

**Proposal to the Board of Directors of the
Golden Retriever Club of America
From the Points Review Committee**

The Points committee would like to present to the Board of the Golden Retriever Club of America our suggestions for possible revisions to the calculation of point schedules and/or awarding of majors. These are the ideas that we believe will provide the most benefit to the breeds and will be easiest to implement.

1. Set the number of dogs in competition to award majors so that approximately .75% of entries for that breed finish each year.
2. Set an upper limit to the number of dogs in competition in order to earn a 3 point major

Each of these proposals and our reasoning behind them will be explored in more detail below.

After careful consideration of the information available to us we believe that a change in the method of awarding "majors" would be of great benefit to our breed genetically and we feel that the other popular breeds would reap similar benefits.

In addition to the information provided at the Annual meeting we would like to present some additional statistics and interpretations of that information in support of this view. To try and compare our present situation with that of approximately 25 - 30 years ago we went to the GRCA yearbooks. We used the data from the 1970 year book (which represented the years 1968 & 1969) and compared that to data from the 1996 yearbook (covering the years 1994 & 1995).

In 1968/69 there were 172 Champions compared to 425 for the years 1994/95. Due to the estimated expense of several thousand dollars we were unable to obtain official entry data from AKC for the 68/69 years. However, based on the difference in point schedules between those years (roughly 8 dogs required for a major in the late 60's, with fewer shows, as compared to over 20 dogs required in 94/95) there were probably well under 10,000 entries per year in these earlier years. This is less than a quarter of the entries of today, yet only slightly more than double the number of Champions finished in 94/95. Since we are currently finishing less than 1/2 of one percent of entries, it is reasonable to assume that the percentile was greater than 1% of entries finishing in the 60s. Since only about 14 breeds currently fall below the 1% figure of dogs finishing, we feel this is a good minimum percentile to suggest for all breeds. As mentioned before, and explained in detail on the web site, the breeds that fall below 1% do so only because the 18% rule combined with the maximum number of shows will not allow over about 250 champions for any breed.

Another thing that we looked at was the percentage of dogs that earned Championship titles whose parents also had Championship titles. As the purpose of this committee is to explore the point system for Conformation Championships, we looked only at Championship titles in determining these figures. However, the committee realizes the significant importance of other titles, abilities, and attributes such as health, temperament, and working ability to the breed.

Year	1968/69	1994/95
Both Sire & Dam Champions	51 (30%)	247 (58%)
Sire Champion - Dam not	74 (43%)	153 (36%)
Dam Champion - Sire not	13 (8%)	8 (2%)
Neither Sire or Dam Champions	34 (20%)	17 (4%)

While both are certainly only snapshots in time, this information tells us a lot about the trends in the breed. What it tells us is that people are looking to the Championship title in determining breeding stock. While other "types" or what some call "styles" of dogs may be getting bred, the vast majority of dogs that win in the rings and actually earn that Ch title are themselves the offspring of titled Champions.

We believe that the significant decrease in the number of offspring from non-Champion titled dogs is important. Because many of those dogs genetically can provide the breed with needed infusions of "new blood" or in some cases "old blood" that has fallen out of favor we see their inclusion in our gene pool as a big plus for the genetic health and diversity of the breed.

Let's look at some additional statistics from those year books.

Year	1968/69	1994/95
Number of Different Sires that produced Champions	118	180
Number of Champions By Single Top Producer	8 (4.6%)	32 (7.5%)
Number of Champions By Top # Producers	18 (10%)	77 (18%)

So with 172 Champions in 1968/69 and 425 Champions in 1994/95, the figures in the chart above show a 250% increase in the number of Champions, but only about a 50% increase in the number of sires. The single top producer of Champions in 1968/69, Ch. Cragmount's Hi-Lo, produced only 4.6% of the Champions (8), while in 1994/95 the top producer, Ch. Asterling's Wild Blue Yonder, produced 7.5% of all the Champions (32). The top 3 producing sires of 68/69 produced 10% of all the Champions vs. 18% for the top 3 sires of 94/95.

What this is telling us is that even though there were far fewer goldens to choose from for breeding stock 30 years ago, they were able to produce Champions from a wider variety of dogs. Why is that?

We believe that is because breeders are choosing to breed primarily to the dogs they see as the safer bet. Due to the highly competitive nature of the Conformation ring, the large entry numbers and the resulting high point schedules, combined with the great expense that goes into showing dogs today, people are unwilling to breed to dogs unproven in their production history, or that of their parents. So breeders go almost exclusively to the Champion, and preferably one that has

already produced Champions.

It is also our belief that unless there is some way to get more Champions from other lines out there, the current limit on the number of Champions will only make the situation worse. Based on the 94 yearbook, over 90% of the dogs that earned Championships went back to Ch. Sunset's Happy Duke, 50% of those coming down through Aruba. Both of them were wonderful dogs with many great qualities. But for any dog's bloodlines to predominate in a breed to that level is a potential problem.

We believe that one of the steps to rectifying the current situation is to provide for more Championships to be available so that a wider variety of bloodlines are available. Perhaps allowing for a similar percentage to finish as we had in the past would help in this effort. The continuing efforts of both judge's and breeder's education are also an important step.

As stated above, we believe that the other popular breeds would also similarly benefit from the availability of more majors.

After a lot of thought and discussion, here are our two recommendations for potential revisions in the point system. To make these decisions, we looked at the top 14 breeds for entry numbers and the lowest percentage of championships earned as a product of the entries. All of these 14 breeds have under 1% of their total entries finishing. There are 6 breeds that fall below .75% of their entries finishing. Since the range for the percentage of championships is 0.45% up to 2.89%, with the average being 1.7%, we felt that guaranteeing a minimum of .75% of entries to finish would be beneficial to the high entry breeds genetically.

While any change will help increase the number of championships earned for these high entry breeds, they will still have less championships earned as a percentage of entries than all of the other breeds, and well below half of the percentage for the breed as compared to the average for all breeds. Therefore, we do not feel this will cheapen the title in any way.

For a comparison of the breeds based on the percentages finishing and how it would impact all breeds if points were based only on a percentage basis, please see the chart on the NEWPOINTS website at: <http://members.tripod.com/~newpoints/breedfare.htm>

For the betterment of our breed, however, we feel that genetic diversity will benefit from a restructuring of the point schedules. We feel our best approach to the AKC would be to point out first the antiquated nature of the current system (which puts an upper limit on available titles via the 18% rule without any consideration to the entry numbers) and then the potential genetic benefits of a revision.

For these reasons, we feel the best possible solution is to have a guaranteed minimum percentile of entries able to finish for each breed. This will also have the benefit of allowing breeds that gain in entry numbers to be included while those losing entry numbers will simply revert back to the 18% rule as has been used for the last 80 years.

We have included one other proposal, but we feel the minimum percentile solution is far superior. We also considered several different variations on points for reserves, however we felt that they were of limited benefit and would be difficult to implement.

For these reasons, here are the proposals we would like for you to consider for presentation to the AKC:

Proposal 1 - (Our preferred method) Championship point schedules would be set to achieve a certain minimum percentage of entries being able to earn championships.

It would require the following changes to AKC calculation procedures.

- a) Have the computer determine which breeds finish less than .75% of entries.
- b) For each of those breeds calculate the percentage of shows that need to be majors using this calculation.

Formula:

$$\frac{(\# \text{ of entries for 3 years}) \times 0.0075}{(\# \text{ of shows for three years})} = \% \text{ of shows that need to be majors,}$$

- c) In determining point schedules: those breeds over .75% finishing would continue to use the existing 18% rule. For those breeds under .75% finishing the percentage determined above would be inserted into the current calculation of point schedules in place of the 18%.

This proposal has the simplicity of not impacting the lower entry breeds AT ALL, while allowing a few of the more popular breeds the ability to finish a larger number of dogs. It also does not change any of the "Rules" with regard to how points are won.

Proposal 2 - Set an upper limit on the maximum number of dogs that have to be in competition for a major. As the current range for a 3 point major in the continental United States for 2000 ranges from 18 - 31, we propose a maximum of 20. It will allow for more majors to be gained in the very high entry areas while it will have little impact on the areas that already have relatively low point systems because the required numbers to beat will only drop slightly if at all.

In goldens only, this is the number of ADDITIONAL majors that would have been created if a maximum were set for majors in 1999.

Maximum Entry	22	21	20	19	18	17	16
Dogs	5	15	21	28	46	64	92
Bitches	32	55	74	96	119	152	180

Since each dog requires two majors to finish, the increased number of championships earned will be approximately half the numbers above. Because Goldens have the highest entry numbers of any breed, the number of additional championships for other breeds will be significantly lower. At

a maximum of 20 dogs, this would only provide for about 47 additional Champions which would still put the breed below 1% of entries finishing at only .59%. Therefore, this limit would only affect the Golden Retrievers, Labs, and Dobermans if figures are comparable to the 1999 entry numbers and numbers finishing for all breeds.

As in our first proposal this one would not affect the lower entry breeds. The other point breaks (1, 2, 4 & 5) would have to be adjusted to be in line with the limit above.

To access many statistics and information we have gathered, should you choose to review them, please visit the NEWPOINTS website at: <http://members.tripod.com/~newpoints/>

We would like to thank the Board for their time in reviewing this proposal and if you have any additional questions or suggestions we would be willing to provide whatever additional service is necessary.

Sincerely,

The Point Revision Committee
Jennifer Krawsczyn - Committee Chair
Margaret Strowe
Ginny Gray
Janeen Rice

CC: GRCA Board

Barbara Rollins
Sally Ray
Ellen Hardin
Nancy Talbott
Dianne Barnes
Ron Plusk
Hach Hacthel
Nancy Kelly
Judy Super
Rhonda Hovan
Janine Fiorito