**Student: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Link to submission (if available): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Scoring Description** | **Optional Explanation of Score** | |
| **Word Document** | | | |
| Was the dashboard/worksheet/story the reviewers should look at specified? | – No    – Yes, but it wasn’t specific enough to identify the visualization easily    – Yes |  |  |
| How reasonable/thoughtful was the stated take-home message of the original visualization? | – It wasn’t relevant at all to the original visualization    – It was reasonable, but probably wasn’t the best interpretation of the original visualization    – It was a reasonable and thoughtful description of the intended take-home message of the original visualization |  |  |
| How reasonable/thoughtful/complete were the stated strengths of the original visualization? | – No accurate strengths were provided    – The strengths described were accurate, but the list was not complete or well thought-out    – The list of strengths provided was complete, accurate, and well thought-out |  |  |
| How reasonable/thoughtful/complete were the stated improvements the original visualization needed? | – No reasonable improvements were provided    – The suggested improvements were accurate, but the list was not complete or well thought-out    – The list of suggested improvements was complete, accurate, and well thought-out |  |  |
| How interesting and engaging was the chosen “data story” for the submitted makeover? | – It wasn’t relevant at all to the data set    – It was reasonable enough, but not very interesting or engaging    – It was a thoughtful and engaging data story |  |  |
| How different was the submitted makeover from the original? | – Not at all different    – somewhat different    – very different |  |  |
| How thoughtful were the implemented changes? | – Not at all thoughtful (the intended changes were trivial)    – Somewhat thoughtful (the intended changes would make reasonable and noticeable improvements)    – Very thoughtful (the intended changes would improve the visualization dramatically) |  |  |
| **Tableau Visualization** | | | |
| How well is the intended data story communicated? | – Needs substantial improvement    – Somewhat; the illustrated data supports the intended story to some degree, but could be chosen better, and/or it took a while to understand the take-home message    – Well; the illustrated data supports the intended story effectively, and the take-home message can be understood quickly |  |  |
| Were the graph-types well-chosen? | – No, the chosen graphs are very poorly matched to the type of information the audience needs to understand    – The chosen graphs do showcase the relevant data to some degree, but they either do not provide the right level of precision or it is difficult to interpret the data in a way that is necessary for understanding the story    – Yes, the chosen graphs effectively display the data at the right level of precision for the story |  |  |
| How well was the overall visualization organized? | – Poorly; it wasn’t clear at all where to look, or why    – Adequately; improvements could be made to illustrate the data story more effectively    – Well; it was obvious where to look and one’s eyes looked at the data in an order that effectively communicated the data story |  |  |
| How well was white space used? | – Poorly; everything is very crowded or too spread apart    – Adequately; the visual elements could have been distributed more effectively    – Well; the visual elements were well-distributed with the right amount of white space between them |  |  |
| Overall, how useful was the non-data “ink” included in the makeover? | – Not useful; The number and thickness of gridlines, tick marks, borders, shading, and extra icons or graphics was way too overwhelming and distracting    – Somewhat useful; some uses of the gridlines, tick marks, borders, shading, and extra icons or graphics could have been improved    – Useful; The number and thickness of gridlines, tick marks, borders, shading, and extra icons or graphics were well-chosen and engaging for the purpose of the visualization |  |  |
| How informative and well-placed were the titles and legends? | – Not at all; When titles were needed, they were not provided or were completely irrelevant    – Somewhat; When titles were needed, they were provided, but could have been placed better or have described the take-home message better    – When titles were needed, they were placed strategically and described the take-home message effectively and directly |  |  |
| Were the fonts and font-sizes well-chosen? | – No; the fonts were way too small or large and were unreadable    – Somewhat; the fonts and sizes could have been optimized better    – Yes; all text was readable and effective |  |  |
| How effectively was color used in the makeover? | – Poorly; the colors were confusing, distracting, misplaced, or overwhelming    – Somewhat; color could have been used more effectively    – Very effectively; the colors were strategically chosen and placed for the purpose of the story |  |  |
| Are the labels well-placed (ideally near the data mark instead of in a legend), and not redundant (it would be rare for both a data legend and label to be needed)? | – No; it takes a lot of effort to figure out what each mark represents    – Somewhat; some labels are redundant and/or there are ways to make it easier to know what each mark represents    – Yes; the labels are efficient and it’s very easy to understand what each mark represents |  |  |
| Are the data points in each graph ordered in a reasonable and effective way? | – No; either the data aren’t ordered or they are ordered in a confusing/unintuitive way    – Somewhat; the way the data were ordered could have been optimized better    – Yes; the way the data are ordered is intuitive, reasonable, and supports the data story |  |  |
| How effectively were “actions” (such as hovering, highlighting, and filtering) used? | – Not at all; either no actions were used when actions would have been helpful, or the actions that were implemented were distracting or confusing    – Somewhat; the actions that were implemented could have been optimized better    – Very effectively; the actions were effective, intuitive, well-labeled or obvious, and helped optimize space and the order in which data was revealed |  |  |
| How effectively were comparisons or contrasts used (either between different data groups or with some type of reference)? | – Not at all; no contrasts were shown when they would have been useful and/or the contrasts that were shown were irrelevant to the story    – Somewhat; the ways comparisons were used could have been optimized better    – Very effectively; comparisons were used effectively when they could help convey the data story and were not used unnecessarily |  |  |
| How creative, overall, was the intended make-over? | – Not creative at all; the changes implemented were simple and obvious    – somewhat creative; the implemented changes were interesting    – very creative; the implemented changes were innovative, very interesting, and/or thought-provoking |  |  |

Other considerations:

1. Is there any evidence that somebody else’s work or notebook was used to make the submission? If so, please explain here:
2. Was the submitter’s name missing from the file names?
3. Did you have any difficulty opening the submitted notebook because the extract was not created correctly?