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ABSTRACT
This paper introduces VISAP’14, the IEEE VIS 2014 Arts Program. We discuss the motivations leading to the choice of this year’s theme, Art+Interpretation, and provide an overview of the work presented in the Arts Program papers track and art show. We describe our process of creating an effective interdisciplinary peer review system where artists and researchers decided jointly on installations and papers that were of the interest to the various communities present at IEEE VIS. We conclude with further ideas for improving future incarnations of VISAP, which may also be of interest to organizers of other interdisciplinary arts conferences.

1 INTRODUCTION
This is the second year that the IEEE VIS Arts Program included an Art Show track and a Papers track. Overall, there was a 59% increase in submissions from last year, reflecting the continued interest in intersections between visual aesthetics and visualization research as well as the growing awareness of this dedicated forum for the rigorous and creative exploration of these intersections [13, 14].

Once again, the selection process was highly competitive. Of the 53 submitted artworks, 13 were accepted, for an acceptance rate of 24.52%. There were 25 long paper submissions of which 10 were accepted, for an acceptance rate of 40%. Additionally, each of the artists were invited to write short papers describing their work and its relation to visualization themes in further detail.

This year an additional incentive to both artists and researchers is the newly forged connection with the Leonardo Journal and the International Society for Arts, Sciences, and Technology (ISAST). Leonardo is the leading journal for media artists interested in the application of contemporary science and technology to the arts, and has been in continuous publication since 1968†. The Leonardo editorial board has agreed to accept a selection of a few “best” papers and artworks to be featured next year in future issues.

2 ART+INTERPRETATION
In the call for entries for Art+Interpretation—the title of this year’s Arts Program—we asked artists and researchers to think about the role of interpretation in art and visualization, and to reflect on possible answers to these questions: “Can artistic practice offer insight into thinking about the effective interpretability of complex data? Conversely, can visualization research offer quantifiable methods to artists seeking to investigate and represent cultural phenomena?”

The varied goals of data visualization include not only sensemaking and hypothesis generation, as articulated by Card [3], Shneiderman [30] and many others, but also the effective communication of the meaning of a particular representation or investigation of a dataset to audiences of both experts and non-experts, as discussed recently by Segel and Heer [29] and Kosara and Mackinlay [19], among others. As has been explored by Hullman and Diakopoulos [17], West et al. [37], and Viegas and Wattenberg [34], information visualization projects often intersect various social contexts and cultural concerns. The Arts Program, through the presentation of papers and artworks, explores the ways in which new ideas about incorporating interpretive components to visualization systems could augment sensemaking aspects of existing approaches, or alternatively, how strategies used in visualization projects could be used by artists to create new forms of interpretation.

In certain ways artists and visualization researchers share common goals: to make things visible which are normally difficult to see; and to enable reasoning about information that we might otherwise remain ignorant of [18, 20]. A conventional explanation of the differences between art practice and visualization research is that artistic exploration raises new questions, while visualization research aims to help domain experts answer existing questions. However, these categorizations may be oversimplified [24]. Media artists create opportunities for reflecting on cultural issues, but also highlight how we absorb technology and explore how the exposure to tremendous amounts of data affects our daily lives. In the visualization research community, significant emphasis has been placed on notions such as indicating uncertainty [23, 31], accurately portraying data provenance [2, 4, 28], and using narrative techniques to aid in transmitting information more effectively [16, 19, 22]. Visualization systems not only provide a representation of data collections, but also, wittingly or unwittingly, provide an interpretation of that data. Hence, potential areas of overlap between art and research practices are becoming more discernible. From the submissions to this year’s call for entries, we looked especially for projects and papers that explore the relationships between visualization research and artistic practice, and that present or discuss creative visual techniques that emphasize the interpretive or narrative aspects of scientific or cultural exploration.

3 INTERDISCIPLINARY PEER REVIEW
For the first time this year, we invited external reviewers from both the arts and research communities to participate in the peer review process of evaluating submissions to the Arts Program. Each submission received at least three reviews from the pool of twenty-nine reviewers, along with a meta-review summarizing their evaluation. Because a guiding principle of the Arts Program is that the selected artworks and papers are highly relevant to the themes of the main VIS conferences, we included artists and researchers in the peer review process for both the artworks and the papers. This is a somewhat unorthodox approach. The content of an art exhibition is often decided by a jury who takes into account the overall balance of the show, making sure that, for instance, no particular medium or subject matter dominates the exhibition. Often, a jury may also try to include the participation of both younger and more established artists [6]. Similarly, a papers chair will normally go to some lengths to match the expertise of the reviewer with the content of the paper [9]. Again, we wanted the research themes to be relevant to arts contexts and research contexts, and so each paper was reviewed by both artists and researchers. In addition to selecting papers that are more broadly relevant, this review process itself presents an opportunity for the different communities to understand and comment upon each others approaches.

We anticipated that some of the reviewers would not be comfortable reviewing submissions related to topics that they were not experts in, so we provided quite detailed instructions and the reassurance that this cross-fertilization was precisely what we were looking for. We wrote: “We have encouraged submissions both from artists who may not be as savvy at writing technical papers.
as well as from researchers who may not be as savvy at describing aesthetic contributions. Thus, we want you to be open-minded about the nature of the submissions as you review them. But at the same time, we want you to represent the interests of the VIS community. We provided only general instructions regarding the review of artworks: “The artworks should be at least partially evaluated based on how interesting, challenging, provocative, novel, and/or beautiful the ideas or artworks are. Does the submission cause you to think? Is it enjoyable? Would the average VIS attendee stop and look at it? Be generous to the submissions that make an effort to connect to the current concerns of the VIS community and, even if your final score is low, offer suggestions on what they could have done to get a higher score from you.” Likewise for the papers, we encouraged reviewers to evaluate submissions in terms of both originality and relevance: “The criteria for evaluation should be related to its originality and its relation to VIS topics. The VIS Arts Program is positioned differently from SIGGRAPH, Computational Aesthetics, ACM Multimedia, ACM CHI, and other technical conferences that have an arts component in that there should be some connection, either directly or indirectly, to the interaction with or representation, analysis, interpretation, or meaning of data.”

Overall, merging arts and research evaluation approaches was a successful, if unusual, approach to peer reviewing in an interdisciplinary context. Artists and authors received feedback from different perspectives, and the reviewers themselves had the opportunity to reflect on approaches that may have been somewhat different from their areas of expertise.

4 The Arts Program Submissions

The artworks showcased at VISAP’14 are collected in the IEEE VIS Arts Program Art Show Catalog [12]. A number of artwork submissions focused on the presentation of interesting datasets in novel ways. A project by Till Nagel and Benedikt Groß titled Shanghai Metro Flow demonstrates multiple ways of looking at changes over time on a subway map. Culturegraphy, an interactive website by Kim Albrecht, Marian Dörk, and Boris Müller allows a viewer to investigate a map of iconic visual patterns in a wide range of popular films. Point Cloud, by Muhammed Hafiz Wan Rosli and Andrés Cabrera combine data sonification techniques with Gestalt theories of visualization to create an engaging atlas of lightning strikes throughout the world over the course of a year. An installation by Chin-En Soo called Psychology uses color as way to highlight user interpretation of the ink blots used for Rorschach tests. The artist Kate McLean presents Smellmap, a visualization and of smells experienced in the city of Amsterdam.

We also feature artworks that interpret pixels as data, and that transmute existing images into new forms: Danny Bazo’s Escher Animator creates an infinite series of sequences from high-resolution Escher prints, and Voice of Sisyphus, a project by George Dolinsky and Hangarter [8] discuss an interactive art-science investigation: Dolinsky and Hangarter [8] discuss an interactive art-science collaboration: Dolinsky and Hangarter [8] discuss an interactive art-science project that takes place in an educational context, and Walker and von Ommepa [35] discuss a series of projects involving artworks created in collaboration with scientists.

In sum, the submissions to this year’s VISAP were especially strong. Each of the submissions interpreted the Arts Program theme in a different way, and, taken as a whole, explore a range of topics at the intersections of art and visualization.

5 Conclusion

While we expect to fine-tune the peer review process for future iterations of the Arts Program, we believe that the thorough feedback from our expert reviewers was instrumental in the success of VISAP’14. We hope that the inclusion of the Arts Program within the other IEEE VIS activities will inspire meaningful dialog about the important and varied roles of art and creativity in visualization research and in data-centric art.
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