

Feedback received on CC Track Sprint criteria through online form, with responses

Commentaires reçus sur les critères piste sprint par le biais de la formulaire en ligne, avec réponses

*Jan. 19, 2026 – The following responses are without prejudice.
Le 19 janvier 2026 – Les réponses suivantes sont sans préjudice.*

Feedback received / Commentaires reçus	CC response / Réponse de CC
<p>1. Coach Panel discretion • How is Coach Panel discretion intended to be applied relative to published performance-based criteria? • Are there defined limits on when discretion may override objective results, and are such decisions documented or communicated to athletes? 2. Use of training sessions in selection decisions • How are performances in Cycling Canada–led training sessions evaluated relative to competition results? • Are athletes informed in advance when a training session may be used as a formal selection input? 3. Appeal process clarity • When and how are reasons for non-selection communicated to athletes? • Is the appeal deadline structured to ensure athletes have sufficient information to submit an informed appeal?</p>	<p>1. In the individual events, athletes who meet the objective criteria are selected first. Coach Panel discretion is only used if there are no more athletes who have met the objective criteria. For Team Sprint, because the positions are interdependent, Coach Panel discretion is used to select the team from among athletes who have met the objective performance criteria.</p> <p>2. Given the small number of competitions each year, performances in training sessions are important and are evaluated at the same level as competition performances. Athletes are aware that any training performance may be used. This provides athletes more opportunities to meet time standards.</p> <p>3. Selections are communicated verbally to the athletes by the national coach, as well as by e-mail. Athletes can ask for additional information at any time and there is more than enough time prior to the appeal deadline for an athlete to decide whether an appeal is warranted.</p>
<p>Overall i understand and accept the logic that selections are made and I know that no selection is easy for a coach/staff team - someone is always going to have to miss out - but I do have concerns about the short+long term impacts of the logic outlined by the order priorities of selection (from 1-6). I understand the logic that you've taken with this, but I feel it has the capability (and does in reality) to bias riders towards trying to peak for early goals in the season (ie canadian nationals) to get selected for panams->World cups. Ie if you get that good first result in the season it means it can be very hard to fight your way back into a selection spot for sprint or keirin over riders who are getting those opportunities. Long term I believe this means we as a team miss out on having the best riders represent us at major events. For example: if a rider like Cole Dempster, isn't in form at canadian nationals or gets injured etc, doesn't then get selected for Pan-Ams then when it comes to World Cups where they're maybe equal with other riders in the pool, they don't have the Panam results => no selection. Then if they hit the scenario where they actually come really good pre</p>	<p>Riders have the opportunity to earn a spot on the team by demonstrating through competition and training performances that they are faster than established athletes with a past history of performances. Having said that, given there are so few international competitions, and so few spots on the team, it may not happen overnight – it might take a season for an athlete to be regularly selected for international competition. Trials are sometimes an appropriate way to select the team, but they do not truly replicate the demands of competing at the World Cup or World Championships level; the only way to know how an athlete performs in that environment is for them to do it.</p>

<p>worlds, what's the route into that selection for them? With all due respect I do feel that right now the selection policy doesn't have an ability for someone to be selected on current form rather than previous form 6-12 months earlier - namely because coaching discretion is included 6 points lower. In my view I feel it would be better to have trials or selection projects (maybe in a C1/2 environment) just closer to the relevant event. I know it is a difficult balance to strike of ending up having 4x trials a year in staff resource time etc, but I feel having a more flowing continual process than this one outlined now is more effective long term at balancing internal competition and gives athletes more continual clarity towards where they stand. I feel if an athlete is to get injured (ie like Ryan or Emy) right now as the policy stands its really unclear as to how they can fight their way back into the team if they've 'missed the boat' with Panam/World Cups selection etc. I appreciate all the work that's went into this document and I know that every staff member is doing their best, but I just feel this is going too far down the route of not getting sued or complained about rather than what's best for performance.</p>	
<p>Technical & tactical ability is something included in coach discretion: is there any method that coach or CC use in quantifying this or measuring this from one rider to another? Rather than just a rider beating someone 'faster', with sprinters racing so rarely in a season it could just come down to one event at nationals or a C2 that could effectively be luck or just their opponents' mistakes. Surely there are other ways to quantify or outline what the coach considers key tech/tactical qualities (ie decision making, manouvres, observation, adaptability in positions, adaptability going between positions)?</p>	<p>The assessment of technical and tactical ability is based on the coach's observations over multiple training sessions and competitions rather than a single competition. The elements that are assessed are taught and refined by the national team coach and it's important that athletes understand what strong performance looks like in their discipline.</p> <p>At a high level, the technical and tactical requirements are not defined through a fixed rubric or checklist. They are assessed through how effectively an athlete applies their skills in training and competition environments, in alignment with the demands of their discipline.</p> <p>Much of this feedback is intentionally delivered through ongoing coaching in training and racing.</p> <p>No single metric (including 200m time) fully captures readiness. While max speed is critical, race opportunities are based on an athlete's ability and potential to perform.</p> <p>From a selection perspective, evaluation focuses on things such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consistency and reliability of technical execution at speed ▪ Tactical decision-making and adaptability in race situations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ability to execute the race plan and respond to changing dynamics ▪ How skills hold up under fatigue and stress <p>If there is uncertainty about specific areas for improvement, that discussion is best had directly with with the National Coach, within the context of training and competition.</p>
<p>Further to the grasp of technical/tactical qualities. To be realistic of where our sprint programme is (with the exception of Lauriane), our riders right now aren't fast enough to challenge to get into QF spots at World Champs etc. Surely a more appropriate way would be to be more 200 minded as it is a more repeatable and measurable metric to compare riders that will also be more indicative of finishing result at a World Champs/Cup etc? None of our riders are regularly racing their way into finals when they qualify 18th, so let's be realistic about the riders we have, not the riders we wish we had.</p>	<p>Our program is driving for Olympic qualification and results. It only makes sense to bring athletes to World Cups if they are ready to contribute to that goal, or advance far enough into the tournament to benefit from the experience. Flying 200m times are one indication but no guarantee that an athlete is ready to race, so selection has to look at a broader range of factors.</p>
<p>In all of the selection criteria for sprint and keirin there is reference to CC reserving the right to select based off of the wider Oly Qual strategy. What is the wider strategy? Is it TS focussed for men and/or individual events for women? And if so, then given qualification for TS for men includes qualification for SP + KE, surely then on a tight budget selection for individual events should come from riders in the TS pool - as happens in almost every other TS nation (GBR, AUS, GER, FRA, CHN etc). Should we really be taking riders to major races who aren't team sprint competitive?</p>	<p>The Olympic qualification strategy will evolve based on our athletes' abilities and Canada's qualification status for events that count towards Olympic qualification, and may differ between the men's team and the women's team. Expending resources on the Team Sprint may not be the best strategy for 2028 if there is a low chance of being top 8 in the Olympic ranking and it compromises Canada's ability to qualify for individual events.</p>
<p>Specifically regarding the clause around "Suitability to specific positions in the Team Sprint." - is there further metrics how this is selected? Is a P2/3 selected on the riders ability to do a fast standing 125m that can get them on the wheel or their ability to do a fast lap even if there's 0.4s changeover difference?</p>	<p>This is assessed partly based on times – our National Team time standards include times for each Team Sprint position – and partly on observation in training and competition. As noted above, the positions are interdependent: each athlete's time is affected by the riders before them. An athlete would only be selected to P2/3 if they can follow P1, but that assessment would depend on how fast P1 is.</p>