**RUUKKU Studies in Artistic Research**

**Peer review form**

Dear reviewer,

Before starting you’re your review, please familiarize yourself with the following guidelines.

All submissions to RUUKKU are multimedial expositions created using the Research Catalogue (RC) platform, which provides a general framework within which authors are free to compose their expositions.

The general design and structure of the exposition should support the presentation of research and illuminate the research aspects of artistic practice. We expect the reviewers to take a critical but constructive stance towards the expositions and artistic research more generally.

Please see also “Some Notes on Constructive Reviewing” at the end of this form.

We wish that in your review you will think through your comments for our various questions in this form. Our questions are instructive, you may choose to change or ignore them should this be necessary for your review.

However, please take care to formulate your feedback anonymously in a manner that allows us to return it to the author(s) of the exposition.

The peer review system in RUUKKU is unilaterally anonymous: the authors of the expositions are identified, the reviewers remain anonymous.

**Submission details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of artist(s)/author(s): |  |
| Title of the submission: |  |

**Reviewer details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |
| Affiliation/occupation: |  |
| E-mail: |  |

**Reviewer Self-assessment**

Possible conflicts of interest - please inform us of any existing relationship you have with the author(s):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Please indicate your level of expertise for reviewing this work. If you feel that you cannot evaluate some aspects of the exposition, you can also mention it here.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

What level of expertise do you have in the subject area / discipline / practice exposed in this submission?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| High level of expertise  | Medium level of expertise  | Low level of expertise  |

**Assessment**

Note: When you formulate your assessment please take into account that what you write is sent as is to the artist(s)/author(s). Please be both critical and constructive in your remarks!

**1. General assessment**

Does the exposition fit the theme of the issue? Does it respond to the questions raised in the call for papers?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Assessment |
| Outstanding  | Very good  | Good  | Adequate  | Unsatisfactory  |

Which aspects of the exposition are of particular import? What is best about this exposition?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Assessment |
| Outstanding  | Very good | Good  | Adequate | Unsatisfactory |

Is the exposition of interest as artistic research?

What is the role of artistic practice in this research? Are the theme, methods or outcomes research-oriented?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Assessment |
| Outstanding  | Very good | Good  | Adequate | Unsatisfactory |

How does the exposition illuminate the relationship between artistic practice and research?

Note: In the Research Catalogue, practice is exposed, translated, transformed, performed, curated etc. as research. The claim that something is research implies a relationship (in one way or another) to academic criteria for the conduct of research. The submission need not comply with all (or even one) of the points listed here, but one might question whether it does, and if not, what the artistic, aesthetic or intellectual rationale of the exposition is.

Please consider:

* Does the submission contain a description or exposition of the question, issue or problem the research is exploring? If not, does this omission matter?
* Does the submission show evidence of innovation in content, form or technique in relation to a genre of practice?
* Is the research issue contextualized in terms of social, artistic and/or theoretical issues? Is it linked to discussion on the positions taken by other artists to whom this work contributes a particular perspective? Is the process that led to this submission well documented? If not, do such omissions matter?
* Does the submission provide new knowledge, interpretation, insights or experiences in, on, or for art or art pedagogy? What might these comprise?
* Are the methods used adequate and sound? Is the research, analysis and/or experiment thorough?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Assessment |
| Outstanding  | Very good | Good  | Adequate | Unsatisfactory |

**2. Does the exposition design and navigation support the (artistic) proposition?**

Note: although the form of the exposition is free, we prefer a basic, legible design. Whenever design choices differ from this, they should be justified and support the central ideas of the exposition. Do the design and navigation support the contents? Are the manner of referencing correct and/or feasible? Is the submission legible (including the use of language)?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| Assessment |
| Outstanding  | Very good | Good  | Adequate | Unsatisfactory |

Does the exposition need language checking or technical support?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**3. Research ethics**

Does the exposition raise any special ethical or legal concerns (e.g. arising from the practice with human or other animal subjects, or the use of property)? Please see also https://tenk.fi/en/advice-and-materials/RCR-Guidelines-2012

|  |
| --- |
|  |

***4. Your Conclusions***

Please give your overall conclusions on this submission, highlighting strengths and weaknesses. If possible or necessary, please suggest ways for the author(s) to improve the submission.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Please assign an overall grade to this submission.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6 (high) | 5  | 4  | 3  | 2  | 1 (low) |

**5. Recommendation**

Should the submission be published in RUUKKU?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The submission should be rejected |   |
| The submission should be rejected in its current state.\* |   |
| The submission should be accepted with minor changes |   |
| The submission should be accepted |   |

\*In this case, the exposition has significant omissions or it requires substantial changes. It is still possible to publish the exposition, if the author addresses the review and editorial notes.

**6. Feedback for the Editorial Board**

We would like to hear of your experiences as a peer reviewer for RUUKKU and we appreciate your suggestions for improving our review process. Please provide us some feedback!

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Some Notes on Constructive Reviewing**

As a reviewer, you represent your community and your review should be professional and constructive. The quality of RUUKKU depends on the quality of reviews, which we see as more about ‘engaging’ with the work of our peers than ‘judging’ them. The job of the reviewer is *both* to select high quality, innovative submissions for the journal, *and* to suggest ways to improve the research, as well as to uphold and/or improve on the standards of the artistic research community as a whole. A persuasive review details the strengths and weaknesses of the submission.

However, it is common knowledge that the process of reviewing is itself flawed. While still ‘the best of all possible worlds’ we have to recognize some pitfalls which might help you to produce a constructive and persuasive review.

1. **Pitfall:** Seek to find all flaws in the submission, in part to show your expertise as a reviewer.

**Recommendation:** Look for reasons to accept a submission. Despite its flaws, does it point in new directions or expose promising insights in art and/or research? The community can benefit from imperfect, insightful submissions.

1. **Pitfall:** Since the review process is anonymous, it is appropriate to criticize the submission as if the authors did not have feelings.

**Recommendation:** Your tone should be the same as if you are giving comments to a colleague face-to-face. It is always possible to be constructive, focus on the work, and do not attack the artist-researchers behind it. The purpose of a review is not only for selecting submissions, but to improve the quality of all the work in our area.

1. **Pitfall:** Advocate accepting or rejecting a submission with little comment, because it is obvious that all will agree with you.

**Recommendation:** Explain why you advocate acceptance or rejection, because people will often disagree with you. Your explanations will make your review credible and effective.

1. **Pitfall:** Advocate rejecting (almost) all submissions to show how tough you are.

**Recommendation:** The best in a given field is not usually found by rejecting every submission. Artistic research can only advance through helping artist/researchers improve their work.