

Society of North American Goldsmiths  
Fall Board Meeting  
October 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>, 2013  
Agenda

Friday, October 4<sup>th</sup>, 12:00pm-2:00pm

1. Greetings
2. Announcements
  - a. Confidentiality
  - b. Recognition of approval of minutes-Becky
  - c. Revisions to agenda, additions, inserts, and support documents
3. Consent Calendar
  - a. Guilds
  - b. Lifetime Achievement Award
  - c. President
  - d. Student Related Services
  - e. Community Liaison
  - f. Road 2 Success Mentoring Program
  - g. Fundraising
  - h. Professional Development Seminar
  - i. Symposiums
  - j. Conference
  - k. Website
  - l. NEC
4. Year End Estimate-Anne
5. Exhibition Planning Committee-Bove
6. Transitional Plan-Gwynne
7. Core Questions-Jen

Saturday, October 5<sup>th</sup>, 12:00pm-3:00pm

1. Strategic Plan Description-Gwynne
2. Strategic Plan Phase One-Gwynne
3. Board Affairs-Jen

Society of North American Goldsmiths  
Fall Board Meeting  
October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013  
12:00 – 2:00 pm EST

Renee Zettle-Sterling - President  
Sue Amendolara - Past President  
Anne Havel – Treasurer  
Gwynne Rukenbrod –Executive Director

Jim Bove – Exhibition Planning Committee Liaison/Board Speaks Out  
Karen Lorene – External Fundraising/Outreach  
Brigitte Martin – Community Liaison, Volunteer Liaison, OPC Liaison, PDS Liaison  
Sharon Massey- Student Programs and Services Liaison  
Becky McDonah – Lifetime Achievement Award Liaison/Guild Liaison  
Bryan Park – Executive Committee  
Todd Pownell - Symposiums  
Pam Robinson – Conferences  
Jen Townsend – Online Presence Committee  
Kristi Kloss – Nominations and Elections Committee

**1. Greetings**

SNAG President Renee Zettle-Sterling called the meeting to order at 12:03 EST.

**2. Announcements**

**a. Confidentiality.**

The President reminded the board that everyone is encouraged to speak their minds during these meetings, and that opinions and comments are to remain confidential.

**b. Recognition of approval of minutes-Becky**

Drafts of the minutes were previously presented to board via email for review and a vote of approval was called for separately for each meeting date. The president noted the absence of two sets of minutes (Aug 16 & Sept 13) that will be submitted at a later date by Sharon and Renee.

The vote was tallied and the meeting minutes for Aug. 8, Aug. 23, Sept. 6, Sept. 20, and Sept. 27 were unanimously approved.

Approved minutes will be sent to the webmaster both electronically and in the mail with directions to post them on the SNAG website.

**c. Revisions to agenda, additions, inserts, and support documents**

**Additions:  
EiP Budget**

- 3. Consent Calendar**
  - a. Guilds**
  - b. Lifetime Achievement Award**
  - c. President**
  - d. Student Related Services**
  - e. Community Liaison**
  - f. Road 2 Success Mentoring Program**
  - g. Fundraising**
  - h. Professional Development Seminar**
  - i. Symposiums**
  - j. Conference**
  - k. Website**
  - l. NEC**

**Motion:**

The motion was made to accept the consent calendar.

Seconded.

Passed Unanimously.

**4. Year End Estimate-Anne**

**5. Exhibition Planning Committee-Bove**

The following motion was brought to the board to be fully considered and voted on.

MOTION: Funds promised to support a partnership and/or project must be available and set aside for that project. These funds can only be absorbed back into the general budget if the project fails to be completed by a set deadline.

After discussion it was brought to light that in order to reserve funds there would have to be a separate account created, which would involve expenses. It was decided that Jim, Anne and Gwynne would investigate this option further in order to create an informed proposal that they can bring to the Board by January 1<sup>st</sup>.

Discussion of Namita Wiggers' exhibition funding noted \$2,000 already disbursed and \$18,000 remaining to be dispersed over two years in payments of \$9,000 each. The discussion of restricted funds was applied to projects with signed contracts.

Mike Holmes has agreed to push back his exhibition proposal date.

The idea of supporting programming that involves the need to raise funds was discussed as to how much do we depend on fundraising/development projects and grant writing that have not happened yet. There could be an amount attached to a certain deadline, which would allow the ability to opt out of the project if the goal was not met by that time, in order to take some pressure off the EPC if there are difficulties raising the funds.

There was discussion of the inclusion of a stipulation in the fiscal policy that would limit the amount of money that the Executive Director can commit to a project without the approval of the Board.

## **6. Transitional Plan-Gwynne**

Gwynne provided the Board with a Transition Plan for October 2013 to April 1, 2014 and asked for any suggestions to be sent in email form to Gwynne.

## **7. Core Questions-Jen**

SNAG needs to identify itself in order to stand united and communicate what it is doing well. There will be open discussion tomorrow to weigh in on the SNAG core strategic planning questions. The Board was asked to go over these questions for the discussion tomorrow.

### **Other items:**

#### **EiP Budget**

The budget for *Animal Instincts* (previously referred to as *Animalia*) *EiP 2014* with expenses of \$2,890 was submitted by David for a vote of approval. The total revenue was projected at \$6,046; this was considered based on a conservative entry number but there is potential to make more. Two jurors were listed and the Board proposed an additional \$500 added to the budget to bring in a third juror in order to facilitate more juror diversity. Gwynne or Renee will contact David with the approved budget and proposal.

#### **Board Affairs**

Jen is reworking the handbook documents. She will share them as google docs to enable and gather input. She will use orange where she has questions. This should help cut down on overbearing email load and make editing easier and more efficient.

Pam has been creating the conference documents on google docs so they have been recording data that way. This can be available for the Board to view, suggest edits or make comments. They will not be available for the general membership to see as they are working documents on planning the conference.

The goal is to build institutional memory and have it available on the website with only board access. Some folders will be locked, and they would not be visible to the general membership.

### **Conference 2017 Location**

Pam discussed research into selecting the 2017 conference location. She circulated information on Portland, Oregon, San Francisco, California, and Albuquerque, New Mexico. There was discussion as to the decision to only hold the conference in first tier cities and suggestions to investigate New Orleans as a potential site for 2017. Other first tier cities noted included New York City, Seattle, Atlanta, San Diego, San Francisco Philadelphia, Chicago, Las Angeles, Las Vegas, Dallas, Boston, Denver taking in the consideration of the density of available exhibition venues and transportation.

Pam will look into New Orleans for 2017 with Kate and Monica.

The discussion about brining the conference into a college campus was brought up and the comments were made that there are issues with this route, as they will not book that far in advance for our event. If it were held in June or July it might be less likely to conflict with graduations, but still our desired attendance would be challenging for a university to accommodate. SNAG conference planners had specifically changed to holding conferences in hotels because of the guarantee of space reservation that the universities could not provide.

Having set rotating cities for the conference was discussed, but there was concern in only having a set 5 or 6 cities (i.e. Boston, Chicago, Seattle, New Orleans, Atlanta and Philly). With a lot of the volunteer work for the conference being able to do off site this could be done without a heavy burn out rate of local volunteers.

It was also noted that in the future we could consider other opportunities and possibly include second tier cities and going back to holding a conference every year with our goal to keep it reasonably priced and be a location that people want to go.

### **Potential 2015 Programming Change - Pam**

Pam circulated documents outlining the change in programming desired but the co-chairs for the Boston conference and other new conference format goals.

The 2015 conference co-chairs are suggesting a change in programming to include 3 panels talking about each specific component of their conference theme: Impact, Heritage and Innovation; 3 individual speakers, and 3 rapid fire presentations along with 1 interview style presentation.

It was noted that the presenters invited are expected to do their presentation and then a smaller conference experience. Replacing the panels suggested for more interactive smaller groups could be an option for something more interactive and within the budget. Pam will write up a concise proposal for the board to go over and prepare for voting on this issue tomorrow.

Meeting adjourned 1:59 pm

Society of North American Goldsmiths  
Fall Board Meeting  
October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013  
12:00pm-2:00pm; 3:00pm-4:00pm EST

Renee Zettle-Sterling - President  
Sue Amendolara - Past President  
Anne Havel – Treasurer  
Gwynne Rukenbrod –Executive Director

Karen Lorene – External Fundraising/Outreach  
Brigitte Martin – Community Liaison, Volunteer Liaison, OPC Liaison, PDS Liaison  
Sharon Massey- Student Programs and Services Liaison  
Becky McDonah – Lifetime Achievement Award Liaison/Guild Liaison  
Bryan Park – Executive Committee  
Todd Pownell - Symposiums  
Pam Robinson – Conferences  
Jen Townsend – Online Presence Committee  
Kristi Kloss – Nominations and Elections Committee

Saturday, October 5<sup>th</sup>, 12:00pm-3:00pm

- 1. Strategic Plan Description-Gwynne**
- 2. Strategic Plan Phase One-Gwynne**
- 3. Board Affairs-Jen**

**Greetings**

SNAG President Renee Zettle-Sterling called the meeting to order at 12:00pm EST.

**Announcements**

The President reminded the board that everyone is encouraged to speak their minds during these meetings, and that opinions and comments are to remain confidential.

**Agenda Additions**

**2015 Conference programming structure**

**Handbook changes in EAC responsibilities regarding the EiP**

## **2015 Conference programming structure**

Board Members discussed documents that were circulated explaining the current conference format and the proposed format from the Boston co-chairs.

The 2015 change in the programming proposes:

3 speakers for 1 hr

3 Panels (of three people each theme: impact, heritage and innovation)

3 Rapid Fires

This puts the budget over the typical average cost for programming.

The alternative suggestion is:

3 speakers for 1 hr

3 lecture spots (with 3 speakers on same theme for 15 minutes each instead of panels)

3 rapid fire sessions

Speakers will be required by contract to participate in some secondary programming. The keynote will do a “larger” smaller session and Early Career Artists will do smaller group sessions. This is already happening in Minneapolis; using the invited speakers in secondary programming.

The current pricing structure for programming was discussed and compared to past pricing structures.

The 2015 committee is still waiting for a response from their first choice of a Keynote Speaker.

Starting in 2015 the development of a partnership with ACC has put into action a sponsorship of one speaker of their choosing. This may be one of their College of Fellows or Gold Medal winners. They would pay honoraria, travel and hotel.

### **Motion**

Pam Robinson made the motion to approve a programming change for Boston 2015 that would include: 1 keynote, 3 speakers, 3 sessions with 3 speakers speaking 15 min each on one topic/theme, 3 early career artists rapid fire sessions and 1 interview style presentation if funds are available. Bryan seconded.

All in favor: unanimous

## **Handbook changes in EAC responsibilities regarding the EiP**

Changes were purposed to the handbook for the Editorial Advisory Committee Responsibilities and Procedures regarding the *Exhibition in Print*.

The motion on the table is to change the wording in the handbook to reflect previous discussion to change the current wording of the last bullet point under the EAC Members Responsibility that reads “suggest/select jurors” to “suggest jurors for board approval” and “suggest/select commissioned curators” to “suggest commissioned curators for board approval” and “select curatorial proposals for EiP” to “suggest curatorial proposals for EiP for board approval.”

This will also include changing the wording under the Liaison Responsibilities from “Create and present to the Board for approval all budgets for the Annual EAC Meeting, the Exhibition in Print, and any other special projects falling under the purview of the EAC” to “ Create and present to the Board for approval all budgets, jurors, and curators for the Exhibition in Print, and any other special projects falling under the purview of the EAC.” In addition to this, the bullet points “Oversee the EAC Chair” and “ Create EAC reports for EAC Annual meeting, board meetings, and other meetings as needed” would be added.

These edits do not change the majority of the document, the change in wording interjects the call for board approval.

Other formatting suggestions for the handbook arose and it was suggested to number sections instead of using bullets for more clarity when discussing an item in the future and using a highlighted document to pinpoint the changes.

It was agreed that these changes in wording should go into effect immediately and the addition of \$500 for another juror become effective immediately and communicated to the EAC committee.

### **Motion**

Gwynne made the motion to change the EAC guidelines in the handbook as stated in the documents circulated to the Board to interject Board approval of the jurors and curators for EiP. Sue Seconded.

All in favor: unanimous

### **1. Strategic Plan Description-Gwynne**

Gwynne discussed the importance of revisiting the strategic planning process although it has been done recently. Who should be involved in strategic planning process was identified as the Planning Process Champion and Plan Writer to be Gwynne. The Planning Process Facilitator is Renee. The Planning Team is the Board of Directors and the Executive Director and the Clients are the members of the organization.

The deadline for the plan to be adopted by the Board will be the April Board Meeting. The plan can be developed over Oct/Nov/Dec with the board and input collected in Jan/Feb from the membership. The plan developed in 2011 will be used as a foundation.

This plan will strive to be more specific and narrow the relevance. For example: Goal number 1 – how do we measure this? Let's reword this so we can measure it. SNAG will release a survey to the membership in January that covers what do you see SNAG as now and what would you like SNAG to become? This will track the response of members and non-members.

Noted was the question of what is SNAG's value and who does SNAG serve? Look at the programming. Does it serve? Does it need tweaking?

## **2. Strategic Plan Phase One-Gwynne**

Mission Review: A document with the collection of the SNAG Mission, SNAG Vision and By-Laws Preamble (specifically the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph) was circulated to facilitate comparison.

The Board was asked to make specific note of the use of text such as where the terms artists, designers, jewelers, metalsmiths, practitioners, teachers and advocates were used. They are not all universally included.

As the organization is headed for more inclusiveness the need to create a sustainability plan was discussed. It was suggested to look at other organizations and determine if SNAG intends to duplicate services or is SNAG going to build partnerships and help and support each other. SNAG can be an organization that also helps members connect to other organizations with a different specialty.

Emergency mode will continue on top of this planning, but we need to be thinking beyond the immediate patchwork and get the organization back on a solid path. The donormeter has reached the \$15,000 mark, but there is still a long ways to go to reach our goal of \$25,000 by December 31<sup>st</sup>.

### **SNAG core strategic planning questions:**

#### **SNAG Identity**

Discussion covering "Who/What is SNAG?" commenced. We need a clear, concise way to describe a multi-faceted organization.

Some responses included:

SNAG is made up of national/international jewelers and metalsmiths not all working in gold not all working in jewelry that includes other materials and artforms. We are an educational non-profit organization.

We have grown from the post war studio craft tradition into something new.

SNAG is a thinking organization. The term Society is used to describe a historical thinking organization. Societies were groups based on useful knowledge and did not just share craft techniques. From 1968 until now, SNAG has gone through different ways of thinking and changes in philosophical ways of thinking. A reason to join and participate is because it helps promote thought and pushes an artist forward even if the materials are not what they work with. Thinking is synonymous with making. SNAG is shared knowledge.

SNAG is an exchange of ideas. A chance to get to think about something besides commission work.

SNAG is a collective pool of knowledge. A resource of people to contact about techniques and materials.

SNAG is bigger than just traditional goldsmiths. We aren't even North American anymore, we are international.

It was then discussed how SNAG differs from organizations such as AJF, ABANA, etc. SNAG does not want to exclude, but must question if we are duplicating services of organizations that exist. We must decide if we want to be in competition or collaborative partners.

The next topic of discussion was: **Why do we exist?**

Some responses included: As a resource. To learn from one another. To connect artist who tend to be isolated and are very individual in our process. SNAG is culturally relevant. To secure the continuation of the craft and not lose sight of how things are produced. Do not lose the history as we evolve into the future. We do not let go of the past. It is our responsibility to archive the history.

SNAG has an advocacy role. We need to teach the outside world and develop our ability to describe ourselves to outsiders. Developing an outreach program was discussed along with how could we possibly support something that would get this out to the community through high schools, museums, perhaps regional chapters of SNAG sharing what we do and explaining our relevance.

**Who do we want to be?**

Some responses to this question included: We want to become advocates. We want to all get along and include the entire field. People are seeing a division, but there is learning potential in diversity. We are trying to forge partnerships with other organizations. We want more of the people who criticize become part of us by getting involved and participating. We want to evolve and still pay attention to the fabulous history we have. We value our diversity and different ways of thinking.

We want members to take note of what the traditional makers can offer to the conceptual makers and vice-versa.

### **Stakeholder Identity**

Stakeholders are the people and other organizations for whom SNAG matters.

Gallery owners. SNAG serves gallery owners but need to get more gallery owners to recognize this. They can gather and grow with SNAG.

Academia, educators and students, collectors, makers.

Concern was expressed on how we label each other and more questions were raised. Educators and jewelers can both be makers. Are we North American or International? Do we foster relationships with other organizations in different countries? Do we lean more towards jewelry than sculptural objects? Does the magazine tend to focus on one form more than another?

Do we respond to the clients well in finding out what they want and what their needs are? The board consists of members that the membership elected to speak for them and represent them. A signifier of the organization's concern with listening to the membership was the creation of a Board position specifically to actively listen to the public and bring concerns to the board. We listen to the positive and the negative and have branched out with social media.

Email any thoughts to Gwynne that you didn't get a chance to share.

Meeting broke at 2:01pm EST

Will resume at 3:00pm EST

---

SNAG President Renee Zettle-Sterling welcomed Board members back from a short break and resumed the meeting at 3:00pm EST.

Gwynne thanked the board for their time.

### **Discussion resumed on SNAG core strategic planning questions.**

#### **Philosophy**

Ideas about if SNAG is stronger or weaker as a big tent organization were shared. Many agreed that if SNAG is to remain big tent it needs to be something for everyone, it can not be everything for everyone. Find different things that fill the broad spectrum of constituencies.

More discussion continued over the good of having something to offer to the diversity but questioned splitting up the programming up too much to avoid further splitting up the membership and reinforcing of labeling.

The idea of looking into helping facilitate more opportunities for mixers at the conferences was brought up. Having events like the student mixer to help attendees feel more comfortable at the conference could be done for other sub-groups like galley owners, educators, curators, etc. No extensive programming, just providing a space and time to meet.

Discussion over what SNAG values, and what we want SNAG to value was tallied from a list of choices. The importance of adding community as something that SNAG values was noted.

Feelings that the mission statement is mushy and wordy were voiced. It was stated that a strong mission statement should be easy enough to memorize.

### **Media**

There was discussion over what is the function and who is the audience of *Metalsmith* magazine. Does it serve a portion of the membership, the entire membership and/or a larger audience? Do we want it to be a broad representation of the field?

Discussion commenced and focused on the desire to broaden the audience to include traditional makers, objects, sculpture and to exist outside our world and be of interest at other venues such as architecture firms, fashion offices, etc. The goal to represent/mirror the membership more and still be outwardly focused was stated. American Craft magazine was given as an example of a publication that is doing a great job doing this. Other magazines to look at include Ornament Magazine and Dwell.

Regarding *Exhibition in Print* there was discussion of trying to serve a broader base by selecting multiple jurors/curators to create a more eclectic vision. This brought up the question of possibly creating a less cohesive exhibit. Ideas for identifying the difference of the EiP included replacing the heading "*Metalsmith*" with "*Society of North American Goldsmiths - Exhibition in Print*" or since it is a show catalog for a show that never physically happens, have it be the title of the show. This way viewers are presented with the theme before they open the magazine. This was countered by the issue of losing our branding that we have minimal chances to reinforce.

What is the function of the website and what could it be:

The website should be a go to place to get SNAG/field related information. *Riveting News* can direct readers to the website and embed links.

We want readers to go to the website to look for information about the conference, or something else specific, but then start to explore the other content. We want to utilize the Maker Profile Pages more. Highlighting one member a week is a start. There is work being done to get a place to type in a search for specific people. Right now you can get them through the member directory.

Some kinks are being worked out on the *Contemporary Goldsmithing* online exhibition. These should be fixed soon and the exhibit can be announced in Riveting News on Monday. The banner is up on the SNAG homepage as of yesterday.

Thank you went out to Anne and Gwynne for putting together the contract for Gwynne. There was a reminder to look at Gwynne's transition plan and let her know if you have any edits/editions this week. Gwynne will work with Anne and formally propose a fiscal policy for the Executive Director at a later time.

Kristi's Nominations and Elections Committee Report will be discussed in a future meeting.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 pm