C.R.A.P. PRINCIPLES

There are many different colors being used here that make it pretty hard to concentrate on any particular graphic. This ties back to the Contrast principle within C.R.A.P. because this graphic might have been easier to look at if the author chose a maximum of 3 colors, or perhaps a gradient of one color so long as it doesn't affect those who are visually impaired. For example, there are various gray shades in the student engagement section and bottom right quadrant, blues, greens, yellows, and reds. This makes it quite hard to digest the information. There is also no reason to have some text shaded. Proximity could have been used better to separate and group the data. For example, all test scores like the SAT, ASOT, ACT, and relevant benchmark data could be grouped together on the left, while things like the student engagement information could have been on the right along with other data points that aren't directly related to scores and grades. Furthermore, the alignment of different headings should be standardized—we see some graphics with centered titles while the rest are left aligned.

GESTALT PRINCIPLES

The gestalt principle of proximity could have been used to separate the different graphics from one another to let the reader know what data points have a greater relationship with one another. This also helps to prevent the reader from fatigue. For example, spacing between the headers should be greater and standardized throughout the graphic. Similarity should have been used as I mentioned in the C.R.A.P. principles section to group similar data points together.

TUFTE PRINCIPLES

We see quite a low data-ink ratio in some of the data presented. For example, the Student Satisfaction with Learning Environment graph uses a 3D graph, with various gray shading that is differently designed from the other graphs that maintained a 2D shape. Furthermore, there was no need for the graphic that shows the graduation rate. Instead it would have been more effective to just state the graduation rate without the whole graph that came with it. However, there are some positives that this graphic has, for example they got rid of the axis for most of the horizontal bar charts that might not have been needed to understand the graph's point. In terms of graphical integrity, the only section of the graph that really worried me was the scaling for the ACT scores. For example, it doesn't show that the scores are out of 36, and the % meeting benchmark makes it seem like the percentages are quite close with one another.