

GWPCA Board meeting  
April 17, 2013  
Minutes

Present: Ray Calkins, Bob Perry, Liz Dixon, Garnett Persinger, Chuck Casanova, Erika Brown, Lori Sargent. Guests: Pat Laurans, Judy Cheshire & Greg DuBois

President Calkins called the meeting to order at 8:37 pm EDT.

**Approval of minutes from March meeting** Garnett moved to approve the minutes from the March BOD meeting, Bob seconded, motion unanimously approved

Report on black/white issue – Pat Laurans – See report below:

**A Meeting of GWP Fanciers and Breeders Regarding the Black/White Color in our Standard**

In February, 2013 a group of long-time GWP fanciers/breeders, under the leadership of Pat Laurans, AKC Delegate for the GWPCA, came together to discuss the issue of how the GWP standard addresses color in our breed. They talked about how it confuses not only our own fancy, but judges of the breed as well, and how it has become a divisive wedge within our ranks. Those in attendance either in person or by Skype were: Pat Laurans, Jane Alston, Joy Brewster, Judy Cheshire, Lisa George-Ramirez, Laura Reeves and Helen Witt.

We had hoped that an open discussion would enable us to work together to move this issue forward to a clearer resolution, and we believe it did.

Below is the Agenda .The comments are the result of our discussion.

Agenda and Discussion

**1. Purpose of this gathering – Discuss Black and White in GWPs**

To get together to discuss a clarification of the breed standard for breeders, judges and the general public. To better define the current wording and the intent of the Standard. To encourage a unification of those in the breed, who have the betterment of the breed at heart, and who want to see it move forward in a positive direction rather than perpetuate misunderstanding and controversy.

**2. Historical Background**

We had a discussion of how the original standard was written. We acknowledged that there was no written conformation standard from the country of origin at that time, and that the Danish standard which did not allow black and white dogs, helped guide the thought process. The country of origin accepts black and white, but does limit the percentage of dogs bred and registered. “Any black in the coat” was added to the AKC standard as a severe penalty when AKC strongly discouraged disqualifications.....that standard committee felt that the wording was the strongest that they could include. Unfortunately, it made the subject of color, very misleading and nebulous. Their intent was not to allow black and white dogs or the potential of tri-color dogs.

**3. Pros/Cons of B/W color in GWPs**

Discussion followed regarding the reasons why to or not to include black and white dogs in our standard. We agreed that although a black/white dog will not improve the depth of liver pigment nor darken eye color, that the color in itself will in no way do any genetic harm and is

not associated with any known health issues. A quality dog, regardless of color, is a benefit in a breeding program. We all realized that black was a dominant color and requires thoughtfulness and responsibility in a breeding program. We also understood that individuals are currently already producing black/white and solid black dogs and that will not change. Education about the inheritance of coat color should be provided and should be ongoing.

Pros – Black and white dogs are accepted in the FCI standard and in most other countries. Therefore, acceptance of the color would bring the AKC standard in line with others.

Cons – Black is a dominant color and it will require continuing education for the understanding of correct breeding practices and neither the AKC nor the parent club are able to regulate the decisions of breeders.

**4. Why is there so much diversity of opinion and so much emotion regarding this subject?**

This goes back to how each individual interprets the standard. Some feel that a black/white dog is a “severe penalty” and equate it with an over or undersized dog, a poor coat or excessive grooming. They think that the quality of the dog should be considered and that the black/white color should be merely a penalty. Others feel that the standard calls for a liver/white dog with a liver head, liver ears and brown nose –and that black/white dogs are not accommodated in the standard. Their interpretation is that as the standard is presently written, black/white dogs do not meet the standard at all, and that showing them is not respectful of our standard. It’s a conflict of “upholding the integrity of the standard as it’s currently written” vs. the personal feelings one may have about a good dog that is not a color that fits the standard. There also continues to be a general lack of knowledge about the inheritance of coat color in this breed.

**5. What is the responsibility of the Judges Education Committee presently and in the future?**

The JEC must continue to educate judges on the intent of the standard as it is currently written. It must help breeders understand the inheritance of coat color in the breed and the best practices for utilizing black/white dogs in a breeding program. If and when the standard changes, the JEC will facilitate that education in the judging community, whether it be to accept black/white dogs or to disqualify them.

**6. What should we share with the GWPCA BOD regarding the thoughts/recommendations we have as a result of this gathering?**

The entire group agreed that the standard needs clarification – either disqualify or accept black/white GWPs. It was also agreed that if black/whites were accepted, that solid black should be a disqualification and that the acceptable pattern of color on black/white dogs should be defined. Everyone was comfortable with wording that liver/white is preferred and black/white is acceptable.

**7. If the GWPCA BOD decides to once again establish a Standards Committee, what is the general process?**

A committee should be established by the BOD to review the standard and decide the issues to be addressed, remembering that once the standard is opened, it cannot be reopened for 5 years from when it was last approved. AKC should be notified of the decision to review/revise the standard and the membership of the GWPCA need to be apprised of what the committee is doing. Input from the membership needs to be solicited and publicized prior to any vote.

Report on Versatility Committee – Greg DuBois – see report below:

By GWPCA Board approval, the Versatility Committee resumed work on the first revision to the rules and guidelines of the Versatility Program in March of 2013. The group consists of these original members of the committee from 2006, Greg DuBois, Barb Tucker, Sharon Jahn and Carol Cagle. During the BOD meeting in March 2013, Greg requested suggestions for a new member as another original member stated she was willing to assist the committee but could not promise 100% participation. Kay Braddock was then added to the committee.

Revision to the Versatility Program involved discussion of various matters. The issues that were voted on are as follows:

1. Adding Grand Champion to the Bench area
2. Adding retriever hunt test titles to the Field area
3. Adding relatively new AKC obedience titles to the Obedience/Rally area
4. Removing Canine Good Citizen from the Obedience/Rally area
5. Lowering the point value of Rally Advanced Excellent from 6 to 5 in the Obedience/Rally area.
6. Adding a Therapy Dog title to the Versatility Program.

The following is how the committee voted on each issue:

1. Not to add Grand Champion to the Bench area.
2. To add the retriever hunt test titles to the Field area.
3. To add Beginner Novice for 1 point, Graduate Novice for 3 points and Graduate Open for 5 points to the Obedience/Rally Area.
4. To remove Canine Good Citizen from the Obedience/Rally area
5. To lower the point value of Rally Advanced Excellent from 6 to 5.
6. To not add Therapy Dog to the program

The predominate feeling that drove the committee's decisions was that the V program is, for the most part, solid and would not benefit from the clutter and complication resulting from adding too many options. Adding the Beginner Novice level obedience title facilitated the removal of the 1 point awarded for the Canine Good Citizen certificate. The CGC was seen as too easy to achieve due to the tasks and behaviors tested. Other factors included in the decision were that AKC does not recognize CGC as a title and the fact that the certificate takes only one test conducted by a "tester", not three legs earned in a trial setting with an actual judge.

The point value reduction for Rally Advanced Excellent was primarily due to that title not being equivalent in difficulty to the Utility title in obedience.

**President's Report** – I talked to Pat Lamantia from Purina about a donation for Nationals. The contract with Purina was lost and another one had to be signed. I talked to several people about judges for National field trial. Diane Turner was concerned about losing money on the spring issue of Wire News.

**Secretary's Report** - none

## **Treasurer's Report –**

General \$21,426.14

Maturity \$629.29

Emergency Rescue Fund \$4,758.24

All Star \$2,060.54

FT Trophy supplemental Fund \$1,770.00

- Erika is getting new member welcome letters together
- membership list ready to issue in roster
- Pay Pal seems to be best option for online payments
- Erika moved that we start using Pay Pal, Bob seconded, Garnett said to set up another bank account to be associated with it, motion unanimously approved

## **Committee Reports:**

### SEAC Report – Judy Cheshire provided report:

The ballot for the 2015 National Specialty Show judge has been put on the GWPCA website for the convenience of the members and to encourage voting. As the Wire-News is not yet out, there was concern that the ballot might not reach the membership in time to vote.

The following has not yet been passed by the SEAC, but has come to my attention and thought I would share it. The Morris and Essex show is held every five years in memory of Geraldine Rockefeller Dodge, with much of the proceeds going to charity. It will be held on October 1, 2015 in Somerset County, NJ. They are asking either parent clubs or local specialty clubs to host a specialty or a supported entry with this show. I will bring this subject to the Delaware Valley club to see if they are interested in holding their specialty/supported entry at that time. However, I will first offer it to the GWPCA if you are interested. Not knowing the dates or location of our Nationals for 2015, I don't know if this is even feasible. But the cost to whatever club decides to participate will be nominal or non-existent if there's enough support and Morris and Essex will refund \$2 per entry for a specialty and \$1 per entry for a supported entry to the host club.

### JEC Report – Judy Cheshire provided report:

The GWPCA has been asked to provide a parent club presenter to the "Summer Classic" dog shows hosted by the Oklahoma City Kennel Club. They plan to have judges education for the entire Sporting Group. While I feel that it is worthwhile, I think that the cost of sending a presenter to this particular location will be prohibitive. Currently, we need to revamp and reprint our JE materials and I feel that this is a priority. I will inquire to see if any of the GWPCA mentors will be going on their own and if they would be comfortable giving the JE presentation. If the BOD feels otherwise and would like to spend approximately \$600-700 on airfare, hotel and expenses, please advise me of same.

### FEAC Report – Liz

Nebraska submitted two names [for the 2013 Nationals], and the FEAC chose two judges. The way the balloting goes, the FEAC votes approval, or they have concerns over the choices made by the host club. Of the 15 people on the committee, 14 voted. 9 expressed concerns for Jim Douglass, 8 with concerns for Kevin Kuiper. 4 voted for both, and one person abstained.

I have attached the rules for voting, as it appears that the GWPCA board of directors then decides what to do. If there was no host club, the FEAC would vote again.

We do have 2 judges that the FEAC chose, and both are available. David Taylor and Joe Fingerlin. I have attached the bios for all of the gentleman concerned so you have a chance to read them. The BOD needs to vote approval or not for these two gentleman. The BOD needs to vote on the names submitted by Nebraska.

Taylor & Fingerlin as FEAC recommended judges; Garnett moved we approve these 2 judges, Bob seconded, the motion was unanimously approved.

- Motion to accept FEAC recommendation not to approve Kuiper & Douglass; Garnett moved we approve the Nebraska Club's nomination of Douglass as Amateur Gundog judge, Chuck seconded, 6 yes votes, 1 no vote, motion carries
- Bob moved we approve the Nebraska Club's nomination of Kuiper as Open Gundog judge, Chuck seconded, 2 yes votes, 4 no votes, 1 abstention, motion not approved

Directors' reports:

Midwest - Chuck – not having Classic this spring;

West - Bob – National location committee has not been able to agree on everything

East – Garnett – Kay Braddock got a MACH on Belle; Fort Detroit hunt test, agility trials, specialty coming up

Rescue – no report

**Old Business:**

2013 Nationals

- Caterer confirmed
- Hunt test judges – Eugene Larson, Laura Myles, Steve Kreuser, Tracy Nelson
- Working on budget

2014 Nationals – nothing new

2015 Nationals – e-mail to vote on conformation judges sent out; need to make decision on location

Open positions:

- GWP-U Coordinator

New memberships – none

**New Business:** none

Next meeting May 8, 8:30 EDT

Garnett moved to adjourn, Bob seconded, motion unanimously approved

Meeting ended at 11:10 pm EDT.