

November 2015 Secretary's Report

This report details the day-to-day activities of the ASCA Board of Directors. It includes issues brought before the Board of Directors through mail, fax, e-mail, and/or telephone communications.

This report is respectfully submitted by Kalla Jaco, Executive Secretary.

Board Email Motions

BD.15.117 Uphold DQ of Chinook

Approve: Unanimous

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion carries.

Motion by Wesen

Second by Dolan

Based on Counsel's recommendation and the Dog Aggression Rules, I move to uphold the disqualification of Chinook by Judge Sandra Katzen for a dog bite which occurred at the ASC of British Columbia Agility trial on September 6, 2015.

BD.15.119 Conformation Judges' Training Video

Approve: DeChant, Dolan, Gray, Vest, Wesen

Disapprove: Gibson, King, Kissman, Silveira

Abstain: 0

Motion carries.

Comment from Gibson: The video needs a voice-over/narration to be clear on all sections.

Comment from Kissman: I believe there is too much confusion concerning what is to be posted. After this is cleared up, another motion can be made.

Comment from Silveira: I cannot support this motion as questions were asked with no answers forthcoming and a lack of discussion by the Directors.

Motion by Dolan

Second by Wesen

I move to direct the Web Master to post a link to the Conformation Committee's 2015 National Specialty Judges' Training seminar on the ASCA web site.

Rationale: Posting the video link on the web site allows Judges who were unable to attend to view the training.

Effective when approved by the Board of Directors.

BD.15.120 Board Directive - Conduct at an ASCA Event (Revised)

Approve: Dolan

Disapprove: DeChant, Gibson, Gray, King, Kissman, Silveira, Vest, Wesen

Abstain: 0

Motion fails.

Comment from Gibson: I feel this needs to be reworded so that it is more program-neutral and fits the needs of all of ASCA's competitive programs.

Comment from Kissman: I do not believe that the wording of this motion will help resolve the issues that some Judges are experiencing. Currently, I believe that Judges have the authority and responsibility to take action as they see fit.

Comment from Vest: Membership responses did not support the motion as written.

Comment from Wesen: I think it needs more work.

Motion by Dolan

Second by Vest

I move to direct the Program Committees to insert the following in their respective program rulebooks. A list of proposed locations follows the text of the insert.

Conduct and Sportsmanship at an ASCA Event

ASCA has the right to reprimand or suspend any person or persons, including but not limited to visitors, exhibitors, contestants, judges, helpers, and officials, from any or all privileges of ASCA for conduct prejudicial to the best interests of the Australian Shepherd, ASCA events or ASCA. Exhibitors are to maintain the highest level of sportsmanship and are to conduct themselves accordingly. Foul or abusive language, yelling at exhibitors or judges, disorderly conduct, and/or poor sportsmanship will not be allowed and shall be disciplined.

An Affiliate, or the Board, may take direct action if poor conduct occurs, even if no formal complaint is filed. If a Formal Representative of the Affiliate (Show Secretary, President, other officer, etc.) witnesses disruptive conduct/poor sportsmanship, the Affiliate should remove the disruptive individual/s from the event grounds for the entire show/trial weekend. Any other person observing poor sportsmanship may file a complaint making the behavior in question subject to the ASCA Dispute Rules.

Good Sportsmanship includes: Congratulating winners, taking responsibility for your dog(s) including grooming, training, feeding, and clean-up, showing respect for fellow competitors and their dogs, respecting the judge's decision, etc.

Poor Sportsmanship includes, (but is not limited to): Any negative remarks heard at ringside or anywhere on the show grounds about the judge or other competitors, mistreatment of a dog (defined but not limited to) treating a dog harshly or with a heavy hand, or an over harsh correction or being cruel to the dog because you lost, throwing ribbons or gifts on the table when leaving the ring, improper handling/ring procedures such as up-staging, crowding the handler in front of you, stepping on a dog or handler behind you or baiting dogs other than your own. Poor Sportsmanship is grounds for discipline

The presiding Judge/Judges is/are responsible for enforcing the preceding within the ring/trial arena. The Show Committee is responsible for enforcing the preceding outside the ring/trial arena/trial and within the Show Grounds.

For enforcement the following definitions apply:

Boundaries of Ring/Trial Arena and Show Grounds:

a. RING/TRIAL ARENA: The ring/trial arena is the bounded area in which judging of an event occurs and over which the Judge has authority. The boundary is defined by physical barriers plus a buffer zone extending ten (10) feet from such physical barriers.

b. SHOW GROUNDS: The Show Grounds are the boundaries of the grounds on which ASCA events are held. They include, but not limited to, all areas outside the ring/trial arena (including the buffer zone) set aside for grooming, holding of dogs, and parking of exhibitor vehicles.

Proposed rulebook locations:

Agility - Insert as section 1.5

Conformation - replace present section 1.11

Juniors - Replace section 1.3

Obedience - Insert as section 1.33

Rally - Insert as section 1.36

Stockdog - Insert as section 4.16

Tracking - Replace section 1.14

Rationale: The most complete information governing show/trial personal conduct appears in the Conformation rulebook. The Junior rulebook contains definitions of sportsmanship. Other program rulebooks contain little or no information concerning personal conduct. When implemented, this directive places all programs on common ground with respect to show/trial personal conduct. The program committees shall process this directive so it is included in the June 2016 rulebooks.

Effective when approved by the Board of Directors.

BD.15.121 Rescue Grant Applicant (Aussie Rescue in MI)

Approve: Unanimous

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion carries.

Motion by Vest

Second by King

The Grant Review Committee moves to accept the grant request from Australian Shepherd Rescue in Michigan in the amount of \$5000.00. The grant is to be used to support their continued efforts to provide the appropriate health care and MDR-1 testing for all dogs they foster. MDR-1 testing is important to ascertain for the rescues as it was documented by Washington State University that testing on Australian Shepherds found the gene in 50% of dogs tested. All health information as well as MDR-1 test results are provided to perspective owners to insure no adverse drug reactions for the rescues.

Rationale: Australian Shepherd Rescue in Michigan has provided all supporting documentation required for approval of their grant request.

Effective date: Immediate, upon approval of the BOD.

BD.15.122 Rescue Grant Applicant (Aussie Rescue of MN)

Approve: DeChant, Dolan, Gibson, Gray, Kissman, Silveira, Vest, Wesen

Disapprove: King

Abstain: 0
Motion carries.

Motion by Vest
Second by DeChant

The Grant Review Committee moves to accept the grant request from Aussie Rescue of Minnesota, Inc. in the amount of \$5000.00. The grant is to be used to support their continued efforts to provide transportation for the dogs they foster. The dogs are picked up at shelters and owners all over the state of Minnesota. They are taken for vet care, on visits to perspective homes, and other trips as necessary to locate homes for the dogs. Trips are regularly in excess of 100+ miles. The van that is currently in use has 250,000+ miles and its reliability is in question. The supporting documentation in the request details the benefit that Aussie Rescue of Minn. has provided to the breed. Per the documentation, this rescue has found homes for approx. 1000 Australian Shepherds since 1999. The number of dogs placed and resources required for the same signifies the dedication that Aussie Rescue of Minnesota, Inc. has shown to the rescue of Australian Shepherds.

Rationale: The stated need on the request was for "transportation", with end result being the purchase of a van to fulfill transportation concerns. The Rescue Grant document specifies "the organization must provide a specific need for an award" and in this case Aussie Rescue of Minn. has met that standard. Grant request was reviewed and approved by ASCA Counsel.

Effective date: Immediate, upon approval of the BOD.

BD.15.123 Obedience Committee Applicant (MacLehose)

Approve: Unanimous
Disapprove: 0
Abstain: 0
Motion carries.

Motion by Wesen

I move to except Beth MacLehose to obedience committee. Region 4 is vacant.

JA.15.40 Approved Breeder Judge (McDaniel)

Approve: Unanimous
Disapprove: 0
Abstain: 0
Motion carries.

Motion by DeChant

I move to approve Flo McDaniel for Approved Breeder Judge as she has met the requirements.

JA.15.41 Non-Regular Breeder Judge (Williams)

Approve: Unanimous
Disapprove: 0
Abstain: 0
Motion carries.

Motion by DeChant

I move to approve Dianna Williams for Non-Regular Breeder Judge as she has met the qualifications and has been published with no comment received.

RA.15.12 Pinning the C Class Ribbons

Approve: Unanimous

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: 0

Motion carries.

Motion by Wesen

I move to approve this motion from the Rally Committee.

Motion title: RC Motion 15.12 Pinning the C class ribbons

Effective Date: June 1, 2016

Maker of motion: Karen Black

Secunder of motion: Corinne Shanks

Motion Statement: I move to clarify the pinning of the C class so there is less confusion for the judges, affiliates and exhibitors at all rally trials when awarding ribbons to exhibitors in the C class.

Purpose for motion: There is a lot of confusion regarding qualifying scores in the C class and if the 170 to 189 qualifying scores should receive ribbons or only those with a 190 or higher. A qualifying score in Rally is 170 - 200. What is confusing about the C class is that in order to receive a qualifying C leg toward the C title, the team has to score a 190 or higher. This motion confirms qualifying scores and how to distribute ribbons at trials with exhibitors in the C class.

Party(s) affected by the motion and how it will affect them:

Judges: judges will now understand that all qualifying scores receive a ribbon and that the actual score is what determines how the score contributes toward titles.

Affiliates: affiliates will not be confused about how ribbons are distributed.

Exhibitors: exhibitors will now understand they get a qualifying ribbon because they did qualify but that in order to receive credit for a score to count toward the C title it has to be 190 and for the score to count toward an X title it has to be 195 or higher.

If necessary, please state the date that the affected office was contacted: Draft Motion was sent to the office 10/25/15 to see how this might affect the Business office and if anything would need to be changed from their perspective.

Please include either the response or a summary of the response here: Ray Fryar, Business Office Manager, responded on 10/26/15 the he reviewer the proposed motion and sees no problem from the office on this.

Results of the committee vote:

Approve: 7

Disapprove: 3

Abstain: 0

Non-voting: 0

Comments from committee members:

Carrie Lovell: I strongly disapprove of this motion. I believe that instead of clearing up confusion this motion is only going to create more, thus being detrimental to the Rally program as a whole. It is in direct conflict with section 1.11.3 in the rulebook clearly stating that a "C" qualifying score will be awarded to those teams with a score of 190 points or higher in any C Rally class. A qualifying score is the means to earn a title, not just earn a ribbon.

Ann Lovell: I fail to see the logic in this motion. If a change in the rules is needed, it would be better to make the minimum qualifying score in the C classes a 170 like in the A and B classes, rather than risk more confusion by giving out qualifying scores that don't count towards a title.

Pat Pierce: There has been confusion for some time, from exhibitors all the way through judges, as to whether or not dogs entered in a C class, and earning a score from 170 - 189, have earned a Qualifying ribbon since the earned score was not high enough to earn a leg towards a C title. Our clarification follows the precedent set by Obedience, where scores of 170 and above are defined as Qualifying scores, earn a Qualifying ribbon, and have that score recorded on judges books and trial summary paperwork, as Qualifying. Scores below a 190 are indeed Qualifying scores, but have not met the requirements to earn a qualifying leg towards the C title.

Beryl Billingsley: I do not believe that this motion "fixes" the named problem. The C class in Rally is unique in that it requires a higher than normal score to "qualify" and earn a leg. This motion allows a non-leg earning 170 score to receive a qualifying ribbon. A better option, in my view, if we want to allow 170's to be qualifying in the C classes is to change the C class titles to a point system based on a score of 190 or higher. This allows all 170 or above scores to qualify, and still retains the integrity of the C class titles.

Leah Swatko: Due to confusion and questions from exhibitors and judges this motion clarifies the pinning of the C classes. The added cost to the club for a flat ribbon is negligible compared to the cost of an entry. This supports clubs who hold rally trials and promotes the tangible sign of success for each entrant regardless of the score. A qualifying score is still 170 or better.

Karen Souza: I have personally been at trials where this question has come up. The rule book is not clear and can easily be misinterpreted. I feel this motion is needed to clarify the intent of the Rally program.

Karen Black: There has been confusion regarding pinning the C class as soon as exhibitors started showing in this class. All scores of 170 and higher are recorded in the judge's book because qualifying scores in rally are 170 and higher and judges books are then sent to the Business Office. All scores are entered into the computer and figure into merit standings regardless of how high the score is. If scores are 190 or higher from the C class, credit is given toward the "C" title for that dog. This motion clarifies that dogs who score 170 or higher return to the ring for a regular qualifying green ribbon. Scores of 190 or higher are recognized as counting as one of the 5 required scores of 190 or higher to receive the "C" title. And scores of 195 or higher receive an "X" qualifying score just as it does in all ASCA classes. This motion simply instructs the judges to call all qualifiers back to the ring instead of just the ones getting 190 or higher. This motion will also encourage exhibitors to continue showing even though they have not quite reached the level needed for the "C" title. I believe this will serve the affiliates, exhibitors and ASCA's best interest and keep them coming back for more rally. People like ribbons, people like being recognized for their successes in the ring. This motion in no way diminishes or changes any of the titling requirements for any class or level.

Body of the motion:

PROPOSED WORDING

2.11.2 Pinning the Class

Before awarding the prizes, the Judge shall inform the exhibitors and spectators as to the maximum number of points for a perfect score, an X score, or a C score out of the C class, as well as the minimum number of points to qualify, and shall then announce the score of each placement. The Judge shall then present to all handlers with qualifying scores their X, C, or regular qualifying score and their X or regular qualifying ribbon.

A team competing in the C class receiving a qualifying score between 170 and 189 will receive a regular qualifying ribbon. A team competing in the C class receiving a qualifying score between 190 and 194 will receive a regular qualifying ribbon and their score will count toward their C title at the level they are entered. A team competing in the C class receiving a qualifying score between 195 and 200 will receive an "X" qualifying ribbon and their score will count toward both their X title (if it has not already been earned) and their C title at the level they are entered.

CURRENT WORDING

2.11.2 Pinning the Class

Before awarding the prizes, the Judge shall inform the exhibitors and spectators as to the maximum number of points for a perfect score, an X score, or a C score out of the C class, as well as the minimum number of points to qualify, and shall then announce the score of each placement. The Judge shall then present to all handlers with qualifying scores their X, C, or regular qualifying score and their X or regular qualifying ribbon.

Board Teleconference Meeting Minutes

November 12, 2015

Present: President Ann DeChant, 1st Vice President Preston Kissman, 2nd Vice President Laura Gibson, Treasurer Pete Dolan, Secretary Ken Silveira, Director Linda Gray, Director Cindy King, Director Rachel Vest, Director Jan Wesen, Executive Secretary Kalla Jaco

There is a quorum with 9 voting members of the Board present.

DeChant called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm Central Time.

Items in Executive Session

There are two items that were discussed in Executive Session below. The times are marked for when ES was entered and exited. No votes were taken.

Assigning Issues to Directors

It was suggested by DeChant that the Board go back to assigning issues that come in to individual Directors to investigate and make a recommendation to the entire Board. It can be problematic when the Board discusses an issue or attempts to respond to an issue without appropriate due process or without understanding all the facts.

The Executive Secretary keeps a rotating list of Directors who are in line to investigate. Kissman has been assigned to investigate two complaint appeals that came in over the same subject. Gray has been

assigned to investigate a member's complaint against an Affiliate. King has been assigned to investigate a request from an Affiliate regarding a member's conduct.

Ratify October Email Votes

BD.15.124 Ratify October Email Votes

All present approve.

Motion carries.

Motion by Kissman

Second by Dolan

I make a motion to ratify the October email votes.

October Treasurer's Report

Dolan gave the Treasurer's Report for October. There is \$156,818.89 in the Chase checking account, \$250,371.35 in the Chase savings account, and \$100.00 in the Chase wire account. There is \$171,241.74 in the Raymond James investment account.

There is \$38,032 in the Additional Event Membership Dues account. This balance includes payment to the 2015 Host Club. From the inception of the \$.25 fee ASCA has collected \$79,117 and paid \$41,085 to host clubs (2013, 2014, and 2015).

There were increases in income from Aussie Times subscriptions (\$9,542.99) and registry services (\$1,395.65). There were decreases in income from Aussie Times ads (-\$5,410), gain/loss on securities (-20,316.47), member services (-\$3,766.68), membership dues (-\$1,959.17), miscellaneous (-\$765.28), and program income (-\$18,776.30). There were increases in expenses for Aussie Times mail preparation (\$2,310.15), computer (\$123,135.49), depreciation expense (\$7,846.59), Director/Officer reimbursement (\$9,529.75), member services (\$5,321.52), miscellaneous (\$1,150.60), national ASCA expenses (\$1,050.18), NSF checks (\$751.00), office expenses (\$8,822.58), and payroll (\$3,882.44). There were decreases in expenses from advertising (-\$1,510), Aussie Times postage (-\$3,478.49), Aussie Times printing (-\$12,517.75), contract labor (-\$2,236.79), equipment rental (-\$3,211.73), insurance (-\$4,922.22), junior pins and year end awards (-\$2,150.00), professional fees (-\$2,291.90), repairs (-\$4,621.93), and staff travel and "ent" (-\$805.00). Net income through October is -\$65,476.49.

There has been \$116,698 paid so far to FrogSlayer and the total cost is quoted around \$270,000. Kissman questioned if ASCA will be able to pay for the new system with what is remaining in our savings and Dolan responded that we should.

ASCA is up in expenses compared to the 5-year average, but that is mainly a combination of payments to FrogSlayer and the increasing cost of maintenance for the system we currently have. It has been an average year for income and a higher-than-normal year for expenses, compared to the 5-year average.

BD.15.125 October Treasurer's Report

Approve: DeChant, Gibson, Gray, King, Kissman, Silveira, Vest, Wesen

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: Dolan

Motion carries.

Motion by Vest

Second by Kissman

I make a motion to accept the October Treasurer's report as provided by Pete Dolan.

System Upgrade

Vest has been keeping the Board updated by sending out weekly email updates (see below). There had been a question from System Liaison Allison Bryant about involving ASCA's program committees in revising the program rule requirements and making sure FrogSlayer is working from the most updated requirements. DeChant has been in contact with Bryant and Fryar about this. When the RFP was first done, the program committees did go through and put a lot of effort into putting in the requirements. That was years ago, however, and FrogSlayer has been drawing from the actual program rules and Fryar has been making sure they are getting the correct info. It may be beneficial, however, to have the committees do the work instead of FrogSlayer. The Board then discussed program rule changes that may occur that would affect the system programming. A previous Board had attempted to place a moratorium on rule changes that would affect the system, but it was premature and not very successful. Vest, DeChant, Bryant, and Fryar will work on all this and report back to the Board.

Email update from 11-2-2015:

- Dual Lifetime membership application
- Members can order DNA kits and view the kits they've ordered
- Lab sheet print-out (useful for admin-side kit packaging)
- Customers can log-in and edit the lab sheet for print out

Email update from 11-9-2015:

- Existing member registration
- Printing Lab Forms for Kits
- CSV results import for DNA Kits
- Kennel Ownership Change (incomplete)
- Kennel Admin page (incomplete)
- Planning for Dogs and Litters this week

Committee Membership

The Board discussed what happens when a Chair steps down, but chooses to remain on the committee as a contributing member. If the Chair is elected from the membership of the committee, then they have already been assigned a two-year term by the Board of Directors and they may serve on the committee until that term is expired (unless they resign or are removed). If the Chair is elected from outside the membership of the committee, they would be off the committee if they were to step down as Chair (they have not been assigned a two-year term to serve out).

Committee membership for all committees, except Stockdog, is organized by an *ideal* set up of two members per region and one Chair, for a total of 15 members. There are no requirements for a certain number of judge or contestant positions on any committee, except Stockdog. Because of the Stockdog Committee's rigid organization there can be issues, such as when a Chair steps down and their member position has been filled – keeping them on the committee would put their membership in conflict with their rules. Directing the Stockdog Committee to align their organization with the other committees could prevent any potential issues with membership being out of sorts.

BD.15.126 Directive to Stockdog Committee – Align with Committee Procedures

All present approve.

Motion carries.

Motion by DeChant

Second by Kissman

I make a motion to send a directive to the Stockdog Committee to make their committee makeup match up with the Committee Procedures used by the other committees, so we no longer have the problems with filling judge/contestant slots.

2016 Rally Judges

Kissman shared with the Board his desire to allow the 2016 Host Club extra time to finalize their Rally judges, beyond the November 15 deadline for their premium to be submitted. The Host Club is not at fault and so an extension would be appropriate. The Host Club will still be required to submit their premium by November 15, though, less the Rally judges.

BD.15.127 Extend Deadline for Hiring 2016 Nationals and Finals Rally Judges

Approve: DeChant, Dolan, Gibson, Gray, King, Kissman, Vest, Wesen

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: Silveira

Motion carries.

Motion by Kissman

Second by Gibson

I move to extend the date for hiring the Rally judges for 2016 until Dec 1, 2015. The Premium will still be expected on Nov 15, 2015.

The Rally Committee is currently working on a questionnaire for the Office to send to Rally Judges determining their eligibility to judge Rally Finals. In the future, that list can be provided to host clubs to make their selections from.

Increase Judging Limits for 2016 Nationals Conformation Judges

The 2016 Host Club has requested that the Board increase the Nationals Conformation judging limit from 175 dogs per day to 200 dogs per day. They think that this will keep the spillover on Friday to a minimum and will not affect those who wish to attend the banquet.

Some Directors shared their thoughts that judging 175 dogs in one day can be already very physically and intellectually taxing; adding 25 dogs to a day may seem small, but that's another hour to an already long day. Some had heard input from Breeder Judges who felt that they would not be able to give each dog the time they deserved to be evaluated by trying to fit judging more dogs into one day. Wesen stated that she did not want to see ASCA become like AKC with someone sitting outside the ring with a stopwatch making sure the judges are making time on evaluations. Silveira shared that he had spoken to many Breeder Judges who felt comfortable with the increase and did not feel that they would be incapable of giving each entry a fair go-over because of the extra dogs.

Several Directors expressed that they would be opposed to a rule change, but would entertain an exception for the 2016 Nationals. However, if you allow it for one year, you set a precedent. Kissman brought up the past increase in stock runs that are judged per day, from 40 to 60, and how that was a rule change and not an exception. Gibson questioned what inspired the increase for stock and Silveira responded that it was to increase the number of entries. The issue is a bit different here, as they do not limit entries for Nationals Conformation and this only has to do with how many dogs are judged per day, not how many may enter. King suggested that an extra day be added to Nationals Conformation to spread things out and allow exhibitors to engage in evening educational and social activities.

BD.15.128 Increase Judging Limit for 2016 Conformation Nationals

Approve: Gray, Gibson, Kissman

Disapprove: DeChant, Dolan, King, Vest, Wesen

Abstain: Silveira

Motion fails.

Motion by Gray

Second by Kissman

I move to raise the judging limit per day for the 2016 Nationals from 175 dogs to 200 dogs.

✚ The Board entered Executive Session at 8:15 pm to discuss two complaint appeals that have been filed with the Board. The appeals were assigned to Kissman to investigate and bring a recommendation to the entire Board.

✚ The Board exited Executive Session at 8:25 pm.

Conduct at an ASCA Event

Kissman shared some concerns he had regarding the current exhibitor conduct motion before the Board for email voting. He brought up what the Board discussed at Nationals - clarifying that the judge is the absolute authority within the ring or arena and the show committee is responsible for anything outside of that, but on the show grounds. A judge or a show committee can remove an exhibitor for unsportsmanlike conduct. It would then be up to the Board to take any disciplinary action beyond that. This is how ASCA's rules stand now and some Directors felt that this current motion was reaching into territory that the Board had not discussed. Some asked for the motion to be withdrawn so the committee of DeChant, Dolan, and Gibson that was formed at Nationals can work on the wording and create something more concise.

There were concerns brought to the Board at Nationals that Judges feel like the Board isn't going to back them up for disciplinary action. No one on the Board could recall an actual incident where a judge was not backed up by ASCA, but this is a problem nonetheless. People in general are afraid to speak up because they are fearful that they will face backlash for coming forward. Silveira commented that people feel it is dangerous to challenge what they see going on.

✚ The Board entered Executive Session at 8:40 pm to discuss a question concerning two complaints that have been filed with an Affiliate.

✚ The Board exited Executive Session at 8:43 pm.

Conflict of Interest

Kissman requested that the issue of "conflict of interest" be added to the agenda for the December Board's teleconference meeting. There had been some discussion and questions about this during the Nationals meetings.

Committee Functioning

Gibson has noted some divisive behavior on the committees and feels that the Board should send a notice to committees instructing them to behave in a professional manner when conducting business. Sometimes the committees forget their function in this back and forth. There is not any precise language about professionalism in the Committee Procedures.

DeChant feels that usually there is self-regulation on the committees and if someone is being rude other members will step in. Vest was always of the opinion that it was the job of the Liaison to step in when the committee gets too far out of bounds, or they are rude to each other, and get them back on track. The remainder of the Board agreed.

January Rule Book Printings

If a committee presents a valid request to have a January rule book printing the Board will typically grant that request. Some rules can go in a January rule book printing that don't change the composition of the program and do not need to be held for a June printing. In general, however, significant rule changes should be held for June.

Aussie Times Ad

The Board received a request at their Nationals meeting from Stockdog Finals Course Director Pam Watson for the Board to pay for an Aussie Times ad to thank all the volunteers that helped to make the 2015 Stockdog Finals a success. This would be a full page black & white ad for \$75.

BD.15.129 Aussie Times Ad to Thank SDF Volunteers

Approve: DeChant, Dolan, Gibson, Gray, King, Silveira, Vest, Wesen

Disapprove: 0

Abstain: Kissman

Motion carries.

Motion by Gray

Second by Vest

I move to approve the request of Pam Watson for a full page black & white ad in the Aussie Times to thank the Stockdog Finals volunteers.

2016 National Specialty

Kissman stated that as the Liaison for the 2016 Nationals he will be sure to keep the Board informed on everything that is going on. He would like to put any concerns that the Board may have to rest. He is satisfied with the organization and believes that the 2016 Nationals will go on as advertised. Vest was unaware that there were any serious doubts about that and Kissman said that several Directors had shared concerns with him. Gibson said that the Agility Committee has shared concerns due to a bad experience in 2015, not necessarily because of anything 2016 Host Club has done.

Dock Diving

Silveira told the Board about a phone call he and Gray had with Debbie Markwardt, President of North America Diving Dogs (NADD), and Doug Ljungren, Vice President of AKC Sports & Events.

AKC and NADD have an exclusive agreement to test dock diving. When asked multiple times how would AKC change their agreement with NADD, no answer was given. AKC will require the use of the AKC logo on NADD's pools wherever NADD is set up to conduct a trial. AKC will not allow the use of the ASCA logo at any NADD trial with the exception of the ASCA National Specialty.

Mr. Ljungren asked if ASCA would be interested in allowing AKC to allow their dogs to record ASCA Stockdog Titles. He was told that ASCA's program was very different from AKC's and that he could look at ASCA's website to find the Stockdog Rules to make his own comparison.

Silveira then spoke to Ms. Markwardt about the conversation with Mr. Ljungren. Silveira told her that the ASCA Stockdog program is not in play for permission from AKC to be involved with NADD. She spoke about ASCA sanctioning ASCA dock diving trials. Silveira told her ASCA was not going to sanction any trials. ASCA would like to sign a contract with NADD to provide the same services as with AKC.

If AKC is not willing to allow ASCA access then this is a non-starter. If AKC will change their agreement to allow ASCA equal access to NADD for testing and certification purposes then NADD will support ASCA in the same manner as they do AKC.

The process for this would be that members can earn a certificate with NADD which can be submitted to ASCA to have that title added to the dog's registered name. There would be an administrative fee and an ASCA certificate of title would be issued. The Business Office is figuring what it would cost to cover this and how it would affect the computer system.

DeChant thinks that before anything is done the Board needs to have a rule in place that allows ASCA to enter into a reciprocal agreement with an organization that offers a program ASCA does not.

Silveira suggests sticking with this topic a little longer to see if Mr. Ljungren is willing to share access to NADD. However, if he is going to set up any kind of conditions to our access then ASCA will not accept.

Agreement with CKC

Silveira questioned whether an actual written agreement with CKC existed. Yes, it states that CKC will accept ASCA registered Aussies and use the ASCA Breed Standard.

Junior Merit Directive to Agility and Stockdog Committees

The Board clarified their directive to the Agility and Stockdog Committees to work with the Junior Committee to create a year-end program that mirrors Obedience. At one time the Junior merit/year-end standings program for the Juniors in Stock mirrored that of Obedience, where scores were cumulative and the Juniors qualified with a base score + additional scores for HIT and HIT with competition. At one time it was changed to averaging, so a Junior earning points in Stock now does not even have to earn a qualifying score except to enter an arena a minimum of twice and they average their two scores. If they get two good scores they can sit on it and qualify for All Around Junior without having to work for the whole year. A bad score can also jeopardize what they have been working for all year. It's the only division in the Junior programs that doesn't accumulate scores. Agility right now does not have any merit/year-end standings program or scores counted toward All Around Junior. The directive is to take it back to where it used to be – make it cumulative. In Junior Showmanship handlers can earn recognition in a "500 Club" with their cumulative points and none of the other junior programs offer that.

Dolan moved to adjourn.

DeChant called the meeting adjourned at 9:33 pm.