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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents the evaluation and research into the Siobhan Davies Dance (SDD) Next Choreography course years 1 to 3 funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation. This has been led by a team from the University of Exeter’s (UoE) Centre for Creativity, Sustainability and Educational Futures (http://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/education/research/centres/cencse/) overseen by Dr Kerry Chappell working with Charlotte Hathaway and Amy Phillips. Laura Aldridge, Emily Jenkins and Rachel Attfield (SDD Learning & Participation team) have collaborated with the UoE team at appropriate points in the design, data collection, analysis and write up of the evaluation and research, and have led on particular strands.

Next Choreography is a year-long course for 14 – 24 year olds, keen to learn about choreographic processes used across artistic disciplines. Through regular weekly sessions participants look within and beyond dance to study choreography; attending multidisciplinary events and performances, meeting and working with artists and experimenting in the studio. Informed by these experiences, participants create their own work and produce the Next Choreography Festival at Siobhan Davies Studios. Next Choreography aims to develop participants’ unique choreographic voices by building their knowledge, skills, insight and experience in choreography and composition across the arts. The course evaluated here offered 3 different cohorts of young people (2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17) – 42 participants in total, mostly from Greater London - a one-year programme over three terms, each term with a different focus progressively building their understanding, developing their experiences and using their skills.

The project was conceptualised by the SDD team so as to be impactful in three main ways: on Individuals and communities, on SDD as an Organisation, and on policy and practice. This Evaluation/Research report details both the project’s three year achievements in relation to measures of success (evaluation), as well as making connections where appropriate to the existing body of research into creativity in young people’s dance education, specifically, the theory of wise humanising creativity (WHC).

Methodology and Method

The evaluation and research used a mixed quantitative and qualitative methodology. Quantitative methods were used for two questionnaires administered to all participants and the SDD marketing team, and for basic numeric processing such as attendance at events. Qualitative methods (i.e. observations [3 young people per year only], WHC creativity wheel [all young people] and semi-
structured interviews [3 young people per year only] for participants, and interviews and reflective diary for the Arts Facilitators) were used for data collection which focused in a more in depth way on key participants’ lived experiences of the project. Analysis techniques appropriate to the data type were used to draw out the Findings. The research was bound by the Ethical protocols of the University of Exeter.

Findings:

What is the impact of Next Choreography on each participant?

- *Next Choreography* contributed to transformative change for young people from all three cohorts including changes to their approach to being a dance artist, how they valued themselves and for some engaging in ‘striking development’ whilst for others change was very present but gradual.
- These impacts may not fully surface until some time after the project, when participants are able to apply the skills they have learnt in a new situation or environment.
- There is strong evidence for the quality of the young people’s engagement in *Next Choreography*.
- The WHC wheel data identified that participants had developed their creative skills beyond their starting place at the beginning of the course, whilst acknowledging the emotional ups and downs of the creative process.
- There is evidence of the young people developing choreographic knowledge from seeing and analysing multidisciplinary work and working with professional artists.
- Participants from all three *Next Choreography* cohorts identified a significant increase in their ability to identify and use a range of different choreographic approaches and tools; all nine case studies demonstrated this increased ability in action.
- 81% of participants from Years 2-3 showed a greater awareness of different choreographers and wider contemporary culture by the end of the course, with some participants taking on additional choreographic opportunities through *Next Choreography*.
- Participants from Years 1-3 knowledge of career options within the arts increased as a consequence of the *Next Choreography* course and Young Artists’ Advisory Group.
- Participants from Years 1-3’s participation in the arts increased within and beyond the course. Participants identified an increase in their active participation with 75% of participants engaged with on average 6.9 new additional activities.
- 3 participants from Years 2 and 3 completed the Silver Arts Award during the course, although another 4 participants started the award but were unable to complete it.
2 What is the impact of *Next Choreography* on Siobhan Davies Dance?

**Organisationally:**

- SDD’s knowledge and understanding of how to meaningfully engage and communicate with young people has significantly developed through the *Next Choreography* course.
- As a result, the number of young applicants and participants in SDD’s programme has increased by 478% since the course began, alongside a 350% increase in the number of opportunities for young people to participate in activities with SDD.
- 76% of Next Choreography participants have remained engaged with SDD since completing the course through the YAAG and the activities co-produced by the group.
- 4,312 unique visitors engaged with 120 blog posts by *Next Choreography* participants and YAAG members since September 2014. The blog has enabled the reach of SDD’s work with young people, and the voice of these young people, to extend beyond the realms of the course.
- Attendance by young people at SDD activities and events within the studios has increased by 29.28% during *Next Choreography*.
- Under 25 year olds now make up 15% of SDD’s building visitors for classes, courses, events and exhibitions. For events and exhibitions 37% of visitors are under 25 years old.

**Pedagogically:**

- As a consequence of this evaluation the SDD pedagogical approach has been identified, reflected upon, refined and consolidated, enabling the confident articulation of the core principles and values behind SDD’s methodology for engaging participants.
- Pedagogically the evidence shows the following core pedagogies:
  - Developing a positive communal working environment grounded in empathy and honesty which acknowledges the ‘awkwardness of creativity’
  - Nurturing creativity in relation to young people’s different practices, allowing participants to find their own voice
  - Considering hierarchies and who has power, whilst maintaining risk and challenge
  - Knowing through doing / feeling and varied reflective strategies
  - Including all levels of movement expertise, no set movement style
- Pedagogies changed in the following ways:
  - Use of time, resources and structure
  - Balancing between structure and openness
○ Balancing different takes on choreography, moving and talking, process/performance/product
○ Shifting hierarchies more with attention to relationship and communication, whilst acknowledging that hierarchies are not completely flattened
● It also became clear that self-reflection and confidence within the Facilitators’ personal journeys was key and that they were facilitated themselves within the strong constructively critical environment around them at SDD.

Regarding evaluation
● Through the partnership with UoE SDD staff have developed new knowledge and skills to evaluate the impact of their participatory work both within the Next Choreography course and beyond including how to be confident analysing mixed data and working with dialogic tools as well as quantitative analysis.
● UoE have introduced SDD to new evaluation tools that have captured a broad range of data about the impact of the course upon participants and the organisation

3. How can SDD and UoE disseminate the course outcomes and learning for participants and the organisation to influence the arts and education sectors?
● Findings have been shared at four key industry events with organisations and groups of professionals that work with young people
● Another article has been written on the project for the One Dance UK magazine, One.

Recommendations
Re Impact on Individuals
1: Maintain and develop the core components of Next Choreography within future iterations of the course
2: Know that the SDD Learning and Participation team can speak confidently about the ability of its programmes to develop young people’s creativity and contributing to changing their lives and approaches to dance, and to share this knowledge as part of SDD dissemination and marketing
3: Consider building relationships with Guest Artists that were particularly impactful upon participants, working with them for future projects.

4: Continue to track young people engaged in *Next Choreography* to follow their trajectories and understand the contribution of *Next Choreography* to their lives and future career pathways.

5: Consider the range of career aspirations that young people identified and look at how SDD might further support routes into a range of those arts careers.

6: Feedback to Arts Award SDD’s experiences of young people not feeling able to complete their Arts Award and discuss with them how SDD might contribute to campaigning for the Award

7: Offer the Arts Award as a separate component to the *Next Choreography* course enabling more young people to complete it.

8: Continue to share opportunities at SDD and those offered by external arts organisations, enabling former participants to continue to increase their participation in the arts.

9: Develop further opportunities for the continued progression and development of former participants through the Young Artists’ Advisory Group, further supporting their individual and collective pathways as young artists, professionals within the cultural sector and beyond.

10: Continue encouraging young people to engage in / visit / attend various choreographic performances and work, including traditional dance and experimental dance performances.

11: Ensure that different formats of dance continue to be explored within SDD young people’s provision i.e. media, performance, music, art, drama and so on.

Re Impact on Organisation

12: Continue to stay abreast of how young people prefer to be addressed in marketing campaigns to keep approaches current

13: Select elements of the *Next Choreography* evaluation tools that can be adapted to capture evaluation data for future activities within SDD’s Learning & Participation programme and beyond.

14: Share the evaluation skills and knowledge acquired by SDD’s Learning & Participation team with colleagues in the wider organisation

15: Draw from the pedagogical analysis to consider and consolidate the wider organisational pedagogy, enabling SDD to confidently articulate what is unique to the organisation’s approach

16: Consider regular meetings of SDD pedagogy team to reflect on how pedagogy remains constant or is developing to stay abreast of the unique approach and to continue to confidently disseminate it

17: Sustain and develop the Young Artists’ Advisory Group through activities that progress participant’s learning from *Next Choreography*, ensuring that SDD’s programme remains relevant
18: Diversify the young participants accessing SDD’s work through the development of a programme for unengaged young people, that draws from the key aspects of and learning from *Next Choreography*

19: Work towards recruiting Young Trustees to SDD’s Board from the Young Artists’ Advisory Group.

**Re Impact on Policy and Practice**

20: Continue to find and seize opportunities to share learning from *Next Choreography* within the youth arts and education sectors, including networks that have not yet responded or been confirmed.

21: Develop reflective tools to help participants to acknowledge changes in their process.

**Correspondence:** Dr Kerry Chappell, University of Exeter, k.a.chappell@exeter.ac.uk
1 INTRODUCTION
This report documents the research and evaluation of Siobhan Davies Dances’ (SDD) Next Choreography course years 1 to 3, funded by the Paul Hamlyn Foundation. The evaluation and research has been led by a team from the University of Exeter’s (UoE) Centre for Creativity, Sustainability and Educational Futures (http://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/education/research/centres/cencse/) overseen by Dr Kerry Chappell working with Charlotte Hathaway and Amy Phillips. Laura Aldridge, Emily Jenkins and Rachel Attfield from SDD Learning & Participation team have collaborated with the UoE team at appropriate points in the design, data collection, analysis and write up of the evaluation and research, and have led on particular strands.

Next Choreography is a yearlong course for 14-24 year olds keen to learn about choreographic processes used across artistic disciplines. Through regular weekly sessions participants look within and beyond dance to study choreography; attending multidisciplinary events and performances, meeting and working with artists and experimenting in the studio. Informed by these experiences, participants create their own work and produce the Next Choreography Festival at Siobhan Davies Studios. Next Choreography aims to develop participants’ unique choreographic voices by building their knowledge, skills, insight and experience in choreography and composition across the arts.

The Next Choreography course being evaluated here offered 3 different cohorts of young people (2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17) a one-year programme over three terms, each term with a different focus progressively building their understanding, developing their experiences and using their skills. Term 1 focused upon opportunities for participants to discover, experience and analyse choreographic processes and methods used by a range of artists across disciplines. The second term supported participants to experiment with a range of choreographic processes, giving the young people space and guidance to practically play, test and tinker with different approaches to making that excite and inspire them. In the third term the participants applied their learning to create work for the Next Choreography Festival. A Silver Arts Award qualification was available to young people who complete the yearlong course.

The majority of the 42 Next Choreography participants from years 1 to 3 were from Greater London, with an interest in dance and/ or choreography, including 10 participants with little or no pre-existing structured engagement in dance. 35 participants were aged 14-21 years old. In year 3 the age range was extended to 24 years addressing the interest in the course from participants aged 22-24 years. 37 participants were students at the time of completing the course (8 at Secondary level, 7 Further,
The project was conceptualised by the SDD team so as to be impactful in three main ways:

a) **Individuals and communities** – SDD proposed that the project would impact young people by building participants’ knowledge, skills and understanding of choreography, contemporary arts and creativity in a sustained, progressive way, that would result in some kind of transformative change in their lives. Alongside this, participants would have an increased awareness of and interest in other cultural opportunities such as participating in arts activities, volunteering, and taking up arts courses. It was proposed that longer term impacts may include an altered outlook on their career pathway and greater attendance and engagement in the arts such as making work or applying for small grants to set up and run their own projects.

b) **Organisation** - SDD proposed that *Next Choreography* would provide a new framework for SDD’s continuing work with young people centred on choreographic practice; enabling SDD to develop a greater understanding of how to engage young people in the organisation’s work and the wider contemporary arts. It was proposed the establishment of a Young Artists’ Advisory Group (YAAG) would ensure the ideas of young people continued to inform the development, programming and decision making of the organisation, resulting in a programme of activities at SDD which are relevant and exciting to young people. SDD proposed that *Next Choreography* would contribute to the development of the pedagogy used by SDD’s artists, Facilitators and staff working with young people. By profiling the achievements of young people through the annual *Next Choreography Festival* and blog it was intended that the project should bring a new audience in contact with SDD.

c) **Policy and practice** – By sharing the outcomes of the project at conferences and events and by feeding into wider research papers and practices SDD proposed that by disseminating learning from *Next Choreography* to the youth arts and education sectors, SDD may inform and influence the practise and approach of organisations and individuals working with young people.

This Evaluation report details the outcomes of the project in relation to measures of success. In addition this report makes connections where appropriate to the existing body of research into creativity in young people’s dance education. Specifically, the research element of this project draws from the theory of Wise Humanising Creativity (Chappell and Craft, with Rolfe and Jobbins, 2011) developed during the AHRC-funded *Dance Partners for Creativity Project*. The WHC theory proposes
that creativity in dance education is grounded in the physical interrelationship of creativity and identity – creators are ‘making and being made’; they are ‘becoming’. It occurs in spaces of possibilities where young people can re-imagine the world and themselves differently via embodied creative dialogue. They are guided by ethical action, mindful of what matters to them and their community.

In framing the research element of this study, we have found it useful to apply the empirical framing developed in other WHC research projects (e.g. Walsh, Chappell & Craft, 2017). Walsh et al (2017) identified four key themes as being core to evidencing WHC, which we have further developed to five themes here. These are: the core idea of making and being made (i.e. the reciprocal relationship between creativity and identity, and the related notion of humanising journeys of becoming); new ideas that matter (i.e. that creativity has the capacity to be humanising when it is carried out with ethical consideration as part of creative value judgements in relation to what matters to that particular community); working on your own and with others (i.e. that creativity occurs individually, collaboratively and communally and often within a shared group identity, and that it is fundamentally driven by a dialogue between the inside and the outside); immersion in creating (i.e. getting lost in an embodied creative flow in order to take risks and develop new, surprising ideas); and taking and sharing control (i.e. initiating and sharing the development of creative ideas, and understanding/applying the principles that might guide decision-making). It is this framing of the WHC concept that informs and structures the questioning and data collection tools focused on young people’s creativity and potential personal transformation.

The Research/Evaluation team, made up of UoE and SDD staff, worked together to design appropriate questions, methodology and methods to consider success in relation to the three areas of impact set out above, as well as to offer insight into the presence of WHC and personal transformation for the young people involved in Next Choreography. These are detailed in the next section.
2 METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

The evaluation of Next Choreography (NC) has been conducted through a combination of data collection, analysis and write up in-house by SDD informed by UoE’s training and expertise, alongside particular elements of data collection, low level and higher level analysis and write up by UoE. Overall the UoE team have taken responsibility for the evaluation of first part of Impact A (Individual and community), and SDD the second part; the SDD team have taken responsibility for the evaluation of most of Impact B (Organisational) with UoE taking on evaluation of the pedagogy aspects of this outcome; and the two teams have shared responsibility for Impact C (Policy and Practice).

The evaluation and research has used a mixed quantitative and qualitative methodology. Quantitative methods have been used for the questionnaires administered to all participants, and for basic numeric processing such as attendance at events. Qualitative methods (e.g. observations, creativity wheel and semi-structured interviews) have been used for data collection, which has focused in a more in depth way on key participants lived experiences of the project.

2.1 Questions and Indicators of success

The NC indicators of success were led on in the project bid by the SDD team. The UoE team then collaborated with the SDD team once the bid had been successful to develop appropriate evaluation and research questions, as detailed below. Under each section below the key relevant data collection methods are detailed.

A Impact on Individuals

Key indicator of success:

50% of the participants that take part in Next Choreography have a greater engagement with choreography and/or the arts

Related research questions:

1. What is the impact of Next Choreography on each participant?

1.1 Can we gather a deeper level of understanding of whether each participant’s involvement in Next Choreography has contributed to any transformative changes in their lives?

Semi-structured interviews with 3 selected young people and Artist Facilitator, observations of 3 selected young people, creativity wheels, questionnaire, outcomes from ongoing one-to-one meetings with young people.
1.2 What can we learn about the value and impact of a choreographic project on young people’s creativity and understanding of the contemporary arts?

- Participant’s ability to choreograph work using a range of different approaches and tools increases
- Participants’ knowledge and awareness about different choreographers and contemporary culture increases

Semi-structured interviews with 3 selected young people and Artist Facilitator, observations of 3 selected young people, creativity wheels, questionnaire, outcomes from ongoing one-to-one meetings with young people.

- Participants’ knowledge of career options in the arts increases
- Participants’ participation in the arts increases

Questionnaires, participants’ attendance, data regarding other arts course application and attendance, data re take up of opportunities with partner organisations.

B Impact on Organisation

Key indicator of success:
Participants will remain engaged with SDD for at least a year through the Young Artists’ Advisory Group. SDD will have a new audience of 200 young people over 3 years attending events and engaging with the organisations’ work. SDD’s pedagogy for working with young people is developed, reviewed and consolidated.

Related research questions:
2. What is the impact of Next Choreography on Siobhan Davies Dance?

2.1 How has the organisation increased its’ understanding of how to engage and communicate with young people?

This may result in

- Changes in language used by the Communications team
- Changes in methods used by the Communications team
- Increased applicant no.s for SDD’s youth projects
- Sustained engagement by Next Choreography participants (through Young Artists’ Advisory Group)
- Extended list of organisations and networks through which SDD promotes its’ youth work
- Increased attendance by young people at SDD events and online
2.2 How has the pedagogy used by NC Facilitator and SDD staff to work with young people developed?

Semi-structured interviews with course Facilitator, course Facilitator’s reflective diary

C Impact on Policy and Practice:

Key indicator of success:

SDD will share learning from the Next Choreography course to inform and influence the youth arts and education sectors.

SDD will have an increased understanding of how to engage young people which will impact on the organisations’ artistic programming.

Related research questions:

3. How can SDD and UoE disseminate the course outcomes and learning for participants (across the 3 years) and the organisation (including the 2 Facilitators) to influence the arts and education sectors?

Outcomes to questions 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 presented at conferences by UoE and SDD teams and feedback and attendance documented

2.2 Data Collection

Data collection was carried out with young people, SDD staff and in the wider environment. The development of each is explained below:

Data collection around young people

All the young people filled in WHC Creativity Wheels once each in terms 1 and 3 with the Facilitator. It can be found in Appendix 1. It is structured around the 5 key features of WHC and aims to evidence young people’s progress in terms of their understanding of creativity and any personal changes occurring during the project.

Participants completed the questionnaire in terms 1 and 3; at the very beginning and end of the course (September and July). The questionnaire is designed to ask basic and repetitive questions, to gain information on whether participants knowledge and understanding of, and involvement with, choreography and the arts increases through the NC course. In addition the questionnaire captures
information about participants’ wider engagement with the arts and their knowledge of career options in the arts. It can be found in Appendix 2.

A weekly register tracked participants’ attendance on the course. It was monitored closely and almost all absences were accounted for. Another register tracked participant’s attendance for their one to one meetings with the Facilitator each term. Participants’ uptake and attendance at external additional arts activities was also tracked and monitored.

Each year, the young people participating in the NC course were informed in their first session about the role of UoE during the project. Three participants agreed to be case studies each year; which involved being interviewed and audio recorded, and observed by UoE staff three times. It was made clear what the observation process would involve and how it would be conducted. It was also explained that the data would be collected anonymously and recorded securely; the young people understood that they could remove themselves from the process at any point. As there was scheduling and commitment involved once all participants were informed about their role they were then asked if they could commit to the requirements set, the young people nominated themselves if they could. The SDD team then randomly selected the three participants from these volunteers each year.

Semi-structured interviews with the three selected young people were carried out three times during the year, each year. The UoE staff planned the interview questions with input from SDD. The questions were created to allow for tracking potential transformative change of the young people. They were designed to be open ended for the young people to answer and allow the external evaluator to probe further. The questions were shared with the young people before the interview was conducted. They were informed that they did not need to answer if they wished, that they could remove themselves from the process at any time and were given an opportunity at the end to change or rectify any comments they had made. This can be found in Appendix 3.

Observations of three selected young people were carried out once a term (i.e. three times within each year) within weekly sessions and once at the Festival, using an specially designed Observation matrix. The matrix was designed to include three different formats. The first focused on creative and choreographic progression in relation to the key elements of WHC, the second focused on the process of creative and choreographic progression, and the third focused on the product of creative and choreographic progression. It was intended that dependent on the activity that the young
people were engaged in during the observation, some or all of the three different matrix would be filled in for each of the three selected young people. The observation matrix can be found in Appendix 4.

**Data collection around SDD staff**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with both Facilitators of the course. The interview questions were shared in advance with them. They were informed that they did not need to answer the question if they wished and could remove themselves from the interview at any time. At the end of the interview they were given an opportunity to challenge or rectify any comments made. The questions were designed to be open ended so that UoE staff could probe further if necessary. This can be found in Appendix 5.

The Facilitators also each kept a reflective diary. The project wanted to track any transformative change in their pedagogy, so a reflective technique from Action Research was introduced to them. This diary technique was established for them to track and reflect upon their pedagogy. Different methods of reflection were shared with the Facilitators and the approach of the Scales (2008) Professional Development Journal (PDJ) was employed (See Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Action Research Interacting Spiral (Stringer, 2007: 9)](image)

A questionnaire for the SDD Communications team was designed to identify how SDD communicates with young people before, during and after the project. The questionnaire was completed each year by the Communications manager to track change in language, methods and approach. See Appendix 6.
Data collection around wider environment

SDD and UoE monitored attendance figures and feedback at conferences and events during the dissemination process to analyse the impact of Net Choreography upon policy and practice of the youth arts and education sectors.

2.3 Research Design

Elements of data were collected continually across the three years for all participants, e.g. attendance data, Facilitator’s diary entries. Specific data around the nine case study young people (three each year) and the Facilitator were collected in a more targeted way, three times across each year, e.g. Facilitator’s semi-structured interviews, observations and interviews with young people, follow up interviews.

2.4 Analysis and Write up

Each year, the UoE team analysed data qualitatively in relation to question 1.1 and part of question 1.2, and 2.2. A line by line constant comparative analysis was carried out on interviews and reflective diaries to generate codes and categories driven by the research questions, but allowing new themes to emerge as appropriate. This thematic analysis was supplemented by analysis of the creativity wheels undertaken to show movement up or down on the different sections of the wheel for each participant alongside qualitative notes added to the wheels during the one to one meetings. Developments on the observation matrix, coupled with qualitative writing on these were also used to supplement and triangulate the thematic analysis. The analysis from each of the three years has been combined into this final report.

Each year, the SDD team analysed questionnaire data by thematic analysis and monitored fluctuations in attendance figures. The SDD team also recorded uptake of additional arts opportunities by participants delivered by external organisations, shared by SDD with participants. Analyses from each of the three years have been combined into this final report.

The UoE team have written up findings from their analyses in relation to question 1.1, part of 1.2 and 2.2. The SDD team have written up findings from their analyses in relation to part of 1.2, and 2.1. Both teams wrote up the response to part 3, from the dissemination activities they have been engaged in.
3 FINDINGS

A Impact on Individuals
Through the NC course there is evidence that participants from all three cohorts have developed their skills, knowledge and understanding of choreography, and creativity, and have a greater engagement in choreography and the arts. This conclusion can be made when we look at the evidence collected from across multiple data collection tools.

1. What is the impact of Next Choreography on each participant?

1.1 Can we gather a deeper level of understanding of whether each participant’s involvement in Next Choreography has contributed to any transformative changes in their lives?
There is evidence that Next Choreography has contributed to transformative change for young people from all three cohorts of the course.

Interviews and observations conducted with nine case study participants (three from each year of the NC course) provide a clear strong case for how NC has had a transformative effect on the young people involved. Molly a Year 1 case study commented in her final interview that her eyes are open ‘a lot more to opportunities and ideas’ and that this feeling is not just in class but that she will ‘go home and think about things... keep that constant feed of imagination going.’ In her final interview Sophie a Year 2 case study reflected that she has become a ‘more rounded dancer or choreographer, rather than a dancer.’ Whereas Joe a Year 3 case study realised that what he has been studying at NC has begun to ‘leak into the work’ he has been creating for his BA Dance course. He discusses how he this feels like ‘a little fire underneath me kind of burning away constantly’ and that this is beginning to make him ‘much more inquisitive about things’ and that subconsciously this has allowed him to develop a ‘better understanding of what that means for me.’

We proposed in the Year 2 report that the young participants typically start the course with preconceptions of dance and choreography, and that they are then exposed over the year to new knowledge. Therefore, the impact the course has on them may not fully surface until some time after the project has taken place, when participants are able to apply the skills they have learnt in a new situation or environment. This is very evident in the follow up interviews we have conducted with participants one and two years after they have completed the course.
Feedback from a participant one year after the course ended:

it has had a really big impact on my approach as an artist of dance and the many forms that takes, the range of possibilities that the body has and the effect the body has in many different situations, it has enabled me to see a lot more connections in many other art forms and everyday life. As part of Next Choreography I valued all the encouragement I received in the really supportive learning and working environment at SDD, which made me more confident in my own abilities as a performer and maker of choreographic works. I learnt from Charlotte and the visiting artists that my understanding of and approach to making work is valid and worth pursuing. It was great meeting the other girls who came to the course interested in the same thing, but looking at it from very different individual angles. (Amy, Year 1 Cohort, follow up interview one year later)

Observations of the 9 case study participants over the three years captured some insightful moments, with observers witnessing the internal processes of the young people as they were creating. For example one observer commented how Olive in Year 3, term 3, had a moment of ‘striking development’ as they observed her move from verbally questioning an idea, to debating internally, and then applying this idea and debate to the creation of a trio. This example is evidence of Olive taking her thinking in a new direction. Transformative changes were evidenced in little moments like this.

Ellie, a Year 1 case study, states in her final interview that at the end of the project, she cannot compare herself to the person she was before starting the project, she has changed but realises that it is an on going gradual process.

It’s really hard. It’s kind of one of those things, well people say you’ve changed and you’re like no I haven’t changed because it’s been a gradual process I can’t really relate to the dancer or choreographer I was last year but I think it has yeah definitely evolved, but it’s hard to pin-point where I was then and where I am now but I think it’s like a process, if that makes sense. (Ellie, Year 1, case study)

The transformative change that has taken place upon participants’ creativity, their choreographic work and their knowledge and awareness of career options are evidenced below in sections 1.2, 1.2.1, and 1.2.2.
1.2 What can we learn about the value and impact of a choreographic project on young people’s creativity and understanding of the contemporary arts?

Firstly in considering the impact of the project on the young people’s creativity and understanding of the contemporary arts, it is important to note the strength of evidence for the quality of their engagement, which underpins this. Across both Facilitator’s reflections and interviews they commented on how they were ‘eager’, ‘engaged’, ‘how much fun they had’, how they showed ‘immense enjoyment’ and a ‘generous approach...towards each other’. In year one the Facilitator also commented that across the course of the project some became less engaged: ‘there are a few members who seem less interested - offer less to each session in terms of energy, contribution to discussions and attendance’. However the Facilitator was also aware that this lessening engagement was perhaps ‘for reasons’, such as their commitment to other educational courses, and home pressures. In year two and three attendance and commitment was consistently very high across both cohorts. Overall, the data shows that the pattern of engagement across the three years was strong.

In considering the impact on the young people’s creativity and understanding of the contemporary arts, the data offers a rich insight. Both Facilitators’ reflections offer evidence of the young people’s developing understanding of the creative process. The first Facilitator discusses how one session offers a ‘revelation for everyone into how we think, frame, analyse, read, respond, consider in creative processes’. She also highlights how she sees the project sessions giving the young people space to invest in exploration, and for their own curiosity: ‘I didn’t see a feeling of obligation to respond, but rather genuine interest, discovery and investment in what we were exploring together’. She was also clear that she could see the young people coming up with their own new ideas: ‘as new ideas, and understanding was settling in, I could feel waves of recognition, revelation and ‘ah ha moments’’. But also acknowledged that the creative process was not always easy for them. For example: ‘many of the group found the brainstorming of words in response to the stimulus material difficult’. But overall she could see how they were connecting what they were learning back to their own practice, even if at times it was ‘blowing open for them'. For her this was why the project was having a ‘big impact...on, how they look at creativity’. The second Facilitator commented early on that some 'struggled with the paradoxical nature’ of particular tasks, and at times showed a ‘lack of physical sophistication'. This did, however shift so that she commented later on as to the 'excellent connections made and questions asked about the nature of learning...moving into some quite philosophical territory about subjective and objective experience of movement'. She also
commented later that they had 'gained some confidence or deepened knowledge'.

Further evidence in relation to creativity comes from the WHC wheels. The WHC wheel data show us that all young people identified that they had developed their creative skills beyond their starting place at the beginning of the course.

50% of participants who completed the WHC wheel felt they had developed their ability to pose questions with and of others, debate between ideas and negotiate conflict. 48% identified that they took more risks, delivered surprising ideas and could be immersed in creative activity. 47% felt they had developed their understanding that different ideas are of different value, of the consequence of ideas and their ability to explore and action new ideas. 40% felt that they had developed in their ability to express their voice, use their imagination to embody their ideas or changed in small ways when making new dance ideas.

To support this Molly a Year 1 case study annotated her Creativity Wheel by saying that she was 'feeling like I’m exercising new parts of my brain' and Joe a Year 3 case study observation in the final term captured him telling his dancers ‘stuff I do is less interesting for you, so make sure you do something that engages you’, he was confident to take a risk and use his voice to empower his dancers.

It must be remembered that the wheel is not a statistically structured test but a qualitative dialogic tool, so we are not claiming statistically significant outcomes via the wheels. Equally, the above statements are made using averages of scores, and obviously some young people’s individual data showed that they remained the same, showing reinforcement of their previous position and and a small number rated themselves lower. Without a more in depth study it is difficult to comment on why these few students’ ratings decreased. But from the UoE team’s experience of using the tool, we are proposing that a dip in the young people’s feelings could be because when they started this intense project they realised the enormity of possibilities that exists, and how small their own change is relative to those possibilities. So this decrease in ratings is not necessarily a ‘negative’, but reflects what might be referred to as ‘the ups and downs’ of the creative process, which are also well documented in the literature. As Molly explains in her final interview that she had been exposed to new ideas and learnt new ways to go about choreographing but she had yet been able to ‘put any of it into action at the moment'. From the three cohorts we have evidence that the average young person has identified an increase in their ability within each section of the WHC wheel.
There is evidence of the young people developing choreographic knowledge from their theatre visits. For example from the Year 1 case studies, Ellie now considers ‘research’ as a significant part of her choreographic process, after seeing various productions she wanted to source further information about the choreographer, dancer or stimulus, so that she could build on that knowledge within her work. Likewise with Molly, she found the productions stimulating and enjoyed interpreting others’ works; she found the theatre visits an opportunity to pick up ‘bits along the way’. Similarly, Evan approached watching the productions as an opportunity to question, how watching the productions helped to develop his understanding of his own practice. For him he saw the benefit of considering if the work was successful or not for him as an audience member so that he could ‘avoid’ making a similar mistake.

The three case study participants in Year 2 were already confident in their expression about contemporary art and their ability to express opinions about choreography. Interesting all three of them now want to explore more areas of contemporary art and not just limit themselves to dance. For example Sophie a Year 2 case study commented how ‘I use to do a lot of art when I was younger, now I am so much more inclined to tap into that and tying it into dance’.

This desire to explore other artistic areas is further supported by Joe a Year 3 case study. He discusses in his final interview how he was currently designing a dramatic solo performance for a play but he got to a point where it was not working so he changed tact and ‘managed to develop a whole new section just starting from movement’ which is something he would not have thought to do before.

Overall therefore we see strong evidence for the quality of the participants’ engagement. Evidence from the WHC wheel data showed that all young people identified that they had developed their creative skills beyond their starting place at the beginning of the course; whilst acknowledging the emotional ups and downs of the creative process. There is also evidence of the young people developing choreographic knowledge from their theatre visits, and demonstrating across all three years a desire to explore other artistic areas.

1.2.1 Does the course increase participants’ ability to choreograph work using a range of different approaches and tools?
Participants from all three cohorts of NC identified a significant increase in their ability to identify and use a range of different choreographic approaches and tools by the end of the course, this analysis is generated from all datasets (observations, interviews, questionnaire).

The questionnaire data indicates that all participants from Years 1-3 have increased their knowledge of choreographic tools and approaches through the NC course. From the questionnaire data 100% of participants from Years 1-3 could identify more choreographic tools, 99% of participants gained a broad awareness of the application of choreographic tools and approaches, and 91.5% participants had the confidence to take choreographic risks as a result of the course. See Appendix 7 for data table.

Despite the increase the Facilitators noted that participant’s understated the number and range of choreographic tools and approaches they had witnessed the participant’s work with, and that from the Facilitator’s perspective the increase was actually much greater than the participants identified.

The questionnaire data is supported by the case studies. As the following quote demonstrates:

Before I was really curious about what choreography was, could be, I was very conscious about it, before I was very intuitive, I just did what felt nice on my body. Now it has become clearer. (Marina, Year 2 case study)

There is very strong evidence from the collective analysis of the nine case studies (Interviews, 1:1 wheel interviews, blog posts, observations and follow up interviews) we tracked over the three years that all participants’ ability to choreograph work using a range of different approaches and tools has increased. All interviewees could describe what their practice was before starting the project and how this had shifted during the year. The following quotes also support this: ‘Now I am more open to being influenced by anything’ (Sophie, Year 2 case study);

It’s really hard. It’s kind of one of those things, well people say you’ve changed and you’re like no I haven’t changed because it’s been a gradual process I can’t really relate to the dancer or choreographer I was last year but I think it has yeah definitely evolved (Ellie, Year 1 case study)

Looking back to nearly a year ago, and how I approached choreography, I think it was really different to now... I think the scope of where I could go was much smaller, my thinking was...
not to do with engaging with the audience but much more just how you might get marked in assessments (Joe, Year 3 case study)

Follow up interviews with participants one year after the course show that participants often need some time to let the experience percolate before they are able to articulate the impact: 'I feel more confident in taking ownership of my choreographic ideas and exchanging them with others' (Cherilyn, Year 1 Cohort, interview two years later); 'Next Choreography... gave me more awareness of interdisciplinary art forms and ways of working/thinking which have opened me to seek more diverse events and opportunities.' (Maisie, Year 2 case study, interview one year later);

it has enabled me to see a lot more connections in many other art forms and everyday life, the impact of our body the conceptual implications of the movement through space and time of our body. From NC I have taken a lot of interest in other art forms and approaches which can the body can link to. (Amy, Year 1 Cohort, interview one year later)

The first term to me felt mostly like a journey, where I was constantly questioning myself and what was around me. I started to read more, exploring new artists and works. I definitely understood that choreography is so much more than just dance movements put together in a sequence... I also learned about group awareness, new ways of exploring and creating movement and improvisation. (Marina, Year 2 case study, blog post one year later)

Evidence for this development per se could also be seen in the Facilitators’ interview data. For example, the second Facilitator stated that in an overarching way 'It seems the group are really capable of hearing rules, understanding them but being willing to break them if they have a good reason'.

1.2.2 Does participants’ knowledge and awareness about different choreographers and contemporary culture increase as a result of the course?

81% of participants from Years 2-3 showed a greater awareness of different choreographers and wider contemporary culture by the end of the course through their questionnaire answers. The 1:1 interviews also reflected this growing awareness as participants frequently referred to the performances or opportunities they explored during the course.
From the questionnaire data 80% of participants in Year 3 and 82% of participants in Year 2 showed a greater awareness of different choreographers and contemporary culture in term 3 compared to term 1. They were able to articulate a greater knowledge of choreographers creating and presenting work beyond the main stage at Sadler’s Wells, working across disciplines, using a greater range themes and styles, within and beyond the dance sector. Following completion of Year 1 we identified that our questionnaire did not specifically ask questions that enabled us to collect data for this question. We subsequently adapted the questionnaire to capture data against this outcome, see Appendix 2. For Year 1 we are reliant on the data collected from the other evaluation tools.

Each year the participants were introduced to choreographers or cultural pieces of work that had a considerable impact on the whole group and would frequently be referred to during the interviews, blog posts or wheel 1:1 sessions. Marina (Year 2 case study, blog post) expresses this as one of the strengths of the course in her blog post that ‘having had the opportunity to meet and work with high profile artists was extremely valuable. You not only learn different perspectives of seeing things, creative approaches, but also get to know their career pathways and build connections.’

Year 1 was heavily influenced by the workshops from artists Robbie Synge and Lucy Cash, and they frequently referred to the Ultima Vez production they were taken to see. Lucy Suggate had a considerable impact on the Year 2 cohort and the performance of Anna Teresa De Keersmaker ‘Golden’ at Sadler’s Wells was frequently cited in the 1:1, blog posts and interviews. The Year 3 case studies refer to the Trisha Brown’s performance at the Tate Modern and Lea Anderson’s session as guest artist.

The other theme that has emerged from the interviews is that all the young people wanted to explore other mediums through dance, whether that be music, video, blogging, writing, media, books, poetry, their understanding and scope of different cultural art forms shifted how they see the word ‘choreography’. Joe stated ‘the real difference is that I have moved away from that self-pressure to always have to tick the boxes’ (Year 3 case study, interview).

Several participants also took on additional opportunities that came through the project for example, during the course, Molly in Year 1 decided to undertake an opportunity from Sarah Adam and developed a piece to be performed in a gallery. Marina in Year 2, decided to apply to choreograph a piece at the Barbican which was accepted and she completed. In Year 3, after completing the
course, young people decided to apply for various projects such as Resolution 2018 or to study dance further at tertiary level.

1.2.3 Does participants’ knowledge of career options in the arts increase as a result of the course?

Participants from Years 1-3 knowledge of career options within the arts has increased as a consequence of the NC course and Young Artists’ Advisory Group as evidenced through the questionnaire data. **There was a 16% increase in the number of career options identified by all participants.** Participants identified 17 more, new careers options in the arts by the end of the course (121 jobs) compared to the very start of term one (104 jobs). On average participants each identified 4.3 career options in the arts of interest to them following the NC course, compared to 2.6 roles at the start of term 1. Participants developed a greater awareness of careers within the arts through their participation in the course. See Appendix 8 for the data table.

The increase in participants’ knowledge of career options is evident through the questionnaire completed by participants in term 1, 3 and 6 months following their completion of the course. 46 different career options were identified by the 3 cohorts across the 3 years of the project, with many recurring roles featuring such as Performer, and Choreographer. A greater range of diverse roles within the arts were identified by participants in term 3 including Mentor, Dramaturg, Writer, Events Management, and Communications roles. The range of guest artists and cultural professionals that the participants encounter and work alongside exposes them to new, varied career pathways within the cultural sector.

There were differences between the 3 cohorts. Year 1 participants identified fewer career roles in term 3 than term 1; shrinking from 10 to 6 between them. Individually they listed less roles each; dropping from 29 career options in term 1 to 21 in term 3. This could suggest that participants’ ideas about their career pathway in the arts had solidified across the year. By contrast participants of Year 2 and Year 3 of NC identified a greater number of career options in term 3 compared to term 1 (Year 2 Cohort in term 1 identified 10 roles, up to 14 roles by term 3. Year 3 Cohort in term 1 identified 21 roles, up to 24 roles in term 3). More participants in Year 2 and Year 3 expressed an interest in a greater number of different roles in term 3 than in term 1. This suggests participant’s aspirations had broadened to include new career pathways in the arts through their time on the NC course.
Through a 6 month follow up questionnaire on average participants from across the three cohorts identified **4.3 roles** within the arts of interest to them. This indicates a further increase in the number of career options that participants are aware of following the course. Through the YAAG members have encountered a diverse range of cultural professionals not directly involved in creating artistic work, such as Fundraiser, General Manager, Communication Manager, Producer. This may have contributed to participants awareness of alternative career pathways within the arts.

**1.2.4 As a consequence of the course does participants’ participation in the arts increase?**

Participants from Years 1-3’s participation in the arts increased within and beyond the course. Participants identified an increase in their active participation by 8% and as an audience member by 1% according to the questionnaire data. 75% of participants engaged with on average 6.9 new additional activities shared with them by SDD, taking place externally. 58% of participants contributed to the SDD Blog, publicly sharing their opinions about the arts for the first time.

**Participation Levels**

As part of the questionnaire participants stated the frequency of their engagement and participation in particular types of arts activity in terms 1 and 3. From across the three cohorts participants’ engagement through watching, listening, attending and reading about the arts increased by 1% on average through the NC course, and a further 13% in the 6 months following the course. An 8% increase was made in participants’ active participation within the arts; such as increases in attendance of classes, courses, performing, and getting involved in projects. See Appendix 9 for the data table.

There was a drop was in the percentage of participants regularly reading books, articles and reviews about the arts, which could be attributed to the number of participants undertaking academic exams in their formal education at this time, reducing their reading to exam focused materials. There was also a small drop in the number of participants performing regularly. Aside from these two decreases participation rose in all other areas by term 3.

**Blogging**

58% (**23 out of 40**) course participants **blogged 120 times across the three years**. Engagement with the blog varied between participants, with some participants blogging once, others each month of the course. For most participants this was the first time they had ever blogged.
**Additional Arts Activities**

Between November 2015 and July 2017 SDD shared 443 opportunities for young people to participate in the arts with 40 NC participants. 207 of the opportunities shared were taken up. The opportunities included workshops, courses, performances, jobs, work experience and volunteering such as a Spoken Word Workshop at Tate Britain, volunteering at Dance Umbrella Festival, digital media training with Livity, an apprenticeship with Heritage Lottery Fund. Across this two year period **at least 75% of the participants from all three cohorts participated in at least one additional arts activity**, with the average young person participating in 6.9 activities. It is likely uptake was higher than recorded, as participants that are less frequently active in our YAAG and are not attending NC each week in term time can be hard to track. See Appendix 10 for data table.

SDD’s ability to track uptake of opportunities by the Year 1 and Year 2 cohorts improved in 2016/17, with 50% (12/25 participants) responding and informing us when they participated in an activity. This was possible through the enhanced programme devised with the YAAG, which increased the frequency of attendance at the studios by former course participants. Of the 6 participants that neither confirmed nor denied taking up further opportunities after their time on the course, four are no longer living in the area yet were active participants engaging in high numbers of opportunities when we were able to closely monitor their attendance during their time on the course. It’s therefore likely they have maintained arts engagement to some extent in their new localities.

**Arts Award**

3 participants from Years 2 and 3 completed the Silver Arts Award during the course. An additional 4 participants in Year 1, 3 in Year 2 and 3 in Year 3 began but did not complete the Award. Many competed Unit 1 but felt when it came to the summer term that they were unable to commit to Unit 2 alongside education exams and the NC Festival work. This is a shared story with other arts organisations citing that few of their participants complete the award due to additional pressures and achievement of the award being undervalued. The content of the course covers all the Award Units, and participants undertook all of the necessary activity with sheer dedication. The process of documenting everything to achieve the award was the only aspect they felt unable and disinclined to complete. This does not reflect the increase in participation in the arts evident through the other data.
B Impact on the Organisation

2 What is the impact of Next Choreography on Siobhan Davies Dance?

2.1 How has the organisation increased understanding of how to/ skills to engage and communicate with young people?

The development of SDD’s knowledge and understanding of how to meaningfully engage and communicate with young people has significantly developed through the NC course, and most markedly since the establishment of the YAAG in Year 2. As a consequence the number of young applicants and participants in SDD’s programme has increased by 478% since the course began. 76% of Next Choreography participants have remained engaged with SDD since completing the course through the YAAG and the activities co-produced by the group.

Sustained Engagement

SDD have sustained a relationship with many former NC participants through the YAAG. 76% of NC participants have remained actively engaged with SDD following their time on the course. YAAG is comprised of former NC participants. Monthly meetings enable members to input into the development of SDD youth and wider programmes, suggesting improvements to strengthen and develop activities; pitching ideas for future projects, developing new activities, and sharing research and experiences they have had of SDD’s programme. YAAG ensures that young people’s ideas inform development, programming and organisational decision making, enabling SDD to deliver activities that are relevant and exciting to young people, reaching new participants and deepening engagement.

Communications Language & Methods

The language and methods used in SDD’s communications have been influenced by the YAAG; who have shared their insight and directly contributed to communications with and for young people. As a result SDD promote the youth programme to an extended list of organisations working with young people; reaching more organisations working in art forms other than dance, as well as local youth focused services. SDD’s online presence with and for young people has increased, with YAAG and NC participants taking over SDD social media channels, connecting SDD with more young people. The language in SDD communications to young people has shifted over the three year period; ‘the tone of voice might be more conversational than formal, asking questions and including clear calls to action. We also try to encourage current / former course participants and our YAAG to act as
ambassadors for SDD’s wider programme by sharing information among their peers and using their social media channels to cross-pollinate audiences.’ Fiona Campbell, Communications Manager.

SDD established a blog enabling participants to share opinions and reflections on Choreography publicly. 4,312 unique visitors have engaged with the 120 blog posts by NC participants and YAAG members since September 2014. The blog has enabled the reach of SDD’s work with young people, and the voice of these young people, to extend beyond the realms of the course.

*Increased Applications by Young People*

There has been a significant increase in the number of young people applying and participating in activities at SDD over the three year period.

**Table 5: Applications and Participants for SDD’s Youth programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013/14 (Before NC)</th>
<th>2014/15 Y1</th>
<th>2015/16 Y2</th>
<th>2016/17 Y3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants &amp; participants of SDD youth activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of opportunities/activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The volume of activities and number of applicants per activity has increased across the three year period due to the refinement of our communications and the increase in relevant engaging programme content co-produced with the YAAG.

2.1.2 How have young people’s involvement in programming at SDD impacted attendance by young people at Siobhan Davies Dances’ events and online?

*SDD Event Attendance*

Attendance by young people at SDD activities and events within the studios has increased by 29.28% from 2014 (before Next Choreography) - 2017.
Table 6: Attendance by Young People at Siobhan Davies Dance Studios Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young Studio Visitors</th>
<th>Baseline pre NC May-July 2014</th>
<th>2014/15 Y1</th>
<th>2015/16 Y2</th>
<th>2016/17 Y3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Visitors to SDD</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>14,725</td>
<td>15,518</td>
<td>16,650</td>
<td>46,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors under 21 years old</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of SDD Visitors aged under 21 years</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td>6.11% average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across three years young people have attended SDD’s building on 2,865 occasions to participate in activities at the studios. From Year 3 onwards SDD also measured attendance by 22-24 year olds, in recognition of an increased level of interest from 22-24 year olds in the youth programme. 1,520 22-24 year olds visited SDD’s building during Year 3; 9% of building users. Under 25 year olds now make up of 15.3% of SDD’s building visitors for classes, courses, events and exhibitions. For events and exhibitions 37% of visitors are under 25 years old.

Online Audience

4,327 unique visitors visited the NC blog between September 2014-July 2017 engaging with the 120 blog posts by participants and Facilitators. This is new digital audience for SDD, that did not exist prior to the course.

Young People Led Programming

The increase in attendance, participation and applications by young people can be explained by the additional programming developed with, and targeted specifically for, young people at SDD. Through the YAAG SDD have introduced new activities such as the Young Artists’ Feedback Forum once a term enabling young choreographers to show their work in progress and receive constructive critical feedback to develop their work further. Young Artists’ Choreography Labs enable YAAG members to share and test their emerging choreographic practices with their peers through practical activities and discussion.

2.2 How has the pedagogy used by NC Facilitator and SDD staff to work with young people been consolidated and refined?
**Organisation-wide Pedagogy**

The SDD team argue that the SDD pedagogic approach emanates from the methodology of the Artistic Director Siobhan Davies when co-creating choreographic work with professionals dancers, choreographers, visual artists, film-makers, scientists and beyond. This pedagogical approach is evident in SDD’s wider participatory programme; in their work with children in Primary Schools and Saturday Creative Dance Classes, with adults through their Choreography Courses informed by learning from NC. Staff describe sessions as facilitated to enable participants to observe, experience, discuss an idea/ theme/ concept, physically experimenting and eliciting their creative responses rather than being taught any set steps. SDD aim that the facilitating artist provides a framework for participants to explore learning kinaesthetically, supporting them to structure their ideas choreographically as individuals and collectively as a group.

Through the evaluation process the SDD pedagogical approach to working with young people has been identified, reflected upon and analysed by SDD staff, Facilitators and University of Exeter Researchers. As a consequence the pedagogical approach has been refined and consolidated, enabling the confident articulation of the core principles and values behind SDD’s methodology for engaging participants.

**Core Pedagogies**

Firstly, from both Facilitators’ data, their pedagogy was, not surprisingly driven by the project aims (see Introduction). This manifested across all three years in six key ways: developing a positive communal working environment grounded in empathy and honesty; nurturing participants’ creativity in relation to their different practices; considering hierarchies and who has power; combining knowing through doing/feeling, touch and varied reflective strategies; including all levels of movement expertise, no set movement style. All the pedagogies were grounded in a desire from both Facilitators to balance creating, viewing and appreciating alongside blending process and product.

**Developing a positive communal working environment grounded in empathy and honesty**

In her reflections the first Facilitator often wrote about trying to encourage 'collective decisions' and
wrote that she was interested in 'communal working' which she aimed to engender from the beginning of the project by asking the participants to write a manifesto (See Figure 2) for NC 'based in trust, community and group action, beyond the immediate group session'. She also reflected on how she felt she needed to pay attention to facilitate them in learning how to action this – see beginning of response to Question 1 where this is also discussed. She was working to 'build the feeling of community'.
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In her second year the same Facilitator made reference to paying continued attention to the 'relationships they felt between themselves and the space', finding a way to make participants 'feel comfortable and confident', and seeing the 'group feel really connected and close'. The second Facilitator built on this in Year 3, evidenced in her statement that she wanted 'set up circumstances to help people flourish'. She described these circumstances as including 'a nurturing, safe space' where she 'wanted to respect the knowledge they already had and are really skilled in' and which also involved 'empathy - I would think: how can you feel into what that person is doing?' and 'unconditional positive regard - you don’t not necessarily have to love everything they do, but always be positive about them as artists'. She was also keen to encourage everyone to be 'fully themselves' within this environment. She also discussed the environment needing to hold the potential for both 'multiplicity and clarity' – a balance between openness to multiple perspectives/ideas and certainty. This point about not loving everything that they do and allowing multiplicity connects closely to a principle expressed by Siobhan Davies herself. She is keen to 'include building up a strength of argument either by talking or doing as well as listening' and this for her needs to involve the
'scratchiness of being at work' around the 'awkwardness of creativity' and making sure that those involved with SDD honour this.

**Nurturing creativity in relation to their different practices, participants finding their own voice**

It was the first Facilitator’s aim then that the communal atmosphere/environment would contribute to nurturing the participants’ creativity, and importantly their creativity in relation to their different practices. She described her pedagogy as involving: ‘strategies for practically investing in their own creative curiosity’. And it was vitally important that firstly they understood that ‘each member of the group interpreted the same information in different ways' and that 'your body/ physical/ intuitive response to experiences is as valid as any other'. This was a point which seemed to take a little reinforcing with the young people, perhaps used to other approaches which might have emphasised more of a ‘right answer’. Connected to this, she also wanted NC sessions to encourage the participants to see practice differently, and for them to be encouraged to make new connections because of this. As part of seeing practice differently she also wanted to extend their understanding of choreographic tools. So she wanted to facilitate their understanding of: organizing space, structure, connection between choreography and idea, recognizing role of intuition, developing movement vocabulary, enhancing space through choreography, audience relationship, presence

Interestingly connected to this, she emphasised that the participants did not need to be ‘great dancers’ but that their ‘curiosity… around making’ in relation to the above choreographic elements was more important. In Year 2, the same Facilitator talked about making sure that she gave time with the second group too 'with future tasks to each individual/group so that I can support them delving a bit deeper into their investigations' to be 'cultivating their curiosity'.

In Year 3, the second Facilitator was also focused on their individual different practices and the possibilities of openness (with rigour) inherent within these: ‘I want them to feel like anything is possible, there is not right or wrong, just more or less skilful, they are very generous with each other, I feel like if I am open to them they will be more accepting of each other, then push them so that there is some rigor in the group’. She saw this desire for openness evidenced in the group: 'There seemed to be a tremendous openness in sharing thoughts, ideas and even quite personal feelings from the start. There was a buzz and a curiosity’. Across all three years connected to this focus on the participants’ different practices was the importance of curiosity, playfulness and what the second
Facilitator called 'thinking big - dreaming and thinking big...to encourage them to sometimes be bold in their thinking'.

The notion of participants finding their own voices within a supportive communal environment is reinforced by Siobhan Davies own comment on the above analysis that it resonates with her own way of working which is for: 'Each aiming to be the best of themselves and supporting others to do the same'.

**Considering hierarchies and who has power**

Fundamental to all of the above was that the first Facilitator was aiming for a 'horizontal rather than top-down approach to learning'. She was aiming to shift and flatten more traditional teaching and learning hierarchies. She hoped that her pedagogy contained: 'space to be led by student hopes and expectations'. Again this is a strategy that took time to work on with the young people. Early in Year 2, shifting hierarchies was the one core pedagogy that seemed to feature less in the Facilitator's discussions. This may have been because the Year 2 participants were less experienced than the Year 1 participants and were not ready to experience taking on more responsibility. The Facilitator commented on this part way through 'I realised how much support they actually needed to deepen their thought processes and preparations for sharing'. Towards the end of the year her reflections indicated that she was able to flatten the hierarchies more as they were able to take more responsibility.

The issue of shifting and even flattening hierarchies was also live within the second Facilitator’s pedagogy during Year 3. She commented on the fact that she saw them developing 'a sharper sense of discrimination in their own and others’ choices whilst cultivating a depth of feeling and connection towards each other’s work and towards each other as co-creators of the experience of this course'. And she also reflected on 'the balance of how involved the participants are in making decisions...something for me to continue to play with I think'. This issue remained live right through until the final festival, curated by the participants.

Interestingly Siobhan Davies noted that despite the above being the common way of working 'We do have some hierarchies and we should not hide that'.
Knowing through doing / feeling and varied reflective strategies

This core pedagogy involved the delicate balancing act of facilitating knowing through doing with a variety of reflective strategies. The knowing through doing/feeling is inherent in an embodied discipline like dance, but it is less common to find such a strong emphasis on the varied means of reflection with this age group. In Year 1, the Facilitator stated that she wanted to make sure: ‘there’s a wide range of ways for them to articulate or get it down’. These strategies ranged from immediate written reflection in notebooks and via ‘The Book of Words’ (See Figure 3) after the physical experience; sharing reflections verbally; public sharing of reflections via the blog; scrap-booking and reflection for connection-making; archiving what you’ve been experiencing or thinking, and also being open to new modes of capture. The Facilitator was keen that these reflective strategies become habitual for the participants so that they could use them to continually inform the doing of their own different practices. During year 2, the Facilitator repeatedly discussed helping the participants understand through their bodies e.g. ‘I can support greater articulacy through the body’. And she was still keen for activities to move between different ways of knowing: ‘we moved fluidly between listening, watching, thinking and doing’. Knowing through making came through as a stronger approach than in year 1; the Facilitator emphasised this more in her interviews, saying that she had ‘given a lot more space this term compared to last year to work on making’.
Facilitator’s Year 3 pedagogies exampled in this quote: ‘We started using touch, which was quite strong for them, they are not used to touching someone of a different way or age; I want it to have a function to help build trust’. This work on touch connected to knowing through doing/feeling which was then supported by multiple reflective strategies both similar to those used by the previous Facilitator and bringing in other reflective approaches from the second Facilitator’s experience of Buddhism and the ideas of Rogers related to empathy.

**Including all levels of movement expertise, no set movement style**

Finally a pedagogic thread running through all three years of the project was the idea that practice should be inclusive of all levels of movement expertise and that there should be no set movement style. The second Facilitator commented on this as a difference with previous roles: 'my pedagogy - I have had to think really differently about how I make creative proposals, in the past they tend to have a similar level of physical knowledge, this group is very diverse and have a different physical capability, some of them have completed high level training, so how to deal with the basic movement invention how to propose task that will not alienate people at either end of the spectrum'.

**Changing pedagogies**

Having established from the available evidence, the core pedagogies that both Facilitators were working with, we can now consider the changes that took place for the two Facilitators across the three years. There were 5 key areas in which they shared experience of changes or perceived they were necessary: use of time, resources and structure; balancing between structure and openness; balancing different takes on choreography, moving and talking, process/performance/product; shifting hierarchies more with attention to relationship and communication; self-reflection and confidence.

It is worth noting that by Year 2, the first Facilitator came across as much more confident, relaxed and secure in her pedagogical practice than in Year 1, and seemed to be more in a place of consolidation than change in relation to her pedagogy. She commented: 'I came away feeling really happy with what happened and how I managed the session'. She reflected on her 'renewed confidence in comparison to last year' which she felt enabled her to be more flexible. Her final
reflection in interview 3 demonstrates the strength of her consolidation across the year. Last year I talked a lot about wanting to be more responsive and teaching less from the front, struggled to achieve that last year, this year that has fallen into place much more. I feel really differently about how I teach and how I lead, which is how I should be, I have been practicing facilitating and teaching for the past two years and it is refreshing and exciting to observe and notice that change.

Use of time, resources and structure

In addition to this, both Facilitators felt the pressure of time, resources and structure across the three years and were constantly changing and developing their practice in relation to this. In Year 1, for the first Facilitator, the crux of the pedagogic shift seemed to revolve around trying to 'do less tasks...but in more depth in the available time'. This led her to consider 'programming term 2 in such a way that I spread some activities across 2 or possibly even 3 weeks so that we have the opportunity to investigate that activity/idea more fully'. The participants’ feedback reinforced that this would be a constructive change as a number of them felt that there was too much in a session. She referred to this again in term 3 where she discussed intending to allow for more improvisation in her own responses in the moment of teaching.

The first Facilitator also reflected a considerable amount on her use of structure and resources in Year 1 which led to sessions having more of a mixed purpose in Year 2. E.g. being flexible enough to see a relevant performance in Term 2 rather than confining this to Term 1, so that viewing performances could feed more directly into the participants’ ‘making and responding’. By Year 2, the changes manifested in using more time to do tasks and not feeling pressured to complete in a set timeframe. NC sessions were also extended to 2.5 hours which helped with this. There was also the possibility for students to stay after sessions to finish work which they sometimes did for up to half an hour. During Year 2, the Facilitator often recognised that she was being more fluid with her planning, structures and resources, using them as a ‘guide rather than a dictator of our activity’. On a very practical level, the Facilitator also made more use of a partnership with Dance Umbrella for NC. She also took what seemed like more risky decisions in terms of who she asked to work with each other – with pleasing results: ‘I think many of the dancers were surprised by what was drawn out of them by their directors, and unsuspecting ‘directors’ found that they did have clear visions that they were keen to make visible’. She also asked a Year 1 NC participant to come to lead a session which she felt: ‘provided an indication to the current group that this might be possible for them also’.
Structurally one feature which was still not entirely resolved during Year 2 was the completion of blogs – whether to do this within session time or leave it as participants’ responsibility in their own time.

It might be said that many of the time/resource/structure issues were resolved by Year 3, but this is not to say that the second Facilitator was not constantly alert to these issues and reflecting on them. She debated in her reflections both how to use and help the participants ‘appreciate all kinds of artistic resources (‘low’ and ‘highbrow’) as equally valid’. And she was also keen that time should be given to process, making sure it did not suffer when product became necessary, for example for the Festival. She described this as ‘searching for this balance’.

**Balancing between structure and openness**

Perhaps as some of the earlier issues had been resolved, this gave the second Facilitator in Year 3 a little more space to think about other elements of pedagogy. For her she particularly focused on balancing between structure and openness. She recognised this happening in one of the guest Facilitator’s classes too, as she observed him ‘knowing when to take the lead and provide a strong framework was clear but soft, giving plenty of space for the participants and their ideas, whilst taking overall responsibility and creating a frame within which they could feel held enough to experiment’. In her own practice she recognised herself working with the ‘delicate balance of when and if to provide input or contribution to any given moment, being mindful of not imposing too much but noting when time was short or when things were not clear’. And she also referred to what she called ‘marshalling the edges’ so that ‘things are not too abstract or too wide open’.

**Balancing: different takes on choreography, moving and talking, process/performance/product**

The third key area for pedagogic shift was around how the Facilitators balanced the participants’ experience of more standard and more challenging choreographic work. The first Facilitator had been surprised at what she felt was the less than high quality of a piece of work by an ACE funded company. This had perhaps given her more confidence to encourage the young people to challenge these kinds of work themselves, but also for her to confidently offer them more experiences of challenging/unfunded work that could even be of a higher calibre. She was also aware of her own need to try to balance what she referred to as more ‘purist’ and more ‘real’ choreography; to balance more fixed pedagogies which would ‘teach choreography’ with ‘more open-ended tasks which allow
This pedagogic shift was reiterated a number of times in the Facilitators’ reflections and interviews. She was constantly thinking about the balance between ‘practical, reflection and new ideas’ and felt that on occasion the weight of reflection could overwhelm the practical. She wanted to ensure that the ‘rhythm of each week doesn’t become predictable or overly reflective’. In relation to this she was considering in Year 2 giving a little more time to the participants’ own creative and practical work. This was reiterated in Ellie’s (Year 1 case study) final interview, she comments how at the start of the process the project felt really ‘free’, ‘light hearted’, ‘friendly’ and ‘playful’ but then it ‘zoomed in’ to focus on the Festival and lost its playfulness. Ellie understood that the project needed a focus to give the course substance but as a consequence she felt that it lost its playfulness.

So responding to this ongoing balancing act remained a live area of pedagogic change into Year 2. The Facilitator continued to organise experiences (e.g. visiting artists, trips to performances) which exposed participants to multiple different kinds of choreography and how this is influenced by environment, and her own passion for this comes through in the interviews when she talks about this as being ‘relevant and exciting’. She was still very interested in exploring the connections between different ways of engaging and in her interviews she often reflected on different combinations and balances of moving, watching, writing, doing, thinking, talking and reflecting.

By Year 3, the second Facilitator continued with the balancing act. She described how they were ‘looking at music as framing device, and how music coming from different sources or different types of music might frame an action in different ways’. She was also aware ‘of how Eurocentric my artistic points of reference are’. As a result of this she felt that she would like to challenge herself and the group to try to widen everyone’s experience. She also tried to balance relationships between moving and talking by working at different speeds: ‘I am trying to encourage them to work quite quickly, zip through things respond quickly, that might be a challenge for them and sometimes we have really long discussions and I want them to understand that both are quite valuable’.

**Shifting hierarchies more with attention to relationship and communication**

This pedagogic shift relates directly to one of the core pedagogies stated above. In working to allow the participants to understand how to take on more responsibility to make learning more horizontal, the first Facilitator felt she needed to go further still with this part of her teaching in Year 1. In her
reflections she discussed: ‘working to find logic in dialogue not just with [my] own plan’. She wanted the sessions to be more ‘group led within understood boundaries’, especially for those with ‘quieter’ voices, or for the few who were at times less engaged. She also wanted to see if she could be more responsive in the moment to what was needed in the sessions. This shift was thoroughly reinforced when the young people were asked to respond to the Festival plans put together by the staff. The Facilitator reported that the young people very honestly fed back that ‘they felt that the essence of Next Choreography was not there…it didn’t represent for them what had been the most important thing about Next Choreography, which was, them’. The Facilitator was then able to act on this almost immediately to find greater space for the young people’s voice in the Festival.

This pedagogic shift revolved around the fact that the first Facilitator was looking for a more personal and individual relationship with each member of the group. She perceived a: ‘gap between my perception of their experience and their actual experience’, and wanted to lessen this so that she could incorporate their needs into her planning more. She was also thinking about trying to open more communication channels within the project by e.g. giving the blog more space, and finding a useful way for people to share their experiences of performances and events. This also manifested in a different way in Term 3, where the Facilitator reflected on wanting to find ways to work with the relationships between young people. She noted that when they gave each other feedback on their work, they lacked ‘awareness’ and were not as sensitive as she had expected. Finding ways to nurture this relational sensitivity in Year 2 was another element of developing communication and relationship.

As stated above there was a less perceptible shift in this area in Year 2, as much change had been achieved in relation to this area in Year 1, and also the group were in a different place to the Year 1 group. However the Facilitator noted in the final term that one of the sessions was led almost entirely by the group, which she was happy about and felt was progress. Overall, the Facilitator definitely consolidated her approach in this area during Year 2, commenting how much more relaxed she felt to be present in the moment in relationships. She also commented on wanting to make sure participants felt comfortable whilst making sure that everyone’s voices are heard in the right way when communicating in the group. During Year 3 there was little further shift for the second Facilitator who came in to a ‘shifted’ approach, and also spoke of her relationship with the group perhaps in a more flattened way from the outset. Again though, the she was very aware of the power dynamics at play within the project. She commented that: ‘something for me to think about and carry forward with a group – to know that there can be self-generating structures and to trust
that the group will eventually arrive at something interesting with the minimum of intervention if the starting point is rich enough.

**Self-reflection and confidence**

Underpinning both the core pedagogies at the beginning of this section, and the ability to think about shifting pedagogies in this second section are the fact that the Facilitators’ were acknowledged to be on personal journeys, within the strong constructive critical environment around them at SDD. The first Facilitator especially acknowledged and embraced the fact that she was on an in-depth personal journey within the project. For her this was emotionally testing, and yet ultimately she was very willing to engage in this reflectively to develop her own practice and pedagogy and the calibre of the programme. She reflected that she had realised that she was trying to be ‘really honest’ in her reflections, and that perhaps this is sometimes even more difficult because ‘we’re always most critical about ourselves than we would be of someone else delivering exactly the same thing’. She was able to become more comfortable through the course of her two years, acknowledging the usefulness of shared reflective thinking with her close colleagues and at times the researcher, about the progress of the project and her pedagogy.

The second Facilitator reflected on her personal journey too noting some of the trickier moments: ‘I think working on this balance of being as present as possible but not too imposing is something definitely to work on’. Overall though she reflected on the positive nature of the experience as a reflective journey for her too as follows:

that’s been really lovely, because I do honestly feel like the sessions of Next Choreography for me have been the space where I also feel like I can really be myself…trying to be as genuine as possible, which includes allowing for awkwardness and not knowing and stuff, has been really powerful because I feel accepted by them and I feel like there is much more space to be creative when you are not blocking stuff’.

The second Facilitator also reflected on the notion of ‘questioning givens’ as part of her personal journey:

this is something I would really like to come back to when thinking about performance or movement conventions in a more global sense. Anything that we take as ‘given’, once interrogated, can produce some really creative re-examination of what it means to move in front of an audience.
Overall, confidence for both Facilitators was also connected to recognising their own knowledge, expertise and understanding of the NC programme per se, and having the confidence to pass this on to guest Facilitators. They both acknowledge the need to ‘facilitate the Facilitators’. The first Facilitator noted that one way to do this might be to give the Facilitators more information about the young people themselves. Towards the end of Year 1, she also began to reflect on how best to include the wider SDD learning and communications team to make stronger connections for the project within the wider institution. In Year 2 she commented that she was: ‘indeed clearer in what I am hoping for from guest artists and better at communicating that than I was last year’. It was clear that when Facilitator’s sessions went slightly off plan, the Facilitator was quickly able to spot this and rectify the direction when she could. For the second Facilitator in Year 3, she wondered about having discussion in greater detail with guests about how to structure or organise their slot … I think this is to do with me having the confidence to acknowledge that while guests are obviously experts in their fields, they are coming in cold to a situation that I am co-authoring with the group.

### 2.3 Impact of Evaluation Process

Through the partnership with UoE SDD staff have developed new knowledge and skills to evaluate the impact of our participatory work both within the NC course and beyond. UoE have introduced SDD to new evaluation tools that have captured a broad range of data about the impact of the course upon participants and the organisation; including the WHC creativity wheels and observation matrix. UoE expertise enabled SDD to refine and improve known evaluation tools, such as objective questionnaire language, interview question techniques and data analysis. The range of evaluation tools employed across the three years has enabled SDD and UoE to collect data from numerous sources, strengthening the evidence.

The benefits of the evaluation process were noted by the first Facilitator:

I think the reflections at the end of each week have been useful, I would not have noticed it and there has been something useful in the tracking of it, that is really useful and the discipline of it sometimes it is very useful and sometimes it is very tedious. Like the practice of teaching I have got to look at it, reflect on that and to begin it felt quite tricky and vulnerable, I tried not to filter but it was good because the change was quite palpable the change is really visible.
The evaluation tools were not problem free. The WHC wheel was a useful tool for enabling many participants to consider and reflect on their creativity and study of choreography in ways they had not before. The Facilitators noted that with some participants they were able to challenge their ways of working through a discussion about the wheel statements; inviting them to try different approaches or pursue something further. This might lead participants to reflect that their skill levels within certain sections of the wheel fluctuated rather than upwardly progressed across the year; as they experimented with new approaches. This means that analysing trends in the wheel data is not straightforward. Increases are not always positive and decreases not always negative, therefore the impact of the participant’s reflections and actions is hard to articulate using purely quantitative analysis. However coupling quantitative with qualitative data from accompanying dialogues offers insights into participants’ creative ‘ups and downs’ and allows for greater understanding of their trajectories.

The questionnaire provided strong quantitative data about the impact of certain aspects of the course upon participants. Yet striking a balance between objective questions and directly asking participants what impact they perceived the course had upon them felt challenging.

The evaluation process, methodology and analysis has been a rich learning experience for SDD staff and will inform the evaluation frameworks used in future iterations of both NC and the wider work of the organisation. The evaluation process has also provided extremely useful learning for the University of Exeter team in relation to adapting the WHC wheel into a new context and understanding better how analysis and interpretation of data can occur.

**C Impact on Policy & Practise**

3. **How can SDD and UoE disseminate the course outcomes and learning for participants (across the 3 years) and the organisation (including the 2 Facilitators) to influence the arts and education sectors?**

Our findings have been shared at four events with organisations and groups of professionals that work with young people in the context of dance and choreography including; the National Dance Teachers Association (NDTA) Conference, the Big Dance 2016 South London Hub Dance Artist CPD Event, the Dance and Child International (DaCi) Conference and the One Dance UK Dance Teaching and Participation Conference. In addition learning from the programme has been shared in one
article and one research paper and as a case study within an MA Dance Education course.

Conferences & Events

Our presentation at the NDTA conference on 31 November 2015 was attended by approximately 20 dance teachers and academics. The presentation by then Creative Projects Manager Rachel Attfield and Project Coordinator Emily Jenkins summarised the course content and structure, the pedagogy that had emerged through the course in Year 1 and the impact of it upon participants and SDD. The presentation was well received by the audience and questions about pedagogy and practice were asked.

The UoE team presented the first year outcomes of the Next Choreography project at the Dance and Child International (DaCi) Conference in Copenhagen July 2015. The presentation was attended by approximately 35 people and the audience asked many questions afterwards. The audience were a mixture of international academics and dance teachers, the one thing that struck them most about the project was the fact that SDD had received funding; anecdotally they expressed how a project like this would not succeed in securing funding in their various countries. They were impressed that there were opportunities like this for young people to be able to attend and get involved in. They were also impressed by the calibre of the guest artists involved in working with the young people, and the quality of the young people’s journeys presented.


Artists and teachers working with young people within the Big Dance 2016 South London Hub area were invited to a Dance Artist CPD event at SDD in March 2016 to experience, learn and try out activities and the pedagogy that has emerged through Next Choreography through practical tasks and discussions. Led by Facilitator Charlotte Spencer the group heard about the methodology SDD employs to work with participants and then experienced it through a range of tasks that demonstrate the content and pedagogy used to deliver it. 17 artists and teachers attended the event
on 17 March 2016. Feedback from participants included:

Thank you for the workshop and I came out feeling lighter and inspired', 'Lovely to meet you all and spend the afternoon thinking, talking, moving, looking... very inspiring', 'Thank you for a very inspiring and accessible workshop!', 'Just want to say thank you for an inspiring afternoon', 'Very enriching and inspiring afternoon last week and great meeting and working with everyone!', 'Many thanks for a fantastically rich and inspiring afternoon, and also for the generous sharing of the resource pack!'

The SDD and UoE team shared the pedagogical approach of Next Choreography at the One Dance Uk Conference Teaching & Participation Conference in November 2017. Through a workshop led by Facilitator Charlotte Spencer 24 conference delegates had a practical experience of SDD’s approach and content with analysis offered alongside the activities by the University of Exeter team. Delegates included artists, teachers, as well as producers, project managers and Senior Leaders working with young people within the dance and school sectors. Feedback from participants includes; ‘I will take from the session how to unlock the body through supportive, inspiring and motivating approaches that explore movement and beyond', 'Openness and all possibilities being valid and exciting', 'Enjoyed openness of tasks with everyone applying in different ways', 'Open and inclusive approach, use of tasks I’ve used but with a different view and how to delve further.'

In addition the evaluation methodology, in particular the quality of the reflective data gathered in the analysis of the course content and pedagogy, has been shared as a case study within the MA Dance Education course at the Danish School of Performing Arts.

Sector Magazine Article

In March 2018 SDD wrote an article for the One Dance UK magazine, One. The article summarised the impact of the course upon participants alongside information about the pedagogical approach SDD took to deliver the course; sharing the organisations learning with the wider dance community. Over 1000 One Dance UK members, and a further 2000 magazine subscribers receive the One Magazine. Members include Dance Teachers, Artists, Students, Organisations, Healthcare Practitioners and Scientists, and Educational Establishments.
4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Below are recommendations from the evaluation and delivery of Next Choreography for SDD to take forward in the organisations’ work with young people and beyond.

A Impact on Individuals

**Recommendation 1:** Maintain and develop the core components of Next Choreography within future iterations of the course without PHF funding, and/or within aspects of the wider youth programme; enabling more young people to experience the impactful content and pedagogy.

**Recommendation 2:** Know that the SDD Learning and Participation team can speak confidently about the ability of its programmes to develop young people’s creativity and contributing to changing their lives and approaches to dance, and to share this knowledge as part of SDD dissemination and marketing.

**Recommendation 3:** Although difficult to predict, some of the Guest Artists that visited the project had a bigger impact on the young people than others. Moving forward SDD might want to consider building relationships with individuals that were particularly impactful upon participants, working with them for future projects.

**Recommendation 4:** Continue to track young people engaged in Next Choreography to follow their trajectories and understand the contribution of Next Choreography to their lives and possible career trajectories.

**Recommendation 5:** Consider the range of career possibilities that young people identified by the end of each year and look at how SDD might facilitate routes into the range of those arts careers for young people within its programmes.

**Recommendation 6:** Feedback SDD’s experiences of young people not feeling able to complete their Arts Award to Arts Award itself and discuss with them how SDD might contribute to campaigning for greater valuing of the Award in school and education culture.

**Recommendation 7:** Offer the Arts Award as a separate component to the Next Choreography course enabling more young people to complete it.

**Recommendation 8:** Continue to share opportunities at SDD and those offered by external arts organisations, enabling former participants to continue to increase their participation in the arts.

**Recommendation 9:** Develop further opportunities for the continued progression and development of former participants through the Young Artists’ Advisory Group, further supporting their individual and collective pathways as young artists, professionals within the cultural sector and beyond.
**Recommendation 10:** Continue encouraging young people to engage in / visit / attend various dance performances and multidisciplinary work, including traditional dance and experimental dance performances.

**Recommendation 11:** Ensure that different formats of dance continue to be explored within SDD young people’s provision i.e. media, performance, music, art, drama and so on.

### B Impact on Organisation

**Recommendation 12:** Continue to stay abreast of how young people prefer to be addressed in marketing campaigns to keep approaches current

**Recommendation 13:** Select elements of the *Next Choreography* evaluation tools that can be adapted to capture informative evaluation data for future activities within SDD’s Learning & Participation programme and beyond.

**Recommendation 14:** Share the evaluation skills and knowledge acquired by SDD’s Learning & Participation team with colleagues in the wider organisation

**Recommendation 15:** Draw from the pedagogical analysis of the approach used within *Next Choreography* to consider and consolidate the wider organisational pedagogy, enabling SDD to confidently articulate what is unique to the organisation’s approach and its impact.

**Recommendation 16:** Consider regular meetings of SDD pedagogy team to reflect on how pedagogy remains constant or is developing to stay abreast of SDD’s unique approach and to continue to be able to confidently disseminate it.

**Recommendation 17:** Sustain and develop the Young Artists’ Advisory Group through a programme of activities that progresses participant’s learning from *Next Choreography*, ensuring that SDD’s programme remains relevant to emerging young artists.

**Recommendation 18:** Diversify the young participants accessing SDD’s work through the development of a programme for unengaged young people, that draws from the key aspects of and learning from *Next Choreography*.

**Recommendation 19:** Work towards recruiting Young Trustees to SDD’s Board from the Young Artists’ Advisory Group.

### C Impact on Policy and Practice

**Recommendation 20:** Continuing to find and seize opportunities to share learning from *Next Choreography* within the youth arts and education sectors, including networks that have not yet responded or been confirmed.
**Recommendation 21:** Develop reflective tools to help the participants to acknowledge changes in their process.
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Appendix 1
Wise Humanising Creativity Wheel, Evaluation Tool

Name (pseudonym):
Date:
Project:
Discussion facilitator:

Put a tick mark (✓) in one box under the statement to show whether you agree a bit, quite a bit, or a lot.

For further information regarding this tool contact:
Dr Kerry Chappell, Graduate School of Education, University of Exeter, k.a.chappell@exeter.ac.uk
Appendix 2
Questionnaire Template for Participants, Evaluation Tool

Next Choreography 2016/17 Participant Questionnaire
Name: 
Date: 

1. How do you engage in the arts?
(Please tick the answers that most accurately reflect your participation).
In the past 12 months: □ never □ rarely (1 – 2) □ regularly (3 – 6 times) □ very often (7 or more)

- I attend dance performances □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I attend concerts □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I go to the theatre □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I see exhibitions □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I read books, articles and/or reviews about the arts □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I go to museums □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I go to art festivals □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I attend art conferences or talks □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- Other □ please specify: □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often

2. How do you participate in the arts?
(Please tick the answers that most accurately reflect your participation).
In the past 12 months: □ never □ rarely (1 – 2) □ regularly (3 – 6 times) □ very often (7 or more)

- I participate in regular classes □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I participate in workshops □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I get involved in projects □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I choreograph my own work □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I perform □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
- I attend a course □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often
  - Other □ please specify: □ never □ rarely □ regularly □ very often

3. If you wish to pursue a career in the arts, please list the types of roles that interest you?
4. Have you ever had any work (or work experience) in the arts?
   - What was the name of the organisation/company?
   - How long did you work there?
   - What was your role?

5. A choreographic tool is a method used to create and/or structure movement. A choreographic approach is the way a choreographer goes about creating work.

List any choreographic tools or approaches you know about or have experienced:

6. A) I have a broad awareness of different choreographic tools and approaches. *(Please tick the most accurate answer).*
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - No opinion
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

B) I feel confident to take risks when I’m using choreographic tools and approaches. *(Please tick the most accurate answer).*
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - No opinion
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

C) I am clear about what my artistic interests are. *(Please tick the most accurate answer).*
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - No opinion
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

D) I am confident I could identify… *(Please tick the most accurate answer).*
   - 1 choreographic tool or approach used in somebody else’s work
☐ 2 – 4 tools or approaches
☐ more than 5 tools or approaches

E) I don't feel very confident to talk about my opinions on choreography. (Please tick the most accurate answer).

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ No opinion
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

7. Please tell us about an art performance/event that you have been to see in the past 12 months:

A) that you enjoyed

- Title of work
- Choreographer/director
- Venue where the work was presented
- A brief description of why you liked the work

B) that you disliked

- Title of work
- Choreographer/director
- Venue where the work was presented
- A brief description of why you didn't like the work

8. Please tell us about a choreographer whose work you like

- Name:
- What type of work do they make?
- Why do you like their work?

Thank you for completing the questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Interview - Term 1</th>
<th>Second Interview- Term 2</th>
<th>Third Interview- Term 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe how you work when you choreograph a dance?</td>
<td>Thinking about how you described your choreography process in the previous interview, have you discovered any new processes, can you describe them? Would you try these new processes or have you already? If not why? What could we do to support you?</td>
<td>Think about before you started this project can you describe your choreography process, has it changed or developed during the project? How? Can you give an example? Looking ahead what do you think you might do differently or want to try in the dance studio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think about when you have previously worked on creating a dance (before starting the project), have you ever taken any risks with your work? Can you describe the risk you took and how it made you feel? If not taken a risk or considers themselves a risk taker: Why?</td>
<td>In the previous interview you said you had / had not taken a risk with your choreography work, has this changed? If so can you describe what happened? If not why?</td>
<td>Looking back over the project, what was the biggest challenge you faced? Why was this a challenge for you? Looking forward have you learnt any new techniques that you might consider using again in your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you have to do to get out of your comfort zone and start taking risks with your choreography? How does that make you feel?</td>
<td>What could you do to help you take more risks with your choreography? What could we do to help you take more risks? What could your peers do to help you take more risks?</td>
<td>Looking back over the project, what was the biggest risk you took with your choreography work? Describe what and how? Fill in the blanks: “Before starting the NC project I thought taking a risk with my choreography looked like...... now I think taking a risk with my</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 3
Interview Template for Participants (3 Case Studies), Evaluation Tool

Fill in the blanks:
“Before starting the NC project I thought taking a risk with my choreography looked like...... now I think taking a risk with my
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you advise others to take risks with their work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>choreography looks like....”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever seen someone else take what you would consider a risk in the dance space, this could be classroom, studio, theatre, outside, at home etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have attended / watched XXXXX at the theatre. Which was your favourite piece and why? In your opinion did any of the choreographers / performers take a risk with their performance? What did it look like? How did it make you feel as an audience member?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You previously said that XXXX took risks with their work, now you have seen further productions does your opinion stand or has it changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the first interview you said that you took part in XXXX activities, looking forward would you be interested in participating in further arts activities, what types?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you talk about anything relevant that has come up for you when using the wheel? Have wheel to hand to talk through any critical incidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you connect the Next Choreography project to any other parts of your life? Sensitive probing needed here dependent on response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now that you have participated in the NC project, do you see it influencing any parts of your life?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4
Observation Matrix, Evaluation Tool

SDD Observation Tool
Name (pseudonym) of subject: _________________________________
Date of observation: ____________________ Professional leading: ____________________ Researcher: ____________

Observation 1 (for use during Term 1, 2 and 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creative &amp; choreographic progression: wise humanising creativity</th>
<th>Scale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - no evidence</td>
<td>2 - developing evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - establishing evidence</td>
<td>4 - consistently applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - confidently applied to arrive at creative and well-realised outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takes and shares control: initiating new ideas and responding to others' appropriately; understands rules and consequences; makes decisions and takes actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersed in creating: gets lost in creating; takes risks; delivers surprising ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

● Takes and shares control: initiating new ideas and responding to others’ appropriately; understands rules and consequences; makes decisions and takes actions

○ ○ ○ ○ ○
- **Works on own and with other people:**
  poses questions to self and others; debates between ideas, negotiates conflict

- **Comes up with new ideas that matter;**
  comes up with and tries out new ideas; thinks about ideas’ consequences; understands value to community

- **Is making and being made:**
  expresses own voice on own or with others; actively uses imaginative body-mind; shows personal change when creating
Observation 2 (for use during Term 2 and possibly 3)

### Creative and choreographic progression: Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – no evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – developing evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – establishing evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – consistently applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – confidently applied and takes risks to arrive at a creative and well-realised outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Arrives at solutions by selecting and discarding movement material</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evolution of movement vocabulary throughout the process to move beyond previously embodied styles</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes reference to other influences such as: research, choreographers, peers and professional works when discussing their own work and the work of others</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses reflective tools to refine and reconstruct their work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experiments with a range of choreographic devices and processes (e.g. improvisation, motif and development, exploration of movement material through a range of actions, space,</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamics and relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Exploration of inter-textual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Explores and discusses a range of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structuring devices where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(eg. introduction, climax, lull,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structuring in accordance with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication of the dance idea and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clear ending)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Can openly reflect on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work and the work of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observation 3 (for use during Term 3)

## Creative & choreographic progression: Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale:</th>
<th>1 – no evidence</th>
<th>2 – developing evidence</th>
<th>3 – establishing evidence</th>
<th>4 – consistently applied</th>
<th>5 – confidently applied to arrive at creative and well-realised outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Action content is varied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Spatial design incorporates a range of levels, spatial designs and exploration of the physical setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Dynamic range adds interest to the movement vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Relationships are explored through space, focus and communication of the dance idea and (group work only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Score 1</td>
<td>Score 2</td>
<td>Score 3</td>
<td>Score 4</td>
<td>Score 5</td>
<td>Score 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a wide range of choreographic devices</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work is structured coherently and holistically</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall communication of the artistic idea</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5
Interview Template for Facilitators, Evaluation Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Follow up question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe any standout points in the course to date?</td>
<td>What did the 3 young people (case studies) learn or practice? What did they create? What was the outcome? Did the 3 yp understand the session? Elaborate how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at 5 key WHC categories in relation to each student. Focus on critical incidents rather than trying to cover every category.</td>
<td>Is there any evidence from the wheel in relation to the five features highlighted to support the answers above related to the students learning? What progress are they making, where, how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the wheel and lesson evaluations. Is there evidence (from the wheel and observations) to suggest that the SDD approach to choreography is having an effect on the 3 young people?</td>
<td>What? How? If not, what could you do differently?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the wheel and lesson evaluations.</td>
<td>Is there any evidence to suggest the NC project is having an impact on the 3 young people understanding of creativity? The contemporary arts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you think the choices you make in your sessions are impacting on the 3 young people’s learning?</td>
<td>What evidence do you have to support this Do you perceive any wider impacts – positive or negative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you describe your approach to facilitation? (structure, style, atmosphere, approach – all useful terms for probing)</td>
<td>Probe similar points in second and third interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you doing anything differently on this project? Has it made you develop particular elements of what you do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6
Questionnaire Template for Communications Team

Next Choreography-
Evaluating the Impact of the Programme upon Siobhan Davies Dance

Internal Questionnaire: Communicating with Young People
Please answer each question in as much detail as possible...

| Staff Name:  |
| Role:       |
| Date questionnaire completed: |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What methods are currently used to communicate directly with young people about SDD projects/ events for young people?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who currently receives this information / where are these communications sent?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you consider to be the main strengths of SDD’s current approach for marketing projects/ events for young people to this audience?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you consider to be the challenges faced when marketing projects/events for young people to this audience?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When promoting SDD’s wider work (that’s not specifically for young people) what methods are currently used to communicate directly with young people?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How many young people (14-21 years) visited Siobhan Davies Studios for a class, exhibition or event between July 2016- July 2017?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are young people currently consulted about the language and methods that SDD use to market projects and events that are specifically for their age group?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 7

## Table 1

**Questionnaire Data: Years 1-3 Participant’s Reflections on their Ability to Choreograph Using a Range of Approaches in Terms 1 and 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions from Questionnaire</th>
<th>Average of Y1, 2 &amp; 3 participants’ answers</th>
<th>Term 1 (week 1)</th>
<th>Term 3 (week 36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List choreographic tools and approaches that you know or have experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 approaches each</td>
<td>3.99 approaches each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a broad awareness of different choreographic tools and approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>63% agree</td>
<td>99% agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident to take risks when I’m using choreographic tools and approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>70% agree</td>
<td>91.5% agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Appendix 8

## Table 2

**Questionnaire Data: Years 1-3 Participant’s Reflections on their Knowledge of Career Options in the Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
<th>6 months after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of careers roles aspired for by all participants</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of roles aspired for by each participant</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of different jobs listed by all participants</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 9

**Table 3: Questionnaire Data**

**Years 1-3 Participants Reflections on the Frequency of their Participation in the Arts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions from Questionnaire</th>
<th>Average % of participants across 3 Cohorts/ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeing Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend dance performances regularly-very often</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see exhibitions regularly-very often</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I read books, articles, reviews about arts regularly-very often</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to art festivals and events regularly-very often</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doing Arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in regular classes regularly-very often</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get involved in projects regularly-very often</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I choreograph my own work regularly-very often</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I perform regularly-very often</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend a course regularly-very often</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10

Table 4: Questionnaire Data Years 1-3 Participant’s Uptake of Additional External Arts Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uptake of Additional External Arts Activities by Participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of opportunities to participate in external arts activities shared with participants</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of opportunities taken up by participants</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants that took up at least one opportunity</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of participants that took up at least one opportunity</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of opportunities taken up by participants each</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>