

Grade 1 Ohio Social Studies Explorers



HQIM Analysis Report

Program Reviewed: Ohio Social Studies Explorers, Grade 1
Evidence Reviewed: Unit 1–4 overviews, Unit 1–4 storylines, Grade 1 Implementation Teacher Guide, Ohio Social Studies HQIM Rubric (April 2025)

NOTE: This analysis report was generated by providing ChatGPT with the unit overviews and storylines for all four units, along with the Implementation Guide. The prompt asked ChatGPT to provide an analysis of the curriculum based on the uploaded documents using Ohio’s Social Studies HQIM rubric.

Below is the **same HQIM analysis report format** you received for Grades 2–5—now completed for **Grade 1**, using the **Ohio Social Studies HQIM Rubric (April 2025)** and your **uploaded Grade 1 unit overviews, storylines, and implementation guide** .

Overall Rating: MEETS EXPECTATIONS

Gateway	Criteria	Max Points	Score	Rating
Gateway 1: Alignment	1.1 + 1.2	10	10	Meets
Gateway 2: Instructional Support	2.1 + 2.2 + 2.3	28	26–27	Meets
Overall	All criteria	38	36–37	Meets Expectations

Summary: Grade 1 is developmentally strong and HQIM-aligned: concrete time concepts and evidence-from-the-past tools (Unit 1) build into place/environment thinking (Unit 2), civic responsibility/fairness (Unit 3), and foundational economics (Unit 4). The inquiry structure and teacher usability are consistent; any possible scoring reduction would come from “committee-proof” documentation (centralized accommodations/assessment system), not instructional quality.

Gateway 1: Alignment (10/10) — MEETS

Criterion 1.1: Alignment to Learning Standards (4/4) — Meets

What the rubric looks for: grade-level standards present, appropriate rigor, coherent sequencing, accurate/evidence-based content.

Evidence from Grade 1 materials

- **Full coverage and explicit identification of Grade 1 content statements** across the year (as documented in the implementation guide “Year at a Glance”):
 - **Unit 1** (CS 1, 2, 3, 7): past/present/future; primary sources (photos/letters/artifacts/books); basic needs and cultural practices changing over time
 - **Unit 2** (CS 4, 5, 6): maps locate places; physical vs human characteristics; families interact with physical environment across time/places
 - **Unit 3** (CS 8, 9, 10): responsibility/accountability for common goals; collaboration/respecting others; rules/fairness/consequences
 - **Unit 4** (CS 11–14): scarcity/choices; goods/services; trade; currency as exchange
- **Coherent and developmentally logical sequence** (time → place → civic responsibility → economics) is explicitly laid out in the Grade 1 Year-at-a-Glance and pacing notes.

Score rationale: complete alignment + strong sequencing that fits how Grade 1 students learn (concrete → applied).

Criterion 1.1b: Primary/Secondary Sources + Variety of Mediums/Complexity (2/2) — Meets

Grade 1 appropriately uses “sources” as concrete evidence:

- Unit 1 explicitly teaches learning about the past through **photographs, letters, artifacts, and books** (primary-source concept is stated directly in teacher background).
 - Storylines show consistent use of varied media: time capsule items, videos, books/read-alouds, “investigating primary sources,” and student-created products (timelines, maps, reflections).
 - Unit 2 uses maps (including Google Maps in the storyline) and hands-on map/key work to build geographic literacy.
-

Criterion 1.2: Social Studies Practices & Disciplinary Literacy (6/6) — MEETS

1.2a Inquiry-based instruction (2/2) — Meets

Grade 1 storylines show consistent inquiry flow with clear lesson progression and student outcomes:

- Unit 1 includes Engage (time capsule), Explore (timeline creation), Explain (sharing/justifying), Elaborate/Evaluate (calendar/months + primary source work).
- Unit 4 uses a concrete scarcity hook (cookie activity), followed by structured choice tasks, classification (goods/services), and reflection.

1.2b Disciplinary literacy across history/geography/civics/econ (2/2) — Meets

The program builds grade-appropriate disciplinary habits:

- **History/time:** past/present/future categories; sequencing; evidence from primary sources
- **Geography/place:** map purpose; locating places; physical vs human characteristics; families and environment across times/places
- **Civics:** responsibility/accountability, collaboration/respect, fairness-based rules and consequences
- **Economics:** scarcity/choices; goods/services; trade; money/currency

1.2c Discourse + perspectives + credibility (2/2) — Meets

For Grade 1, this is appropriately met through structured discussion, partner talk, sharing, and respectful collaboration routines:

- repeated discussion/debrief structures in storylines (students explain timelines, compare ideas, solve helping scenarios, reflect on fairness/choices)
- Unit 3 explicitly focuses on respecting others' rights/opinions in collaboration and fairness in rules/consequences—core discourse norms in early civics learning.

Gateway 1 Total: 10/10 — MEETS

Gateway 2: Instructional Support (26–27/28) — MEETS

Criterion 2.1: Assessment (5–6/6) — Meets

Strengths

Assessment is present and developmentally appropriate:

- Unit 1 includes student-created products (timelines/time capsule artifacts) and calendar/month sequencing tasks.
- Unit 2 includes map tasks with symbols/keys/directions and map creation to demonstrate understanding.
- Unit 3 includes reflective products (e.g., “My Helping Hand”) and applied responsibility/fairness scenarios.
- Unit 4 includes “show what you know” style reflections and applied classification/choice tasks tied to scarcity, goods/services, and community jobs.
Implementation guidance reinforces that assessments should prioritize explanation and application over recall.

Potential “strict reviewer” point deduction

As with other grades, committees often award the maximum score when a curriculum includes a single centralized assessment overview that explicitly includes:

- consistent scoring tools (simple rubrics/checklists, exemplars), and
 - accommodations guidance for assessments.
Your assessment design is strong; centralizing documentation reduces reviewer ambiguity.
-

Criterion 2.2: Student Supports (10/10) — Meets

Grade 1 is highly supportive and well-scaffolded:

- concrete hooks (time capsule, Google Maps neighborhood maps, helping scenarios, scarcity cookie activity)
 - multimodal learning: speaking, drawing, writing, role-play/discussion, sorting/classification, visuals/books/videos
 - strong conceptual scaffolding: repeated sequencing, categorizing, and “explain your thinking” routines at a first-grade level
-

Criterion 2.3: Teacher Supports (11/12) — Meets

Strengths

- Implementation guide provides pacing guidance and clearly states that Units 3 and 4 benefit from additional discussion/role-play time due to abstract concepts (fairness, trade, choice)—strong teacher usability.
- Unit overviews include clear teacher background and conceptual framing (especially Unit 1 time/primary sources; Unit 4 scarcity/choices and economic language).
- Storylines provide practical planning supports: time, materials, vocabulary, and student outcomes.

Why not a full 12

To consistently earn 12/12 in adoption reviews, programs usually include one clearly labeled, centralized section compiling:

- differentiation + accommodations toolkit (EL/IEP/advanced learners), and
 - repeatable routines/protocols (discussion norms, evidence routines, checks for understanding) in one place.
- Many of these supports are embedded across lessons; centralizing them improves “review-proofness.”
-

Gateway 2 Total: 26–27/28 — MEETS

Final Rating: MEETS EXPECTATIONS (36–37/38)

Biggest strengths

1. **Developmentally appropriate inquiry design** with concrete hooks and repeated routines (discussion, creation, reflection).
2. **Strong evidence-from-the-past foundation** (photos, letters, artifacts, books) that builds real historical thinking for Grade 1.
3. **Coherent yearlong progression** supported by pacing guidance and implementation priorities.