

iLRN Conference - Review instructions

- [Reviews for Academic Stream - Full & Short Papers \(Oral Presentation\)](#)
- [Reviews for Academic Stream - Extended Abstracts \(Poster Presentation\)](#)
- [Reviews for Academic Stream - Doctoral Colloquium Paper \(Oral Presentation in DC session\)](#)
- [iLEAD 2026 Conference Review Criteria \(Immersive Learning Education, Arts & Design-Focused\)](#)
- [Industry Product Demonstrations Policy](#)

Reviews for Academic Stream - Full & Short Papers (Oral Presentation)

Thank you for supporting iLRN's peer review process. Your careful and ethical evaluation ensures a high standard of research in immersive learning. Please review each submission **fairly, confidentially, and professionally**, using the criteria provided in the **review form** while following established international ethical guidelines listed below. The review form is embedded in EasyChair (have a look at [this page](#) to see how to add your review).

Paper Type

Please consider the paper type when reviewing. You can find more information on the Academic Stream on this website: <https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/academic-stream/>

Full paper

- 12-15 pages, incl. references
- Springer LNCS template
- for **oral presentation**

Comprehensive reports of research, development, and application of immersive learning and technologies. Oral presentations might include live recording and global distribution. Online presentations will include publication and distribution of a pre-recorded video.

Short paper

- 8-11 pages, incl. references
- *Springer LNCS template*
- for **oral presentation**

Concise reports or preliminary findings of ongoing research on immersive learning/technologies. Oral presentations might include live recording and global distribution. Online presentations will include publication and distribution of a pre-recorded video.

What to Evaluate

In the EasyChair form, please provide ratings on:

- **Contribution to Immersive Learning Research**

How much does the submission contribute to research on learning, instruction, teaching or education with immersive technologies? Please keep in mind that the scope of the conference includes research on learning (education/teaching/training/instruction/...) WITH immersive technology (VR/AR/XR/MR/games/360°...), so both components should be clearly included in the submission. Please also check if the submission fits well to the topic that it was submitted to. Otherwise please suggest a better fitting topic (

<https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/call-for-papers/#program-tracks>). Justify your review in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Originality and innovation**

How original and innovative is this contribution? How novel and unique are the proposed approach, methods, or ideas? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Methodological or theoretical rigor**

Depending on the type of contribution (empirical or theoretical): How sound is the research methodology or theoretical contribution of this submission? For empirical work: are the experimental design, data collection, and analysis appropriate and well-executed? For theoretical work: are theoretical conclusions logically structured and coherent? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the proposal submitters to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Validity and significance of claims and conclusions**

How valid, significant and appropriate are the claims and/or conclusion the authors make? Do they interpret and discuss the implications of their empirical results/theoretical conclusions and (if applicable) the limitations of their work? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Quality of writing and academic style**

Is the text error free (spelling, syntax, grammar)? Is the text comprehensible to the academic community? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Anchoring in relevant and current literature**

How well is the paper anchored in relevant immersive learning research literature? Does it provide appropriate citation of related work in the field? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Compliance with Springer LNCS style/formatting and referencing guidelines, including use of the respective template**

Does the paper comply with the Springer LNCS template and guidelines (<https://www.springer.com/gp/computer-science/lncs/conference-proceedings-guidelines/>)? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **If helpful, recommend a more appropriate paper category to support the authors.**

Which category would be most appropriate for this paper? Would you recommend the author/s to submit a revised version of the paper to another category? The author/s will be

required to revise their paper as necessary to comply with the relevant page limits, and the paper will be reviewed again. Optional: If you want, you can add explanations in the text box.

- **Overall Evaluation**

Please provide the overall evaluation for the submission. Should it be accepted for publication in the conference proceedings and presentation at iLRN2025? For all categories, revisions of papers based on the reviewers' comments should be made. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

Constructive, Ethical & Objective Review

iLRN adheres to recognized peer-review ethics. Reviewers are expected to follow:

- **COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers**

<https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>

- **iLRN Publications Ethics & Malpractice Statement** (*Reviewers' Responsibilities*)

<https://www.immersivelrn.org/about/publications-ethics-and-malpractice-statement/>

- **Springer Nature Reviewer Guidelines** <https://www.springer.com/gp/editorial-policies/peer-review-policy-process>

Your comments to authors should:

- **Explain and justify all ratings**
- Identify **strengths and weaknesses**
- Offer **specific, actionable suggestions**
- Use a **respectful, unbiased, and professional** tone

--> *Do not include personal judgments or assumptions about author identity, background, location, or intent.*

--> *Maintain confidentiality - do not share, store externally, or reuse content.*

--> *Do not upload manuscripts into generative AI tools, per COPE and Springer Nature policies.*

Evidence-Based Evaluation

For **empirical** contributions:

- Clear research questions and rationale
- Appropriate methodology and execution
- Transparent reporting of **results, limitations, and implications**

For **theoretical/conceptual** contributions:

- Logical and coherent argumentation

- Grounding in recognized scholarly literature
- Clear advancement of conceptual understanding in the field

Evaluate **only what is presented** in the manuscript.

Literature & Research Integrity

Assess whether:

- Prior work in immersive learning research (i.e. prior ILRN conference proceedings) is **properly cited**
- The contribution is **clearly contextualized** within the field
- Citation practices meet **academic integrity** norms

If you suspect **plagiarism, fabricated data, ethical issues or unreported AI use**:

→ Report concerns via *Confidential feedback to the program committee only*.

Overall Recommendation

When rating acceptance suitability:

- Consider both the **importance of the contribution** and the **feasibility of revisions**
- Ensure alignment between **ratings, recommendation, and review narrative**
- *Even when recommending rejection, include **constructive feedback** to help the authors improve*

Reviewer Confidence & Confidential Notes

- Indicate your **true level of expertise** in the confidence field
- Use confidential notes only for **communication with Program Committee Chairs** (*not to authors*)

Award Nominations

Nominate a paper only if it demonstrates:

- **Outstanding rigor, originality, clarity, and impact**
- Clear potential to **advance immersive learning research**

Thank You!

Your thoughtful review contributes to:

- **Excellence** in scholarly publication
- A **fair and supportive** academic review culture
- Growth and **advancement** of the immersive learning community

For any questions related to ethics or review standards, please reach out to the [iLRN2026 Program Chairs](#) or the [iLRN Scientific Quality Assurance Team](#).

Reviews for Academic Stream - Extended Abstracts (Poster Presentation)

Thank you for supporting iLRN's peer review process. Your careful and ethical evaluation ensures a high standard of research in immersive learning. Please review each submission **fairly, confidentially, and professionally**, using the criteria provided in the **review form** while following established international ethical guidelines listed below. The review form is embedded in EasyChair (have a look at [this page](#) to see how to add your review).

Paper Type

Please consider the paper type when reviewing. You can find more information on the Academic Stream on this website: <https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/academic-stream/>

Extended abstract

- 4-7 pages, incl. references
- iLRN Conference Proceedings template
- for poster presentation

This includes but is not limited to submissions of work that is **still in progress**, describing **early-stage research** with theoretical background, methodology, and, if applicable, **first data collections** and a **description of next steps**, or completed work, condensed research concepts that **may be read and understood within an hour**. All poster presentations will also include the publication and distribution of a pre-recorded video through the iLRN YouTube channel.

Extended Abstracts can thus be at an early stage or a work in progress. Please consider this in your review.

What to Evaluate

In the EasyChair form, please provide ratings on:

- **Potential Contribution to Immersive Learning Research**

How much does the submission (potentially) contribute to research on learning, instruction, teaching or education with immersive technologies? Please keep in mind that the scope of the conference includes research on learning (education/teaching/training/instruction/...) WITH immersive technology (VR/AR/XR/MR/games/360°...), so both components should be clearly included in the

submission. Please also check if the submission fits well to the topic that it was submitted to. Otherwise please suggest a better fitting topic (

<https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/call-for-papers/#program-tracks>). Justify your review in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Originality and innovation**

How original and innovative is this contribution? How novel and unique are the proposed approach, methods, or ideas? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Proposed Methodological/theoretical design**

When evaluating the project at its current phase of development, how comprehensive and robust is the proposed methodological or theoretical design of this submission, whether it's an initial concept or a fully realized study? For empirical research, consider if the experimental design, data collection methods, and analysis plans are thoughtfully constructed and feasibly actionable, showing a deep grasp of the research challenge. For theoretical research, examine whether the framework or conclusions are solidly grounded, logically coherent, and poised for a meaningful contribution to the field. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the proposal submitters to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Conclusions, Limitations, and/or Expected Outcomes**

Assessing the current development stage of the project, how well-defined and promising are the conclusions and recommendations or next steps and future directions as outlined by the authors, whether it's an initial concept or a fully realized study? Evaluate whether the authors have effectively communicated the potential advancements and broader implications stemming from their initial empirical findings or theoretical developments, while also acknowledging and planning for any limitations. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the proposal submitters to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Quality of writing and academic style**

Is the text error free (spelling, syntax, grammar)? Is the text comprehensible to the academic community? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Anchoring in relevant and current literature**

How well is the paper anchored in relevant immersive learning research literature? Does it provide appropriate citation of related work in the field? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Compliance with iLRN Proceedings style/formatting and referencing guidelines, including use of the respective template**

Does the paper comply with the iLRN template and guidelines (

<https://publications.immersivelrn.org/index.php/academic/templates>)? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **If helpful, recommend a more appropriate paper category to support the authors.**

Which category would be most appropriate for this paper? Would you recommend the

author/s to submit a revised version of the paper to another category? The author/s will be required to revise their paper as necessary to comply with the relevant page limits, and the paper will be reviewed again. Optional: If you want, you can add explanations in the text box.

- **Overall Evaluation**

Please provide the overall evaluation for the submission. Should it be accepted for publication in the conference proceedings and presentation at iLRN2025? For all categories, revisions of papers based on the reviewers' comments should be made. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

Constructive, Ethical & Objective Review

iLRN adheres to recognized peer-review ethics. Reviewers are expected to follow:

- **COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers**

<https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>

- **iLRN Publications Ethics & Malpractice Statement** (*Reviewers' Responsibilities*)

<https://www.immersivelrn.org/about/publications-ethics-and-malpractice-statement/>

- **Springer Nature Reviewer Guidelines** <https://www.springer.com/gp/editorial-policies/peer-review-policy-process>

Your comments to authors should:

- **Explain and justify all ratings**
- Identify **strengths and weaknesses**
- Offer **specific, actionable suggestions**
- Use a **respectful, unbiased, and professional** tone

--> *Do not include personal judgments or assumptions about author identity, background, location, or intent.*

--> *Maintain confidentiality - do not share, store externally, or reuse content.*

--> *Do not upload manuscripts into generative AI tools, per COPE and Springer Nature policies.*

Evidence-Based Evaluation

For **empirical** contributions:

- Clear research questions and rationale
- Appropriate methodology and execution
- Transparent reporting of **results, limitations, and implications**

For **theoretical/conceptual** contributions:

- Logical and coherent argumentation
- Grounding in recognized scholarly literature
- Clear advancement of conceptual understanding in the field

Evaluate **only what is presented** in the manuscript.

Literature & Research Integrity

Assess whether:

- Prior work in immersive learning research (i.e. prior ILRN conference proceedings) is **properly cited**
- The contribution is **clearly contextualized** within the field
- Citation practices meet **academic integrity** norms

If you suspect **plagiarism, fabricated data, or ethical issues**:

→ Report concerns via *Confidential feedback to the program committee only*.

Overall Recommendation

When rating acceptance suitability:

- Consider both the **importance of the contribution** and the **feasibility of revisions**
- Ensure alignment between **ratings, recommendation, and review narrative**
- *Even when recommending rejection*, include **constructive feedback** to help the authors improve

Reviewer Confidence & Confidential Notes

- Indicate your **true level of expertise** in the confidence field
- Use confidential notes only for **communication with Program Committee Chairs** (*not to authors*)

Award Nominations

Nominate a paper only if it demonstrates:

- **Outstanding rigor, originality, clarity, and impact**
- Clear potential to **advance immersive learning research**

Thank You!

Your thoughtful review contributes to:

- **Excellence** in scholarly publication
- A **fair and supportive** academic review culture

- Growth and **advancement** of the immersive learning community

For any questions related to ethics or review standards, please reach out to the [iLRN2026 Program Chairs](#) or the [iLRN Scientific Quality Assurance Team](#).

Reviews for Academic Stream - Doctoral Colloquium Paper (Oral Presentation in DC session)

Thank you for supporting iLRN's peer review process. Your careful and ethical evaluation ensures a high standard of research in immersive learning. Please review each submission **fairly, confidentially, and professionally**, using the criteria provided in the **review form** while following established international ethical guidelines listed below. The review form is embedded in EasyChair (have a look at [this page](#) to see how to add your review).

Paper Type

Please consider the paper type when reviewing. You can find more information on the Academic Stream on this website: <https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/academic-stream/>

Doctoral Colloquium

- 4-7 pages, incl. references
- *iLRN Conference Proceedings template*
- for **oral presentation in the DC session**

Both doctoral level as well as master's by research students/candidates are eligible to submit to the doctoral colloquium (DC). The DC will be held as a session in addition to the regular paper sessions, with students presenting their research to each other (in English). You can find more information on the Doctoral Colloquium here: <https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/doctoral-colloquium-dc/>

Doctoral Colloquium submissions are thus contributions by (Doctoral) Students, usually about their doctoral project or a specific study from it. Please consider this in your review.

What to Evaluate

In the EasyChair form, please provide ratings on:

- **Potential Contribution to Immersive Learning Research**

How much does the submission (potentially) contribute to research on learning, instruction, teaching or education with immersive technologies? Please keep in mind that the scope of the conference includes research on learning (education/teaching/training/instruction/...) WITH immersive technology

(VR/AR/XR/MR/games/360°...), so both components should be clearly included in the submission. Please also check if the submission fits well to the topic that it was submitted to. Otherwise please suggest a better fitting topic (<https://www.immersivelrn.org/ilrn2026/call-for-papers/#program-tracks>). Justify your review in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Originality and innovation**

How original and innovative is this contribution? How novel and unique are the proposed approach, methods, or ideas? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Proposed Methodological/theoretical design**

When evaluating the project at its current phase of development, how comprehensive and robust is the proposed methodological or theoretical design of this submission, whether it's an initial concept or a fully realized study? For empirical research, consider if the experimental design, data collection methods, and analysis plans are thoughtfully constructed and feasibly actionable, showing a deep grasp of the research challenge. For theoretical research, examine whether the framework or conclusions are solidly grounded, logically coherent, and poised for a meaningful contribution to the field. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the proposal submitters to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Conclusions, Limitations, and/or Expected Outcomes**

Assessing the current development stage of the project, how well-defined and promising are the conclusions and recommendations or next steps and future directions as outlined by the authors, whether it's an initial concept or a fully realized study? Evaluate whether the authors have effectively communicated the potential advancements and broader implications stemming from their initial empirical findings or theoretical developments, while also acknowledging and planning for any limitations. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the proposal submitters to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Quality of writing and academic style**

Is the text error free (spelling, syntax, grammar)? Is the text comprehensible to the academic community? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Anchoring in relevant and current literature**

How well is the paper anchored in relevant immersive learning research literature? Does it provide appropriate citation of related work in the field? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **Compliance with iLRN Proceedings style/formatting and referencing guidelines, including use of the respective template**

Does the paper comply with the iLRN template and guidelines (<https://publications.immersivelrn.org/index.php/academic/templates>)? Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

- **If helpful, recommend a more appropriate paper category to support the authors.**

Which category would be most appropriate for this paper? Would you recommend the author/s to submit a revised version of the paper to another category? The author/s will be required to revise their paper as necessary to comply with the relevant page limits, and the paper will be reviewed again. Optional: If you want, you can add explanations in the text box.

- **Overall Evaluation**

Please provide the overall evaluation for the submission. Should it be accepted for publication in the conference proceedings and presentation at iLRN2025? For all categories, revisions of papers based on the reviewers' comments should be made. Justify your review by providing constructive feedback to the authors to improve their contribution in the field "Comments for the Authors" below.

Constructive, Ethical & Objective Review

iLRN adheres to recognized peer-review ethics. Reviewers are expected to follow:

- **COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers**

<https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>

- **iLRN Publications Ethics & Malpractice Statement** (*Reviewers' Responsibilities*)

<https://www.immersivelrn.org/about/publications-ethics-and-malpractice-statement/>

- **Springer Nature Reviewer Guidelines** <https://www.springer.com/gp/editorial-policies/peer-review-policy-process>

Your comments to authors should:

- **Explain and justify all ratings**
- Identify **strengths and weaknesses**
- Offer **specific, actionable suggestions**
- Use a **respectful, unbiased, and professional** tone

--> *Do not include personal judgments or assumptions about author identity, background, location, or intent.*

--> *Maintain confidentiality - do not share, store externally, or reuse content.*

--> *Do not upload manuscripts into generative AI tools, per COPE and Springer Nature policies.*

Evidence-Based Evaluation

For **empirical** contributions:

- Clear research questions and rationale
- Appropriate methodology and execution
- Transparent reporting of **results, limitations, and implications**

For **theoretical/conceptual** contributions:

- Logical and coherent argumentation
- Grounding in recognized scholarly literature
- Clear advancement of conceptual understanding in the field

Evaluate **only what is presented** in the manuscript.

Literature & Research Integrity

Assess whether:

- Prior work in immersive learning research (i.e. prior ILRN conference proceedings) is **properly cited**
- The contribution is **clearly contextualized** within the field
- Citation practices meet **academic integrity** norms

If you suspect **plagiarism, fabricated data, or ethical issues**:

→ Report concerns via *Confidential feedback to the program committee only*.

Overall Recommendation

When rating acceptance suitability:

- Consider both the **importance of the contribution** and the **feasibility of revisions**
- Ensure alignment between **ratings, recommendation, and review narrative**
- *Even when recommending rejection*, include **constructive feedback** to help the authors improve

Reviewer Confidence & Confidential Notes

- Indicate your **true level of expertise** in the confidence field
- Use confidential notes only for **communication with Program Committee Chairs** (*not to authors*)

Award Nominations

Nominate a paper only if it demonstrates:

- **Outstanding rigor, originality, clarity, and impact**
- Clear potential to **advance immersive learning research**

Thank You!

Your thoughtful review contributes to:

- **Excellence** in scholarly publication
- A **fair and supportive** academic review culture

- Growth and **advancement** of the immersive learning community

For any questions related to ethics or review standards, please reach out to the [iLRN2026 Program Chairs](#) or the [iLRN Scientific Quality Assurance Team](#).

iLEAD 2026 Conference Review Criteria (Immersive Learning Education, Arts & Design-Focused)

Established: January 2026

Last Updated: 1/14/2026

Purpose

This page defines the review criteria and reviewer guidance used for evaluating submissions to the iLEAD (Immersive Learning Education, Arts, and Design) Stream at the iLEAD 2026 Conference.

The criteria are published to support transparency, consistency, and shared understanding across contributors, reviewers, and program leadership.

These criteria serve two functions:

1. For authors – to clarify expectations and support the development of strong, well-aligned submissions.
2. For reviewers and chairs – to guide evaluation, calibration, and program-building decisions.

This document functions as a versioned procedural standard within the iLEAD governance framework. Updates or revisions are documented and stewarded through the iLEAD Program Chairs in consultation with the General Chairs and the iLRN Scientific Quality Assurance process.

Scope

These review criteria apply to all iLEAD 2026 submission categories, unless otherwise noted in specific calls or track guidance.

Where appropriate, submission formats (e.g., workshops, demonstrations, panels) may include additional contextual guidance, but such guidance does not replace or override the core criteria defined here.

iLRN iLEAD Review Criteria

The criteria below are applied holistically. Reviewers are asked to consider submissions in relation to their stated purpose, context, and intended contribution.

1. Relevance to iLEAD and the 2026 Conference Theme

- Alignment with immersive learning as a field of research, design, practice, or application
- Relevance to the 2026 conference theme and/or the mission of iLEAD
- Clarity of intended audience and contribution

2. Contribution to Practice and Community Relevance

- Usefulness to educators, designers, trainers, or practitioners
- Clear articulation of actionable insights, tools, or transferable lessons
- Engagement with real-world challenges and opportunities

3. Quality of Design, Method, or Practice

- Soundness of learning design, development process, or implementation approach
- Appropriateness of methods, tools, or platforms used
- Evidence of thoughtful implementation or inquiry

4. Innovation and Creativity

- Novelty of approach or application
- Creative or insightful use of immersive technologies
- Introduction of fresh perspectives, even when exploratory or early stage

5. Clarity, Organization, and Communication

- Clarity and coherence of writing or presentation
- Logical organization and completeness
- Accessibility to the intended audience

6. Practical Conclusions and Takeaways

- Clear articulation of lessons learned or recommendations
- Substantiation of conclusions through experience or design rationale
- Value of takeaways for other practitioners

7. Compliance with style/formatting and referencing guidelines.

- Does the paper comply with the [iLRN template and guidelines](#)?

Additional Considerations

Depending on submission type, reviewers may also consider:

- Ethical considerations and responsible practice
- Inclusivity, accessibility, and cultural awareness
- Transparency of limitations and future directions

These considerations are not scored independently but inform overall judgment.

Reviewer Guidance and Ethics

Reviewers are expected to contribute to a supportive, constructive, and professional review environment.

Expectations

- Provide actionable, specific feedback that supports author development
- Avoid personal judgments or assumptions about author integrity, background, or intent
- Maintain strict confidentiality of submitted materials

Ethics and Integrity

- Do not upload manuscripts to generative AI tools
- If concerns arise regarding plagiarism, fabricated data, ethical issues, or unreported AI use, report them via Confidential Comments to the Program Chairs only.

Reviewers are expected to adhere to:

- COPE Ethical Guidelines for Peer Reviewers <https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/cope-ethical-guidelines-peer-reviewers>
- iLRN Publications Ethics & Malpractice Statement <https://www.immersivelrn.org/about/publications-ethics-and-malpractice-statement/>

Review Process Notes

- Submissions are reviewed using EasyChair with these criteria as a shared framework and review form ([this page](#) provides information on how to add a review)
- Reviewers should indicate their confidence level accurately
- Final program decisions are made by the iLEAD Program Chairs in consultation with Track Chairs and the General Chairs
- Acceptance decisions reflect both submission quality and overall program balance
- Revisions based on reviewer feedback are expected for all accepted submissions

Award Nominations

Submissions may be nominated for awards when they demonstrate:

- Outstanding originality, clarity, and impact in practice or design

- Clear value to the iLEAD community
- Potential to meaningfully advance immersive learning education or design

iLEAD Book Series

Selected iLEAD submissions will be invited to contribute a chapter to the iLEAD Book Series.

Related Materials

- [iLRN2026 Call for Submissions](#)
- [iLEAD 2026 Submission Information](#)
- [Recorded iLEAD Webinar](#) (November 25, 2025) – Review Criteria Overview

Versioning and Revision

This page represents the current review criteria for the iLEAD 2026 Conference. Prior versions, revisions, or post-conference reflections may be archived to support transparency and institutional memory.

Editorial Note

The iLEAD review criteria are intended to support fairness, transparency, and constructive evaluation. They are reviewed periodically to ensure alignment with evolving practices, community feedback, and the broader goals of the iLEAD Innovation Garden.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact the iLRN2026 iLEAD Program Chair Team (ilrn2026.ileadprogram@immersivelrn.org).

Industry Product Demonstrations Policy

iLEAD Stream — Industry Product Demonstrations Policy

Summary.

LEAD supports reflective, practice-based contributions across immersive learning in Education, Arts, and Design. Industry product demonstrations are acceptable when they are framed as educational, artistic, or design practice—prioritizing insight, reflection, and dialogue over promotion.

Purpose and Scope

The **iLEAD (Immersive Learning Education, Arts, and Design)** stream explicitly allows *industry-facing product demonstrations* **when they are framed as reflective, design-informed, and practice-oriented contributions**, rather than as promotional showcases.

This page clarifies the intent, boundaries, and review criteria for iLEAD submissions that involve **commercial or proprietary products**, and is intended for:

- Prospective iLEAD contributors
- iLEAD reviewers
- Program Chairs and Organizing Committee members

“ **Opinion:** iLEAD is strongest when it acts as a structured bridge between research, practice, and industry—*not* when it mimics a trade show. This policy is designed to protect that distinction while still welcoming industry participation.

iLRN encodes **Education, Arts, and Design as practice domains**, seeking Industry participation while remaining legally sound, reviewer-friendly, and non-promotional. iLEAD asks our industry partners to maintain BOTH the legal and perceived boundaries between for-profit pursuit and the collective pursuit of our non-profit mission.

Immersive Learning industry demonstrations in perspective

The **iLEAD (Immersive Learning, Education, Arts, and Design)** stream is explicitly practice-oriented. It exists to surface, examine, and advance *how immersive learning is used, expressed, and built in the world*.

Accordingly, iLEAD welcomes contributions grounded in **three complementary areas of immersive learning practice**:

Education

Educators, trainers, and facilitators using immersive learning experiences with learners or trainees. Contributions may focus on instructional intent, learning contexts, facilitation strategies, learner response, institutional constraints, and practical outcomes across formal, informal, and workplace settings.

Arts

Artists and creative practitioners using immersive media to experiment, express, and provoke—creating experiences that hook attention, motivate engagement, inspire reflection, and evoke emotion, thought, or action. Artistic contributions are evaluated on clarity of intent, expressive coherence, and reflective insight, not on instructional assessment alone.

Design

Designers and developers crafting immersive learning experiences with attention to interaction design, experience architecture, pedagogy, ethics, accessibility, and quality. Design-focused contributions emphasize process, trade-offs, constraints, and lessons learned rather than finished products alone.

Implications for Industry and Product Demonstrations

Within this practice-oriented framing, **industry product demonstrations may be appropriate in iLEAD** when the product serves as a *vehicle* for examining educational practice, artistic expression, or design decision-making.

A commercial or proprietary system may therefore be presented when it is:

- Used as a **case of educational practice**, illuminating how immersive learning is enacted with real learners or institutions;
- Treated as an **artistic medium**, enabling discussion of expressive intent, affective impact, or cultural meaning; or
- Examined as a **design artifact**, foregrounding design rationale, constraints, trade-offs, and implementation insight.

The determining factor is not whether a product is commercial, but whether the session advances understanding of **immersive learning practice across education, arts, or design**.

Sessions that function primarily as marketing, promotion, or sales—rather than reflective practice—remain **outside** the scope of iLEAD. Industry representatives should refrain from direct sales pitches or promotions in any iLEAD presentation, but may discuss such topics in private conversations.

Relationship to the iLRN Yellow Pages

Industry, design, and artistic product demonstrations accepted into the iLEAD stream may be invited to participate in the iLRN Yellow Pages, a publicly accessible directory documenting immersive learning organizations, platforms, programs, and individual expertise.

Inclusion in the iLRN Yellow Pages:

The iLRN Yellow Pages function as credentialed visibility, not advertising. Their legitimacy derives from participation, disclosure, and contextual placement—never from payment or promotion.

- Is optional and requires explicit consent
- Does not constitute endorsement by iLRN
- Reflects a willingness to engage transparently with the iLRN community
- Supports discoverability, scholarly context, and professional connection

Yellow Pages entries are presented as descriptive, structured profiles, not promotional content. Listings may include:

- Declared domain(s) of practice (Education, Arts, Design)
- Use contexts (formal education, informal learning, workforce training, cultural production)
- Prior iLRN engagement (e.g., iLEAD demonstrations, workshops, webinars)
- Public documentation or research-adjacent links

Review and Governance Implications

- Acceptance into iLEAD does not guarantee inclusion in the Yellow Pages

- Yellow Pages listings are curated infrastructure, not benefits of sponsorship
- Reviewers evaluate submissions solely on practice-based merit, independent of any directory listing

This separation preserves:

- Reviewer independence
- Non-profit integrity
- The scholarly credibility of iLEAD and the broader iLRN ecosystem

Codex Metadata

- Applies to: iLEAD Stream
- Audience: Reviewers, Contributors, Program Chairs
- Status: Active Policy Clarification
- Maintained by: iLEAD Program Committee

Closing Reflection: [iLRN places practice first, visibility second, and promotion nowhere in the stack.](#)

Codex Metadata

- **Applies to:** iLEAD Stream
- **Audience:** Reviewers, Contributors, Program Chairs
- **Status:** Active Policy Clarification
- **Maintained by:** iLEAD Program Committee