

DATA VISUALIZATION RUBRIC RUBRIC

	STRONG	MEDIUM	WEAK	POINTS	COMMENTS
COVERS THE RIGHT CONTENT 20 POINTS	20 19 18 17 16 The content of the rubric represents the best thinking in the field of data visualization about what it means to create meaningful and truthful graphics. The content of the rubric aligns with the objectives of the course and covers issues of credibility, ethics, aesthetics, and accessibility.	15 14 13 12 11 Much of the content of the rubric represent the best thinking in data visualization, but there are a few places that are questionable. Some features don't align with the objectives of the course and omit features related to credibility, ethics, aesthetics, or accessibility.	10 9 8 7 6 5 It is difficult to tell what the rubric is intended to assess and the content is far removed from the best thinking in data visualization. The rubric does not alight with the objectives of the course and does not cover features related to credibility, ethics, aesthetics, or accessibility.		
	CRITERIA ARE WELL ORGANIZED 25 POINTS	25 24 23 22 21 20 The rubric is divided into easily understandable criteria. The number of criteria reflects the complexity of assessing data visualizations. The details that are used to describe a criterion go together; you can see how they are facets of the same criterion. The relative emphasis on various features of performance is right—things that are more important are stressed more; things that are less important are stressed less. The criteria are independent. Each important feature appears in only one place in the rubric.	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 The number of criteria needs to be adjusted a little—either a single criterion should be made into two criteria, or two criteria should be combined. Some details that are used to describe a criterion are in the wrong criterion, but most are placed correctly. The emphasis on some criteria or descriptors is either too small or too great; others are okay. Some features are included in more than one criterion.	12 11 10 9 8 7 The rubric is a long list of everything; there is no organization. The rubric looks like a brainstormed list. The rubric seems mixed up. Descriptors that go together don't seem to be placed together; things that are different are put together. The rubric is out of balance—features of more importance are emphasized the same as features of less importance. Features are so redundant that the criteria don't really cover different things.	
NUMBER OF LEVELS 5 POINTS	5 The number of levels of quality used in the rating scale makes sense. There are enough levels to accurately rate the visualization, but not so many levels that it is impossible to distinguish among them.	4 3 More levels would be helpful to make finer distinctions in the assessment of the visualization.	2 1 The number of levels is not appropriate—there are either so many levels that it is impossible to reliably distinguish between them, or too few to make important distinctions.		

	STRONG	MEDIUM	WEAK	POINTS	COMMENTS
LEVELS DEFINED WELL 25 POINTS	25 24 23 22 21 20 Each score point is defined with indicators or descriptions. There is enough descriptive detail to allow you to match the visualization's performance to the right score. Two independent users raters assign the same rating most of the time. Wording is descriptive, not evaluative.	19 18 17 16 15 14 13 Only the top level is defined; the other levels are not defined. There is some attempt to define terms and include descriptors, but some key ideas are fuzzy in meaning. It is uncertain if two independent testers, even with practice, could assign the same rating most of the time. Wording is mostly descriptive, but there are a few instances of evaluative labels.	12 11 10 9 8 7 No levels are defined; the rubric is little more than a list of categories to rate followed by a rating scale. Wording of levels (if present) is vague or confusing. It is unlikely that two independent raters could assign the same rating. Wording is evaluative and not descriptive (e.g. the visualization is "interesting" or "above average")		
PARALLEL LEVELS 5 POINTS	5 The levels of the rubric are parallel in content—if a feature is discussed in one level, it is discussed in all levels. If the levels are not parallel, there is a good explanation why.	4 3 The levels are mostly parallel in content, but there are some places where there is a feature at one level that is not present at the other levels.	2 1 Levels are not parallel in content and there is no explanation of why.		
TOTAL 80 POINTS					