

Scottish Arts Council style guide

In order to ensure consistency of approach to assessing applications and artistic evaluations, we have gathered together useful words and phrases that can be used in various contexts.

Open applications

Definitions

Priority Level:

- **High** is an organisation which fully meets the criteria, and in some instances may **surpass** them **and/or** be an example of best practice
- **Medium** is an organisation which meets the criteria, but **which has** a small number of **development areas**
- **Low** is an organisation which partially meets the criteria, but **which has** a significant number of **development areas**

High

Surpasses criteria

Fully meets criteria

Well-evidenced

SMART

Strong strategic fit

Innovative/'original'

Excellent

High-quality

Financially sound

Well-constructed

Strong Impact/benefit/legacy

Progressive (approach)/pushes thinking beyond status quo

Authoritative

Renowned

Highly competent

Thorough

Holistic

Exciting

Inspirational

Dynamic

Ambitious

Benchmarking

Inclusive

Innovative

Distinctive

Imaginative

Positive

Well-constructed

Proven

Strategic

Well-informed

Researched

Well-grounded
Consultative
Realistic
Well-developed

Medium

Met criteria adequately rather than strongly or weakly
Adequate level of fit
Realistic and viable
Artistic criteria met although certain financial aspects could be strengthened
About 5 out of 10
Average
Lacking inspiration
Lacking vision
Lacking ambition
Some areas stronger than others
Not sufficiently articulated
Not of high strategic importance
Not of a consistently high standard
Reasonable
Adequate
Further development required in this area
Insufficient information provided to make a decision
Unclear on the information provided...
Outcome unconvincing
This application does not add to/develop existing practice

Low

Lack of clarity in aims and objectives
Does not sufficiently meet criteria
Does not demonstrate convincing artistic track record
Little or poor artistic leadership
Not financially viable (£)
Little or poor ambition
Not realistic
Not demonstrating innovation
Programme as described unlikely to give participants/stakeholders a high-quality experience
Fails to demonstrate... to a specific degree
Unlikely to achieve planned objectives on the basis of the information contained within the application
Did not meet criteria to a sufficient degree to be a priority for support
Need to develop your artistic practice
Suggest you explore relationships with organisations with similar aims
You don't give enough information to convince us that you can achieve what you say you will
The ambitions of your project are not articulated clearly
Not convinced by financial management
Your project could be managed on a commercial basis rather than through public funding.

Artistic Evaluations – in development

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:

- 1 - Very Poor** – standard falls well below what is acceptable.
- 2 - Poor** – not attaining acceptable standards of conception or presentation.
- 3 - Competent** – routine rather than especially interesting.
- 4 - Good** – well-conceived and executed
- 5 - Excellent** – conceived and executed to a high or very high standard(s).

Competent

The individual performances from the dancers were proficient – but uninspiring.
works lacked a sense of serious rigor and choreographic originality
no real affinity between the music and the movement being produced
standard in its movement vocabulary
...has produced a double bill of works that bare little relation to each other