<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Poor (1 point)</th>
<th>Acceptable (2 points)</th>
<th>Good (3 points)</th>
<th>Excellent (4 points)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose (Nathan)</td>
<td>Data presented is superfluous, unnecessary, redundant, hilarious.</td>
<td>Infographic gives some topic-related information, but largely focuses on disparate data</td>
<td>Most data provided is related to a central theme, allows for conclusions to be drawn.</td>
<td>Data is compelling and conveys useful or meaningful information to the reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization (Robert, Rob, &amp; Suzie)</td>
<td>Jumbled and confusing data</td>
<td>Slightly better but not noticeably so than poor display, but confusing and hard to read</td>
<td>Easily spaced and clear to read, but no organization to data</td>
<td>Clear and consistent methodology to organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Visualization (Curtis)</td>
<td>All aspects of information presented are unclear.</td>
<td>Lack of relationship between graphic and info to be presented. Some conveyed well, however.</td>
<td>Most of the information is clear. Good use of spatial relationships, interactions, use of visuals to describe info.</td>
<td>Experiment is clear from infographic and all information is presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Charts (Taylor)</td>
<td>Inappropriate charts (pie)</td>
<td>Excel basics (bar, line)</td>
<td>R basics (bubble)</td>
<td>Original graphics related to data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Color (Tony &amp; Kyle)</td>
<td>Colors are chosen arbitrarily or seemingly without reason</td>
<td>Colors do not distract from the overall presentation of the material, but nor do they aid</td>
<td>Colors correspond well with the chosen data</td>
<td>Colors correspond well with the chosen data, and complement each other to enhance the attractiveness and flow of the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Text (Lester)</td>
<td>No explanations anywhere</td>
<td>Very brief notes under figures, but poorly conveyed.</td>
<td>Description of graphs are good enough so reader understands.</td>
<td>Data on graphs clearly described nearby so reader understands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources (Robert, Rob, &amp; Suzie)</td>
<td>No sources cited</td>
<td>Sources are given but inconsistent, generally incomprehensible and not clearly found</td>
<td>Consistent Sources but not clearly related to specific data (Hard to find)</td>
<td>Sources are reputable, easily found, clear and consistent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics (Daniel)</td>
<td>Dull, uninteresting.</td>
<td>Evokes a cursory glance, mildly interesting.</td>
<td>Makes the reader feel like it was worthwhile to read it. Interesting.</td>
<td>Commands the attention of the reader. Would grab someone’s eye from across the room.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>