

RULES EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Rule Change Proposals for the 2016 ACoD

The following Rule Change Proposals will be submitted for approval to the 2016 Annual Convention of Delegates. New wording is underlined; deleted wording is ~~struck-out~~. Explanations for the proposal are included, along with REC recommendations. THESE ARE PROPOSALS ONLY; those that receive a favorable vote will be considered a change in the *Running Rules and Field Procedures for Lure Field Trials*. Such proposals will be published on the ASFA website after the 2016 ACoD, and will go into effect on January 1, 2017.

----Dawn Gibas and Russ Jacobs, Co-Chairs, REC

All Proposals were referred from the ASFA Board of Directors

(1) Chapter I, General Rules

Section 3. (a) Hounds determined to have a breed disqualification at the time of roll call shall be barred from regular competition and be given the option of entering the Singles stake. Should they choose not to enter the Singles stake, their entry fees shall be refunded. Spayed, monorchid, cryptorchid, and neutered hounds without breed disqualifications may be entered in regular competition.

Effect: To include moving/entering Singles stake if needed at the time of roll call due to a disqualification. Clarifies return of entry fees if the exhibitor chooses not to enter the Singles stake.

Reason: This addresses any gray area about moving a hound to Singles stake as a result of breed disqualifications found during roll call and the return of entry fees if preferred.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(2) Chapter II, Officials

Section 1. Field Trial Secretary (~~must~~ should be a member of the host club)

Effect: To soften the membership requirement for the Field Trial Secretary.

Reason: This addresses concerns that there are times when it is difficult for a club to provide a club member as an experienced Field Trial Secretary for a trial.

The REC recommends that this proposal be REJECTED.

RATIONALE: Given that under our current rules and procedures, clubs are held responsible for the way that field trials are run, the REC thinks that it is important that the Field Trial Secretary have an affiliation with the trial-giving club. However, we would consider a revision permitting a non-club member to serve as FTS for a very large or special event: e.g., an II, Regional Invitational, or breed National Specialty.

(3) Chapter II, Officials

Section 1. #6 The Field Trial Secretary may decline any entries for cause for a period limited to 12 months from the first refusal of entry for cause, but in each instance the Field Trial Secretary shall file good and sufficient reasons for so doing, along with the current mailing address and e-mail address of the affected owner, with the Corresponding Secretary of the ASFA. The Corresponding Secretary will forward a copy of the letter to the affected individual by e-mail and by certified mail.

Effect: This would facilitate communication by email in addition to USPS or Certified Mail. This also clarifies and makes consistent the title of “Field Trial Secretary” in several places.

Reason: This allows the Corresponding Secretary of the ASFA to provide notification to an owner by email and certified mail instead of just certified mail, thereby increasing the ability to contact a person within a shorter timeframe.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(4) Chapter II, Officials

Section 3. #3. It is strongly recommended that, whenever possible, a field clerk be placed on the field to collect paperwork. The prompt collection after each course allows the field clerk to check for the judge’s signature, correct additions verify that the judge’s scores are added correctly, and promotes a smoother flow of paperwork.

Effect: Clarifies that field clerks should be on the field if at all possible to assist with checking judges sheets to make sure that they are signed by the judge and the addition is correct.

Reason: This addresses concerns that the field clerk is not correcting a judge’s scores, but checking them to ensure that they are correct.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(5) Chapter II, Officials

Section 7, The Field Committee. #1 The field committee will make every attempt to conduct the trial in accordance with what is published in the premium list. Changes may only be made out of necessity, not convenience. This includes the field committee and their assignments, judges, lure operators, and course plan. Such changes shall be posted at the trial site.

Effect: To ensure that any changes to the published premium list are provided to the participants at field trials.

Reason: This addresses concerns that changes are not formally announced to those with hounds entered at field trials.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(6) Chapter IV, Scheduling the Meet

Section 1. #1. An approved date must be obtained for a lure field trial. The requesting club must be sanctioned by the American Sighthound Field Association. Applications for dates must be submitted ~~in writing~~ to the Scheduling Committee either by use of the date request form or the on-line date request at www.asfa.org; such applications must be submitted by the Field Trial Secretary or an authorized member of the host club at least 45 days prior to the date requested.

Effect: This changes the words “submitting in writing” to allow submission either via the date request form or ASFA website. This is to clarify that requesting dates may be done electronically.

Reason: This clarifies how the scheduling of field trials is to be done.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(7) Chapter IV, Scheduling the Meet

Section 3. ~~Two~~ One sample ~~copies~~ copy of the premium list and entry form must be sent to the Scheduling Committee Chair no less than 45 days prior to the approved date. A Field Trial Secretary may not ~~mail out~~ publish or distribute the premium list until such time as it has been approved ~~for mailing~~ by the Scheduling Committee Chair.

Effect: This changes the current language from “two sample copies” to one sample copy being sent to the Scheduling Committee Chair. It also states that a Field Trial Secretary may not “mail out” and/or distribute a premium list until it has been approved by the Scheduling Committee Chair.

Reason: This addresses concerns that two copies of a premium list are not needed for the Scheduling Committee Chair and that premium lists are not distributed prior to approval, which can lead to confusion as to which premium list is the most current.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(8) Chapter IV, Scheduling the Meet

Section 8, 3(t), 4(e), and 5(e).

3. The following items must appear within the premium list, in approximately the order indicated (only minor deviations from the indicated order will be approved):

(t) ~~Return address and directions to the site.~~ Address to which entries should be mailed.

u) Directions to the trial site.

4. It is highly recommended that the following information be included in the premium list mailing.

~~(e) Return address and/or directions to the trial site.~~

5. Optional information may be included in premium lists, so long as it is consistent with these running rules and is pertinent to the trial(s). The following items are specifically allowed:

~~(e) Return address and/or directions to the trial site.~~

(f) (e) Reasonable health restrictions.

Effect: This addresses language conflicts in Chapter IV, Section 8, 3(t), 4(e), and 5(e) because they state must, highly recommended, and optional, which is confusing. By stating the need for the address to which the entries are to be mailed and the directions to the trial site/location as required in #3(t) and (u), the confusion is removed.

Reason: This addresses possible confusion between sections and provides consistency.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(9) Chapter V, Running the Meet

Section 2. Except for national breed specialties, any entry limits shall be restricted to limitations in overall number of hound entries accepted at a trial. National breed clubs may choose, in addition, to require that any hound entered in a national breed specialty must have earned 20 ASFA points, or equivalent points in its country of residence, or must be a Field Champion of Record. If a national breed club chooses to impose such a requirement, proof of non-ASFA title and non-ASFA points for hounds should be in the form of a photocopy of the certificate, or page of formal ~~printing~~ publication and included with the entry.

Effect: Clarifies that the points or title needed to establish eligibility must be published in a formal publication.

Reason: This addresses what is acceptable proof of title and what can be used for submission with an entry.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(10) Chapter V, Running the Meet

Section 13 (c).

(c) Bench stake: for hounds of any individual breed; an entry shall consist of a single hound with proof on file with the ASFA of a conformation champion title from the AKC, CKC or both or a conformation grand champion title from the UKC.

In all non-regular stakes there will be only one winner per breed with no championship points awarded. Hounds entered in the Singles stake are not eligible to enter non-regular stakes.

Effect: To make it clear that hounds in that are entered in the Singles stake at any trial offering non-regular stakes are not eligible to compete in these non-regular stakes.

Reason: This brings clarity to what hounds are eligible for non-regular stakes.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(11) Chapter VI, Records & Fees Forwarded to the ASFA

Section 1 (b). ~~Names and complete addresses of all judges and their city and state of residence and the complete mailing address of the Feld Trial Secretary.~~

Effect: To be consistent with previous change for Chapter IV, Section 8, 3b.

Reason: This provides consistency across the Running Rules.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(12) Chapter XI, Licensing of Judges, Licensing for Additional Breeds

Section 5: Any judge regularly licensed in at least three breeds may seek an additional breed by meeting the following requirements; so long as those requirements are met, Singles stake shall also count as an additional breed.

(a) Judge provisionally the breed or Singles stake for which the license is sought at no less than three trials with three different licensed judges. (Judging five hounds per breed is a requirement for the first three breeds only and does not apply to any breeds thereafter, or to Singles stake.)

Section 10. Provisional judges may judge ~~Singles and Limited stake stakes~~, however, the assignments shall not count toward fulfilling their licensing requirements.

Effect: To make it easier to obtain the required number of dogs for additional breeds in pursuit of the regular judges license.

Reason: To allow potential judges in areas not hosting large trials to obtain numbers for additional breeds.

The REC recommends that this proposal be ACCEPTED.

(13) Appendix, Revising the Running Rules

Section 9. A proposal that has received a favorable vote at the Annual Convention of Delegates shall be considered a change to the Running Rules and Field Procedures for Lure Field Trials. Such proposals shall be posted on the ASFA website, and any other method of publication as approved by the Board of Directors and shall go into effect ~~January 4~~ on October 1 following the ACoD ratification.

Effect: To make approved rules effective on an earlier date.

Reason: This addresses concerns on the long period of time between approving rules and their becoming effective.

The REC recommends that this proposal be REJECTED.

RATIONALE: There was no proposed date that accompanied this proposal for the REC to consider, therefore the October 1 date was suggested by the REC to provide an opportunity for discussion of the proposal. The implications of such a change include:

- There is a cost to modifying the rules and records and whatever else may be affected by a particular rule. A single date, such as the current January 1 date, achieves some economy in such changes.
- Impactful changes are probably best implemented on January 1 in order to allow the time for modifications to take place, as well as to coincide with our standard running calendar (such as changing the definition of a veteran for a particular breed).
- An earlier implementation date would put more pressure on other committees and officers to get their business completed sooner in the year.
- A change in the middle of the year could affect the Top 20 and how it is tallied.

(14) Various places in the Rulebook

The phrase Field Secretary appears in many places in the Running Rules, rather than the more appropriate Field Trial Secretary. REC is requesting permission to do a global search of the Running Rules, and replace Field Secretary or field trial secretary with Field Trial Secretary wherever it appears.

Effect: Housekeeping; to refer consistently to the position.

Reason: The position should be consistently, and correctly, referenced throughout the Running Rules.

The REC recommends that this be ACCEPTED.

(15) Various places in the Rulebook

The phrasing or wording for Singles stake appears several different ways; Singles, Singles Stakes and Singles Stake. Capitalization of this phrase also varies. REC is requesting to do a global search of the Running Rules, and replace the varying phrases with Singles stake wherever it appears.

Effect: Housekeeping to refer consistently to Singles stake.

Reason: The phrase should be used and referred to consistently throughout the Running Rules.