

Grade 3 Ohio Social Studies Explorers



HQIM Analysis Report

Program Reviewed: Ohio Social Studies Explorers, Grade 3
Evidence Reviewed: Unit 1–4 overviews, Unit 1–4 storylines, Grade 3 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.

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 3 is strongly aligned to Ohio’s standards, consistently inquiry-driven, and highly usable for teachers. The only “near-perfect” opportunities are mostly **documentation-level** (e.g., making accommodations/assessment system language more explicit in one consolidated location), not gaps in instructional quality.

Gateway 1: Alignment (10/10) — MEETS

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

What the rubric looks for: clear alignment to grade-level standards, coherent sequencing, accurate/evidence-based content, and inclusion of multiple perspectives where appropriate.

Evidence from Grade 3 materials

- **Full coverage and clear identification of content statements** across the year:
 - Unit 1: CS 1–4 (timelines, sources, local change, map types/elements)
 - Unit 2: CS 5–8 (daily life/resources, human modification, transportation/communication, cultural groups)
 - Unit 3: CS 11–13 (laws + authority + local government structures)
 - Unit 4: CS 14–20 (graphs over time, incentives, scarcity/trade-offs, markets, budgeting, costs/benefits)
- **Coherent progression:** the year intentionally builds tools first (maps/timelines/sources in Unit 1), then applies them to communities/environment/government/economics (Units 2–4). This sequencing is explicitly reinforced in the Year-at-a-Glance guidance.
- **Rigor matches expectations:** “I can” targets consistently reflect Ohio’s intent (e.g., interpreting maps using title/key/grid/directions; distinguishing primary vs secondary sources; evaluating impacts of laws; justifying economic decisions with scarcity and costs/benefits).

Score rationale: Clear alignment + coherent sequence + strong match to grade-level expectations.

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

- Unit 1 explicitly teaches and uses **primary and secondary sources** to analyze community change over time, alongside maps and timelines.
 - Units regularly incorporate **videos, read-alouds, articles, photo analysis, maps, and data displays**, creating a strong multimodal source ecosystem.
-

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

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

The program consistently uses an inquiry cycle (Engage → Explore → Explain → Elaborate → Evaluate) at the exploration level. For example, Unit 1 Exploration 1 clearly sequences an Engage (video + T-chart), Explore/Explain (source-based reading + student presentations), Elaborate/Evaluate (hands-on mapping), and an explicit assessment.

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

- **Geography:** map elements, physical vs political maps, location skills
- **History:** timelines (years/decades/centuries), sourcing (primary/secondary), change over time
- **Civics:** laws, authority, community impact, local government structures
- **Economics/data literacy:** consumers/producers, markets, incentives, scarcity, budgets, graphs and interpretation

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

Frequent, embedded structures for discussion (debriefs, Think–Pair–Share, anchor charts, compare/contrast, scenario analysis) appear throughout the storylines, supporting evidence-based talk.

Unit 1 and Unit 2 also position students to consider **how communities differ** and how people interact with environments and cultural groups—natural entry points for perspective-taking and community-connected discussion.

Gateway 1 Total: 10/10 — MEETS

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

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

Strengths

- Clear recurring assessment moments at the end of explorations (e.g., “Exploration 1 Assessment”) and ongoing checks for understanding via discussion, products, presentations, and performance-like tasks.
- The implementation guide explicitly emphasizes that assessment should require explanation/application rather than recall.
- Multiple modalities: mapping products, anchor charts, categorized law sort, scenario-based reasoning, economics simulations and justification tasks.

The system is strong, but the materials would score highest if there were a **single consolidated assessment system page** that explicitly names:

- common scoring tools (rubrics/exemplars), and
 - a clearly labeled accommodations set tied to assessments (even if already used in practice).
- (Your implementation guide moves toward this, but a dedicated one-pager would remove all reviewer doubt.)
-

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

- Varied approaches and modalities over time: visuals/photos, read-alouds, videos, articles, hands-on mapping, classification/sort tasks, community “mini-tour” analysis, product design/selling plans, graph interpretation, budgeting.
 - Frequent opportunities for students to explain thinking, revise understanding through debriefs, and apply concepts in new contexts (e.g., mapping skills applied to community landmarks; laws tied to places; economics concepts tied to real community examples).
 - The year-at-a-glance guidance supports pacing and instructional planning that keeps inquiry visible (supports consistent engagement for diverse learners).
-

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

Strengths

- Strong teacher-facing clarity: unit summaries, teacher background sections (notably robust in Units 1–4), inquiry-stage tables, materials lists, key vocabulary, student outcomes.
- The implementation guide provides pacing guidance and practical “how to use” steps (unit-at-a-glance, exploration prep, misconceptions, discussion/writing/source use).

Why not a full 12

To reach a “can’t-miss” 12/12 for many committees, add a short, standardized section that is easy to point to during adoption:

- **Differentiation & accommodations toolkit** (EL/IEP/advanced learners) in one place
 - **Source credibility & perspective routines** labeled as repeatable protocols
These supports appear implicitly via lesson structures and discussion routines, but committees often reward the “one-stop” documentation.
-

Gateway 2 Total: 26–27/28 — MEETS

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

Biggest strengths

1. **Excellent standards alignment + coherent yearlong progression** (tools → application across disciplines).
2. **Authentic inquiry structure** visible in storylines and supported in implementation guidance.
3. **Strong disciplinary literacy**: maps/timelines/sources (history/geography), laws/government (civics), decision-making and graphs/budgeting (economics).