

General Membership Meeting

September 20, 2006

West Bend, WI

Attendance: Jerry Aufox, Chris Davenport, Linda Gray, Jo Kimes, Michelle Berryessa, Peter Hellmeister, Roger Steven, Maarten Walter, Kristin McNamara, Ally Bryant, Patrick MacRoberts, Debbie Cospers, ASCA® Executive Director

Members: Robbie Norman, Corey Norman, Kathy Dawson, Chris Reed, Glenda Stephenson, Leah Swatko, Dakota Duvall, Sunday Miles, April Fuchs, Sally Josselyn, Marilyn Ska-prol, Renee Desorcy, William Pechka-King, Cynthia King, Hope Schmeling, Melissa Borde, Kathi Schwengel, Marie Murphy, Sara McDonough, Kay Fuecker, Louise Smallidge, Sandra Penn, Cynthia Taylor, Jan Wesen, Kyle Trumbull-Clark, Mary Quam, Donna Armstrong, Kathy Bryan, Preston Kissman, Glenn Morton, Jayne Lips, Wendy Summers, Marti Parrish, Becky Parker, Stacie Harris, Libby Graham, Pete Dolan, Jean M. Janotta, Bruce Caldwell, Teresa Caldwell, Mark Magness, Andrea Hoffman, Rebecca Smith, Bjintze Jager, Anneke DeJong, Kathy Stevens, Carol Gerken, Lyle Gerken, John Knepper, Linda Bell, Barbara Hoffman, Gayle Kukulka, Earl Thompson, Kathy Reeve, Susan Paluszcy, Susan Graham, Marilee Mansir, Karen Spriggs, Steve Shope, Anne Shope, Mike Bryant, Meghan Rosenstengel, Debra St. Jacques, and Miriam Walter, and a few other people who didn't sign the attendance list.

Jerry Aufox called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

Jerry introduced all Directors and Debbie Cospers, our Executive Director. He stated that tonight is the last official Meeting for himself and Chris Davenport. He stated that the newly elected Directors are Patrick MacRoberts and Kristin McNamara with Roger Stevens who was elected to serve another term. That being said, "Welcome."

The next order of business is the Treasurer's Report.

Chris Davenport reported from the Audit Report.

Total Liabilities and Net assets for ASCA® of \$614,629

The Total Expenses were \$755,518

Net Loss of \$19,755

Chris says she has a copy of the Audit if anyone wants to see it while she's here, but she needs it back. You can get copies from the Business Office. Chris was asked if that was the 2005 Audit, and Chris said it was from December 31, 2005.

Jerry explained the Net loss as that our Expense exceeded our Income by approximately \$19,000. "The Board is taking steps, appropriate steps and will continue to see that we do well." Someone asked who monitors this over the year, and Jerry responded, "The Board." So you guys are bleeding out money and no one is saying, "Whoa. If it was my house, we wouldn't be eating for a long time. It is amazing to me that it hasn't been stopped." Jerry said, in a business you run a little differently than in a home as you have assets to use to cover a loss. "We had unusual circumstances in

2005 like the turn over at the Office. You all heard of the problems in the Office and they caused us to have overtime expenses. We have also have temporary expenses, and those expenses over the past year have grown rather large. Those expenses, payroll expenses, are mostly ongoing expenses unless you lay someone off and then you are reducing that expense. So we have payroll expenses, and the other expenses are somewhat fixed. Don't forget, our revenue is based on fixed rates that we can estimate, and they can change. Things fluctuate. I would like to say, for the sake of clarity, this is the first year in which we have two audited financials years in a row under our belt. Prior to this, we have had compilations. A compilation is nothing more that an Auditing firm putting together your books, compiling the numbers in a set format. They don't make any guarantee about the accuracy or the validity of those numbers." Jerry was asked if there were any recommendations from the Audit? "Yes, with a full audit you get a management letter. And their recommendation was to increase the controls at the office by dividing up responsibilities for certain areas at the office. The Board is undertaking to accomplish those recommendations." Continuing along with that was there any other procedures that they found to be improper? "The only procedures that were recommended were to divide up certain responsibilities such that the same person was not for instance be on both ends of an expenditure and paying off bills. So, that damage has now been controlled. That damage," said Jerry, "has now been controlled. Our full audit, we had for instance, because of the change over we had some adjustments that had to be made due to errors of repetition, but no losses." Someone asked, "So this is actually our first correct audit?" "No, Jerry answered, "This is our second full audited year. When you have your first audit, you have nothing to compare it to. So then we have audited figures for 2004 and 2005, and now you have a basis and the next year. You always show two years." Pete Dolan asked about the loss, and Jerry said that it was exactly \$19,755. Jerry said that we have assets that can cover the loss. "We have the assets to cover the loss, so it's not like we are in debt, because we are not." A question was asked about what funds would cover the loss, and Jerry said they could come from our investments. He answered that, "Yes, additional funds are in interest bearing accounts."

Leah Swatko asked if the Board has decided to ask for budgets from all the sectors, projected and expected. Jerry said, "The Board had received their first budget from our Executive Director, and last night we reviewed it and commented on it and asked for elaboration and changes." Leah asked again about all the Committees and their budgets. Jerry stated that Committees don't really have the authority to spend money. Leah: "Okay, then they don't submit a budget?" Jerry: "The Committees don't have expenses other than a conference call if the Committee chooses to have one."

"What are our Administrative costs?" Leah asked. Jerry: "\$534,415. They are made up of: Payroll, *Aussie Times* - \$115,000 average year to produce, Postage for AT - \$50,000." He explained that we just qualified for the periodical rate and depending on our level of advertising, that will save us money. Someone asked if we pay postage for the *Aussie Times*? And Jerry said, of course we do, how do you think you get it? There was laughter, as he was joking. "Cynthia is our Editor, and we pay her \$13,000 a year to edit and produce our *Aussie Times*, and then we get it printed, we pay for it. We are

the publisher, we pay her to produce it, we contract to have it printed and packaged for mailing, and we pay the postage. The advertising revenue doesn't even come close to covering the *Aussie Times*, you pay as part of your dues, a fee for the *Aussie Times*, that is part of our income. The *Aussie Times* is not thing that makes money." Leah said, "It's a high quality Aussie magazine and the way it's produced is not cutting corners. It doesn't make money when it is produced." Roger said that Debbie found a way to use the Periodical Rate which will result in savings. (Secretary's Note: The original suggestion for pursuing the Periodical Rate was made to Ann DeChant by Member, and past *AT* Editor, Vicki Rand, and the suggestion was made to the Board at the April Meeting.) When a Member said she had no idea that the *Aussie Times* cost that much money, and Jerry said he would give us an example...the *Aussie Times* expense was \$192,000 which includes mailing \$55,400 for 2005. Advertising income generated: \$21,000. Membership dues to ASCA® generated \$295,000. Other revenue for Registry and other things amounted \$419,800. A member asked if more advertising was the answer, and Jerry said it's a double edged sword as more advertising might mean that your postage rate changes. "I know," he went on, "that members may think that based on total expenses of \$755,518 that some think that we take a lot of money for ourselves, but the total Director Expense was \$26, 000 which was spent on Director officer reimbursement for Travel expenses, which includes all expenses for our April Meeting and attending the Nationals." Leah asked if for all those expenses were there justified in other words there were receipts, and Jerry said, "Absolutely or the Auditors would be questioning." Leah asked if there were better ways to get the *AT* produced that are less expenses such as having parts of it be accessible from the Web Site...Placing, standings, etc. Jerry said that the official method of communication under our Bylaws is the *Aussie Times*. Someone said that since we could never seem to get a quorum, we could never seem to change the Bylaws. "People are forgetting that the *Aussie Times* is not just a magazine, it's our newsletter and by putting parts of it on the internet, you are taking a certain portion of the Membership that does not have the internet out of the loop. It's the official newsletter of ASCA®, so it's got to be available to all Members. It's not there to make money, it's there to communicate with everybody out there. I suppose you could make it on paper and staple it like a Girl Scout newsletter." Patrick said, "If you look at the very early *Aussie Times*, it is exactly that. We could easily go back to that as the newsletter to go out to everybody and then have a subscription based periodical that also goes out. That could happen if the Membership wants it, but we don't have a quorum for your guys to make that decision. We could put that question in the *Aussie Times*." Another Member reasoned that this would not save money to have a magazine and a newsletter, and Patrick agreed. Sally Josselyn asked if having the *AT* in .pdf format on the Web site would be possible for those who did have internet access. There were several concurrent discussions of ideas, and the Jerry called everyone back saying that there are many good ideas for saving ASCA® money, and they can be discussed. He said that these decisions don't have to be made tonight as that the Board will look at all kinds of expenses and revenue enhancements to ensure that we are run with a balanced budget or a surplus. "We don't have to do that here, tonight." Patrick said, "One of Debbie's duties is to help us with that budgeting process and help us with the ongoing maintenance of the budget, the

ongoing monitoring of where we are...the expenses and revenue picture and allow us to get a better handle on the money that comes from you guys. “

Just to report a story as a Member of the *Aussie Times* Committee, Ann DeChant stated that she had received a hand-written letter from a Member who complained that he *Aussie Times* falling apart. She scanned the letter and sent it to the Board and Cynthia. Cynthia's immediate response was to get a new binder within two days, she got a new company. Ann said, “This was from a member who didn't have internet access and wrote a letter, so though we take our communication on the internet for granted, we do have members who still write hand-written communications to ASCA®.” She also thought that Cynthia's response was a credit to her handling of our magazine. Leah agreed that while she gets hers in Canada in the middle of the second month of the issue, it does arrive in good condition.

Another Member asked how we stand in Registrations, and Jerry said we are slightly down in Registrations. She then asked about Membership, and Jerry said slightly down in Membership as well. Membership dues were \$294,900 in 2005, in 2004 \$303,500. Sunday Miles asked if there had been sufficient time to see if there was a monetary increase with the new litter registration with the availability of doing a whole litter at once. For years she noticed that you would have a litter of a certain size and only a few pups got registered. “There is a discount,” Jerry said. He said he didn't have the information about that. He thought Debbie could look into that.

Sally Josselyn asked if Membership took into account the people who get First Class *Aussie Times* delivery. “No,” Jerry said that is not Membership fees. The postage and the *Aussie Times* are not part of the Member fees. Someone asked about financial reports being in the *Times*, and Jerry said that is one of Debbie's tasks, and they will be in the *Aussie Times*. Someone asked if the deficit will continue and Jerry said that for 2006, our best guess is for the deficit to continue.

There was a discussion about why the attendance sheet was going around. Ann DeChant said she would like it so that the names of those who attend could be in the minutes.

It was asked if the salaries had increased. \$19,000 is that all salaries? No, Jerry said, “We raise cost of living 3-4% increase over previous years.” Will the increase in salaries cover the \$19,000 and Patrick said no, it wouldn't cover that. “We are trying to hire the best people we can. We had a complete turn over in the office. Our salaries are within the benchmark for salaries in the area for that type of work. We only have 6 full-time employees in the Office.”

Someone asked about the reasons for the loss. “We had losses that were due to misappropriation of funds, our losses now have to do with trying to get a handle on things...temporary help, and other areas. We are trying to control things.” Jerry said that we didn't have a good handle on things until now as we quite frankly didn't have

anyone qualified to do financial statements or operating statements. "You can't use your auditors for that. They won't do it as they are auditors."

Jerry asked if we could complete the Treasurers Report.

He said that we were moving on to the Committee Reports, and that we would go alphabetically.

Sue Graham reported for the Agility Committee:

Agility Committee:

Good evening, my name is Susan Graham and I am the current chair of the Agility Committee.

I would like to start by thanking all the ASCA affiliates; dedicated Agility Committee and ASCA members for their efforts in supporting ASCA Agility. I would also like to send a special 'thank you' to all my agility friends and competitors who rallied together on Saturday to help Rock River ASC build the courses and those who helped staff the Epilepsy fundraiser trial. We had a great time out there on Wednesday and managed to raise approximately \$7000 to donate to the epilepsy fund.

From January - September 2006 there were 30 ASCA only trials scattered throughout the U.S. and the 1st every ASCA agility trial was held in Germany. Many clubs have found unique ways to encourage participation such as awarding buckles for HIT over a series of trials, pack team events for special classes, jackpot prizes...some clubs have Friday afternoon trials or one day trials. As you can see, the possibilities are endless of ways that clubs can support ASCA® Agility.

In the next few months the committee will be discussing ways to improve upon the judges approval process, course design guidelines, the development of a judges training program, an electronic committee newsletter (similar to the SCC) and a way to supervise newly approved judges.

I have been working with the office to ensure that proper protocol is followed. Please remember that we are all human and the new office staff is trying their best to tend to your needs. If your situation does not get handled in a timely manner, then please ask again, or contact me and perhaps I can get the situation solved or your question answered.

The committee welcomes your input. Please remember that all input should be sent to the committee in a letter format...mentioning something to me while I'm at a trial walking a course sometimes I won't get your idea down on paper and the ball may get dropped.

Another thing I'd like to discuss is the ASCA® Office staff and it would be like me hiring my husband to run that program. They didn't get hired knowing about Agility. Sarah is

doing a great job, so please be patient. If they answer your questions wrong or can't answer your questions, let me know so that I can help them.

Questions were asked about judges from other Agility venues and what they have to do to qualify. Is there a test they have to take on the ASCA® Rulebook. They have to provide a resume and the other venues that they have judged, and they take a test on the ASCA® Rulebook, so they do have to be familiar with the ASCA® Rules. People on the Committee then approve the person as someone usually has knowledge of them, and then they are forwarded to the ASCA® Board for approval. There was another question about whether the Committee has considered having Judge Applicant submit their courses designed for the other Agility programs to see if they are designing courses that fit well with ASCA® and so we would have an idea of what ongoing education is needed as other programs are testing different skills. Judges could be USDAA judges and they could say they are used to trialing in ASCA® or NADAC, but just because they trial there doesn't guarantee that they can design ASCA®-style courses from that perspective. Sue Graham said that the people reviewing the course are trying to work through this issue. Who are the reviewers? They are Pam Bryant-Meeks, John Raymond and Judy Boone. We have a couple of other reviewers who are not ASCA®-NADAC judges but we are trying to teach them our concept of flowing, fun courses.

In closing, I would like to squash the rumor that ASCA Agility is dead, but it will take the dedication of the ASCA members to ensure its success. **We** are ASCA and if **we** want to, **we** can make ASCA Agility work. Thank you.

A comment was made about the tendency to call ASCA® Agility ASCA®-only and that may cause people to think that if you are not an ASCA® Australian Shepherd, you can't play. In advertising it might be better to say, ASCA® Sanctioned All-Breed Agility Trial. Sue said that she thinks this is coming from an emphasis of breaking away from NADAC and ASCA®-only was used. Now we are trying to say, "ASCA® Sanctioned All-Breed Agility Trial." Anybody else? Thank you very much!

ARPH:

Allison Bryant reported that the Pamela Leach President couldn't be here so Ally was doing the report. Pamela Leach, ARPH President sent Ally the following:

Good afternoon everyone.

This year ARPH has maintained a steady pace of new dogs into the program. So far for 2006 we have brought in and adopted over 400 dogs. Our dogs average almost 5 months in foster care before being placed so the foster homes we have are very much appreciated. The average age of dogs in our program is 1.5 years and the number of senior dogs we have been able to help this year is over 20. The knowledge that adopters and volunteers open their hearts and homes to these "hard to place" dogs is heartwarming. We have over 500 volunteers in the United States and Canada. Our finances have remained stable, thanks to our dedicated volunteers seeking discounts

for rescue from vets, and their diligent fundraising to cover extraordinary medical expenses for dogs needing our care.

The ARPH Board accomplished the task of revising the R&Ps last year. This year, as promised, we are revamping the ARPH web site. It is still a work in progress, but I encourage you to go view it. Our volunteers are excited about the changes and are offering many suggestions on how to improve it even further, and share more breed information with the public.

We have also streamlined the record requirements, and have scanned the older records onto CD's which will make storage much less burdensome in the future. Our eBay store is up and operational, and we've been auctioning off some wonderful items donated and made by our volunteers.

The ARPH Board is also pleased to announce a new member, Keith Sturgess. Keith's leadership skills and experience will be an asset to the Board. Greta Kaplan stepped down from the Board so she can concentrate on her Rep duties in the Northwest Region.

Again, this year, ARPH wishes to thank ASCA for its continued support.

Respectfully,
Pamela Leach, President
ARPH, Inc.

Ally said that tomorrow there is an Agility Trial to benefit ARPH.

Breed Standard Review Committee:

Kristin McNamara, Committee Member, reported. Terry Martin couldn't be here today. She's the Chair, and there are two other BSRC Members in the audience, Sunday Miles and Linda Bell, and Kim Cochran is also at the Nationals and you can talk to any one of us.

The committee continues to work on the "reasons" for revisions, we present last year. I know there are concerns about the Annotations that we are working on. They are not Annotations intended to replace the existing Annotations. They are just clarifications of clarifications if that makes sense. Also, some of the stuff that we submitted last year, the Board went through and told us what they wanted to see, and so we went ahead and discussed it and clarified the clarifications. So a little bit of it is going to be different that what we had floating around last year and on the web site. I have a copy of what we have worked on in the last year, but I wasn't able to print off copies, so see me if you would like to look at what I am carrying around with me. Just remember that what's going on right here absolutely has to be approved by the Board 100% before it can go to the Membership, and then after that the Membership is going to have to vote it in with a 2/3 majority section by section."

Sally Josselyn asked if the Membership could vote for one section, and Kristin said, "Correct."

Conformation Committee:

Glenda Stephenson, Committee Member, reported. My name is Glenda Stephenson. I am a member of the ASCA Standing Conformation Committee. Liz Gibson, our chairman, is sadly not able to attend this year's Nationals, so she has asked me to give the report from our committee.

Our committee members send their greetings. We are fortunate to have members from all four points of the United States and Germany. As a committee, we have been turning our attention to matters of the utmost importance to our fellow fanciers.

First and foremost, due to an inadvertent error, the point schedule for the ongoing show year had been incorrectly calculated. The Committee has unanimously passed a motion and sent to the Board for approval which, for the ongoing show year, should be beneficial for all clubs.

As for the 2007-2008 Point Schedule: The advantage of having more than one show per day has shown some effect. Most clubs have had their point schedule become overly inflated. The committee has worked long and hard to come up with a schedule and procedure that we think will work. This new point schedule is based on a club's show average instead of the total number of dogs shown. Our motion is now before the Board of Directors and will also be published in the next available *Aussie Times* for your comments.

Another big item we worked on was to bring the Judges Code of Ethics into the rulebook as a set of rules. With the growth of ASCA, these procedures had become outdated and unenforceable. By inserting in the Show Rules & Regulations a Section that applies to Judges' Ethics gave the Club an avenue to enforce violations of the Judges Code of Ethics.

With the onset of the Conformation finals, the committee has passed several rules and guidelines for these Conformation Finals. Currently the committee is working on how this event is to be scored. Several options are up for discussion, but the committee members would appreciate any and all comments or suggestions for the Finals.

Other items in the Show Rules and Regulations that the committee has worked on are:

Clarifying how points are acquired on Champions. By clarifying the rules, it is clear to a layman how points are accrued on a class entry in the progression of the dog from Winners on up to Best of Breed.

In the Altered Division, all the rules that have applied to Intact are now either defined in their own Chapter or are in the process of being clarified. Most particular is the rule that a full slate of classes must be offered for the Altered Division.

And to help our Affiliate Clubs, the Board has approved our motion to allow Affiliate Clubs in the application process for Sanctioned shows the ability to file for a show date and request an extension so that additional time may be granted to obtain judges. This rule has been in effect for the Obedience Sanctioning, but not Conformation. With the addition of Conformation events to this rule, it will alleviate multitude of problems.

Liz would like me to state to the ASCA Membership and the Conformation Committee members that she has enjoyed being the Chairperson for the past 2 years. We are glad that she will continue on the committee as a viable member.

Let me stress to the ASCA Members that the committee endeavors to assist the club in all areas of the Conformation world. As always, the committee members enjoy any and all comments, questions or concerns. Let us know how we can help make ASCA a stronger club.

Currently we do have openings on the conformation committee. If you are interested, please send your resume to Jo Kimes.

At this time, myself and the Committee would like to introduce our new chairperson: Wendy Summers.

Does anybody have any questions? There were none.

DNA & Genetics Committee:

Chris Reedy, Chair, reported...Our Liaison is Ann DeChant. We recently did our elections for a new Chair and New Liaison, and it's the same. No changes were made. Chris stated that the Motions they passed on the last year are all on the Secretary's Report on the ASCA® web site, and you can go there to see them. The current rule regarding reconstructing a deceased parent DNA is on the Registry Rules, but the lab has informed ASCA® that technology has advanced and in some cases they can do that with fewer offspring. In some cases, it might take more, but in some, it might be less so we are working through that rule right now. We might also make it available for other unavailable parents as well. The cost of the DNA Kit recently went up to \$40, so that is something to be aware of. If you have any questions about a test you submitted, don't contact the lab. Contact the Business Office and for results as well. Make sure you sent the Kits to the Lab and not the business office. We had a DNA Blood draw at the Nationals over the last two days. 85 dogs were done. An Epilepsy Blood draw was also done today with 27 more dogs being sent to U of Missouri with donations to cover postage and mailing costs. We have a new Member, Amy Burnette, and we do need two more Members, so if anyone is interested, please send in your resume. There are a couple of new things and if you read CA Sharp's Double Helix to find out about ongoing research that need samples, most of which are confidential. There is also a new test for

the Merle Gene available. Many of you may say, why do I need a test to find out about the Merle Gene when you can see it, but it is really not that easy? You may find that your dog has the merle gene when it doesn't appear that they do, and we all know how the merle gene behaves, so it's good to now. The lab that does that test was here today, and be looking for articles in the *Aussie Times* about this. There were no questions.

HOF Committee:

Anne Shope, Chair, reported. We are not messing with HOF, and we are working on HOF-Excellent. These are ideas in the committee. Kennel HOFX is all that's under discussion.

1. Right now the Committee is focusing on Hall of Fame Excellent for kennels. The following are some of the ideas that are currently being discussed:
HOFX - 10/10/10/10 plan: 10 conformation titles (A-CH, CH), 10 Stockdog titles (OTDsc ATDd), 10 titles from either of the foregoing or from the performance disciplines (agility RS-O or RV-O or RJ-O, obedience CDX, tracking TD) and 10 years in ASCA as kennel owners & members in good standing. The titles that qualify for the current Hall of Fame would qualify for the 10-10-10.

Another idea was to double our present HOF requirements. A kennel would need: 20 Stockdog titled or championed progeny with a minimum of 6 champions of record and 6 Stockdog titled (A-CH, CH, OTDsc ATDd). The remaining 20 could come from the afore-named disciplines or from the performance disciplines: agility RS-O or RV-O or RJ-O, obedience CDX, tracking TD.

Another idea was 50 HOF titles, which titles would include those presently named in our HOF, plus further acceptance of: ATDsc, RS-E, TDX, and UD. 10 Conformation and 10 Stockdog would be required with the other 30 to come from those same disciplines or from the performance disciplines named.

Another idea was the HOF Kennel should have a Hall of Fame Sire or Dam. These are all separate ideas.

Two more ideas that are being discussed:

Hall of Fame Sire & Dam Idea: Create a HOFD (Hall of Fame Discipline) wherein sires & dams are rewarded for producing progeny that excel in a specific discipline. Present HOF categories and disciplines would be applicable. Sires would need 12 in a specific discipline and Dams would need 8 in a specific discipline. HOFDa (Agility), HOFDo (Obedience, etc.)

We also have discussed a Hall of Fame for ASCA members: This discussion was tabled but all members were interested in establishing recognition for those ASCA members who have gone above and beyond in the breed.

We are only working on HOF Excellent – HOF-X. I would like to introduce the Members at the time: REGION 2: Gina Larson, CA, Cheri Preciado, CA, Laura Diebold, CA; REGION 5: Robin McNeill/FL, Anne Shope /NM, Dorothy Montano/NM; REGION 6: Chris Davies, PA; and REGION 7: Anneke de Jong, Netherlands. If you are interested in joining the Hall of Fame Committee, please send your resume to Jo Kimes at jo.kimes@imsday.com

The Committee is requesting the following clause regarding grandfathering of titles be added to the rulebook, the *Aussie Times*, and to the website immediately after the listing of prerequisites for qualifying for the present HOF:

99:02 Effective 1/1/03 add to HOF requirements passed April, 2002: Any allowed titles earned towards HOF Requirements prior to 1/1/03 will count towards HOF requirements after 1/1/03. Any allowed titles earned after 1/1/03 must be earned under the new HOF requirements.

Education Committee:

Michelle Berryessa, Liaison, reported for the Chair Lisa Bell who was not able to be here.

Committee roster: Lisa Bell (chair); Kim Cochran; Shelly Hollen; Kay Marks; Terry Martin; Jean Mitchell; Chris Reedy; Rhonda Silveira; Glenda Stephenson; Gina Stocker. We continue to accept resumes preferably from regions 3 and 7. BoD Liaison-Michelle Berryessa, DVM.

Best wishes go to Kristin McNamara as she leaves the Committee to join the Board of Directors. Kristin will continue input on the Breed Standard series she initiated to see this project to completion.

The Committee continues to review educational materials on the website and work to update this information and create new information. We are in contact with the Business Office to assist in the creation of articles and flyers that will facilitate filling out various forms and familiarize readers with the Australian Shepherd and ASCA.

Content and focus for the 2007 National Specialty Educational seminar will begin. Current focus for the theme is “Proper Ring Procedure and Management”. Organization for regional educational events will also be on the agenda. The Committee will work in cooperation with the Conformation and Junior Committees to create Regional workshop formats in an effort to begin a mentor and education program. We extend the same offer to other committees through the Liaison Network program.

We invite membership comments, questions or concerns and will attempt to address these issues relating to Education.

The Committee has produced a number of articles that you will see in the *Aussie Times* and one the Web Site. Some are suitable to be distributed by the Office. There were no questions.

Junior Committee:

Andrew Martin, Committee Member, reported. Hi, I am Andrew Martin the Junior Committee Junior Chair. This year with worked on:

1. Novice Move ups. We changed it from having to make one Best Junior with competition or 6 first place wins with competition to 6 first place wins over competition or two Best Junior Handlers over competition. You can elect to move up from the Novice anytime you want, you just can't move back down. We thought that we the best way for the Novice Juniors who weren't ready to move up into Open.
2. We worked on Finals qualification. At first, it was you have to be in Open, and you could show. We decided you must make the "first degree" of Excellency which would make it a more elite competition and make it a little bit funner! The First Degree is 100 points. It is very simple and easy to make. You can earn it in one or two weekends out.
3. We also instated a Junior Code of Ethics. It was developed by the Juniors on the Committee and it was supervised by the adults. This was a great way for the Juniors to really understand Sportsmanship. It shows you character and integrity and also Sportsmanship in the Junior Program. The Juniors thought it would be a good idea to put it on there to promote better sportsmanship and less bad talking about the Judges as that happens and we all know that (big laughter).
4. Stuff to work on: Revising with Rules and finishing the Rulebook.

We are thinking of adding 500 Club or some kind of award for performance achievements, so that could take us a year to do it correctly.

We welcome new Adults and Juniors as we have openings on the Committee. We would like suggestions as to how to get more juniors to participate in all venues. There will be a Junior Committee Meeting Thursday at 1:00 in the Pavilion. If you have anything you would like to have the committee consider, please see a Committee Member. Thanks to Michelle Berryessa and Cindy King who are also on the Committee, and they can answer questions also.

MVA Committee:

Andrea Hoffman, Chair, reported. We've had a very quiet year. Everyone's been busy working on their stuff so we haven't gotten very much accomplished. Things seem to be running smoothly. I keep thinking there might be things that need tweaking, but we are a small Committee. Our Liaison is Ally. We have a small Committee and we need new Members particularly those with ideas. Our new Committee Members are Bob McGee and Gina Larson.

Obedience Committee:

Peter Hellmeister, Liaison, reported for Janet White.

Obedience Committee Report

Good evening... Janet White, had to fly home today.

Overall, the Committee is pleased with the quality of the obedience runs all over the country. We are tickled pink (delighted) that there are many motivational trainers out there and the attitude of our exhibitors lately has been excellent.

Lately the Committee has added a mixed run Utility B class as well as a mixed run Open B class. We also included a Wild Card class for all levels; please encourage your local clubs to offer this fun, nonregular class as it is very beneficial for us as trainers. As always, please refer to the ASCA website or your *Aussie Times* for results on the Committee's motions.

The Obedience Finals program gets better every year; of course, we accept suggestions from every host club. One thing we will work on soon will be to come up with some way of making the awards presentation consistent. Next year, obedience will have its own building at the New Jersey Nationals site; a luxury we are thrilled to have.

The Committee is aware of the new AKC rule regarding its judges; we are waiting on the final verdict in regards to obedience. Hopefully, our program will not suffer because of it. Every ASCA affiliate should do its best to find good qualified judges to run its obedience trials; good stewards are also essential for a smooth trial. Please know we will still have a pool of UKC obedience judges at our disposal. We can also encourage more of our ASCA exhibitors to apply for an ASCA obedience judge's number. One thing the Committee will work on soon is to determine whether or not the ASCA obedience test should be reinstated and if so, for whom.

As for our group, the Board of Directors recently approved five new members to the ASCA Obedience Committee. We could still use a member from Region 7 if anyone is interested. Please submit resumes at any time of the year to Jo Kimes, ASCA's executive director.

In closing, please remember that all your ASCA Committees are run by volunteers, and we certainly are not perfect. If you have any ideas, corrections, or if you see any inconsistencies in the obedience rule book, please let our chairperson know. Her e-mail address is in every *Aussie Times* as well as on the ASCA website on the Committee page. We need you to help us make the ASCA obedience program better and better.

Debbie St. Jacques said that she is asked to Judge wanted to ask that she be able to show at other places after she judges. She is asked to Judge in other places and also to show her own dog. If she is asked to Judge on the last day of a show, she can't show her own dog in the other venue on the days prior to her assignment. She would like to see us look at changing the Rules to allow Judges to show in other venues. She can show in herding and judge in Obedience or Conformation. Now that we are facing losing the availability of some of our Judges. Let's loosen up and trust our Judges. Could we look at it trusting judges to let them? Obedience and Conformation need to think about that. Making a good point, to trust our judges.

Someone asked if anything ever happened to the Rally Program.

Rally Committee:

Jerry announce that the Rally committee has been appointed. Ally Bryant read the appointees.

Region 1: Sharol Maloney

Region 2: Cheri Preciado

Region 3: Sharon Elkins

Region 4: Jeri Long, Rebecca Smith, and Hope Schmeling

Region 5: Robin McNeill and Jeanette Schoffler

Region 6: Peggy Parmenter and Kay Marks

Region 7: (No applicants)

Jerry said they were just appointed this week, and they have to get organized. There is not Chair yet and no Liaison.

Stockdog Committee:

Mike Bryant, Chair, reported.

First, I'll start with some statistics. ASCA® had 108 trials, over the last show year which is an increase over 2004 in which 97 trials were held. During the same time we awarded 432 Started Titles to Aussies, 385 Started Titles to other Breeds; 285 Open Titles to Aussies and 163 to Other Breeds; 216 Advanced Titles to Aussies and 127 to Other Breeds, 54 WTCHs to Aussies and 37 to Other Breeds; Ranch Dog Certificates - 6 to Aussies and 1 to another Breed; we had 19 Ranch Trials which is the same number that were held the previous year, with 67 Ranch Trial titles to Aussies and 41 to other Breeds. When we look at these numbers its always interesting how many titles are awarded to other Breeds and how much they support our Program.

Our make up is different from the other Committees in that we decided to use 7 Contestant for the seven different Regions and then have five Judge Positions. So this year we had to back fill a few Contestant positions and Chris Caldwell will serve in Region 1 and Anneka DeJong will serve in Region 7. We have also had a Judge return who has a long history with the Stockdog Committee. Kathy Warren will join us in a Judges Position.

A few highlights of what we have worked on in the last year. The German Coolie have been added to compete in ASCA® Trials. Has anyone seen a Coolie at any of or ASCA® Trials? No? Well, maybe that is something for all of us to look forward to. The Committee made some changes to the Rule Book to clarify the procedure for applying for Ranch Dog Certification. And we also expanded the responsibility of the Ranch Trial Subcommittee who view and approve for Ranch Dog Inspection applications. Previously the Committee dealt with these, but now it has been delegated to the Ranch Dog Subcommittee. Following the Stockdog Committee's recommendation, the Working Description has been adopted as an official document of ASCA® by the Board of Directors. The Stockdog Committee requested that the Membership should be poll regarding the placement of the Working Description within ASCA®'s Programs, and we developed a questionnaire that was used. A significant number of respondents to the

Poll were in favor of placing the Working Description within the Stockdog rules and regulations. The SDC received a proposal from a group of ASCA® Members for a Farm Trial classes within our program. We will have classes similar to the Ranch Dog Classes but in a smaller space and possibly with less stock. We are losing several Members: Sandra Zilch, and Rafi Herscher, and Mike thanked Chris Davenport, the Committee Liaison. Her term on the Board of Directors ends at the conclusion of this Meeting. That's a few minutes, congratulations, Chris...laughter. Chris Davenport, will have finished six years of service on the ASCA Board of Directors and two years as the Stockdog Committee Board Liaison. We wish to thank Chris for working with us and for her dedication to the Stockdog Program and the working Australian Shepherd.

He thanked all of the Contributions to the Finals. These donations help offset the Finals costs. It's a very expensive program. Thanks to RRVASC for their trials and Course Director Kathy Schwengel and her workers. They've done a great job as usual. SDC News was explained. SDC feedback list as well. Instructions for subscribing are in every committee report in *AT*. Send feedback to Mike or Jo Kimes. They haven't picked a Board Liaison yet. They will be doing it soon as they have 30 days from the Nationals to decide. Donations for Stock Finals will be in the Finals column.

Feedback: The Stockdog Committee thanks all members who have contributed their ideas and welcomes comments on any Stockdog Program issue. For the complete text of all non-confidential committee discussions, please subscribe to the SDC-News Yahoo Group by visiting <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/SDC-NEWS> and clicking on "Join This Group". To send feedback to the committee, either send your comments to mgbryant@4mi.net or to the SDC-Feedback Yahoo Group. To subscribe to SDC-Feedback, please visit <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/SDC-Feedback> and click on "Join This Group".

Tracking Committee:

Deb St. Jacques, Committee Member, reported. She thanked RRVASC for a great Nationals. This has been too much fun. As part of the Tracking it always fun. I said I would do this provided that Celeste had to write it. I'm Debra St. Jacques a Member of the Tracking Committee. This year, so far, we finished updating a new judges list. We had just gotten ready to post the list on the Web Site, then we got word of the AKC Conflict of Interest Judges policy. There goes our Judges List! You can imagine our surprise and chagrin...I didn't write this! ASCA® has 6 Tracking Test s in 2005. We will be postponing the posting of our Judges List until we see how this shakes out. I have a Judge who agreed to do our Nationals, and he just can't as he has put too much money and time into it, and he is really upset about it. Despite this, we will continue to grow ASCA®'s Tracking Program. We have regions where we have Judges. And we have Regions who need to grow their Judges List. We will see how it shakes out. We need our own Judges. Consider becoming an ASCA® Tracking Judge. If you know anyone who is qualified, encourage them to become and ASCA® Tracking Judge. If you want more information, there are a number of Tracking Committee Members here and we would love to talk to you about it. We have Meghan Rosenstengel. Angela Rector, Sue Schroeder (A new Tracking Judge), Anne Hershey was here, but she had

to leave. She successfully passed a Tracking Test with her dog. We have a new Member, Jan Wesen, and another new applicant as well. Encourage people who you know who has done some tracking encourage them to apply to be an ASCA® Tracking judge. They want Member input. The Committee has a Member Feedback List, TC feedback@ yahoogroups.com. A few new things have happened thanks to a Member wrote in with a suggestion. What happens to a dog when they find the articles? Deb said it's okay for the dog to play with it. They clarified the rules as AKC doesn't allow it, but why not? They are working to clarify the Nationals rules. They are going to work with the Education Committee so that the clear rules can go on the web site. They are working on new Tracking Tests such as Urban Tracking. Show different tracks at next year's Nationals. It will be its own stand alone thing not requiring a TD or TDX. She wanted to thank the local committee for a great test. 4 TDs, 4 passes. TDX passed. Wonderful site and wonderful food.

New Business:

Leah asked, "When is ASCA® going to develop a reciprocal agreement with CKC for registration. Would like to see a reciprocal agreement developed." Leah further stated that you can register a dog with CKC (Canadian Kennel Club) with ASCA® papers and five generation ASCA® pedigree, but you can't bring a dog with a 3-generation Certified CKC pedigree and registration in CKC and have ASCA® register it. It only goes one way. She would like to see ASCA® develop a reciprocal agreement with CKC so registrations can go both ways. Jerry said the Board would work on it.

Renea Desourcy suggested that she do a Nationals manual with rules for all venues. She offered this after the last time they hosted the Nationals, but now she has headed up a venue and found even more need for it. The rules and guidelines need to be Nationals specific. Some rules for everyday shows don't apply. Some are unrealistic. She headed up Tracking and she found it very difficult to head this up. It needs to have Tracking Committee help. She would be happy to create a whole Nationals handbook with its own procedures. She would like the Board to allow her to work on this. If each Committee could provide the Nationals Rules for that venue, she would be willing to put it all together in a comprehensive manual. It would help things going forward for host clubs. Ally explained that if we put the rules into one Nationals rulebook you have to update them in two places. Renea feels that a manual can be put together that walks you through every aspect of it so that everything about each venue. She will work on it if the Board will allow it. Stacy Harris, Tracking Chair for 2001 Nationals said the same thing. Especially for tracking. Tracking Committee is going to be addressing it.

Someone asked about where the Board is on a Mini Statement. It was stated that the Board has three drafts of a Mini Statement. A proposed Motion is going back for redrafting. Several drafts have been reviewed. Three drafts have been kicked around. It is being worked on.

Paul Kirk said he wants to take a Resolution of a Sense of the Meeting and move that the Bylaws amendments be voted on a section at a time. There was a second and the tape didn't pick up who that was. Kirk explained that at the Colorado 1998 General

Membership Meeting the Articles of Incorporation were changed to say that the Bylaws can be amended by the Membership that was incorporated by the Board in April of 1999. The Bylaws should have come back to the Members before 8 years since that Meeting. The Dispute resolution Article was removed from the Bylaws and at that time, that was the right thing, but it should be put back into the Bylaws. This is not the way that the organization should be run. There is precedent for kinds of things coming to us. If we go back to 1999, we had to make changes in our Membership to make it more acceptable in terms of IRS. Three different separate Bylaw changes were brought to the Membership for a vote. We voted on these individually. I would urge you to support my resolution give a sense to the body that this is a sense of this body so that the Board will realize that we don't just sit here and talk but that we have some kind of ...even if we don't have a quorum ...we do feel that these kinds of things should be brought to us individually in terms of either the section or the Article of the Bylaws so again, my Motion is: It is the sense of the Meeting that voting on the proposed Bylaws Amendments be by separate votes on the content parts such as by Section and /or Articles of the Bylaws. Jerry said there is a second. A vote of the sense of the meeting was held. Jerry called for the vote asking, those in favor, those opposed, and someone said, What about those of us who don't understand what we are voting on? The comment was that most of us don't understand what he was trying to say. Jerry explained that if there are to be amendments to the Bylaws or changes, that they be voted on section by section and not as a complete change to the entire Bylaws. Is that correct? Paul said, "Correct." Someone asked whether this was legal or not and Jerry said that the Bylaws must be changed by a vote of the Membership and that it can be voted one either as an entire document or by the Section or Article. Jerry said, "We've already amended two sections." Someone asked Paul to explain it again. Paul said that obviously, "Bylaws can be changed and you can either adopt a whole new set, or you can vote on the Articles or separate Sections, and I am simply pointing out or asking to discuss them in separate sections. There are several good reason for this because if you have multiple different changes and you have to vote on the whole Bylaws, you may find yourself in agreement with some sections and in disagreement with one or more and it doesn't give you a good vote to have the entire document." One Member said that Jerry just said we can vote on them that way, and Paul said, "It has not clear how this will be brought to us. I'm saying that rather than has a whole big package, we be given it this way." Jerry said, "Paul is asking for it to be one way. He is asking that it be the sense of this Meeting that the Board be advised that the Membership would like it to be article by article instead of the whole document." Jerry said also, "The sense of the Meeting is that the Motion passed." Someone else asked about the results again, and Paul asked for a division of the House. There was one against, and it passed by a Majority. Paul asked, "Mr. President would you mind calling the vote again?" Jerry said, "Fine." It was announced that it passed again, and someone questioned why so many abstained, and that was cleared up that only one was opposed and many abstained, but it carried. Then the vote was announced. 39 Favored, 1 Opposed, 22 abstained.

Linda Bell asked if we are going to do anything with Judges Education. She asked about general rules of education of Judges. Jerry asked which venue and she asked

about it in general. Jerry suggested that she take her questions and concerns to the Committee for each venue. She just said, in general how is it handled, and Jerry said at the individual Committees. There were discussions about how there are committees that hold education for their Judges. The Conformation Committee held their first seminar last night someone explained, and she asked about education requirements, and Jerry again suggested that the questions go to the individual Committees as some do offer education.

That concluded the new business and Jerry asked if there was any Old Business.

Kyle Trumbull-Clark was recognized.

"Over the last almost twenty years as an ASCA member, I have heard over and over about how the Board keeps taking away the membership's ability to have a true say in what happens within their club. Rarely does something come up that has a direct relationship to the dogs, our Aussies, the whole reason we are here. As a past Board member of two terms and as ASCA President, we worked very hard to have the membership directly involved in as many important changes as possible. Sometimes it is difficult or even impossible due to limited time, legal or financial issues. But, there has been one major issue facing our club's members that had no time, legal or financial restraints and has huge implications regarding our dogs. That would be the Working Description.

The Secretary's Report of April 2, 2004 states:

"Board discussion of Working Description - What is it? Where to put it? We can't say what it is until the Committee comes up with it. Decided to put out a statement that we all agree we will look at what the Stockdog Committee sends to us. We will send it back to the committee until we like what they send us, then we will send it to the membership for X time period.

We will look at the comments and see whether it can go to the members for a vote, which the Board will abide by, provided it passes by a majority vote."

Obviously the Board started with the right idea of giving the membership the final vote, but then chose unilaterally and capriciously to make the final decision on something this important. Yes, it is enormously important. It's all about how our dogs are supposed to work. The basic building block of our breed. It is more important than a dog's coloration, ear set or whether they have a tail or not. But yet, the Board is not allowed to usurp the membership's approval process over ear set, tail length or color. There's a problem here. A nine person problem.

Yes, we the ASCA membership gave these people on our Board the power to guide our club. But, we made those decisions based upon what we were told and promised by them. Here are a few quotes from some of their "Candidate Resumes" they wrote for publication in the *Aussie Times*:

"I believe the strength of ASCA is in the membership."

"ASCA is a complex corporation, but it needs to be run for and by its Members. I believe

that Membership support and involvement is critical to keeping ASCA as the primary guardian of the Australian Shepherd Breed long into the future. ASCA belongs to all of us, the Members. We are ASCA."

"It's important for ASCA to remain an independent, financially secure dog club run by the people who care the most about this breed - the members."

"As a Director of ASCA, I will be determined to represent you as the members."

In the President's Report, it clearly states: "...whatever the outcome is, it will be backed by a majority of our membership."

We were deceived by the people we put into office. They told us they supported the membership and then they turned their backs on us. Those nine people made a momentous decision regarding our breed without our majority approval. We, the membership, were told we would vote on a Working Standard. Now it has been shoved down our throats by this Board. We are supposed to be appeased by being allowed an opinion poll on where it appears on our official papers? That is nothing. I'm sorry, but I just can't get past the true deceit plus, the overwhelming conceit that they feel they can make this type of decision without us.

No matter how disturbed I am over the Working Description itself, it is even more disturbing to me how this Board took it upon themselves to impose something this important to our membership, our Stockdog program, our breeders, our Stockdog judges and the very essence of our breed. As a past President and continuing ASCA Member, I am disgusted and have lost all respect for this Board." -Kyle Trumbull-Clark

Loud applause. Roger Stevens said something that was not picked up by the tape.

Pete Dolan said he is the Chairman so far for next year's Nationals. He said he hates to follow that, but he wanted to lighten things up and suggested that everyone come to NJ for the Nationals. They are September 29 to October 6, 2007. It is ASCA's Fiftieth Anniversary and they did send a letter to Ernie Hartnagle who will be available for anyone who wants hear him speak. It's a great site. Some of it is better than this and some is not as good, but it's a great site. It's an hour and a half from New York. Someone asked if it will be warm. The consensus was that it won't be. The dates were repeated. Obedience will be inside on mats. Agility will be outside.

Las Vegas Nationals. Donna Armstrong stood up to talk about Vegas. 1st week of November. Someone said it will be warm. Donna said it will probably be chilly. Jo asked if there was a Chair. Donna said that it would be Becky Maloney. Donna said to fly into Vegas airport and it would be about 30 minutes to site. It will be at the Nevada Fanciers Dog Park it will be the whole facility – 30 acres. The Stock people will have a good trial and the rest of you will be happy. Pete asked about the guidelines for Nationals are bad and he support strongly enough that we need Nationals Guidelines as Rene is right. Pete said a Nationals Committee is in order.

Anne Shope wanted to change the topic. She would like to go back to Kyle's and ask the Board why the Members didn't get to vote on the Working Description. Why you sent us ballots on where we were going to place it, but you did not even tell us what you were going to do with it. We want to know why we didn't get to vote on it. Ann DeChant said the vote on the placement was what we were going to do with it. Anne Shope said, No, we didn't even get to vote on it. Someone said, "It said, none of the above." Ann Shope, "No we wanted to vote on it, and there are so many people who don't even work dogs who wouldn't understand what was going to be done with it depending on where it was going to be placed. We didn't even get to vote on the Description and then the placement is the second issue. The voting is the first issue, and we didn't even get to vote. Roger said, "And you were told by the Board that you would be voting on it." Jerry said that he can't recall his vote. Jerry said he thought he made a proposal that got shot down, but he didn't remember how he voted. He thought he voted against it, and that was confirmed. He said he voted against it and that was his vote. Ann DeChant said she thought the Board voted on exactly what was done. Jerry said that we voted to adopt the Description and then voted to send the placement to the Membership on the Ballot. Anne Shope said, "I'm sorry those people that work dogs, this is their description and what you've done is you took like Conformation people and you've said you don't get to vote, but you can tell us where to put the Description. Ann DeChant said, "The Committee sent a motion to ask the Members to decide where to put it, and that's all it was...a support of the Committee Motion." Kyle said. "Get out, you're the Board, you're working for us. You people need to say to yourselves in your little meetings, 'You know, maybe we should have the Membership vote on this because it's that important.'" Roger stated that he and Jerry were the only ones who voted against it. The rest of them chose to vote for it. Kyle said, "Then I want to know from each one of you, why did you vote on it." Somebody said, "Peter do you want to tell us?" Peter said that the Motion came from the Committee and he supported that. "They are the experts in this field. There are ten or twelve Members of this committee. There was always the possibility for you to provide feedback to the Committee." Kyle said, "They are only ten or twelve people out of how many Members do we have?" Roger: "The problem I have about it is as I understand it that you got the Committee to write the "Standard" you only had people on the Committee who wanted the "Standard." Mike tried to answer and Roger said, "No, no, no, a Yes or no answer. I know some people who wanted to be on the Committee, and I was sent an e-mail that said if you are not for the "Standard" you couldn't be on the Committee." Mike said that Roger had read his personal opinion about it during the discussion, but he didn't feel that the people on the subcommittee were chosen that way. Roger asked Mike if all the people who were on his little Subcommittee were for the Working "Standard," and Mike said that they were for the Working Description, and Roger said, "Of course they were." Someone in the back of the room was recognized by Jerry and she asked Roger, "How could someone write the Working Description, Roger, if they were against it? You don't have to agree with everything the majority wants, but if you are just against it, how can you write a Description?" Roger said, "Yes, but if you are writing a Description, you need both sides." Jerry took over and said, "The fact of the matter is very simply, the Committee put together a document that was voted on by the entire Stockdog Committee. So, like anybody making a Motion to a body, the Stockdog Committee

adopted a Motion to adopt it as a Working Description and then passed it on to the Board for its action.” Someone asked a question that didn’t get picked up on the tape, and Jerry said, “It doesn’t have anything to do with the Committee. A Committee can bring anything to the Board and it’s up to the Board to adopt. That’s how the procedure works. The Board takes the adoption process. The Board can refuse to adopt it and send it back to the Committee or it can turn it down altogether.” Many people yelled that the Board can decide to send it to the Membership, and Jerry said, “They could have done that, too, yes they could have.” Leah Swatko was recognized and she stated that people who are against something are not going to serve on a committee or a project to create something. “If I thought Conformation was the silliest thing in the world, I’m not going to get on the Conformation Committee. I’d have gone on with a negative agenda.” Mike Bryant said that was exactly his thinking, and “As I said before, I do not believe that that was what was used to chose the people for the subcommittee.” There were more statements about that the Committee sent it to the Board and that’s where it went. Jerry brought the meeting back. Someone made a long statement that was not picked up by the tape. The gist of which was that this body was stating that this should go to the Membership for a vote. Ann DeChant asked for a minute and she read the two Motions that were sent to the Board in the April Secretary’s Report. One was a change in a rule and the other was the vote on the ballot question and she read the motions and the vote results. She said there was no other vote in the April Secretary’s Report from the Stockdog Committee. So someone asked if the basic motion was ever approved, and Jerry and Roger said that it was during the April Meeting. That Jerry and Roger tried to get a different Motion passed but it was voted down, “but Jerry and I voted against it.” Mike Bryant said that was brought up at the Affiliate Meeting last night that is the missing minutes. The Board did adopt the Description at the April Meeting, but that is missing. Jerry said that there was earlier a consensus of the Board, previous to the Working Description, that it was going to be brought to a Membership vote, and we didn’t do that. “As far as I’m concerned, the Board screwed up.” Someone else asked if it can be either the Board or the Membership can be making decisions for the Breed. Jerry said, “As far as the Breed Standard is concerned, according the Bylaws, the Membership can vote to change the Breed Standard. It requires unanimous approval of the Board and then approval from 2/3 of the voting Membership. As far as anything else, any other matter if you are complying with the Bylaws the Board is the body that passes and operates the Club.” The speaker said she has been a member for thirty years, and she has missed less than a handful of Nationals and she can’t tell you that there has even been a quorum. Jerry said there was in 1998. The speaker asked if there was any way to take the numbers that have been in attendance at the last five Nationals and average the number and use that to establish a quorum. This would allow people who are involved in the Breed and support the Breed ...the people who entered. The people who are at the Meetings would be the quorum. This would allow this body to get our opinions across to the Board that we are staring at. Jerry said that the Members are being heard tonight by this Board. “By making your comments here, you are presenting your opinions to the Board. With a quorum, you could take action. If you had a quorum here you could take action, even on the Bylaws with a vote.” It was noted that many are out to dinner tonight. There was discussion about those who are at the Nationals but not at the Meeting are not here to support the Breed, they are here to

show or trial of do Agility or Obedience, but not to support the Breed. But Jerry said, “If they are Members of ASCA®, their opinions are just as important and carry just as much weight as the people in this room.”

Maarten said that Kyle had asked to hear from all of us. Maarten said, “The normal way that I take input is through the Committees. They have the function to gather the input from the Membership. I have no problem at all with sending this to the Membership as I wasn’t on the Board when those quotes were put out there, so if you feel that strong about it then we need to know that.”

Someone asked for clarification about the Committee system and how the Committees and the Chair is determined. Jerry reviewed the procedure that the Members apply to Jo to be on a Committee, the resumes go to the Liaisons, the Liaisons take forward the Committee applicants to the Board with their recommendations for who to appoint and the Board decides who to appoint for the Committees. The Committee then elects a Chair and a Liaison each year. Her question was if someone wants to be on a committee and they are not qualified, can the list of applicants be published in the AT for Member comment? Mike Bryant said, “That is a good idea, but it’s hard enough to get people to volunteer for a Committee and we don’t have a full Committee now.” Sunday Miles said most people volunteer as they have a passion about that venue. Someone said that you wouldn’t want people to on the Agility Committee if they weren’t passionate about Agility. Jerry said, “We would hope that the Liaison would know who would be good appointees.”

Jerry recognized a Member: “My name is Chuck Spriggs and we just sort of started in Herding. If I understand this right, I went and bought a puppy based on the fact that it was registered as an Australian Shepherd. I bought this puppy, I joined this club and you took my money, and you’re saying that at some point two years down the way, you could tell me I don’t have an Australian Shepherd?” Jerry said, “Absolutely not, absolutely not.” Chuck said, “If he doesn’t work a certain way, I can’t compete with him?” Jerry: “No, we aren’t saying that whatsoever.” “Well,” Spriggs asked, “What’s in the Breed Standard? I don’t know what’s in the Breed Standard.” Roger said, “It’s a Working ‘Standard’, so it’s got to work a certain way. A Conformation Dog has to look a certain way.” Mike Bryant said, “Roger, that’s a bunch of baloney.” Jerry took over and said, “The Breed Standard is what defines the Australian Shepherd. It has nothing to do with the Working Description. So what you bought as an Australian Shepherd, is an Australian Shepherd.” Chuck: “But what if he doesn’t perform the way of the Standard?” Jerry: “The answer was that is was not a Standard it is a description and has nothing to do with Judging. It is not a rule. How it is going to be used? I don’t know. Who is going to use it? I don’t know. What the Board did was adopt it, and the Board after a referendum of the Membership, has placed it in the Stockdog Rule Book.” Mike Bryant said, “It hasn’t been placed there yet.” But Jerry said, “It’s going to be.” Spriggs: “So I have no fear that what you’ve done is somebody won’t throw that up at me and say your dog doesn’t work right, so you won’t be allowed to compete in Stock anymore?” Jerry said, “You will always be able to participate in Stock. I can’t answer your question. That’s my answer.” “So,” Spriggs said, “You said that you don’t know what you are

going to do with it, but yet, we are developing it?" Jerry, "It's already developed by the Stockdog Committee. That's where we are." Kyle then said to the Board, "Mike's responsibility for the Working description is done. Now it's your responsibility. You accepted it. Tell us why it's here. You never told us why." Someone else said, "You said you made a mistake..." Chris Davenport said, "We didn't all say we made a mistake, Jerry said we made a mistake, and I don't want Jerry speaking for me. I voted for it because it came from the Committee and I happen to approve of it and believe in it. It's a Description, not Breed Standard, it's not a Standard of how the Breed has to work, it's a description of what some people agree is the way an Aussie works. I'm not going to sit here and tell you that the Board made a mistake. I don't remember us promising that Members would get to vote on it. Personally, I have no problem with it, but in my opinion, it came up properly. The Committee worked on it. They approved it. It came through to the Board and was approved by the Board. I believe it's the one I forwarded to the Board in e-mail (as the SDC Liaison), and Jerry said that there wouldn't be enough time for discussion, so we kept it for discussion in April. There was no discussion. It got approved with very little discussion. Where it was going to be put got more discussion than the actual description. There were comments made that we were surprised at how quiet it was when it was actually out there. It was put out there so everyone could see what was being worked on, and I never got calls that said...what are you doing and why are you doing this?" Mike Bryant said. "It's kind of interesting. We didn't hear anything about this during our Stockdog Committee Meeting Tuesday, that was yesterday. We didn't hear about it at all. At the Stockdog Committee Meeting, we didn't hear about it at all. We didn't hear any objections at the GMM last year. All I'm saying is we've been wanting feedback from both sides of the issue. We were expecting feedback at previous Nationals." Jerry recognized someone else. "Why do we keep hearing that the Board has to unanimously approve it and the Membership has to approve by 2/3?" Jerry said, "That is the Breed Standard, not the Working Description. Please, what describes an Aussie is the Breed Standard." The person asked, "Then what is the Working Description?" Jerry, "That describes how an Aussie works." Someone else asked, "Is that how it's listed as a Description?" Jerry said again that it's not a Standard. "In my opinion, it's an educational piece." Spriggs: "So the Judge will use that to Judge my dog?" Jerry: "No, it's not a Rule." Spriggs: "Will the Judge read it then?" Jerry: "Like anyone else." Roger: "If it's in the Rulebook, it's going to be construed as a Rule." Many people said no it wouldn't. Jerry recognized another person who asked if 2/3 of the Members don't approve it will it keep coming back year after year of is it done. Jerry said, "Forget about the 2/3 vote. It doesn't have anything to do with this. Let's assume whatever the vote is, majority for, majority against, whatever, it's just information for the Board. It is informational." The person again asked even if the whole Membership approves it, it's still not in effect until the Board approves it. Jerry: "Correct." The person said, "So the only thing our Bylaws say Members can legally vote for is the Breed Standard?" Jerry: "And the Bylaws, and Directors." The person again, "So basically the poll of the Members isn't going to validate, but it gives them a chance to give their opinion." Paul Kirk: "Just a difference of opinion, Mr. President. Clearly the Bylaws could be written in such a way that these things could go for a vote to the Membership. It can be done." Jerry: "What I said is that at present they can vote for changes in the Bylaws, the Breed Standard and vote

for Directors.” Kirk: “And that could be changed.” Jerry: “A lot of things could be changed.”

Jerry recognized Linda Bell. “I have friends on both sides of the issue, and it’s not an easy one. I think it comes down to our Board being very sensitive to the issues to taking both sides into consideration so that something isn’t rammed down one half of the Membership’s throats and I’m for a Working Description. I think it’s important, but my understanding of it is that after being on the Breed Standard Review Committee, the Breed Standard describes the perfect Aussie and no one has a perfect dog. It’s what you try and get close to. A Working Description is a description how we think the Aussie will generally work. My Aussies are going to work like some of this, maybe they’re going to miss it here. You Aussie will work like some of that and will miss some of this. It’s a general idea of what you aim for not a way to say your done, your out, you can’t trial. That’s not how I see it. If some people see it that way, then maybe that’s the problem that we have to deal with. But the bottom line is, it’s dividing our Club. It’s gotten ugly, friends go against friends, and it’s really unpleasant. It’s unfortunate and I don’t think it’s helping the dogs.” Jerry: “I understand your concern. I’ve said my piece. Please understand that we have people who very strongly feel about what this Board has done, and in my opinion, we didn’t do what we said we would do. That’s beside the point. This could be that when this issue is being considered, it’s very important for the Board to hear these things. There are strong feelings on both sides of the issue. Initially when the whole idea was proposed years ago, that is when the initial flurry of opinion was heard. Before there even was a Description to talk about.” There was more discussion about what the Members did get to vote on. The Board did approve the Description and that is what was on the Ballot when the questions were put before the Members for where to put it. Someone mentioned that they did get a choice to say none of the above. Someone else said that Members did get to vote on where to put it but not to approve the Description. Kyle said, “What you were asked to vote on was, the Board has approved this, now where should it be put.” Jerry said he would allow the three people with their hand raised to speak on the issue then the Board would take your feedback into account. Someone asked that the Board would take this to the Membership for their opinion. Sunday Miles expressed that these Meetings should be a quorum as we usually can’t get a quorum at the Meetings unless there is something juicy and controversial. Can’t we make a change to make it so these Meetings can have a quorum? Jerry said that the reason we can’t change the quorum is that it is in the Bylaws. “If there was a quorum here then you could make a motion and pass the change.” Mary Finley was recognized and she said that she wanted to discuss the fact that several Directors had said they supported the Working Description since it came from the Committee and she pointed out the circular thing that it’s the Board who approves the people on the Committee. There’s a Liaison is on the Committee and then they recommend to the Board who is on the Committees and there is no openness as to who applies for the Committees. How do we know if people are being cherry-picked for committees based on their support of certain political issues? There is no way we can question this. “I’d like to have a way to have input into this.” Jerry responded by saying that in his 6 years on the Board, he thought he could count on one hand the number of people who weren’t appointed to committees due to their being

more than the needed number of applicants. “Usually it’s the other way around and there are not enough applicants to fill the committees.” The speaker said that a few years ago on the Agility Committee, there were appointments that were made that seemed to be supporting a certain political side. Since there isn’t openness, she wonders with the Stockdog Committee if this isn’t the case with who has been appointed. The assumption is whether it’s correct or not that that is what is happening. Jerry asked how many people would apply if their name was going to be published in the *Times* for input. That is a concern is for him.

Jerry said unless there is an issue on a different topic it is now 10:15 p.m. “Are there any other issues? Do any Board Members have any other issues?”

Andrea Hoffman moved to adjourn. There was a second and the Meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Ann B. DeChant".

Ann B. DeChant, Secretary