

Attendance: Jim Sahr, Kim Allen, Cathy Coulson-Keegan, Lucy Kingsley, Diane McWhorter, Sue Theolass

Other Participants: Jeff Allen, Bill Wright, Charlie Ruff, Justin Honea, Jon Silvermoon, James Nason, Robb Bokich, Peter Huiras, Wren Davidson

Scribe: Diane McWhorter

Report from Charlie: The recent changes in the Craft Inventory world and the sanction process were difficult and the process of reviewing the current policies and working toward some policy recommendations to the Board in the fall will be helpful. Some kind of Craft Booth Policy Document could ease the operations process when discipline is needed. Some type of Review Board might be established, and definitions for terms such as “manufactured” and “significantly altered.” The piece that was missing for the people sanctioned and for management was the opportunity for the response of the members sanctioned. This can be a healthy opportunity to evolve as an organization.

Justin echoed the need for some type of review board or organizational process to clear up some of the situations that have been building over the years. Craft Committee will be needed to define terms, take complaints and for steps in the process of review. He and Charlie both want to be involved in the process. There will be initial issues with imports and manufacturers but the work will probably lessen once the terms are clear and existing complaints are resolved. The decisions need to be defensible and the evidence needs to be strong and clear and those facing sanctions have to be heard.

Craft Committee is in general agreement with working on these issues post-Fair, clarifying related issues such as booth succession, kid crafters, and so on. This work will take several meetings and possibly a retreat day or two.

\*\*\*Motion: Craft Committee will skip the June meeting and meet in August. (Cathy/Jim) All in favor 6-0-0.

Guests: James Nason requests, as the top-juried crafter for the past three years, to be allowed to take space 224 as a permanent space. He has worked on the space for 2 years and invested in it. Justin backs up the request. He meets the requirements in Guideline 55: Five years participation, presence at one of the previous three fairs, and has top jury scores. He is currently a “solution” as he cannot continue in the space but has to find a share with another crafter (in the two year on, one year off system).

\*\*\*Motion: Craft Committee recommends that James Nason gets space #224 for 2014 and beyond (Kim/Cathy) Motion passes 5-0-1 (Sue abstains due to conflict of interest.)

The committee noted the unfamiliar process of working with Registration and Management and without Craft Inventory involvement. This is a good example of how the committee can be useful and powerful in the growing transparency of the craft-related policies and operations.

Robb Bokich: Robb’s Pillow Furniture is in its 40<sup>th</sup> year of participation. Robb is trying to pass some of the business functions to his stepson, who has been selling and working with him for four years as an apprentice but was not successful in passing the jury. There is no guarantee that he will ever pass the jury, as is sometimes the case with traditional crafts that do not have the photo-appeal of the new and

spectacular crafts chosen by the current juries, and even if he does it will take another two years to make him the booth rep. The committee was sympathetic and recognizes the problems with jurying, but could only advise him on some ways to get a better jury score, including making something spectacular, making something new and inspired, making sure the digital images are really well-composed, and writing a skillful presentation. There are four screens and the opportunity to have descriptions read to the jury.

Every jury is different, and lots of people deal with this situation. This is another issue that could be improved by some deliberation during the formation of a review board. Some of the grandfathered crafts from 1983 could be given some points for “historical relevance” or “existing crafts transitioning” and the “institutional value” of the booths could be addressed. The review board would not have to be strictly disciplinary. James offered to work with Robb on his presentation.

Jon Silvermoon: Jon did not have a specific issue but wanted to observe and get a better sense of the Craft Committee and the issues on the table. He is particularly interested in the booth succession issue and the “hand-crafted vs. manufactured” discussions.

Board Liaison Report: Sue said the report from Craft Committee was well-received and there were lots of comments of encouragement. Wren gave a wonderful statement.

Minutes Approval: \*\*\*Motion: Approve the April minutes (Sue/Cathy) Motion passes 5-0-1

Sanction Letters: Charlie used CC drafts with some minor edits and will send them immediately. He has talked with the recipients informally and did not feel the need to make the formal letter more informal.

Logo Jurying: The process was difficult this year as those who presented the items had not done it before and did not communicate much with the Board or the jurying craftspeople. During the CI transition this process can be addressed. The Craft Committee can help CI with some historical info for their operations and training in the post-Fair period.

Justin will try to collect the information and see that it gets to the Peach Pit.

Wren’s Survey: There are many pieces of information which would be helpful in understanding what parts of the craftsperson’s experience need clarification or improvement. These include the length of the member’s involvement, how their annual income is tied to the OCF, how their Booth Rep handles the booth issues and fees, what their issues or points of frustration might be, etc. This could help discover situations that have been rumors or complaints in the past about unfair practices or continuing problems.

One opinion is that allowing artisans to expand their offerings outside their strict craft definition would help to “freshen up” the craft offerings. There was not group agreement that opening up categories for established crafters would be fair or helpful, or that it is even within the guidelines to display work that is not juried for sale. Discussion of this item and of a Crafter’s Bill of Rights were set aside for another time. There are problems with the Booth Rep system and discussions can be held about improving it in the process toward a review board.

The Committee felt that there was not enough time this year to craft and distribute a well-thought-out survey. There is a survey crew which could be helpful. If we start in the winter we can have time to do it well.

There was a suggestion to incorporate the Grievance process into any sanction letters as a path to settlement of issues. Include this in the brainstorm process in August.

James would like to speak on the One-year-only process in August or September.

Meeting Evaluation: Meeting process has improved; meeting went well; happy to not meet in June; there will be a lot to do in August; appreciate the willingness to listen; how to carry the Fair forward in a changed craft world is important work; it is important to find ways to sustain the organization and be more clear, concise and transparent in our dealings with each other.

**Next meeting August 13, 6 pm.** Items for the August agenda include: Definitions of terms; Brainstorm on Policy changes and Review Board; Survey; Crafter's Bill of Rights, Responsibilities and Duties; One-year-only process