

**South Region Soccer League L5/L6 Mini
Annual General Meeting
Mississauga Convention Centre
Sunday January 11th, 2009
Minutes**

Meeting called to order at 9:10 am.

Jean-Claude Cadieux welcomed everyone.

1. Roll Call: Taken by the Secretary, Camilla McDonald.

Club Members Present:

Bolton S.C
Brampton East S.C
Brams Utd S.C
Caledon S.C
Clarkson S.C
Dixie S.C
Erin Mills S.C
Georgetown S.C
Mississauga S.C
Mississauga Croatia S.C
North Mississauga S.C
Norval Croatia S.C
Oakville S.C

Absent:

Brampton S.C
Burlington S.C

Total Votes: 69 votes out of 85

2. Jean-Claude Cadieux, President of SRSL, welcomed the membership and introduced the Guests and Head Table.

Executive Members Present: Jean-Claude Cadieux, Pino Jazbec, Paul Gesse, Camilla McDonald, Chris Wilson, John Miljan, Zoltan Jakab, Alex Russo, and Shirley Russo

Executive Members Absent: Brenda Wilson

Guests:

PHSA: William Hay

3. Minutes of previous AGM: - January 19th, 2008

Motion: North Miss S.C
Seconded by: Brampton East S.C
Questions: None
Carried

4. President's Report:

Motion: Oakville S.C
Seconded by: Dixie S.C
Questions: None
Carried

5. Treasurer & Auditor Report

Motion: Mississauga S.C
Seconded by: Clarkson S.C
Questions: None
Carried

6. 2008 League Results

Motion: Bolton S.C
Seconded by: Miss. Croatia S.C
Questions: None
Carried

7. Proposed Budget for 2009

Motion: Caledon S.C
Seconded by: Brampton East S.C
Questions:

Jean – Oakville S.C stated that last year the league operated with expenses of \$22000 for 82 teams however for 2009 the league is projecting a budget of \$37000 for 80 teams. What is the explanation of increased expenses?

Jean-Claude Cadieux – The league has proposed some expenses that were not charged to the Mini league in previous year. For example: \$4000 for Office Rental, \$1000 for Telephone and increased Wages. The league has decided to divide expenses by total number of teams in each league to come up with a percentage that the individual league will be responsible for. In previous year the Mini league was carried by the SRSL U11 to U18 divisions and the league feels this should be rectified.

Jean – Oakville S.C pointed out that the league has a surplus of \$13000 from last year. What are the plans from the league in using this money?

Jean-Claude Cadieux – stated the league has no formal plans at this stage. The mini league in my opinion is too volatile at this point. The league needs money in the bank to operate from year to year.

Alice – Georgetown S.C – asked if the surplus funds for the L5/L6 kept separate from the SRSL's other funds?

Jean-Claude Cadieux – stated yes, the league has a separate bank account for the Mini League which is why we also have a separate Audited Financial Statement.

8. Other Business

Alice – Georgetown S.C – stated that last season we had a major issue with scheduling of referees. We had about 10 games at the start of the season that didn't happen because a referee didn't show up. I realize it was fixed but just want to make sure that it doesn't occur again this year.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – The league did fix the issue and it will not happen again this season.

Ed – Brams Utd – stated we had 2 under 10 teams, A & B and this year we also have a training team. If we register with the SRSL how will this team be placed.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – stated in previous season teams were placed based on a random draw for each division. We will have this discussion under New Business later in the meeting.

Michael – Mississauga Croatia S.C – Thank-you. You are doing a decent job up there and we appreciate it. With all due respect I would like to place a rhetorical question. Is the SRSL concerned with player development or is the SRSL concerned with competitive soccer. The reason I ask that is at the U10 level teams are now being pit against each other when they should be concentrating on development so they can place for divisional placements. In the past years at the U11 the choices' were picked out of a hat which is acceptable however this year it was different teams are going from 7v7 to 11v11, fields are bigger it is a completely different game. I would like to motion that we remain with U11 – L4 being chosen out of a hat. In 2008 we received a letter with 3 weeks left in the season stating teams will be placed based on standings of 2008. I understand the league was required to put something in writing however I would suggest concentration to be on skills and allow the children to make mistakes, allow coaches the choices to make those mistakes and not penalizing them by having to get another goal in the net to finish higher in the standings.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – stated we cannot accept your motion. This is an issue from the OSA down to the districts that there is now L5 league in NSA, HDSA, & PHSA. That is the pyramid of play in order to arrive at division for the U11.

Michael – Mississauga Croatia S.C – Is it not my understanding that the SRSL met with the PHSA to ask if they could do it in this manner? Or was it recommended by the PHSA.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – stated when the league met with the PHSA it was a meeting to allow us to operate the mini divisions. We cannot change the mandate. The South Region League Management Committee which is comprised of the 3 district approves the promotion formula.

Brampton S.C arrived at 9:30AM

Total Votes: 75 votes out of 85

Jean – Oakville S.C – concerned from a few clubs that player development should be at the core. We had a number of discussions this year specifically with Coach & Technical directors and I would hope that the SRSL actually seizes the opportunity to engage the clubs and technical directions and resources that are there and the expertise that is there to look at how we can enhance player development through the league. I don't believe a league is strictly a schedule, getting referees, organizing fields and giving out trophies. It has to be much more than that. I think we have an

opportunity to do that and strongly encourage the SRS� to engage the technical directors in the different clubs. CSA has adopted a long term player development program and I think the league needs to see how to get fit in that direction. I think the league needs a strategic plan. You are an organization and need to know where it is and where it's going and having a plan would be a key aspect and I would strongly recommend and would like to put a motion forward to the membership that the SRS� engage and starts the process of where the league wants to be in 5 years time. Map out the future for the league.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – This is the same comments you made at the league management meeting that I attended a few months ago where we had all the league in Ontario and I didn't see any league jumping up saying we should be doing that. We all said to you and the rest of the board that was there that the league is here to serve the clubs whatever the clubs want we will do that is what the league function is to do. Having a strategic plan as to where we are going in 5 years and put on paper but at the end of the day the clubs decisions will dictate to us the league and it will change from year to year.

Jean – Oakville S.C – It is not just about the paper. It is about the process, engaging your membership and outline steps and priorities.

Motion seconded by: Georgetown S.C

William Hay – PHSA – Just a point of clarification. The league meeting today is for Mini and it is a district league that you operate so in this case your motion is applying to the district.

Joe – Mississauga S.C – stated I hear all this stuff about Strategic planning about where were going to go with soccer and most of us in this room have been involved in soccer a lot of years. I think the folks that are running this particular league have stepped up to the plate and have done a very good job to get these players on the field playing. It is not their mandate as far as Player Development. Player Development comes from the Club structure. The league is simply providing a venue for them to play. All these motions about strategic plans and so on give the league the opportunity to look at it and at the end of the day if as member clubs we give them a mandate there is a process in doing that. It needs to be embedded in the constitution. We put kids on the field and it is all competitive even at the house league level.

Motion Passed.

Des – Brampton East S.C – The placements of mini teams has previously been done by drawing them out of a hat. I don't think that works for a number of reasons. Player development being number one. Plus you end up with a small club playing against big clubs. Teams that are A teams playing against C teams. The Results are clear and maybe the league can have some consultations with the clubs so we can find an alternative way to place the teams. Make a more balance division. This issue becomes more apparent at U10 level because how they finish determines placement at the U11 Division.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – This is the forum to say what you want and how you want your teams to be placed. This issue has been talked about since before the kick-off meeting this year. I've told all of you we would discuss this today. We are not going to call another meeting to discuss with technical directors.

Bo – Caledon S.C – as a small club we don't have the luxury of multiple age groups and players and it's always a challenge to participate perhaps I need a clarification on

what happens if you in U9 are you already seeded or is it strictly a blind draw. Also, I cannot support a motion if teams are seeded right from the get go.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – We cannot use the standings of U9 to place teams at U10. We are not allowed to do that. L5/L6 OSA doesn't give us that right to do that. U10 to U11 we can use the standings. Up until now that is why teams were drawn randomly from a hat. The league is looking for discussion on what/how we should be placing the teams. The league has received many suggestions: North/South or put all A's together and all the B's together etc but what is an A team and what is a B team? Another option is for the club to tell us the team is A, B or C team. We have also looked at population of each club however it still not quite right. Whenever we decide here today should be considered a 1 year pilot project and then next year come back and discuss and review.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – As far as A, B, C if you want to use Colors that is fine as long as we are able to identify from the application who is A, B, and C.

Ed – Brams Utd stated this is exactly the direction we want we like this option.

Jean – Oakville S.C – I think we need to find a solution and we appreciate the league being open to different solutions and we are not saying one is better as there is always flaws but if we can get a consensus that is what we need for player development. When we have a team playing another one of the teams it means there is no way for moving of players. That means players that are not starters don't get the opportunity of playing time. I think we need a way to move players up and down. It is very important.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – Depending on the number of teams it also possible to have 2 teams from the same club in the same division.

Joe – Erin Mills S.C – We support the idea of the club identifying the teams by A, B, & C and feel it is important to keep it consistent. We also support Oakville suggestion of player movement. Development of players is what we are all there for.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – Player movement up and down? You can move a player up but you cannot move a player down. Players cannot move all around and the league would not support. Current system is available, transfer the player.

Ed – Brams Utd – When doing application like to tell you this is the C team but we can use a color in the team name.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – Yes.

Tony – North Miss S.C – I agree we should have A teams, B teams within divisions I think movement of players up is okay but down? We need to be very careful and it needs to be well structured otherwise there will be a lot of game playing.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – Clubs will need to identify A/B/B team and we will use that as our criteria for 2009 in all age groups. Only issue we will have is if we end up with more than 10 teams that have been identified as an A team. At that stage we would have to randomly pick which teams would be moved to B group.

Des – Brampton East S.C – It is a Pilot Project and this is a good place to start. I'm really pleased that the league has been so receptive and I think it is a good Step forward.

Alice – Georgetown S.C – U8 or U9 standings don't matter so you don't have to play teams the same number of times. I don't think anyone would care.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – The standings don't count but we do count them.

Joe – Mississauga S.C – fully supports this option and wants to know if any recourse if a club who says it's a team but it is in fact B team. Is there any recourse? The onus is on the clubs. Clubs need to genuinely inform the league teams A/B/C and having been around as long as I have unfortunately is not always the case at times. Integrity each and every one of us to make sure when club completes the form truthfully.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – Hopefully Clubs will be truthful. The league will email all clubs a list of all registered teams and the league will give a week to get response if need to move A to B or vice versa.

Paul – Bolton S.C – We would support the more than 8 Team divisions.

Jean-Claude Cadieux – The league will consider this but the max will be a 10 team division.

7. Adjournment: 10:16AM