

ARTISTIC EVALUATION

It should be noted the views expressed in this evaluation are intended to represent, as far as possible, an objective aesthetic judgement. Specialist advisors and officers should avoid making judgements based on their own personal tastes and preferences.

Artist/Company: CripToNite

Venue: THEATRE WORKSHOP

Title of Event: FLUFF

Type of Event: Moved Reading

Date of Visit: 10/08/07

Overall Rating: Good

CripToNite's show though quite conventional, dealt effectively and wittily with the professional, domestic and sexual lives of 3 young women. Their inclusion in the Degenerate4 festival seems to confirm Theatre Workshops commitment to providing a professional platform to international disabled artists.

Name: Stewart Ennis
Specialist Advisor

Date: 12/07/07

Please circle the relevant title

This report has been commissioned by the Scottish Arts Council to evaluate the artistic quality of the production named above. 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 will form evidence for the Artistic Leadership and Public Engagement sections of the Quality Framework and 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 Joint Board to report on the overall performance of its 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, with particular reference to the strengths and weaknesses of the following:

Artform	Criteria	Rating	Comments and key reasons for rating
All	Vision and imagination of work - Quality of ideas, skills in execution; if you've seen the work of this artist(s)/ company before, please comment on the comparison.	Good	On the surface this was rather a conventional piece but its lightness of touch was also in counterpoint to some quite dark satire. It's treatment of certain aspects of the politics of disability made it a perfect choice for this Theatre Workshop Degenerate4 festival.
All (if relevant)	Curatorial/ programming vision/ selection Please indicate how the event originated eg from the exhibiting/ producing organisation, artist-led or commissioned. If the event is part of a Festival, please say how it contributes to the overall programme.	Good	CripToNite are part of a mini festival Degenerate4 at Theatre Workshop. This festival is described as "Scotland's leading disability multi-arts festival". The breadth of the programming (comedy, cabaret, theatre, poetry etc) appears to confirm Theatre Workshop's unique commitment to offering a platform to international disabled artists.
All	Success of event against stated aims - in the programme or other printed material, including how well it communicated the artistic themes.	Good	The performance was advertised as a Moved Reading and this is what it was. Degenerate4 in the Theatre Workshop brochure states one of its aims as offering a platform to work which "challenges outdated stereotypes." CripToNite certainly fulfil this aim with this piece of work.
All	Performers/tutors - technical standard, performance skills and ability to communicate and engage.	Good	Sophie Partridge, Liz Carr and Taharah Azam all gave solid performances full of charm and wit. At times they stumbled with the scripts which hindered engagement with audience. Perhaps better familiarity with script or a straightforward reading would have been worked to their advantage.
Dance, Theatre	Choreography/Use of choreography - originality, use of space, number and use of dancers, length of piece, etc	N/A	
Theatre	Script – particularly in relation to new work or second productions. Relevant to classics where the original has been substantially changed.	Good	The script by Sophie Partridge was quite conventional though filled with wickedly observed wit and satire. It invited us into the "fluffy" world of three wheel chair bound women, sharing their , successes, failures and humiliations in their professional, domestic and sexual world. At times its conventions felt more akin to a radio play but this may be put down to direction and the fact that it was after all a reading.
Theatre, Dance	Direction - Concerns issues of interpretation, casting and presentation.	Good	Director: Alex Bulmer. The delineation of characters was clear enough bearing in mind, the actors were reading from scripts. There were occasions when scripts seemed to get in the way, and this seemed to be due to staging decisions rather than lack of familiarity.
Dance, Theatre	Use of music – appropriateness and effect of sound or music (whole/part, live/ recorded) to the production.	Good	Nice use of pre show late 70's TV themes adding to deliberate <i>fluffy</i> feel of the piece. Use of recorded voice of Zippo the clown was nice touch though sound quality could have been better.

Artform	Criteria	Rating	Comments and key reasons for rating
Dance, Theatre	Design – costume, set, lighting. Take into account how appropriate the design is in relation to the venue and, where appropriate, the touring schedule.	Good	This was after all a Moved Reading so set was necessarily minimal, offering a mere suggestion of domestic environment. However, the studio space is very small and this felt quite appropriate.
All	<p>Quality of Presentation/Engagement</p> <p>Performing Arts - technical presentation of the production (eg lighting and sound cues, etc).</p> <p>Education events - relevance/ appropriateness of presentation and teaching methodology (one to one, group, child centred); details of participant group and activity, including genre.</p>	Good	<p>A few stumbled lines, even with scripts in hand. In fact the scripts did seem to get in the way at times, though this felt like a 'direction' issue. Unnecessary fades and blackouts and variable recorded sound quality. But generally, for a reading, the technical presentation side of things was minimal.</p> <p>Technical and BSL assistance was usefully offered by Claire Saddleton, nicely incorporated into the piece</p>
All	<p>Audience</p> <p>Performing Arts - appropriateness of the production for the audience/participants; estimate the size and reaction</p> <p>Crafts/Visual Arts – time spent, interest, activity, and visitors' books comments, number of visitors/ participants at the time of visit</p> <p>Education/learning – pre-event involvement, participants/ schoolteachers reaction, understanding, commitment, enthusiasm, number involved, etc</p>		The studio theatre was about half full. The audience reacted positively to the humour of the piece.
All	Additional Interpretative activity – what activities were available to enhance the experience of the event eg workshops, artist's talks, discussion groups? Please indicate age-groups targeted.	N/A	
All	Outcomes of education activity – what learning/skills development took place? What did participants take away with them? Are education resources being provided for follow up work? Is it strategically linked to the curriculum (formal or informal)?	N/A	

2. 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. Please try to view the venue and the services, and interpretative material as though you had never visited it before eg if you did not know the venue's location, how easy would it be to find your way there, and to find your way around once you had arrived?

Criteria	Comment
Suitability of the venue for the event	The studio theatre was a good space for this presentation.
Information/ interpretive material at venue - programmes, displays etc.	Good and useful information on the Degenerate4 festival in Theatre Workshop brochure. Nice "Fluffy" programme freely distributed by CripToNite company. Good displays on all companies participating in the Degenerate 4 festival.
Publicity/ pre-publicity – leaflets, posters, websites, etc. What is produced, is it easy to understand and where can you get the information? Please be alert to the publicity available prior to your visit to the event and comment on the company/organisation's website.	The Theatre Workshop website is very easy to negotiate and full of easy to understand information on productions and exhibitions. The foyer of theatre workshop is filled with easily accessible and info and employs very helpful front of house staff.
Ease of booking and payment	Problem booking online but telephone booking was very straightforward.
Location of venue – eg is it easy to find? Is it on a main transport route?	Easy access by public transport.
External signage and signposting	Good visibility.
Internal directional signage	Good Signage and excellent assistance from front of house staff.
Access and provision for disabled people – what can you see?	Being a mini festival dedicated to disabled artists one would expect good disabled provision. This was indeed the case, including front of house staff employing BSL for deaf audience members and priority given to wheelchair users etc.
Timing of the event – was the length appropriate? Did the start and finish time seem to be appropriate for the audience?	Timing of event seemed about right.
Customer service - quality and efficiency of staff (e.g. box office, front of house, bar and/or catering)	As above: excellent front of house staff. Generally excellent café facilities.
Acknowledgement of Scottish Arts Council Funding ¹	SAC acknowledged on all Theatre Workshop's printed material

¹ In press releases, at launches, on all published materials (including leaflets, brochures, programmes, posters, company's website, notices display, exhibition materials, websites and advertising, recordings, publications, video, broadcasts, computer programmes etc.) Where the event is publicised in the programme brochure of another organisation (eg venue, gallery, etc) then SAC acknowledgement should appear against the particular programme entry for this event.

3. Organisation's Comments (optional)

This is the organisation's opportunity to respond to points raised within this assessment. Please do not feel obliged to fill this section in. In the spirit of the Quality Framework, we would ask that any comments are self-evaluating, providing an insight as to why, if there is, a major disagreement of response between the organisation and the evaluation, in a constructive way.

This will not alter the rating given by the assessment, but will allow the organisation the opportunity to give their opinion/feedback. The Scottish Arts Council reserves the right to edit comments if they are deemed to be libellous or defamatory.

As the Scottish Arts Council implements the Quality Framework internally, we intend to publish artistic evaluations on organisations that we support regularly on our website. The final artistic evaluation, including the organisation's response will be published on a quarterly basis on our website.

Please keep your response to max 500 words. If we do not hear from you in 15 days, we will assume that you do not want to respond.