

RESULTS OF SCJA'S FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE JANUARY 1984 FROM OUR INITIAL MEMBERSHIP WHICH INCLUDED ALL BUT TWO OR THREE OF THE ALL-BREED JUDGES

These results are based on our members' signed responses. Below is a list of several suggestions discussed in the SCJA News Bulletin. We first asked each member to indicate with a "YES" or a "NO" as to whether they felt it was an important subject and should be considered for the SCJA Board to take action on. Secondly, on those that had a "YES" answer, we then asked the responding member to rank importance of each suggestion by assigning a priority number (#1 being top priority, etc.).

- **APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL BREEDS WAS AT THE TOP OF LIST WITH OVER 86% OF OUR MEMBERS RANKING IT FIRST IN IMPORTANCE (This note is made over 25 years later and was obviously not a part of the original survey. Most individuals judging back then or who were knowledgeable of the system would agree that the approval process today is unrealistic, unfair, too complicated and conducted by individuals whose qualifications on the judging approval process are questionable.)**
- **Next in importance was Judges Education**

Following were other areas which our members agreed the SCJA Board should consider:

Centralized Travel Procurement -- Medical Equipment & Personnel -- Group Standard Booklets -- Letters to AKC -- Illustrated Standards -- Recordkeeping -- AKC Representatives -- Open Letter to Clubs -- Assignment of Overloads -- Lunch Hour -- Breed Conflicts -- Judging Newly Approved Breeds -- Observer Program -- Time for Photographs -- Insurance