



Artistic Evaluation – Visual Arts

Organisation/Venue: Tramway, Glasgow (Project Room)

Title of Event: Stephen Sutcliffe

Type of Event: Exhibition

Date of Visit: Sat 20 December 2003

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

1.1 Vision and Imagination:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Work of significant young artist shown in one of Scotland's key spaces. Scale of project room was appropriate for this particular installation
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

1.2 Clarity of Communication:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Multi layered aspect of work, combining a range of cultural influences and source material, worked well in the domestic scale of the project room. The placing of the viewer in the darkened space heightened the ideas of distance and the unobtainable that ran through the work.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

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

1.3 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: The work successfully translates the tensions and contradictions of contemporary (British) culture, utilising a range of overlapping material and experiences which reflects the reality of how we form our ideas and opinions today. The TV is central to this cultural education, and Sutcliffe's use of a few monitors to present the work reinforces our common experience
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	

Excellent		
-----------	--	--

1.4 Curatorial Vision/Selection:

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		Kind of programming expected form a key visual art space
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

(Please tick above as appropriate)

1.5 Standards of presentation – please include:

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

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		The installation worked really well, combining a space and equipment of a domestic scale reached through a curtain and black out which suggested a cultural “performance”
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
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		
Poor		
Competent	x	
Good		
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		
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		Very appropriate work for the space – particularly with the relevance of the performative aspect of Sutcliffe’s work.
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

1.10 Please indicate events available and groups targeted:

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		No information available from foyer staff.
Poor	x	
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

- | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------------------|
| workshops | <input type="checkbox"/> | pre-school | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| artist’s talks | <input type="checkbox"/> | primary | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| discussion groups | <input type="checkbox"/> | secondary | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | students | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | over 18 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | over 60 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

(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 – in terms of quality of work and relevance to profile/artistic programme of venue.
- 2.2 Information/Interpretive material provided at the venue (e.g. programmes, displays etc)
- range, quantity and clarity
 - Adequate handouts but with no range interpretive levels. Language used was clear and comprehensible.

- 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.

Only info on show seen prior to visit was the website info. Which was clear and the site easy to use. No specific poster produced for the Sutcliffe show.

- 2.4 Accessibility of the venue
- ease of payment (if applicable)
 - location
 - external signposting
 - internal directional signing
 - access and provision for disabled people
 - opening hours/ timing of event
 - attractiveness for children/families

Tramway is a slight distance from the city centre with public transport limited to bus or taxi - no immediate underground station – making it more difficult to pull in the passing public. Internal signage is adequate. Venue accessible to wheelchair users – all on one level through to gardens with lift access to upper floor.

- 2.5 Customer service
- quality and efficiency of staff (eg welcoming, informed)
- Staff were friendly but not particularly informed about the show – one assistant did try to contact a member of curatorial staff but they were unavailable.

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.

SAC credited on print material and website.

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	x	
Excellent		

Name: Lorraine Grant
Date: 4 January 2004

Advisor **X**
(Please tick above as appropriate)

Scottish Arts Council Officer