Minutes of the Meeting of the Dog Show Rules Committee – December 10, 2015

Chairperson Cindy Miller called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and asked the members to introduce themselves.

Committee Members present:

Duane Butherus	Nancy Perrell
Linda Flynn, Secretary	David Powers
Mary Manning-Stolz	Robert Schroll
Cindy Miller, Chairperson	John Shoemaker
Harry Miller	Cindy Stansell

Committee Member absent: Sue Goldberg

Also present were AKC Board Liaisons Tom Davies and Harvey Wooding and Staff Liaison Gina DiNardo.

Delegate guests present were: Sally Allen, Central IN KC; Robert Arbuthnot, Superstition KC; Jaimie Ashby, Carolina KC; Rita Biddle, Ingham County KC; Charlotte Borghardt, Greater Sierra Vista KC; Terrie Breen, Farmington Valley KC; Barry Cavanna, Contra Costa County KC; Richard F. Coletti, North Shore KC; Cindy Collins, Genesee County KC; W. Cook, So. Oregon KC; Jan Croft, Land O Lakes KC; Marilyn Currey, American Chinese Crested Club; Almira Dallas, Forsyth KC; Toni Doake, Town & Country KC; William E. Ellis, Plum Creek KC of Colorado; Sally Fineburg, Hatboro Dog Club; Nancy Fisk, Hockamock KC; Debby Fowler, Trinity Valley KC; Diane Franck, Langley KC; Anne Gallant, PBGV Club of America; Dennis Gallant, Penn Ridge KC; Barbara Gates, English Springer Spaniel Club of Michigan; Robert Gloster, Sammamish KC; Keith Hicks, Santa Ana Valley KC; Ralph Hogancamp, Minneapolis KC; Michael Knight, Texas KC; Stephen Lawrence, Classic Toy Dog Club of W. Mass.; Larry Libeu, Santa Maria KC; Louise Leone, Colorado KC; Sid Marx, Colorado Springs KC; Virginia McEvoy O'Connell, Greater Lowell KC; Janet Narushla, West Volusia KC; Julie Parker, Erie KC; Greg Paveza, Elm City KC; Tom Pincus, Houston KC; Margaret Pough, Finger Lakes KC; Julian Prager, Central Florida KC; Pat Putnam, Icelandic Sheepdog Assoc. of America; Joan Savage, Portland KC; Abbe Shaw, Santa Barbara KC; Barbara Shaw, Greater Collin KC; Nancy Shaw, San Antonio KC; Diana Skibinski, Lake Shore KC; Patti Staub, Greater Fredericksburg KC; Dan Stolz, Clearwater KC; Harold Tatro, Forth Worth KC; Bill Totten, Roanoke Kennel Club; Marjorie Underwood, Clermont County KC; Tony Vasquez, San Gabriel Valley KC; Richella Veatch, Tennessee Valley KC; Clete Wakefield, Jefferson County KC of MO; Ann Wallin, Atlanta KC;

Misc. Housekeeping Items

It was noted that although the September minutes had been approved and published on the Delegates' Portal previously, there was an error that was not previously caught. Mary Manning-Stolz was present at both the regular committee meeting and the organizational meeting following the delegates' meeting.

Chairperson Miller reminded the members that every member must respond to all email vote requests.

The next DSRC meeting will be on March 7 in the morning.

Items sent to the Board

Items sent to Jim Crowley for Board consideration included:

- Proposed amendment to Ch. 16, Sec. 1 to allow combining both sexes to award a maximum of one point for Best of Winners if no points are credited to the dog awarded BOW.

Chairperson Miller noted that the following amendments proposed by the DSRC are to be voted at the Delegates meeting:

- Ch. 4, Sec. 2 to allow clubs to utilize electronic documents for premium lists
- Ch. 7, Sec. 12 to allow clubs to utilize electronic documents for judging programs
- Ch. 12, Secs. 1, 3, 4 and 6 to allow clubs to publish their catalog electronically
- Ch. 16, Sec. 7 to recognize multiple levels of Grand Championship titles

Item 2 – Board Update

Harvey Wooding reported on the recommendation of the Real Estate Committee to continue offices in NY and NC.

Item 3 – Staff Update

Gina DiNardo did not have any updates to report.

Item 4 – Ch. 2, Sec. 3 – Territory Issue

Chairperson Miller reported that the subcommittee is still working on this. There are some issues that are being reviewed by AKC Legal. She noted that we need to change the mindset of the delegates to look at venues rather than territories. She noted that clubs using sites outside their territory need to do more outreach to minimize the impact on exposure to purebred dogs. Harry Miller added that we need to look at the whole picture. Clubs need to get along and learn to share venues.

Item 5 – Clean-up of Italicized portions of the Rules

Cindy Stansell noted that the subcommittee of Sue Goldberg, Mary Manning-Stolz, Nancy Perrell, Johnny Shoemaker and herself was tasked with reviewing the italicized sections of the Rules. The subcommittee was requested to review the Rules in sections to avoid bringing all proposed amendments before the Committee at one time. She reported that the subcommittee reviewed Chapters 1 to 6 and proposed the following amendments to Chapter 3 for review and vote by the Committee:

Upon motion duly made by Nancy Perrell, seconded by Johnny Shoemaker, it was unanimously voted to propose to the Board for its consideration the following paragraph to be added to the end of Ch. 3, Sec. 4 and the italicized paragraph deleted:

In a single show with multiple days of judging, the first day of a show is considered to be the first day on which there is regular conformation judging in accordance with Section 3 of this chapter. (Sweepstakes and Futurities are not considered regular conformation classes.)

Upon motion duly made by Johnny Shoemaker, seconded by Nancy Perrell, it was unanimously voted to propose to the Board for its consideration the following paragraph to be added to the end of Ch. 3, Sec. 5:

In a single show with multiple days of judging, the first day of a show is considered to be the first day on which there is regular conformation judging in accordance with Section 3 of this chapter. (Sweepstakes and Futurities are not considered regular conformation classes.)

Upon motion duly made by Mary Manning-Stolz, seconded by Robert Schroll, it was unanimously voted to propose to the Board for its consideration the following paragraph to be added to the end of Ch. 3, Sec. 7 and the italicized paragraph deleted:
Professional handlers are defined as any person who belongs or has belonged to a professional handlers' organization, distributed rate cards, or otherwise advertised or represented themselves as handling dogs for pay.

Upon motion duly made by Johnny Shoemaker, seconded by Mary Manning-Stolz, it was unanimously voted to propose to the Board for its consideration the following paragraph to be added to the end of Ch. 3, Sec.16 and the italicized paragraph deleted:
The Best in Show judge at an All-Breed show shall first award Reserve Best in Show, followed by Best in Show.

Upon motion duly made by Mary Manning-Stolz, seconded by Cindy Stansell, it was unanimously voted to propose to the Board for its consideration the following sentence to be inserted as the second sentence of Ch. 3, Sec.17:
A brace is defined as two dogs of the same recognized breed or variety that are similar in appearance, performing in unison, and presented by a maximum of two handlers. Both dogs competing in brace competition must have at least one common owner.
The italicized paragraph should be deleted.

Upon motion duly made by Cindy Stansell, seconded by Nancy Perrell, it was unanimously voted to propose to the Board for its consideration the following sentence to be inserted as the second sentence of Ch. 3, Sec.19:
Change to rule and eliminate date: A team is defined as four dogs of the same recognized breed or variety that are similar in appearance, performing in unison, and presented by a maximum of four handlers. All dogs competing in team competition must have at least one common owner.
The italicized paragraph should be deleted.

The subcommittee will present the next section for review at the March meeting, and was requested to submit proposed revisions to Secretary Linda Flynn in advance of the meeting for distribution to the Committee for its review prior to the meeting.

Item 6 – Ch. 16, Sec. 6
Johnny Shoemaker and Robert Schroll drafted a proposed amendment regarding the inclusion of non-regular class entries held prior to Best of Breed or Variety competition to be included in the calculation of Grand Championship points. The proposal was distributed to the Committee for review prior to the meeting. The proposal adds "and non-regular classes" to this section following the word "regular" throughout the section. Gina DiNardo was asked to find out if the italics language should be removed or changed. There was discussion regarding the potential for dogs entered in classes after Best of Breed being added to the calculation of points. Cindy Stansell and Linda Flynn noted that many non-regular entries are also entered in other classes, including Best of Breed. This calculation would apply only to single dog Best of Breed eligible dog entries. **Linda Flynn was requested to send the proposal to Alan Slay and Bri Tesarz for comment and to redistribute the proposed amendment to the Committee for review.** Cindy Stansell asked that the Committee be advised of the IT implementation costs before we vote on any change. Harvey Wooding responded that the costs are in the purview of the Board.

Cindy Miller noted that Linda Flynn had circulated an email from Mary Manning-Stolz regarding a question on counting entries for grand championship points. Cindy noted that for Grand Championship points for Best of Breed and Best of Opposite Sex placements, all dogs are counted. For Select, two are subtracted from the Select Dog calculation and two are subtracted from the Select Bitch calculation.

Item 7 – Points for Group Placements
Cindy Miller noted that this was proposed for rare breeds placing in the groups, but not enough competition to earn points in the classes. Cindy Stansell suggested we wait until we see what happens with the proposed amendment to Ch. 16, Sec. 1, and then see if any action is needed. **This item was removed from the agenda.**

Item 8 – Coordinating Committee Request to Review our Charge
There was discussion about adding Registration back into our charge. Cindy Miller felt this was not a bad idea for us to consider but she expressed concern whether our Committee has the time to take on more responsibility. Our charge is to review and make recommendations to proposed amendments to the Dog Show Rules. Linda Flynn noted that initially we were responsible for registration when it was included in the same book as the Dog Show Rules. There was discussion about proposals to increase registrations. Linda felt that if we were to accept responsible for Registration, our charge should only relate to the actual Registration Rules and not involve increasing registrations. **The DSRC charge was reviewed and removed from the agenda.**

Robert Schroll brought up the Petland program. Dr. Davies explained that if sire and dam were AKC registrable, their puppy can be registered as an AKC puppy with a Q registration. It is only offered to Petland. It was noted that it takes several generations for a WP dog to be registered. There was discussion at the delegates meeting many years ago about this. 67% of puppies are produced by back yard breeders. It is called conditional registration. Information on these registrations is available on the AKC website. For any comments about registration, delegates can contact Mark Dunn.

Item 9 – Ch. 2, Sec. 2
Since Nicklas Pisias was not present at the meeting, this item was tabled until he is present at a meeting.

Item 10 – Showing Spayed/Neutered Dogs
This item was tabled until we hear back from the Parent Clubs Committee. Cindy Miller will discuss this with Pat Laurens.

Item 11 – Practice Rings
Dr. Davies noted that MBF is now charging fees for practice rings and wanted Clubs to be aware that the Supers will be charging to set up these rings. It was noted show and go rings are a good opportunity to welcome exhibitors and allow people to practice during the day. Clubs were encouraged to negotiate with their Super to eliminate or reduce any fee. Cindy Miller noted that we can discuss the positive impact of these rings but she questioned if there is anything in the Rules that we need to address, and was not aware of any Rules that prohibit practice rings. Gina DiNardo noted that a ring can be used as a practice ring when the judging in that ring is completed, or a separate ring can be used. Duane Butherus noted that if a club sets up its own ring, the Super may not cover any liability. Gina DiNardo recommended practice

ring and hours be published in the Premium List and the Judging Program. Cindy Stansell noted that practice rings cannot be used in Obedience.

Item 12 – Asterisk in Judges' Book to denote NOHS eligibility

An asterisk in the judges' book will identify dogs that are owner-handled. This change was proposed to help judges determine eligibility. It was noted that there is a flow chart that describes eligibility; however, it was also noted that the judge does not know if the steward is providing correct information as to eligibility. Another comment was that when in doubt you can always call for the Field Rep or Super. Johnny Shoemaker expressed his concerns about this kind of identification of a dog/exhibitor and felt it gives the wrong perception. He has received many emails from exhibitors who are against this change. Cindy Stansell noted that she and Johnny agree but disagree. She does not want the asterisk in the judges' book but not for the same reason – she felt keeping track of eligibility was problematic. Dr. Davies noted there is no reason not to have it in there. The identification issue is nonsense, since there are PHA, RHP, etc. pins on people that make the perception issue irrelevant. He noted that maybe 1 in 4 times a judge has a knowledgeable steward. There is nothing unethical about this; it is a convenience for the judge. Harvey Wooding noted that about a year ago a survey was sent out to those eligible for the class and 40% did not want to be identified. Earlier this year because of concerns expressed by judges, show chairs, stewards, etc. another survey was sent out and 55% preferred to have the asterisk in the judges' book to eliminate confusion. The Board acted based on that feedback and input from judges. Harry Miller noted that owner handlers are proud to be recognized as such. Cindy Miller noted an alternative is to list the owner-handled dogs on a separate page after Best of Breed in the judges' book for every breed. Johnny Shoemaker was not opposed to that idea. Cindy Miller could not stress enough to clubs that they need knowledgeable stewards and need to rely more on professional stewards to run rings. A comment was made regarding the amount of time necessary to judge Owner Handled and that clubs need to request Supers to allow more time in the judging times. Dr. Davies asked if every dog entered should be "unidentified" so that we do not know what class the dogs are entered in or came from when they are in Best of Breed competition? Another comment was that recordkeeping is the real issue. The steward should be tracking the dogs all the way through the classes. It is the steward's responsibility. Several guests were not in favor of the asterisk, but another commented that the judge should be trusted to judge the best dog.

Item 13 – Ch. 6, Sec. 9

Johnny Shoemaker raised this based on a notice sent out by Glenn Lycan of AKC to Supers regarding shows closing the week of Veterans Day. The notice reminded them that all entries received **by the time of the first mail** on November 12, 2015 will be acceptable for entry, including any entries received by phone, fax, online, hand-delivered, etc. His concern was that there was no way to note what time the first mail is. Cindy Stansell noted that previously it was just regular mail, and Gina DiNardo noted that was how it was, but not how it is today. Proposed changes suggested were "by noon of the following day," "by the time of the first mail or noon by any other means," or "24 hours after the published closing time."

Johnny Shoemaker moved that the proposed amendment to the last sentence of Ch. 6 Sec. 9 be sent to the Board for its approval: *Whenever the closing day noted above falls on a postal holiday, entries received up to 24 hours from the published closing date may be accepted. Nancy Perrell seconded, and it was unanimously voted.* Linda Flynn was requested to send this proposal to Alan Slay and Bri Tesarz for review prior to sending it to the Jim Crowley.

Dr. Davies asked the Committee to think about shortening the time between the closing date and the show date. Cindy Miller felt that would need to be discussed with the Supers' group. After the vote on electronic catalogs, Gina DiNardo was asked to find out what time frame could work for closing dates. It was noted that UKC just went to 10 days.

The issue of judge changes was raised in the context of entries being withdrawn the day of show, and whether an entry could be added the day of show for a judge change. There was no further discussion on this.

Item 14 – Puppy of Distinction (Exhibit A)

Material from Bri Tesarz on this proposal was distributed to the Committee prior to the meeting. Nancy Perrell questioned whether there was sufficient interest. Linda Flynn commented on her experience judging 4-6 month puppy classes. She noted that many events have entries well in excess of 50, and there is much interest by exhibitors many of whom are novice. **Upon motion made by Johnny Shoemaker, seconded by Robert Schroll, it was unanimously voted to endorse the Puppy of Distinction Title as presented to the Committee by Bri Tesarz on November 4, 2015.**

Item 15 – Proposal for Show Levels

Cindy Miller explained that Sid Marx had distributed this proposal to her, Jim Crowley, Ann Wallin, Ron Menaker, Harvey Wooding and Steve Gladstone. She called upon Sid to discuss his proposal. Following his presentation, Cindy Miller noted this is already in place in Australia. **She requested two volunteers to serve on a subcommittee to review this proposal along with two members from the All Breed Committee and Sid Marx, as Chair. Nancy Perrell and Cindy Stansell volunteered. Harvey Wooding recommended that staff be invited to work with the subcommittee. Cindy agreed and will contact staff to find out who will be appointed.**

Cindy Miller discussed the last item for discussion was a reinstatement issue. The concern raised was the ability of one judge to disqualify a dog permanently. There is no appeal process for a dog to be reinstated if the judge or the Event Committee does not feel the dog should be eligible for reinstatement. A specific situation was presented to the Committee, and a request was made to revise the Rules to accommodate an appeals process. Cindy Miller, as well as other Committee members, noted that there is nothing in the Rules that address this issue, and the procedures for Disqualification and Reinstatement are covered by Board policy. It was suggested that this issue should be presented to the Board. Harvey Wooding noted that letter was sent to Ron Menaker describing this situation. He noted that this Committee has no means to address this issue. He will follow up with Ron and the Board. **Cindy Stansell, Mary Manning-Stolz and Johnny Shoemaker volunteered to research the Rules for mention of any appeals process and bring the results of their research back to the Committee.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Flynn, Secretary