Since 1997 the NAIA has had the privilege of being invited to participate in the annual International Festival and Events Association Conference (IFEA). The four-day convention includes events that range in scope from the Kentucky Derby to the Louisiana Shrimp & Petroleum Festival. On any given hour of each day there are multiple sessions being conducted pertaining to the production and presentation of festivals and events. On Friday, the Visual Arts Affinity Group, which is comprised of visual arts festivals, conducts an all-day session on issues pertinent to their success. Annually, the NAIA has been invited to speak and participate in these sessions.

One of the primary objectives of the NAIA has been to establish a positive and constructive working relationship with art festivals. Participation in the IFEA sessions, in addition to the directors’ conferences that we host, are the two most effective and productive means of accomplishing that objective. It is reassuring that the mutually dependent and mutually beneficial relationship between festivals and artists is acknowledged and appreciated by all participants.

This year, one half of the all-day session was devoted to the jury process. The jury process is one of the most important aspects of visual art festivals. It not only decides which artists will be invited to participate but it also determines the overall look and quality of the event. Despite the importance of the jury process, the verbal or written instructions that many shows give to their jurors tend to be general and vague.

Rick Foris, one of our NAIA board members, has initiated some research into the specific instructions that shows give their jurors. I presented the initial results of this work in progress at the convention and they served as a springboard for discussion (see newsletter article p. 4). It was explained how important it is for the jurors to understand that booth slides should reflect consistency in a body of work, overall quality and presentation, and ultimately a preview of what the show will look like. Criteria such as excellence, professionalism, artistic merit, craftsmanship, and creativity were discussed. Also proposed was the use of specific instruction as a means of handling a difficult category such as mixed media. All in all, it was evident that more attention should be given to jury instruction. I concluded the presentation by
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NAIA at the International Festival and Events Convention

by Larry Oliverson
NAIA President
Dear Editor,
June 7, 2000
We had just completed the Columbus Art Festival and had the opportunity to meet Dale Rayburn and his lovely wife Mammie Joe. We were staying at the same camp ground, and on Tuesday, Dale and I had a conversation pertaining to the show. I had never met Dale, nor have I ever been involved with NAIA other than to glean the artist statement from your web site, yet the conversation pertaining to reproductions, seemed to flow with Dale's question "How was your show?" I explained to Dale that as a fiber artist I was offended by the selling of posters by the artist next to us. The prices were $10, $15 and $20 and although they had 4-5 originals hanging in the booth, their primary “88%” was selling posters. These were not numbered and signed but were clearly marked reproduction. I suggested to Dale that I had no concept as to print versus reproduction and he just happened to have a copy of the Fall 1998 issue which has a comprehensive article, written by Dale, which really answered many questions and gave me a real insight into the on-going issue.
I had no problem with proper disclosure being offered in each artist booth as to a print/reproduction. In my opinion every fine art show should make it mandatory to have full, complete disclosure statements. Then it becomes the patron's choice. I do object to the posters not being matted or at least on foam core. This format, matted work, takes the reproduction to a little higher level than a flea market. It is obvious the issue will remain, yet the shows themselves can establish guidelines and it becomes our choice whether or not we participate. There are some things we can do, such as controlling our own environment, by not accepting guidelines we find offensive.
To our many photographer friends, and we do have many, reproductions of your work, unless you pull your own, are nothing more than reproductions and should not be called a print. You can read Dale's wonderful, objective presentation on the NAIA web site.
We all love this industry and certainly want to preserve its integrity.
With the highest respect for all artisans,
Barbara Fellman

From The American Center for Artists
(www.americanartists.org) A new article on State Arts Council and grants to individual artists of all kinds has been published this September by the Associated Writing Programs (the national association of college creative writing programs) in their JOB LIST. (http://awpwriter.org. (403) 993-4301. Written by painter Jules White, the article canvasses the 50 state arts councils and gives ideas about directions of giving to individuals. Tips on applying are included. The article also recommends certain websites for grant information. White can be reached at james@americanartists.org or at (401) 867-6370.
proposing each show compose a written set of instructions for their jurors. The act of writing the instructions would: 1) force them to more thoroughly consider their objectives and 2) would provide a record for consistency from year to year, especially if there were staff changes in the future.

Dave Kronenberg of the Columbus Arts Festival compiled another survey regarding jury process information from five visual arts festivals. The results of this survey, presented in the accompanying table and notes, are self-explanatory. (see p.8)

Accompanying the presentation, the NAIA provided each show a database of jurors. This database was initiated by a couple of show directors at a previous convention. We supplemented their list and provided it either in a PC or MAC formatted disk. The NAIA will continue to manage this database and everyone is encouraged to regularly contribute new names so that it can constantly be updated. Increasing the number of qualified individuals, whether they are artists, curators, academicians, or gallery owners should ultimately benefit us all. (Please see the accompanying form p. 13 to make your contribution.). Shows that were not present can obtain the juror database by contacting the NAIA at eatonart@earthlink.net.

An exciting presentation by Western States Arts Federation regarding electronic applications gave us all a peek into the future. The potential of this technology could provide incredible timesaving opportunities for both artists and directors. It was generally agreed that the visual or slide portion of an electronic application would be a little further into the future, but the data portion is currently attainable as soon as some of the parameters and details are determined. A working committee is being formed to thoroughly examine this subject. However, the results will be presented at the next NAIA /Festivals conference. An awareness that some artists are not computer oriented was mentioned and a method of assuring that these artists are included will be part of the investigation.

Another topic that the NAIA strongly advocated was the incorporation of a Slide Information Statement of twenty words or less that would be read to the jurors at the time an artist’s slides were projected. The intention of this statement is to increase the jurors’ knowledge regarding technique, materials, size, or any other information that the artist feels would assist the jury in defining and understanding exactly what they are viewing. It also serves to correct any inaccurate assumptions the jurors may make regarding the slides that they are viewing and would help insure that each artist’s slides were viewed for the same amount of time. (For example, in jurying processes that do not allow discussion, if a juror has a question regarding the work they are viewing, the process stops. This results in those slides being viewed for a disproportionately longer time period.) Although this procedure might require an additional person and some more coordination by the staff, the advantage of providing more pertinent information to the jurors without increasing time certainly would be a worthwhile endeavor.

One of the show directors raised the need of increased professionalism on the part of some artists regarding contact with jurors. Apparently, some jurors are reluctant to have their names published because some artists badger them requesting information as to why they were not accepted into a show. It is unfortunate, but virtually all of us are confronted with rejection in our careers. The NAIA always advocates professional behavior and asks artists to be considerate and thoughtful if they have any contact with jurors.

The NAIA made two more presentations. The first was a presentation on the mixed media category by Celeste Simon and the second was an introduction of a NAIA marketing initiative promoting the visual arts. Celeste prepared some PR samples that incorporated slogans and artwork provided by a number of NAIA artists. Both of these topics are discussed in accompanying articles that she wrote for this newsletter (see pp. 14, 15).

Additional issues that were briefly addressed by various attendees were: 1) another request for the elimination of social security numbers on applications, 2) an article by Eddie Soloway and Don Ament addressing the technological changes that are occurring in the photography category [see p. 25], 3) the problems and successes involved in permanently moving the 50-year-old Austin Fine Arts Festival, including a name change, 4) the challenges and successes of temporarily moving the Main St. Fort Worth Arts Festival to a new location due to a tornado that ravaged the traditional site, and 5) a summation of the on-going process of resolving the issues affecting the Ann Arbor Street Art Festival and its neighboring merchants.

The one-day session was packed with meaningful discussion of issues that were pertinent to our professions. It was both reassuring and motivating to see the progress that has been made and that continues to be made when artists and directors work together. As Stephen King, Chair of the Visual Arts Affinity Group stated on the NAIA open forum: “This meeting and the ongoing relationship with NAIA gave all of us a sense that we are reaching a point of working forward, not simply trying to keep up. The future looks brighter than ever before.”
There are many aspects of the jury process that are equally important, but this project intends to focus on just one: the list of instructions, either written or verbal, that jurors receive prior to viewing the artists’ slides. The purpose of this list is to help the qualified jurors understand what the show directors expect of them.

Just because jurors know about art doesn’t mean they know how to look at hundreds of sets of slides and come up with the kind of show that the show director is looking for. Slide jurying is not an easy job. It’s not enough to tell them “Here are the slides, pick us a show”. Jurors need to know what they should be looking for when they view the slides.

A few questions individual shows have to deal with, and things the jurors need to know before hand might include:
- What should jurors take into account?
- How do they keep their focus while looking at hundreds of sets of slides?
- Is quality and technical expertise of the art work what’s wanted or is there a need to balance that with affordability?
- What is the purpose of a booth slide?
- Will the jurors be allowed to discuss the slides or ask questions?

Many shows already have such jury instructions in place, but many more don’t have anything. It’s the intent of this project to compile lists for the twofold purpose of being a reference for shows without a set of instructions, and to enable the shows with a list to do a little fine-tuning.

Feedback from artists has been collected as well. Some of these comments fall a little bit outside the parameters of this survey, but I’ve included them because I feel this will give shows the opportunity to see what artists feel is important. This is a terrific opportunity for further communications between artists and shows which usually results in a greater understanding on both sides.

The NAIA has no desire to homogenize this aspect of the jury process nationwide. We realize the desire of directors to keep their shows unique. This compilation exists solely for the purpose of being a reference tool.

I’ve eliminated all show names from the responses to retain the objectivity of this project. No offense was intended.

Thanks to everyone, show directors and artists, who responded. Your comments and interest are appreciated.

Slide Jury Instructions

The following selections are gleaned from the shows responses.

Show A:

The Festival jury is a competitive jury. The goal of the jury is to present the highest quality and most diverse art work to the public, selected from the applicants you will see today. Invitation to the fair will be based on the highest scores within each medium. There will be 300 artists in the fair. Sixty of those have been reinvited based on scores from the on-site jury conducted at last summer’s Festival. The staff has the responsibility of determining the number of artists in each medium. Your scores will also be used to establish a waitlist.

We have selected you for our jury because of your expertise with fine art and fine craft, street art festivals, and the range of media experience you bring to the jury. You may or may not have served on a jury before. If you have, you probably have a set of internal criteria that you use to determine excellence. However, if you have not, we offer the following as suggested criteria on which you can base your scores:
- Artistic Merit: design, vision, creativity
- Craftsmanship/Technical Competence: Technique, skill, degree of difficulty, ease of materials used.
- Marketability/Booth Presentation: will this work appeal to the audience; is the work presented in a professional manner.

Please refrain from making comments that will indicate to other jurors your opinion of the work shown. We have invited 5 of you because we want a variety of evaluations. However, if you have a technical
question which will help you to judge more effective-
ly, please ask. We have the artist applications avail-
able to help answer questions. Also, if you feel com-
petent to answer another’s question, please do,
remembering to describe or define technique only
and not to reveal your opinions. Each of you has sig-
nificant experience in at least one medium.

When reviewing the artist’s work, please keep in
mind that the Festival is a visual arts market, and the
function of the work is secondary. The work is
expected to function as described. Please evaluate
each artist’s work on its visual merits. Also, the
Festival permits artists to select the medium in which
they jury. Therefore, you may see artists in one cate-
gory you feel would be more appropriately juried in
a different medium. However, this is a personal
choice of the artist which we ask you to respect.
Please make your very best effort to remain consis-
tent throughout the jury. Establish your personal cri-
teria and stick to it. Only by scoring consistently will
you provide us with the best result possible.
Some artists will have work which may not meet the
rules of the Festival. It is my responsibility to make a
note of all work-related problems and take care of
them after the jury. You may bring problems to my
attention if you like, but in the interest of efficiency,
we will keep Rules-related discussions short. If you
have a question about Festival Rules, or about partic-
ular work, please ask me.

Some artists have applied to the Festival more
than once, with different work. This is acceptable,
but will result in you seeing a booth slide more than
once. If you think you’ve seen a booth slide before,
you probably have. It’s okay.

Mechanics:
Each category will be previewed and then you will be
able to view the slides again for scoring each artist.
You each have a set of ballots which are identified by
jury codes. Make sure you check the jury code each
time it is read. If you find that you are not on the
correct code, please let us know as soon as possible.
We will catch you up. It is important that each artist
receive the same consideration as every other artist.

As I said, we will preview each medium quickly and
then go through it slowly, at which time you will
mark your ballots. The artist’s work is evaluated in
the three areas previously described. You will be giv-
ing the work a score of 1 (low) to 5 (high). Please use
the entire range of scores—it is very important, and
helps us to have a wide range of totals. The lack of a
three also aids us in establishing a range of totals.
Please be consistent. If you start with a strict stan-
dard, please continue to be tough throughout the
day. Consistent scoring is key to a good result for us.
Each artist deserves the same opportunity as every
other artist. If you need more time, tell us. If you
need a break, tell us. We will take some breaks
between media.
Please check our pace, and let us know if we go too
fast or slow. If you’re ready, let’s begin.

Show B:
The jurors are instructed to look for a level of excel-
ence and professionalism in the work (and display)
they are about to see.

They are asked to take into account the originality of
the work.

Additionally, as members of the artistic community
themselves, they are expected to recognize and
appreciate the technical level of mastery in the work
that they are viewing and judge accordingly.

Before the judging is done, there is a preview run-
through of the entire category.
A brief (15 words or less) description of the work is
read for each set of slides.

The jury is reminded that they make their recom-
mendation based solely on the five slides submitted
by the artists, taking into consideration the lighting
and presentation of their work and the consistency
between the art slides and the display slide.

No discussion is allowed.
Show C:

Jury Comments

All applicants are juried by the jury. There is no screening of applications.

All exhibitors submit five slides; four of their work and one booth slide.

We are looking for creativity, fresh ideas, craftsmanship, skill, booth design and layout.

Score each set of slides from one to five.

Keep in mind when viewing that the booth slide should be 25% of the score.

Feel free to ask questions.

If you have questions or are not sure what you are looking at, call out. We will read from the artist’s description of their work.

If the pace is too slow or fast, call out and we will change the pace.

If a break is needed, call out and we will take a break.

“These instructions are also given verbally before the viewing of slides is started. This is a good opportunity to ask questions and make comments. The questions help all the jurors have somewhat the same set of standards going into the process. The list is general on purpose. I don’t want to have the jurors be a rubber stamp for the show. I wanted the jurors to shape the show with their expertise and knowledge.”

Show D:

Standards Statement: Whether produced in quantity or as an individual piece, the ideal work reflects excellence. The work should be well conceived, expertly executed without technical faults, and reflect the unique design skill and vision of the artist.

1. The purpose of the jury is to choose one-of-a-kind and production work, encompassing a diversity of styles, and conforming to the Standards Statement.

2. New and innovative work is encouraged if it conforms to the Standards Statement.

3. Jurors should not be prejudiced against work that has remained relatively unchanged for some years if this work is the unique design statement originating and identified with the artist.

4. Discussion will be kept to a minimum. Questions are limited to information given on slides as to size, technique or materials.

5. Scoring is now done on a 1 to 7 point system and jurors are expected to use the full range of points in their voting.

6. The highest standard of professional ethics is expected from each juror. Personal prejudices and personality conflicts must be left outside the jury room.

Show E:

The jurors’ instructions are verbal and simple: Pick the best art out of the entries.

The criteria comes down to the use of materials, artistic vision, consistency, originality, technical facility, strength of composition, color, design, and all other formal elements.

The judges are also asked to curate the whole show, so there is no unbalance as to over or under representation of a particular media. (This is also influenced by who the entrants are. If one year we suddenly have 500 watercolorists enter, its a safe bet it’ll be a competitive category and the show will contain a higher proportion of watercolorists than a year when only 50 entered.)

We have no point system. The jury is encouraged to “argue it out” and convince each other of the merits of a particular artist or the weaknesses.

Show F:

Jurors are instructed to concentrate on overall quality of artwork and originality/uniqueness.

Demographics of the area are explained to the jury and pricing is taken into consideration, but quality is the top priority. A balanced show is the objective, and category imbalances are generally taken into account when filling vacancies from the wait list.

Show G:

Slides are scored on the following criteria:

- Quality of work and craftsmanship
- Uniqueness of work/creativity/one-of-a-kind aspect
- Cohesiveness of individual style (i.e., the thematic sense of the artist’s work)
- Overall presentation of work (includes booth slide)

Jurors may request information on the description, dimensions, process or technique of the artwork as stated by the applicant.
Show H:
Before reviewing the slides, the jurors are given a verbal statement of the emphasis and overall look desired by the show. They are asked as they view the slide, to keep in mind the level of craftsmanship, technique and originality demonstrated in the artist’s work. Also, they are asked to use the booth slide as a tool to check on dimensions and scale of work, as well as to note the attention paid to the presentation of the work.

Show I:
Our goal is to arrive at a show that is balanced. There is no entitlement or quota for categories or ratios of applications received to artists accepted.

The criteria for selection of artists is artistic excellence. We also have objectives to achieve a show that is representative of diverse styles and techniques and that it includes a broad range of pricing.

Artists’ Comments and Recommendations

Qualified jurors
• Artists need to pass certain criteria, so should jurors
• Jury panel knowledgeable in all categories
• Category jurors - e.g., jewelers selecting only jewelry slides, etc.

Number of jurors - more than 2 or 3

Jurors should be told what the focus of the show should be, e.g. *one of a kind* fine art or mix with reproduction work. Do they want to put on a *cutting edge* event or just have work that is easily accessible to most ordinary people?

If an agenda for a show has been set (e.g. category quotas, pricing, number of available openings), this should be spelled out in the prospectus in fairness to the artists.

Booth slides - used as a barometer for quality of exhibition, artfulness of display and range of work

Professional ethics
• Be aware of jurors with a bias to any category or style
• Be aware of jurors with a personal bias towards/against any individual artist

Read descriptions and techniques to jurors during slide presentations

Allow discussion by jurors
• only in the final cut
• during the slide viewing

View slides concentrating on:
• Quality of work
• Uniqueness of work
• Cohesiveness of style
• Clearness of artistic message
• Technical mastery

Look at all of the slides beforehand and go back a second time to make the final decisions.

Show the accepted work to the jurors for further consideration and fine tuning, balance

View slides based on use of line, form, color, texture, composition and emotion.

Give jurors more time to view slides.
Have jurors view slides with a critical eye towards whether they are seeing fine art or a mass produced product.

Pull slides of accepted work and show the jurors the completed show. Give the jurors the ability to change their minds after viewing the selected slides.

Have a wildcard, that lets each juror pick one entry regardless of score.

Read title of work to jurors.

Eliminate all categories and go simply to 2D and 3D. This would simplify the entire process and eliminate the need for so many artists to apply under categories to which they do not belong.

(There were multiple responses for many of these topics and I have taken the liberty of paraphrasing and combining when appropriate.)
### Jury Process Information for Selected Arts Festivals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cherry Creek</th>
<th>Coconut Grove</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Saint Louis</th>
<th>Utah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of artists</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of spaces open to jury</strong></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of applications</strong></td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of slides</strong></td>
<td>4 + 1</td>
<td>4 + 1</td>
<td>3 + 1</td>
<td>4 + 1</td>
<td>3 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of jurors</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 - 3D, 5 - 2D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of days for jurying</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoring system</strong></td>
<td>Yes/No/Maybe</td>
<td>1-4-7-10</td>
<td>1-2-4-5</td>
<td>Yes/No/Maybe</td>
<td>1-2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are slides grouped by category?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is field previewed prior to scoring?</strong></td>
<td>Yes-entire field</td>
<td>Yes, by category</td>
<td>Yes, by category</td>
<td>Yes-entire field</td>
<td>Yes-entire field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the jury have much discussion?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is balancing the show a consideration for the jury?</strong></td>
<td>Yes-see notes</td>
<td>No-handled by staff</td>
<td>No-handled by staff</td>
<td>Yes-see notes</td>
<td>Yes-see notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes:

**Cherry Creek Arts Festival**
Jurors choose on whether to preview the entire set of submissions before scoring. Round 1 is yes/no round. All 5 must agree no to eliminate a candidate. Rounds 2-4 require a consensus of at least three yesses to advance. After round 4, the show and wait list pool is agreed upon. Round 5 is scored numerically to achieve a show cutoff and determine the wait list. There is substantial jury discussion. On balancing: The objective is excellence. Ideally, we can achieve balance while meeting the objective of excellence, but excellence takes priority.

**Coconut Grove Arts Festival**
A different set of 5 jurors scores 2D and 3D. Jury discussion is allowed but not frequent. Balancing the show is done by having the percentage of spots available in each medium equal the percentage of applications received in that medium.

**Columbus Arts Festival**
Jury discussion is allowed but infrequent. Show balance is achieved by setting a percentage of spots aside for each medium, and filling out the show with the top remaining scores from the jury.

**Saint Louis Art Fair**
The same jurors are used for both the on-site and slide juries. There is substantial discussion during the jury process. The jury follows the format of narrowing over several rounds, and then viewing what’s left to determine the show and wait list. Balancing: There is no quota in any category, quality takes precedence. The wait list is selected by quality.

**Utah Arts Festival**
About 20% of slides are discussed by the jurors. After scoring, jurors review the show they’ve selected to confirm that they like what they’ve chosen and haven’t left anything out that they liked. Balancing: There is no quota on any category.

*Compiled by David Kronenberg*

*Columbus Arts Festival*
Reflections on the Jury Process

by Kathleen Eaton

The jurying systems for art festivals seem to have become the object of controversy partly because so few exhibiting artists have participated in the process that there aren’t enough people with this experience to have a thorough airing of the topic. This past year and a half I sat on slide juries for the Portland Art Festival, Des Moines Art Festival, Old Town Art Fair (for the 2 Dimensional jurying) and the Woodstock (IL) Fine Art Fair. Several years ago I participated in the slide jurying for Cherry Creek and Evanston Lakefront. Although this is a pretty broad spectrum of types of shows, and the number of applicants for each varied considerably, there is still much to be learned about the process.

First of all, I believe that exhibiting artists have an important place on these slide juries. If juries are only composed of people that have no interest or stake in art festivals the jury process will never be examined or improved in order to afford artists the fairest and most thorough evaluation of their work. The current mix of exhibitors and academics that were present in the juries I encountered had a fairly broad range of backgrounds with which to evaluate work. The presence of those outside the art fair world can provide another perspective on art. However, exhibiting artists who are familiar with art festival exhibits, may compensate for the shortcomings of the way art is presented in slides. In addition, as producing artists, they should be able to separate the substantial from the trendy in art. Most of the jurors from academic backgrounds were very interested and supportive of the art festival industry. However, there were a few exceptions and these did not respect either the artists or the art exhibited at festivals. Their belief was that art done for commercial purposes is not worthy of serious evaluation. I hope this type of person will become less of a factor in the jury processes of the future.

Beyond the makeup of the juries, the process itself varied from excellent to mediocre. Most of the festivals had very good viewing facilities and equipment so that all slides had maximum exposure. A couple shows with tight budgets used different types of slide projectors that projected the work at different sizes and different illuminations. This was very distracting to me and I felt care should be taken to have the same type of equipment so that the projections would all be consistent. In addition, I believe that slide jurying itself does have its shortcomings. Subtle textural or color effects are pretty well lost in this process. Exquisite craftsmanship doesn’t always show up. Also I’ve always felt that the print quality of photographs doesn’t translate well when viewed from a projected slide. These are problems that could be overcome with more jurors that have actually seen the work in person.

Every show had rough parameters of time for the process, but the viewing speed was determined by the judges. Most often the slides were kept up until all judges had signaled they were through with their evaluation. Thirty seconds was about average. For much of the work I believe this is enough. If a judge had not finished and the slides were changed, it was requested that they be reviewed and the request was always honored. There are a great many applicants whose work is entirely inappropriate for shows that only allow original work. Many slides I saw were not original in concept and some were obviously factory work. These do not require a great deal of thought in the scoring process. Work that is outstandingly excellent does not require a great deal of thought as well. It is the slides that are difficult to understand, unusual processes, and outright weird stuff that requires more contemplation and often the jurors would request information and there was some discussion. From my experience, a show that has approximately 500 or less applicants could be juried in a full day’s time. For more applicants than that, two days would be necessary for adequate viewing. I believe shows that have huge numbers of applicants probably should be pre-juried to eliminate those applicants that are clearly outside the parameters of the show’s mission. The pre-juried artists could then have their slides and entry fees returned.

All the slide juries, except one, used numerical systems to give assessments. The scale varied from 1-10 to 1-5 and often we were not allowed to use the middle score. (I assume this creates a statistical prob-
lem but I sure would have liked to have it). There was always a brief viewing of the slides of each category before judging, and sometimes there was a viewing of the slides afterwards so that a juror could review their scores. I liked this afterwards review, but actually my scores hardly ever changed, and not more than one point if they did. Only three fairs showed the final results of the judging before we left. In only a few cases did the results surprise me and that is to be expected when you have subjective judgments from different people.

One component of the slide mix that I feel is of utmost importance is the booth slide. All the slide juries in which I participated, except the Old Town Art Fair, required booth slides and they were an enormous help in evaluating the work. (In the case of Old Town a large number of participants were reinvited so that much of the work on display had been judged from the art itself). The whole purpose of the slides is to present as much information about a person’s work as possible. The booth slide should represent the artist’s display of work. After seeing several slides of booths set up inside people’s homes or in snow drifts in order to fulfill this requirement, I think the wording for the booth slide should be more specific. The canopy structure is the least important aspect of the slide. Jurors and show committees need to see the scale of the work, how it is displayed (framing, pedestals, number of bins, etc.) and what type of work is actually going to be in the booth. The shows that do not ask for booth slides really suffer for it.

On-site jurying is another issue and one of great importance. I street juried the Old Town Art Fair, Portland Art Festival, and the Uptown Art Fair last year. One of the main problems in this area, I believe, is the lack of time allotted for viewing a show. It is difficult to really look at people’s work if you have less than 2 minutes per booth. Ideally, I think a show should schedule one hour for every 25 artists. If a show is crowded and/or the weather less than perfect this compounds the problems. This is especially critical if the on-site jurying is for reinvites. It is quite unfair to allow so little time for look-
I recently sat on the jury panel for the Oregon Arts Council’s (OAC) annual Individual Artist Fellowship program. This is where Oregon residents vie for, basically, free money. In this case, ten artists (and one alternate) would be selected to receive $3000 to use in any manner they choose. I apologize for the length of this, but I’m posting it because some of the procedures we used were quite interesting, and may be useful to some shows who are looking for ways to improve their jury process. The methods were something of a cross between what most show jury processes currently seem to be, and some of the ideas recently posted on the NAIA open forum by Rick Bruno.

About two weeks before the jury date, I received two large binders filled with artist support material. This consisted of the artist’s one page application, their resume, and another page that had space for 1) an artist statement about their work, and 2) their statement about how the grant would help them. Although (surprisingly) only 125 artists applied for the grant, the two binders were about three inches thick each. Why so thick? Well, some of those resumes were, uh, lengthy.

So I guess I was supposed to look at some of this. I decided to look at one thing only: How would the grant help them, if selected? This was limited to one small paragraph, and if I saw something interesting, I figured I could flag it, and then refer back later if the slides looked interesting on the day of the actual jury. After reading through a few, I noticed they all sounded quite similar. “I’ll buy some supplies”, “I’ll travel to Europe”, “The recognition will help my career” (by far the most common). “Because, other than dying, this is the best way I know to get some extra money for my art”. I flagged that one. The rest I pretty much let go, and decided that what really mattered most to me was the work itself. I’d look at the work first, and then refer to support material if necessary.

The actual jury date arrived. There were six of us. The other person present was the assistant director of the OAC, who facilitated the meeting, and also ran the projectors. Here is how we scored the applicants.

Round One: We went quickly through each artist’s slide presentation. This consisted of 10 slides per artist, shown sequentially using two projectors. When I say quickly, I mean rather quickly. There was enough time to adequately see the work. Each pair of slides was on the screen for about six seconds, and each artist had five pairs of slides (10 total slides). Also, if we felt the viewing was going too fast or slow we could say so. We privately scored yes or no, and there was no discussion. After this round we had a show of hands indicating how we had scored each artist. Any artist receiving four or more yes votes moved on to the next round. The idea was to bring the pool of applicants down to a manageable level that we could then give more serious time to, including discussion about the work and supportive material.

Our goal was to cut the pool at least in half, but in fact we cut the original 125 down to 27. I wonder if street shows could do something like this? Just adding a zero to those two numbers would give you 1250 applicants narrowed down to 270 finalists for the 150 (or so) available spots. You’d have to speed up the preliminary viewing, of course, but showing all slides of a single artist simultaneously would help out. Let’s say each artist got 10 seconds on the screen for the first round. Multiplied by 1250 artists that would be three and a half hours. You could then break for lunch and come back for round two.

Round Two: Although at first it might seem we had to pick from 27 artists for the 11 winners (10 actual winners, and one alternate), it didn’t turn out that way. There were four that ALL jurors had given a yes in round one. We decided they were in. That left seven slots to fill from 23 remaining. Here is where the discussion started, and here is where we referred to support material.

Let me say this about the support material. Educational background, exhibit history, awards, etc. were very UNimportant to this jury panel, even to the academic type jurors. What WAS important is...
“What Am I Looking At Here?” “Oh, I see, this is stonework turned on a lathe.” “Oh, now I understand, these are fresh vegetables smashed upon a tree.” Another thing that was totally unimportant was the price of anything. In fact, none of that information was even available to us. (Although for street shows, I can see an argument being made either way on whether to include pricing information.)

Back to Round Two. Even as we discussed filling our remaining seven slots, the in charge person reminded us of something he had said earlier. Even though we had already eliminated the vast majority of applicants, any of the jurors, at any time, could bring any of the eliminatees back onto the table. In other words, if just ONE juror felt extremely strongly about an artist, they could bring them back into the discussion even as we were taking the final vote on the final 11. Interestingly, he said that this had happened in each of the four prior years that he had been involved. And it happened this year, too. I really like this idea, because it leaves room for that artist who makes an extremely strong connection with someone, but doesn’t necessarily fit in with majority rules. Anyway, our discussion in Round Two sometimes involved viewing the work again, but sometimes we didn’t need to, so it actually went very quickly getting to the final 11, including bringing that one eliminatee back into the mix (who ended up getting an award and not just being that alternate).

So, what worked?

1. Being able to refer to support material that explained “What is this thing?”
2. Having group discussion and group dynamics involved in selecting winners from finalists that were picked in Round One.
3. Individual juror having the ability to bring an artist back into discussion phase even after they were eliminated by group vote in Round One.

There is a bill reintroduced into Congress concerning the allowance for artists to take an income tax deduction for donations of their artwork. It is Bill HR3249. This time it has been introduced into congress by Amo Houghton (R-NY) and is called the Artists’ Contribution to American Heritage Act. As you are probably already aware, artists cannot take a fair market value deduction for a donation of artwork to charity. They can only deduct the cost of materials. Owners of artwork not their own, can take an appreciated full market value deduction.

I feel that it is important to get the current law changed. It has been in existence since 1970. Numerous attempts to modify it have been unsuccessful. If we as a community of artists support it as vocally as possible it may have a chance. This is a time when we need to come together and let congress know this bill is important to us.

Kathleen Eaton

Below is a sample letter that was sent to me, which you are welcome to copy, use, modify or whatever, to send to your congressman. Please send a note, call, or email to your representative now.

If you don’t know who your congressman is visit http://www.house.gov

Dear...(Congressional Representative)

We need your help! Please sign on as a co-sponsor or vote for Bill HR3249, which has been introduced in congress by Amo Houghton. As artists and supporters of the arts, we feel strongly that the current law that does not allow artists to take a fair market value deduction for a charitable donation of their work is unfair. Owners of artwork not their own, can take an appreciated full market value deduction but the artist cannot. The new bill HR3249 would rectify that inequity.

It is important and helpful for charitable organizations to be able to raise money through auctions of artwork. Museums need to add to their current collections. By amending this law, artists would be willing to donate work of higher quality to these organizations, which in the end would benefit everyone.

Please help us to change this double standard and make it equal for both artist and patron. Vote for HR3249.

Thank you for your consideration and representation of our needs.
Recommended Jurors

As an organization, we maintain a list of recommended jurors to share with shows. We would like you to add to this list by submitting the names of people who you feel are qualified in this capacity. They may be exhibiting artists, other people with art backgrounds, or just jurors you feel did a good job at a show in which you participated. Please give as much background information as possible. This should include their profession, credentials if you know them, any jurying experience or other relevant information. Also, please include your name in case we need to contact you for more information about the individual you recommend. If you have more than two names please feel free to send the names on other sheets of paper.

Name: ______________________________
Address: _____________________________________
City: _______________________________________
State: _______________ Zip _____________________
Phone: ____________________________________
Email: _______________________________________
Background information:
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________

Name: ______________________________
Address: _____________________________________
City: _______________________________________
State: _______________ Zip _____________________
Phone: ____________________________________
Email: _______________________________________
Background information:
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________
_____________________________________________

Send to: NAIA PO Box 334, Dundee, IL 60118-0334

Your Name: ______________________________
Phone No: _______________________________
During a board meeting in July of 1999 the NAIA committed to becoming more proactive in the area of public relations. This meant the development of a broad PR/Educational vision. It was our intention for this vision to be all encompassing, one that would nurture artists, arts educators, art shows, galleries, and museums. We decided to develop this initiative in order to educate and encourage the public as to the value of the visual arts. It was decided that this broad vision was important enough to pursue with or without outside assistance. I think it is obvious that the project would best be implemented with the help of many partners. To this end, a brief presentation was made at the IFEA conference in New Orleans. The presentation was stressed as preliminary and an opening for ideas and sources to be exchanged.

The important factor would be developing partnerships with art shows, interested individuals, arts related businesses, grant agencies, legislators and visual artists. The NAIA would be active in developing slogans and accompanying visuals to be used on packaging materials for use at point-of-sale, billboards, and magazine type PR. The NAIA will also be active in seeking out new arenas of advertising such as travel and airline magazines as well as movie theater ads. The NAIA is actively seeking visual materials of exhibiting artists to be used in these prototype campaigns.

The following are some examples of suggested text for use with visuals:

- Buy Art: For the Beauty of It!
- Fine Art: The Original Status Symbol
- Buy Art: The Beautiful Investment!
- Be Smart: Buy Art!
- Create Your Dream Home: Buy Art.
- Express Yourself: Buy Art!
- For Your Home, Your Office, Your Heart: Buy Art!
- Invest in Art Futures: Attend Your Local Art Festival!
- Diversify Your Portfolio: Buy Art!
- Feed Your Soul: Buy Art!
- Be Creative: Make Art & Buy Art!

The sample PR packet presented to each participant included a glycene bag with a 'Buy Art' visual logo on the front. Inside each bag was an envelope with another 'Buy Art' visual introducing the PR project and accompanied by five selected images with appropriate text. I selected images from Eugenie Torgerson, Edward Avila, Lynn Whipple, Aletha Jones, Jerry Berta and myself. These images were combined with text and used as examples of concepts to be expanded upon in the future. As a preliminary introduction to what will be a huge creative project I feel some good groundwork was laid by passing out these examples. Larry and I already have received excellent feedback from shows. The outcome of one conversation is that the NAIA could use a poster to promote our organization. I would like this to be one of the first PR projects. Consider this a call for NAIA poster entries and PR volunteers. I see a special need for those of you with advertising talents and computer skills in Photoshop!

An area of PR we discussed that can be accomplished immediately is the need for shows to provide detailed descriptions of exactly what kinds of materials they seek when they put out the call for PR materials. We need sizes, color, format, length of text, and any insight into what is useful and what is not!

I would like to stress that this is a beginning project and we want input from the entire membership. We see this broad plan as a great way to validate what we do as artists and the kind of venues we choose for exhibiting our works. It also enables us to use some of the best visuals available: your artwork! I asked the show directors at the conference to partner with us in this project: to produce positive PR that informs the public that no matter what the circumstances (weather, parking, crowds, etc.) the exciting quality of artwork makes the effort of coming out to a show more than worthwhile!

To help with this effort call (727) 321-0665 or email: mixedm@gte.net
In August I was invited to give a presentation concerning the mixed media category to the Visual Arts Affinity Group that would be attending the IFEA Conference in New Orleans. I formulated the presentation from the perspective of having served as slide juror and being an exhibiting mixed media artist. From this double vantage point I sought to explore areas of concern and some possible solutions.

First, I talked about efforts to define mixed media as a category. Two years ago I conducted a survey of about forty mixed media artists, some NAIA members and some artists from show listings. In the survey I asked participants to define mixed media. I used this resource as well as several show applications to arrive at a couple of definitions. One of the agreed upon category definitions would state “where the primary working intent is the extensive incorporation of two or more media.” Another approach to the mixed media category is taken by ACE Craft shows, this group divides the category into 15 subcategories which include handmade paper, toys and puzzles, musical instruments, brooms and brushes as well as traditional mixed media. This definition is mostly application driven but useful to examine as a different way to handle the confusion this category can provide jurors and applicants alike.

The presentation then examined the issues we could explore concerning the category. Issues included were the following:

1: Is there a distinction between 2-D/3-D mixed media?
2: Is the mixed media category inundated with applicants who don’t belong because there is not a more suitable category available?
3: What are your instructions to the slide jurors concerning this category?
4: Are category spaces allocated according to the number of applicants or is this a fixed number?
5: What might be an appropriate name for a category that could encompass the needs of those artists who do not fit the mixed media criteria but whose work might otherwise qualify for jurying?

Some of these questions were concerns voiced in the mixed media survey. Some are from show directors who over the years have expressed frustration at the huge jumble of applicants viewed during the mixed media part of the slide jurying.

Of big concern to mixed media artists is the use of this category by many applicants who are not actually producing mixed media work but see this as another opportunity to apply thus increasing their odds of attaining a space. Yet another concern is that of misinforming the public when incorrect media/category is printed on show signage. I stressed the idea that if the shows are as concerned as they seem to be about maintaining a balance amongst the categories then it is only fair that the artists exhibiting in these categories actually fit the definition!

Discussion centered on the definitions and guidelines to be used, the naming of an alternative category and instructions to the jurors. One concern arises when applications become too lengthy due to an over abundance of details and guidelines. Also artists do not want to be more burdened by an already confining application process, one that seems to limit their area of creativity and exploration when heavy on the guideline side.

So what were the conclusions and recommendations? It was decided that the simplest way to address some of the confusion surrounding the category is through the use of clear instructions to the slide jurors and clear information on the applications. Before the slide process begins in each category it is important to go over the definitions and requirements. Also what is the vision of the show for this particular category and is this part of the instruction process? The show application should reflect this vision &/or definition for the category. Use of the short artists’ materials/process statement might also help assure that the work submitted is actually being viewed in the proper category. It is also important to follow up on the slide jury process with on-site viewing. One question which remains somewhat difficult is that of naming another category which would house those works which are not mixed media but which may qualify for jurying. The title ‘Other’ does not have much pizzazz nor does it inform the public in a proper way. Any suggestions we artists may have could be put on the forum or submitted to the shows or myself for further exploration and hopefully a successful conclusion.

Why is this category issue such a big concern? With competition so fierce for space in shows it becomes more and more necessary for the jury
As Chair of the Board of Directors, I also chaired the Nominating Committee which recently completed the task of compiling a slate of nominees to join the Board. The other members of the Nominating Committee were Celeste Simon, Vice-Chair, Banister Pope, Pamela Hill, and Woody Jones.

The nomination process works as follows: During the year, the Nominating Committee solicits names from the membership of possible candidates who the members feel would make good Board members. Members of the Nominating Committee also try to talk to as many artist/members as they can to gather information about potential nominees as well as other issues of interest to the membership throughout the year.

This year, several dozen people were discussed and interviewed as potential Board members. The Nominating Committee ultimately identified 16 qualified candidates who were willing to serve on the Board if elected. We were seeking 6 members to replace the Board members whose terms were expiring on September 1, 2000.

Selecting a slate of six nominees from the 16 potential members requires attention to assure diversity of geography, media, and gender but the Nominating Committee’s main concern is to identify members who are able to work in a group and to think about broad issues which may be outside the scope of their personal career or interests.

It was a difficult process to select 6 from an exceptionally qualified group of 16. The six people selected, five of whom are new to the Board, are: Sara Rishel, Don Ament, Lynn Whipple, Mitch Lyons, Cynthia Davis, and me, Bob Briscoe.

I wish to thank the new Board members for making the commitment to serve on the Board. I also want to thank the other 10 people who agreed to stand for nomination and election.
The New NAIA Board Members

Don Ament

Compared to many of the board members, I am a relative newcomer to the Art Fair World, as this is my sixth year of full time exhibiting. It seems like I’ve *always* been a photographer, but have had other jobs to support myself until I made the breakaway in 1995. Some of my other jobs include X-ray Field Service Engineer, Hotel Maid, Nightclub DJ, Carpet Sales, TV News Reporter, Graphic Arts Pre-press, Property Valuation Field Agent (dog bite scars to prove it), plus some other weird stuff. So there’s really no good reason for me to be on the board.

Except when they asked me to consider it, I wrote up something for their consideration that said something about me knowing something about communication. That last sentence should pretty much prove it. Actually, I have had a bit of training in communication and listening skills, and mostly what I know is that communication is a hard thing. We all hear things through our own filters, and we often get it wrong. I will attempt to help out in the communication area so that everyone can keep up with what is going on with our organization.

Although I have been somewhat vocal on the NAIA open forum, in person I am a fairly quiet person who usually just likes to observe things. And mostly what I observe about life is that it is really funny. There are cosmic giggles to be found everywhere, and as I think about it now, THAT’S what I hope mostly to contribute to the NAIA-- a sense of light-ness.

Cynthia Davis

I am honored and excited about having been nominated and elected to the NAIA Board of Directors. Several Board and past-Board members encouraged me to toss my name into the pot and I hope to be able to live up to their expectations!

I have been making my living with my fine art photography for over 20 years. My interest in art began early in life. My interest in photography as an art form began at the University of Colorado while working toward my BFA in painting. After graduation, I apprenticed at the Denver Art Museum’s Photography Department which gave me extensive darkroom experience. I also began exploring alternative photographic processes and settled on the Polaroid SX-70 manipulation process probably due to it’s affinity to painting. I have my home and studio/darkroom in Ann Arbor, MI where I live with my partner, John Berry, a jeweler and 3 cats. While I have also sold my work through galleries, I sincerely believe I would not have been able to make my living from my art if it weren’t for the art fair/festival venues. I feel I am very fortunate for this and heartily embrace the system.

Over the years there have always been complaints from myself and others about how various things should be improved and issues addressed. But we had no cohesive front or channel in which to do this. The NAIA has provided us with a viable way to communicate our needs to one another and to festival directors. It has become our advocate with these issues.

I see my strengths as having over 20 years of experience as an exhibiting artist and an ability to (usually!) see many sides of an issue. Having worked in research at a library in my post-graduation years, I have an tendency to research an issue to death. I agree that communication between the triad of artist/festival/public is a top concern and the key to our success. I believe in diversity and freedom of the arts. I hope that if you see me at a show you will stop by to say “hello” and to bend my ear with any issues that concern you and any possible solutions you may have.
Mitch Lyons

I want to thank the nominating committee for their confidence in my election to the NAIA board. When I first heard about a national grassroots organization starting up to address some of the problems we were experiencing out on the street I was totally for it: I became a member and still feel that this much needed collective voice will help foster better understanding for our artistic community. There are three areas that are of interest to me;

1. Help with membership. Naia is a conduit for all artist/crafts people who are primarily making their income from doing art festivals/shows. A strong membership can have a strong voice.
2. Encourage younger generation. As I travel around the country doing shows I notice that there is a lack of younger people in the business of making and selling art/craft. I would like to try to be involved in improving this situation.
3. Print/Reproduction? This area is most important to me on a personal level as well as a professional level since I am a printmaker. This is a difficult problem to solve because I feel this has impacted our artistic community in a negative way. I hope in some small way I can make a difference.

Between 1970 and 1980 I was doing street shows as a potter. I was invited to do the first Philadelphia Craft Show and the first Baltimore Craft Show for ACC. Between 1980 and 1990 I spent some time developing an idea. That idea was what I called ‘Clay Printing’. Applying colored clay slips onto a wet slab of clay, wetting paper, rolling over it with a wooden rolling pin, and pulling prints. Now I make my living showing and selling Clay Prints. I think I have a sensitivity for crafts as well as fine art since I was in both camps. From time to time I have been asked to teach my craft and do workshops/demos in clay printing. Stop by to say hello and to discuss any problems you may be experiencing.

Sarah Rishel

I received my B.F.A in Communication Design with a minor in printmaking from RIT in Rochester, New York. While employed at an educational television station as a graphic designer I continued to follow my other love, printmaking. Twenty-two years ago I decided to pursue etching full time and sell my work at outdoor festivals. I've sold my images in galleries and with art representatives as well as producing commission work for Ethan Allen Coordinates Co. My skills, techniques and images are constantly evolving. Yet my love of interpreting my everyday visual world remains constant.

I have participated in almost every major festival and lots of minor ones. Each event always proves to be a learning experience! This life as a street artist has provided a wonderful education for myself and my family as we have traveled the country. I have lived in Atlanta for the last 14 years and participated as a volunteer artist advisor with the Arts Festival of Atlanta and the new show - Artscape. It would be wonderful if more festivals could be encouraged to avail themselves of their local working festivals.
artists. Working as an advisor has helped me gain insight into the challenges and difficulties the festival directors must deal with along with the realization of the positive things we can accomplish working together.

I’m excited to be joining the board of the NAIA. The hard work and dedication of so many individuals in getting this organization off the ground is very impressive. After just a few short years the NAIA has come together as a positive voice for everyone and the issues that affect us all. We now have a place to have dialog and come together with the kind of ideas that will improve our industry. We should all consider ourselves art festival consultants. Most of us have twenty or more years of experience doing shows. Together, I hope we are able to gather more and more solid ideas in order to keep the art show industry moving forward in new and innovative directions. We can accomplish a lot together so please feel free to let me know your thoughts and ideas.

Lynn Whipple

Greetings fellow artists. I was looking back to my first art festival experience, and I realized it was with my grandfather and mother when they were both in the Winter Park Sidewalk Art Festival, when I was just a preshooler. Wow, way back. Then, I remembered my first out of state show. That was in Georgia, with my mother and she was showing painting at that time. I was about twelve or thirteen. As luck would have it, I ended up marrying into a family of artists, who also did the outdoor shows. Who knew?

My husband John and I are both mixed media artists. I have been working with a combination of acrylic, wax, drawing, found images and found objects for the past several years. The constant exploration and joy in new combinations, has kept me fascinated with all the possibilities mixed media has to offer. We live in Winter Park, FL and share a warehouse studio with 21 other artists, and a cat with 17 names.

I am honored to be joining the NAIA board. The art festivals have been such a wonderful part of our lives. This is a venue that allows us to show our work to a broad audience, to travel, to make lasting and enjoyable friendships, to create art for a living, and to run our own businesses. My hope is to somehow give back, and to help our industry to continue to move in positive directions. One of the things that gives me great pleasure is helping newer artists get started. I was given so much help, support and encouragement from other artists, and I look forward to returning the favor.

I see the NAIA as our voice, and a great tool for communication. Working together with each other, and the show directors is something that can benefit us all.
For those of you unable to attend the third annual NAIA membership meeting here is an overview. Approximately 60 members spent an extra day in the Ann Arbor area following the four day Ann Arbor shows. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by President Larry Oliverson. Larry welcomed everyone and introduced the board members present: Bob Briscoe (Chair of the Board), Celeste Simon, Dale Rayburn Rick Foris, Woody Jones, Banister Pope, Toni Mann and Aletha Jones.

NAIA Board Structure
Larry explained the structure of the NAIA as board-driven. Members’ input guides the board in the formation of policies; therefore member involvement is critical to our organization. He encouraged the members to make their opinions known to board members and communicate their views through town meetings, the NAIA artist’s survey, serve as category advisors and write articles for the newsletter.

NAIA’s Involvement With Show Directors
Larry reviewed some of the topics discussed at the Director’s Conference held following the Winter Park show in March 2000. It proved to be mutually beneficial for all who attended. Members may view the details of the conference posted on the NAIA web site. (www.naia-artists.org/work/conf_3-00.htm) The NAIA has been invited to present topics at the IFEA (International Festivals and Events Association) Convention in New Orleans in September 2000. One of the subjects to be discussed will be the jury process and the importance of educating directors regarding current artistic issues.

Comings and Goings of the Board of Directors
Board Chair, Bob Briscoe named the five members of the board who served on the 2000 Nominating Committee: Celeste Simon, Woody Jones, Banister Pope, Pamela Hill and Bob Briscoe. Bob reported the new slate would be announced shortly through the Newsletter or a special mailing. Both Bob and Larry thanked the departing board members Banister Pope, Celeste Simon, Dale Rayburn, Jody dePew McLeane and Aletha Jones for their invaluable contributions to NAIA.

Members’ Benefits
Gordon Bruno reported The Red Roof Inn has agreed to offer 15% discount on hotel rates to NAIA members. The Show Off canopy company has offered a 10% discount on canopy products for our membership and Newton’s Display Products (The Craft Hut) agreed on 10% discount on accessory items.

Educational Efforts in Public Relations
Celeste Simon discussed the idea of a public relations campaign focused on “the value of art.” She suggested several slogans that could be used for this promotion - “Art, just for the Beauty of it,” or “Will work for art.” Celeste spoke of partnering these efforts with specific show sponsors to create local campaigns. She asked for slogans and visuals that could be included in this publicity campaign and active participation from the membership.

Ann Arbor Street Art Fair Discussion
Larry opened the discussion by encouraging the membership to view the Ann Arbor situation as an example where the NAIA goal is to help top quality art fairs continue and thrive. He briefly summarized the history of the Ann Arbor Street Art Fair and its partnership with the South University Merchants Association. The two groups have come to an impasse over issues of money and control. The Merchants Association now wanting more money and control. Shary Brown, Executive Director of the AASAF, explained the AASAF will face major decisions in August 2000 regarding the show location for 2001.

(Foreign Note; Updates on the AASAF situation have been posted on the NAIA members forum.
http://naia-artists.org/resources/forum)
NAIA Virtual Art Show and Other Alternative Venues
Larry reported discussions with a .com company regarding the possibility of a NAIA Virtual Art Show. Several members expressed an interest in learning more about this new marketing tool and Larry will continue to investigate this venue. Pamela Hill has been exploring possible ways to include fine art participants in the indoor craft show venue. Members also expressed interest in exploring this avenue.

Open discussion of Members Concerns

Artist’s Forum. A desire to see more active participation on the internet forum by the membership. Currently discussions can be wide-ranging from active philosophical exchanges to nuts and bolts practical information.

Promoting Street Artists as Professionals. Concerns that street artists aren’t considered professional. Several suggestions followed: 1) sending biographical information to a show for advance publicity 2) handing out resumes containing professional achievements 3) noting participation in nearby gallery or museum shows in the local festival area.

Invitation to Art Critics. Suggestion to invite local art critics to art show jurying sessions, as well as show itself. Hopefully these critics would gain insight regarding art festivals.

Publicity Guidelines. Suggestion that guidelines to help artists write promotional articles for newspaper consideration would be helpful. Drafting some guidelines might be a good topic at the Director’s Conference.

Criteria for NAIA Goal Development. Questions arose concerning the specific criteria the NAIA board utilizes to examine issues or establish goals. This criteria was briefly addressed and discussion shortened due to time constraints.

(Editor’s note: Here is a checklist of questions the board utilizes when considering what policies to pursue.
1. Ask “What benefit do we want?”
2. Is it within NAIA’s span of control?
3. Is it realistic, given our existing or future potential resources?
4. Is it measurable?
5. Is it needed?

6. Is it acceptable or desired by the members?
7. Should this be one of the board’s top concerns?)

Booth Sprawl. A concern that booth sprawl is a problems for some artists. Artists encouraged show directors to enforce their space restrictions and not allow booth sprawl to occur.

Mentioning Smaller Shows. One artist commented that many small shows have good ideas that are often overlooked by larger shows. The exchange of ideas from small and national shows benefits all One show director mentioned that one of her goals is to mentor smaller shows by giving her time and advice.

Larry Oliverson expressed his appreciation to everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.
Wireless Credit Card Processing Solutions
by Don Ament

Many artists would agree that the ability to accept charge cards is an integral part of their business. However, the numerous methods to actually do this present a difficult choice for the artist. Sorting through all the different equipment choices, processing companies, rates, fees, etc. can be quite confusing.

This report will cover only the processing options for wireless, battery powered credit card processing at the show site. Although it is certainly possible to accept cards at the show, and then key them in later at home or a hotel, most questions from artists seem to be about the portable, wireless machines. Additional concerns are the processing companies and banks that will work with, and understand, both wireless technology AND our independent types of businesses.

This report represents opinions and research done by several people, and should serve as a starting point for your own research into wireless credit card processing. It is not the intent of the NAIA to recommend any one processing company, or type of machine. Indeed, there is no one solution that is the best for everyone, and equipment choices, prices, and processing rates will obviously change. Still, this report will attempt to give you the information you need to ask the right questions, and to provide you with sources that you may actually ask those questions.

Why go wireless? A few reasons would be:

1. **Lower processing rates.** The ability to physically swipe the card through the terminal at the time of purchase will allow your processing bank to offer you a lower rate vs. manually keying in the purchase back at the studio. The higher rates are often referred to as “mid-qual” or “non-qual” rates, and can effectively double the percentage (known as *discount rate*) you will pay to your bank.

2. **Peace of mind.** You no longer have to worry about whether the charge will go through back at the studio. You have immediate confirmation. Based on comments from artists who have made the switch to wireless, this benefit provides more value than they originally anticipated. Also, should you somehow lose your sales ticket or manually imprinted charge slip, you will not lose the sale as well, because you have already sent it through to your processing bank. (Losing a sales slip with a customer’s credit card information on it would, of course, present other problems to you and your customer in the area of fraud risk.)

3. **Time saver.** Depending on how many charges you make at a typical show, this can be significant. Not only do you no longer have to come home and key in the transactions, but the money is already on its way to your bank.

What are the currently available wireless technologies?

1. **Radio.** A rather vague term to describe machines that use Bell South’s wireless data network. The various models of the Nurit terminal, made by Lipman, are the most widely known terminals to use the Radio technology.

2. **CDPD (Cellular Digital Packet Data).** Fancy sounding terminology that is used by the Symphony credit card machine, some Nurit terminals and others.

3. **Analog cellular.** The Tranz 420 and similar type machines use this. A separate analog cellular phone, and a connecting *magic box* interface between the phone and the terminal, is required to run the terminal.

Which one is the best? A lot of that depends on where you are going to be doing your shows. Analog cellular offers virtually universal coverage, but you will get stuck with various types of *roaming charges* from your cellular phone company which can vary wildly, and can add up quickly. Plus, the processing units tend to be a bit cumbersome, as you need a terminal (plus its charger), a phone (plus its charger), and a connecting interface. Some artists have avoided this cumbersome set-up by using an all in one terminal called a POS 50, manufactured by US Wireless Data (not sure if these are still available,
see ‘Sources’ at the end of the report). Still, with the arrival of Radio and CDPD units, analog cellular technology is generally considered old technology. It certainly works, and works well for those that are using it, but if you are just now converting to wireless, the newer technologies are likely a better choice.

Radio and CDPD are similar in that you will not incur traditional roaming charges from a cellular company. Still, the various processing companies typically charge a fixed monthly subscription fee in order to use either service. A main advantage of machines that use these technologies is that they are all-in-one units that are compact and lightweight. No extra cables or connections, and you get quick response time when processing transactions. So, are there differences between Radio and CDPD? In the real world, one big difference will be coverage areas. This is where you must ask questions of the company you purchase your terminal from. Find out if Radio or CDPD coverage is in the cities where you do shows. Ask them to provide you with web sites that show updated coverage maps for each system.

What are some of the questions you should ask, and what are some of the things for which you should watch out?

1. **What are the fees?**

Fees are probably the most confusing thing to figure out. You need to make sure you are getting EVERY COST from a company that gives you a quote. A really great looking "discount rate" could be offset by other fees. Here are some fees to look out for, you must factor every fee into the equation to determine your true cost. Not every processing company will have ALL of these, but they will have MANY of them. Be thorough and diligent so that you truly compare apples to apples.

   A. **Discount percentage rate** (this is the percentage skimmed off the top of your sale)
   1. Get the rate for “swiped transactions”
   2. Get the rate for “manually keyed transactions” for those times when, for whatever reason, your terminal will not get a signal

   B. **Application, or set-up fee.**

   C. **Monthly statement fee.**

   D. **Monthly subscription fee to the Radio or CDPD service** (this will not apply if you are using an analog cellular system, as the charges will come from your cellular company)

   E. **Annual account maintenance fee or membership fee.**

   F. **Per transaction fee.**

   G. **Is there a Voice Authorization fee?**

   H. **Is there a monthly minimum** you will be charged even if no sales activity occurs?

   I. **Are supplies included, or extra?**

   J. **Cancellation fee or penalty.** WATCH OUT for this one. We have seen contracts that, if you cancel, can severely stick the financial screws to you. READ the fine print.

2. **Coverage.**

As stated previously, be sure to check on the coverage area for the type of system you are considering. Analog cellular will cover you virtually anywhere, but you will incur roaming charges from your cellular company. CDPD and Radio will cover you almost everywhere, but each of these two technologies has coverage gaps, and WHERE THOSE GAPS ARE LOCATED MAY SURPRISE YOU. CDPD reportedly works better from indoor settings, due to the frequency range of it's radio signal, but it is lacking coverage in some major cities such as Kansas City and Atlanta. Also, it is possible that your CDPD carrier may not be licensed to operate in every market that has CDPD coverage (this may change, of course-- ASK for current coverage maps).

3. **Technical support,** particularly on weekends, when your terminal goes “Burp”.

We can’t stress the importance of this one enough. Still, how do you know if you will actually get good service? How do you know if you will be able to talk to a real human being, or just a machine that says “call back on Monday when we are open”. Start by asking the sales person of the terminal you are buying what kind of support you will get on weekends. Find out if the bank that will do the actual processing has weekend Tech Support for wireless users. Ask
if the Tech Support staff understands our mobile business, and if they are familiar with the equipment you are about to spend a lot of money on. And, of course, ASK other artists if they have used the company you are thinking of dealing with, what kind of problems they have had, and were those problems effectively dealt with.

4. **Does the company you are considering buying from offer more than one type of wireless technology?**

   As we have stated in this report, no one technology is right for everyone. Make sure the company you are considering can offer you all the choices, and work with them to determine which one is right for you.

**Sources**

OK, you’ve just read through the *generic answer*. The generic answer has hopefully given you an idea of some of the questions you need to ask. For *specific answers*, start by contacting the following businesses for current equipment and processing information. We have received positive reports on these businesses from artists who use their services. There are, of course, other companies that offer processing solutions, and if your favorite processor is not listed it in no way implies they are not absolutely great. However, the companies listed here have shown they understand our business, and have many satisfied customers.

   It should be noted that the NAIA has made attempts in the past to establish group rates and benefits from some of the major national card processing companies, but after looking at the offerings, it has been determined that those large companies tend to not understand or adequately support our independent, mobile type businesses. Also, the rates and benefits were no better than what you will find by contacting the following companies that do indeed understand our business.

**Mobile Artisans and Crafters National Co-op**

1-888-333-5513

Many satisfied artists, knows our business very well, web site has links to coverage maps for CDPD and

**Arts and Crafts Business Solutions**

1-800-873-1192

Many satisfied artists, knows our business very well, no web site yet, but are working on one.

**Ring On Line**

1-248-698-4659 x101

Sells the Symphony CDPD unit, and can set you up with a processing bank. Web site also has links to CDPD coverage maps

**U.S. Wireless Data**

800-219-3282

Services the POS 50, an all-in-one analog cellular terminal mentioned earlier. The POS 50 may no longer be available as a new unit, and is considered ‘old’ technology.

**Google.com** Great search engine. Type in “credit card terminals” or “credit card processors” and prepare to be deluged with information. Highly recommended if you wish to advance your *studies*. Just remember to ask your questions, and read the fine print before signing on the dotted line.
Photography, Art Shows and the Digital Realm
by Don Ament and Eddie Soloway

The rapid development of digital imaging technologies in the last decade has thrown an enormous and intriguing ball of excitement into the photographic community. However, along with the excitement has come many questions about the creative and technical possibilities of these new tools. This report attempts to address some of these questions and shed light on some of the confusion. Both authors are actively involved in the digital imaging community, and have over five decades of combined experience in traditional photography (are we really getting that old?)

The report is divided into two sections:
1. Technical Basics on digital photography and digital output
2. Specific Issues for Art Fairs

Technical Basics

The word digital as it pertains to photography encompasses a wide spectrum of tools and tasks. Digital cameras can be used in place of film-based cameras to create images. While currently very expensive on the high-end side, their ability to capture a wide spectrum of light values does and will continue to allow the artist to capture more of what the eye sees than does film. Film only captures a relatively narrow spectrum of light values. It should be noted that the cost of digital cameras continues to drop, and the quality continues to rise. It is becoming increasingly economically realistic to create very high quality photographic images without using film at all.

Once a film or digital image is captured with the camera, it can then enter another digital realm, often referred to as the digital darkroom. Taking the place of the chemical darkroom, the image is transferred into a computer. From film this would be accomplished by scanning the image and recording it onto a CD, Zip drive or other data storage media, then opening the image file in the computer. From a digital camera you could also transfer the image to a similar storage media or directly into the computer.

Once in a computer, the image is adjusted in similar ways that it would be in a wet darkroom. Careful printers, either traditional or digital, spend enormous amounts of time and effort meticulously creating the right color balance, determining contrast, maintaining highlight and shadow detail, etc; in other words nudging the final print in the direction they originally envisioned.

It must be stressed that master printers working in either a wet darkroom or a digital darkroom are concerned with exactly the same issues. The software programs created for digital darkroom work are geared towards people with a solid and deep understanding of traditional darkroom printing. One advantage to digital darkroom work is that you can work at a very meticulous level without the constraints of a traditional darkroom determining when you are finished, or what you can accomplish. For example, the artist can try many different ways to open the shadow areas in an image, select one, study it against other choices, and finish it to be just as desired.

Once an image is worked to the artist’s satisfaction on the computer, it can be output in many different ways. One option is to have the digital file output to traditional photographic film, then go back into the wet darkroom and print from the film containing all the careful digital manipulations that were made.

Two high-end direct digital options are being used by many photographers, museums and collectors. With one of these processes, the finished digital file is transferred to a machine that burns laser light onto traditional photographic paper which in turn is developed in standard chemistry. The papers in this process are a new generation of archival photographic papers. These prints are often referred to as LightJet or Lambda prints, which simply refers to the name of the manufacturer of the printing machine. In a second direct process the digital image file can be transferred to a giclee (pronounced “zhee-clay”) inkjet machine that sprays extremely fine drops of ink onto various types of high quality paper. There are several manufacturers of giclee printers, with Iris, Epson, and Roland often considered the leaders in true photographic output. The term “giclee” has caused some confusion, but it is simply another term for a very high quality inkjet print. It is not a trademarked name. Early generation giclee prints suffered badly from quick fading, but there are now many ink and paper combinations that offer extraordinary fade resistance, with some types lasting to 100 years and longer (based on accelerated aging tests performed by Wilhelm Imaging Research). Also, early generations of the printers had poor resolution, producing prints with a noticeable dot pattern from the drops of ink. The newest generation of printers have eliminated this problem, producing drops of ink so small that they are virtually impossible to detect even with a 20X magnifying loupe. In short, when properly printed, they are indistinguishable from traditional color photographic prints.

Specific Issues for Art Fairs

We will attempt to address some concerns and questions that have popped up in the art fair community.

1. If it has a digital component, it is not photography.

The Art Fair community is the only place where this idea has surfaced. The mainstream gallery, museum, and fine art photography communities have accepted and embraced digital technology as simply another tool in the arsenal of the photographer. We asked a colleague working for a digital photographic lab what clients he had of national recognition. He mentioned The Whitney Museum, The Museum of Fine Art in Boston, The
Ansel Adams Trust, Irving Penn, Pete Turner, David Muench, to name a few. At the Santa Fe Photographic Workshops the list of national and international photographers that use and teach digital printing is larger than those that do not. All of these photographers and institutions consider their work ‘photography’. They are simply in pursuit of the highest print quality possible. Ideas suggest that if an image has been in a computer it is no longer a photograph overlook two key facts. First, most photographers working digitally today are not concerned with manipulating an image to the extent of moving trees or altering colors and so on. They are simply in search of a cleaner photographic print, with often obsessive commitment to the integrity of how the image was originally shot. Secondly, the concern about big scale manipulations overlooks the history of photography. Since its inception, some photographic artists have made images by compositing many images and/or components together. Photography has always had an experimental side. The computer, like the traditional darkroom, is simply another creative tool for the dedicated artist.

2. Digital prints are reproductions.
For the first time, we are dealing with a technology that is capable of producing both reproductions and original prints from the exact same printing device. Confusing? You bet! Painters and other two dimensional artists are able to have their work scanned and REPRODUCED by a skilled technician using a giclee printer. At the same time, photographers are able to output their images on the same machines to produce an ORIG-INAL photograph. How can an art show deal with the confusing definitions? One key difference of course is the fact that a painting already exists, and the artist is simply handing it over to a printing house with the instructions to reproduce the original as closely as possible. Duplication is the goal, with no creative interpretation. With the digital photograph, however, the final print IS the original. All creative interpretations and adjustments have been made in the computer, by the photographic artist, and the final result is the finished photograph. The creativity expressed through the computer is inherent in the final piece. This is no different from traditional, chemical based darkroom printing, only a different tool is used. In this regard then, digital photography is not unlike the computer art category, as both are capable of producing original prints via giclee or ‘LightJet’ printers.

3. If it has a digital component, the artist should enter in the Computer Art category.
With widespread and respected international acceptance, digital tools have already become a part of photography. We would suggest that use of these tools by photographers at Art Fairs should not require any special treatment by shows much in the same way that alternative and historic photographic processes do not. The suggestion here would be full disclosure of printing methods in the Artist Statement. We would also suggest that the statement “photographs must be printed from the artist’s origi-

nal negative”, found on many applications, needs updating, as it will become more and more likely that a traditional original negative does not even exist.

4. Digital photographic prints are easy to make, just push a few buttons.
To this, we would only ask, have you ever had ANYTHING work on a computer that was as seamless and productive as the advertising claimed? Artists who are exploring the digital frontier are encountering enormous technical and creative challenges. The authors can personally attest to this! It is a never ending quest to keep up with, understand, and properly implement the technology. Of course, it is certainly possible to push a few buttons and get an image out of a computer. Just as it is possible to push a button on a camera, put a brush to canvas, throw a hunk of clay on a wheel, and get something. The reality of digital photography, much like anything else, is far more complex than what meets the eye.

5. Digital photographic prints are inexpensive to make, and are of ‘cheap’ quality.
We hope to have debunked this myth in the Technical Basics area of this report because actually the exact opposite is true for photographers making high-end digital prints. The excellent quality of these prints can only be obtained with expensive scans, followed by extremely detailed digital darkroom work requiring a high-end monitor and a computer with enormous amounts of memory to hold and work with the large files from the scans. This is followed by output onto a very expensive printer. Also, the raw material costs are much higher than traditional color photographic materials. Having said all that, we must state that of course it is also possible to take a digital file down to the copy shop and have them run off a stack of laser copies. The quality of digital photography, like all art, runs the gamut.

Conclusion
We like humorist Dave Barry’s take on computer technology. Dave advocates that computer stores should place large trash dumpsters near their checkout lines, so that you can conveniently throw away the obsolete computer you just bought. The same thinking could easily apply to the rapidly evolving area of digital photography! Be assured, however, that we are working diligently to stay abreast of, and involved in, the forefront of this changing technology, and we invite your further questions, concerns, and comments.
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don@donament.com
www.donament.com

Eddie Soloway
505.466.6030
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www.anaturaleyecom
Obituary

Manfred Heine-Baux

Manfred Heine-Baux of Cambridge, Ontario, died June 25th from a stroke. You may remember Manfred and his wife, Marie-France. He did bold, expressionistic paintings and prints, very colorful and full of life. In recent years Marie-France has been exhibiting photographs from Europe.

Manfred studied psychology, art history, painting, lithography and etching at the Academy of Fine Arts in Munich, where he taught after receiving his degree of Master of Fine Arts in 1964, (Ph.D in Art History). He lived and worked in Germany, South Africa, France and the United States, and established his studio in Canada where in 1984 he settled with his family. He has traveled and painted throughout France, Italy, Portugal, East Africa, Hawaii, the Caribbean, South America, Thailand, Tahiti, Hong Kong, Indonesia, India, Nepal, USA and Canada. The impression left with him by these travels had a tremendous impact on his work.

As well as participating in art fairs he exhibited his work and has pieces in collections in the United States, Canada, Europe and Asia.

Marie-France Gillet-Heine can be contacted at 641 Queenston Rd., Cambridge, Ontario N3H3K2.