# Arts & Humanities Research Council

## Confidential – Peer Review Form

| Applicant | | |
|---|---|---|
| Title    Ms | First Name    Helen | Surname    Bailey |
| Name of Institution    University of Luton | | |
| Name of Department    Creative Arts and Technologies | | |

| Peer Reviewer | | |
|---|---|---|
| Title    Professor | First Name    ▇▇▇▇ | Surname    ▇▇▇▇ |
| Name of Institution | | |
| Name of Department    ▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇ | | |

| Title of the application |
|---|
| Relocating Choreographic Process: The impact of Grid technologies and collaborative memory on the documentation of practice-led research in dance |

If you feel you may have a **conflict of interest** or if you have a **low level of confidence** in your ability to provide a review of this proposal, **please advise the AHRC as soon as possible**. Conflicts of interest may arise, for example: if you are intending to apply to the same round of the competition for which you are being asked to provide a review. A list of other possible conflicts can be found in the guidance notes.

If there are aspects of the proposal that do not fall within your expertise, for example, if the proposal is interdisciplinary, please comment only on those elements of the proposal that fall within your area of expertise.

| Your Area of Expertise          (please tick where appropriate) |
|---|
| 1.  **What level of expertise do you have in the subject area of this application?**<br><br>[ ] High Level of expertise        X Sufficiently knowledgeable to provide an informed opinion<br><br>2.  **Which aspects of the application are you commenting on?**<br><br>X Whole application          [ ] Particular aspects<br>If particular aspects, please indicate what these are: |

Please complete the boxes overleaf and then award the proposal an overall grade, ensuring that you refer to the scheme specific Guidance Notes. It is helpful to us if you can complete the form in typescript wherever possible.

**Please tick one box only**

A+ X

| Peer Reviewer's signature | |
|---|---|
| Signature | Date |

**Name of applicant:** Ms Helen Bailey
**Department and Institution:** Creative Arts and Technologies, University of Luton
**Application ID:** AH/E006361/1

**Please note that all comments provided below will be forwarded – strictly anonymised – to the applicant.**

**Your Review** (please provide a narrative assessment, ensuring that you refer to the scheme specific guidance when addressing the headings below)

**A. Quality and Importance**

This proposed project aims to bring software developers, E-grid and design rationale specialists together with choreography researchers to develop e-grid tools to support distributed planning, performance and review/analysis of dance pieces.
The research objectives are numerous (almost too numerous) but the most obvious ones can be summarised as (1) using access-grid to research new forms of choreography; (2) Develop new tools in order to support objective (1) including hypermedia documentation and replay and analysis tools; (3) identify how choreography practice can help e-science practice, (4) to develop a 'transdisciplinary' understanding of the making and marking of spaces.

Reading the proposal, I get a clear view on how (1) and (2) will be achieved. There is a clear and aggressive tool development agenda (WP3-5) around the tools that is seemingly well-integrated with the 'Research Intensives'. (WP1). This seems a strong aspect of the proposal. Objectives 3 and 4 seem less well-defined but potentially of great significance in terms of contribution to research knowledge. It would have been good for example, to be able to more clearly understand how the results of the research would inform "experience design within human-computer interaction research". It would also have been good to hear a little more about what the researchers felt were the key challenges that would need to met with respect both to tool development and choreographic research. This would have helped me to get a clearer conception of where the biggest research contributions are expected to be. Nevertheless, I believe there is a lot of potential in this project for extending knowledge beyond the tool development objectives.

The amount of worked planned for the two years seems ambitious, but it is difficult to judge how mature the AG tools development work already is and what the risks there are here. However, the team is very strong.

## B. People

The proposal brings together a very interdisciplinary group whose individual members seem very highly qualified and experienced. They seem well placed to tackle the ambitious interdisciplinary challenges presented by the project. There is experience of inter-disciplinary work, there is experience of managing large projects (but perhaps more in the CVs of the CIs rather than PIs), some have experience of working together and there is a high degree of subject-mater expertise.

**Name of applicant:** Ms Helen Bailey
**Department and Institution:** Creative Arts and Technologies, University of Luton
**Application ID:** AH/E006361/1

## C. Management

The management of this project seems to have been well thought through. Work packages, milestones, meetings and deliverables etc. are clear. It will be important for the success of the project that channel of communication between PI and CIs are good and that management decision making is shared.

There are obvious dependencies between the development of software tools and the research intensives. It will be important that the tools can be delivered when required.

## D. Outputs and Dissemination

These arrangements are very good offering a wide range of channels and also opportunities for participation from the wider communities interested in this research.

## E. Value for money (NOT APPLICABLE FOR RESEARCH LEAVE OR FELLOWSHIPS IN THE CREATIVE AND PERFORMING ARTS)

The proposal could be seen as costly, but in my view the cost is justified by the ambitious aims of the project and timescales. The heavy involvement of CIS and PIs is essential to overcome the potential problems that this form of 'extreme' interdisciplinary working might present, but at the same time the dedicated effort of

the RAs will be necessary to make the technology work.

**Name of applicant:** Ms Helen Bailey
**Department and Institution:** Creative Arts and Technologies, University of Luton
**Application ID:** AH/E006361/1

## F. Strengths and Weaknesses

*Major strengths are the team, the well-defined developments goals, and the collaboration through the research intensives. A minor weakness is the lack of detail over objectives 3 and 4, but these are longer term objectives.*

## G. Additional Information