



Findlay Adult Hockey League Player Rating System Handbook

Prepared by: FAHL Board of Directors
Last updated: September 6, 2026

Table of Contents

Part I – Foundations.....	6
1. Introduction.....	6
1.1. Purpose.....	6
1.2. Vision.....	6
1.3. Objectives.....	6
1.4. Core Principles.....	7
2. Player Rating System.....	8
2.1 Purpose.....	8
2.2 Scope.....	8
2.3 Rating Scale.....	8
2.4 Divisional Rating Ranges.....	8
2.5 Team Rating Caps.....	9
2.6 Goalie Substitution Rating Exception.....	10
2.7 Definitions.....	11
2.8 Relationship Between Ratings, Divisions, and Team Ratings.....	12
2.9 Guiding Philosophy.....	12
3. Governance.....	12
3.1 Purpose.....	12
3.2 Scope.....	13
3.3 Governance Structure.....	13
3.4 The Board.....	13
3.5 Commissioner.....	13
3.6 Associate Commissioner.....	14
3.7 Ratings Coordinator.....	14
3.8 Divisional Rating Teams.....	16
3.9 Decision-Making Authority.....	17
3.10 Multi-Division Players.....	18
3.11 Guiding Principles.....	18
Part II – Rating Operations.....	20
4. Annual Rating Cycle.....	20
4.1 Purpose.....	20
4.2 Scope.....	20
4.3 Annual Workflow.....	20
4.4 Phase 1 – Preseason Planning.....	20
4.5 Phase 2 – Registration and Initial Ratings.....	21
4.6 Phase 3 – Early Season Evaluation.....	21

4.7 Phase 4 – In-Season Administration.....	22
4.8 Phase 5 – End-of-Season Review.....	22
4.9 Summer Season.....	23
4.10 Guiding Principles.....	23
5. Rating Players.....	24
5.1 Purpose.....	24
5.2 Scope.....	24
5.3 General Evaluation Standards.....	24
5.4 Returning Players.....	25
5.5 New Players.....	25
5.6 Substitute Players.....	26
5.7 Mid-Season Rating Adjustments.....	26
5.8 Rating Adjustments.....	26
5.9 Documentation.....	27
5.10 Guiding Principles.....	27
6. Rating Discussions.....	27
6.1 Purpose.....	27
6.2 Scope.....	28
6.3 Preparing for the Meeting.....	28
6.4 Conducting Player Discussions.....	28
6.5 Team Representation.....	29
6.6 Reaching a Decision.....	29
6.7 Informal Discussions.....	30
6.8 Documentation.....	30
6.9 Guiding Principles.....	31
7. Maintaining Consistency.....	31
7.1 Purpose.....	31
7.2 Scope.....	31
7.3 Rate Current Ability.....	31
7.4 Evaluate the Complete Player.....	32
7.5 Statistics Are One Tool.....	32
7.6 Compare Similar Players.....	33
7.7 Avoid Common Sources of Bias.....	33
7.8 Maintain Stability.....	34
7.9 Think Beyond the Individual Player.....	34
7.10 When in Doubt.....	35
7.11 Continuous Improvement.....	35
7.13 Guiding Principles.....	37

Part III - Administration.....	38
8. Player Rating Reviews.....	38
8.1 Purpose.....	38
8.2 Scope.....	38
8.3 Guiding Philosophy.....	38
8.4 Requesting a Player Rating Review.....	38
8.5 Timing of Player Rating Reviews.....	39
8.6 Review Process.....	39
8.7 Frequency of Player Rating Reviews.....	40
8.8 Finality of Rating Decisions.....	40
8.9 Guiding Principles.....	40
9. Documentation and Recordkeeping.....	41
9.1 Purpose.....	41
9.2 Scope.....	41
9.3 Official Records.....	41
9.4 Meeting Records.....	42
9.5 Historical Information.....	42
9.6 Confidentiality.....	43
9.7 Record Accuracy.....	43
9.8 Guiding Principles.....	43
Appendices.....	44
Appendix A – Rating Chart.....	44
A.1 Purpose.....	44
A.2 Using the Rating Chart.....	44
A.3 Rating Chart.....	44
A.4 Notes on Interpretation.....	45
A.5 Maintaining the Rating Chart.....	46
Appendix B – Current Example Players.....	46
B.1 Purpose.....	46
B.2 Using Example Players.....	46
B.4 Maintaining the Example Players List.....	47
B.5 Important Considerations.....	48
Appendix C – Player Evaluation Worksheet.....	48
C.1 Purpose.....	48
C.2 Instructions.....	48
C.3 Player Evaluation Worksheet.....	49
C.4 Record Retention.....	51

Appendix D – Season Rating Meeting Checklist.....	51
D.1 Purpose.....	51
D.2 Scope.....	51
D.3 Seasonal Rating Meeting Checklist.....	51
D.4 Best Practices.....	53

Part I – Foundations

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose

The FAHL Player Rating System Handbook establishes the policies, procedures, and guiding principles used to evaluate player skill levels, assign player ratings, and promote competitive balance throughout the Findlay Adult Hockey League.

This handbook serves as the official operating manual for the FAHL player rating system. It is intended for use by the Ratings Coordinator, Divisional Rating Teams, Commissioner, and other league officials involved in administering the rating process. While players are welcome to review this handbook, the FAHL Player Handbook remains the primary source of information intended for league participants.

The procedures contained within this handbook are designed to promote consistency, transparency, and fairness while recognizing that player evaluation requires informed judgment. No handbook can anticipate every unique situation that may arise. When circumstances are not specifically addressed, league personnel should make decisions that are consistent with the Core Principles outlined below.

Because the FAHL is administered by volunteers and every player evaluation is unique, this handbook intentionally uses terms such as "normally," "generally," and "whenever practical." These terms recognize that unusual circumstances may occasionally require reasonable judgment while preserving the overall consistency and integrity of the Player Rating System.

1.2. Vision

Provide every player with the opportunity to participate in a division that best matches their current skill level while creating balanced teams that produce competitive and enjoyable hockey games.

1.3. Objectives

The objectives of the FAHL Player Rating System are to:

- Promote competitive balance within every division.

- Place players in divisions appropriate for their current skill level.
- Encourage player development by providing an appropriate level of competition.
- Build balanced teams through the use of Team Rating Caps.
- Maintain a consistent and objective player evaluation process.
- Apply rating standards consistently across all divisions and seasons.
- Continuously improve the rating system through periodic review and refinement.

1.4. Core Principles

The following principles guide every decision made within the FAHL Player Rating System.

1. **Competitive Balance** – The primary purpose of the rating system is to maximize parity and create competitive games for all participants. Individual player ratings should ultimately support balanced competition throughout the league.
2. **Current Ability** – Player ratings reflect a player's current hockey ability, not past accomplishments, reputation, age, or projected future ability.
3. **Consistency** – Players demonstrating similar abilities should receive similar ratings regardless of team affiliation, friendships, or personal relationships. Rating standards should remain as consistent as practical from season to season.
4. **Divisional Expertise** – Divisional Rating Teams are best positioned to evaluate players within their divisions because they regularly observe those players throughout the season. Their evaluations serve as the foundation of the FAHL rating system.
5. **League-Wide Oversight** – The Ratings Coordinator is responsible for maintaining consistency between divisions and ensuring that league policies are followed. Overrides of Divisional Rating Team decisions should occur only when necessary to preserve fairness, consistency, or compliance with league policy.
6. **Evidence-Based Evaluation** – Rating decisions should be based on repeated observations, informed discussion, and objective evaluation of player ability rather than isolated performances or personal opinions.
7. **Continuous Improvement** – The player rating system should continue to evolve as the league grows. League leadership should periodically review rating policies, procedures, and outcomes to identify opportunities for improvement while preserving consistency across seasons.

2. Player Rating System

2.1 Purpose

This chapter describes the structure of the FAHL Player Rating System. It defines the rating scale, division rating ranges, team rating caps, and other foundational concepts that support player evaluations and league operations.

2.2 Scope

This chapter applies to the overall design of the Player Rating System. It establishes the terminology and framework used throughout this handbook.

2.3 Rating Scale

Every player participating in the FAHL is assigned a numerical player rating based upon their current hockey ability.

Player ratings are assigned using a twelve-point scale ranging from **1.0** to **12.0**. Ratings may be assigned in half-point increments (e.g., 3.5, 6.5, or 8.5) when appropriate to more accurately represent a player's current ability.

The Rating Chart, located in **Appendix A**, defines the characteristics associated with each rating level and serves as the primary reference when evaluating players.

A player's numerical rating determines:

- the division(s) in which the player is eligible to participate;
- how the player's skill contributes toward a team's Team Rating; and
- how the player is evaluated relative to other players within the league.

2.4 Divisional Rating Ranges

Each division operates within an established rating range intended to group players of similar ability.

Division Rating Ranges are reviewed prior to each season and may be adjusted when necessary to maintain competitive balance, accommodate registration numbers, or support league objectives.

Current Division Rating Ranges are published on the FAHL website and are not maintained within this handbook.

Whenever practical, players should participate in the division that best matches their current rating. Participation in a division below a player's assigned rating range should occur only in exceptional circumstances approved in accordance with league policy. Players may participate in higher divisions when permitted by league policy, although doing so is generally not preferred because it may reduce competitive balance within the higher division.

Because the number of goaltenders available each season is often limited, exceptions to Division Rating Ranges may be permitted when necessary to ensure adequate goalie coverage within a division.

2.5 Team Rating Caps

Each division may establish a Team Rating Cap to promote balanced team construction and discourage the concentration of highly skilled players on a single team.

A Team Rating Cap represents the maximum allowable Team Rating for a team's roster during league play.

Preliminary Team Rating Caps are established before registration opens to assist with roster planning and may be adjusted prior to or during the season if necessary to preserve competitive balance.

The methodology used to calculate Team Ratings is established below:

$$\text{Team Rating} = \frac{(\text{player1} + \text{player2} + \text{player3} + \dots + (\text{goalie multiplier} * \text{goalie}))}{(\text{number of skaters} + \text{goalie multiplier})}$$

Team Rating Caps are intended to encourage balanced roster construction rather than restrict legitimate player movement.

2.6 Goalie Substitution Rating Exception

Purpose

Because qualified substitute goaltenders are often limited, the FAHL permits a limited exception to the normal Team Rating calculation when substitute goalies are obtained through an equitable league-administered process.

Qualifying Conditions

A goalie substitution qualifies only when:

- opening offered equitably
- official goalie communication
- website posting
- eligible goalies receive first opportunity
- reasonable opportunity given (as determined by the Sub Coordinator)
- league-approved process followed

Rating Calculation

When a goalie substitution qualifies under this policy, the lower of the below ratings shall be used when calculating the team's Team Rating:

- the rostered goalie's rating; or
- the substitute goalie's rating

If the team does not have a rostered goalie, the lower of the following two ratings applies:

- the highest rating permitted in the division; or
- the substitute goalie's rating

Directly Solicited Goalies

When a team or goalie directly solicits a specific substitute goalie, this exception does not apply.

The substitute goalie's actual player rating shall be used when calculating the Team Rating.

Manipulation Prohibited

Teams, players, and goalies shall not manipulate or attempt to manipulate the equitable goalie assignment process.

Examples include:

- arranging in advance for a particular goalie to claim a publicly posted opening;
- delaying notification to eligible goalies;
- intentionally limiting who receives notice;
- using another person to circumvent the process.

Violations may result in suspension, loss of the rating exception, or other discipline deemed appropriate by the Board.

2.7 Definitions

For the purposes of this handbook, the following terms are used consistently throughout the document.

Player Rating – A numerical value assigned to an individual player representing the player's current hockey ability.

Rating Chart – The official league document describing the characteristics associated with each player rating.

Division Rating Range – The range of player ratings that defines the intended skill level for a particular division.

Team Rating – The calculated value representing the overall skill level of a team's roster based upon league-approved formulas.

Team Rating Cap – The maximum Team Rating permitted for a team within a particular division.

Competitive Balance – The condition in which teams and divisions are reasonably balanced in skill, resulting in competitive games and an enjoyable playing experience for participants.

2.8 Relationship Between Ratings, Divisions, and Team Ratings

The FAHL Player Rating System operates through three interconnected components.

First, each player is assigned an individual Player Rating based upon current ability.

Second, Player Ratings determine the division(s) in which the player is eligible to participate through the established Division Rating Ranges.

Finally, Player Ratings are combined using the league's Team Rating formula to determine each team's Team Rating, which must remain at or below the applicable Team Rating Cap throughout the season.

Together, these components create a system that promotes balanced divisions, equitable team construction, and competitive games throughout the league.

2.9 Guiding Philosophy

The Player Rating System is intended to be objective, consistent, and adaptable.

No evaluation system can perfectly measure hockey ability. While statistical performance may provide useful information, ratings are based upon a comprehensive evaluation of a player's current ability, including skating, puck skills, hockey IQ, positioning, consistency, and overall impact on the game.

Because player development and ability naturally change over time, ratings are periodically reviewed and adjusted when appropriate. These adjustments are intended to preserve competitive balance rather than reward or penalize individual performance.

Accordingly, player ratings should not be viewed as achievements or rankings. Rather, they are administrative tools used by the league to create the most fair, competitive, and enjoyable hockey experience possible.

3. Governance

3.1 Purpose

This chapter establishes the governance structure of the FAHL Player Rating System by defining the responsibilities, authority, and relationships of the individuals and groups responsible for administering the rating system.

3.2 Scope

This chapter applies to all league officials involved in the administration of the Player Rating System. It defines decision-making authority but does not establish the operational procedures used to evaluate players or conduct rating discussions.

3.3 Governance Structure

Responsibility for the Player Rating System is shared among the following groups:

- Board
- Commissioner
- Associate Commissioner
- Ratings Coordinator
- Divisional Rating Teams

Each group has distinct responsibilities intended to provide both divisional expertise and league-wide consistency.

3.4 The Board

The Board provides overall governance of the Player Rating System.

The Board is responsible for:

- appointing the Ratings Coordinator;
- approving significant changes to the Player Rating System;
- approving amendments to this handbook; and
- providing oversight of league governance.

The Board does not normally participate in assigning individual player ratings.

3.5 Commissioner

The Commissioner is responsible for ensuring the Player Rating System operates in accordance with league policies and objectives.

The Commissioner shall:

- work with the Ratings Coordinator and Associate Commissioner to establish preliminary Division Rating Ranges prior to each season;
- work with the Ratings Coordinator and Associate Commissioner to establish preliminary Team Rating Caps prior to each season;
- approve any override of a Divisional Rating Team's player rating decision;
- assist in resolving issues that affect multiple divisions;
- assist in resolving Player Rating Reviews when requested by the Ratings Coordinator; and
- provide leadership on matters affecting the overall operation of the Player Rating System.

The Commissioner does not normally determine individual player ratings.

3.6 Associate Commissioner

The Associate Commissioner assists with the administration of the Player Rating System and provides additional league-wide perspective during preseason planning.

The Associate Commissioner shall:

- assist in establishing preliminary Division Rating Ranges;
- assist in establishing preliminary Team Rating Caps;
- provide input on league-wide rating policies; and
- assist the Commissioner and Ratings Coordinator as needed.

The Associate Commissioner does not normally determine individual player ratings.

3.7 Ratings Coordinator

The Ratings Coordinator is responsible for administering the Player Rating System on behalf of the league.

The Ratings Coordinator shall:

- oversee the operation of the Player Rating System;
- appoint members to each Divisional Rating Team;
- organize and facilitate Divisional Rating Team meetings;
- coordinate communication between Divisional Rating Teams;
- maintain consistency in player ratings across divisions;

- administer the Team Rating formula and other rating-related calculations established by league policy;
- enter approved player ratings into the league management software;
- maintain official player rating records;
- coordinate Player Rating Reviews;
- maintain the Rating Chart and supporting reference materials;
- recommend improvements to the Player Rating System; and
- perform other duties assigned by the Board.

The Ratings Coordinator should facilitate discussion and encourage consensus rather than substitute their own judgment for that of a Divisional Rating Team.

Override Authority

The Ratings Coordinator may recommend overriding a Divisional Rating Team's decision only when necessary to:

- preserve league-wide consistency;
- correct a clear procedural error;
- address conflicting ratings between divisions;
- maintain competitive balance; or
- enforce league policy.

Any override requires approval by the Commissioner before becoming effective.

League-wide Rating Realignments

From time to time, the Ratings Coordinator may determine that incremental player rating adjustments are insufficient to maintain competitive balance across the league. In such cases, the Ratings Coordinator may recommend a league-wide rating realignment.

A league-wide rating realignment shall be conducted by a Rating Realignment Panel consisting of:

- the Ratings Coordinator;
- the Commissioner; and
- the Associate Commissioner.

The purpose of a league-wide rating realignment is to review player ratings, division rating ranges, and other rating system components to ensure that the rating system continues to accurately reflect player ability and supports the league's competitive balance objectives.

The Rating Realignment Panel may seek input from the Divisional Rating Teams as part of the review process before final recommendations are implemented.

3.8 Divisional Rating Teams

Each division shall have a Divisional Rating Team responsible for evaluating players within that division.

Composition

During the Fall and Winter seasons, each team within the division shall be offered one representative on the Divisional Rating Team. The representative may be the Team Captain or another individual selected by the team.

During the Summer season, the Team Captains shall serve as the Divisional Rating Team unless otherwise determined by the Ratings Coordinator.

Team Participation

Prior to each season, the Ratings Coordinator shall invite each team within the division to designate a representative to serve on the Divisional Rating Team.

Teams are encouraged to participate in the player rating process by providing a representative. However, participation is voluntary.

If a team does not designate a representative or does not respond to the Ratings Coordinator's request within a reasonable period of time, the Divisional Rating Team may proceed without representation from that team.

The absence of a team representative shall not delay or invalidate player rating discussions or decisions.

Representation

Each team within a division may be represented by only one individual on the Divisional Rating Team.

If a representative plays on teams in multiple divisions, it is preferred that the individual represent only one Divisional Rating Team. This helps ensure a diversity of viewpoints and prevents any one individual from having disproportionate influence over player rating decisions across multiple divisions.

The Ratings Coordinator may make exceptions when necessary due to limited volunteer availability or other operational needs.

Responsibilities

The Divisional Rating Team is responsible for:

- assigning initial ratings to new players;
- evaluating existing players;
- determining player rating adjustments;
- reviewing player rating requests;
- evaluating new sub players prior to participation;
- recommending preseason Division Rating Ranges;
- recommending preseason Team Rating Caps;
- recommending adjustments to Division Rating Ranges or Team Rating Caps during the season when necessary; and
- assisting in maintaining competitive balance within the division.

The Divisional Rating Team serves as the league's primary evaluator of individual player ability.

3.9 Decision-Making Authority

The following summarizes responsibility for the major decisions within the Player Rating System.

Decision	Primary Responsibility
League rating policies	Board
Handbook revisions	Board
Preliminary Division Rating Ranges	Commissioner, Associate Commissioner, and Ratings Coordinator

Decision	Primary Responsibility
Preliminary Team Rating Caps	Commissioner, Associate Commissioner, and Ratings Coordinator
Seasonal adjustments to Division Rating Ranges	Affected Divisional Rating Team with approval of the Ratings Coordinator
Seasonal adjustments to Team Rating Caps	Affected Divisional Rating Team with approval of the Ratings Coordinator
Individual player ratings	Divisional Rating Team
Override of player rating	Ratings Coordinator with approval of the Commissioner
Official player rating records	Ratings Coordinator

3.10 Multi-Division Players

Players participating in multiple divisions shall be evaluated by each applicable Divisional Rating Team.

When Divisional Rating Teams assign different ratings to the same player, the teams should first attempt to reach a consensus through discussion.

If consensus cannot be reached, the lower division shall make the final recommendation. Because the player's rating typically falls within the upper portion of the lower division's rating range, that division is generally the most directly affected by the player's assigned rating.

If necessary, the Ratings Coordinator may facilitate additional discussion or recommend an override in accordance with Section 3.7.

3.11 Guiding Principles

League personnel should exercise the authority granted by this chapter with the understanding that the Player Rating System functions best when decisions are made collaboratively.

Whenever practical:

- player ratings should be determined through consensus;
- disagreements should be resolved through discussion before voting;
- authority should be exercised only when necessary;

- consistency should be prioritized over convenience; and
- all participants should act in the best interests of the league rather than any individual team or player.

Part II – Rating Operations

4. Annual Rating Cycle

4.1 Purpose

This chapter establishes the annual workflow used to administer the Player Rating System. It identifies when rating activities occur throughout the year and the responsibilities associated with each phase of the annual rating cycle.

4.2 Scope

This chapter applies to the annual administration of the Player Rating System. It defines when rating activities occur but does not establish the standards used to evaluate players or the procedures used to conduct rating discussions.

4.3 Annual Workflow

The annual rating cycle consists of five phases:

1. Preseason Planning
2. Registration and Initial Ratings
3. Early Season Evaluation
4. In-Season Administration
5. End-of-Season Review

Each phase supports the next, creating a continuous cycle of evaluation and improvement.

4.4 Phase 1 – Preseason Planning

Prior to opening registration, the Ratings Coordinator, Commissioner, and Associate Commissioner shall prepare the Player Rating System for the upcoming season.

Responsibilities include:

- reviewing the previous season;
- evaluating league-wide competitive balance;
- establishing preliminary Division Rating Ranges;

- establishing preliminary Team Rating Caps;
- preparing Divisional Rating Teams;
- reviewing the Rating Chart for necessary revisions; and
- identifying operational issues requiring attention before registration opens.

Whenever practical, preliminary Division Rating Ranges and Team Rating Caps should be finalized before registration opens.

4.5 Phase 2 – Registration and Initial Ratings

During registration:

- returning players retain their existing player ratings;
- new players receive provisional player ratings before participating;
- new substitute players receive provisional player ratings before participating; and
- players are assigned to divisions based upon the current Division Rating Ranges.

Following registration, the appropriate Divisional Rating Teams shall review the preliminary Division Rating Ranges and Team Rating Caps and recommend adjustments when necessary based upon actual player registrations.

Procedures for evaluating new players are described in Section 5.5.

4.6 Phase 3 – Early Season Evaluation

During approximately the first two to three weeks of the season, Divisional Rating Teams shall observe new players participating in league games.

Following the observation period, each new player's provisional rating shall be reviewed to determine whether it should:

- remain unchanged;
- be adjusted; or
- result in the player participating in a more appropriate division.

If the Divisional Rating Team determines that a new player's assigned division is no longer appropriate, the player may be reassigned to another division during the season. Such reassignment should occur only when necessary to ensure the player's

assigned division accurately reflects the player's current ability and to preserve the competitive balance and integrity of the affected divisions.

This provision applies only to new players during their initial evaluation period and should not be interpreted as authority for routine mid-season division changes involving existing players.

Evaluation standards are described in Sections 5.3 and 5.5.

4.7 Phase 4 – In-Season Administration

Once the initial evaluation period has concluded, player ratings should generally remain unchanged throughout the remainder of the season.

Routine responsibilities during this phase include:

- evaluating newly registered substitute players;
- maintaining official player ratings;
- coordinating communication between divisions;
- maintaining rating records; and
- supporting Divisional Rating Teams.

Mid-season player rating adjustments should occur only under extraordinary circumstances and only when necessary to preserve competitive balance or correct a clearly inaccurate player rating.

Evaluation standards for mid-season adjustments are described in Sections 5.3 and 5.7.

4.8 Phase 5 – End-of-Season Review

At the conclusion of each Fall and Winter season, each Divisional Rating Team shall meet to review every player who participated within its division during the season. This review shall include:

- rostered players;
- players who entered the league during the season; and
- substitute players who participated within the division.

The purpose of the seasonal review is to determine whether each player's current rating continues to accurately represent the player's hockey ability.

Approved player rating changes shall become effective for the following season unless otherwise determined by league policy.

Following completion of the seasonal review, the Ratings Coordinator shall update the official player ratings within the league management software.

Procedures for evaluating returning players are described in Section 5.4.

4.9 Summer Season

Because the Summer season is shorter and generally involves fewer participants, the annual rating cycle is modified as follows:

- Team Captains normally serve as the Divisional Rating Teams.
- Existing player ratings generally remain unchanged.
- New players and substitute players follow the same evaluation procedures as all other seasons.
- Existing player ratings should be adjusted only when clearly necessary to preserve competitive balance or correct a substantially inaccurate rating.

The Summer season is intended to maintain continuity while continuing to evaluate new participants entering the league.

4.10 Guiding Principles

The Annual Rating Cycle is intended to provide stability while allowing the Player Rating System to evolve as players develop.

League personnel should strive to:

- complete each phase in a timely manner;
- minimize unnecessary mid-season changes;
- evaluate new players as early as practical;
- maintain accurate player records;
- preserve consistency from season to season; and
- complete each season with player ratings that accurately reflect current player ability.

5. Rating Players

5.1 Purpose

This chapter establishes the evaluation standards used whenever Divisional Rating Teams assign, review, or adjust player ratings. It identifies the factors that should be considered when determining whether a player's assigned rating accurately reflects their current hockey ability.

5.2 Scope

This chapter applies to every player evaluation conducted under the Player Rating System, including new players, returning players, substitute players, mid-season reviews, and player rating reviews. It establishes evaluation standards but does not describe when evaluations occur or how rating decisions are made.

5.3 General Evaluation Standards

Regardless of whether a player is new, returning, or participating as a substitute, the same evaluation standards shall be applied.

When evaluating a player, Divisional Rating Teams should consider the player's overall hockey ability, including:

- skating ability;
- speed and agility;
- puck control;
- passing ability;
- shooting ability;
- hockey IQ;
- positioning;
- defensive play;
- offensive play;
- consistency; and
- overall impact on the game.

No single characteristic should determine a player's rating. Player ratings should reflect the player's complete body of work rather than isolated strengths or weaknesses.

Additional guidance regarding evaluating player ability is provided in Chapter 7.

5.4 Returning Players

Returning players shall be evaluated during the seasonal review process described in Section 4.8.

The purpose of the evaluation is to determine whether the player's current rating continues to accurately reflect the player's current hockey ability.

Factors that may support a rating adjustment include:

- sustained improvement;
- declining ability;
- increased hockey knowledge or experience;
- extended absence from hockey;
- recovery from a significant injury or surgery;
- previous rating inaccuracies identified during seasonal review; or
- other substantial changes affecting the player's current ability.

Rating adjustments should be based upon long-term observations rather than short-term performance.

5.5 New Players

New players shall be evaluated in accordance with the procedures described in Sections 4.5 and 4.6.

Because limited information is initially available, ratings assigned before participation are considered provisional.

Initial evaluations should consider:

- information provided during registration;
- previous playing experience;
- previous leagues or levels of competition;
- recommendations from individuals familiar with the player; and
- any other reliable information available.

The objective is to assign the most accurate initial rating possible while recognizing that adjustments may be necessary after observing the player during league competition.

5.6 Substitute Players

Substitute players shall be evaluated using the same procedures and evaluation standards as rostered players.

New substitute players should register no later than twenty-four (24) hours before their scheduled game whenever practical to allow sufficient time for:

- assignment of an initial player rating;
- review by the appropriate Divisional Rating Team; and
- completion of league registration requirements.

Substitute players shall remain subject to seasonal review by each division in which they participated.

5.7 Mid-Season Rating Adjustments

Mid-season rating adjustments shall be conducted only in accordance with the procedures described in Section 4.7.

The evaluation standards contained within this chapter apply equally to all mid-season player reviews.

5.8 Rating Adjustments

Player ratings should be adjusted only when sufficient evidence demonstrates that the player's current rating no longer accurately reflects the player's present hockey ability.

The purpose of a rating adjustment is not to reward improvement or penalize declining ability. Rather, rating adjustments are made only to ensure that a player's assigned rating continues to accurately reflect the player's current hockey ability while supporting competitive balance throughout the league.

Whenever practical:

- existing player ratings should normally be adjusted in one-half point increments unless a larger adjustment is necessary to accurately reflect the player's current ability;
- larger adjustments should be reserved for exceptional circumstances;
- significant adjustments should be supported by multiple observations; and
- similar players should receive similar ratings.

5.9 Documentation

Routine player evaluations generally do not require formal documentation.

However, whenever practical, the following should be documented:

- significant rating adjustments;
- mid-season rating changes;
- player rating overrides;
- player rating review requests; and
- decisions involving multiple divisions.

Maintaining appropriate documentation promotes consistency and provides valuable historical context during future evaluations.

5.10 Guiding Principles

When evaluating players, Divisional Rating Teams should strive to:

- evaluate players over multiple games;
- compare players with others of similar ratings;
- avoid reacting to isolated performances;
- focus on current ability rather than historical reputation;
- apply the Rating Chart consistently; and
- place the interests of competitive balance above individual preferences.

6. Rating Discussions

6.1 Purpose

This chapter establishes the procedures used by Divisional Rating Teams when conducting player rating discussions. It defines how rating discussions are prepared, conducted, and documented to promote consistent decision-making.

6.2 Scope

This chapter applies to seasonal rating meetings and informal rating discussions conducted throughout the season. It establishes discussion procedures but does not define the evaluation standards or guiding principles used to assess player ability.

6.3 Preparing for the Meeting

Prior to each seasonal rating meeting, the Ratings Coordinator shall distribute a list of all players within the division to each Divisional Rating Team member.

Before the meeting, each representative should review every player and identify those whose ratings they believe should be adjusted.

Representatives should submit their recommended rating adjustments to the Ratings Coordinator before the meeting whenever practical.

Players for whom no representative recommends a rating adjustment shall normally retain their current rating without further discussion.

Only players receiving one or more recommended rating adjustments shall normally be discussed during the meeting.

6.4 Conducting Player Discussions

Players shall be discussed individually.

For each player under review, the Ratings Coordinator shall provide every Divisional Rating Team member an opportunity to share observations or recommendations.

Whenever practical, the representative recommending the rating adjustment should begin the discussion by explaining the basis for the recommendation before other representatives provide their observations.

Discussions should focus on:

- the player's current hockey ability;
- observations made throughout the season;
- whether the current rating accurately reflects that ability; and

- whether adjusting the rating would improve competitive balance.

Representatives should support their opinions with observations whenever practical.

6.5 Team Representation

Divisional Rating Team members provide valuable insight because they regularly compete against the players being evaluated.

However, when a player being discussed is a member of a representative's own team, that representative should generally allow other members of the Divisional Rating Team to lead the discussion.

The representative may provide factual information or respond to questions when requested but should avoid dominating the discussion regarding their own teammate.

This practice helps promote objective evaluations and reinforces confidence in the integrity of the rating process.

6.6 Reaching a Decision

The Divisional Rating Team should first attempt to reach a consensus regarding each player's rating.

Consensus allows the collective observations of the Divisional Rating Team to produce the strongest and most consistent rating decisions.

When consensus cannot be reached after reasonable discussion, the Ratings Coordinator shall call for a vote.

Each represented team shall be entitled to one vote. However, a Divisional Rating Team member may abstain from voting when appropriate, including but not limited to situations where the member:

- has not observed the player sufficiently to make an informed recommendation;
- believes a conflict of interest exists;

- or otherwise believes abstaining is in the best interests of maintaining an objective evaluation.

Only votes cast in favor of or against a recommendation shall be counted when determining whether a simple majority has been achieved. Abstentions shall not be counted as votes.

The Ratings Coordinator serves as the meeting facilitator and normally does not vote.

If a vote results in a tie, additional discussion should occur before another vote is taken.

If consensus or a majority decision still cannot be reached, the player's existing rating shall remain unchanged unless otherwise provided elsewhere in this handbook.

6.7 Informal Discussions

Not all player rating decisions occur during seasonal rating meetings.

When new players or sub players require timely evaluation during the season, the Ratings Coordinator may facilitate discussions through electronic communication, including group text messages or email.

Whenever practical, these discussions should follow the same evaluation standards and decision-making principles used during seasonal rating meetings.

6.8 Documentation

Following each seasonal rating meeting, the Ratings Coordinator shall:

- record all approved player rating changes;
- update the official player ratings within the league management software;
- document recommendations involving multiple divisions; and
- retain any information necessary to support future rating discussions.

Routine discussion notes need not be retained once final decisions have been recorded.

6.9 Guiding Principles

Effective rating discussions depend upon collaboration, professionalism, and mutual respect.

Divisional Rating Team members should strive to:

- prepare before the meeting;
- contribute observations honestly and objectively;
- allow every representative an opportunity to participate;
- seek consensus before voting;
- avoid allowing personal relationships to influence discussions; and
- make decisions that best support competitive balance throughout the league.

7. Maintaining Consistency

7.1 Purpose

This chapter establishes the guiding principles used to promote consistency in player evaluations across divisions, seasons, and Divisional Rating Teams. It is intended to help league personnel apply the Player Rating System consistently when exercising judgment.

7.2 Scope

This chapter applies whenever player ratings are assigned, reviewed, or adjusted. It supplements the evaluation standards contained in Chapter 5 by providing guidance for exercising sound judgment and maintaining consistency throughout the league.

7.3 Rate Current Ability

Player ratings should always represent a player's current hockey ability.

Ratings should not be based upon:

- historical reputation;
- previous ratings;
- past accomplishments;
- age;
- potential future ability; or
- how long a player has participated in the league.

Previous ratings provide useful context but should never prevent a player from receiving the rating that best reflects their present ability.

7.4 Evaluate the Complete Player

No single characteristic should determine a player's rating.

Likewise, no single statistic should determine a player's rating.

Instead, Divisional Rating Teams should evaluate the player's overall impact on the game by considering the player's complete skill set.

Examples include:

- skating ability;
- speed and acceleration;
- puck handling;
- passing ability;
- shooting ability;
- hockey IQ;
- positioning;
- defensive awareness;
- offensive awareness;
- consistency;
- competitiveness; and
- overall influence on the outcome of a game.

Players with different strengths may appropriately receive the same rating if their overall impact on the game is comparable.

7.5 Statistics Are One Tool

Statistics can provide useful information, but they should never replace direct observation.

Goal totals, assists, plus/minus, or other statistics should be viewed within the context of:

- quality of teammates;

- quality of opponents;
- role on the team;
- amount of playing time; and
- overall style of play.

Some players create scoring opportunities, prevent goals, control possession, or improve their teammates' performance without producing exceptional statistics.

Likewise, strong statistics alone do not necessarily indicate that a player's rating should increase.

7.6 Compare Similar Players

One of the most effective methods for maintaining consistency is comparing players with others already assigned similar ratings.

When evaluating a player, Divisional Rating Teams should ask:

- Which currently rated players most closely resemble this player?
- Does the proposed rating place the player among peers of similar ability?
- Would this rating remain appropriate if the player changed teams?

If two players of similar overall ability receive significantly different ratings, the reasons for that difference should be clearly understood.

7.7 Avoid Common Sources of Bias

Divisional Rating Teams should recognize that every evaluator brings personal experiences and opinions into the discussion.

Whenever practical, Rating Team members should avoid allowing the following to influence their evaluations:

- recent performances more than an entire season of play;
- friendships or personal disagreements;
- team affiliation;
- historical reputation;
- isolated highlights or mistakes;
- individual statistics without supporting observations; or
- assumptions based upon age or past playing experience.

Player ratings should not be influenced by a player's leadership role, sportsmanship, disciplinary history, personality, friendships, or other factors unrelated to the player's current hockey ability unless those factors directly affect the player's on-ice performance.

The objective is not to eliminate judgment but to ensure that judgment is based upon relevant hockey observations rather than unrelated factors.

7.8 Maintain Stability

Player ratings should generally change gradually over time.

Frequent or dramatic rating changes reduce confidence in the Player Rating System and make maintaining competitive balance more difficult.

Whenever practical:

- rating adjustments should be conservative;
- large adjustments should be supported by substantial evidence;
- multiple observations should support significant changes; and
- similar situations should be handled similarly from season to season.

League-wide rating realignments described in Section 3.7 are intended to address exceptional circumstances and should not replace routine seasonal evaluations.

7.9 Think Beyond the Individual Player

Every player rating affects more than one individual.

Changing one player's rating may affect:

- team construction;
- Team Rating Caps;
- division eligibility;
- competitive balance; and
- future player comparisons.

Accordingly, Divisional Rating Teams should consider how a proposed rating fits within the broader Player Rating System rather than evaluating each player in isolation.

7.10 When in Doubt

Occasionally, reasonable people will disagree about the proper rating for a player.

When uncertainty exists, Divisional Rating Teams should ask:

- Which rating most accurately reflects the player's current ability?
- Which rating is most consistent with comparable players?
- Which decision best supports competitive balance?
- Would we likely make the same decision next season?

These questions often help guide discussions toward a fair and consistent outcome.

7.11 Continuous Improvement

The Player Rating System should continue evolving as the league grows.

League leadership should periodically review:

- the Rating Chart;
- player rating distributions;
- Division Rating Ranges;
- Team Rating Caps;
- seasonal outcomes; and
- feedback from Divisional Rating Teams.

Improvements should be made thoughtfully and consistently while preserving confidence in the integrity of the Player Rating System.

7.12 Questions to Consider

Experienced Divisional Rating Team members often ask themselves questions such as the following before recommending a rating adjustment. These questions are not intended to produce automatic answers. Rather, they encourage thoughtful discussion and help promote consistency throughout the Player Rating System.

Current Ability

- Does the player's current rating accurately reflect the player's present hockey ability?
- Has the player's ability changed enough to justify a rating adjustment?
- Am I evaluating the player's current ability rather than their past reputation?

Comparable Players

- Which currently rated players are most similar to this player?
- If this player were placed on another team, would I still assign the same rating?
- Would another Divisional Rating Team likely assign a similar rating?

Impact on the Game

- Does this player consistently influence the outcome of games?
- Does the player make teammates around them better?
- Is the player's impact reflected primarily through statistics, or are there contributions that statistics do not capture?

Competitive Balance

- Would changing this player's rating improve or reduce competitive balance?
- Does the proposed rating fit naturally within the division's overall player distribution?
- Would I feel comfortable defending this rating to another Divisional Rating Team?

Confidence in the Decision

- Am I reacting to one exceptional performance or to a consistent pattern observed over time?
- Have I listened to differing viewpoints before reaching a conclusion?
- If we reviewed this player again next season using the same information, would I likely reach the same decision?

These questions are intended to supplement—not replace—the evaluation standards contained elsewhere in this handbook. Thoughtful discussion and sound judgment remain the foundation of every player rating decision.

7.13 Guiding Principles

Every rating decision should support the long-term integrity of the Player Rating System.

Divisional Rating Teams should strive to:

- evaluate current ability rather than reputation;
- compare players with similarly rated peers;
- use statistics as supporting information rather than primary evidence;
- avoid common sources of bias;
- preserve consistency across divisions and seasons;
- make thoughtful rather than reactive adjustments; and
- place competitive balance above individual outcomes.

Part III - Administration

8. Player Rating Reviews

8.1 Purpose

This chapter establishes the process by which players may request a review of their assigned rating. It defines how review requests are submitted, administered, and resolved.

8.2 Scope

This chapter applies only to Player Rating Reviews requested by players. It does not apply to routine player evaluations conducted as part of the Annual Rating Cycle, which are governed by Chapters 4 through 7.

8.3 Guiding Philosophy

Player ratings are determined through observations made by multiple Divisional Rating Team members over an extended period of time.

Accordingly, player ratings should not be changed simply because a player disagrees with their assigned rating.

A Player Rating Review is intended to determine whether a player's current rating continues to accurately reflect the player's present hockey ability. It is not intended to provide repeated opportunities to challenge previous rating decisions.

8.4 Requesting a Player Rating Review

A player may request a Player Rating Review by submitting a written request to the Ratings Coordinator.

Whenever practical, the request should include:

- the player's name;
- the division(s) in which the player participates;
- the reason the player believes a review is appropriate; and

- any information the player believes the Divisional Rating Team should consider.

Players are encouraged to provide objective information supporting their request rather than simply expressing disagreement with their assigned rating.

8.5 Timing of Player Rating Reviews

To promote consistency and minimize unnecessary mid-season rating changes, Player Rating Reviews shall normally be conducted as part of the seasonal review process described in Section 4.8.

Requests submitted during the season shall generally be deferred until the next scheduled seasonal rating meeting.

The Ratings Coordinator may determine that a request warrants earlier consideration only when extraordinary circumstances exist, including but not limited to:

- a significant injury or surgery affecting long-term ability;
- a clear administrative error;
- information that was unavailable during the original evaluation and would reasonably be expected to affect the player's rating; or
- other exceptional circumstances that substantially affect the player's current hockey ability or the integrity of the Player Rating System.

8.6 Review Process

Upon receiving a Player Rating Review request, the Ratings Coordinator shall forward the request to the appropriate Divisional Rating Team.

The Divisional Rating Team shall consider:

- the player's current rating;
- observations made throughout the season;
- information provided by the player;
- previous rating discussions, when relevant; and
- any other information the Divisional Rating Team considers appropriate.

The Player Rating Review shall be conducted using the evaluation standards, discussion procedures, and consistency principles established in Chapters 5 through 7 of this handbook.

Following discussion, the Divisional Rating Team shall determine whether:

- the player's current rating should remain unchanged; or
- the player's rating should be adjusted.

The Ratings Coordinator shall notify the player of the outcome following completion of the review.

8.7 Frequency of Player Rating Reviews

Following completion of a Player Rating Review, the player may not request another review for twelve (12) months.

The Ratings Coordinator may waive this waiting period only when extraordinary circumstances exist, including but not limited to:

- a significant injury or surgery affecting long-term ability;
- a clear administrative error;
- extraordinary changes in the player's hockey ability; or
- other exceptional circumstances determined to justify an earlier review.

8.8 Finality of Rating Decisions

The Player Rating System depends upon stability and consistency.

Accordingly, player ratings determined through the procedures established in this handbook shall generally be considered final until the next scheduled seasonal review.

The existence of a Player Rating Review process should not be interpreted as an expectation that a player's rating will change whenever a review is requested.

8.9 Guiding Principles

When administering Player Rating Reviews, league personnel should strive to:

- evaluate current ability rather than defend previous decisions;
- consider every request objectively and consistently;
- maintain fairness across all divisions;
- preserve competitive balance;
- avoid unnecessary mid-season rating changes; and
- maintain confidence in the integrity of the Player Rating System.

9. Documentation and Recordkeeping

9.1 Purpose

This chapter establishes the documentation and recordkeeping practices used to support the administration of the FAHL Player Rating System. Appropriate documentation promotes consistency, preserves institutional knowledge, and provides historical context for future player evaluations and league decisions.

9.2 Scope

This chapter applies to all official records created or maintained as part of the Player Rating System. It identifies the records that should be maintained, the responsibilities for maintaining them, and the principles governing their use.

9.3 Official Records

The Ratings Coordinator shall maintain the official records of the Player Rating System.

Official records may include:

- the current player rating database;
- historical player ratings;
- approved rating adjustments;
- Player Rating Review requests and outcomes;
- current and historical Division Rating Ranges;
- current and historical Team Rating Caps;
- the current Rating Chart;
- reference materials used during player evaluations; and
- other records determined necessary for administering the Player Rating System.

The official player rating database maintained by the Ratings Coordinator shall serve as the authoritative record of player ratings.

9.4 Meeting Records

Following each seasonal rating meeting, the Ratings Coordinator should maintain sufficient records to document:

- approved player rating adjustments;
- significant decisions affecting multiple divisions;
- approved recommendations regarding Division Rating Ranges or Team Rating Caps; and
- other decisions that may provide useful historical context.

Routine discussion notes, draft recommendations, and working documents need not be retained after final decisions have been recorded unless otherwise determined by the Ratings Coordinator.

9.5 Historical Information

Historical records provide valuable context during future player evaluations and periodic reviews of the Player Rating System.

Whenever practical, historical information should be retained in a manner that allows league personnel to identify:

- previous player ratings;
- the timing of significant rating adjustments;
- previous Player Rating Reviews;
- league-wide rating realignments;
- revisions to the Rating Chart;
- historical Division Rating Ranges;
- historical Team Rating Caps; and
- significant changes to Division Rating Ranges or Team Rating Caps.

Historical records are intended to provide context for future evaluations and should not be used to prevent player ratings from accurately reflecting current hockey ability.

9.6 Confidentiality

Player rating discussions are intended to encourage open, honest, and objective evaluations.

Accordingly, internal discussion materials, draft recommendations, voting results, and other deliberative communications should generally remain confidential among league personnel responsible for administering the Player Rating System.

Nothing in this section prevents the league from communicating final player ratings, league policies, or other information that is intended for public distribution.

9.7 Record Accuracy

The Ratings Coordinator is responsible for maintaining accurate and current records.

Whenever an error is identified, reasonable efforts should be made to correct the official records as soon as practical.

If conflicting records exist, the official player rating database maintained by the Ratings Coordinator shall govern unless otherwise determined through the procedures established in this handbook.

9.8 Guiding Principles

Documentation should support—not complicate—the administration of the Player Rating System.

League personnel should strive to:

- maintain accurate and current records;
- document significant decisions rather than routine discussions;
- preserve information that provides long-term value;
- maintain appropriate confidentiality; and
- ensure that official records remain organized, accessible, and reliable.

Appendices

Appendix A – Rating Chart

A.1 Purpose

The Rating Chart serves as the primary reference for evaluating player ability within the FAHL Player Rating System.

It provides standardized descriptions of each player rating to promote consistency between Divisional Rating Teams, across multiple seasons, and throughout the league.

The Rating Chart is intended to support informed judgment rather than replace it. No written description can perfectly describe every player. Divisional Rating Teams should apply the evaluation standards described in Chapter 5 and the consistency principles described in Chapter 7 when using this chart.

A.2 Using the Rating Chart

When evaluating a player, Divisional Rating Teams should:

- Compare the player's overall ability to the descriptions contained within the Rating Chart.
- Consider the player's complete body of work rather than isolated performances.
- Compare the player with similarly rated players throughout the league.
- Use the Rating Chart together with direct observations and informed discussion.
- Remember that players may demonstrate strengths or weaknesses that are not fully reflected within a single rating description.

The Rating Chart should be used as a guide, not as a mathematical formula.

A.3 Rating Chart

No player is expected to match every characteristic listed within a rating level. The descriptions identify common characteristics typically demonstrated by players assigned that rating. Divisional Rating Teams should evaluate the player's overall

ability and determine which rating most accurately reflects the player's complete body of work.

A++	12	Recently played minor, college, or high level prospects hockey	Exceptional all-around hockey skills. Can completely control an A division game
A+	11	Above average player in the A division	
A	10	Average player in the A division	Does not fall on own, excellent transitions, great puck control, and great hockey IQ
A-	9	Cannot be contained in the B division, but skills are below average in the A division	Can regularly control a B division game
A/B	8	Can compete in either the A or B division, but can still be contained in a the B division	Can rarely control a B division game
B	7	Above average player in the B division, but could not be very competitive in the A division	
B-	6	Cannot be contained in the C division, but skills are below average in the B division	Rarely falls, transitions well, catches passes, can handle the puck, and has decent hockey IQ
C+	5.5	Can compete in either the B or C division, but can still be contained in the C division	Can rarely control a C division game
C	4.5	Average player in the C division	Can regularly control a D division game
D+	3.5	Can compete in either the C or D division, but can still be contained in the D division	Can rarely control a D division game
D	2.5	Average player in the D division	Still falls sometimes, slow transitions, misses some passes, can sometimes handle the puck, and has limited hockey IQ
D-	1	Fairly new to both skating and hockey	

A.4 Notes on Interpretation

When using the Rating Chart, Divisional Rating Teams should remember:

- Ratings represent a player's current hockey ability.

- Ratings are administrative tools, not awards or rankings.
- Similar players should generally receive similar ratings.
- Statistics should support—not replace—direct observation.
- Players may possess exceptional abilities in one area while remaining appropriately rated because of limitations in other aspects of their game.
- Small differences between players do not necessarily require different ratings.
- Half-point ratings should be used whenever they more accurately represent a player's current ability.

A.5 Maintaining the Rating Chart

The Ratings Coordinator is responsible for maintaining the official Rating Chart. The Rating Chart should be reviewed periodically to ensure that:

- rating descriptions remain clear and meaningful;
- examples continue to reflect current league standards;
- terminology remains consistent throughout the handbook; and
- the chart continues to support fair and consistent player evaluations.

Revisions to the Rating Chart should be made thoughtfully and only when necessary to improve the administration of the Player Rating System.

Appendix B – Current Example Players

B.1 Purpose

This appendix provides examples of players currently assigned to each rating level within the FAHL Player Rating System.

The purpose of these examples is to assist Divisional Rating Teams in comparing players with others of similar ability when assigning or reviewing player ratings.

Example players are intended to supplement the Rating Chart contained in Appendix A and the evaluation standards contained in Chapters 5 through 7.

B.2 Using Example Players

Example players provide practical reference points for discussions during player evaluations.

When using this appendix, Divisional Rating Teams should:

- compare players with others of similar overall ability;
- consider the player's complete body of work;
- recognize that players with different strengths may appropriately receive the same rating; and
- use the examples as guidance rather than definitive standards.

Whenever practical, multiple example players should be considered before recommending a rating adjustment.

B.3 Current Example Players

Not B Eligible	Greg McCann, Collin Hoops, Griffin Duron, Brandon Maas, Justin Gray (goalie), Cody Mlsna (goalie)
8	Chase Wilcox, Nolan Willis, Matthew Pierce, Phil Henzler, Kerry Schwable, Tony Wulff
7.5	Logan Feeney, Jim Kuhn, Paul McCarthy, Lewis Johnson (goalie)
7	Frank Wise, Jeff Houck, Lucas Hastings, Matt Petrlich (goalie), Brian May (goalie)
6.5	Shaun Butler, Jason Cline, Dave Hoops, Kyle Thines (goalie), Josh Cislo (goalie)
6	Todd Carr, Scott Corwin, Josh Felkner, Bill Carder, Nathan Young
5.5	Trent Green, Park Hemminger, Xavier Ardner, Jason Reier, Jake Garlock, Yu Otsuki (goalie)
5	Ryan Bonnell, Dave Osbon, Kerry Trombley, Jack Frost (goalie), John Palovcik (goalie)
4.5	Sam Fruchey, Brian Poe, Pete Allesee, Ben Mens
4	Marlin Winchester, Andy Hemminger, Jeff Clinger, Jimmy Irwin, Ryan Tabler (goalie)
3.5	Jim Eckhardt, Brian Fulcher, Rich Fowler, David Sohn, Scott Geis (goalie), Jeff Tichenor (goalie)

B.4 Maintaining the Example Players List

The Ratings Coordinator shall maintain the official Example Players list.

Unlike the Rating Chart, the Example Players list is expected to evolve as players improve, decline, retire, or enter the league.

Accordingly, the list may be updated following seasonal rating meetings whenever necessary to ensure that it continues to provide useful and representative examples of each rating level.

Changes to the Example Players list do not constitute changes to the Player Rating System and do not require amendments to this handbook.

B.5 Important Considerations

When using the Example Players list, Divisional Rating Teams should remember:

- Example players are reference points, not benchmarks.
- A player's inclusion in this appendix does not guarantee that the player will always retain the same rating.
- Not every player assigned a particular rating will closely resemble every example player.
- Differences in playing style, position, age, and team role should be considered when making comparisons.
- The objective is to identify players of comparable overall ability—not identical skill sets.

Appendix C – Player Evaluation Worksheet

C.1 Purpose

This worksheet is intended to assist Divisional Rating Team members when evaluating players whose ratings may require adjustment.

The worksheet is designed to encourage consistent observations and thoughtful discussion. It is an optional reference tool and is not required to be completed for every player or retained as part of the official records of the Player Rating System.

C.2 Instructions

When preparing for a seasonal rating meeting, Divisional Rating Team members may use this worksheet to organize their observations regarding a player.

The worksheet should supplement—not replace—the Rating Chart, the evaluation standards contained in Chapter 5, and the consistency principles contained in Chapter 7.

C.3 Player Evaluation Worksheet

Player Information

Item	Information
Player Name	_____
Current Rating	_____
Proposed Rating	_____
Division(s)	_____
Evaluation Date	_____
Evaluated By	_____

Reason for Evaluation

- ☐ New Player
- ☐ Returning Player
- ☐ Substitute Player
- ☐ Player Rating Review
- ☐ Mid-Season Evaluation
- ☐ Other: _____

Overall Evaluation

For each category, indicate whether the player performs **Below**, **At**, or **Above** their current rating.

Category	Below	At	Above	Notes
Skating Ability	☐	☐	☐	
Speed / Agility	☐	☐	☐	
Puck Control	☐	☐	☐	
Passing Ability	☐	☐	☐	
Shooting Ability	☐	☐	☐	
Hockey IQ	☐	☐	☐	
Positioning	☐	☐	☐	
Defensive Play	☐	☐	☐	
Offensive Play	☐	☐	☐	
Consistency	☐	☐	☐	

Category **Below At Above Notes**

Overall Game Impact ☐ ☐ ☐

Comparable Players

List players with similar overall ability.

Player **Current Rating**

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Observations

What observations support the proposed rating?

Questions to Consider

- Does the player's current rating accurately reflect their present hockey ability?
- Has the player's ability changed enough to justify a rating adjustment?
- Am I evaluating the player's current ability rather than their reputation?
- Which currently rated players are most similar to this player?
- Would I assign the same rating if this player were on another team?
- Am I relying on observations from the entire season rather than a few games?
- Would this rating improve or reduce competitive balance?
- Would I feel comfortable explaining this rating to another Divisional Rating Team?

Recommendation

- ☐ Maintain Current Rating
- ☐ Increase Rating
- ☐ Decrease Rating

Recommended Rating: _____

Comments:

C.4 Record Retention

This worksheet is intended solely as a planning and discussion aid.

Completed worksheets are not required to be submitted to the Ratings Coordinator or retained as official league records unless specifically requested as part of a Player Rating Review or other administrative process.

Appendix D – Season Rating Meeting Checklist

D.1 Purpose

This appendix provides a practical checklist for the Ratings Coordinator to assist in planning, conducting, and completing seasonal rating meetings. It summarizes the procedures established throughout this handbook and is intended to promote consistency from season to season.

D.2 Scope

This checklist applies to the seasonal Divisional Rating Team meetings conducted following the Fall and Winter seasons. It may also be used as a reference when conducting rating discussions at other times during the year.

D.3 Seasonal Rating Meeting Checklist

Before the Meeting

Divisional Rating Team

- ☐ Confirm the Divisional Rating Team members.
- ☐ Verify that no representative is representing more than one team unless an exception has been approved.
- ☐ Contact any teams that have not designated a representative.
- ☐ Confirm the meeting date, time, and location.

Meeting Preparation

- ☐ Prepare the current player list.
- ☐ Prepare the current player ratings.
- ☐ Prepare the current Rating Chart.

- ☐ Prepare the current Example Players list.
- ☐ Prepare Division Rating Ranges.
- ☐ Prepare Team Rating Caps.
- ☐ Identify players participating in multiple divisions.
- ☐ Distribute the player list to all Divisional Rating Team members.
- ☐ Request proposed player rating adjustments prior to the meeting.
- ☐ Collect proposed rating adjustments before the meeting whenever practical.
- ☐ Prepare a discussion list containing only players for whom at least one representative proposed a rating adjustment.

During the Meeting

Opening

- ☐ Explain the meeting process.
- ☐ Review any significant changes to league policies or the Player Rating System.
- ☐ Review Division Rating Ranges and Team Rating Caps, if applicable.

Player Discussions

For each player on the discussion list:

- ☐ Allow all representatives an opportunity to speak.
- ☐ Ask representatives to support recommendations with observations whenever practical.
- ☐ Encourage consensus.
- ☐ If consensus cannot be reached, conduct a vote.
- ☐ Record abstentions when applicable.
- ☐ Record the final recommendation.
- ☐ Identify any players requiring discussion with another division.

Closing

- ☐ Review all approved rating changes.
- ☐ Review unresolved items.
- ☐ Identify follow-up items.

After the Meeting

Records

- ☐ Enter approved player ratings into the league management software.
- ☐ Update historical player ratings, if maintained separately.
- ☐ File any documentation that should be retained.

Communication

- ☐ Coordinate with other Divisional Rating Teams regarding shared players.
- ☐ Resolve any outstanding player rating disagreements involving multiple divisions in accordance with Section 3.10.
- ☐ Notify the Commissioner of any issues requiring additional review.
- ☐ Notify affected players of Player Rating Review decisions, if applicable.

Final Review

- ☐ Verify all approved ratings have been entered correctly.
- ☐ Verify multi-division player ratings are consistent.
- ☐ Archive meeting materials as appropriate.
- ☐ Identify recommendations for improving future rating meetings.

D.4 Best Practices

The following practices have consistently contributed to productive seasonal rating meetings:

- Encourage representatives to prepare before the meeting.
- Limit discussions to players requiring review.
- Give every representative an opportunity to participate.
- Seek consensus before conducting a vote.
- Focus discussions on current hockey ability rather than isolated performances.
- Compare players with similarly rated peers.
- Document final decisions promptly.
- Update official records as soon as practical following the meeting.