Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

Present were: Executive Director Lee Heighton

Board of Directors

Kim Davis, Sam Ford, Nancy Garcia, Leerie Jenkins, Karen Oleson, Curtis Smith, Dale Smith.

Leerie opened the meeting at 9:51 am MST.

Ally Stern and Dave Walt were unable to attend.

Chair's Comments:

Leerie sincerely thanked the board of directors for their hard work, as well as a special thanks to the outgoing board members, Curtis Smith and Ally Stern for their hard work and all their accomplishments while in office.

The BOD unanimously approved the date and location of the 2014/2015 AGM for January 10-11, 2015, in Athens, GA in conjunction with the Double Dog Dare flyball tournament.

NAFAscore Update – Leerie has been working with Emma and a number of people using NAFAScore to score tourneys and have had good results and feedback. We will plan on publishing in the near future to the website. There is an additional standalone piece for the Online C.9 data entry, which is published on database/public reports section of the website, and to be used for tracking judging measuring assignments. Plans include having the C.3 and C.6 forms online as well.

Executive Director's Comments:

Lee received a request from Carla Thomas to lift her suspension. Lee has decided that he would lift the suspension effective immediately and place her on probation through October 16, 2014. Sam moved that the board ratify Lee's action. Dale seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Lee communicated a letter he had from one of his regional directors to be able to declare what region in which he could vote. The complexity of administrating preferred regions for a judge or other service votes is not feasible at this time. Several alternatives were suggested.

Treasurer's Report:

- Directors Insurance has been set up on auto-payment from the bank.
- Accountants have completed the 1099s and will be sent out soon.
- Quickbooks software will be upgraded to the latest version.

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

- 72,736 points on American Express account
- Will also be checking on recurring charges
- Discussed transitioning treasurer duties.

Secretary's Report: Nothing to report.

Standing Committee Reports

Election Committee:

Leerie wanted to thank all the committee members, for their time and effort ...

• Ratification of Results

Leerie moved that the Board enter into Executive Session at 10:44 am.

The Board exited Executive Session at 11:19 am.

The board elected new officers and ratified the BigPulse election results.

Meeting broke at 11:20 PM.

Meeting back in session at Noon.

Leerie called the meeting back to order.

Judges Committee:

- Jeanne Harem, Bessemer, AL Provisional to Approved. Jeanne was unanimously recommended by the rules committee for promotion. Karen moved to accept the recommendation. Curtis seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
- Anthony Pirnat, Westminster, CO Provisional to Approved. Anthony was unanimously recommended by the rules committee for promotion. Karen moved to accept the recommendation. Dale seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Rules Committee:

- 1. Best effort to complete a heat -- Ally Stern
- 2. Fastest times reported with tournament results: Breakout vs. non-breakout -- Dana Hanson
- 3. <u>Revisions to lottery draws for limited tournaments -- Dawn Young</u>
- 4. <u>Specifying the timing system used on the C.6 Tournament Results Form -- Leerie Jenkins</u>
- 5. Modifications to rules for regional champions -- <Discussion among board members>

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

- 6. Modifications to rules for NAFA champions -- Leerie Jenkins
- 7. <u>Clarification of experience required for Judge of the Year -- < Discussion among board members></u>
- 8. Service vote eligibility for newly promoted approved judges -- Leerie Jenkins and Dave Walt
- 9. Minimum number of assignments for newly promoted approved judges -- Leerie Jenkins and Dave Walt

1. Best effort to complete a heat -- Ally Stern

I did some research regarding team sports and what other organizations say about teams deciding to pre-maturely stop competing while the other team is still on the field. Here's one example:

<u>http://www.theglobeandmail.com/sports/olympics/badminton-scandal-is-a-reminder-of-sports-dark-thread-cheating/article4457025/</u>

The second paragraph inspires me. "Eight women – a doubles teams from China, two from South Korea and one from Indonesia – were thrown out of the London Games for violating badminton's code of conduct, "not using one's best efforts to win a match" and play that undermined the sport."

I am asking the Rules Committee to review our Code of Ethics. I would like to see a re-write of (g) in our Code of Ethics. Here's my idea for the new wording:

(g) Regional Directors should warn teams and file unsportsmanlike conduct charges if teams are obviously and repeatedly holding back their dogs in tournaments to gain an unfair advantage. Teams should always use their best effort to complete the heat.

Recommendations: The committee noted that a similar proposal was discussed at the January 2013 board meeting at which the decision was made to accept the recommendations of the committee that no action be taken since "it would be extremely difficult to codify all possible circumstances for which it might not be possible to run all four dogs." Similarly, during the discussion of the above proposal, the committee thought many of the same potential problems and difficulties would arise when trying to codify what is meant by "best effort." Therefore, the committee recommended that the board not adopt the proposal.

Sam motioned to accept the recommendation of the rules committee. Karen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Fastest times reported with tournament results: Breakout vs. non-breakout -- Dana Hanson

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

<Paraphrased question>: Since NAFA now allows title points for breakout times, should the fastest time for each team reported with the tournament results be the actual fastest time, or fastest non-breakout time?

Recommendations: During discussion of the above question, the committee drew attention to the following: 1) The fastest time of a team is sometimes used by the host club of a tournament to break ties for divisional placements; 2) The fastest time may be used by NAFA to calculate the average of four fastest times for a club's four best regional tournament placements as the tie-breaker for regional championship placements; and 3) The fastest time can be used by NAFA to calculate the average of six fastest best times for a club's six best tournament placements for the calculation/determination of the overall NAFA champions for the year (from amongst the regional champions).

With regard to #1, since a breakout results in a loss for that particular heat, it is unlikely that host clubs use breakout times to break ties for divisional placements. With regard to #2 and #3 above, the committee members unanimously agreed that only non-breakout times should be used. However, it is important to note that clubs vying for a regional and/or NAFA championship are almost always seeded in the top division where the breakout rule does not apply.

The committee recommended that the board consider the feasibility of adding another field to the NAFA database to track the fastest non-breakout time for those teams that break out during a tournament. Such tracking would also require associated changes to the NAFAScore and fbscore tournament scoring programs along with the C.2 Time Sheet Form. Furthermore, such a change could add extra work to those who score tournaments since they would need to determine the fastest non-breakout times for any teams that broke out during the event. On a related note, the committee also recommended that breakout times be included in the seeding lists/reports maintained as part of the NAFA database since people enjoy seeing how their teams stack up to others.

In summary, the committee recommended that the board carefully weigh the burden of reporting/tracking both the fastest time and the fastest non-breakout time for each team that breaks out and the associated changes that would need to be made to the NAFA database and the C.2 Time Sheet Form against the possibility of a breakout time being used as a tie-breaker for a regional championship and/or the determination of a NAFA championship.

The board discussed the recommendations. Karen moved to change the C.2 form to indicate that the "Fastest Time" should be the fastest <u>non-breakout</u> time. Dale seconded. Discussion: Fbscore and NAFAScore users should be notified to be sure that the fastest time be the fastest non-breakout time. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Revisions to lottery draws for limited tournaments -- Dawn Young

<Portion of original request>: I would like to propose that NAFA reviewing the current lottery system and recommend the following:

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

- If a club submits one entry into a limited tournament, regardless of the class, they should automatically be awarded a spot. It is my understanding that all Regular teams are awarded a spot (if available) and if it doesn't fill, a club's second, third, fourth, etc. entries are then added into the class. This should be the same in the Open class.

- In order to be eligible for a lottery entry, the club must be active. Participation in a minimum of (3) NAFA sanctioned tournaments, in Regular class, during the fiscal year, unless the club is newly formed, should be required to maintain active club status. Additionally that club must have at least three active dogs on it to be considered active; you cannot run in tournaments if there are no active dogs. This should reduce, and hopefully eliminate, phantom club entries.

- If a club gets two or more entries accepted in the lottery (they win two or more spots during the draw), they are not given the option to withdraw any entries; they should be mandated to pay for all spots they won. This should reduce or eliminate clubs submitting multiple entries in an effort to increase their odds of winning. In the instance I referenced above, it turns out there are not enough dogs on their own team to fill all of the spots, so now they are opening up their Open teams to people on other clubs that did not get in through the lottery.

Recommendations: With regard to the first bullet in the proposal, the outcome of a draw for a tournament with one or more limited classes depends on the limits set by the host club. Each limited class has an independent limit and each class is handled identically. However, when entries for one or more classes exceed the sanctioned limit, and entries for one or more classes do not meet the sanctioned limit, the size of the classes that have excess entries will be expanded by the automated draw to add excluded teams up to the maximum declared total number of teams permitted in all limited classes. In such a scenario, preference is given in order to: Regular, Multibreed, Open, Veterans. The committee does not recommend changing the expansion process so that the Open Class is expanded first to the disadvantage of Regular and/or Multibreed. To provide the opportunity for more teams to compete in the Open Class, the host club would need to simply set a relatively high limit for the Open Class.

With regard to the second bullet in the proposal, requiring that entries only come from active or newly formed clubs would likely not prevent abuse of the limited entry process since people can easily shuffle their dogs between clubs, newly formed or otherwise. At the May 2012 board meeting, the board accepted the following recommendations of the Rules Committee when the issue was last raised: "...[S]ubmitting entries from 'ghost clubs' for the purpose of gaining an unfair advantage in a draw is against the spirit and intent of the rules and consequently unsportsmanlike conduct. When situations such as this arise, the committee recommends the board defer to the Executive Director for additional review and possible punitive action." The present committee had the same recommendations.

With regard to the third bullet in the proposal, the committee noted that disallowing the withdrawal of any entries would disadvantage those clubs who wish to get into the most limited class(es). For example, if members of a club prefer to run in a limited multibreed class, but they are willing to run in a different limited class if necessary, they should not be forced to risk being left out of the tournament by submitting a single entry for multibreed which may be the class with the lowest limit.

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

In conclusion, the committee recommended not adopting the proposal.

Karen moved to accept the recommendation of the committee. Dale seconded. Discussion: It remains the host club's responsibilities to make trade-offs on the limits offered in each class, to best suit the event. As well, if abuse of the current limited draw process is observed, these situations should be brought to the executive director immediately for examination (not several weeks after the event). Motion carried unanimously.

4. Specifying the timing system used on the C.6 Tournament Results Form -- Leerie Jenkins

At the August meeting, the board passed some new language for this year's (10/01/2013+) rulebook requiring the use of "NAFA Board approved" EJS in order for times to count for regional/overall NAFA championship [tie-breaking] purposes.[...] I think it would be a good idea to add something to the C.6 form, to have the host club specifically state what sort of timing system was used at their tournament.

Recommendations: The committee unanimously agreed that: 1) the C.6 Tournament Results Form be revised to include a check box indicating whether the entire event was timed using a NAFA board approved EJS; and 2) a NAFA board approved EJS must be used for an entire event for fastest times to be used in the tie-breaker process with regard to a regional championship and/or the determination of a NAFA championship. Furthermore, the committee recommended the following changes to the last sentences of Sections 8.3(g) and 8.4(b) in the Corporate Policies and Procedures (page 46, PDF page 53) (underline indicates additions and strikethrough indicates deletions):

Only times recorded using a NAFA Board approved EJS will be used in this calculation. This calculation will only use times from events that were timed entirely under NAFA board approved electronic judging systems.

If a board approved EJS were to fail mid-tournament, the above change would eliminate situations in which a club vying for a regional and/or NAFA championship has the unfair advantage of running under the EJS more than other clubs vying for a championship, perhaps simply because of the timing of when the EJS failed or because one ring may have a functioning EJS while another ring is being manually timed.

Some members of the committee recommended that the change apply to the current racing year. NAFA officials would retroactively investigate whether there would be any effect on tournaments that have already been run.

Karen moved to accept the recommendations of the committee. Dale seconded. Karen withdrew her motion.

Karen moved to change Section 8.3(g) and 8.4(b)

<u>From:</u> "This calculation will only use times from events that were timed entirely under NAFA board approved electronic judging systems."

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

<u>To:</u> "Only times recorded at events timed entirely under NAFA board approved EJS will be used in this calculation."

Curtis seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Karen moved to revise the C.6 to include a checkbox that the entire event was timed using an NAFA board approved EJS. Curtis seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Karen moved to make this retroactively effective October 1, 2013. Curtis seconded. Discussion: Regional Directors and Judges will be reminded to report any EJS malfunctions or variances during an event. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting breaks at 12:30 pm

Meeting reconvenes at 1:00 pm

5. Modifications to rules for regional champions -- <Discussion among board members>

Board members discovered there is an inconsistency in the rule book when only one tournament qualifies for regional points in a given year. The first sentence of Section 8.3(e) in the CP&P (page 45, PDF page 52) states that only one tournament needs to qualify for regional points (assuming all other criteria are met). However, the presumed intended interpretation of the "up to 80 percent" stipulations in Section 8.3(f) implies that at least 2 tournaments must qualify for regional points (since 80% of 1 is 0.8 which gets truncated to 0, while 80% of 2 is 1.6 which gets truncated to 1). The Rules Committee was tasked with removing the inconsistency making sure to maintain the ability to win a regional championship even if only one tournament qualifies for regional points (assuming all other pertinent criteria are met).

Recommendations: The committee recommended the following changes to the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of Section 8.3(f) of the Corporate Policies & Procedures (page 45, PDF page 52) (underline indicates additions):

For regions that host 7 or fewer tournament weeks, regional points are to be accumulated from up to 80 percent, <u>but no less than one</u>, of the tournaments regardless of the number of tournaments held per week....[etc.]

When a region hosts events in more than 7 tournament weeks, a club will earn regional points from up to 80 percent<u>, but no less than one</u>, of the tournament weeks in that region based on the club's best finish from any event to a maximum of 10 tournaments held in separate tournament weeks...[etc.]

Sam moved to accept the recommendation of the rules committee. Karen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

6. Modifications to rules for NAFA champions -- Leerie Jenkins

I think it might help if the overall NAFA champs language makes it clear that to be eligible, you have to have 6 eligible/qualifying times (e.g., you can't just go to one multibreed tourney that counts, run a time, then go to 5 multibreed tourneys that only have 2 teams in the class, and come away with a one-time "average" to compare vs. clubs that have a 6 tournament time average).

Recommendations: The committee agreed that some modification/clarification within the rule book would be helpful. What follows is the recommended rewording of Section 8.4(b) of the Corporate Policies and Procedures (page 46, PDF page 53) (underline indicates additions) with some additional discussion below as to what number should go in place of "<???>":

A minimum of six (6) tournaments must be entered, regardless of their location, to qualify for the NAFA Championship. Of all tournaments entered in any competition year (inside or outside of a team's region), the six (6) fastest times from the club's best team placements <u>in tournaments with at least <???> teams competing in the</u> <u>contested class</u> will be averaged...[etc.]

However, some members of the committee thought that, if applicable, the average should include tournaments with as few as 2 teams competing in the contested class arguing that there is no advantage gained in speed from having only one opponent in your division, while other committee members believed the minimum should be 4 teams since a 4-team minimum is found in other portions of the rule book (e.g., tournaments that qualify for regional points; minimum number of teams required in a tournament). Thus, no consensus was reached by the committee.

The board discussed the different interpretations of what this change might mean. Dale moves to table this to the next board meeting and asking the rules committee for information to show if the issue exists and how it affects regions. Karen seconded. Discussion: Also integrate the other regional championship requirements (length of runback, excluded teams and limits, etc) for tournaments in the wording for NAFA Champion. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Clarification of experience required for Judge of the Year -- < Discussion among board members>

After a discussion among board members, it was suggested that the rule book clarify that a nominee for Judge of the Year must have at least five years of experience at the approved level or higher.

Recommendations: The committee unanimously recommended the following changes to Section 8.7(a) of the Corporate Policies and Procedures (page 47, PDF page 54) (underline indicates additions and strikethrough indicates deletions):

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

The judge must be in good standing with NAFA and must have been a judge for at least five years at the time of nomination at least five years (60 months) of experience at the approved level or higher at the end of the nomination period.

Dale moves to accept the recommendations of the rules committee. Sam seconded. Motion carries unanimously.

8. Service vote eligibility for newly promoted approved judges -- Leerie Jenkins and Dave Walt

<Paraphrased>: Request that the Rules Committee discuss whether it is necessary to explicitly state within the rule book that all approved and supervising judges on September 30 receive a service vote.

Recommendations: The committee agreed that some clarification within the rule book would be helpful. The following are the recommended changes to Section 2(b) of Article VII in the bylaws (underline indicates additions and strikethrough indicates deletions):

Service Votes. An individual who serves <u>serving in their position</u> as a NAFA Board member, Regional Director, or an approved or supervising judge <u>as of September 30</u> shall receive one (1) delegate vote <u>for the upcoming election</u> for each form of service rendered, up to a total of three (3) delegate votes, over and above any delegate votes otherwise earned.

Dale motioned to approve the recommendations of the rules committee. Sam seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

9. Minimum number of assignments for newly promoted approved judges -- Leerie Jenkins and Dave Walt

[Request that the Rules Committee discuss the] minimum assignments for (newly) approved status judges - judges who become approved during a year, so are approved for only a partial year, have been treated as exempt from the minimum judging requirements (or perhaps they must have 3 when considering approved assignments AND provisional assignments together? Consider 2 extreme cases. Case 1: judge gets moved to approved during October of a year (teleconference). Case 2: judge gets approved during September of a year (teleconference). Could both of these cases judge less than 3 events total (as an approved and/or provisional judge), and still be Approved in good standing?

Recommendations: The committee unanimously recommended the following change to the beginning portion of Chapter 2(i) from the Corporate Policies and Procedures (underline indicates additions):

(i) In each racing year, a head judge must judge at least one division in three tournaments on different weekends. The judge must be the measuring head judge on one of those three weekends. <u>If the judge transitioned from</u>

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

provisional to approved status during the racing year, provisional and approved assignments will be combined to meet the minimum number of required assignments.

Karen moved to approve the recommendations of the rules committee. Sam seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Nominating Committee: Nothing to report

Marketing Committee: Nothing to report

Finance Committee:

Leerie moved that the Board enter into Executive Session.

The Board exited Executive Session at 3:45 pm.

The Board reviewed preliminary financial results of last year's CanAm expenses and year-to-date finances.

Based on increasing expenses and some reduction in tournament entries, the board has tasked the finance committee to study the current environment and projections and make recommendations on both the income and expense sides. Due to the rate at which some of these changes are occurring, it may be prudent to take immediate action in advance of the finance committee's further review.

Curtis moved that a 20% increase be applied to NAFA recording fees for NAFA events starting on or after March 1st 2014. Previously sanctioned tournaments affected by this change, can alter their sanctioning to adjust their entry fees. Dale seconded.

It has been several years since recording fees were adjusted. We remain an exceptional value in the realm of dog sports. Motion carried unanimously.

Karen moved to publish a new rulebook to reflect the new fee structure. Dale seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Disciplinary Committee:

Disciplinary Committee Report:			Effective Date(s)
Carla Thomas	ED Probation	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	1/17/2014-10/16/2014
Jaimie Weber	Probation	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	6/1/2013-5/31/2014
Tux, 100191	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	10/29/2013
Dobby, 080286	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	11/4/2012
Roxie, 051102	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	8/22/2011
Gimli, 040608	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	11/17/2008
Junior, 000165	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	07/13/2002
Tucker, 960374	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	06/24/1996
Marion Brinkman	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely

Board of Directors Meeting Denver, Colorado

Abridged Minutes January 17, 2014

Mike Mattos	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Janet Nelson Morris	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Dave Mueller	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Cheryl Mueller	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely
Jennifer Nelson	Suspension	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	Indefinitely

Review Panel:

- Kelsey 071127 07/14/2013 Appeal, Excusal Upheld
- Zoe 120472 10/20/2013
- Tux 100191-10/29/2013 Second Excusal
- Zip 111052 11/16/2013
- Ryder 120736 12/07/2013 (Mat time)

The Board asked the Rules committee to review the aggression excusal rules.

Special Committee Reports

<u>Technology Committee:</u> Nothing to report.

NAFA/Flyball History Committee: Nothing to report.

Old Business: None

New Business:

• The Treasurer and Vice-Chair are tasked to propose a transitioning plan for the Treasurer's duties.

Curtis moved to recess. Karen seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting recesses until the AGM.