



**Artistic Evaluation – Visual Arts**

**Organisation/Venue:** WASPS / Alloa  
**Title of Event:** Open Doors  
**Type of Event:** Open studios event  
**Date of Visit:** 4 October 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:
Very Poor		A range of work by 8 artists that varied in style and content, including performance, painting and mixed media work. The work was appropriate to the audience and setting, although not making new departures in terms of innovative practice. Great effort had been put into the overall organisation of the event.
Poor		
Competent	<b>X</b>	
Good		
Excellent		

### 1.2 Clarity of Communication:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		As above. Most of the messages and motivations within the work could be clearly understood through its execution. Fascinating venue, providing an interesting background context for the work.
Poor		
Competent		
Good	<b>X</b>	
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:
Very Poor		Have seen almost all of these artists' work before.
Poor		Most of them were dealing with personal themes relating to emotions and feelings that could be understood by a general audience. Others dealing with more political themes that acted in a challenging way. Overall the quality of ideas and execution was variable, but fitting to the location.
Competent	<b>x</b>	
Good		
Excellent		

1.4 Curatorial Vision/Selection:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	<b>X</b>	
Good		
Excellent		

Although the studio belonged to only one artist, Peter Russell, he exhibited work alongside other members of an artists' group he belongs to. This offered a more diverse range of work, which in turn was more interesting for visitors. There were interesting parallels between some artists' work. As there was no curatorial agenda for the exhibition this can't really be taken into account- it was self-selected.

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 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		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	<b>x</b>	
Excellent		

The space was used fully and provided a fascinating backdrop to the work- it did look like a working studio rather than a gallery. Well organised layout to accommodate both the work and visitors. No presentation equipment used but performance piece was well accommodated within overall layout.

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		
Excellent	<b>X</b>	

Each artist's work was accompanied by labels and neatly presented wall panels with texts written in a clear and informative style.  
At least half of the artists were present at all times to talk about their work informally.  
There were portfolios of additional work as well as flyers and cards.

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		
Good		
Excellent	<b>X</b>	

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		
Excellent	<b>X</b>	

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		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	<b>X</b>	
Excellent		

1.10 Please indicate events available and groups targeted:

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		Artist led workshop by Peter Russell with his regular Saturday sketching class from Stirling- a good way of introducing them to other artists' work. No opportunity for general public to join in.  Informal talks with artists on one-to-one basis for many visitors.
Poor		
Competent	<b>X</b>	
Good		
Excellent		

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

*(Please tick 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?

The venue was spacious and provided a safe and comfortable environment for visitors not used to gallery setting. A very welcoming atmosphere with fascinating array of objects and work throughout. A lot of effort had been put into making the space suitable for displaying the work.

### 2.2 Information/Interpretive material provided at the venue (e.g. programmes, displays etc) range, quantity and clarity

Very good range of materials available as well as approachable artists to talk to. This was suitable for all types of audience. Text material was varied, clear and well presented.

### 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.

Generic leaflet and poster by WASPS was very good, with a clear identity for the event that could be carried through by each location. Good design and distribution for audiences throughout the country. Website, publicity and press coverage well managed. The website for Open Doors was easy to download with clear homepage. The site is professional, bright, informative and easy to navigate with good quality images and maps.

## 2.4 Accessibility of the venue

- **ease of payment (if applicable)** n/a
- **location**  
Bit out of town, but that's usually the nature of artists' studios. Easy access off main road.
- **external signposting**  
A banner or large poster directly on the turn off from road to car park would have been useful. On arrival I didn't see the cards stuck onto the main sign in the car park.
- **internal directional signing**  
entrance to studio clearly signposted.
- **access and provision for disabled people**  
None- stairs leading to studio. No work at ground level.
- **opening hours/ timing of event**  
Good – open most of the day, Saturday and Sunday
- **attractiveness for children/families**  
Relaxed atmosphere with children and dog there! Refreshments of all kinds and plenty of space to move around.

## 2.5 Customer service

- **quality and efficiency of staff (eg welcoming, informed)**  
n/a, but artists present were very friendly and willing to talk about their work.

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

Poster, flyer and website all carried SAC logo.

## 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.

<b>Overall Rating</b> <i>(Please tick)</i>		<b>Comments and key reasons for rating:</b> Nationally, this is a key event bringing artists and audiences together in a direct way. It is well organised and acts strategically. On a local level it offered the only event of its kind in the region and set this into a national context and structure. The artists in Alloa obviously valued the opportunity to participate, put in a lot of effort and were successful in attracting a large, diverse audience. The only downside is that there's no WASPS group studio in the area that can offer the public an even wider view of contemporary practice from locally-based artists and support those artists to develop their practice and reach new audiences.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	<b>X</b>	
Excellent		

**Name:** Kirsteen Macdonald

**Date:** 16 November 2003

**Advisor** X

*(Please tick above as appropriate)*

**Scottish Arts Council Officer**