

NAFA® Board of Directors Meeting, April 16-17, 2011, Detroit MI - Agenda:

Disciplinary Hearing - DC # 2011-1

Officers' Reports

Chair's Comments:

Executive Director's Comments

Treasurer's Report

Secretary's Report

Standing Committee Reports

Marketing Committee:

Finance:

Judges Committee:

- Steve Corona, Georgetown, TX - Provisional to Approved
- Stuart Tait, Regina, SK - Provisional to Approved
- Melisa Taliana, Inverary, ON - Apprentice to Provisional
- Novice Judges Exam

Rules Committee:

- Definition of "handler"
- Definition of "course"
- Proposal from Chris VanWert re: Board Composition
- Request to recognize AKC Foundation Stock Service
- Request to prohibit hanging tags on collars
- Proposed changes to juniors serving as line and box judges
- Proposed Breed Challenge process

- Request to reconsider rule change prohibiting strollers in the ring
- Request regarding RD, TD, and Head Judge club affiliations

Disciplinary Committee:

- DC #2011-1

Election Committee:

- Ratification of Results
- Election Process Document

Nominating Committee:

Review Panel:

- Santana - 100371, 03/05/2011
- Turkey - 100519, 02/20/2011
- Buddy - 100267, 03/19/2011

Special Committee Reports

Technology Committee:

NAFA/Flyball History Committee:

Delegate Accrual Committee:

Old Business:

- Iron Dog Award

New Business:

- CanAm Venue
- Top Pointed Breeds Recognition

NAFA Rules Committee
Recommendations
April 16-17, 2001 BoD Meeting

1. [Definition of “handler”](#)
2. [Definition of “course”](#)
3. [Proposal from Chris VanWert re: Board composition](#)
4. [Request to recognize AKC Foundation Stock Service](#)
5. [Request to prohibit Hanging tags on collars](#)
6. [Proposed changes to juniors serving as line and box judges](#)
7. [Proposed Breed Challenge process](#)
8. [Request to reconsider rule change prohibiting strollers in the ring](#)
9. [Request regarding RD, TD, and Head Judge Club Affiliations](#)

1. Definition of “handler” – Mike Miller

The Rules Committee received a request from Mike Miller to change the definition of “handler” as follows:

Current rule is on Page 5 Chapter 3:

(c) Each team is to consist of a minimum of four dogs and four handlers, with a maximum of six dogs and six handlers, plus a box loader and at the discretion of the team, a runner or two, to pick up loose tennis balls, to set up knocked down jumps, or to otherwise assist the team, provided doing so does not interfere with the judges or the opposing team and does not in any way assist the dogs in navigating the course or violate the rules.

The definition of a handler is on Page 15 of the Glossary:

Handler - The person releasing and/or catching the dog.

If the definition of a handler is revised to:

Handler - The person safely holding, releasing and/or catching the dog.

This would enable teams that have 1 person who has 2 dogs on a line up to catch and release their dog so long as they have someone hold the dog. Safety would still have to

be maintained. There would still need to be at least 4 and maximum of 6 handlers as previously noted in the rules.

-Mike

NAFA Approved Judge

The Committee acknowledged that this proposed change would clarify that a person holding a dog or helping to catch a dog may also be considered a handler. This would also provide support for instances where there are multiple handlers for a dog. The members expressed some concern about including the term “safely.” Our rulebook is replete with references that safety is paramount. Including that language here might diminish the message that all elements of the sport of flyball should stress safety.

There was unanimous support for changing the definition to handler to: “The person holding, releasing and/or catching the dog.”

[\[back to top\]](#)

2. Definition of “course” – Dave Walt

The Rules Committee received the following request from Dave Walt to add a definition of “the course” to the glossary. The issue came up in a discussion of training in the ring and the Board’s May 8, 2010 explanation of what conduct would constitute training in the ring.

IF we were to define "course" in the rule book, based on what we actually want it to mean, would we not be better off saying the course starts from the point were one releases their dog and ends at the finish line? I feel this would clear up EVERYTHING and give no room to not understand what NAFA means.

The Rules Committee discussed the proposal. The members felt that the comments in the minutes from the May 8, 2010 meeting where the rule was changed were clear. Nevertheless, Committee members agreed to table the issue until the August meeting to see if more clarification is needed. This would still give time for any changes to be included in the October 1, 2011 rulebook. There was concern that defining the course to begin where the dog is released might have ramifications on other rules. For instance, the second page of the rulebook discusses it being a 51 foot “course.” It might also cause problems with how runback is defined and other ways in which the term course is used throughout the rules.

For clarification, the Rules Committee restates the May 8, 2010 minutes regarding this issue:

The Rules Committee received questions from Emily Venator about various types of conduct inquiring whether they would constitute training in the ring. In reviewing these questions, the Rules Committee had concerns about whether the current rules gave sufficient support to a judge to call training in the ring when the assistance was from

someone other than the handler, whether that person be inside or outside the ring. The Rules Committee recommends the following change:

Chapter 3 (page 5 of the current rulebook)

(c) Each team is to consist of a minimum of four dogs and four handlers, with a maximum of six dogs and six handlers, plus a box loader and at the discretion of the team, a runner or two, to pick up loose tennis balls, to set up knocked down jumps, or to otherwise assist the team, provided doing so does not interfere with the judges or the opposing team and does not in any way assist the dogs in navigating the course or violate the rules.

This rule change would make it clear that other people may assist the dogs and handlers, but may not assist the dog in actually navigating the course. A person helping catch the dog in the back area, or revving the dog up before they run would not violate the rules. But, a person funneling a dog into the jumps or running alongside the dog as they run over the jumps (even outside the ring) would not be permitted. Using food in the ring is permitted, as are tugs and other motivators.

May 8, 2010 Board meeting minutes.

[\[back to top\]](#)

3. Proposal from Chris VanWert re: Board composition

The Rules Committee received the following proposal from Chris VanWert:

To Leerie Jenkins, Chairman of the NAFA Board of Directors, Members of the Rules Committee,

Please accept this (revised) version of a proposal to increase the number of Voting Members of the NAFA Board of Directors, submitted earlier this day. I had accidentally accessed and quoted an outdated version of the NAFA By-Laws.

Article IV, Section 2, By-Laws

States the following: "The number of voting members of the Board of Directors shall consist of no less than nine (9) nor more than fifteen (15), unless pursuant to the Michigan Nonprofit Corporation Act and in accordance with these Bylaws such number is increased by amendment to these Bylaws."

Since NAFA became an incorporated entity, the number of voting members of the Board of Directors has not increased by a single member above its stated minimum of nine (9).

In a search of NAFA News Archives, according to the January 1997 issue, there were 9 NAFA Regions, equaling the minimum number of Directors on the NAFA Board. Today, fourteen (14) years later, NAFA is divided into twenty two (22) Regions which represents a 170% increase. NAFA has nearly tripled over the last decade and a half and the number of NAFA employees on the Executive Staff has increased accordingly.

The number of voting members of the NAFA Board of Directors has not.

According to NAFA's published 2007 IRS Form 990 (the latest one available on the website) NAFA's Board members "average" hours per week spent on activities directly related to their volunteer service on the NAFA Board range from 6 hours (per week) to 4 hours. That is what NAFA is reporting to the IRS. Yet, in NAFA Chat Transcripts, I quote the following:

- Candidate Chat, January 4, 2010: Leerie Jenkins **"Well, I wasn't distinguishing...I meant for the board. 10-20 hours a week...maybe more."**
- Candidate Chat, January 4, 2010: Karen Oleson **"Again, it's hard to put an "hours per week" value on this. There have been weeks that I have spent over 60 hours on NAFA board duties, while in other weeks I have spent considerably less time."**

Looking at the above quotations and comparing them to an official document filed with a Federal Government agency, NAFA is not reporting the truth. Or, is it possible, that incumbent members of the NAFA Board running for re-election were "embellishing" for the sake of votes?

Current Committee Assignments

A quick perusal of this year's Committees and Committee member assignments reveals some astonishing facts.

- There are four (4) non-BoD on Standing Committees. This is unprecedented. These are committees required under our **By-Laws, Article V, Section 2**.
 - This does NOT include the Nominating Committee which is specified to have all Non-BoD as its members.
 - Each BoD member is required under Article V, Section 2 to serve on at least ONE committee. In fact, there is only one BoD member that serves this minimum requirement.
1. Two BoD members serve on four (4) standing committees.
 2. Two BoD serve on three (3) standing committees.
 3. Three BoD serve on 2 standing committees.
 4. When "Special" Committees are added into the above equation, there are six (6) committee members that serve on three or more NAFA committees.
 5. There is one non-BoD committee member assigned to **four (4)** NAFA committees

Recommendations of This Proposal:

1. The Board should do a study of its current "Business" model and determine if individual voting members of the NAFA Board of Directors are taking on too much work through duplication of committee assignments to individual members.
2. Part of this study should answer the following question: Are Committee Chairpersons relying too much on "non-BoD" committee members to complete their committee's "work"?
3. Determine if the workload of individual NAFA Board members could be reduced by increasing the number of voting members of the NAFA BoD as provided for in Article IV, Section 2 of the NAFA By-Laws.

In order to keep NAFA elections orderly and minimize the (possible) turmoil caused by adding voting members to the NAFA Board of Directors, I additionally recommend that additional Board terms commence in sync with current elections already scheduled in accordance with our By-Laws.

*I also recommend that NAFA adopt the practice of offering non-BoD committee assignments (whenever possible) to the pool of runners-up candidates **in the order of their finish** of the previous NAFA Election. This will ensure that NAFA Committees will be composed primarily of individuals who have already expressed their "willingness" to serve the NAFA organization AND that the voting Delegates have a voice when making NAFA Committee assignments. (To clarify, I am **not** recommending this "practice" should be codified but, rather, that non-BoD committee member "appointees" should reflect a more "democratic" image.)*

Sincerely & Respectfully,

*Christine VanWert
The Wooferines Flyball Team
NAFA Affiliated Club #455*

The Rules Committee does not recommend the Board adopt the proposal. Increasing the number of Board members would make scheduling even more difficult than it already is. Our current Board has members in five different time zones. The Committee also believes that the present size of the Board provides a nice balance between productivity and varied input from its members. Adding more members to the Board would likely lead to longer less productive meetings.

[\[back to top\]](#)

4. Foundation Stock Service – Laura Green

The Rules Committee received the following request:

Leerie,

I emailed someone else about three months ago regarding this, but haven't heard anything back yet. I was wondering if this could be discussed within the NAFA Rules Committtee meetings. If I have contacted you, in error, please let me know who should get this. Thanks.

I know NAFA accepts all AKC registered dog breeds, but what is the ruling on dogs recognized under the AKC's Foundation Stock Service (FSS) program? There are breeds listed here which are not covered by the other NAFA recognized breed registries and I'd like to know what reasoning either goes into accepting these breeds or not under NAFA rules. As far as my research has gotten me, the AKC sees these FSS breeds as legitimate but for any number of reasons (litter numbers, membership enrollment, national country of origin, etc.) the breeds are not meeting all the requirements for full AKC recognition.

Thank you for taking the time to discuss and answer my questions.

Laura Green

Some additional information from Leerie regarding AKC's FSS program:

There are a lot of requirements that the rare breed clubs have to meet before they are moved into the Miscellaneous class and then into full AKC recognition to show in the conformation ring. (All FSS breeds are now eligible to compete in the Companion Events - Agility, Obedience, Rally and Tracking).

Here is a link that gives the full run down of what FSS is and what the requirements are to move towards full recognition. http://www.akc.org/req/fss_details.cfm

The Committee reviewed the Foundation Stock Service program and was generally supportive of recognition of these breeds. The members felt comfortable that the American Kennel Club competently vets these breeds and stud books. NAFA is not set up to register breeds of dogs. There was interest in obtaining further information as to whether other registries have equivalent programs. The Committee recommends that the Board recognize breeds contained in AKC's Foundation Stock Service.

[\[back to top\]](#)

5. Request to prohibit hanging tags on collars – Veronica Sily

The Rules Committee received the following request:

I emailed a couple of months ago and haven't heard back. I know there were some website If changes and assume that my email was lost in cyberspace.

Since the option to email the rules committee isn't listed above I am going to send my question to you and hope that it gets forwarded to the correct people.

I have had the pleasure of running my dog in a few NAFA regions (moved for work etc). It has come to my attention that rules for hanging tags on collars and harnesses varies from region to region and judge to judge. After having my dog catch his tag on the box, I began removing them when he races to avoid injury.

I am concerned that items hanging, jingling and smacking a dog in the chin etc his a serious accident waiting to happen. Tags, hanging tabs and other decorations of the sort should be removed before racing. If owners are concerned about their dog not having id tags, there are flat options that attach to the collar and do not pose a safety hazard.

It boggles my mind that some judges see the problem and require that handlers remove the tags and others do not. Either this is a safety problem (and it is) or it is not. I would ask that the rules committee look into this matter and make a ruling.

Thanks!

Veronica

In considering this request, the Committee firmly acknowledged that if any attachment appeared to be dangerous, a judge may require it to be removed. However, the Committee was concerned that if the Board prohibited tags on this basis, it should also prohibit tabs which would be far more likely to be caught on a box or jump than a collar tag. There was concern expressed that some areas require dogs to have rabies tags displayed on collars. Some members also felt that any small danger of having a tag caught on equipment would be outweighed by the advantage of having tags in the more likely scenario of a dog getting loose at a tournament site. Overall, the Committee did not recommend the Board adopt the proposal.

[\[back to top\]](#)

6. Proposed changes to juniors serving as line and box judges – Russ Bobb

The Rules Committee received the following request:

Leerie,

I am contacting you as you are the only NAFA Board Member I know.

While following the recent Region 15 thread, referenced in the Subject (I was looking for the mouth-ball thing), I re-read the NAFA Official Rules of Racing, Corporate Policies and Bylaws and stumbled upon: Corporate Policies and Procedures, Chapter 2 - Judges Section (k): Line or box judges under the age of 18 must have prior approval from the Regional Director. (Head Judges should also be notified).

As a former educator (middle school) and the uncle of 33+ nephews and nieces (many of whom I have brought to flyball tournaments and introduced to box and line judging (without prior knowledge of the above requirement)), (I guess I violated NAFA Rules); after reading the problems that the child referenced in the e-mail thread encountered, I began to think that maybe NAFA should enforce the above policy (I would assume prior means before the race in which the child is judging, not prior to the tournament). Enforcement would then allow the RD (or his/her representative) to instruct the child in dispute resolution. This would mean that if an adult (or even another junior handler) is confronting the child, the child would have instructions as to the proper way to address the problem (immediately contact the RD, TD or Head Judge) rather than feel bullied or "put down" by an adult (and only bring up the issue after the fact). This would also give the child a feeling of empowerment as the child would be "backed up" by an authority.

To this end; I would propose that NAFA create a form to list approved under-eighteen Box and Lines judges, to be posted in the same manner as the list of height dogs (and to be updated as more children are approved). I would also propose that NAFA devise an instruction sheet to be given to the children which would instruct them in the proper procedure on how to deal with confrontational adults. I would also like to have the

Board consider a "Junior Judge" pin (a one time award) to be given to those children who take upon themselves the (sometimes) onerous job of "sitting in chairs".

I feel bad for the poor girl that was bullied and I would like to see NAFA take an interest in protecting and nurturing the future of our sport.

NOTE: I use child in the literal sense as an individual under the age of majority to distinguish from an adult who is over the age of majority. Perhaps "junior" might be a better term but the language would have to be determined by the Board.

Russ Bobb (and Mischief)

The Committee considered the proposal, but ultimately decided not to recommend that the Board adopt it. The Committee expressed concern that any competitor would bully a line or box judge, regardless of age. Any such conduct should be immediately reported to the head judge or the Regional Director and may be considered unsportsmanlike conduct. The current rules do permit persons under 18 years of age to serve as line and box judges, with the approval of the Regional Director. This approval should be sought prior to the assignment. The Judges Committee recently produced a line and box judge training video which is available on the NAFA web page. This video may be helpful in training line & box judges of all ages. Junior Handlers who act as competitors or assist teams in a meaningful way are eligible to earn a yearly pin. Juniors who act as line and box judges should also be eligible to receive the Junior Handler pin.

[\[back to top\]](#)

7. Proposed Breed Challenge process – Lee Heighton

The Rules Committee received the following proposal from Lee Heighton, designed to mirror the Height Card Challenge Process:

North American Flyball Association Breed Challenge Process

A dog's breed may only be challenged once in the lifetime of the dog

An Approved or Supervising Judge may make a maximum of three (3) breed challenges per fiscal (racing) year. To bring a challenge, the Judge must witness the dog competing while officiating.

A Club Owner may make a maximum of two (2) breed challenges per fiscal (racing) year. A Club Owner may only bring a challenge against dogs that the Club Owner witnessed competing at a NAFA® sanctioned tournament at which the Club Owner's club was also competing.

A Judge or Club Owner who wishes to make a breed challenge must complete form C(?) and submit it to the Executive Director no more than fourteen (14) days after the last day of the event at which he or she witnessed the dog competing. If the form is mailed, it must be postmarked or email dated within the fourteen

(14) day period. A Club Owner breed challenge must also be accompanied by a \$100.00 USD fee.

If upon receipt of the C(?) form and the fee (if required) the Executive Director finds that the challenge does not meet the submission requirements or that there is currently a challenge in process, the challenger will be notified and the challenge fee (if any) will be returned.

The Breed Challenge Process

If the breed challenge meets the submission conditions, the Executive Director shall, with ten (10) calendar days, notify the dog's owner by postal mail that the dog's listed breed has been challenged.

The challenged dog's registered breed may be verified by any one of the following:

A pedigree, containing the challenged dog and at least three (3) generations

An ILP/PAL, or similar issued by one of the breed registries currently recognized by NAFA®

Verification of the challenged dog's breed by a Breed Challenge Panel

Breed Challenge Panel

The Board of Directors will select three to five (3-5) established breeders with specific knowledge of the challenged dog's registered breed to form the Breed Challenge Panel

Members of the breed challenge panel shall be impartial and shall have no conflict of interest with either the challenger or the dog owner (e.g. shall not have family or Club ties with either the challenger or dog owner).

All submitted photographs will be distributed to the selected breeders

Photograph requirements

All submitted photographs must be taken after notification of the challenge by the Executive Director.

The photographs will provide an unobstructed view of the challenged dog from both sides and a frontal view.

The dog's owner has ninety (90) days, from the postmark date of the notification letter to provide suitable photographs of the challenged dog to the Executive Director.

Failure to provide suitable photographs within the allotted time will result in a breed revocation at which time the challenged dog's breed will automatically be changed to "mix".

Breed Challenge Panel review process

The Breed Challenge Panel members shall view the submitted photographs independently and shall make one of three findings. They will report their findings to both the Executive Director and the Judge's Committee.

The photographs are unacceptable for the purpose intended and what the deficiencies are

The photographs are acceptable and the challenged dog is likely to be the breed that is currently registered under

The photographs are acceptable and the challenged dog is not the breed that it is currently registered under and recommends that the dog's breed be changed.

A majority vote from the Breed Challenge Panel will determine if the challenged dog's registered breed is correct.

If the majority of the Breed Challenge Panel determines that the dog's breed is not correctly registered, the dog's breed will immediately be changed to "mix".

The Executive Director shall implement the recommendations of the Breed Challenge Panel within ten (10) calendar days of the receipt of the Panel's assessment by:

Notifying the dog owner that the first photographs were unacceptable with an explanation of their deficiencies and acceptable photographs are required within ninety (90) days. If acceptable photographs have not been submitted within the extended ninety (90) day period, the dog's breed will be changed to "mix"

Notifying the dog owner and challenger in writing that the dog's breed has been upheld or changed to "mix"

Breed revocation

NAFA® will publish all breed status changes. No other penalties shall be pursued other than the breed of the challenged dog shall be changed to "mix".

The Rules Committee was split as to whether to recommend adoption of this new process. There were a few suggestions for possible modifications, including: allowing judges who are certified to judge the breed in conformation be able to participate on the panel; allowing challenge of a mix where there is concern that the dog should be more correctly registered as a purebred; whether we should eliminate the current ability for a person to change the dog's breed once during its lifetime.

Some Committee members were concerned that this process would be far more subjective than the Height Card Challenge process and questioned the perceived fairness of the process. There was also some concern expressed that there have only been two requests for challenges to a

dog's breed in recent history. Creating an entire process to address a few isolated issues seemed unwarranted. The Committee is looking forward to discussing the proposal further with the entire Board.

[\[back to top\]](#)

8. Request to reconsider rule change prohibiting strollers in the ring – Lynette Brown

The Rules Committee received the following request:

I have seen lately concerns brought forth concerning babies being carried in a sling while racing. In order to prevent a baby from being carried the proposal was defining the age of the child to be in the ring and this would involve a stroller.

My husband and I have brought up 2 children while playing flyball and both were in strollers inside of the ring so we could see them and they could see us. They were on the side away the dogs, but in the ring. The ring's in our region are surrounded by a 3 foot curtain, so having a stroller on the outside of that would prevent the eye contact that is needed for personal security of parent and child. The new proposal would effect parents like us that have been attracted to this sport because we can have family fun with our dogs. We take our childrens safety very seriously and would not put them in harm. I agree with not having a child in a sling, and hope that you could not include strollers in your final wording. I would rather issues are addressed with individuals rather than a clean sweep rule.

Flyball is a great sport that families can participate together in. My son(8) now ball shags, and loves coming to flyball events. We are so priviledged to have this time with our children and hope more parents in flyball get to experience this as well.

I also believe the judges should have the final say and if they deem a situation dangerous, then that should be respected by the participants.

Lynette Brown

FAME - Moncton NB

The Committee was unanimous in recommending that the Board not change the rule adopted at the January meeting, effective October 1, 2011 regarding strollers. The Committee members all felt that strollers are dangerous in the ring. Even if dogs on the parents' team are safe around strollers, there is no guarantee that dogs racing in the opposing lane would be good with them. Children in a stroller, especially unattended, have a greater risk of harm from dogs given that they are at head height for many dogs. If a competitor does not have child care arrangements, the Committee would encourage him or her to speak to local clubs, TDs, and RDs to see if someone from another club would be able to supervise the child during racing.

[\[back to top\]](#)

9. Request regarding RD, TD, and Head Judge Club Affiliations – Andy McBride

The Rules Committee received the following request from competitor, Andy McBride.

I would like to request that NAFA implement a new rule requiring that the RD or Acting RD, TD, and Head judge at a tournament can not all be members of the same club.

Further clarification.

By head judge I'm referring to the judge currently controlling the racing lane at any given time. If Club A is the RD & TD then there should not be any judges from club A as competing clubs have no unbiased and uninvolved parties to go to who represent only NAFA when discussing issues involving the host clubs entered teams.

If the host club is the RD, TD and wants to use their own judges they should assign a competent person who is familiar with NAFA rules and is not a member of their club to be the acting RD.

*-Andy [McBride]
Go Dog Go!
Region 9*

The Rules Committee received this request shortly before the meeting and is recommending that the issue be tabled until the August meeting to give more time to consider the request.

[\[back to top\]](#)