**Redesign Project Grading Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Adequate** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| Visualization (45%) | * Outstanding redesigned visualization(s) in all aspects (design, clarity, appropriateness, sufficiency, accuracy). * Redesign achieves major improvements over the original in terms of the degree and/or number of improvements. * There are no flaws in the redesigned visualizations (e.g. insufficient labeling, misspellings in titles, etc.). | * Outstanding redesigned visualization(s) in all aspects (see excellent) except one. * Redesign achieves moderate improvements over the original in terms of the degree and/or number of improvements. * There is one flaw in the redesigned visualizations (e.g. insufficient labeling, misspellings in titles, etc.). | * Great redesigned visualization(s) in most aspects (see excellent). * Redesign achieves some improvements over the original in terms of the degree and/or number of improvements. * There are 1-2 flaws in the redesigned visualizations (e.g. insufficient labeling, misspellings in titles, etc.). | * Redesigned visualization(s) are deficient in most aspects (see excellent). * Redesign achieves little to no improvements over the original in terms of the degree and/or number of improvements. * There are numerous flaws in the redesigned visualizations (e.g. insufficient labeling, misspellings in titles, etc.). |
| Writing (35%) | * Clear and detailed communication of design flaws in original visualization. * Provides extensive and compelling commentary on the negative impacts of the design flaws on ease of use, interpretability, and representation of findings. * Provides excellent illustrative examples within the context of the data. * Extensive and compelling comparative analysis of the original and redesigned visualizations. Clearly articulates all improvements over original and provides illustrative examples to highlight improvements. | * Clear communication of design flaws in original visualization. Missing some minor details. * Provides great commentary on the negative impacts of the design flaws. Commentary not as extensive as needed or lacking clarity in one area. * Provides some illustrative examples within the context of the data. * Great comparative analysis of the original and redesigned visualizations. Minor improvements needed to improve clarity and provide more details. | * Clear communication of design flaws in original visualization but lacking in detail. * Provides some commentary on the negative impacts of the design flaws. Missing some important details. * Illustrative examples missing or require additional details. * Some comparative analysis of the original and redesigned visualizations. Numerous improvements needed to improve clarity and provide more details. | * Failed to identify design flaws in original visualization. * Provides little to no commentary on the negative impacts of the design flaws. * No illustrative examples provided. * Little to no comparative analysis of the original and redesigned visualizations. Unclear as to what design improvements are made and why. |
| Creativity (20%) | * Highly innovative redesigned visualization in two or more of the following areas:  1. Incorporated multiple approaches covered in class to creatively address design flaws. 2. Researched new approaches not covered in class and incorporated into visualizations to creatively address design flaws. 3. Demonstrated a deep, expert knowledge of a particular approach and perfectly tailored the approach to creatively address design flaws. | * Highly innovative redesigned visualization in one or more of the areas described in the excellent category. | * Appropriate redesigned visualization. Demonstrates intermediate knowledge of methodology. Straightforward application of one approach covered in class. | * Redesigned visualization inappropriate or overly simplistic. Demonstrates little to no understanding of approach. |