

2027 Ringette Nova Scotia Canada Games Ringette Program Athlete Selection Framework: Phase 1

Bias Safeguards in Athlete Evaluation

The Canada Games Ringette Program recognizes that athlete selection is vulnerable to unconscious bias and subjective influence. To ensure fairness and transparency, the following safeguards are built into our process:

1. Multi-Evaluator System

- Every athlete is assessed by multiple independent evaluators at both camps.
- Staff and alumni evaluators are intentionally diverse in background, playing position, and coaching experience.
- All alumni and coach is responsible to identify and declare any significant bias or conflict of interest.

2. Consensus Decision-Making

- Final selection decisions are made by the coaching group collectively, not by any single evaluator.
- Scores and observations are reviewed as a group; disagreements are discussed openly to reduce the impact of individual bias.

3. Separation of Roles

- Alumni evaluators focus on observation and scoring, while coaching staff oversee integration and athlete feedback.
- This reduces role conflict and helps evaluators remain objective.

4. Blind Portfolio Review

- When feasible, athlete portfolios (scores, sensor data, video tags) are reviewed without names attached to minimize bias from reputation, club, or background.

5. Equity of Access

- Special circumstances policy ensures athletes are not disadvantaged by injury, remote status, or multi-sport commitments.
- This aligns with LTAD 3.0's emphasis on keeping doors open for athletes on different development paths.

2027 Ringette Nova Scotia Canada Games Ringette Program Athlete Selection Framework: Phase 1

6. Conflict of Interest (COI)

We recognize that evaluators and coaches may have prior relationships with athletes that could consciously or unconsciously affect judgment.

- A conflict of interest exists when an evaluator's ability to provide a fair, impartial assessment is compromised (or perceived to be compromised) by a personal, professional, or historical connection.
- Examples include:
 - Parent evaluating their own child.
 - Alumni asked to score a close friend or former teammate.
 - Coach who previously had a significant conflict with an athlete (positive or negative).
 - Any situation where the evaluator cannot reasonably separate past interactions from the present evaluation.
- Management:
 - All evaluators are required to declare potential conflicts prior to camps.
 - Conflicted evaluators are either re-assigned or their scores are removed from the athlete's selection file.
 - Where unavoidable, conflicted evaluators may observe but not contribute to final scoring or decision-making for the athlete concerned.

7. Transparency to Athletes & Parents

- Clear rubrics, scoring anchors, and feedback summaries are provided to athletes.
- Athletes understand what is being measured and why, reducing perceptions of hidden bias.