

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 and mail, fax, e-mail and/or telephone communications.
February 1-29, 2012.

Board of Director's Teleconference Monday February 13, 2012

Conference Call Minutes of February 13, 2012.

The meeting was called to order at 8PM. CST by President Russ Ford. All Directors were present.
Motion by Hellmeister, second by Dexter. I move to ratify all previous email motions for the month of January, 2012. Approve: Unanimous. Motion approved.
Printing of Rule Books - The motion to rescind made by Vest and seconded by Dexter was approved unanimously.
BREED STANDARD REVISIONS - The Color Section was clarified by David Clayton. The Board will discuss this issue until the next conference call, which is scheduled for Monday, February 21, 2012, at 8PM, CST.
A report on Committee Make Up will be discussed from now until the April Board Meeting. The issue will be voted on at that time.
Stock Dog Courses - This issue will be placed on the Agenda for the April Board Meeting.
2004:15 ASCA BUSINESS OFFICE - *Motion by McClintock, seconded by Hellmeister.* I move to accept the bid submitted by AgniTEK for server, Operating System and Software and Labor in the total amount of Fourteen Thousand One Hundred Seventy-One Dollars and Fifty-Seven cents, (\$14,171.57). Approve: Unanimous. Motion approved.
Motion by Ford, Seconded by McClintock. I move to adopt the Financial Manual, without addendum, as submitted by Treasurer, Greg McClintock. Approve: Unanimous. Motion approved.
ASCA TRADEMARK PROGRESS - No questions on our trademarks.
2011:03 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OFFICE
Motion by Gray, seconded by Vest.
I move to hire Pete Dolan as Executive Secretary effective immediately. Motion was called out of order by the President. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.
Respectfully submitted,
Jo Kimes
ASCA Executive Secretary

CONFERENCE CALL OF FEBRUARY 21, 2012.

All Directors were present. The meeting was called to order by President, Russ Ford at 8 PM, C.S.T.
2011:03 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OFFICE - *Motion by Dexter, seconded by Gray.* I nominate Pete Dolan as Executive Secretary. Approve: Dexter, Gray, Vest, Hellmeister and Clayton.
Disapprove: Bates, McClintock, Gann and Ford. *Motion is approved.*
The conference call ended at 9:20 PM, CST.

Respectfully submitted,

Jo Kimes
ASCA Executive Secretary

2011:39 RALLY - CH 7 - Motion 12-2A / RM Title

Motion by Vest

I move to approve this addition to Chapter 7: Chapter 7: Rally Excellent Masters Title
3. A dog must have earned the RM title prior to a trial in which the dog enters both Masters B and Excellent B.
Comments: This is to ensure teams complete the base titles first before starting the double Q's for the REM or REMX. This motion will take effect on June 1st, 2012. Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows:
Approve: Unanimous. *Motion is approved.*

2000:15 BREED STANDARD REVIEW COMMITTEE - Revised motion

Motion: Ford Second: Clayton

Breed Standard revision vote by membership:

As part of the 2012 Director election, the membership will vote to approve/disapprove the proposed Breed Standard revisions. The vote will be cast on a section by section basis. The ballot will include pages containing the current standard and explanations of the revisions. The ballots will be tabulated by Election Trust LLC supervised by the ASCA Election Secretary.

The ballot will be sent with an explanation page which includes the current standard and the revisions listed side by side. Rationale: The following motion approved at the 2011 National meeting does not clearly state how the committee intended the membership to vote:

addendum to 2011 Motion: Motion by Clayton, second by Ford: I move to send the Breed Standard Revision to the membership for a vote in the June election cycle. The revised standard will be printed in the next three (3) AT for membership review. The standard revisions will also be posted to the ASCA website and Facebook, effective immediately. Approve: Westerman, Ford, Berryessa, Dolan, Vest, Clayton, Dexter. Non-voting: Bates, Hellmeister. The motion is approved. Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows. Approve: Bates, Ford, Clayton, Dexter, Gann, McClintock and Vest. Abstain: Gray.

Disapprove: Hellmeister.

*Letter of Dissent - I believe that the Standard is a document as a whole and not a summary of sections and should be voted on as a whole. *Motion is approved*

98:05 CONFORMATION COMMITTEES - Chapter 15 Section 15.6(3)

Motion by Dexter

I, Sunday Miles move to approve the following motion.

Chapter 15, Section 15 .6 (3) to read as follows

3.) Rosettes/Ribbons: The Finalists placing first (1st) through tenth (10th) Altered and Intact, will receive a placement rosette. A Conformation Finals Qualifier rosette labeled "Conformation Finalist" will be Awarded for all qualifiers with the qualifying dog's ASCA registered name and ASCA titles printed on the side streamer. Non ASCA titles will not be included. All Rosettes/Ribbons will be printed with the date and location of the Conformation Finals. Any qualifying team that is unable to participate in the Conformation Finals is responsible for the cost of shipping their Qualifying Rosette/Ribbon, or requesting that the Rosette/Ribbon be entrusted to someone else for delivery. The Host club is not responsible for the cost of shipping Rosettes/Ribbons.

Reasons behind change;

I would submit that the wording on the ribbons be changed to read "Conformation Finals Qualifier" instead of "Participant". This will eliminate further confusion/argument as to whether or not they should be passed out. In Wisconsin ribbons were not given out to those who for one reason or another could not attend, instead they were simply tossed out or recycled. I feel both sides had valid reasons for their interpretation but I also see it thru my eye's that those whom have qualified have "Participated" in the program. It is a class much like the parade of titleholders... you know who is in it because they have Qualified by participating in multiple shows to accumulate the required points to qualify. Therefore a simple change to the printing on the ribbon itself will allow all whom have participated to qualify for the honor of receiving their ribbon.

Effective 2012 Conformation Finals

Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows: Approve: Gray, Bates, Ford, Clayton, Dexter, Gann, Hellmeister and Vest. Disapprove: McClintock. *Motion is approved*

*Letter of dissent by McClintock - I believe that those who make the commitment and effort to attend Finals deserve recognition, and that those who qualify, but do not attend, have not, in fact, participated in "Finals." There is a difference between one who qualifies for finals but does not attend, and one who attends and competes in Finals. The awards presented at Finals should reflect who was there and made the effort. If one must be present to win, one necessarily must also be present to receive recognition for attempting to win.

2009:05 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES - New Member Leemhuis

Motion by Vest

I move to approve the addition of Guy Leemhuis to the Legislative Committee.

Comment: The Legislative Committee could use additional members and the Chair, Susan Beals requested addition of Mr. Leemhuis in Region 2. See member information from Mr. Leemhuis below.

Effective date : Immediate upon affirmation of the BOD

Dear Mr. Ford

My name is Guy Leemhuis. I have recently joined as a lifetime member. I have two purebred Aussie pups and one has been recently registered the other shall be in a few weeks. I had an Aussie for 14 years prior to that. I am very interested in becoming involved in ASCA. I am looking to have my dogs compete in conformation, obedience and agility over the next few years. I also work with Hall's Australian Shepherds and will be handling a few of her dogs at conformation shows. I also have family in Houston and Palacios Texas so I do visit Texas occasionally as well. Please let me know if there are any opportunities to serve on a committee or on the Board. I am an attorney by profession and specialize in disability rights and special education law, family and probate law. I hope I may be of service, look forward to hearing back from you. I am really excited Nationals will be in CA next year as this will be my first opportunity to witness an ASCA national and maybe if I am lucky will be handling an Aussie or two competing. Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows: Approve: Unanimous. *Motion is approved.*

2004:05 AGILITY COMMITTEE - judge move-up – CORRECTIONS

Motion by Ford

I move to approve Chet Katwyk to be released from supervision and promoted to full fledged agility judge. All 13 committee members voted 'yes' Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows: Approve: Unanimous. *Motion is approved.*

98:11 OBEDIENCE RULES - Ch. 7, Paragraph 2

Motion by Bates

MOTION BY Anne Shope, SECOND by Jan Weis to change Chapter 7, Paragraph 2: OBEDIENCE TRIAL CHAMPION - OTCH as designated below.

FOR: Unanimous AGAINST: None ABSTAIN: None

FROM: A total of one hundred (100) points must be earned. Points can only be accumulated after the dog has received a UD title from ASCA. A dog must have one(1) score of 193 or higher from the Open B and/or Open V, one (1) score of 193 or higher from Utility B and/or Utility V, and one (1) score of 195 or higher from either Open B and/or Open V or Utility B and or Utility V.

TO: The following required points and scores towards earning the OTCH can only be accumulated after the dog has received the UD title. A total of one hundred (100) points must be earned as set forth in the Point Schedule below. A dog must have one (1) score of 193 or higher from the Open B and/or Open V, one (1) score of 193 or higher from Utility B and/or Utility V, and one (1) score of 195 or higher from Open B and/or Open V or Utility B and or Utility V. PURPOSE: The rule was ambiguous about when the scores must be accumulated, even though understood that scores are earned after acquiring the UD. Therefore the rule has been clarified. Scores & Points must both be accumulated after the UD is earned. EFFECTIVE: 30 days after publication. Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows: Approve: Bates, Hellmeister and McClintock. Disapprove: Ford, Clayton, Dexter and Vest. Abstain: Gann and Gray. *Motion is disapproved.*

2011:39 RALLY - Motion 11-36A / Rally Merits

Motion by Vest

Motion by: Jody **Second by:** Kathi

I move to add this to the rulebook for merits Chapter ____: Rally Merit Program (Top Ten)

SECTION 1

: Miscellaneous

1. Eligible dogs are ASCA or LEP registered Australian Shepherds owned or co-owned by a full ASCA member in good standing during the qualifying period of the current merit program year.
2. The program will run from June 1st through May 31st of the following year.
3. Scores used for calculating the average will be listed under the dog's name followed by their averaged score.
4. The top 20 dogs will be listed in the Aussie Times and/or on the ASCA website by placement using averaged scores.

If there is a tie for 20th place, all dogs tied for 20th place will be listed.

Example: Dog A has an average score of 197.5, dogs B, C, and D each have average scores of 196. They will be listed as dog A in 1st place, dogs B, C, and D in 2nd place, and dog E in 5th place.

5. A dog may be ranked in more than one merit list during the same year.

6. Certificates will be issued for 1st through 10th place including all dogs tied for 10th place. Each year, the first

place winners will receive a complementary photo of their dog in the issue of the Aussie Times where Merit winners are recognized.

SECTION 2:

Novice, Advanced, Excellent and Masters Merit Lists

1. There will be separate lists for Novice, Advanced, Excellent and Masters. Scores for each level may be earned in the A, B, and C classes.
2. The top three (3) scores from the current merit year will be used for each dog's averaged score. A minimum of three (3) scores are needed to be included in the merit list.
3. Ties for placements will be determined by the dog with the fewest number of trials placing higher. If a tie still exists, the higher placement will be awarded to the dog with the highest individual score. If a tie still exists, dogs will be listed alphabetically.
4. Once a dog earns the next level title, they are no longer eligible to earn scores toward the lower level merit standings. Earned scores in a level remain eligible in the merit level list regardless of titles earned.
5. Once a dog qualifies in Excellent B and Masters B at the same trial, they are no longer are eligible to earn scores for Masters merits.

SECTION 3:

REM Merit List

1. The REM (Excellent and Masters) merit list will come from combined (double qualifying) scores. Scores will come from the B classes.

Example: A Masters B score of 192 and an Excellent B score of 197, both in same trials, will be a combined score of 389.

2. The top five (5) combined scores from the current merit year will be used for each dog's averaged score.
3. Ties for placements will be determined by the dog with the highest combined score placing higher. If a tie still exists, the five (5) Masters scores from the combined scores used will be averaged, and the dog with the highest average places higher. If a tie still exists, dogs will be listed alphabetically.
4. Once a dog earns a RTCH, it is no longer eligible for REM merits past the end of the merit year when the RTCH was earned.

SECTION 4

: RTCH Merit List

1. Dogs holding the title of the RTCH will be eligible for this list after the merit year in which the title was earned. Qualified combined scores will be calculated when a dog qualifies in both Masters B and Excellent B in the same trial.
2. The top five (5) combined scores from the current merit year will be used for each dog's averaged score.
3. Ties for placements will be determined by the dog with the highest individually combined score placing higher. If a tie still exists, the five (5) Masters scores from the combined scores used will be averaged, and the dog with the highest average places higher. If a tie still exists, dogs will be listed alphabetically.
4. A dog competing for the RTCH merit list cannot earn scores towards any other merit list.

Comments - : This is to add Merits to the Rally program.

Effective date

: This motion will take effect on June 1st, 2012. We also ask that the previous two years be calculated and listed up on the ASCA Website for those teams who supported this program from the beginning. We have checked with the Office and they don't see it as a problem and are happy to do it. Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows:
Approve: Unanimous. *Motion is approved.*

94:01 STOCK DOG COMMITTEES - Judges Education Results

Motion by Bates.

Move to approve the following SDC Motion.

The motion was approved by the SDC 9:0 with 1 non-voting member (Butler).

The motion (Schvaneveldt) with a second (Wesen) has been made to forward the

SD Judges Education Proposal to the Board as a recommendation in response to the previous directive

Current:

National SDC Judge / Contestant Seminar has been held at the National Specialty each year.

Yahoo Discussion List started 2008 to provide an avenue for SD Judges to be apprised of new proposed rules, provide feedback about rule changes, discuss

issues about courses, etc.

Improve / Expand:

SD Judge-only Seminar was started in 2009 at the Greeley Nationals. This was a very positive event and was continued in 2010 at the Waco Nationals. There was not a similar event in 2011. There have been only 15 +/- SD Judges in attendance so the dissemination of information could be improved.

Provide capability for SD Judges who are not able to attend in person to join by teleconference.

Provide capability for video capture of the entire proceedings (2 hrs), have the video duplicated and mailed to all SD Judges.

Provide capability for the entire proceedings to be streamed live via video and notify all SD Judges of the opportunity

Develop:

SD Judge feedback system that is more objective and useful than the current paragraph format sent to the affiliate club with the sanctioning paperwork.

There should be question in an easy reply / data entry format to gather information about the SD Judges knowledgeable of livestock, SD Rules, SD trial scoring, and SD trialing to be available to provide a more constructive feedback.

Apprentice program needs some revision to enhance the learning experience of all SD Apprentices going forward.

Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows: Approve: Ford, Bates, Dexter, Gray, Gann, Hellmeister, Vest and Clayton. Disapprove: McClintock.

*Letter of dissent: I can't find a definitive motion within this text on which to vote. Most of the statements are either summary factual in nature and not supported with references to source, or broadly speculative, but do not rise to the level of a proposed change to a rule, or a proposed course of action. The thoughts expressed are more in line with those of the strategic planning committee, i.e., brainstorming, but not a clear, concise statement of what to do and when to do it. There is no statement regarding who is affected, or what the anticipated cost to ASCA might be. For example, I have no knowledge if ASCA has or has access to the equipment needed to do live Internet video streaming, or what the cost would be in equipment or the talent needed to operate such equipment. As such I can't being to guess how much such a thing would cost ASCA and can not in good conscience enter into such a project without solid information. Because this motion is not in the form of a motion, and because I can not filter from it enough information to decide what it is the committee proposes here or what such a commitment might cost the club, I must vote no. *Motion is approved.*

2011:39 RALLY - 11-37/CH 7 # 2 REMX Title

Motion by Vest.

I Move to change CH 7 Number 2:

It reads:

CHAPTER 7: Rally Excellent Masters Title

Existing rule in June 2011 Rally Program Rules:

2. ASCA will issue a Rally Excellent Masters X certificate to a dog with an ASCA registration or a tracking number and will permit the use of REMX after its name when it has received ten (10) double qualifying scores in Excellent B and Masters B on the same day and Trial by at least three (3) different Judges. Three (3) of the ten (10) qualifying scores must both be scores of one hundred ninety five (195) or more in the same Trial.

Rule adopted by the BOD in Oct 2011 and due to print in the Jan 2012 Rally Program Rules:

CHAPTER 7: Rally Excellent Masters Title

2. ASCA will issue a Rally Excellent Masters X certificate to a dog with an ASCA registration or a tracking

Number and will permit the use of REMX after its name when it has received ten (10) double qualifying scores of 195 or higher in each class of Excellent B and Masters B on the same day and trial from at least three (3) different Judges.

Proposed NEW MOTION to replace motion adopted by the BOD in Nov 2011:

Chapter 7: Rally Excellent Masters Title

2. ASCA will issue a Rally Excellent Masters X certificate to any dog, with an ASCA registration or tracking number, and will permit the use of REMX after its name when it has received five (5) double qualifying scores of 195 or higher in each class of Excellent B and Masters B in the same trial. Double qualifying scores must be earned under at least three (3) different judges. **Comments:** Reasoning behind motion:

When discussing the Rally Trial Championship (RTCH), the committee realized it had set the qualifying bar too high for the REMX, making attaining the RTCH almost impossible.

Comments from Committee members:

From Sandy: Motions 11-37 REMX and 11-38 REM to the ASCA Board of Directors

I voted to lower the requirements for the REM title from the current 10 double qualifying scores to 5 double qualifying scores and the REMX title from the current 10 double qualifying scores of 195 and above to 5 double qualifying titles of 195 and above. Most titles in our Rally program require only three qualifying scores, as do most other Rally programs. Like AKC Rally, our double title was first offered requiring 10 double qualifying scores. In addition to the regular titles, ASCA added the " titles to award those teams who perform to a high level, earning 3 scores of 195 and above. The REMX, while still requiring 10 double qualifying scores, needed only three to be 195 or above. This was recently changed to requiring all 10 double qualifying scores be 195 and above. As we have continued looking at the program, and most notably a Rally Championship, I felt that requiring 10 double qualifying scores, especially for the REMX, was not in line with where we (using "we" to indicate the majority of those expressing opinions) wanted the program to go. Reducing the requirement to 5 double qualifying scores of 195 and above for the REMX, and consequently the associated REM title, in my opinion, does. Looking at the statistics provided by the ASCA Business Office supports this opinion. In the 1 1/2 years the program has been in existence, only 5 teams, out of the over 1100 that showed during this time have been able to complete the RTX title, currently our highest. And these were earned using the original requirements of only 3 double qualifying scores of 195 and above. From the provided scores, none of these teams would have completed the RTX using the new rules. In addition, there are currently only 11 teams who are eligible for Finals at the next Nationals, and of those, about half of those dogs are handled by only 3 owners. Yes, there is still 5 months for additional teams to qualify, but if we even double that number; it still doesn't reach the maximum number. For these reasons, I feel the bar was set too high originally. Lowering the number of double qualifying scores to 5 for both the REM and the REMX would allow more teams to earn our higher titles, without making them too easy. It'll also bring them inline with a Championship title. The committee is currently working with a proposal which builds off an REMX of 5 double qualifying scores of 195 and above. In addition, we need to consider the exhibitors, and whether they feel these higher titles are not only worthy of the title, but also able to be earned. If we keep the bar so high that most teams feel they'll never be able to attain them, they won't continue showing. This will hurt both the individual clubs, and ASCA, as the entries in the higher classes will not be as high as they would be if the teams were continuing on to the highest titles. I acknowledge that the vote within the committee was close. Most of those who commented on the motions voted for them, as they saw the advantage to bringing these titles more in line with where they wanted the program to go. Most of those who voted against them did so for unknown reasons, as they did not express any opinions. Because of my love and dedication to the sport of Rally (11 years and counting), and ASCA Rally in particular, I ask that you approve these two motions. My hope for ASCA Rally is that it continues to grow and prosper. In order for this to happen, exhibitors must feel like they are able to work toward our high titles. These motions, in my opinion, will accomplish this.

From Karen: I voted in favor of these two motions because in reviewing the ASCA Rally program as a whole, these changes are necessary to complete the program through all levels of competition from Rally Novice through the Rally Trial Championship. It is my understanding the Board of Directors only has what is currently in the rule book and these motions being presented now as reference points to arrive at a decision. Please allow me to elaborate; I will do my best to keep it short. The current program, effective 1/1/2012, under the best circumstances with a team scoring 195 or higher (only 5 points from perfect) every time they compete, will need 22 trials to complete their RNX, RAX, REX, RMX, REMX which awards them their RTX. [As a point of reference, in North Texas there are two ASCA Affiliates currently hosting trials. Between the two of us we held 6 weekends of trials last year and are slated for the same this year. I have been told we are one of the more active areas of the country; right up there with

Florida and California.] Add trials to that number for each trial they score less 195. The current motions under consideration would still require 22 trials to complete the "X" titles, but allows for some flexibility at the REMX level. It still requires 10 double qualifying scores, but with 5 of them being 195 or higher in the Masters B and Excellent B classes on the same day. By restructuring the REMX in this way, it allows for a logical progression in numbers and strength of scores for a RTCH (Rally Trial Championship) offering with expectations and requirements that will reward consistent high-scoring above-average teams to reach the highest success in ASCA Rally. Leaving the program structured the way it is currently (as of 1/1/12), the requirements for the REMX and the subsequent RTCH will have the bar set so high that only the occasional exceptional team will achieve success. Of the few teams who currently hold the ASCA REMX title from earlier standards, NONE of them would have that title if they had to meet the requirements that are now in effect. With the realignment of the REM/REMX based on the motions before you now, it will take a team scoring 195+ at every trial, in our very active area, 2 years or more to complete their base titles through the RTX. Add another significant amount of time for completing the RTCH requirements. This program will not be easy by any means, but should be doable for above average teams. I feel very strongly that above average teams should be able to find success in ASCA Rally. I really believe that a team who has demonstrated the ability to consistently perform at the levels mentioned above should be worthy of the RTCH once the additional requirements of that title are completed. Realignment of the program as prescribed in Motions 11-37 and 11-38 will provide ASCA with a really good base program to build on and will allow the committee to offer a RTCH title proposal that will complete the ASCA Rally program and provide the exhibitors with a program that will keep them motivated and engaged for years to come. I am happy to discuss this further should the Board of Directors want or need further information.

From Cheri: I voted to lower the requirements for both REM and REMX from the current 10 double qualifying titles for REM, and 10 double qualifying titles of 195+ for REMX. Most titles in our Rally program require three qualifying scores. As do most other Rally programs, and most performance venues throughout the United States (obedience, agility, etc.). ASCA Rally punched it up, and offered X titles for those achieving scores of 195 or higher. In keeping with AKC protocol, our double title was first offered requiring 10 double qualifying scores. For the X title, it was required to have three of those ten double qualifiers at the 195+ mark, in keeping with the other X titles. It was then suggested and approved for our REMX to require ALL ten double qualifiers to be scores of 195+, Reason: no other X title allowed for scores less than 195+. This motion was approved and should appear in the 1/1/12 rulebook. Now I find that in looking at the overall score statistics from 1.5 years of trials offered, our ideal was out of line with reality. In 1.5 years of trials, we have only 5 dogs out of over 1100 that have achieved the RTX (our current highest title). With the 10 double qualifiers of 195+ as is now the current rule, we have none who qualify. In 1.5 years of trialing, we have only 11 dogs (represented by 6 handlers) that have earned the right to be in the Finals at Bakersfield, all 11 come from hotbeds of Rally competition (FL/GA/VA, TX, CA). I realize that we still have six months of qualifying trials that have not occurred, but it doesn't look like a "fun" program, when we can't even fill our Finals roster by mid year. In reviewing the stats of qualifying scores earned over the past 1.5 years, it was discussed and projected that it could conceivably take a dog entering 5 trials a year (many areas do not have that many trials offered) earning the average scores so far put into statistics, approximately 5-6 years to gain the titles needed to peruse the Rally Trial Championship requirements. With the requirements as currently in discussion, it would add more years to the completion RTCH. Without the suggested lowering of the REM/REMX, we would have to scrap the current discussion for RTCH and increase the requirements for RTCH. This would leave all but the smallest fraction of 1% achieving the top title of RTCH before 8-10 years. Those who have voiced an opinion on the committee have been in agreement with these, or similar, projections. Those who have voted no to these motions have had little or no opinion on the committee list, so their reasoning, at least to me, is unclear.

From Cheryl: I believe the only reason this motion was put forth was to lower the requirements for the REMX Title. The original requirements were voted on and passed. I feel that lowering the requirements would be a mistake for the program and for the REMX Title.

From Kathi: I voted in NO for both of these motions because in reviewing the ASCA Rally program as a whole, these changes are not necessary to complete the program through all levels of competition from Rally Novice through the Rally Trial Championship. This program will not be easy by any means, but should be doable for

average teams and above average teams to earn titles as far as they want to go in the ASCA Rally program as the rules are now as of January 1, 2012.

From Jody: I am opposed to lowering the requirements for the REM and REMX. This program is very new and we do not have enough data to make a true judgment call as to whether or not it is too difficult to achieve these titles with the present requirements. Until we have more shows - and there are very few areas that have had enough shows for enough dogs to get to the advanced titles - we should allow the program to stay the same. Rally is easier than obedience, stock, agility to Q in and scores are higher. The dog does not have to leave the handler, have access to equipment or stock or be exceptional in structure and the handler can talk the dog through the course until Masters. A score of 198 or more in Rally would be equivalent to about a 190 in obedience - and even the 'average' dog can get that if the handler is willing to work and train their dog. And finally, I think it would be is wiser to lower the requirements at a later date, if in fact "no one" can get these titles in the present program than it would be to raise them later when teams get more experienced and begin getting high scores more frequently.

From Ginni: The REMX should not be lowered to 5, QQ at 195 since and the REM is 10 QQ and the REM should not change to only (5) QQ scores to keep consistency. They should both remain at 10 QQ and with scores of 195 or higher for the REMX. Both these are linked together and the requirements should be consistence with the our complete ASCA Rally program. We require other "X" titles to have scores of 195 or higher so there should be no difference with the REMX. Lowering the requirement to just (5) scores would only result in more titles being issued. It would not show any improvement in the teams showing in rally. It would not improve our program, there would be no goals for some teams to strive for. The point of ASCA Rally is not to just issue titles to any dog, it is to showcase the Australian shepherd breed and for the betterment of the breed. Keeping the titles as they are to be as of Jan 1st, 2012 does this.

From Lori: I voted against this motion as I do not feel that lowering the requirements for the REMX is needed. I feel rally is an easy enough sport that given time, teams will find their way to these scores. Actually, teams are already obtaining these scores and the program hasn't been out but 1.5 yrs. The qualifying ratio in rally is much higher than any other ASCA sport. The scores are also much higher in Rally overall. It is much easier to get a 195 in Masters or Excellent than it is in Open Obedience and therefore to keep Rally in line with other ASCA programs. I feel that when the Committee voted to raise the requirements to the ten (10) double scores of 195+ we were merely keeping consistency in the program. Qualifying scores in each level of rally are given for scores of 170 or above and any title can be upgraded if you will to an "X" title by receiving the same amount of scores needed for each title of 195+. With the qualifying and score ratio being much higher, I don't feel that five (5) scores for the REMX is enough for a double qualifying X title. We are in the infancy of our Rally program with not many teams having reached the double qualifying level yet and I feel that when they do, teams will achieve success.

Voting on the enclosed motion went as follows: Approve: Bates, Hellmeister and McClintock. Disapprove: Ford, Clayton, Dexter and Vest. Abstain: Gann and Gray. *Motion is disapproved.*

