



Scottish Arts Council

ARTISTIC EVALUATION – DANCE

Artist/Company: Colette Sadler, Stammer Productions

Venue: Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh

Title of Event: DdumY

Type of Event: (e.g. performance, informal showing, work-in-progress, etc)

Lecture/film/performance as part of Body Parts Festival at RSA

Date of Visit: Sunday 25 February

Overall Rating (Please rate the production overall, taking into account your ratings for each section. Please state the key reasons for your overall ratings – i.e. the particular strengths and weaknesses).

4 an impressive performance in the face of adversity! Collette was hampered by illness and some technical limitations which required her to adapt the performance of DdumY considerably for this occasion. Despite this, she was able to create a valid context for her work and to provoke the audience through strong verbal and physical presentations.

Name: ___Lucy Mason_____ Date: ___14_/3_/2007_____

Specialist Advisor

Scottish Arts Council Officer

Please circle the relevant title

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 an officer of the Scottish Arts Council, 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 the venue 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 producing company 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:

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 standard.

1. Artistic Assessment

Please evaluate the artistic quality of the event, taking account of the following

Criteria	Rating	Comments and key reasons for rating
Vision and imagination	4	As a result of illness, Colette was unable to perform the full piece as originally intended. Instead, she made imaginative use of the opportunity by presenting the work in three sections: a talk on the ideas behind the work; edited sections of the work on film; and a final live performance adapted to take account of her reduced physical ability. In the context of a Festival of work addressing the body in performance, this seemed a highly appropriate choice.
Clarity of communication	4	Having the lecture-style presentation as an introduction to the performance ensured that the piece was seen and could be interpreted in a context that clearly outlined the performer's intention.
Quality of production – production's success in relation to stated aims i.e., in the programme or other printed material)	3	Despite the artist's introduction and invitation to consider the ideas behind the creation and performance of the work, it remains a challenging work (intentionally so), which requires the audience to work hard to remain engaged. On this occasion, this was made harder because of the lack of definition of the film projection, due to poor lighting in the venue. It was clearly understood that presenting the show in this version was not the original intention of the artist.

2. Strengths and Weakness

Assess the strengths and weakness of the event with reference to the following:

Criteria	Rating	Comments and key reasons for rating
Choreography - originality, use of space, number and use of dancers, length of piece, etc	4	Hard to judge the work fairly due to the nature of the presentation. However, it is clearly a challenging piece for the solo artist to perform, which demands clarity of movement, extreme physical control and discipline.
Performers - technical standard, performance skills, and ability to communicate	4	As above. This is a powerful work that can clearly make a strong impact on its audience. In this situation, Colette spoke well and managed the live element of the performance well.
Sound – appropriateness and effect of sound or music (whole/part, live/ recorded) to the production.		N/a there didn't appear to be any sound score to accompany the work.
Design – costume, set, lighting	3	The design is limited to a bank of tables on which the performer works. This suited the nature of the work, which is quite dry and pared down.

Criteria	Rating	Comments and key reasons for rating
Technical standards – technical presentation of the production (e.g. lighting and sound cues, etc)	3	The lighting in the space was very limited and it stayed up during the showing of the film, which restricted the impact of the film and the audience's ability to engage with it. This was outwith the control of the performer, but was certainly unhelpful for the audience.
Audience – appropriateness of the production for the audience, estimate the size and reaction	4	This was an excellent forum in which to present Colette's work. The audience had been part of a day long programme of physical/visual/conceptual art and was very open to receiving Colette's work within this quite specialised environment.

3. Management of Event

Please evaluate the way the event was presented/organised by the organisation and the venue, with reference to the checklist below, including additional comments/observations.

Criteria	Rating	Comment and key reasons for rating
Suitability of the venue for the event	3	Good programming within the Body Parts Festival, but poor venue for film performance.
Information/ interpretive material at venue ¹	3	Good postcard, fairly well distributed at the venue. No programme
Publicity/ pre-publicity ²	3	As above
Ease of booking and payment	3	Very easy to purchase ticket at the door
Location of venue	4	Very good location in the centre of Edinburgh
External signage and signposting	3	Good generic promotion for the Festival. Less specific internal publicity for this particular show.
Internal directional signage	3	See above
Access and provision for disabled people	4	All very accessible. There was an audience member in a wheelchair who appeared to enter and leave the space easily
Timing of the event	3	Fine time for me. Possibly Sunday afternoon not good for all?
Customer service - quality and efficiency of staff (e.g. box office, front of house, bar and/or catering)	4	All very welcoming

¹ These include programmes, displays etc., assessing the range, quality and clarity

² Publicity/pre-publicity (leaflets, posters, etc), including the 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

Criteria	Rating	Comment and key reasons for rating
Acknowledgement of Scottish Arts Council Funding ³	3	

³ The 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, 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, computer programmes etc."

Please comment on whether these conditions of grant were met, including use and prominence of the Scottish Arts Council logo on the company's website.