

Grade 5 Ohio Social Studies Explorers



HQIM Analysis Report

Program Reviewed: Ohio Social Studies Explorers, Grade 5
Evidence Reviewed: Unit 1–4 overviews, Unit 1–4 storylines, Grade 5 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 3 and 4—now completed for **Grade 5**, using the **Ohio Social Studies HQIM Rubric (April 2025)** and your **uploaded Grade 5 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	25–27	Meets
Overall	All criteria	38	35–37	Meets Expectations

Summary: Grade 5 is strongly aligned to Ohio’s standards and built around inquiry, disciplinary tools, and evidence use. The program is robust in content knowledge and skill-building (timelines/maps → civilizations → diversity/migration → government/economics). Any “point loss” risk is mostly tied to **how explicitly** the materials centralize accommodations/assessment system documentation, not instructional quality.

Gateway 1: Alignment (10/10) — MEETS

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

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

Evidence from Grade 5 materials

- **Full coverage and explicit identification of Grade 5 content statements** across the year (as documented in the Year-at-a-Glance and unit overviews):
 - **Unit 1** (CS 1, 4, 5, 6, 7): historical time conventions; geographic tools; latitude/longitude and climate generalizations; regions; human–environment interaction
 - **Unit 2** (CS 2, 3): early civilizations (Maya, Inca, Aztec, Mississippian) + European exploration/colonization and lasting effects
 - **Unit 3** (CS 8, 9, 10): American Indian cultural groups; push/pull factors; movement of people/products/ideas; cultural diversity and impacts
 - **Unit 4** (CS 11–18): public issues + research + data; types of government; present/future consequences; productive resources, specialization, trade, interdependence; careers
- **Coherent progression** is explicitly stated: Unit 1 “tools of the discipline” supports later investigations, and the implementation guide makes that intentional sequence clear (foundational tools → application to civilizations/diversity/government/economics).
- **Rigor matches expectations:** targets routinely require compare/contrast, analysis, evaluation, justification, and use of sources (e.g., evaluating impacts of exploration, analyzing push/pull, justifying decisions with costs/benefits, analyzing types of government).

Score rationale: Complete standards coverage + coherent yearlong structure + strong match to the intent of the grade-level expectations.

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

- Unit 3 explicitly emphasizes generalizations based on **multiple sources (primary and secondary)** and warns against stereotypes, which is a strong HQIM signal for source use and disciplinary thinking.
- Unit 4 explicitly expects students to use **almanacs, maps, trade books, newspapers, photographs, and digital resources** to investigate public issues and evaluate information.
- Storylines show recurring use of varied media: visuals/slides, artifacts, maps, station evidence packets, eBooks, and research-based tasks.

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

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

Grade 5 storylines consistently use inquiry cycles (Engage/Explore/Explain/Elaborate/Evaluate) with clear student products and discussion/debrief routines. For example:

- Unit 1 includes misconception checks, scavenger hunt timeline work, reading-based reasoning, and student-created multi-tiered timelines.
- Unit 4 uses info stations to evaluate sources and bias, interprets data displays, and culminates in applied evaluation tasks.

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

- **History:** chronology systems, timelines, causation and historical reasoning; civilization comparison; exploration and colonization impacts
- **Geography:** map tools, cartographers' choices, latitude/longitude and climate, regions and human–environment interaction
- **Civics:** government categories (democracy/monarchy/dictatorship), power relationships, citizen impacts, informed decision-making on public issues
- **Economics:** scarcity/trade-offs, costs/benefits, productive resources and specialization, trade/interdependence, careers and human capital

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

- Unit 4 explicitly builds credibility moves: information stations ask students to reflect on **bias and source reliability**, aligning directly to the rubric's credibility expectations.
- Unit 3 includes explicit framing that generalizations must be evidence-based and not stereotypes and that American Indian peoples are living cultures—strong alignment to multiple perspectives and responsible interpretation.
- Across storylines, frequent debriefs, discussion protocols, and writing tasks support evidence-based discourse.

Gateway 1 Total: 10/10 — MEETS

Gateway 2: Instructional Support (25–27/28) — MEETS

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

Strengths

- Assessment is embedded through:
 - performance-like products (timelines, maps, comparative organizers, presentations),
 - writing tasks (opinion/claim-evidence tasks in Unit 4),
 - inquiry evaluations at the exploration level,
 - and application tasks requiring evidence use.
- The implementation guide explicitly directs teachers to check that students demonstrate understanding through **explanation, comparison, evidence use, and application rather than recall**—a key HQIM assessment signal.

Potential “strict reviewer” deduction

To ensure an automatic 6/6 in committee scoring, many districts look for one centralized page that explicitly documents:

- accommodation options for assessments (without altering content), and
 - a consistent scoring system (rubrics/exemplars) across units.
- Your tasks are strong and often include rubrics/keys in practice, but centralizing this documentation tends to remove reviewer hesitation.
-

Criterion 2.2: Student Supports (9–10/10) — Meets

- Strong multimodal access: visuals, artifacts, stations, readings, research, mapping tasks, collaborative products, and discussion routines.
 - Multiple entry points over time: Unit 1 scaffolds disciplinary tools; Unit 2 builds structured comparisons; Unit 3 supports evidence-based generalizations; Unit 4 supports research and data literacy.
 - Unit 4 explicitly builds information literacy (checking accuracy, reliability, bias), which supports access for all learners by giving clear “how to” routines for evaluating sources.
-

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

Strengths

- Implementation guide provides a clear year-at-a-glance pacing plan, unit big ideas, exploration flows, and teaching priorities that keep inquiry visible and predictable for teachers.
- Unit overviews provide teacher background and conceptual framing (especially strong in Units 3 and 4) to support accurate instruction and prevent misconceptions (e.g., generalizations vs stereotypes; living cultures).
- Storylines provide practical planning supports: durations, materials, vocabulary, and student outcomes.

Why not a full 12

To reach 12/12 consistently, committees often want:

- a centralized differentiation/accommodations toolkit (EL/IEP/advanced learners), and
 - explicitly labeled repeatable protocols for discourse and source credibility (some are present, but not always centralized).
-

Gateway 2 Total: 25–27/28 — MEETS

Final Rating: MEETS EXPECTATIONS (35–37/38)

Biggest strengths (what HQIM reviewers will highlight)

1. **Exceptional coherence** across the year (tools → civilizations → diversity/migration → government/economics), explicitly documented in the implementation guide.
2. **Strong disciplinary literacy + evidence practices**, including explicit focus on source reliability/bias and evidence-based generalizations.
3. **Authentic, student-centered inquiry tasks** (stations, research, comparisons, writing and decision-making tasks with evidence).