

THE SCOTTISH ARTS COUNCIL
SPECIALIST ADVISER ARTISTIC EVALUATION - DRAMA

Organisation/Venue:ek at The Tramway

Title of Event: Soul Pilots

Type of Event: (e.g. performance, work in progress, opens rehearsal etc)
Performance.

Date of Visit: 13/02/04

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 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: An exploration of identity and social relationships that played with notions of difference and similarity between people, reflected by the ethnic diversity of the cast. This piece had a somewhat dry and intellectual approach and perhaps because of this there was little emotion portrayed, although there were many amusing elements.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.2 Clarity of Communication.

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: The themes of the piece were communicated reasonably clearly through script and movement. Repetitive physical and verbal motifs played a key part in this. There was some difficulty hearing some of the performers at times.
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: It was unclear who wrote this so presumably it was company devised. This was non-linear and verged into the absurd at times. The use of language reflected elements of playfulness between the characters, as they often interrupted each other in a humorous way with increasingly ridiculous stories. The most effective recurring use of dialogue was the way that many words were omitted – emphasising both the similarities in the characters (and audience members’) experiences and also the differences.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.4 Direction

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: By Pamela Carter. Excellent use of the space throughout the whole production, exploiting the shape of stage to full advantage. Visually the production was consistently interesting and Carter showed confidence in her physical direction/choreography. There was good variation in the pace of the piece. However, there was little emotion or feeling, which contributed to a “sameness” of mood throughout.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
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: A strong ensemble cast, with an obvious sense of ownership of the piece. The cast all seemed confident in their parts and all showed a certain integrity and honesty, using their own identities/backgrounds as part of their performances. It was obvious that some of the cast had more physical training than others, but this worked well in the context of this production. A special mention must be made of Sven Till, who has an incredible physical stage presence and obvious technical skill.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	X	

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 <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: By Stephen Cracknell. Pre-recorded. This worked well with the production, adding subtle atmosphere.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.7 Use of Movement or Choreography

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: See under direction.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
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 <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating: Well designed lighting by Sergey Jakovsky that lit up sharply defined stage areas at times and used floor lighting to good effect. Very simple set (suspended screen and bell, running tracks on the floor.) This worked very well with the style of the piece, which did not need anything fussy, and also with the shape of stage.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

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

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: Competently presented.
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
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 (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating: This was successful in that the production did deliver an exploration into the director's original themes (identity etc.) as discussed within the original application to Scottish Arts Council. The physical elements of the production were strong and well integrated. The piece engaged intellectually but there was little emotional engagement. The production could perhaps be developed further taking more risks, which might involve audience members' feelings more?
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

1.11 Was the performance appropriate for the audience?
Entirely appropriate.

1.12 Estimated size of audience and reaction to the production.
Sold out in Tramway 4 (c. 120.) Some of the audience obviously greatly enjoyed the humour. Reaction at the end was good, if not ecstatic.

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

Very suitable.

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

- range, quantity and clarity. – Free programmes with limited information. Reasonably well designed and clear.

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.

Tramway brochure I assume? Invitations, flyers.

2.4 Accessibility of the venue

- ease of payment – N/A invited.
- location - fine
- direction – reasonable
- access - fine
- timing of event - fine

2.5 Customer service

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

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.

SAC logo on flyers, programmes but not on invitations

Name: Jaine Lumsden

Date: 16/02/2004

Scottish Arts Council Evaluation Form

Advisor **Scottish Arts Council Officer** **X**
(Please tick above as appropriate)