

THE SCOTTISH ARTS COUNCIL
SPECIALIST ADVISER ARTISTIC EVALUATION - DRAMA

Organisation/Venue: TAG Theatre Co/Bonnyholm Primary
Title of Event: Love like Salt
Type of Event: Workshop
Date of Visit: 23rd February 2004

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 a Council Officer, as indicated at the end of the form. The report will be circulated to the organisation which produced the work, 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

1.1 Vision and Imagination.

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: The workshop was set up to integrate the contributions of both the young primary school pupils and those of the elderly people. The event was held in a gym hall. The event was a bit creaky getting started because this was the first time the two groups had come together. The workshop leaders worked hard to draw material from the children, with the elders more ready to contribute. They also had two video camera operators working with both groups to collect video material. The whole event felt a bit low, and unfocussed, but this may not be reflective of the whole process or the final performances in April. (Next assessment to follow up on the performances.)
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	x	
Good		
Excellent		

1.2 Clarity of Communication.

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Aims were clearly stated to the group. Again drawing out information seemed a bit like pulling teeth, however this may be due to the fact the group did not know each other well. It seemed to lack energy and direction.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

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

1.3 Script (particularly in relation to new work, or second productions).

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Not applicable
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

1.4 Direction

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Lacking in direction and focus at this stage of the process. It is hard to make a general overall comment about the process on the basis of one workshop, since there may have been more focussed activity before or since this example. Things did seem a little diffuse. Perhaps it's worth bearing in mind that this assessment is taking place at a time the company may be struggling without an artistic director. They didn't seem at full strength. It is a complicated thing to bring together elders and primary school pupils. Children and elders seem to enjoy themselves quietly.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

1.5 Standard of performers- where performers are not trained, please reflect this in your comments.

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Enthusiastic contributions from the two actors playing the king and his daughter.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

1.6 Use of music – in particular please comment on the quality and appropriateness of any original music composed for the production. Please 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 (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Not applicable
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

1.7 Use of Movement or Choreography

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Not applicable.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

1.8 Design – including set, costume and lighting design. Please take into account how appropriate the design is in relation to the venue, and, where appropriate, the touring schedule.

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Not applicable
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

1.9 Technical Standards – please comment on whether the production was professionally presented from a technical point of view.

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Not applicable
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

1.10 Overall production – was the production successful overall in relation to any stated aims (e.g. in the programme or other printed material, and stated aims and objectives)

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: The company seemed please with the results of the workshop, one of a series, and felt they had gained some good progress and material for the play they are producing.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

1.11 Was the performance appropriate for the audience?

Yes, the workshop was aimed at its participants skill level.

1.12 Estimated size of audience and reaction to the production.

A full class and about 15 elders

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.

Well managed.

2.1 **Was the venue suitable for the event?**

Yes

2.2 Information/Interpretive material provided at the venue (e.g. programmes, displays etc)

- range, quantity and clarity.

None

2.3 Publicity/Pre-Publicity for the Event (leaflets, posters, etc)

- 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.

2.4 Accessibility of the venue

- ease of payment
- location
- external signposting
- internal directional signing
- access and provision for disabled people
- timing of event

None

2.5 Customer service

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

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

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 and 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, and computer programmes etc. “

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

Not applicable

Name: Sally Hobson

Date: 9th March 2004

Advisor X **Scottish Arts Council**
Officer

(Please tick above as appropriate)