



THE AUSTRALIAN SHEPHERD CLUB OF AMERICA®

6091 E State Hwy 21
Bryan, TX 77808
www.asca.org

P: (979) 778-1082
manager@asca.org
executive.secretary@asca.org

ASCA Executive Secretary's Report June 2022

Announcements	
<p>New Committee Members -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maia Halvorsen (Tracking - region 1) <p>New Judges -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provisional Breeder Judge Shelby Shank (Wyoming)• Apprentice Agility Judge Bambi Ellis (Arizona)• Agility Judge Susanne Schwarzmann (Germany)• Sr. Breeder Judge Eric Brickson (Ohio)• Sr. Breeder Judge Brandy Greenhagen (Colorado)• Sr. Rally Judge Ann McCabe (California)• Sr. Rally Judge Betsy Coleman (Utah) <p>System Upgrade - The Board agreed to a Change Order from Inventive to complete WARP-1 of the system upgrade project.</p>	<p>Nationals -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2023 Agility Finals Judge: Mark Buehl• 2023 Agility Nationals Judges: Roger Coor and Chuck Klein• Amendments were made to the contracts for the Nationals Entry Clerks.• New guidelines have been put in place for Conformation Finals scoring tabulation. <p>Business Office - A copy of the new Pee Wee/Sub Junior rules will be included with all conformation show paperwork for the next year.</p> <p>Agility Committee - A subcommittee was created to develop the ASCA agility judge's exam.</p> <p>Stockdog Committee - Changes were made to the rules regarding ownership of stock used for Stockdog Finals.</p>

ASCA Board Meeting Minutes

The meeting was held via GoToMeeting on Thursday, June 9, 2022.

In attendance: President Liz Busquets, Treasurer Jan Wesen, Secretary Ann McCabe, Director Susan Byrne, Director Denise Creelman, Director Carol Gerken, Director Jean Roberts, and Executive Secretary Kalla Jaco.

Absent: 1st Vice President Gina Larson and 2nd Vice President Rick Gann.

Open Session topics were recorded and may be listened to on ASCA's [YouTube channel](#).

President Busquets called the meeting to order at 6:08 pm.

Reimbursement of 2021 Nationals Entry Clerk

This discussion was held in **Executive Session** from 6:08 pm to 6:38 pm. The Nationals Advisory Committee requested permission for ASCA to reimburse the 2021 Nationals Entry Clerk Terri Morgan for her travel and lodging expenses for 2021, totaling \$1600, beyond what is in her contract. The Board agreed to table this discussion until more information is provided.

Member Issue

This discussion was held in **Executive Session** from 6:38 pm to 7:11 pm. This topic concerned some recent posts to a public ASCA forum. The Board agreed to send letters to those involved.

May 2022 Treasurer's Report

This discussion was held in **Executive Session** from 7:11 pm to 7:17 pm. The financial reports for the period ending May 31, 2022, were presented by Treasurer Wesen and she updated the Board regarding ASCA's current fiscal condition and projections for the future. Members can find the Treasurer's report and analysis in the member's only section of ASCA's website.

BD.22.86 May 2022 Treasurer's Report

Motion carried (6-0-1) – Approved: Busquets, Byrne, Creelman, Gerken, McCabe, Roberts. Disapproved: None. Abstained: Wesen. Absent: Gann, Larson.

Motioned by Roberts to approve the Treasurer's report for May 2022 as presented. Seconded by Byrne.

Judge Application

This discussion was held in **Executive Session** from 7:17 pm to 7:20 pm. The Board voted on a judge application that was missed during the email voting cycle.

Change Orders from Inventive

This discussion was held in **Executive Session** from 7:20 pm to 7:23 pm. The Board received two Change Orders from Inventive. One is to complete the current WARP-1 upgrade and the other is for the credit card project. Discussion of this topic was tabled since System Liaison Larson was not present.

Last Month's Email Business

Started at 7:23 pm. Due to the requirements of Washington State Law, all legal business of ASCA must be conducted via face-to-face meetings or telephone conference call meetings. To meet this requirement and continue to conduct business via email, each face-to-face meeting or conference call meeting includes a motion to ratify all business conducted via email since the last face-to-face meeting or conference call meeting.

BD.22.87 May 2022 Email Business

Motion carried (7-0) – Approved: Busquets, Byrne, Creelman, Gerken, McCabe, Roberts, Wesen. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Gann, Larson.

Motioned by Byrne to ratify all business conducted over email in May 2022. Seconded by Wesen.

System Liaison's Report

Started at 7:24 pm. This topic was skipped since System Liaison Larson was not present.

Amendment to the 2022 Nationals Entry Clerk Contracts

Started at 7:25 pm. The Nationals Advisory Committee requested the Board amend the contracts for the 2022 Nationals Entry Clerk, Agility Data Entry Clerk, and Stockdog Data Entry Clerk to reimburse budgeted expenses instead of providing a flat fee.

Current wording of contract for 2022 Nationals Entry Clerk:

2. For these services, ASCA will pay the following: (A) \$1,600 (one thousand, six hundred dollars) plus \$1.25 per entry fee, i.e.: 1 dog entered in 4 agility classes, 1 conformation, 3 stock = \$10.00. (B) RV, stalls, grooming spaces, results, etc. are not extra. (C) \$1.25 per canceled entry fee processed. (D) Clerk is responsible for payment of all expenses Clerk may incur, whether for meals, lodging, travel, office supplies, postage, post office box rental, any assistants that may be hired by Clerk, or otherwise. (E) To the extent ASCA requires use of specialized/proprietary software or registrant use of armbands exclusive to the event, these will be provided by ASCA.

Proposed wording:

2. For these services, ASCA will pay the following: (A) ~~\$1,600 (one thousand, six hundred dollars) plus~~ \$1.25 per entry fee, i.e.: 1 dog entered in 4 agility classes, 1 conformation, 3 stock = \$10.00. (B) RV, stalls, grooming spaces, results, etc. are not extra. ~~(B C)~~ \$1.25 per canceled entry fee processed. ~~(C D)~~ **Clerk** ASCA is responsible for payment of all **budgeted** expenses Clerk may incur, whether for meals, lodging, travel, office supplies, postage, post office box rental, ~~any assistants that may be hired by Clerk,~~ or otherwise; receipts and prior approval of expenditures by the 2022 Nationals Chairperson are required for reimbursement of expenses. ~~(D E)~~ To the extent ASCA requires use of specialized/proprietary software or registrant use of armbands exclusive to the event, these will be provided by ASCA.

Current wording of contract for 2022 Nationals Agility Data Entry Clerk:

2. For these services, ASCA will pay the following: (A) \$700 plus \$1.25 per Agility entry fee processed. (B) Clerk is responsible for payment of all expenses Clerk may incur, whether for meals, lodging, travel, office supplies, postage, post office box rental, any assistants that may be hired by Clerk, or otherwise. (C) To the extent ASCA requires use of specialized/proprietary software, it will provide it.

Proposed wording:

2. For these services, ASCA will pay the following: (A) ~~\$700 plus~~ \$1.25 per Agility entry fee processed. (B) ~~Clerk~~ ASCA is responsible for payment of all **budgeted** expenses Clerk may incur, whether for meals, lodging, travel, office supplies, postage, ~~post office box rental, any assistants that may be hired by Clerk,~~ or otherwise; receipts and prior approval of expenditures by the 2022 Nationals Chairperson are required for reimbursement of expenses. (C) To the extent ASCA requires use of specialized/proprietary software, it will be provided **it**.

Current wording of contract for 2022 Nationals Stockdog Data Entry Clerk:

2. For these services, ASCA will pay the following: (A) \$700 flat fee, plus \$1.25 per Stockdog entry fee processed. (B) Of those amounts, \$500 will be paid to Clerk when entries open. (C) The balance of the fee owed will be paid to Clerk within two weeks of completion of submission of the Agility Finals and Nationals results. (D) ASCA will issue Clerk a 1099-MISC form for fees paid and Clerk promptly will provide ASCA with a completed W-9 for that purpose. (E) Clerk is responsible for payment of all expenses Clerk may incur, whether for meals, lodging, travel, office supplies, postage, post office box rental, any assistants that may be hired by Clerk, or otherwise. (E) If ASCA requires use of specialized/proprietary software or registrant use of armbands exclusive to the event, it will provide them.

Proposed wording:

2. For these services, ASCA will pay the following: (A) ~~\$700 flat fee, plus~~ \$1.25 per Stockdog entry fee processed. (B) ~~Of those amounts, \$500~~ \$300 will be paid to Clerk when entries open. (C) The balance of the fee owed will be paid to Clerk within two weeks of completion of submission of the **Agility** Stockdog Finals and Nationals results. (D) ASCA will

issue Clerk a 1099-MISC form for fees paid and Clerk promptly will provide ASCA with a completed W-9 for that purpose. (E) Clerk ASCA is responsible for payment of all budgeted expenses Clerk may incur, whether for meals, lodging, travel, office supplies, postage, ~~post office box rental, any assistants that may be hired by Clerk,~~ or otherwise. (E F) If ASCA requires use of specialized/proprietary software ~~or registrant use of armbands exclusive to the event,~~ it will be provided ~~them~~.

McCabe thought the amendments make it easier and fairer for the entry clerks considering the amount of work they do. It is net-zero in terms of financial liability for ASCA.

Gerken thought it was good that the clerks need to present receipts for reimbursement within a budgeted amount.

Creelman agreed with McCabe. It's understood that receipts must be provided for reimbursement.

Wesen said she supported this with the stamp of approval from Counsel and the accountant.

Roberts asked if we have that approval. We were not able to get ahold of the accountant, but what was our attorney's advice?

Busquets said that Counsel was okay with it but had advised that it would be best to have the accountant's approval and a letter on file stating that.

Byrne thinks this is a good way to proceed in the future. The reimbursement will still have to be within a budgeted amount. Anything beyond what is budgeted will be the responsibility of the individual. She is in favor of the amendments.

Busquets was also in favor but wished that ASCA had something on file from the accountant.

BD.22.88 Amendments to Contracts for the 2022 Nationals Entry Clerks

Motion carried (7-0) – Approved: Busquets, Byrne, Creelman, Gerken, McCabe, Roberts, Wesen. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Gann, Larson.

Motioned by Byrne to approve the amendments to the 2022 Nationals entry clerk, agility data entry clerk, and stockdog entry clerk contracts as stated in the proposed contracts. Seconded by McCabe.

Judges for 2023 Agility Finals and Nationals

Started at 7:31 pm. The judges for the 2023 Agility Finals and Nationals must be approved by the Board.

BD.22.89 Judges for 2023 Agility Finals and Nationals

Motion carried (7-0) – Approved: Busquets, Byrne, Creelman, Gerken, McCabe, Roberts, Wesen. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Absent: Gann, Larson.

Motioned by Byrne to approve the Agility Finals judge to be Mark Buehl and the Agility Nationals judges to be Roger Coor and Chuck Klein for the 2023 Nationals. Seconded by McCabe.

Creelman asked if the other judges for the 2023 Nationals and Finals have been approved. The Finals Judges have now all been approved. Some of the Nationals Judges have been approved, and the remaining judges will be approved with the first draft of the premium in the fall.

With no further agenda topics, Busquets thanked the members listening to the audio recording of this meeting and all the Directors for being in attendance.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm (Motioned by Creelman, Seconded by Wesen).

ASCA Board Motions

Director Recommendations

EM.22.04 Reimbursement for 2021 Nationals Entry Clerk

Motion carried (6-0-1) - Approved: Busquets, Creelman, Gann, Larson, McCabe, Wesen. Disapproved: None. Abstained: Roberts. Non-voting: Byrne, Gerken.

Comment from Director Roberts: The signed contract between the clerk and ASCA was to cover entries and expenses.

Motioned by Gann to approve the requested amount of \$1600.00 for out-of-pocket travel expenses for Terri Morgan which occurred during the 2021 ASCA National Specialty. Seconded by Wesen.

Comments/Rationale: I have attached supporting documentation which actually is nearly \$400 over the requested amount.

Affected: Terri Morgan.

Effective Date: Immediately upon Board approval.

EM.22.05 Change Order for SOW 0008 from Inventive

Motion carried (7-0) - Approved: Busquets, Creelman, Gerken, Larson, McCabe, Roberts, Wesen. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Non-voting: Byrne, Gann.

Motioned by Larson to approve Web Platform Rebuild Change Order 002 for Statement of Work 0008 from Inventive. Seconded by McCabe.

Comments/Rationale: This will enable Inventive to complete the system upgrade project. The estimated completion time is 6 to 8 weeks from May 14, 2022.

Affected: Inventive, ASCA.

Effective Date: Immediately upon Board approval.

Committee Recommendations

AG.22.07 Agility Committee Judge's Exam Subcommittee

Motion carried (6-1-1) - Approved: Busquets, Byrne, Creelman, Larson, McCabe, Roberts. Disapproved: Wesen. Abstained: Gann. Non-voting: Gerken.

Comment from Director McCabe: The agility judge's exam needs to be fixed. I don't know if this is exactly the way to do it. I hope the committee can all work together to try this and possibly adjust this procedure if need be.

Dissent from Director Wesen: This is not giving education to judges. I believe it is important for a committee's judges to be the first to take the test to work out issues. The test needs to be more than a small committee.

Motioned by Liaison Byrne to approve the following recommendation from the Agility Committee.

Committee Recommendation: 10-2022 Motion to create a subcommittee to design/develop ASCA agility judge's exam. Motion by Sandra Katzen to design/develop a judge exam that will cover more topics (for educational purposes), ensure less variance on the correct answer, and

include a variety of questions provided by the ASCA Agility judges. Seconded by Michael Kurdzo.

Results of Committee Vote: Approved: 6. Disapproved: 5. Abstained: 1. Non-Voting: None.

Dissent from Committee Member Sherry Butler: I think there are some really good ideas in the motion, but don't agree with some of the rationale. Also, there are some sections of the motion that need re-work and clarification.

Dissent from Committee Member Jan Niblock: My reasons are that it does not address many issues within it. There are certainly some very good ideas and we have always had a subcommittee to do this, but the secrecy behind this motion is not needed or beneficial to the committee. It will fracture the concept of a committee as a team. Here is the list of my reasons that I voted no:

- Since the test is open book there is no reason to have a secret group making up the test. If the test was to be done by memory, then that makes sense. But the test is open book without a time limit so there is no advantage or disadvantage to having judges on the committee work on the subcommittee.
- There are many misstatements in the rationale and comments, much of it is just hearsay.
- The creation of the subcommittee doesn't address the structure such as, will it always be the same people each time? What happens if 3 non-judges do not volunteer? Will they be conscripted? Who will decide who will chair it?
- The motion calls for course design questions to be submitted in CRCD. Are we now requiring non-judges on the committee to purchase this, or will the board be purchasing it for them? Without it, they will not be able to look at questions sent in that format.

Dissent from Committee Member Heather Tyler: I think the premise is a good one. There are points in the motion that need to be made clearer. I disagree with some of the ambiguous wording. I believe if presented to the board like this, the motion will be voted down. I think the motion should be withdrawn and reworked with clearer language and things spelled out exactly.

Dissent from Committee Member Diana Curl: I like the idea and would like to see more discussion and revision. It was hard for me to follow as a non-judge.

Comment from Committee Member Sandra Katzen: Having judges write the exam makes it pointless for them to also take the exam. As a course reviewer, I can absolutely say that every judge needs to take the exam. Unfortunately, we have judges submitting courses that require an abundance of corrections and revisions. I am honestly dismayed that it often appears as though the rule book has never been looked at, or for that matter agility ever been attempted, when looking at the courses submitted by some judges for review. The fact that it is an open book exam, does not mean that writing it and then taking it is not, quite simply, cheating.

The past tests did in fact have multiple questions without one correct answer. As an example of how that happens: in a multiple-choice question there was more than one correct answer, but only allowance for one to be chosen. This put the judges taking the exam in the position of having to guess which one was the "correct" one. If you got lucky, (or wrote the test), you picked correctly on the first try, if not you had to guess again and resubmit. One truly excellent judge refused to play that game and is not currently judging because of it. Many others, myself included, copped out and played the game, but wrote complaints, and found the experience to be the exact opposite of educational, in fact, it was demeaning. Nothing in the rationale is a misstatement, nor is it hearsay, I am a judge, and have taken these past exams. It is all absolute truth, which is why I was approached by a number of judges and asked to try to fix this problem.

There is no “secret” committee or group, no secrecy involved whatsoever. The goal is to be the opposite, by including every judge in the submittal of questions and requiring proper citation as to where the answers are to be found, it does indeed become an educational tool.

Currently, you either pass the exam with 100% accuracy, or you are no longer able to judge until you do. This proposal does add the mandatory submittal of a minimum of one question/answer with citation. The purpose of which is both to be inclusive, and educational for all judges equally.

I feel quite confident that three non-judges are willing and able to be on the subcommittee.

In making the motion, I felt that some things should be left up to the subcommittee members and did not need to be specified at this stage. The members of the subcommittee should be able to choose who heads the committee. As for the question of whether or not it will be the same people serving on the subcommittee every two years, I felt it self-evident that it would not, since the make-up of the agility committee itself changes.

The rationale for having any questions on the exam utilizing a picture of a course be done in a course design (CD) format is so that in taking the exam, the judges will need to be able to demonstrate an ability to use the CD program. For example, they might need to check distances in order to figure out the correct answer or be able to draw the dog’s path. This allows the exam to again be more of an educational tool. The currently available CD program license fee is not expensive, and I am willing to purchase one for the agility committee. The license will only be allowed to be on one computer at a time but will be transferable to different computers, on a one at a time basis. I would assume the subcommittee chair would be the one to have it on their computer first. And I would like to point out that while the final exam questions will be sent in this format, it is a very simple task to “save as” in a form that can be viewed by anyone. The only time there will be a need for the CD format will be for sending out the final version of the exam to all judges.

Current Wording: None.

Proposed Wording:

8.4.1 Agility Committee Exam subcommittee

A subcommittee of at least three committee members will be selected to review the exam questions submitted by the judges and prepare the bi-yearly judge exam. The test subcommittee will be comprised of non-judge members of the Agility Committee, so no judge (serving on the Agility Committee) will have any advantage over non-committee judges in the formulation of the exam questions. The subcommittee will choose a lead person (“liaison”) to be the contact person/liaison between the judges during the question-gathering process.

8.4.2 Formulation of exam questions

On every even calendar year, within thirty days after the latest version of the rule book has been published, the exam subcommittee liaison will send an email letter to every ASCA Agility judge, including apprentice judges, and non-active judges on the ASCA Agility Judges List, outlining the following:

A request for each judge to submit one or two questions and answers to the Agility Committee test subcommittee. It is mandatory for every judge to submit at least one question and the correct answer along with the answer/citation (page and paragraph) in order to remain on the approved judge list. Judges must acknowledge receipt of the letter and submit their questions within thirty days of the letter distribution date.

Areas from the rule book to use for test questions*:

Course Design Requirements

Obstacle requirements

Obstacle Performance & Faults

Handling Faults

Qualification Requirements

*If a judge chooses to ONLY submit one question/answer it must come from the course design section(s) of the current rule book. Questions can incorporate the use of a course map submitted in Course Designer 'CD' format. Questions can be designed as multiple choice, yes or no, or fill in the blank.

Judges who do not follow the above time frames will receive a reminder email with a deadline of two weeks to submit their questions and answers. Failure to submit questions/answers will result in a request sent to the Board of Directors regarding possible disciplinary actions.

8.4.2.1 Final Exam

After the thirty-day exam question submission period has expired the exam subcommittee will review all questions and supporting answers and choose thirty to forty questions that will cover a range of topics.

Upon review of the exam questions and answers, the subcommittee will have forty-five days to develop the final judge exam.

The exam will be forwarded to the Business Office for distribution to all ASCA Agility Judges and the answers to the exam questions will be sent to the ASCA agility coordinator for exam grading purposes.

Comments/Rationale: One of the best tools we have for judge education is the bi-annual judge exam. That said, it has not been utilized very effectively for this purpose and needs revamping in order to be used as such. Sadly, for the past couple of tests, there have been multiple questions for which there has been more than one correct answer, or a correct answer was not available. Other questions were ambiguous. This made answering the questions a guessing game, and luck as to whether or not you got the answer correct. It also made for additional time spent by the office staff corresponding with judges. We would like to see the guesswork taken out of the judge exam. Since course design seems to be an area where most judges struggle, it makes sense to see an emphasis on questions that cover course design.

The motion requires the ASCA agility judges to submit exam questions and establishes a subcommittee to review the exam questions and answers. The Agility Committee will choose a contact person from the Agility Committee for the inaugural test subcommittee; this contact person should NOT be a judge, in order to preserve the integrity of the exam process. The contact person will be responsible for sending the letter (via email) to the judges and the person who will receive the judge exam question(s) and answer(s).

Upon submission of the exam questions, the test subcommittee members will review the questions and answers and review the questions and answers for accuracy. They will choose which questions to use for the actual exam.

Affected: Agility committee will need to formulate a subcommittee to complete the tasks listed in the motion. All ASCA Agility judges will need to comply with the request to submit at least one exam question. ASCA Office - no change to current procedures.

Effective Date: Immediately upon Board approval.

CO.22.03 Rules for Tabulation of Conformation Finals

Motion carried (8-0) - Approved: Busquets, Byrne, Creelman, Gann, Larson, McCabe, Roberts, Wesen. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Non-voting: Gerken.

Motioned by Liaison Byrne to approve the following recommendation from the Conformation Committee.

Committee Recommendation: Rules for Tabulation of Conformation Finals. Motioned by Michael McGuire to approve the National Advisory Committee's guidelines for ASCA National Final's Tabulation for streamlining of the finals process. Seconded by Brandy Greenhagen.

Results of Committee Vote: Approved: 10. Disapproved: 4. Abstained: None. Non-Voting: None.

Dissent from Committee Member Mary Hellmeister: The motion text is unclear as it stands right now and needs cleaning up. Also, items like the use of the laptop and "Exhibitor escort" need to be defined.

Dissent from Committee Member Gail Karamalegos: The NAC rewrite is fine in some areas, but I do not approve of the addition of entering scores into a computer spreadsheet that currently doesn't officially exist. Who is creating this spreadsheet, and can the NAC guarantee that someone with a laptop and Excel proficiency will be available to do the data entry and tabulate placements? Last year, I created a Word and PDF spreadsheet because one didn't exist, and I manually entered the scores and totals. My only error was not adding an additional column for placements, which I have since done as soon as I was selected to take the Conformation Chair position recently. And the mix-up that occurred had nothing to do with the tabulation of the scores, which were 100% correct. Data entry problems can occur just as easily when using a computer spreadsheet as on a hard copy.

This rewrite doesn't address the need to state what the Finals Chair should be provided by the Business Office, and what he/she is supposed to provide. When I chaired last year, all I received was a stack of scoresheets that had to be cut in half before they could be used and blank tiebreaker forms. Lucky that I have a paper cutter, or I would have had to cut 90 sheets of paper in half. I had to buy the manila envelopes, and label each one with the armband #, gender, and whether altered or intact.

The scoresheet and tiebreaker form should be added to the Conformation Rules in an appendix and links added to the ASCA website link for conformation forms. I and my judges had never seen either of these forms until the blanks were mailed to me. I took photos of the blank forms and sent them to the judges in advance and reviewed the forms and procedures with the judges the evening before Finals. This rewrite does not address this problem.

When making the use of a computer mandatory, there should be a backup plan in case there are issues with the device or program. No other program's rules mandate the use of a computer to tabulate scores, so I have to wonder why the Conformation Finals are being singled out.

I also object to the Board giving a directive to the NAC to rewrite an entire section of the Conformation Rules and sending it to the CC for "comments," when the CC was completely unaware of what was being done prior to the rewrite being forwarded to us. I'm very concerned about the precedence that this may set.

Current Wording:

Section 15.10 Scoring

A. The score sheet has the Judge's name, exhibitor's armband number, Altered or Intact and the sex of each dog.

B. Each judge uses a simple score sheet for each dog with a numeric scale from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest score. The Judge shall circle the points he/she determines each dog deserves in that section/subsection of the score sheet. EXCEPTION: In the event one judge determines there is a disqualifying fault under the Breed Standard, that judge will mark on the score sheet "DQ" and state the reason for the disqualification, i.e., teeth, color, etc...

1. The scoring sheet consists of eight sections and six sub-section. The scoring follows the Breed Standard and be divided accordingly. General Appearance (1-10). Head (1-5) divided into three sub-sections: teeth (1-5), eyes (1-5), and ears (1-5). Neck and Body (1-10), Forequarters (1-10), Hindquarters (1-10), Coat (1-5), Color (1-5), and Gait in three sub sections: Coming (1-10), Going (1-10), Side Gait (1-10). The maximum score will be one hundred points.

C. A separate score sheet from each of the three Judges will be used for each exhibitor. After each Judge scores the individual exhibitor, the score sheet will be placed into an envelope by each judge and taken by the steward and handed to the score keepers. The first score keeper will add up each of the three scores for each exhibitor. The second score keeper will verify the scores tabulated by the first score keeper and place the final score on a spread sheet according to the exhibitor's armband number only.

D. In the event of two or more tied scores within the Altered Top Ten or Intact Top Ten placements, the following procedure must be followed:

1. The dogs involved in the tie will enter the ring together and be judged as a class. Then the three Judges will place themselves in three corners of the ring so they can observe each dog coming and going. Each dog will gait to the first Judge who will observe the front movement and then the rear movement as the dog gaits to the next judge and so on, so that all three judges observe each dog coming and going. As each dog leaves the last Judge, it will arrive back at the ring entrance where all the dogs will re-stack as a class. At this time comparison examination, gaiting or conferring may be utilized at the discretion of the three Judges. Re-judging of the tied dogs shall be utilized to break the tie and not to determine the final score. At the conclusion of the tie breaking judgment, the Judges' Tie Breaking Work Sheet will be tallied. The highest scoring dog will have a plus sign (+) denoted on the dog's original Score Sheet next to the original score. If the tie involves more than two dogs, an A will be placed next to the highest scoring dog's original score on the original Score Sheet, B on the second highest scoring dog's original Score Sheet, C on the third highest scoring dog's original Score Sheet, and so on. The Tie Breaking Work Sheet will not be posted.

E. Within twenty-four hours of the completion of Conformation Finals competition, the Host Club will post all exhibitor scores in a central location where announcements and other venues scores are posted. The score sheet shall include the total score, placement, and Judge's name according to the exhibitor's armband number. Altered and Intact competitions are to be posted on separate score sheets in the same location.

Proposed Wording:

Section 1.1 Scoring

A. **Score Sheet**

1. Each of the three Conformation Finals Judges will use a simple score sheet for each dog, which will

have ~~The score sheet has~~ the Judge's name, exhibitor's armband number, Altered or Intact, and the sex of each dog. Each Judge will complete a separate score sheet for each dog.

4 2. The score ing sheet consists of eight sections and six sub-sections. The scoring follows the Breed Standard and be is divided accordingly; General Appearance (1-10); Head (1-5), divided into three sub-sections – teeth (1-5), eyes (1-5), and ears (1-5); Neck and Body (1-10); Forequarters (1-10); Hindquarters (1-10), Coat (1-5); Color (1-5); and Gait, divided into three sub-sections – Coming (1-10), Going (1-10), Side Gait (1-10). The maximum score will be one hundred points. On the numeric scale, 10 (1-10) and 5 (1-5), 1 will be the lowest score and 5 and 10 will be the highest. Half points may also be awarded.

~~B. Each judge uses a simple score sheet for each dog with a numeric scale from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest score.~~

3. The Judge shall circle the points he/she determines each dog deserves in that each section/subsection of the score sheet. EXCEPTION: In the event one a judge determines there is a disqualifying fault under the Breed Standard, that judge will mark on the score sheet "DQ" and state the reason for the disqualification, i.e., teeth, color, etc...

~~C. A separate score sheet from each of the three Judges will be used for each exhibitor. After each Judge scores the individual exhibitor dog, the exhibitor's escort will scan the score sheet for omissions and~~

~~then place the score sheet will be placed into an the dog's scoring envelope by each judge and taken by the steward and handed to the score keepers. If the Judge has missed scoring a section, the exhibitor's escort will hand the score sheet back to the Judge so that the scoring may be completed.~~

B. Tabulation of Scores

Once the dog has been examined by all three judges and all three score sheets have been placed in the

envelope, the exhibitor's escort will deliver the envelope to the scoring tabulation table. The tabulation

table will be set away from the rings and shall be cordoned off to provide privacy for the score keepers

and to prevent spectators from seeing scores and score sheets. The first score keeper will add up each of the three scores for each exhibitor the scores on each of the three score sheets for each dog and write the total score on the bottom of each score sheet. The second score keeper will verify enter the scores tabulated by the first score keeper into the computer spreadsheet and place the final score on a spread sheet according to the exhibitor's armband number only will verify the totals are the same as those tabulated by the first score keeper. When all scores have been entered into the computer spreadsheet, the scores will be sorted, highest to lowest, to determine the ten top-scoring dogs and to determine whether there are ties within the top ten placements. The Conformation Finals Chairperson should verify the scores before announcing the top ten placements, serving as a third set of eyes on the results.

D C. Procedure for Breaking Tied Scores in the Top Ten Placements

In the event of two or more tied scores within the Altered Top Ten or Intact Top Ten placements, the following procedure must be followed:

1. The dogs involved in the tie will enter the ring together and be judged as a class. Then the three Judges will place themselves in three corners of the ring so they can observe each dog coming and going. Each dog will gait to the first Judge who will observe the front movement and then the rear movement as the dog gaits to the next judge and so on, so that all three judges observe each dog coming and going. As each dog leaves the last Judge, it will arrive

back at the ring entrance where all the dogs will re-stack as a class. At this time comparison examination, gaiting or conferring may be utilized at the discretion of the three Judges. Re-judging of the tied dogs shall be utilized to break the tie and not to determine the final score. At the conclusion of the tie breaking judgment, the Judges' Tie Breaking Work Sheet will be tallied. The highest scoring dog will have a plus sign (+) denoted on the dog's original Score Sheet next to the original score. If the tie involves more than two dogs, an A will be placed next to the highest scoring dog's original score on the original Score Sheet, B on the second highest scoring dog's original Score Sheet, C on the third highest scoring dog's original Score Sheet, and so on. The Tie Breaking Work Sheet will not be posted.

D. Announcement of Placements

At the conclusion of the judging and after scoring is finalized, all Finalists will be brought back into the ring for recognition and the ten top-placing dogs will be announced in random order. After both Altered Finals and Intact Finals have been judged, the Top Ten Altered Finalists and Top Ten Intact Finalists will be brought back into the ring together, and the order of finish will be announced, alternating between Altered and Intact Finalists, starting with tenth place and culminating with the announcement of the first place dogs.

E. Posting of Results

Within twenty-four hours of the completion of Conformation Finals competition, the Host Club Conformation Finals Chairperson will post all exhibitor scores in a central location where announcements and other venues scores are posted. ~~The score sheet shall include the total score, placement, and Judge's name according to the exhibitor's armband number.~~ Altered and Intact competitions are to be posted on separate score sheets in the same location. Scores are to be posted by armband number only and shall include placement, Judge's name and score for each dog, and the total score for each dog.

Comments/Rationale: These guidelines are needed to ensure clarification of this program and provide privacy for the tabulators crunching numbers in an area that is within close proximity to the ring but in a secure area occupied by a limited amount of people.

Affected: No adverse effects to any parties.

Effective Date: Immediately upon Board approval.

JR.22.04 Pee Wee/Sub Junior Rule Change Notice

Motion carried (9-0) - Approved: Busquets, Byrne, Creelman, Gann, Gerken, Larson, McCabe, Roberts, Wesen. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Non-voting: None.

Motioned by Liaison McCabe to approve the following recommendation from the Junior Committee.

Committee Recommendation: Pee Wee/Sub Junior Rule Change Notice. Motion by Andrea Bair to approve the following motion to become effective immediately. Seconded by Alexi Staples.

The Junior Committee would like to require that the ASCA BO send a copy of the new Pee Wee/Sub Junior rule with all sanctioned conformation show paperwork for a period of one year.

Results of Committee Vote: Approved: 10. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Non-Voting: 1.

Current Wording: None.

Proposed Wording: None.

Comments/Rationale: This procedure is to ensure that the affiliate clubs are aware of the changes and can guide their judges, ring stewards, juniors, and parents at their shows accordingly. The junior committee has put out the new rules in several formats (via ASCA publications as well as others) in hopes to advise as many people as possible, however, the word is still not reaching everyone.

Affected: ASCA Business Office (sending the information) and ASCA Affiliates (receiving the information). The Business Office has agreed to send a copy of the new rule, per Misty.

Effective Date: Immediately upon Board approval.

SD.22.16 Change to Ownership of Livestock for Stockdog Finals

Motion carried (5-4) - Approved: Byrne, Creelman, Gann, Gerken, Wesen. Disapproved: Busquets, Larson, McCabe, Roberts. Abstained: None. Non-voting: None.

Dissent from Director Busquets: Although I believe that finals competitors should not own the stock used for finals, this motion seems to be a reaction to an exception that had to be made this year. The rule seems unnecessary to me and is trying to address a problem that really doesn't exist.

Dissent from Director Larson: This has happened only one time. If it continues to be a problem, it can be revisited.

Dissent from Director Roberts: The exception to the ownership rule for this year should be just that, an exception. ASCA should not change the ownership rule for all finals going forward.

Comment from Director Wesen: I would like to include an emergency for all livestock. I hope the committee will move forward regarding the loss of livestock.

Motioned by Liaison Gann to approve the following recommendation from the Stockdog Committee.

Committee Recommendation: Change ownership of livestock for Stockdog Finals – Stockdog rule 24.8.1. Motioned by Jacqueline Tinker. Seconded Tanya Wheeler.

Results of Committee Vote: Approved: 12. Disapproved: None. Abstained: None. Non-Voting: None.

Current Wording:

24.9.1 Ownership and Stock Handlers

Stock cannot be owned by a Finals competitor. Finals handlers and family members cannot act as stock handlers during the Finals as long as the competitor is still competing.

Proposed Wording:

24.9.1 Ownership and Stock Handlers

Stock cannot be owned by, worked by, or prepared by a Finals competitor. An exception may be made for ducks. If the National Specialty Committee cannot find a suitable duck raiser, then a Finals competitor may step in as long as they agree in writing to refrain from using their Finals eligible dog to work the ducks. ASCA would be the official owner of the ducks in this scenario. No other exceptions may be made with other types of livestock. Competing finals handlers and family members may ~~cannot~~ act as stock handlers during the Finals ~~as long as the competitor is still competing.~~

Comments/Rationale: As requested by the board, the SDC reviewed rule 24.8.1. Due to recent struggles finding duck raisers for the National Specialty, which includes finals, the committee determined clarification on stock ownership is needed. The SDC also determined that adding an exemption for duck raisers would lessen the strain on The National Specialty Committee and Course Directors. The committee feels it would not provide an unfair advantage to a finalist to compete with ducks he or she raised. The finalist would be required to refrain from working the ducks with their finals' dog/dogs.

Affected: Contestants, National Specialty Committee, ASCA.

Effective Date: June 1, 2023.

Respectfully submitted by Kalla Jaco, Executive Secretary.