

	Encodings (40%)	Design Considerations (20%)	Overall Quality (20%)	Insight (20%)
Excellent	Encodings are very well thought out and appropriate for the visualisation task. They are expressive and effective.	Excellent discussion of alternative encodings and their pros and cons. This can include discussion of the intended audience and what is appropriate for them.	Appropriate use of filtering, aggregation, and data transformation to create a clear picture. Good use of small touches (titles, axis labels, legend placement etc) to improve the readability of charts.	Interesting observations made about the data, clear connection between the visualisation presented and the insight obtained.
Very Good	Encodings are appropriate for the visualisation task. They are expressive and effective	Clear discussion of the pros of the current visualisation, some discussion of alternatives	Some use of filtering / data transformation to improve chart, some effort with small touches.	Insights a little obvious but a clear connection between the visualisation presented and the insight obtained.
Good	Some issues with the encodings (e.g. bar chart used correctly but employs a color scheme that is hard to read) or a clearly better encoding not employed	Reasonable justification for encoding used but no discussion of alternative encodings	Graphs relatively clear but could be improved through data manipulation (e.g. filtering, aggregation). Some attention paid to small touches but improvements could be made.	Marginal insight - e.g. describing what is at the top and bottom of a bar chart
Satisfactory	Encoding that is not wrong but has major issues	Poor justification for encoding used	No attention made to small touches, default font sizes, colour schemes etc	Little insight obtained from the visualisations, poor connection between the stated insight and the visualisation shown.
Unsatisfactory	Encodings are not appropriate for the visualisation task (e.g. a line chart for non-continous data)	No justification for encoding used		