



Scottish Arts Council

## ARTISTIC EVALUATION – DANCE

**Artist/company:** X-Factor Dance Company

**Venue:** The Tron Theatre, Glasgow

**Title of Event:** Echoes

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

Performance

**Date of Visit:** 21<sup>st</sup> March 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 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 <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	✓	
Excellent		

*To be honest, I wasn't particularly inspired with the premise of a 'greatest hits' show but the performance was really enjoyable and was very much a show in its own right.*

*It was a strong and entertaining dance piece, dealing with the theme of identity with imagination and drama.*

**1.2 Clarity of communication**

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	✓	
Excellent		

*Alan's ability as a choreographer, to tell stories and communicate purely through the movement came over very strongly in this work. Although there was still a lot of text in the sound score, he wasn't relying on this to communicate as much as in previous productions, but was engaging in the task as a choreographer/ storyteller.*

**1.3 Quality of production**

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	✓	

*The design, lighting and music, all contributed to the overall look and quality of the show.*

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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	✓	
Excellent		

*Alan has totally engaged with the dancers, the chance to work with a larger cast and the skills they brought to the production. The choreography was imaginative, varied and refreshing. The piece was well structured and pacey.*

**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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	✓	

*Alan has succeeded in bringing together a stunning company of dancers for this show that really got under the skin of his work and his choreography seems to have thrived working with them. Technically accomplished but, more importantly to me, artists who lived the work and engaged with the audience.*

**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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	✓	
Excellent		

*A distinct element of Alan's work is original sound scores bringing together stories, poems and film clips with new music.*

*The pre-recorded score was integral to the performance and a strong element in the production.*

**1.7 Design – including costume, set, lighting design.**

Rating for this section <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	✓	
Excellent		

*I was impressed by the design of the show – beautiful and creative lighting played a major part in the over all look of the work. There was a distinct look to the show which showed collaboration and respect between the designers and choreographer.*

**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:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	✓	

*Sound and lighting were of a high quality and it all seemed very slick.*

**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 <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good	✓	
Excellent		

*This production seemed a major step forward for X-Factor and was more cohesive than previous productions. The opportunity for Alan to be outside of the production, and not also performing in the work seems to have made a distinct improvement to the overall direction.*

**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 <i>(Please tick)</i>		Comments and key reasons for rating:
Very Poor		
Poor		
Competent		
Good		
Excellent	✓	

*I saw the show on a Sunday evening performance at the Tron and before hand was rather sceptical about an audience turning out. However, it worked really well and the auditorium really busy. The predominantly young audience gave an excited response to the show.*

**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 show worked well in the Tron, with the lighting looking especially good in the venue.*

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

*Programme was simply but informative and put the piece in context. It was freely available to all members of the audience.*

- 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.

*Excellent publicity print from the company which is succeeding in establishing a distinct look and identity throughout its marketing. Good preview coverage in a selection of papers/ magazines.*

*Although I am on the venues mailing list and have been a regular dance attender there over a number of years, I did not receive anything other than the season booklet about the show.*

*The X-Factor website is up-to-date and informative.*

- 2.4 Accessibility of the venue, including:

- Ease of booking and payment - *Fine*
- location of venue - *Fine*
- external signposting and signage - *Fine*
- internal directional signage - *Fine*
- access and provision for disabled people
  
- timing of the event - *I was sceptical about the Sunday evening performance but it seemed to work really well.*

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

*Fine, everyone was helpful and accommodating.*

**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.

Acknowledgement of Scottish Arts Council funding and logo featured on all print and on the company's 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.

Good – well produced with excellent cast. The montage approach worked well in terms of keeping the audience engaged, with certain sections choreographically stronger than others. The opening was particularly stunning.

**Name:** Anita Clark

**Date:** 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2004

**Advisor**      ✓

**Scottish Arts Council Officer**