

AGES

&

STAGES

**A CONFERENCE FOR ANYONE
INTERESTED IN COMMUNITY PERFORMANCE**

7 JANUARY

AGES AND STAGES - WHAT HAPPENED ON THE DAY

Ages and Stages was a conference organized by London Bubble that drew together participants, academics, organizations and artists to consider the challenges and particularities of theatre and dance made with participants of mixed ages.

It was held at the Canada Water Culture Space on Saturday 7th January 2012.

This report includes:

- Welcome – from Jonathan Petherbridge
- Panel 1 – **“A STRANGE BEAUTY” – The Artists Perspective**
- Panel 2 – **WHO’S IT FOR? – The Participants Perspective**
- Panel 3 - **CRITIQUING COMMUNITY – The commentators perspective**
- Panel 4 - **NOT JUST THE ONCE – From the perspective of organisations who have been working long term**
- List of delegates

WELCOME (from Jonathan Petherbridge, Creative Director of London Bubble)

In using the title Ages and Stages we've highlighted the intergenerational aspect of this conference, and indeed this is the year of ACTIVE AGEING AND SOLIDARITY BETWEEN GENERATIONS, but.... I don't want us to get hung up on Age.

I think what many of us have in common is making theatre and dance projects that involve people. The process and the artistic aspiration signal that the work is 'open'.

And these projects bring professional and non-professional artists together in fresh and dynamic ways.

Since 2000, Bubble has made 10 such 'open' projects. Some outdoor, sometimes site specific, promenade, scripted, verbatim, devised, all quite different but all with one commonality - they had a company of performers aged between 7 and 70 who were able to give their time and creativity because the project was open to all.

The projects seem to be popular with those volunteers - many of whom return. And the work is popular with audiences (Blackbirds has sold out again this weekend) and it should be noted these audience are not just friends and family. The majority have no link to the cast. But how does this 'open' and Intergenerational work sit alongside other mainstream and fringe work. And what can it do for the health of the sector. Those are a couple of the questions that I think we should consider.

And how do you describe it? It's not 'Am Dram', in that only very rarely do we take an extant script, cast it and perform it in a theatre building.

And it's not a Community Play - in the Ann Jellicoe model, in that it rarely deals with the history of a community or local myths. The work is usually generated by a 'community' but it also involves professional makers and shapers who work closely with the volunteer performers.

The resulting work can be many things - obscure, scruffy, natural and/or beautiful. I would argue it has a very particular aesthetic – it is wiki theatre, outsider theatre, collectively made. Heartfelt, gifted, flawed, human. And I think it bears examination.

And I think this examination is timely. It comes at a time that the arts are struggling to attract broad public support. And it comes at a time we seek moments of community and live experiences and meaning.

So some questions

- how do we define it ?
- where does it sit ?
- is it useful ?
- how do we do it ?

and

- how do we celebrate and profile it ?

Because this work does seem to be off the radar. Unless it is led by a high profile mega artist such as Antony Gormley or Danny Boyle - which leads me to wonder whether an Olympic opening ceremony can be considered as a piece of intergenerational open performance work.

Through pulling together Ages and Stages we've connected with a range of organisations and artists who enjoy and appreciate "open" and intergenerational performance making. As a result we have a fantastic room of wisdom here. And we've tried to reflect in the exhibition of images and in the delegate pack.

But, unusually, not only do we have the Director and Producers who often grace these events, but we also have performers (which is unusual) - and not only do we have the professionals and funded organisations but also the people they make work for and with - adults and young people whose days are not spent in the rehearsal room or box office - and we will hear from them.

We've got 4 panels to give different perspectives

- Artists
- Participants
- Commentators

and

- Directors or organisations

But their job is to provoke discussion amongst all of us. We're documenting this through notes, recording and Twitter. Tweeters please use #AgesandStages.

So chip in, speak out, tweet and attend.

Thank you for coming.

AGES AND STAGES, SESSION 1

“A STRANGE BEAUTY” – THE ARTISTS PERSPECTIVE

PANEL

Rosemary Lee - Choreographer- slide show

Simon Startin - Playwright

Chair: David Slater – Director, Entelechy Arts

SUMMARY

During the first session, the two guest speakers outlined their approach to working on intergenerational projects.

Key to both speakers was the belief that watching a company of mixed ages, backgrounds and abilities allows the audience a sense of connection through recognition. The performers are ‘us’.

For Rosemary Lee, her aim was to reveal each performer un-masked and to their full potential and it was essential to create an environment where people felt at home, comfortable and nurtured. A company made up of a range of ages and abilities allows an audience to make a connection with their own personal journey from birth to death, their strength, their vulnerability and their profound connection to others.

For Simon Startin, the participants and the audience also mirror each other in a way that is different from watching a professional company. He also enjoyed the sense of continuity and sharing of lives that emerged when old and young are on stage. A sense of ownership, particularly for younger participants, was very important for Simon. He also believed that intergenerational work encouraged tolerance in both young and old.

A range of issues arose from the speakers contributions. This included the value judgements where performers were selected for inclusion and the delicate balance between providing techniques which enable performers to have ownership and facility and application of ‘professional theatre standards’ to work with non-professionals.

FULLER REPORT

David Slater opened the discussion with quotations from two participants involved in intergenerational work; an eighty-year old from Los Angeles and a ten year old from south London performing in the London Bubble Theatre intergenerational production of ‘Blackbirds’:

“I had asked them why they were so passionate about creating work in the company of people generations apart; what makes them keep on coming back? The ten year old and the eighty year old, six thousand miles apart instantly gave the same response:

‘It makes me feel alive’. “

He then introduced Rosemary Lee. As a London based choreographer she has worked with both professionals and non-professionals and has been involved in intergenerational site-specific dance events, most recently in Greenwich and Central London.

Rosemary tackled the idea of a strange beauty by addressing her personal aesthetic based on the question, 'What do I find beautiful?' The answer for her was people unmasked, where technique does not mask the gamut of who we are. For her, beauty lies in duality, in light and dark, innocence and experience, youth and age. Dance particularly can address and explore what it is to be alive; through our bodies, the senses and our movement. Though our cultural backgrounds, income bracket and individual beliefs, et al may differ, we are alive and we share this experience, we know what it is like to melt, to fall, to rise. Rosemary does what she does in order to move people to a sense of self, of their own lives, their existence in another way.

When we see professional dancers it may be hard to make a personal identification with them. Ballet dancers are 'other creatures to us'. When we watch people 'who could be us, younger and older people performing together, it reminds us of where we are in our life line, of the present the past and the future, of birth and death. In her work she is exploring the concept that we are both powerful and also vulnerable.

Not all of her pieces are open to everyone to join. Some have a level of selection and, therefore, she wondered if they could be strictly classed as Community Theatre/Dance.

Rosemary confessed to a dichotomy between her personal struggle with belonging to a group and her love of ensemble work with a wide range of bodies and ages. She has difficulty with mass movement events and referenced the Hitler rallies and the Beijing Olympic ceremonies as examples of those that she finds disturbing as well as extraordinary.

Simon Startin began by outlining his ten year long journey with The London Bubble Theatre from actor to writer and his involvement with 'Blackbirds'. The play is based on the testimony of adults who were children during the Blitz, material gathered by young people in a year-long project. Childcare problems were solved when Simon's children decided to take part. As his son has no living grandfather, Simon felt that interviewing one male elder had been of significant importance to him and led to a real level of engagement in the project.

The ensemble then went through a devising period, which Simon had found difficult, as there were so many stories. To sensationalise the events would not have honoured the testimonies and he wanted a form that would allow all the large cast to have ownership of the piece. He decided to focus on one question, 'What happened?' He then explored this on a factual and emotional level.

The outcome was a script with different textures, a light narrative and a crowd of protagonists. This was then handed back for the cast to work on and change. In his own words, "I'd written a mess and it turned into something".

Simon was very clear on what the play and the experience of being involved was not about. It was not about being highly skilled in terms of RADA techniques, nor was it elitist. There was no selection, no hot-housing. It was, for him, an implicit gathering of ages on stage and a sense of the

old handing on their stories and referred to the opening when a young girl stands on stage and asks an old woman to “Tell me your story”, as the sharing of life in generational terms.

The process of rehearsal had allowed young people ownership; they were able to tell adults what to do.

In performance, the actors and the audience mirror each other. They are like ‘us’. Simon felt that a spirit of generosity had developed, similar to that experience in his work with Graeae, where individual needs were shared and tolerated.

David Slater then opened the discussion to the Floor.

Rosemary Lee was asked to explain the thinking behind her selection process. She felt that she needed to be clear about the physical demands and the tolerance levels required by people wanting to participate in any particular piece. For example, would someone be able to deal with talkative children or forgetful adults? She also had to feel that the person would get something out of the involvement. Very importantly, did they have the ability to ‘un-mask’?

"I make structure like a basket. Solid but with space between the weave. Participants form the basket's content and all through there has to be potential in to be safe in order to be unsafe".

Selection had also to be made in terms of numbers and age groups. Her solution to including people was to try and work with different combinations over time. Her next piece will be with women over the age of 80, performing on chairs and filmed.

Simon was asked if people became involved in ‘Blackbirds’ who had had no intention of performing. Simon said that parents had brought their children and ended up staying as part of the company. A father in the audience described how his mother-in-law had taken his daughter to the Bubble Theatre youth theatre five years ago, which had led to his involvement in the play. He had been involved in Amateur Dramatics earlier in his life, but this had been very different. He described how the experience could “open your mind a little bit to who you are yourself”.

Nick Hall, another conference member, described his experience of being involved as a mature adult with a dance piece by his daughter who was a choreographer.

Mary Swann from Proteus Theatre outlined how specific work that the company has produced had had a ripple effect and created the demand for The Proteans, a regular non-professional company. She then described the organic movement from the youth theatre into The Proteans and then out into other work.

David Slater raised the issue of ‘wellbeing’ that taking part in this sort of work engendered and the question of commitment required. Was it necessary to step into the everyday world of participants to ensure this?

Two delegates, who had worked with cancer patients and adults with memory loss, stressed that whilst continuity and commitment were important, it is possible to absorb the shock of a continually changing group, by stressing the values of the process, over that of the end event.

A warning note was sounded by a delegate who had had the personal experience of injury during a project and who had felt a degree of emotional pain through the ensuing exclusion from the performance at the end of the project.

One delegate admitted to having done some really bad work in this area in the past, she always asks now, "What do you want to say, (for example, to your grandchildren?)". Andrew Loretto from Sheffield Theatres spoke of the difficulty that organisers have at times with the risk of late outcomes of this type of work.

A student, who had been on a three year Performing Arts course, talked of the mindfulness as a twenty year old he had experienced by taking part in a project that included a range of ages and experiences. In particular, he remembered a woman in her forties sharing her experience of domestic violence.

David Slater drew the attention of delegates to a project in America where adult students, performing with eight year olds, were seen to be dancing more freely and asked if they were perhaps functioning in a different way because of the age difference?

One delegate thought that with one's own age group, one might have the sense of 'knowing', rather than being open to exploring.

Discussion then turned to the role of adults when working in a group that contained young people. One of the adult participants in the Bubble show stressed the need for tolerance. Simon Startin agreed that adults had to abandon the normal power structure so that, for example, he was happy to allow participants, including the younger members, to alter his script.

Patrick O'Sullivan from Queen's Theatre Hornchurch described their process, whereby the script is written and then cast through audition, as the aim was to make a very good piece of theatre for their main stage.

This led to a heated discussion about the production values of work in this area and the balance between making judgement calls and giving participants access to techniques.

David Slater then asked the conference to go back to the concept of un-masking introduced by Rosemary Lee and how best to enable participants to engage intimately.

Julia Voce, an artist who worked on 'Blackbirds', stressed the need for clarity in the starting terms of engagement and the importance of approaching such projects with the idea of what we can share with each other.

Notes taken by June Mitchell.

AGES AND STAGES, SESSION 2

WHO'S IT FOR? – THE PARTICIPANTS PERSPECTIVE

PANEL

Daniel North – Square Dance

Sally Manser – Common Dance

Nick Hale – Common Dance

Martin Palmer – The Proteans, Proteus Theatre

Chris Hawney – London Bubble

Rosie Lea – London Bubble

Kezia Herzog – London Bubble

Paul Wilshaw – Wimborne Community Theatre

Chair: Iris Dove – London Bubble

SUMMARY

Feedback from the panel included comments on how and why participants have become involved in Participatory Groups, what they enjoy about it, and what are the notable aspects of working on creative performance projects within intergenerational companies. The physical and mental challenges were discussed as was the creative processes. There were observations of the support of the group and the sense of 'family' this created during the process. Additionally, the panel discussed the wider impact of their participation on the audiences, friends, families and the communities within which they perform.

FULLER REPORT

Participants were asked how and why they became involved in their groups. Responses varied from, **how** - being brought along or recommended to by family or friends, in some cases bringing children along to participate and being asked to join in themselves; and **why** - needed an expressive outlet from otherwise sedentary, freelance, possibly isolated work patterns, and that working in this way was a more social and challenging alternative activity from, for example, badminton, running or doing crosswords.

Some participants had taken part in other musical or dramatic activities, others had not. So generally the reasons why participants joined is because it was a free time activity which was not just enjoyable and different, but also one in which people felt they had a valued input, through the creation of a public performance, rather than just weekly workshops or exercise.

The discussion then addressed what participants gained from the work and what kept them coming along to sessions. There was an overwhelming sense of the mental and physical challenges presented and then overcome. The physical challenges ranged from issues brought about by ageing, and other disabilities which were of a specific challenge, such as in one instance, a child with cerebral palsy. In the case of dance work, the importance of breaking down 'body taboos' through touch, lifting, lying on top of people, being aware of space and looking after others physically was extremely significant and 'took self consciousness to another place'. The ability to play and the unpredictability of live work was considered exciting.

Beyond physical development, building self-confidence was also mentioned as a key gain. Confidence manifest itself in the act of performing itself - physically and vocally, and in responding to audiences; confidence in relating to other people perhaps not within your own generation; and confidence in doing other things outside the group. For example in one case a participant has started working with young offenders, which was personally very revealing but that working on the dance piece had helped him to feel more confident to deal with that situation. It was also pointed out by all groups present that young people and children grow in confidence and maturity, visibly, when working in mixed generational groups.

On issues of intergenerational work, both young and old expressed the advantages. Young people said how special it was to feel part of a group and to make friends with people of different ages, especially where elders were not present in their own families. One young panelist spoke of her awareness of the negative press that young people have, and felt that it was good to work alongside elders, to dispel some of these perceptions. She also spoke sensitively of her awareness of adults arriving at evening rehearsals, who had perhaps 'not had a good day', but that getting into character was a good way to change the mood.

Adult participants spoke of the energy and stamina children brought to the rehearsal space. In other cases participants expressed how age differences became irrelevant, that one did not notice age when involved in a theatre piece, and that often one felt about 20 inside anyway (not middle aged)! 'Groupness' engendered support, dedication, 'upping the game' and the importance of 'finding your niche', 'helping each other out' and 'playing to your strengths' were also mentioned.

For some, the relationship children may have had with older positive role models within the company was extremely important, and parents who came to projects with their children were aware of how this may develop their relationships as well.

The creative process was discussed. Music, words and phrases were all cited as stimuli. Workshops acted as a kind of training space and/or introduction to the material or physicality needed. Learning text and/or interviewing the elders (as in *Grandchildren of the Blitz*) developed language.

Rehearsal processes often took place in smaller 'family groups', before coming together into a larger group with the other 'families' - micro and macro.

In terms of creative input, statements included "Rosemary was the crafter, but I cannot unpick the authorship" and "I didn't bring my own ideas, but how I would interpret my character". Participants commented on the like-minded teams of helpers who supported the directors in rehearsals, and, that sometimes it was very challenging when not everyone could make it to the rehearsals.

On the issue of audiences and spaces, participants mentioned the unpredictability of their audiences, of negotiating, and of breaking down the barriers between actor and audience, and that through sensing the responses of the audience, "one looks to oneself as a performer".

There was talk about the performance venues within the community and how these in some cases intrigued audiences to come and have a look, and how the subject matter, in some cases, attracted local people who had personal experience and local knowledge. It was noted that

friends and families came to see the productions, sometimes more than once, and in doing so saw aspects of the productions beyond the contribution of their loved ones.

Creating the plays was an education for some of the participants in learning about local historical issues as well as for the audience, which made them often very moved by the material whilst performing, as they felt the situations of their characters deeply, perhaps thinking of their own families' history. The impact of the work on participants' families included "lots of friends and family are very proud of me. Because of my disability they thought I would not do much. I have ideas for future projects."

Two comments stand out amongst many. "I enjoy it and I've made new friends. When you do something you enjoy, it makes it special." and "You build a mutual confidence, amazing to achieve amongst 8 - 80 year olds."

Notes taken by Pip Nash

AGES AND STAGES, SESSION 3

CRITIQUING COMMUNITY – THE COMMENTATORS PERSPECTIVE

PANEL

Lyn Gardner – The Guardian

Helen Nicholson – Professor of Theatre and Performance at Royal Holloway

Alison Rooke – Visual Sociologist, Goldsmiths College

Chair: Dr Louise Owen, Lecturer in Theatre and Performance at Birkbeck College

SUMMARY

The session focused on the relationship intergenerational community work has with the community and how important it is to leave the right legacy. It was also felt that critics and commentators might consider the process too much and that they should be encouraged to consider the outcome on its own merits, unless invited to participate in the process.

FULLER REPORT

The session began by Dr Owen suggesting that they would aim to approach the question of writing with a degree of humility – as a process of exploration and discovery, not just opinion.

Helen Nicholson wondered how we talk about art in the 21st Century and what value we put on it - in the 19th Century people talked about great art being civilising and in the 20th century it was a Humaniser. Academicians bring critical reflection, by looking at the bigger questions outside of the immediacy of the work and Helen was intrigued about how the writing of intergenerational community work can be more precise. In her opinion the big questions were about Space and Time – how do people make time which is not commodified (i.e. not work) and yet connect with others. She felt intergenerational work was a way to get to know our neighbours, in a world where we are instantly connecting with our global counterparts and sometimes forgetting those closer to home.

Alison Rooke worked with London Bubble over The Grandchildren of the Blitz, as a research project, and spoke primarily of her findings from that research. She found that people come to the Bubble and stay – a long term relationship was developed that allowed people to come back even if they went off to do other things in between. The Bubble was talked of as a family not as a theatre company. People spoke of being listened to, of sharing one's experiences, about remembering and telling, of respecting each other and creating a cooperative way of working as being of value to them. She also noted that people felt challenged working with the Bubble and said that it adopted a culturally democratic way of making theatre.

Lyn Gardner spoke about the place of community theatre in mainstream theatre press, and about a cultural shift taking place as bloggers and twitterers gain more influence. She felt that the dominant culture of theatre made for people was changing to theatre made for and with people. However, as collaboration, participation and community become buzz words, there is a danger that people use them for their own artistic purposes. She spoke to creating a legacy and ensuring that not just the funding and artists but the community should be in place as well.

Discussion and questions ensued.

Whilst sustained working with a community is important to create a legacy, Helen noted that the element of surprise that a one-off engagement created is also important.

Mary Swann from Proteus Theatre felt that being a part of a community of theatre makers supported by professionals is as much a learning curve for her as an Artistic Director as it is for the participants.

Jonathan Petherbridge felt a piece of theatre made by a community should be placed alongside every other cultural offer in the city.

Comments were made about a lot of professional work being viewed by friends and family, but that should not be flagged as a stereotype audience for community pieces.

In response to a question about community theatre being made as a response to social issues, Lyn felt that social work is not good theatre but theatre often turns out to be the best social work.

Notes taken by Shipra Ogra

AGES AND STAGES, SESSION 4

NOT JUST THE ONCE – From the perspective of organisations who have been working long term

PANEL

Tony Horitz – Co-founder Wimbourne Community Theatre

Neil Beddow – Artistic Director, ACTA Bristol

Chair: Jonathan Petherbridge (Peth) – Creative Director, London Bubble

SUMMARY

This was a panel of practitioners who had been making work in a community context for 10 years or longer. Neil and Tony introduced the work of their respective companies and talked about the constituencies they worked with and the audiences. The importance of companies' work being a family affair was underlined. The impact of the work on the communities involved was discussed as were the reasons for people getting involved in it. The importance of both wellbeing and artistic quality was discussed and their interdependence.

FULLER REPORT

Neil introduced the work of the company. ACTA (founded 1985) works on new pieces of theatre relevant to the community, with performers from the community, some of which are intergenerational. The audience are not necessarily friends and family. He noted the groundswell of interest in this area of work and how the movement is disparate. ACTA start with people and make the play rather than the other way around.

Tony described Wimbourne's work. The company (20 years old) came out of a TIE company and works in a rural area. They have long association with participants and often develop site-specific work, with an active role for audience. They used to build shows in constituent groups and then put together but now work with smaller groups involving different sections of the community. Their work has departed from exploring local issues.

Peth asked how their families are involved with the work. Neil remarked that often married couples run the companies. Peth noted that John Fox's kids were in his last show and they exactly understood this work.

Peth asked what difference the work had made to the community. Neil responded that it was hard to be scientific but he knew the company was valued and enjoyed through anecdotal evidence. **Discussion ensued.**

Marigold Hughes remarked that community theatre was attractive to participants for artistic reasons and reasons of wellbeing and asked which was more important. Neil stated that both were important. Tony thought a new aesthetic was important and that there was a need to redefine what community theatre means. Neil commented that people's investment needed to result in something artistically good but that all community theatre could not be judged in the same way as the hegemony of theatre. Peth felt that if you did not engender well being the work would not be good and that watching somebody do something well gives pleasure.

Sally Manser asked for advice for young professionals wanting to do community work. Neil suggested learning from watching somebody who is doing it. Peth emphasised the need to take risks and to have the guts to change direction. He is interested in young funky artists who want to work with the community. Tony's advice was to follow your passion.

Louise Owen asked who the audience was for this sort of theatre. Neil replied that for big community plays it was a lot of family and friends whilst for smaller shows in areas where there were no family and friends it was people attracted by the subject matter. Louise was uncomfortable with the idea you would know exactly who your audience was going to be as theatre was about communication. Neil felt there was a huge assumption about audiences. Community theatre finds new audiences who despite themselves find theatre interesting. You couldn't take them to something else and that was what he means by audience specificity.

There was a question about whether there was a collective around to define the movement and fight cuts. Tony felt conferences like this were important and that more young people were needed to join the movement and rekindle it. Peth felt ACE had a problem with keeping up with all companies and all projects. An audience member said people want to be involved because they feel marginalised and that he likes the word community. David Slater felt that we don't make community theatre but theatre. Both Neil and Tony felt an infrastructure was needed.

There was some discussion around issue based work and work based on old stories. Peth stated that you needed to be clear about why you were choosing a particular piece of work.

Peth highlighted the Message Board on Ages and Stages and 'Devoted and Disgruntled'.

Simon Hughes MP (Chair of Bubble) wound up by thanking everyone and emphasising the importance of inter-generational work. He encouraged everyone to tell old stories in new ways and to be bold.

Notes taken by Sue Timothy

LIST OF DELEGATES

Other names	Surname	Organisation
Pat	Abraham	London Bubble
Vicki	Amedume	Upswing
Adam	Annand	London Bubble
Ruth	Basten	
Neil	Beddow	Acta Community Theatre
Daniel	Bendelman	
Francesca	Bertolli	
Carrie	Bonnett	Liminal State Theatre
Kiara	Brennan	
Estelle	Buckridge	Freelance Drama Facillitator
Bo	Chapman	Salmagundi Films
Maria	Chatzistogianni	
Gemma	Coldicott	SLIDE
J William	Davis	J William Davis Theatre Design
Jenny	Davison	Elders Voice
Iris	Dove	
Bridget	Floyer	
Zoe	Flynn	Salmagundi
Lyn	Gardner	Theatre Critic
Tamasine	Gilbert	
Denise	Gilfoyle	Stephen Joseph Theatre
Cindy	Glover	Alzheimers Society
Molly	Graham	London Bubble
Nick	Hale	Dance Umbrella
Vicki	Hargreaves	The Point
Barbara	Hart	Wimborne
Jeff	Hart	Wimborne
Ross	Harvie	Proteus
David	Haworth	Forest Forge
Chris	Hawney	
Rosy-Lea	Hawney	
Kezia	Herzog	
Robert	Herzog	
Jeannette	Hobden	Proteus
Julia	Honess	
Tony	Horitz	Wimborne Community Theatre
Stella	Howard	Laban
Susanna	Howard	
Caroline	Joyner	Connected Culture
Rosemary	Lee	
Sarah	Lewis	Norfolk Dance
Dvora	Liberman	
Andrew	Loretto	Sheffield Theatres

Kate	Lovell	Toynbee Hall
Gail	MacLeod	
Sally	Manser	
Paul	Margrave	Capital Age Festival
Ainslie	Masterton	East 15
Laura	McGill	Norfolk Dance
John	Miles	Keele University
June	Mitchell	
Caroline	Moore	
Sharon	Muiruri	Poole Community Passion Play
Lucy	Munro	
Ben	Myers	
Pip	Nash	
Helen	Nicholson	Royal Holloway, University of London
Daniel	North	Dance Umbrella
Patrick	O'Sullivan	Queens Theatre Hornchurch
Shipra	Ogra	London Bubble
Louise	Owen	Birkbeck College
Martin	Palmer	Proteus
Neil	Paris	SMITH dancetheatre
Emma	Pask	Real Arts
Sarah	Peachey	
Elsa	Perez	Dance Around The World
Rachel	Perry	Sheffield Theatres
Jonathan	Petherbridge	London Bubble
Lee	Phillips	
Elizabeth	Price	Proteus
Kirsty	Ratcliffe	London Bubble
Jill	Rezzano	New Vic Theatre
Alison	Rooke	Goldsmiths
David	Slater	Entelechy Arts
Simon	Startin	
Emily	Swain	
Mary	Swan	Proteus Theatre
Sheree	Tams	
Jane	Thompson	
Tamsin	Tyers-Vowles	
Marie	Vickers	London Bubble
Julia	Voce	
Anita	Wadsworth	SLIDE
Jenni	Warren	
Paul	Wilshaw	Wimborne Community Theatre
Helen	White	Proteus
Zoe	Williams	