# What if Tufte Ran the IR Office?

# by Liz Sanders, Isander3@depaul.edu 06/01/10 Chicago AIR

### The 6 Design Principles for Graphical Excellence

The purpose of an evidence presentation is to assist thinking. The principles of analytical design are derived from the principles of analytical thinking. These principles relate to both producing presentations and consuming presentations—after all, we're all in this together.

### Show comparisons, contrasts, differences

The fundamental analytical act in statistical reasoning is to answer the question "Compared with what?" Visual displays, if they are to assist thinking, should show comparisons.

### Show causality, mechanism, structure, explanation

The reason we examine evidence is to understand causality, mechanism, dynamics, process or systematic structure. Principles of design should attend to these tasks.

### Show multivariate data—more than 1 or 2 variables

The only thing that is 2-dimensional about evidence is the physical flatland of paper and computer screen. Strategies of design should make the multivariate routine.

### Completely integrate words, numbers, images, diagrams.

Tables of data are paragraphs of numbers, tightly integrated. Don't rely on a single mode of evidence-frame research questions along the lines of "how can something be explained?" Use whatever it takes.

Thoroughly describe the evidence-provide detailed title, authors and sponsors, data sources, measurement scales, and relevant issues. Take responsibility for the analysis, demonstrate credibility; give credit.

Analytical presentations ultimately stand or fall depending on the quality, relevance, and integrity of their out**comes.** Content counts most of all-and this suggests that the most effective way to improve a presentation is to get better content. Design cannot salvage failed content.

Taken from E. Tufte, Beautiful Evidence, pp. 120-139.

### How did we get started?

The first steps to a Tufte-centered approach to information design were to assess our readiness to change and then take inventory of what we do, and where the short/long-term opportunities are: standard management reports, research reports, ongoing research partnerships—action research projects, and formal presentations.

### Were we ready to change?

Attending the Tufte course motivated many to adopt new practices and begin to change. He is an engaging and funny lecturer. He lives his philosophy.

### Our short-term opportunities? Basic report and graphic modifications can begin immediately.

Supergraphic development is was next in our adoption process.

### Our long-term challenges?

Presentations and the supplemental materials continue to challenge us. Learning curves, presentation styles, and time restrains us.



The box of Tufte books that is part of the lecture series for all attendees. Tufte will autograph copies before class. Photo thanks to http://www.codinghorror.com/blog/2006/12/ reading-with-edward-tufte.html

### Some of Tufte's examples of good visual displays: The New York Times



This superb work was done by Amanda Cox, The New York Times, and published January 6, 2008. http://www.edwardtufte.com/bboard/g-and-a-fetch-msg?msg\_id=00035a&topic\_id=1



Sparklines: Theory and Practice. Discussion Board post by Mariano Belinky, March 2005. www.edwardtufte.com. For an interesting comparison between bar graph and sparklines, see: http://intepid.com/2004-12-06/23.32/

### **Tufte Sources**

Edward Tufte Publications below. Also visit http://www.edwardtufte.com/tufte/ Beautiful Evidence. Second Edition. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press. 2001. Envisioning Information. Second Edition. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press. 2001. The Visual Display of Quantitative Information. Second Edition. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press. 2001. The Cognitive Style of Powerpoint. Second Edition. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press. 2001.

These comments about Tufte's approach highlight the challenges that we continue to face: "Tufte is really proud of this graph (Napoleon's March to Moscow). I think this is one of the worst graphs ever made. He's very happy because it shows five different pieces of information on three axes and if you study it for 15 minutes it really is worth 1000 words. I don't think that is what graphs are for. I think you are trying to make a point in two seconds for people who are two lazy to read the forty words underneath." Seth Godin, http://www.juiceanalytics.com/writing/godins-take-on-tufte/

"Tufte completely ignores many different kinds of presentations. He seems to think all we do is analyze and present statistics! On the contrary. Among the presentation purposes that come immediately to mind are planning, overview, inspiration and motivation, explanation, and reporting. In all of these, PowerPoint can be useful. To my mind, it's not PowerPoint that is at fault, but the lack of skills in using it." Bob Horn, http:// www.sociablemedia.com/articles dispute.htm

"Edward and I disagree. He thinks people are a lot smarter than I do. He likes packing a ton of information into a slide and letting people teasing it out..." Seth Godin, www.sociablemedia.com/articles\_dispute.htm

"Tufte is so focused on the one problem he is unparalled at thinking about (information design) that he is missing several other problems that are equally important in this context (usability, usefulness, speed, appropriateness). Christopher Fahey, www.graphpaper.com

## **Better Visual Displays**

What we learned?

This is an analytical as well as a design challenge.

By moving away from simplistic unidimensional graphs to multi-graphic displays with adjacent information from blended software, information is richer, gives fuller picture of the data's story. Try new software experiment and try to teach old software new tricks.

Reader usability is key in this process: Have colleagues review the graphic: what do they see and how do they see it?

### What are the challenges?

This is a time intensive process, it is iterative, and software flexibility is limited. It is also time intensive for the reader, requiring a new level of engagement with the content in order to effectively receive the 'data dump.'

Sometimes, design compromises are required. Tufte completes his charts in Adobe Illustrator—we are not doing this.

### Better Reports What we learned?

We developed a standard design template for all reports, dense, with meaningful color changes, and conditional formatting. Our aim was to minimize the lines, grids, and non-essential ink, and provide relevant contextual information and documentation.

### What are the challenges?

Standard reports that are automatically generated were not an area for extensive redesign, annotation, and integration. Design modifications were focused on cleaning up chart-junk and providing relevant context.

Interactive reports such as pivot tables can be given a cleaner design, but are largely providing the reader with the ability to shape the data inquiry. This on-demand interface challenges design concepts, adjacent information, and annotation.







				He	adcount							Credit Hours								
		2008	2009	2010	2008-2009 Chg		2009-2010 Chg		2010	% of	2008	2009	2010	2008-2009 Chg		2009-2010 Chg		2010	% o	
		(4/26/2008)	(4/25/2009)	(4/17/2010)	#	%		%	Budget	Budget	(4/26/2008)	(4/25/2005)	(4/17/2010)		%	#	%	Budget	Budge	
Commerce	ugrd	4,291	4,360	4,247	69	1.6%	-113	-2.6%	4,419	96.1%	64,415	65,819	64,544	1,404	2.2%	-1,276	-1.9%	66,725	96.7	
	grad	2,089	2,108	2,098	17	0.8%	-8	-0.4%	2,263	92.7%	15,134	15,116	14,812	-18	-0.1%	-304	-2.0%	15,308	96.8	
		6,380	6,466	6,345	88	1.3%	-121	-1.9%	6,682	95.0%	79,549	80,935	79,356	1,386	1.7%	-1,580	-2.0%	82,033	96.7	
Communication	ugrd	1,041	1,243	1,376	202	19.4%	133	10.7%	1,505	91.4%	16,224	19,162	21,225	2,938	18.1%	2,063	10.8%	23,012	92.2	
	grad	132	199	241	67	50.8%	42	21.1%	220	109.5%	900	1,356	1,664	456	50.7%	308	22.7%	1,304	127.6	
		1,173	1,442	1,617	269	22.9%	175	12.1%	1,725	93.7%	17,124	20,518	22,889	3,394	19.8%	2,371	11.0%	24,316	94.1	
CDM	ugrd	987	1,115	1,248	128	13.0%	133	11.9%	1,082	115.3%	14,030	16,256	18,583	2,227	15.9%	2,327	14.3%	15,800	117.6	
	grad	1,903	1,767	1,760	-138	-7.1%	-7	-0.4%	1,593	110.5%	11,759	10,854	11,168	-905	-7.7%	312	2.9%	9,810	113.8	
		2,890	2,882	3,008	-8	-0.3%	128	4.4%	2,675	112.4%	25,789	27,110	29,749	1,322	5.1%	2,639	9.7%	25,610	116.2	
Educ	ugrd	707	754	849	47	6.6%	95	12.6%	684	124.1%	11.008	11,953	13,221	945	8.6%	1,268	10.6%	10,578	125.0	
	grad	1,325	1,328	1,460	3	0.2%	132	9.9%	1,304	112.0%	9,010	9,298	10,004	288	3.2%	706	7.6%	8,530	117.3	
		2.032	2.082	2.309	50	2.5%	227	10.9%	1,988	116,1%	20.018	21.251	23,225	1.233	6.2%	1.974	9.3%	19,108	121.5	
LA&S	ugrd	4,563	4,730	4,893	167	3.7%	163	3.4%	4,714	103.8%	67,256	69,385	72,525	2,129	3.2%	3,140	4.5%	68,553	105.8	
	grad	1,458	1.594	1.727	138	9.5%	133	8.3%	1.548	111.6%	9,955	11.110	12.513	1,158	11.6%	1,403	12.6%	10.091	124.0	
	×	6.019	6.324	6,620	305	5.1%	298	4.7%	6,262	105.7%	77,210	80,495	85,037	3,285	4.3%	4,543	5.0%	78,644	108.1	
aw	prof	0	0	0	0		0		0		0	0	0	0		0		0		
Music	ugrd	243	227	238	-16	-6.6%	9	4.0%	224	105.4%	3.925	3.634	3,742	-291	-7.4%	108	3.0%	3,598	104.0	
	grad	112	116	113	4	3.6%	-3	-2.6%	97	116.5%	785	851	771	66	8.4%	-80	-9.4%	674	114.4	
		355	343	349	-12	-3.4%	6	1.7%	321	108,7%	4,710	4,485	4.513	-225	-4.8%	28	0.6%	4.272	105.6	
SNL	ugrd	1.896	1.838	1.974	-48	-2.5%	136	7.4%	1.941	101.7%	11,454	11.742	12,981	288	2.5%	1,239	10.6%	12,566	103.3	
	grad	155	138	145	-17	-11.0%	7	5.1%	132	109.8%	786	774	744	-13	-1.6%	-30	-3.8%	715	104.1	
		2.041	1.978	2,119	-65	-3.2%	143	7.2%	2.073	102.2%	12.240	12,516	13,725	276	2.3%	1.210	0.7%	13,281	103.3	
Theatre	ugrd	278	281	283	5	1.8%	2	0.7%	287	98.6%	5,337	5,377	5,365	40	0.7%	-12	-0.2%	5,351	100.3	
	grad	35	38	39	3	8.6%	1	2.6%	35	111,4%	649	684	699	35	5.4%	15	2.2%	596	117.3	
		311	319	322	8	2.6%	3	0.9%	322	100.0%	5.986	6.061	6.064	75	1.3%	3	0.0%	5.947	102.0	
PD		43	64	52	21	48.8%	-12	-18.8%	58	92,9%	352	442	365	90	25.6%	-77	-17.4%	562	64.9	
Total	ugrd	14,037	14,612	15,158	575	4.1%	546		14,856	102.0%	194.000	203,770	212,550	9,770	5.0%	8,781		206,183	103,1	
	prof			.0,100	0		0		0		0	0	0	0		0		0		
	grad	7,207	7,286	7,583	79	1,1%	297	4.1%	7,192	105.4%	48,978	50,043	52,373	1,065	2.2%	2,330	4.7%	47.028	111.4	
University Total		21.244	21,898	22,741	654	3.1%	843		22.104	102.9%	242.978	253.812	264,923	10.835		11.111		253.773	104.4	

### Better Research Partnerships What we have learned?

Reaffirms analyst's role as data expert, and the purpose of these evidence presentation meetings as assisting thinking.

By moving away from simple, single-graphic presentation pages to multi-graphic displays with adjacent information from blended software, information is certainly richer. Many research partners are engaged in thinking about the information and appreciate the opportunity to have more complex discussions.

### What are the challenges?

This type of visual display development is a time intensive process.

Supergraphics are by design dense data dumps. Using them requires a change in culture—an engaged audience that wants to spend time looking at and thinking about the data. Some of our research partners want more synthesized findings, they don't want to analyze the data themselves.

### Better Presentations What we have learned?

As an expert in the data patterns, the analyst's role is to present the findings—the software plays a supporting role. We need to move away from bulleted lists of text and reading text to the audience. Presentation skills in both formal or informal environments are critical.

### What are the challenges?

Supergraphics require a change in culture, and an engaged audience. Our audience for larger presentations expects to be "presented" with findings and engage on implications. We struggle with the right Tufte-centered format for presentations. This transformation takes time. (Comment and Tufte's Response: Tufte website)

The problem is with presenters who misuse PowerPoint. PowerPoint is just a tool; why blame the software for bad presentations? When a carpenter makes a crooked cut, do we blame the saw? Just because some people do silly things in PP doesn't mean that PP has a problem; people do silly things in written reports also.

This makes one good point: responsibility for poor presentations rests with the presenter. But it is more complicated than that. PP has a distinctive, definite, well-enforced, and widely-practiced cognitive style that is contrary to serious thinking. PP actively facilitates the making of lightweight presentations.



🍪 DEPAUL UNIVERSITY