

DH2027 Digital Arts Track Evaluation Criteria

Guidance and scoring framework for conference submissions

Purpose. This framework supports constructive, equitable, and practice-sensitive review of Digital Arts Track proposals. It recognises that digital arts/creative practice can generate knowledge through (amongst other modalities) making, performing, exhibiting, composing, designing, facilitating, documenting, and reflecting.

Preamble

Digital Arts / Creative Arts Practice submissions may communicate their contribution through artistic form, embodied or situated inquiry, experimentation, documentation, critical reflection, or combinations of these. Reviewers should assess each submission in relation to its stated aims, context, and mode of practice rather than expecting every submission to conform to a conventional scholarly model.

These criteria are intended to:

- Prompt constructive feedback rather than comments that are only negative;
- Ensure that the written review substantiates the score awarded for each criterion;
- Encourage consistency between reviewers' comments and numerical scores;
- Ensure that reviews are sufficiently detailed to be useful to submitters;
- Build a shared understanding of what the scores signify;
- Recognise diverse forms of artistic knowledge, research, and communication;
- Broaden the range of practices, traditions, communities, perspectives, and presentation formats represented at the conference; and
- Avoid treating novelty, technical complexity, written scholarship, or alignment with dominant artistic traditions as the sole measures of quality.

Reviewers should acknowledge the limits of their own expertise, particularly when evaluating practices grounded in cultural traditions, communities, disciplines, or modes of knowledge with which they are less familiar.

Evaluation Criteria

1. 20% Contextual and Critical Grounding

Does the submission provide sufficient context for understanding the creative practice, including relevant artistic, cultural, social, historical, theoretical, technological, or community-based lineages? Where appropriate, does it acknowledge related practitioners, works, traditions, methods, communities, and sources?

References may include scholarly publications as well as artworks, performances, exhibitions, recordings, scores, archives, oral histories, community knowledge, technical resources, and other forms appropriate to the practice.

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes, very much. The submission is exceptionally well situated within the relevant contexts and lineages, with almost no significant omissions.
8	Yes. The submission is clearly situated, with only minor omissions or areas requiring clarification.
6	To some extent. Relevant context is provided, but several significant connections, lineages, perspectives, or sources are missing or underdeveloped.
3	Not really. The contextual grounding has major gaps, making it difficult to understand how the practice relates to relevant fields, traditions, or communities.
0	Not at all. The submission provides little or no relevant contextual grounding.

Reviewer comment Please explain how effectively the submission situates the practice. Which contexts, practitioners, works, traditions, communities, or perspectives could be more fully acknowledged? Identify useful additions where possible. Write at least 20 words.

2.a 20% Creative Critical or Experiential Contribution

Does the work make a meaningful contribution through its artistic proposition, process, form, experience, interpretation, application, or findings?

A meaningful contribution need not depend on unprecedented novelty. It may involve developing a form or method, reframing an established practice, bringing practices into a productive new relationship, creating a significant audience or participant experience, responding to a particular place or community, making under-recognised knowledge perceptible, or generating insight through practice.

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes, very much. The work offers an exceptional creative, critical, methodological, cultural, or experiential contribution.
8	Yes. The work offers a clear and substantial contribution.
6	To some extent. The work offers a recognisable but modest or insufficiently articulated contribution.
3	Not really. The work is relevant to existing practice, but its particular contribution is unclear or weakly developed.
0	Not at all. The submission does not identify or demonstrate a meaningful contribution and shows little engagement with relevant practice.

Reviewer comment Please describe the nature and significance of the submission's contribution. What is compelling or productive about it, and how might that contribution be clarified, strengthened, or developed further? Write at least 20 words.

2.b 20% Content and Purpose Workshops Participatory Sessions and Creative Laboratories

Does the submission describe the workshop, participatory session, or creative laboratory in sufficient detail for readers to understand what participants will explore, make, learn, question, or experience?

This may include themes, prompts, practices, techniques, materials, technologies, forms of participation, expected outcomes, and any necessary preparation.

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes, very much. The content, purpose, and participant experience are exceptionally clear, with almost no relevant information missing.
8	Yes. The content and purpose are clear, with only minor information missing.
6	To some extent. The general content is understandable, but some significant details are absent or underdeveloped.
3	Not really. Several important aspects are missing, making the proposed activity difficult to understand.
0	Not at all. There is very little information about what participants will do, explore, make, learn, or experience.

Reviewer comment Please identify which aspects of the session's content, purpose, activities, materials, or anticipated participant experience would benefit from further detail. Write at least 20 words.

3.a 20% Artistic Process Method and Realization

Does the submission describe the artistic process, practice-based inquiry, methodology, or mode of realization with sufficient detail for readers to understand what was, or will be, done, how, and why, within the limitations of the submission format?

Where relevant, this may include experimentation, iteration, improvisation, collaboration, embodied practice, material or technical choices, failure and revision, ethical decision-making, documentation, audience engagement, or relationships with communities and places. The process need not be linear or fully resolved, but its relationship to the submission's aims should be intelligible.

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes, very much. The process and its rationale are exceptionally clear and appropriately detailed, with almost no relevant information missing.
8	Yes. The process and rationale are clear, with only minor omissions.
6	To some extent. The overall process is understandable, but some significant choices,

Score	Descriptor
	stages, relationships, or rationales require further explanation.
3	Not really. Major aspects of the process or rationale are unclear or absent.
0	Not at all. There is almost no information about how or why the work was, or will be, developed and realised.

Reviewer comment Please describe which aspects of the process, methods, materials, relationships, ethical choices, documentation, or mode of realization would benefit from further explanation. Write at least 20 words.

3.b 20% Facilitation Materials and Progression Workshops Participatory Sessions and Creative Laboratories

Does the submission describe its facilitation approach, materials, accessibility provisions, and progression of activities with sufficient detail for readers to understand how participants will be supported through the session?

Where relevant, the submission should address participation expectations, group size, timing, space, equipment, technical requirements, physical or sensory demands, safeguarding, consent, cultural protocols, and alternative modes of engagement.

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes, very much. The facilitation, progression, materials, and participant support are exceptionally clear and comprehensive.
8	Yes. Almost all relevant information is provided, with only minor omissions.
6	To some extent. The overall approach is understandable, but some important practical, pedagogical, ethical, or accessibility details are missing.
3	Not really. Several important aspects of facilitation, progression, materials, or participant support are unclear.
0	Not at all. There is almost no information about how the session will be facilitated or how participants will be supported.

Reviewer comment Please identify which aspects of the facilitation, materials, sequence, participation model, accessibility, or ethical framework would benefit from further detail. Write at least 20 words.

4. 15% Equity Diversity Inclusion and Ethical Practice

Does the submission broaden the range of practices, topics, cultural traditions, approaches, communities, bodies, identities, and perspectives represented at the conference? Does it appropriately

recognise relevant practitioners, knowledge holders, collaborators, and communities, including those who have been historically marginalised or under-represented?

Where relevant, does the submission demonstrate ethical attention to authorship, attribution, consent, access, cultural protocols, community relationships, power, representation, care, and the conditions under which the work is produced and presented? A submission should not be rewarded merely for featuring marginalised people or topics. Reviewers should consider the quality, specificity, and ethical integrity of the submission's engagement.

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes, very much. The submission makes an exceptional and ethically grounded contribution to equity, diversity, inclusion, or representational breadth in multiple ways.
8	Yes. The submission clearly and thoughtfully supports relevant aspects of equity, diversity, inclusion, or ethical practice.
6	To some extent. The submission makes a limited or partially developed contribution, with some relevant issues requiring further consideration.
3	Not really. The submission gives insufficient attention to relevant questions of inclusion, recognition, access, representation, or ethical practice.
0	Not at all. The submission excludes, misrepresents, or seriously fails to recognise relevant perspectives, contributors, communities, or ethical responsibilities.

Reviewer comment Please explain which aspects of the submission do or do not support equity, diversity, inclusion, representational breadth, and ethical practice. How might the submission be strengthened in these respects? Write at least 20 words.

5. 15% Clarity Coherence and Appropriateness of Form

Is the submission structured and communicated in a way that enables readers to understand its aims, context, process, contribution, and proposed mode of presentation?

The submission's form may be experimental, multimodal, non-linear, performative, visual, sonic, or otherwise practice-specific. It should be assessed on whether its communicative choices are purposeful, coherent, accessible, and appropriate to the work, not solely on conformity to conventional academic prose. Where supporting media are included, do they materially help reviewers understand the work, and are captions, credits, links, and access instructions adequate?

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes, very much. The submission is exceptionally clear and coherent, and its form strongly supports understanding of the work.
8	Yes. The submission is clear and appropriate, with only minor problems in structure, language, documentation, or presentation.

Score	Descriptor
6	To some extent. The submission is broadly understandable, but several issues reduce its clarity or coherence.
3	Not really. Major problems in structure, language, documentation, or presentation make the work difficult to understand.
0	Not at all. The submission is barely comprehensible or provides insufficient material for meaningful evaluation.

Reviewer comment Please identify which aspects of the submission's structure, language, documentation, media, or presentation format could be revised to improve understanding. Write at least 10 words.

6. 10% Overall Recommendation

Taking the criteria above into account, as well as the submission's ambitions, the appropriateness of its proposed format, and any other relevant considerations, do you recommend that the submission be accepted for presentation?

Reviewers should evaluate the submission in relation to what it is trying to achieve. A work-in-progress, experimental proposition, or process-led contribution should not be marked down simply because it does not present finalised results, provided its aims, process, contribution, and conference value are sufficiently clear.

Score	Descriptor
10	Yes. I strongly recommend that this submission be accepted.
8	Yes. I recommend that this submission be accepted.
6	Borderline. I do not have a strong position on acceptance or rejection, or I believe the submission could be accepted subject to clarification or feasible revision.
3	No. On balance, I recommend that this submission not be accepted in its current form.
0	No. I strongly recommend that this submission not be accepted.

Reviewer comment Optional: State any additional considerations that affect your overall recommendation. Explain why they influence your assessment positively or negatively, and distinguish essential concerns from suggestions for further development.

Reviewer Confidence

Confidence 1 Not weighted Familiarity with the Practice Context and Methods

How familiar are you with the artistic field, cultural context, forms of practice, and methods relevant to the submission?

Score	Descriptor
10	Very familiar. I have extensive expertise in nearly all relevant aspects of the submission.
8	Quite familiar. I am well informed about most relevant aspects of the submission.
6	Somewhat familiar. I am informed about several relevant aspects but lack expertise in others.
3	Not very familiar. I recognise some aspects of the submission, but important elements fall outside my knowledge or experience.
0	Not familiar. Most of the practice, contexts, or methods are outside my current knowledge and experience.

Reviewer comment Optional: Identify the areas in which you have relevant expertise and any areas in which your knowledge is limited.

Confidence 2 Not weighted Familiarity with the Conference and Creative Arts Practice Programme

How familiar are you with the conference and with the aims, formats, audiences, and practical conditions of its Creative Arts Practice programme?

Score	Descriptor
10	Very familiar. I have participated in the programme as an artist, presenter, curator, organiser, or reviewer several times.
8	Quite familiar. I have participated in one or more of these roles at least once and understand the programme well.
6	Somewhat familiar. I have attended the conference or comparable programmes and have a general understanding of its context.
3	Not very familiar. I have limited direct experience of the conference or its Creative Arts Practice programme.
0	Not familiar. I have no previous direct experience of the conference or programme.

Reviewer comment Optional: Describe any relevant experience or limitations that may have shaped your review.

Guidance for Constructive Review

- Evaluate the submission according to its stated artistic, critical, cultural, social, or research aims.
- Explain the evidence supporting each score.
- Identify strengths as well as limitations.
- Offer specific and feasible suggestions for improvement.
- Avoid assuming that artistic knowledge must be translated fully into conventional academic language.
- Avoid using personal taste as a substitute for evaluation.
- Distinguish unfamiliarity from lack of quality.
- Recognise that risk, ambiguity, incompleteness, and productive failure may be intentional and valuable aspects of creative practice.
- Respect culturally specific forms of knowledge, attribution, authority, and communication.
- Declare where additional expertise may be needed for a fair assessment.