



National Trust *for* Historic Preservation
**Where Women
Made History**
Telling the full American story.



**LOS ANGELES
CONSERVANCY**

A Toolkit for Change: The Los Angeles Women's Landmarks Project

Setting Priorities with an Impact Score

Background

With only 2 percent of Historic-Cultural Monuments (HCMs) designated for women's history, how do we even begin to choose just a handful of sites for amendment or designation out of the hundreds of overlooked sites of women's history?

The L.A. Women's Landmarks Program (LAWL) Impact Score developed out of this simple question. We had a list of forty-three existing designations for potential amendment and a list of three hundred sites for potential new designations. We needed a systematic way to measure the potential impact of a new designation or amendment toward the project goals and values. This ultimately allows us to determine which sites to prioritize during different project phases.

The overall score is determined in two parts. Part 1 (Impact Level) measures how well a potential amendment or designation aligns with project goals. Part 2 (Priority Level) evaluates the factors that determine if a site is very high, high, medium, or low priority. The higher the score in individual categories and overall, the more the potential amendment or designation aligns with the project's goals and values. The scoring process is designed to be a conversation between the project team.

This score is not intended to provide a definitive metric whether the LAWL project team should or shouldn't pursue a particular amendment or designation. It is a tool that helps categorize an ever-growing list of underrecognized sites of women's history and how well those sites align with the project's overall mission.

Once you review the score parameters below, we've provided the **Template: LAWL Impact Score (Spreadsheet)** located in the Evaluation and Assessment part of the toolkit.

Impact Score

Part 1–Impact Level

Designed as a checklist, each category represents a key project goal. Adapt as needed based on the goals of the project and organization.

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	POINT VALUE
Underrepresented Neighborhood*	This HCM is in a neighborhood that is minimally represented in current designations. Project Goal: Increase the geographic diversity of HCMs and reflect the contributions of women throughout the City of Los Angeles	0 – No 1 – Yes
Intersectional History	This HCM reflects women from diverse backgrounds, highlighting different races/ethnicities, socioeconomic statuses, immigration statuses, LGBTQ+ history, and disability history. Project Goal: Tell a more complete, more diverse story of all the women who shaped Los Angeles	0 – No 1 – Yes
Community Interest	There is community interest in amending/designating the site and/or the site is regularly used by the community it is located in. Project Goal: Involve the community in the amendment/designation process as much as they are willing and able	0 – No 1 – Yes
Owner Support	Owner is supportive and/or involved in the nomination/amendment. Project Goal: Pursue owner-supported amendments/nominations	0 – No 1 – Yes
Council Member Support	Council member supports nomination or amendment. Project Goal: Gain council member support for amendments/designations	0 – No 1 – Yes
Integrity	Building exists and resembles what it once was. Project Goal: Convey women’s history in everyday surroundings	0 – No 1 – Yes

* A review of HCMs by Los Angeles Community Plan Area revealed the most represented neighborhoods out of over 1,300 HCM designations: Hollywood (220), Wilshire (166), Northeast Los Angeles (152), Downtown (143), South Los Angeles (123).

Part 2–Priority Level

While many sites might have a high impact level, these categories help determine which sites are higher priority. These categories are weighted and require discussion to determine point value.

CATEGORY	DESCRIPTION	POINT VALUE
Other Interested Group(s)	Are there other individuals or groups interested in working on the amendment or designation? Is there a potential partnership to share the workload?	0 – No 1 – Potential groups/individuals, but need to contact and establish partnership 2 – Identified group/person has communicated interest and willing to partner
Level of Work	What is the necessary level of work needed to bring this HCM to current standards? Are there enough accessible primary and secondary resources to amend/designate within the desired time frame?	0 – Difficult access to material, would require significant time or money to complete amendment or nomination 1 – Manageable with longer time frame 2 – Manageable level of work for project team within desired time range
Under Threat?	Is the site under threat of demolition or significant alteration? Consider issues such as gentrification, environmental threats, and demolition by neglect.	0 – No Threat 1 – Potential Threat (such as in neighborhoods with high rates of gentrification or original residents leaving) 2 – Immediate Threat (active plans to demolish or significantly alter)
Precedent Setting?	Does this site allow us to incorporate new methods (such as oral histories), expand existing practices, or challenge how historical narratives are told?	0 – No, adheres to current practices 1 – Challenges methods OR challenges narratives 2 – Challenges methods AND challenges historical narratives or the city, neighborhood, or specific site

Final Score and Recommendations

POINT RANGE	LEVEL	RECOMMENDATION
11 - 14	VERY HIGH	Prioritize site for amendment or designation.
8 - 10	HIGH	Strong candidate. Explore ways to share this story in the short term. If unable to prioritize currently, discuss options to pursue amendment/designation in the future (another phase, through partners, etc.) Requires further discussion about any potential issues with pursuing amendment/nomination.
5 -7	MEDIUM	Not priority for amendment or designation by LAWL. Consider alternate ways to share this history. Could be moved to HIGH if there is another reason (not reflected in scoring) it should be considered.
0 - 4	LOW	Not priority for amendment or designation by LAWL.

Prepared by Arabella Delgado, Lead Researcher, L.A. Women’s Landmarks Program.