

**TO: WeGO Board and Guild Representatives**  
**FROM: Linda Davis, Chair, 2018 Traveling Show**  
**RE: Final 2018 WeGO Show Report**  
**DATE: April 2019**

The 2018 WeGO Traveling Show concluded December 7, 2018 at Willamette Heritage Center. We visited five venues over the course of the year. Everything was safely returned to the artists or their buyers or representatives during the week of Dec. 10.

### **Summary**

We had 68 pieces submitted by 39 artists with a total value of \$17,925. We had a wide range of pieces representing almost every approach to weaving. Fifty-two (52) of the 68 pieces submitted were for sale. Twenty-five (25) pieces sold for a total of \$4,145. It was a fabulous show and really showcased weavers in our state as true artists!

### **Budget**

In 2016, the WeGO Board pledged a total of \$3,500 for show expenses -- \$2,500 was budgeted in 2016 and \$1,000 in 2017. The Show Committee prepared a budget with estimated expenses of \$3,409 dollars with entry fees as the only other source of income, estimated at \$1,000, giving us a total of \$4,500 in resources. The actual entry income was \$1,050. Our final total expense came in at \$2,591.73, giving us a net income over expense of \$958.27. Jurying and mileage reimbursement expenses were higher than predicted and other categories were either as projected (awards), or lower, with return shipping considerably lower. In fact, the savings from lower shipping fees is almost equal to the overall lower cost of the show. These came in lower because about half of the pieces were picked up in Salem at the end of the show, including all the large, heavy, framed pieces.

We believe the success of the 2018 Show can be attributed to three factors:

1. The venues, all of which were public, nonprofit art centers or galleries. This raised our professional image and increased interest by weavers to enter. These galleries have professional staff who understand the business and process and did a lot to assist with the show in terms of hanging and publicity, at their expense.
2. Having fewer venues than in previous shows provides more time for exposure in the local area and beyond. It also cuts down on the amount of work for the committee, including transporting the show.
3. Fewer venues reduced or eliminated our potential costs for hanging, props and publicity.

### **Next Show**

The 2018 Committee was organized in the summer of 2015, a little more than three years before the submittal date. **This was none too early!** If the next show is to be in 2022, it is imperative that a chair be found immediately to start planning. If this is not possible, it would be desirable to at least have a chair appointed by 2020. Having a chair identified by 2020 could be an advantage as this person could attend the conference, network with exhibitors and provide some advance publicity about the show. It might

be more realistic to plan on a show in 2023 given the time requirements and the demands of the 2019 ANWG conference.

The primary factor that drives an early timeline is finding suitable venues and at least getting preliminary interest if not approval. Competition for venues and dates is becoming greater and is especially difficult in the Portland area. Portland has very few public, nonprofit art centers or galleries and is now even fewer since Marylhurst has closed and more recently announced, Oregon College of Art and Craft (OCAC) will also be closing. Most other communities also have few, if any, suitable venues. It will also be important to have a theme and graphics early on to market our show to venues.

Attached to this summary is a more detailed report that can be passed on to the next show committee.

#### **Time Demands on Chair and Committee**

As stated above, and detailed more in the attached report, the most immediate demands are to establish the number and location of venues. There are several tasks that will need to be done to make this successful, namely establishing a theme and designing a logo and related graphics. After that, the timeline is fairly wide and open until about a year before the submittal date. And then after submittal there is a flurry of activity until the hanging of the first show. After that, if well-coordinated and planned, the demands on the chair and other committee members lessen considerably. So, while it can to a 3-year process, this is not a constant, ongoing time demand over this timeline.

## 2018 WEGO TRAVELING SHOW REPORT

### PROCEDURES AND LOGISTICS

Prepared by Linda L. Davis, 2018 Show Chair

#### Show Committee

The committee was composed of three people:

Linda Davis, Chair, Central Oregon Spinners and Weavers

Penny Unverzagt, Salem Fiberarts and Portland Handweavers Guild

Mary Wonser, Central Oregon Spinners and Weavers

This number was adequate along with the assistance of local guild members.

#### Show Schedule/Timeline

| Time Period                | Tasks and Activities  |
|----------------------------|---|
| Summer-Fall 2015           | Developed show schedule<br>Chose theme<br>Established exhibit standards for entries<br>Identified number of venues and locations<br>Established the number and type of awards and prizes for each<br>Show announcement communicated to guilds |
| Winter 2016                | Contacted venues, negotiated agreements with three<br>Graphic artist prepared theme logo and digital graphics   |
| Spring 2016                | Finalized prospectus and artist agreement   |
| Summer 2016                | Developed budget and presented to WeGO<br>Publicized and distributed prospectus to guilds, the WeGO website and ANWG website  |
| Fall 2016                  | Chose a judge, developed contract agreement and located jurying location and date   |
| Winter-spring 2017         | Finalized venues and agreements with final two venues   |
| Fall 2017                  | Developed details on logistics of setting up and taking down exhibit at each venue. Coordinated with local guilds on responsibilities, receptions, etc.<br><b>Received exhibit entries (Oct. 31, 2017 deadline)</b>                           |
| January 2018-December 2018 | The Traveling Show Traveled!<br>Show entries returned to artists  |
| Winter-Spring 2019         | Conducted Survey Monkey survey of show artists and developed final report to WeGO Board   |

#### Comments and Recommendations:

**Show Schedule:** As tentative as it may seem, two to three years ahead, it is important to pinpoint key dates and work from those.

- Determine the time period of the overall show. The 2018 show, and previous shows, followed a particular calendar year. This makes it easy to title and publicize. However, from the standpoint

of the committee's work, it is not ideal. The submittal time, jurying and first hanging all competed with holiday demands in November through New Years. And then take-down and return of items happened in December also causing a potential conflict with holidays. Thus, if a different overall schedule could be developed that avoids the November-December time of year, this would be desirable.

- Contact venues as soon as possible as many have a two-three-year lead time for scheduling. Some or all will want to know the theme and will probably ask for photos of past shows so they can see what it is about, if it is a new venue. Negotiation with some may take time. In the case of Umpqua Valley Community Arts Center in Roseburg, they don't schedule more than a year ahead of time, so we were on hold for a year until the time came, though they had "penciled" us in. In the case of Crossroads in Baker City, a staff change caused delays at three points in the agreement process.
- Get publicity out at least one year ahead of the entry deadline. This means establishing a theme and developing the prospectus and artist agreement so that it is clear what will be accepted. We sent the announcement out to WeGO newsletter and website, the ANWG website and local guilds. The March 2019 Survey Monkey Survey (SMS) of artists indicated that 87.5% of them heard about the show from their guild; 25% said they heard by word-of-mouth. A small percentage (12.5%) heard about it from the WeGO website, and 6.25% from the ANWG website. (Note: survey respondents could select more than one answer).

### **Entry Standards**

We reviewed entry standards (number, sizes, etc.) for the previous show and obtained comments from the prior show chair. Standards were revised accordingly. The revised standards prevented very large pieces that would have been difficult to transport and return ship. In the SMS, 100% of respondents said standards were clear and easy to follow, and we did not have any questions or objections. (See Prospectus for entry standards). (Note: there was a situation at the time of submittal about whether a group of pieces, meant to be shown together, constituted a single or multiple entry. The chair made the decision based on their similarity or whether the pieces, if for sale, were to be sold as a unit or separately).

Applicants were required to submit an artist statement. No requirement for content was given. Therefore, the quality and the type of content ranged from barely passable to extensive. Of particular interest to the judge, and subsequently to show-goers, was more information as to how the piece was produced including the weave structure and technique (of interest to weavers!). The statements were put into a notebook and went with the show to each venue. It is recommended that more specifics in terms of content would be highly desirable.

Photographs of entries were not a requirement. It was felt that this could discourage some to enter if they felt they could not supply a good photograph. However, photographs were needed for publicity and for the WeGO website. This forced us to seek good photos after the jurying, and there were not many to choose from because most submitters did not photograph their pieces prior to entry or did not feel they were of the quality they wished to submit. In future shows, the committee should consider whether to require photos, not necessarily for screening/jurying, but for publicity. This is particularly important for award winners. For example, Handweavers Guild of America's (HGA) *Shuttle Spindle and Dyepot* magazine required a photo for the HGA award and permission from the recipient to publish the

piece. The recipient had not photographed the piece before submitting. We, and not the artist, had to photograph the piece on display which was not the ideal situation due to lighting and other aspects. Since there is no way to know in advance who will win awards and specifically all the demands for photos, it would be best to at least recommend, if not require, that all applicants for entry be prepared to submit a good quality, high resolution photo upon request. An alternative, which would add an expense unless a good quality photographer is willing to do it pro bono, is to photograph all or the needed entries after they have been accepted and/or as needed for publicity.

In the end, the issue is balancing the need for a reasonable set of standards and information to put on a quality show and not over-burdening applicants with too many requirements and standards which could either make the process more confusing or discourage some from entering.

### **Jurying**

The committee intended for the judge to use the same standards that were used by the judge in the 2013 show (these standards were not publicized). However, as it turned out, the 2018 judge chose not to use them but simply decided if something was of sufficient quality to be in the show. It demonstrated a philosophical difference in judging approaches. The 2013 judge had an approach that was more technical, with a point system, like that used in county and state fairs. The 2018 judge looked at the exhibit in a more artistic manner and did not consider technical aspects except to make the award for Technical Excellence. The question of judging standards needs to be discussed and agreed upon with the judge ahead of time. Whether the standards should be publicized in advance should also be decided. Since no entries were rejected by the judge, the standards used were not questioned.

The jurying process took about six hours. All items were transported from Sisters, where entries were shipped, to Salem and back.

### **Prizes**

The committee set prizes and award amounts very early in the process. They were

Best of Show -- \$250

Best Use of Color and Design -- \$200

Best Technical Excellence -- \$200

Best New Weaver (Less than three years' experience) -- \$200

People's Choice-- \$150

In addition, the judge made a "Judge's Choice Award". This received a ribbon but not a cash award.

Award ribbons (inkle woven bands) were made by a weaver from the Salem Fiber Arts Guild. WeGO provided the cost of the materials. The award ribbons were exhibited with the pieces throughout the show. Award winners were mailed certificates, but these were not displayed.

In addition, both Complex Weavers (CW) and HGA provided non-cash awards. CW had its own criteria for its award but HGA did not provide any criteria for its award. Both awards were made by the judge. These organizations provided their own award ribbons and certificates. It was important to contact both organizations several months in advance to request the show be approved to make these awards.

A locking ballot box was purchased for the Peoples' Choice Award voting, and ballots were printed on pads and sent along with the show. Voters could indicate the venue where their vote took place. The

ballot box was displayed at each venue. The number of votes cast was 1,131 or an average of 226 per venue. One venue apparently did not place the box in a prominent place and had very low balloting. The award winner was announced by email to the artists about a week after the show closed.

A word about the theme “Color Gone Wild”. We did not establish a prize related to “Best Interpretation of Theme” or something similar. In a sense, the theme was somewhat meaningless as entries represented a broad range of colors, including monochrome, and perhaps only a few were “wild”. One could argue whether a theme is necessary, but the venues seemed to want one and it was helpful to develop graphics for publicity materials. No one commented on the observation that the theme was not strictly adhered to. The issue of a theme is also one that can intimidate would-be applicants if strictly required to, or difficult to understand (too conceptual or abstract, for example) as part of the entry process.

## **Venues**

Prior shows had 10-12 venues throughout the state. The practice had been to have local guilds find a venue, negotiate agreements with the venue, do the hanging and take-down, and be responsible for receiving and transporting the show to the next venue. In agreeing to chair the 2018 show, I stated upfront that I felt we should limit the number of venues to no more than six, approximately two months at each location. This was based on my personal experience with being involved in previous shows, both as an artist as well as local guild member who coordinated the hangings locally. I felt there was too much work involved in trying to have 10-12 venues, including the time and logistics of moving the show from one venue to the next. This time also limited the ability to visit the show at each venue. There was one complaint about this limitation in venues from a small guild on the Oregon coast that wanted to host the show. While we were aware that some areas of the state could not be served with a local show, I believe that the decision to limit the number of venues was a good decision for the reasons that were originally used to justify it.

We also wanted to find venues that were more public and accessible for more hours per week than some previous venues that had limited hours and/or required guild members to be present when the show was open. This caused a hardship on some guilds and increased resistance to be involved in the show at all because of the responsibility. Therefore, we sought out public and nonprofit venues. In most cases, the venues were open for at least normal business hours and two were open on weekends and evenings.

The decision to go with public and nonprofit venues had some additional benefits that came to be realized as we worked with them. All of them had staff who took on a lot or all the responsibility for hanging, local publicity and coordinating sales. Four of the five had the same type of hanging system which simplified our job of preparing items for hanging. All of them also had display cabinets and other props we could use. The only thing that was not provided was mannequins for garments, where those were needed or desired. In a few cases, local guild members provided additional props as needed.

Each venue had its own process and policy for handling sales and collecting commissions, and these details became a large part of the negotiation of the contract agreements with the venues. These differences had to be communicated to the entrants who had items for sale as part of the prospectus and artist agreements.

## **Entry Process and Inventory Control**

All entries were shipped to Linda Davis in Sisters. I made up an Excel spreadsheet to record all entries, assigning them an entry number as they came in. The entry number was not permanently affixed to the piece until after judging in the event that any items were rejected. Before the first hanging, the numbers were affixed to the items by safety pin or tape (framed pieces). Laminated labels were made with the entry number, artist name, name of piece and price if for sale. These were used throughout the show at all venues and held up very well.

## **Local Guild Coordination**

The major change with the show in addition to reducing the number of venues was the larger responsibility WeGO took on in finding venues and negotiating agreements. However, local guilds were requested to coordinate the hanging at each venue with the venue, hold an artist reception (optional), and coordinate with the guilds for transporting the show from one venue to the next. Once hung, local guilds did not have any responsibility to be at the venues during open hours or coordinate sales. At the same time, there was a designated person at each guild close to the venue who was asked to stay in contact with the venue manager and troubleshoot issues. Very few issues came up. In addition, I kept in close contact with all venue managers throughout the tour to make sure everything went well and clarify any issues related to sales.

**Receptions:** Hosting an artist reception was an option for local guilds. In two instances (Umpqua and Crossroads) the venues hosted receptions as part of their monthly art walks. In the other three instances, it was the responsibility of the local guild as to whether a reception should be held and to pay for it. In retrospect, this seems unfair and the committee would recommend that money be allocated to guilds to pay for a reception if not provided by the venue. The receptions were key to local publicity, voting for the Peoples Choice Award and boosting sales.

## **Sales**

Managing sales was the most complicated aspect of the show. We had 68 pieces submitted by 39 artists with a total value of \$21,400. We had a wide range of pieces representing almost every approach to weaving. Fifty-two (52) of the 68 pieces submitted were for sale. Twenty-five (25) pieces sold for a total of \$4,145. Each venue had a slightly different process for handling sales. Three of the venues took commissions from sales and two did not.

WeGO has not traditionally been involved in managing sales (taking sales income from buyers and disbursing payments to artists, or shipping sold items to buyers). Rather, the tradition, which was followed in 2018, was to have the buyer contact the venue manager and then have the venue manager contact the artist. From there, it was up to the artist and buyer to make arrangement for delivery of the item at the end of the show. With the three venues that had commissions, the venues took payment from the buyer and then paid the artist less the commission. Where a commission was not charged, the buyer directly paid the artist based on whatever arrangement was satisfactory to both. When a sale was confirmed, the venue placed a red dot on the label to indicate it was sold.

This process was at times confusing to the venue, artist and buyer and had to be clarified by me several times. Even though clearly stated in the artist agreement and the contracts with each venue, there was pressure to "let something go" before the end of the show. In a few instances, sales were probably lost

because a buyer did not want to wait. We tried to stress that the real intent of the show was to exhibit weaving and that sales were a secondary benefit. Of those who responded to the SMS, all but two (2) of thirty (30) respondents were very satisfied with the sales process at each venue where a sale took place. One sale at Umpqua VAA was mismanaged by a staff person and caused months to straighten out but it was an anomaly.

Even though WeGO did not get involved in the sales, per se, we were asked to be informed of all sales for our record-keeping and to be able to troubleshoot any issues that came up. One issue came up that related to where a sale had taken place that we were able to answer so that the right venue received the commission.

## **Returns**

Artists were given the options of having their item(s) returned shipped or picked up at the last venue during take-down. The artist could authorize in writing someone else to pick up their item, including a buyer. Authorization forms were sent out to all artists several weeks before the end of the show requesting to notify us of the method they wanted to return their items and included the authorization for someone else to pick up the piece(s). Most items were picked up at the end of the show in Salem. Items submitted by Central Oregon artists were hand-delivered, leaving only nine pieces that had to be return-shipped from Sisters. This greatly reduced the cost impact over what had originally been projected (\$132 vs. \$1,000 budgeted). This points out the benefit of having the final venue in a location that provides the most access to the artists, which Salem has.

A concern was the quality of the items at the end of the show. The SMS revealed that all but one person was either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the condition of their returned item. One person was very dissatisfied and found the returned item had been damaged, probably during hanging and not from the shipment, per se.

The allegation of damage indicates the possible need to have each piece inventoried and more closely inspected at the end of each showing before passing on to the next venue. Even at take-in, it would be beneficial to have anything noted that might later be subject to damage, such as any loose threads. Stricter jurying standards might also eliminate any of these potentials.

| 2018 WEGO TRAVELING SHOW ACCOUNTING |                                 | Budget      |             | Paid 2016 | 2017 Exp/Incon | Paid 2017   | 2018 Exp/Incon | Paid 2018 | 2019 Exp/Incon | Paid 2019 | Payee               | Total       | Actual/Budget |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---------------|
|                                     |                                 | Est. Income | Expenses    |           |                |             |                |           |                |           |                     |             |               |
| Total budgeted 2016 \$2,500         |                                 |             |             |           |                |             |                |           |                |           |                     |             |               |
| <b>Awards</b>                       | <b>TOTAL</b>                    |             | \$ 1,000    |           | \$ 850         | \$ 850      | \$ 150         | \$ -      | \$ -           | \$ 150    |                     | \$ 1,000    | 100%          |
|                                     | Best of Show                    |             | \$ 250      |           | \$ 250         | \$ 250      |                |           |                |           | Francisco Bautista  |             |               |
|                                     | Best Use of Color & Design      |             | \$ 200      |           | \$ 200         | \$ 200      |                |           |                |           | Corienne Geddes     |             |               |
|                                     | Best Technical Excellence       |             | \$ 200      |           | \$ 200         | \$ 200      |                |           |                |           | Cynthia Jack Newman |             |               |
|                                     | Best New Weaver                 |             | \$ 200      |           | \$ 200         | \$ 200      |                |           |                |           | Patty Beckman       |             |               |
|                                     | People's Choice                 |             | \$ 150      |           |                |             | \$ 150         |           |                | \$ 150    | Corienne Geddes     |             |               |
| <b>Jurying Expense</b>              | <b>TOTAL</b>                    |             | \$ 400.00   |           | \$ 609.56      | \$ 609.56   |                |           |                |           |                     | \$ 610      | 152%          |
|                                     | Judge's fee + mileage           |             | \$ 400.00   |           | \$ 425.00      | \$ 425.00   |                |           |                |           | Rosalie Neilson     |             |               |
|                                     | Committee Expense -lodging      |             |             |           | \$ 126.31      | \$ 126.31   |                |           |                |           | Linda Davis         |             |               |
|                                     | Committee expense - lunches     |             |             |           | \$ 58.25       | \$ 58.25    |                |           |                |           | Penny Unverzagt     |             |               |
| <b>Mileage</b>                      | <b>TOTAL (\$ .14/mile)</b>      |             | \$ 163.52   | \$ -      | \$ -           | \$ -        | \$ 281.40      | \$ 281.40 | \$ -           | \$ -      |                     |             | 172%          |
| 130                                 | Bend to Marylhurst              |             | \$ 18.20    |           |                |             | \$ 105.00      | 52.92     |                |           | Sue Walsh           |             |               |
| 173                                 | Marylhurst to Roseburg          |             | \$ 24.22    |           |                |             |                | 52.08     |                |           | Sue Walsh           |             |               |
| 406                                 | Roseburg to Baker City          |             | \$ 56.84    |           |                |             | \$ 117.60      | \$ 117.60 |                |           | Corienne Geddes     |             |               |
| 350                                 | Baker City to Salem             |             | \$ 49.00    |           |                |             | \$ 58.80       | \$ 58.80  |                |           | Cheryl Griffith     |             |               |
| 109                                 | Salem to Sisters                |             | \$ 15.26    |           |                |             |                |           |                |           | NC                  |             |               |
| <b>Publicity</b>                    | <b>TOTAL</b>                    |             | \$ 100      |           |                |             |                |           |                |           |                     |             |               |
| <b>Misc.</b>                        | <b>TOTAL</b>                    |             | \$ 1,745.00 | \$ 120.00 | \$ 449.04      | \$ 126.95   | \$ 131.73      | \$ 322.09 | \$ -           | \$ 131.73 |                     | \$ 700.77   | 40%           |
|                                     | Graphic Artist                  |             | \$ 120.00   | \$ 120.00 |                |             |                |           |                |           | Kim Gardell         |             |               |
|                                     | People's Choice Ballot Box      |             | \$ 50.00    |           | \$ 51.95       | \$ 51.95    |                |           |                |           | Linda Davis         |             |               |
|                                     | Labels                          |             | \$ 75.00    |           | \$ 11.82       |             |                | \$ 11.82  |                |           | Linda Davis         |             |               |
|                                     | Brochure Printing               |             | \$ 250.00   |           | \$ 197.58      |             |                | \$ 197.58 |                |           | Linda Davis         |             |               |
|                                     | PCA ballots                     |             |             |           | \$ 67.99       |             |                | \$ 67.99  |                |           | Linda Davis         |             |               |
|                                     | Hanging & Props                 |             | \$ 150.00   |           | \$ 44.70       |             |                | \$ 44.70  |                |           | Linda Davis         |             |               |
|                                     | Ribbons                         |             | \$ 100.00   |           | \$ 75.00       | \$ 75.00    |                |           |                |           | Leslie Verts        |             |               |
|                                     | Return shipping (est 40 pieces) |             | \$ 1,000.00 |           |                |             | \$ 131.73      |           |                | \$ 131.73 | Linda Davis         |             |               |
|                                     | Based on entry fees             |             |             |           |                |             |                |           |                |           |                     |             |               |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                        |                                 | \$ -        | \$ 3,408.52 | \$ 120.00 | \$ 1,299.04    | \$ 1,586.51 | \$ 563.13      | \$ 603.49 | \$ -           | \$ 281.73 |                     | \$ 2,591.73 | 76%           |
|                                     | <b>INCOME</b>                   |             |             |           |                |             |                |           |                |           |                     |             |               |
|                                     | Entry Fees (Income)             | \$ 1,000.00 |             |           | \$ 1,050.00    |             |                |           |                |           |                     | \$ 1,000.00 | 105%          |
|                                     | WeGO Budget                     | \$ 2,500.00 |             |           | \$ 1,000.00    |             | \$ 1,500.00    |           |                |           |                     | \$ 2,500.00 | 100%          |
|                                     | TOTAL BUDGET                    | \$ 3,500.00 |             |           |                |             |                |           |                |           |                     | \$ 3,500.00 |               |
|                                     | <b>TOTAL ACTUAL INCOME</b>      |             |             |           | \$ 2,050.00    |             | \$ 1,500.00    |           |                |           |                     | \$ 3,550.00 |               |
|                                     | <b>TOTAL ACTUAL EXPENSE</b>     |             | \$ 3,408.52 | \$ 120.00 | \$ 1,299.04    | \$ 1,586.51 | \$ 563.13      | \$ 603.49 | \$ -           | \$ 281.73 |                     | \$ 2,591.73 | 76%           |
| <b>BALANCE</b>                      | Income Over Expenses            |             |             |           |                |             |                |           |                |           |                     | \$ 958.27   |               |