

Review Publishing Editorial Policy

ABOUT REVIEW

Review Publishing
1708 Campbell Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
816-471-2343
<http://ereview.org>
editor@ereview.org / 816-994-7132

SCOPE

Review publishes solicited and unsolicited materials. All submitted material is edited for length, style, and content. Review is open to diverse types of content addressing contemporary visual arts directly and as they relate to other disciplines. Review is committed to serving the greater Kansas City area and the following states in the Midwest region: Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, Colorado, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

REGULARLY FEATURED CONTENT

Examples of content published in Review: critical exhibition reviews; visual projects (including video interviews and curated presentations); curator, artist, venue, destination profiles and interviews; essays about trends and deeper issues; news/coverage of time-sensitive events; book reviews related to visual arts and arts career building

MISSION

Review Publishing produces publications about visual art culture for regional distribution. Its print periodical Review provides a venue for emerging and established art historians, curators, artists, writers, and students to publish critical reviews, editorials, features, and virtual exhibitions.

VISION

Review Publishing will raise the level and breadth of art discourse in greater Kansas City and increase national awareness about the Midwest's vibrant visual art community, through interactive dialogue with other communities.

VALUES

Review Publishing is guided by the following values in all its efforts:

- We maintain journalistic objectivity in all editorial content.
- We appreciate that education is a by-product of our mission.
- We share visual art in an accessible manner without diluting its intelligence.
- We support expression of ideas without censorship.
- We see the interconnectivity of all arts through a visual arts lens.
- We invite respectful dialogue among diverse perspectives.

STATEMENT OF ETHICAL FAIRNESS AND EQUALITY

Review Publishing recognizes and honors an ethical code of conduct that insists upon equal opportunity.

Review Publishing does not discriminate on the basis of age, ethnicity, gender, economic or social standing, political or religious beliefs, marital status, sexual orientation, or artistic expression.

Review follows the ethics code of the Society of Professional Journalists (<http://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp>)

FAIR USE AND REPRODUCTION

Under United States copyright law (Title 17, United States Code) “Fair Use” reproduction of materials published by Review is allowed without prior permission. Title 17 defines “Fair Use” as reproduction and distribution of copyrighted materials for **non-commercial purposes** such as criticism, comment, parody, news reporting, teaching (including multiple copies for classroom use), scholarship, or research — on the condition that the works are **reproduced only in part** (i.e. excerpts) and that proper attribution of the source is provided in all copies.

Some materials published in Review may be copyrighted by other entities, and persons wishing to reproduce such materials must assume all responsibility for identifying and satisfying any claimants of literary property rights or copyrights.

Contributors and individuals with whom published material is shared agree to indemnify and hold harmless Review, Inc., its officers, employees, and agents from and against all suits, claims, actions, and expenses arising out of the use of reproductions provided by Review Inc.

Review holds the copyright to items as edited, formatted, and published by Review, with individuals retaining their copyrights over their own original work. Occasionally Review receives requests from other entities to republish material, and authors are consulted to make a determination on a case-by-case basis (if the original agreement between contributors and Review was not explicit on that term.) Review does not allow the republishing of its materials without consent and proper crediting information. Contributors should note that when (if) resubmitting original material to other publications, they are under ethical obligation to disclose the original publication venue and date; professional standards request to note "A version of x-y-z originally appeared in Review (<http://ereview.org>) on January 10, 2010," for example.

To request permission for reproduction falling outside of the terms of “Fair Use” (such as reproducing individual articles in their entirety) please contact Review’s editor using the contact information at the top of this document. Terms of any reproduction rights granted will be negotiated based upon intent of use and on a case-by-case basis.

For more information on copyright law please visit: <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/>

DISCLAIMER

Content published in Review does not necessarily reflect the opinions, beliefs, or policies of Review, Inc., its subsidiaries and affiliates, its board of directors, or its staff members.

Review Publishing Submission Process

BECOMING A CONTRIBUTOR

Individuals interested in submitting an article for consideration or receiving assignments for art reviews must submit two writing samples, preferably relevant to the field of contemporary visual art. Also, include an updated resume with at least two references, and a cover letter expressing specific subjects of interest.

PROPOSING AN ARTICLE OR VISUAL PROJECT

Send a brief proposal describing the subject of your article or project. Outline the submission objective, story “angle” and relevance to Review’s mission and scope. Also include any collateral information that would help inform Review’s decision to accept the proposal, such as images and historical or biographical information on the subject. Do not send valuable originals, as materials will not be returned (email/digital inquiries are preferred/quicker).

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Be aware of any real or perceived conflicts of interest. If you are writing about individuals or organizations you maintain a personal or professional relationship with, that relationship must be disclosed within the article (or as a footer or in your author bio page). Additionally, disclosure should be provided if the subject is a current or previous Review Studios artist. If your personal feelings (liking or disliking an individual or organization personally, or having blanket admiration or distaste for specific genres or media) in any way detract from your ability to write objectively about a subject, do not write about it.

Review is a venue for informed critical dialogue. Express praise and criticism constructively with support.

Please inform Review’s editorial department of potential conflicts of interest prior to each submission.

Do not write about exhibitions at locations where you are currently employed or about exhibitions that you have independently assisted in organizing, curating, or producing. Assignments for essays written by artists about their work are an exception to this policy. Do not, in any way, encourage or facilitate a collaboration of written content with your subject(s). You may share portions of the content with your subject(s) to confirm fact accuracy, but you should not send drafts to subjects for wholesale approval or advice.

Review does not typically print previously published materials. Notify the editor of any article submissions that have appeared (or will appear concurrently) in other publications.

CONTRACTS, PAYMENT

Review pays contributors based upon experience, length of article / amount of images / work, and available budget. Rates are agreed-to on a case-by-case basis when assignments are accepted. Email correspondence serves as contract of terms at this time.

General Guidelines on Writing Art Exhibition Reviews (for Review / ereview.org)

An exhibition review should be visually descriptive, while also addressing the content or conceptual “meaning” that is inherent or apparent within the given subject. Each writer should express a critical assessment of his/ her experience viewing the work and the basis for reaching such an assessment.

(A "show" should refer to something that includes performance. Most things should be called exhibitions.)

Create an engaging lead paragraph for your review and avoid bland “who, what, where, when” statements. This information is made clear in the exhibition information that will run along with the review and will only end up sounding redundant. Also try to avoid, "I walked into blah and saw blah" or too much "geographical delineation," unless that is the main point the artist was up to in an installation. Ideas should take precedent over laying out the scene.

Physical description of the artwork should be present, including media used by the artist and the scale of the work; the quality of its installation in the exhibition space (including placement, lighting, labeling, etc.); quality of craftsmanship; and an overall sense of the show (particularly regarding large or group exhibitions).

Provide an interpretation of the subject matter depicted within the artwork such as potential narratives, symbolic meaning, or content. What is the work about? Establish points of reference to the artwork with those inside/outside the field of art history or to previous bodies of work by a given artist. This may include geopolitical and/or cultural influences or anything that helps to establish a context for the contemporary relevance of a given artist and his/her work. If possible, talk to the artist and/or curator to help inform your perspective.

Offer overall and specific assessments of qualities inherent within the work: Does it succeed or fail? The writer should also provide an explanation of this assessment, preferably following or preceding any qualitative statement(s). In other words, prove what you assert with visual references.

Writing style:

Unless otherwise indicated by the editorial department of Review, write in a journalistic tone that clearly expresses your ideas without heavy reliance on superlatives, unnecessary academic jargon, or personal testimonials. We use a modified AP style. First-person (I saw x-y-z) is acceptable, but is not always desirable or necessary. See other online and published sources for examples. Anything that can be tied or compared to art history or other work by that same artist or others helps provide context and support to arguments.

Usage and verb tense:

When addressing an exhibition that is current refer to it in the present tense. Always use the present tense when referring to artwork that will remain in existence beyond the duration of the exhibition, too. Common sense should dictate what is truly past. Always refer to deceased artists in the past tense.

Quotations and links:

Avoid using long, quoted statements from exhibition catalogs, essays, books, other articles or individuals whenever possible, particularly at the beginning and/or end of your article. Quotations from artists obtained in interviews are excellent additions. If citing a quote from an artist that is second-hand from a press release or other source, say so. First-hand information is always preferred, of course.

Think of links to include in the writing (galleries, artists, general things that, if clicked, will enhance a reader's understanding of what is being described). In reviews, the gallery, city and dates of the exhibition are handled in a header and do not need to be repeated in the body text.

Citations and factual content:

Refer to titles of exhibitions and art works with italics. If including year of creation and/or dimensions in illustrating critical points in your article, refer to them parenthetically. If it's obvious or redundant (as in you have already described a painting as large and how large because its size was significant to the artist's intention, for example, or the impact it made on the viewer or is not necessary, don't waste the words; esp. because online, a lot can be covered with links (and even in print) through the provided image captions. In **captions**, the style uses " for inches, ' for feet and puts <Artist, Title, media, dimensions, year of creation> in that order, followed by <Image: photo Name (if of an installation or there is credit due), courtesy of the artist (and/or gallery)>. Try to be specific and avoid calling everything a piece or a work. They are sculptures, prints, installations, paintings, concepts, performances, etc.

Citations in the form of endnotes are accepted, but often a more casual note within the body of an article works fine. Check facts / follow up on all posted information such as dates and spelling of names. Wikipedia is not a citable source (but sometimes can provide reference clues of other places to search).

Qualitative Statements:

Discussion of the visual arts is often accompanied by passionate opinions. Review your writing carefully to ensure that it is not overly personal or unduly speculative. If your personal feelings (liking or disliking a subject personally or having blanket admiration or distaste for specific genres or media) in any way detract from your ability to write about a subject, please DO NOT write about it. It is important to use educated opinions to critique subjects. This includes giving praise and criticism constructively, with adequate explanation and support.

Images:

Writers should make arrangements with the exhibiting venue and/or artists to either: take their own digital photographs (either for reference or for publication); have the gallery/museum/artist arrange to send JPGs of work the writer will be discussing (as well as some installation views); have the editor find a photographer. In other words, we need to make sure we have permission to reproduce and properly credit the images for publication. See above for caption information; JPGs do not need to be print-quality resolution or size — generally, a width of 550 is acceptable, but editors can accept larger files and reformat them, especially if it saves the museum staff's time from having to do so. The ideal is to turn in both text and images at the same time, for quicker posting turn-around.

A Nutshell Approach to a review: 3 Worlds Critique:

3 Worlds-A Methodology for Critique: Facts, Feelings and Context*

This "method" is an introduction to three worlds of discourse. Consider considering and writing your reviews from the following three points of view, and make a summary as noted.

- 1) For the discourse of Facts, make an inventory of the work that describes the imagery and form.
- 2) For the discussion of Feelings use figurative language to discuss the feeling of the facts — explore your personal projections, memory and the expressive polarities you find in your peer's work.
- 3) In the conversation on Context make connections to other worlds of discourse, to art history and the cultural context.

Conclusion: Summarize by addressing questions of quality, consistency and values.

*From an abstract written by Michael Torlen, Purchase College, State University of New York for the panel, "I Don't Know Why I Like it, I Just Do:" Best Practices in the Use of Critiques for Undergraduate Studio Courses at the 2003 College Art Association Conference in New York City.