



Lost Stories: Historical Marker Criteria

While historical markers may attempt to accomplish many goals, it can be argued that these commemorative pieces all **address historically significant individuals or events** and aim to **communicate a clear message** in a way that is **impactful**. With this in mind, the following criteria are suggested for the evaluation of students' planned historical markers.

Evaluation of the Proposed Historical Marker:

1. Historical Significance (Explained Orally by Students)

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
A clear and convincing case was made for the individual's or event's historical significance by appealing to several of the criteria for historical significance (i.e., scope and scale, causal impact, impact on present, symbolic impact).	A strong case was made for the individual's or event's historical significance by referring to several of the criteria for historical significance (i.e., scope and scale, causal impact, impact on present, symbolic impact). Additional details or more in-depth explanation would provide greater clarity.	A solid case was made for the individual's or event's historical significance. However, the justification was either lacking in detail or made use of the criteria for historical significance in a superficial fashion.	The case for the individual's or event's historical significance made little or no use of the criteria for establishing historical significance.

2. Marker Communicates Clearly

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
The marker is visually clear . A passer-by can easily comprehend the marker and all of its parts.	The marker is generally visually clear. One or two small features may be difficult to understand.	The marker is somewhat visually clear. Several features may be difficult to understand.	The marker is difficult to understand.
The most important aspect(s) of the event are highlighted . The design team has carefully chosen the content and is able to provide a clear and convincing rationale for their choices.	Important aspect(s) of the event are highlighted, however, the design team's criteria could be clearer or more convincing.	Some of the included material seem unconnected to the narrative the design team is attempting to convey.	The design team has either focused upon unimportant events, given their chosen narrative, or lack criteria to justify their choices.
There is a clear narrative . A passer-by can understand the design team's intention.	The narrative is mostly clear. One or two small aspects of the marker may be difficult to understand.	The narrative is somewhat unclear. Many aspects of the marker are difficult to connect to the narrative.	The narrative is unclear.

3. Impactful

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
The marker catches attention . It would be hard to walk past without stopping.	The marker draws attention, but lacks the ability to stop someone in their tracks.	Parts of the marker may catch attention.	The marker would be easy to miss.
The marker generates a strong reaction in its audience . (This can range from raising questions or stirring curiosity to emotional reactions of anger, sadness, or pride, but a strong marker will have an impact on its audience).	The marker is likely to generate an emotional response from many individuals.	The marker will have an emotional impact on a small number of individuals (e.g., those already impacted by the issue).	The marker is unlikely to lead to any emotional response.
The marker is respectful . While the marker raises questions about the event(s), it does so in a respectful fashion.	The marker is neutral and avoids dealing with potentially controversial issues.	While the marker intends to be respectful there is a possibility of it being misunderstood.	The marker is likely to offend some of its audience.

4. Evaluation of Student “Pitch” of Marker (Communicating Presentation)

Outstanding	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
The students began with a clear and compelling hook .	The students began with a clear hook .	The students began with a hook.	There was no hook
The students maintained a connection with their audience .	The students made a connection with their audience .	The students tried to connect with their audience .	The students did not try to connect with their audience .
The pitch flowed and maintained audience interest .	The pitch usually flowed and maintained audience interest .	The pitch occasionally flowed and maintained audience interest .	The pitch did not flow and/or maintain audience interest .
The pitch clearly explained the need for the new marker by outlining the importance of its narrative	The pitch offered some explanation for the need for the new marker	The pitch offered minimal explanation of the need for the new marker	The pitch did not explain the need for the new marker
The students made excellent use of non-verbal communication techniques (eye contact, use of gestures, posture).	The students made good use of non-verbal communication techniques (eye contact, use of gestures, posture).	The students made some use of non-verbal communication techniques (eye contact, use of gestures, posture).	The students made limited use of non-verbal communication techniques (eye contact, use of gestures, posture).
The students made excellent use of verbal communication techniques (vocabulary, projection, fluidity).	The students made good use of verbal communication techniques (vocabulary, projection, fluidity).	The students made some use of verbal communication techniques (vocabulary, projection, fluidity).	The students made limited use of verbal communication techniques (vocabulary, projection, fluidity).