

## Statistics on January 2019 Lecture

230 delivered, 152 opened; 1 bounced, 80 clicks, 64 Responses

Philip Reeves: Printmaker and Painter by Chrisopher Andreae

Q1	Which of the following criteria describe the lecture?		Q2	Which of the following describe the lecturer's presentation?	
	Subject was well researched	44		Clear and audible voice	56
	Informative content	34		Confident presentation	27
	Related to title	46		Managed equipment well	1
	Organised structure	10		Managed time well	8
	Relevant images	37		Rapport with audience	33
	Good quality images	34			
	<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>64</b>		<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>60</b>

Q3	How did the Lecturer respond to questions?		Q4	How do you rate the lecture?	
	Responded well	46		Outstanding	1
	Did Not Respond well	14		Excellent	7
	Not applicable	2		Very Good	9
				Good	18
				Passable	19
				Poor	10
		<b>62</b>		<b>Answered</b>	<b>64</b>

### Q5: Please use the space if you wish to make any further comments. (40-2=40 responses)

- Bio on the person needed. Better slides.
- Did not enjoy this lecture.
- I can never hear questions because the speaker is not required to come forwards or use a microphone.
- I enjoyed the lecture and the time which was allowed to appreciate the content of his talk. Abstract art is difficult. Although the lecture was shorter than usual, the questions asked and comments made by the members contributed to a light-hearted ending. It was good that he was so local and not in the throes of a long journey.
- Was a pleasant man with a style more suited to a small group presentation where questions could have been asked as he spoke.
- I thought there was a strong element of the Emperors new clothes about the subject.
- While the speaker had a clear voice he certainly could not manage the technology involved. It would have been helpful if more detail of Philip Reeves' life and the techniques he used had been explained. However, it did introduce me to someone I'd never heard of. By the Art Society's standards this was a poor lecture; one member remarked "she had been short changed".
- Most interesting and fascinating lecture. Thoroughly enjoyed all - it made you think very differently about Abstract Art.
- He recovered well from any stumbles & was the best person I have heard explaining the kind of Art that Philip practised.
- Surprised the speaker passed the Arts Society's rigorous vetting of their lecturers.
- I would have been interested in learning more about the actual printing process-e.g.what makes a good print?
- An idiosyncratic presentation. Not enough prints or in-depth information. Nevertheless a pleasant lecturer who encouraged us to look beyond the printed image.
- Squirmed several times. Wonder how he got on the list of speakers. The lack of content (25%) was covered up by kind audience. He ought to be too embarrassed to take a fee.
- Preparation of the lecture was poor. The time allowed was not fully utilised to the detriment of the lecture.
- I would have liked the lecturer to give some more detail on the technical side of print-making. That was one of my reasons for going. He could also have mentioned if Reeves had had any influence on his students during a long career at GSA. Very irritated by the question time session, as many of the 'questions' developed into

longish interactions with the speaker. Quite a lot of this was inaudible from about the middle of the hall where I was sitting.

16. Seemed rather uncomfortable with the equipment. Hesitant manner. Not well structured.
17. Regret I was unable to attend due to a Vestry commitment.
18. I found his delivery a bit slow and overall, a bit boring.
19. One of the poorest lectures.
20. Muddled presentation
21. A lovely man and despite shortcomings in lecture content he achieved a level of engagement and audience questions rarely seen after a lecture, that's abstract art for you!
22. Although elderly and frail Christopher enlightened and entertained us in this lecture. I think we shall see abstract art in a new light,
23. I liked the bit when he asked the person asking the questions to come to the front. It was a nice touch to see who was asking the questions
24. loop system for hard of hearing worked well
25. A knowledgeable and likeable personality, but seemed a bit vague at times, especially in relation to the images. Very interesting Q&A.
26. This wasn't a typical Arts' Society presentation. I enjoyed it because it wasn't the usual polished presentation of a stream of facts but allowed time for the audience to listen, look and consider. Although use of the equipment was less than perfect the lecturer was able to engage with the audience over his inexpert approach. It might have been deliberate playing with us?
27. Not a subject I was interested in.
28. Not my sphere of interest but the lecturer made it appear interesting
29. best lecture this session, thought-provoking, measured, highly informative -will alter the way I look at all art
30. Good to be made to think about the value of a different kind of visual art - most of us would never take the time to look properly, and in depth, at abstract art.
31. Lecture perhaps a bit 'thin' but good question and answer questions helped considerably.
32. Unable to attend
33. Presentation could have been more structured
34. Surprisingly good!
35. This was a missed opportunity to inform a general audience of the complexity and process of printmaking. The images were good but limited and we were told of Philip Greens use of the colour green and there were none.
36. I think the speaker missed the opportunity to spend a few minutes explaining the complexity of the printmaking process. This would have helped the audience understand the artists work. Very disappointed with the lecture.
37. Unfortunately the lecturer was not au fait with the equipment and appeared to be becoming a bit forgetful so that although charming the lecture was largely disappointing. .Perhaps it is time to retire from lecturing and concentrate on his book.
38. I've never been into abstract art but found the content of this lecture very interesting and thought provoking.
39. Poor use of time and left us with little knowledge of the artist's life. Images were not adequate to illustrate key points and lecturer had poor grip of technology.
40. A disappointing experience and a missed opportunity to engage the audience with a challenging style of art. Images were small on the screen, with no detailed images to demonstrate what was being said ( eg blocking of what's behind the image.) Very little detail about how images were created and how they were used/circulated etc. Facts such as size of images which help contextualise the slides were missing ( reference only to large or small) and basic biographical information was not given ( is he still alive ?). Lecture was very short and equipment was poorly managed. Can't help feeling the lecturer has been good but is a little 'past his prime'.