

February 17, 2010

To the Board Members of the Samoyed Club of America,

It is with great frustration and disappointment that I am writing this letter. At the annual meeting on October 8, 2009, the Illustrated Standard Feasibility Committee provided the membership with its report. Upon the conclusion of this presentation our board and our members had a lengthy and at times, combative discussion regarding whether we would proceed. At the time, my perception was that some board members called into question the integrity of the members of this committee, which I found to be offensive. We are adults in a dog club and I would expect that we conduct ourselves with decorum, honesty and respect.

At the meeting, we had a lengthy debate and at least two votes regarding motion 09-129 which, according to page 72 of our *Winter Bulletin* states that we “moved to poll of membership ballot continue as per Mon. BOG meeting to include a statement challenging some of the findings of the ISFC to be provided to the [members?]”. Basically this motion was to include a letter composed by a hastily assembled group to provide information which was in disagreement with the findings of a committee appointed by the board. This motion failed, twice. After arriving home from the Nationals, we received a letter from some board members arguing against the findings of the committee. I question whether these members were functioning within the spirit of this vote. I question how my address was obtained? Was the SCA mailing list used? Were other materials that board members would have in their possession for the purpose of SCA business used? Is this a misuse of SCA property if these materials were used for personal business? With this, I was a bit miffed but decided that perhaps I was being petty.

Upon receipt of the Communication Service from a Board of Governors meeting dated January 31, 2010, I was greatly angered by motion 10-014, which, in some places, was completely inaccurate. It leads me to believe that this board is going against the members’ wishes. I do not appreciate my time being wasted. If you as a board are not going to do as we wish, why are you wasting our time at annual meetings? Why are you wasting our time surveying us?

Here are the main areas with which I take issue:

1. The motion is to “create a committee to research the ownership of the SCEA Illustrated Standard.” It further states that the budget should not exceed \$3,000.
 - a. This amount is over half of the full price of the artist’s fee of \$5,000 (see page 24 of the packet provided to the members at the annual meeting). As I recall, the minimal artist’s fee of \$5,000 was a point of contention among the members because that money could be used elsewhere. If we are concerned with fiscal conservatism, why would we be spending such a large amount on finding the owner of an outdated standard that is not owned by us?
2. The committee makes the very good point that “Ms. Adams chose not to have the copyrights passed on to the Samoyed Club of America.”
 - a. One comment regarding Ms. Adams will. If she would have wanted us to eventually own the rights to her document, she would have left it to us. I see no point in spending **\$3,000** to attempt to go against her wishes. If she would have wanted the Samoyed Club of America to possess this document, she would have bequeathed it to us.

3. In the motion, it states that “the [Illustrated Standard Feasibility] committee also recommended that we find the current owner of the [*Illustrated Standard*] as a first step”
 - a. This is not true. If you will refer to page 23 of the packet distributed at the annual meeting, it states that “The committee believes the Samoyed Club of America needs to have its own illustrated standard so that it can own all the copyrights and control how the drawings are used
 - b. Furthermore, on page 25 of the same document the recommendations of the committee are as follows:
 - i. *Proceed with the development of a Samoyed Club of America Illustrated Standard*
 - ii. *If the Board finds it necessary to get a vote of the entire membership, this report should be included so all members have an opportunity to review this information and make a knowledgeable, informed decision.*
 - iii. *The President with the approval of the Board will appoint an Illustrated Standard Development Committee.*
 - iv. *The Board will set up a dedicated fund with an initial deposit of \$3,000.*
 - v. *The Board will enter into contract with Jeanne Flora and pay the \$2,500 retainer from the dedicated fund that was set up.*

In no section of this document does the Illustrated Standard Feasibility Committee state that they recommend we find a current owner.

After membership survey, which given the current divisive climate of our club, was wisely sent to an outside agency for tabulation, the majority of the membership voted “yes” to the question “Does the SCA Membership want to pursue a New Illustrated Standard?”

Upon the conclusion of our annual meeting and upon receipt of the report of the Illustrated Standard Feasibility Committee along with the survey question, I was under the impression that voting “yes” to this question meant that we would follow the committee’s recommendations as written under Item 3, Section b.

As board members, I would expect that you would follow our, the members, wishes, regardless of your personal beliefs. It is disturbing that members would twist words to meet their needs and create a perception of lack of integrity on the part of this board, particularly when the integrity of a previous board had been questioned at the Lancaster Nationals.

Currently, I am questioning whether this board is being intellectually honest as it relates to its motives regarding some of the actions taken since last October. As I am not privy to who is driving what on this board, I feel badly about accusing those on this board who are conducting themselves in an honorable manner. For those of you who are not conducting yourselves in an honorable manner, shame on you. Shame on you for not doing your duties as a board member. Shame on you for not being honest with us regarding your intentions. Shame on you for putting the remainder of the board members in a position which makes them look bad. Stop following your agenda and start following the intent of the members’ vote, which was to follow the recommendations of the Illustrated Standard Feasibility Committee.

Because this perception exists among many members, I am strongly suggesting that half the committee that must be convened be composed of members of the Illustrated Standard Feasibility Committee. Additionally, I believe that its Chair absolutely should be a member of this new committee. The

rationale is that I trust that they will ensure that their work will be represented accurately on the committee you were charged to create to complete the task of developing a New Illustrated Standard. The other half of the committee should consist of a broad range of breeders who are experienced, are knowledgeable about structure, the range of acceptable type, correct movement and who can work with others in a professional, constructive manner.

I am very disappointed that I feel compelled to confront the board with this issue. I have never written any board prior to this; I've never spoken up at an annual meeting prior to this Fall. If you have read your AKC Gazette throughout the past few years, you will see that the Pekingese Club of America has fallen into complete dysfunction to the point where the American Kennel Club has refused to approve specialties for a time. Do you want this to happen to our club? I was moved to act because I fear your actions will further divide our club and could potentially lead us down the path of the Pekingese Club of America. Please reconsider your current course and make this right for your members.

Sincerely,

GloriJean Harper
Tundra Ice Samoyeds
Member since 1997