shouldn't change every shift, maybe only per half. Perhaps 4 8 min periods instead of 2 halves??

Staggering start time

have 1 goalie for the whole game, just like none of the other players change positions mid game

No ideas

2 sticks per team

Goalie rotation game to game vs during a game.

One goalie for the whole game

we made it work

If due to goalie pads, a goalie can play a period then switch.

two goalie sticks per team for when the larger team splits in two

one goalie per game not period

Our team seemed willing to rotate the goalie position so that each player had a turn to play 1 whole game. This was common in Calgary - goalies did not change during game play. However, once "official" games started on Nov 2, our association drastically reduced our practice ice times. We could have 3-4 games in a row with no practices. This was difficult from a coaching perspective to adequately prepare the players for this position. When I asked my association about it (Bow View), I was told that we were being given ice in accordance with "Children's

Ringette" guidelines which was the same as Active Start. I disagree with this because Step 1 has more rules than Active Start (a passing line, creases, free passes, a full dressed goalie) and therefore I recommend that Step 1 should have an increased number of practices above what Active Start receives.

midway change

On half ice I don't see any need for goalies to actually be wearing gear. They aren't keeping track of scores so it really doesn't matter. Less gear would make it easier in the change rooms and on the bench.

1 goalie per practice or game

Not applicable

90 seconds shifts are too short to allow for flow. Really, it's on the coach to prepare the players for the change before the 90 seconds comes up. When coaches do, the transition time gets dramatically reduced and the flow can be better.

Have players take shifts- pads are not necessary

Be ready we changed every shift no problem

Don't know

All the players should be able to try net

Part of the early game

I don't know

They can play with shin pads underneath and each team should have two pairs of pads. I always get a second pair of pads for my team anyways as I always have two goalies dressed at practice so they can learn by teaching each other and don't get lonely or bored.

Dress more than one goalie

Don't go to half ice beyond Step 1

we did not have any goalie change issues, the amount of time inbetween periods is sufficient to switch goalie pads onto a new player.

supply 2 sets of pads or give a longer intermission to get the goalie changed

Don't change the goalies during the games.

changes only at half time unless an injury occurs

Change at the half

1 goalie dressed per ice time

We change goalies with each shift - no pads used at all

Promote goalie development for younger age groups. There is no access to focused coaching until until 10-3.

This takes up too much time

No goalie changes. Two goalies dress for every game. One on each side of the ice.

N/A

We were able to leverage two goalie sticks and always had a girl ready to go into net at the sound of the horn for AS. Also, have multiple coaches on ice made the transition smoother.

Keep goalie same throughout the game.

Should be changed each half

Goalie assigned for the game - no changes

Perhaps goalie changes at half time

SPRA did not give goalie equipment to step1

One goalie per game

Don't have them, teams should have designated goalie for each game

No comments

For U10 step 1-3, a different goalie should play each game. Active start should swap everybshift

It takes 2 minutes

Don't dress a goalie - just use a goalie stick and rotate them in or the goalie stays and they swap pads at half if need be

Have 1 goalie play the entire game with proper goalie equipment

One goalie for game

No Pads, just goalie stick

Having one goalie per game. Still alternate, but every game, instead of 2x/game

.

Only one change per period.

Didn't notice this as a problem

One or two goalies per game

Should keep the same goalie all game or at least only switch during half time.

N/a

Have goalies rotate by period. If girls do not want to be in goalie rotation, do not force

Red deer lacks in all goalie age levels.

Assign one goalie per game not per period/shift for some teams

Maybe after 2 line changes

I think it is good that each player gets to see how that position works

Just stick to one goalie a game

change pads and blocker only, and use each players's own equipment for all other items

Use one goalie per game with appropriate equipment

We used a goalie for full game

rotate goalies each game

no

At S1, have a couple goalie sticks to make quick changes easier. At S2, keep one goalie for the whole game

No equipment

Don't allow it. One goalie per game.

one goalie per game

Don't have them wear goalie pads, or find pads that are easy on/off.

Full ice

AS and Step 1, if goalies are wearing full goalie equipment, no goalie changes- they play the entire game.

Nothing

Let them play the entire game.

In AS goalies switching every shift is too much. It almost requires a coach to just deal with that. Goalie switching every 3 or 4 shifts is a more reasonable timeframe from what we have witnessed.

i don't have a suggestion

Same goalie for entire game

Don't change goalies. Play the same goalie for the whole game

Don't do half-ice games

Kids should change every shift in goal.

No equipment except quick change of pads or just a stick.

One goalie/game. Or switch them to at half time, if required - like they do in hockey

One goalie per game, then no need to change pads at half time

With each buzzer at Step 1 is fine. Step 2 and Step 3 might be best to let athletes try out net for the whole game with the goalie gear.

Don't change the goalie more than once per game

4 minute halftime

Have 2 sets of goalie equipment, assign a parent to get other goalie dressed on bench while game is being played and do same to unchange the goalie to player.

This takes extra time between periods to change pads. When four teams are in the ice, we've noticed that almost an entire shift can be missed when one side is changing goalies and the other isn't. This also depends on the referees, some wait for both sides... Others start the game and the clock runs without two teams playing the first shifts.

There shouldn't be any logistical issues with goalie changes. If you don't wear pads change goalies only at half time. If you do wear pads change goalies for each game but not during the games.

None

longer shifts to reduce number of changes

Ice surfaces with no markings/ ie: bingo dabber marking on ice

Using street pads with buckles

Dress one goalie per game

They don't really need goalie equip on half ice, there aren't many if any 6&7 year old kids with a rocket wrist shot

I do not agree with every player should play goalie. If there are players that show interest then play them but don't force players no one wants to.

Continue to switch at 1/2 time or reduce required goalie equipment to just a goalie stick.

Keep the same goalie for the whole game

having extra goalie sticks so we don't waste time switching every time

Play one goalie for each game

We have found this very unsafe! With 50+ people in the dressing room we have had to have 2 parents stand guard while the player puts on their goalie gear.

N/A

There should be more of an option to not be goalie if the child doesn't want to play that position

First half of season change goalie every 3rd shift with no equipment and second half use equipment for kids that want to go in and switch goalie at half time

Are fine.

longer shifts

No changes we dress 1 goalie each game

Same goalie for entire ice time or game

Na

Per game is fine.

Goalies have sticks only or velcro pads with no toe straps

We dressed our goalie for whole game and that worked great

Goalie in for full game unless injured

2

For active start no equipment is used so changes are quick, u10 having one player play the whole game

Have more than one set of goalie equipment available to cut down the time to dress a second goalie and undress the first, instead of waiting for the first to undress to dress the second.

Change at half or not at all

don't do them

not sure

we swapped goalies (without pads) every 2nd shift which worked great, but it would be nice to have the longer shifts- all other teams we played had full goalie equipment and so they lost time(minutes) as we swapped out our goalie

2 more minutes for half time

Goalies might have to get dressed in the hallway to avoid getting their fingers/hands chopped off. For games it should be one goalie for the entire game.

no issues, we dressed one goalie per game

done by period only, not by shift. Rotation through per 1/2 game.

Keep the goalie the same for the entire game

N/A

Just take goalie changes into their game times so it's a given that the girls may need a couple extra minutes to get ready for the second half.

I think everyone should play goalie

don't need goalie equipment at Active Start level. Rotate goalies each ice time with U10, if rotating still desired.

same goalie through the entire game

nothing

No issue.

No comment

We used 1 goalie per game, we did not switch out.

1 goalie per game unless of a emergency.

Rotate them with the rest of the line changes, or play max one half and then change.

Not an issue

don't change to half ice for Step 2-3

I saw no issues with goalie changes at the step 1 level

This is not a big deal

1 Or 2 goalie per game Not switching every 2mins

We never had to do a goalie change.

Go to full ice

Only change goalies at half time.

Hasn't been an issue

Not a problem at U10 Step 1 level; used one goalie per game

One goalie per game

Just one goalie per half (or no equipment for goalies while they are very young)

not a problem just switch on the ice at the break

Better organized shift rotations

Full sized nets at Step 3, appropriate fitting equipment, must have more than 1 goalie for the year.

I doubt goalie changes would have a large logistical impact. Changing goalies during a stoppage in play should not take long

2 goalies per game that switch only at the half

No comment

Goalies should change every 2nd shift

Every team should have 2 sets of goalie gear and switch a player at half time

We moved to a goalie playing a few shifts in a row. This made line changes easier and got the goalie more committed for their time in goal.

We only got 2 ice times a week, not enough time to have goalie practices

We have not specified goalies as of yet in U6 in the way of putting the pads on.

same

Goalie changes happen at half time usually. Allow for a slightly shorter game and a longer break between halves to allow for the change.

Coach on ice keeps ringette stick I exchange for the goalie stick during that shift.

Teams change goalies partway through games?! How is there time to change pads?!

For AS every shift - little girl lose interest too quickly for them to stand there any longer.

Same goalie plays for the full game.

multiple goalie stick or multiple shifts in net.

don't change goalies

changes seemed to take only a few minutes - just ensure a clear direction to timer and referee to give 3 minutes at half

One goalie per game, please. Have had to wait while other team is doing a position change. Between ice set up and tear down ice time was tight.

None

Full ice

Do not change goalies. Increases goalie development

More goalie development for players

Only one goalie per ice time, taking turns with everyone on the team.

This was manageable for past u10 teams at the half so only needs about 5 minutes to make it stress free

Make sure all teams are on the same page about goalie changes, we had frequent changes and no equipment most had and only changed at 1/2 time if at all

With just a goal stick, this change should be fine.

Don't do it. 1 goalie plays the whole game.

It is hard to find kids that want to be goalie, now you need double the amount.

The goalie role was not really developed during cross ice games

No issues

Goalies in can change at 1/2 time during a game. This wouldn't have to change with 1/2 ice.

The goalie plays for the entire game. And all players take turns as part of the team

?

At u10 level dress two goalies and split them on either half of the ice. The players can switch sides at half way or not.

Rotate each game

We don't change during the game, only game to game

None

I do not feel that a goalie change in a game is necessary

This has not been terrible in our experience

Keep 1 goalie per game with pads on so they get used to them and don't switch mid game. Rotate kids in goal per game.

Every 3 games

1 goalie per game

None

No experience with this.

We kept the same goalie for an entire game and only switched if needed or when a new game began

Keep one goalie for the whole game.

Don't go 1/2 ice

No goalies, last player back or net cover

Full ice

Already a challenge now with one team, wouldn't want to have to do that with two goalies.

Not a problem

1 goalie per ice time

NA

I did not see this as a logistical issue

Goalie changes should be done at half time

N/a

Same goalie for the whole game

Keep goalie in full game?

Not aware of any issues with goalie changes in playing half ice vs full ice

Stay at full ice

Was much better later in the year, but goal equipment couldn't be used if teams wanted to change with shifts

We were the only team who changed every shift and our goalies didn't wear goalie equipment. Consistency in approach would be appreciated.

Full ice would elongate this

Not sure what this means

Na

Provide Additional Pads/team.

Longer half time

This is something to deal with unless you are able to extend the amount of time between periods. It is unrealistic to require teams to have two sets of goalie equipment per team.

Every shift with mandatory rotation

Change every shift

Having a different goalie every day hasn't been affected

Having players swap in and out of net without proper gear is not safe and completely underdevelops goalies

Don't dress a goalie or dress 1 goalie per game

I'm fine with goalie changes at a half time... whatever that time frame would be.

Make a list of who is playing goalie every game for the entire year. Rotate evenly through the list.

We use 1 goalie per game

I do not understand why

No issue here as our team only had one kid play in net for a game. Each kid rotated to ensure that each one got a turn.

Difficult process for volunteer coaches in a 1 min break

Goalie plays entire game

Timed break at half. Ex 5 min

Make games full ice

No goalie pass or just change once at half time

Change every game, not every shift.

?

No goalie equipment, double shifts in goal.

Honestly who cares - pass a stick to someone and the next round play our - goalies provide very little at this age for AS

Why

Can change with the skaters, if possible

Na

OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY AND COMMENT)

Parking lots congested

require players to show up dressed to play (except skates)

no opinion

"Equal opportunity" every player should be given a chance to play in a game situation not just a practice

Congestion in the dressing room is a definite concern. Not sure what solutions could be.

Only schedule these teams at ice surfaces that have larger dressing rooms when possible. i.e.

don't have them play at Crowchild Twin Arena or West Hillhurst.

None

At the active start age half ice seems very appropriate.

If the facility does not have 4 change rooms to run 2 half ice games at the same time, then maybe the schedule at these facilities needs to be stretched out. But again, I'm not sure how many facilities this is a true concern for.

Half ice practices, full ice games

I don't know enough to comment.

Part of the issue is having enough ice time to set up rink dividers and paint on creases (if Arena's don't have them). We use 2.25 hour time slots, and forego a flood between games to achieve time for this.

Ask the Hockey Associations do with their novice teams

Rules of the game

Too many kids and distractions in half ice game play. Benches are out of control with up to 30 kids on each bench.

I have never had a child in half ice. I don't have any suggestions

larger teams so there is only 2 teams per ice assignment instead of 4 teams per ice assignment, split up in As and Bs

As a coach, I found it difficult to be drawing creases and free pass dots before the Step 1 games. I met other coaches from other parts of Alberta who told me that the rinks are starting to make these lines permanent at various arenas around the province. This would be a great timesaver for coaches in the Calgary area who are already trying to set up dividers and manage the logistics of 4 teams trying to warm up on the ice at the same time.

Team mates and families don't get to bond when everyone is split up due to half ice play.

Not applicable

Need to reinforce the 'play on' at shift changes. Also there should be an evolution from step 1, step 2 to step 3

Arena's are not set up for half ice, no where near enough dressing rooms, space for so many extra kids and families in the building for practices/games at the same time

Don't go to half ice beyond Step 1

when playing at facilities that do not have half ice boards, teams should be encouraged to switch ends after the 1st period to make for equal playing opportunity for each team. Faceoff dots and goalie creases are inconsistent in location and size, to have this already under the ice for the beginning of the season would be nice.

will be very different going from rules on full ice to half ice

90 second shifts are too short for the kids starting out as they do not transition on and off ice fast enough

Unfortunately I don't have many ideas for these. The room issue is certainly difficult but rinks

are limited on what they have. Only things as goalie possibility would be to have 2 sets of pads and perhaps take your skater off a few minutes early to put on the pads on the bench?

The split ice is terrible and worst idea ever. Now my child will have to re learn most of the rules as they didn't call any rules during the games just wanted them to skate and pass over the line. This was certainly a rip off for what we paid!!!!

I think there needs to be more consideration on the move to 1/2 ice. I think your questions should be more balanced psychometrics. If your not making ringette any different than hockey. Your going to loose enrollment...

The friendship and team bonding is what brings girls back to ringette. With multiple teams in the room, this does not happen. Coaches do not get a chance to have team chats before games. There is room for siblings even to feel the atmosphere of the dressing room and get excited to play...there are simply too many people crammed in. Girls who form friendships come back and play the sport which ultimately leads to competitiveness. This is being lost right now.

The refs need to know the rules for half ice play. The shifts should be at minum 2 minutes not 90 seconds.

Some Kids (Especially as they get >8) are motivated by the score and it's important for them to see the score and keep track of wins and losses. Half ice games can't keep score because there's one score clock. Can they find another way to do it at ice level?

There is no way around the nightmare of having two teams in one dressing room. Parents can't even help their kids and coaches can't even talk to players before the game. Ringette is all about Friendships and you can't build a strong bond with team mates when the room is that chaotic.

I truly don't feel the girls will develop and learn the game of ringette with moving to 3 on 3

#1 issue is to get more facilities with access to boards and small nets. So many facilities have this for hockey / work towards overall sharing with cost share or payment from ringette to hockey.

I think only AS Should be half ice and step 1 starting half ice and transitioning to full ice

Having to set up dividers....not enough volunteers as it is.

When the buzzer goes to change and the players are supposed to leave the ring, the rule doesn't work because some coaches don't make their players leave it and referees don't enforce the rule so some teams would pass it to their own player coming off the bench. When a team has less than 3 players on the bench if the player remaining on the ice doesn't touch up at the bench it is an advantage to that team and coaches and refs don't enforce it.

By Step 3, players should be playing on full ice. Once they move to U12 they need to learn large nets, shot clocks, full ice. Lets gradually keep athletes engaged at the appropriate levels. By step 3 athletes should be playing full ice.

Full ice

for Step 1, half ice has been a positive decision in our Board's opinion.

Smaller program for 1/2 ice. Reduced cost for this as it's a lesser program.

Need to define how play is to be resumed when buzzer line changes occur. I've seen goalie ring, free pass, and chaos of just racing to see who gets to the ring first.

I would get rid of intermission and play straight through the game. Get coaches to work on line changes during practice, this will also help the athletes to be more comfortable on there skates.

Only do half ice and don't create a second set of rules for cross-ice. Most arenas are reluctant to paint one set of new creases and NONE that I have been in have painted 2 new sets.

I think starting these players out on half ice is okay, it allows for them not to be so overwhelmed. However, the entirety of this game is full ice. So the moment they're able to skate from one end to the other, it should immediately become full ice. I don't agree with the half ice all season.

47 would love to see continuous play on buzzer. So much of the playing time is taken up setting up
3/5/2020 9:57 PM players. The ring would still be placed if the whistle had gone at or just before
the buzzer.

Crowded benches

Taking the bumpers on and off of the ice is a logistical issue as well. It is not a major problem as there are always parents happy to help, but it is just another volunteer requirement of already busy parents.

bench congestion

How are you going to teach the actual game of ringette? Blue lines and circles from personnel experiences all the girls on Lexi's team were more than ready to play full ice in u10-2

Drawing lines for goals/free pass dots done by coaches (instead of coaching their team); moving bumpers; sharing a bench congestion - many issues were not addressed or communicated appropriately prior to the start of the season to coaches or referees

Na

Settings up goalie crease. Practice time was 1.25hr yet game time was 1hr?

Time to set up ice (draw lines). The amount of whistles and buzzers is confusing to the kids.

I would increase the time on ice per shift from 90 secs to 2+mins

Each team should have their own dressing room for games. There isn't room for 2 teams not no chance to talk and plan with your team.

put barriers in place at the center line

1min and 30 seconds is too short for the girls to get situated and back off the ice. 2 min is a better time frame.

lack of lines on the ice for half-ice, when lines or so important to understanding ringette are really the only obvious downside to half-ice play.

n/a all games full ice this yr and majority of last yr

nothing

For half ice games, you should not make teams any larger than 10 players (ie. 3 lines of 3 players + 1 goalie)

Have not experienced and can't speak to potential solutions. That said these issues are common in hockey as well and are leading to a negative experience for parents and children alike.

don't change to half ice for Step 2-3

Passing over the blue line and ice time are my biggest concerns. The half ice teams need to be the right size of there is going to be less girls on the ice.

2 min shift change is better then 90secs

Full ice allows for kids to be challenged.

When 2 games were going on at the same time, the whistles on the other ice were distracting

Half ice for Step #1 is OK, not in favor for Step #2 half ice

For a player to go from full ice back to half ice is ridiculous. I would switch to hockey.

Ask parents to be aware of the space they are taking up in the room. Parents do not need to sit in the changerooms

Don't learn all the rules they need to play full ice.

Not having goalie equipment was a disadvantage to all other Associations

Setting up boards for games takes away from actual game time. No other team should be on the ice practicing as it interferes with focus, whistles, buzzers

Why did U10 step 1 only get two ice times a week but pay full ice fees?

77 There is no bench comradely in half ice games

3/4/2020 4:35 AM

build smaller sized rinks for the younger ages

Half ice allows equal access to the surface rather than one team's goalie being so far away, there's less useable space cross ice, half has more merits.

Sorry no suggestions on how to make this better.

All arenas need to provide the bumper to separate games. Shifts need to be 2 minutes and not 90 seconds.

Try watching the sport. These decisions seem to come from people with no skin in the game.

27 minute periods were out of the question. Our best set up was 24 minute periods. Cheers between periods were consolidated into one group cheer versus 2 separate.

We have been through this with hockey... the novice hockey community would be a great support and suggestions in regards to difficulties with large teams in dressing rooms and half ice challenges. Last year I'm hockey was difficult but now the kinks have been ironed out

Limit half-ice games to arenas that have portable boards like in hockey.

My daughter plays full ice. I heard about 1/2 ice complaints

I dont understand why keeping score is a bad thing. Learning to win AND lose graciously is a life skill. This 'everyone wins' mentality does not benefit children later on.

I find the range of ages on the team to cause parents and kids to be at very different points in life. I'm not interested in travel tournaments for my 6 year old but I could see a 9 year old. Same with evening activities or team bonding. Doesn't really happen the same because of ages.

Ringette alberta having their ducks in a row. The rules for step 1 this year weren't even finalized before the season started. Each association is playin how they want to and now one is following what has been put out. The refs don't even know what is going on.

Challenge is keeping kids engaged when they dont get opportunities to play alot of games or progress from 3;3 to bigger ice and more skill development.

These are some of the reasons to not increase the use of half ice games - less ice time and less goalie development at an early age.

Half ice higher than step is a drastic mistake for the game

Score should be taken, it's part of life - winning & losing, kids know who won the game

None

I am concerned for the players that have played full ice in u10 for 3 seasons who do not make the ste 3 teams will be forced to go to half ice games

Don't go 1/2 ice

In general dressing rooms are set up for one team at a time not two not worth making more challenges for kids, coaches and parents.

Dividers are not essential, coaches can stay on the ice and help with traffic and fetch rings

N/a

Run it identical to how it's being run now and just decrease the playing surface.

Heard several times 90 second shifts is not feasible. Heard 2 minutes works better.

Or all arenas had ability to split ice. Time to set up board assemblies cut into playing time

Benches are chaos and you are always fighting for space

My daughter is so upset she has to play full ice for three years she is considering going Back to basketball next season.

We did not have these issues as we played full ice all year. However, I understand the frustration with these issues.

2min shift change intervals. Change ends at half time

Increase the shift time to allow the players to build momentum. Do not have passing starts. Less lines to allow the girls to have more playing time.

Step 1 has been great as half ice I'm just concerned with lack of improvement with my child of step 2 is half ice next year. She won't improve any cause there is no need to be better then how she is playing now on half ice.

As a team manager, I have really struggled with the smaller teams that have come from the change to half ice. For example, a small team is fantastic for ice time, skating/skill development, ring touches, etc., but the team infrastructure aspect has been a real challenge. For example, we still need a head coach, assistant coach, manager, jersey parent, treasurer, and social coordinator. On game day, I require parent volunteers for the box and a PSL. Having a small team means that everyone is doing something and many are doing multiple jobs. If you have a couple kids in team sports, it really has been a challenge to coordinate. I would suggest following the Hockey Alberta model of larger teams that practice together but then on game day the ice is split in half and the teams run 2 games concurrently. It would have been so much easier as a parent volunteer to divide up the duties, never mind the challenges I had ensuring there was enough players available for games.

Come dressed

Seems more like a way to reduce ice slots so the higher levels can have more full ice.

Don't go to smaller ice surfaces for step 2 & 3.

Shift times are too short. The girls just get there momentum and the buzzer goes. Also having referees that are making calls and teaching the girls the rules not just blowing the whistle on possession change. When the game is becoming physical they should be using these moments as teaching tools.

Which dressing room and clearer which rink vs who playing!

Go back to full ice

Get the coaches especially Bow View to accept the changes and play so the kids can have fun and worry less about the true ringette rules pleasantly of time to learn later

By the end of the season. Was not an issue

Na

Q31 In order to reduce travel and ice costs, one option for half-ice Ringette is to establish four-team mini round-robin tournaments involving 2-hour ice slots (in which each team plays 3 x 25-minute games with free skating in between games while goalies change). How likely would you be to support such a change?

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Very likely	9.11%	76
Likely	22.54%	188
Neither likely nor unlikely	23.98%	200
Unlikely	18.59%	155
Very unlikely	25.78%	215
TOTAL		834

PLEASE ELABORATE ON YOUR RESPONSE

Not applicable options to us because we are a small association.

Just sounds too chaotic. You'd be taking the fun away.

I personally don't want to spend three hours at the rink every time my daughter plays just because people think it is beneficial to cut down on my travel time. I'm really not travelling that far. That takes up even more of our day on the weekends/weeknights. It is not appealing in the slightest.

might get more parent engagement with this process then what we had this past season.

If it were to give my daughter a chance playing goal then I would support the above, otherwise possibly not, again I was disappointed she didn't get a chance to play even after she asked multiple times

Again, where we are located, people are travelling regardless.

Kids should not be waiting on goalies changing. This will only make the dressing room issue worse and could tire the kids out too much skating for 2 hours whether it's free skate, drills or the game.

To have the option of going to a hotel and having fun with their teammates is a huge part of why these girls sign up in the first place. This format is fine but don't take away their fun time with away tournaments

So long as this keeps to S1. I think keep the game format the same for one more seasons and then make a change to the above if beneficial to most members.

Kids love games and tournaments. The more opportunity we have to simulate that experience the better.

Terrible idea

Daughter played step 3. I do not think Step 3 should fit with step 1 and 2. Just like atom hockey. Age makes a difference and most kids in step 3 are 9-10.

I think the concept of half ice is right, but I think you are missing a proven model of executing this. Look at Hockey Canada's Novice (U9) model and follow that. People are happy with this for the mostpart.

I like the idea of mini tournaments but a 2 hour ice a slot is far to long for both families and kids to be at the rink. 1 hour is lots of time.

But my kids also moves to U12 next year. But I believe if she played half ice some struggles could have been avoided and more time learning to play the game would have been a benefit.

Ringette is not broken. We should not be trying to fix it.

We do something similar already. 4 teams for the first hour, then 4 teams for the second hour.

This also ensures the first set of dressing rooms are vacated in time for the next user group

25 minute games seems very rushed.

A longer time commitment in the weekend. So silly!

the Kids fitness levels and attention spans are not at an appropriate level for this approach.

I am pleased we will hopefully continue to avoid half ice ringette.

More ice time means more skill development, bonding time, coaching time, fitness development, etc. The half ice part limits the ability for players to see the bigger more accurate game picture

With my child going into fifth year she needs to be full ice. Going to half ice would not benefit her

I don't know enough to answer these.

That is a much bigger time commitment and will likely generate significant conflicts with other sports schedules of siblings.

That is a long ice time for little legs. Players can already struggle with a 60 minute ice slot.

most kids don't want to be out there for 2 hours

The dedicated time change needs to be minimum 2 minutes, 90 seconds is too short for half ice.

As a coach, I think that 2 hours is too long to be in equipment and skates. I like the intensity of a 1 hour game and players are tired & sweaty afterwards because they worked hard! Many of the new players are quite ready to take off their skates after 1 hour. On a different note, I feel like our association (Bow View) already saved a significant amount of money because they charged Step 1 families the same fees as Step 2 & 3 families, even though we had 4 teams sharing 1 ice time (instead of 2) and we did not have refs for the first half of the season. We received 35% less practice times than Step 2 and 3 which is a huge difference when you consider the fees that Step 1 paid. These issues were raised to Bow View in December and Step 1 families have yet to receive a formal acknowledgement of the problem and/or offer a solution. It is difficult to build trust with new ringette families when they know that their association is treating Step 1 players different than Step 2-3 players but charging the same fees.

in Step 1, Our family is a proponent of full ice in step 2 & 3.

I feel that playing on 1/2 ice really reduces the competitive piece of the game. There is no keeping score and often no keeping of goals even. I feel like that is a big part of the game and you are missing the competitive piece of the game for the girls.

Depends on ice availability.

Time commitment is too much depending on frequency in the season

I think this is a good idea

don't know

That's a long time for kids to be on the ice, depending on their age and maturity. It also might create challenges for sore feet, equipment causing discomfort, etc. that is a reality when dealing with 8/9 year old kids. That said, it simply takes time for people to adjust their expectations and get their kids set up properly to play the sport. A lot of time when we are at the ice, I wish the time slot was better utilized and more efficient, which this solution provides. I would support it.

That seems like a long ice/helmet/skate time for young players.

In my opinion that is too long of an ice slot for children of that age group. Their attention is gone after an hour.

We will most likely leave the sport until U12 if this is the case. Most kids from 8-10 are ready for a more competitive environment.

The players in active start are exhausted after one game. The one hour time slot is great however the game time could be easily reduced to 15-20min halves.

Not interested in a high energy activity for a seven year old for two hours. One hour is plenty, she was often exhausted afterwards, especially the early morning ones.

I don't believe the kids will have an attention span Or the interest for a 2 hour ice time.

I have 4 kids who play, this would actually likely add more stress on me and my family if we are expected to spend longer at arena's

Having goalies change between periods would be fantastic! I have had players who had natural talent in net but didn't want to play a full game so we accommodate this already. The most important thing is that girls have Step 3 to learn full-ice play with two line passes, switches between D and Forwards within the three in the zone regulation etc. before moving into U12 where the shot clock is introduced and the nets get bigger. All my truly Step 3 players were mastering full-ice play as well as their transitions, tight turns, ring protection etc. What we need to do is stop progressing girls into Steps they aren't ready for (for ex. the two girls on our team who would have benefited from small space and fewer rules both have diagnosed learning delays, which explains why the additional rules are not serving them well). I can't imagine the rest of the players moving to half ice play next year in Step 3 , it would be a major set back.

They can switch D and Forward, do set plays with drop passes, call to each other, tick-tack-toe the ring across both blue lines etc. If you saw them play you would not consider asking them to go to different rules and less strategy next year.

I think it's a terrible idea to move Step 2 and Step 3 kids to half ice. I honestly think you will see a drop in membership numbers. The kids are too big and too competitive. Half-ice makes sense for novice hockey but I can't see it benefiting ringette players. The game is basically 3v3 anyway, the only place it's not 3v3 is the neutral zone so I can't see a benefit to switching the Step 2 & 3 kids to half ice. If a switch to half ice is made, fees better go down by ~50% as most of the costs are associated with ice time. We love ringette but if my daughter is to play U10-S3 on half-ice I will move her to hockey.

Waste of time when they could be playing the game is about skating and I think it will be inhibiting the players from getting up into the play

I would like to see the games keep the same structure as traditional ringette. 2 periods should be the standard for a game.

Time commitment is too significant for young players. Stamina and attention are issues. These are not elite athletes who can push through.

We have three children and to dedicate 2 hours at once in one arena would be prohibitive, especially as we have two girls who played U10 this year.

This sounds ridiculous. Again...you are not helping the girls develop skills they need for how the games are actually played. They will get to Step 3 and U12 and be at a clear disadvantage.

This would likely lead to less ice time overall.

I feel if the kids have played multiple years on full ice. It would not make sense to switch down to 1/2 ice as there is skills they have learned that require the passing lines.

A 2-hour ice slot for any child under 12 is an unrealistic expectation of their attention span, their stamina, and their ability to absorb learning moments.

My kids are exhausted at the end of 1 game - adding 25 minutes on for time is a lot.

i'm sure this would have some advantages. i'm also sure some parents would hate it.

I disagree with the half ice for U10 step 2 and 3

We are playing ringette to provide my children something active and collaborative to do with peers throughout the winter months. I like the 2-3 time a week commitment. I would be nice if Children's Ringette could be isolated to 2 specific days and ice times weekly. I feel that would help with retention of younger players starting at age 4-5.

We haven't traveled for games yet but more play with less travel seems fine.

2 hours is too long. The children are done after a 60 minute ice time.

retention of the children

I do not believe we can keep the kids engaged for that long. Why do we need to change goalies if every team has two sets of goalie gear?

Most of our AS girls were pretty tired after 2 x 24 minute games, so making them play another 2 games seems like it would be trouble. Also their attention span will have a hard time staying focused for 2 hours...half are girls are asking, "when is it over" at the 45 minutes time slot

That sounds like fun.

Haven't thought about it. As my daughter played step through this year, and will likely do so again next year before moving to U 12, we will not be impacted by the changes.

Thankfully I miss the half ice groups.

While less travel and cost would be ideal, 3 games in a two hours time slot is tiring for the players. Especially at the younger ages my fear would be they would lose attention and ambition by the end of the two hours. If it does prove to work it would be great!

It sounds like an option to try. But like everything there are drawbacks as well as benefits.

2 hour slots are too long for this age group

We are new to the sport and just want our daughter to have a positive experience while developing some skills and learning how to be a part of a team. We love the positive atmosphere and support sharing ice time.

Half ice was a waste of time. In SPRA we paid the exact same amount for step 1 as we did for step 3. To totally different experiences step 3 had around 35 full ice games and the kids loved it. Step 1 played 13 half ice games. Including 1 tournament because of the rules. Kids love tournaments that is what hooked my other 2 daughters in ringette. My youngest is not hooked on ringette because she did not have the fun factor with the games being boring in so few games.

I completely disagree with going to half ice for Level 2

For U10 step 1 I actually don't see the point of tournaments - no score is kept, no one wins.

This is incredibly difficult to do, you will need extensive discussions with ice schedulers. Not fair to them to be told "just make it happen". Unless RAB is willing to deal with arenas on this directly smaller associations may find this impossible or beyond their patience and abilities

If you have to... For u10 step 1-2, Step 3 keep current format

Young kids do not have the attention span for 2 hours. Parents do not have the time to drive to the arena, get their kids dressed, be there for 2 hours, get undressed and then drive home. This would be equivalent to a 4-5 hour commitments, which is impossible, especially if they have other kids, work, etc.

We would have to see how our child reacts before making a decision.

That's a long time for a child to be on the ice with no break.

This feels like U10 will be glorified Active Start if this happens.

At this age two hours may be too much Of time commitment and energy level, especially for younger kids (age 7-8); may put those kids at a disadvantage.

Since I'm not in favour of half ice, I don't feel I can answer this question

Keeping costs down and reducing travel would be beneficial to lots of parents. The kids would get more game time experience as well. Ans o think they would like it

My child will be in the u12 level and I don't have much opinion to this.

No teams will travel to our area to play a 2 hour game slot. We can't even get them to come to regular league games. this works great for Calgary and large centres but it doesn't work here. A better way would be for tournaments to only have games on 2 days, say a Friday and Saturday for step 1. Without other teams to play our teams get bored of playing each other all the time. They want to feel like they get to play other teams and that is important and shouldn't be ignored.

Girls will truly not develop. You are going to run into major issues come U12 when all these girls don't know the game of ringette and their skills will not be there . How can they develop as a skater when they don't have any ice to skate on?

It depends if that was once a month maybe. Not every weekend. The season is too long for step 1 as it is. All the older teams are done before them. That is not necessary or beneficial.

In an active start or u8 program it may be beneficial. At 8 and 9 years of age kids are developed physically that full ice is needed to properly develop the skills of the game.

Too much of a time slot when I have 3 other kids in sports.

Uncertain of what the current tournament format is and if this would be better or not.

That's a long time for our little girls to skate

Too much ice time at one time

2 hour ice slots may be harder on home associations

A very long skating session for young ones.

My daughter will be U14 next year. She played overage U10 Step 2 this year. We did not play half ice. I have no experience so do not feel my opinion is valid.

Hard to keep girls engaged in their ringette game-play during their free skates. Tired legs for a 2 hour ice slot. Hard to work on goal setting as a coach. The players may lose interest in playing over a 2 hour time span at this age level.

I prefer meeting more often. With fewer games it has a bigger impact if you miss one time. Two hours is a lot of time for young players to be dressed and focused. It could get boring for them.

I think it's worth a try. Maybe do one early in the season and try it and adjust the schedule if it works.

Yes travelling got difficult at times I think designating 2hrs in one day is a lot harder to manage with other siblings.

love the idea!

This is not a good idea...since there is comparisons to other sports, look at hockey that has successfully implemented half/cross ice programs. Why is there a need to reinvent the wheel with a new format? At younger ages, I don't support having players at the rink for more than 60-75 mins. It is a big commitment to be there 30 mins before the game, 120 mins for the ice slot, 30 mins after the game, and let's also assume a 30 minute commute. A 4.5 hour investment in time doesn't make sense. I think ringette will lose participation as a result.

Doesn't really effect me one way or the other.

The idea is good, it is more difficult to manage when dealing with arenas, they may not be able to accommodate these ice times.

At a Step 1 level only. If you go to 1/2 ice for Step 2 next year then they should still do league and travel

This would be nothing like real ringette. You are dumbing down the sport for no reason. Girls have played full ice at this level for decades without any problem. If this change is implemented, I will be moving my daughter to a new sport.

Again it seems that the goal is to reduce costs, increase profit. Our step 3 child loved playing in real games. This is not ringette that you are proposing.

My daughter has only played full ice. I have not dealt with 1/2 ice.

Step 1 would be appropriate. Step 2 players are at a transitional level in which free skating between goalie changes would slow the pace of the game and hamper learning the rules of the game. I'm smaller organizations, we offer have 9 year olds in step 2, and this format will do a disservice to the girls moving up to U12, playing with full ice and shot clock.

I do not 2 hour I've times as a coach. No thanks !!

Parents sign up for ringette knowing that there is time and travel involved - please don't change the format we've all signed up for just to accommodate people who don't want to travel or spend time! These are also people who will not volunteer or fundraiser!

I don't see a benefit to this over the current half ice format

There is a lot more analysis and things to consider than what can be put into this question. Math on this question is incorrect; For each of the 4 teams to get 3 games, actually only 90 minutes (not 2 hours) is required. ARA ice times are either 1 or 2 hour slots. We could end up with 30 minute unused and wasted ice, that costs money. In Zone 2, I foresee when half ice is implemented at Step 1 and Step 2, if game is say hosted in Airdrie between Airdrie and Strathmore. On 1 half would be Airdrie and Strathmore Step 1, and on the other half would be Airdrie and Strathmore Step 2. Full ice is utilized and fits into everyone's 60 or 75 minute ice times. Within Zone 2 most participants are used to travelling (30 to 90 minutes) I do not think this is much of a worry for most Zone 2 associations (although I do know Foothills has some concerns). For zone 2 to minimize travel, it would better to have us participate within the Calgary 123 league (we have our own league right now), this would do more to minimize travel time for Zone 2 than it would be for this proposal in question 12.

I don't believe kids can be engaged for such a long period of time. They are better suited to succeed with shorter ice times (1hr) more often which may not be ideal for parents.

2 hours to commit to play Ringette is too long for families. It is also too long for the players to hold their attention and have a desire to play and not be complaining of their feet hurting in their skates.

glad my child will not be doing the half ice. Too many kids in the dressing room gets her upset, 2 games on the ice at the same time would stress her.

Worth a try, our greatest accomplishment's come from our failures.

I will no longer support Ringette in any fashion if my child is pushed to half ice on her fifth year of playing

Half ice games now with 2x24 minute periods seem to go fast enough. I'm not sure the skaters would enjoy hanging out for two hours to play even shorter games.

If I understand the premise there would be 15 minute breaks between each mini-game for "free skating". This total of 45 minutes would be better used to run structured practice drills but the goalie who is changing misses out? Why not have 2 50 minute games if you are trying to reduce travel. I for one would pay more to get more ice as my kids all love being on the ice more.

Too much skating for the younger kids as they get too tired and aren't effectively playing.

I would find 2 hr ice times once a week preferable to multiple trips to the rink.

This year was very hard on games with splitting up our team and playing different teams that were not even on home ice.

I don't have a child in ringette yet. I'm also very old school. I don't like change very much. I think parents coming into the sport fresh and new wouldn't mind it because their kids would get a lot out of it potentially but I'd rather just stick to full ice practice and play, always.

Our association and league had all step 1 teams play at one arena giving one team a bye every week. (9 teams) The games were 2 24 minute run time periods. This filled the two hour time slot

We are not able to get 2 hour ice slots at this point. There is no reduction in travel. We are a small association in Rural Southern Alberta we played a jamboree format this year and we are driving an 90 to be the home team in Cochrane when we play Strathmore. It would only be 45 min for Strathmore to come to us. Half the driving time.

I think this should be decided on an association by association basis, for what is the best fit for their teams each season.

Ice is difficult to get. To try and get a defined two hour slot on a regular will be difficult. Our arena will not give us ice in that increment. Also makes it less probably for any reschedules.

Keeping it in an hour 15/hour slot will be more flexible.

Would be a joke as my daughter has one more year of u10 and has played all years of ringette on full ice. If our association had step 3 would be different story but they don't have. Enough girls. You will ne lossing more girls

Rural travels regardless. Are you trying to push out rural ringette?

2 hours is too long for young kids to stay focused. Some arenas are very cold, their feet get sore. It's also a long time for coaches and referees to be on the ice trying to organize.

We are a small group and have different age groups playing

Not every association can get 2 hours of ice back to back. I am not sure I see how having 4 teams travel to the same place is reducing travel times. I would suggest making teams large enough to split into 2 groups. Then only one team has to travel, but can use the same ice times as suggested. There are lots of variables in this question

The reason should not be "to cut costs" And I would not agree. In a sense to dumb down the game because it is cheaper I would not agree with, If in fact this would be the best way to develop Kids I would very likely support it. I have not yet been told or seen the facts that it would work.

That's too much time commitment. With 3 in ringette next year this would be awful for our family

my team was pretty tired after one hour(active start) this might work for say one tournament...but I'm still not a fan

This means that they would not get a game every weekend and so games would be clumped...

if players are away they would miss 3 games instead of just 1.

You guys are guessing what will work now??

The girls are way beyond this skill level of play

The ice gets too much snow on it for the little ones to complete passes. The ice needs to be cleaned after 50 minutes of play. And I wouldn't want it to replace playing once per week. I think that those little minds forget what they are supposed to do if they go too long between games.

It would depend on the time of the ice slot. If it's starting at 6:00pm with a 5 year old, that's tough. It might be difficult to maintain the attention and motivation from a 5 year old for 2 hours too.

Please explain how ice was allocated in 2019 - 2020. Step 1 games use half the ice and half the refs yet all fees at the U10 level were the same? Seems like this was overlooked all in the name player development - what about conditioning of athletes which is hindered by half ice practices and half ice games?

I am past this stage, but I think there is too much encouragement for young kids/families to travel. It may be fun, but it is expensive and takes away from family time at a young age.

Active start has trouble when the ice time is 1 hr and 15 min vs 1 hr normally. Can't even imagine a 2 hr ice slot. They'd be laying on the ice not moving

I think 1 hr is long enough for the kids to play. They are tired after the game so 2 games would be too much

No value after 1 hour on the ice.

I think the girls learn so much from being on a specific team, with their own dressing room and playing full ice. We saw our daughter's skills sky rocket when she played her first year of U10 on full ice last year...and again this year in step 2. The skating and passing skills acquired because of all the space on the ice would be impossible to mimic on half ice games.

This is too busy and long. I am lucky if I have the time for the one hour game.

That's too long on the ice in skates. The girls were tired after games this year, and as manager of the team, I have been on the bench during practices. The practices are an hour and the girls are done at the hour. They get very tired. If the players are indeed getting more ice time with half ice, you are increasing their ice time, and the amount of time they are expected to play. They are going to get too tired and not enjoy playing.

I would prefer a reduction in cost.

We have a good thing here in red deer and at this age we don't have any interest in driving to Edmonton or Calgary every weekend. We won't play if that's what we have to do

Although I like the idea of decreasing travel time, 2 hours is too long for intense exercise at such a young age. My child barely gets through the late afternoon/evening ice times as it is.

Not sure if they would like ringette as much if it was that long of an ice time, all the time.

If it replaces traditional games it wouldn't help with planning and strategy. It also removes the focus on the opponent on hand and makes regular tournaments less exciting as they would just be a glorified version of this.

I believe that if there is an opportunity for the players to bond at away tournaments or in between mini round robin games that is the goal. These players love the 'off the rink' bonding as much as on. I am in favour of minimizing travel at the half ice level

Would support this if there were 4 dressing rooms. This would prove difficult for weekday games. We've also had numerous complaints that every icetime is on a saturday and sunday. That effectively kills pretty much every weekend for the entire season. We would all like only one weekend icetime and one weekday icetime.

Increased time commitment for games is a deterrent for us. Greater than 1 hour on ice is

unacceptable, and logistically impossible for the ice allocator. Do not put additional strains on smaller associations already struggling with ice space.

With smaller teams 2 hours may be too long for the kids

It's hard to gauge how the girls would do with having to play for almost 2 hours straight. The younger ones especially were dragging their feet just at the end of two 25 min periods. The 6 year olds I think would find it too much. While the older girls may be alright.

Maybe at a Step 1 level, not at step 2

I think this is great of the younger/newer players. One challenge is that in Fort McMurray we are 5 hours from the nearest competition (other association). Another challenge is that apparently there are different age groups for levels within other organizations.

my daughter has essentially played all her ringette on full ice; moving to half ice would be a significant step back

If this happens, we will be changing to hockey as the advantage Ringette had will be gone.

To do a mini tournament like that is absolutely caos. You have 2 or 3 teams sharing a dressing room, whistles blowing at all different time which cause mass confusing for the players trying to learn to stop the play if the whistle blows. They aren't learning the full game when majority of them are more then ready to learn and play.

2hrs is too long for younger players (5 to 8) to keep focused and motivated. I believe there would be substantial drop off in play and participation after the first 1hr.

I prefer to keep things the way they are.

I don't understand why?

I think a 2 hour time slot would be difficult for the players new to skating/ringette. I think it would also be very difficult for the younger players

Let's try to keep it simple here. 2 hour ice slots? This is a bit much.

Going into ringette you know your going to have to travel it's something that families have done forever. It's apart of the experience of the game. I've travelled outside the city with my team this year. The farthest was 1.5 hours and I know other teams travel further as we get up into higher levels. It's an experience for the athlete as they get to see new places that they may have not seen before and to skate in different arenas.

As long as the kids like it!

At the Step 3 level I do not support any form of half-ice play. Half-ice should be for Step 1 only. For the Step 1 age group 2-hr ice slots are too long and by the 3rd mini-game the kids are checked out. We already have kids counting down shifts in a 2-period game, 3 would be too much.

Please avoid excluding the half ice teams from participation in large tournaments with standard full ice play. The sooner you can include these teams as part of the Ringette community the more likely the players are to want to continue in the program.

Was traditional ringette so terrible?

That's a stupid idea - I think you can come up with a better solution than that. The majority of families have other kids who are in sports too, which we need to get them to. You'll be splitting up families even more. South plays South, North plays North. Most of our games this season were on a Monday at 5:00pm at Huntington Hills. I had to pull my kids out of school early in order to make it on time. Ridiculous scheduling and completely unnecessary. The north teams didn't come to the South even once.

I liked the format our Active Start 1 had in one of our exhibition games, where the coached pulled kids to side while waiting to play and worked on drills. It was actually really great to see my daughter learn a new skill (raise the ring to shoot) and then use it 5 minutes later in her game. This type of formatting could be used in this situation.

A 2 hour ice slot for a U10 (step 1player) is too long. Physically and mentally.

I don't think the travel was a problem this year. how would this reduce cost? you still have 2 hours of ice for 4 teams. I don't think the free skate time would be beneficial, not enough time to really set up any learning. I think the u10 step 1 was perfect the way it was this year

Half ice Ringette is for U10 step 2 will not help develop our players skills, by step 2 kids should be equipped to play full ice.

I believe if they are ready for full ice, let them try. That should be asked of the girls and parents at evaluations.

More tournaments offered to active start teams would be a huge improvement totally depends on the team roster amount. If they are playing half ice, with a team of 15- 18, kids will not be on the ice enough.

Children would get tired and loose interest with a 2 hour ice time.

As long as the children are moving, and being engaged, that is where the love for the sport, and the willingness to go every weekend, comes from. I have unfortunately watched minor hockey where the middle of the ice is used as the "skill development" area, but there are no coaches or people that are doing any drills to focus the kids attention on skill development. They just kind of glide around. It would be good if the "free skating" was instead something focused on developing skills (e.g. skating the circles, practicing shots, etc) that could then be implemented when the kids go back to their next game situation.

My daughter will be moving up next year, therefore I do not have any direct opinion.

I have 2 daughters in U10. 1 in step 3 the other in step 1. I was very disappointed and unhappy about the amount of travel the step 1 team had this year. We play in Sherwood park and we had games where we had to go to Hinton 3+ hours away for a league game. That's 6 hours of driving for a game with 7-8 year olds, ridicules. And if we didn't play the game our team would be fined \$1000. I would rather play in a 4-5 team league then have to travel especially in step 1 and 2

I'm not sure how doing this and allowing children to skate that long is any different than children playing a full ice game with coaches on the ice to help move the play. Attention and focus would be lessened if all done in a 2 hour ice slot

Step 3 does not plan to move to half ice and since my daughter plays step 3 this current season it's likely she will play step 3 next season as well. In my option step 3 should never play half ice in order to get the players ready for U12

At these levels it is more important to ensure they are active and playing and enjoying the game. This format of play during a tournament wouldn't impede that.

The fact that there will be different games being played against different teams each 25 mins will be intriguing for the players.

My child has been playing for four years. Her first year in active start their were two teams and the girls enjoyed the full ice scrimmages. I feel like the girls that have been playing 3-5 years full ice will not be happy playing half ice. Kids in school sports play games on a full court by grades 3 and 4. I feel like my child might think about trying a different sport if it comes down to playing half ice.

The kids get more teams to play instead of the same team over and over

I still vote for full ice especially for step 2 and above. However if you are keeping half ice, this mini tournament would be fun for the girls.

As long as there are teams to play in this round robin. Being in Lacombe we faced the challenge of minimal teams to play

2 hours on the ice is too long for these younger kids. They would start to get too tired by the end of the games and then not want to keep coming back. Even at the end of a game now, I see my daughter being tired and less likely to be involved in the play.

I don't see how half ice will help develop these players. My daughter has developed very well playing full ice- along with the rest of her team.

My girls are so tired after 2 25 minute halves. There's no way they could do it. They are only 4, 5, and 6.

Ringette is unlike a lot of sports in that that blue line passing rule encourages team play, passing, evasion all within small areas. I support half ice in step 1 but if step 2 teams are properly built I believe these players receive all the benefits of small area play within the confines of full ice.

That's too long for them to skate. Especially step 1s

I just do t know how long my daughter will remain interested in playing on 1/2 ice or less.

Luckily, my daughter is moving to u12, so we don't have to deal with half ice. It all seems very complicated with the logistics of shared change rooms. My son plays novice hockey, and they get their own dressing room but have to share the bench with the opposing team - very squishy. Ringette is a very different game from hockey. I don't support half ice ringette past step 1, and I think step 1 should go from half ice to full ice halfway through the season so kids can prepare for step 2 or 3.

Getting kids and parents to commit to a one hour time slot can be tricky at times - especially when they have other kids and other activities on the go at the same time. Asking someone to be at the rink 1/2 hour early and then they have to be there for another 2+ hours is a huge commitment.

This would mean less days per week on the ice which would result in less daily physical activity.

I don't think that the kids will stay engaged for that long. They will be tired and cold (7am ice times!). I coached AS this year and only 20% of my team would have excelled with this format. It has to be fun.

Too long. Families won't have time for 2 hours of games. Just play two games at once on the ice within the hour.

2 hours is too long for this age group to keep their interest and focus

I do not understand how this saves ice time or travel. It is very rare for more than one league game to be played per weekend in U10 parents will need to travel to the rink if this change is implemented or not. From what i understand the proposed changes also do not increase the number of players on the ice as there may be an increase in the number of teams however the rosters will be smaller. It would also mean that parents are tied up at the rink for longer periods of time. If Ringette Alberta wishes to implement changes based on hockey Canada recommendations I would also suggest changing the ring into a puck and adding a blade onto the stick.

It was quite ridiculous to travel to Clive early in the morning to play another Red Deer team. I was aware of open ice in Red Deer. If it wasn't given to Ringette, there should have been more request for ice time put in.

Why do the kids need to keep skating while the goalies change? These kids are small and may want a snack a rest or often even require a washroom break.

A two hour time slot seems pretty long for young athletes.

Might be hard to ensure kids - especially younger ones - can stay interested for such an extended period of time. Makes sense logistically but harder to put into practice

2 hour ice slot is too much for children that age. They get bored, their feet hurt in their skates. Lack of attention will decrease skill building and could increase injury.

As we only had one half ice team. Our slot only had us on the ice. We tried to have a practice at same time but the constant 90 second buzzer was hard on the other team. It would have been much more efficient to have full ice used.

I think this would be a great change for stage 1 as it is a great introduction for new players/families.

Dressing room.issues for teams use ice after that game

Sounds very chaotic and crazy for the girls.

When do they pee

I would support this change for Active Start and U10 Step 1. Step 2 and 3 should remain full ice.

If we are talking about 5-6 year olds that is a long time for them to be engaged in physical activity and have them try to keep learning.

I strongly disagree with making all of U10 (step 1,2 &3) half ice then throwing kids into full ice at U12 with all the other rules and larger nets that come with U12.

I don't understand the benefit to this. Dressing rooms would be an issue. Why not have 2 teams in a 1 hour time slot? 2 hours of ice time without a break/snack for young kids seems like an unrealistic expectation. I feel kids would lose interest/become hungry/ need a bathroom break in the middle of ice times. 2 hours seems unreasonable for unknown benefit.

One nice feature of ringette is that the games are only an hour and don't take up the whole day. At u10 level I worry that it might make it harder to attend games for some families that have multiple kids or kids in multiple sports. For myself it would have been a benefit. Even at the full ice level in u10 this would have been fine with a 15-30 min break in between.

Kids will be tired with free skating and 2 hours of ice

My daughter played full ice this year so I do not expect her to play half-ice next year. Objectively, I guess it's a fine idea.

My child will be playing U10 for 5th year next year...if she is told its half ice not sure she will want to continue.

2 hours is a long time. How do you schedule bathroom/snack breaks??? The players will be exhausted

Have you even stepped inside some of the cold arenas that these kids play in? 2 hours is a long time to be on the ice. On paper I like the idea to get more playing time for all the travel required but at the young age I feel like not every kid has the stamina to last for 2 hours on the ice.

My 6 year old had 3 games in a mini tournament this year and was tired and disinterested by the last game.

I do not find the cost of ringette prohibitive. Rather than 4 teams on one ice slot keep ice slots with 2 teams

Would there still be a 1/2 time where team does a chant? I think this part of game is very important for team bonding. I think 2 hours on ice is too long in general for young ringette players aged 6-8. Don't think they can last and be effective.

It would Be similar to a practice. The feedback I heard from the girls is they like Games as they add variety vs practices that are sometimes the same thing over and over.

You guys are ruining the game. You will have all of the kids move to hockey with these changes and will kill the sport. If people don't want to drive then they shouldn't play a sport. This is a ridiculous question.

I would support this in U10 step 1 but not in U10 step 2 and 3.

The more ice time without driving all over the better.

Not enough ice/time game over the course of the season. We would play less than half the number of games that we have have played, with decreased ice time.

I think it really detracts from the importance of the games and that by the third game the girls would not be focused.

I think 2 hours is too long to expect a 6 or 7 year old to stay on the ice.

Myla played full ice this year so I am hoping she is moving to Step 3. Half ice wouldn't be a challenge for her and she wouldn't develop as a player.

For the players already playing full ice step 2 and up.. I think they should continue full ice going forward.. for new players entering into step 1 or 2 then 1/2 ice would be implemented.

That makes for a lot of confusion logistically on the ice. A large part of learning to play a game (vs a practice) is how to react and adapt to your opposition. Even at a very early level that is an

important concept to learn. To many different opponents in a short time is confusing for the participants.

Ohhhh my gosh I don't know how to answer these questions I don't even know what size ice we play on like ask coaches these questions they know what's going on not first year parents who have never been in a area in their life before now.

It's not enough time and by step two the girls are ready for full games.

Depending on the time between each 25 minute game I suspect the level of player engagement will diminish over the 75 minute play time resulting in less than desirable outcomes.

We would love to participate, but for example this year there were only 4 step one teams between Med hat and Lethbridge. Because Zone 2 actually schedules all of the other teams in smaller areas we found it incredibly hard to find anyone else to play against us unless we paid \$550-\$650 to go to a 3 game tournament, defeating the notion of keeping things affordable/accessible.

Has anyone complained about travel or ice costs? We are all used to the travel and costs for full ice games so I don't see a problem with continuing with the way things have been working. I would pay extra and travel to have full ice games.

I feel this will take away from the experience of a 'season' and the ongoing development of the athletes of games are packed into tight weekends like that.

Nothing is wrong with current time allowance for games or tournaments

In my opinion the U10's should be playing full ice. Half ice is for U7's and younger

Makes sense for AS and possibly S1. Makes no sense for 8&9 year olds in S2 and S3

The younger kids get too tired playing that much in succession.

I think this would be great as we are a team that always has to travel far for any out of town games and therefore most often must stay at least one night to make the morning games. This way it isn't a bunch of weekends of travel and often poor road conditions. It would make it fun for the girls as it would be like a mini tournament without being to overwhelmingly on the number of weekends spent traveling.

I have been happy with the way ice times have been arranged this year.

Reduces the opportunity for development between games. Challenging for family's with multiple kids in ice sports to manage longer ice times.

They is too long for the girls

All games now are pretty local within an 40 min commute, and most families have multiple kids in same or different sports so time becomes very valuable.

My daughters favorite part about Ringette is games. Although the game appears to be longer it will still appear to be one game for their minds. So if this idea means the girls have 10 games to 40 practices(currently have 20 games to 40 practices) I am

not supportive of it. If we will still have the same amount of games I would be supportive of it.

I believe it is a great dis service to put U10 step 2 to half ice..these girls are competitive, increasing their skating capabilities while still learning the game. All it would promote is goal tender ring and fighting for the ring all the time as they pile up on one another

Just give clear direction to all associations and coaches

It does not prepare the kids adequately enough to compete in the U12 division when they move up. I agree with step 1 as half ice but not 2 -3. They need to learn the game properly and not have such a big change when they move over to u12

The players are extremely excited for out of town tournaments and by taking that away - again there will be retention issues.

While we have not participated in 1/2 ice activities, we have experience with managing tournaments. This leads to a lot of players in a small congested space, difficulties with change rooms, difficult for spectators and family involvement. Too much all at once. Dedicating one hour for games is more than appropriate for time management and family life outside of the

rink. I prefer the Step 1 doing 1/2 ice for first part of the season then transitioning to full ice for the latter 1/2. I think this would be beneficial for all players. Keep on full ice for Step 2 and onward. My daughter today would not benefit with 1/2 ice play and would be discouraged if it were to occur.

2 hours in skates is a long time, especially for younger kids. Actually quite enjoyed 15 minute halves at BGL Wind-Up.

If teams don't have a lot of extra players the kids will get very tired playing for 2 hours at that young age.

Hockey is starting to look like a much better sport.

I'd be interested to see how it works

I like that option. 2 - 24 minute halves hardy got the players warmed up

At step 3 level they should be playing full ice in my opinion

So this is for people who can't afford ringette and don't appreciate travelling this beautiful province on a Saturday or Sunday. I grew up with these memories that you describe as a problem and wouldn't trade it for the world. I want my daughter to have those same experiences not stay in Langdon/Indus and only play at her local rink. This idea sounds like it caters to a small handful of parents definitely not the majority.

That seems like a long time for kids to be on the ice.

We had to pay full price for half ice games this year and feel like we are already getting ripped off. We would leave ringette

It seemed fine this year. That seems unnecessarily complicated

Not for U10 step 2 and higher. These girls will become quickly bored with the sport and may leave the sport under these circumstances.

Too much travel in Black and Gold.

Not at step 2 or 3 when these players have been playing for years. For active start and step 1, sure.

I think this sets kids up for failure when they go to full ice. They need the consistency of a real game on 1/2 the surface

Dressing rooms will still be congested and you're asking parents to be at the rink for 2.5 hours minimum on a week night or early morning. They're young kids with short attention spans

I don't know enough about our current ice association in order to comment on it from its impacts on other teams in the association. From the perspective of a Parent, this seems to be a great concept to really get full use out of the ice however, for some of the younger players, 2 hours on the ice, whether during a game or free skate is a long time to keep their interest.

Having smaller ice and encouraging all player to touch the ring is good in my opinion. Some kids are great pleasures, but in their younger years are kind of like wall flowers and are sometimes placed In Day where they do nothing because there is not a lot of action for D in the little ages. D is my favorite position, I'm not dissing D, but some 'go-getter'kids will be put in F or C and the 'wall flowers' put in D. Which is horrible. Some kids take the wheel, some need to be given the wheel. I'm loving the new format. All kids given the wheel so to speak

We live in a very small community (Hinton) with barely enough players to make up even one team per age group. To do this mini tournament style we would still have to travel to Edmonton

My child is unlikely to play at all as this is geared more towards kids under 8 years old.

That is way to long to expect kids to be on the ice and stay happy and focus on any quality of play

I would not support children who are already successfully playing full ice to transition to half ice.

This works for AS and perhaps a partial season of Step 1. I would support this format is half ice is set. I do not support half ice past Step 1

Please refer to my earlier comment.

If you switch U10 to half ice you will lose a good majority of players in Medicine Hat to hockey. These girls have been playing on full ice for 3 plus years to switch to half ice would be a complete disaster for the ringette association

I do not want my child moving to half ice, since she played full ice for Step 1 and Step 2.

For step 1 and maybe step 2, but definitely not step 3.

Why do the goalies need to change during the game. Why can't each team pick a player to play net for that game and then rotate the kids each game so that they all get a turn to play net.

Switching to this format diminishes our game. At step 2 & 3, the players are fully capable of playing full ice format & have the ability & opportunities to develop in line with the development philosophy. I don't feel that our players were hindered this year or did not develop.

I would prefer 1 x 1 hour on ice a week as opposed to 1 two hour session every second week. At this age it is vital to have regular ice time at shorter intervals if needed. 2 hours is too long to keep all kids engaged

Less game time and essentially less ice time does not promote children's skills and advancement

We enjoy our games..I'm not certain this would be helpful for the girls

I don't like the idea of half ice games at all. I think with other sports it may work but with ringette it takes away positional play and basic ringette skills.

2 hours is way too long to keep the attention of kids this age.

Not needed in Calgary

Ice costs are not for Ringette Alberta to manage. Municipalities should be independently managing ice costs.

Q32 Please provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding Children's Ringette

RESPONSES

I coached AS2 for the 18-19 season and was planning to coach it again as my youngest daughter was coming up. The end of the season they said Zac and Paula were going to coach AS2. Ok, fair enough. The season is now complete and their attendance was under 30%, the FMRA needs to do better. I understand it's hard to hold a volunteer accountable but it's not fair to the kids, there was no consistency. A big shout out should be given to Sean Pedersen for stepping up and taking the lead for AS2

I know that it would be very challenging for my daughter - who has played full-ice for the past 4 seasons - to have to play half-ice next year as she would still be on a U10 Step 2 team. In fact, I think she would choose not to play if that were the case... unfortunately; her decision would be made based on a combination of her knowing the game she already knows and her personality.

Love it. Great for our family.

Smaller team sizes so kids get more ice time. Or play 4 on 4 instead of 3 on 3. 2 minute shifts if they continue to set up from the dot every time. With 90 second Shifts, they end up playing less than a minute by the time they get set up and start play.

Children's ringette is near and dear to my heart. I am a firm believer that change can bring about great things but I am also a firm believer that making change because it works somewhere else is not a good enough reason. If we are going to have our players play cross and half ice for FIVE years we are going to lose players. They will get bored and find an alternative sport to participate in which would be so disappointing. I love the idea of half ice in Step One. I have seen the growth and development in our players, the new to ringette and our AS kiddos who just moved up. I am not sold on the running time and do see players looping around the net and not passing but that happens on full ice as well once both lines are crossed. I really think that half ice in Step 2 is important to continue the development of Step 1 players, to introduce AS players and new to ringette 9 years olds to half ice. I do not feel that a full year of half ice is important in step 2 as our AS kiddos in Step 2 are the stronger skaters and will be at least 7 and able to develop to the idea of full ice faster than their counterparts who have not played AS. Having a first year Step 1 and second year Step 1 could be beneficial as we could then have a place for our 9 year olds to play (with the second year Step 1s) and the new to ringette 6-8 year olds could be in first year step 1. Then your step 2 players would be AS players who may have been playing for two years already and your players that played 2 years in step 1). It would allow our 8-9 years olds who have been playing for a couple of years to play full ice in Step 3. They are able to visualize plays and have started to see where the ring is going instead of where it is. Having half ice in step 3 delays, in my opinion, development and makes the transition to U12 overwhelming. It also allows our players who want to develop as Goalies a better chance to do so from the perspective of full ice. I am glad that we have been able to give our opinions and feedback. However, we were sharing this information a year ago and a lot of what we said was shrugged away by those who do not currently have players in the children's ringette age bracket. The response that we don't like change and that we didn't have to deal with the small net change is condescending and annoying. Switching to a small net is nothing in comparison to switching the game to a small ice surface for ALL players under the age of 10. I truly hope that RAB listens and discusses with Ringette Canada the feedback we are giving and that we can perhaps create a combination of what they do in Finland and what we do in Canada!

do not just rush into half ice play for Step 2 until you work all the issues with step 1 first. There was a lot of negative feedback from our parent group over this season.

So thrilled to have found this wonderful community that has helped my daughter flourish!

It would be nice if you could align the associations with a range of expected ice time requirements. I understand this is hard to do based on the associations access to ice however there are drastic differences between certain associations as a result of this and should be investigated as it makes for unbalanced tournament competition.

A great idea for large associations or associations that are not considered remote.

It was a fun season, very good attitude.

Additional dryland/power skating options.

My child's skating and overall ringette abilities improved dramatically playing on a full ice surface. I am not sure that she would have experienced the same level of development on a

half ice surface.

A gradual introduction to the full ice and ringette rules from step 2-3. Step 3 is still competitive, and making it small ice and nets all year is ridiculous. The jump into tiering and big nets and shotclocks at u12 can be overwhelming. And a kid who starts in AS and goes through even 3-4 steps in u10 has played only small nets and ice for all those years? Parents won't see bang for their buck and I have already seen parents want to move their kid out of ringette for exactly that reason.

Fewer boys playing. They dominate the game and it is unfair for our girls.

Keep at S1 only. Change the timing to 24 minute halves, 5 minute warmups, 2 minutes at half and 5 minutes at end of game for handshakes and clean-up. 2 minute shift change buzzers. Officials should not be on these games, why not try to bring young coaches and pay them the \$25 dollars to administer the game. That way coaches and players learn together.

Awful and disappointing development for ringette.

Step 3 does not fit with the plans for 1-2. Ringette has a lot of rules. It's a big learning year. You can't go from half ice to U12 with shot clocks

Active start struggled with 90second shifts. There is a wide variety of skating abilities making shift change take up to 30s. This meant wasting lots of time not playing.

I disagree with moving U10S2 to half ice, if you are going to allow final year in U10 players to be in S2. These players will be very poorly prepared for U12 and may become discouraged with "little kids play". I coached 5 final year U10 players this year and their skating and strategic thought process are too advanced for half ice play. As for 1st year U10 players, I don't think it is wrong to make a U8 division and have them at half ice. I had 4 players that were of U8 age and while they could keep up skating-wise with the full ice games, they would have had many benefits from a well structured half ice games, i.e. Hockey Canada Novice model. They would have touched the ring more. All I can say is that I think Children's ringette needs to think more about the changes and their impact on the older players in U10. I also think that Children's ringette and the associations need to follow the rules of U10 play as well. In all of the games we played this year, we never once used the 90second shift timer for U10S2, and it would have been so useful for the coaches and players as they are not old enough to understand changing on the fly. Then the coaches could have spent more time on the bench coaching, rather than yelling players names to

come off from their shift. Finally, whatever Children's ringette does, they should not mess with the opportunity for players to be part of a team and develop strong connections with players. This by far is the advantage of team sports, and especially for females, will be the best preparation we can give them for their future as an adult.

Totally agree with Cross ice game play for active start and half ice for step 1 and 2. Step 3 should transition to full ice in addition to implement a shot clock. I don't think there needs to be a bunch of emphasis around changing goalies at the step 1 level. Keep play going, limiting the number of kids on respective benches. More ice keeps this age group engaged.

I know this is about half ice but I just wanted to say that the amount of games being played for step 1 was shocking. I didn't expect to be immersed so quickly and it was a lot to commit to for our family. We were very close to not rejoining the next year. Maybe consider half as many games in step 1 vrs step 3 and step 2 could us a weekend off a month as well. I have 4 kids and as much as I want to support thier every whim. It was stressfull.

Half ice ringette in Alberta is a lot better than half ice hockey. Ringette is at least 3 on 3 with a 3 goal limit; a line to pass across; shorter shifts; and smaller team sizes

I feel the girls on our team will be ready for a full ice for step 2

Give the schedule way before in advance

Feel Ringette girls are much better skaters than hockey boys at this age and should not be held back to half ice games and practices. They are already team players, passing over blue lines, and that is not need in Ringette. Understand having half ice for stage 1....but not after that!!!

At the active start level we wanted our daughter to improve her skating, learn some basic ringette and team play skills and more than anything have fun and spark a love of being active in her. These goals were met. I wouldn't want to see the game get super technical at this stage. Keep it simple, keep it basic. Keep them moving and growing which they should be able to do on any ice surface at this stage. The half ice games were positive I believe because everyone

got a chance to get in on the action, passes were more successful and they were able to practice their changes in and out of the box. If it was full ice I don't know that they won't have progressed as much.

Our biggest concern was the very large jump from Active Start to U10 Full Ice for our 6 year old. Not only skill wise but physically.

Do not go to half ice for u10-2. Kids will lose interest and quit the sport. Can't expect them to play full ice for 2-3 years then go Half ice and not play competitive games or tournaments.

I support Step 2 moving to half ice format and allowing the players moving up to continue to develop in that format. There may have to be consideration given to players that played full ice Step 2 this year to be automatically placed in Step 3 next season. I feel that Step 3 is the correct time to transition to full ice

Step 1 half ice I agree with. Step 2 half ice I 100% disagree. Step 2 players are fully capable of full ice. Smaller centres that need all levels of players to ice a team will not benefit from making step 2 half ice. You will deter players from playing ringette (ie: step 3 players playing on a step 2 team because there is only one team in the organization) and they will simply go to hockey.

I would prefer not to have players who have only ever played full ice play half ice next year. So would be nervous about half ice at U10 step 2, if that is being considered. I had many players that would probably benefit from playing another year of step 2, but shouldn't have to play half ice, as they never have.

I support half ice for active start and Step 1. I am confident that my child's skating ability, skill development, knowledge of positioning/game rules, and ability to compete are directly related to playing on full ice (all her years of ringette). I am sad to hear that Step 2 is moving to half ice and greatly concerned if Step 3 changes as well. However, this will hopefully not impact us!!!!

There should be a progression of skills from level to level, from 1 to 2 and from 2 to 3 otherwise there is no point in having different steps at all. Ringette is a skating focused game: the players need the room & time to develop and grow these skills.

I feel that 4 should be the start age for Active throughout Alberta, consistency.

At the rate of the growth of the sport there are becoming negative impacts to the retention of players. Our local associations board has dealt with the impacts of a poorly rolled out 1/2 ice program with limited support from RAB. To continue on the development of our sport and players I strongly encourage at step 3 second session shot clocks be added into the game.

Avoid half ice at the step 2 level as the feedback is negative.

Seasonal development of ringette would be greatly improved with increased skating instruction or power skating to supplement the coaching given.

Furthermore with ringette seasons ending in March, it is very difficult to find ringette related activities for my girls from March to August. I really wish red deer would form some sort of spring 3 on 3 season, and have the blessing of ringette Alberta in doing so. I understand this Covid crisis has us all in limbo, but I'd happily welcome some sort of spring 3 on 3 league or anything to keep the girls active in ringette. A lot of families are in ringette just for fun and I get that completely, myself however encourage my girls to be the best they can be and would love to

have an option in central Alberta without having to move to Edmonton or Calgary to have access to spring/summer ringette. You all do great work and I'm proud to be part of it.

Not every child fits in a half Ice mould scenario

Very happy with this season.

Leave current format in place

I fully support the half ice program and wish it had been available for my daughter in her Active Start and Step 1 year. However after 2 years of playing full ice it would be a huge step back for all the girls on my Step 2 team to go back and play half ice, even though I feel that some of the girls may not be ready for step 3 either. I am hoping that is being considered as this program continues to be rolled out.

I agree with the changes in general but feel it is not fair to players who have been playing full ice to have to now go to half or even cross ice.

90 second shifts are way too short for active start. 2 minute shifts should be the standard for

active start.

I am strongly opposed to half ice for U10 Step 2/3. If parents (or coaches) feel their child is not ready for the full ice transition then they should remain in Step 1. The transition to U12 is big enough with the addition of shot clock and pace of play, to add full ice and 2 lines would be overwhelming. Seeing the score on the board is a large factor in the thrill of the game and half ice does not offer that.

None

As a Step 1 coach, I enjoyed the new half-ice format. I coached Active Start last season (18-19) and saw how inappropriate full-ice games are for younger players and new skaters. However, I was very surprised and disappointed that there was no coordination in Calgary with regards to the change. This was a pivotal year for ringette in Calgary and there were absolutely NO coaches meetings to talk about the new rules, how to implement them, what to expect, or how to promote the new format with families. I thought there would be some type of meeting at the beginning, middle or end of the season, but there was nothing coordinated. We received written copies of the rules before games started and were left to interpret them on our own. We could not turn to refs to support us because we were not offered refs until January and then were disappointed to realize that no one had shared any information with them either. As a ringette player myself (Open B), I can see that there are gaps in the rules. #1 - the "free pass" from the dot is not clear in the rules. Ringette Alberta says "If a goal is scored, Infraction, or Ring out of Play - Start from starting point, defending team must back past the Ringette line".

Ringette

Calgary is a bit more vague - it says that the "Defending team must retreat to halfway"

(12.4.7.8). It does NOT say when the defending team is allowed back over the ringette line. At the whistle? Once the pass is made? The idea of a "free pass" is the hallmark of ringette. I would suggest being more specific in the wording for the rule - for example: "once the ring leaves the stick of the person taking the free pass, the defending team can cross the ringette line". #2 I was also concerned to see that there was no rule regarding goalie throws. There is nothing written about whether or not a goalie can throw the ring past the ringette line in Step 1. In full-ice ringette, it would be rare to see a goalie throwing the ring over the blue line because of the 5-second delay violation. It would not be a recommended goalie-ring strategy in the older age groups. I have seen several teams in Step 1 where the goalie is encouraged to throw the ring as far as possible towards the other goalie. Since Step 1 is only half-ice, some goalies can throw it quite far. My recommendation would be to say that goalies cannot throw the ring past the ringette line in Step 1. This would be a reasonable ringette rule. In summary, I felt like coaches wasted a lot of time discussing and trying to interpret rules on the ice while trying to coach and act as a ref at the same time. I recommend that Ringette Calgary coordinate special coaches meetings for coaches involved with the new half-ice format. I would also recommend that refs receive specific training in the new format and that Step 1 games have refs right from the beginning of the season. There is no advantage to waiting until half the season is over. Thank you for your time.

Ringette has been a huge part of our family of 4 girls for the past 5 years since our eldest began playing at the age of 5 in Active start 1. The overall experience has been great along the way, and though we were unsure how the 1/2 ice experience would be for our 7 y/o daughter this season we were very satisfied with the format and the development of all the girls in the step 1 level. We are confident that the

2019/20 format will provide a strong foundation and developmental experience for reach level of U10.

I feel very disappointed to hear that you are planning to move step two to 1/2 ice as well. I feel like you are discouraging many players from playing and enjoying the game. I feel like you are missing a big part of the game and all of the competitiveness in the beginning. I think that some changes need to be made to keep kids engaged. I feel very disappointed in how SCRA handled their evaluation process this year and the transition of girls to 1/2 ice. I hope that we don't lose a lot of great families in the sport because of it but I do feel it's a very real possibility. It was an extremely frustrating year for many people and now it looks like it will be again next year. Hopefully you can get it right.

Great move, look forward to seeing the longer term benefits in a few years.

I have watched all of the videos, participated in calls etc. I believe half ice ringette is a good idea at the younger level- Active Start, Step 1. I think if Step 2 and beyond should be played on full ice. At this stage from my experience the children have a fairly good handle of the game and should be given the opportunity to play. I do not think Step 3 should be played at half ice as Step 3 prepares them for U12 in which the pace really picks up. I also wonder if older girls Step 2 and 3 may not like half ice and we may lose girls from the sport. Once a child has played full

ice, they should not have to play half ice. Any time there is transition, Ringette Alberta should be involved in structuring teams so there is not a big discrepancy between teams. Often when a change happens, each association makes up their teams differently and some teams are much stronger than others. The overall goal should be to have relatively even teams.

I think we should have a few time slots during the year to evaluate players in the u10 division so they can be appropriately placed. Something as objective as possible to provide a metric to allow the league to, without prejudice, place players for the player's greatest benefit. Players develop at different paces and the largest hurdle is the flexibility to move players to their appropriate skill level without upsetting parents.

Step 3 is definitely not appropriate for half-ice - you should not progress to this as planned. The kids are too big, too fast and need to develop appropriately for U12 play at either A, B or C levels. I've heard anecdotally that there is not much passing going on in Step 1 because the goalie just puts the ring past the line to 1 player who goes and shoots. Also - lots of collisions. One coach has suggested half-ice but longitudinally so that there is still blue line passing and a ringette line in play.

My daughter loves ringette, I do feel that after playing full ice ringette for 4 years if my daughter doesn't make step 3 next year and has to play half ice I will probably pull her for the year and she can do something different.

Half ice is not sufficient for a sport that I cocked so much skating. Ringette is not hockey and you play them so differently. Half ice is a big mistake.

For my own child, these changes have not been beneficial for her. This is her third year ringette and during the first 2 years she played full ice for half of the season. She did not enjoy playing half ice for an entire season for her third season of ringette. She keep asking to play real ringette and is bored. She was a bubble player that could have easily played step 2. She had teammates last year of similar caliber play step 2. Likely they will play step 3 next year and my daughter will be step 2 as she did not develop as they did having the opportunity to play step 2 full ice. I'm unsure if she will want to continue ringette if she has to play half ice again. A well, on on general comment, kids that are 9 years old, playing half ice with shared dressing rooms is very discouraging. There was no pre-game dressing room camaraderie, no opportunity to feel a part of a team during games. One of the greatest benefits ringette offers is friendships and feeling part of a team. Sharing dressing rooms and benches diminishes this significantly. I support the children's ringette at the active start level, but do not support it at the U-10 level.

Again, we found the half ice game disappointing and lack lustre. I would like u10 Ringette to return to the full ice format.

I think this program is great. Keep on improving it but dont let what has happened to minor hockey happen to ringette. Not everything needs to be about politics and procedure. So please dont over do it...but great so far. Blaize Fabbi AS Coach

Thank you to everyone involved in organizing. Even having this survey, which may be time consuming to go through, and tricky to have the questions apply to many people's teams, it is very much appreciated that our input is being asked!

I fear the sport will not grow if it's played on half ice as kids will drop out. How is a child how has played step 2 full ice then moves to half ice going to progress? Players who are pushed into a higher level of play may not enjoy the game as much, let all players play on full ice.

please make a decision for age groups and half ice/ full ice this year and then stay with it. My daughter is 8 and hopefully will be playing for some time. I do not want her to go through multiple changes every season. whatever structure is decided on, make the decision and stick with it.

Step 1 to step 2 to step 3 should evolve over the divisions. I do not support half ice games over the 3 divisions.

The early ice times for the smallest players frequently both on Saturday's and Sundays each weekend could definitely be a deterrent to return the following year. We skipped several early morning practices throughout the season to allow our daughter to sleep in one day each weekend.

The half ice is a necessity in the early stages of ringette. A more free play game with less stoppages and more explaining from the coaches and especially the paid referees (which

happened rarely this year) would help with understanding and play

Ringette this year was very disappointing for my daughter. Her skills not only didn't improve but possibly she got worse. Coach Christine and Lindsey were very unprofessional. They focused on the same basis drills for 6 months. Coach Kerri and Coach Justin both have played very high level in hockey and ringette and were not allowed to offer any coaching tips. This was very apparent to the kids and the parents. My daughter said they (Kerri and Justin) would ask if they could say something and Christine would ignore them. When a 9 year old notices this you know something is wrong. On our away tournament in Red Deer Christine had a fight with Justin in front of the kids and said that if he didn't want to listen to her to go sit in the ***** stands. I feel that Christine was very arrogant and didn't want advise from any coaching stand point and unfortunately she was the one who was the least qualified to be the head coach. A team is a team leading from the top to the bottom. If the coaches cant get along and work as a team how are the kids suppose too??? My daughter felt very discourage and is hoping for a different coach next year.

I am very disappointed that full ice is being planned to roll out as it is. Bring back U8 and have U6, U8 & U10 Step 1 half ice, that would build stronger players

I completely support Step 1 and Step 2 ringette being small game play and have been singing the praises of this approach in my ringette community. I am a trainer of the Canada Sport 4 Life model through High Five PHCD. I played ringette growing up and was on a university ringette team as well. I am now coaching my daughter and have developed a great coaching repertoire that saw our Step 2 team improve so much over this past season! We do small space drills in practice and the girls were ready for high level strategy like switching mid-game from W zone defence to man on man coverage for a centre free pass to respond to the opponents set up by the end of the season. By the end of the year they were calling each others names and ticktack-toeing the ring across both blue lines and in for a break away, doing switches into the offensive zone, drop passes at the top of the triangle, wrist shots and deaking out goalies. They are absolutely ready for anything ringette has to offer and moving them to half-ice play next year as they progress into Step 3 would be an absolute shame. As 8 and 9 year olds are into that cognitive milestone referred to in the literature as 'the age or reason', able to independently navigate the world in larger and larger areas, they are definitely ready for the strategy and additional rules of full ice play and we just need to be sure our coaching program is strong enough that they have done tons of small space skating, especially transitions as well as ring protection etc. prior to Step 3.

This is probably one of the most biased surveys I have ever seen. Consultation before decisions, not after decisions is much more effective. I haven't spoken to a single person (coach, parent or player) who thinks moving all of U10 to half-ice is a good idea. This really feels like an ice-time availability issue being masqueraded as a skill development issue.

The kids that have played 2 years of full ice have no desire to play 1/2 ice. You may see an increase of kids leaving the sport.

I think that RAB should look more closely into how they configure their steps based on age. the age gap for some of my players this year was unfortunate. ringette is a team bonding sport and it is hard for a 6yr old to bond with a 9yr old. I think that step one should be u-8 regardless of ability and to try and keep the ages closer together regardless of ability because you will have a mix of abilities at this level anyways at least let them play with kids their own age. They will strive more when playing with kids their own size and age.

This issue could be so much simpler if 1/2 ice is inevitable up to the end of u10....which it is. Any new AS or U10 players that have never played full ice, put them on half ice. Any players who have played or always played full ice keep them on full ice. There are likely only one or two more years of players that either started on or have been on full ice, let these players transition to u12 as they normally would and those coming behind them will know no different re: 1/2 or full ice. And if the research to improve potential, playing on smaller playing surfaces, is correct the evidence will be in the skill they illustrate as these players transition to u12. We aren't going to be able to stop the implementation of 1/2 ice play, that has already been decided but make it logical for those who have already been playing on full ice surfaces! Thank you for listening.

We have two girls who play ringette. One (who was 9 this season) has played for 4 years and is an excellent skater and played U10 Step 2. She got a hat trick nearly every game and had no problem skating end to end. If her ice would have been reduced to half, I honestly can't imagine how congested the ice would have been or how high scoring the games would have been. The girls on her team were all great skaters and understood the game. Also, I think getting sufficient

exercise is as important to me as learning the skills - I like to see the girls skating end to end, sweating and working hard. My other daughter is 7 and has played for 3 years and is not as great a skater yet. She played U10 Step 1. It worked great for her to have half-ice games - it allowed them to have the puck more, improve their skating, etc. I would be very hesitant to put my girls in ringette U10 Step 2 or 3 if it goes to half-ice. We would consider other sports and/or hockey (although the girls love ringette!). I really hope you keep the ice surface the same as it is now (Step 1 - half ice and Step 2/3 - full ice).

Follow Hockey's lead. Step 1 and 2 should be half ice and step 3(mostly atom aged players) should be full ice .

I disagree with many of the changes being proposed for the coming years. My daughter was frustrated in Active Start bc they didn't play full ice. She wanted to play "real ringette". I also think it will put the girls at a disadvantage once they move up to Step 3 or U12. If someone is looking for a *fun* or non-competitive style of ringette..they should not have their daughters in a competitive sport.

I prefer to keep it like it is this season. active start and step 1 is half ice. step 2 and 3 remain full ice

Not entirely sure that the move will have the desired effect on player skill development. Will have an AS in the new program to compare against older players in U10.

Our U10-S2 team had a tremendously successful season with a mix of skills among the players. We had 10 on the roster; 2 assessed at S3, 4 at S2, 2 at S1 and 2 absolute unskilled rookies. The veteran girls truly embraced their mentorship role while the weaker girls stretched, grew, and were motivated to "get as good as the senior girls". I would be very disheartened if U10-S2 was to change to half-ice, as our experience this season demonstrated that these girls were more than capable of the full-ice format. They ALL became better players.

I enjoyed the half ice format for step 1.

keep educating the parents it's about the kids having fun, being healthy, learning teamwork, and not about parent egos. it takes some folks a lot of repeats to get the message

My child has played two years on full ice, I feel we would be going backwards to put her on half ice now. It doesn't sound like there is any evidence to support this in on ice sports. If there is I would love to hear more about it.

I haven't heard anyone experiencing it who is excited to participate again or enjoyed this season. I have major concern we are going to have a shrinking participation from younger players this year, next season. I do not have any young children but I can't say we would be continuing if my children weren't older. My U10-2 child really missed out by missing the development of U10-1 because of all the accommodations the league made to bump full ice AS players up to 10-2.

My daughter has played full ice for 2 years in U10 Step 1 & 2. I don't think it is fair that if she doesn't make Step 3 next year that she will have to play on half ice (which she has never done on a team). I hope this is taken into consideration for these Step 2 players for next year.

Otherwise it will be very disappointing for her to lose those full ice skills she had developed.

My younger daughter played on half ice and my oldest started on full. I feel my oldest definitely developed more game concept and flow of the game then my youngest on half ice.

I believe that half ice ringette games slows the player development after active start (and even sometime in active start). Any "study" comparison with hockey should be considered lightly as the movement skill are very different in ringette. Just as an example, ringette does not require any puck handling skills which require a lot of practice on there own. I can see the use of half ice play in hockey, but not ringette at levels above active start. I also head coached a U10 step 1 team last year and a few of my player made it into step 3. They would not have development to this level if they played half ice in their step 1 year. I would also recommend listing to the coach's opinion and feed back. I have been involved with the 3 on 3 trial last year, as well as some one-line discussion/intro sections with the club and

it seems that no one is listening to the feed back and just going ahead with the changes. It seems the request for feed back is more of a gesture that actually going to be considered.

the half ice is good for active start, step 1 and maybe step 2. I have heard there is talk about going to half ice for step 3. I don't think this is a good idea. By the time the children are in step 3

their skills are good enough to do full ice. Shifts should be 2 minutes for the active start.

Active starts and u10step 1 - are fine for half ice, but u10 step 2 & step 3 should be full ice. we need to be able to set up our children for success in the higher levels. All players, no matter of ability should have the opportunity to play and excel to the best of their ability.

The number of league games Step 1 played (10) was not enough. Why aren't we playing a full season of games? It's the number one reason why my girls are moving to hockey next year: not enough play time. There are three other girls from our team making the move too. For the cost, it doesn't make sense to pay for half as many games in ringette as we would play in hockey.

I believe our active start team is going to finish the season with around 70 ice times. In my opinion that is way too many ice times for 5 and 6 year olds and the commitment level dropped off in large amounts in the new year due to the amount of practice ice times. Also getting schedules one week in advance makes it impossible to schedule lives or have children participate in other sports or extra curricular activities as you never know when your next practice is...These 2 issues are the biggest problem I see with the AS program in Calgary ringette.

I had two children in ringette. One was born in 2014 and it was her second year, and the other was born in 2016 and it was her second year. You should include an option for more than one child if you want accurate data.

Perhaps the kids should know the metrics of success, like those skills discussed in this survey, for evaluations if they don't know already.

I do not agree with the change to step 2 and 3. I fully support the half ice initiative for active start and step 1. I strongly feel you are reducing the skills learned in half ice at the higher levels and transitioning the game over u10 with two levels at half ice and two levels at full ice give the players more time to learn the skills unique to ringette. I also strongly feel we are losing the sense of game play at half ice. There are so many parts to the game that require time to learn to allow a competitive experienced player as they move up over the years and head into U14 and beyond. I do not support these changes going forward. I am an experienced player/coach/parent and feel that enforcing half ice to 10 years old does not make them better skilled players. It actually does the opposite. I have played the sport since I was 5 and also have a child in u16 and U14 and it really makes me sad that we are losing the chance to learn the skills and game play of ringette slowly over a few years and turning U12 into a year with so many changes.

My daughter has played full ice for three seasons. She is currently in Step 2. If she remains in step 2, it would be, not only detrimental to her abilities and her confidence, she would blow any player who has only played half ice out of the water. Players who have only played full ice HAVE TO continue on to step 3 in order to be fair to their skills and the skills of the athletes coming up. If this change occurs and my daughter has to move to half ice after playing full ice for three years, we will move to hockey. Ringette Alberta needs to smart about this and ensure that all the associations are not making girls who have played full ice move to half ice.

Give Beaumont step1 u10 party of our money back for the garbage ice time to you gave our team and tournament time. This was a waste of money for \$700!!! All in for \$1000 and barely any games or tournament experience. And wanting us to put money in for our own tournament that we didn't even get to be apart of!!! As parents who already had stated multiple times about these fees and it took you months to get back to us with some sorta of reconciliation which we never really did get one. I would be moving my child to by playing hockey next year. I would rather pay what I paid for in hockey to actually learn the game on half ice and get tournaments.

A major reason that hockey went to half ice is due to lack of ice times for the amount of teams/kids registered. Unfortunately/fortunately that is not an issue with ringette.

I would be very disappointed if ringette changes to smaller ice surfaces. It is a passing game and full ice surfaces are very important to learning crucial parts to the game. My daughters would also be very disappointed. Not sure if we would continue in the sport.

This was my first year coaching and my daughter's first year playing. She loved it. It was unfortunate that we had to share practice time with two other teams but that seems to be an internal matter. We played a few exhibition games and my kids loved it. Thank you

With the possibility of U10S2 being half ice this upcoming season and then the S3s the following season I think it may pose issues for moving into U12 with full ice, bigger nets & shot

clocks. I think 2 years of U10 full ice is better as the space seems to get smaller as the girls get bigger. Unlike hockey or soccer a few sports that uses small space games they don't have the same rules as ringette. So the passing over the blues lines is an additional thing to add in U12 should all U10 be half ice. I realize I half ice they have 1 blue line but the rules are so different so only having the 1 blue line to pass over.

Half ice should only be brought in for new players who have not played full ice yet. Girls who play full ice now should not be moved to half ice for their last year of u10

So far it has been very positive and I like that it is not heavily focused on competition. The coaches are wonderful and I like that it is more focused on skills and sportsmanship.

I have many more comments and plan on sending an email to ringette Alberta. If I didn't really like the game I would not bother commenting. It is tough to see how far ringette went down hill in just one season. I find it very hard to believe that they are still going to go ahead with step 2 being half ice next year and step 3 the year after. With being very involved in ringette and little to no positive feedback on step one and active start this year I can't see any reason why ringette would go through with more changes. With the low numbers this year in step 1 and active start and with many of them saying they are leaving ringette for another sport because of the changes. Ringette won't get these kids back and for what ringette wants for the future with the changes they will never work if they can barely find enough kids to make one team.

Somebody better step up and really listen to what the parents are saying before ringette

Canada or Alberta that is pushing these changes completely cripple ringette permanently.

For step 2, half at the start, then full after Christmas. That way, the players are ready for step 3 and or U12

Step 1 is fine for kids learning to play half ice, but beyond that they need to step up to full ice. At some point the transition needs to be made, coming out of U10 into U12 is too late. Step 2 is the right time as the kids have had the opportunity to learn the basics.

It is a great game for girls. You take the chance for them to learn the game and strategy you will have a ton of girls lose interest and quit ringette. Maybe in hockey the boys can play half ice longer, but girls are different they need to understand the 'why' and strategy of the essential parts of the game at a younger age. The changes will be detrimental and the sport will lose participants.

Our association only has adult players

My daughter has played three years of full ice U10 and still has another year of U10 left. We have one team in our association and it would be a shame to see this fall apart because our team is forced to go to half ice games. We will likely lose many

players if U10 step 2 transitions to half ice next season. Many of these kids have played a full ice game for 3 years and won't want to play a half ice game.

Naked it 3 periods instead of two

While I feel 1/2 ice at step 1 is an asset, moving 1/2 ice to step 2 makes little sense when skating abilities can far exceed this containment. Far better off to go to U6 U8 and U10. You will be pushing kids up to U12 when they may have skating abilities to handle full ice but not mature enough abilities to compete. Call half ice beginner ringette and put UAA's on it. Abilities can determine full ice.

I have seen many players just starting out and barely able to skate, able to whip around the ice within weeks. Their skills starting out should not limit their ability to transition to full ice. I also know families who would like to switch their daughters from hockey to Ringette just so they can play full ice. My daughter has greatly benefited from full ice and would be devastated to move to half ice next year.

As someone who has grown up playing ringette, played community and AA ringette, won National championships, instructed camps, coaches for years, etc., I don't think they smaller ice surface is the answer. I understand why hockey does it, but hockey and ringette are two completely different games. Kids are getting bored with smaller ice surfaces. They aren't being given credit for their skills or how hard they want to excel. True ringette strategy and game play are completely lost right now as every level is a different sport at this point. Girls at the U10 level want to be competitive and build on their skills while still having fun. I have a daughter in active start and have coached active start. That game can be split lengthwise down the middle of the ice. It teaches blue lines, skating and passing and builds a foundation for the next levels.

U10 should be full ice with the differentiating being skating ability/passing/shooting and game strategy .

Step 2 and Step 3 should not move to half ice. Step 1 is a good stepping stone with half ice and getting to know the game and rules but should also be designed for the younger players just coming out of Active Start. The players need full ice in U10 to better their skating skills and understand the real ringette rules and passing lines.

I wish the girls played more double game / it is a waste of fuel and time to drive an hour and a half to play 36 minutes of ringette / and my kid maybe plays half that time

I think the change makes sense but ringette is a different sport with the ice being utilized as an entire team. It's not like hockey where one player can carry a game. By 9 years old these kids can really skate. Hockey had private leagues created and people left minor teams - this could happen with ringette or by 9 you'll lose the kids to hockey. Or change the ages so it's the same as hockey. At 9 hockey plays full ice

As a parent of a second year U10 Step 2 player I can say I really do value development over all else. My kid would not have excelled had she moved to step 3 this season and instead, has grown a lot, developed a ton and grew in confidence by staying in step 2 for a 2nd season. Having said that, I am VERY concerned with the rumors I've heard about moving all players who did Step 2 this season up to Step 3. At least 3-4 players on our team are young and lack the skills required to move up. Another year of step 2 would be very good for them developmentally. Additionally, by moving up players into step 3 that do not have the skills needed (simply because they don't want to go from full ice to half ice) you will water down the talent in step 3 and the teams will not compete well against other teams. By step 3 the skill level should be fairly high and homogenous so that coaching/development and competition can be done at a higher level. If the step 3 teams are weakened by players who don't really belong there and they don't compete well in games and tournaments, and we end up with "losing" seasons, girls will inevitably leave the sport. The more skilled players will be frustrated with having to pass to less skilled players who have trouble with ring possession. Losing some games is important. Getting beat every game and being distrustful of your teammates abilities is awful and is the exact opposite of development. I sincerely hope that this is not the decision for SARA.

My daughter loves playing ringette!

As I said before, I think half ice is ok for step 1, but don't agree with it for step 2 or 3. I think having players go from half ice in step 3, to full ice, big nets and shot clocks in U12 would be crazy! And I really don't see how this benefits players. On a completely different note, I don't understand why provincials was eliminated from U12. I think this should be reinstated.

I am normally one that supports enhancement in sport but I am really struggling with this. This survey feels as though it is designed for you to justify implementing these changes without further impact on the sport. Yes there are some advantages for Step 1 to be on half ice, but step 2 and 3 will limit their ability to transition to U 12. If you ask everyone of our step 1 players, they enjoyed their season but are now bored with half ice. Boredom leads to players quitting. The enhancement of the sport in your mind outweighs all of the other potential ramifications of the changes you are proposing. I feel that there is absolutely no consideration for smaller associations and the struggles we already have and the challenges that this may create going forward. The lack of travel and games deters kids from developing their love of the sport. My older daughter didn't play any games in active start and there were 4 of her group that quit because of it. They were 4 great players that didn't get to see what they were working towards and they left the sport. If you must move forward with these changes, please only move step 2 to half ice for half a year then transition them to full ice. Honestly, step 3 players are ready for full ice and in my mind is no reason to move them back to half ice ever. Please don't make decisions about the future of this sport without considering all of the issues and consequences.

Your tunnel vision on plowing ahead with this is really disappointing.

I am not in agreement of 8/9 year olds playing on half ice. They are perfectly capable of following the rules and knowing line passes at this age. The games in step 3 were very fast paced and few whistles called. The girls knew the rules. My daughter would not play ringette still if she was on half ice still. Additionally, going from half ice in step 3 to full ice, larger nets, and the shot clock in u12 would be a huge adjustment. I feel that u10 is such a big age range as well. This is our 5th season playing. It's unfair that some associations have 8/9 year olds playing in step 1 still (with 2 years experience) Kids that went from playing full ice last year, down to half ice this year. The division of players into each step is not done evenly with all

associations. They should split up u10 into u8 and u10 divisions and the u8 I could understand being on half ice.

Friends of ours daughter is in Step 1 and is currently experiencing the half ice and they came to watch my daughter who is in Step 2 (full ice) play a game . The father of this girl turned to me and was floored at the difference between the two levels. Our Step 2 girls can skate and are truly developing amazing skating skills (ie: cross overs , backwards and forwards skating , stopping, transitions) . They have also learned so many plays and are understanding the "whole" picture of the game. Maybe I am bias but my daughter was truly lucky to have the coaches she had this year . They taught them the triangle, break out and so many more play offence and defence. How on half ice with 3 on 3 can they truly be taught these plays? They can't. Come U12 it will almost be like back to teaching U10 Step 1's at the beginning. The only difference is these girls will be taller and (hopefully) better skaters.

If U10 step 2 or 3 goes to half ice I will not register my child for ringette next year. I believe that ringette is an excellent team sport and better then hockey but if half ice is put forward for step 2 or 3 I would rather register my daughter in hockey with a full ice option.

The half ice has worked well. You should just decide by age who gets full ice not ability. Kids can start at any age. Your going to put a nine year old with seven year old because she's just starting ? They want to play with their peers and friends to have fun. Playing with kids 2 or three years younger than you isn't fun. We had that very experience with my older daughter. You want kids to continue to join them you have to move them up together. Otherwise just say after age 5 don't bother joining. It's too late for you. Not a very welcoming feeling when you are on team with no friends. And isn't this supposed to be fun? Why are we doing all of this?

ringette alberta is in need of a u8 age group. 4 years of age between players is far to much. 9year old vs 6year old in a game is terrible for both players. Younger players are intimidated and scared to play, older players are not allowed to play aggressively to battle for ring control without penalty. In a u8 age group 1/2 ice would be perfect for the skill and ability of players that age. At 8and 9 years old, players(even 1st year players) with in weeks of evaluations have developed to a close competitive ability.

All well

The U10 division is too big of an age gap. Having 5-6 year olds play 10 year olds can be intimidating even if the younger player is more skilled. The older players should be placed with people their age. Their improvement curve seems to be a lot higher based on size and maturity, they would benefit more playing with peers their own age.

Was a great experience for our first year. I do not think half ice should go past U10 step 1. These girls need a chance to learn all the rules and how to play the games it's meant to be played.

I don't believe Step 3 should be moved to half ice at any point . How do the girls prepare for u12? How many numbers will you loose with girls going to Hockey? In Hockey 2011 babies do not play half ice - for this reason alone many could go try hockey for a year and come back to Ringette? Ringette is a passing game - do these changes really change ring touches ? Game sense and do our Ringette girls become weaker skaters ? Right now Ringette is known for developing girls skating skills over girls in hockey at the same age. Need to understand the advantage to stay in Ringette at half ice?

N/a

I am a huge proponent of smaller playing surfaces for athlete development. Don't let parents who are stuck in their ways slow you down. But leadership does need to think critically and creatively to come up with solutions to the logistical challenge.

Half ice is one of the worst ideas that I have ever heard and 100% disagree that it is beneficial to a child's development. Give your head a shake and just stop with this ludicrous concept.

Red deer ringette association continues to place 2 - U10 and 2- U12 step 3 teams where the association of players is not there for 2 step 3 teams every year. At best, red deer has only available talent and players for 1 step 3 team in each age category. Every year should be looked at different versus mandatorily placing weak Step 3 teams in the division. Red deer would benefit to try and support development, competition and confidence in a Step 2 division in both U10 and U12 leagues.

Most importantly I want to voice my opinion for step 2 and step 3 to remain full ice. The whole idea of children's ringette is to allow for player progression over time. Changing step 1/2/3 all to half ice does not allow for progression but forces players to remain stagnant. Then when they advance to U12 they will be completely overwhelmed as they need to learn 5 on 5, pass across blue lines, 3 in rule for offensive and defensive, large nets, shot clocks. To allow for progression step 1 should be half ice but then step 2/3 full ice. That way if a player joins ringette but has advanced skills they could move to step 2/3 without having to jump to u12. I was head coach of a step 2 team this year and I can't imagine them playing half ice. Every player has played defense, forward, and center. Every player has scored many goals and assists. They ALL understand the 3 in rule and passing across the blue line - rarely is there a whistle for this. They play defensive triangle very well, have defence rush in/someone stay out almost every shift, do many different plays. We have a very young team with only 4 players moving to u12 next year. We have 5 players born 2012 - my concern for them if children's ringette progresses as planned then those players who have been playing full ice for 3 years will be forced to then play half ice. This is not in the best interest of those players (my daughter being one of them). I also do not think only step 3 should be full ice as those in step 2 also deserve to be as prepared for u12 as the step 3 players. I think you really need to listen to the feedback from the parents and the coaches who are experiencing this ringette right now. There has been a lot of discussion on the coaching forum and I have yet to see 1 person in favour of rolling forward with the half ice for step 2 and step 3. Many other provinces have not implemented the changes we have. I read in a previous email that you will be attending tournaments in March. I'm hoping if you are in Lethbridge you come and watch our step 2 team - Airdrie blue Sharks. It really is impossible to imagine them being half ice. Also I would like to comment on this survey - it was very high level learner so I'm sure many found the questions very hard to understand and therefore answer accurately. I work in education and can say that the questions were not worded in a way that you will get very accurate feedback. Thanks.

It seemed like each association and/or league had a different interpretation of the step 1 rules. We were told only a goalie stick for goalies and yet most of the teams we played had goalie equipment. During the golden ring we were told by all the Calgary teams that they were told to play "no stoppage" at shift changes. So each shift changed the ring did not go to a free ring but was played from where it was left

Make a u8 division. Trot step 3 next year as most organizations will push through all step 2's to step 3 next year to avoid the conversations with parents and the heartbreak for the kids.

The lines for each team should have players that are similar skill playing with each other to optimize their learning capacities as well as stay encouraged to play on the ice

I was not happy that our practice and games were so early. My husband could only make one game to see our daughter play..

Our fort mcmurray team did not get accepted into any tournaments so we have not played many games so it is hard to have an opinion. I feel like all divisions should get into 1 tournament as it seemed pointless to play this year knowing they weren't going to any tournaments.

I agree with half ice in Step 1 but as a parent who's kid played both Step 1 and Step 2 this year I cannot see the benefits of having half ice for Step 2. The Step 2 games were very high pace and the kids seemed to thrive with full ice.

I saw many benefits for s1 at half ice. However many associations could have used more guidance in the implementation of the new children's program. However leaving s3 at full ice would provide more progression for players. If s3 were to be half ice it would be an even larger jump to s3 to introduce full ice, 3 in the zones, passing overs the blue lines and shot clocks.

I think only Active Start should be on half ice and step 1 start on half ice and transition to full ice halfway through the season.

Seems to be a lot of changes each yr to 2yrs. I got out of facilitating coach clinics because of the continued changes and need to recertify continuously. If players movement is based on coach evaluation it is expecting that much more from volunteers.

Have a graduation from 1/2 ice to full ice at beginning of session 2 so the girls can learn positional play (centre, forward, defense). There are quite a few girls that evaluate at the step 2 level in u10 and miss out on step 3 so they will be moving to u12 the following year. Moving to full ice will benefit their development and they will have a fair evaluation process the following

year as they will be learning the full ice game. If they dont learn the full ice game prior to going to u12, I feel they will be quite overwhelmed for that year as they also have to readjust their game re: shot clock and using bigger nets.

I found this season the most frustrating of the 3 seasons my daughter has played. I payed the same amount as everyone else for half ice all season, that is a joke. Refereeing was terrible for most games, most did not know the rules for half ice, and there aren't very many rules. Different associations making their own rules on team sizes and age of girls in step 1 is ridiculous. Minor hockey would never have rolled something out so poorly, and ringette had minor hockey's model to learn from. All associations should also have to have 2 sets of small nets available for every game, stuff like that should not be an issue. I love ringette and have enjoyed helping each year my daughter has played. I appreciate all the work that the many volunteers do. I hope they can work out most of the issues that we had this year and I look forward to a great year next year.

I think care needs to be taken that we don't remove the aspects of competition that interest the older ones in this age group. If it is too "boring" or "babyish" you risk losing these players. My youngest played 3 full seasons at U10S2 and had she been forced to restart at half-ice at the start of each season I believe she would have quit long ago. and doing 4 years at half ice and then going to U12 would have been horrendously hard on her. I liked that she had good competition at step 2 for those

3 seasons, but then played U12 C without any issues at all. She is now a first year U14 playing B!

My daughter will be U14 next year. She played overage U10 Step 2 this year. We did not play half ice. I have no experience so do not feel my opinion is valid.

I do not agree with half ice at the step 2 level and we are moving up to u12 next season so it is not something we have to contend with. I know, had it been introduced to step 2 this past year, we would have quit ringette. I know other parents who will do the same if their daughters are pushed to go half ice after playing full ice. Just moving girls with full ice experience up another step is not fair to the girls/teams who legitimately should be there.

I don't think a kid who has been playing full ice since the beginning, should revert back to half ice. Plus, I grew up in a small town where ice times were not hard to come by. I played close to 17 years of ringette, all on full ice. To suggest that going to half ice is the only way to develop athletes, is a bit leading. We seem to over complicate things now.

My only concern with the smaller playing surface involves those children in their last year of U10 (typically Step 3). Moving to U12 already involves the introduction of new game elements: shot clock, large nets, and (in some associations, but not all) dedicated goaltending. Adding their first time playing full ice seems a bit much. I would prefer to see 9 and 10 year olds playing full ice for a year before they have these other elements added, but also understand that not all U10 players will necessarily have a year at Step 3 before moving to U12.

We need to have the necessary info structure in place before making all these chandlers. If you are making new rules example small nets, dividers and shot clocks.

Ringette teams are not given the same importance or consideration for ice times that hockey teams are - ice times are difficult to get. We are considering putting our child in hockey because of this reason.

I'm happy with the changes made this year. For smaller communities you should allow special consideration for players to play step 1 and 2 in a season if they have a certain score where they are borderline step 1/2. the smaller communities could keep their better players interested and not lose them. the step 1 would not be forced to play at a higher level when they aren't ready. you won't lose the good players cause they are challenged and the weaker ones because they aren't intimidated.

I like and support the idea of half ice for development. By Step 3 athletes should be able to transition to full ice. This transition should be reconsidered by RAB to implement full ice at Step 3.

149 We are hearing a lot of concern from coaches and parents that half ice will eventually be introduced to Step 3. Half ice is very strongly opposed for Step 3 as those players need to begin preparing for the transition to U12. Players moving to U12 already have to adjust to full nets and shot clocks. Players should make the adjustment to full ice at Step 3. There is also a lot of concern about introducing half ice at Step 2. We have a lot of logistical bumps to figure out from this first year of implementation at AS and Step 1. We would prefer to have time to

review all the feedback, make some adjustments in next season, and get a solid understanding of the implementation before pushing it through to Step 2. We also need to see how/if the changes and issues this season will impact our registration numbers for AS/S1 next season. We have heard rumours of many families not returning next season due to dissatisfaction with the format. Our volunteer-run organization would prefer some time to assess the past season at AS/S1 and smooth out the issues, taking a measured and informed approach before moving forward with additional changes.

The ringette structure for this year was absolutely horrendous. The Beaumont area will lose many girls after this season because of how bad it was. The setup of the games is absolutely ridiculous. The girls' time on ice is so low there are days you wish you were not even at the rink. I understand the model as I have 2 boys in hockey but the way it was rolled out with ringette was horrendous. First problem is that the teams don't divide and use both ends of the ice. All the girls are crammed into half the rink and on one bench. Half of the ice that is paid for is completely unused and all of the athletes spend most of the game sitting on the bench. What a waste! Second, the setup of the games is absolutely ridiculous. We played all season with 1:30 shifts during a game with each shift ending on the buzzer. After each buzzer for some insane reason, the ref would gather the ring and initiate another face off. The organizing of the face off and getting everybody in the right place generally took about 30 seconds, leaving only a minute of play before the next buzzer. 1/3 of the games were wasted waiting for a face off. We are wasting half of the rink to start with, and then go further to waste an additional 1/3 of the ice time between each buzzer. We are using the ice at around 35 percent efficiency! God forbid that there happens to be a whistle or a goal scored during play. This eliminates another 20 seconds of the shift. This is not beneficial to any of the kids to have them all sitting on the bench and not exercising. It's absolutely crazy and whoever came up with this plan has no business being involved in kids sports. Third, the size of the teams needs to be adjusted if going forward the 3v3 format will stay in. Our team has 14 girls on it. With four girls (3 skaters and 1 goalie) going on the ice every shift, we have more than three shifts of kids every game. Has anyone with ringette in Alberta done the math with time on ice for the girls in a game?! My daughter goes on every fourth shift! Do the math. Sit on the bench for 4 and a half minutes, get on the ice, screw around waiting for the face off for 30 seconds and then play for a minute. If there is a whistle or a goal, it erodes the play even lower. I have seen my daughter play literally a total of 30 seconds of game play before the buzzer and has to return to the bench to watch for another 4 and half minutes before getting another chance to skate. It's absolute insanity and somebody needs to use their brain and notice this is terrible instead of just blindly following this half ice is better philosophy. I understand we tried to copy the kids hockey setup but this has zero resemblance to what the IP and novice hockey kids are doing. They use both ends of the ice! 8 kids from each team in each end. Playing 4v4. They are on every second shift!! They don't face off every buzzer, they leave the puck and the next group goes and grabs it where it sits and they keep playing! Every kid gets tons of exercise and is involved in playing the sport for an hour straight. What ringette has done has had the exact opposite effect. We have all of our girls sitting on the bench for most of the game. They don't even come back to the dressing room red faced or tired and sweating. Imagine being a parent and sometimes driving hours to a game, for your child to get a total of 7 or 8 minutes of time on ice. It is frustrating beyond what you can imagine. Somebody needs to address this. This was an embarrassing season watching this unfold. The wastefulness of ice was

disgusting. The way that ringette Alberta did this was of no benefit to the girls and did not take advantage of any of the positive things that they got from doing this in the hockey world. Make changes or there will not be any girls left to play this sport.

The survey and research should be considered with an open mind for this decision on children's ringette for upcoming season not on one or two people's decision or to consider the research mentioned is 100% true.

I think the format there is now is fine

I think the change to half ice is great for the players. Figuring out the logistical issues may take time, but in the end it will benefit the game and help players develop. Kids who get more interaction and ring touches in the game are more likely to enjoy playing and therefore more likely to keep playing.

This last year was disappointing from an implementation perspective from the eyes of a board member and the hiccups encountered. There was no clear programming principals, rules, guidelines to make this new program universal for all individuals in ringette for half/cross ice.

Ringette Canada did not have a manual of this is how half/cross ice will be played with all questions asked. Ringette Alberta did not have anything similar either. I would go to the Hockey

Canada website and print off the Initiative/Timbits Manual to get a better understanding of how these changes can be implemented effectively. Avoid looking too much at Finland and their small area games formats. Part of the reason they have half/cross ice is the population density around certain cities and 250 rinks in the entire country. In order for Finland to accommodate hockey and ringette on 250 rinks, they need to go to half ice.

With children in both ringette and hockey, we have noticed that the hockey teams have their season set in stone for practices while the ringette teams only knows their schedule two weeks out if that. That being said you should have a set number of practices then slowly work games into the mix with practices mixed through them so the girls can learn and grow to love the game, not get beat hard every time. As a coach and father at one point I felt like I was failing as a coach. We had a bunch of practice at the start then went on a crazy number of games with no intermittent practicing along the way to learn from what we were failing at in the games. We pay the same as a team playing full ice the use of the dressing rooms should be the same as the older girls one team per room. If you have teams playing half ice then the arenas should have the bumpers in proper areas for ease of access not in the second arena in the far corner.

I really do think that half ice in step 1 and active start has been fantastic just from catching a couple games in our association. I have 2 girls in the sport, U12 (2008) and step 2 (2012)I had three girls at one time. I had my twins (2012) in step 1 (in 2010)when they were five as there was no active start team. It was full ice, they barely touched the ring during games and I really do think one of the twins quit because of it (as well as her personality lol). But I think if it would have been half ice back then her experience would have been better and still be playing. Now having the other with two more years in U10, having her in half ice would be a real detriment to her development and she is the type of kid would maybe look to another sport? I'm just looking down the road at step 3, if that's half ice in two years, forget about it. That's my opinion about her. As mentioned in previous comments, I think half ice step 2 is a mistake and that it is geared to bigger associations. Step 3 half ice might be a sport killer in Alberta? Where is the proof that it will be better or is it just the opinion of Dave Myers with RAB?

AS has been successful in our Boards opinion. Step 1 is successful as well. Time will tell on Step 2, we have concerns about potentially moving Step 3 to half ice in the future. Our Board feels the players should experience full ice before U12 division.

None

From what I saw it was a good system to develop the players. Players that would have very little ring time now were able to get and carry the ring. The only comments that I had that were negative were about not keeping score. Some parents and players that had played step 1 last year were bored by the end of the year as they felt that there was nothing driving the girls in a "non competitive" game. Maybe start keeping score in the second half of the season?

we do not support any sort of dumbing down of the sport of ringette to a half-ice set-ups step 1 U10 is perfectly capable of full ice play. The amount of rules and strategy that they miss out on with half-ice is to the extent that it is not even the same sport. These changes would only benefit the bottom line of the ringette association with cheaper ice costs at the expense of the player experience. This will negatively impact the sport, and girls will leave the sport because they know they are being short-changed.

Our frustration with ringette peaked this year. The way our step 1 child was treated this year was deplorable. We have 2 other children in ringette who love and live for ringette. Our step 1 child, with the new changes, was held back, harassed on the ice by opposite coaches for being too good, told to hold back, and punished by not being affiliated with step 2 despite evaluating at a step 2 level during evals. Involved parents in decisions and rationale. I offered to discuss our concerns with the director who never responded. I can get behind an active start or maybe step 1 half ice but don't make excuses for holding kids back ("team size" should not be a valid reason). What happened this year with our child coincided with the changes and our child got the brunt end of the stick, to the point where we are evaluating whether to simply pursue hockey.

I understand the science/research behind 1/2 ice ringette for those starting out but I do not feel it should go beyond active start/step 1.

My daughter was progressed from Step 1 last year to Step 3 this year. While this may be fine for some kids, my daughter was sad and frustrated to not be playing with her friends and was not emotionally ready to make the jump. Before being placed at a level higher than they are due to play, parents should be consulted to ensure that their child is emotionally ready to make the

jump. My daughter has barely touched the ring the year and is so frustrated that she is quitting ringette and not playing next year. Is that what you want for this sport? I would be happy to provide further feedback at jason99johnson@gmail.com.

I do not like the way we are going with this at all. As a coach I think it's backwards. My children loved full ice at u9 u10. U6 and active start 1 and 2 used half ice and it was ok but if my girls had to do 1/2 at the u10 step program I think they would be bored as they LOVE the set up of full ice games passing over blue line and 1/2 practice/full ice. I have heard a lot of people like me do not think 1/2 games are ringette. It's extra work for coach to do a practice with set up. Drawing passing line on ice, putting up barriers and goalie prep. Are parents in u10 step one we're and are mad at the whole change. We will probably lose players.

I have very clearly stated my concerns and suggestions in past comment sections - I think switching everyone to half ice is it conducive to development - I think the opposite is true, these athletes are then having to learn ringette BASICS (positioning, line passing, four-in rules) at the U12 age - seems ridiculous. If U10 step 2 goes to half ice, we will certainly pull our daughter out and switch to hockey until she's at a full ice game again - but by then she may have changed her mind and wish to stick to hockey. I feel like our family is not alone in this frame of thinking.

Watching the Step ones this season, I was impressed at their skating skill development on the half ice surface. The 3v3 format also gives less skilled players a greater chance to become involved in the play.

Race to the ring between shifts. Don't stop clock for line changes.

ARA does see value in these changes, but think that it needs to be looked at in totally with everything. Ice size, age categories (do you still continue with Step 1, Step 2, Step 3), 3 on 3 vs 5 on 5 play, shot clock etc. The concept is to ease athletes into full adult version, I get that and familiar with the concept. My son in soccer went through 3 field size changes, and number of athletes on field, and implementation of rules until reaching the full adult version at age 13; my own experience in hockey involved cross ice games, half ice games, and then full ice games. So this is not without merit, and think its good. But you need to consider the whole structure, not just the ice size. Need to consider when is shot clock implemented, when does 3 on 3 change to 5 on 5 play. When do athletes play the entire game in net as the goalie with equipment. Does the current U10 structure of Active Start, Step 1, Step 2, Step 3 adequate enough to facilitate this gradual easement of athletes into the full adult game version. Consider all the elements.

It is my opinion that U10 Step 2 should remain full ice. Step 1 should remain half ice. As the athletes progress they need to time to be able to understand the unique rules associated with ringette. Playing full ice games is the only way to be able to do this. The fact that U10 teams can have wide ranges of ages for the athletes requires the ability for full ice due to athletes that may be older that are on step 2 but will go directly into U12 because of their age. We will lose kids or potentially not even see them start the sport if they start ringette at 9 years old on half ice in step 2 and go directly in to U12 the next year. The game is about skating and transition in and out of the zone. We have girls from ages 7 - 9 in step 2 currently and they all get lots of ring touches.

I believe that there are some benefits to having half ice in U10 but I believe that it will be crucial to get children into the appropriate division even more so than before. If a child is placed in Step 1 when they are already a good skater they may see very little progress in that season.

The progress my team made this year in skating, ringette skills and game play was outstanding. I believe that can be attributed to the fact that they were able to play the game as it is meant to be played. I believe that if children play half ice until U12

there will be children who will lose interest and are not being given the opportunity to play ringette as it is meant to be played and will not have a true sense of the game.

Half ice has been a fantastic experience in S1. It is the proper size of ice to the skills of the players. There is no need to have full ice at the S1 level. Without having played half ice in S2 yet, I do feel it will be beneficial to the players and their skill development. I am confident that half ice at the S3 level is not the right choice. Player speed and skill is strong enough at this level to play full ice. Most players playing at the S3 level have played ringette for 3+ years. To have them play half ice for 4 or more years will not help the skill development of players or the overall skill developed in the game of ringette.

I do strongly feel that we are putting too much on to u12 not playing at a full ice game starting in step 2. You transition small pieces of the game play into each level allowing the players more

time to learn the different techniques Of the game. Being a player myself for 35 years and having 3 kids in the Sport currently I feel like We are losing the learning time for the game as well as the skill of the players when cramping everything into a two year period of u12 instead of slowing building the skills and game play over a few years (step 2-u12)

Keep feeding the proof train to families through out the year, this will eventually get through to them. If the proof is there it works then do that, its hard to argue logic / poven statistics

I don't know the ultimate solution and I fully understand the purpose behind the dollar value of doubling up the players on the ice. There is no benefit of a child having full ice for four full seasons only to be regressed into half ice.

My daughter loves ringette, and is with Step 1 U10, but AP's when required with Step 2. Other than positioning on the ice she seems to fit in with the skaters with ease. It would be disappointing for the children who are now ready for full ice to have another year of half ice, just because they don't quite have Step3 skills. I like to think of U10 Step 2 as a transition full ice year, this enables the skaters to get positioning and passing over the blue lines, not ringette line etc. After a year of half ice for two years then over to full ice, its a lot to learn positioning and passing lines all over again when the skill level with Step3 full ice is that much greater. From all parents of full ice this year, I know some won't be paying next year if they children are still in Step2 for half ice... They won't make their children go backwards. My daughter loves ringette, and I would hate to have her excited for full ice next year just to tell her another year she can only play half ice. If the skaters are ready, I say let them play hard on full ice for Step2.

I liked the half ice for step 1. Would starting step 2 off as half ice and transitioning to full ice halfway through the season be feasible? Then have step 3 full ice as the girls should have their skills developed enough by that time. Thanks so much!

I have 2 daughters in higher age group AA teams and believe the options provided/suggested will provide better development for younger players.

I feel that utilizing the half-ice surface is a great starting point for U10 leagues with skating skills etc., Also let's more teams play at the same time. More ice time = better players and more fun in the end of it all.

I believe active start and Step 1 is ok for 1/2 ice however moving forward step 2 and 3 should be full ice to get ready for U12

I think the current format of U10 step should remain as is. Active Start - Cross Ice Step 1 - Half Ice Step2,3 - full ice Step 1: - teams should be limited to 11 players. - only 2 coaches on the bench from each team. - ice surfaces should have the complete half ice markings

I would like to see the U10 Step 2 program run as full ice. If not at least half a season. I am concerned that if the plan is still to move Step3 to half ice there is no transition to full ice. When we compare ourselves to Hockey they play half ice at u9 and full ice u11. Our step 3 girls if they were playing hockey would then be playing full ice. Hockey also has a plan in place to have the first year half ice, transitioning into full ice part way through the second half of the season. I would love to see continuous play so that when the buzzer goes the ring is left and the players change and then the next three come on. So much time is wasted in players setting up for a free pass. I would love to see more involvement and clearer direction on what the on ice officials should be doing. I have a hard time warranting the pay they get for the work they do. (I am an official). Please find the a link to a very informative hockey Canada U9 program <https://cdn.hockeycanada.ca/hockey-canada/Hockey-Programs/Coaching/noviceprogram/downloads/hc-novice-resource-guide-e.pdf> <https://www.hockeycanada.ca/enca/hockey-programs/coaching/novice>

I am in favor of Step 1 being half ice, and possibly Step 2 as well. However, I do feel that by Step 3, players are ready to move to full ice play.

I believe the half ice U10-1 is a good transition. To do it for U10-2, I am unsure. At end of season some girls are getting bored. I think U10/2 should stay as is.

Keep it the way it is, works fine and isnt on a big enough platform to do stupid experiments

I think that in u10 step 2 you might do half ice for the first half and full or larger ice for the second half. U10 step one I think half ice is ok as long as it's played on the larger ice surfaces. As I said before, we need to be cognizant of the size of the ice surface when it's half ice and make sure it's relatively the same league wide. We also need to think about officials, I would

like to see new officials be able to gain experience somehow from these games. We are not just developing players.

Very disappointed with where ringette Alberta is going. Have been involved for 13 years now and sad that these new rules are killing our association.

Some smaller associations may struggle with formats based on enrolment from year to year. An action plan should be discussed with nearby clubs to alleviate any issues if encountered.

I agree with half ice at step 1 - these children are beginning to learn the game and learn skating skills. If a child has enough skill to be placed on a step 3 team, they have likely already had the benefits of playing half ice and they are ready for full ice games. My suggestion would be this: step 1 half ice, step 2 half ice for half the season, full ice for the last half, and step 3 full ice all year. For those children moving from half ice game to U12 - where there is full ice, shot clock, pass over 2 lines, bigger net etc - there are so many changes all at once, it would be difficult. I also see a problem with children that have been playing on full ice and asking them to play half ice next year. As a small association, I fear we will lose players if we have to ask them to do this. They don't want to play half ice once they have played full ice.

I hope for all the best to the decision makers to find a common ground and create the foundation for all athletes to be engaged in. When I speak of All Athletes I mean at all levels. If the focus stays with the athletes that are not Top level players may leave the sport or go to another association and vice versa. It's the 80-20 rule. I believe there is a way to give all athletes the opportunity and to take care all athletes in the 80-20. Take what is going on in minor hockey. I believe they swung the pendulum to far to the 80 and left the 20 out to dry. Let's avoid decisions that create divide and create options/opportunity for all.

The half ice was great for u10 step one. The girls learned a lot. However they don't have much more to learn without turning up the surface. They need to learn to fly and can't in such a small surface. I also fear that we will see issues with step 3 if there isn't a transition to full ice in step 2.

Step1 seemed to have more difficulties this season on half ice learning the crease and passing over the line plus they got no exposure to 3 in the zone. I hope that ringette listens closely to what players and parents want and we do not end up having half ice at step3. It seems like it would make sense to have different game formats at each step- active start cross ice. Step1half ice. Step2- start season on half ice and transition to full ice with coach on the ice (my preference would be full season on full ice with coach on the ice) step3-remains as is. U12 remain as is. We have already gone through the change to steps (from age divisions) and I think we will lose players at this age if we go to only half ice game play for u10.

Thank you for asking for our feedback! We love ringette. We love the team building and sportsmanship we have seen develop in our daughter. We love the parents and the ringette community. We love seeing the older players play and the pride and passion they have for their ringette team and North West association. Our daughter's physical fitness and physical literacy is very important to us. Ringette develops these for her. I want this sport to continue to be challenging for her and I fear a 3rd year on half ice will not be challenging enough. Moving to full ice for U10 Step 2 and 3 is what I would like to see happen. If she needs another year of development, she will show that in the fall evaluations and will spend another year in Step 1. However, if her skills are strong enough I believe moving on to Step 2 (or even 3) at full ice is what she will be ready for. Again, thanks for asking for our opinions and thoughts on this matter.

Its unfortunate but you can clearly see confusion in the association and a grasping at straws to identify how to moderate limited ice times & funding with the quantity of players interested. You can take this survey and shove it up your ass as you are failing your athletes and parents and ruining what should be a wonderful experience.

would only recommend Step 2 as half year for half ice then Step 3 as full ice. I also coach u12 and it is already hard enough for the kids making the transition to U12 with faster game play, more technical skills required, shot clock etc. our step 2 team saw first hand the delay of step one players when they affiliated with our team. they were so lost as to correct full ice positional play, unaware of ringette line and 3 players in each offensive and defensive zone. at a minimum
- players should absolutely have these basic ringette knowledge going into u12.

I believe 1/2 ice for active start and Step 1 is beneficial for players learning how to skate and basic ringette skills. I truly believe Step 2 and Step 3 need to keep full ice to develop the players properly for the jump to U12, I also think on some levels 1/2 ice will slow the

development of the players with a better skating and ringette skill level. I also think it will be more difficult on the coaching end to try and teach the game on 1/2 ice. Not to mention the other issues created by sharing dressing rooms and condensed ice times.

Focus needs to be on better coaching skills and expectation. Not half Ice to save money. We're are very upset and do not agree with this change to half I've at this skill level

I really like the idea of half ice for step 1 and step 2. And next year with step 2 half ice it might change my mind for step 3 as well but at this point step 3 is ready for full ice. Thank you for taking the time to ask our opinions

Concerned that some players will be going down to half ice after 3-4 years on full ice seems not progressive

It's a great game. We love it.

I believe 1/2 ice practices and games for step 1 and below does benefit the knowledge and skill of the players, however above this level should be transitioned to full ice to allow additional skills and systems of the full game to be taught.

If you are just learning how to play ringette, than fine keep Step 1 half ice. However for Step 2 and 3 keep it full ice, especially for the girls that are last year in U10, its already a big transition to U12 with the shot clock and bigger nets.

Players that want to play are going to play... Players that become disinterested will leave..

changing the sport beyond U10 Step 1 to cater to the players who are disengaged will not save this sport. If anything it will discourage players who have earned the opportunity to progress. Tell me what the reward to making Step 3 is if it's the same compressed space? Also please publish the research you've used to make these decisions - this would help with buy-in! Thanks and I do hope we can all move forward constructively with the athletes LT development in mind.

With the foreseeable change that step 2 will be half ice games as well, my opinion is that all of these changes should have occurred this season as it would have been less disruptive to U10 ringette and players would not have been pushed up in this transition year to levels that they quite frankly are not ready for. While it would have been a major change, long term it would have made more sense and players and coaches would have been much better off

It would be nice to have more of an idea of ice time in advance. This year we ended up with practices that were very similar time on 2 days of the week. These were the only 2 days she had something else scheduled. Had I even known at the start of the season maybe I could have moved something - such as her piano lessons. It makes it hard to do anything else. 4pm ice times are also so hard and I was surprised to see so many for step 3. My daughter doesn't even get off the bus until 3:55pm (we are the latest school out in SP). Thank you for all your thoughts and organizing of children in sport and also for asking for feedback.

I'm actually one of the few people that is very much in support of the half ice for U10 especially for step 1 And 2. U10step3 should consider at least after Christmas as full ice so the jump to U12 isn't as Drastic as it's going to be. They will jump to full ice, shot clocks, passing over the blue lines all at once. A bit much

My daughter played active start last year, full ice games, to half ice yet I paid way more money. These kids are going to be confused going to full ice. Half ice should be half price. Do I get reimbursed for some of the money I paid this year. I've played for 35yrs and still play. This year was ridiculous. Her ringette is 200+ more than mine.

Having watch AS and step 1 use the smaller ice I was impressed with how many touches they got and how fast the play moved.

Price for u10 Step 1 shouldn't be the same as step 2/3 when we get half ice and less practices and games

Please do not make any other level beside step 1 half ice, there are girls who might not be able to make step 3 but would be taking a giant step backwards if they were to have to play half ice. If absolutely necessary, please decide on some type of phasing in/grandfather rule to ensure girls are not having to go from full ice back to half ice. Thank you for your hard work.

Keep it the way it is. My daughter started at age 4 on full ice.

Please be careful how quickly you move to half ice. Some of the girls will have played four or five years on full ice and because they are in U10 for two more years will have to go to half ice for their last season for U10. I am being told by a number of parents they will pull their player to do hockey if that happens. It is not fair to play full ice for five years then play half ice. I would suggest making step 2 half ice next year but waiting another year before making step three half ice. Let those kids transition up to U12 before making them step backwards onto half ice. Also I believe step three should be half a season on half ice and half on full ice. That way the players have time to prepare for U12. Going into U12 and not knowing how to play on full ice and have to play with a shot clock would be a large leap in play. There should be some sort of transition.

Please allow strong skaters to progress. I just feel it would be a shame to hold kids back that are excelling

I appreciate the 1/2 ice for my U10Step 1 daughter. She learned a lot and was able to catch up to the better players on her team. The cost coupled with a difficult ice time (before 5) make me unsure if she should play another season. I would also like to see dedicated ice times outside of practice for skating skills.

I think all u10 should be full ice.

Half ice for step 1 only. Or create U8 division that is half ice and u10 is full ice

I think that all the early morning ice times has been hard on my child...perhaps consider varying the ice times a bit more. 2 early morning ice times almost every weekend was difficult

I believe U10 should be full ice ringette, all the benefits you suggest you get from half ice you get from full because in ringette you play in smaller areas already in the offensive zone and defensive zone with the three in

If the main game is played full ice, kids should practice and play full ice at all levels. But that's what I think without any evidence or research to back up my thoughts.

Based off of the progression of skills in our active start 2 and even active start 1 groups, keeping them limited to half ice for 3-4 more years would be detrimental to their development. While I believe they will still benefit in step one to hone their close quarter skills, it will hold them back beyond that. they will not have the ability to learn proper offensive and defensive responsibilities, their creativity with open space will be limited, and understanding proper rules will be delayed as they cannot properly be fully enforced on the smaller ice. On another note, the differences would likely be accentuated for any ringette players who join their hockey counterparts in camps or at "academy" schools. This could have a negative impact on both the view of the sport being equal in quality and competition, as well as enrolment as families have to choose between the sports. Keeping the development curve similar would help to bridge that gap and alleviate those concerns.

Childrens ringette should be for U10 only. I know most other associations ignore it in U12.

Spruce Grove followed it and it and you can slowly see how this will start to impact our teams in U14 as we start to weaken. My suggestion is to keep it to U10

I agree and see the benefit of U10-1 and even U10-2 as half-ice games. U10-3 needs to be full ice to progress, develop and prepare them for U12 (big nets, shot clock, faster pace, etc.) Teams that play half-ice games (and even cross ice) need to be able to affiliate between them for easy access to players. Too many young families cannot commit so easily to games and being there - and you need small teams to accomodate dressing rooms etc. If they can affiliate between each other without issue (more than 1 or two!), that would be beneficial. Let Active Start players affiliate to U10 (step1) as well - so exciting for them and a great experience.

1/2 ice in Step 2 and 3 will be a travesty to the sport. Playing both Saturday and Sunday of each week is annoying parents and players. NW teams never playing NW teams is strange. It makes for a lot of unnecessary travelling across the city (sometimes in rush hour)

I believe that U10 Step 2 should be full ice.

Ringette 'code' indicated that players would play in their skill group rather than age group - generally, I think this is a great model. However, in moving from CottonTail/Bunny/Novice/Petite etc., to age indicated levels (U-10, U-12 etc.), the opposite is indicated. It is more difficult to move kids up or down, or to possibly level a team in the proper skill division (U12A, U12B, U12C etc.), when age is indicated. I strongly feel that highly skilled/strong boys should not be playing ringette past the level of U10. My own son played ringette for 3 years, and I think that is great. But already by Active Start 2, too often boys begin to dominate. We have boys in our own

organization playing to U12, and sometimes U14. They have been MUCH MUCH better than the average, and usually better than every girl on the team by a wide margin. This takes away from the development of the girls as they will defer to the stronger/better/dominant boy. Yes this can sometimes happen with a dominant girl, but it is much less likely to happen. And moving a dominant girl up an age group is an easier fit maturity-wise than is moving up a young (more immature) but dominant boy. I truly feel that boys who play hockey and then also play ringette in a dominant manner should not be playing ringette. Primary concern is for the development of the girls, secondary concern is for the boys - they are generally not well received by opposing team fans, coaches, etc. - when they are dominant. And I can understand that. This does not excuse ill-treatment of the boy, nor opposing fans, coaches etc. - but it is a situation that is caused by the current allowance. I have coached at the Active Start through U14 levels. I have 3 girls in ringette, and my son also played. I have been involved with ringette for 6 years. I have won with boys on the team who were dominant - and it was uncomfortable. I have also coached dominant boys where our team was moved from B to A, when only the boys were good enough for that level (they were probably AA of the next age group), and the rest of the team was B, or C. This is not good for development. Are boys and girls different? Absolutely. Thanks for all you do.

Children's Ringette needs to be communicated and decided on more in advance of the start of the 2020-2021 season. It was logistically a nightmare for many associations (ours included) and we will be losing families this year because of it. It's not because of the 1/2 ice piece; it's because all of these changes were not communicated and problems solved in advance of the start of the season, which left many scrambling.

I think half ice is good for active start and step1 but not entirely realistic for step 2. You may have kids going from half ice step 2 next year to U12 full ice which will be a huge adjustment to learn rules of full ice passing, etc and changing lines on the fly from the pace which they came from in half ice.

Ringette is a game based on lines, I understand half ice for active start, but after that point it should be a full ice game

I enjoy the half ice format for Step 1. I think it was a great addition. I understand the research behind the small ice so it makes sense to me. As for Step 2 I think they may be ready to start using the open ice, but there should almost be a tryout between step 1 and step 2 to determine the players skating ability.

My daughter will be playing her third year of U-10 next year, and in our association we would not have a step 3 option. Instead of her (in her fourth year) moving to half ice in step 2, I would rather request her play up at the U-12 level.

I think a couple games against the U10 step 2 may help them to grow as well just during the last couple months of the season to give the girls an idea of what is to come.

I think we can see the benefits of half ice at a Step 1 level. I believe the kids touch the ring more, they figure out positioning in front of the net, teaches passing in tight spaces. I believe the kids are ready for full ice at Step 2 as my 7 years experience of coaching active start, step 1 and step 2. The kids that are not can spend more time at half ice and work on their skating skills, passing, shooting, etc.

as noted throughout my survey; my daughter has played all of this year (U10 step 2) and the majority of her first yr of ringette (AS) on full ice; though there may be benefits to half ice I would really find it a step back for her if she is placed in U10 step 2 and moves to half ice

I am a big supporter of half ice for step 1. My daughter played full ice last year and we kept her in half ice by choice. I do not regret this decision, however I do not see any benefit to keeping any of our kids on half ice going forward. Their engagement has dropped in the game and there is no consistency across ringette alberta. Coaches are taking it upon themselves to play the game differently and this is frustrating for the kids and coaches especially with young teams. I feel that all of our kids are successful and have developed this year, but myself and my husband who is head coach, do not feel that the year has been a success. My recommendation is not to push forward with the half ice to step 2 until the step 1 program can work out its issues and be a successful program. There is a lot of frustration with the program that is not related to coaching that unfortunately have parents considering leaving ringette and step 2 half ice will solidify that decision. If step 2 goes half ice, I will register my child in step 3, I will not participate in half ice again, nor will it be recommended to any of our kids who return.

Children's ringette was good this year. This is the first year my daughter has played any team sports. She enjoyed herself and will be continuing next season. I consider that a win in my books

Our local Association really dropped the ball on the transition this season. Decision makers for this age group should be individuals who are experiencing this change first hand, not those who have children playing at higher levels. It's one thing to say it's ok, but to experience it was another and it was incredibly disappointing. Unfortunately, Ringette may lose players with the lack of preparation and understanding of the change.

My opinion is please dont change step 2 and step 3. My daughter played 2 years of active start which was half ice and the cost was low. She got to learn how to skate better and learn the basics. When she moved up to u10 step 1 we paid the full \$600 and was not informed that it would be glorified active start which upset alot of parents. There are 8 kids from the team that aren't playing ringette next season just due to the misinformation and full charges. Luckily I love the game i played for beaumont for 11 years and my daughter loves the game regardless. Dont change the rest of u10 to half ice. They need to learn the game.

This is my daughters second year in active start. Her older daughter has played 3yrs and is now in U12. My active start daughter couldn't wait to play and loved her first year last season. They played full ice for the entire second half of the year. This year with the cross ice games has been a struggle to get her to go all year and now she has completely lost interest and motivation to play. I feel the cross ice play has caused her loss of enjoyment as she is bored because she can basically skate around and score at will. There are no refs and no score boards. She will be ready for U10 step 2 next year and I am concerned that if the half ice is implemented in step 2 next season she will again not enjoy it and/or want to quit. If it also moves to step 3 that would mean 5 years of cross ice/half ice seasons before she got full ice in U12. I know she would not continue in ringette if that was the case and I could not blame her. That would be very frustrating and disappointing for us as she has shown a natural ability and enjoyment for the game.

I have two girls in U10 step 1 but hte survey only accepted one. My other player was born in 2012 and this is her second year after one year of active start.

Ringette is the ultimate TEAM sport. It is unlike hockey or soccer or anything of the like because you actually need the whole team to get from one end of the ice to the other. I've coached hockey and ringette. The ringette teams bond quickly and maintain friendships because they need each other to play the game and there is more of a connection between the players. I fear that the congested dressing rooms/sharing of the bench will take that fantastic social experience away from the players. I understand the logic of the smaller ice surface and I do think that active start and U10 Step 1 should be competing on a smaller ice surface. I think there is a conversation to be had regarding Step 2...maybe start the year at half ice and progress to full ice mid-season. I don't think Step 3 should ever drop to a smaller surface. Kids at the Step 3 level have the skills and game sense to play full ice. The Step 3 kids will be the future A players in U12 and that needs to be considered. U12 should NEVER change to a smaller ice surface. If kids are just starting to play ringette at the U12 level, there should be some kind of development program to guide them along.

As noted above. Split into a U8 group for 1/2 ice and skill development. U10 for full ice and learning the game. 95% of the athletes I have coached have had no issues learning the game on full ice and many are excelling at higher levels.

I would agree to active start and even step 1 until Christmas playing half ice. By the time most are in step 2 they have played 3 years and fully understand the gameplay of ringette. I believe if our daughters were forced into half ice beyond step 1 it may have deterred us from wanting to participate.

I think this survey was terrible. First, if you are asking the coaches for the number of ice times for practices and games them I think there is as problem. Shouldn't the associations be providing this input up to ringette Alberta? And shouldn't ringette Alberta be seeing the guidelines for the number of practices and games that should be happening in a season? As an example u10 step 1 and active start shouldn't have as many ice times as the older groups. Why not set a guideline for the number of practices and games expected. This whole issue around half ice needs to be resolved and I don't think asking a bunch of opinionated parents for their opinions is the way to resolve

it. I would expect the board to consider the two main points. 1. At what age and step should we be doing half ice? 2. How should that be executed with respect to team size (ie total ice and skating time for kids), goalie and scheduling of ice times. This should

also be reflected in the fee structure for the teams doing half ice. 3. How do you manage the transition? It would be expected that no girl has to go from full ice to half ice. If everyone abides by that rule then we all have fair teams. I've heard that the Flex League was not great. I think there is an opportunity to turn it in to a house league instead of something that seems more like a rec or free skate with little or no guidance from a coach.

Half-ice games are fine for Step 1, but no further. Once the kids reach Step 2, they're more than capable of getting up and down the full-ice to be part of the play, getting as much time with the ring (or not) as their personality and disposition affords them. Even in half-ice games, there are kids who spend their time doing twirls or looking in the stands, but that's what Step 1 is for. Step 2 and 3 need to be focused on preparing kids for real ringette on full-ice. By Step 2, they have enough strength and speed to play on the full-ice, and going to half-ice in Step 2 will only stunt their development. We have already seen cases where half-ice Step 1 kids affiliated with full-ice Step 2 teams and it was a failure because they don't understand the full ice or the rules of ringette (only 3 in the zone). Step 2 and above needs to remain actual ringette on the full-ice. Half-ice games in U10 just delays the kids from growing up and learning what the sport actually is, so please do not push half-ice past Step 1.

I think cross ice has been great for kids new to the game in step 1. I think a transition to full ice while still in U10 would be ideal so the players have some experience before making the jump to U12

I think ringette on full-ice worked very well for games, as our team participated in dozens of practices which were half-ice. As long as there is sufficient practice I would not support half-ice ringette.

I think a lot of the changes being made are about costs and ice time availability which I get. I really don't see how half ice improves skills a large amount for the older U10's (ie 8 to 10).

I think that there are benefits to half ice - however I feel that U10S 3 should be full ice in order to prepare the girls with the skill and understanding of playing on a full-ice surface along with the introduction of shot clock.

Please carefully review the team placement decisions when holding back a single child from a team. This made for a difficult year when all her teammates moved up to Step 2 and she did not. She was penalized for poorer skill level (regardless of her year's of experience) and then provided reduced ice time and half ice skill, which will prevent her development from catching back up with the rest of her teammates.

Having and coaching a child in U10 Step #1 with half ice games has been OK. I am not looking forward to another season of half ice in Step #2. Time to play/ coach real ringette.

Small space and half ice play can be accomplished by increasing practice to game ratios. Ringette is the fastest game on ice for a reason. Children need both ring touches (which doesn't happen if you are only on the ice every third shift), but also as they play in step 2 and 3 they learn to have ice vision and having a little more time and space allows for enough brain processing time to be creative. Its very concerning how different the programming is between Alberta and Ontario. Alberta seems to be in a rush to implement and change U10 Ringette instead of making small refinements that may have more impact without making the Ringette community angry. My daughters will not be affected but Ringette had a great reputation compared to a lot of other sports, but in the past season I have never heard so much animosity. Keep step 2 and 3 full ice and make sure the associations are supported to have enough practice ice compared to games to develop small space game play.

I think U10 Step 2 needs to stay full ice. Step 1 is good for promoting skill development in small spaces. Step 2 is the transition between those skills learned in Step 1 and the larger ice and speed of play of Step 3. To move Step 2 to half ice would make it the same as Step 1 and I suspect players and parents would lose interest in the sport.

This season was unbelievably disappointing. Scheduling was horrific, evals were a complete joke, and half-ice play for U10 is actually doing more harm than good as the players are actually developing bad habits.

Like I mentioned before. I feel that 99% of the kids on my U10 Step 1 team are ready for full ice, and were actually becoming bored and complaining about half ice games. If you are trying to grow the wonderful sport of ringette you need to make U10 Step 2 full ice, or they will start losing interest and just transition over to hockey. My daughters have already told me they do

not want to play ringette next year if it is half ice, they will switch over to hockey with their other friends. Please don't make the mistake of going half ice for U10 Step 2.

A transition to 1/2 ice step to will result in a loss of step 2 players, our daughter will not be playing step 2 in our home association we will be required to get a release & move to another association. I feel the changes are not necessary & going to hurt small associations that struggle to keep enough numbers for teams.

At the step 2 level, switch to full ice after Christmas in order to prepare the kids for either step 3 or u12.

I believe u10 step 2 should be full ice - by then the girls are ready for it, even if they haven't played before because they are older and learn quickly. I do not agree with the decision to change them to half ice. Thank you.

My daughter plays full ice now and will most likely play half ice next year. She is not happy about it and feels like it's a step down. It's not very encouraging to feel like they are moving backwards.

All in all had a good year and will be returning next year

The majority of girls only need 2 years of half ice (Active Start and Step 1). Most of the issues stated here are based on coaching decisions too concerned with winning. Competition and doing their best should be the focus, and we say that they are, but when you watch the games, coaches adjust the rules to be a 'winning team', at the cost of developing players. (shortening benches, goalies with too large of equipment). We also need buy in from parents and coaches, or none of this will work. They will just move on to Hockey. Glad this survey was released.

Although I see the benefits being described with 1/2 ice play in terms of speed of play and active time with the ring I worry that my child would see going from full ice down to 1/2 ice as a demotion and possibly want to quit ringette

It would be hard and probably confusing to move the kids that have already been playing full ice down to 1/2 ice. It would be better to implement it in a way that only include new participants and those already playing on half ice.

I think one thing that needs to be shared with all coaches is that having kids standing around, especially at a young age, is not conducive to those kids being engaged. Many times this year our daughter's coach would spend 2 to 3 minutes explaining a drill, then have the kids doing 10 to 15 minutes of stationary drill learning (e.g. cross overs over your stick, standing at the boards and pushing off with your hands, etc) There are skills that you can teach, while keeping the kids mobile and engaged, and that should be a focal point of each practice.

We were really disappointed that U10- step 3 Players were being placed on teams based on age and friends rather than skill. After spending 4 years In ringette i was hoping to start emphasizing on skill rather than friends. The beauty of sport is the ability to make new friends from team to team and year to year. I understand for step 1 and possibly 2, you want the kids to have fun and be comfortable with friends. Step 3 you need to prep them for U12. If you can't tell I was disappointed that after 4 years of playing the range of skill level of our step 3 team was extreme. It's not fair to the girls when you have 1/2 the team far better then the bottom half. If in U-12 they place a higher priority on keeping kids with friends and same pier group as before rather than based on child's skill level, I will pull my girls from ringette and put them into hockey. I really want to start challenging my girls and think they deserve it after leaning the sport for 4 + years.

I believe that if evaluations are doing their job at the beginning of the year, players will be placed appropriately on teams. Active start is learning to skate, step 1 should be half ice to develop skating further and passing, step 2 should be full ice with a coach on the ice for the season to progress the game and help with kids learning the blue lines and rules, step 3 should be full ice with small nets, penalties and plays being incorporated in order to progress to U12 where they learn more rules, big nets, shot clock....it's a game of progression and each level is built to move a child up to the next level of play. Maybe look at the evaluation process to place a child on a team at U10 at the beginning of the season or have children play 4 years in children's ringette before moving up to U12 (would have to make a change at the levels ex. U11, U13, U15, U17...) Personally, Gracie has played every U10 step and has developed very well to play full ice.

I think half ice is fine for U10S1. For U10S2 I think they are ready for full ice, especially

because there are a number of 9 year olds who play at that level and are moving up to U12 the following year. For U10S3, they should be playing full ice, half ice would be a mistake.

I commented earlier on

I think it has great benefits for skaters who are not as confident to be able to join the game as they are able to keep up to the play better. It also has allowed our players to master some skills in a smaller environment.

This is my daughter's second year of Active Start, last year she played full ice. I like the crossice format and I think she has enjoyed the season more than last year. My concern is how the children will develop to full-ice play. Ringette has a lot of rules which can only be practiced on full-ice. If the players are not experiencing full-ice games then I worry the transition may take a long time.

Dibs is inconvenient as all heck

I feel that a U8 division may benefit the game. Maturity of the players at the step 3 level especially ex. how they think the game, etc.

Each team needs their own change room if you stay with half ice and parents need to be eliminated due to space which means making coaches and one locker room parent only allowed. To not have full ice until U12 seems crazy as the girls don't learn the positioning and rules around full ice ringette. My daughter is in her third year of ringette and did not develop this year. I with half ice on a step 1 real with new skaters.

Active start 2 had enough players to make 2 teams. This makes it challenging for practicing and games. We had enough coaches. When we went to tournaments we ended up having to split our team up and play themselves

Skating is the biggest skill that needs to be developed for our kids to transition to a higher level. After half the season on half ice I think the majority of the kids were ready to move to full ice. I saw my child's skating skills become stagnant by the end of the season because she wasn't challenged

I don't think kids that have already played full ice ringette should have to go down to half ice. I don't see how it would benefit them or improve their skills.

I am not in support of half ice above U10 step 1; i have coached for three years and watched the progression of our players; they are very capable of using the entire ice and would be limited by such a change; in fact i believe their development would go backwards

I am also an official and the inconsistency in reffing at this level is frustrating to watch. We need much stronger guidelines for our officials during these games. I've seen everything from the ref standing in front of the net, to refs not calling Cross-checks to the head. There is confusion about live play and having to reset the ring at a starting point every 90 seconds. Also, because we have not been doing live play in our league, 90 seconds is not long enough for play. Sometimes the ref will wait for doors on the benches to be closed before starting play and players only have 50 seconds of time before the buzzer goes again. It is not enough time to even get the play flowing.

Although I support half ice in active start I do no in u10. Most girls who have played 2 years are ready to play full ice.

Keep it how it is. The kids learn so much more with full ice and having real games with real rules and refs. It is much more exciting and engaging for the kids playing this way.

I believe that U10 Step 2 should remain as full ice. Otherwise, to have them jump up to full ice for the first time for Step 3 would essentially "water down" the skills and competitiveness there currently is. It would also make it that much harder for kids moving from U10 Step 3 up to U12 to be able to make the A or B team first year out, as they're at the disadvantage of only playing full ice for one year, and their skills and full ice game understanding would be lacking. And what would happen to the kids that stay in U10 Step 2 until they have to move up to U12? Their first time playing full ice would be at evaluations? And there again you are watering down your C teams with kids learning full ice for the first year. I can appreciate having half-ice for Step 1 for those that are still learning. But by bumping up a Step, you are agreeing that these kids have enough knowledge and skating ability to take on full ice game play. Otherwise some kids may never end up on a competitive team in U10 that would perhaps of made it by having the Step 2 year be full ice to learn the game play and increase skating and ring ability.

Many more merits for half ice rather than cross ice. Shifting needs stop time in Active Start. We spend most of a shift getting kids out the gate and into position.

See my last comment

I think it was an odd season. The teams didn't seem to be on par with other areas. The difference between players on teams was huge. And not great for development when some players can hardly skate/ stop and others are quite proficient. The coaches spend time teaching some to skate while others are bored. That said I think the research may be sound in smaller ice surfaces but kids should not have to move to half ice that are already used to full ice. There should also be some penalties for when some kids are always missing games/ practices. Not uncommon for our daughters team to have 8 or 9 skaters. Also when some parents don't do the required fundraising, it doesn't seem fair.

From my experience coaching and interacting with children and parents most children I have seen that have played 2 or more seasons demonstrate skills needed to move to more ice space. I think at u10 step 1 some kids are able to and ready for more space. Most kids at u1" step 2 are ready for whole ice.

By step 2, there should be no buzzer indicating shift changes and ringette should be full ice. Many girls finish their u10 careers at step 2 - how is less time playing full ice going to prepare them for u12? I've heard step 2 will be moving to half ice - I hope that's just a rumour....

In season 1 of AS start ringette, my daughter played cross ice, half ice and the full ice game. In her second year, she only got to play the cross ice game. I think this is a tremendous disservice to the girls and the game. The girls in the cross ice game make their one pass (which is usually a hand off like pass) and then skate around the control the ring until they get a shot. Not at all what we are trying to teach. I think there needs to be some progression and some opportunities for the AS teams to play a half ice game. In U10, I think the full ice game is way better than the half ice game and offers the girls a more complete offering of the game. I think that the step 1's could start with half ice and then graduate to full ice by the mid point of the season.

If changes are made to next season, I would expect a change to follow in registration fees. It's not fair to have families pay the same fee when we would be playing half ice. And the step 2 played full ice this year. Even better, compensate me for having to pay this year's full registration fee when I shouldn't have had to!

Step 2 and absolutely Step 3 needs to be full ice. It has been a frustrating year. For the future of half ice, shifts need to be 2 minutes. Smaller teams would allow more playing time for 3 vs.3. Teams should not be larger than 10 players max. Players ready to go to Step 3 from Step 1 should be given the opportunity for the 2020-21 season without politics involved in the decision making. Some children went from Active Start to Step 2 because their parents were good coaches, when the child was clearly a Step 1 player. This is not fair.

Our players missed out on the tourney experience. It would be nice to see more options out there that did not include less than 3 games and requiring parents to

take a Friday off or kids to miss a day of school. I would be great to have more support regarding games and drills for AS.

Would've liked to have seen more direction in relation to who can play where when there are no teams available for your aged child. Not letting a child play who wants to is unacceptable. Make sure all associations have knowledge of what to do in unique situations or who to call to find out.

If you want to grow the sport stop trying to be other sports. These consultations seem to come after decisions have already been made. I would suggest in person consultations. If the consultation is with local associations prior to decisions being made, I would be interested to know how many board members have children who recently played at the U10 level and not U14/16/19AA.

This year the girls really enjoyed the full ice games - they were a treat (U 10n step one). they picked up on both rules quickly - maybe have a portion of U 10 step 2 full ice and the rest half ice - a mix

The start of the season was very unorganized. It seemed as no one knew what was going on for shift changes, period times, Gamesheets etc. I was not a coach or mgr and neither of them knew either. I emailed asking about Gamesheets, where to get them and what to do with hem after. I received and email from 2 board members asking the president for clarification. The president never replied to either of my emails so I stopped using the Gamesheets. With minor

hockey we have a coach/mgr meeting every season and they provide a coach/mgr handbook with the majority of information needed for team set up. This would be useful to have for ringette.

Many parents on our team are switching to hockey just based on price versus ice time. We had angry parents this year over only having 10 games. Some kids did benefit from the half ice, others were limited and bored. Encouraging passing was challenging as without goal makers being limited to only 3 goals, some players dominated. And there was no motivation to pass to other players even though the coaches would be strongly encouraging this during the game. Consistent officiating was lacking. Many times had to explain rules to them as they didn't understand how to call the game. Please call penalties, don't need penalty minutes but need to be educated !! Trying to teach them to play correctly (tripping/slashing) without consequence enforces bad habits. Obviously some will get missed but there is a reluctance to call any. Playing teams in step one that have kids that will be in U12 next year will have a huge learning curve, just based on their size they could dominate our small players but with an older child playing in that division they may suffer from a lack of confidence or enthusiasm just based on their knowledge and abilities compared to their future competitors who have played on full ice. I truly feel bad for them. I think half ice for step 1 is a good idea, but not for the next two levels. Having had one daughter enter into the game from the old system and one

daughter now in this proposed new system, my vote would be no to half ice in Step 2 and Step 3 but a yes in Step 1.

This year worked well and I do like the transition from step 1 to step 2 for 1/2 ice to full ice. If a player has not seen full ice before U12 I believe we are doing them a disservice. Leaving U10 step 3 as full ice will offer the kids that have a more developed ability somewhere to continue to develop rather than have them board or stagnant for a season.

I understand the reasoning and some of the benefits for smaller ice surface games. I could agree with half ice for the first half of the season for U10S2 but I strongly disagree half ice for U10S3. Our household has had many discussions about this with 2 athletes in our family, one in U10S2 and the other in U10S3. If Children's Ringette had been rolled out with only changing AS to half ice this 19/20 season, a lot of issues would have been avoided. To give you an example of how our family will be directly affected, our 2012 Step 2 player will move to Step 3 in the 20/21 season but will stay in Step 3 for a second season in 21/22. If Children's ringette changes Step 3 to half ice in 21/22 then our youngest will have played 3 years full ice and then have to play half ice for her 4th season in ringette. We are not the only family that will be directly affected in this manner. How is this helping further development for these athletes? They will be bored and confused by these changes and how will this set them up for success in U12? May I pose this question for your consideration, How many registrations are you willing to forego to force your children's ringette philosophies on our families?

Largely happy with the changes this year

It sounds like they have already made a decision as far switching all U10 to half ice eventually, but I do hope they reconsider. I have seen so many players over the years thrive/grow/develop while playing full ice. The smaller ice may provide certain benefits, but I think as they progress to stage 2/3 they can thrive on the full ice.

It would be unfortunate if kids who played full ice step 2 this year had to play 1/2 ice step two next year

Step 1 can remain half ice and focus on skill development. Step 2 needs to be full ice so players can develop their speed and skating skills. Also start focusing on the rules of the game and move on to more technical plays.

My suggestion would be to have the first half of the season as half ice and then transition into full ice at the step 2 level. Step 3 i would not recommend. Often step 1 players have a returning year to learn the full ice game. At step 2 there are usually some players that will be in their final year of u10 and could benefit from learning full ice so that they can do proper changes on the fly and transition down the ice to be able to keep flow in a u12 game with a shot clock. It will also make it extremely difficult to affiliate any of these players to higher levels because they dont seem to be able to pick up the concept of the game at half ice as well as on full ice and therefore will likely not be confident in playing a full ice game.

Half ice should be left to 8 and under. Most u10-3 teams are 9 year olds. They have developed skills to play full ice. Half ice is a great tool. I font have the answer. With my 2 girls i have been involved in stage 3 for 4 years in a row now be hard to see them go to half ice. Could work.

If this half ice proposal goes through, then all association fees should be half the price.

I coach kids hockey, soccer, and ringette and have witnessed first hand all three sports' attempts at scaling the game down for developing players. I started the year quite neutral on the half-ice/full-ice discussion and felt that easing players into the sport is generally a positive thing. However, having coached my daughter (a 7-year old who unexpectedly made the Step 2 team after one year of Active Start) this year and seeing her progression, not to mention the progression of the rest of my players that were all 1 or 2 years older, my feelings are much more considered. There are a few factors that limit the transferability of the studies done for hockey to Ringette. 1) U10 includes 3 years' worth of players. Novice hockey is only 2 years. The oldest Ringette players can't be compared to Novice players and have outgrown the research subjects 2) the ice surface is already naturally made smaller by virtue of the rules. Unless you are a center, you are only really utilizing 3/4 of the ice. 3) turnovers in ringette happen more rarely. This may be viewed as an argument in favor of a smaller playing surface, but I see it more opportunities to move while in control of the play, vs. spending more time chasing broken plays like in hockey. As such, while I generally agree with scaling down the game, the nuance of Ringette doesn't compare as neatly with hockey or soccer. I should note that at the beginning of the season, I would have argued that most of my players would have benefitted from playing half-ice, but by the mid-way point, they had all picked up their pace to the point that half-ice would have been extremely boring to them. We would play half-ice in practices sometimes, and it was great for 15 minutes, but I don't think it would sustain interest for the duration of a whole game. Ultimately, if players start at half ice and keep playing half-ice, then I guess they don't know what they are missing, but my experience this year is that most 8-year-olds and ALL 9-year-olds have outgrown half ice. Even the ones who had never played before. My observations are limited mostly to my team and I think Edmonton Ringette would agree that they graduated too many players to Step 2 this season, which made things difficult for some players and also diluted the teams that were otherwise all built to be equal based on UAA scores. It's maybe on the associations to do a better job of identifying which players should play at each level, but there's still room for full ice at this age group. All this said, my biggest concern is if/when this change takes place, how the transition will be handled. In hockey, there was a transition year by which all second-year novice players played full ice while first years played half ice, so that no one had to take a step back. The jumbled nature of having one "age group" with different rules at each step level has made things difficult for "tweener" players. ie. My daughter (and arguably, most of my team who went directly from Active Start to Step 2) would benefit from another season of Step 2, assuming that the same rules as this year were still in place. Graduating to Step 3 will keep this group of players as the "weaker half" for another season, but keeping them in Step 2 would be a massive step backward in their development if they have to go to half ice. If/when this change takes place, there needs to be a transition year of Step 2.5 or 3B or something that collects players that fit these criteria. Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

I found the whole experience of setting up the rink and splitting our team into two, having enough players and coaches to run each bench chaotic. I found the dressing rooms claustrophobic. There were times where our girls didn't have a seat on the bench because it was so crowded with players and parents. I found trying to teach the girls position play such as defense and offense difficult with only 3 players. Some of these girls were used to full ice and were great skaters. It's almost like they regressed in the small ice surface.

Make it so bench moms do not have to do any other volunteer positions unless they want to.

Regarding half ice, I think it is a good idea and would have benefited my daughter. However she started with full ice and I do not want to see her go back to half ice. She still has two years left in U10 and I don't think it would be good to her or any other players who have played full ice to go back to half ice. Additionally I don't think those girls should be pushed up to u12. One suggestion I have is to create a 4th step (U10-4) that is full ice for the 2021-2022 season so these players don't have to go back to half ice or up to u12. I realize there wouldn't be as many teams in this new step for the one year it is created however I think it would benefit the players already used to full ice.

This survey will not be easily understood but many ringette parents new to the sport. I would anticipate a low involvement of parents who are not familiar with the sport, or who cannot read at a university level, English is a second language. The descriptions are not in layman's terms, and are quite confusing with limited background information.

I will be switching my daughter to hockey if full ice is in U 10 step 3 for her, one more year 1/2 ice is all I'm willing to do. Longer shifts for sure are needed

Step 1 half ice I can see as beneficial for first year players only. However, Skating did not improve as did our U12 daughters did in step 1. Her development was more noticeable over her first year with skating, game sense, and rules. With half ice they don't know much about the blue line, penalties. Referees don't guide them in what not to do. They are bodies on the ice. How do they understand positioning when not on full ice? When given the chance to play full ice during practices the girls are so excited and do great. They are forced to skate faster too.

If you are going to move Step 2 to half ice I really believe that you need to have some form of progression from Step 1 (ie. 4 on 4 with on 3 allowed below the ringette line). The kids need to feel like they actually moved up a step (1 to 2) and teach them more of the game. Parents want to see that they continue to progress the kids as well

I'll say it for the 5th time. Bring back u8. There is too big of a difference for 6 and 9 year old to play on the same team. Size wise, maturity wise, ability to learn the game. I feel like I've said before it would be a logical transition to go half ice at U8 to full ice at u10 and within each age group there could be a step 1 and 2 or some sort of tiering involved. It would make the transition a lot easier to u12. As it stands we have kids playing step 2 that entirely skip step 3 before u12 and with the changes going to step 2 next year we are going to have 7 year olds playing step 3 not because they are ready but because they want to avoid half ice. If there was U8 AMD u10 then everyone would play half ice then full ice before go to big nets and shot clocks. I feel like the kids that have a higher level of skill than their peers are going to have their development hindered by staying in u10. We found that stage 2 was a lot weaker this season because there were kids that should have been step 1 but got bumped to avoid half ice and now the development was reduced. For instance there was a kid last year on our team that would have had similar skill level than a lot of the kids that went to stage 3 this year but because she didn't evaluate well she ended back on the stage 2 team. Her development actually went down. Kids that are playing stage 3 this year but have another year WILL NOT DEVELOP next year because of these changes. Maybe kids that are starting out this year and progress through the half ice games are fine but there is a group that will be negatively affected that are caught in this aftermath of this transition period.

Grandfather the athletes who play full ice. Introducing 1/2 ice when all they've ever played is full ice is unfair and burdensome.

I would like clarification on how evaluations are done. It seems some Step 3 kids shouldn't be there and some who skip step 1 altogether and go directly to Step 2 are lost for the first 1/2 of the year because they are just learning positioning and the rules of ringette. There should be more opportunities to learn the game rules in Active Start. I think dividing ages into U8 and U10 create more competition and equal play. Hockey does that with initiation and novice and it seems to work well.

I think cross ice ok for step 1. However I really feel the change room is a significant factor that affects family participation and team building and bonding. This is significant. By step 2 athletes should start to experience full ice so they are ready for step 3. By step 3 these athletes are really good and the full ice really displays their skating skills. The jump to U12 is large and adding full ice could be too much. Switch to full ice at step 2 so kids are ready for full ice in step 3 and then even more ready for U12.

Would like to see a natural progression U6 cross ice, U8 half ice, U10 full ice and U12 the introduction of the shot clock. If keeping with the U10 half ice transition need to determine what to do with new kids in sport (age 8/9 with no previous skating or game experience) and how to support these kids who come into the sport late. Also if U10 fully becomes half ice (including step 3) will need to move shot clock to U14.

Long year playing half ice with 17 players and early icetimes every day of every weekend.

I'm not sure how you think making the game half ice is going to benefit the kids. When they hit u12, they will be so shocked with all of the differences that they will have to relearn the game. You are going from half ice, where the ringette line is actually the passing line, there are only three kids, and positioning doesn't matter to full ice (conditioning to this alone will be a big step, and half ice practices are creating it so teams can't even practice the game properly), to the passing lines actually being the blue line (and not one but two lines to pass over), 30 second shot clock, the ringette line where only three players can be in at a time, actual positioning, and pushing the ring out of an actual large circle (one that takes up almost a 1/4 of the half ice) when starting the ring or change of possession. This is the biggest mistake alberta can make and will eventually kill the game. You are already seeing deteriorating numbers in the sport. Hockey doesn't need a come try it event.... I have a daughter who played step one this year, if

this transition keeps on continuing I know I'll be pulling her to play hockey, as will many other parents who I know. Hockey is an easier game to transition to full ice. I'm not going to invest my money and time into a sport that my child has played 5 years in, and once she hits u12 it's like she's playing a brand new sport. This makes my blood boil.

I support half ice at U10 step 1. I do not support half ice in U10 step 2 or step 3. I believe the first year playing ringette, half ice is beneficial but the kids seem bored at this point so I'm hearing a lot of kids may not come back for a second year if it's half ice in step 2 next year. Step 2 and 3 are preparing for U12. How can they all of a sudden start doing changing on the fly and shot clocks and skating fast on full ice coming right from half ice? If my daughter is playing in step 2 next year and it changes to half ice, she has already told me that she won't be playing ringette. She has played half ice once before and has heard about it from her 7 and 8 year old friends currently playing half ice in step 1. Please reconsider half ice for U10 Step 2 and 3.

If half ice goes ahead, make it down the length of the ice vs the Width. Plus reduce the fees when it goes to Half ice. My boys play half ice In hockey And I Love it. Because they never pass In hockey. Half ice for ringette width wise loses the passing Across the blue line aspect of the game.

I am in support of half ice for step 1 and possibly even step 2 but think a transition is needed before kids move to U12. As an Association we do get kids who start at the U12 level and are either not able to skate or by parents request are put on a step 2 team. I'm concerned if all of U10 is half ice it would be harder for older kids to join the sport because they are beyond the half ice level but are not comfortable playing at the U12 level. Where would you recommend these kids go?

The Active Start & Step 1 development is good on 1/2 ice. When you get to Step 2 and with 7-9 year olds the kids are mentally able to understand more concepts and strategy and understand the overall game. Especially if the child has played 1/2 ice for 2 or 3 years already. By the time they have the skill level to play Step 3, there is no doubt they are ready for full ice and all the rules and strategy that makes ringette such a great game. It is already such a large jump from Step 3 to U12 that there needs to be time at both step 2 & 3 to prepare for the game. I especially think changing to 1/2 ice for Step 2 in the 2020/21 is a big mistake. There are kids that have played full ice for 4 seasons that are better suited because of skill to be in step 2 than step 3, but if it changes to 1/2 ice will regress next season as opposed to advance. I think if step 2 changes to 1/2 ice many kids will be placed in step 3 that really aren't there yet and it will create a huge imbalance in step 3. Especially with smaller associations.

My biggest issue is the girls who have played full ice at U10 stage 2 this season, should be able to continue to play full ice. If it moves to half ice at stage 2 U10 for next year, what will happen to those kids who are used to full ice?! They should be able to continue to play at the level they have been!

I think it's really important for Step 3 to remain full ice. I've spoken to many families who feel that it would be detrimental to their child's development and transition to U12 if they did not have at least one year playing full ice prior to moving up to U12

I think switching to half ice for step 3 would be a huge mistake. Children who are good skaters get bored and registrations will decrease.

Step 3 needs to remain more advanced than step 2. Players still need to demonstrate the skills required not just move up because step 2 is half ice now. Some kids will never make step 3 and that needs to be ok

I am not in support of my child going to half Ice after already playing 2 seasons of full ice.

My child has played full ice hockey and ringette for the last 5 years. As a result she learned the rules of the game early, developed great skating and game sense, and is ready to transition to U12. Moving back to half ice would be a huge detriment to her game play. I also believe it's a detriment to not keep Step 2 and 3 as full ice. Athletes need time to learn a full ice game and rules before moving to U12 with shot clocks and big nets. Don't throw all of that change at them in 1 year. I also notice that the half ice players who are now moving up through steps to full ice are having a harder time understanding the rules and having the stamina of a full ice game, than those athletes in previous years who played lower steps at full ice. Also, as a manager and as a tournament coordinator over the years, I can tell you that the concept of half ice being focused on fun and development doesn't always resonate with the players. Our athletes and

other teams athletes are born competitors, and they keep score regardless. Half ice tournaments are extremely hard to organize with moving of dividers, many players in the dressing rooms, and trying to get double the amount of teams to fill the ice. This is a deterrent to associations to host tournaments or attend tournaments, which leads to less development and team bonding for players. It also leads to less fundraising for associations. Lastly, I worry about the overall development of ringette as a sport because of the push to move to half ice. We are going to lose athletes to hockey which starts full ice at the age of 9. We are going to develop less goalies as half ice doesn't support proper goalie development or use of gear, and goalie development seems to be a problem for pretty much every association out there. Many parents are frustrated with the lack of competition at younger ages in sports with the push to no score, participation medal type play. I'd like to see ringette grow as it's one of the only female dominated team sports there is. Please don't water it down.

Some of our girls in a small association will go step one and two. Never progressing from step two in U10. Having a great time playing the game. Then they move to U12, which then for the first time play full ice, 30second shot clock and big nets. They will be lost. Also affiliating becomes a huge problem, especially in a small association

Left comments throughout sorry I'm not more help but these questions are way out there for me

I can't imagine U10s playing on half ice. I fully support it for younger ages, but limiting the U10s to half ice would hinder their potential to develop skills necessary for future progression

I think that the U10 girls that have been playing full ice for the past 3 years and still have another season of U10 it will be detrimental to their skill development to make them go to half ice from full ice. For the new kids joining U10 half ice will have benefits in skill development.

My suggestion would be to put a maximum amount of goals that one player can score to allow opportunities to develop passing skills among team mates.

Regarding half ice my opinion is that the kids dont have the space to develop some keys skills because the lack of room.

Take out half ice option for u-10. Don't fix what isn't broken.

Overall I think its a wonderful game as it instills many quality values in the girls and I would encourage all girls to try it.

Not linked to the topic on the survey...This is my first year with a child in ringette. I've been involved in many other associations and sports. I've been very impressed with the local and provincial care and involvement in ensuring the development of these young ringette athletes. Keep up the good work and the communication. Regardless of outcome/action I appreciate how thorough the process is.

There is overwhelming frustration with the idea of changing to half ice above step 1. Coaches and players are beyond frustrated. They are not playing ringette or learning the game properly, over crowded dangerous dressing rooms, fees are the same as full ice, dangerous line changes with half ice, kids racing out to uncontrolled ring and smashing into each other. Step 2 & 3 girls have definite skills and do well on full ice, The sport will suffer with is change

Major overcrowding in dressing rooms and on the ice. With multiple teams in one dressing room you've lost the team camaraderie, my kid still doesn't know her teammates and season is almost over

I am upset that the 2011 age group will partly be playing half ice and partly be playing full ice. It creates a huge divide for moving up to u12. Either all the step 2s from last year need to be moved up to u10 step 3 or u 12. It would not be fair for them to go from half ice then tryout against kids who have played full ice the following year. I think perhaps like hockey all 2011 need to either stay on full ice or go to half ice next year

We were really unsure how this season would go. However we were surprised at how well it went especially having a bunch of newer kids on the team. They were able to engage in play and have a really positive experience and really gain some new skills and game experience.

The kids like the half ice as they are learning. And the skills have really developed. I don't see a need for full ice in Step 1 or 2. It's much more enjoyable to watch the kids on half ice compare to when my son played Timbits and Novice hockey on full ice.

It is a great sport, would be shame to lose players to hockey as we transition to new format. I

have not heard any problems/complaints about play format from parents of child who played half ice as new players but I have had discussion with parents who are anxious for returning players who may have to play half ice.

Don't go 1/2 ice for S2

After a full year of step 1 doing half ice I hear they enjoy it - but I am not sure how well they will transition to full ice when our step 2 team is still getting comfortable with transitions at half ice and for affiliate programs how will a full ice team call on a half ice recruit who will or know the cut overs. More to my personal point - my daughter has been play one on full ice for 4 years ... if she has to go to half ice she will lose the skill she has already learned and my become even more board and less active - the transitions that have ennn competed I recommend you let them ride for another season and see how transition goes for those girls to full ice and if they can keep up or get discouraged

Our daughter has played Ringette since she was 4 years old (she is now 9). We definitely support cross ice for Active Start then half ice for Step 1. Also, a possible option for half ice for half the year for step 2, however, definitely not for a full year and 100% NOT for Step3. Furthermore, there needs to be a very clear expectation that associations follow the rule that girls should not be held back because of their young age if they have the skills and understanding to play at a higher level.

I strongly believe any of the kids that have played full ice for 1 or more years should not have to be put into a half ice situation as this may cause many different challenges and confusions as to what they have already spent many hours being coached and learning for full ice game play and rules.

Ringette is a fast skating sport, u10 step 2 should remain full ice because the girls will not gain speed with only half ice.

If a child has already played full ice in 2019-20 she should be playing full ice next season. However if a child has already played active start or u10 for 2 years and their skating skills are fundamentally sound they should have the opportunity to play full ice as well.

I'm happy my daughters were able to play full ice before this was implemented. Because if you have a child go from half ice in step 1 and progress to full ice, rules, refs, in step 3 the learning curve is huge!

Additional thoughts: Step 1 as 1/2 ice Step 2 starts as 1/2 ice and transitions to full ice half way through the season Step 3 should NEVER Be 1/2 ice - this would be WAY to much of a jump When going up to U12

If my daughter were to have to play half ice next year instead of full ice like the last 2 years, I would pull her out of ringette entirely

I think that half ice is great and kids should progress through step 1,2,3 in order. Friends matter at this stage. By Christmas the abilities are more or less equalized.

I did have a concern with the ice times. I understand tournaments but 4pm ice times were extremely often this season. For working parents and kids that have school until 3:45pm these practices and games were not often attended. That definitely needs to be better assessed by Nicole.

U10 Step 2 and Step 3 belongs on full ice. It is a natural progression from Step 1 being on half ice. After one season of Step 1 half ice most girls over 8 have learned all they can and need to progress to full ice to continue growing and learning

U10 step 2 should not be half ice...it would be a great dis service to our children's development. The weaker child strive to keep up with their friends and the more developed show the others new skills.

I have few concerns about step 2 being half ice next year. My girl has been playing and learning for the last 4 years and playing full ice 2 years. What if she stay step 2 and need to learn a different way to play the game because everything change. These girls make progress and then we would see them regress because that's

what's the association wants? I do t know. I have lots of concern. Playing half ice for same price ? What's the point. PleaSe maybe give answer

My biggest concerns are the lack of direction provided to the associations and more importantly the team staff. Ringette ALBERTA should have a mandatory coaching module for any coaches coaching in half ice or cross ice situations

If half ice is going to stay in U10 step 1 that is fine. But we have girls from 2012 who have played on a full ice surface for 3 seasons now and will absolutely not develop as they should if they are held back on half ice. Again that may make weaker step 3 teams which isn't the answer because there girls on my current step 2 team who aren't ready for step 3 yet. I have watched step 1 games and feel that the development is slower than what I have seen in the past and struggle to see how it is beneficial for the game of ringette. I have watched the videos and have also been through this with my son in hockey and still after 2 seasons, don't hear many parents say they love the half ice implementation for hockey either. I grew up playing ringette and love the game and love coaching the girls. I see problems with the age limits in U10 - with 7 year olds not playing step 3 and 9 year olds not playing below step 2. That has resulted in step 2 being a real mix of skill and age. If you ask a 9 year old to play step 2 on a half ice surface and then move to U12 - the player has a huge learning curve to climb. She will be learning positions, 3 in rule, shot clock, and big nets. I can't imagine how hard that will be for them. But a new player to ringette who can't skate shouldn't be put in step 3 where those girls have earned their way and many are in their 5th year of ringette. If the objection of ringette Canada is to only have a one step progression and not have players jump past more than one level then that will be successful. The AS players will only make step 1. Step 1 will only make step 2. And many step 2 players will progress to step 3. With the half ice restrictions I see limited progression until U12.

Don't have players that have played full ice for two years revert back to 1/2 ice.

I understand there are benefits to half ice but I think there are benefits to full ice play and don't think kids will be ready for u12 if they don't play full ice for step 1 and step 2. It may be good for the weaker kids but the stronger kids with older siblings will get bored of the half ice and will want to play on full ice like their siblings.

Keep up the great work

Please don't ruin ringette like they have so willingly done to hockey. I can't help but see this as merely an economic solution because the player development reasoning is a lie and the studies are done by people who peddle the product, not the parents and fans. Nothing is perfect but the proposed changes will only make the game worse rather than better as it has done in the half ice hockey model. My daughter loves the full ice game btw and in ringette the entire team gets quality ring time which I don't see happening in the half ice version similar to how only a few get quality puck time in half ice hockey. My son is stuck with half ice hockey and is a weaker player, he may smack the puck from time to time but it's taken by a superior player rather quickly. In full ice if he played his position he may touch the puck less, but the quality of the puck time would be far superior, especially if he played his position well and unlike half ice he would be able to reach his top speed and experience high speed action like the big boys, something that half can't provide.

Active Start 1/2 ice Step 1- 1/2 ice until Christmas then full ice after. Step 2- Full ice because they have developed skating skills and 1/2 ice would be a hindrance to developing their power skating skills. Step 3- these are often very good players. Again, 1/2 ice would not be beneficial in transitioning their power skating. The other concern if the Children's ringette chose 1/2 ice for U10, the transition to U12 would be very difficult and discouraging. I feel that the association needs to take into account the power skating development of the players and give them a platform to continue to have the space to grow. 1/2 ice play leads to a lot of players on the ice, overall crowded surfaces and does not address the rules of play for the game that will be in play for U12. My daughter the last 2 years developed very well and understands the game fully as she advances to U12 for next year.

Love half ice at AS and S1, where previously I was absolutely against it. Would love to see S2 at half ice for half the season, then full ice for the remainder. Then S3 would be full ice. This concept would be somewhat consistent with hockey. If hockey is full ice at Atom and we're still half ice, we'll lose players.

I feel moving to half ice past U10 step 1 would be detrimental to the game play and development of the athletes

Some of the fundamental aspects of the game of Ringette like passing over blue lines and zones really get lost with playing half ice

I feel like this survey was designed to produce an outcome that supports half ice for step 1, and step 2. And this decision is only supported by opinion and a study done for hockey players, not Ringette.

Step 3 should remain full ice moving forward. Step 2 should be half ice, if that is the direction being considered.

I feel u10 step one should remain half ice but step 2 and 3 should stay full ice

One and one half shifts are too short. By the time the shift is changed and play starts again, 30 seconds of the shift is often lost and play can't develop in the last minute. 2 minute shifts seemed to work best when teams agreed to this and Ringette Alberta kept their nose out.

Missing value related to learning full ice rules - maybe do half season at half ice and half at full ice. Kids gain benefits of some skill, but also have to pass less, have to skate less, no centre ice free pass. Kids will have to go from U10 to U12 without having played full ice, no penalties, non Ringette zone play and the introduction to shot clock. Having had a kid start at full ice and one start at half ice, my opinion is there are value added skills not learned in half ice games.

I agree with half ice at step 1 and 2 Step 3... the kids are too big Skating fast and keeping the game fast paced is important This is what sets ringette aside from hockey You can skate fast and remain in control of the ring And due to the team sport nature, you must utilize your teammates

I support half/cross ice for active start and step 1, but not for all of U10. I can see the benefits and understand that ringette Alberta is following the research. However, I feel that implementing these things so rapidly is not really giving us a chance to see if it actually works. If active start and step 1 were more for development and step 2 and especially 3 move more to a full ice game with rules and strategy, u10 could have the best of both worlds. It is frustrating to have to potentially go "backwards" after spending YEARS teaching the same group of girls how to play the game on full ice and develop their skills. Additionally, ringette Alberta only recently put in the 'step' program, and we haven't really seen the benefits or drawbacks to that yet as players move up. Stop making so many sweeping and drastic changes before giving them a chance to really be evaluated in the sense of LTAD.

Step 3 should be full ice.

My child loved the 1/2 format and it suited her size and experience. Being new to the sport and a somewhat weak skater, she would rarely have touched the ring had it been a full ice format, which would have frustrated and discouraged her. U10 step 3 should be full ice, step 2 should still be half ice

I believe Step 1 half ice has been great for my new player. However, I have great concern for half ice in Step 2. As she will be 9 next year, and her last year in U10, to jump right into full ice U12 is not fair. They will have no introduction to the rules. There are several girls, like my own daughter, who while new, have improved so much and are quite athletic would have a legitimate chance of playing on a B team in u12. I also believe that some u10 Step 2 girls are way too fast and big to play half ice. It is a definite determining factor in my youngest returning next year. Like I have previously stated, Step 1, half ice is great. Another suggestion would be an entry level half ice, maybe a portion of the season for new players at any age.

All associations should have proper goals

My concern is that how is my daughter going to progress to U12 following next year if she goes from full ice this year to possibly 1/2 ice next year. Seems like a step back to me. I hope that will be taken into consideration. I think all girls should get to play full ice in u10 the year before going to U12 to prepare them.

For the kids who played active start for 2 years, moving to half ice has hurt their skating. As they moved to half ice the girls will be very behind once they hit U12 (if it continues to step 3) as they will learn to pass over the blue line, passing from the circles, and only 3 players in. My daughter has asked numerous times to change over to hockey this year. I worry that we will lose girls to hockey because of these changes. When you compare the fees to play ringette to hockey, it is cheaper to play hockey for the same age. Even though we are now getting half of the ice, our fees did not go down.

Having now coached and experienced S1, S2, and S3 levels, I fully supported the concept of half ice for S1 from a sport technical perspective. I voiced concerns in regards to the

implementation plan from the start and these concerns weren't addressed. There are impacts on smaller associations that will directly result in less engagement from players/families who may be on the cusp of moving to full ice but due to registrations numbers are limited to half ice. I do not support S2 and S3 moving to half ice in any year both because of the size and skill of some of the players (who may have already played 4-5 years) but also because of the issues this causes for smaller associations where it is highly likely to have players moving to u12 without having played full ice, without having played 5v5. Other PSOs have looked at u8 and u10 levels, where u8 is half ice and u10 is full ice. This is something that I would support.

Haha. I think I did this in my last section. Sorry for my rambling

I do not think step 2 should have half ice games but fully support a full season of half ice games at step 1. In step 1, I think teams should switch ends at half time and the shift change should be every 2min.

My daughter loves playing ringette. She is 8 years old and is currently in U10-2. She has taken power skating lessons and started with Active Start Ringette, then U10-1 and now U10-2. Her power skating combined with three years of ringette has allowed her to improve her skating immensely. She has an excellent understanding of the game, positions and rules. I worry that if she were to move to half-ice, that she would feel like it is a step backward (after playing on full ice for two years). I can understand the potential for starting off with new players at half ice, but I do not agree with moving children from full to half ice. I am concerned that she would no longer have the same love for ringette that she has now.

I think that they will reduce the number of new girls playing in the 8-9 year old category as they do not recognize the cognitive differences in children at each age level. Having one approach for all kids at all age levels up to U10 doesn't work. Not learning ringette rules at 8 or 9 doesn't work. A better idea is to start a U8 level to address these issues.

I think there should be U8 and U10 divisions. I think there is too big of an age gap between 6 and 9 years old and it makes it hard to create even teams.

I really hope that the format stays the same next year as this year. Step 1 half ice and step 2 and 3 full ice. The dressing rooms are a disaster to having to share with another team and I know our girls that are 6-8 are very uncomfortable in these. I also hope step 2 is full ice as I can't imagine any of the girls on step 1 improving with another year of half ice. Without being bored and just not being pushed to improve in passing, stopping, speed, and planning ahead in game plays.

I think sometimes when you guys make these changes you don't think about how it effect the smaller communities. If you are to make step 2 half ice you are really taking away from the sport. These kids at age 8/9 are way above playing half ice. I truly believe if you move half ice to step 2 you will loose a huge amount of players. I think people don't give these children enough credit that they are more then capable of learning and growing on full ice. My child will be 4th year u10 next year. If she had to play half ice she would be devastated and would leave the sport. She also would know that her favourite sport was taken away due to YOUR choices not hers. PLEASE don't ruin this sport. We need ringette to stand out above other sports not to conform to what everyone else is doing.

Children Ringette beyond the Step 1 level is destroying the sport. Registration numbers are dropping everywhere. 9 year old girls (and yes they can be this age at Step 1 or 2) are large and can not safely play the sport on half ice. Refs are underdeveloped having to learn reffing at u12. Goalies are underdeveloped. And players are underdeveloped as they learn no proper rules before they are thrown to u12 with shot clocks/ large nets and real rules. We are losing the sport of Ringette here

Half ice is great for step 1 and active start but I don't think that step 2 would benefit or even step 3 how do you expect to teach them the game before the hit u12 where there's a shot clock. When you have players that are bigger and understand the game there isn't the challenge to teach them new skills to take forward such as free play passes , drop passes and 3 in the zone switch working with your team. As a coach of u10s2 the girls have picked up some great skills this year that I don't think they would have half ice as they all skate well and can handle the ring. I think this could really affect the sport badly going to half ice in step 2 and step 3.

Step 3 to stay full ice otherwise to much of a change from step 3 to U12

My daughter was able to practise and play full ice games occasionally during step 1. Her team played much better - there was more room to skate, more room to spread out, gave them a

chance to work on passing as well

Teams need to be tired. Half ice is not favorable for backward skating practice in game situations. Game play and game sense, passing (lines), goalie creases are altered and squews the way a player sees the game. By step3, most players are fully aware of how the game is played, have good game sense and are proficient skaters or excellent skaters. The game is a fast paced game and limiting 9 and 10 year olds

to play slower and in a confined space is ridiculous. My daughter said to us, if I had to play half ice, I would quit.

Just really consider age during the transition phase. Having Step 1 moving to U12 is absurd. I saw positives for the very young ones, older ones it was not challenging and they could not grow with 1/2 ice.

Although I will no longer be with u10. I feel so strongly that step 3 should never be half ice. These girls are getting so strong and they need the development before moving to u12.

If there is half ice again, DO NOT CHARGE THE FAMILIES THE SAME PRICE AS THOSE KIDS PLAYING FULL ICE. This year was a complete disappointment and bullshit that the organization COULD NOT REFUND the difference back to the parents whose kids were only playing half ice. That is complete disorganization by the organization. If this happens again this organization WILL LOOSE a lot of players. There is absolutely no reason why they could not have refunded the difference if they have proper bookkeeping. If they don't have proper bookkeeping, then it's time to change out the DIRECTORS to MORE COMPETENT people. It's simple math!!

my girls have enjoyed it. It was overwhelming as a parent coming in at u10 and u12 level but it evened out. I wish my youngest wouldn't have played full ice until at least January as I think if she's known how to stop she wouldn't have e got a concussion in full ice full speed collision. I liked playing just red deer area for her u10 level though the talent wasn't at the same level. maybe adding Beaumont would help add diversity of play.

I would be very disappointed if my child went backwards to half ice since all she has known is full ice.

Ringette is a great sport, but my main concern is going to half ice.

My only concern is whether my daughter, who has played 3 years of full ice ringette, and may not make step 3 would lose interest in the sport going to half ice. We have considered switching to hockey as she would be Atom and full ice. She loves ringette so this would be a shame, I feel some of the team atmosphere and bonding is lost in half ice and she enjoys being on a close knit team. We have experienced half ice hockey with my older son. I understand some of the benefits, but hope it wouldn't be disheartening for kids who have played full ice for years to feel like they are taking a step backwards.

I found the ref's were a little too lenient(let my kids get away with too much) and so they aren't learning a few essential rules to progress. Also a lot of my kids have already outgrown half ice play. I feel step 3 should be on full ice especially since u12 has even more rules to learn (shot clock) and the kids should know rules such as only 3 in the zone before they reach this age.

I don't have another daughter coming up so this will not affect me in future, however my daughter played AS, S1 then jumped to S3 for the last two years. I cannot imagine how different her skill set would be if she had played half ice step 1. She would not have been ready for that jump which was so important and enhanced her development. I honestly feel it does a disservice to the game to make it half ice. You cannot get a feel for the true game of ringette without the proper lines and space. My daughters step 1 team came so far in that one season and it was exciting and very good for their development. The S3 games these last few years are SO FUN. They are intense, great passing, amazing skaters - I believe if that is their first year playing full ice it's not like it is now. I understand the benefits of small area games for hockey, but with the drastically different rules of ringette it compromises the game too much. Finally - the dressing room is such an amazing and important part of the team. The thought of those girls missing out on that experience as team bonding having to share a dressing room is heartbreaking! I worry you will lose way more girls to ringette half ice than full ice.

I don't agree or support the move to make U10 play exclusively on small ice surfaces. I think we are underestimating the potential the players/girls have.

Having one child having played her entire U-10 on full ice and another moving to step 1 half ice next year, I can certainly see the benefits of half ice. However I believe that kids still need to be

on the ice twice a week if possible. I also have concerns about moving 8 year olds who have played step 2 full ice this year back to half ice if they are not ready for step 3 next year

It should be full ice for all u10 games

Grandfather kids so they do not get looped into half ice after playing full ice

Don't move to half ice -

I am hugely disappointed in Ringette's decision to go half ice for U10S2 Small associations like Pembina will never have the opportunity to have a U10S3 team and thus be disadvantaged going into and competing in U12 and realistically going forward altogether. Sincerely disappointed, Rhonda McConaghy

Full ice for step 1- or first half of the season as half ice until they learn the rules and positions in practice and allow them to change to full ice. But most importantly changing the shift times. 90secs is far to short. They can handle more. Keeping score- the girls all do it anyways they are aware of they win or lose so let them see the score.

Half ice is dependents on the skating ability of the child U10/2 most are skating & half ice would hold child development up

I don't think half ice has any benefit unless the child doesn't know how to play or skate.

Good changes with smaller ice. Think active start is better on half than cross ice as closer to full ice and can start to teach lines etc

Children who have already been playing full ice in U10 should be grandfathered into full ice teams (Step 3) next year if skills are adequate for that level.

Girls age 9 at higher levels (U10S3) are definitely ready for full ice

I grew up playing ringette. It was incredibly frustrating watching my daughter play half ice this year as they are not getting the full experience of playing the game. I think there needs to be a divide in age groups. Active start, u8, u10 etc...like in every other sport. You're allowing 6 year olds to go out and okay against 9 year olds. I had 1 daughter already quit and my daughter who plays now will be playing hockey. This transition was completely disorganized not only by ringette Alberta but also by the associations. I think this is going to cause a lot of girls to drop out and it's sad because it's a great game.

We are new to ringette but I definitely see the benefits of half ice and would support half ice in step 2 and 3. Dressing room congestion and rinks without bumpers are the major issues that I have seen this year.

I highly support having multiple ice times on one day to reduce the amount of travel. We are often traveling 4 hours round trip for a 1 hour ice time. This is expensive and very time consuming.

We have been extremely pleased with our daughter's ringette experience to date. The Active Start coaching this year has been outstanding and we feel she is fully prepared to move to U10 in the fall.

Make sure half ice play is long ways on ice so they play with lines and rules from the start

As a parent of a u10 player that it's her first year playing ringette but could skate well prior to starting I couldn't imagine her playing half ice.. she would not enjoy it at all but for u6 I totally agree with half ice!

I would like full ice as it is better play and teaches them more skills

So disappointed with the implementation this year - it was terrible South Calgary did not seek appropriate input as it's run by parents of older kids who don't care about the changes. They shouldn't have big teams this year but didn't listen. Bow view needs to get over their ego and accept the changes and I think all the associations should work together in Calgary to make it better - we are leaving and going to hockey because of above

Eliminate Friday during school day Tournament games. All Tournament should start after 4 pm on Friday

The largest concern with the change of game format has always been, what is the plan for player development to get ready for full ice. There has been ZERO guidance on what to do next

or how to approach coaching for small ice surface. To make this a good experience for player development, there needs to be support for coach development.

What would you tell a player that has only played full ice, but is getting bumped back to half ice. Oh don't worry it will make some you better.

Red deers U10 step 2 teams were stomped on in tournament play, the teams outside of Red Deer have full ice practices and in some cases 2 plus more ice times a week. It's very disheartening to have young women who want to play the game get beat the way they were by teams outside of Red Deer.

I believe Step 2 and 3 should be playing full ice
