



Artistic Evaluation – Visual Arts

Organisation/Venue: Modern Institute

Title of Event: Björn Dahlem

Type of Event: Exhibition

Date of Visit: 12/2/04

This report has been commissioned by the Scottish Arts Council to evaluate the artistic quality of the production named below. It has been prepared by either a Specialist Advisor or a Council Officer as indicated at the end of the form. The report will be circulated to the organisation which produced the work and to the management of the venue if it is Core Funded by the Scottish Arts Council.

The report may be made available to Scottish Arts Council Officers, Council and Committee members, and Specialist Advisors as appropriate. It will be taken into account in assessing the work of the organisation in relation to applications for funding to the Scottish Arts Council. It may also be used by the Council to report on the overall performance of its Core Funded organisations.

Evaluators should enter their rating under each section, explaining briefly their reason for the rating with reference to their comments under each section. Ratings should be given in accordance with the following:

- **Very Poor** – standard falls well below what is acceptable
- **Poor** - not attaining acceptable standards of conception or presentation
- **Competent** – routine rather than especially interesting
- **Good** – well conceived and executed.
- **Excellent** – conceived and executed to a high standard.

This form is available electronically. Please word process/type response.

Assessment will depend of nature of event/exhibition reviewed but we anticipate it should take between 30 - 45 minutes to fill this form in.

1. Artistic Assessment

Please evaluate the **artistic quality** of the event

2.3 Vision and Imagination:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

The work filled the space fully, making a big visual impact. It also altered spacial qualities of gallery with materials (light and Styrofoam) and through its sculptural form.

1.2 Clarity of Communication:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	x	

The striking visual elements of the work didn't need to rely on interpretation to communicate the key ideas behind the work.

You are also asked to assess the **strengths and weaknesses** of the event with specific reference to the following:

2.3 Artist's Work - please include:

- quality of ideas skills in execution
- have you seen the work of this artist/these artists before (particularly in relation to new work, or second productions)

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		<p>I knew of the artist's work, but hadn't seen it first hand before.</p> <p>High quality production of work and use of materials with detailed attention to the surrounding space.</p> <p>Visually it was instantly appealing, with further meaning</p>

Good		behind the work, apparent through closer inspection.
Excellent	X	

1.4 Curatorial Vision/Selection:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Dahlem's work fits coherently within the gallery's programme of solo exhibitions throughout the year. The exhibition reflects Modern Institute's work with artists within the international scene- collaborations with other galleries, art fairs, etc.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

Please also indicate, as far as you are aware, if the event:

has been originated by the exhibiting organisation **X**
 hired a collaboration
 part of a festival artist led

1.5 Standards of presentation – please include:

- use of equipment
- use of space
- overall layout/hang

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Two pieces fit within two linked gallery spaces – each with it's own character – they play off each other and responding to the space they sit within High quality materials and attention to existing fittings within the space.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	X	

1.6 Please indicate the range, quantity, clarity, tone and level of Interpretative information/material provided at the venue:

- wall panels labels catalogue leaflets artists CVs

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: The work operated on such a direct visual level that little interpretation is needed. Artists' CV, floorplan and text were available in the gallery
Very Poor		

Poor		space and further information available informally through staff in the office. No wall panel or large print versions of material. Information written for the gallery's core audience which is contemporary-art literate.
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.7 Please indicate the number of visitors/participants at the time of your visit:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		Four visitors were present during my short visit
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.8 Please indicate the audience reaction – to include:

- time spent
- interest
- activity
- visitors' book comments

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		Positive responses- taking interest in the work. No visitors book
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.9 Please indicate how appropriate you think the work was for the audience:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		Modern Institute serves the art community in Scotland very well. This was a strong presentation of work by a young artist with an international career - a great opportunity to see his work in Scotland.
Poor		
Competent		

Good	X	
Excellent		

2.3 Please indicate events available and groups targeted:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor	X	N/a Not aware of any events but the Modern Institute doesn't aim to deliver audience development in this way- it serves the Scottish arts scene through other areas of work and audience development through collaborations with other public galleries.
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

workshops	—	pre-school	—
artist's talks	—	primary	—
discussion groups	—	secondary	—
		students	—
		over 18	—
		over 60	—
		other	—

(Please tick above as appropriate)

2. Management of Event

Please evaluate the way the event was presented/organised by the organisation and by the venue. Please answer, where relevant, with reference to the checklist below adding any other comments/observations you may have.

2.1 Was the venue suitable for the event? **Yes. The artist responded to the venue itself and his work clearly fits within overall programme.**

2.2 Information/Interpretive material provided at the venue (e.g. programmes, displays etc)

- range, quantity and clarity
Good range of material. CV, text and floorplan – would be good to have multiple copies of these so that they can be taken away without having to ask in the office.

2.3 Publicity/Pre-Publicity for the Event (leaflets, posters, etc)

- range, content and when and where available. Please be alert to the publicity available prior to your visit to the event. Please also view and comment on the company's website where one is advertised. Comment on the ease of use, and quality of content and presentation, and currency of information.

Invitation card sent by direct mail.

Press previews in listings/art magazines

Website- informative and stylish with useful information on artists and Modern Institute itself. Images and CV for Bjorn Dahlem.

Opening times not stated on website

2.4 Accessibility of the venue

- ease of payment (if applicable) **n/a**
- location **City Centre – more visible since hotel built across street**
- external signposting **None other than invite card on door**
- internal directional signing **Not particularly visible- same style as all the building's tenants**
- access and provision for disabled people **Poor- stairs lead to front door of building**
- opening hours/ timing of event **Weekday office hours only**
- attractiveness for children/families **Poor unless already familiar with venue, layout and size. Not a target audience.**

2.5 Customer service

- quality and efficiency of staff (eg welcoming, informed)
Friendly and informative staff in office

3. **Acknowledgement of Scottish Arts Council Funding** (if applicable)

Following is an extract from the Scottish Arts Council's conditions of grant for funded organisations:

"The company should acknowledge Scottish Arts Council funding in press releases, at launches, on all published materials (including leaflets, brochures, programmes, posters, notices display and exhibition materials, websites and advertising). Acknowledgement of the Scottish Arts Council grant must also be made in any secondary or indirect products arising from the revenue funding such as recordings, publications, video, broadcasts, and computer programmes etc. "

Please comment on whether the above conditions of grant were met, including use and prominence of the Scottish Arts Council logo on the company's website.

No SAC logo on print or website. No text acknowledgement of support

4. **Scoring**

Overall Rating. Please rate the event overall, taking into account your ratings for each section. Please state the key reasons for your overall ratings – that is the particular strengths and weaknesses.

Overall Rating <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		

Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Name: Kirsteen Macdonald

Date: 28 / 2 /04

Advisor
(Please tick above as appropriate)

Scottish Arts Council Officer