

Coursework Marking Grid – Data Visualisation – Part 1

Name LEWYS THOMAS

Mark _____

Grade 52.6

QUESTION	EXCEPTIONAL 6	MERITORIOUS 5	HIGHLY COMPETENT 4	COMPETENT 3	PASS 2	FAIL 1
Description of what is right with the original poster (20%)	Provides detailed breakdown of cognition in data presentation	Identifies a wide range of good points	Explains the main good points in terms of cognitive processes	Identifies three to six good points	Identifies one or two obvious good points	Provides no ideas relating to the good points of the poster
Description of what is wrong with the original poster (20%)	Provides detailed breakdown of cognitive errors in data presentation	Identifies a wide range of problems	Explains the main problems in terms of cognitive processes	Identifies three to six problems	Identifies one or two obvious problems	Provides no reasons why the original poster was weak
Suggestion of improvements (30%)	Provides detailed breakdown of cognitive support in data presentation	Suggests a wide range of justified improvements	Justifies the main improvements in terms of cognitive processes	Suggests seven or more improvements; may justify some of them	Suggests three to six appropriate improvements	Makes few suggestions for how to improve the poster
Links to literature (10%)	All points referenced	Most points referenced	Considers cognitive issues	Considers other issues	Considers visual issues	No links to the literature
Document presentation (10%)	Reads like a technical review article	Good use of signposting; good use of English; tables of figures and tables	Clear sectioning of content; labelling of tables and figures; reasonable English	Some labelling of tables and figures; clearly needs spell- and grammar- checking	Basic use of introduction, body and conclusion; English is comprehensible.	No clear structure; incomprehensible
Referencing (10%)	>10 references AND three quarters or more of references are book/journal standard	>4 references AND three quarters or more of references are book/journal standard	<5 references AND more than half of references are book/journal standard	<5 references OR fewer than half of references are book/journal standard	<5 references AND fewer than half of references are book/journal standard	No references

Comments

Don't use "I" in technical writing.
 Try not to use long quotations. It's much better to rewrite these things in your own words, and then reference the idea or the fact described. If you must use long quotations, put them on an indented new line.
 This doesn't create a negative mental model, it makes it difficult to create any mental model.
 Remember to put complete references in the reference list, not just URLs. Check your study skills materials for how to do this.

Part 2

QUESTION	EXCEPTIONAL 6	MERITORIOUS 5	HIGHLY COMPETENT 4	COMPETENT 3	PASS 2	FAIL 1
Presentation of data (35%)	All forms are highly effective	Most forms are highly effective	Some forms are highly effective; all forms work	Most forms work; none a wildly inappropriate	Some forms work, others are inappropriate	Uses totally inappropriate forms
Answers questions (15%)	Answers all questions clearly and with minimal cognitive load	Answers all questions clearly	Answers 4 questions clearly	Answers 3 questions clearly	Answers 2 questions clearly	Answers 1 or no questions clearly
Use of colour (20%)	Professional-looking design	All colours are used appropriately and allow for limits of visual system	All colours are used appropriately	Most colours are visible	Some colours are readable	Unreadable
Use of other elements (20%)	Professional-looking design	All elements are used appropriately and allow for limits of visual system	All elements are used appropriately	Text is a sensible size and well-spaced	Text is readable but in an inappropriate manner.	Unreadable
Creativity (10%)	Professional-looking design	Most graphic design elements work well	Aesthetically pleasing/elegant in its simplicity	Some graphic design elements that work well	Plain, with no attempt to add graphic design elements	Ugly

Comments

Title? Don't use 3D graphics, as the extra complexity of the diagram requires more cognitive effort to decode them.

- 1) Good.
- 2) Confusing. It would be better to show bar charts for each health board, or a stacked bar chart for each time period.
- 3) This suggests that a higher percentage of people are treated in under 4 hours at major units, which is untrue. You may be showing numbers in the pie chart, not percentages.
- 4) Why is one customers, and the other patients? And why are these different styles? Using the same style for both would make it easier to compare them.
- 5) You should show the whole data set, not just August.