



Scottish Arts Council

ARTISTIC EVALUATION – DANCE

Artist/company: New Moves International

Venue: Arches, Glasgow

Title of Event: National Review of Live Art

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

Date of Visit: 17/03/04

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:

Very Poor – standard falls well below what is acceptable.

Poor – not attaining acceptable standards of conception or presentation.

Competent – routine rather than especially interesting.

Good – well conceived and executed

Excellent – conceived and executed to a high standard.

1. **Artistic Assessment** - please evaluate the **artistic quality** of the event taking account of the following:

1.1 **Vision and imagination**

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: The National Review of Live Arts supports both established and emergent artists and provides audiences with an opportunity to view live and performing art. The programme brings together a feast of work by exciting artists from around the world and fuses them into an original programme, not seen elsewhere in Scotland.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	x	

1.2 **Clarity of communication**

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Generally this was good with the performances I saw. Performers were intensely focused on their work and this was communicated well to the audience. Mark Jeffrey – installation. Some text projected onto the wall, a doll's house and lots of daffodils. Not a lot happening and people unsure what they were supposed to be looking at.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

1.3 **Quality of production**

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: The Arches lends itself to hosting such an event, as it has a myriad of performance spaces under the same roof. It suffers from music and sound pollution from nearby pubs, which impacted on Daniel Léveillé's piece, as part of the piece was supposed to be done to silence, and the audience were confused/unsettled by a modern pop song infiltrating the performance. Technically things went reasonably smoothly. A rather alarming crack with the seating in the Playroom, which was rectified after the show. Overall the quality of the event was good.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

You are also asked to **assess the strengths and weaknesses** of the event with specific reference to the following:

1.4 Choreography (including originality, use of space, number and use of dancers, length of piece, etc)

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Mark Jeffrey – see 1.1 Collette Sadler – solo piece, 45 mins long. Interesting blend of intense slow movements contrasted by dynamic movements. Daniel Léveillé’s piece was striking in its use of the human body as an artistic image. The dancers seemed to move between poses, minimising the route there by rapidly moving from one pose to the next. Reminiscent to me of De Vinci’s images of the human body.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

1.5 Performers – including technical standard, performance skills, and ability to communicate.

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Performers were technically highly skilled and fully engaged with their performances. This was received positively by the audience
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	x	

1.6 Sound – appropriateness of sound/music to the production. Please also indicate whether the music was performed live or recorded, in whole or in part, and what effect this had on the quality of the production.

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Recorded music was used. The quality of the recordings were reasonable. Daniel Léveillé's piece suffered from noise interference from the nearby pub during the show, which detracted from the overall enjoyment of the piece.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

1.7 Design – including costume, set, lighting design.

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Daniel Léveillé – there was no costume. The bodies were used as the canvas. Lighting was minimal. Collette Sadler - Interesting use of costume and set. Minimal lighting design
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

1.8 Technical standards – comment on the whether the production was technically well presented (e.g. lighting and sound cues, etc)

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Technically competent. Fairly basic lighting on offer. Some technical glitches eg lights going off during the production. Seating bank in the Playroom not fully extended, so clicked into position when the audience sat down making rather an alarming sound.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	x	
Good		
Excellent		

1.9 Overall production – assess the success of the production in relation to any stated aims (e.g. in the programme or other printed material)

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: The Festival is renowned for its development and promotion of emergent artists and provides one of the only opportunities to view a range of Live and Performance Art. The Festival programmes invited and commissioned international work and provides a diverse, exciting and stimulating range of work.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	x	

1.10 Audience – assess the appropriateness of the production for the audience, estimate the size of the audience and record their reaction.

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Full houses for both live performances – approximately 100 for Daniel Leviene and 70-80 people for Collette Sadler with some people turned away. The audience engaged fully with the pieces and seemed to enjoy the experiences. Mark Jeffrey installation – people drifting in and out, so difficult to tell numbers
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	x	
Excellent		

2. Management of Event

Please evaluate the way the event was presented/organised by the organisation and by the venue. Please answer, where relevant, with reference to the checklist below adding any other comments/observations you may have.

2.1 Suitability of the venue for the event.

The Arches are well suited to putting on performances. Sight lines were not great.

2.2 Information/interpretive material provided at the venue (e.g. programmes, displays etc), including the range of materials, quantity and clarity.

Displays about the NRLA in the foyer. A daytime handout produced.

- 2.3 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.

Leaflets were distributed late. Information New Moves' website.

- 2.4 Accessibility of the venue, including:

- Ease of booking and payment

Box office staff pleasant to deal with. The computer was slow, so the queue began to build rapidly.

- location of venue

Central location, near public transport

- external signposting and signage

Reasonable. The beer more prominently signposted than the venue.

- internal directional signage

Reasonable

- access and provision for disabled people

Good. Lift available for physically disabled. I was not aware of any audio loop or braille signage

- timing of the event

6pm till late – a variety of shows and art to see within the period.

- 2.5 Customer service, including: quality and efficiency of staff (e.g. box office, front of house, bar and/or catering).

Box office staff friendly. Slow in processing tickets, computers on a go slow, which meant a long queue developed.

3. Acknowledgement of Scottish Arts Council Funding (if applicable)

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.

Logo clearly displayed on marketing material.

4. Scoring

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.

Rating: Good

The evening was good value for money with tickets priced £8. I would have expected to pay more for an evening of entertainment. The performances I saw were fresh and enjoyable. The installation I saw did not yet look complete.

Name: Susan Hay

Date: 30/03/04

Advisor



Scottish Arts Council Officer

✓