Presenter Names:

_____

Map Presentation Rubric

Presentation Style	4	6	8	10
Eye contact/non-verbal communication	Never looks at audience. Many distracting uses of hands or body movement.	Decent eye contact and several distracting mannerisms or body movement.	Good eye contact with the occasional distracting body movement.	Good eye contact with audience. Effective "stage presence." No distracting movements.
Map visibility	Maps are not clearly visible. Mapping platform not ideal.	Most maps (if there are multiple) are clearly visible. Choice of mapping platform is not ideal	Most maps (if there are multiple) are clearly visible. The choice of mapping platform is effective.	Maps are clearly visible. The choice of mapping platform (static map, map series, storymap) complements the historical question.

/20

Time Limit	14	16	18	20
15-20 minutes	Students went significantly under or over time.	Students went over time (more than 20 minutes)	Students went under time (less than 15 minutes)	Students kept within time limit

/20

Map Content (Ideas)	19	11	13	15
Historical Question	Map does not address historical question.	Map addresses historical question, but not several parts of the map(s) clearly relate to the subject	Map addresses historical question, but not all parts of the map(s) clearly relate to the subject	Map clearly addresses (or answers) historical question.
Redlining Component	Map makes no connections to redlining and/or segregation	Map makes few connections to redlining and/or segregation	Map makes some connections to redlining and/or segregation, but those connections are not clearly expressed	Map clearly addresses some aspect of redlining and/or segregation
Creativity	Map visibly lacks creative use of platform potential	Map makes some creative use of platform potential	Map demonstrates a creative use of the platform, but does not employ multimedia, text to the best extent	Map demonstrates a creative use of the platform (inc. multi-media, text if applicable)
Sources	No sources are identified	Some sources are identified, some are scholarly but they are minimal and/or are incorrect	Sources are present, though difficult to find. Many sources not scholarly	Sources are clearly present and accurate. Scholarly.

/60

Map Content (Visualization)	4	6	8	10
Symbology	Map symbology is difficult to read/understand	Map uses consistent symbols, but they do not seem logical and/or seem cluttered.	Map makes clear, consistent, and logical choice of symbols, but their placement is confusing.	Map makes clear, consistent, and logical choice of symbols. Not cluttered.

Color	Map has a very poor use of color	Maps use of color is distracting and/or illogical	Map generally uses an effective color scheme, with some minor problems	Map uses an effective color scheme. Good choice of contrast, transparency, lightness (if applicable)
Balance	Poor choice of basemap, ineffective balance of data/non-data areas.	Decent balance between blank (data-less) parts of map, and those containing data and the basemap is distracting.	Good balance between blank (data-less) parts of map, and those containing data, but the basemap is distracting.	Effective choice of basemap. Visual balance between content areas and non-content areas. (Effectively zoomed in/out)
Text	Poor use of text throughout the map	Text is clear in most parts of the map, but there are significant areas where text is either missing or unclear.	Text is clear, concise, and with a careful choice of text font size, but labels are not effective (and don't include multimedia if applicable).	Text is clear, concise, and with a careful choice of text font size. Labels are effective (and include multimedia if applicable).
Mapping Elements	Map makes poor use of additional elements	Generally effective use of mapping elements, but with 2-3 mistakes.	Generally effective use of mapping elements, but with one mistake. (i.e. the arrow is too big, the scale bar does not use even numbers/is too large, arrow too ornate, etc.)	Effective use of compass arrow, legend, scale bar, and title. (if applicable)

/50

TOTAL: /150

Additional Comments/Notes for Peer Evaluation: