May 2013 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.

13.61 2012 Finals Payment

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Bates, DeChant, Ford, Gann, Gray, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Clayton
Abstain: Hardin
Motion Passes 7-1

13.61 2012 Finals Payment

I move to approve payment of the attached invoice for ASCA’s Finals from CVASC Nationals 2012.

Motion: Gray
Second: Bates

98:10 Tracking: TDU Test Entry

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Unanimous
Abstain: Hardin
Motion Passes 8-0

98:10 Tracking: TDU Test Entry

I move to approve the following from the Tracking Committee.

Motion: Gray

Motion: Hershey
Second: Wesen

Approve: 5
Disapprove: None
Abstain: 1

I move that the present draw order for TDU Test entry be modified to enable previously titled dogs to compete evenly with untitled dogs in these draws, with
exceptions for dogs who already have achieved the 3TD/TDU titles required for
the ASCA Master Tracker title.

The present regulations for TDU Test entry are presented in Section 1.20 b of the
ASCA Tracking Regulations and read as follows:

Section 1.20 a The TDU "Draw for Test Entries"
The TDU "Draw for Test Entries" shall be at random from all entries received,
except that for a Tracking Dog Urban (TDU) Test, priority in the "Draw for Test
Entries" shall be given in the following order:
1. To a non-titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd with a certification* or an
equivalent title,
2. To a non-titled dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number with a certification*
or an equivalent title,
3. To a TDU titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd,
4. To a TDU titled dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number,
5. To a non-titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd without a certification or
equivalent title,
6. To a non-titled dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number without a
certification or equivalent title.

I move that the priorities in draw order be revised to read as follows:
1. To all ASCA registered Australian Shepherds, including those previously titled
through ASCA TDU 2 or ASCA TD 2, or TDU and TD, or untitled but with
certifications or equivalent titles.
2. To all dogs with ASCA Office Tracking Numbers, including those previously
titled through ASCA TDU 2 or ASCA TD 2, or TDU and TD, or untitled but with
certification or equivalent titles.
3. To all ASCA registered Australian Shepherds with TDU 3, TD 3, or TDU/TD 3
titles,
4. To all dogs with ASCA Office Tracking Numbers with TDU3, TD3, or
TDU/TD3 titles,
5. To a non-titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd without a certification or
equivalent title,
6. To a non-titled dog with and ASCA Office Tracking Number without a
certification or equivalent title.

Comments: This revision is necessary because ASCA now has adopted the
Master Tracker title, which requires a total of 3 TD/TDU passes, as well as 2 TDX
passes. The present regulations place previously titled ASCA registered
Australian Shepherds behind all untitled dogs in the draw for test entry. Because
very few test tracks are offered in a given TDU Test - a maximum of 12 tracks
according to ASCA tracking regulations, and usually fewer - the present priority
scheme creates a titling bottleneck for previously titled Australian Shepherds,
who are given lower priority than untitled dogs of other breeds in the Draw for
Test Entry. The suggested revision places previously titled Australian Shepherds
and untitled certified Australian Shepherds into the same top priority pool for the Draw for Test Entry. It will give these demonstrably capable, well-trained dogs the opportunity to enter the tests they need in order to achieve the MT title within a reasonable length of time. The revised priority also gives dogs of other breeds opportunities to complete their titles, and it allows TDU/TD 3 dogs to enter our tests, though with lower priority in the Draw for Test Entry.

98:10 Tracking: TDX Test Entry

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Unanimous
Abstain: Hardin
Motion Passes 8-0

98:10 Tracking: TDX Test Entry

I move to approve the following from the Tracking Committee.

Motion: Gray

Motion: Hershey
Second: Wesen

Approve: 5
Disapprove: None
Abstain: 1

I move that the present draw order for TDX Test entry be modified to enable previously titled dogs to compete evenly with untitled dogs in these draws, with exceptions for dogs who already have achieved the 2 TDX titles required for the ASCA Master Tracker title.

The present regulations for TDX Test entry are presented in Section 1.20 c of the ASCA Tracking Regulations and read as follows:

Section 1.20 a The TDX "Draw for Test Entries"
The TDX "Draw for Test Entries" shall be at random from all entries received, except that for a Tracking Dog Excellent (TDX) Test, priority in the "Draw for Test Entries" shall be given in the following order:
a. To an ASCA registered Australian Shepherd with a TD or TDU title which has not earned a TDX,
b. To a dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number with a TD or TDU title which has not earned a TDX,
c. To an ASCA registered Australian Shepherd with a TDX,
d. To a dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number with a TDX.
I move that the priorities in draw order for test entry be revised to read as follows:

1. To all ASCA registered Australian Shepherds, including those previously titled through ASCA TDX 1 or untitled,
2. To all dogs with ASCA Office Tracking Numbers, including those previously titled through ASCA TDX 1, or untitled,
3. To all ASCA registered Australian Shepherds with TDX 2 titles or MT titles,
4. To all dogs with ASCA Office Tracking Numbers, with TDX 2 titles or MT titles.

Comments: This change is necessary because ASCA now has adopted the Master Tracker title, which requires a total of 2 TDX passes, as well as 3 TD passes. The present regulations place previously titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherds behind all untitled dogs in the draw for test entry. Because very few test tracks are offered in a given TDX Test - a maximum of 6 tracks according to ASCA tracking regulations, and usually fewer than 6 - the present priority creates a titling bottleneck for demonstrably capable dogs who should be able to achieve the MT title in a reasonable length of time. As it is, some of these dogs have to wait for years before they are able to enter our tests. Opportunity is given for TDX 2 dogs or MT dogs to continue entering tests, after other dogs’ entries have been drawn.

**98:10 Tracking: TD Test Entry**

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Unanimous
Abstain: Hardin

*Motion Passes 8-0*

**98:10 Tracking: TD Test Entry**

I move to approve the following from the Tracking Committee.

Motion: Gray

Motion: Hershey
Second: Wesen

Approve: 5
Disapprove: None
Abstain: 1

I move that the present draw order for TD Test entry be modified to enable previously titled dogs to compete evenly with untitled dogs in these draws, with exceptions for dogs who already have achieved the 3TD/TDU titles required for the ASCA Master Tracker title.
The present regulations for TD Test entry are presented in Section 1.20 a of the ASCA Tracking Regulations and read as follows:

Section 1.20 a The TD "Draw for Test Entries"
The TD "Draw for Test Entries" shall be at random from all entries received, except that for a Tracking Dog (TD) Test, priority in the "Draw for Test Entries" shall be given in the following order:
1. To a non-titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd with a certification* or an equivalent title,
2. To a non-titled dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number with a certification* or an equivalent title,
3. To a TD titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd,
4. To a titled dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number,
5. To a non-titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd without a certification or equivalent title,
6. To a non-titled dog with an ASCA Office Tracking Number without a certification or equivalent title.

I move the priorities in draw order be revised to read as follows:
1. To all ASCA registered Australian Shepherds, including those previously titled through ASCA TD2 or ASCA TDU2, or TD and TDU, or untitled but with certifications or equivalent titles.
2. To all dogs with ASCA Office Tracking Numbers, including those previously titled through ASCA TD2 or ASCA TDU2, or TD and TDU, or untitled but with certification or equivalent titles.
3. To ASCA registered Australian Shepherds with three or more TD/TDU titles,
4. To dogs with ASCA Office Tracking Numbers with three or more TD/TDU titles,
5. To a non-titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherd without a certification or equivalent title,
6. To a non-titled dog with and ASCA Office Tracking Number without a certification or equivalent title.

Comment: This revision is necessary because ASCA now has adopted the Master Tracker title, which requires a total of 3 TD passes, as well as 2 TDX passes. The present regulations place previously titled ASCA registered Australian Shepherds behind all untitled dogs in the random drawings for test entry. Because very few test tracks are offered in a given TD Test - 12 tracks maximum according to ASCA regulations, and usually fewer than 12 - the present priority creates a titling bottleneck for demonstrably capable Australian Shepherds who are being denied the test entries they need in favor of untitled dogs of other breeds. Revising the priority scheme to place previously titled Australian Shepherds and untitled certified Australian Shepherds into the same first priority pool for the Draw for Test Entry will give these capable, well-trained dogs the opportunities they need to achieve the MT title within a reasonable length of time. The revised priority scheme also gives dogs of other breeds good
opportunities to complete their titles, and it allows TD/TDU 3 dogs chances to enter our tests, though with lower priorities in the Draw for Test Entry.

94:01 Stock Dog: Change of Lettering to 11.7.4.d

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Bates, Clayton, DeChant, Ford, Gann
Disapprove: McClintock, Miller
Abstain: Gray, Hardin

Motion Passes 5-2

94:01 Stock Dog: Change of Lettering to 11.7.4.d

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Motion Approval: Unanimous

I make a motion that the lettering of 11.7.4 (d) be changed if the motion to (e); and the current (e) Sanctioning fee be changed to (f)

Rationale: If the motion to allow club generated score sheets passes there will need to be an adjustment to the subsequent lettering. If the board passes this motion it will be inserted into the January 2014 rulebook.

94:01 Stock Dog: Insertion of Farm Trial Score Sheet Template to ASCA Website

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Clayton, DeChant, Ford, Gann, Gray, Miller
Disapprove: Bates, McClintock
Abstain: Hardin

Motion Passes 6-2

94:01 Stock Dog: Insertion of Farm Trial Score Sheet Template to ASCA Website

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Motion Approval: Unanimous
If the motion concerning the club generated score sheep passes, I move that the Farm Trial Score sheet currently found on page 71 be removed. The example score sheet will be placed in the rule book opposite rule 11.7.4.

Rationale: If the motion concerning the club generated score sheep passes s passed an example score sheet will work will make it clearer for the clubs to understand. If approved by the board, a text entry score sheet template would be placed on the ASCA website under Stock Dog Forms starting in January 2014.

94:01 Stock Dog: Change to Page Number for Sample Farm Trial Score Sheet in Appendix

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: DeChant, Ford, Gann, Gray
Disapprove: Bates, McClintock, Miller
Abstain: Clayton, Hardin

Motion Passes 4-3

94:01 Stock Dog: Change to Page Number for Sample Farm Trial Score Sheet in Appendix

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Motion Approval: Unanimous

I make a motion that rule 11.6.4 be modified so that the appropriate page number can be inserted for the sample score sheet. The score sheet should be on the opposite page from the rule 11.7.4 (If the motion concerning clubs creating their own score sheet passes, otherwise remain in the appendix section and page number noted).

Current: 11.6.4 Score Sheet: (see page 55 – Farm Trial Score Sheet):
Proposed: 11.6.4 Score Sheet: (see page {insert appropriate page number} – Farm Trial Score Sheet):

Rationale: This motion is a housecleaning item. The page that the score sheet will be on will change with the modifications to the Farm Trial rules. If approved by the board this motion would be inserted into the January 2014 rulebook.

94:01 Stock Dog: Changes to Provisional Stock Dog Judge Requirements
Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: DeChant, Ford, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Bates, Gann, Gray
Abstain: Clayton, Hardin
Motion Passes 4-3

94:01 Stock Dog: Changes to Provisional Stock Dog Judge Requirements

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

SDC Motion by Sanderson, second by Hageus
Vote: Unanimous

SECTION 5 – PROVISIONAL STOCKDOG JUDGE
Current:
8.5.1 Upon appointment by the Board of Directors of an Apprentice Judge to the position of Provisional Stockdog Judge, the Provisional Stockdog Judge shall:
a. Serve a probationary period of two years, which must include judging at least six stock trials consisting of at least two trial days of sheep/goats, cattle or ducks/geese.

Change to:
8.5.1 Upon appointment by the Board of Directors of an Apprentice Judge to the position of Provisional Stockdog Judge, the Provisional Stockdog Judge shall:
a. Serve a probationary period of three years, which must include judging a combined total of 1200 runs. The combined total may be made up of any combination of runs with the exception that at least 200 runs are judged on each class of livestock (sheep/goats, cattle, and ducks/geese). The period of time needed to complete the 1200 runs may exceed the three year period and may be done without penalty. At no time is Provisional Judge eligible to move out of the Provisional Program before they have completed both three years and 1200 runs.

Rationale: This addition and change to the Provisional Program will allow the Provisional Judge to gain more experience before being moved to the Regular Stockdog Judge position. This ensures the individual has the necessary experience and time at the provisional level before moving to a Regular Stockdog Judge. This extension will ensure that no judge is able to judge ASCA Stockdog Finals before gaining the necessary experience. To be placed in the January 2014 rulebook

94:01 Stock Dog: Changes to Apprentice Stock Dog Judge Requirements
Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: DeChant, Ford
Disapprove: Bates, Gray, McClintock, Miller
Abstain: Clayton, Gann, Hardin

Motion Fails 2-4

94:01 Stock Dog: Changes to Apprentice Stock Dog Judge Requirements

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Motion by Sanderson, second by Hageus
Approval: Unanimous

SECTION 4 – APPRENTICESHIP

Current:
8.4.3 Trials: The first trial must be worked within 12 months of receiving notification from the Business Office of acceptance. The third trial should be completed within 24 months of notification unless an extension has been approved by the ASCA Stockdog Committee.

Change to:
8.4.3 Trials: The first trial must be worked within 12 months of receiving notification from the Business Office of acceptance. If the applicant lives in North America, the third trial should be completed within 24 months of notification unless an extension has been approved by the ASCA Stockdog Committee. If the applicant lives outside of North America, the third trial should be completed within 36 months of notification unless an extension has been approved by the ASCA Stockdog Committee.

Current:
8.4.6 Number of Trials: The Apprentice Judge will work a minimum of three (3) ASCA sanctioned trials on both cattle and sheep/goats and one on ducks/geese. A minimum of 60 runs each must be judged on sheep/goats and cattle, 30 on ducks/geese. The Apprentice Judge will work one trial outside of their region in which they reside with a minimum of twenty (20) runs each of cattle and sheep/goats.

Change to:
8.4.6 Number of Trials: The Apprentice Judge will work a minimum of three (3) ASCA sanctioned trials on both cattle and sheep/goats and one on ducks/geese. A minimum of 120 runs each must be judged on sheep/goats and cattle, 120 on ducks/geese. The Apprentice Judge will work one trial outside of their region in
which they reside with a minimum of twenty (20) runs each of cattle and sheep/goats.

Add:
8.4.13 Each Apprentice must have at least one assignment in North America. If the applicant lives outside of North America, he/she has 3 years to complete the requirements.

8.4.14 Any Judge the Apprentice works under may be asked to join a conference call with the ASCA Stockdog Committee to answer any questions that may arise upon completion of the Apprentice work.

Rationale: The changes and additions are made to ensure the Apprentice Judge is receiving all of the necessary skills and training during this period. This will enable the Apprentice to be a more qualified and experienced judge when they move to the Provisional Program. This also assists our new applicants in areas outside of North America by allowing them more time to satisfy the requirements. This is needed because of the financial hardship required in coming to North America to learn the skills necessary to become an experienced judge. To be placed in the January 2014 rulebook

94:01 Stock Dog: Addition of Advanced Trial Dog - Multiple Courses and ATD - X Titles

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Bates, Clayton, DeChant, Gann, Gray, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Ford
Abstain: Hardin

Motion Passes 7-1

94:01 Stock Dog: Addition of Advanced Trial Dog - Multiple Courses and ATD - X Titles

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Motion by Sanderson, Second by Wesen
Approve: 11
Disapprove: 1
Nonvoting or abstain: 0

I make a motion that rule 6.4 be amended, adding item d. and e., reassigning items f. through k. and adding items l., m., and n. as follows:
SECTION 4 – TITLES

Titles that may be awarded are:

a. Started Trial Dog - STD (class of stock)
b. Open Trial Dog - OTD (class of stock)
c. Advanced Trial Dog – ATD(class of stock)
d. Advanced Trial Dog Multiple courses – ATD-M(class of stock)

Awarded to Advanced Trial Dogs who have completed these additional requirements:
Two qualifying scores on Course A
Two qualifying scores on Course B
Three of the following four options (for a total of 6 additional qualifying scores):

Two qualifying scores on Course C
Two qualifying scores on Course D
Two qualifying scores on Course E
Two qualifying scores on Course F

Scores on each course must be received from 2 different judges.

e. Advanced Trial Dog Excellent – ATD-X(class of stock)
   Awarded to Advanced Trial Dogs who have completed these additional requirements:
   Two scores of 100 or higher on Course A
   Two scores of 100 or higher on Course B

   Three of the following four options (for a total of 6 additional scores of 100 or higher):
   Two scores of 100 or higher on Course C
   Two scores of 100 or higher on Course D
   Two scores of 100 or higher on Course E
   Two scores of 100 or higher on Course F

   Scores on each course must be received from 2 different judges.

f. Post Advanced Trial Dog - PATD (class of stock)
g. Open Farm Trial Dog – OFTD (class of stock)
h. Advanced Farm Trial Dog - AFTD (class of stock)
i. Ranch Dog - RD
j. Ranch Trial Dog - RTD (class of stock)
k. Working Trial Champion - WTCH (awarded to dogs who receive ATD titles in all three classes of stock).
I. Working Trial Champion M – WTCH-M (awarded to dogs who receive ATD-M titles in all three classes of stock)
m. Working Trial Champion X – WTCH-X (awarded to dogs who receive ATD-X titles in all three classes of stock)

Rationale: The addition of the Multiple Courses and ATD – X Titles will provide additional challenges and opportunities for members. If approved, the motion will be included in the January 2014 rulebook.

94:01 Stock Dog: Clarification of Free Standing Pen Dimensions for Geese in Course B, E, and F
Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Unanimous
Abstain: Hardin
Motion Passes 8-0

94:01 Stock Dog: Clarification of Free Standing Pen Dimensions for Geese in Course B, E, and F

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Stock Dog Committee Motion by Sanderson, second by Wesen
9 approve, 2 non-voting

I make a motion to make the following changes to the Stockdog Rule Book:

3.12.2 Course B Arena
c. Panels: We need to add to the "Note": The free-standing pen for Ducks/Geese must be a minimum of 4' by 4' and a maximum of 6' by 6'.

The final wording of the description will read as follows:
c. Panels: Ducks/geese arena panels will be 4-5 feet long and at least 2 feet high.
Cattle and sheep/goats arena panels will be 8-12 feet in length and will be at least 4 feet high.
Note: the free-standing pen panels for cattle and sheep/goats must be a minimum of 12 feet and a maximum of 16 feet with a gate of no less than 12 feet. The free-standing pen for Ducks/Geese must be a minimum of 4' by 4' and a maximum of 6' by 6'.

3.12.4 Course D Arena
Pen will be 4’ by 4’ needs to be changed to from 4’ by 4’ to 6’ by 6’.

The final wording of the description will read as follows:
Ducks/Geese arena panels will be 4-5 feet long and at least 2 feet high. Panels
shall not be closer than 9' to any fence. Openings between panels will be 6'. Pen will be from 4' by 4' to 6' by 6'. Sheep/Cattle panels will be: 8'-12' in length and at least 4' high. For arenas 100' to 124' in width 8' panels are recommended. Arenas 125' or wider 8' - 12' panels may be used.

3.12.6 Course F Arena
Pen will be 4' by 4' needs to be changed to from 4' by 4' to 6' by 6'.

The final wording of the description will read as follows:
Ducks/Geese arena panels will be 4-5 feet long and at least 2 feet high. Panels shall not be closer than 9' to any fence. Openings between panels will be 6'. Pen will be from 4' by 4' to 6' by 6' Sheep/Cattle panels will be: 8'-12' in length and at least 4' high. For arenas 100' to 124' in width 8' panels are recommended. Arenas 125' or wider 8' - 12' panels may be used.

Rationale: The reason for this motion is to coincide with the previous changes made to allow an increase in the number of Ducks/Geese to 10 head used in a trial. The current size pen of 4' x 4' is too small to accommodate 10 head of Geese, requiring an option to increase the minimum size of the free-standing Pen. This motion if passed will be included into the January 2014 rulebook.

94:01 Stock Dog: Correct Measurements for Ducks/Geese on Courses D & E
Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Unanimous
Abstain: Hardin
Motion Passes 8-0

94:01 Stock Dog: Correct Measurements for Ducks/Geese on Courses D & E

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

SDC Motion by Sanderson, second by Wesen
Vote: unanimous

I make a motion to include the following corrections/changes to the course description for Course D, Course E, and Course F regarding Ducks/Geese.

3.12.4 Course D add:
h. Obstacle 4: For Ducks/Geese the end of the panel closest to the re-pen end
of the arena will be placed 15’ above the Advanced Handler Line (opposite the re-pen end of the arena).

The entire subsection should read as follows:

h. Obstacle 4: There are two in-line panels that have a ten foot opening. The end of the panel closest to the re-pen end of the arena will be placed 30’ above the Advanced Handler Line (opposite the re-pen end of the arena). For Ducks/Geese the end of the panel closest to the re-pen end of the arena will be placed 15’ above the Advanced Handler Line (opposite the re-pen end of the arena). The stock must move from left to right for the exit. To receive course points, at least one head of livestock must pass the plane between the in-line panels. Only livestock that have cleared the opening of Obstacle 4 when the gate on Obstacle 5 is opened will earn course points. If the stock passes through the obstacle from the wrong direction, at least one head must be driven past the plane of the in-line panels so that DAYLIGHT can be seen by the Judge between the line and the stock. Only those head of stock that clear the daylight line will count for Course points. The stock then must be turned around to attempt the obstacle in the correct direction. Ability to control livestock points for this work will be subject to the manner in which the movements around the obstacle were executed.

3.12.4.5 Course E add:

e. Obstacle 1: For Ducks/Geese the center of the opening will be set at the center of the width of the arena and positioned 8’ above the end of the right hand panel (edge opposite the re-pen end of the arena) of Obstacle 5. This will be 12’-13’ above the Advanced Handlers’ Line depending on the length of panel used (8’ plus the length of panel).

The entire subsection should read as follows:

e. Obstacle 1: There are two panels that are in-line with each other that have a ten-foot opening. The center of the opening will be set at the center of the width of the arena and positioned 27 feet above the Advanced Handlers’ Line. For Ducks/Geese the center of the opening will be set at the center of the width of the arena and positioned 8’ above the end of the right hand panel (edge opposite the re-pen end of the arena) of Obstacle 5. This will be 12’-13’ above the Advanced Handlers’ Line depending on the length of panel used (8’ plus the length of panel). The stock must move through the panel opening from the take pen side of the arena towards the top of the arena. When at least one head of stock passes through the panels, then no further course points can be counted. To receive course points for obstacle 1, at least one head of livestock must pass the plane of the panels. If the stock passes through the panels from the wrong direction, at least one head must be driven past the plane of the inline panels so that DAYLIGHT can be seen by the Judge between the line and the stock. The stock then must be turned around to attempt the obstacle in the correct direction. Ability to control livestock points for this work will be subject to the manner in which the movements around the obstacle were executed.
i. Obstacle 5: For Ducks/Geese Obstacle 5 is a chute consisting of two 4’ – 5’ panels parallel to each other with an 8’ opening.

The entire subsection should read as follows:
i. Obstacle 5: Obstacle 5 is a chute consisting of two 12' panels parallel to each other with a 20' opening. For Ducks/Geese Obstacle 5 is a chute consisting of two 4’-5’ panels parallel to each other with an 8’ opening. The bottom of each panel (closest to the re-pen end of arena) will be placed on the Advanced Handlers’ Line with the right hand panel situated perpendicular to Obstacle 1/Obstacle 4. The right hand panel shall be even with the end of the left hand side of the panel which makes up the Obstacle 1/Obstacle 4. The dog is to put the stock through the entrance of the opening between Obstacle 4 and Obstacle 5, then turn in a counter-clockwise turn and drive the stock to the opening of the chute, through the chute and out the exit (bottom end of chute). When at least one head of stock passes through the parallel panels, then no further course points can be counted. To receive course points, at least one head of livestock must pass the plane between the parallel panels. If the stock passes through the obstacle from the wrong direction, at least one head must be driven past the plane of the panels so that DAYLIGHT can be seen by the Judge between the line and the stock. The stock then must be turned around to attempt the obstacle in the correct direction. Ability to control livestock points for this work will be subject to the manner in which the movements around the obstacle were executed. Obstacles 1, 2, 3, and 4 must be attempted before attempting the chute as described in Chapter 3, Section 11.4.

3.12.6 Course F add:
h. Obstacle 4: For Ducks/Geese the lower edge of the panel (edge closest to the take pen) will be 8 feet from and perpendicular to the left edge of the left hand panel of Obstacle 1.

The entire subsection should read as follows:
h. Obstacle 4: Consists of one panel set at a 90 degree angle to the left hand panel of Obstacle 1 with a 20’ opening. The lower edge of the panel (edge closest to the take pen) will be 20 feet from and perpendicular to the left edge of the left hand panel of Obstacle 1. For Ducks/Geese the lower edge of the panel (edge closest to the take pen) will be 8 feet from and perpendicular to the left edge of he left hand panel of Obstacle 1. From the exit of obstacle 3 the stock will be moved parallel to the left hand fence and then turned counter-clockwise to enter obstacle 4. When at least one head of stock passes through the panels, then no further course points can be counted. If the stock passes through the panels from the wrong direction, at least one head must be driven past the plane of the inline panels so that DAYLIGHT can be seen by the Judge between the line and the stock. Only those head of stock that clear the daylight line will count for Course points. The stock then must be turned around to attempt the obstacle in the correct direction. The stock will be driven or fetched clockwise around the
right hand end of the right hand panel of Obstacle 1. Ability to control livestock points for this work will be subject to the manner in which the movements around the obstacle were executed.

Rationale: The reason for this motion is to correct an oversight in the development of the courses previously considered by the Stockdog Committee. This is a simple correction of math and measurements to allow for proper placing of obstacles when used with Ducks/Geese. To be placed in the January 2014 rulebook.

94:01 Stock Dog: Clarification of For Exhibition Only within Trial Divisions and Classes
Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Clayton, DeChant, Ford, Gann, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Bates, Gray
Abstain: Hardin
Motion Passes 6-2

94:01 Stock Dog: Clarification of For Exhibition Only within Trial Divisions and Classes

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Approve: Unanimous

I make a motion to add the phrase "(excluding "For Exhibition Only" - FEO)", to rule 3.3.1

Change Section 3.3.1:

SECTION 3 – TRIAL DIVISIONS AND CLASSES

3.3.1
All dogs, whether competing for certification or not, must enter in the Started Division and progress through Advanced. Titles are earned in a division when two qualifying scores are received under two different Judges in each division and class AND when official notice is received from the Business Office. After receiving two qualifying scores in a division, regardless of whether the certificate has or has not been received from the Business Office, the dog may move up immediately to the next division in the same class of stock, OR continue to compete in that division for up to 60 days, OR may continue to compete in that division until the following criteria have been met. Prizes and placements are still awarded while competing in the division and class entered. Merit points are not
earned beyond 60 days after earning the second qualifying score. (See 3.3.2f for FEO exceptions)

Change to:

3.3.1
All dogs, competing for certification (excluding "For Exhibition Only" - FEO), must enter in the Started Division and progress through Advanced. Titles are earned in a division when two qualifying scores are received under two different Judges in each division and class AND when official notice is received from the Business Office. After receiving two qualifying scores in a division, regardless of whether the certificate has or has not been received from the Business Office, the dog may move up immediately to the next division in the same class of stock, OR continue to compete in that division for up to 60 days, OR may continue to compete in that division until the following criteria have been met. Prizes and placements are still awarded while competing in the division and class entered. Merit points are not earned beyond 60 days after earning the second qualifying score. (See 3.3.2f for FEO exceptions)

Rationale: This is a minor change that does not impact the meaning of the statement, but adds clarity concerning FEO to compliment the note at the end of the paragraph to look for FEO exceptions in 3.3.2f). If approved, this motion will be included in the January 2014 rulebook.

94:01 Stock Dog: Take Pen Use in Finals

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Clayton, DeChant, Ford, Gann, Gray, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Bates
Abstain: Hardin
Motion Passes 7-1

94:01 Stock Dog: Take Pen Use in Finals

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Approve 7, Oppose 2

I make a motion to add 12.1.5 to the Stockdog Finals Chapter:

12.1.5 For each class of stock, at least one round must include a take pen

Rationale: The required use of a take pen will further demonstrate the abilities of
the Australian Shepherd and promote the continued use of pen work. This motion if approved this motion will be included in the January 2014 rulebook.

94:01 Stock Dog: Course C, D, E, F or PATD Use in Finals
Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Gray, McClintock
Disapprove: Bates, DeChant, Ford, Miller
Abstain: Clayton, Gann, Hardin

Motion Fails 2-4

94:01 Stock Dog: Course C, D, E, F or PATD Use in Finals

I move to approve the following motion from the Stock Dog Committee.

Motion: Clayton

Approve 7, Oppose 2

I make a motion to add 12.1.4 to the Stockdog Finals Chapter:

12.1.4 For each class of stock, at least one go-round must use either C, D, E, F, or PATD. Ducks are not eligible for PATD. It is recommended that this course choice be used on the second elimination go-round, prior to the final go-round.

Rationale: This is for Finals only and offers the chance to demonstrate another skill for the top dogs in ASCA. The SDC recommends the second go-round to utilize these courses. If approved, this motion will be included in the January 2014 rulebook.

Statement of Opposition: Although I am a big supporter of courses C, D, E, F and Post Advanced I feel mandating one of these courses be used in finals before we have a means to be reasonably assured that there will be workable stock (especially cattle) is the wrong thing for the program. I have run these courses and found them fun when you have "workable stock". I have also run them with stock that was a far cry from workable and it was not pretty; you might say it was more like a rodeo. Now some clubs seem to understand this and some don't. If you are going to run the off the fence courses you can't get stock from the stock yard the day before and expect to have something that you'd be proud to see on the news or use to attract potential sponsors. The places that have used these course successfully have taken the time to dog break the cows, not course broke (hard to course train these courses) so that they are responsive to the dogs. Google the BC finals and you will see some really good dogs but they are not working rank cattle, they are working dog broke stock and they showcase what their dogs can do. That is what we should be doing if we ever want to attract big
time sponsors. The finals should be showcasing the best dogs and sure enough these courses help separate the really good ones from the average dogs; however mandating these courses without something in place that can give the program reasonable assurances of workable stock doesn't improve the program and can actually harm it.

Tom Mhire

**87:16 Juniors: New Committee Member - Bair**

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Unanimous
Abstain: Hardin

*Motion Passes 8-0*

**87:16 Juniors: New Committee Member - Bair**

I move to add Andrea Bair to the ASCA Junior Committee. Resume is attached.

Motion: Gann

**04:05 Agility: Motion 08-2013 Equipment List to Judges**

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Bates, Clayton, DeChant, Ford, Gann, Gray, McClintock, Miller
Abstain: Hardin

*Motion Passes 8-0*

**04:05 Agility: Motion 08-2013 Equipment List to Judges**

I move to approve the following motion from the Agility Committee.

Motion: Miller

This motion passed with 14 yes votes and 1 no vote.

I would like to make a motion we add the following verbiage (already in the Judges section 10.6) to the Sanctioning section 2.1.5.

Upon the hiring of a judge, host clubs shall electronically provide judges with a detailed list of available equipment to be used for each ring, plus a diagram of each ring to be used, showing ring dimensions, location of gates, nature and uniformity of surface, and locations, nature, and dimensions of any ring.
obstructions. The host club shall also indicate whether electronic timing equipment is available for use. The equipment lists, ring diagrams, and information on electronic timing shall be provided not later than 60 days prior to the first day of the trial.

Rationale: No where in the rulebook does it state the clubs must send this information to the judge. Many clubs have/had no idea they are to do this. This motion states that. Judges need this information so they can design courses and forward the information to the course reviewers.

**04:05 Agility: Motion 07-2013 Gamblers 6.4-6.6**

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Bates, DeChant, Ford, Gann, Gray, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Clayton
Abstain: Hardin

*Motion Passes 7-1*

**04:05 Agility: Motion 07-2013 Gamblers 6.4-6.6**

I move to approve the following motion from the Agility Committee.

Motion: Miller

Motion 7-2013 Chapter 6 Gamblers sections 6.4 – 6.6 – Motion by Sue, 2nd from Carol. Discussion ends 4/24, voting ends 5/4. Motion will be inserted into the June 1st Rulebook for all trials applying for sanctioning after August 1st.

Voting ends for this motion tomorrow, May 4th.
I vote 'yes'. This motion will help judges and trial staff with a reduction of the number of options for calculating the gamble closing sequence times. The motion will also assist judges in designing their gamblers courses and put some of those 'unwritten' guidelines into the rulebook. Sue

**Existing Section 6.4- Course Design Requirements currently reads:**

*Section 6.4 - Course Design Requirements*

The following table lists the minimum distance the obstacle to be performed shall be from the handler at each competitive level for a successful gamble. The first obstacle which starts the gamble might also serve as a boundary line for the handler; therefore it would not have to be the minimum distance from the handler. The judge need not require the handler to remain in a stationary position on the course during the gamble, only to require that the handler stay the minimum distance from each obstacle during the gamble. As with all ASCA course design philosophy, there should be a smooth flow from one obstacle to
the next of the gamble sequence. The judge is solely responsible for setting the course time for the gamble. A judge may design a gamble which could include a distance control test, a directional control test, and/or an obstacle discrimination test.

Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number (#) of gamble tests allowed &amp; Distance from handler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice (1-2)</td>
<td>10’ (3.1 m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Novice competitors will be asked to perform one (1) and may be asked to perform two (2) of the three (3) tests.
*Open competitors will be asked to perform two (2) of the tests.
*Elite competitors will be asked to perform two (2) of the tests and may be asked to perform a combination of all three (3) tests. If the dog is performing an obstacle discrimination test or directional test the dog should be at a minimum distance from the handler.

6.4.1 Distance Control Test Requirements

distance control test means that the dog will perform a sequence of gamble obstacles with all of the obstacles being no closer than the minimum distance listed. The gamble may start with one obstacle which determines the start of the handler line. In this case the first obstacle would not have to be the minimum distance away.

6.4.2 Directional Control Test Requirements

A directional control test means that the dog must change direction during the performance of the gamble on a command from the handler.

6.4.3 Obstacle Discrimination Test Requirements

The obstacle discrimination test shall require the dog to discriminate between two obstacles upon direction from the handler. The obstacle discrimination test should not require that the dog be farther away than the minimum distance for their level of competition. At the Novice Level, the two obstacles for the discrimination should be no closer than eight (8) feet (2.4 meters) to each other, unless one of the obstacles is a contact obstacle. At the Open Level the two obstacles should be no closer than six (6) feet (1.8 meters) to each other, unless one of the obstacles is a contact obstacle and at the Elite level the two obstacles should be no closer than four (4) feet (1.2 meters) to each other, unless one of the obstacles is a contact obstacle. In the case that one of the obstacles used for obstacle discrimination is a contact obstacle, then the minimum distance between the two obstacles shall be one-half (1/2) the distance. In other words, if a contact obstacle is used, the minimum Novice level distance would be four (4) feet (1.2 meters), the minimum Open level distance would be three (3) feet (91.4 cm), and the minimum Elite Level distance would be two (2) feet (61 cm). Although some or all contact obstacles are not allowed as an obstacle to be executed at the different levels, they may be used as an obstacle in an obstacle discrimination test. The judge must always keep in mind that safety is of the utmost importance at all levels and should design gambles with that thought in mind.
Rework verbiage in the following sections to clarify that distance is a required challenge and add other guidelines to help judge design gamblers courses.

Section 6.4 - Course Design Requirements

6.4.1 Opening Point Accumulation Period Course Design

The course must have 14 - 20 obstacles placed on the course to encourage a safe and flowing path for the dog to accumulate points. Whenever possible**, there shall be a minimum of two to three obstacles, not included in the 'gamble closing sequence', for exhibitors to use to start their point accumulation period course. (**Note: an exception may be allowed for narrow (60') trial arenas.)

There must be a minimum of two possible entries (lead in obstacles placed no further than 25' from the first gamble obstacle) into 'the gamble'.

6.4.2 'The Gamble' Course Design

The gamble itself will be spaced as if it were part of a regular course, meeting Regular course design spacing guidelines (18'-21' between obstacles), and with flow.

In the closing gamble sequence, the dog will perform a numbered set of obstacles to be done in a set time assigned by the judge.

The 'gamble closing sequence' consists of four obstacles to be performed in numbered order. The gamble will include, at every level, at least one sequence of two or more obstacles which is performed while the dog is the required minimum distance (distance challenge) from the handler. To determine where the gamble line should be placed, the minimum distance will be measured from the dog's logical path of performance of the obstacle to the handler line.

For a discrimination challenge, any two obstacle placed within 21 feet (measured by the dog's path) of another will be considered a discrimination challenge. Note: This is not limited to obstacles to be performed within the gamble, but shall include any obstacle outside the gamble where the dog's path to that obstacle would be within 21'.

At a trial where multiple classes of Gamblers are offered, a judge shall design gamble closing sequences that include different obstacles and different challenges and require that the handler lines vary from both sides (i.e. dog on the right or left). For example, on a weekend where four Gamblers classes are offered a judge should offer gambles with directional challenges, discrimination challenges and use varying obstacles for the gamble closing sequences. For example, a judge should avoid having weave poles in more than two rounds or a contact/tunnel obstacle discrimination in multiple rounds.

A bonus obstacle(s) is a 5th or 6th obstacle 'in flow' that may be offered. Bonus obstacles do not need to meet either minimum or maximum distance standards (see Section 6.4.3).

Novice: The Novice gamble (obstacles 1 through 4) must include a distance test, and MAY include one other test; either a discrimination OR directional test.
*Distance test- At the Novice level, the distance test will be two or more obstacles in sequence where the dog is 10 feet or more from the handler. The maximum distance for the placement of the handler line shall be no more than 12’ from the dog's logical path of performance of the distance challenge obstacles. If the teeter or weave poles are used in the Novice gamble, they must be used as the first obstacle in the gamble closing sequence with the gamble line placed less than 5’ away and the handler line for subsequent obstacles shall be placed so they gradually increase in distance.

*Discrimination test - At the Novice level, a discrimination test is a choice between two or more obstacles set no closer than 10 apart. If the discrimination is a tunnel beside an Aframe or dogwalk, the center of the tunnel may not be closer than 4’ from the center of the contact obstacle. The teeter will not be used as a discrimination obstacle.

*Directional test - At the Novice level, a directional test will mean the handler has asked the dog to change its path, either towards the handler or away from the handler. Turns made away from the handler shall be at no more than 90 degrees. At all times, when asked to change paths, the novice dog will be able to see the next obstacle. The directional test will be a visible change of side and all turns must be visible; a change of direction that occurs in a tunnel is not a directional test.

**Open**: The Open gamble (obstacles 1 through 4) must include a distance test AND must include one other test; either discrimination OR direction.

*Distance test - At the Open level, the distance test will be two or more obstacles in sequence where the dog's logical path is 15 feet or more from the handler line. The maximum distance between the handler line and the dog's logical path, will not be more than 18 feet.

*Discrimination test - At the Open level, a discrimination test will be a choice between two obstacles no closer than 10 feet from each other. These obstacles may be side by side or as an off course option. If the discrimination is a tunnel next to an Aframe or dogwalk, the center of the tunnel may not be more than 3 feet from the center of the contact obstacle.

*Directional test - At the Open level, a directional test will mean the handler has directed the dog to turn 90 degrees away from the handler, perform a 180 degree turn either towards or away from the handler, or a wrap of a jump. All turns must be visible; a change of direction that occurs in a tunnel is not a directional test.

**Elite**: The Elite gamble (obstacles 1 through 4) must include a distance test AND must include one other test, either directional or discrimination. It may also include a third test, either directional or discrimination.

* Distance test - At the Elite level, the distance test will be two or more obstacles in sequence where the dog's logical path is 20 feet or more from the handler line. The maximum distance between the handler line and the dog's logical path, will not be more than 25 feet.

*Discrimination test - At the Elite level, a discrimination test will be a choice between two obstacles. These obstacles may be side by side, or as an off course
option. If side by side, the two obstacles will be a minimum of 10 feet from each other. If the discrimination is a tunnel next to a dogwalk or Aframe, the tunnel may touch the contact obstacle.

*Directional test - At the Elite level, a directional test will mean the handler has directed the dog to turn 90 degrees away from the handler, perform a 180 degree turn away from the handler, or perform a wrap. Only visible turns away from the handler will count as a directional test; turns accomplished while the dog is in a tunnel will not be counted.

**Table III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level &amp; (#) of Tests</th>
<th>Gamble Line - Minimum Distance</th>
<th>Gamble Line Maximum - Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novice (1-2)</td>
<td>10’ (3.1 m) for Teeter Totter/Weave Poles</td>
<td>12’ (4.267m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open (2)</td>
<td>15’ (4.6m)</td>
<td>18’ (5.793m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite (2-3)</td>
<td>20’ (6.1m)</td>
<td>25’ (7.62m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6.4.3 - Bonus Obstacles**

A gamble closing sequence may consist of more than four obstacles. The judge shall calculate the 'closing gamble sequence' time based on the performance of the first four obstacles (1-2, 2-3, 3-4) in the gamble closing sequence. There shall be no additional time added for the performance of any 'bonus' obstacle. If a 'bonus' obstacle is used, the finish line will be placed directly after the 'bonus' obstacle and the dog will only be required to successfully complete the first four obstacles in the gamble before the second whistle/horn is sounded to denote the end of the allowed gamble time. The handler shall guide the dog to perform the 'bonus' obstacle to stop the dog's course time. If the 'bonus' obstacle is not performed to stop the clock, then the dog's time will stop when the handler places the leash on the dog.

Currently section 6.5 reads:

**Section 6.5 - Course Time**

6.5.1 Opening Sequence Course Time

The time gave for the point accumulation period shall be thirty (30) seconds for all dogs.

6.5.2 Course Time for the ‘Gamble’

The judge shall be responsible for establishing the time allotted for the ‘Gamble’. The ‘Gamble’ is composed of four obstacles. These four obstacles make up three sequences: 1-2, 2-3, 3-4. Each "sequence" is the transition from obstacle to the next. When calculating the gamble, a judge will start with a "base" time. Seconds will be added to or subtracted from the base time, taking the three sequences in the gamble into consideration.

**Gamble Base Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modifying the Gamble Base Time:

Add 1 second for each "challenging sequence"
Subtract 1 second for each "simple sequence"
Do nothing for a "normal sequence"
Add 1 second for A-Frame, teeter or short weaves
Add 2 seconds for long weaves

An example of a simple sequence would be two jumps in a straight line. For that kind of sequence, the judge would subtract 1 second. Anytime the sequence is logical or follows the path that the dog is already taking, it should be considered a simple sequence.

Anytime where the dog must change direction, or shorten his stride (collection) a judge would add a second. Based on the class level, a serpentine of four jumps may be considered a challenging sequence and a judge may add one or two seconds. The judge will determine the ease or difficulty of the sequence and add times accordingly. An arc of four jumps would be considered three simple sequences and a judge would subtract three seconds.

No Gamble Time shall ever be 3 seconds less or 3 seconds more than the base Gamble Time for each level.

Change to read:

Section 6.5 - Course Time

6.5.1 Opening Sequence Course Time
The time given for the point accumulation period shall be thirty (30) seconds for all dogs.

6.5.2 Course Time for the 'Gamble'
The judge shall be responsible for establishing the time allotted for the 'Gamble'. The 'Gamble' is composed of four obstacles. These four obstacles make up three sequences: 1-2, 2-3, 3-4. Each "sequence" is the transition from obstacle to the next. When calculating the gamble, a judge will start with a "base" time. Seconds will be added to or subtracted from the base time, taking the three sequences in the gamble into consideration.

Gamble Base Times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUMP HEIGHT</th>
<th>Elite</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Novice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20&quot;/20&quot;+/24&quot;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot;/8&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modifying the Gamble Base Time:

Add 1 second for each "challenging sequence"
Subtract 1 second for each "simple sequence"
Do nothing for a "normal sequence"
Add 1 second for A-Frame, teeter or short weaves
Add 2 seconds for long weaves

An example of a simple sequence would be two jumps in a straight line. For that kind of sequence, the judge would subtract 1 second. Anytime the sequence is logical or follows the path that the dog is already taking, it should be considered a simple sequence.

Anytime where the dog must change direction, or shorten his stride (collection) a judge would add a second. Based on the class level, a serpentine of four jumps may be considered a challenging sequence and a judge may add one or two seconds. The judge will determine the ease or difficulty of the sequence and add times accordingly. An arc of four jumps would be considered three simple sequences and a judge would subtract three seconds.

No gamble time shall ever EXCEED 3 seconds less or 3 seconds more than the base gamble time.

Existing section 6.6 reads:

6.6 Determining Course Time
Section 6.6.1 Determining a Dog's Course Time
In the Gamblers class the dog's time shall be determined by using electronic 'eye' timing or by using a stop watch. The 'opening sequence' time should begin when any part of the dog crosses the start line. The time for the course shall end when any part of the dog crosses the finish line after attempting/performing the 'closing gamble sequence'.

A dog will have a numerical value recorded for his course time unless he is eliminated (ELIM) (i.e. for training in the ring). A judge may not reassign the recorded course time for a dog except in the event of a timer malfunction as described below.

Amend to read:

6.6 Determining Course Time
Section 6.6.1 Determining a Dog's Recorded Course Time
In the Gamblers class the dog's time shall be determined by using electronic 'eye' timing or by using a stop watch. The 'opening sequence' time should begin when any part of the dog crosses the start line. The plane of the start line shall be clearly marked for the timer and handler.

The time for the course shall end when any part of the dog crosses the finish line after attempting/performing the 'closing gamble sequence'. The finish line shall be placed as close to the last obstacle (jump or tunnel) in the closing sequence. The dog must break the plane of the finish line before the horn/whistle sounds to denote the end of the closing gamble sequence. The dog will be required to perform the final (4th) gamble obstacle before the horn/whistle sounds in order to be awarded points for the final gamble obstacle.
Note: in the case of a 'bonus' (fifth or sixth) obstacle in the closing sequence, the finish line will be placed as close to the end of the 'bonus' obstacle. If a gamble contains a bonus obstacle, the bonus obstacle must be performed before the horn/whistle sounds in order to be awarded points for the bonus obstacle.

A dog will have a numerical value recorded for his course time unless he is eliminated (ELIM) (i.e. for training in the ring). Any dog that does not perform the last gamble or bonus obstacle (thus crosses finish line) will have its time stopped when the handler places the leash on the dog. A judge may not reassign the recorded course time for a dog except in the event of a timer malfunction as described below.

Leave existing section 6.6.2 as is.

**Section 6.6.2 Timer Malfunction**

Before the start of each class, the judge shall brief the timer as to how to handle a timer malfunction. In Gamblers, the judge should be notified (during the run) as soon as the malfunction is noticed.

In the event of a timer malfunction in the opening sequence of the gamblers class, the dog shall be allowed a rerun, and the handler and dog must run as close to the original opening sequence as possible. If the timer malfunction was in the closing sequence of the gamblers class, a judge has the following options:

1. Allow the dog to re-attempt the gamble by repeating the final two obstacles taken (lead in obstacles) on the way to the gamble and having the gamble closing sequence time start when the dogs starts its 're-run'.
2. If the judge is absolutely sure the dog successfully completed the gamble within the allotted time, the judge may award the gamble points and assign SCT.
3. Offer a complete re-run, requiring that the handler run as close to the original sequence as possible, in a safe, sportsmanlike manner.

**04:05 Agility: Motion 06-2013 Ring Size**

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Bates, DeChant, Ford, Gann, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Clayton
Abstain: Gray, Hardin

*Motion Passes 6-1*

**04:05 Agility: Motion 06-2013 Ring Size**

I move to approve the
Agility Committee motion below.
Effective date has been corrected.

Motion: Miller

After searching the archives I believe the final tally on this motion was:
10 Yes and 5 Non votes.

Proposed (amended version 2) motion by Pamela, 2nd from Sue. Discussion will end on 4/24/13, voting will end on 5/4/13.
Effective date would be for all trials scheduled after 10/1/13.

2.3.1 Arena/Ring dimensions from:
The minimum usable course area for an Agility trial ring is 8,000 square feet (743 square meters)*. Although the 8,000 square feet (743 square meters) usable area is the absolute minimum size acceptable for agility, a 12,000 square foot (1115 square meters) or larger ring (e.g., 100' x 120' (30.5 m x 36.6 m), 110' x 110' (33.5 m x 33.5 m), 95' x 130' (29 m x 39.6 m), or 90' x 135' (27.4 m x 41.2 m), etc.) of clear, unobstructed ring surface, is highly recommended wherever feasible. The trial area shall be of a non-slip surface, preferably grass, which will provide a safe and cushioned footing for the dogs and handlers competing.
*In exceptional cases where a dog walk with 8' (2.4 m) planks and only wingless jumps with 4' (1.2 m) bars are used, the minimum usable course area may be 7,200 square feet (669 square meters). Course areas this small should be the rare exception when no larger, more suitable facilities can be found, and only if the aforementioned small-dimension equipment is used.

04:05 Agility: Motion 05-2013 Paying Course Reviewers

Voting on this motion went as follows:

Approve: Bates, DeChant, Ford
Disapprove: Clayton, Gray, McClintock
Abstain: Gann, Hardin, Miller

Motion Fails 3-3

04:05 Agility: Motion 05-2013 Paying Course Reviewers

I move to approve the following motion from the Agility Committee.

Motion: Miller

The motion passed with 2 AB, 10 Yes, 2 Non Votes, 1 No.

Motion by Sue, 2nd from Carol. Motion to pay course reviewers for the time they spend reviewing courses and corresponding with judges. Discussion period ends 4/23/13 followed by a voting period that will end on 05/03/2013. Please note that I amended the 'rationale' section to include the statistics from the 1st Q 2013.

Section 10.5 - Course Design Review
Item #2 currently reads:
2. Course reviewers shall be experienced, respected agility judges appointed by the Board of Directors upon recommendation of the Agility Committee. They shall serve as unpaid volunteers. At least three course reviewers, plus at least one alternate, should be appointed whenever feasible, at least one each to review courses for trials.

Change to read:
2. Course reviewers shall be experienced, respected agility judges appointed by the Board of Directors upon recommendation of the Agility Committee. Course reviewers shall be paid to review each course that is designed for an ASCA sanctioned 'class' offered in the trial premium. The rate of pay per class/course reviewed will be $1.50. Fees will not be assessed for the review of non-regular classes. A staff of three to five course reviewers will be available to review courses designed for ASCA sanctioned trials. They will be considered 'outside consultants' and the income they receive for their services will be recorded, verified by the business office and a 1099 will be issued, as required by law.

Course Reviewers will submit a list of trials and the number classes/courses reviewed. They will submit their 'assignment worksheet' on a quarterly basis to the ASCA Agility Coordinator at the business office who will review the worksheet. Worksheets shall be submitted within 15 days of the end of each calendar quarter. Payments will be calculated and processed within 15 days of submission. Course Reviewers that wish to decline payment have that option and shall not submit a request for payment.

Rationale: Agility competitors expect to have different and appropriately
challenging courses offered to them at each trial. Conforming to the ASCA course design guidelines is an important element to our program. The ASCA course reviewers spend numerous hours working with judges on course reviews and late submission by judges often require that a course reviewer rearrange their schedule to accommodate the reviews. The course reviewers have gone above and beyond the duty of volunteering their time at the expense of their private lives and they deserve to be compensated for their time.

Most ASCA agility trials offer 15 - 18 classes per day. Corresponding with the judge requires many minutes of the reviewer's time. Once the courses are received, opening each file/course takes about 30 seconds, then each course has to be reviewed to see if the equipment used is 1) offered by the host club and 2) is approved for that class/level. The size of the arena has to be confirmed, any irregularities noted, then the course has to be examined to see if it 1)contains the appropriate challenges; 2) is flowing and safe for the handler and dog; 3) has the correct number of obstacles and challenges for the class and level and contains the correct required information of class description, etc. This is done for each class/course and takes two to five or more minutes. Courses that do not meet the criteria have to be discussed with the judge and the course must be changed, re-submitted and reviewed again. Based on the time frame above, a set of 18 courses with NO changes (not the average review) takes at least 35-50 minutes and the amount payable to the judge would be $27.00 for those 18 courses.

In the first quarter of 2013 (Jan - Mar), there were about 97 days of trials. If an average of 15 classes were offered at each trial, then 1455 courses were reviewed for these trials and a minimum of 50925 minutes (~850 hours) to 72750 minutes (~1200 hours) were spent opening courses and reviewing them. This time estimate does NOT include any additional time spent on correspondence between the course reviewers and the judges. The run income received from these trials was approximately $20907. If all the course reviewers submitted requests for payment to review these trials in the example above the approximate costs would be $2182 (~10%) of the run fee income.

All other agility organizations have a paid staff of course reviewers that review courses before judges are able to use them to ensure that the rules and course design guidelines are followed. With the increase in ASCA agility trials (and income) paying the course reviewers is long over due. Reviewing courses is a skill that requires years of course design experience as well as the delicate 'art' of issuing criticism to the judge that has designed the course.

I would like to make this motion include the review of all trials scheduled after October 1st, 2013.
President Ford called the meeting to order in Executive Session at 8:03 PM CDT. Those in attendance included President Russ Ford, 1st Vice-President Rick Gann, 2nd Vice-President Ronnie Bates, Secretary Ann DeChant, Treasurer Greg McClintock, Director Rick Hardin, Director David Clayton, Director Linda Gray, and Director Jean Miller. There is a quorum.

- Executive Session closed at 8:34 PM CDT.

**13.62 2013 Stock Dog Finals Replacement Judge**

*I move to approve Sharon Simmons as replacement judge for the 2013 ASCA Stock Dog Finals.*

Motion: Gann
Second: Gray

Approve: DeChant, Gray, McClintock, Miller
Disapprove: Bates
Abstain: Clayton, Ford, Gann, Hardin
Motion Passes 4-1

Letter of Dissent from Bates: I vote no on the motion to approve Sharon Simmons as a replacement judge for the 2013 SD Finals. My no vote is not that Ms. Simmons is not qualified to judge this prestigious event. My dissent is that the process was flawed. If we are to use a random selection, it needs to be random. Otherwise, abandon the random draw because what appears to happen this year did not follow the intent of a random draw, IMO.

**Changes to Stock Dog Rule 12.7.2**

The Board determined that Stock Dog rule 12.7.2 needs to be clarified to express the intent that judges be contacted and secured or deemed unavailable in draw order, one at a time. The Board will construct suggested language before sending a directive to the Stock Dog Committee. The item has been added to the agenda for the May 13th Teleconference Meeting.

**Adjournment**

*I move to adjourn the meeting.*

Motion: Bates
Second: Clayton

President Ford adjourned the meeting at 8:50 PM CDT.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Kalla Jaco, Executive Secretary.
President Ford called the meeting to order at 8:00 PM CDT.
Those in attendance included: President Russ Ford, 1st Vice-President Rick Gann, 2nd Vice-President Ronnie Bates, Secretary Ann DeChant, Treasurer Greg McClintock, Director Rick Hardin, Director David Clayton, Director Linda Gray, Director Jean Miller
There is a quorum.

Ratification of April Email Votes
I move to approve all April email votes.

Motion: Bates
Second: Clayton

Approve: Unanimous
Motion Passes 9-0

Review of Financial Reports
McClintock went over the profit/loss sheet for April 2013. ASCA is $53,405.53 in the black.
I move to approve the financial report as submitted and to request we get a report for the month prior at every meeting.

Motion: DeChant
Second: Miller

Approve: Unanimous
Motion Passes 9-0

Draft Request for Proposal (RFP)
The draft RFP was sent to the Board. Bates requested that the Board review the document and get back to him with any changes or comments.

Systems Executive Committee
The committee is formed, but will not come into use until the RFP is finalized. There is still time to make any necessary program changes.

12.63 Investigation of Selection of 2013 Stock Dog Finals Replacement Judge
I move to open an investigation of the selection process of the replacement judge for the 2013 Stock Dog Finals.

Motion: Hardin
Second: Miller

Discussion: The period of time under investigation is from Rick Pinney’s resignation until now.
Approve: Bates, Clayton, DeChant, Ford, Gray, Hardin, Miller
Disapprove: McClintock
Abstain: Gann
Motion Passes 7-1

The Board discussed how best to go about investigating the issue. It was determined to assign the investigation to Clayton, with the assistance of Hardin and Gann. Daily updates will be sent to the Board by email.

**Changes to Stock Dog Rule 12.7.2**
The Stock Dog Committee is working on a final recommendation for the Board.

**12.64 Chair Stipend for Anne Shope**
*I move to approve the $200 Chair stipend to Obedience Committee Chair Anne Shope.*

Motion: Bates
Second: Ford

Discussion: Anne has decided to step back in as Chair at least until Nationals.

Approve: Unanimous
Motion Passes 9-0

**Adjournment**
*I move to adjourn the meeting.*

Motion: Bates
Second: McClintock

Approve: Unanimous
Motion Passes 9-0

President Ford adjourned the meeting at 9:05 PM CDT.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Kalla Jaco, Executive Secretary.
President Ford called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM CDT. Those in attendance included: President Russ Ford, 1st Vice-President Rick Gann, 2nd Vice-President Ronnie Bates, Secretary Ann DeChant, Director Rick Hardin, Director David Clayton, Director Linda Gray, Director Jean Miller. Those not in attendance included: Treasurer Greg McClintock. There is a quorum.

13.65 Investigation of 2013 Stock Dog Finals Judge Selection
I move to accept the investigation report into the minutes.

Motion: Clayton
Second: Gann

Approve: Unanimous
Non-Voting: McClintock
Motion Passes 8-0

13.66 Rescind 13.62 2013 Stock Dog Finals Replacement Judge - Sharon Simmons
I move to rescind 13.62 2013 Stock Dog Finals Replacement Judge - Sharon Simmons based on the findings of the investigation.

Motion: Clayton
Second: Gann

Discussion: This does not necessarily preclude Ms. Simmons from being selected as a judge; this is simply to ensure that proper procedure is followed in the selection process.

Approve: Clayton, DeChant, Ford, Gann, Gray, Hardin, Miller
Disapprove: Bates
Non-Voting: McClintock
Motion Passes 7-1

13.67 Host Club to Follow Stockdog Rule 12.7.2 in Replacement Judge Selection
I make a motion that ASCA will follow the judge selection criteria for the Finals as found in 12.7.2 which identifies that the 3 remaining judges of the original 9 will be contacted to determine if any of the 3 are available and willing to judge the 2013 Colorado National Finals.

Motion: Clayton
Second: Gann

Approve: Clayton, Ford, Gann
Disapprove: Bates, DeChant, Gray, Miller
Abstain: Hardin
Non-Voting: McClintock
Motion Fails 3-4

13.68 Selection of Replacement Judge for 2013 Stockdog Finals
I move to direct the Host Affiliate to exhaust the list of 9 names of qualified Stock Dog Judges originally given to them, and hire if available. Once a judge has been selected the Host Club must resubmit the premium for Board approval before it is posted.

Motion: Bates
Second: Gann

Approve: Bates, Clayton, Ford, Gann, Gray, Hardin
Disapprove: DeChant, Miller
Non-Voting: McClintock
Motion Passes 6-2

- Executive Session opened at 8:01 PM CDT.
- Executive Session closed at 8:44 PM CDT.

13.72 Invalidation of Color Section on 2013 ASCA Ballot
I move to invalidate the color section on the current ASCA ballot for 2013.

Motion: Clayton
Second: Gann

The Board unanimously approved the wording that appears on the color section of the 2013 ballot in August of 2011. After membership input, the section was modified and then unanimously approved in March 2012. The color section on the 2013 ballot is not composed of the most recently approved wording.

Approve: Unanimous
Non-Voting: McClintock

Adjournment
I move to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: Bates
Second: Clayton

Approve: Unanimous
Non-Voting: McClintock
Motion Passes 8-0

President Ford adjourned the meeting at 8:51 PM CDT.
These minutes are respectfully submitted by Kalla Jaco, Executive Secretary.
Investigation of 2013 Stock Dog Finals Judge Hiring Practices

1. Review Stock Dog Finals Rules concerning hiring of judges

SECTION 7 – SELECTION OF FINALS JUDGES
12.7.1 Once the host club, location, and dates for the finals have been determined, the Business Office will send a letter to all Judges to determine who is available to judge.

12.7.2 Drawing for Selection:
   a. The Board of Directors or its assignee will perform a random draw of all Judges who satisfy the requirements listed in Chapter 12.7.3 and affirm their availability to judge the ASCA Stockdog Finals.
   b. The first nine names drawn will be supplied to the Host Club to hire six Finals Judges.
   c. If six Finals Judges cannot be secured from this list, the Host Club will be provided with the next Judge(s) name(s), in draw order, until all Finals Judge assignments are filled.

12.7.3 Judges for the Stockdog Finals will be selected from all ASCA Stockdog Judges who return the questionnaire to the Business Office by the designated date and indicate they would be available. Stockdog Judges will be excluded from the potential list if they:
   a. Have provisional status.
   b. Have pending or previous disciplinary action within the last year.
   c. Have judged SD Finals in both of the last two years.
   d. Have failed to judge at least three unrelated ASCA Working Trials on all classes of stock in the past three years. (Related Trials are those held at the same place at within the same 10 day period.)

12.7.4 It is possible that the available Judges may not meet all of the priorities listed. The available Judges who meet the greatest number of listed priorities will be recommended to the host club.

12.7.5 No Judge may judge the Finals more than two years consecutively

Background: Correct Finals Judge List in Assigned Random Order:
The first 9 names that were given to the host club in no particular order were:
James Bergert
Rick Hardin
Ken Lyle
Tony Padgett
Rick Pinney
Marie Murphy
Maxine Schvaneveldt
Michael Tremblay
Jan Wesen

Alternate names, in random draw order
The alternates would be contacted in the following in order;
Sharon Simmons
Larry Teaff
Stockdog Finals Judges Selected in **Bold**

**Interview list**

A. Russ Ford  
B. Rick Gann  
C. Ray Fryar  
D. Becky Parker  
E. Contact the three judges, James Bergert, Rick Hardin and Michael Tremblay, the three remaining of the first 9 to determine if they have been contacted by the host club and asked to judge the finals.

2. Review timeline of events from Becky Parker and ask similar questions of all participants.  
3. Use free conference call service to contact members to be interviewed

**Questions:**

1. Were the judges evaluated by the business office to determine if they met the criteria to be potential finals judges?  
2. Were all of the first nine judges contacted? (Becky, Judges on the list)  
3. Who at the business office was contacted by Becky Parker?  
4. Did the business office check to determine if the host club had contacted all judges on first list of 9, before releasing additional names?  
5. How many names were released to the affiliate?  
6. If all of the other judges on the first nine list not contacted: Why not?  
7. (TimeLine item #4) Why were Finals Judges not on the list suggested? 2014 list verses 2013 list? Preston was not on either?  
8. (TimeLine item #7) Why was there preference inferred for the 2014 Finals over the 2013 Finals? (Rick Gann, Russ Ford)  
9. (TimeLine item # 13) Did the ASCA President (via the Liaison) offer his services to judge in place of the #10 judge on the list? (Rick Gann, Russ Ford)

All persons on the list were contacted between Friday 5/17 and 5/18. Interviews typically took about 30 minutes per person. David Clayton interviewed Ray and the remaining persons on list were interviewed by all three members. Individual judges on the original list of 9 were contacted by David Clayton, except for Rick Hardin who did so during his interview.

**Findings:**

**Interview with Becky Parker:** When Becky was contacted by Ricky Pinney stating that he could not fulfill the judging contract and another judge would have to be secured. Becky contacted Rick Gann, the liaison to the CASA nationals and asked for additional names. After some
discussions with Russ, she was referred to Ray Fryer, office manager for ASCA. When asked if Becky had read the Finals Stock Judge Selection rules, she said she had a general knowledge of them but had not read them during judge selection or to date. However, it was her understanding that if one judge was not available that she would have a total of 9 judges to choose from and requested additional names. When asked if she had contacted the remaining 3 names from the original 9, she said she had not.

12.7.2 Drawing for Selection:

b. The first nine names drawn will be supplied to the Host Club to hire six Finals Judges.
c. If six Finals Judges cannot be secured from this list, the Host Club will be provided with the next Judge(s) name(s), in draw order, until all Finals Judge assignments are filled.

E-mail response from 3 remaining judges in first 9 selected, confirmed that none of the judges on this list had been contacted and asked to judge the SDC finals.

The interview with Ray Fryer: Ray confirmed that all judges on the list had been vetted and met all the criteria to judge the finals. He confirmed that he was the only member at the business office that talked with Becky concerning the finals judge replacement. He also confirmed Becky Parker’s timeline. When called by Becky to ask for additional names, he felt as office manager, to expedite the process he gave her all the remaining names. He felt this was a very time sensitive process and this would provide the quickest solution. There is some question in what order the names were provided to Becky, they may not have been in the random order and that is how Sharon Simmons name appeared later on the list. The correct random list places Sharon as the 10th judge.

Interview with Russ Ford: Russ also confirmed in general Becky’s timeline. He verified he had additional conversations with Becky Parker. He clarified that he was one the finals list of judges but asked that his name be removed as he wanted to work finals. His offer to judge finals as a solution came from this conversation. Due to questions about the order of the list and the apparent, lack of random order it was provided, Russ felt that Sharon Simmons was not next on the list but further down. Negotiating different alternatives before all the facts were known, caused additional confusion and may have contributed to the board acting before all facts were known.

Interview with Rick Gann: Rick confirmed Becky Parker’s timeline though minor differences in details differed from one person to another. Rick as liaison was trying to remain neutral in the selection of the replacement judge.

Summary
After reviewing all the facts and group discussion of the rule and answers to the questions, the recommendations of this committee were unanimous.
1. Becky Parker as Course Director for CASA failed to familiarize herself with the finals rules concerning hiring of judges and failed to contact the three remaining judges in the original list of 9, before requesting additional names.

2. Ray Fryer, ASCA’s Office Manager failed to follow ASCA’s Finals Selection Rules. As office manager Ray should have reviewed the rules prior to supplying names to Becky Parker. He as a representative of ASCA should have asked if there had been an attempt to secure all judges from the original list of 9. He further should have supplied only one name in the determined random order and not provided all 5 names.

3. Russ Ford acting as ASCA’s President, tried to solve what he believed was a rule violation with the finals course director and called the board together before all facts were known.

**Recommendations:**

It is the findings of this committee that the Stock Dog Finals rules concerning the selection of a finals judge were not followed.

The following are the recommendations to the board from this committee.

1. ASCA will follow the judge selection criteria for finals judges as found in 12.7.2.
2. Sharon Simmons was inappropriately selected as a finals judge by CASA.
3. The three remaining judges in the original list of 9 shall be contacted to determine if any of the three are available and willing to judge the 2013 Colorado National Finals.
4. If one of the 3 remaining judges contacted agrees to judge the finals, then they will become the 6th finals judge.
5. If this happens then the expenses associated with Sharon Simmons contract will be upheld and she will be paid. In addition to payment, Sharon Simmons will receive an apology from the ASCA board stating that she was inappropriately hired by CASA and the ASCA Board is sorry for any inconvenience and thanking her for her willingness to serve.
6. However, if none of the three judges of the first 9 can be secured, then Sharon Simmons as the first alternative will become the 6th judge.
7. Becky Parker will be reminded that as Course Director securing judges on behalf of ASCA for the finals, it is part of her job to know and follow ASCA rules and that adherence to finals judge selection rules is of paramount importance.
8. Ray Fryer will be reminded that he is a representative for ASCA and as such is responsible for following ASCA rules. If Ray was unsure of the finals judge selection rules he should as Office Manager read the rules and adhere to them prior to talking to the course director or giving out additional judges names.
9. Russ Ford shall be admonished for his involvement with the Finals Selection Process and for bringing the board together to act before all facts were known.
10. We request that the Board meet at its earliest convenience for final action in this matter.