



DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF  
**EDUCATION**

## **Social Studies Standards Revisions**

*Public Comment Summary and Anticipated Agency Response as of Mar. 1, 2023*

In 2019 the DC State Board of Education (SBOE) passed resolution SR19-7, which included the directive to review, revise and update the District's social studies standards. From July to November 2020 the Social Studies Standards Advisory Committee (SSSAC), a local panel of social studies experts and stakeholders, met to draft guiding principles for standards revision. The [Guiding Principles](#) developed by SSSAC were approved by the SBOE in November 2020, in SR20-15. In February 2021, OSSE launched the DC Social Studies Standards Technical Writing Committee (TWC), which was charged with the review and revision of the social studies standards. The TWC, comprised of K-12 social studies educators from DC Public Schools, and public charter schools, as well as local and national technical experts, worked to draft, revise, and refine social studies standards from February 2021- December 2022. Consistent with the commitment made by OSSE to SBOE, OSSE released the standards for public comment on Dec. 16, 2022. Public comment closed on Feb. 10, 2023, and OSSE is working with content experts to ensure that the final document represents the strongest social studies standards in the nation. The following memo contains a summary of the feedback OSSE received from the public and key stakeholders in Dec., Jan., and Feb., 2023, as well as OSSE's planned revisions to the standards in response to these comments.

As of Feb. 13, 2023, 398 individuals have begun the public comment survey and 239 individuals have completed the survey. The largest groups of respondents were educators and administrators (34%), "Other/ Blank" (25%), and organizations (12%). Additionally, representatives from Georgetown University, Howard University, University of California, Berkley, Dumbarton Oaks (Harvard University Research Institute and Museum), The University of Pennsylvania and the DC History Center have commented on the standards.

Among the 272 individuals who identified their location, 66% were District residents and 34% were from outside the district. Many respondents who identified as living outside of the district identified themselves as District educators. All eight geographic wards are represented in the public comment feedback, with at least 13 respondents from each ward. Most respondents who identified their ward are from Wards 6 and 3; Ward 8 has the fewest number of respondents.

OSSE received eight letters from stakeholder organizations, The Sikh Coalition and The Foundation Against Intolerance and Racism, iCivics, Globalize DC, The Hindu American Foundation, a former State Board of Education (SBOE) member, The DC History Center and the Public Charter School Board. The Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Washington provided comments on specific standards but did not submit a letter. There has been one letter to the editor printed in the Washington Post about the standards.

OSSE held two listening sessions with local educational agency (LEA) leaders across the District on Jan. 25, 2023. In attendance were representatives from Maya Angelou Public Charter School (PCS), DC Prep PCS, District of Columbia Public Schools, Center City PCS, Friendship PCS, DC Bilingual PCS, Bridges PCS and Two Rivers PCS. Overall, LEAs expressed excitement with the new standards. Feedback was primarily centered around support for implementation, with smaller LEAs expressing hope that OSSE would produce supportive resources and professional development to help them develop new curricular materials.

In general, comments are specific and constructive. Commenters focused on specific grade levels and standards, with 33 respondents opting to provide holistic feedback.

The highest volume of feedback is currently focused on the breadth of the standards and the ability of educators to implement such broad standards. OSSE anticipated this feedback and intends to address much of it by developing supporting resources during the 2023-24 school year. However, during the review process OSSE will also make specific adjustments to clarify standards about which commenters expressed confusion .

The information provided below represents OSSE's current evaluation of standards during the review process, and is accurate as of Mar. 1, 2023. OSSE will continue to work with SBOE the TWC, and expert reviewers, and as such may make additional modifications in finalizing the standards.

If you have further questions about OSSE's anticipated response to public comment, please e-mail [OSSE.TTA.@dc.gov](mailto:OSSE.TTA.@dc.gov).

## State Board of Education Feedback Summary and Anticipated Response

On Feb. 16, 2023, OSSE received thoughtful and comprehensive feedback from the DC SBOE. OSSE's anticipated response to each feedback category is detailed below.

SBOE Evaluation Category	OSSE Response
<b>Student Civic Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• OSSE appreciates SBOE's recognition of the increased attention to student civic engagement throughout the standards. OSSE also appreciates the call to increase opportunities for global action.</li><li>• Grade 8 currently incorporates a global context for action civics in each Driving Concept.</li><li>• To respond to SBOE's comment that global opportunities for action is not fully realized, OSSE will incorporate an additional Driving Concept in Grade 8 that is focused on global opportunities for action.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Global Opportunities for action will focus specifically on global opportunities for humanitarian action and an evaluation of the appropriate levers of international change making (NGOs, International Policy, Diplomacy, etc.).</li><li>○ This concept will also include an evaluation of the Holocaust and global humanitarian crises to better incorporate additional feedback about the study of this pivotal event in history.</li></ul></li><li>• See grade 8 feedback below for additional details.</li></ul>
<b>Higher Order Thinking and Refining the Precision of Standards Language</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• OSSE appreciates SBOE's recognition of the important shifts in the higher order thinking skills present in the standards.</li><li>• To respond to SBOE's feedback that there are some instances in the draft where the standards may need to be revised to make the higher-order verbs more meaningful, OSSE will revise the verbs used within each standard to ensure the verbs are meaningful within the context of the standard, in particular replacing "evaluate" with "analyze" where appropriate or including a metric for evaluation.</li><li>• To respond to SBOE's feedback that some verbs detract from the usability of the standards, OSSE will continue to replace verbs like "examine," "explore," and "investigate" with verbs that more clearly define the student expectations.</li><li>• To respond to SBOE's feedback that OSSE revise standards language to ensure that it is meaningful outside of the context of the standards document, OSSE will continue to revise the language of standards to ensure that each is meaningful outside the context of the standards document, including specifying date ranges, regions and contexts as necessary.</li></ul>

<p><b>Environmental Literacy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares SBOE’s commitment to thoughtfully incorporate environmental literacy as a meaningful thread throughout the standards. Indeed, clearly articulating the importance of environmental literacy was a core priority of the educators on the TWC, who served as the primary drafters of the revised standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In grade 8 the standards instruct educators to use a case study approach to evaluate the Driving Concepts. OSSE will illustrate where environmental literacy or environmental justice is best utilized as a case study. However, including additional environmental impact standards may undermine the case study approach to action civics (i.e., should an LEA choose healthcare to evaluate government function, it would be difficult to meaningfully incorporate an environmental literacy standard). Accordingly, OSSE will not include additional environmental impact standards.</li> <li>○ The standards encourage educators to use environmental policy as the case study chosen for Driving Concept 4 - Power and Access to Power in Society. <i>“Throughout this Driving Concept, students should evaluate a specific public policy case, such as environmental policy, through the lens of power, and create a proposal for action.”</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• To remain consistent with best practices for action civics, OSSE will not further incorporate environmental literacy in grade 8. However, OSSE will include materials for using environmental literacy as a case study in ancillary guidance materials.</li> <li>• OSSE appreciates the feedback to further incorporate environmental literacy in US History II. Although US History II does not include Human Environmental Interaction anchor standards, the concept is not absent and is represented in the standards below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ US2.Inq.DC.22 <i>Evaluate the impact of progressive and populist movements on economic, social, and political inequality in America.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Hist.DHC.35 <i>Analyze the causes and consequences of the Dust Bowl, comparing it to other natural disasters, and the impact on Americans across racial/ethnic, ability and class groups.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Inq.DC.42 <i>Analyze the reasons for and the consequences of the United States decision to drop the atomic bomb, including the human and environmental impact of the decision.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Civ.CE.72 <i>Evaluate the tactics of modern social, labor, political, and environmental activist movements in America, measuring their success.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Civ.CE.75 <i>Analyze the advancements and challenges to the environmental movement after 2000.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• To remain consistent with the “fewer, clearer, higher” guiding principles and feedback that some courses still contain too many standards, OSSE will not incorporate additional environmental literacy standards in US History II. However, OSSE will ensure environmental literacy resources and matesupportrials are incorporated in the ancillary guidance materials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Digital Literacy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates SBOE’s interest in increasing digital literacy in K-12. In response to this feedback, OSSE will ensure that digital literacy and online civic reasoning is present in all grades K-12. Digital media literacy in social studies education encompasses skills that help students understand the limitations of information and develop students’ abilities to approach and fact check unfamiliar content.</li> <li>• OSSE also appreciates SBOE’s feedback to include more advanced strategies for digital literacy. However, advanced strategies for online digital research are best addressed through teaching civic online reasoning, which includes strategies of lateral reading and helping students make smarter selections from online search results (click restraint). These skills are already included in the standards.</li> <li>• Copyright laws, digital marketing and online safety are outside the scope of social studies standards, and OSSE will not revise the standards to include these skills.</li> <li>• OSSE is exploring methods for expanding educator understanding and implementation of digital literacy standards through the creation of a digital literacy community of practice and professional development resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Humanizing Language</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates SBOE’s thoughtful analysis of the language present in the standards and agrees with SBOE’s interest in ensuring that these standards are inclusive.</li> <li>• OSSE will work to ensure that educators have the necessary supports to understand how to translate this language into robust and inclusive curriculum.</li> <li>• OSSE appreciates and agrees with SBOE’s feedback that humanizing language can be further incorporated into upper grades., OSSE will revise additional standards to use humanizing language in upper grades, as appropriate.</li> </ul>

<b>Historiography and Interrogation of Evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates SBOE’s careful analysis of the incorporation of historiography and the interrogation of evidence in the revised standards.</li> <li>OSSE will continue to support historiography and interrogation of evidence by developing resources to support educators engaging their students in historical thinking.</li> </ul>
<b>White Supremacy &amp; “Hard History” in the United States</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates SBOE’s suggestion to expand the standards’ coverage of white supremacy, and where appropriate, will explicitly include standards that address how white supremacy has harmed religious minority and non white groups in the United States and abroad.</li> <li>In response to SBOE’s feedback that OSSE should include standards that further explore groups harmed by white supremacy, OSSE will add additional standards to address the impact of white supremacy on additional groups. OSSE will pay particular attention to the rise and impact of Islamophobia and Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) hate in making additions to the revised standards in response to this suggestion.</li> <li>Additionally, OSSE will include a Global Opportunities for Action Driving Concept in grade 8 that addresses the causes and methods for taking action to address global injustice.</li> <li>OSSE will include greater representation of religious minorities in American history and modify the standards to include a full understanding of individuals and groups who were harmed by discrimination and white supremacy in American history. See revisions to US History I and US History II, below.</li> <li>OSSE will also clarify the role of white supremacy in US History II Driving Concept 3: Empire, Expansion and Consequences.</li> </ul>
<b>Democratic Principles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates SBOE’s suggestion that the standards should increase focus on the fragility of democratic principles in our current society.</li> <li>In response to SBOE’s feedback that OSSE should incorporate more standards about the fragility of democracy, OSSE will expand <i>Driving Concept 1: What is the Role of Government in Society?</i> in Action Civics and <i>Driving Concept 1: Foundations of American Democracy in US Government and Civics</i> to include an increased focus on these themes.</li> <li>OSSE will include robust resources for supporting these topics through US History content in Grade 7 and US History II, including ancillary resources that include Federalist Papers and James Madison’s <i>Vices</i> as supporting source material for educators to use with their students. OSSE will make revisions to the content of the US History I and US History II courses to include a greater focus on Democratic Principles. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will add a standard to US History I <i>Driving Concept 3: A Newly Formed, Diverse Nation: Confederation to Constitution (1770s to 1800s)</i> that includes a specific focus on the democratic principles embedded in the constitution and the political debate surrounding its adoption.</li> <li>OSSE will expand 7.Hist.DHC.41 to include a specific focus on the debates between the Federalists, Democratic-Republicans and others about the democratic principles and their application in the early republic.</li> <li>OSSE will expand US History I Driving Concept Driving Concept 4: Invasion and Control: Expansion of the Nation (1800-1860) to include an evaluation of Jacksonian democracy.</li> <li>OSSE will revise US History I Driving Concept 7: Unresolved: The Reconstruction Era (1865–1877) to explicitly focus on the expansion and contraction of voting rights.</li> <li>In US History II OSSE will include voting and a greater evaluation of democratic principles in US2.Hist.HC.13, and Driving Concept 2: Rise of Industrial and Progressive America.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Reevaluation of Anchor Standards Labeling System</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates and agrees with the feedback that the anchor standards do not contain mutually exclusive skills and E is fully committed to reevaluating the anchor standard labeling System. The standards are intended to help educators further understand the skills that are associated with individual content standards and OSSE agrees with the feedback that social studies content is often interdisciplinary and can be labeled with multiple anchor standards. As such, OSSE will shift the function of the anchor standards so that they are similar in function to <i>Standards for History and Social Science Practice</i> in the Massachusetts state standards. OSSE will further revise and remove overlapping anchor standards.</li> <li>To further clarify how anchor standards can be used to support educators in developing curriculum, OSSE is producing a vertical articulation of anchor standards document that clarifies how social studies skills progress over the course of Grades K-12.</li> </ul>
<b>Vertical Alignment of Content and Skill</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the feedback and evaluation of the current vertical articulation of social studies content. OSSE remains committed to vertical alignment.</li> <li>Research on media literacy and skill standards suggests that learners understand in different way as sources increase in complexity in each grade level. Consistent with this, the language of the standard will not be revised, however, this is not inconsistent with vertical alignment. OSSE will not further revise the media literacy standards at this time.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the feedback that students are asked to identify the characteristics of the 13 British colonies twice and will revise 7.Geo.GR.19 to ensure there is vertical progression of skills between grades 4 and 7 and will include language asking students to apply this understanding.</li> <li>The media literacy standards listed in the SBOE feedback are vertically aligned; in grade 8 students are merely comparing coverage of an issue of concern, while students in grade 12 DC history are comparing and using that information to consider the credibility and perspective of each account.</li> <li>OSSE appreciate the feedback that the standards asking students to analyze maps of the DC region do not support a deeper and more nuanced understanding over time and will revise standards that include maps of the DC region to ensure greater vertical articulation of skills over time, including an increasingly sophisticated analysis and application of mapping skills.</li> <li>OSSE will revise standards across all grade levels to ensure that stylistic conventions are consistent, however, the final draft will maintain some differences in granularity to accommodate the different nature of different social studies disciplines. To meet instructional goals of different disciplines within social studies, different courses necessarily require different levels of detail in each standard and each Driving Concept. Grades 6 and 8 appropriately focus on case study analysis for the development of social studies skills, rather than focus on developing skills through content.</li> </ul>
<b>Scale Back the Thematic Approach to Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates and agrees with SBOE’s feedback to revise the thematic standards to narrow the scope of the themes and ensure they are manageable for educators and will revise grade 6: World Geography and World History II. The thematic case study approach in grade 6 allows educators to focus on current global issues and events that are most germane to their students and develop geographic thinking skills throughout the course. OSSE will clarify language in the grade 6 Geography course to provide appropriate guidance for educators. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Current:</b> 6.Inq.DQ.22 <i>Analyze contemporary issues facing people of Africa, and identify characteristics and causes of these issue(s).</i></li> <li><b>Revision:</b> <i>Analyze at least one contemporary issue facing one region or country within Africa and identify characteristics and causes these issue (s).</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>For additional updates to grade 6 standards, see the grade 6 analysis below.</li> <li>OSSE will more clearly define the canon of content for the World History II course by shifting to the same approach that is utilized in World History I. OSSE is also working to significantly reframe and update World History II. For additional updates to World History II standards, see the analysis below.</li> </ul>
<b>Reframing Global Perspectives, History, and Cultures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE agrees with SBOE’s feedback that World History II remains too Eurocentric and appreciates SBOE and the public’s engagement on this topic. OSSE is currently partnering with the University of Pittsburgh World History Center to reframe and decenter European perspectives in the World History II course.</li> <li>In response to SBOE’s feedback that OSSE should decenter Europe to help students understand the rich experiences and history of people in other parts of the world beyond ancient history, OSSE is expanding grade 2 to include African, Asian and American histories between 1100 and 1400 so students have deeper context of the rich histories of different global societies.</li> <li>OSSE will include additional standards that address the context of immigration and global context for revolutions in grade 4 and grade 7.</li> <li>OSSE agrees with and appreciates SBOE’s feedback that global history needs to be further incorporated into the standards and will include a Global Civics focus in grade 8 that is inclusive of an evaluation of global genocides including the Holocaust.</li> <li>OSSE will rephrase the culture standards in grade 6 to consider how cultural practices or ideas hold intrinsic importance to people within those cultures. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Analyze at least one cultural element of a country located in Asia (i.e. art, literature, music, dance, cuisine, philosophy, religious or political thought), including its local significance and influence on other societies.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>For additional updates to the standards, see the analysis below.</li> </ul>
<b>Furthering the Inclusion of Under-Represented Groups</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE agrees with an appreciates SBOE’s feedback that the standards should actively combat false narratives about different religions and will include a Driving Concept in World History I that includes more comprehensive coverage of the rise, spread and influences of global religions in history.</li> <li>OSSE will expand the inclusion of the history of religious minority groups in the United States, including the history of Judaism, Islam and Sikhism in the United States. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will expand the history of immigration and citizenship in America. OSSE will also add an additional standard to the US Government course about the evolution of citizenship in the United States that includes <i>Thind v. United States</i> and <i>United States v. Wong Kim Ark</i>.</li> <li>OSSE will expand the standards to include a fuller understanding of AAPI and Latinx history in the United States, including both moments of struggle and moments of joy. OSSE is working with our expert reviewers to identify where we can meaningfully expand this history in the standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSSE will expand the role of queer history in the K-12 standards and is currently working to identify where we can meaningfully expand queer history in the K-12 standards.</li> <li>● The standards in grades K-2 were drafted to ensure students have windows and mirrors outside of their local communities in Washington D.C. OSSE will clarify the language in those standards and include additional supports for including windows and mirrors in illustrative content and concepts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Clarity Around Economics and Financial Literacy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OSSE appreciates SBOE’s analysis of the economic standards and understands the need to increase the number of standards relating to economics.</li> <li>● Economic principles are embedded as an interdisciplinary understanding in standards across K-12, including standards that are not labeled as explicitly economic standards. Some examples are included below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3.Inq.DC.24 <i>Use primary sources and demographic data to evaluate the changes in Washington, DC between the Civil War and the 1950s, including the impact of segregation, “Black Codes”, immigration, and industry on the district.</i></li> <li>○ 4.Inq.DP.6 <i>Evaluate historical evidence to explain the development of various economic and systems of trade of Indigenous peoples across the Americas (e.g., Inca Ceque system; the use of cacao as currency and the trade of turquoise and minerals in Chaco).</i></li> <li>○ 5.Inq.DP.45 <i>Compare the different experiences of servicemembers when they returned to the United States after the war, including white, Black, Latinx, Indigenous and Asian American servicemen.</i></li> <li>○ 5.HSC.HC.49 <i>Evaluate the reasons for and resistance to segregation in the North, including the impact of redlining and uprisings in the North and West.</i></li> <li>○ 6.Geo.HE.18 <i>Explain how population distribution, natural resources, and the history of Africa have impacted changes in land use over time.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>● The current draft social studies standards prepare students to understand systemic economic inequality by ensuring that students know the roots and causes of the current economic system, and include specific standards regarding redlining, resource distribution, and discrimination. OSSE will add additional economic standards where appropriate.</li> <li>● Although OSSE is not revising the social studies standards to include additional financial literacy standards, OSSE is open to exploring the development and adoption of standalone financial literacy standards.</li> </ul>

### General Feedback Summary and Anticipated Response

The comments below are from commenters who responded to the entire draft social studies standards, rather than individual standards.

Comment Summary or excerpt	OSSE Response
<p><b>LGBTQ+ and Gender Identity Feedback</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I wanted to say I am very thankful to see lgbtq+, Jewish, indigenous, and black identities highlighted in these standards. None of these groups received the focus that they deserved in past standards which has been shown to hurt student learning as they don't see themselves reflected in the curriculum. I am glad to see that these standards have followed the state board resolution SR21-7 on lgbtq inclusive education and I would like to see professional development sessions that allow and ensure that teachers around the city have the resources to teach this material.</li><li>• these changes are sorely needed especially in the current anti LGBTQ environment. bravo DC for leading the way. I strongly support the adoption of these standards and commend the board for considering, and hopefully approving, this vital update to the social studies curricula</li><li>• 2.Inq.ID.29 "Analyze the daily lives of different individuals in ancient societies including histories of same-sex relationships and gender fluidity in civilizations." I doubt whether many 2nd grade children are able to understand the concept of gender fluidity. It's a topic for health educators, not social studies teachers. "same-sex relationships" – The question I raise is: At what grade level or age can this be comfortably introduced to children by a teacher? This needs to be determined on the basis of student readiness. OSSE needs to provide clear guidance. The positive intention can easily run into trouble if not thoughtfully introduced.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement in response to these standards. It remains important that students from all family structures see themselves reflected in the curriculum. OSSE will develop curricular supports and professional development resources to assist educators with implementation.</li></ul>
<p><b>Focus on skills and inquiry</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Very thoughtful and relevant standards that will teach our students that history is not just about memorizing facts and dates, but about understanding history from multiple perspectives and developing critical thinking skills - skills that are essential for our future citizens and leaders</li><li>• I am in complete awe at how effective and inclusive the OSSE social studies standards are. Thank you for bringing awareness to telling a full history of the United States, being culturally responsive in thinking about the diversity of learners, and using best practices like the inquiry arc and interdisciplinary themes. Way to go! Approve, approve, approve!</li><li>• Wow! The new standards are amazing! I love the new Anchor Standards. You can tell that the Technical Writing Team thought deeply about the purpose of social studies and they centered disciplinary concepts throughout! What a wonderful expression of democracy throughout. The Inquiry anchor standards in particular are great. You can tell that the writers are versed in historical thinking skills. And this is true for the History anchor standards too. I see some things that are reminiscent of the college board's work. In particular in that section, I like the Drawing Historical Connections part here. WOW! Yes, this is the purpose of social studies. Making connections to better understand the present. I also see that most of the</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement, and the standards will remain the same in response to the supportive comments.</li><li>• OSSE will provide specific guidance to demonstrate the vertical articulation of anchor standards in each grade band.</li></ul>

<p>disciplines have an anchor standard that makes skills essential. Geographic Representations and Economic Decision Making put skills as a priority in each discipline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think maybe you should have added some way to explain how each grade level is different here. The anchor standards are a great expression of what ultimately you want for kids, but this would look different for a 7 year old and a 17 year old. Is there a way to show how an anchor standard gets more complex over time?? Maybe this is an academic question and is covered by the grade level standards themselves??</li> <li>• In addition to teacher-initiated inquiries, the draft standards provide opportunities for students to develop their own deep inquiries about American history and civic life, thereby allowing students to practice informed engagement around issues they find important to themselves, their communities, and their republic. Examples of these opportunities are present throughout the grade levels, but especially in middle school civics and high school government where students are expected to apply their learning. As in other subjects, such practical application is essential to civic learning.</li> <li>• "Love the ""Anchor Standard: Civics, Government, and Human Rights"" and the descriptions of the breakdown/descriptions for world gov'ts, US gov't, laws and policies, civic engagement....Love that the Anchor standard for Inquiry Arc includes civil discourse and ""respect for human rights"" as a factor in decision making.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Inclusion of occupations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am a D.C. educator who is pleased with the changes made to the OSSE social studies standards. I would include in the Anchor Standard at-a-glance pages in the section that is blank for Identity information for occupations. There is a need to increase student knowledge about the occupations and jobs related to Social Studies. I think it would be beneficial to include in the Identity section topics related to jobs and locations in D.C. where students can make connections to specific standards...</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the comment and the standard will remain the same in response to the supportive comments.</li> <li>• Occupations are incorporated into the current draft of the standards in standard 1.Econ.EM.31 <i>Explain the varied ways that people labor, define the term income, and describe the kinds of work that people do inside and outside of the home.</i> Because the professional landscape is constantly evolving, it is more appropriate for social studies standards to ensure that students are able to describe the various ways and occupations in which people work, rather than explicitly naming certain professions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Human Rights Inclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am very happy to see the strong inclusion of Human Rights within the anchor standards, and within the content of the rest of the standards themselves!</li> <li>• Suggest weaving in more explicit reference to human rights in 3-5 standards (4.Inq.DC.26, 4.Hist.CCC.29 &amp; 30)</li> <li>• There needs to be a specific discussion of Human Rights as a thematic guide for analysis of global, national and local historical periods, development of governmental systems, laws and political culture and as a motivator and analytical tool for civic engagement. It's fine that Human Rights is identified in the Anchor Standard. However, the Human Rights concept isn't given the treatment in the actual detailed description of the Anchor standard that Civics and Government are given.</li> <li>• Very good to see human rights concepts included in the youngest grade levels, as in K.Civ.WG.18, Grade 1 Working and Building Together. Also please[d] to see specific reference to human rights implications of the European settlement/occupation of the Americas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates commenters' support for the robust inclusion of human rights and intends to maintain the inclusion of this important topic in the final standards.</li> <li>• OSSE will incorporate additional references to human rights in 4.Inq.DC.29, grade 5 Driving Concept 7: The Long Civil Rights Movement and grade 7 Driving Concept 2: Colonization and Revolution.</li> <li>• In the current draft of the standards, human rights is addressed as an explicit theme for motivating civic engagement in 8.Civ.WG.23 <i>Research the history of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and analyze the rights enumerated in this document.</i></li> <li>• OSSE will expand standard 8.Civ.WG.23 to ask students to evaluate the application of these rights in modern contexts.</li> </ul>



### **Racism and White Supremacy in Social Studies Standards**

- It is clear from the following excerpts from the Guiding Principles that the revision process was framed through the lens of critical ethnic studies, which teaches that individuals are largely defined by their immutable characteristics... With such guiding principles, it is not surprising that the newly released Draft Standards have an overarching focus on immutable characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, gender, and ability, or external circumstances the children cannot control, such as socio-economic status and family conditions. The revised standards go as far as integrating “identity” in the anchor standards’ arc of inquiry, thereby violating the fundamental precepts of liberal education. There are no more Italians, French, English, Germans, Polish, Spanish, Czechs etc., only Europeans, used as an interchangeable concept for whites or a synonym of white power or supremacy. The latter expression is characteristically used to designate an unseen, ubiquitous power comprised of all white people united in a conspiracy against their fellow human beings of color, as if the term white supremacy were interchangeable with racial prejudice
- Please reconsider the knowledge-framing choice of anti-racism and intersectionality.
- The myopic focus on race and identity advanced in the draft curriculum is dangerous and divisive. The absolute worst thing you can teach a young African-American child is that the rules are stacked against them. Many will not try if they think they have not future in this country. Meanwhile, black and brown kids who emigrate to the United States will continue to thrive in what is the best country with most opportunity in the world. This is a cruel irony.
- As further evidence of essentialism and generalization, the word Europeans is used throughout most of the Draft Standards not to designate inhabitants of the European continents, but the optimum on the scale of domination.. Similarly, equating colonization with “white supremacy” leads to an oversimplification about the driving forces behind the subjugation of populations outside of Europe by a variety of European settlers, administrators, traders, etc, which could not be explained alone by the idea of racial prejudice. The use of such essentializing words, whether to designate victims or oppressors, constitutes an oversimplification of the infinite dynamics between individuals, families, clans, villages, neighborhoods, groups, tribes, nations, regions, etc., which have shaped the history of the world. Words such as BIPOC and indigenous as they are used throughout the Draft Standards reduce the infinity of possibility to clashes between monoliths whose members inevitably think, feel, and experience in the same way. For example, if the Draft Standards are adopted, students in second grade history will be asked, to “[e]valuate the impact of Jim Crow and other discriminatory laws in the North and South on the lived experiences of different individuals, including but not limited to Black, Latinx, and Asian Americans across different gender and socioeconomic contexts.”
- "I am writing simply to use my voice to express the educational validity, worth, and usefulness of standards that embed attention to marginalized and minoritized

- OSSE remains committed to ensuring that the revised DC Social Studies standards are historically accurate, including explaining the “hard history” of racism and white supremacy and the impacts of such ideologies on our society.

<p>racial, ethnic, and cultural groups. In particular, for students in the District of Columbia, rigorous attention to African-American history is necessary for all students as they grow into young adults who will participate in the civic life of the city. I am extraordinarily concerned about nationwide attacks on educators—particularly educators teaching Black history – and I am proud to send my child to a school system which rejects these hateful viewpoints. I am thankful that my child, who is white, is not being brought up to see his own self and identity as a default perspective, but is exposed to a diversity of perspectives and viewpoints. The ability to see himself as a one part of a larger whole of society is critical for his social and emotional development. I am grateful to our dedicated and passionate educators who work to ensure that all students are able to have “windows and mirrors” in the curriculum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I looked at the 4th-7th-HS US history progression. It looks like you did a nice job differentiating them. I see an increasing sophistication in the study over time. Nice progression in the academic challenge. In particular, I REALLY like what you did with the Reconstruction units! Bottom up history. Profoundly respectful of the lived experiences of African Americans. And you address the on-going legacy of the unresolved issues of the Civil War and the racism that ended Reconstruction. You went there! You called out white supremacy explicitly!!! YEAH!!!!</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Some content is not included in the standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By doing so, they ended up with standards that, unbelievably, fail to mention Chinese civilization, Greece, the Ottomans, Nazis, Stalin or even the word dictator. Though I know the standards writers were aiming to center anti-racism, these standards end up centering Europe more and the rest of the world less. That’s just not acceptable. The new standards also hugely miss the boat on the immigrant experience-globally, nationally and locally. As a former DC History teacher, I’m saddened the new standards don’t correct the old standards in failing to name the Mexican, Salvadoran and Ethiopian communities in DC. DC History without the explicit teaching about the Salvadoran and Ethiopian communities is not DC History. And throughout the standards the immigrant story is told mostly as it relates to major events in the dominant culture, not through the lens of the story of these communities themselves. Clearly a decision was made to prioritize broad themes over explicit content. To be honest, as a teacher I always wanted the opportunity to go deeper with fewer standards rather than on the surface with more. I am very aware that as history marches on and we condense a longer timeline into the same years of schooling, the challenge is immense. Not to mention the proper focus on being explicit about Black History, Latin@ history, LGBTQ history and much more. But switching to broader themes and removing the content was unnecessary. Instead, the right compromise is to plan the courses thematically but still be explicit what content fits under each theme. We must ensure standards are vertically aligned throughout the grades but not isolate themes to a certain grade band. Themes should “touch down” in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates and shares this commenter’s interest in ensuring that DC students are taught about the full range of DC’s immigrant communities.</li> <li>• OSSE will revise grade 3 Driving Concepts 3: The Evolving History of Washington, DC and Driving Concept 4: Today’s Washington, DC to include greater representation of the District’s immigrant communities.</li> <li>• In the current draft of the standards, Mexican, Salvadoran and Ethiopian immigration to Washington is included in grade 12, DC History: DC.Geo.HP.27 <i>Evaluate the reasons for and impact of changes to the District’s population at the end of the 20th century, including the impact of immigration from Central America, Asia and Africa.</i> Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• Globally, the immigrant experience is explicitly addressed though global geography standards such as 6.Geo.HP.52 <i>Analyze maps to trace the migration of people within, from, and to Europe over time, and assess the impact of migration on the region.</i> OSSE will clarify these standards to ensure they do not cover the full history of immigration on a continent, but instead explore a case study to trace the experiences of a specific group of individuals. OSSE will also expand grade 5, US History I and US History II standards to include a greater focus on the history and contributions of immigrant populations in America.</li> <li>• The Ottoman Empire is explicitly named in World History I Driving Concept 5: Early Modern Empires (1000 CE – 1600 CE). OSSE will keep this standard as written, with no revisions.</li> <li>• OSSE shares this commenter’s belief in the importance of ensuring that students understand the role of Joseph Stalin in history. Currently, two standards in World History II reference Stalin: WH2.Hist.HC.21 <i>Analyze the impact of industrialization on the Russian Empire, including the Bolshevik Revolution and the creation of the Soviet Union</i> and H2.Hist.CCC.41 <i>Analyze how totalitarian</i></li> </ul>

<p>each grade band and, in each, be tied to modern events students can use as a mental hook.</p>	<p><i>leaders came to power after World War I.</i> OSSE will ensure the World History II course is revised to include more specific content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares this commenter’s belief in the importance of ensuring that students understand Nazism. Currently, Nazism is included in two standards: US2.Civ.WG.39 <i>Evaluate the reasons for the rise of fascism and Nazism in Europe and the scapegoating of historically marginalized peoples (including Jewish, Romani, Slavic, disabled, and LGBTQ+ communities) by Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco</i> and WH2.Hist.CCC.43 <i>Evaluate the cause, course, and consequences of the Holocaust.</i> OSSE will add an additional Driving Concept to grade 8 Action Civics that includes an analysis of global humanitarian crises, including the Holocaust.</li> <li>• Chinese civilization is included in the standards several times. Several standards in grade 2 Driving Concept 3: Innovations of Long Ago specifically mention ancient Chinese civilizations, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.Hist.DHC.26 <i>Compare the various physical structures constructed across the Americas, Rome, ancient China and Aksum, and investigate the purposes of these structures (i.e., temples, pyramids, walls, etc.).</i></li> <li>○ World History I Driving Concept 3: Ancient Empires (800 BCE to 700 CE) includes Han China.</li> <li>○ World History I Driving Concept 4: Reorganization of Societies and Increasing Networks of Exchange (400-1200CE) includes the Sui, Tang, and Song Dynasties in China. World History I Driving Concept 5: Early Modern Empires (1000CE- 1600 CE) also includes the Song Dynasty in China.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• OSSE is currently partnering with the World History Center at the University of Pittsburgh to revise the World History II standards. World History II standards will be adjusted to decentralize European actions from the narrative, while continuing to provide space for educators to critically evaluate the global impact of colonization and imperialism. World History II will continue to approach history thematically; however, OSSE will revise World History II to align with the approach taken in World History I.</li> <li>• OSSE has budgeted \$500,000 to work with experts and educators to develop a comprehensive set of ancillary resources that further illustrate which content addresses the themes included in each standard. This approach allows individual LEAs to include content that is appropriate and timely in response to changing current events while focusing on the skills of historical inquiry and analysis.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standards do not include a hopeful message</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, I believe that the proposed standards may be less successful at creating engaged citizens because they do comparatively little to instill hope in students, or to provide visions of the capacity for human societies to achieve equity, justice, and universal thriving. To be ""engaged individuals who contribute to their communities,"" students must not only be able to identify systemic injustices but also must be motivated to address them. And it is hard to develop sustained, lifelong motivation for something one has little or no hope in. In particular, the 6th and 7th grade course descriptions emphasize deconstructive skills significantly more than constructive ones. In other words, students are taught thoroughly how to deconstruct the world around them, but they are not thoroughly taught how to build something up or create something. For instance, the 6th grade course uses the lenses of “power, privilege, and injustice” to understand “the use of natural resources, waste and pollution, and responses to climate change. .” 7th grade looks at early American history with a strong emphasis on conflict and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will not revise the standards in response to this comment. The standards include many opportunities for students to investigate both the promises and shortcomings of society and take action to address shortcomings or advance progress. The goal of standards is to provide neither a hopeful nor a pessimistic message about society but to allow students to fully investigate the world around them and arrive at their own conclusion. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 8.Civ.LP.24 <i>Identify the rights of Americans codified in the Constitution and to investigate the extent to which some of those rights have been realized.</i></li> <li>○ 8.Hist.CCC.25 <i>Analyze historic Supreme Court cases that establish, extend, or limit the rights of citizens.</i></li> <li>○ 8.Civ.CE.26 <i>Evaluate the ways different activist groups have used the court system to expand or limit the rights of citizens.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Each of these standards allows for students to analyze both progress and setbacks and provides students with the opportunity to explore the different avenues and means of change making.</li> </ul>

<p>the legacy of atrocities. All of these deserve significant, serious, sustained attention. But I wonder whether these courses could do more to emphasize human agency, including under circumstances of oppression and marginalization, and include more constructive analysis tools to identify successes and moments of progress, which might in turn inform students' present and future actions.</p>	
<p><b>Include Greater Representation of AAPI History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2021, when the DC social studies standards first went up for public comment, I and fellow students testified before the DC State Board of Education to demand that the standards be more inclusive of Asians and Asian Americans. We determined that the standards needed to include more AAPI and Asian culture, start introducing AAPI content in earlier grades, and include plans for directly exposing students to AAPI people and culture through programs like field trips.</li> <li>• However, in looking over the newest draft of the standards, we've realized that none of our recommendations were followed by the Office of the State Superintendent of Education, and in many ways the standards have regressed in their inclusion of Asians and Asian Americans. To summarize, we found that the standards fail to go into sufficient depth on AAPI culture, and also fail to cover a wide range of Asian countries. In addition, the standards are vague and Eurocentric, and are not exposing students directly to the AAPI communities here in D.C. The standards should be improved in these aspects because ultimately, a more thorough education on Asians and Asian Americans will help D.C. students be more understanding of these communities and therefore take the first step toward reducing anti-Asian hate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares commenters' commitment to fully representing AAPI history in these standards. DC History in grade 3, Driving Concept 3: The Evolving History of Washington, DC and grade 12 Driving Concept 3: Emergence of Modern Washington, DC will be expanded to include greater representation of AAPI history in the District of Columbia.</li> <li>• OSSE will update the following two standards to explicitly incorporate AAPI history: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.Inq.ID.3 <i>Explain the ways in which different communities, including but not limited to, AAPI, Latinx, LGBTQ+, Ethiopian, and Black Washingtonians, have shaped and defined the community of Washington, DC.</i> and</li> <li>○ 1.Civ.US.11 <i>Identify important leaders in our community past and present, including, but not limited to George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Susan B. Anthony, Harriet Tubman, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to include additional leaders.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Grade 6 Driving Concept 3: Asia was specifically crafted to allow educators to conduct case study analyses and geographic investigations into the culture and geography of a wide range of Asian countries. The language of all grade 6 standards will be further clarified so educators understand that the standards call for analysis of a specific city, country or phenomena and do not require an investigation of the full continent.</li> <li>• OSSE will expand the histories of AAPI, Latinx, religious minority and LGBTQ+ history in US history standards, including the study of immigration and nativism, as well as expanding stories of joy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level of Rigor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am concerned about the vertical alignment, developmental appropriateness, and the support that teachers will get transitioning. I think that these standards start to high level and although elementary students are quite capable and understand more than given credit for, I feel that these are too deep and many. I know it is not this simple, but I think if most standards were shifted over two years and a more solid foundation of inquiry, civics, history, geography, and economics were built this would have more success. Thinking in terms of less is more. 27-35 social studies standards is a lot for each year (k-2) when these skills are so fresh. Additionally, the word "significant" came up a lot. Is this something that will have additional guidance? Vague leaves open possibilities but also confusion. See some specific comments below.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE remains committed to the vision of rigorous social studies standards established by the SSSAC and will not make significant adjustments to reduce the level of rigor present in the standards.</li> <li>• The word significant (1.Hist.CCC.26 <i>Identify significant events in the history of the school community and explain what makes each event significant.</i>) was intentionally selected to allow educators to and their students to investigate and define this term through inquiry.</li> <li>• OSSE worked closely with expert reviewers and educators to develop these standards. Experts and educators agree that they represent an appropriate level of rigor for each grade level.</li> <li>• OSSE is committed to developing professional development modules and resources to support educators in scaffolding appropriate, rigorous and engaging learning experiences for their students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standards are too specific</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some standards make reference to specific materials such as the UN's Sustainable Development Goals. Is that really the only way to address the important thinking and content, or can it be done using a different framework, or perhaps by having students develop their own? These are curriculum decisions that have made their way into learning standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commenters disagree about the level of granularity included in the standards, with some commenters indicating that the standards are overly broad, and others indicating that they were too specific.</li> <li>• Because of the careful attention that the expert reviewers and educators who developed these standards provided to the level of granularity generally included in the standards, OSSE declines to make any global changes in response to these comments.</li> <li>• However, OSSE will standardize the number of examples called for in grade 6, World Geography.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the language in the standards and framework for each Driving Concept are too prescriptive. For example, requiring students to evaluate 'at least three' examples of something requires LEA's and teachers to go pretty broad in a topic when we may decide it is an opportunity to go really deep into one strong example.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Standards are too broad</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each of these standards were and are entire college courses. There is no way a teacher given these with no resources could possibly do any of them justice. They also don't repeat over the course of grades (ex. gender identity or racial identity) and that is a disservice to all children.</li> <li>Both sets of standards (and most of the standards in other courses), but especially the World History standards, suffer from being over-general and therefore vague. The public policy goal of standards is to assure that across schools, certain content and skills are taught to all. A key stated goal of the standards themselves is to promote critical thinking. But critical thinking—any kind of thinking—depends on knowing relevant content. These proposed standards regularly ask students to “assess,” “evaluate,” and otherwise think about the course material, but they often fail to provide the content needed to answer them. Finally, there is increased understanding that reading proficiency depends on broad background knowledge. But these very general standards provide very limited guidance on the knowledge students need. This is not a call for a narrow “memorization of facts” but to provide students the content they need for strong reading comprehension and the grist that underlies critical thinking. The current standards, while needing updates in some sections, do a far, far better job than the proposed standards in making clear what students need to learn at different grade levels and how it all fits together.</li> <li>The standards as a whole seem too broad. There is not enough specific information language to indicate how students meet the standards. The standards don't provide enough direction for what we as a district want students to leave school knowing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE specifically worked to address and correct the high volume of content in the 2006 standards in revising these standards and instead, uses an inquiry lens to enable educators and students to engage in a more sophisticated analysis with a range of content.</li> <li>In developing inquiry-driven standards, OSSE notes that inquiry is not devoid of content. When students analyze the causes and consequences of the decision to drop the atomic bomb, that lesson by necessity includes content such as the dates and major figures of World War II. Accordingly, because of the inquiry design of the standards, OSSE is ensuring that students will not only learn content, but also that students are able to understand that content in a variety of contexts and from varied perspectives.</li> <li>The new standards represent a fundamentally different orientation to teaching history. One discipline suggests that the more stories we tell about the different aspects of the world, the more students will understand the world. However, this approach leaves students ill-equipped to encounter new information, new stories, and new histories when they leave the classroom. The other discipline suggests that by giving students the ability to interrogate the stories they are told, to question evidence, to dive deep into a consideration about how we know what we know will better prepare students to go into the world and when they encounter new stories and new information, they will be better equipped to ask questions, critically analyze that information and be better citizens of the world and democracy. It is important that students have access to diverse stories, but it is more critical that they have the skills to interrogate information. In places where critical stories have been left out, OSSE will include them in the new standards. But it is critical teachers have the time and support to teach this critical 21st century skill so student learning, questioning, and engaging does not end when they leave the K-12 system.</li> <li>OSSE is committed to developing supplemental materials that further illustrate how to implement these standards and has allocated \$500,000 to support the development of professional development supports, curricular resources, sample content and concepts, and assessment guidance that will include specific events, individuals and source materials that can be used to implement these standards.</li> <li>OSSE will revise grade 6 standards to clarify that educators should choose one country, city or experience in each region to study.</li> <li>OSSE will also revise World History II standards to reflect the same structure used in the World History I standards, and more clearly provide structure for educators about which civilizations and histories are considered part of the historical canon.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Additional support for implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition each of these standards should be linked to rich literature that ties into multiple standards (not just social studies ones). To give these to teachers who barely have planning time with no resources linked is absurd. Go back and add those resources alongside the collaboration of DC public libraries, local book stores and librarians...</li> <li>In ELA and in Math, we have focus standards for each grade level that get more attention than others because they are foundational to the work of that grade. Is it possible to provide this for this set of standards? That</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE is committed to working with DC institutions, subject matter experts and educators to develop robust supplemental guidance to support educators in implementing all K-12 standards. These supports include illustrative content and concepts, anchor texts, primary source sets and case study suggestions.</li> <li>OSSE is working with teacher preparation programs to develop professional development modules that support educators in using inquiry, culturally relevant instruction and best practices to drive learning, especially focused on geography, elementary education, action civics, media literacy, historical thinking, and hard history.</li> </ul>

<p>way, as we develop our curriculum, we are making sure that we are giving the proper weight to the standards that are the most important/need the most attention for future understanding. Or, are we to interpret each standard as holding equal weight and attention?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide more clarity on how teachers implement the Social Studies standards in practice. Currently, the Social Studies standards provide little guidance on how teachers might implement the standards. I recommend adding a section under each grade level that includes context for interpreting, connecting, and applying the content and skills of each standard. Some states already have this essential information in their standards, including California (with a narrative description) and Colorado (through Academic Context and Connections).</li> <li>• These standards are incredible, robust and ambitious and most of the standards could operate as stand-alone university courses in the depth and time that addressing them fully would require. Thus, my main concerns, particularly at the early Elementary level, are that the standards are incredibly broad and wide-ranging and achieving all of them in one school year would be impossible. As well, it would be absolutely necessary to provide resources to teachers for these standards, including anchor texts/books.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>The 2006 Standards should not have been thrown out</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was time for them to be updated—but not thrown out. In multiple statements, SBOE members called for these strong standards to be “revised,” not replaced... They were replaced by standards that are often extremely broad, vague, over-ambitious, and lacking specific knowledge. (e.g., “Analyze the role of religion, belief, systems, and culture in the governments and maintenance of societies in Africa, Asia and Europe.”) They are less coherent than what they propose to replace and, relatedly, less disciplined in following key themes across time periods and standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Technical Writing Committee (TWC), comprised of DC educators, drafted standards to include a structure, sequence, and foundation to meet the needs of 21<sup>st</sup> century students.</li> <li>• 2006 Standards are Outdated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The rise of online media has dramatically changed the skills students need to be successful since 2006.</li> <li>○ The scholarship on effective social studies education has shifted significantly since 2006, with important implications for standards.</li> <li>○ The resources available for educators have expanded since 2006.</li> <li>○ Issues with 2006 Content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The 2006 standards lack adequate rigor, utilizing verbs such as “identify,” “describe,” and “explain” too often.</li> <li>○ The volume of content is such that educators cannot reasonably teach the 2006 standards in one school year.</li> <li>○ The 2006 standards lack opportunities for student agency and inquiry-based learning.</li> <li>○ Indigenous, Black, and LGBTQ+ history is often hidden in these standards, and students lack adequate windows and mirrors for understanding the world and seeing themselves in the standards.</li> <li>○ The draft, revised standards reflect the changes in scholarship around what elementary students are capable of and include a more direct examination of white supremacy, racism, and resistance to oppression.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Use of the word “caste”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am concerned the inclusion of caste under the “Civics, Government, and Human Rights” anchor standard, substandard “World Governments”, is inconsistent with the language of specific grade-level standards that discuss social hierarchies, such as WH1.Geo.HC.26. To ensure consistency and clarity for educators and students, I strongly recommend that “caste” be removed from this anchor standard and instead replaced with “social hierarchy.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the community and will make the recommended change, replacing the word “caste” with the phrase “social hierarchy”.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of Action Civics</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE remains committed to requiring action civics in grade 8.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am wondering about the lack of world history in middle school. I'm sure that you can introduce world history in 2nd grade, but you don't have it again until 9th grade. Maybe it is worth it because the new 8th grade course is worth it???? I think it is because you are doing really interesting things in 8th grade. It is at the cost of world history, but it is likely worth it. 8th grade is a perfect place for action civics.</li> <li>• Social studies should include history from a wide array of perspectives. The draft standards tilt toward a perspective that gives disproportional weight to group membership. Other perspectives focus more on the principles that tie all people together and consider the full complexity and diversity within each group. These perspectives also deserve consideration by students. Additionally, activism should be studied but not encouraged, lest activism in a particular direction be an explicit part of a school curriculum, which is inappropriate.</li> <li>• Another area of concern, illustrative of the critical ethnic studies framing, is the standards' extensive focus on militant action, called YPAR in the critical ethnic studies movement. Described by its most ardent partisans as a favored tool of "incorporation" into education of "race conscious interventions," p[lacing the emphasis on the students' " lived experience and insight on ways to dismantle racist structures in education," YPAR is a way to displace the value of transmission as the cornerstone of education in favor of political activism.</li> <li>• I am hugely excited by the inclusion of Action Civics in 8th grade. But the action civics frame must not be isolated just to 8th grade. As part of Mikva Challenge I regularly facilitate Project Soapbox events across the country watching young people of all ages speak out on issues important to them. Recently in New York I saw children as young as 5 and 6 deliver powerful speeches- breaking down an issue, understanding their target audience and making an ask. There is truly no grade level too early for this work. In Kindergarten, the standards explore why classrooms and schools have rules and consequences of not following them. This is an opportunity for democracy and action civics education- allowing students to explore how they are made, what consensus means (is it 51 %, is it 100 %?) and to make their own suggested school rules and even propose them to the principal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with the Guiding Principles, the action civics standards invite students to consider an issue of concern, decide for themselves how they feel this issue is best addressed and then take (or not take) action in a way they feel is appropriate. These standards will help ensure that students have the necessary tools to impact change should they choose to do so. OSSE trusts young people to be independent and critical thinkers and rejects any characterization of action civics as leftist indoctrination. Specifically, 8.Econ.DM.16 is politically neutral. It does not prescribe a viewpoint, but instead asks students to evaluate the efficacy of different government policies, this can include tax policy, policies that support the growth of businesses, social safety nets, etc.</li> <li>• OSSE will ensure educators are supported in implementing these standards in a non-partisan manner, consistent with best practices for engaging students in civic discourse.</li> <li>• The decision to incorporate action civics was made by the TWC and supported by OSSE, expert reviewers, and many commenters.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Global Studies Focus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I was excited to see the changes and focused on the k-6 standards. I saw global competence in multiple places through perspective taking, action taking, communicating and investigating in local, national, and global contexts but do see areas of improvement in the 3-5 years. It is an important part of preparation for an increasingly interconnected world. Overall, I applaud the efforts and am excited about the direction and rigor of these standards. I think this is a radical (in a good way) approach especially given the climate toward standards around the country....students identify and explain the process of conflict and cooperation (political, economic, religious, etc.) among people in the contemporary world at local, regional, and national levels. - What about global connections? What else was</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares this commenter's interest in ensuring that these standards support students' global competency, including kindergarten students. Indeed, global perspectives have been included in kindergarten through the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ K.Econ.DM.23 <i>Drawing on personal experience, literature, and informational texts, compare the different jobs individuals around the world perform and the ways in which specific goods and services are produced, both inside and outside of the home.</i></li> <li>○ K.Econ.EM.26 <i>Identify a scarce resource in our community, world, and classroom (e.g., food, land, water, air, energy), and evaluate how to allocate it to promote fairness.</i></li> <li>○ K.Geo.GI.27 <i>Identify products that we use in our daily lives, where they come from, and how they connect us to local and global communities.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>going on in the world during these years? That was missing in the 3-5 standards with the exception of some European colonization and the triangle trade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All social studies content should be embedded within a global context....So it has been with a huge sense of frustration to find that these draft standards have failed, intentionally or not, to follow this guidance and truly embed a global perspective across all grade levels. The document continues an outdated paradigm of studying the rest of the world as “other” or separate – and primarily confined to World History and Geography... I can guarantee that as currently written, these draft standards do not meet that goal in regard to its treatment of global education or in laying a solid foundation for our students for informed global engagement and confident participation in the culturally diverse, globally interconnected, and frankly perilous world they will inherit. We recommend Global Perspectives be added as another Inquiry Arc Anchor Standard to address this deficit. Or perhaps OSSE has different thoughts about how to do this – perhaps as an essential question (which some state standards include)....A global lens could and should be incorporated in the earliest grades. Integrating a global perspective would ensure that elementary students think and act globally from an early age. From the earliest age, students should see themselves as members of a large global community. At present, this is not the case. For example, look at the K-2 Arc. In grades K-1, students learn about their “community” – Kindergarten (Myself and My Community) and Grade 1 (Working and Building Together). Grade 2 (This Wide World) focuses entirely on ancient history, not the contemporary world, with the exception of consideration of environmental change. Rather than setting up this unfortunate duality seeing ourselves in the present and the rest of the world through a historic lens, the standards should apply a global lens from the beginning.</li> <li>• There is much to like in these new draft standards, in particular to advance other guiding principles adopted by the State Board. Please add an explicit, ongoing global thread for the social studies revisions as stated by Globalize DC. When I was staff at National Geographic and did some volunteer work with DC teachers, I was shocked to meet students who had never left their neighborhood! This is the international hub of the world -- all roads lead to DC. K-12 students who lack global skills and knowledge and comfort with OTHERS are disadvantaged in major ways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ K.Hist.CCC.16: <i>Compare how historical people in our families, communities and from different countries lived, learned, worked, and relaxed.</i></li> <li>• OSSE will update grade 1 Driving Concept 1: Building a Community to include the global community.</li> <li>• OSSE will include a greater focus on African, Asian and American Kingdoms between 1100 and 1400 in grade 2 to create a stronger global foundation for later courses. Global perspectives have been included in grade 2 through the following standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.Geo.HP.7 <i>Using data, visual displays, and textual information, examine and generate questions about where and how people live around the world today (i.e., use graphic or data visuals to examine population; consider whether such as expected levels of precipitation; cultural elements like food and clothing, etc.)</i> (note the wording of this standard will be updated for clarity, see grade 2 below).</li> <li>○ 2.Inq.TA.8 <i>Discuss the difference between needs and wants, identifying essential needs of all humans.</i></li> <li>○ 2.Geo.HE.9 <i>Examine the ways people have lived (and continue to live) around the world, identifying nomadic patterns and more stationary or sedentary patterns.</i></li> <li>○ 2.Inq.DP.11 <i>Examine ways people get food and water today — starting with local examples and expanding to global.</i></li> <li>○ 2.Inq.DP.30 <i>Compare societies of long ago to societies today with a focus on gender roles, technology, and relationship with the natural environment.</i></li> <li>○ 2.Geo.GI.32 <i>Using image - and text - based resources, as well as data, examine how the climate has changed from long ago to today; analyze how it impacts life on earth, including but not limited to plants, animals, and people.</i></li> <li>○ 2.Inq.TA.34 <i>Identify a current question of sustainability and develop an action plan for increasing sustainability in your community or globally.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• OSSE will further expand the grades 3-5 standards to include global context for American History.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Teaching about the Holocaust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is at least one egregious hole in the new proposed curriculum. I am writing after reading in the Washington Post on February 13th, “How D.C. is changing ‘archaic’ social studies curriculum.”</li> <li>• I applaud that the “new standards include increased representation of the experience of people of color and a direct examination of racism and white supremacy.” All children, including those in DC schools should receive this type of balanced education.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares this commenter’s belief in the importance of ensuring that students are taught about the Holocaust. However, the TWC, researchers and The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum do not advocate for teaching about the Holocaust before grade 6. This is supported by research into best practices.<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• In the current draft of the standards, the Holocaust is taught in the following grades: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 5.Civ.WG.41 <i>Explain the causes of World War II and the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany, and understand how bias and prejudice led to the scapegoating of marginalized</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

○ <sup>1</sup> See: <https://www.ushmm.org/teach/fundamentals/age-appropriateness>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, the new D.C. proposed social studies curriculum for grades kindergarten-eight has an egregious hole: The Holocaust is not mentioned.</li> <li>• I understand from a D.C. rabbi and a number of parents, that the D.C. schools have had a poor history of teaching the Holocaust. And this will continue according to the article for: In fifth grade to quote, “students explain the causes of World War II and understand how ‘bias and prejudice led to the scapegoating of marginalized groups in Europe,’ including Jews, disabled, LGBTQ+ and Romani people.” Bias and prejudice led not to scapegoating but to the murder of 11 million people who might or might not have considered themselves part of a “marginalized” group. This murder is referred to as the Holocaust and should be referred to as such in D.C.’s curriculum. And for that matter, it is not the only holocaust students should learn about. The overwhelmingly worst holocaust was done to indigenous people over several centuries, and holocausts continue to this day. Please review the proposed curriculum to make appropriate revisions.</li> <li>• I think the standards are very strong as regard Diversity and Inclusion and Knowledge framing: democratic citizenship, civic dispositions &amp; experience. I think they could be made stronger with the inclusion of teaching of the Holocaust. Currently, 23 states have mandatory teaching about the Holocaust in social studies curricula. The District of Columbia, home of the United States Memorial Holocaust Museum, is not one of them. These hate movements inform not only the issues of inclusion and diversity but democratic citizenship as well. The supremacist movements are most often part of political organizing aimed at destroying democracy by demonizing parts of the electorate so that remaining voters will be more inclined to accept autocratic rule. I believe that requiring age-appropriate discussion of how these movements are politically designed to appeal to the worst instincts of citizens will produce adults who are more tolerant and inclusive of those who are different, and voters who are more resistant to resistant to hateful political tactics</li> </ul>	<p><i>groups in Europe, including Jewish, Romani, Slavic, disabled, Jehovah’s Witnesses and LGBTQ+ communities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ WH2.Hist.CCC.35 <i>Analyze the reasons for the consequences of violations of human rights during World War I and World War II, such as the Armenian genocide, Nanjing Massacre and Holocaust, and the cooperative global response of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.</i></li> <li>○ WH2.Hist.CCC.43 <i>Evaluate the cause, course, and consequences of the Holocaust.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Civ.WG.39 <i>Evaluate the reasons for the rise of fascism and Nazism in Europe and the scapegoating of historically marginalized peoples (including Jewish, Romani, Slavic, disabled, and LGBTQ+ communities) by Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Civ.CE.41 <i>Assess the United States’ global commitment to universal human rights before, during, and after World War II, including but not limited to its role during the Holocaust and incarceration of Japanese Americans.</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will include an additional unit on global action civics and include an evaluation of the causes and consequences of genocide as part of the grade 8 action civics course.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Expanding focus of religious history</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are disappointed to see that the K-12 Social Studies Standards draft failed to include learning about the Sikh community in their most recent review. While we recognize that the time period of “Ancient Empires” from 800 BCE to 700 CE does not align with Sikhism’s emergence in 1469, we believe that it is vital for the 5th largest world religion to be included in the Social Studies Standards where it has potential to align with pre-existing standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s interest in ensuring full inclusion of Sikh history and will update the standards to explicitly include the history of the Sikh community in the United States.</li> <li>• Specifically, OSSE will add an additional standard about the evolution of citizenship in the United States that includes <i>Thind v. United States and United States v. Wong Kim Ark.</i></li> <li>• Further, OSSE is revising the approach to religion in World History I standards; see the World History I course updates below, which will include specific reference to Sikhism.</li> <li>• Additionally, throughout the US history standards OSSE will revise the standards to specify religious history.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Use of the word analyze</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Standards Guide uses the term “analyze” to introduce standards 301 times, but never explains what the prompt word “analyze” expects teacher to teach or students to do.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will clarify or update the verbs used in the standards as needed.</li> <li>• OSSE will also provide ancillary resources and supports for educators to ensure they understand how to support students in historical and geographic analysis.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Concerns with Guiding Principles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Preamble to the Guiding Principles states that OSSE should seek standards writers who reflect the demographics and experiences of District students and of the communities they are writing about (e.g., seeking LGBTQ+ writers, (b) ensuring inclusion of advocates for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Guiding Principles were voted and adopted by DC’s SBOE.</li> <li>• OSSE remains fully committed to developing and implementing standards that reflect and reinforce the Guiding Principles and will not revise the Guiding Principles at this time.</li> </ul>

<p>people with disabilities, teaching Black history through the words of Black people, giving agency to BIPOC4 rather than discussing only in relation to white people) (p4) Problems: (a) The Guidance omits the most important qualification: Writers who are knowledgeable about DC, US and world history, geography and government and understand the role of standards in guiding curricula. This does a disservice to all communities the standards are intended to serve. b) Did OSSE advertise for qualified social studies draft writers who are knowledgeable about history (DC, US, World), geography, civics/government, economics Under Guiding Principles; Structure and Content, the SSAC Guide states: "The standards should be written and organized in such a manner that promote student understanding of complex ideas and concepts rather than learning a long list of facts, individuals, etc. This is of course not to say that factual information, individuals, etc. should not be included in the standards, but their inclusion should serve to promote deep understanding of essential content rather than surface-level analysis." (p5) Problems: "understanding complex ideas and concepts rather than ...a long list of facts, individuals.."This statement is pseudo-science. It fails to understand that "ideas and concepts" consist of facts, not "long lists of [unrelated or random] facts, individuals, etc.", but facts grouped in meaningful clusters by the common theme of the facts, e.g. grouped by domain of knowledge. Example of such a cluster is the many forms or resistance by enslaved people: work slowdown, breaking tools, songs of freedom, jokes, trickster tales, mysterious fires, running away, rebellion, etc. Social studies is an inquiry-based discipline." (p5) Problem: Neither "inquiry-based" nor "inquiry" is explained. No evidence of its effectiveness is cited; yet, it is presented as an authoritative statement. Inquiry is one of many activities that teachers might use to engage students in a more narrowly focused learning activity. A similar activity is National History Day, which offers a variety of formats, but does not replace instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eurocentrism This an accusation of bias. It doesn't distinguish white Americans from Europeans.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Missing Skills</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking notes and effective note-taking strategies</li> <li>• Maintaining a notebook for class notes &amp; textbook notes</li> <li>• How to analyze a primary source document</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will not revise standards in response to this comment. Historical analysis of a primary document is included throughout the standards and can be further illustrated in curriculum.</li> <li>• Although these skills may be a meaningful part of a student's education, note taking strategies and how to maintain a notebook are not social studies skills that are aligned with the College, Career and Civic Life Framework for Social Studies Education.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Including Africans as Slavers and Indigenous Nations as Collaborators with Europeans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is widely known that merchants from European countries and later from ports in New England, New York, Philadelphia and other Western Hemisphere ports were the exclusive agents of Middle Passage, but many still think they were also the original captors of free people. The ambiguous passive voice, "people who were kidnapped from Africa," allows for a reader to think that both the kidnapping and the transport to the Americas was carried out by the same European or American merchants and crew. In fact, the great majority of enslaved Africans were captured in African</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE remains committed to developing and implementing social studies standards that confront white supremacy and the role of policy and history in shaping current racial and economic inequities.</li> <li>• The Guiding Principles specifically call for standards that address the origin and legacy of slavery in the United States and its impact on American Democracy.</li> <li>• OSSE will not revise these standards in response to this comment. Race-based chattel slavery that existed in the Americas was created by European colonizers. There is no evidence that any system which resembled this unique form of slavery existed in Africa prior to European contact.</li> </ul>

<p>wars or kidnapped in the interior by people from other African societies and moved to the coast often through a network of indigenous African traders. See attached slave trade packet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slavery was a global institution. Until recently, slavery was a global institution found in almost every settled human society from the first agricultural settlements. At one time or another most societies enslaved others or were themselves victims of enslavement. When enslavement of Africans to be sold in the Americas began in the 1500s, slavery was widely practiced by indigenous American societies.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Sustainable farming</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Intentionally recognize community farming”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s suggestion; however, OSSE will not be explicitly including community farming in DC’s social studies standards.</li> <li>Nevertheless, OSSE notes that this content can be taught with standard 2.Inq.DP.11 <i>Examine ways people get food and water today — starting with local examples and expanding to global</i> and through the grade 6 Global Geography or grade 8 Action Civics courses.</li> <li>Accordingly, LEAs and educators have the freedom to incorporate additional materials around community farming should they choose.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Identity in Social Studies Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I wonder if there are lessons that could explore identity that could be included also.</li> <li>The inquiry standards are logically ordered but then oddly list 'Identity' at the end with no clear rationale. Identity should be incorporated throughout (e.g. reflecting on one own's identity when determining which questions are worth asking / solving for, looking at various perspectives including those from different identities).</li> <li>I also have a question about the undefined “identity” inquiry standard. Why is an identity inquiry applied to some history – and a history or other anchor standard applied in others?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE shares this commenter’s interest in incorporating identity in these standards and notes that identity is incorporated through standard K.Inq.ID.15 <i>Identify a range of identities that exist, including gender, racial, religious and ethnic identities, and discuss the important contributions of different individuals to the community.</i></li> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s question regarding the identity inquiry standard and is working to revise this inquiry standard.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Disability history</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a glaring lack of standards about Deaf and Disabled individuals, especially given their outsized presence in the DC, MD, and VA areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE shares this commenter’s interest in explicitly incorporating disability in these standards and notes that disability history is included in the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Inq.ID.3 <i>Explain the ways in which different communities have shaped and defined the community of Washington, DC</i> and</li> <li>K.Inq.ID.14 <i>Identify and describe the historic achievements and contributions of individuals with different abilities.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>OSSE will include additional standards in grade 3 and grade 12 DC History standards that expand the diverse populations represented in DC History standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of DC History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I like the DC history early on and then reinforced later</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the community engagement with social studies standards and shares this commenter’s commitment to the vertical alignment of DC History throughout the standards.</li> <li>OSSE will not be making any adjustments to these standards in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Changes to the text of the anchor standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Anchor Standards: Civics, Government, and Human Rights: Civic Engagement (p. 8-9): Add a sentence at the end of the section: ""Students will practice taking part in fundamental processes of civic engagement, including registering to vote, voting, and completing the U.S. Census."" This could include practices like mock</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates and agrees with the feedback that the anchor standards do not contain mutually exclusive skills andE is fully committed to reevaluating the anchor standard labeling system. The standards are intended to help educators further understand the skills that are associated with individual content standards and OSSE agrees with the feedback that social studies content is often interdisciplinary and can be labeled with multiple anchor standards. As such, OSSE will shift the function of the anchor standards so that</li> </ul>

<p>elections, as well as actual opportunities for eligible students to register or pre-register to vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anchor Standards: Inquiry Arc: Gathering Diverse Perspectives and Evaluating Evidence (p. 5): Add: ""At all levels, students will demonstrate information literacy skills, including use of library resources.""</li> <li>The history standards lump continuity, change, and context together when contextualization is a different concept / theme. ""Historical Connections"" is also vague.</li> <li>The Economics standards effectively list two themes and then include World and US Economics to bring it to a total of four. This makes for a pretty shallow understanding of economics that needs to be fleshed out with additional themes (e.g. scarcity, incentives)</li> <li>For the History Anchor Standards, I would like to see them emphasize the role of people more, in addition to the current focus on ""events"". What individuals, groups, ideas, and institutions have been the movers of history? I would also emphasize adaptability and interconnection (especially in terms of globalization), though these are more covered by other Anchor Standards.</li> </ul>	<p>they are similar in function to <i>Standards for History and Social Science Practice</i> in the Massachusetts state standards. OSSE will further revise and remove overlapping anchor standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To further clarify how anchor standards can be used to support educators in developing curriculum, OSSE is producing a vertical articulation of anchor standards document that clarifies how social studies skills progress over the course of Grades K-12.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Include Specific Scholars</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include: Black, Chicana, and Asian American feminist scholars and thought leaders such as Alice Walker, Audre Lorde, Dolores Huerta, Angela Davis, and Yuri Kochiyama.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE shares this commenter’s commitment to including diversifying the feminist scholars and thought leaders and will explicitly incorporate these scholars into US History Courses, as appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Culture is not adequately addressed.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Learning about culture – what it is; the diversity of world cultures, world views, and ways of being in the world; the importance of recognizing and respecting cultural differences; how to communicate and work collaboratively across cultures; how to resolve cross-cultural conflict; the ways in which culture is transmitted, transformed, and connected to our history, our political and economic systems; and the idea that cultures are not fixed, but fluid and change over time. Cultural competence is essential to educating for global competence. Yet a serious approach to the understanding of culture, even as it relates to “identity,” one of the inquiry standards, is missing. The removal of “culture” from the title and contents of the 6th grade standards, formerly “World Geography and Culture” and now simply “World Geography,” is perplexing. Perhaps the writers think of culture as food, festivals, and fashion, and have dismissed it as superficial. Without an opportunity to engage with OSSE, it’s difficult to understand the rationale.</li> <li>With more attention to culture, students could explore more deeply the variation of African cultures in the Americas and the diaspora more broadly; could likewise examine the diversity of Asian and Latin American cultures; intergenerational culture and culture conflict within immigrant families; frontier cultures; culture as a form of social and political control, as well as resistance and resilience; and so on.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will not make specific revisions to the standards in response to these comments. The grade 6 global geography course is inclusive of global history and modern global events, through each standard students learn about different global cultures and events through the investigation of geographic data and patterns. For additional information about updates to culture standards in grade 6 and the ways culture are addressed in grade 6 see the comments made at that grade level.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Opposition to including “hard history”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please rein in the wokeness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE remains committed to the Guiding Principles adopted by the DC SBOE and will not be generally modifying the standards in a manner that is in direct opposition to these principles.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Violence, peace, and conflict resolution.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a member of the SSSAC, I don’t recall any significant discussion about the importance of including content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s continued engagement in the standards revision process.</li> </ul>

<p>and skills in the social studies standards related to war and peace, conflict resolution, peacebuilding, peer mediation, truth and reconciliation. We recommend finding a way of incorporating some standards along these lines, which have relevance at the personal, local, national, and international levels. Students must understand the fault lines of race, ethnicity, culture, caste, religion, gender, politics, etc., and how divisions are created, exploited, manipulated, through stereotyping, scapegoating, dehumanization, etc, leading to conflict, exploitation, violence, genocide, and war. Much of this content and skills development would be appropriate for a reimagined World Geography and Cultures course at Grade 6, discussed in #7 below.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE agrees that there is an opportunity to better include concepts and content such as war and peace, conflict resolution, peacebuilding, peer mediation, and truth and reconciliation.</li> <li>• OSSE is developing an additional Driving Concept for taking global action in grade 8.</li> <li>• For additional updates to the standards, see the grade level analysis below.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Digital Media Literacy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I saw that you connected the 8th grade digital citizenship to the HS Government course. And I checked- the language is more sophisticated. You can see an obvious progression here! I like the use of Lateral Reading and Fact Check sites. This is such a great habit of mind to develop in students. Vital to the future of the country.</li> <li>• A strong attentiveness to cultivating students' information literacy skills—especially around digital information—is explicit in the draft standards' commitment to inquiry and how this is embedded throughout the grade levels...The draft social studies standards take great care to provide not only for today's world, but also for the world of tomorrow. As early as grade 3, students are asked to "evaluate the credibility of online sources" and employ essential media literacy skills such as lateral reading. By high school, students continue to have multiple opportunities to apply reasoning strategies to evaluate sources, claims, and perspectives. This deep and intentional spiraling of information literacy skills throughout the grade levels sets these draft standards apart and well ahead of those in many other states.</li> <li>• Digital literacy is incorporated in 6th and 8th grade and Government &amp; Civics. This is wonderful - no complaints there - and agree that the unit really digs into how to evaluate reliability and validity of media sources of information etc. However, digital literacy should also be integrated (albeit in smaller chunks) much earlier - arguably throughout K-12 as these concepts are life skills that students will need to develop - the earlier the better. Perhaps for some of the ""evaluate or compare"" standards could specify that one ""media"" source be included in that analysis?</li> <li>• Finally, I recommend there to be a standard explicitly promoting traditional and social media literacy. I imagine the reason for this is abundantly clear."</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the feedback to increase digital literacy in K-12 and will make changes to ensure that digital literacy and online civic reasoning is present throughout the updated standards. Digital media literacy in social studies education encompasses skills that help students understand the limitations of online information and develop students' abilities to approach and fact check unfamiliar content.</li> <li>• OSSE is further committed to expanding digital literacy through the creation of a digital literacy community of practice and professional development resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Teaching US History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft DC social studies standards align to the philosophical and pedagogical principles of EAD and meet the characteristics of "exemplary" state standards as enumerated by the Fordham Institute in their June 2021 analysis of the state of social studies standards for civics and U.S. History.[3] Taken as a whole, the draft DC Social Studies Standards articulate modern standards for teaching U.S. History that reflect our plural yet shared past and present while fostering inquiry and independent thinking. We applaud the rigor of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement of the community and will not make revisions to the standards in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>

<p>content presented in the standards, and are pleased to see the spiraling of deep and challenging topics across grade bands with increasing complexity and depth, thereby signaling and reaffirming the District of Columbia's commitment to excellence for all students. We support the prioritization of historical analysis skills that, among other things, help students make sense of the past both chronologically and thematically. This challenges students to both know the important "key events, people, and periods of the historical era" and develop the deeper understanding and concrete skills necessary to "explain the sources of historical continuity and how the combination of ideas and events explains the emergence of new patterns" (p. 103). Further, in aiming to prepare students to be informed and engaged participants in our self-governing society, we particularly welcome the focus on information literacy throughout the grade levels and encourage such an approach across curricular areas, as well.</p>	
<p><b>Additional Areas of Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall, the standards look good but having worked in educational publishing for more than 20 years, I have some suggestions: 1) Build more empathy, inclusion, and social skills into every grade level to compensate for more screen time. 2) cross reference these standards with National Geographic's Geography standards to integrate them into every grade. 3) Look at IB's curriculum for K-12+. Students need to be aware of global issues that will affect them and their future., as well as skills such as data literacy and analysis, media/information literacy, and personal finance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the feedback from the community but will not make revisions in response to this comment. Empathy, inclusion and social skills are embedded in social studies instructional practices. However, OSSE will produce ancillary supports that make the connection between social studies pedagogy and SEL skills explicit for educators.</li> <li>Geography standards are integrated into every grade level, some examples are below. These standards are consistent with National Geographic's geography standards       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Geo.GR.17 <i>Locate and explain physical features on maps (i.e., mountains, oceans, rivers, lakes, etc.)</i></li> <li>1.Geo.GR.21 <i>Describe how and why people have changed the physical landscape of the local community and/or greater Washington, DC area over time.</i></li> <li>2.Geo.GR.5 <i>Using an array of maps and other forms of data or visual displays, examine and locate the continents, major oceans, the equator and poles; identify other geographic terms — such as, but not limited to, coast, bay, gulf, sea, delta, river, lake, peninsula, plain, mountain, canyon, volcano, etc.</i></li> <li>2.Geo.GI.32 <i>Using image- and text-based resources, as well as data, examine how the climate has changed from long ago to today; analyze how it impacts life on Earth, including but not limited to plants, animals, and people</i></li> <li>3.Geo.GR.5 <i>Compare contemporary ward maps and the distinct features of each of Washington, DC's wards including significant roads, access to public transportation, important landmarks, business locations, park space, etc.</i></li> <li>4.Geo.GR.8 <i>Analyze the changes to the political geography of the Americas in the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries and identify the geographic locations of major civilizations in the Americas during this time.</i></li> <li>5.Geo.HE.13 <i>Evaluate the environmental impact that settler colonialism had on the Great Plains region, West Coast, and North and Southwest</i></li> <li>6.Geo.GI.5 <i>Describe the purpose, creation, evolution, and impact of international borders and evaluate who benefits and who is harmed by border policies</i></li> <li>7.Geo.GI.17 <i>Identify and analyze global trade routes and their impact on the formation of the European colonies throughout the Americas — including North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean — as well as the impact on African and European society.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 8.Geo.GR.39 <i>Analyze the impact of urban geography and zoning on access to power and opportunity in Washington, DC.</i></li> <li>○ WH1.Geo.HE.34 <i>Explain the ways geography influenced the development of economic, political, and cultural centers in Africa, Asia, the Americas, and Europe and how the centers facilitated cultural diffusion.</i></li> <li>● The themes of global issues, data literacy and analysis, media/information literacy and personal finance are included in the standards as written. Some examples are below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ US2.Inq.DP.66 <i>Analyze media coverage of two key events in a movement for equality, comparing multiple perspectives and the use of framing and focus in coverage of key events.</i></li> <li>○ DC.Econ.DM.40 <i>Evaluate different financial resources and opportunities available to District residents, and critically evaluate information from a variety of sources to make informed consumer decisions.</i></li> <li>○ 2.Geo.HP.7 <i>Using data, visual displays, and textual information, examine and generate questions about where and how people live around the world today (i.e., use graphic or data visuals to examine population; consider whether such as expected levels of precipitation; cultural elements like food and clothing, etc.).</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Historical Podcasts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● As a DCPS alumni, I didn't get a chance to go into any depth with World History. Only as an adult have I been exposed to the history of the nations on the European, Asian, African continents that didn't exist before the American Revolution. If we're discussing Vikings, there's an impact on the culture and world view during their occupation of the British Isles in England's future colonizing strategies. Only recently did I learn Japan occupied Korea in the 19th century. I'm sure students are getting information like myself through dramas and documentaries, books, and online — my sister and I discuss these topics in our historical drama (focused) podcasts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OSSE shares this commenter's interest in ensuring that DC's social studies standards go beyond Europe and American History. As such, OSSE is updating the World History II standards to ensure they decenter European narratives and engage students in sustained inquiry across global history.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of Social Emotional Learning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● One only begins to develop social emotional skills in the early grades. Their full integration takes consistent reinforcement and elaboration through a child's developmental arc into early adulthood. OSSE, DCPS, and many charter schools are already committed to some combination of social emotional learning, mindfulness, restorative justice, peace education, nonviolent communication, conflict resolution, or peer mediation so standards in this spirit are more of an affirmation and encouragement, than an imposition.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OSSE agrees with this commenter's commitment to ensuring that students develop social emotional learning skills. Accordingly, empathy, inclusion and social skills are embedded in social studies instructional practices.</li> <li>● OSSE will produce ancillary supports that make the connection between social studies pedagogy and SEL skills explicit for educators.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Include Greater Attention to the American Revolution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The main problem I have seen is a difficulty making the inferences necessary to truly understand and grapple with the weighty and important questions the lessons are centered around. One of the causes I have noticed is an underdeveloped knowledge of the foundational concepts and documents that inform our history... I fear that in practice it tries to do too much too fast. Reading through the document itself I can find no fault in the driving concepts....While I strongly support the ideas of teaching complexity, providing a global (and local) context, and having high standards I am concerned that there is not adequate space and time to discuss and understand the core concepts regarding our system of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OSSE shares this commenter's interest in ensuring that students have an opportunity to grapple with weighty and important questions. Indeed, the inquiry design of these standards will enable students to do just that.</li> <li>● However, OSSE will not revise grades 4 or 5 to focus exclusively on the American Revolution. Instead, OSSE remains committed to supporting educators in ensuring that students understand the many moments in American history that are important for building students understanding of modern society.</li> <li>● OSSE will produce ancillary supports to ensure educators have the support in scaffolding instruction for students.</li> </ul>

<p>government and the American Revolution. What happens if for some reason students miss those all important segments? What happens if another pandemic hits and the schedule gets disrupted (again)? I would therefore urge OSSE to slim down the amount of concepts and subjects in the proposed 3rd through 5th grade standards to allow students the space, time and depth to discuss and truly understand the foundational principles of American history.</p>	
<p><b>Opportunities for Dual Credit</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the Social Studies Standards to ensure ample opportunities for students to receive dual high school and college credit. The District must make higher education quality, affordability, and opportunity an absolute priority for our students furthest from opportunity. Therefore, OSSE should take every measure to ensure the updated Social Studies standards allow for dual high school credit and college credit with the institutions of Higher Education (IHE) the District currently has partnerships with and even future ones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s interest in education in the District of Columbia.</li> <li>The recommendation made by this commenter is outside the scope of the social studies standards revision; and therefore, OSSE will not be making a change to the social studies standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Financial Literacy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include financial literacy as a critical content area within the Social Studies standards. D.C. does not require students to learn personal financial literacy skills. Personal financial literacy teaches essential concepts like saving, investing, debt, budgeting, setting short- and long-term financial goals, and money management. These are integral to the financial well-being of students. Currently, ten states offer financial literacy as a part of the social studies standards, and the District should do the same at every appropriate grade level. It’s a shame that students will learn about the Global Economy but not how to manage their budget, which is a vital life skill.</li> <li>Include financial literacy as a critical content area within the Social Studies standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic principles and industry are embedded as an interdisciplinary understanding in standards across K-12, including standards that are not labeled as explicitly economic standards. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Inq.DC.24 <i>Use primary sources and demographic data to evaluate the changes in Washington, DC between the Civil War and the 1950s, including the impact of segregation, “Black Codes”, immigration, and industry on the District.</i></li> <li>4.Inq.DP.6 <i>Evaluate historical evidence to explain the development of various economic and systems of trade of Indigenous peoples across the Americas (e.g., Inca Ceque system; the use of cacao as currency and the trade of turquoise and minerals in Chaco).</i></li> <li>5.Inq.DP.45 <i>Compare the different experiences of servicemembers when they returned to the United States after the war, including white, Black, Latinx, Indigenous and Asian American servicemen.</i></li> <li>5.HSC.HC.49 <i>Evaluate the reasons for and resistance to segregation in the North, including the impact of redlining and uprisings in the North and West.</i></li> <li>6.Geo.HE.18 <i>Explain how population distribution, natural resources, and the history of Africa have impacted changes in land use over time.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>The current draft social studies standards prepare students to understand systemic economic inequality by ensuring that students know the roots and causes of the current economic system, and include specific standards regarding redlining, resource distribution, and discrimination.</li> <li>Although OSSE is not revising the social studies standards to include additional financial literacy standards, OSSE is open to exploring the development and adoption of standalone financial literacy standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Incorporating current events into social studies standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standards do not address or under-emphasize some of the most pressing social challenges in public discourse that the next generation will inherit locally, nationally, or globally: racism, climate change, mass incarceration, gun violence, gender-based violence, pollution, biodiversity loss, nuclear proliferation, inequality, social fragmentation/polarization, radicalization, and the inequitable persistence of poor physical and mental health outcomes. Where they are mentioned, it is largely in a historical context. I would</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE shares this commenter’s interest in ensuring that these standards help equip current and future students to face challenges in the future.</li> <li>Accordingly, each Driving Concept in grade 8 Action Civics requires a case study approach -- <i>“throughout this Driving Concept, students should evaluate a specific public policy case and create a proposal advocating for the benefits of the current system or propose a change that would improve the ways in which the federal or local government meets the needs of residents”.</i></li> </ul>



<p>advocate for standards that encourage our schools to reflect on these issues as pose current challenges that touch each of us personally and warrant significant changes in our social, economic, and political policies and institutions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case study approach allows District educators and LEAs to determine what current events will be covered and ensure that the material is appropriate and relevant for their student population.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Removal of Ancient History in Grade 7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Guiding Principles document claims that learning about the whole world is important, but that is not apparent in the Learning Standards. An entire year of World History (Ancient Civilizations) has effectively been cut from our student's education-- Students will not learn any World History throughout Middle School except for what is incorporated into the 6th and 8th grade courses.</li> <li>• These changes increase the distance between all us history and world history courses, which means students are less likely to be able to use near transfer and remember basic information from all of these courses without the linear formation. Additionally, ALL social studies units should include action civics, therefore it is pointless is repetitive to have an entire standard related to them.</li> <li>• We appear to devote much greater attention (and standards) to ancient history as compared to recent history. I think this needs another look and some recalibration. Contemporary history and current global issues too often get short shrift in social studies classrooms. In the case of these draft standards, with the addition of significant new and sometimes repetitious content on indigenous societies and ancient civilizations, attention to more current history and global issues is extremely weak and only addressed in the most generic ways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's elevation of the Guiding Principles and remains committed to ensuring that the standards enable students to fully engage with global content concepts and themes.</li> <li>• The TWC, expert reviewers, research, and OSSE are aligned in the decision to shift the course structure in the middle school grades and are not considering reinstating Ancient History in grade 7. The shift in course structure better aligns with best practices for social studies education and the Guiding Principles.<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Inadequate attention to global issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The two courses that deal specifically with civic engagement pay only marginal attention to global themes and issues. If the OSSE writing team had in fact adopted an ongoing global thread across the grade bands, inquiry, and anchor standards, then teaching global content and global competencies can more easily and appropriately be addressed. It's clear that time to examine contemporary world issues and recent history is seriously shortchanged at a time when the imperative for students to understand the world and develop global competencies is high.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's perspective.</li> <li>• Nevertheless, the grade 6 Global Geography course is inclusive of global history and modern global events; through each standard students learn about different global cultures and events through the investigation of geographic data and patterns. The grade 6 course will be updated to specify educators should use a case study approach to teach each standard. Examples of standards that ask students to evaluate modern global events are below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 6.Inq.DQ.22 <i>Analyze contemporary issues facing people of Africa and identify characteristics and causes of the issue(s).</i></li> <li>○ 6.Inq.TA.36 <i>Identify a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) and assess individual and collective options for taking action to address challenges in the region, taking into account a range of possible levers of power, strategies, and potential outcomes.</i></li> <li>○ 6.Geo.HP.44 <i>Analyze maps to trace the migration of people within, from, and to Latin America and the Caribbean over time, and assess the impact of migration on the region.</i></li> <li>○ 6.Geo.HP.53 <i>Analyze the forces that drove urbanization in Europe and evaluate the structures and amenities of European cities.</i></li> <li>○ 6.Geo.GR.67 <i>Examine the impact of climate change on people in different regions within Oceania.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> See <https://www.educatingforamericandemocracy.org/the-roadmap/>

<p><b>Diversity in Social Studies Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Students will benefit from the work with maps and data across numerous grade levels. I also value the repeated opportunities for students to study DC history and government. I am happy to see standards in numerous grades focused on learning about First Nations and indigenous peoples who have lived and are living around the world. I value the way the standards incorporate opportunities for students to study moments from the history of the LGBTQ community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's support for standards that focus on Indigenous History and the LGBTQ history and does not anticipate making changes in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of Greater DC History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...We are excited about the proposed changes to the Washington DC K-12 Social Studies Standards. Local history has more of a presence throughout the K-12 curriculum rather than concentrated to a few grades, giving students the chance to gain a deeper understanding of their city as they progress through school each year.</li> <li>• I support the implementation of new social studies standards for D.C. public schools. Social studies education is essential to fostering an informed and engaged citizenry. By equipping our students with the knowledge and skills to understand current events and the history that shapes our society, we can empower them to become informed and active participants in the civic life of our city and nation. The new standards will provide students with the understanding and skills needed to participate in our democracy and build a better future for all.</li> <li>• The language within the standards is more inclusive and conveys the importance of understanding the lives of a diverse array of Washingtonians throughout history. For example, In the draft standards, the Nacotchtank (or Anacostan), Piscataway, and Pamunkey peoples are explicitly incorporated into the standards concerning DC history and present life. While in the current standards it reads, 12.DC.2: Students describe the early Native American and English settlements that were established during the 17th and 18th centuries. By naming the Indigenous groups, you are acknowledging the diversity of their culture, language, and traditions.</li> <li>• The two major drawbacks from the revised standards that we found is one, the new standards don't mention Emancipation Day by name...This is a major oversight that we hope is corrected. Emancipation Day is one of the unique pieces of DC history that should be addressed in the curriculum.... Additionally, the revised standard about integration no longer mentions Bolling v. Sharpe</li> <li>• We would like to see Bolling v. Sharpe added back into the curriculum to spotlight the local activists and parents who helped desegregate DC public schools....</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares this commenter's excitement regarding the social studies standards.</li> <li>• OSSE agrees with this commenter's suggestion to explicitly name Emancipation Day and <i>Bolling v. Sharpe</i> in grade 3 and DC History standards and will modify the standards accordingly.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Verb Adjustment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some standards use vague and unmeasurable verbs such as 'understand' and 'investigate' which need to be clarified so that teachers can meet the right level of depth and target specific thinking in their instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the recognition of the important shifts in higher order? thinking skills present in the standards. OSSE will revise the verbs used within each standard to ensure the verbs are meaningful within the context of the standard, in particular replacing "evaluate" with "analyze" where appropriate or including a metric for evaluation.</li> <li>• OSSE will continue to replace verbs like "examine," "explore," and "investigate," throughout the standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Whiteness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards reference the social construction of race, which is good, but then betrays that by using vague</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's perspective regarding this use of the term "whiteness" within the standards and will ensure that the term 'whiteness' is appropriately defined.</li> </ul>

<p>phrases such as 'whiteness' with no clear definition / criteria / context to ground it.</p>	
<p><b>Local Economic Structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "I would like these standards to prepare students to understand not just how our system exists, but also to question the structures and processes in order for them to be better prepared to not just vote and buy things, but actually participate in a changing democracy and economy. Some suggestions: explain not just the structure of our local government, Bur also the budget process and the way change and advocacy happens. and also give them concrete experience doing Advocacy at the local level where they can make a difference and see it in action. this is only reaching a scarcity economics that was designed 100 years ago, not exploring alternative frameworks of abundance and narrative economics for the 21st century. Please add in ideas of the Doughnut model of economics (that an economy must stay in balance, not simply grow forever) and solidarity economy (the alternative economy of cooperation and community support). there are other types of businesses and "consumption" besides competition and extraction - they are called cooperatives and they bring democracy into the economy. Please emphasize these as an another way to be successful and do business. Dc has a rich history of these businesses and Marion Barry's entire economic platform centered on co-ops. People are not just "consumers" but also creators and community builders. 4) explore what "wealth" means beyond money and income. We can build generational wealth through "community wealth" frameworks that are modeled on cooperative principles. Kids need to understand there are options out there that don't put them emphasis entirely on them and their family, but actually on building a larger family and a larger pie of stability and infrastructure for their community. "</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares this commenter's interest in ensuring that DC history is fully incorporated in the standards.</li> <li>• OSSE will evaluate the DC history standards to identify areas where these ideas may be incorporated and make modifications to the standards, as appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>General Support for Adoption</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current draft standards, on which Public Comment recently concluded, are not perfect, but represent a true sea-change in the kinds of content, skills, and dispositions DC students will be expected to learn as part of the standards for social studies in DC. The new standards are inclusive of people and stories missing from the 2006 standards. A forthright approach to teaching "hard history," the effort to directly name white supremacy in the standards, the work to reduce Eurocentrism and the addition of both 8th grade civics and a focus on online civic reasoning are all essential improvements in the current draft standards....I understand and respect the desire of members of the public to keep pushing on OSSE and the State Board to iterate further on the draft standards until they are perfect. However, I urge members to listen to the words of Melanie Holmes, a member of both the SSSAC and OSSE's Technical Writing Committee, who submitted public comment in January. Ms. Holmes was forthright in her feedback, including a critique of the way in which OSSE valued the work of the educators engaged as standards writers. Even with these critiques, she concludes, "...as a member of the SSSAC, I am thrilled that the vision of the Guiding Principles was fully embraced and actualized by my fellow writers. I believe the Social Studies curriculum that will inevitably come</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement of the public on the draft social studies standards.</li> <li>• OSSE has allocated \$500,000 in recovery funds to coordinate with LEA curriculum leaders, educators and experts support the development of resources to support implementation, including sample content and concepts, primary source guides, resource curation and driving questions.</li> </ul>

from the new standards can create “windows and mirrors” for students with the potential to build a more productive city and society. I can only hope this work is valued by the community.” Like Ms. Holmes, I, too, think that the current draft standards adhere to the vision of the Guiding Principles and that these standards – as they are – have the potential to truly transform the way in which DC young people are prepared for their lives as citizens in our civil society. While not perfect, they are far better and more deserving of our children’s time and attention than the current 16 year old standards in use in our schools at present. With that in mind, I ask the Board to consider three powerful actions over the remainder of this year: Please vote to approve the revised DC Social Studies Standards when OSSE brings them for your consideration this spring. Please also commit to a 10 year maximum timeline for the next revision of these standards. Given the three-year process for the current update, this might mean beginning a review by the State Board in eight years (2031) with an expected revision between 2032-2033. Please work closely with OSSE on the roll-out of the revised standards to ensure that teacher professional knowledge is valued, parents are informed. and state-level capacity for teaching and learning of social studies in DC is built in this process. The State Board might: a. Encourage the writing of an open-source voluntary state curriculum, like our neighboring Maryland has, to align with the revised standards. While such curriculum would not be mandated for use in all schools, it would provide a common set of tools, resources, pacing guides, etc. aligned with the new standards and available, freely and equally, to all LEAs. This curriculum can and should be created by educators. So...b. Support efforts to hire & compensate DC educators as the authors of a voluntary curriculum or of illustrative units of study for the revised standards. Then, have those units The revised standards set DC apart from many other states in terms of the content and scope of what is covered in K-12. It will be unlikely that teachers or LEAs will have an easy time finding text books or ready-made curriculum that will align with our new standards. It is also unrealistic to expect that individual LEAs or teachers themselves will have the capacity to create aligned curriculum for the full scope of the standards. Instead, having teachers from different LEAs compensated to come together and create aligned materials with OSSE will provide both professional development for educators and a curriculum that is of and from DC. c. Build opportunities to educate parents on the revised standards. Parents are their children’s first teachers. They will also need support in understanding the kinds of changes in the way their children are learning history and civics, which are likely quite different from how they were taught in school. Please consider a path to assessing the quality and fidelity of the implementation of the revised standards in LEAs statewide. This may be a periodic statewide assessment, like the DC Science Assessment, a performance assessment (i.e., Mikva Soapbox or We The People mock Congressional Hearing), an observational assessment of classroom instruction in LEAs or something else. Nonetheless, what gets measured gets done and the new standards will only

have the power to affect our students if they are taught in all grade levels in all schools.	
---	--

**Summary of Feedback on Specific Standards and Anticipated Response**

**Kindergarten Feedback**

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree.”</li> </ul> <p><b>K.Inq.ID.3, K.Inq.ID.15</b> – these standards did not receive this ranking because respondents felt gender identity was not appropriate for Kindergarteners (see below)</p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>LGBTQ+ standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Civ.US.2 “Awesome addition!”</li> <li>• K.Civ.US.2 “For Kindergarten these topics are inappropriate...of course you tell students to respect EVERYONE, however you don’t introduce terms of biracial, LGBTQ+ or multiracial. There are conversations that belong with parents and caregivers not DCPS”</li> <li>• I wanted to say I am very thankful to see lgbtq+, Jewish, indigenous, and black identities highlighted in these standards.”</li> <li>• K.Inq.ID.3 Please, please, please rephrase this as something along the lines of -- "Develop an understanding of one’s identity being a combination of family, gender, ethnicity, culture, religion, experiences, and ability and how a person’s sense of their identity can change over time."</li> <li>• Children are concerned with having friends and mainly friends of the same gender</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates commenters’ engagement on these standards and understands the concerns of the community.</li> <li>• The Guiding Principles call for windows and mirrors in curriculum for all students; “all” includes students who are members of different family structures. Accordingly, OSSE will not remove these standards.</li> <li>• OSSE will include the suggested phrasing about changing identity over time.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rigor:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Justice is a very abstract term for this age, where is the idea scaffolded in the standards”</li> <li>• “I wonder what examples are appropriate for Kinders”</li> <li>• “Maybe for older children”</li> <li>• “better for older children as they have a better understanding of world view. Kinders world view is their immediate surroundings”</li> <li>• A majority of survey respondents selected “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” in response to Standards are appropriate for this grade level”</li> <li>• K.Geo.GR.19 Explain the relationship between a map and a globe, and explain how they help us to understand our place in the world and community relative to Washington, DC, continents, countries, states – Is this depth appropriate for K? The map and globe make sense, but relative location seems high.</li> <li>• K.Inq.TA.7 See Yardsticks-children rarely see another point of view and take things literally.</li> <li>• K.Hist.CCC.9 Comparing the past and present is questionable for Kindergarten children to comprehend.</li> <li>• K.Civ.WG.18 Better for older children as they have a better understanding of world views. Kinders world view is their immediate surroundings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s attention to the age of kindergarten students. Nevertheless, will not substantially change the level of rigor present in the standards in response to this comment. Expert reviewers and the committee of educators who crafted the K-2 standards agree there is an appropriate level of rigor present in these standards. Older models for elementary social studies education, often called expanding horizons, are built on incorrect or outdated understanding of what young children can do.<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• However, OSSE will revise K.Geo.GR.19 and move the concept of relative location to grade 2 in response to this commenter’s recommendation.</li> <li>• OSSE understands that K.Geo.HP.22 could be challenging for educators to implement with students who are experiencing homelessness. OSSE will curate a set of age-appropriate texts and examples for educators to use with their students and include language in ancillary resources to support educators in appropriately addressing this topic.</li> <li>• OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports for supporting young learning in accessing rigorous concept included in ancillary resources and professional development modules for scaffolding instruction.</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> For more information about Expanding Horizons see <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1002231?seq=5> or [Beyond Expanding Horizons.pdf](#)  
1050 First St. NE, Washington, DC 20002 • Phone: (202) 727-6436 TTY: 711 • osse.dc.gov

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Geo.HP.22 Wow this is relevant but heavy for young kids.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Active Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Inq.TA.7 Is this just to be used as a reflection? otherwise, I would put it in more active language: Identify skills that lead to a productive and respectful conversation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s careful review of the language in this standard and will update K.Inq.TA.7 to include active language.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indigenous Nations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Geo.GR.19How does DCPS look at "Indigenous Nations" too vague. In history the US, Mexico, Brazil etc were indigenous nations until . . . . . you know the rest. Curious on implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indigenous Nations continue to occupy sovereign territory that can be represented on a map. It is important for students to understand that Indigenous Nations continue to exist. Accordingly, OSSE will not update this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• OSSE will develop illustrative content and concepts to further provide guidance for educators, including resources to support educators in teaching about Indigenous Nations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Granularity of standards:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Inq.ID.14 “different abilities is open to interpretation”</li> <li>• K.Inq.TA.8 “the examples in parentheses help significantly... I could see my colleagues overthinking what civil discourse looks like in Kindergarten”</li> <li>• K.Civ.CE.1 “Adding examples of skills would be helpful here”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will clarify language where appropriate.</li> <li>• For some standards it is more appropriate for the term to remain general to enable educators to build a learning experience around developing a common definition as a class (i.e., “justice” or “different abilities”).</li> <li>• OSSE will develop illustrative content and concepts to further provide guidance for educators</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standards that address diversity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Civ.CE.4 The phrase “respect for diverse members of a community” is inappropriate for young kids...the message is individuals who made a difference in their community</li> <li>• K.Civ.US.2 In addition to "demonstrating respect for all people" can we add "and all family structures?"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will retain a standard calling for the respect for diverse members of a community. This standard is consistent with the Guiding Principles call for standards that include “explicit attention to first-person accounts and recognition of people and groups that have been discriminated against throughout history.” OSSE will ensure robust supports for implementing these standards are included in ancillary materials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Global Focus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Civ.LP.5 Please show the life for American students across the US and life for global students in other countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This standard is designed to discuss the universal principle of fairness and what makes a rule fair or unfair, and to establish a foundation for age-appropriate democratic classroom discussion. Accordingly, OSSE will not update this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• Nevertheless, individual LEAs have the flexibility and may determine to include global examples in teaching this standard.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Civil Discourse</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Inq.TA.8 If you have to vote, you are not in agreement. Someone has to defer their preference if arguments are not persuasive. And "improve" is subjective. In kindergarten we are just trying to make some plain old decisions so we can get on with our day</li> <li>• K.Civ.CE.17 This is great. Nothing gets Kinders more engaged than the topic of Unfairness. They have so many questions and have passionate discussions about how to fix it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing norms of civil discourse and democratic rule making is an essential component of civic education and consistent with the expectations set forth in the Guiding Principles. Accordingly, OSSE will not update this standard in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Focus on Family and Community</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Civ.US.2 Foundations of US government begin with communities. Family is one example of a community to which a student can belong. Other communities may include church, sports team, scouts, etc. While the family structure is important to student well being, focusing solely on the family discriminates against or lessens the importance of the other communities children are involved with.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of standards that focus on family and focus on community structures is balanced and appropriate for Kindergarteners. Different standards address both support structures for students. Some examples are below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>K.Civ.CE.1 Describe the roles and responsibilities of being a part of a family, classroom, and local community.</i></li> <li>○ Standard: <i>K.Civ.US.2 Identify different kinds of families and caregivers within a community (e.g., single-parent, blended, grandparent headed, conditionally separated, foster,</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Civ.CE.1 Extending it to "local community" at the kindergarten level is not really going to work, especially with time constraints.</li> </ul>	<p><i>LGBTQ+, multiracial, etc.) and discuss the importance of demonstrating respect for all people.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.Civ.CE.1 Explain what constitutes a community and describe characteristics of different communities</li> <li>○ 1.Inq.ID.2 Describe the ways individuals are all part of the same community, despite their varied ancestry.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not update these standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Length of standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Civ.LP.5 "there are too many pieces to this....I guess we are adverse to having two sentences?"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's suggestion to clarify this standard and will adjust K.Civ.LP.5 to become two separate standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Support for kindergarten educators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Inq.ID.3 This standard is broad and will need specific examples of what this looks like in the classroom and how to measure it appropriately</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will develop illustrative content and concepts to further provide guidance for educators.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The value of social studies education for Kindergarteners:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K.Civ.WG.18 "As an elementary teacher, the emphasis on teaching reading, writing, math, phonics and phonemic awareness takes up the vast majority of instructional time each day"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research consistently demonstrates that social studies instruction improves elementary literacy. OSSE is not considering reducing the number of social studies standards.<sup>4</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Economic Concepts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "I liked ""Driving Concept 5: Meeting Community Needs"" - esp things like scarce resources and how societies make decisions based on finances...</li> <li>• K.Civ.CE.1 Can we include of mention of wants as well as needs? At this age, kids will have a hard time telling the difference between the two and giving them this language can be helpful. Many will feel that their wants ARE their needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the community engagement around community needs.</li> <li>• OSSE will update K.Civ.CE.1 to include wants as well as needs.</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> For further information about Social Studies and literacy see <https://www.socialstudies.org/sites/default/files/view-article-2021-02/se-85012132.pdf>



Grade 1 Feedback

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> </ul>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<b>Timelines</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 1, Driving Concept 3 seems like a good time to introduce the concept of timelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will update Grade 1 Driving Concept 3: My Community Then and Now to include the concept of timelines in standard 1.Hist.CCC.24.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Values</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.Civ.CE.1 Can we also include how individuals and communities have their own sets of values. This is another abstract concept, but I think there's an opportunity for kids to grasp this idea with this driving concept</li> <li>• 1.Inq.ID.2 Is there a reason why just ancestry is mentioned? Can we also say backgrounds, beliefs and experiences?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will update 1.Inq.ID.2 to include backgrounds, beliefs, and experiences.</li> </ul>
<b>Civic Engagement</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.Civ.LP.6 Could we use the terminology "laws" and bring in democracy, as well?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will update 1.Civ.LP.6 to include the term “laws.”</li> </ul>
<b>Granularity of Standards</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.Inq.ID.3 What are "different communities" and how far back do you go? Seems too vague.</li> <li>• 1.Inq.ID.3 I wonder if this should start with the specific ward of the school and then move to the larger city-wide community.</li> <li>• 1.Civ.US.4 Too broad for this age group.</li> <li>• 1.Civ.US.5 This is appropriate because it is tangible to 1st graders.</li> <li>• 1.Civ.LP.6 Who defines "just"-too vague.</li> <li>• 1.Civ.US.7 What is "common good"? Too vague. The role of government is to keep order and safety for its citizens. in the current form "Identify symbols, songs, and phrases that unify the community of the United States and symbols and songs that unify different communities within the United States, as well as national holidays that commemorate American history" To vague and leaves more questions. You have a city and DCPS with roughly more than 50% minority. So what perspective are the unifying songs, symbols etc.? the Flag, anthem, what holidays commemorate American history? do we highlight good and bad? are we telling kids the truth or just the feel good stories? Right after we talk about "just" for the community. This is inconsistent and could use clarification or changes or simple edits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will clarify language where appropriate.</li> <li>• For some standards (1.Inq.ID.3) it is more appropriate for the term to remain unspecific, which allows educators to build a learning experience around developing a common definition as a class (i.e. “justice” and “common good” – members of society may have different definitions of these terms).</li> <li>• The current language in 1.Civ.US.7 allows for an investigation of symbols that reflect both nationally recognized holidays and symbols that reflect the identities of students across Washington, D.C. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• OSSE will ensure ancillary guidance includes support for educators and examples for engaging with this topic.</li> </ul>
<b>Rigor</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.Geo.GR.21 This topic you cant give them the entire history, too much for young kids.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s engagement, but disagrees with this commenter’s perspective that this standard is too rigorous for grade 1 students.</li> <li>• 1.Geo.GR.21 allows educators to choose a specific aspect of their community to focus on, or to develop lessons appropriate for their student population.</li> <li>• Additionally, OSSE will develop illustrative content and concepts to further provide guidance for educators.</li> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not be modifying this standard in response to this comment.</li> </ul>

Grade 2 Feedback

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> </ul> <p><b>2.Hist.DHC.22, 2.Inq.DP.30, 2.Inq.ID.29</b> did not receive these ratings due to the mention of gender and gender roles. See below.</p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Rigor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.Inq.DQ.1 Not age appropriate.</li> <li>• 2.Geo.GR.3 Level of student thinking required? What would be involved in, say, comparing the Sahara Desert and the Mojave desert, or the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, at a second-grade level? Why do it?</li> <li>• 2.Geo.GR.5 Easily accessed by 2nd graders.</li> <li>• 2.Geo.HE.9 Not age appropriate.</li> <li>• 2.Civ.WG.14 Seems to this is way out of the social sphere and background knowledge of second graders-not age appropriate because they don't have a connection with the topic.</li> <li>• 2.Hist.DHC.16 This is so far off the mark! elementary teachers are not trained in ancient civilizations!! This is AP World History</li> <li>• 2.Hist.DHC.16 Very appropriate for second grade, and probably interesting to second graders. This is a just-right standard.</li> <li>• 2.Civ.WG.14 What? Learning "the characteristics of ancient civilizations" is a huge undertaking, usually completed by middle school students. How will second graders learn them? By memorizing a list? That would be quick but not meaningful. By inferring them from a study of multiple civilization? That would be meaningful but should take weeks.</li> <li>• 2.Econ.EM.19 This is an intriguing standard. It would work well for grade 5+, but I'm not sure how effectively second graders can analyze multiple civilizations and draw general conclusions. Given lots of support and scaffolding, they probably could, and it would be a worthwhile attempt. Is there a way to signal, within the standard, that lots of scaffolding and structure will be necessary to achieve this learning</li> <li>• 2.Hist.DHC.27 Level of cognitive work required? "Identify and describe" could be done through lecture and memorization.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will not substantially change the level of rigor present in the standards. Expert reviewers and the committee of educators who crafted the K-2 standards agree there is an appropriate level of rigor present in the standards. Although older models for elementary social studies education, often called expanding horizons, may not follow this construct, research and practice demonstrate that the level of rigor presented here is appropriate for young children.<sup>5</sup></li> <li>• OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports for supporting young learners in accessing rigorous concepts, including illustrative ancillary resources and professional development modules for scaffolding instruction.</li> <li>• OSSE is committed to ensuring students have critical foundational knowledge for future courses.</li> <li>• OSSE agrees that standard 2.Geo.GR.3 may not be as cognitively rich as some other standards, this standard is critical to ensuring that students can identify the seven continents and five oceans on a map and understand the key characteristics of both. Ultimately, this set of knowledge and skills will enable students to understand the historical content in the grade 2 course.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Clarity of Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driving concept 1 description: This says “to refine their mapping skills” but I don’t remember where mapping skills were introduced earlier in the standards. Should this say “develop” their mapping skills. In addition, can we avoid using the word lens twice in the second sentence.</li> <li>• 2.Geo.HP.7 It’s not really clear what content this standard should address. If the goal is more aimed at the critical investigation</li> <li>• of information sources, that needs to be clearer</li> <li>• 2.Inq.DP.11 There is also a possibility for comparing and contrasting here.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will revise the language in Driving Concept 1: Understanding Ourselves in the Larger World description to say “develop.”</li> <li>• OSSE will update the following standards as described below:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.Geo.HP.7 <i>Using data, visual displays, and textual information, develop claims about where and how people live around the world today (i.e., use graphic or data visuals to examine population; evaluate cultural elements like food and clothing, etc.)</i></li> <li>2.Inq.DP.11 will be updated to read: <i>Compare ways people get food and water today — starting with local examples, and expanding to global.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<sup>5</sup> For more information about Expanding Horizons see <https://www.istor.org/stable/1002231?seq=5> or [Beyond Expanding Horizons.pdf](#)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.Inq.ID.12 I don't know what this means. For example, in our culture, lots of people use social media and we eat a lot of fast food. What does that tell us about how Americans lived long ago</li> <li>• 2.Hist.DHC.21 A personal comments: we risk missing something if religious structures are reduced to their technological significance. Is there a way to also address the meaning and social function of such "innovations"?</li> <li>• 2.Hist.CCC.28 I wonder if the whole standard can be broken up into more sentences to make it more clear.</li> <li>• 2.Inq.TA.34 A small question to consider is about audience and use of the word "your" here</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.Inq.ID.12 will be removed.</li> <li>○ 2.Hist.DHC.21 will be updated to include religious beliefs.</li> <li>○ 2.Hist.CCC.28 will be revised for clarity.</li> <li>○ 2.Inq.TA.34 will be revised to remove the word "your".</li> </ul>
<p><b>Curriculum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2nd grade units feel better in this draft, although a bit too much overlap with the close reading units. For example we have an entire close reading unit called "then and now" so it feels like overkill to then also have SS unit 3 - innovations of long ago. I'm wondering if there was any cross-curricular considerations or planning here, and if there's a way to reduce the workload rather than pile more on with these topic</li> <li>• 2.Hist.CCC.28 I think that it is a bit over the top to ask kids to describe and analyze government systems of ancient civilizations when they haven't yet fully dived into the US government, which comes in a fabulous 3rd grade ELA close reading unit. This feels too rigorous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement on the social studies standards. This comment concerns curricular decisions which are made by individual LEAs. OSSE will release guidance that outlines best practices for Social Studies implementation including interdisciplinary implementation.</li> <li>• Students do not need to understand American Government to describe the role of a king, pharaoh, or priest in a government system.</li> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Global studies and culture focus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given that the course is about world geography, and later courses address ancient history, couldn't it be better to focus on the present? Will there be a place, for example, for students to learn about, say, Nigerian dance or Mexican food or Japanese tea ceremonies (more generally, about the many fascinating ways people in the world today live differently)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will not revise grade 2 standards to focus on cultural differences. Throughout the standards there are opportunities for educators to include global culture, some examples of which are below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>K.Hist.CCC.16 Compare how historical people in our families, communities and from different countries lived, learned, worked, and relaxed.</i></li> <li>○ <i>1.Geo.HE.22 Describe how location, weather, and physical environment affect the way people live, including the effects on their food, clothing, shelter, transportation, and recreation.</i></li> <li>○ <i>1.Econ.EM.31 Explain the varied ways that people labor, define the term income, and describe the kinds of work that people do inside and outside of the home.</i></li> <li>○ <i>2.Geo.HP.7 Using data, visual displays, and textual information, examine and generate questions about where and how people live around the world today (i.e., use graphic or data visuals to examine population; consider whether such as expected levels of precipitation; cultural elements like food and clothing, etc.).</i></li> <li>○ <i>2.Geo.HE.9 Examine the ways people have lived (and continue to live) around the world, identifying nomadic patterns and more stationary or sedentary patterns.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• While the study of culture is interesting and important, it is also important for students to understand the rich and diverse history of global civilizations beyond surface level</li> </ul>

	<p>study of different cultural practices and ensure that students have a nuanced understanding of global society.</p>
<p><b>Importance of Social Studies in K-2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The many indicators seem very ambitious for each standard. As an elementary teacher, the emphasis on teaching reading, writing, math, phonics and phonemic awareness takes up the vast majority of instructional time each day. This does not even take into consideration specials, SEL, lunch and recess time. Either deleting standards and/or indicators may make it more manageable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research consistently demonstrates that social studies instruction improves elementary literacy. OSSE is not considering reducing the number of social studies standards.<sup>6</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.Inq.TA.8 This is a good standard, but how should it play out in a course that focuses on world geography?</li> <li>2.Inq.DP.13 It is also questionable whether the teacher will present the event in the correct context because teachers are not properly trained as historians.</li> <li>2.Hist.DHC.27 There MUST be videos and photos and kid-friendly books relating to these.</li> <li>In general I think the standards across elementary education are a bit too rigorous and also rely on the idea of a LOT more funding to get resources and sources into teachers' hands. I like the overall topics better but I think there is a bit of rigor here that is just way too much for kids. If we don't get materials for these units, then people will not do them justice in their teaching. There is a lot of history in this curriculum. We need photos, videos, and age-appropriate fiction and nonfiction books that support the curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this feedback and notes that grade 2 focuses on global communities. A study of how different individuals across the globe define wants and needs is consistent with the grade 2 course. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise 2.Inq.TA.8 in response to this comment.</li> <li>OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports including illustrative content and concepts to support educators in implementing standards, including curating examples of photographs and texts that are appropriate for grade 2 students.</li> <li>OSSE is working with teacher preparation programs to develop professional development modules that support educators in using inquiry, culturally relevant instruction and best practices to drive learning, especially focused on Elementary Education and Historical Thinking and looks forward to making these materials available to LEAs and educators.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Environmental Literacy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.Geo.GR.6 Better left to science. Why include this in social studies? Environmental Literacy</li> <li>Driving Concept 4: Our World Today misses any aspect of human energy demands and what energy resources we use or even the consideration of what is sustainable or not specific to energy and the connection to climate change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental literacy is a core component of the Guiding Principles and a necessary part of social studies education. Understanding the climate patterns of different global regions is foundational knowledge for exploring the cultures and civilizations of different global regions.</li> <li>Sustainability is included in standard 2.Geo.HE.33 in an age-appropriate manner.</li> <li>Accordingly, OSSE will not revise standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Choice of Civilizations for Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In second grade you start ancient world history - please try to have something in Africa other than Akum... southern Africa or central... And more mentions of Asian cultures early as well.</li> <li>2.Geo.GR.23 I'd pick 2 or 3 civilizations. It is too broad and the reality is it's one of 4 units and most schools teach SS/Sci every other unit so you're really looking at a 6-8 week unit.</li> <li>2.Geo.GR.2v3Has DC made the absolute decision that these civilizations are the most critical for second-graders to study? I understand wanting to add an African civilization, but even though I know a lot about world history, I had to google Aksum to find out what it is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE is updating the grade 2 standards to include African, American and Asian history between 1200 and 1400.</li> <li>Due to this update Aksum will be removed from Driving Concept 3: Innovations of Long Ago.</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> For further information about Social Studies and literacy see <https://www.socialstudies.org/sites/default/files/view-article-2021-02/se-85012132.pdf>

<p><b>Hindu-Arabic Numerals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.Hist.DHC.27 in referencing “number systems” fails to properly give credit to Hindu mathematical achievements.. Please correct “number systems” to the proper term “Hindu-Arabic numerals” to properly give credit and be consistent with other state social studies standards (see Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this feedback and has clarified 2.Hist.DHC.27, which did not intend to reference Hindu-Arabic numerals as they were not consistent with the chronology of the standard.</li> <li>For clarity 2.Hist.DHC.27 has been updated to read: <i>Identify and describe the scientific and technological innovations across the Americas, as well as across Rome, Aksum, or ancient China (i.e., alphabets and language systems, roads, aqueducts, etc.).</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Focus on the Americas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 2, Driving Concept 2: Please note that these processes happened in the Americas too. Students are going to think civilization only developed in one small corner of the world. This is partially balanced out by the next unit, but that one's more about mature civilizations than how they develop. Not talking about how civilizations developed in Asia and the Americas can play into false histories that suggest these regions received civilization from an outside force instead of developing it from within indigenous cultures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 2 Driving Concept 2: First Ancient Civilizations has been updated to include Olmec civilizations. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hist.DHC.16 <i>Explain the importance of using water to grow a food source and the importance of developing systems of irrigation, especially in early civilizations such as Egypt, Kush, Mesopotamia, and Olmec.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Historical Thinking Skills</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.Inq.DP.13 This is really important</li> <li>2.Inq.DP.24 There is a lot of focus in all of these SS standards on "examining sources" which I think is over the heads of 7 year olds. I think using them in a teacher-guided setting IS appropriate - asking kids to determine the credibility or which sources is best, is a secondary ed skill</li> <li>2.Hist.DHC.26The level of this standard is appropriate for second graders. I am left wondering what they should discover through this study-- that all civilizations approached building in similar ways? That they used different, available natural resources for building? That some cultures were more advance in their building techniques than others?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates commenters’ engagement and support of historical thinking skills.</li> <li>OSSE will not substantially change the level of rigor present in the standards. Expert reviewers and the committee of educators who crafted the K-2 standards agree there is an appropriate level of rigor present in the standards.</li> <li>OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports for supporting young learning in accessing historical thinking skills in a grade appropriate way, including ancillary resources and professional development modules for scaffolding instruction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>History of Gender</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I'm really excited they're going to learn about Kush and matriarchies</li> <li>2.Inq.ID.29 I'm so glad this is in here!</li> <li>2.Inq.ID.29 What? Gender identity ? You have to be kidding me. These standards are getting more absurd! As a 2nd grade teacher, I will not teach to this absurdity!</li> <li>I'm very excited that we're offering more of a holistic view on history, including gender roles, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates commenters’ engagement on these standards and understands the concerns of the community, however the Guiding Principles call for windows and mirrors in curriculum for all students, and this include students who are members of different family structures. It is critical that students see examples of powerful women in history and understand that gender roles in society are not fixed constructs. OSSE will not remove these standards.</li> <li>OSSE is committed to ensuring educators have robust supports for discussing gender, LGBTQ+ families, and respect for diversity during implementation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Government Structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.Hist.CCC.28: Would love to see the idea of complementarity (as opposed to hierarchy) addressed alongside ""female-led"" societies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this suggestion and will consider including this idea in the grade 9 course where students and educators will be better equipped to address this standard.</li> </ul>

**Grade 3 Feedback**

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> </ul> <p>3.Inq.ID.9, 3.Inq.TA.11, 3.Inq.DC.17, 3.Econ.DM.18, 3.Hist.DHC.29 and 3.Inq.DC.31,3.Civ.US.41 did not receive these scores due to rigor or opposition to engaging students in action civics. See below.</p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Rigor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.Inq.DC.17 This concept is too advanced for 3rd graders.</li> <li>• 3.Inq.DC.31 Too advanced and kids of this age cannot comprehend the issues discussed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will not substantially change the level of rigor present in the standards. Expert reviewers and the committee of educators who crafted the grades 3-5 standards agree there is an appropriate level of rigor present in the standards. Older models for elementary social studies education, often called expanding horizons, are built on incorrect or outdated understanding of what young children can do.<sup>7</sup></li> <li>• OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports for supporting young learning in accessing rigorous concepts, including an ancillary resource guide and professional development modules for scaffolding instruction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>DC Connections</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.Inq.DC.13 What's alternative if family has no DC ties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students who attend school in Washington, D.C. have ties to the District.</li> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports for supporting young learning in accessing rigorous concepts, including ancillary resources and professional development modules for scaffolding instruction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Curriculum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.Geo.HC.14 This is a great lead up to the content covered in the first ELA unit in 4th grade.</li> <li>• 3.Civ.US.34 This one and the last one are directly connected to and support the work in the ELA WDC ELA unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement on the social studies standards. This comment concerns curricular decisions which are made by individual LEAs.</li> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not update these standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Geography Skills</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.Geo.GR.2 I like the idea of identifying significant physical features and natural characteristics of the region. Locating DC on a map feels like a skill that should be included in the lessons but not in the overarching standard. And by region are we talking about Maryland DC and VA?</li> <li>• 3.Geo.GR.2 Standard is irrelevant if students have no understanding of what geographical features means.</li> <li>• 3.Geo.GR.3 Yet again students need background knowledge on geographical features.</li> <li>• 3.Geo.GR.4 What kind of map are we talking about? Paper and digital? Most people use digital maps. Some clarity around the types of maps would be helpful.</li> <li>• 3.Geo.GR.5 This standard sound similar to the one about identifying the wards in DC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will update the language of 3.Geo.GR.2 to clarify the meaning of “region”. OSSE will continue to include locating Washington, DC, on a map.</li> <li>• Study of geographical features is included in early grade levels, and this is not vocabulary that is essential to understanding 3.Geo.GR.2 or 3.Geo.GR.3. Accordingly, OSSE will not update 3.Geo.GR.2 or 3.Geo.GR.3 in response to this feedback. OSSE will ensure robust supports for implementing these standards are included in ancillary materials. The difference between paper and digital maps is not meaningful for the implementation of 3.Geo.GR.4. Accordingly, OSSE will not update this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• OSSE appreciates the comment that 3.Geo.GR.4 and 3.Geo.GR.5 are similar and will combine these two standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Identity Affirming Spaces</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.Inq.ID.9 Please provide context to "Identify and explain the importance of identity-affirming spaces within Washington, DC for different individuals". This is unclear what is meant, very vague. for young kids I dont understand what is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the feedback about the clarity of 3.Inq.ID.9. OSSE will ensure the language of the standard is revised to define identify-affirming spaces.</li> <li>• OSSE will provide further guidance for educators in ancillary resources to ensure this standard is implemented appropriately.</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> For more information about Expanding Horizons see <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1002231?seq=5> or [Beyond Expanding Horizons.pdf](#)  
 1050 First St. NE, Washington, DC 20002 • Phone: (202) 727-6436 TTY: 711 • osse.dc.gov

<p>trying to be accomplish or why its phrased so cryptic. Could use a re-write or clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Inq.ID.9 Segregated spaces based on “identity” encourage division, not inclusion. Usually “identity” is chosen by the majority and often is the source of intolerance when viewed from a historical perspective</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Urban Planning and Gentrification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Geo.HP.7 I'd like to see the word gentrification in this standard.</li> <li>3.Inq.DC.10 THIS is what I was looking for! Love the inclusion of information about redlining and highways. I'd also included the train - metro.</li> <li>3.Inq.DC.10 Conceptually too advanced</li> <li>3.Inq.TA.11 Activism at this age is difficult and can be viewed as indoctrination. It's hard for kids this age to disagree comfortably</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s perspective and will update 3.Inq.DC.10 to include the Metro.</li> <li>OSSE appreciates commenters’ engagement on these standards and understands the concerns of the community, however the Guiding Principles call for civic engagement throughout the standards. Accordingly, OSSE will not remove these standards.</li> <li>OSSE is committed to ensuring educators have robust supports for engaging students in civic discourse, including respectful disagreement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Expanding Representation of District Communities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Hist.DHC.22 Will there be some mention of Latinx people and their impact on DC?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will update grade 3 Driving Concept 3: The Evolving History of Washington, DC, and Driving Concept 4: Today’s Washington, DC, to include greater representation of Latinx and AAPI history in Washington, DC.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moving Grade 3 to Grade 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 3, Driving Concept 3: It seems strange to have students evaluating DC’s role in major national historical events that students have not otherwise studied</li> <li>We should move grade 3 to Grade 5 so students have more context for DC History.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the feedback about shifting grade 3 to grade 5 so students can have more context for the DC History standards. OSSE is currently exploring the feasibility of this shift and its impact on the vertical articulation of skills, rigor and content in grades 3-5.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Including Institutions of Higher Education and their histories</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Geo.HC.19 Include: Georgetown University and the Maryland Jesuit's history of “selling” more than 272 enslaved African Americans in 1838 and other documented institutional wealth accumulation from chattel slavery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the commenter’s feedback that the history of slavery is responsible to the institutional wealth of Georgetown University. While this does not make sense to include in 3.Geo.HC.19, OSSE will include a standard that addresses the role of slavery in the development of Washington institutions, including Georgetown University.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Including Specific Events in DC History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Hist.DHC.26 Black Lives Matter protest in DC, January 6th insurrection, Supreme Court Same Sex Marriage Ruling in 2015</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s attention to recent events and notes that they can be addressed through current standards 3.Hist.DHC.26 or 3.Hist.DHC.27; individual LEAs may choose additional significant events on which to focus. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise 3.Hist.DHC.26 in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Including recent events</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Hist.DHC.29 Modern political movements are too nuanced for this age group. It’s not fact based and leads to political indoctrination</li> <li>3.Hist.DHC.30 Please include all of their faults.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Home Rule movement is a significant historical movement that directly impacts the government structures and freedoms of DC residents. The standard does not take a position on the historic movement, but helps students understand the reasons for results of the movement. Expert reviewers and the committee of educators who crafted the grades 3-5 standards agree there is an appropriate level of rigor present in the standards. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise 3.Hist.DHC.29 in response to this comment.</li> <li>The standard does not take a position on the legacy of the figures listed, and instead asks students to evaluate the legacy and contributions of significant figures in DC history. This would include an evaluation of successes and shortcomings. For these reasons, OSSE will not revise 3.Hist.DHC.30 in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Updating Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.Hist.DHC.28 Compare and contrast the lived experiences of diverse Washingtonians from different time periods (e.g., Opechancanough, Henry Fleet, Benjamin Banneker, Frederick</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will revise 3.Hist.DHC.28 to more accurately reflect the names of the region during the lifetimes of the individuals named in this standard.</li> </ul>

<p>Douglass, William Costin, Mina Queen, Anna Julia Cooper). Opechancanough was a contemporary of the Jamestown colony. There was no Washington at the time. Benjamin Banneker assisted in the survey for the 1st ten weeks (he maintained the regulator clock and made astronomical sightings during the day and at night) of the Federal City, the future Washington, but Banneker never lived there. The survey began in the Virginia portion, that was retroceded in 1846.</p>	
<p><b>Civic Engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.Civ.US.35 Too close to a political debate for me but understand how this issue is of longstanding importance to the culture of DC residents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE remains committed to ensuring that the standards fully reflect the Guiding Principles and will not revise 3.Civ.US.35 in a manner that is inconsistent with the Guiding Principles.</li> <li>• As written, this standard is consistent with the Guiding Principle: Knowledge framing: democratic citizenship, civic dispositions &amp; experiences.</li> <li>• Additionally, including civic discourse is a best practice for social studies education.</li> </ul>



Grade 4 Feedback

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received "Agree" or "Strongly Agree"</li> </ul>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Standards are strong</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Super strong and straight forward set of standards!</li> <li>• 4.Inq.TA.20 excellent focus</li> <li>• 4.Geo.GI.21 very strong set of standards and aligned to the existing DCPS units of study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the community and will work to ensure educators have robust supports for implementing these standards with fidelity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Clarity of language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.Inq.DC.2 The language here is confusing. I suggest: Analyze how physical geography (e.g., natural resources available, waterways, landforms) impacts the choices people make and analyze how people impact the natural environment</li> <li>• 4.Geo.GR.3 Muddy language. I dont know what it means to "analyze natural resources." I suggest: Using a map or mapping tools, analyze (SOMETHING ABOUT) natural resources and the terrain of the land we now call North America before 1100 CE. Identify natural resources that may have been available over time</li> <li>• 4.Inq.DQ.4 language of "analyze reasons for how and when" is confusing to me- when analyzing reasons, you would analyze for a "why," not a how or a when." Perhaps: "Identify/describe/explain the different reasons people began to migrate around the globe and populate the Americas. (e.g., land-bridge theory, Beringea; Yana site and evidence of mammoth hunting; coastal-route theory; Clovis sites.</li> <li>• 4.Inq.DP.6 Use historical evidence to explain the development of various economic and systems of trade of Indigenous peoples across the Americas (e.g. Inca ceque system; the use of cacao as currency and the trade of turquoise and minerals in Chaco)</li> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.10 "cultural practices" is nonspecific - could be further specified as religious beliefs and practices and/or social and economic structures.</li> <li>• 4.Geo.GR.15 not sure if we want to use the language of "exploration" and "colonizing" vs settler colonialism etc.</li> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.23 I'm not sure how you can "evaluate an experience"</li> <li>• 4.Inq.DC.26not sure how you can "Analyze Spanish settlement"; maybe: Analyze the impact of Spanish settlement on the Southern and Western United States, with a particular focus on Indigenous Nations.</li> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.28 Not sure how "including the signing of the Mayflower Compact" fits with the sentence. Are we trying to get students to identify the impact of the signing of the mayflower compact on different groups of people at the time?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will update language for clarity as needed, while considering ways to maintain the level of rigor present in the standards. The word "evaluate" will be clarified when appropriate.</li> <li>• OSSE will update the standards below as follows in response to this commenter's suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 4.Hist.DHC.10 will be updated to include religious beliefs and practices and/or social and economic structures</li> <li>○ 4.Geo.GR.15 will use updated descriptions</li> <li>○ 4.Hist.DHC.23 will be updated to read: <i>Evaluate primary sources to make claims about the experiences and legacy of Europeans who traveled across the Atlantic between 1607 and 1700.</i></li> <li>○ OSSE will update 4.Inq.DC.26 to include the suggested revision such that it reads: <i>Analyze the impact of Spanish settlement on the Southern and Western United States, with a particular focus on Indigenous Nations.</i></li> <li>○ OSSE will update 4.Hist.DHC.28 to read: <i>Explain the reasons for establishing Plymouth and the Massachusetts Bay Colony and analyze the experiences of early life in the colony from the perspectives of Indigenous Nations and European settlers, and explain the significance of the Mayflower Compact.</i></li> <li>○ OSSE will divide 4.Hist.HC.43 into two standards.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.39 what does "to British actions and revolution" mean?</li> <li>• 4.Hist.HC.43 Are we asking students to "Evaluate the reasons for the creation of the Constitution" or also to evaluate "the Constitutional debates about the size and role of a federal government and the compromises that delegates reached in framing the Constitution (e.g., the Three-Fifths Compromise and the Connecticut Compromise)"?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Historical Accuracy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.Inq.DP.13 I do not know if there is any documentation of how the Haudenosaunee Confederacy engaged those outside of the gender binary of women/men, but might be worth exploring that language.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s suggestion and will update 4.Inq.DP.13 to read: <i>Evaluate the governing model created by the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and the ways in which women and men exercised political power.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>History of Enslavement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.24 I like the use of the word kidnapped- it's important that students understand the nature of how many Africans were brought over to the Americas.</li> <li>• 4.Inq.DC.29 Appreciation for the word, "forcibly"</li> <li>• 4.Hist.CCC.30 Students need to know how climates in the Northern and Southern colonies were for African Americans.</li> <li>• 4.Inq.ID.33 Love this! Let's uplift the rich cultures of the people taken from their countries. Their story did not begin the moment they touched ground on the soil in the Americas.</li> <li>• 4.Inq.ID.33 I believe the ie should have examples that show rather than opinions (this group of people did this vs this, etc etc)</li> <li>• 4.Inq.DC.41 This feels pretty specific</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the community and the supportive comments.</li> <li>• OSSE will not revise 4.Hist.CCC.30 in response to this comment because, as currently written, it includes the experience and treatment of enslaved people in northern and southern colonies.</li> <li>• OSSE disagrees with this commenter’s suggestion that 4.Inq.ID.33 includes opinions. Instead, OSSE believes that this standard, as written, includes examples of diverse histories in illustrative content and concepts and robust support for educators, and OSSE will further review this standard to ensure that those examples are explicit.</li> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s thoughts regarding specificity; however, OSSE will maintain the level of specificity in 4.Inq.DC.41 because, as written, the TWC and expert reviewers support that this standard contains the appropriate level of specificity to help students evaluate the complex history of American independence.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Including Additional Content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.Geo.GR.15 Add Hernán Cortés and Spanish conquest of Mexico/Aztec Empire.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will include additional examples, as recommended by this commenter, in illustrative content and concepts resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Expanding Representation of American Civilizations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.Inq.DP.5 Itemize additional agricultural practices of Indigenous peoples in the Mesoamericas and Andes</li> <li>• 4.Inq.DP.7 Physical "documentation" also includes figural and iconographic systems in diverse media in Mesoamerican and Andean societies such as sculpture and pottery or textiles.</li> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.9 Why does the standard have to analyze only one specific tribe of the Native Americans. elaborate more and why students are discussing the Native Americans and what happened with them.</li> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.9 an you say Cahokia and other peoples who built mounds in North America?</li> <li>• 4.Geo.HE.11The Aztec cultivation of Lake Texcoco through chinampas is a great example, of water management, the use of urban spaces for agriculture, and the use of waterways for trade</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will include the practices named by this commenter in 4.Inq.DP.5 and the reference to pottery and textiles in 4.Inq.DP.7.</li> <li>• 4.Hist.DHC.9 will be revised to include “and other people who built mounds in North America.”</li> <li>• OSSE will include the Aztec cultivation of Lake Texcoco in the illustrative content and concepts materials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Concerns about perspective</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.Geo.HE.11 I feel like the standard is clear. I just want to know how will this be taught and in what aspect from a biased or unbiased stand point. Social Studies should be taught in all aspects not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will not revise 4.Geo.HE.11 in response to this comment, because this standard is about Indigenous innovation it is not inclusive of European perspectives and does not include European history.</li> </ul>

<p>necessarily only what happened when the Europeans concurred Americas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.Inq.DP.18 there are cross-cultural hybrid source materials such as colonial codices that are neither discretely Indigenous or European. These hybrid objects were a way to understand Indigenous cultures for Europeans and a way to continue the tradition of manuscript production and self-identity/representation for Indigenous groups due to colonial suppression.</li> <li>4.Inq.TA.20 Provide a nuanced understanding rather than a binary of Indigenous peoples vs. European colonists such as Indigenous allies, Tlaxcalans, who helped Spanish conquistadors and contributed to the collapse of the Aztec civilization. Conflict from alliances/divisions as well as "subjugation, capture, and enslavement" existed within Indigenous societies prior to colonization.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the public engagement with standard 4.Inq.DP.18. OSSE will include the recommended materials in supplemental materials in consultation with Indigenous History experts.</li> <li>OSSE will not revise 4.Inq.TA.20. The standards already promote a nuanced understanding of Indigenous societies in the Americas. There is no evidence that any system which resembled this unique form of slavery existed in Africa prior to European contact.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Nuance to the European Experience</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 4, Driving Concept 4: Might also want to address the motives for immigration of Europeans who settled in the colonies, perhaps as part of 4.Hist.DHC.23</li> <li>4.Hist.CCC.25 Evaluate the status, treatment and experiences of European indentured servants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this comment and agrees that it will strengthen the standards.</li> <li>OSSE will revise Driving Concept 3: Life in the Colonies-Rebellions and the Roots of Revolution (1500s – 1700s) to include the varied motivations and experiences of European immigrants in the colonies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Rigor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.Inq.DQ.32 The concept of "historiography" feels a bit too high for 4th graders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will not substantially change the level of rigor present in the standards. Expert reviewers and the committee of educators who crafted the 3-5 standards agree there is an appropriate level of rigor present in the standards.</li> <li>OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports for supporting young learning in accessing rigorous concepts, including ancillary resources and professional development modules for scaffolding instruction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Include a Global Lens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A global lens could and should be incorporated in the earliest grades. Integrating a global perspective would ensure that elementary students think and act globally from an early age.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will update grade 4, Driving Concept 4: Rebellions and the Roots of Revolution (1500s- 1700s) to include additional contemporary global revolutions.</li> <li>OSSE will also update grade 4 Driving Concept 3: Europeans Enter the Americas (1400s- 1500s) to include African and European History.</li> </ul>

Grade 5 Feedback

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: commenters did not necessarily rank all standards in response to these questions.</i></p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Driving Concept 1: American Innovations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fifth Grade - Modern America: I'm worried about starting with ""Driving Concept #1: ""American Innovations"" - starting there might lead to JUSTIFYING the brutal things that were done - ""yes it was unjust, but look at the amazing innovations we gave to the world - and even to those people we oppressed..."" INSTEAD of being ""Driving Concept #1, I think it could be ""Driving Concept #5""</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will replace grade 5 Driving Concept 1: American Innovations with historical inquiry standards in response to this commenter’s recommendation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Course Content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I’m confused as to why the grade level history courses jump from Reconstruction to WWII without discussing WWI which had a profound impact on the society, culture, community in ways we’re only beginning to understand.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s engagement and query. However, OSSE will maintain the topics named by the commenter for grade 5, at the recommendation of the educators on the TWC who framed the course and intended grade 5 to serve as a study of significant moments in modern American history.</li> <li>• OSSE also notes that DC students will study World War I and the Progressive Era in US History II.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Clarity of Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.Hist.HC.7 " . . . in the territorial conquest of Indigenous Nations' territories.</li> <li>• 5.Hist.CCC.9 It would make sense to put "experiences" first and then "legacies", since the experiences would happen before the long term impacts</li> <li>• 5.Hist.HC.10 Do you mean this impact of these events on individual lived experiences?</li> <li>• 5.Civ.LP.37 I tend to avoid the term "citizens" in this context, because it is more complex and not all-encompassing. And there is a period in the 1860s between the passage of new "Black Codes" and the passage of the 14th Amendment that might get lost with this terminology. That said, I understand that this is part of a civics anchor standard, and I think it still gives teachers and students room to interrogate the meaning of citizenship in this period.</li> <li>• 5.Inq.DC.38 Comments: This excellent 5th grade standard should be retained with slight revisions suggested above for clarity and simplicity. Including coverage of the targeting of Jewish, Latinx, and Asian American communities in this standard supports deeper student learning of the broader nature of white supremacist ideology. This, in turn, helps students gain a better understanding of the ways in which various forms of racialized hate reinforce each other</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will revise language for clarity as appropriate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSSE will clarify 5.Hist.HC.7 to ensure Indigenous sovereignty is explicit.</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise the language of 5.Hist.CCC.9 to ensure chronology is accurate</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise 5.Hist.HC.10 to read: <i>Describe the causes of the Texas Independence movement and Mexican War from the perspective of Tejanos, enslaved Texans, Mexicans, American settlers and Indigenous Nations with a focus on the impact of these events on individual lived experiences</i></li> <li>○ OSSE will revise the language of 5.Civ.LP.37 to more accurately reflect the political status of Black Americans during the 1860s.</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise 5.Inq.DC.38 to read: <i>Explain how white supremacist groups founded in the aftermath of emancipation such as the Ku Klux Klan enacted terror against Black people and also Jewish, Catholic, Latinx, and Asian American communities.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Indigenous History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.Econ.DM.8 Given the lack of time teachers have to teach social studies, I'm reluctant to lift up the Lewis and Clark expedition as the example of American settlers' treatment of Native Americans, unless you specifically state the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s suggestion and will update 5.Econ.DM.8 to clarify the impact of the Lewis and Clark expedition, as well as the consequences for Indigenous populations of these expeditions.</li> <li>• OSSE remains committed to ensuring that this topic is covered with appropriate nuance.</li> </ul>

<p>aftermath of this expedition -- how it empowered more European Americans to move west. Could you also explicitly state how the success of the Lewis and Clark expedition hinged on the generosity and help of Native Americans?</p>	
<p><b>Reconstruction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.Inq.DC.34 This seems like a great way to introduce young students to the Reconstruction Amendments and the power and limits of legislation in this period and beyond.</li> <li>• 5.Civ.CE.36 This is an excellent and accurate departure from most standards on Reconstruction, which primarily emphasize change as top-down. It is great to introduce young students to Reconstruction as the grassroots, Black-led movement it was across all areas of life, which this standard encourages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s support for standards that focus on the history of Reconstruction and does not anticipate making changes in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Coverage of the Holocaust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 5: Foundations of Modern America, Driving Concept 6: World War II and Postwar US, p. 61, 5.Civ.WG.41, Retain: “Explain the causes of World War II and the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany, and understand how bias and prejudice led to the scapegoating of marginalized groups in Europe, including Jewish, Romani, Slavic, disabled, Jehovah’s Witnesses and LGBTQ+ communities.” Comments: This is a vital 5th grade standard and should be retained. The standard offers a valuable introduction to the place and importance of targeted bias in Nazism and Italian and Spanish fascism. Learning about how Nazi and fascist regimes used racialized hate to advance their goals supports better student understanding of fascism as an ideology and prepares students to engage with these concepts in later grades.</li> <li>• 5.Civ.WG.41 “Bias and prejudice led not to scapegoating but to the murder of 11 million people who might or might not have considered themselves part of a “marginalized” group. This murder is referred to as the Holocaust and should be referred to as such in D.C.’s curriculum.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE shares this commenter’s belief in the importance of ensuring that students are taught about the Holocaust. However, the TWC, researchers and The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum does not advocate for teaching about the Holocaust before Grade 6. This is supported by research into best practices.<sup>8</sup> OSSE will include an additional unit on global action civics and include an evaluation of the causes and consequences of genocide as part of the grade 8 Action Civics course.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Expanding Focus of Immigrant Experience</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.Inq.DP.12 Why is this limited to just those three groups? What about other Asian immigrants during this period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will update 5.Inq.DP.12 to include all Asian immigration during this period, and include additional standards about the impact of the Chinese Exclusion Act.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Civil War</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 5, Driving Concept 5: perhaps discuss war and slavery as economic issues of the Civil War as well as social ones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will not revise grade 5 Driving Concept 5: The Creation of a New Nation – The American Revolution and Founding of the United States Government (1700s- 1790s) in response to this comment because the evaluation of economic impacts of the Civil War are included in grade 7 and US History II.</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup>For additional information see: <https://www.ushmm.org/teach/fundamentals/age-appropriateness>

Grade 6 Feedback

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> standards received a mix of “agree”, “neutral” or “disagree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> standards received a mix of “agree”, “neutral” or “disagree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> standards received a mix of “agree”, “neutral” or “disagree”</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: commenters did not necessarily rank all standards in response to these questions.</i></p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Granularity of Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Grade 6 standards are extremely problematic, and in my view require a complete rewrite. “Culture” has been removed from the title of this course and it should be restored. Beyond this, both the structure and content are not well developed and try to cover far too much material. Long lists of generic standards are applied to each geographic region separately (much appears to be cut and pasted), supplemented by a list of equally broad geography standards and a deep dive into the Sustainable Development Goals.</li> <li>• This standard feels pretty huge, especially since it isn't connected to any specific content.</li> <li>• 6.Geo.HP.6 what are geographic patterns? There are HUGE elements included here. How many of them can teachers grasp?</li> <li>• How many are really appropriate for sixth graders? The central idea is sound, but too much is left wide open</li> <li>• Again, this is HUGE, particularly since it isn't connected with any specific place or time. If I were a teacher, I wouldn't have any idea what to do with it</li> <li>• 6.Geo.HP.20 Including "up to three African cities" is really helpful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the community engagement on these standards. The grade 6 standards were written to enable students to study each continent through a case study approach, so educators and LEAs can make individual determinations about which content is most relevant given current global events.</li> <li>• Under the grade 6 standards, students will gain a deeper understanding of culture through geographic inquiry and developing geographic thinking skills. For example, when considering where borders should be in each region, students will need to consider language, history, industry, identity, physical geography and a host of additional factors to make the case about the extent to which current borders are the best method for dividing regions. Furthermore, OSSE will clarify the language of each standard to ensure the orientation to a case study approach is clear for educators and LEAs. For example:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Current Draft:</b> 6.Inq.DQ.22 <i>Analyze contemporary issues facing people of Africa, and identify characteristics and causes of these issue(s)</i></li> <li>○ <b>Revision:</b> <i>Analyze at least one contemporary issue(s) facing one region or country within Africa and identify characteristics and causes these issue(s)</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• The standards in Driving Concept 1: The Power of Maps are intentionally broad. OSSE appreciates that in order to implement these standards with fidelity, educators may need additional supports and will further clarify the possibilities for implementation with ancillary resources, driving questions, and a geography community of practice.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sustainable Development Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the sixth grade standards, the effort to include the sustainable development goals in connection with each continent makes me worry that educators will be rushed to get through standards rather than have time for students to engage in sustained inquiry. Would it be possible for the standards to indicate that students should study sustainable development goals in context and consider opportunities for action at least twice during the school year (rather than 7 times)?"</li> <li>• I REALLY like the use of the UN Sustainable Development Goals in 6th grade!! Previously 6th grade could be too much of a boring geography course that focused on maps, but this puts real world issues at the center of each unit. Eleven year-olds can do great work and it is nice to see that they are going to be given a valuable academic experience that is meaningful to the world.</li> <li>• Love this one - 6.Civ.CE.10 on the SDGs - suggest also adding ""challenges in meeting the SDGs""</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's thoughtful comments and will retain the standards about UN Sustainable Development Goals.</li> <li>• However OSSE will also appropriately modify 6.Civ.CE.10 so students understand the purpose and rationale for the UN Sustainable Development Goals.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Civ.CE.10 selecting a specific framework is too specific and does not provide LEA's appropriate latitude. Schools and teachers should be able to select their own framework or have students create their own. If these are used introducing students to all 17 is excessive and guarantees a shallow glance at the topic.</li> <li>6.Civ.CE.10 Do you want students to memorize the 17 goals? It sounds like it. Also, it could take a good month to really honor this standard, including looking at multiple examples of collective action and doing research. Was that intentional?</li> <li>The incorporation of the SDG across units is a specific curriculum decision that has made its way into the district standards that all schools will need to implement</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Global Climate Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Econ.DM.23 Mostly this makes sense. But couldn't it also be the case that global climate policy (whatever that might be) could DECREASE access to...</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's suggestion and will revise 6.Econ.DM.23 and similar standards across continents to read: <i>Identify ways that global climate policy could impact equitable access to economic, social, and public health opportunities for at least one group of people in Africa.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Regions as a social construct</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"regions as a social construct"?</li> <li>Is this suggesting that continents (which are defined geologically, rather than culturally) are invalid constructs? Really? Is this truly meeting the needs of sixth graders?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the commenters engagement with the geography standards. OSSE will not revise the standards in response to this comment. These standards help students develop deeper geographic thinking skills. By asking students to determine where a border should be drawn in comparison to where they currently exist, students have to consider several factors, including culture, climate, physical geography, economy, etc.<sup>9</sup></li> <li>OSSE will ensure ancillary resources include robust supports to ensure educators are prepared to implement these standards. OSSE is also exploring the development of geography education professional development modules.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Increase focus on human and environmental interactions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the 6th grade geography standards there is a strong emphasis on human-constructed elements of geography such as borders. I would include more emphasis on the material impacts of the environment on human societies. The history of the American West provides one example demonstrating why this is important. The development of the American West cannot be understood without knowledge about both the region's actual aridity and about the maps and depictions of the West made by white Americans in the East. Both the actual water, and the ideas about water promoted by different groups, are crucial to the human geography of the region. I would suggest refining and combining some of the existing standards and adding in a standard that more thoroughly addresses these material aspects of geography.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the public engagement with the Geography standards.</li> <li>The impact of the environment on human societies is included in standards similar to 6.Geo.HE.18 6. <i>Explain how population distribution, natural resources, and the history of Africa have impacted changes in land use over time.</i></li> <li>Accordingly, OSSE will not revise the standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Borders and Border Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Geo.GI.5 The standard is limiting to generally who is hurt and helped and is not grounded in any specific policies. Could this standard look something like 'Describe the purpose, creation, evolution, and impact of international borders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will update 6.Geo.GI.5 to clarify it is intended to focus on the creation of borders rather than the creation of border policy.</li> <li>OSSE will further develop resources, including sample content and concepts, that will include specific borders</li> </ul>

<sup>9</sup> See [Who Lives on the Other Side of That Boundary: A Model of Geographic Thinking](#)

<p>and evaluate a present day border policy or proposal, including analyzing who is helped and who is harmed.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Geo.GI.5 Borders and border policies are two very different things. Also, which borders? When? I'm guessing teachers will need much more guidance on how to make this work in their classrooms.</li> </ul>	<p>educators may choose to focus on (i.e., India and Pakistan, Israel's borders, etc.).</p>
<p><b>Scope of Grade 6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>77 standards (so far)? Does that make sense?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's careful count of the standards and will consider ways to reduce or combine standards.</li> <li>In particular, OSSE will consider combining any standards that appear to be redundant, such as those provided below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Inq.DQ.22 <i>Analyze contemporary issues facing people of Africa and identify characteristics and causes of the issue(s).</i></li> <li>6.Inq.TA.24 <i>Identify a Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) and assess individual and collective options for taking action to address challenges in the region, taking into account a range of possible levers of power, strategies, and potential outcomes.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Drawing Regions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't know what this means. "Draw regions" (ok so far) to compare "with the existing region's economic communities"? What?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE's thanks this commenter for the opportunity to clarify this standard.</li> <li>Regions are contested and changing. Therefore, there are different ways to depict regions, and this standard is specifically designed to enable students to determine what should constitute a region in each continent.</li> <li>Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>OSSE will ensure educators have robust supports for implementing these standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>European Worldview</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Hist.HC.9 Will sixth graders know that a European view is central, especially if they study a new social studies curriculum that doesn't place the European view in the center?</li> <li>6.Geo.HC.8 I'd also like to discuss why the European perspective (with its biases) became the most prominent one (what motivated conquest? and why was that conquest so widespread?) with concepts like European conceptions of hierarchy, ownership of resources (especially land), Christian proselytizing, technologies, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's questions and the opportunity to clarify that 6.Hist.HC.9 is addressed through previous standards that investigate power and map projections, and again through World History standards. OSSE will remove 6.Hist.HC.9.</li> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's commitment to interrogating the history of European conquest, the reasons for the spread of European ideas are not within the scope of this standard; however, these concepts are addressed in World History II and Driving Concept 5: Europe.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Use of the term Indigenous</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Hist.DHC.15 Just wondering-- is the phrase "indigenous people" commonly used to describe people in Africa, where indigenous Africans are the majority (in most places)?</li> <li>I believe this is asking for students to understand the role of Africans or Asians, as opposed to settlers or colonizers, in the development of Africa and Asia respectively. If so, the standard is way too broad to be meaningful. If "indigenous" has some other meaning, it should be explained. Likewise other terms used which come out of the US context (BIPOC and people of color) don't have the same meaning in an a different global context.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's thoughtful question and agrees that the named standards are not integral to furthering the aims of the Grade 6 Global Geography course.</li> <li>OSSE will remove 6.Hist.DHC.156, 6.Hist.CCC.28, 6.Hist.CCC.40 and 6.Hist.DHC.66 accordingly.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Using Maps to Determine Perspective</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are we dropping a standard about maps being bias and having a point of view? I may have</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's interest in ensuring that students have an opportunity learn about bias in maps.</li> </ul>



<p>missed it. I would like to see this old standard represented in some way. -&gt; 6.1.9. Give examples of how maps can be used to convey a point of view, so that critical analysis of map sources is essential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE has included this concept in 6.Geo.GR.1 and 6.Geo.HC.3 and will include additional language for clarity in 6.Geo.GR.1 to ensure that this concept is explicitly named in these standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't see any development in standards. It could be good to say, for example, "given patterns of urbanization (or climate change, or anything else), predict patterns on this new continent and then compare findings against predictions. Also, draw conclusions about world patterns." (This is a more general comment, rather than one on this standard.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public. Using data to make predictions is one of many ways these standards can be translated into the curriculum, as such this skill is more appropriate to incorporate into curricular materials than standards. Therefore, OSSE will not revise these standards in response to this comment. OSSE will ensure robust supports for implementing these standards are included in ancillary materials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Incorporating specific language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some language I would like incorporated in 6th grade standards at some point -- population dynamics, demographics, growth rates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The terms named by this commenter - "population dynamics", "demographics", and "growth rates" - can be embedded through the source materials educators use to conduct geographic inquiry. OSSE will ensure these materials are included in ancillary supports. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise the standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Expanding to non-human focused climate change</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Geo.HE.7.3: I would expand the focus here to include more than only human-created causes of climate change. While students certainly need to understand human causes of climate change, they would also benefit from learning about times, ways, and reasons that the climate has changed over the course of geologic time. This information could help students more deeply understand how ecosystems, animal species, and human societies have been affected by changes in the climate regardless of the causes of those changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement on this standard and shares this commenter's commitment to ensuring that these standards promote students' environmental literacy. Currently, environmental literacy is included in the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Geo.HC.2 <i>Evaluate how human behaviors and identities are shaped by the environment and physical geography.</i></li> <li>6.Geo.GR.17 <i>Examine the impact of climate change on people in different regions within Africa.</i></li> <li>6.Geo.HP.30 <i>Assess the costs and benefits of changes in land use over time due to population distribution, natural resources, and human behavior.</i></li> <li>6.Geo.HE.42 <i>Analyze how population distribution, natural resources, and the history of the region have impacted changes in land use and economic systems in Latin America and the Caribbean over time.</i></li> <li>6.Geo.HE.43 <i>Evaluate the influences of long-term, human-induced climate change on patterns of conflict, cooperation, and migration within Latin America and the Caribbean.</i></li> <li>6.Geo.HE.51 <i>Explain how population distribution, natural resources, and the history of Europe have impacted changes in land use over time.</i></li> <li>6.Geo.GR.67 <i>Examine the impact of climate change on people in different regions within Oceania.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>Accordingly, OSSE will not be revising the grade 6 geography course in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Who draws borders?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Inq.DQ.12 or elsewhere in Driving Concept 2: Africa - suggest incorporating that the African continent is comprised of 54 countries and that the borders from these countries were drawn by colonizers. Something like - ""Analyze different geographic representations of Africa's 54 countries, created by different groups of people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This concept can be directly examined in 6.Geo.GI.5 <i>Describe the purpose, creation, evolution, and impact of international borders and evaluate who benefits and who is harmed by border policies.</i></li> <li>There have been many different attempts both driven by European colonizers and those driven by internal communities to redraw the borders of countries within Africa. To ensure students have the opportunity to study</li> </ul>

<p>over time, including European colonizers, to support claims about African history and geography.""</p>	<p>African geography outside of a Eurocentric viewpoint, OSSE will not update 6.Inq.DQ.1.</p>
<p><b>Inconsistencies in Wording</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.Geo.HP.53 Why does Europe have a different wording about the ""amenities"" of its cities as compared to the other continents? Either put that into the other continents or take it out entirely. Probably just change it to be the same as the others, but I would be interested to discuss the amenities of global cities, particularly art, infrastructure, and civic engineering</li> <li>6.Geo.HP.61 Why do some continents have this one and some the one about cultural influences?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s careful read of the standards and will add the language “amenities” to all urbanization standards to ensure standardization across continents.</li> <li>However, OSSE will not expand the language about cultural influences, to adhere to the Guiding Principle’s directive to maintain “fewer, clearer, higher” standards, the geography Driving Concepts focus on the standards that are most relevant for each continent.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Global Culture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term “contributions to global culture,” or “global culture” needs to be explained. Our students should be able to learn about and appreciate the variety of world cultures for their own sakes, rather than as contributions to some unified global culture (if in fact this is what this term is supposed to mean).</li> <li>6.Geo.HC.54 : For consistency, this standard should be changed to correspond to the wording of the identical standard, 6.Geo.HC.21... the standards should also include coverage of European religions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s thoughtful suggestion and will revise standards that are similar to 6.Geo.HC.21 to read: <i>Analyze at least one cultural element of a country located in Asia (i.e. art, literature, music, dance, cuisine, philosophy, religious or political thought), including its local significance and influence on other societies.</i></li> <li>OSSE will also revise 6.Geo.HC.54 to include European religions to maintain consistency across continents.</li> </ul>

Grade 7 Feedback US History I

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree”</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: commenters did not necessarily rank all standards in response to these questions.</i></p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Focus on Skills and Content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I really like that these standards attend both to historical narrative AND interrogation of historical evidence!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement of the public with the standards and will not be making any changes in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Early Human Migration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.Inq.DC.2 It might be useful to explicitly refer to different theories of how/when humans first arrived in the Americas (and how these theories are supported not only by archeologists, but also by geneticists).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE agrees with this commenter’s thoughtful suggestion and will revise 7.Inq.DC.2 to explicitly name the different theories, including the Bering Land Bridge and Clovis theories.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Clarifying Wording</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.Inq.DP.3 For this standard to be useful, I think it needs to state more explicitly why such sources of evidence might be limited</li> <li>• 7.Inq.DP.6 Not sure what it means to “evaluate the historical evidence to trace” . . . Perhaps just “Trace the development. . .”</li> <li>• 7.Geo.HP.11 Perhaps “population data” instead of “numerical data”? Not sure what is meant by numerical data</li> <li>• 7.Inq.ID.15 Perhaps add “how Indigenous Nations have been portrayed in American history *and popular culture*”</li> <li>• 7.Geo.GR.19 Probably would be clearer as follows: Locate and identify the geographic, economic, demographic, and social features of the 13 British colonies</li> <li>• 7.Inq.DC.23 It’s unclear if this standard is about Bacon’s rebellion or about the emergence of a racial caste system of slavery. If it’s the latter then I would reword the standard to front-load the codification of race.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s indication of specific components within the standards that can be clarified and will revise the following standards for clarity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSSE will revise 7.Inq.DP.3 to explicitly state why evidence might be limited.</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise 7.Inq.DP.6, to read: <i>Explain the development of technological and scientific innovations of at least three early Indigenous societies.</i></li> <li>○ OSSE will revise 7.Geo.HP.11 to include population data rather than numerical data.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• OSSE will include popular culture in 7.Inq.ID.15.</li> <li>• OSSE will update 7.Geo.GR.19, to read: <i>Compare and contrast the geographic, economic, demographic, and social features of the 13 British colonies.</i> OSSE will further ensure this standard is significantly differentiated from 4.Geo.GR.31.</li> <li>• OSSE will update 7.Inq.DC.23 to front-load the codification of race.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Roots of European Colonization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.Econ.DM.16 This 7th Grade standard should be retained. Recognizing the place of religious motivations in economic decision making supports deeper student understanding of the intellectual roots of European colonization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s support for standards that focus on religious motivations in economic decision making and does not anticipate making changes in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Including Specific Examples</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.Inq.DC.22: It might be useful to elaborate on specific examples here for teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will ensure these examples are included in the ancillary materials for educators to support their understanding and deeper engagement on standard 7.Inq.DC.22.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of Religious Minorities in American History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.Inq.ID.21 New suggested version: “Investigate the lived experiences and culture of early colonists, free Black people, enslaved people, women, religious minorities, and indentured servants across the colonies.” Comments: This 7th Grade standard would benefit from the inclusion of the lived experiences of religious minorities. Religious groups should be added because their inclusion aligns with the overall driving concept as well as the identity anchor standard</li> <li>• 7.Inq.DP.24, New suggested version: “Analyze the experiences, perspectives, and identities of people who were denied access (e.g., enslaved people, women, free Black people, religious minorities, etc.) to full rights</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public and will update 7.Inq.ID.21 to read: <i>Investigate the lived experiences and culture of early colonists, free Black people, enslaved people, women, religious minorities, and indentured servants across the colonies.</i></li> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public and will update 7.Inq.ID.24 to read: <i>Analyze the experiences, perspectives, and identities of people who were denied access (e.g., enslaved people, women, free Black people, religious minorities, etc.) to full rights across the colonies, including citizenship, marriage and voting restrictions.</i></li> </ul>

<p>across the colonies, including citizenship, marriage and voting restrictions.” This 7th Grade standard would benefit from the inclusion of religious minorities as an example for analysis. Religious groups should be added because their inclusion aligns with the overall driving concept as well as the diverse perspectives anchor standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.Inq.DC.27 New suggested version: “Evaluate the contributions of key figures during the Revolutionary era, including George Washington, John and Abigail Adams, Phillis Wheatley, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, Haym Salomon, and James Armistead Lafayette, among others.” Haym Salomon (1740-1785) should be included in this standard on key figures of the Revolutionary era, as he is widely considered, along with Robert Morris, a key figure in maintaining the financial solvency of the Continental Army</li> <li>• 7.Inq.DC.32, New suggested version: Analyze the impact of the Revolution on the social and political status of different groups in the new nation, including but not limited to women, Indigenous Nations, enslaved and free Black people, religious groups, and white people of various socioeconomic groups (e.g., rural farmers, Southern planters, urban craftsmen, Northern merchants, etc.). Comments: This 7th Grade standard would benefit from the inclusion of religious minorities as an example for analysis. It fits with the overall driving concept of this unit</li> <li>• 7.Inq.ID.56 This vital 7th Grade standard should be retained. Including religion in this standard supports deeper student understanding of the societal restraints placed on social reform movements in the early 19th century</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public and will ensure the legacy of Haym Salomon is included in the ancillary resources for 7.Inq.DC.27. OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public and will update 7.Inq.ID.32 to read: <i>Analyze the impact of the Revolution on the social and political status of different groups in the new nation, including but not limited to women, Indigenous Nations, enslaved and free Black people, religious groups, and white people of various socioeconomic groups (e.g., rural farmers, Southern planters, urban craftsmen, Northern merchants, etc.).</i></li> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s support for standards that focus on religious history and does not anticipate making changes to 7.Inq.ID.56. in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standards that Address Reconstruction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7.Hist.HC.65 This is a big improvement from the 2006 standards on Reconstruction Amendments. I appreciate, especially, how it gets at law in a de jure and a de facto sense: the differences between constitutional protections and actual freedoms/lived experiences of Black Americans. That distinction is so useful for students to know, both in terms of understanding Reconstruction and the broader legal system into today.</li> <li>• 7.Civ.LP.66 I think it is good and important for students to know about these debates and differences, as long as it is also clear how organizing on the ground factored in, too. If there is a way to work that piece into the standard, so it is a little less top-down and those connections are clearer, that would be great. That said, I know other standards in this set are attentive to grassroots movements.</li> <li>• 7.Civ.CE.67 This is a fantastic standard. I especially appreciate the attention to land and fair labor, which often gets lost or misconstrued in the story of Reconstruction</li> <li>• 7.Inq.ID.68 This is excellent. I really appreciate the emphasis on different types of sources here, and the focus on Reconstruction both in and beyond the South.</li> <li>• 7.Inq.DC.69 I appreciate the emphasis on different types of sources, and also the emphasis on short and long-term impact. I do wonder if there should be a subject — as in, who challenged the federal initiatives — to better guide teachers and students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the sustained and thoughtful feedback to improve standards that address critical moments in American history.</li> <li>• OSSE will make the following modifications to these standards in response to this commenter’s feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSSE will include grassroots movements in standard 7.Civ.LP.66.</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise the language of 7.Hist.DHC.72 to remove the phrase “abrupt end of Reconstruction”. The recommendation for 7.HIST.DHC.72 will be included in the ancillary materials to provide educators with a question set for students to further investigate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• However, OSSE will not revise the standards to focus on the successes of Reconstruction, as this is already included in the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7.Hist.HC.65 <i>Evaluate the impact of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments on the lived experiences of Black Americans, including the extent to which each amendment expanded freedom and constitutional protections for Black Americans.</i></li> <li>○ 7.Civ.CE.67 <i>Explain the impact of grassroots efforts by African Americans to gain access to land and fair labor, participate in political, economic, and legal systems, and achieve public education, in reconstituting a multiracial, democratic society.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.Hist.HC.70 I appreciate how this approaches the backlash to Reconstruction: That it was widespread and, of course, rooted in white supremacy. Not many Reconstruction standards (in general) do that, or they might tend to overemphasize the Klan as a stand-in for all racial violence.</li> <li>7.Hist.CCC.71 This is an excellent standard. The story of the Civil War and Reconstruction in the West and the experiences of Indigenous peoples is so often lost or misconstrued, so I appreciate the wording and attention to it here.</li> <li>7.Hist.DHC.72 I tend to push back on the idea that the Reconstruction project ended abruptly in 1877. And that is, in part, because U.S. troops in the South were not doing much anyway leading up to the federal government's withdrawal, and some of Reconstruction's aims and achievements continued into the 1880s and '90s. But I know that 1877 is the "official" end in most narratives, and it is excellent that this standard asks students to trace the legacy of this time into the present.</li> <li>7.Inq.DC.73 This focus on narrative is so important. Thank you!</li> <li>This is a huge improvement from the 2006 standards for middle schoolers. Thank you!</li> <li>The success of Reconstruction is underplayed. Its defeat is barely marked. Since the current standards were written, a. W.E.B Dubois describes Radical Reconstruction as "the finest effort to achieve democracy for the working millions which this world had ever seen." The extent of voting, the election of thousands of African Americans, and the policies that voting produced does not come through here, likely leaving students without a full grasp of the tragedy that was the end of Reconstruction. It also misses the opportunity to connect voting rights to change and policy. As noted above, the only mention of voting and elections during Reconstruction is parenthetical, about violence at voting booths (USH #9). b. To grasp the catastrophe of the loss of Reconstruction, students would need to understand its success; the initial but waning efforts to secure it and the brutality and violence that brought its overthrow; and how long running and widespread this violence were. As noted above, the inspiration isn't adequately conveyed. The brutality and terror that immediately followed is named (#USH1-70 and USH2-9), though the sections are weakened without specific examples....</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.Inq.ID.68 <i>Use primary and secondary sources to analyze the ways and means by which formerly enslaved persons created new lives for themselves in the South, North and West following the end of slavery.</i></li> <li>OSSE will provide specific examples to support the implementation of 7.Hist.HC.65, 7.Civ.CE.67 and 7.Inq.ID.68 in the ancillary materials to support educators in engaging students in the legacy of the Reconstruction era.</li> <li>OSSE will not include additional standards to address the violence of the Reconstruction era. The standards below include the violence of Reconstruction and expand that narrative to include the role of northern politics in ending Reconstruction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.Hist.HC.70 <i>Analyze the rise of white supremacy and racial violence during Reconstruction - including incidents of mass racial violence - including the impact of so-called "Black Codes" on Black Americans.</i></li> <li>7.Inq.DC.69 <i>Use primary and secondary sources to examine how and why federal initiatives begun during Reconstruction were challenged and assess the short- and long-term impact.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of the American West</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In Driving Concept 5: Emerging Social Movements (1800-1877) 7.Inq.DP,55. In this standard be sure to add, not only the East and West Coasts, but the Rocky Mountain West -- particularly Montana. Montana was a leader in the movement for Women's suffrage. Jeannette Rankin of Montana was the first woman to be elected to Congress. I knew some of her colleagues who told wonderful stories of the movement for women's suffrage in Montana</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement of the public with the standards.</li> <li>In response to this comment, OSSE will widen the geographic scope of the suffrage movement to ensure the voices of women across the country are included.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Attention to Democratic Evolution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On the plus side, the proposed standards include standards on the key founding documents and their ideas—the Declaration, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. And, more so</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's careful comparison of DC's historical and these draft revised standards.</li> <li>The current draft of the revised standards and Driving Concepts address democratic evolution in the United States, as follows:</li> </ul>

and more explicitly than the current standards, they helpfully ask students to consider the compromises that were included in the Constitution, especially around slavery; whether the Bill of Rights was fairly applied to all; the perspectives and lives of those to whom the documents did not apply, and the extent to which the ideals or rules in the documents match the reality.

- But in comparison to the current standards, they offer little on democratic ideas and principles. And, the larger story of how the country's democracy evolved from its extremely limited beginning is missing or very weak. In some cases, parts of the story are present, but they are without drama and are disconnected from democracy's overall evolution. ... Part of the problem is that, like the world history standards, these largely exclude the earlier "backstory" of the colonists, losing a chance to provide context for the Founders' interest in representative government, limited government authority, and religious freedom, for example. (Note: There is also no backstory on the ideas, culture and experience that Africans brought to America; their first introduction is in USH#20, already enslaved. Recall that this history was also dropped from world history standards.) But it's also that there is no explicit effort to track democracy's evolution. Major events around the coming and going of key rights go unmarked. Even when they are addressed, it's often discretely, in a way that isn't well-connected to the story of democracy's expansion or contraction. ...

- 7.Econ.DM.16 *Compare the economic, religious, and political motives that led to the establishment of early, distinct European colonies in the Americas.*
- 7.Hist.DHC.26 *Evaluate the economic, political, and ideological reasons for the movement for independence from England and construct a timeline of key events including the Stamp Act, Boston Massacre, Boston Tea Party, and the Battle at Lexington and Concord.*
- 7.Inq.DC.32 *Analyze the impact of the Revolution on the social and political status of different groups in the new nation, including but not limited to women, Indigenous Nations, enslaved and free Black people, and white people of various socioeconomic groups, rural farmers, Southern planters, urban craftsmen, Northern merchants, etc.*
- Driving Concept 3: Newly Formed, Diverse Nation: Confederation to Constitution (1770s- 1800s).
- 7.Inq.DC.48 *Evaluate the causes and consequences of the Mexican-American War, with specific attention to the impact of the war and the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo on Mexicans and Indigenous peoples living in the newly acquired American territories.*
- 7.Hist.HC.54 *Evaluate the political, social and economic opportunities and challenges faced by Indigenous Nations and Mexicans living in land incorporated into America after 1848.*
- 7.Inq.DP.55 *Compare gender rights and roles on the East and West coasts of the United States, and evaluate the goals and tactics of the women's suffrage movement.*
- 7.Hist.CCC.62 *Use context to assess the reasons for Abraham Lincoln's issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation, evaluating its short- and long-term impact.*
- 7.Hist.HC.65 *Evaluate the impact of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments on the lived experiences of Black Americans, including the extent to which each amendment expanded freedom and constitutional protections for Black Americans.*
- 7.Civ.CE.67 *Explain the impact of grassroots efforts by African Americans to gain access to land and fair labor, participate in political, economic, and legal systems, and achieve public education, in reconstituting a multiracial, democratic society.*
- 7.Hist.DHC.72 *Examine the ways in which events of the past continue to influence the present by tracing the legacy of unresolved issues the nation faced after*

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>the abrupt end of Reconstruction after the Compromise of 1877.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will add a standard to US History I Driving Concept 3: A Newly Formed, Diverse Nation: Confederation to Constitution (1770s to 1800s) that includes a specific focus on the democratic principles embedded in the constitution and the political debate surrounding it's adoption.</li> <li>• OSSE will expand 7.Hist.DHC.41 to include a specific focus on the debates between the Federalists, Democratic-Republicans and others about the democratic principles and their application in the early republic.</li> <li>• OSSE will expand US History I Driving Concept Driving Concept 4: Invasion and Control: Expansion of the Nation (1800-1860) to include an evaluation of Jacksonian democracy.</li> <li>• OSSE will revise US History I Driving Concept 7: Unresolved: The Reconstruction Era (1865–1877) to explicitly focus on the expansion and contraction of voting rights.</li> <li>• OSSE will support educators in implementing these standards through the creation of ancillary resources.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of Political History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards ignore narrative political history, losing the opportunity to show the connections between and among individual and community experiences, social movements, events, public debates, the shaping of public opinion, elections, elected leaders, and changes in policy and laws. Chronology is hidden. I know the standards writers wanted to move beyond “holidays and heroes.” But this goes well beyond that and is a great loss: In these standards, stuff happens—but the ‘why’ is less visible than it should be. Causation gets lost. The connection between voters and government is lost. The story is lost. For example, after decades of increasingly intense public debate, Lincoln was elected, the Civil War happened; slavery was ended. Lincoln was assassinated. Andrew Johnson assumes the presidency and prevents Blacks from getting rights under Reconstruction. Grant wins election and sends troops to the South. Hayes wins and the troops are withdrawn. This is a dramatic, high-stakes story that doesn't come through....Across the standards, there are almost no elections or leaders—in or out of the White House--making choices, determining policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s interest in political history and will revise select standards to include a greater focus on political history, as appropriate. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSSE will add a standard to US History I Driving Concept 3: A Newly Formed, Diverse Nation: Confederation to Constitution (1770s to 1800s) that includes a specific focus on the democratic principles embedded in the Constitution and the political debate surrounding its adoption.</li> <li>○ OSSE will expand 7.Hist.DHC.41 to include a specific focus on the debates between Federalists, Democratic-Republicans and others regarding democratic principles and their application in the early republic.</li> <li>○ OSSE will expand US History I Driving Concept 4: Invasion and Control: Expansion of the Nation (1800-1860) to include an evaluation of Jacksonian democracy.</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise US History I Driving Concept 7: Unresolved: The Reconstruction Era (1865–1877) to explicitly focus on the expansion and contraction of voting rights.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• OSSE will focus on larger themes of American history to ensure perspectives are expanded to include a more nuanced evaluation of historical events. The following standards include political history. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>7.Civ.US.34 Identify key individuals at the Constitutional Convention and evaluate the consequences of the compromises that emerged to secure ratification by the states, including the distribution of political power, rights of the states, and the makeup of the Senate and Electoral College.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7.Hist.DHC.37 <i>Evaluate the reasons for the creation of the Bill of Rights and determine the extent to which the fundamental liberties ensured by the Bill of Rights were equitably and fairly applied to people within the United States.</i></li> <li>○ 7.In q.DC.39 <i>Analyze the presidency and legacy of George Washington, including his legacy as an enslaver and as a leader who voluntarily relinquished political power.</i></li> <li>○ 7.Hist.DHC.41 <i>Examine international and domestic disputes that shaped the application of the between 1789 and 1820, assessing their short- and long-term significance.</i></li> <li>○ 7.Inq.DC.48 <i>Evaluate the causes and consequences of the Mexican-American War, with specific attention to the impact of the war and the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo on Mexicans and Indigenous peoples living in the newly acquired American territories.</i></li> <li>○ 7.Hist.HC.46 <i>Compare and evaluate the actions taken and rationales provided by the United States government to acquire western or Indigenous territory in the 1800s, with particular attention given to the policies and campaigns of President Andrew Jackson and the consequences such actions had on the land and people.</i></li> <li>○ 7.Inq.DC.57 <i>Evaluate the impact of territorial expansion and the conflict over the expansion of slavery on sectional tensions between Northern and the Southern states.</i></li> <li>○ 7.Civ.LP.66 <i>Compare different approaches toward and policies of Reconstruction (e.g., Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, and the Radical Republican plan), evaluating their rationale and impact.</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OSSE will ensure robust supports for implementing these standards are included in ancillary materials.</li> </ul>
--	---



## Voting Rights

- Voting rights and citizenship rights: These central anchors of equal treatment get almost no explicit attention. Two standards [#40 and #24 parenthetically--“(e.g., enslaved people, women, free Black people, etc.)” acknowledge that some Americans don’t have voting or citizenship rights; two parenthetically (US2 #9 and 58) reference “violence at voting booths”; one standard each in US1 and US2 is on the women’s suffrage movement and one each implicitly reference voting rights in general standards on the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. But the issue mainly goes under the radar. There is no acknowledgement that Native Americans or Asians didn’t have voting rights and citizenship rights. In no case is the importance or impact of winning the vote for any of these groups noted (more on this in 3a below). The only standard that explicitly marks any initially disenfranchised group gaining voting rights is USH2#60 when the Voting Rights Act is included in a list of civil rights laws passed in the 60’s. There is no mention of the Chinese Exclusion Act or other rules that kept Asians (including, explicitly, Chinese women) out of the country and/or ineligible for citizenship.
  - There is no discussion of these rights in the context of closing the gap between American ideals and reality. No discussion of the debates, conditions, or historical context that finally led to these changes. No drama. No detail. A lost opportunity to help students to connect voting to democracy’s principles and evolution.
- OSSE will revise US History I Driving Concept 7: Unresolved: The Reconstruction Era (1865–1877) to explicitly focus on the expansion and contraction of voting rights and will carefully review and modify, as needed, standards to make the connection to voting rights more explicit.
  - Currently, the following standards explicitly address voting rights and political participation in the United States, and OSSE will maintain these standards as written in response to this comment.
    - 7.Inq.DP.24 *Analyze the experiences, perspectives, and identities of people who were denied access (e.g., enslaved people, women, free Black people, etc.) to full rights across the colonies, including citizenship, marriage and voting restrictions.*
    - 7.Inq.DC.32 *Analyze the impact of the Revolution on the social and political status of different groups in the new nation, including but not limited to women, Indigenous Nations, enslaved and free Black people, and white people of various socioeconomic groups (e.g., rural farmers, Southern planters, urban craftsmen, Northern merchants, etc.).*
    - 7.Civ.US.36 *Compare the US Constitution to the Articles of the Confederation, Haudenosaunee Confederacy and the British Government by examining differences or similarities in government structure and power, as well as individual rights and liberties.*
    - 7.Inq.DP.40 *Examine primary and secondary sources—including selections of writing from Olaudah Equiano and Harriet Jacobs’ autobiographies— to gain perspective on the daily lives of those who were not allowed to participate in the formation of the US government or were denied access to civil rights, such as voting and/or citizenship.*
    - 7.Inq.DC.48 *Evaluate the causes and consequences of the Mexican-American War, with specific attention to the impact of the war and the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo on Mexicans and Indigenous peoples living in the newly acquired American territories.*
    - 7.Hist.HC.53 *Evaluate the reasons for Chinese immigration to the United States, including immigration policy, and the political, social and economic opportunities and challenges different individuals face in the United States.*
    - 7.Hist.HC.54 *Evaluate the political, social and economic opportunities and challenges faced by Indigenous Nations and Mexicans living in land incorporated into America after 1848.*
    - 7.Inq.DP.55 *Compare gender rights and roles on the East and West coasts of the United States, and evaluate the goals*

	<p><i>and tactics of the women's suffrage movement.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7.Hist.HC.65 <i>Evaluate the impact of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments on the lived experiences of Black Americans, including the extent to which each amendment expanded freedom and constitutional protections for Black Americans.</i></li> <li>○ 7.Civ.CE.67 <i>Explain the impact of grassroots efforts by African Americans to gain access to land and fair labor, participate in political, economic, and legal systems, and achieve public education, in reconstituting a multiracial, democratic society.</i></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will also include an additional standard specifically evaluating the impact and reason for the Chinese Exclusion and similar laws.</li> <li>• OSSE will ensure robust supports for implementing these standards are included in ancillary materials.</li> </ul>
--	--

<p><b>Africa is missing from American History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Across multiple grade bands that focus on early American history, there still seems to be only minimal attention devoted to learning about those African societies and cultures from which enslaved Africans were kidnapped during the transatlantic trade. I only found: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In Grade 7: 7.Inq.ID.20 Investigate the experience, perspectives, and identities of Africans who were enslaved from the start of the transatlantic trade through bondage, including the codification of race as a tool of oppression and resistance to enslavement.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• With so many standards devoted to a deep dive into indigenous societies (and appropriately so), it is imperative that the story of Black Americans not start with enslavement, but with an understanding of what was happening in Africa in the 16th-18th centuries, and what Africans brought with them to the Americas. Standards focused on the countries of origin of the European colonists is almost as thin, beyond examining the imperialist/colonizing impulse, but not as urgent as the need to add more content for a fuller story of Africans who came to the Americas.</li> <li>• It was my hope that the new Social Studies Standards would move in a bold way to allow for meaningful and significant changes in the way we teach our children to learn about who they are, how the world works, how</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's careful review of the standards and will make modifications to standards in grades 4 and 7 in response to this comment. Specifically, OSSE will review and revise the standards in these grades to include a greater focus on global events, including African history and the context of global revolutions.</li> <li>• The motivations of European colonists are addressed in standard 7.Econ.DM.16 and 7.Hist.HC.18. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise the standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
---	--

the world has come to be the way it is, and their place in it. While the guiding principles are well-meaning and the draft standards do shift the paradigm some, they do not go far enough. "The draft standards do not go far enough in several key ways. We need standards that will allow curriculum developers the opportunity to create instructional materials that allow students to grapple with the essential issues that face our nation today. Students need to make real-world connections to what they are learning in order for the instruction to be meaningful. As written, the standards do not go far enough to center the African American experience at the core. African American students make up nearly 70% of the students at all levels in DCPS public and public charter schools. We must have standards that address the lived experience of those students at the core if we truly are about being anti-racist and seeking to educate ALL children. If we continue to use a Eurocentric or white liberal lens to develop and teach social studies curriculum to a school district of majority African American students, we will continue to get more of the same. For example Standard 7.Geo.GI.17 Identify and analyze global trade routes and their impact on the formation of the European colonies throughout the Americas-including North, Central, and South America and the Caribbean-as well as the impact on African and European society. Yes, lets examine the global trade routes and their impact on colonial America. But let's not examine their impact on Africa as an ""as well as."" Let's start in Africa with the disruptive nature of the Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade in Africa. If the standards are going to create mirrors let it create mirrors to see the majority of the students in DCPS and thus allow other students to have a new window through which to see African Americans. If we really want to push the bar we have to be more radical than just including the African/African American experience, ""as well."" I will applaud the inclusion of white supremacy as a concept to be included in the standards. Acknowledging that white supremacy exists is definitely moving in the right direction. However, it lives primarily in the world history standards. It shows up for the first time in Driving Concept 5 in the Grade 5 Standards in connection with Reconstruction. It shows up again in Grade 7 US History again in connection with Reconstruction. White Supremacy is clearly a driving force in the founding of the United States and should certainly be included in the earlier US History Standards. The remaining references to white supremacy are appropriately placed in the World History Standards. We cannot continue to stick our heads in the sand when it comes to telling the hard truth about America's past.

- The draft standards actually do a good job covering slavery content wise. However, I would like to see more emphasis on the humanity of the enslaved Africans focusing on their lived experiences, family, resilience and resistance, life choices and existence. I would like to see more opportunities for students to understand how enslaved Africans endeavored to make their lives palatable, not just focusing on the ""nuts and bolts"" of history. Again, overall, the draft standards are a good attempt to improve upon the current outdated standards. And they do. However, we must push the

envelope further if we want to see meaningful growth for ALL DCPS students, especially those east of the river.	
---	--

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
Commenters declined to provide specific feedback on the grade 8 standards for clarity, appropriateness or relevancy.	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Global Action Civics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standards for this grade band are probably the clearest evidence of what is wrong with this draft, and the ways in which it does not apply the explicit ongoing global lens to the content that the Board recommended, with a focus on interconnections as well as comparisons. Rather, the standards adopt in my view a 20th century framing of global education. For each Driving Concept, one standard, identified as a “Civics: World Governments” Anchor Standard, is included – calling on students to compare a topic across three different nations, i.e., comparing ideas for the purpose of government and the role of the people; government structures; and rights of citizens. There are a few additional standards that require students to look at international alliances (I believe this is the only place in the standards where the UN, NATO, the IMF are mentioned), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and citizen protest globally. Then there are a few standards that call on students to construct an action proposal around a local, national, OR international issue. As Professor Laura Engel, who separately submitted her comments, has earlier pointed out, it is more appropriate to address the interconnectedness of an issue in its local, national, AND international contexts – as opposed to one or the other.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s interest in the proposed action civics course.</li> <li>The purpose of action civics is to engage students in the evaluation of different methods for taking action at different levels of government. This course was framed by the TWC to help students evaluate issues of concern to them, and understand how policy functions on a local, national, and international level. While issues are interconnected in a local, national and international level, this is beyond the scope of this course. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise the structure of the action civics course in response to this comment.</li> <li>OSSE will incorporate an additional Driving Concept in grade 8 focused on global opportunities for action. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The additional Driving Concept will focus specifically on the causes of global humanitarian crises and the role of global policy for taking action.</li> <li>The Driving Concept will include the evaluation of the most effective ways for individuals and countries to impact change on an international scale (NGO’s, levers of foreign policy, etc.). This Driving Concept will include an evaluation of the causes and consequences of global genocides, including the Holocaust, to fully capture this pivotal event in history.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Elevate the role of religion in American political history</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New suggested version: 8.Civ.US.3 Examine the historical and philosophical influences on the creation of the American government system, including the role of race, gender, religion, and socioeconomic status. Comments: The ideal of religious freedom that is part of the American government system was a unique innovation at its creation.</li> <li>Introduction, New suggested version: “Through this driving concept, students will think critically about how power and the access to power have shaped public policy and societal experiences from a global, national, and local perspective, including analysis along the lines of race, gender, religion, ethnicity, and socio-economic status. Students evaluate the relationship between the people and government, identifying, acknowledging, and solving real-world issues. Throughout this driving concept, students should evaluate a specific public policy case, such as environmental policy, through the lens of power, and create a proposal for taking action.” Comments: To align itself with the Civics Anchor Standard, the introduction to Driving Concept 4 should add religion as a marker of identity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s engagement with the social studies standards and agrees that religious history is an important component of American history.</li> <li>OSSE will update the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Civ.US.3 to read: <i>Examine the historical and philosophical influences on the creation of the American government system, including the role of race, gender, religion, and socioeconomic status.</i></li> <li>The introduction to Driving Concept 4 to read: <i>Through this Driving Concept, students will think critically about how power and the access to power have shaped public policy and societal experiences from a global, national, and local perspective, including analysis along the lines of race, gender, religion, ethnicity, and socio-economic status. Students evaluate the relationship between the people and government, identifying, acknowledging, and solving real-world issues. Throughout this Driving Concept, students should evaluate a specific public policy case, such as environmental policy, through the lens of power, and create a proposal for taking action.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>Clarifying Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Civ.WG.32 Analyze the ways in which countries use diplomacy, communications, and trade, among other means, to advance their national interests at home and abroad." Comments: The current version of the standard is overly broad and does not provide teachers with adequate guidance for implementation. Adding suggested examples and using the term "national interests" makes the standard clearer for educators.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates stakeholder's careful review of these standards and will update 8.Civ.WG.32 to read: <i>Analyze the ways in which countries use diplomacy, communications, and trade, among other means, to advance their national interests at home and abroad.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Hist.DHC.35 This a great standard/issue to study, it'd be challenging to put together materials and lessons to make this accessible for my students, particularly those who are on the [note: commenter did not complete sentence]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the community's engagement with these standards. OSSE will develop ancillary resources to support educators in further developing and strengthening their curricular materials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Moving Ancient History to Grade 9 is a Loss for Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Civ.WG.1 My issue again is that this standard can be incorporated into an ancient civ course. Although this standard does include governments from around the world, it is limited to the present and robs students of evaluating these systems with the benefit of historic context</li> <li>This is more appropriate to DC history in high school, it also doesn't need to be taught twice at the expense of other world histories and cultures.</li> <li>8.Inq.DC.7 What I typed in my first response, that ancient history provides emotional distance. This is an example. It's safer for students to discuss Hammurabi's laws and *if they want* they can draw parallels to the US justice system, but we are not traumatizing students by forcing them to discuss things like current government oppression</li> <li>8.Civ.LP.19 In my class on ancient world history, we still talk about DC's disenfranchisement as a parallel to the civic disenfranchisement of conquered territories (think Gaul in the Roman empire). Students like to make these kinds of connections on their own. With this standard, it takes away the opportunity to expand their worldview and situate DC residents into a global and historic context</li> <li>8.Civ.LP.24 This also feels like setting students up to grapple with their trauma.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE is supportive of the TWC's decision to include action civics in grade 8. Action civics is student centered, engaging and relevant to the lived experiences of students. This is consistent with the Guiding Principles and the Road Map for American Democracy. Students should be able to evaluate the means by which one they can make change in a modern society. American and District government is complex, and students deserve an opportunity for in-depth exploration and understanding of how policy is enacted and how citizens can impact this process.</li> <li>Accordingly, OSSE will not be removing the action civics course in response to this comment.</li> <li>OSSE will provide professional development and ancillary resources to support educators with the engagement of their students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Order of courses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can students, "Examine the historical and philosophical influences on the creation of the American government system" when we have moved these into 9th grade, AFTER action civics?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will retain the current structure of courses. This content is covered in Grade 7, US History I, Driving Concept 2: Colonization and Revolution and Driving Concept 3: A Newly Formed, Diverse Nation: Confederation to Constitution (1770s-1800s).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Appropriate knowledge for students in Grade 8</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Hist.DHC.4 Why do students need to know this in 8th grade?</li> <li>8.Civ.US.5 Again, it's not clear how this standard is important to this age of student.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will not revise 8.Civ.US.5 or 8.Hist.DHC.4. The TWC, expert reviewers, research, and OSSE are aligned in the decision to shift the course structure in the middle school grades and are not considering reinstating Ancient History in grade 7. The shift in course structure better aligns with best practices for social studies education and the Guiding Principles.<sup>10</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Civics is a liberal course that creates political activists</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This standard comes across as "know your rights" which is not a bad thing, but what is the agenda behind this course? If it is to create activists, then we are pushing a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will not remove the grade 8 Action Civics course. The purpose of this course is to give students tools to impact change.</li> <li>These standards are consistent with the guidance put forth by the Guiding Principles.</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> see: <https://www.educatingforamericandemocracy.org/the-roadmap/>

<p>political agenda, and not giving students an education where they can decide what is important to them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Civ.LP.12 This is where I want to know more about the agenda behind this course. It becomes a philosophical discussion on the purpose of education. If it is to create activist citizens, then this standard makes sense, however my philosophy is that education is to allow students to develop their curiosity and belief in their ability to learn and think critically for themselves. My belief is that if given those tools in middle school, then by high school gov't students will be open to learning the proposed standard and will understand their own power within the American legislative process</li> <li>This standard has a clear agenda of creating activist citizens and school should not be pushing any agenda onto students. Students should be given information and then they can decide how involved they want to be with making changes in our country. Although the standard doesn't say that it wants students to become activists, the following standards include taking action. It's also in the name of the course. Social studies is SOCIAL it is not purely civic education. The new course changes prioritize civics over all else within the umbrella of social studies which is a loss for our students.</li> <li>I am personally far-left politically, so I am not typing these criticisms because I am anti-government support, but this standard is blatantly designed to show students how the US is behind other countries in providing social safety nets to its citizens. We have to allow students to come to these conclusions on their own, we cannot force feed them a class so clearly reactionary to the last four years of governance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Econ.DM.16 is politically neutral; it asks students to evaluate the efficacy of different government policies, to include tax policies, policies that support the growth of businesses, and social safety nets, etc.</li> <li>OSSE will provide resources to educators to support the implementation of these standards in a non-partisan manner, consistent with best practices for engaging students in civic discourse.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Universal Human Rights</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Civ.WG.23 Retain: "Research the history of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and analyze the rights enumerated in this document." Comments: This essential civics standard should be retained</li> <li>8.Econ.DM.27. Add: Explore the economic issue through the lens of the economic, social and cultural rights identified in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the public's engagement with the social studies standards. OSSE will retain 8.Civ.WG.23 and will revise the wording for clarity to read: <i>Analyze the history of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and analyze the rights enumerated in the document.</i></li> <li>OSSE will not update 8.Econ.DM.27, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is included in 8.Civ.WG.23.</li> </ul>
<p><b>This is a statehood agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.Civ.LP.19 This is a statehood agenda standard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will not revise this standard. 8.Civ.LP.19. Consistent with the Guiding Principles, the action civics standards invite students to consider an issue of concern, decide for themselves how they feel this issue is best addressed and then take (or not take) action in a way they feel is appropriate. These standards will help ensure that students have the necessary tools to impact change should they choose to do so. OSSE trusts young people to be independent and critical thinkers. Specifically, 8.Civ.LP.19 is politically neutral. It does not prescribe a viewpoint, but instead asks students to evaluate the impact of the District's political status on the lives of citizens.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Suggestions for Implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing a letter to an elected official on any topic could help the student understand why the first amendment is so important</li> <li>We are in DC, a field trip to the Mall or capitol building to visit our DC Delegate should be strongly encouraged as a field trip</li> <li>Student pass a test on DC Statehood and a certificate of completion is presented to them. Have the DC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on these standards, and the curricular suggestions. Writing letters to elected officials or visiting delegates are curricular decisions that may be made by individual LEAs. As such these skills are more appropriate to incorporate into curricular materials than standards.</li> <li>Accordingly, OSSE will not revise the standards in response to these comments.</li> </ul>

<p>Statehood delegation issue the certificate and award it to all students who pass</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have student take action with the DC Council and Mayor on any issue they choose that affects them.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>DC History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.Hist.DHC.45 DC History is unknown to most HD Students I talk with. The history of DC and its fight for equal rights needs to be emphasized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on these standards and shares this commenter’s interest in DC History.</li> <li>• DC history has been embedded throughout the draft standards, including some of the examples below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Grade 12 Course: District of Columbia History and Government</li> <li>○ Grade 3 Course: Geography, History, and Cultures of the District of Columbia</li> <li>○ 2.Inq.DQ.1 <i>Compare different representations of the Washington, DC and Chesapeake region, including maps representing the political geography of Indigenous Nations, to develop claims about the changes to the Washington region over time.</i></li> <li>○ 1.Inq.DC.25 <i>Analyze maps and images of the Chesapeake region and Washington, DC from different historical periods to describe the ways the community has changed over time.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not make updates to the standards in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Social Media</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8.Inq.TA.59 I don't think that it is proven that social media provides much to any value to our political community. In fact, there is much more evidence to suggest that it causes more anxiety and hate. Perhaps it is better for students to engage in our political community through other means besides social media. Students need to be literate in social media, but they don't need to be encouraged to engage in the harmful world of it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the feedback from the public. While OSSE understands the concern with the use of social media, it is important that students have access to a variety of strategies for political action.</li> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• OSSE will ensure that digital literacy and online civic reasoning is present in all K-12 grades to help students critically evaluate the role of social media on society.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Citizen vs. Person</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Driving Concept 3: Rights of the People 8.Civ.CE.26: In this standard, look also at the ways the court system has been used to expand or limit the rights of human persons, be they citizen or noncitizen. It's important to remember that many of the rights protected by the Bill of Rights and the 14th Amendment apply to ""persons.""</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s perspective and will revise 8.Civ.CE.26 to ensure include language of all persons, including citizens.</li> </ul>



US History II

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree”</li> </ul>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Standards that Review US History I</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.1 I don't know if I would describe freedom, equality, and justice as ideals of the founding documents — unless we make clear/try to reconcile immediately that those ideals were only intended to apply to a very small minority. But, overall, I think this is a great standard: examining how the founding documents upheld racial injustice, incorporating primary sources, and emphasizing freed people's voices are all excellent and appreciated focus areas.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.1 It requires substantial time for students to understand the context of the Declaration and U.S. Constitution--weeks' worth at a minimum--in order for them to be equipped to make informed claims about what these documents meant, including the ideals embedded in them. The major problem in separating US History I from II in is that students will struggle to answer the type of question posed by Standard: US2.Inq.DC.1. The problem with this framing is that students without a strong grounding in these founding documents will be set up to give superficial and likely presentist answers to this important history and civics question.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement with this standard and will incorporate the ideas and sources in ancillary resources.</li> <li>• OSSE will not combine US History I and US History II. The division allows educators to explore themes of American History in greater depth.</li> <li>• The purpose of US2.Inq.DC.1 is to review content covered in grades 7 and 8. Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standards that Address Reconstruction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.2 This is such an important point. I appreciate that this standard can emphasize, essentially, that Black people conceived of freedom through traditions of resistance and reimagining long before the Civil War and emancipation. In other words, it indicates that the Civil War and Reconstruction are part of a long Black Freedom Struggle.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DP.3 Such important primary sources to incorporate — thank you.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.5 I only wonder if there is a way to add grassroots organizing to this, so the "aims of Reconstruction" are less topdown in this standard. But I know that many other standards in here emphasize the perspectives of non-elites and appreciate that.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.5 I believe that there should be mention of other reconstruction plans and not just focused on the two ideas from the Republican Party at the time</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.5 The chronology and the sequence could be nuanced to include the phase of Reconstruction that began during Lincoln's presidency (1862 or so), including major national legislation that fundamentally altered the course of U.S. History (e.g. Homestead Act). This provides a fuller and more accurate picture of Reconstruction and equips students better to answer questions about how revolutionary it was or wasn't.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.6 This standard could put more emphasis on the historical and civic question of freedom itself. What did the history of the Bureau reveal about what freedom meant in this period?</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.7 I've made a similar comment in previous standards here re: the Reconstruction Amendments, but</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on this standard. US2.Inq.DC.5 will be reframed to include grassroots organizing, and Radical Republican will be rephrased to state “Congressional Reconstruction”.</li> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on US2.Inq.DC.6. This recommendation will be included in the ancillary resource to support educators in the implementation of the standards.</li> <li>• OSSE will carefully review the structure and wording of Reconstruction standards and revise for clarity as needed.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.8 includes religious and cultural life. Accordingly, OSSE will not update this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• OSSE will adjust US2.Hist.CCC.9 to include fraud as a tactic to deny Black people political, legal, social, and economic power.</li> <li>• OSSE will revise the wording of US2.Civ.LP.11 to remove reference to Post Civil War era.</li> <li>• OSSE will revise the wording of US2.Hist.CCC.12 OSSE to ensure it is clear that the end of Reconstruction was contested, and that the standard is clearly referring to the Compromise of 1877.</li> <li>• OSSE will revise US2.Hist.HC.13 for clarity.</li> <li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement with the Reconstruction standards and appreciates the different perspectives on the progress and failures of Reconstruction. OSSE has not named specific actors or policies in this time period; the content is covered through the standard and additional resources will be available through the ancillary resource for educators.</li> </ul>

<p>it seems worth repeating. The framing of legislation and policies around the possibilities they open up and their limitations — especially without enforcement — is great.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.7 Some of the wording could be more precise. What are social and economic institutions, for instance? Does this just mean society and the economy? Can the economy even be presented with opportunities? The antecedent of "their" limitations could be clearer, too</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.8 Why leave out religious life? Why leave out cultural life? Including a clear reference to the church within the history of the African American freedom struggle would help here</li> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.9 This emphasis on systemic white supremacist violence is so important and rare to find in standards, so thanks for including it. My only suggestion would be to add "fraud" as a tactic to deny Black people political, legal, social, and economic power.</li> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.9 This could be framed to provide more context by including the role of state governments, the federal government, and African American communities in this question.</li> <li>• US2.Civ.LP.11 The stories of Chinese and Indigenous peoples so often get lost in this history, so I appreciate the emphasis. It gives students a much more complete and complex picture, too.</li> <li>• US2.Civ.LP.11 The Homestead Act and Pacific Railway Act are not from the post-Civil War Era. (1862.)</li> <li>• US2.Civ.LP.11 "Using primary and secondary sources, examine legislative actions of the post-Civil War era — including but not limited to the Homestead Act and the Transcontinental Railroad Act." Correction: These two acts were passed in 1862 during the Civil War. The effort to pass them was blocked by the slave states, because it would lead to slavery opponents moving to the areas that were opened up.</li> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.12 Could be clarified. "Series of events" suggests that Reconstruction was not contested and ultimately dismantled by historical actors making specific choices..."Evaluate the forces that led to the end" might capture this better. "The impact"...of what? Of Reconstruction or the end of Reconstruction or the Compromise</li> <li>• US2.Hist.HC.13 What are legal and social structures?</li> <li>• The success of Reconstruction is underplayed. Its defeat is barely marked. Since the current standards were written, much new scholarship has moved into the mainstream on Reconstruction, the role of race, and the Civil Rights Movement. I would expect these standards to be much stronger on these topics than those they replace. In some ways they are, but, again, so much is missing. a. W.E.B Dubois describes Radical Reconstruction as "the finest effort to achieve democracy for the working millions which this world had ever seen." The extent of voting, the election of thousands of African Americans, and the policies that voting produced does not come through here, likely leaving students without a full grasp of the tragedy that was the end of Reconstruction. It also misses the opportunity to connect voting rights to change and policy. As noted above, the only mention of voting and elections during Reconstruction is parenthetical, about violence at voting booths (USH #9). b. To grasp the</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE will not make further revisions to the reconstruction standards in response to this comment.</p>
--	--

<p>catastrophe of the loss of Reconstruction, students would need to understand its success; the initial but waning efforts to secure it and the brutality and violence that brought its overthrow; and how long running and widespread this violence were. As noted above, the inspiration isn't adequately conveyed. The brutality and terror that immediately followed is named (#USH1-70 and USH2-9), though the sections are weakened without specific examples. The general impact of Reconstruction's end is acknowledged in standard USH2 #13 asking students to "Examine laws and policies of the Jim Crow era," including segregation and "unequal access to legal and social structures." But there is not adequate acknowledgement that the discrimination and terror went unabated for 100 years. The focus doesn't return to Jim Crow, segregation, voting rights, until after World War 2, 40 standards later! Since the last standards, so much scholarship on these years has entered the public discussion. There are so many specifics that could be named. This hole that should be filled. The connection between the loss of the effective right to vote with ongoing terror and inequality should be made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This set amounts to a huge improvement from the 2006 standards. Thanks for all of your work.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Incorporating Indigenous Perspectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.4 This is an important question but should be reformulated to incorporate Indigenous perspectives. A reunited U.S. after the Civil War meant devastation of Indigenous life in the American West</li> <li>• US2.Civ.LP.23 "westward movement" is not the correct term.</li> <li>• US2.Hist.DHC.25 Is there standardized terminology across the standards when referring to Native Americans? "Indigenous Nations" (with the double capitalization) is not a common way to refer to these peoples and political entities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will revise standards to ensure that the Indigenous perspective of the Reconstruction era is included in Driving Concept 1: Reconstruction.</li> <li>• US2.Civ.LP.23 OSSE will update this standard to say "westward invasion" to ensure the standard accurately depicts the invasion of the territory of sovereign nations.</li> <li>• OSSE acknowledges that best practices are to name individual Indigenous Nations, however, there are 574 federally recognized indigenous nations, therefore, this is impractical in the context of the current standards. OSSE's naming conventions are aligned to the recommendations of our expert reviewers.<sup>11</sup></li> </ul>
<p><b>Specificity of the Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.2 This standard is very vague. Key events - what events? There should be key examples. It isn't good for history standards to be so wide open. There should at least be supporting examples, even if they are optional. But there should also be consideration in terms of "must knows" especially with such an important topic.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.4 This seems great and all-encompassing without being too broad.</li> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.4 This is a good skill. But it is largely devoid of content. There should be more guidance as to what this should cover and pertain to.</li> <li>• US2.Hist.HC.10 This is very vague. I appreciate the intent, but as an educator I am not sure what this means and how it would be implemented. I think either we need clear examples or more direction as to what this means</li> <li>• US2.Civ.LP.11 This is a HUGE standard. It needs to be broken down in order to build clarity</li> <li>• US2.Econ.US.14 This standard literally doesn't make sense. It is also HUGE. Is this the power standard? I am unclear how these standards are set up. There is also no content. Does the content come later? How does the content standards support the power standard? You can</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standards intentionally move away from the content approach to social studies education and toward critical historical thinking approach to social studies education. OSSE will not revise the specificity of the standards. OSSE will provide ancillary resource to support educators in the implementation of the standards.</li> <li>• OSSE did not develop or name "power standards" as part of these revised standards because OSSE does not recognize some standards as more essential than others.</li> <li>• OSSE will revise US2.Hist.HC.70 to specify the rise in Islamophobia and surveillance of Muslim populations in America.</li> <li>• OSSE will support LEAs and educators in teaching the role of white women in perpetuating violence and racism in the south and specific examples of Reaganomics in the ancillary materials to support educators in implementing social studies standards.</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> [A Note on Terminology](#)

<p>lessen the number of standards, but if they are ALL power standards, you actually have INCREASED the amount of information we will have to try and teach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Hist.HC.70 I am concerned that we only have a foreign act of domestic terrorism and not problems with domestic terrorism. I also think there should be explicit references to Islamophobia in this standard (if it isn't done somewhere else). Is there a way this could also look at the impacts on the lives of everyday Americans? "Domestic policy" could certainly include surveillance of mosques, changes in TSA screenings, but doesn't necessarily capture increased Islamophobia and other social consequences</li> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.9 While these actions were mainly perpetrated by white men, they were done in the name of and with the complicity of white women</li> <li>• US History II, Driving Concept 8 - Address Reaganomics and the widening wealth gap? "</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Specificity of Labor Movements</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.18, New suggested version: "Use primary and secondary sources to analyze a case study, such as the Knights of Labor, the American Federation of Labor, the Pullman Strike, the Homestead strike and the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory Fire, to evaluate the extent to which labor movements were able to create change." Comments: This excellent high school U.S. history standard would benefit from a broader list of examples for potential case studies. Educators will appreciate the additional guidance as they prepare curricula to meet this standard. The recommended additions also help make the standard more representative of the diversity of the labor movement in this period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement on this standard. These labor movements will be included in the ancillary resources to allow the granularity of US2.Inq.DC.18 and consistency with the US History II course.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Clarifying Wording</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Hist.HC.27 The wording is confusing with the two clauses (emerging as a... and domestic debates) not really being parallel things</li> <li>• US2.Hist.HC.28 I would revisit the use of the term "Indigenous" here, which is being used as an umbrella term for a lot of peoples and nations who are not all Indigenous peoples.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will adjust the wording of US2.Hist.HC.27 to ensure the language is parallel.</li> <li>• OSSE will revise the term Indigenous in US2.Hist.HC.28 to ensure the language clearly expresses that the perspectives of these events should be from the individuals who were living in each country prior to U.S. imperial actions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Include Different Kinds of Media</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Inq.DP.3 This is a great question. But can you rephrase to clarify? Also, you might put the emphasis not just on the perspectives but on the diverse media of these perspectives, which can range from letters to early sound recordings of interviews to sheet music, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the community. The important focus of US2.Inq.DP.3 is who produced the source material, rather than the medium of the source.</li> <li>• Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</li> <li>• However, OSSE will support DC LEAs and educators with ancillary resources to enable them to successfully support students in understanding and using primary source material.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of inequality in standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Inq.DC.16, Retain: "Analyze the reasons for racial and ethnic inequality in industrial America and evaluate the different reasons for, and efficacy of, different tactics used by movements for racial and ethnic equality." Comments: This high school U.S. history standard should be retained because it provides vital support for student learning about the challenges facing marginalized groups in industrial America including the growth of antiimmigrant sentiment, white supremacism, and antisemitism in the U.S. during this period. This material also prepares students for subjects covered in standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's recommendation to retain standards that focus on inequality in industrial America and does not anticipate making changes in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>

<p>US2.Civ.WG.39, US2.Hist.DHC.40, and US2.Civ.CE.41, among others</p>	
<p><b>Driving Concept 8: Access to Democracy and Power from the 1980s-Present Day</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would this be an appropriate place to examine changes in US demographics (racial, ethnic, religious) over the past few decades and the impacts of those changes?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s suggestion and will include a standard about the changing demographics of the United States (including the impact of urban and rural migration) in Driving Concept 8: Access to Democracy from the 1980s- Present Day.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evaluating US History through a Human Rights Lens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Driving Concept 4: Prosperity and Progress to Depression US2.nq.DC.37: Add: Look also at the Indian Citizenship Act of 1926 --what it did and didn't accomplish.</li> <li>• In Driving Concept 5: Emerging as a World Power: Conflict at Home and Abroad US2.Civ.WG.39 Add: Explore how the language of colonization of non-white peoples by European nations contributed to the language applied by fascist and Nazi governments and leaders to Jews, Roma, Slavic peoples ,etc. *Resource: Sven Lindquist’s “Exterminate All the Brutes – One Man’s Odyssey into the Heart of Darkness.”</li> <li>• In Driving Concept 7: Movements for Justice and Equality US2.Civ.CE.55: Add: Explore the reasons why African American advocacy movements in the 1950s and 60s applied the term ""civil rights"" and avoided the term ""human rights"" in directing their movement. Analyze the decision not to use the human rights mechanisms developed within the United Nations to address the denial of rights to African Americans in the United States. *Resource: Carol Anderson’s “Eyes Off the Prize – The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights (1944-1955)</li> <li>• US2.Civ.CE.59: Add: Examine the reasons the NAACP decided to abandon their efforts to bring the denial of human rights to African Americans in the United States before the UN Human Rights body. Evaluate the consequences of this decision. *Resource: Carol Anderson’s “Eyes Off the Prize – The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights (1944-1955)</li> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.61: Add: Look at institutional racism through a human rights lens. How are the economic, social and cultural rights of African Americans and other minorities affected by the persistence of institutional racism?</li> <li>• US2.Civ.Hist.CCC.62: Add: Evaluate these movements through a human rights lens to identify commonalities. Is the application of civil and political rights without attention to economic, social and cultural rights sufficient to ameliorate the persistent effects of institutional racism</li> <li>• US2.Hist.CCC.63: Add: How has the resistance of U.S. government officials to applying principles of economic, social and cultural rights as expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affected the reception of movements for social and economic equality?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the feedback from the public and will not revise the standards in response to this feedback. There are multiple ways different LEAs can implement the standards named here, and these resources are best addressed through curriculum rather than adjusting the language of the standards.</li> <li>• OSSE will provide ancillary resources to support educators in the implementation of the standards, which will include a resource for evaluating these movements through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in addition to the specific example of the Indian Citizenship Act of 1926.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Including Police Brutality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US2.Civ.CE.72 Evaluate the tactics of modern social, labor, political, and environmental activist movements in America, measuring their success. Include: Movements against police brutality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s interest in ensuring that US2.Civ.CE.72 includes specific timely and relevant topics.</li> <li>• Under this standard, LEAs may choose which social, labor, political, and environmental movements will best support student learning of this content.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Coverage of the Civil Rights Movement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You had some amazing scholars on your 20th century US history team! Very deep. Love the discussion of periodization and the Long Civil Rights Movement. Holy cow, I was unfamiliar with this so I did some reading. Yes! Great scholarship and deep thinking here!!</li> <li>Suggest adding a Civics: Civic Engagement standard linked to economic rights - that the civil rights movement was also advocating for workers and using boycotts to advocate for the economic rights of Black Americans and other marginalized groups.</li> <li>There is exclusion of certain groups, people, trends, and/or ideas throughout. For example, Driving Concept 7: Movements for Justice and Equality for High School US History has mentions of Dr. MLK and Rosa Parks; however, that is it. The standard ""US2.Civ.CE.55 Assess when the Civil Rights Movement began and ended, evaluating grassroots and advocacy movements from the 1890s through the 1960s and into the 21st century."" allows for opportunity to examine that the Civil Rights Movement did not begin in the 50's; however, without mention of people like Charles Hamilton Houston or the NAACP legal defense team, how are teachers going to make instructional decisions that will ensure that students are learning how the movement developed and in what way or what strategic decisions were made during that development?"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the public engagement on these standards. OSSE will add economic rights to the Civil Rights standards.</li> <li>OSSE will also provide ancillary resources to support educators in the implementation of the standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of Political History in Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standards ignore narrative political history, losing the opportunity to show the connections between and among individual and community experiences, social movements, events, public debates, the shaping of public opinion, elections, elected leaders, and changes in policy and laws. Chronology is hidden.</li> <li>I know the standards writers wanted to move beyond "holidays and heroes." But this goes well beyond that and is a great loss: In these standards, stuff happens—but the 'why' is less visible than it should be. Causation gets lost. The connection between voters and government is lost. The story is lost. For example, after decades of increasingly intense public debate, Lincoln was elected, the Civil War happened; slavery was ended. Lincoln was assassinated. Andrew Johnson assumes the presidency and prevents Blacks from getting rights under Reconstruction. Grant wins election and sends troops to the South. Hayes wins and the troops are withdrawn. This is a dramatic, high-stakes story that doesn't come through. Most of these particulars (except Lincoln's issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation) are not captured in the standards. Across the standards, there are almost no elections or leaders—in or out of the White House—making choices, determining policy. In US History 2, which begins with Reconstruction, Booker T. Washington, Ida B. Wells and WEB Dubois are mentioned together in one standard. No other civil rights leader is mentioned in any standard. (Martin Luther King and Rosa Parks are mentioned in the intro to Driving Concept 7). Where is Frederick Douglas (who is in USH1)? In the entire USH2, not one president is mentioned. There is no Franklin Roosevelt (or Theodore). There is no Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, no LBJ. We get perspectives about the "impact" of decisions, but the causation is lost. As importantly, "stories" with real people are more</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will update Driving Concept 2: The Rise of Industrial and Progressive America to include a specific focus on the political history of Industrial and Progressive America.</li> <li>OSSE will also revise US2.Civ.LP.36 to include specific reference to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.</li> <li>The focus on larger themes of American history allow perspectives to be expanded and enable a more nuanced evaluation of historical events. The current draft of the standards incorporates political history; this topic is necessary to teach the standards below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US2.Inq.DC.5 <i>Analyze the aims of Reconstruction, including Andrew Johnson's Plan and the Radical Republican Plan.</i></li> <li>US2.Hist.CCC.12 <i>Evaluate the series of events that led to the end of Reconstruction — including the "Compromise of 1877" – and assess the impact on American political, social and economic life.</i></li> <li>US2.Hist.CCC.31 <i>Assess the reasons for and consequence of United States involvement in World War I and post-war diplomatic relations.</i></li> <li>US2.Civ.LP.36 <i>Evaluate the domestic response to the Great Depression, measuring the impact of and resistance to New Deal programming, including its impact on the economy and different Americans.</i></li> <li>US2.Hist.HC.38 <i>Examine the events that led to the United States' participation in World War II, including the bombing of Pearl Harbor, explaining its impact on the course and outcome of the war.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>memorable. How do you tell a memorable story about this era without these leaders? How do you build students background knowledge when specific events and personalities go unnamed? How do you come to understand the rhythm of politics? How do you interest students in civic and political action, an aim of the standards? For all these reasons, the neglect of politics—the stream that goes back and forth among people/voters, leaders, policy—is a great loss and should be corrected during revisions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ US2.Inq.DC.42 <i>Analyze the reasons for and the consequences of the United States decision to drop the atomic bomb, including the human and environmental impact of the decision.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Hist.HC.49 <i>Evaluate the reasons for and success of containment policies enacted by the United States, including conflicts and proxy wars in Latin America, Southeast Asia and the Middle East.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Including Religious Minorities in Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● US2.Hist.HC.32, New suggested version: “Analyze the social, political, and economic ramifications of World War I on American society, including labor, women, Black Americans, ethnic and religious groups, and civil rights.” Comments: World War I had profound social, political, and economic ramifications for American ethnic and religious minority groups so they should be included in this standard. The rise in anti-immigrant and white supremacist sentiment after the war directly affected Italian Catholics, Eastern European Jews, Greek Orthodox Christians, among others. Adding ethnic and religious groups to this standard supports better student understanding of the broader issues driving American global and domestic policies. Additionally, coverage of ethnic and religious groups in this standard, provides background vital for Driving Concepts 4 and 5. In addition, “ethnic and religious groups” should be added because the Social Studies Guiding Principles on December 16, 2022 explicitly note that “Religious minorities (e.g., Hindus, Sikhs, Jews, Muslims)” are included “...among people and groups that have been discriminated against....”</li> <li>● US2.Hist.HC.34, New suggested version: “Explore the reasons for the Great Depression and examine its impact on different groups of people in the United States, with special attention to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and class, including an analysis of the impact of the underlying economic and social problems of the 1920s.</li> <li>● US2.Hist.DHC.35, New suggested version: “Analyze the causes and consequences of the Dust Bowl, comparing it to other natural disasters, and the impact on Americans across race, ethnicity, ability, gender and class groups.</li> <li>● US2.Inq.DC.37, New suggested version: “Evaluate the portrayal of the “Roaring ‘20s,” including an assessment of the changing societal roles and rights of women, African Americans, Latinx Americans, Jewish Americans and Asian Americans along with the cultural backlash to these changes.” Comments: Jewish Americans should be added to the list of groups covered in this standard to support student understanding of American antisemitism, as well as anti-immigrant sentiment and white supremacism in the U.S. during this period.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OSSE appreciates the public’s engagement with social studies standards and will accept the revisions to the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ US2.Hist.HC.32: <i>Analyze the social, political, and economic ramifications of World War I on American society, including labor, women, Black Americans, ethnic and religious groups, and civil rights.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Hist.HC.34: <i>Explore the reasons for the Great Depression and examine its impact on different groups of people in the United States, with special attention to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and class, including an analysis of the impact of the underlying economic and social problems of the 1920s.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Hist.DHC.35: <i>Analyze the causes and consequences of the Dust Bowl, comparing it to other natural disasters, and the impact on Americans across race, ethnicity, ability, gender and class groups.</i></li> <li>○ US2.Inq.DC.37: <i>Evaluate the portrayal of the “Roaring ‘20s,” including an assessment of the changing societal roles and rights of women, African Americans, Latinx Americans, Jewish Americans, and Asian Americans, along with the cultural backlash to these changes.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Framing of Cold War Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● US2.Hist.HC.47 Why not include the impact of this on domestic society and culture in the U.S.?</li> <li>● US2.Civ.LP.48 The way this standard is framed is problematic to me. I would re-word it entirely. I don't think it is fair to say the US was reacting to the soviet union, they chose to limit civil liberties and used it as an opportunity. I would reframe this standard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● OSSE shares this commenter’s interest in ensuring that students are taught about the domestic impact of the Cold War. In the current draft of the standards, the domestic impact of the Cold War is included in US2.Civ.LP.48 <i>Analyze why the actions of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and the spread of communism in Asia led to fear in the United States, resulting in political efforts to limit civil liberties, including an analysis of McCarthyism and the “Lavender Scare.</i></li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US2.Hist.HC.51 continued Russian relations with the U.S.? Expanding this to the post-Cold War international order would be more relevant and interesting.</li> <li>US2.Inq.DP.52 How does changes in immigration policies during this time factor into this driving concept?</li> </ul>	<p>Accordingly, OSSE will not revise this standard in response to this comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s suggestions regarding language changes to these standards and will make the following modifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US2.Civ.LP.48 will be revised to reflect a fuller history of the reasons for limiting civil liberties and</li> <li>US2.Hist.HC.51 to include the post-Cold War international order.</li> </ul> </li> <li>OSSE will also incorporate changing immigration policies in Driving Concept 6: Ideological Global Conflict.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Movements for Justice and Equality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US2.Hist.CCC.62 It is inappropriate to group all these other movements together into one monster standard. They should be given their own standards in their own right. If we are trying to truly be intersectional, grouping everything together like this signals that they are less important</li> <li>Driving Concept 7: Movements for Justice and Equality, p. 139, US2.Inq.DP.65, Retain with capitalization: “Analyze the writings of different perspectives of the Women’s liberation movement Liberation Movement from women from diverse backgrounds, such as, but not limited to, Gloria Steinem, Elaine Brown, Phyllis Schlafly, and Gloria Anzaldúa.” Comments: This is an excellent high school history standard that supports student understanding of the diverse nature of the Women’s Liberation Movement so it should be retained</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s perspective; however, the goal of US2.Hist.CCC.62 is to further understand and compare the tactics and successes of these movements. Accordingly, OSSE will not divide this standard into multiple standards. Individual movements are addressed in the following standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US2.Civ.CE.64 <i>Analyze the reasons for and impact of the occupation of Alcatraz and the American Indian Movement.</i></li> <li>US2.Inq.DP.65 <i>Analyze the writings of different perspectives of the Women’s liberation movement from women from diverse backgrounds, such as, but not limited to, Gloria Steinem, Elaine Brown, Phyllis Schlafly, and Gloria Anzaldúa.</i></li> <li>US2.Inq.DP.66 <i>Analyze media coverage of two key events in a movement for equality, comparing multiple perspectives and the use of framing and focus in coverage of key events.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>OSSE appreciates the public engagement with the movements for justice and equality standards and will not revise these standards in response to this supportive comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Japanese Incarceration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US2.Civ.CE.41 This is an important question but it also buries Japanese Internment with many other issues, and I don’t think that is appropriate. The wording is also pretty unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE shares this commenter’s interest in ensuring that LEAs and educators are teaching DC students about Japanese Incarceration. Accordingly, OSSE will create a specific standard for Japanese Incarceration and ensure that it includes the experiences of and resistance to incarceration, including the Korematsu case.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The essential role of Immigration in American History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This standard feels limited to only two groups and doesn’t take into account other immigrant groups who faced similar experiences. For examples, South Asian immigrants were also subject to the same discrimination and laws. The primarily male Sikh immigrants from Punjab formed communities with Mexican women when both groups were prevented from marrying white citizens. I would recommend making the language of this standard broader to encourage study of the many diverse communities that shared these experiences</li> <li>US2.Hist.HC.32 “labor, women, Black Americans and civil rights.” These are not quite equivalent things to be listed. I find it confusing. Should immigrant communities be included on this list?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter’s requests for clarity and will make the following edits to these standards in response to this comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US2.Hist.DHC.26 OSSE will expand the focus of immigration and work to increase the focus on the histories of different communities in the United States, including Southeast Asian and Japanese immigration. Additionally, standards will be expanded to include the Chinese Exclusion Act and additional efforts to limit immigration.</li> <li>US2.Hist.HC.32 to move away from the idea that Immigrant communities are foreigners, OSSE will define specific communities in this standard.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Immigration, immigrants and nativism are absent. An essential, unique piece of American history is the central role of immigration—of different religious, ethnic, national and racial groups. Why did different groups of immigrants come here? What role did they play in building America? How were they treated initially, to what extent has that changed over time, and how is it different for different groups? When and how did different groups gain citizenship? What does their initial and subsequent treatment tell us about the continuing and incomplete evolution of American democracy and the promise of equality? How have public opinion and laws on immigration changed over time? Students need to understand both that America is largely an immigrant nation, that relative to other nations it has generally been more open—and that unfair treatment and extreme nativism recurs. Students should also get a sense of how and why the “idea” of American identity has changed over the years—with popular terms shifting among assimilation, melting pot, mosaic, diversity, inclusiveness, etc.</li> <li>• These standards almost completely ignore immigration and immigrants. Specifically, a. Across the two years of secondary history, just 3 standards mention “immigration” or “immigrant.” Each of these specifically discusses Chinese immigrants, and 2 also discuss American descendants of Mexican Americans (US1 #53; US2#11, 26). There are no other references to immigration or immigrants across the entire secondary American history sequence: No waves of immigrants from the Irish famine or elsewhere; except for the Chinese immigrants building the railroad, no immigrants who play big roles in building the country; no Japanese, Jewish, Italian, Polish, or Korean immigrants. No mentions of immigrants from broad ethnic or racial groups (e.g., Asian- or Latin-Americans. b. Apart from immigration, just 6 other standards mention Asian-Americans, Latin-Americans, or any specific European-, Asian-, African- or Latin-American ethnic/nationality groups at all: Specifically, there is 1 standard on Japanese internment (USH#41); 1 on “roles and rights of... Latinx Americans and Asian Americans” during the Roaring 20’s (USH2#37); 3 on the experiences of veterans and impact of WW2 and discriminatory laws on different groups including Latinx Americans and/or Asian Americans. (USH2#40, 44, 53); and 1 on the contributions of the “Asian American Movement...Chicano Movement, Latinx resistance...” to the Civil Rights Movement. That’s it. There are 2 standards that reference impacts or inequality across “ethnic” groups (US2#16, 35). c. As noted earlier, there is no reference to the Chinese exclusion act, which prohibited Chinese immigration in a singular way that was never done before or since with regard to any other ethnic or racial group. There is no reference to the 1965 Immigration law that eliminated national quotas and greatly expanded American diversity. No reference to nativism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Driving Concept 4: “Prosperity and Progress” to Depression will be expanded to include immigration and changes to policy and identity.</li> <li>○ US2.Hist.HC.32 will be expanded to include immigrants.</li> <li>○ Driving Concept 7: Movements for Justice and Equality will be expanded to include immigration policies and consequences.</li> <li>• The United States Government Course will be updated to include an additional standard about the evolution of citizenship in the United States that includes <i>Thind v. United States</i> and <i>United States v. Wong Kim Ark</i>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>The standards are too liberal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After reviewing the standards, I am concerned that the teaching of U.S. history and world history is too heavily influenced by liberal/left-wing scholarship, and therefore presents a simplistic and unbalanced view on core issues. For example, the Golden Age of global innovation was approximately from 1870-1970. Many scientific and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE remains committed to ensuring that the revised DC Social Studies standards are historically accurate and aligned to the Guiding Principles. The standards do not take a political stance but allow students to evaluate past events from the perspectives of multiple perspectives.</li> </ul>

creative discoveries were made by US residents and commercialized to the benefit of humanity. African-American also made important contributions. This looks to me largely missing, and the 1980-present seems to be missing important discoveries in information-tech and energy (eg fracking, solar, wind, batteries). Instead, the focus is on class, race, gender conflicts, which are but a small part of the complete American experience. Meanwhile, much seems to be missing about inter-generational mobility, longer life expectancies, rising educational attainment, and workplace equality and labor force participation of women. Also, I see nothing about important conservative movements like the pro-life movement and the pro-immigration, diverse cabinet, and “compassionate conservatism” era of GW Bush. Those are just a few examples. Globally, there should be more coverage of Genghis Khan and the Islamic Empire, ancient Indian cities, as well as the Byzantines, Hitties, Vikings, Celts, Britons, Persians, and Sassanians, and Phoenicians.

- Accordingly, OSSE will not revise the standards in response to this comment.

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree or “disagree”</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree” or “agree”</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> majority of standards received “strongly agree” or “agree”</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: commenters did not necessarily rank all standards in response to these questions.</i></p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Need for greater specificity and defining terms within standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WH1.Hist.CCC.1 Where is the evidence coming from?</li> <li>• WH1.Hist.CCC.1 The standard needs to identify and Define Australopithecines to Homo sapiens. As new teachers need to know the terms</li> <li>• WH1.Inq.DP.2 The standard needs to be more specific &amp; Define the evidence/methods of research other scholars is vague, who are they?</li> <li>• WH1.Inq.DP.3 The standard needs to be more specific: our, is vague, is it historians, students, scholars, only American students? This term should be more specified</li> <li>• WH1.Geo.HE.6 The standards needs to identify what type of adaptations &amp; Identify what type of environments</li> <li>○ Similar comments to the above four comments have been left on each standard from 1 commenter.</li> <li>• WH1.Geo.HP.5 Include more historical content to improve the clarity of the standard (this comment is repeated throughout the feedback)</li> <li>• WH1.Geo.HE.9 Their should be sub standards or information about what the foraging approach is versus the farming approach</li> <li>• I don't really like how this entire course is structured. I think there needs to be a lot more content included in the standards. The standards are a guide, and the specificity helps us teach when we don't get hardly any resources of value from our district and the textbooks we use (and have been using since I started teaching in DCPS in 2007) are trash.</li> <li>• There is no in-depth look at the history, culture, experience of any specific country or civilization. Every standard that speaks to the history, culture, or experience of a country/region/civilization is now handled as part of a generalized group. Guidance to teach Chinese civilization is gone. Mesopotamia is gone. Ancient Greece is gone. Islamic civilization is gone. Medieval Japan and the Ottomans are gone. The rise of the great religions is gone. The Olmecs in MesoAmerica are gone. The sub-Saharan civilizations of the Middle Ages of Ghana, Mali, and Songhai are gone. A typical standard--this one (Wh1#22) for the 1500 years from 800 BCE to 700 CE -- reads: “Assess the importance and enduring legacy of major governmental, technological, and cultural achievements of ancient empires in Europe, Asia, the Americas, and Africa.” The intro to each section (the “Driving Concept”) lists 10-19 different civilizations that could be highlighted but no guidance for what should be highlighted or why. There’s no way such overly ambitious standards can lead all students to learn what’s most vital. In contrast, current standards expose students to unique, relevant aspects of each of the key civilizations above from across the world and centuries, giving students a genuine</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s careful review and will adjust the language of standards for specificity and clarity to strengthen standards. The revised standards move away from the content approach to social studies education and toward the critical historical thinking approach to social studies education. An ancillary resource will be provided to support educators in the implementation of the standards, to include definitions and terms. OSSE will not increase the specificity of the World History I standards beyond the suggested civilizations. Specific historical content is included in the introduction to each Driving Concept.</li> <li>• The standards intentionally left some terms vague or undefined to allow LEAs autonomy for teaching different civilizations, not only European civilizations.</li> <li>• Chinese Civilization, Mesopotamia, Ancient Greece, Islamic Civilization, Medieval Japan, the Ottomans, the Olmecs and Chana, Mali and Songhai will remain in the standards. A thematic approach allows educators to focus on the skills of historical thinking, geographic inquiry and civic engagement. The revised standards move students away from remembering key historical moments and people to analyzing and evaluating key moments in history.</li> </ul>

<p>appreciation of different cultures and a perspective on our own culture. These proposed standards are thin gruel in comparison</p>	
<p><b>Merging Similar Concepts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH1.Inq.DP.3 This standard is essentially repeated in the following unit with: "WH1.Inq.DP.13 Analyze the values and limits of different archeological evidence in reconstructing the early history of domestication and agricultural settlement. They are slightly different, but could maybe be merged into one standard? Currently teach in 7th grade paleothrough neo- lithic ages and students do assessments of different archaeological evidence to discuss their hypotheses and limitations of evidence at the sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the public’s engagement with the standards, as well as the opportunity to streamline standards, where appropriate.</li> <li>Consistent with this commenter’s suggestion, OSSE will combine WH1.Inq.DP.13 with WH1.Inq.DP.3.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Implementation Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A common threaded comment I have is: is there an approved list of textbooks for world 1 teachers to adapt and consider when teaching this updated content? Spielvogel Ways of the World is old, outdated, and would not reflect the new periodization with the new and updated content</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will work with educators and experts to curate a set of ancillary resources inclusive of primary source resources, sample content and concepts and standards aligned resources to support educators in the implementation of the standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Periodization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH1.Hist.CCC.12 The standards need to identify and define the time periods of analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The important understanding that is addressed through WH1.Hist.CCC.12 is the general challenge to periodization, rather than the specific periods which may be problematic. Individual LEAs may determine the individual periods that are best addressed through the development of curricular materials. OSSE will include additional guidance for addressing this standard in ancillary resources. OSSE will not revise WH1.Hist.CCC.12.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Adjusting the Civilizations of Focus</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Driving Concept 2 Add ancient Israel to introduction. Grades 9-12, World History I, Driving Concept 2: Early Societies and Cities (10,000 BCE to 500 BCE), p. 108, introduction, New suggested version: “Asia: Mesopotamia, ancient Israel, China (the Shang Dynasty), Indus Valley” Comments: As written, the chosen societies have an uneven level of detail. The single city of Jericho is a much more specific example than any of the other broader civilizations on the list (Kush, Nubia, Egypt, Olmecs, Maya, Norte Chico civilization of Peru, Mesopotamia, Shang Dynasty of China, Indus Valley civilization). While Jericho is one of the oldest continuously inhabited sites on Earth, we recommend for consistency of scale that this single city be replaced with the comparable civilization in its region, which was “ancient Israel,” and began in the period covered by this Driving Concept. Ancient Israel is the civilization in which Judaism (and later Christianity) arose.</li> <li>Grades 9-12, World History I, Driving Concept 3: Ancient Empires (800 BCE to 700 CE), p. 110, introduction, New suggested version: “Asia: Han China, Persia, Mauryan and Gupta (India), ancient Israel, and Assyrians” Comments: We recommend replacing the Akkadians with the ancient Israelites in this list of societies of focus because the Akkadian Empire was more than 1350 years before the time period of this standard. The Akkadian Empire, a precursor to the Assyrian empire, reached its peak around 2350 BCE, lasted for just 200 years, and fell a short time later, around 2150 BCE, long before the period covered by this Driving Concept. Ancient Israel, by contrast, flourished from</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the community’s engagement with social studies standards and will confer with subject matter experts on how to strengthen this standard.</li> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement form the public and will include the Byzantine Empire in Driving Concept 5: Early Modern Empires (1000 CE- 1600 CE).</li> </ul>

<p>approximately 1200 BCE to 70 CE, largely within the time period addressed in this Driving Concept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The list of European societies is missing the Byzantine Empire, which is a missed opportunity because it is the only society that existed across multiple periods. It bridges Ancient Rome in Concept #3 (800 BCE to 700CE), is explored in Concept #4 (400CE to 1200 CE), and should be explored in context to Europe and Asia or the Holy Roman and Ottoman Empires in Concept #5 (1000CE-1600CE). In terms of knowledge framing power &amp; bias, it's absence suggests a western-centric bias and follows the predominant narrative of the Western Holy Roman Empire as its true successor</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Expanding the Focus on Religious History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH1.Hist.CCC.18, New suggested version: "Analyze how early religions and belief systems shaped the political, legal, economic, and social structure of states in Africa, Asia, and the Americas." Comments: Including "religious" in this list of innovations helps broaden the standard to cover innovations derived both from ethical philosophies such as those of the ancient Greeks and the more explicitly religious traditions such as those of ancient China, India, and Israel</li> <li>WH1.Geo.HC.19 I'm not a World History I expert. Is a reason for these two particular belief systems versus others?</li> <li>WH1.Geo.HC.19 Comments: As written, the standards limit coverage of Judaism and Hinduism to this driving concept alone, when this period only represents their very early development. Later suggested changes propose adding coverage of Judaism and Hinduism under the proper Driving Concept. If possible, given the geographically and culturally different origins of these traditions, we also recommend splitting this into separate standards to ensure that each tradition is covered adequately.</li> <li>I am concerned that this standard only looks at the historical (and specifically ancient) manifestations of these traditions. How can teachers be encouraged to also examine contemporary Hindu and Jewish communities? Ancient Jewish practices are very different from contemporary, same with Hinduism. Need to avoid projecting the idea that religions are only situated in and relevant to the past. Religions change over time and remain relevant today.</li> <li>WH1.Geo.HC.22 I am a little concerned about asking students compare and contrast the tenets of these belief systems without any other prior foundation in studying religion from an academic perspective. What is the benefit of comparison here? Unlike Hinduism and Judaism in the previous section, the origins of these traditions are not included in this standard. While I don't think that focusing on origins in the best approach to teaching about religions, some additional context seems important here. Further, I am concerned about primarily situating all of these traditions in purely ancient contexts. All four traditions have substantial contributions to societies and cultures throughout history and today. And they have changed and developed since those ancient societies referenced here. How does this standard help students understand their contemporary manifestations? Finally, by focusing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates this commenter's suggestions and will make the following revisions in response to this comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will revise WH1.Hist.CCC.18 to read: <i>Analyze how early religions and belief systems shaped the political, legal, economic, and social structure of states in Africa, Asia, and the Americas.</i></li> <li>The two religions named in WH1.Geo.HC.19 were selected because they are contemporaneous with the time. OSSE will remove this standard, along with WH1.Geo.HC.22 and include an additional Driving Concept that covers the rise, influence, and beliefs of major global religions, including Sikhism.</li> <li>OSSE will adjust the language in Driving Concept 3: Ancient Empires (800 BCE to 700 CE) and subsequent Driving Concepts to include religion.</li> <li>OSSE will revise WH1.Hist.DHC.25 to read: <i>Assess the importance and enduring legacy of major governmental, technological, religious, and cultural achievements of ancient empires in Europe, Asia, the Americas, and Africa.</i></li> <li>OSSE will revise WH1.Geo.HE.34 to read: <i>Explain the ways geography influenced the development of economic, political, religious, and cultural centers in Africa, Asia, the Americas, and Europe and how the centers facilitated population diffusion.</i></li> <li>OSSE will revise WH1.Geo.HE.36 to read: <i>New suggested version: Evaluate the economic, political, religious, cultural, and social impacts of population diffusion in Africa, Asia, the Americas, and Europe due to trade, military expansion, and migration.</i></li> <li>OSSE will revise WH1.Civ.LP.40 to read: <i>Compare and contrast the methods rulers used to legitimize and consolidate power within Asia, Europe, Africa, and the Americas, including bureaucracies, militarism, feudalism, religion, architecture, taxation, and art.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>on the ancient societies, more recent traditions, such as Sikhism are excluded from this area of study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driving Concept 3: Add "religious" and "ancient Israel to introduction, Grades 9-12, World History I, Driving Concept 3: Ancient Empires (800 BCE to 700 CE), p. 110, introduction, New suggested version: "In this driving concept, students will begin to explore the social, political, cultural, religious, and economic traits of societies to understand how humans of the past interacted with each other and with their environment to create complex civilizations." Comments: Adding "religious" to the list of traits summarized in this Driving Concept aligns better to the standards themselves which cover religious traits of the civilizations in the time period covered. We recommend adding this term in each of the Driving Concept summaries which outlines specific society traits that students are expected to analyze.</li> <li>• WH1.Hist.DHC.25, New suggested version: "Assess the importance and enduring legacy of major governmental, technological, religious and cultural achievements of ancient empires in Europe, Asia, the Americas, and Africa." Comments: Complementing standard WH1.Geo.HC.22, adding "religious" to this standard will help students draw connections between foundational ideas in our own and other societies which stem directly from religious traditions and their developments in ancient empires.</li> <li>• Driving Concept 4: Reorganization of Societies and Increasing Networks of Exchange (400-1200 CE), p. 112, WH1.Geo.HC.33, Retain: "Analyze the role of religion, belief systems, and culture in the governance and maintenance of societies in Africa, Asia, and Europe." Comments: This important standard should be retained.</li> <li>• WH1.Geo.HE.34, New suggested version: "Explain the ways geography influenced the development of economic, political, religious, and cultural centers in Africa, Asia, the Americas, and Europe and how the centers facilitated population diffusion." Comments: We recommend adding "religious" to the list of categories influenced by geography in this standard. Many of the civilizations covered by this Driving Concept had population centers located around sacred sites, and pilgrimages to these sites were instrumental in diffusing people and ideas</li> <li>• WH1.Geo.GI.36, New suggested version: "Evaluate the economic, political, religious, cultural, and social impacts of population diffusion in Africa, Asia, the Americas, and Europe due to trade, military expansion, and migration." Comments: As written, this standard conflates cultural diffusion with population diffusion. Each of the impacts listed, including cultural, are the result of the spread of populations, people who carry with them practices and ideas to new areas. The edits to this standard clarify this point. We also recommend adding "religious" to the list of impacts. We suggest replacing "religious expansion" with "military expansion," which can be accurately considered a cause of the population diffusion which resulted in the various kinds of impacts listed (including the spread of religions).</li> <li>• WH1.Civ.LP.40 I'd add religion to that list of methods of legitimation</li> </ul>	
--	--

<p><b>Driving Concept 6</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the standard is relevant, it does not fit well with the overarching driving concept of "Thinking like an Archaeologist and Historian." An archaeologist should engage more directly with material artifacts from a critical perspective, not just online sources, UNESCO sites, and the question of ownership. While the question over ownership of artifacts is an important issue of decolonization, it falls under various roles of provenance researcher, cultural property lawyers, and diplomats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the thoughtful points raised by this commenter and will revise the title of Driving Concept 6: Thinking Like an Archeologist and Historian to remove the reference to Archaeologists and Historians.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Thematic Coverage of the Past</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall I like the standards, but it feels too rushed for one school year. Especially if taught as a block for only one semester. I also don't like that students will miss out on more ancient and medieval societies due to the limitations of only being able to fit in a few per unit. My students have repeatedly said they want more Africa, more Latin America, and Japan. Civilizations from these places are listed, but now competing with each other, and I would love to spend more time with these regions, not less</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement from the education community on these standards. With an increased focus on enduring themes of history, the standards seek to help educators make connections between common characteristics of each civilization. The amount of specific content of each civilization may be reduced, educators' autonomy to identify what interests' students about these regions and further explore topics.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Focus on the Common Man</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I did not like how much ""world history"" is dominated by ""empires"" - that's important, but also important is: What was life like for the common man -- not just who was king/queen and who declared war on who... Don't forget to FOCUS ON: what was the impact on average people. Thanks"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on these standards. OSSE will revise the World History I standards to include an evaluation of the impact of historical trends on individual lived experiences to the extent possible given the historical source materials.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Historical Accuracy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH1.Inq.DP.10 Early complex belief systems are as much related to the relationship between the human and natural worlds as they are about feminine deities. I'd rather gender be addressed more in the way we study these societies (only recently begun to investigate ""feminine"" activities like fiber arts and child rearing) than with disputed information about female deities</li> <li>WH1.Hist.DHC.20 Not sure what is being referred to here? Complex agrarian and pastoralist societies continued to do well across the world up until imperialism and globalization interrupted them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on these standards. The cultural practices of early societies, including fiber arts and child rearing is included in WH1.Inq.DC.8. OSSE will re-evaluate these standards for historical accuracy and make the necessary revisions.</li> </ul>

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Standard is clear:</b> standards for this course received a range of feedback</li> <li>• <b>Standard is appropriate for this grade level:</b> standards for this course received a range of feedback</li> <li>• <b>The standard is relevant:</b> standards for this course received a range of feedback</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: OSSE is currently working with the University of Pittsburgh to reconceptualize the World History II course. While some elements will be retained, the course will be reframed to move away from Eurocentric framing and OSSE will include more specific cannon of content in this course.</i></p>	
Comment Summary	OSSE Response
<p><b>Standards are too broad/ scale back on the thematic approach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again this is way too vague. There are so many things that could be talked about here and if we don't mention some potential examples there are so many incredibly important things that could just be left off.</li> <li>• Too vague</li> <li>• So end of WWI, WWII, all of the Cold War, all of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, all of UN peacekeeping operations in a standard. Not possible. What's the take away for students? These standards set up endless divide and conquer readings. Content is a mile wide but millimeters deep in terms of understandings.</li> <li>• *note: there are many individual comments in this course about the granularity or specificity of different standards,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on the social studies standards. OSSE will revise the World History II standards to match the structure of World History I standards and include specific countries and suggested areas of study.</li> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter's careful review and will adjust the language of standards for specificity and clarity to strengthen standards. The revised standards move away from the content approach to social studies education and toward the critical historical thinking approach to social studies education. An ancillary resource will be provided to support educators in the implementation of the standards, to include definitions and terms. However, OSSE recognizes that more supports are needed within the standards to more clearly define the canon of knowledge students should have.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standards are Too Euro Centric</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yay Europe! Look how great it is. I thought we were beyond this. This is not a standard for a global history. European History... maybe</li> <li>• Eurocentric. Just flipping the narrative and saying white supremacy doesn't make a course not Eurocentric. Suddenly the Europeans are bad, but it is still their story. If this is a world history course there needs to be space for non-European revolutions</li> <li>• This is largely covered in US History. This standard should be minimized. Why do we keep repeating the same things over and over again highlighting western "achievement"? Racist</li> <li>• ENOUGH WITH THE WESTERN CENTRIC FRAMING IT IS THIS WHOLE DOCUMENT AND IT IS MAKING ME EXTREMELY ANGRY</li> <li>• I realize the intent is to de-center Europe and the West in world history, while more fully and honestly exploring the negative impacts of Western expansionism, imperialism, colonialism, and exploitation. But this course ends up being extremely Eurocentric in its design. I know others have noticed and pointed this out as well. There appears to be so much history left out or left to the discretion of the teacher or curriculum writer. I wonder what students will actually learn about South America, Africa, Asia, Europe (for that matter) beyond the Western expansionist, imperialist framing of the course. This is important content but it is also vital for students to understand that other countries have their own histories, complexities, and agency.</li> <li>• 1 standard (#2) is mainly about one or more specific non-European entities (about how the spread of knowledge "from Islamic and Asian societies promoted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE is currently working with the Global Studies Center at the University of Pittsburgh, the TWC and a team of subject matter experts to revisit the lens and framing of World History II standards. OSSE will retain standards that address the causes and consequences of colonialism and imperialism. OSSE will ensure that the history of different regions and countries are not continuously framed in response to European actions.</li> </ul>



<p>maritime exploration and ultimately the expansion of empires.”). **Just 1 (#9) references any non-western country/region/civilization outside the context of colonialism/imperialism (“Evaluate the environmental and cultural impact of the exchange of food, crops, trade goods, diseases, and ideas between Africa, Asia, Europe, and the Americas.”) b. Of the 42 WH2 standards covering 1900-present, 4 **Just 3 are focused explicitly on non-European countries. This period mainly addresses the various causes and consequences of WW 1 and 2, decolonization, and growing global issues, with countries addressed in that context. In contrast, the current standards that cover 1450-1900 include standards on the Ottomans, the Maya, Inca, and Aztecs, developments on the Indian subcontinent, and Islamic, Chinese, and Japanese civilizations. In the post-1900 period, they address developments in Japan, China, the Philippines (including US involvement, which absent here, though it is addressed in US History), land reform in Central America, and more. 3. Likewise, the primary discussion of Europe or any European country before WW1 is in the context of their role in imperialism/colonization/Eurocentrism, as though they too have no relevant history or culture before this period.</p>	
<p><b>Including Specific Mention of the Holocaust</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WH2.Hist.CCC.43 seems to have some overlap with anti-semitism standard. Also with rise of totalitarian leaders. Hyper focuses on a horrible genocide. Does not include Bengal Famine nor Holodomor. Same time period. Don't matter?</li> <li>• Grades 9-12, World History II, Driving Concept 4: Unresolved Global Conflict, p. 124, WH2.Hist.CCC.43, Retain: “Evaluate the cause, course, and consequences of the Holocaust.” Comments: This important standard requiring students to focus specifically on the Holocaust should be retained. As mentioned above, the increase in antisemitism we have seen in recent years necessitates education for students on the history of the most common symbols and ideologies which motivate antisemitism, particularly as they manifested during the Holocaust. This is especially pertinent as a vast majority of antisemitic incidents, particularly in schools, utilize Nazi and Holocaust imagery. American understandings of the dangers of racism and prejudice are greatly informed by our shared education about the Holocaust, and we consider it crucial that students be informed about the Holocaust and Nazi white supremacist ideology as a critical part of their education.</li> <li>• Again, this is super important, my family was directly affected, but why is the Holocaust centered but then we go to other parts of the world, like Latin America, Africa and Asia and we don't get the same level of specificity when dealing with genocides that happened there? This is NOT acceptable. As a white, Jewish woman, I object to this minimization of black and brown experiences with genocide to focus ONCE AGAIN ON EUROPE.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement of the community on this important topic. OSSE will not remove this standard or widen the scope of this standard. While OSSE is committed to decentering European narratives, OSSE has an obligation to include historically accurate standards. OSSE will be more explicit about including additional global genocides (Rwanda, Darfur, Armenia, Khmer Rouge, Kurds, etc.) in the revised World History II course structure.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inclusion of Race</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "In either one of the World History or one of the US History courses, please add the following important and honest standard, now is the time, thank you:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the public’s engagement on this topic and agrees that it is essential to directly confront the history of white supremacy. The investigation of anti-blackness is included throughout World History II. OSSE</li> </ul>

<p>WH2.Inq.ID.7: Investigate anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity from colonial times resulting in the genocides of Indigenous people throughout the Americas, and of African peoples in the Maafa (great tragedy), and identify current organizations and people standing up against anti-Indigeneity and anti-Blackness today.</p>	<p>will not revise the standards in response to this comment.</p>
<p><b>Inclusion of authoritarianism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed WH2 standards do not expose students to democracy’s alternatives. It is often said that “democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others.” Especially now, with democracy under challenge, students should know the grim alternatives. Minimally, students should be exposed to totalitarianism—particularly the most devastating ones of the last century, Nazism, fascism and Soviet-style communism—and authoritarianism and what their impact has been on human rights, national minorities, and the world. These standards do not.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will ensure standards include explicit coverage of different government structures including totalitarianism and fascism in the World History II course during the reconceptualization of the course. The current standards cover alternative forms of global governments, including totalitarianism. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH2.Hist.CCC.41 <i>Analyze how totalitarian leaders came to power after World War I.</i></li> <li>WH2.Hist.CCC.43 <i>Evaluate the cause, course, and consequences of the Holocaust.</i></li> <li>WH2.Civ.WG.46 <i>Compare the ideologies of socialism, communism, fascism, and liberal democracy and explain the reasons for their growth and decline around the world in the 20th century.</i></li> <li>WH2.Civ.WG.52 <i>Evaluate the effectiveness of revolutionary leaders and movements in achieving autonomy, social justice, or sovereignty in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean.</i></li> <li>WH2.Civ.WG.53 <i>Compare the governments formed after World War II in Africa, Latin America, and Asia.</i></li> <li>WH2.Hist.HC.21 <i>Analyze the impact of industrialization on the Russian Empire, including the Bolshevik Revolution and the creation of the Soviet Union.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Scale of World History II Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH2.Econ.GE.12 If we are talking about joint stock companies and the beginning of stock markets... fair. Development of capitalism</li> <li>and end of mercantilism... also fair. But global markets and impacts? What does this look like as a lesson? How is this teachable? Do we have receipts from the corporations? Do we have charts and high-level economic data? Is that useable by students</li> <li>The World History II course seems to be moving in reverse. We have added about 400 years to the front end and history still ends with the end of the Cold War. This course looks about the same as it would have when I was in high school. There is no mention of post-Cold War realignment. The rise and rivalry of Iran and Saudi Arabia are absent. No mention of modern democratic movements. Is Nelson Mandela no longer relevant? This unit seems very thinned out in order to account for earlier history. This is a huge miss for me. This is the history that is most important to our students and it is the world we live in today. All of the rest of the year builds up to this unit and it should be more or less this is the way we got to where we are for better or worse. Woefully inadequate coverage of truly modern and contemporary topics for a course that claims to be "modern" world history</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will expand the coverage of modern global history in the World History II standards and will ensure that modern democratic movements and global politics are included in the revised World History II course.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Expanding Focus on Religious Minorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments: In line with other edits we have suggested, we recommend adding “religious minorities” to this list of groups to which the ideals of the Enlightenment were not applied fully.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will ensure the history of religious minorities is explicitly included throughout the World History II course where appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Implementation Supports</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH2.Inq.DP.29 Do these primary sources exist? What do we have in mind? This sort of text is very, very dense and would require a lot of time to study and evaluate. Great idea, again... pacing needs to be considered</li> <li>WH2.Econ.GE.11 "Including the lasting effects on fundamental beliefs about race and whiteness." Great idea. Do these source materials exist? To my knowledge and experience you are talking about very high-level academic texts only. Doesn't mean shouldn't be done, just means is this standard realistic? This is a really profound standard that could be an entire yearlong course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE is committed to producing an ancillary resource to support educators in the implementation of the standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>U.N. Sustainable Development Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The U.N. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) serve as the foundation of our school redesign. As I was reviewing the high school courses and standards, I was surprised that there are not many, if any, standards that focus on global goals. I would love the opportunity to see if there is a way to connect global goals to any of the high school course standards. I am not a social studies teacher but I am hoping that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development can be included to enhance some of the high school course standards. I truly appreciate the hard work that the team has completed to enhance the standards and look forward to seeing the finalized social studies standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement from the community on this standard. OSSE will not revise the standards to include U.N. Sustainable Development Goals. Grade 6: World Geography includes 6 standards that call for the analysis of the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals from a geographic lens. LEAs have the autonomy to make curricular decisions that best fit their needs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Adjusting specific language in Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WH2.Hist.HC.10 - also include enslavement of indigenous people through encomienda?</li> <li>WH2.Econ.GE.12 - discuss mercantilism?</li> <li>World History 2, Driving Concept 4 - It seems like medical events (Spanish flu, invention of antibiotics, eradication of smallpox and huge reduction in polio) should come up here</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE will adjust the language of standards for specificity and clarity where appropriate. OSSE will include the encomienda system in the revised World History II course.</li> <li>OSSE will not include medical events in World History II Driving Concept 4: Unresolved Global Conflict (1900-1991). This content is best addressed through the development of curricular resources. OSSE will include these examples in ancillary resources to support educators in implementation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Specific Content</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Draft Standards also contain some conspicuous absences. Even by the standard of history as a catalogue of massacres and atrocities, an important absence is the complete silence on the Soviet Union and its gulags, the Chinese Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution—which combined made Mao Ze Dong single handedly responsible for the greatest mass of deaths in the history of humanity. There is no mention of Pol Pot’s genocide in Cambodia, or of the Stalinist regime surviving in North Korea. Nor is there any mention of the conflicts in the current Democratic Republic of Congo since 1996, which have exerted the highest toll in human casualties since WWII. These conspicuous absences reinforce the sense, when reading the Standards and the Guiding Principles, that the only massacres worth telling our children are those perpetrated by white males from capitalist Western democracies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the engagement from the public on this standard. The revisions to the World History II standards and the inclusion of global action standards in grade 8 Action Civics will include specific mention of select events.</li> </ul>

**Government and Civics Feedback**

Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment	
<b>Commenters declined to provide specific feedback on the Government and Civics standards for clarity, appropriateness or relevancy.</b>	
<p><b>Tensions within democracy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driving Concept 1: Foundations of American Democracy, p. 143, GC.Inq.DC.1, Retain: "Identify major tensions within our constitutional democracy: majority rule and individual rights; liberty and security; state and national authority in a federal system; civil disobedience and the rule of law; and the relationship of religion and government." Comments: This excellent high school civics standard should be retained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the public engagement with these standards and will retain GC.Inq.DC.1, consistent with this supportive comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Incorporating Additional Case Studies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GC.Inq.DP.15. New suggested version: "Evaluate the evolution of civil liberties over time including landmark Supreme Court cases such as Gideon v. Wainwright, Miranda v. Arizona, Schenck v. United States, Tinker v. Des Moines, Cantwell v. Connecticut, Loving v. Virginia, Obergefell v. Hodges and Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization." Comments: Cantwell v. Connecticut (1940)</li> <li>• GC.Inq. DP.15 Current Standard: Evaluate the evolution of civil liberties over time including landmark Supreme Court cases such as Gideon v. Wainwright, Miranda v. Arizona, Schenck v. United States, Tinker v. Des Moines, Loving v. Virginia, Obergefell v. Hodges and Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization. Suggested Edit: Evaluate the evolution of civil liberties over time including landmark Supreme Court cases such as Gideon v. Wainwright, Miranda v. Arizona, Schenck v. United States, Tinker v. Des Moines, Loving v. Virginia, Obergefell v. Hodges, United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind, and Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organizations Rationale: The case of United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind underscores how permanent settlement was hindered due to racial barriers to U.S. citizenship. While Thind initially was able to successfully apply for U.S. citizenship through the state of New York which made World War I veterans eligible for naturalization regardless of race, the outcome of the case led to the denaturalization of his status. The decision of this case concluded that naturalization rights would be denied since Thind was not white. This is a landmark Supreme Court case which should be studied by DC's students, as it also presents an opportunity for students in Washington, DC to learn about an important figure in Sikh history.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE recognizes the importance of <i>Cantwell v. Connecticut</i> in furthering the religious freedom narrative and will include this case in ancillary resources for educators.</li> <li>• OSSE will add an additional standard about the evolution of citizenship in the United States that includes <i>Thind v. United States</i> and <i>United States v. Wong Kim Ark</i>.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Include greater coverage of the electoral college</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grades 9-12: Government and Civics: Driving Concept 4: Political Participation and Engagement (p. 148-149): Add a new standard: ""Analyze the origins, functions, and effects of systems and institutions of political participation, including reapportionment/redistricting and the Electoral College."" See California History-Social Science Framework, p. 750: ""Analyze trends in voter turnout; the causes and effects of reapportionment and redistricting, with special attention to spatial districting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the engagement of the public on these standards and will include specific resources to evaluate redistricting in ancillary resources.</li> </ul>

<p>and the rights of minorities; and the function of the Electoral College.""  <a href="https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/hs/cf/documents/hssframe-workwhole.pdf">https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/hs/cf/documents/hssframe-workwhole.pdf</a></p>	
<p><b>Include greater coverage of the rights of incarcerated DC residents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DC has begun outreach to those DC residents incarcerated at the Department of Corrections and Federal Bureau of Prisons to educate them on the RTV, encourage them to register and provide them with ballots. DC residents incarcerated at other facilities are also eligible to register and vote. Those already released, also have their previously lost voting rights restored. The specifics of the law are too numerous to list, however, I would like to speak with someone on how RTV information may be added to the curriculum. Adding this information would go along way to educating DC residents that they can vote regardless of a conviction. Teaching residents while still in school may make this information common knowledge in DC one day</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE shares this commenter’s belief in the importance of “Right to Vote” and has explicitly incorporated this topic in standard GC.Inq.TA.33: <i>Investigate voting rights, laws, and practices in Washington, DC, a state, or a territory and develop a proposal for a specific change in current government policy or law.</i></li> <li>OSSE will include an additional standard in the DC History course that evaluates the right to vote for District residents.</li> <li>OSSE will also include this information in the development of additional curricular supports to enable LEAs and educators to successfully implement these standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Globalize US Government</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US Government should be global. It is not now. These standards have no global content – either in the narrative at the front of the standards or in the standards themselves, except for these two standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GC.Inq.TA.26. Use research from national and international sources to analyze the impact of media and social media on democracy and develop a public policy proposal to strengthen democratic expression and participation in American civil life.</li> <li>C.Civ.LP.38. Evaluate the extent to which different groups of Americans impact domestic and foreign policy, and identify the reasons and consequences of the disparity in influence.</li> </ul> </li> <li>There is no discussion of the US government’s foreign policy apparatus or how foreign policy, embassies, foreign aid and investment, international monetary and trade policy, human rights, peacebuilding and diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, immigration policy, etc. work. There is no discussion of the military, national security, defense alliances and international treaties. There really is very little on the Executive Branch in general. There is nothing here on the tremendous influence of American democratic ideals on the rest of the world, and the many global connections around democracy, protests, and civil society (amplified through technology and social media). Likewise, there isn’t much attention to transnational linkages, based on historical connections (especially immigrants) and identity, and the ways they can be exercised to influence foreign policy or weaponized to suspect citizens of dual allegiances (as with Muslim Americans, American Jews, and Asian Americans).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates and shares this commenter’s interest in ensuring that students are taught about global content and concepts.</li> <li>OSSE is creating a new Driving Concept in grade 8 Action Civics that will speak to the specific evaluation of US foreign policy apparatus and global policy making.</li> <li>Accordingly, OSSE will not be making an update to the grade 12 standards in response to this comment; however, this comment will be addressed by the adjustments OSSE is making to the grade 8 standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Include a Human Rights Lens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government and Civics Introduction, Page 142, Add: Students should also study the ideals contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and key treaties derived from the UDHR, both those the U.S. has ratified and those it has not ratified to understand different</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OSSE appreciates the feedback from the public and will not revise the standards in response to this feedback. There are multiple ways different LEAs can implement the standards named here, and these resources are best addressed through curriculum rather than adjusting the language of the standards.</li> </ul>

<p>ideas about the powers and purposes of American government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driving Concept 1: Foundations of American Democracy Add to second paragraph: Students should also look at the UDHR and the treaties developed pursuant to the UDHR, both those the U.S. has ratified and those it has not to consider the promise and shortcomings of American democracy.</li> <li>• Driving Concept 2: Rights and Responsibilities: Add: Students will also evaluate the history and application of human rights principles, particularly the economic, social and cultural rights that extend beyond the framework of civil and political rights, and the reasons why economic, social and cultural rights analyses have been less well accepted in the political discourse of the United States.</li> <li>• Comments I have not yet had time to cite to the specific sections of the standards. However, it's almost midnight -- your closing deadline: Analyze the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and evaluate how the principles identified in that Declaration are and are not applicable to the rights of Indigenous Nations and peoples recognized by the United States, including through Supreme Court decisions, federal and state laws and policies.</li> <li>• Analyze the unequal outcomes in regard to access to health care, access to decent, safe and sanitary housing, access to education through a lens of civil rights and through a lens of human rights. How does the definition of "discrimination" affect perceptions of these unequal outcomes?</li> <li>• Please add the term "human rights" to this sentence: "...origin and continued existence of organized social movements fighting to expand civil and human rights, including..."</li> <li>• Again, please add the phrase "human rights." "... relating to civil rights or liberties and human rights, and advocate... Thank you.</li> </ul>	<p>OSSE will provide ancillary resources to support educators in the implementation of the standards, which will include a resource for evaluating these movements through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.</p>
--	---

<b>Feedback about clarity, relevancy and grade level alignment</b>	
<b>Commenters declined to provide specific feedback on the DC History standards for clarity, appropriateness or relevancy, except as described below.</b>	
<p><b>Support for DC History Standards</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DC.Hist.DHC.5, Retain: “Use primary sources to evaluate the lived experiences of different individuals in Washington, DC in the 17th century, including the different experiences across race, gender, class and religion.” Comments: This excellent history standard should be retained because it offers vital support for students to learn about the ways different groups experienced the events in Washington, DC in the 17th century. Including multiple, intersecting layers of identity conforms to the anchor standard and promotes a more nuanced understanding of 17th-century life</li> <li>• Retain: “This concept engages students in an analysis of the political development of Washington, DC and the ways in which local Washingtonians fought for economic, political and social equality. Students should evaluate the political context for the loss of home rule. Students should understand this time period through a study of the perspectives of different segments of the Washington, DC population including but not limited to immigrants, Indigenous people, freedpeople, and members of the LGBTQ+ community. A thorough study of this time period should give agency and voice to different segments of the DC community as historical actors.” Comments: This strong standard should be retained because it addresses the perspectives of many segments of the District’s population. Because it looks at the perspectives of immigrants, an important part of the D.C. community which is home to people of more than 170 nationalities and ethnic groups, it is especially key to retain</li> <li>• Retain: “DC.Hist.HC.22 Analyze the impact of World War I, the New Deal and World War II on the District’s population, geography and residents.” Comments: This standard covering an important era in the history of Washington, D.C. should be retained because students will learn about: segregation, the racial violence of “Red Summer,” urban renewal and the nation mall, desegregation, and the impact of the wars and New Deal on new groups of people moving to D.C., including growth in the D.C. Jewish community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates the community engagement and support for these standards and, consistent with this commenter’s supportive comments, intends to maintain these standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Include the role of Georgetown University in Furthering Slavery in the Region</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include: Georgetown University and the Maryland Jesuit's history of “selling” more than 272 enslaved African Americans in 1838 and other documented institutional wealth accumulation from chattel slavery.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE will include a standard that addresses the role of slavery in the development of Washington institutions, including Georgetown University</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standard Clarity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DC.Geo.HE.20 Replace "reasons for" with "origins of"? The current wording could be interpreted as explaining justification for segregation. Or, cut causes altogether and focus on the form segregation took and its impact. I also think stressing the impact of Woodrow Wilson's federal segregation policy is important but maybe that appears in a different standard?</li> <li>• DC.Hist.HC.21 Perhaps periodize this from 1910 onward, or even 1900? (I think 1910 is when the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates this commenter’s specific suggestions to amend the existing standards and will make the following modifications to the named standards:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSSE will revise DC.Geo.HE.20 to replace “reasons for” with “origins of.” OSSE will include the impact of Woodrow Wilson’s federal segregation policy in ancillary materials for educators.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Howard Theater opened; Paul Lawrence Dunbar is very early 20thc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DC.Hist.HC.26 add: "including the rise of go-go and street art...?"</li> <li>• DC.Econ.DM.40 O, New suggested version: "Evaluate financial resources and opportunities available to District residents to increase fiscal independence, and critically evaluate information from a variety of sources to make informed consumer decisions." Comments: The focus should be on economic decision making rather than the differences between groups</li> <li>• DC.Civ.CE.41 New suggested version: ""Assess successful efforts for creating change in Washington, DC and evaluate the efficacy of methods for achieving change in the District." Comments: The focus of this standard is civic engagement and how to use different methods for achieving change. The current wording unfortunately shifts the focus to specific individual change makers, like "the great man theory of history," where only charismatic individuals can effect change, and on conflict between groups rather than aiding students to learn how civic engagement can effect change as part of a movement, group, or organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OSSE will update DC.Hist.HC.21 to cover 1900-1930.</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise DC.Hist.HC.26 to include go-go.</li> <li>○ OSSE will revise DC.Econ.DM.40 to read <i>Evaluate financial resources and opportunities available to District residents to increase financial independence, and critically evaluate information from a variety of sources to make informed consumer decisions.</i></li> <li>○ OSSE will revise DC.Civ.CE.41 to read <i>Assess successful efforts for creating change in Washington, DC and evaluate the efficacy of methods for achieving change in the District.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Expanding focus on immigration and diverse communities in Washington DC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having read over the DC History standards, I did not see any specific reference to LGBTQ history - although it is mentioned in one of the overviews. While I can understand not including every subtopic in the standards, it seems a brief reference to the LGBTQ population is appropriate. I am noting this here b/c of LGBTQ migration to DC around WWII and the campaign led by Frank Kameny against the Lavendar Scare. Of course, LGBTQ history could appear in other standards but I think at some point should have a specific reference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the Lavender Scare is explicitly mentioned in US2.Civ.LP.48, OSSE appreciates this commenter's suggestion and will revise this set of standards to increase representation of diverse communities in the Washington DC standards.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DC's cultural diversity, global resources, and our local career landscape. This is Washington, DC and our standards should reflect the particularities of this city, and take advantage of its unique assets. We should be mindful of the resources at hand that can provide curriculum, professional development, field trip and enrichment activities for students. DC also is rich with career opportunities in government, cultural studies, and global fields of all kinds. Our social studies standards should be written in recognition of this fact. We alone in the US have the ability to directly expose our students to the levers of power on the local, state, national, and international stage, as well as to policymakers, activists, influence makers, and creatives from all over the world. Our standards should not look like any other state standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSSE appreciates and shares this commenter's interest in ensuring that DC's standards reflect the uniqueness of our jurisdiction.</li> <li>• As written, the standards enable educators and LEAs to take advantage of DC's rich cultural, historical, and governmental assets. Accordingly, OSSE is making no change in response to this comment.</li> <li>• However, OSSE looks forward to working with educators and LEAs to ensure that they have the necessary resources and tools to fully implement these standards in a manner that is mindful of the abundant opportunities for engagement in our jurisdiction.</li> </ul>