

North American Flyball Association®, Inc.
Board of Directors Meeting
Detroit, MI
Abridged Minutes
April 16-17, 2011

Present were:

Board of Directors Nancy Garcia,
 Leerie Jenkins,
 Dana Nichols,
 Karen Oleson,
 Kris Pickering,
 Curtis Smith
 Ally Stern
 Dave Walt

Executive Director Lee Heighton and Board member Greg Stopay were voluntarily absent from the disciplinary portion of the meeting.

Guests: Kristy Schultz, Laurence Margolis, Angie Heighton

Disciplinary Hearing - DC # 2011-1

Leerie moved that we enter an Executive Session for disciplinary hearing DC # 2011-1. The Board entered Executive Session at 10:00 a.m.

The Board exited Executive Session at approx 6:00 p.m.

Disciplinary Committee:

- DC #2011-1

The Board heard Disciplinary Action DC #2011-1 at a hearing on 4/16/11 and made the following findings:

“We find that the disciplinary charge was not sustained, but that the accused administered an inappropriate correction in the ring and that correction was administered to another team’s dog. This action merited a reprimand, but did not merit disciplinary action.”

Lee joined the meeting. Dana moved to adjourn the meeting. Kris seconded. The meeting was adjourned until the next morning.

On April 17, 2011 at 8:09 a.m the meeting reconvened.

Present were:

Executive Director Lee Heighton

Board of Directors Nancy Garcia,
 Leerie Jenkins,
 Dana Nichols,
 Karen Oleson,
 Kris Pickering,
 Curtis Smith
 Ally Stern
 Dave Walt

Chairman Leerie Jenkins called the meeting to order at 8:09 AM EDT.

Guests: None. Greg Stopay was absent.

Officers' Reports

Chair's Comments – Leerie Jenkins

Leerie welcomed the three new board members- Curtis Smith, Ally Stern and Dave Walt. He indicated due to board members' flight schedules, we might not follow the agenda- first we would discuss judges, then finance, then rules.

Review Panel- Leerie Jenkins

- Santana - 100371, 03/05/2011
- Turkey - 100519, 02/20/2011
- Buddy - 100267, 03/19/2011
- Asta - 101025, 04/09/2011

Notices were sent and we have not received any appeals.

Executive Director's Comments – Lee Heighton

Lee also welcomed the three new members to the board.

Region 11 – Florida

Recently the board sent Lee to Florida. Mike Pape the acting RD is doing a nice job and the feedback there has been positive. Lee is waiting until Mike has more experience before finalizing the RD appointment.

RD, TD and Judge- same club

Lee talked to the rules committee. He had concerns if the RD, TD, and head judge were not allowed to come from the same club as suggested by a recent rule change request. For smaller regions it could be difficult to comply with that request. However, when hosting a tournament and the RD is the TD, the RD should choose an acting RD that is not from the host club. Dana said in the interim this should be ED handled but in the future we could consider a rule change. Dana moved that we have Lee and the RDs deal with the issue. Lee will communicate the

policy to the RDs and at this point and time we will not have a rule change. Nancy seconded. There was a short discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

Marketing

Lee requested that we enter an Executive Session to discuss a marketing issue. Leerie moved we enter Executive Session. The Board entered Executive Session at 8:30 a.m. The Board exited the Executive Session at 9:10 a.m.

Treasurer's Report- Nancy Garcia

Nancy reported that we have \$100,000 CD (certificate of deposit) that matures on July 20, 2011. Nancy recommended that we roll the funds into our money market fund and then discuss it further at the Board's August 2011 meeting. There was no further discussion.

The Chair moved that we enter an Executive Session. The Board entered Executive Session at 9:12 a.m. to discuss the NAFA AMEX card.

The Board exited the Executive Session at 9:23 a.m.

Secretary's Report- Ally Stern

Since the last meeting the minutes for the January 29, 2011 Annual General meeting and the January 28, 2011 Board meeting were approved. The February 28, 2011 Teleconference meeting minutes to approve committee assignments were also approved. The minutes for the three meetings were posted to the NAFA website.

Dana transitioned the secretarial tasks to Ally and she passed on a large number of documents & supplies to Ally.

Break from 9:25 to 9:45

The meeting resumed and in anticipation of a couple of items, Leerie planned to set up a teleconference. The date was TBD.

Standing Committee Reports

Marketing Committee- Nancy Garcia. There was no discussion.

Finance- Nancy Garcia

The current budget was reviewed. The accounting firm has not finalized our tax return so the final Profit/Loss from 2010 is not available. Nancy noted that the Profit/Loss statement shows a loss of \$62,000. Since the CanAm straddles two fiscal years, the income from CanAm is reflected in 2010, while the expenses are shown in 2011. By the end of the year, the Profit/Loss statement should show a positive income. Also, the finance committee is considering moving towards more progressive software.

Judges Committee- Leerie Jenkins

- Steve Corona, Georgetown, TX - Provisional to Approved. The Judges Committee unanimously recommended advancement. Dana moved to promote the judge as recommended. Nancy seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
- Stuart Tait, Regina, SK - Provisional to Approved. The judges committee received many C18 forms. The committee unanimously recommended advancement but, it is expected that his paperwork will be more thorough. Karen moved that we advance him from Provincial to Approved. Dave seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion passed unanimously.
- Melissa Taliana of Inverary, ON– Apprentice to Provisional. The Judges Committee unanimously recommended advancement. Ally moved to promote the judge as recommended. Dave seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Novice Judges Exam- Leerie reported that we are really pleased with the new exam and the feedback has been positive.

Rules Committee- Dana Nichols

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.”

Dana moved to adopt the rule change as suggested by the rules committee. Karen seconded. There was no discussion. The rule change was approved unanimously. It will be effective October 1, 2011.

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 where 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.

Dana moved to table this issue. Kris seconded. There was no discussion. This motion was approved unanimously.

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.

No motion was made.

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 Committee 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.

Dana moved to change 6.2 (d) to American Kennel Club (including Foundation Stock Service). Nancy seconded. A very short discussion followed. The motion passed unanimously. It will be effective October 1, 2011.

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.

Dana moved that we do not adopt the proposal. Dave seconded. There was no discussion. Approved unanimously.

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.

Dave moved that the proposal not be adopted. However, the Board reiterates that Jr. handlers are an important aspect of our sport and they deserve the respect of our competitors and judges. Curtis seconded. Dana recommended that the RDs should be reminded that under aged box or line judges must be approved before line or box judging. The motion passed unanimously. There was some discussion regarding the language on the Jr. Handler pins. Perhaps in the future we would make it inclusive to all Jr. "participants". The marketing committee will discuss this further.

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.

The rules committee received a couple of comments regarding the proposal. Lee would like the rules committee to refine the proposal. Dana encouraged comments from the

board and public regarding this proposal. Dave moved to table the proposal to the August Board meeting. Curtis seconded. There was no vote on the proposal.

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 privileged 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.

There was a discussion about the history of this issue. Kris suggested we make the rule effective immediately. Dana moved that we reject this proposal and, since we feel strongly enough about the rule passed in January, the Board will make this rule effective immediately. Curtis seconded. There was no further discussion and the motion passed unanimously.

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*

This issue was handled in the Executive Director's report. The Board voted to have the Executive Director address the issue with the Regional Directors. If the issue continued to be problematic, the Board could address it in the future.

Election Committee- Dana Nichols

When the election moved to the on line service, Dana thought it was important to have a standard operating procedure for conducting the election. This procedure would handle questions such as how we ratify the results.

- Ratification of Results

The following text was handed out:

Proposed Resolutions Ratifying 2011 Election of Directors and Executive Director

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors wishes to ratify the outcome of the January 2011 election, it is hereby

RESOLVED, that effective immediately the following persons are hereby elected to the Board of Directors of the corporation with terms ending in 2014:

Curtis Smith

Ally Stern

Dave Walt

FURTHER RESOLVED, that effective immediately the following person is hereby elected as the Executive Director of the corporation with a term ending in 2014:

Lee Heighton

FURTHER RESOLVED, that all actions previously taken by the Board of Directors during 2011 are hereby ratified and confirmed.

Dana moved that we ratify the election using this language. Kris seconded. Curtis, Ally and Dave abstained from the vote. There was no further discussion. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

Because of the change to the on line voting service the Board discussed how the ratification and reporting of results will be handled in the future. Dana moved to table this to the August Board meeting. Dave seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

- Election Process Document- Dana reported that the Election Committee will have a proposal at the August meeting.

Nominating Committee- There was no discussion.

Special Committee Reports

Technology Committee: Karen Olsen

There is no update regarding the modification the EJS software. This software update would include an automatic vets setting, warm up countdown (that also allows for practice mode and then continues with the countdown) and enhanced data output. It would also include a head table override feature. This would allow the judge to reset the EJS and get it ready for the race. It is possible that FarmTek will request a research and development fee to update the software. Dana moved that if Dale Smith needed assistance, the Executive Director could appoint Dave Thomas as a technical contact with FarmTek. Kris seconded. Also, Lee will continue working with FarmTek. We will request a quote from FarmTek.

There was no further discussion. Karen Olsen abstained from the vote. In favour: Nancy, Dana, Kris, Curtis, Ally and Dave. The motion passed.

There was discussion about what data should be made available in the EJS output. Lee will submit a list to the technology committee.

Lee requested a separate motion to authorize the purchase of two new replacement EJS. The total cost is \$18,000 for both sets. Dana moved that we purchase the two new sets. Curtis seconded. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

NAFA/Flyball History Committee- Karen Olsen. She is working on it.

Delegate Accrual Committee- Karen Olsen.

Karen has the raw data but it will take many hours to make the data meaningful. She believes many of the teams that are maxing out at 8 delegate votes will still max out. But, we will look into changing to a weekend system. There was some discussion and Leerie requested that Karen provide more data at the August Board meeting.

Old Business:

Leerie requested that we enter an Executive Session to consider a proposal for the Iron Dog Award. The Board entered Executive Session at 1:20 p.m.

The Board exited the Executive Session at 1:32 p.m.

New Business:

- Top Pointed Breed Recognition (NAFA database)- Lee received a request from Alan Conroy (FL) to add an additional statistic page to show top pointed active dog by breed. This should be incorporated into the new database.
- CanAm Venue- deferred to the August 2011 Board meeting in Las Vegas.
- Lee asked that his club (Spring Loaded, a Region 1 team) prefer Region 2. Dave moved that Spring Loaded be granted an exception to prefer Region 2. They can not earn regional championship points this racing year but, should they host a tournament, it would be a Region 2 event. Kris seconded. There was no discussion. No one was opposed. The motion passed unanimously.

Leerie motioned to adjourn the meeting. Dave seconded. No one was opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 2:02 p.m. EDT.