



Scottish Arts Council

ARTISTIC EVALUATION – DRAMA

Organisation/Venue:	Wee Stories at the Brunton Theatre			
Title of Event:	Treasure Island			
Type of Event:	Performance			
Date of Visit:	11 March 2005			
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.)				
Good				
An entertaining night out for young people and adults. While this show did not inspire me as much as other Wee Stories' productions I appreciated the skill and talent involved and the ability of this work to attract and sustain audiences.				
Name:	Angela Hogg	Date:	__29/04__ /05__	
Advisor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Scottish Arts Council Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Please tick the relevant title</i>

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.	Criteria	Rating	Comment and key reasons for rating
1.1	Vision and imagination	Good	<p>The interpretation of this famous Robert Louis Stevenson book had all the hallmarks of a Wee Stories approach – fun-filled, accessible and interactive storytelling with a clever play on words.</p> <p>However I was not as engaged as I usually am with Wee Stories' productions. (The rest of the audience was very enthusiastic).</p> <p>I think it was because the script (and interaction between Andy Cannon and Iain Johnstone) was too predictable for me. If this had been my first time seeing the company's work I believe I would likely have been more engaged given the unique style of the work.</p> <p>On a more positive note I believe this type of work plays a huge role in attracting and sustaining audiences. I am also sure this particular show will have provided incentive for young audiences to read the book.</p>
1.2	Clarity of Communication	Excellent	<p>Andy Cannon and Iain Johnstone have an excellent ability to communicate (and commune with) audiences. The audience was continuously gripped and appeared to keep up with the action which involved various parallel scenarios interweaving with the main storyline.</p>

2. Strengths and Weaknesses

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

2.	Criteria	Rating	Comment and key reasons for rating
2.1	Script – particularly in relation to new work or second productions	Good	<p>A comical and unique interpretation of Robert Louis Stevenson's story (with a clever play on words) which kept up the interest of the audience. The script appeared to have been developed to appeal to adults as well as young people, which is in keeping with the company's aim of attracting family audiences.</p> <p>As outlined I did not find it as engaging as other Wee Stories' shows however I do appreciate it's potency in providing an accessible and entertaining night out at the theatre.</p>

2.2	Direction	Good	<p>This piece represented a collaboration between Andy Cannon and Iain Johnstone who co-wrote, performed and directed the piece.</p> <p>The various strands of plot, characters (and their interaction with each other) plus supporting design elements and props came together well to provide a distinctive production.</p> <p>The interaction between Andy and Iain follows a tried and tested and distinctive formula which has always proved to be successful.</p> <p>However I would have liked to experience something new from this very talented, creative partnership.</p>
2.3	Standard of Performers – where performers are not trained, please reflect this in your comments	Good	<p>As always the delivery of <i>banter</i> between the characters provided by Andy Cannon and Iain Johnstone has great appeal and comic timing. They certainly know how to keep an audience in the palm of their hands.</p>
2.4	Use of Music ¹	Good	<p>The live music and sound effects were good however, in my view, there was not enough of it. The show lasted approximately 2 hours with an interval which I think is a long time to sustain a piece that relies mainly on the storytelling elements.</p>
2.5	Use of Movement/ Choreography	Good	<p>There were some physical theatre/slapstick moments that were well delivered.</p>
2.6	Design ² – including set, costume and lighting design	Good	<p>A good use of lighting and multi purpose set/props/objects supported this production extremely well. The design set the scene for the era and storyline.</p>
2.7	Technical Standards – was the production professionally presented from a technical point of view	Good	<p>The show was well supported by technical elements.</p>
2.8	Audience Response – appropriateness of the production for the audience, estimate the size and reaction	Excellent	<p>The enthusiastic audience responded extremely well and interacted a great deal. Almost a full house (on red nose day). There was a great buzz before the start suggesting a positive sense of anticipation. Some adults were there without young people (a positive indication of the company's wide appeal).</p>

¹ 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 parts, and what effect this has on the quality of the production.

² Take into account how appropriate the design is in relation to the venue and, where appropriate, the touring schedule

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.

3.	Criteria	Comments
3.1	Suitability of the venue for the event	Suitable.
3.2	Information/ interpretive material at venue ³	An informative programme encouraging the audience to visit the web site was handed out at the end.
3.3	Publicity/ pre-publicity ⁴	An appealing postcard and web based information were viewed in advance.
3.4	Ease of booking and payment	Fine
3.5	External signage and signposting	Fine
3.6	Internal directional signage	Fine
3.7	Access and provision for disabled people	Accessible.
3.8	Timing of the event – was the length appropriate? Did the start and finish time seem to be appropriate for the audience?	A relatively long show (approximately 2 hours with an interval) however the audience was riveted all the way through.
3.9	Customer service - quality and efficiency of staff (e.g., box office, front of house and bar/catering)	Good.
3.10	Acknowledgement of Scottish Arts Council funding ⁵	Appropriately acknowledged.

³ These include programmes, displays etc., including the range, quality and clarity.

⁴ Publicity/pre-publicity (leaflets, posters, etc), including the range, content, and when and where available. Be alert to the publicity available prior to your visit to the event. Also view and comment on the company's website where one is advertised, commenting on the ease of use, and quality of content and presentation, and currency of information

⁵ 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.