



Artistic Evaluation – Visual Arts

Organisation/Venue: WASPS

Title of Event: Wasps open doors (Courtyard Studios, Irvine)

Type of Event Open studios

Date of Visit: 05/10/03

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: Relating just to the local event – evidence of virtually every studio occupant actively involved in presenting their work and engaging with the visiting public. The courtyard layout of the studios facilitated easy visual access for the visitor to all the studios.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.2 Clarity of Communication:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Individual artists mostly very keen to talk to the public about their work and how they use their studios. Probably not a lot of information to link the studios to the wider picture of Wasps throughout Scotland, other than the national leaflet.
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: I was unexpectedly and very pleasantly surprised by the high levels of creativity and execution shown throughout. Obviously different artists showed different goals and directions (some evidently quite commercially orientated, some using their time and space for personal creative development). I knew some artists' work already, others were new to me.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	

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

1.4 Curatorial Vision/Selection:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		Not applicable.
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

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

has been originated by the exhibiting organisation

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 (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		Some artists had used their studios to display work as an exhibition, some also showed work in progress and a more 'normal' studio use. Given the very small amount of space available to most artists, all seemed to use the space to its maximum potential. Other than space, there appeared to be no shared facilities or equipment. The shared courtyard could have been used for some collective event/celebration/display, but was not exploited. Ongoing live music from the studio of the instrument maker provided a delightful ambience.
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: This varied, but in most cases individual artists were in their studios and readily engaging in conversation with visitors. Most had titles and prices on their work. I was not aware of any artists' CVs available. Wasps Opendoors leaflet readily available.
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: Hard to judge, as there was a lot of movement between studios. In all studios there were other visitors during my visit, and in some cases too many to fit more in and I had to return later. 40 visitors had been recorded by Sunday afternoon, but this was undoubtedly a large underestimate by otherwise busy participating artists.
Very Poor		
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: As evident in above comments, visitors appeared to be staying some time, visiting all the studios, talking to artists.
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: Audience appeared to be largely local, passing by, families, friends of one or more of the artists etc. Work in most cases was reasonably accessible in traditional media – painting, photography, crafts, and reasonably priced. Interpretation of some of the more challenging work was undoubtedly helped by artists' presence.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.10 Please indicate events available and groups targeted:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Not applicable.
Very Poor		
Poor		
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?

Very, but more a case of the event being suitable for the venue.

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

- range, quantity and clarity

Very little additional interpretive material, but little needed – artists readily engaging in talking about their own work. No information by or about the council run studio or forthcoming artist in residence (other than verbally from other artists).

- 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.

Had I not been asked to cover the event, I would not have known about it, although the national leaflet, when I saw it, was informative and clear. Locally, successful efforts by the studio group to get local publicity (whole page spread in local paper, although I did not see it in person). Parallel group exhibition of the artists' work in the nearby Harbour Arts Centre, also arranged by the studio group, will have generated extra interest.

- 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

Signage to the studios is poor, but apparently being addressed by the group in the near future, at their own cost.

- 2.5 Customer service
- quality and efficiency of staff (eg welcoming, informed)

Artists not staff, but all welcoming and informed. No local authority presence in relation to the council-run studio.

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.

Funders acknowledged on general opendoors leaflet.

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 interesting and engaging visit, with plenty to see, good quality work and an excellent use of space. A high level of optimism and enthusiasm from participating artists to maintain public interest and visits to the studios.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

Name: Linda Mallett

Date: 06/10/03

Advisor yes
(Please tick above as appropriate)

Scottish Arts Council Officer