

OHSET Rules Committee Meeting – September 19, 2009

Present (underline denotes voting):

Jim Roper (Southern); Chris Dinsmore (NE); Denise John, Ray Hickman (Willamette); Megan Holden, Glen Sparkman, Todd Gary (TRV); Anne Geser, Pam Steinke (Central); Donna Espelien, Scott Chauncey (NW); Don Pack, Laurie Pack (NV); Dawn Keeney, Jill Burnette (SV); Paul Roney (guest); Karen Bragg (Rules Chair); Karissa Dishon (State Vice Chair); Candi Bothum (State Chair); Debi Ferrer (State Secretary)

Candi opened the meeting by explaining procedure for today – each district should have one voice and will have one vote.

She also announced the results of the inquiry about adding cattle to Working Rancher and modifying Working Fours. Districts favored adding cows to Working Rancher 6-2; Districts also favored modifying Working Fours 5-3, but with a few different suggestions for those modifications.

Some suggestions came out of the Judge's Clinic earlier this month:

- Get rid of closed rein rule in team penning
 - Team penning industry almost always uses split reins – they consider it safer
 - If we change it, we should make either closed or split reins optional
 - We might have to allow split reins in Working Rancher if we're adding cattle
- List of requirements about how cattle should be settled; including they must be settled by horseback. Candi said this probably shouldn't be a rule but part of an SOG. We can work at this at our State Board Workshop.
- In break-away roping, if you're going to throw a 2nd rope, you have to carry a second rope – no rebuilding.

Discussion after meeting with districts about Rule Change Submissions. *Original rule change submission is in italics*; original discussion and consensus follow in regular font; and any new discussion and consensus at today's meeting follow in bold. Note that numbering error in August 19 document is corrected in this document.

1.) *Article IV (p. 8-13) District Administrative positions cannot be held by more than one person in immediate family.*

Discussion:

- Might be hard on some small districts in terms of getting willing volunteers
- Probably shouldn't have two family members in positions that sign checks
- Since this change would limit some good volunteers, maybe it's best to leave it up to districts to vote if they don't want multiple family members in office
- Seems odd to have it at district level and not at state level

Consensus: Probably should be procedural to not have family members both in positions signing checks; decision was to pass this on to State Chair and Treasurer to include it in chair/treasurer GOP documentation for district and state levels.

No further discussion.

2.) *Article IV Section 5 (p. 10) Change the number for a quorum.*

Discussion:

- Didn't offer a suggestions as to what a quorum should be.

Consensus: Take no action on this.

No further discussion.

3.) *16.14.2 (p. 74) Consider changing rule to draw maneuvers at the October state board meeting.*

Discussion:

- Maneuvers wouldn't be available at the judges training
- Drawn maneuvers wouldn't be available until later than currently available

Consensus: Leave the rule as is.

No further discussion.

4.) *Code of Conduct Rule 4 (p. 20) Add a rule that requires all coaches, athletes, parents, and volunteers refrain from smoking and alcohol use at all OHSET meets except in campsites.*

Discussion:

- May be violation of rights
- If we rent a site it becomes a school facility site and so it is not legal to smoke or drink on a school facility
- May be hard to enforce parent and other non-athlete behavior.
- If other people are on the site smoking or drinking, we may have to move OHSET kids off facility.
- Most facilities don't allow smoking on their sites anyway.

Consensus: Probably best not to have a rule about it since most of the behaviors are limited by laws. It is also in our Code of Conduct so we can use that when enforcement is needed.

No further discussion.

5.) *Rule Interpretation 1.1 (p 26) Karen would like to move that to the section under Judges – should be in section 5.5*

Discussion:

- Maybe it should be left there so people know judges' decision is final

Consensus: Maybe we can duplicate it; don't need to vote on it since it's just an organizational issue; This does not need to be a rule change.

No further discussion.

6.) *2.1.1, 2.3.3 (p. 27-29) OHSET needs to have own eligibility rules and forms, and exceptions to OSAA rules should be stated on this document.*

Discussion:

- We may need to just duplicate the OSAA rules in our rule book, and then come up with our own exceptions.

Consensus: This can be written into our by-laws; passed on to Bill.

No further discussion.

7.) *Rule 2.1.9 (p. 28) Please consider updating Coaches Manual/Handbook; Change wording to call it Handbook throughout.*

Consensus: We are updating Coaches Handbook; We don't need a rule change but will update wording to call it a Handbook throughout.

No further discussion.

8.) *2.4.2 (p. 32) Allow short-sleeved shirts, but with no long-sleeved shirt under, and performance team events need to have all same type of shirt on team members.*

Discussion:

- Maybe we could just not DQ if sleeves are rolled up. Doesn't seem like it would be fair to allow a short sleeve shirt, and then DQ someone for rolled-up long sleeve. Could allow a warning from judge. Trouble is it would be hard to keep track of who got warned once already.
- In non-OHSET shows long sleeves are required.
- Maybe we could add a rule that allows management to make decision to allow sleeves to be rolled up.
- Some people felt that this rule should not change
- What about adding +5 seconds on timed events and -5 points on performance events?
- Maybe shouldn't be DQ'd until time or pattern starts. Maybe we need to work on re-defining when judging begins; no judging so no DQ takes place; other viewpoint is that as soon as you go into

Consensus: Rules committee recommends to not make it automatic DQ with several options for districts to decide on....

- a. Judges should warn in case of uniform issue
- b. Add +5 seconds in timed events and deduct -5 points in performance events
- c. Officials could make announcement to waive long-sleeve requirement for weather issues

Karen submitted this info for the record: The judges were opposed to making any changes. After all, a Judge must be dressed appropriately all day, while the athlete often has breaks between events to "cool off" if the weather is hot.

Districts preferring Option a - 4

Districts preferring no change - 5

Districts prefer Option c - 3

Proposal we're putting forward - No change in uniform rule

9.) *2.4.2 (p. 32) Change to read... "Upon starting course (as opposed to entering the arena) uniform should be correct."*

Discussion: Much of what was just discussed applies here, too.

Consensus: This can be addressed/clarified along with previous rule change.

Majority opinion - When judge acknowledges athlete to begin or acknowledges that the course is ready.

10.) 2.4.4 and 2.4.5 (p. 32) Clothing and tack style in in-hand events must be the same, or else clarify that it doesn't matter in the rule book; Either way, clarify it in rule book.

Discussion:

- Clarification – This rule change submission is suggesting that if Western style halter is used, athletes should not be in English attire.
- Maybe it should be a judging issue
- Creates inconsistency so kids don't know what to expect and judges
- In rest of industry, it would be expected.
- Focus should be on quality of performance not on nit-picking what type of halter is used
- It may be hard to define a rule that clearly indicates what halters are okay with all the variations and what is acceptable in breed shows, etc.

Consensus: Add a rule 2.5.2 to say halters of any style are acceptable in in-hand classes. Style of halter should not impact score or DQ.

Judges wanted us to indicate "standard" and put some photos on the website as to what is acceptable, but Rules Committee consensus is to put forth the original consensus – no restrictions on halter.

11.) 2.5.1 (p. 33) For organization Karen wanted to see duplicated in Judge's section, too, because it is a judge's action.

12.) 2.5.1 (p. 33) This rule was changed last year. Before we move it to the Judge's section, let's re-consider this rule change.

Discussion:

- Currently, if a rider shows up with illegal equipment or without required equipment, they are not allowed to go on course. Candi pointed out that some illegal equipment is not unsafe and lacking some required equipment is not unsafe, so why not allow them to continue and give a score of DQ.
- From a judge's point of view, it's hard to not let someone ride or show for something that is somewhat trivial.
- Judges should have the ability and expertise to decide what is safe and what is not.
- Judge may not realize until partway through course that illegal equipment is present.
- What is in the best interest of the athlete?

Consensus: We'd like to reverse this rule so that if an athlete enters arena with missing required equipment or with illegal equipment present that is not considered unsafe, the athlete will be allowed to continue on the course, but will be DQ'd in the scoring. Karen will work on wording for this.

Judges are very much in favor of allowing athletes to continue on the course if equipment is not unsafe, and writing DQ on score sheet. Consensus of Rules Committee is the same.

13.) 3.1 (p. 36) Change beginning of season to November 1

Discussion:

- More practice time

Consensus: This must go out to districts to decide on. No recommendation from committee.

No – 5

Yes – 2

Abstentions -1

Proposal to go forward is to leave season as it is.

14.) 7.6.2 (p. 50) Change performance events rules including reining rules to say that off-course is an elimination rather than just a 0 for that element.

Discussion:

- This is the way it is in open shows, so maybe we should try to be more consistent with industry standards.
- With all the time athletes have to memorize their patterns, they really should have them memorized. This would raise the expectations.
- Dressage would be an exception because the industry standard there allows off-course (with penalties).
- In breed/open shows you wouldn't be eliminated, but you wouldn't place.
- In OHSET, there are 10 scores that are given and each element is scored separately, but that's not the way it is in open shows.
- It may be hard to define what is off course – forgetting an element or doing it incorrectly?
- We should consider what college equestrian teams require since many athletes go on to that.

Consensus: Karen will check on what the expectation is in college equestrian teams and include that in what goes out to districts. This is a major philosophical difference so we need to put this out to the membership to decide on this.

Judges were very much against this. This makes us different in a way that is positive for athletes. NW thinks we should be more in line with industry. Donna said people are eliminated for off-course in timed events, and should be in performance events as well. Willamette disagrees with most events but considered it for reining as that's the industry standard. Anne said that OHSET shouldn't feel we always have to follow industry standards because many of our kids won't go on to compete outside of OHSET. Southern wants to stick with same format; athletes should be rewarded for effort.

Districts wanting to eliminate for off course – 2

Districts wanting to leave as it is – 5

Proposal to go forward – Leave rule as it is

15.) 13.13, 14.13 (p. 58) Suggesting that athlete will get no time or DQ if calf goes behind hazing line. This is for safety.

Discussion:

- Eliminate the hazing line; it's not used for any other organizations; it is hard to keep it safe and consistent

Consensus: Eliminate hazing line. In most facilities, athletes can wait their turn outside of the arena, which would be much safer.

Central is very much against getting rid of hazing line but would prefer to give a NT if calf crosses behind hazing line. Central also suggested we could run the event with an open gate, so calf would say straighter. Two problems – times and horses may run into pen.

Judges suggested having next rider in to keep things moving; rider on deck would wait at a spot at discretion of meet supervisors.

Proposal to go forward – eliminate hazing line, add judges’ suggestion 5 agree, 1 disagree

16.) *Same Rule area and page area as above: The will be DQ if horse bolts, bucks, or is otherwise unruly when entering the box.*

Discussion:

- Judges are not consistent about calling unsafe situations.
- It’s not in a rule book but it should be.

Consensus: Add this in such a way that it allows and requires the judge to eliminate any unsafe animal or athlete in ANY event. Karen will work on where this should go.

Central – agree but judges need to call more consistently;

Southern – be careful because judge may not know horse...gaming horses may come in pretty excited, but many riders may be able to handle it. Judges need to use common sense about horse-rider combination. Leave out part about bucks and bolts, so it can be judges’ discretion.

Proposal to go forward - Judges will eliminate any athlete and/or animal they consider to be unsafe. We want this to be for ANY event!

17.) *12.6.2.5 and 12.6.2.5.1 (p. 57-58) In event of equipment failure for barrier, judges may postpone event or go “lap and tap” (ask for calf and go, no barrier).*

Discussion:

- What happens now is judges flag it. It’s really hard for judges to see this.
- Probably not fair to change half way through an event. You’d have to restart event.

Consensus: No records could be set with this method, and that round would have to be re-started. Also, district management would have to make decision based on availability of equipment.

NW district feels you cannot do this without an eye. Judges agreed. Paul judged during such a situation and he said it was not good.

Don’t run without eye (5-2)

18.) **14.6.2 (p. 60) Change to coaches or advisors can help lead horse into a box.**

Discussion:

- Currently mounted athletes are allowed to help a horse into box.
- It’s not always very safe to have athletes helping unruly horses get into the box.
- Without hazing line, there won’t be a lot of mounted athletes in arena.

Consensus: Allow adults to assist athletes and horses into box, but not other athletes, mounted or otherwise. If we don't have a hazing line, we won't have athletes in arena anyway. Keep this the same as is written in 2009 rule book.

Central – would like to keep mounted athlete, but if we eliminate hazing line, that won't work. Adults in arena could be mounted and they could help.

Proposal to go forward - Leave as printed in 2009 rule book – 6 agree

19.) 14.13.4 (p. 61) *Add to DQ if a athlete fouls another horse*

Discussion:

- Not necessary if we remove hazing line, and if we add rule allowing judges to dismiss athlete for anything unsafe.
- We've added another rule to eliminate unsafe horses or athletes anyway.

Consensus: Not necessary if we eliminate hazing line.

Agree still.

20.) 17.1 (p.82) *Cavesson to be required for driving.*

Discussion:

- It is required for 4H; but 4H tends to require equipment that is not required in other organizations.
- Maybe we could list it as optional; leave it to athletes to know what is best for their animals.

Consensus: Karen will look it up and indicate what industry standard is in the document that goes out to districts and then we can put it in optional or required list. Result of Karen's research - In USEF, under Carriage Pleasure Driving, it states (CP112) that a noseband or cavesson is mandatory.

Make it Optional – 4

Make it Required – 3

Proposal to go forward is to make it optional.

21.) 18 (p. 84) *Add Dressage, Dressage Trail so athlete can compete if they only have a dressage saddle.*

Discussion:

- Athlete would have to ride with all appropriate dressage tack (i.e. no kimberwicke)

Consensus: Yes, add this.

Agree – 7, none opposed

22.) 20.5 (p. 87) *Add mandatory safety inspection before HS equitation over fences.*

Discussion:

- We have this for driving, and over fences can be just as dangerous.
- Could do it all together, or could do it individually before going over qualifying fences.
- What happens if girth is too large? Can they go and fix it? In driving, we don't allow that.

Consensus: Unsafe equipment should be elimination. In fact, we already have a rule that allows judges to dismiss; We do need a rule that says we'll add a mandatory safety inspection.

One district said ok, but give adequate time to correct. Suggestion – if they have to leave the arena to fix, then rider is eliminated. Or, give so much time. Right now, in driving, if there's some infraction, it's a DQ. Currently, though, most judges in driving would allow minor adjustments. It should be part of score in over fences, too, like it is in driving.

Proposal to go forward - Take 17.5 rule in driving and re-write it for over fences (7-0)

23.) 20.5.1 (p.87) Add point deductions for refusals

Discussion:

- This proposal is because sometimes clean rounds that are average place lower than rounds with 2 refusals.
- This is an equitation class not a jumping class; sometimes refusal isn't really rider's fault. Better to have best rider win, not best horse. Consensus is that this is not a good rule
- Bill suggested maybe we should add a jumping event.

Consensus: We need to train judges and participants about the expectations of a hunt seat equitation over fences. We don't feel this rule change would be a good idea.

Side Note: We need to not pressure judges into judging classes they aren't qualified for, and then criticize them when they fail. Currently we cannot hire judges who are specialized in certain events, but are not certified by OHSET. Some of our rules are different than industry standard.

Judges universally opposed. Most districts opposed. Karen clarified for us that form over fences is more important than poor riding and clearing every fence.

Don't change the rule: 6-1

24.) Eliminate qualifying jumps at state

Discussion/Consensus:

- Probably can't do this since kids can bring a totally different horse than the one they qualified on.

No all around

25.) 21.3, 4,5 Should not be listed in optional, they should be prohibited or just not listed

Consensus: yes

Agree (not listed is what judges preferred)

26.) 21 Move saddle seat clothing rules from p. 32 to saddle seat section on p. 89.

Discussion:

- But some people will look for it in clothing.

Consensus: Add a cross-reference to refer to clothing section for all disciplines.

Put it in both places with a reference to both pages. Karen will try to do that with all clothing that is specific to certain events.

27.) 24.1.1 (p 93) Any events using time will be reported to .01 only. Thousandths place, if generated, would be dropped with no rounding.

Discussion:

- Currently we have this rule for timed events.

Consensus: Add it to IHOR since it IHOR isn't really a timed event.

Agree - unanimous

28.) 24.1 (p. 93) (In IHOR) Only an athlete currently on course may re-set an obstacle (no other athlete, adults, judges, etc. can reset any obstacles during a team's go)

Discussion/Consensus: Agree to change this rule.

Judges said this is a good idea. All agreed. But we have to be careful to make sure arena crew goes out and double-checks it before next team takes course.

Proposal to go forward is YES to this.

29.) 2.7 (p.34) Team membership may change; points carry with athlete. Coaches may rearrange teams during season and for state. Team A can have many different memberships.

Discussion:

- Two ways of looking at this.
 - Take athletes points individually
 - Take team points
- This gives advantages to large teams if they can manipulate teams to win multiple places within the district
- It may not be fair to athletes who actually qualify, if they get replaced for state
- This would enable a team that loses an prior to state to take another athlete and still be able to compete
- Could we allow one alternate from a team that didn't qualify to complete a state qualifying team?
 - Some feel yes, for any reason
 - Some feel yes, only for eligibility or medical

Consensus: For any team event **at the state championship** that allows alternates, the alternate pool may include any athletes that are not participating in the state meet in that particular event. Teams may choose up to one new alternate for any team event. Clarification – alternates must be declared at least one hour prior to the first state meet event.

In favor of consensus – 5

Opposed – 1

30.) 26.7 (p. 97) Athletes will not receive a NT if they don't show up at gate.

Discussion:

- Rules are that this should be a scratch and no participation point should be awarded (8.6.1.1 p. 50)
- If teams are manipulating this to increase number of participants per class to increase number that can qualify for state, those teams need to be dealt with by district administration.

Consensus: We don't need to add another rule for this.

31.) 30.2.4.1 (p.106) *Team size designations will be determined after the January registration deadline into equal thirds or by natural breaks.*

Discussion:

- The intention is to allow the districts to continue to set their own team size designations for the district season.

Consensus: Keep the rule as is for State; Allow districts to set their own size designation criteria or say they will use the state meet model.

Team size designations for state will be determined after the January registration deadline into equal thirds or by natural breaks.

Team size designations for districts will be up to the discretion of the district. See 9.1.5 which allows other awards to be at discretion of district.

Note – 16.10.1.2

32.) *Pages 106-109 At state meet, parent or immediate family member may not scribe for an event their child is in.*

Consensus: This is not a good rule. We assume people will be honest. Judges can make sure scribe is doing their job appropriately.

33.) 30.1.3 *Clarify (area or arena)*

Consensus: Change rule to say that only state meet officials or designated volunteers can set up practice obstacles on state meet grounds.... Or... Practice obstacles may only be set up on the state meet grounds under the direction of the state meet officials.

Central disagreed – want to change rule book to say “arena” as originally intended, but not limit all the grounds from no practice obstacles. NE district agreed. Most other districts felt that restriction should cover entire grounds.

Only state meet officials can set up in practice arenas only - 2

Only state meet officials can set up in entire grounds - 5

34.) *Add a rule requiring that the arena judge must have eyes on and be the only person to motion athlete to the starting cone of the course. Issue: At what point is the athlete being judged? You can two hand the horse during pattern and just get a 0 on the element, but if you have two hands on the rein at the start cone, you could be DQ'd.*

Consensus: This probably should be just a judge's issue. We will work to continue training judges.

35.) *In the event more than one team is being reconsidered for re-districting, only one team can be voted on at a time.*

Consensus: This is a by-law change, not a rule change. Pass it on to Bill.

36.) *11.2 (p. 53) Take WHO rules about record-setting times and measurements, and put them in our rulebook.*

Consensus: Yes, add these in.

Yes

37.) *All break-away ropers must come out of heel box.*

Discussion:

- This is the way it is in other organizations.
- Probably have to change it so that daubers come out of header side, ropers out of heel side.

Consensus: Yes, change for both events.

Central disagrees because of safety; because we have many unskilled athletes and do not know how to cross over, which can be hazardous to both athletes and calf. Cattle providers have some crippled calves because of kids not crossing over correctly. This rule change was suggested because it's industry standard. But we don't have kids who are necessarily part of the industry. Some districts don't have timers that cover both boxes if it's optional.

Agree with original consensus – 2

Leave rule as is, giving athlete the option – 5

Final note - If you're moving timers for two boxes, and you don't know how to do that correctly, call and get some help on how to do that.

38.) *Working Fours can choose their own 6 drawn maneuvers.*

Discussion:

- If they make up their own, they'd have to submit illustration and expectation to judges ahead of time.
- Disadvantage would be for inexperienced judges....but they should say no to judging drill.
- We need to get newest list on website.
- Can we draw maneuvers differently for Working Fours and Short Program?
- Initially the intent of the Working Fours was for teams that couldn't field a Short Program.
- This changes criteria for drill. Would kids now be allowed to ride on both teams? We would have to change other rules like the one that says large teams can only compete in working fours if they have a short program.
- Currently, only highest scoring drill team only gets placing points

Consensus: Committee recommends that we draw 6 maneuvers for Short Program, and draw 6 different ones that are more appropriate for Working Fours. Do this for 2009 with the idea that we may move to more changes in years to come.

Current rule seems to allow different drawn maneuvers for Short Program and Working Fours, so that we don't have to change a rule.

39.) *Add a team roping event.*

Discussion:

- Our numbers are going down, we have facility challenges, cattle events are expensive
- We're still working out safety issues in other cattle events

Consensus: We're not in a position to be adding events at this time.

Still No

40.) *Add cattle to Working Rancher event.*

Discussion:

- Initially it won't be anything too overwhelming, probably just one or two elements.
- Challenge will be to have consistency with equipment like panels and gates.

Consensus: Yes, do this.

At judges' training, they worked with some ideas to keep it really simple, maybe one pen with three head of cattle, and rider moves into pen, goes in a circle, and goes out, so cattle don't have to be changed.

In favor – 6

Opposed - 1

Next Steps – these recommendations go back to districts for final approval and will be voted on at the next State Board meeting on November 7, 2009.