

ARTISTIC AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

This assessment has been commissioned by Arts Council England to assist with its evaluation of the quality of the work created or presented by the arts and cultural organisations it funds. It may provide a useful starting point for a discussion about quality but it will never provide a full picture of the quality of an organisation and would not be used in isolation to inform a funding decision. It will be shared with the organisation concerned and may be released to a third party under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act. Copyright of this form and of completed assessments is owned by Arts Council England.

| Name of Assessor: | |
|------------------------------|--|
| NPO being assessed: | |
| Title of activity: | |
| Date: (if relevant) | |
| Venue: (if relevant) | |
| Time: (if relevant) | |

Context

| 8 |) Please give details of the context you bring to this |
|---|---|
| | assessment. |
| ŀ | or example: |
| • | <i>y</i> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| | the organisation's |
| | work, the work |
| | being assessed or |
| | the |
| | artists/practitioners involved. |
| • | How familiar are |
| | you with the |
| | style/genre/sub- |
| | artform/discipline? |
| • | Are you familiar |
| | with the venue or is |
| | it your first visit? |

1. The Vision and Concept of the work

| a) (| Concept: Did | |
|-------|----------------------|--|
| | | |
| - | you think it was | |
| | an interesting | |
| | idea? | |
| • (| Consider what | |
| V | was interesting | |
| 6 | about the concept | |
| | and vision of the | |
| | work or activity | |
| | and why. | |
| | Was there a | |
| | strong idea | |
| | behind the | |
| | | |
| | work/activity? | |
| | If you didn't think | |
| | the concept and | |
| V | vision was | |
| i | interesting, | |
| 0 | consider why. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1.) 1 | D - 1 | |
| - | Relevance: Did | |
| | it have | |
| | something to | |
| | say about the | |
| | world we live in | |
| • (| Consider whether | |
| t | the work/activity | |
| 1 | represents or | |
| (| explores issues | |
| , T | which are relevant | |
| á | and important to | |
| | society and why. | |
| | If you didn't it had | |
| | something | |
| | relevant to say, | |
| | - | |
| | consider why. | |

| Does it reflect the diversity of contemporary society? Is the work/activity relevant to the audiences and/or participants, and why? | |
|--|--|
| b) Local Impact: Was it important it was happening here Consider whether the themes, production or presentation had a connection with the place (locality or specific venue) in which it was presented and why. What difference did this make to the experience of the work/activity? If you didn't think it had a strong local impact, | |
| consider why. | |

2. Execution, Production and Presentation

| | ~ | D' |
|---|----------|---------------------|
| | a) | Rigour: was it |
| | | well thought |
| | | through and |
| | | put together |
| | • | Consider whether |
| 1 | • | |
| 1 | | the work/activity |
| 1 | | had been fully |
| | | thought through |
| | | and executed to a |
| | | high standard and |
| | | |
| | | why? |
| | • | For participatory |
| | | work did the |
| | | session feel well |
| | | |
| l | | planned and |
| 1 | | organised? |
| 1 | • | If the aims for the |
| | | work/activity are |
| | | clearly stated in |
| | | • |
| | | publicity material |
| | | or accompanying |
| | | programmes etc, |
| | | were they |
| | | achieved? |
| | | |
| | • | If you didn't think |
| | | it was well |
| | | thought through |
| | | and put together, |
| | | consider why. |
| | | constact wity. |
| | <u> </u> | |
| | b) | Presentation: |
| | | Was it well |
| | | produced and |
| | | presented |
| | • | Consider the |
| 1 | | quality of the |
| | | production/ |
| | | - ' |
| | | presentation |
| 1 | | standards |
| | • | This could be |
| 1 | | lighting, sound, |
| | | use of space, |
| | | overall |
| 1 | | overan |

| | lovout /hong |
|---|--------------------|
| | layout/hang, |
| | graphic design, |
| | 'interpretive |
| | design; use of |
| | digital |
| | technologies etc |
| • | Was the venue or |
| - | space |
| | appropriate? |
| | |
| • | Were appropriate |
| | materials used? |
| • | For participatory |
| | assessments was |
| | the quality of |
| | materials, space |
| | and resources |
| | appropriate to the |
| | participants? |

3. Originality, Innovation and Risk Taking

| | a) Distinctiveness: |
|---|-----------------------|
| | Was it different |
| | from things |
| | you've seen |
| | before |
| | • Consider whether |
| 1 | the work as a |
| | whole, or |
| | elements of the |
| | work, were |
| | distinctive and |
| | different from |
| | things you have |
| | experienced |
| | before within the |
| | sector. |
| • | • If it was a revival |
| | of an existing |
| | work were there |
| | distinctive |
| | elements about |

| • | this production or exhibition? Could the work/activity have been more distinctive? If so, consider why. |
|----|---|
| | |
| D) | Originality: |
| | Was it ground |
| | breaking |
| • | Consider whether |
| | the work/activity |
| | broke new ground |
| | for the artform. |
| • | Think about scale |
| | and ambition, use |
| | of technology, |
| | interdisciplinary |
| | working etc. |
| • | If it was a revival |
| | of an existing |
| | work, was the work shown in a |
| | fresh context or |
| | from a new |
| | perspective? |
| • | Could the |
| • | work/activity |
| | have been more |
| | original? If so, |
| | consider why. |
| | constact wity. |

| c) | Risk: Did the |
|-----------|---------------------|
| | artists/ |
| | curators/ |
| | performers |
| | really challenge |
| | themselves |
| • | Consider whether |
| | the work/activity |
| | has taken risks in |
| | its concept and |
| | delivery and why? |
| • | How successful |
| | was this? |
| • | If you know the |
| | artists'/curators/ |
| | facilitators/etc |
| | work, does this |
| | piece show them |
| | exploring new |
| | techniques or |
| | subject matter? |
| • | Could the |
| | work/activity |
| | have shown a |
| | greater appetite |
| | for risk taking? If |
| | so, consider why. |
| | |
| | |

| d) | Excellence: was |
|------------|--------------------|
| | this work one |
| | of the best |
| | examples of its |
| | type that you |
| | have seen |
| • | Consider the |
| | overall quality of |
| | the work/activity, |
| | how this |
| | compares to |
| | similar things you |
| | have experienced |
| | and why. |

| • D | oes it make a |
|------|-------------------|
| - | ositive |
| | ontribution to |
| th | ne development |
| of | f the discipline? |
| • If | not, consider |
| w | hy? |
| | J |

4. The Impact of the work

| a) | Captivation: |
|----|--------------------|
| | Was it |
| | absorbing? Did |
| | it hold your |
| | attention |
| • | Consider how |
| | deeply you were |
| | absorbed in the |
| | work and why? |
| • | Did it |
| | communicate |
| | successfully to |
| | you? |
| • | What impact did |
| | it have on you? |
| • | How did it make |
| | you feel? |
| • | If the work wasn't |
| | captivating, why |
| | not |
| • | For participatory |
| | assessments, were |
| | participants |
| | engaged |
| | throughout? |

| • | it thought provoking Consider whether the work made you think differently and why. |
|---|--|
| | Consider whether the work made you think differently and why. |
| | the work made you think differently and why. |
| • | you think differently and why. |
| • | differently and why. |
| • | why. |
| • | • |
| • | D: 1 : |
| | Did it provide |
| | fresh or different |
| | perspective on its |
| | topics? |
| • | Did it challenge |
| | how you thought |
| | about its topics? |
| • | Did it encourage |
| | thought about |
| | wider issues? |
| • | Could the work |
| | have been more |
| | challenging? If so, |
| | why? |
| | • |

| c) | Enthusiasm: |
|-----------|-------------------|
| | Would you see |
| | something like |
| | it again |
| • | Consider whether |
| | you would choose |
| | to see similar |
| | work in the |
| | future, under |
| | what |
| | circumstances |
| | and why? If not, |
| | please explain |
| • | For participatory |
| | assessments, |
| | would you |
| | welcome seeing |
| | the approach |
| | taken by the NPO |
| | elsewhere? |

5. The programming or curating of the work

| a) How does the | |
|------------------------|--|
| work sit within the | |
| organisation's | |
| overall programme | |
| or catalogue and | |
| next to work | |
| created/ | |
| presented/ | |
| curated or | |
| published by | |
| others? | |

For programmed work assessments only

| b) Please comment |
|--------------------------|
| on the overall vision |
| of the programmer, |
| choice of material. |
| You are welcome to |
| provide an overview |
| of partners involved |
| in the programme |
| |

6. Audiences & Engagement

| | a) Audience and |
|---|--------------------|
| | participant |
| | responses |
| • | If you experienced |
| | the work/activity |
| | in the presence of |
| | other people, how |
| | did they react? |
| • | Was the |
| | work/activity |
| | intellectually |
| | accessible to the |
| | intended |
| | audience/ |
| | participants? |

| • | How long did you | |
|---|---------------------|--|
| | spend with the | |
| | work or engaging | |
| | with the activity? | |
| • | How many people | |
| | experienced the | |
| | work during that | |
| | time? | |
| • | Is its presentation | |
| | appropriate for | |
| | the intended | |
| | audience? | |
| • | If the work is | |
| | written, how do | |
| | you think other | |
| | readers will | |
| | engage with it? | |
| • | Were participants | |
| | encouraged to | |
| | share and support | |
| | each other? Did | |
| | the facilitator | |
| | respond to the | |
| | needs of the | |
| | group? Was | |
| | everyone | |
| | included? | |
| | | |
| b |) Marketing and | |
| | digital | |
| | engagement | |
| • | Was | |
| | accompanying | |
| | marketing and | |
| | engagement | |
| | material | |
| | appropriate and | |
| | good quality? | |

• For participatory assessments, consider the above in terms of the steps taken to

| | attract |
|---|--------------------|
| | participants? |
| • | Was the work well |
| | explained on the |
| | organisation's |
| | website? |
| • | How did |
| | audiences react to |
| | the work online? |
| • | Did the work |
| | generate |
| | interesting |
| | audience |
| | conversation on |
| | social media? |

7. Overall Quality of Experience

| • | How good and |
|---|---------------------|
| | appropriate was |
| | the visitor care |
| | that you |
| | experienced or |
| | observed? |
| • | How appropriate |
| | was the |
| | atmosphere in |
| | achieving a |
| | welcoming |
| | environment for |
| | the public? |
| • | For participatory |
| | assessments was |
| | the atmosphere |
| | appropriate to |
| | achieving the |
| | intended aims? |
| • | Other areas you |
| | might want to |
| | comment on are: |
| | access, attitude of |
| | staff; ACE logo |

| visibility, signage, | |
|----------------------|--|
| cleanliness, | |
| catering facilities, | |
| heating, lighting? | |

8. Are there any other aspects that you wish to comment on?