Final Prototype

Criteria	Ratings					

INSTRUCTIONS (view longer description)

Acknowledged	N/A
Click "View Description" to view and read the instructions. When done, click this to indicate you have read and acknowledge the instructions. ▲ (selected)	Not Applicable

Visual Encodings (view longer description)

No Rating	N/A
Used for comment-only criteria.	Not Applicable

Comments
In the map, restaurants are encoded as dots colored by the rating they received, and located where they are geographically. In the bar chart, I'm not sure what the encoding is.

Non-Color Encodings (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
	▲				

Comments
The encoding of geographic location by location on the map makes sense. Using the size of the dot for risk is a good idea, too. Putting zip code on the x axis of the bar chart also works. The other encodings aren't clear enough. Are they stacked? Overlapped?

Color Encodings (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
▲					

Comments
The use of the linear scale works for the dots on the map, although they nearly all look like they fall into one of four categories. Is that what you did? Using an ordinal scale for the bar chart is a good choice too, and I like the color scheme.

Context (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
		▲			

Comments
I was unable to figure out how your bar chart encodes data. Your 'encoding' section is too small. The map is clear, though.

Lie Factor (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
	▲				

Comments
Many of the dots seem to overlap, but they are 100% opaque. This obscures some data, which is a problem.

Data Ink Ratio (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
	▲				

Comments
You mostly have data ink. Some more context might be helpful.

Data Density (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
	▲				

Comments
You show a decent amount of data.

Gestalt Principles (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
			▲		

Comments
It's unclear whether the bars in the bar chart overlap or what? This might be a background/foreground problem. Also the dots overlap in the map, which is a problem. Some are too small to even notice, really, and this is a problem.

Planned Interactivity (view longer description)

No Rating	N/A
Used for comment-only criteria.	Not Applicable

Comments
Zooming in the map for details on demand. Filtering by keyword or type of health complaint.

Planned Interaction Effectiveness (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
	▲				

Comments
I like the idea of zooming, this might help with the density problem. The keywords and cuisine filter seems tricky to implement right.

Design and Aesthetics (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
	▲				

Comments
I like your color scheme. The center-justified text is distracting.

Understanding (view longer description)

No Rating	N/A
Used for comment-only criteria.	Not Applicable

Comments
There doesn't seem to be a clear trend showed by this visualization about what parts of the city have which kinds or severity of complaints. It looks like the map mostly just shows where restaurants are in the city? And I was unable to understand the bar chart.

Visualization Goal (view longer description)

No Rating	N/A
Used for comment-only criteria.	Not Applicable

Comments
See relationships between neighborhood, price, health score, and ratings for SF restaurants.

Visualization Effectiveness (view longer description)

5 Very Good	4 Good	3 Fair	2 Poor	1 Very Poor	N/A Not Applicable
			▲		

Comments
I was unable to see much of a relationship.