



Scottish Arts Council

ARTISTIC EVALUATION – DANCE

Artist/company: Xfactor Dance in collaboration with Edinburgh's Telford College and the National Museums of Scotland.

Venue: The Royal Museum, Edinburgh (at the Millennium Clock)

Title of Event: Dreaming

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

Date of Visit: Tuesday 18th November 2003, 7pm

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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

Greig's vision is to use the museum as inspiration for educational and professional development projects in conjunction with Xfactor, Telford College and the Museums of Scotland.

As a pilot initiative, the benefits of future projects were clear given further investment. They would appear to be three-fold;

- Audience Development
- Artist Development
- Student Development

1.2 Clarity of communication

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

- Greig was unable to demonstrate his vision of the collaboration to the audience, as this event was not based on an exhibition housed within the museum.
- Therefore the choreographer's relevance and ability to engage a passing audience on interpretive and artistic grounds was compromised.
- Understanding of choreographer's intention and mood was aided by the soundscore.
- No supporting literature evident

1.3 Quality of production

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor	X	
Competent		
Good		
Excellent		

- This evening's event had the feeling of having been pulled together.

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 (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

- The 'company' was made of the 12 B.A students studying with the Centre for Professional Dance Training at Edinburgh's Telford College.
- The presentation used extracts from Greig's Spring 2003 production, In Your Dreams, using existing movement material that had been further informed and interpreted by a week's residency in the studio with the student dancers.
- Permutations of this work had been seen on *previous occasions*.
- The students worked across all planes, through various configurations; solo's, duets and group arrangements. The work consisted of flowing unison sections, lift work that was good to see and floorwork, which was at times difficult to see.
- The stage arena was used well although this was not a site-specific event as publicised.
- The performance would have seemed brief at 10 minutes for those attending the museum having read the publicity alone.

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

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	X	
Excellent		

- Different techniques were used to communicate to the audience from the abstract juxtaposition of bodies in space to using gesture, comedy and the spoken word.
- The students competently executed the material; teamwork and interdependence were evident.
- The students displayed a mature approach to the subject and style of Greig's work and performed enthusiastically.
- They did however, play out to the 'gods' - missing the opportunity to engage intimately with the audience at their feet.

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 (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

1.7 Design – including costume, set, lighting design.

Rating for this section (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor	X	
Competent		
Good		
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 (Please tick)		Comments and key reasons for rating:
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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

- The publicity received could have focussed more on the triangular relationship between the collaborators and the overall ongoing project aim and objective.

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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent	X	
Good		
Excellent		

- This was an evening's presentation to an invited audience of which there were around 20 seated.
- The presentation attracted bystanders.
- The reaction was confused - due to length and context?
- The post – performance gathering was intimate and well attended by seated audience members and bystanders. All three collaborators and the students were made available for discussion on the event and the choreographer / student experience.

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.

- As it was staged, with the dancers in bare-feet, the venue was not at all suitable because of the marble floor. Due to potential risk of dancer injury, this has to be addressed for future projects. Safe Practice messaging was overlooked.

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

- No evidence of any display or central desk for information on the event however this may have been put in place for the public performances. Xfactor questionnaires could be found on the seats on arrival.

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.*

- Black and white publicity fliers for the event were found at Dancebase, Telford College and the Royal Museum. In this circumstance the length of the production documented on the flier would have been helpful.
- Dancebase, Telford College and Xfactor all forwarded e-mail publicity on the event in advance.

2.4 Accessibility of the venue, including:

Ease of booking and payment

- N/A Free Event

Location of venue

- Central Edinburgh

External signposting and signage

- Good

Internal directional signage

- Good – met and directed by museum attendants

Access and provision for disabled people

- Good (one would presume)

Timing of the event

- Showings for the public were scheduled for the Saturday and Sunday at 2pm and 4pm allowing the company access to the public during peak attendance hours at the museum, reaching more people.

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

- The museum staff, were helpful, polite and unobtrusive.

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.

- The S.A.C were credited on fliers for the above project but no logo could be found on their website.

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.

- Competent

This rating reflects where this initiative is in its development. With further time investment, especially in the studio (for learning to have taken place for both the choreographer and the students) and further investment in production values, one would consider this educational project - well conceived and executed.

Name: JANE HOWIE

Date: 02/04

Advisor

✓

Scottish Arts Council Officer
