

NAFA® Board of Directors Meeting, August 11 2014, Detroit MI - Minutes:

Present were: Executive Director Lee Heighton
Board of Directors Kim Davis,
Dirk Elber,
Sam Ford,
Nancy Garcia,
John Hendriks
Leerie Jenkins,
Karen Oleson,
Dave Walt

Leerie opened the meeting at 9:45 AM EST.

Dale Smith was unable to attend.

Officers' Reports

Chair's Comments:

Leerie welcomed all attending.

Executive Director's Comments

Lee announced that Dan Rode was stepping down as Regional Director of Region 3. Lee is appointing Elizabeth Theesfeld as acting RD.

For quite some time, the board had been looking at the size of Region 16. Many northern teams do not travel back and forth for southern tournaments and vice versa; traveling through Los Angeles is problematic. We also have two RDs to accommodate the travel.

In the past, it's been hard to look at splitting due to database issues. The new database may provide the tools to do so now. Clubs will be able to declare their region.

Lee is requesting to divide the region east and west of Lompoc, based on present participation in local tournaments.

Effective October 1st, Lee would like to divide California, with Region 16 being the southern portion of the state, and the northern section will be assigned Region 17. Hawaii will be re-assigned as Region 23.

Karen motioned to approve Lee's proposal. Sam seconded. Motion carried.

NOTE: Prior to October 1st, Lee withdrew his proposed regional realignment.

Treasurer's Report

Per Nancy, taxes are completed.

Secretary's Report

- Minutes from the May board meeting were approved on July 16th, 2014.
- Minutes from the May teleconference were approved on July 16th, 2014.

Standing Committee Reports

Judges Committee:

Criteria for Promotion to Provisional Judge Status:

- Once all assignments have been completed, the apprentice judge will forward all forms and all C.17 evaluations to the NAFA® Judges Committee for consideration of promotion to provisional judge status. The committee will consider the application and make a recommendation to the NAFA® Board of Directors regarding promotion. The chairman of the Judges Committee will notify the applicant of the decision of the NAFA® Board of Directors. If promotion occurs, the newly appointed provisional judge has ~~one year~~ *eighteen months* from the date of promotion to complete the provisional judge assignments and apply for promotion to approved judge status.
- Failure to complete any portion of the apprentice judge's training program to the satisfaction of the Board of Directors will result in additional assignments being required of the apprentice judge prior to promotion. The number and nature of the additional assignments are at the discretion of the Board of Directors and will be designed to remediate any area of expertise deemed to be lacking by the apprentice judge.

PROVISIONAL JUDGE:

The provisional judge is to demonstrate the ability to perform the functions of a NAFA® approved judge without supervision.

Assignments:

- Judge a minimum of 25 races at ~~three~~ *five* tournaments on ~~3~~ *5* different weekends. Must judge a minimum of 40 races during one of those assignments. *It is highly recommended that these assignments be ~~done~~ completed in a minimum of two separate Regions.*
- Must be the measuring judge at ~~two~~ *three* tournaments on ~~two~~ *three* different weekends and officially measure a minimum of 8 dogs at each tournament.
- Receive a C.18 evaluation form from both the regional director and tournament director from each assignment
- *After completion of the all assignments obtain a Letter of Recommendation for Promotion from a NAFA® Approved or Supervising Judge.*

Learning Objective:

- Ability to perform the functions of a NAFA® approved judge without relying on the immediate input that is provided by a supervising judge.
- Establish a confident ring presence while managing the racing at a NAFA® sanctioned tournament.

Criteria for Promotion to Approved Judge Status:

- Once all assignments have been completed, the provisional judge will forward all Forms, *Letter of Recommendation* and all C.18 evaluations to the NAFA® Judges Committee for consideration of promotion to approved judge status. The committee will consider the application and make a recommendation to the NAFA® Board of Directors regarding promotion. The chairman of the NAFA® Judges Committee will notify the applicant of the decision of the NAFA® Board of Directors.
- Failure to complete any portion of the provisional judge's training program to the satisfaction of the Board of Directors will result in additional assignments being required of the provisional judge prior to promotion. The number and nature of the additional assignments are at the discretion of the Board of Directors and will be designed to remediate any area of expertise deemed to be lacking by the provisional judge.

Dave motioned to accept the judges committee recommendations, Dirk seconded.

Karen asked that "done" be changed to "completed".

Dave motioned to accept the judges committee recommendations plus the change. Karen seconded. Motion carried.

Criteria for Advancement to Apprentice Judge Status:

- *The novice judge has one year to complete the novice judge assignments and to apply for promotion to apprentice judge status.*

which will go just before:

- The novice judge will be promoted to the level of apprentice judge upon satisfactory completion of all assignments. From the date of promotion, the apprentice judge has one year to complete the apprentice judge assignments and to apply for promotion to provisional judge status.

Dave motioned to accept the judges committee recommendations, Karen seconded.

Motion carried.

Dave announced the CanAm judges for 2014: Geoff Brown, Cindy Henderson, Jo Slade, Josh Watson, Melissa Taliana, Toby Emo and Scott Chamberlain.

Rules Committee:

1. [Clarification of distractions -- Donna Fowler](#)
2. [Modifications to rules for NAFA champions -- <From Board of Directors meeting on 1/17/14>](#)
3. [Possible revision of dog aggression rules -- <From Board of Directors meeting on 1/17/14>](#)
4. [Ovary Sparing Spay and dog in season -- Dan Wood](#)
5. [Iron Dog Award -- Dirk Elber](#)
6. [Requirements to win a 2/3 or 5/5 race -- Glenn Hamilton](#)
7. [Ring Conflict](#)

1. Clarification of distractions -- Donna Fowler

I have a query regarding the interpretation of use of objects that may distract dogs in the lanes. It results from a discussion with a judge regarding a teammate who rolled a tennis ball in the runback area for his dog to retrieve after the run. It was a good discussion; I read the citation in the rulebook (pg 21, h) but it really makes me wonder what a “distraction” is and why we allow tugs to be dragged, swung, and slapped, but a rolling ball is not allowed in the runback area. Is it a distraction if no other dog pays attention to the ball? Why is it not considered a distraction when a dog in an adjoining lane is swinging on a tug and is slung into the opposing teams lane? We allow mattresses at the end of the runback, boxes and buckets in the runback lane, every kind of treat imaginable, but a rolling ball is not allowed. Does that seem odd to anyone but me? I have been hit in the face with a tug and hit with a dog on the end of a swinging tug from opposing teams (separate incidents) and it’s never been considered an infraction; it didn’t distract my dog because I was between the swinging tug and the dog and the swinging dog and my dog.

If you can give me some clarity and some rationale for why the rule is interpreted as it is, maybe it will make more sense. If my questions have anyone else thinking that it doesn't make a lot of sense - maybe it's time for a relook at how you define a “distraction”.

From rule book:

(h) Distractions. Team members shall not distract the opposing team by any means, nor throw any object for their dogs (i.e. balls, toys, Frisbees, dummies, gloves, or treats). Team members are required to pick up any loose balls. The first offense of these infractions shall receive a warning; a second offense and any offense thereafter during the race will result in the loss of the heat.

Rules Committee Comments:

- A distraction is something that actually causes a distraction. As long as it (a rolling ball or other) doesn't distract a dog from another team then it isn't a distraction.

Recommendation:

- Send a reminder to judges that a distraction call should be treated just like interference.
- No rule change required.

Dave motioned to accept the rules committee's recommendation, Sam seconded. Motion carried.

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

2. Modifications to rules for NAFA champions -- <From Board of Directors meeting on 1/17/14>

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.

Need to discuss whether the tournaments used to calculate the average of the six fastest times for each regional champion must satisfy some of the same requirements for tournaments to count for regional points, such as:

- ≥ 50 feet of runback
- Have a minimum of four teams competing
- Include all clubs at the conclusion of the automated draw
- Regular classes limited to fewer than 20 teams shall include all teams at the conclusion of the automated draw
- Multibreed classes limited to fewer than 12 teams shall include all teams at the conclusion of the automated draw

Rules Committee Comments:

- The rules are currently silent on this
- Tabled to Board meeting

Recommendation:

- No recommendation.

After discussions, the following was presented for 8.4:

Section 8.4 – NAFA® Champions

- a) *NAFA® Champions will be named from the regional champions. NAFA® will name Regular and Multibreed Champions.*
 - i) *A minimum of six (6) tournaments must be entered, regardless of their location, to qualify for the NAFA® Championship.*
 - ii) *Of all tournaments entered in the NAFA® fiscal year, the six (6) fastest times from the club's best team placements will be averaged.*
 - (a) *Only times recorded using a NAFA® Board approved EJS will be used in this calculation.*
 - (b) *Only times from tournaments that qualify for regional points will be included in this calculation.*
 - iii) *The club with the lowest average time will be named NAFA® Champions*
 - iv) *If a tie exists, Co-Champions will be named.*

Dave motioned to accept the proposed changes, Dirk seconded. Motion carried.

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

3. Possible revision of dog aggression rules -- <From Board of Directors meeting on 1/17/14>

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

Issues to consider:

- Whether to explicitly state that the aggression rule(s) apply at any time when in conjunction with a NAFA event.
- Consider explicitly stating whether the aggression procedures apply to dogs not listed on a time sheet.
- Consider explicitly stating whether aggression procedures apply to dogs that do not yet have CRNs, and if so, how to track such dogs.

Rules Committee Comments:

- "Whether to explicitly state that the aggression rule(s) apply at any time when in conjunction with a NAFA event."
-The rules currently cover what transpires in and out of the ring
"at any time during the competition"
- Consider explicitly stating whether the aggression procedures apply to dogs not listed on a time sheet."
-The rules currently include any dog registered with a CRN regardless of the entry of the dog in the current competition.
"If a dog shows undue aggression at any time during the competition"

- Consider explicitly stating whether aggression procedures apply to dogs that do not yet have CRNs, and if so, how to track such dogs.
 - Tournament Directors have the right to excuse any aggressive dog without a CRN from the event site.

Recommendation:

Change Section 5.7 - Aggressive Dogs to address the 2nd and 3rd concern

From:

If a dog shows undue aggression at any time during the competition, the Head Judge may excuse the dog from competing. The Head Judge must report any dog excused from competition on NAFA® Form C.12. The Head Judge is responsible for sending the completed form to the NAFA® corporate address within ten days of the incident. Ordinarily, the Regional Director and dog owner/ handler (and/or club owner) should receive a copy of the incident report at the tournament. In the event that this becomes impracticable, copies shall be distributed to those individuals within ten days of the incident.

To:

If a dog shows undue aggression at any time during the competition, the Head Judge may excuse the dog from *the competition*. ~~competing~~. *This includes any dog registered with NAFA regardless of entry in the competition*. The Head Judge must report any dog excused from competition on NAFA® Form C.12. The Head Judge is responsible for sending the completed form to the NAFA® corporate address within ten days of the incident. Ordinarily, the Regional Director and dog owner/ handler (and/or club owner) should receive a copy of the incident report at the tournament. In the event that this becomes impracticable, copies shall be distributed to those individuals within ten days of the incident. *Tournament Directors have the right to remove any aggressive dog without a CRN from the event site.*

Discussion ensued on the recommendations

After discussions, the following was presented for 5.7:

- (a) If a dog shows undue aggression at any time in the ring or during measuring, the Head Judge may excuse the dog from the competition.
- (b) If a dog shows undue aggression at any time outside of the ring in conjunction with a NAFA event, the Regional Director may excuse the dog from the event regardless of entry in the competition.
- (c) Excusal from the competition or event must be reported on NAFA® Form C.12.
 - (i) The NAFA official excusing the dog is responsible for sending the completed form to NAFA® within ten days of the incident.

- (ii) Ordinarily, the Regional Director and dog owner/ handler (and/or club owner) receive a copy of the incident report at the tournament. In the event this is impracticable, copies shall be distributed to those individuals within ten days of the incident.

The C.12 was also modified.

Dave motioned to accept the recommendations, Dirk seconded. Motion carried.

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

4. Question regarding Ovary Sparing Spay and dog in season <Dan Wood>

I have a question from a competitor concerning her dog that will be having an Ovary Sparing Spay (OSS) procedure rather than the typical full hysterectomy spay. While the dog will still have her ovaries, and technically still come in season, it won't have a uterus and will not show signs of being in season.

Q: Is a dog with this kind of spay allowed to compete while still technically in season?

My thought is as long as she isn't showing the typical signs, attracting the competing male dogs, there shouldn't be an issue. I would think that if her dog did still attract the males it would become an issue. I don't think I've known any dog having an OSS.

Thanks,

Dan Wood

Rules Committee Comments:

- The rules committee agreed that a dog with this type of sterilization should not run when it is in heat.
- Section 8.5-Condition of Dogs (c) The head judge has the right to inspect any dog at any time during the tournament. If in the opinion of the head judge a dog is lame, ***in season***, recovering from surgery or cannot safely compete, the dog shall be excused from competition. The head judge must report any dog excused from competition to the executive director on NAFA® Form C.12.
- A dog with this type of spay can still technically be in season, and will fall under the jurisdiction of Section 8.5 as it relates to dogs in season.
- If the head judge inspects the dog and is of the opinion that the dog is in season, the dog shall be excused.

Recommendation:

No rule change required.

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

5. Iron Dog wording -- <From Dirk Elber>

It has been brought to NAFA's attention that nowhere is the Iron Dog Award mentioned in the current NAFA Rule Book. This award was discussed and voted on during the April 2011 Meeting, to be debuted at that year's CanAm. Since the discussions and approval were done in Executive Session, the award was not noted in the changes to the Rule Book released October 1 of that year.

I would recommend that a section be added to Chapter 8 Section 8.1 to define the requirements for the Iron Dog Award. Based on the NAFA News Release on the website dated October 8, 2011, I would suggest the following wording be added just below the Flyball Titles table:

A NAFA IRON DOG is a dog that has earned at least one NAFA point in ten consecutive racing years. IRON DOG plaques will be issued annually after the end of each NAFA racing year.

Rules Committee Comments:

- There was discussion regarding where the information should be placed.

Recommendation:

- Add to the rulebook.
Wording will be presented prior to the August 2014 board meeting.

The following was presented:

Section 8.3 – Iron Dog Award

A dog earning at least one NAFA® point in ten consecutive Racing years is awarded the NAFA® Iron Dog title.

An Iron Dog plaque is awarded.

Karen motioned. Kim seconded. Karen proposed changing 'award' to 'title' and subsequent section #s will change accordingly. Motion carried.

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

6. Requirements to win a 2/3 or 3/5 race -- <From Glenn Hamilton>

Leerie

Good Morning,

Attached is a proposed rule change for your attention and review, hopefully before the next rulebook is issued. I believe that it is required to bring some clarity to our scoring methods by articulating a formal requirement to what is required to win a 2 of 3 or 3 of 5 type of race.

Your prompt consideration is very much appreciated. Thanks in advance!

Cheers!

Glenn Hamilton

Office: 705-436-4417

Mobile: 705-796-3004

Proposed Rule Change:

I would like to propose a rule improvement that would clarify the results of a race when the format is a 2 of 3 or 3 of 5 format.

Typically in our region, we race in a "Best 3 of 5" format which requires a team to win 3 heats to earn the race win. In recent years, NAFA has limited this type of racing to a maximum of 5 heats because the scoring software cannot accommodate more than 5 heats. This creates the possibility of a 2-2 score when in one heat, both teams are unable to finish the race.

This year, we have seen host clubs modifying the requirement to win 3 heats in a 3 of 5 race. The event rules are modified to say that "if no club wins 3 heats, the race win shall go to the team with the fastest time in the race."

In reality, every team has the ability to rerun a flagged race to get the heat win.

When both teams in a 3 of 5 race cannot win three heats, they should not be counted as race winners in the tournament scoring or awarded any tournament points.

As an example, recently a division winner only truly won 3 races yet was awarded the division win with a further three wins earned when they had only completed two heat wins like the other team yet had the faster time.

I would like to propose an extension to the Rules of Racing, Section 8.4 for the October 2014 rulebook that adds the following text in advance of the existing wording:

"When a race format is a 2 of 3 or 3 of 5 format, the winner must win the required number of heats, otherwise both teams shall be declared Race Losers with no tournament points to be awarded."

One of the concerns has been that the scoring software cannot process both teams earning a null score. One of the most popular versions, used at the CanAm and elsewhere, can certainly deal with a 0-0 score so this should not be an issue. Developers should always be prepared for rule changes from NAFA.

Respectfully Submitted,

Glenn Hamilton
venham@rogers.com

Rules Committee Comments:

- The maximum limit of 5 heats was a result of the limit to the number of heats a dog could run rather than limitations of scoring software.
- Discussed what actually determines the winner of a race. The committee agreed that it is the win/loss record of the heats that compose a race which determine the winner.
- A race may end in a tie.

Recommendation:

- Change the rules as follows:

Glossary

From:

Race - a group of heats that determine a victor.

To:

Race - a group of heats

Karen motioned to accept. Dave seconded. Motion carried

Section 8.6 - Race Results

From:

Host clubs must post race results (heat times and wins/losses) for competitors, as soon as possible, following the running of each race.

To:

a) The winner of a race is determined solely by the win/loss record of heats that compose a race. In elimination racing when the win/loss record of heats is equal, best time in the race may be used to resolve the tie.

b) Host clubs must post race results (heat times and wins/losses) for competitors, as soon as possible, following the running of each race.

Karen motioned to accept. Dave seconded. Motion carried

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

8. Ring Conflict: Definition <John Fairbairn, Steve Corona, Karen Oleson, >

The current Ring Conflict definition allows competitors and Head Judges to allow any reason for the conflict. Traditionally the Ring Conflict is used to accommodate clubs that do not have enough time to return to the ring due to the spacing of races for their club in the schedule, however is misused and abused to accommodate competitors who compete with multiple clubs causing multiple slowdowns

during the tournament. The proposed rewording of the definition will define a Ring Conflict as that which it appears to be intended for.

Excused Ring Conflict - A ring conflict that is reported to and accepted by the head judge or Head Table prior to the start of the race.

Proposed: Ring Conflict: An instance in which the racing schedule causes a club to compete in one or more consecutive races.

CHAPTER 6 - REPORTING FOR RACES

(a) If a team is more than three minutes late from the conclusion of the designated warm-up period, the head judge will declare a forfeit of that race by that team unless an excused ring conflict exists. Any ring conflicts must be reported to the head judge or the Head Table prior to the race in question.

CHAPTER 7 - WARM-UPS

(c) When a team is delayed by an excused ring conflict, warm-ups shall not begin until both teams are present in the ring unless warm-ups have been waived. Teams already present and waiting may set their jumps and place their box.

Rules Committee Comments:

- The head judge and head table presently has the right to accept or not accept a requested ring conflict.
- "Ring Conflict" may not be the most accurate term to use

Recommendation:

- The committee, by majority, felt no change was necessary

Karen motioned, John seconded. Motion carried.

Dave indicated he would follow up with the judges.

Meeting broke at 11:10 a.m.

Meeting was back in session at 12:45 pm.

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

Nominating Committee: Nominations have opened.

Election Committee: Discussions with Big Pulse concerning past and present charges.

Marketing Committee: Nothing to report.

Finance:

- Budget

Leerie asks to enter Executive Session at 1 pm.

Exited Executive Session at 2:40 pm.

The board reviewed the budget.

Disciplinary Committee:

- Dexter 110597 – first excusal expunged 05/21/2014
- Dobby 080286 – reinstated 05/13/2014

Disciplinary Committee Report:			Effective Date(s)
Carla Thomas	ED Probation	Conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA flyball	1/17/2014-10/16/2014
Tommie, 100016	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	06/08/2014
Taj, 090259	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	05/04/2104
Tux, 100191	Suspension	Two aggression excusals	10/29/2013
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
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:

- Allie 140231 – 07/26/2014
- Mission 120401 – 07/20/2014
- Tommie 100016 – 06/08/2014 Second Excusal
- Quest 130048 – 05/14/2014
- Taj 090259 – 05/04/2014 Second Excusal
- Dia 140129 – 05/04/2014 Confirmed on appeal

Special Committee Reports

Technology Committee: Committee was given the task to review the EJS specifications and the process is still ongoing. Per Lee, Belgium has also asked for the EJS specifications.

NAFA/Flyball History Committee: Nothing to report

CanAm Steering Committee: Judges have been announced. Closing is August 25th. Also, ring set up assignments were discussed.

Old Business:

The board discussed marketing possibilities.

The board discussed the changes and costs for updating the NAFA brochures.

New Business:

Electronic entry of C.9 data:

Proposed language changes to Chapter 6, Section 6.1m

(i) If results are submitted electronically (data meeting the criteria established by NAFA®):

(a) NAFA® Recording Fees

(1) \$24 (US funds) per scored team for single day tournaments

(2) \$36 (US funds) per scored team for tournaments lasting more than 1 day

(3) When multiple tournaments hosted by the same club occur on successive days, the full fee is due for the tournament with the largest entry and \$12 per team may be deducted from each additional tournament;

(b) completed Tournament Results Form (NAFA® Form C.6)

(c) if applicable, any statements with respect to conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA® flyball;

(d) if applicable, any protest(s);

(e) original C.2 (time sheets) must be retained by the host club for at least 1 year following the tournament;

(f) original C.9 (jump heights form) must be retained by the host club for at least 1 year following the tournament and the C.9 information must be entered into the NAFA® database.

(ii) When results are not submitted electronically:

a) NAFA® Recording Fees

(1) \$30 (US funds) per scored team for single day tournaments

(2) \$42 (US funds) per scored team for tournaments lasting more than 1 day;

(b) original time-sheets (NAFA® Form C.2);

(c) completed Tournament Results Form (NAFA® Form C.6);

(d) if applicable, any statements with respect to conduct prejudicial to the sport of NAFA® flyball;

(e) if applicable, any protest(s);

(f) original C.9 (Jump Heights Form) must be retained by the host club for at least 1 year following the tournament and the C.9 information must be entered into the NAFA® database.

C.6 form was changed accordingly.

Sam motioned to accept new language. Dirk seconded. Motion carried.

Dirk motioned to adjourn, John seconded.

Leerie adjourned the meeting at 5 pm.