



Social Studies

High-Quality Instructional Materials Identification Framework

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Why Instructional Materials Matter for Maryland Students.....	2
Document Introduction	3
Document Organization	3
Key Criteria for High-Quality Instructional Materials.....	4
Designed to Affirm Students	4
Key Criteria for Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Instruction	4
Key Criteria for Language Affirming Instruction	5
Grade-Level and Standards Aligned.....	6
Key Criteria for Alignment with the Maryland Social Studies Standards (MSSS).....	6
Key Criteria for Text and Resource Selection	7
Key Criteria for Compelling Questions and Tasks.....	7
Key Criteria for Volume, Quality, and Range of Writing	8
Key Criteria for Speaking, Listening, and Oral Language Development	9
Instructional Design.....	10
Key Criteria for Building Knowledge and Skills	10
Key Criteria for Student Agency.....	11
Key Criteria for Progress Monitoring and Supporting Students.....	12
Educator Supports	14
Key Criteria for Educator Knowledge.....	14
Key Criteria for Usability	15
Research & Scholarship Supporting the Framework.....	16
Designed to Affirm Students	16
Grade-Level and Standard Aligned	18
Instructional Design.....	20
Educator Supports	23

Why Instructional Materials Matter for Maryland Students

The students of Maryland are a vibrant community of diverse learners, including a growing number of multilingual students and students from various racial and cultural backgrounds.¹ Instructional materials designed to best serve these students must facilitate enriching, culturally responsive, and language-affirming environments for all students.

Students deserve the opportunity to engage with rigorous content that builds a strong foundation for their educational journey and empowers them with essential learning skills. High-quality instructional materials offer students engagement with worthy and complex texts, tasks, and learning experiences that foster critical thinking abilities and language development and amplify student voice and agency. Additionally, these materials prioritize the affirmation of students' cultural and linguistic identities, attending to inclusive learning communities that connect education to their real-world experiences and provide the support and skill to ensure that students with diverse learning needs thrive.

By aligning with college and career readiness standards and research-based approaches, high-quality instructional materials unlock and support knowledge-building that encourages active learning and leads to dynamic demonstrations of knowledge from students. Furthermore, these materials offer support for educators, equipping them with the necessary tools, content knowledge, pedagogical expertise, and research-based practices to effectively engage students and adapt to diverse community and school contexts. With this comprehensive approach, instructional materials in Maryland have the potential to create transformative learning environments that prepare students from kindergarten through graduation for a future of choice and opportunity.

¹ In 2022, Maryland's student population included 33% Black, 33% White, 22% Latinx, and 7% Asian students, as well as 12% English learners, 12% students with disabilities, and an increasing proportion who face economic challenges (Maryland State Department of Education).

Document Introduction

This framework serves as a valuable resource for educators and stakeholders across the education sector to identify key criteria in truly high-quality instructional materials. It outlines the essential elements of outstanding curricula and offers clear guidance on the instructional shifts and educator supports needed to foster meaningful learning experiences for students. To deliver the world-class education that the [Blueprint for Maryland's Future](#) envisions, educators and leaders can rely on this framework in service of identifying the research-based, high-quality materials that are necessary to provide students with rigorous instruction, nurture spaces that affirm their cultural and linguistic identities, and ensure their continued progress and success each year.

This framework is grounded in extensive research aimed at defining the content, instructional practice, and instructional design present in high-quality instructional materials. These research-based elements are central to the criteria within this framework and critical to support the kinds of learning experiences that Maryland students deserve.

Despite its strengths as a resource for identifying high-quality instructional materials, there are limitations for how this framework can be used. While the document provides crucial guidelines, it is NOT intended to be exhaustive in addressing all the elements of instructional materials and practices needed to create an equitable experience for students. Additionally, this document is NOT a rubric, meaning it does not provide a checklist or a scoring system for evaluation of instructional materials. Instead, it offers guidance on the essential components of high-quality materials, encouraging educators to exercise professional judgment and adapt to their specific educational context.

It is also important for educators and leaders to recognize any and all humanizing considerations beyond the framework that may be necessary based on their unique students, classroom contexts, and school/district conditions in their review and selection of high-quality materials. Overall, this framework serves as a roadmap, empowering educators to select and use instructional materials that foster inclusivity, rigor, and relevance, ultimately resulting in enhanced learning outcomes for all students.

DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This document, intended for use when considering K–12 social studies core instructional materials, is organized into four categories (Designed to Affirm Students, Grade-Level and Standards-Aligned, Instructional Design, and Educator Supports), with domains that highlight key criteria within each section.

While specific categories have been included for culturally responsive-sustaining pedagogy and language-affirming instruction, related considerations for affirming students are woven throughout the framework. Similarly, considerations for diverse learning needs and Universal Design for Learning have been embedded throughout to reflect the way that these practices must be interlaced in thinking about content, instructional practice, and support for educators.

A collection of research and scholarship used to inform this framework is included as an appendix.

Key Criteria for High-Quality Instructional Materials

DESIGNED TO AFFIRM STUDENTS

Affirming students creates opportunities for cultural and linguistic backgrounds to be an asset and a source of validation in the learning experience. In addition to a foundation of grade-level content, high-quality instructional materials must prioritize instructional practices that affirm students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds and support students with a range of diverse learning needs to thrive through Social Studies. This support includes developing culturally responsive-sustaining learning communities that center who students are, use literacy as a tool for civic engagement, and connect learning to the world outside the schoolhouse walls. Social studies instruction must also intentionally affirm students' languages and language practices through a focus on building upon students' multilingualism, ensuring that texts support language development, and designing language objectives that work in concert with content and literacy learning. Through these instructional choices, materials have the potential to deepen learning, cultivate a sense of belonging and recognize who students are and will grow to be.

Key Criteria for Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Instruction

- **Affirmation and Centering of Students:** Instructional materials affirm, engage, and center past and current knowledge of Black/African, Indigenous, Brown, and non-Western perspectives and highlight multilingualism. Instructional materials are designed to encourage students to anchor learning in their individual experiences, backgrounds, and cultural knowledge to support and further literacy work. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. regular opportunities for students to share who they are and what they know, bringing their unique funds of knowledge to their literacy experiences;²
 - b. reflection and conversation within the context of the text or topic under study that affirm students' identities and experiences;
 - c. tasks that support students to express (orally, in writing, in media, and in other formats) how texts and topics under study do or do not affect their understanding of the world; and
 - d. tasks that require students to integrate what they have read and/or learned from others with their own knowledge and synthesize ideas across texts.
- **Social Studies as a Tool for Civic Engagement:** Instructional materials consistently use texts and tasks that prompt students to apply the knowledge of disciplinary concepts and tools to develop their civic engagement skills, examine current events, build authentic inquiries, and take informed action. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. opportunities for students to read, write, listen, and speak in an effort to think critically about the content/perspective of the text or resources;

² Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.

- b. opportunities for students to apply disciplinary knowledge, skills, and perspectives to inquire about problems involved with public issues;
 - c. attention to historical and social contexts in texts; and
 - d. opportunities for critically examining texts for influence, bias, and diversity of perspectives and for considering whose voice is elevated and whose is absent.
- **Real-World Connections:** Instructional materials consistently connect with students' lives, their future goals, their communities, and world and nurture ways for students to engage in their own communities and beyond. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. use of historical sources and disciplinary tasks to connect to current events;
 - b. engagement in collaborative tasks and/or projects that involve real-world problem-solving through meaningful interactions with peers and their local communities; and
 - c. connections between developing literacy skills and knowledge and students' academic and personal goals.

Key Criteria for Language Affirming Instruction

- **Multilingualism in Social Studies:** Instructional materials are deliberately designed to support multilingualism with a specific focus on building disciplinary-specific thinking skills (corroboration, sourcing, contextualization) while encouraging students to leverage their linguistic repertoire to communicate with one another via reading, writing, speaking, and listening. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. promoting sustained oral and written communication, including explicit encouragement to use a range of language practices and registers and to use their full language repertoire through translanguaging so all students express themselves in a language they are comfortable with while working to learn literacy content and meet language objectives in the target language;
 - b. building vocabulary and understanding of new concepts in English and home language(s), including use of social and academic vocabulary; and
 - c. making translanguaging connections, such as by making connections between students' home language(s) or register and the language or register of instruction (e.g., cognates, academic language registers).³

© 2024 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT PARTNERS Inc., adapted with permission by Maryland State Department of Education

³ García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning. Caslon. For more, see Translanguaging Strategies, English Learner Success Forum.

GRADE-LEVEL AND STANDARDS ALIGNED

Grade-level, standards-aligned content serves as a necessary foundation for equitable student experiences in the classroom. Engaging with this rigorous content from kindergarten through graduation sets students on a path to empowered lives, and instructional materials must be designed so that all students have access to this essential literacy work. The ideas, concepts, skills, and understandings gained in the social studies disciplines prepare young people to be more effective citizens and provide students with the tools to understand, interpret, and effectively meet the challenges of the 21st century. In social studies, learners should be engaged in skill-based inquiry arcs (focused on evaluating evidence, questioning, and communicating conclusions) and academic concepts and approaches that help to organize and make sense of disciplinary content and knowledge. This includes ensuring that all students engage with worthy texts and resources, tackle high-quality questions and tasks, develop their oral language and vocabulary, and pursue a volume of writing to express their learning and ideas to become independent readers and learners.

Key Criteria for Alignment with the Maryland Social Studies Standards (MSSS)

- **Inquiry as a Core Tenet:** Instructional materials reflect the idea that inquiry is the core tenet of effective social studies instruction. Further, materials focus on the interrelated enduring understandings, concepts, and skills from the core social studies disciplines (civics, economics, geography, and history). The instructional materials also contain clear opportunities to practice asking questions, investigate essential questions, and gather relevant evidence to develop claims. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. content of the Maryland Social Studies Frameworks & Standards (MSSFS);
 - b. investigation of compelling and supporting questions in a structured way;
 - c. units that build toward taking informed action and provide students with an opportunity to apply their learning to real-world challenges;
 - d. explicit instruction designed in ways that are clear and authentic;
 - e. explicit opportunities for teachers and students to develop and plan inquiry arcs; and
 - f. lesson objectives aligned to grade-appropriate K–12 college- and career-ready literacy standards.
- **Disciplinary Content Fluency:** Instructional materials contain accurate, detailed content with a variety of culturally responsive sources and abundant, well-designed practice opportunities along with supporting resources that align with the sequence of the MSSFS. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. lessons and units that build disciplinary knowledge and skills through the evaluation of sources and evidence and reflect the practice of social scientists; and
 - b. authentic opportunities to build content knowledge and disciplinary skills across units in history, civics, geography, and economics.
- **Evaluation of Sources and Leveraging of Evidence:** Instructional materials focus in particular on opportunity for source evaluation and the use of evidence to support claims. Materials contain systematic and supportive practice opportunities for students to investigate how the reliability of a document can be affected by the circumstances under which it was created.

Further, instructional materials provide systematic opportunities for learners to gather relevant information from multiple sources while developing claims and counterclaims.

Key Criteria for Text and Resource Selection

- **Grade-Level Texts:** Instructional materials ensure that all students have extensive opportunities to actively engage with grade-level texts. These core texts for instruction are appropriately complex for the grade (based on quantitative and qualitative features) to build students' ability to read closely. These materials include opportunities to engage with longer primary, secondary, and historiographical works across all elementary and secondary levels. In early elementary grades, the texts are used for reading aloud.
- **Supportive Texts and Resources:** Instructional materials incorporate supportive texts and resources. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. texts at a variety of complexity levels from students' home language that are sequenced around knowledge-building topics/themes to support of students' access to grade-level texts;
 - b. a range of knowledge-focused topically connected multimedia and art resources (e.g., videos, visual art, music, virtual museums or galleries); and
 - c. authentic texts that have opportunities for rich vocabulary and syntax to support language development.

Key Criteria for Compelling Questions and Tasks

- **Text Based and Aligned to Standards and MSSFS:** Instructional materials include text-specific questions, discussion prompts, essential questions, and tasks to support students' access to primary and secondary sources. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. alignment to the essential questions embedded within the MSSFS;
 - b. attention to each text's particular qualitative complexities (i.e., meaning/purpose, structure, language, knowledge demands);
 - c. ways to spur the analytical thinking required by college- and career-ready standards at each grade level (i.e., attention to key ideas, details, craft, structure); and
 - d. use of the origin, authority, structure, context, and collaborative value of the sources to guide the selection of evidence from multiple sources.
- **Intentional Sequencing:** Instructional materials sequence essential questions, text-based questions, discussion prompts, and tasks to support students in building enduring understandings targeted in the MSSFS. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. building from students' funds of knowledge;⁴
 - b. attending to the words, phrases, and sentences (including syntax) in texts;

⁴ Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.

- c. embedding checks for understanding (e.g., questions, tasks) of the text, topic, or literacy skill under study to elicit evidence of student learning;
- d. engaging in close reading of especially complex or historically significant sections of text;
- e. building mental models of texts as students read; and
- f. integrating understandings across multiple sources.

Key Criteria for Volume, Quality, and Range of Writing

- **Prominent, Authentic Writing Opportunities:** Instructional materials provide frequent opportunities for students to write, which are connected to taught skills, texts, and topics under study. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. conducting short, focused research projects;
 - b. crafting prose, sentences, paragraphs, and texts that allow students to communicate information and their ideas through multiple means of expression;
 - c. constructing explanations using reasoning, correct sequence, examples, and details with relevant information and data while acknowledging the strengths and weaknesses of the explanations;
 - d. refining claims and counterclaims attending to precision, significance, and knowledge conveyed through the claim; and
 - e. identifying evidence that draws information directly and substantially from multiple sources to detect inconsistencies in evidence to revise and strengthen claims.
- **Explicit Instruction:** Instructional materials include attending to the discrete disciplinary-aligned skills of social studies-aligned writing. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. explicit instruction on paragraph and text structure (e.g., via structure-focused mnemonic devices, graphic organizers);
 - b. use of relevant tools needed for access to effective construction and composition of writing;
 - c. grammar/usage instruction in and out of context; and
 - d. attention to the writing process and language development alongside development of writing skills.
- **Varied Writing Experiences:** Instructional materials address different types of writing (i.e., on demand, process, research) and meet college- and career-ready expectations for writing across genres.⁵ These materials include a focus on argumentative, informative, and blended forms of writing.

⁵ English Learner Success Forum. (n.d.). ELA guidelines: Benchmark 1. <https://www.elsuccessforum.org/ela-guidelines>

Key Criteria for Speaking, Listening, and Oral Language Development

- **Integrated Oral Language Development:** Instructional materials regularly integrate discipline-specific oral language, writing, reading, and discussion about grade-level texts and social studies topics.⁶ These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. attention to meaning and oral language development within disciplinary instruction;
 - b. writing activities that engage students in discussion as part of the writing process;⁷
 - c. use of expressive language (i.e., speaking, writing) with increasingly complex language and syntax, demonstrating growing proficiency in the language of instruction;
 - d. activity organizers that are aligned to the text structure of primary and secondary sources;
 - e. glossaries that, when possible, include student home languages; and
 - f. explicit connections between language and content objectives.
- **Prominent, Authentic Discourse Opportunities:** Instructional materials include frequent opportunities for students to discuss texts and topics under study. This academic discourse simultaneously builds knowledge, vocabulary, and language skills to express ideas and comprehension. These discourse opportunities include prompts that are explicitly connected to various historical sources (primary and/or secondary documents: text, speech, visual arts, music).
- **Vocabulary Building:** Instructional materials include explicit and research-based teaching of discipline-specific and text-based vocabulary, including special attention to academic and content-based vocabulary. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. practice of newly taught words in a variety of modes (i.e., orally, in writing), including through multiple relevant examples that support students making connections with words;
 - b. student-friendly definitions;
 - c. visual representations; and
 - d. encouragement for the use, review, and assessment of targeted words throughout the unit.

© 2024 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT PARTNERS Inc., adapted with permission by Maryland State Department of Education

⁶ English Learners Success Forum. (n.d.). ELA guidelines. Retrieved July 11, 2023, from <https://www.elsuccessforum.org/ela-guidelines>

⁷ English Learners Success Forum. (n.d.). ELA guidelines. Retrieved July 11, 2023, from <https://www.elsuccessforum.org/ela-guidelines>

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

Instructional materials must attend to research-based instructional practices that support meaningful engagement for all students to be deemed high quality. It is through this intentional design that these resources contribute to learning communities in which students unlock knowledge; are authentically engaged as readers, writers, and thinkers; have the support they need; and regularly demonstrate their learning in dynamic ways. This type of learning community builds students' literacy identities and experiences of joy in the literacy classroom.

Key Criteria for Building Knowledge and Skills

- **Knowledge-Building Focus:** Instructional materials center on building knowledge through engaging, inquiry-based investigations about civics, people of the nations and world, geography, economics, and history. Units feature regular interaction with, but are not limited to, knowledge-rich texts, data sets, and simulations. Literacy skills and strategies are primarily taught and used in service of building disciplinary knowledge through reading, writing, speaking, and listening. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. scaffolding of the degree of difficulty or complexity within activities;
 - b. opportunities to generalize learning to new situations; and
 - c. support for prior knowledge and key ideas.
- **Inclusive Content:** Instructional materials for key areas of the MSSS are expansive and representative of diverse identities, including content from a variety of community, cultural, and language backgrounds within and across school years. At each grade level, these materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. elevation of multiple perspectives;
 - b. counternarratives that challenge dominant narratives;
 - c. inspiration for reflection, motivation, or civic engagement in response to ideas and content presented; and
 - d. engagement of students in learning about the joy, resilience, determination, ingenuity, and leadership of all groups and communities, including historically marginalized communities.

© 2024 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT PARTNERS Inc., adapted with permission by Maryland State Department of Education

- **Historical Thinking Skills:** Instructional materials include the synthesis of historical thinking skills throughout, including opportunities for critical historical inquiry. These materials include regular opportunities for all of the following elements:
 - a. contextualization: locating a document in time and place and understanding how these factors shape its content;
 - b. corroboration: considering details across multiple sources to determine points of agreement and disagreement;
 - c. sourcing: considering who wrote a document as well as the circumstances of its creation;

- d. chronological thinking: considering how events in history unfold over time; and
- e. claim development: analyzing claims, interrogating the credibility of evidence, and developing counterclaims.

Key Criteria for Student Agency

- **Metacognitive Processes:** Instructional materials develop students' metacognition by directly teaching and supporting students to monitor understanding during reading and self-regulate during writing. This includes setting goals; self-monitoring growth; and reflecting on the impact of students' choices and ongoing development as readers, writers, and communicators. For multilingual learners, materials provide guidance on developing students' meta-awareness around language use and choices.⁸ These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. setting goals and self-monitoring growth;
 - b. reflecting on the impact of students' choices;
 - c. modeling and developing strategies that support students in making their thinking visible through speaking or writing as they develop their understanding; and
 - d. providing guidance for building metacognition for students with diverse learning needs.
- **Choice and Voice:** Instructional materials include a balance of student-choice and teacher-defined tasks. Students are provided regular opportunities to make choices about how to spend time, whom to spend it with, and what materials are used (texts, topics, and tasks). These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. options for choosing methods to express students' understanding that best reflect their strengths as learners and their understanding of the content;
 - b. self-selection of texts or resources (e.g., selections that represent their interests, identities, abilities);
 - c. tasks that invite students to identify and pursue their own inquiry arcs;
 - d. regular student feedback about literacy experiences and instruction; and
 - e. texts learners can identify themselves within.
- **Collaborative Learning:** Instructional materials engage all students in collaborative learning through a variety of research-based routines, structures, and tasks that allow for whole-group, small-group, and independent thinking. Materials explicitly plan for students to demonstrate their curiosity and share their tentative thinking; ask questions; and adjust their understanding by building on one another's ideas through speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

⁸ English Learners Success Forum. (n.d.). ELA guidelines. Retrieved July 11, 2023, from <https://www.elsuccessforum.org/ela-guidelines>

Key Criteria for Progress Monitoring and Supporting Students

- **Supports and Scaffolds⁹:** Instructional materials are designed to support a variety of student strengths and diverse learning needs in ways that are based on research and do not interfere with their ability to engage with grade-level content. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. text- and/or content-specific guidance on identifying and addressing potential individual student needs so that supports, scaffolds, and extensions can be effectively differentiated;
 - b. reteaching opportunities for students not yet proficient in reading, writing, and language grade-level skills; and
 - c. supports and scaffolds that are designed to shift responsibility to students over time.
- **Simultaneous Literacy and Language Development:** Instructional materials provide appropriate supports for multilingual learners. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. explicit instruction in writing, text structure, syntax (sentence structure), and cohesive devices (words that connect ideas in a text such as although, however);
 - b. sentence or discussion frames; and
 - c. strategic grouping to allow for students to converse in home languages.
- **Progress Monitoring:** Instructional materials embed frequent opportunities to monitor and develop students' progress in disciplinary literacy skills, application of those skills, development of language, and growth of content knowledge. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. embedded and consistent formative assessment practices for content, literacy, and language learning;
 - b. varied and multiple means of demonstrating integrated content, historical thinking skills, literacy, and language learning (e.g., podcast, mock interview, blogpost);
 - c. regular monitoring of grade-level reading proficiency; and
 - d. regular monitoring of oral language development.
- **Meaningful Feedback:** Instructional materials provide frequent opportunities for feedback to advance content understanding and disciplinary literacy skills, as appropriate to the type of literacy instruction. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. peer and teacher cycles of feedback, including communicating progress;
 - b. normalization of mistake-making and affirmation of effort and growth;

⁹ Thoughtfully designed questions and tasks that provide access to grade-level, culturally responsive-sustaining, and language-affirming experiences for students are one form of support for students and are addressed in other sections of this framework.

- c. guidance for explicit, timely, informative, and accessible formative feedback to address partial understandings and alternative thinking about tasks, texts, and topics in ways that allow learners to monitor their own progress effectively and to use that information to guide their own effort and practice; and
- d. guidance on how and when to collect data, as well as how to respond to specific student strengths and needs.

© 2024 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT PARTNERS Inc., adapted with permission by Maryland State Department of Education

EDUCATOR SUPPORTS

To promote facilitation of meaningful learning experiences for all students, instructional materials ensure effective supports for educators. Throughout the instructional materials, explicit tools and resources focus on enhancing educators' depth of social studies-specific knowledge for teaching, using pedagogical content knowledge in planning for instruction, and practicing inquiry-based teaching to build on or extend students' critical thinking. These tools and resources also encourage reflective practice among educators, including the examination of their own identities, and employ research-based practices. In addition, resources are thoughtfully designed for ease of use and fit to community context.

Key Criteria for Educator Knowledge

- **Examine Self:** Instructional materials support teachers in examining their own identities, biases, and belief systems to help them understand how these factors might influence instructional choices and the lens through which they interpret student thinking.”. These materials may include reflection prompts, examples of educator thinking, or embedded professional learning.

© 2024 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT PARTNERS Inc., adapted with permission by Maryland State Department of Education

- **Inquiry-Based Teaching Practices:** Instructional materials support teachers in engaging with students in the inquiry process and inquiry-based pedagogical practices (question formulation, research, inquiry reflection, evaluation, and synthesis).
- **Text and Topic Knowledge:** Instructional materials support educators to engage students with rich texts and topics. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. text analysis for anchor texts, including quantitative and qualitative complexity;
 - b. considerations for engaging a diverse group of students in anchor text/unit content in inclusive ways (e.g., guidance, explanatory content, teacher notes); and
 - c. explanations, examples of concepts, and/or additional resources to support teachers in building their own knowledge of the content and topics under study.
- **Students' Linguistic and Cultural Assets:** Instructional materials support educators to leverage students' linguistic and cultural assets. These materials include prompts for educators to learn about and integrate the knowledge, strengths, and resources of students, families, and the community — especially those who have been historically marginalized.
- **Supporting Language Development for All Learners:** Instructional materials build educators' understanding of research-based practices to support language development for all learners, especially for multilingual learners and students with diverse learning needs. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. use of home language, translanguaging, and development of cross-linguistic connections to deepen understanding of the linguistic features across languages and registers; and
 - b. development of oracy skills.

- **Supporting Literacy Development:** Instructional materials build educators' understanding of research-based practices to support literacy development through social studies instruction. These materials include all of the following elements:
 - a. building of knowledge of students' language development, including oracy, and language development standards;
 - b. simultaneous development of language, content, and literacy skills; and
 - c. examples of student language with varying levels of language proficiency within the lesson context.

Key Criteria for Usability

- **Design and Functionality:** Instructional materials are designed to support ease of student and teacher use. This includes (all of the following):
 - a. a visually appealing design with an organized and logical format;
 - b. materials that are appropriately paced;
 - c. clear and concise educator-facing guidance; and
 - d. a variety of ways to engage with the content, including leveraging current technology.
- **Adaptability for Context:** Instructional materials contain materials and/or meaningful suggestions for how to adapt for district, school, and/or classroom context. This may include varied selections for topics under study; flexibility to modify tasks to connect to local resources, organizations, or issues; or varied pacing suggestions based on number of school days or minutes of instruction.
- **Program Coherence:** Core instructional materials work in concert with (or have the potential to work in concert with) additional supplemental Social Studies materials (e.g., interventional materials). This includes, aligned and research-based content and instructional approaches across materials.

© 2024 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT PARTNERS Inc., adapted with permission by Maryland State Department of Education

Research & Scholarship Supporting the Framework

A robust research and scholarship base underpins this framework. For more information about research-supported practice, see Student Achievement Partners' [Essential X Equitable Instructional Practice Framework™](#).

DESIGNED TO AFFIRM STUDENTS

Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Instruction:

Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. Multicultural education series. Teachers College Press.

Bishop, R. S. (1990). Windows, mirrors, and sliding glass doors. *Perspectives*, 6(3), ix-xi.

Dee, T. S., & Penner, E. K. (2017). The causal effects of cultural relevance: Evidence from an ethnic studies curriculum. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1), 127–166

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, practice*. Teachers College Press

Goodman, D. J. (2011). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups* (2nd ed.). Routledge; Mitchell, T. (2015). *Identity and social action: The role of self-examination in systemic change*. Association of American Colleges & Universities Online; Sleeter, C. E. (2011). *The academic and social value of ethnic studies: A research review*. National Education Association Research Department.

Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(1), 163–206

Doherty, R., William, R. Hilberg, S., Pinal, A., & Tharp, R. G. (2003). Five standards and student achievement. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 1(1)

Howard, T. C. (2001). Powerful pedagogy for African American students: A case of four teachers. *Urban Education*, 36(2), 179–202

Husband, T., & Kang, G. (2020). Identifying promising literacy practices for Black males in P-12 classrooms: An integrative review. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 16(1)

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. Jossey-Bass

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995) Towards a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 2, 132–141

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research.

Equity & Excellence in Education, 41(4), 433–452

Muhammad, G. (2021). *Cultivating genius: An equity framework for culturally and historically responsive literacy*. Scholastic.

Muhammad, G. E. (2018). A plea for identity and criticality: Reframing literacy learning standards through a four-layered equity model. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 62(2), 137–142

Muhammad, G. E., & Mosley, L. T. (2021). Why we need identity and equity learning in literacy practices: Moving research, practice, and policy forward. *Language Arts*, 98(4), 189–196

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (4th ed.). Pearson

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press; Sleeter, C. E. (2011). The academic and social value of ethnic studies: A research review. National Education Association Research Department.

Tatum, A. W., Johnson, A., & McMillon, D. (2021). The state of Black male literacy research, 1999–2020. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 70(1), 129–151

Wood S., & Jocius R. (2013). Combating “I hate this stupid book!”: Black males and critical literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(8), 661–669.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). *Critical race theory: Perspectives on social studies*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Language Affirming:

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon

Lee, A. C., & Handsfield, L. J. (2018). Code-meshing and writing instruction in multilingual classrooms. *The Reading Teacher*, 72(2), 159–168.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. Teachers College Press

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world*. Teachers College Press

Rodríguez, D., Carrasquillo, A., & Lee, K. S. (2014). *The bilingual advantage: Promoting academic development, biliteracy, and native language in the classroom*. Teachers College Press.

Moll, L. C., & González, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 26(4), 439–456

Nieto, S. (2010). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives* (2nd. ed.). Taylor & Francis.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Heinemann

Santamaria, L. J. (2009). Culturally responsive differentiated instruction: Narrowing gaps between best pedagogical practices benefiting all learners. *Teachers College Record*, 111(1), 214–247.

CUNY-NYSIEB (City University of New York-New York State Initiative on Emergent Bilinguals). (Ed.). (2020). *Translanguaging and transformative teaching for emergent bilingual students. Lessons from the CUNY-NYSIEB Project*. Routledge

Caslon; Sánchez, M. T., & O. García. (Eds.). (2022). *Transformative translanguaging Espacios: Latinx students and teachers rompiendo fronteras sinmiedo*. Multilingual Matters.

Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge

Pacheco, M. B. (2018). Spanish, Arabic, and “English-only”: Making meaning across languages in two classroom communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 995–1021

TESOL Quarterly, 52(4), 995–1021

Washington, J. A., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2021). Teaching reading to African American children. *American Educator*, 45(2), 26–40.

García, O., & Wei, L., (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education* (pp. 46–62).

Palgrave Macmillan UK; Horst, M., White, J., & Bell, P. (2010). First and second language knowledge in the language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 331–349

Martínez, R. A. (2018). Beyond the English learner label: Recognizing the richness of bi/multilingual students' linguistic repertoires. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(5), 515–522

Salerno, A. S., Andrei, E., & Kibler, A. K. (2019). Teachers' misunderstandings about hybrid language use: Insights into teacher education. *TESOL Journal*, 10(3).

GRADE-LEVEL AND STANDARD ALIGNED

Adams, M. J. (2011). The relation between alphabetic basics, word recognition, and reading. In S. J. Samuels & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 4–24). International Reading Association

Bunch, G. C., Walqui, A., & Pearson, P. D. (2014). Complex text and new common standards in the United States: Pedagogical Implications for English learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(3), 533–559

Breaking down words to build meaning: Morphology, vocabulary, and reading comprehension in the urban classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(2), 134–144

Cervetti, G. N., Wright, T. S., & Hwang, H. (2016). Conceptual coherence, comprehension, and vocabulary acquisition: A knowledge effect? *Reading and Writing*, 29(4), 761–779

Cheatham, J. P., & Allor, J. H. (2012). The influence of decodability in early reading text on reading achievement: A review of the evidence. *Read Write*, 25, 2223–2246

Ehri, L. C. (2020). The science of learning to read words: A case for systematic phonics instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55, S45–S60

Foorman, B. R., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K. E., Coyne, M. D., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L. M., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE)

Goldenberg, C. (2020). Reading wars, reading science, and English learners. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55, S131–S144

Graham, S., Bruch, J., Fitzgerald, J., Friedrich, L. D., Furgeson, J., Greene, K., Kim, J., Lyskawa, J., Olson, C. B., & Wulsin, C. S. (2016). Teaching secondary students to write effectively (NCEE 2017-4002). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE)

Graham, S. & Hebert, M. (2010) Writing to read: Evidence for how writing can improve reading. A Carnegie Corporation Time to Act Report. Alliance for Excellent Education

Hiebert, E. H. (2017). The texts of literacy instruction: Obstacles to or opportunities for educational equity? *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66(1), 117–134

Hiebert, E. H., & Tortorelli, L. S. (2022). The role of word-, sentence-, and text-level variables in predicting guided reading levels of kindergarten and first-grade texts. *The Elementary School Journal*, 122(4), 557–590.

Kintsch, W. (1986). Learning from text. *Cognition and Instruction*, 3, 87–108; Kintsch, W. (2013). Revisiting the construction-integration model of text comprehension and its implication for instruction. In D. E. Alvermann, N. J. Unrau, & R. B. Ruddell, (Eds.), *Theoretical models of reading* (6th ed., pp. 807-839). International Reading Association.

Lee, J., & Yoon, S. Y. (2017). The effects of repeated reading on reading fluency for students with reading disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(2), 213–224

Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, S. E., & Kelley, J. G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(2), 196–228

Lupo, S. M., Berry, A., Thacker, E., Sawyer, A., & Merritt, J. (2020). Rethinking text sets to support knowledge building and interdisciplinary learning. *The Reading Teacher*, 73, 513–524

Lupo, S. M., Strong, J. Z., Lewis, W., Walpole, S., & McKenna, M. C. (2018). Building background knowledge through reading: Rethinking text sets. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 61, 433–444

McKeown, M. G. Beck, I. L., & Blake, R. G. K. (2009). Rethinking reading comprehension instruction: A comparison of instruction for strategies and content approaches. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(3), 218–253

- Mesmer, H. A., & Kambach, A. (2022). Beyond labels and agendas: Research teachers need to know about phonics and phonological awareness. *The Reading Teacher*, 76(1), 62–72
- Pacheco, M. B. (2018). Spanish, Arabic, and “English-only”: Making meaning across languages in two classroom communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 995–1021.
- Perfetti, C. (2007). Reading ability: Lexical quality to comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 11(4), 357–383; Sirm, R. (2021). The neuroscience behind productive struggle. *Edutopia*
- Proctor, C. P., Silverman, R. D., Harring, J. R., Jones, R. L., & Hartranft, A. M. (2020). Teaching bilingual learners: Effects of a language-based reading intervention on academic language and reading comprehension in grades 4 and 5. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(1), 95–122.
- Student Achievement Partners. (n.d.). College- and career-ready shifts in ELA/literacy. *Achieve The Core*
- Student Achievement Partners. (2020). Priority instructional content in English language arts/literacy and mathematics. *Achieve The Core*. ACT, Inc. (2006).
- Reading between the lines: What the ACT reveals about college readiness in reading
- TNTP. (2018). The opportunity myth: What students can show us about how school is letting them down—and how to fix it
- Torgesen, J. K. (2021). Preventing and remediating reading difficulties: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 36(1), 4–16
- Vaughn, S., Kieffer, M. J., McKeown, M., Reed, D. K., Sanchez, M., & Wexler, J. (2022). Providing reading interventions for students in grades 4-9 (WWC 2022007). National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE). <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/PracticeGuide/29>
- Washburn, J. (2022). Reviewing evidence on the relations between oral reading fluency and reading comprehension for adolescents. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 55(1), 22–42.
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. (2010). Common core state standards (ELA). <http://corestandards.org/>

INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN

Building Knowledge:

- Alleman, J., & Brophy, J. (1993). Is curriculum integration a boon or a threat to social studies? *Social Education*, 57(6), 287–291
- Lupo, S. M., Hardigree, C., Thacker, E. S., Sawyer, A. G., & Merritt, J. D. (2022). Bringing content into the literacy block. In *Teaching disciplinary literacy in grades K-6: Infusing content with reading, writing, and language*. Routledge.
- Cucchiara, M. (2019). Language of learning: Content-rich texts build knowledge and skills. *The Learning Professional*, 40(2), 32–36
- Lee, O., Quinn, H., & Valdés, G. (2013). Science and language for English language learners in relation to Next Generation Science Standards and with implications for Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics. *Educational Researcher*, 42(4), 223–233

Llosa, L., Lee, O., Jiang, F., Haas, A., O'Connor, C., Van Booven, C. D., & Kieffer, M. J. (2016). Impact of a large-scale science intervention focused on English language learners. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(2), 395–424.

Keirn, Tim, and Daisy Martin. "Historical Thinking and Preservice Teacher Preparation." *The History Teacher*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2012, pp. 489–92.

JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23265941>. Accessed 25 July 2023.

Cinthia Salinas, Brooke Blevins & Caroline C. Sullivan (2012) Critical Historical Thinking: When Official Narratives Collide With Other Narratives, *Multicultural Perspectives*, 14:1, 18-27, DOI: 10.1080/15210960.2012.646640

Sigrun Gudmundsdottir & Lee Shulman (1987) Pedagogical Content Knowledge in Social Studies, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 31:2, 59-70, DOI: 10.1080/0031383870310201

National Council for the Social Studies. (2013). *College, career, and civic life: C3 framework for social studies state standards*. Washington, DC: NCSS.

National Council for the Social Studies. (2010). *National curriculum standards for social studies: A framework for teaching, learning, and assessment (NCSS Bulletin 111)*. Silver Spring, MD: NCSS.

Bigler, E., Shiller, J., & Willcox, L. (2013). The teaching of race and class in American social studies classrooms. In J. Passe & P. Fitchett (Eds.), *The status of social studies: Views from the field* (pp. 153–168). Information Age: Charlotte.

Demoiny, S.B. (2018), "Social studies teacher educators who do race work: A racial-pedagogical-content-knowledge analysis", *Social Studies Research and Practice*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 330-344. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SSRP-04-2018-0017>

Student Agency:

Laslocky, M. (2021). The mistake-friendly classroom. *Edutopia*; Youki, T. (2020). The mistake imperative—why we must get over our fear of student error. *Edutopia*.

Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. (2006). Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers: Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(2), 295–340.

Corbalan, G., Kester, L., & van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (2006). Towards a personalized task selection model with shared instructional control.

Instructional Science, 34, 399–422.

Duke, N. K. (2016). Project-based instruction: A great match for informational texts. *American Educator*, 40(3), 4–11

Frankel, K. K., Ward, A., & Fields, S. (2019). Leveraging adolescents agency, engagement, and comprehension-focused reading. *Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy*, 63, 224–228

Graham, S. McKeown, D., Kiuahara, S., & Harris, K. R. (2012) A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(3), 879–896

Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, A. L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M., & Littles, E. (2007). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 245–256

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 601–634). Springer

Harris, K., Santangelo, T., & Graham, S. (2010). Metacognition and strategy instruction in writing. In H. S. Waters & W. Schneider (Eds.), *Metacognition, strategy use and instruction* (pp. 226–256). Guilford

Heafner, T. L., & Massey, D. D. (2016). Initiating C3 inquiry: Using texts and curiosity to inspire readers. *Social Education*, 80(6), 333–342

Monitoring Progress and Supporting Students:

Klute, M., Apthorp, H., Harlacher, J., & Reale, M. (2017). Formative assessment and elementary school student academic achievement: A review of the evidence (REL 2017-259). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>

Kapur, M. (2008). Productive failure. *Cognition and Instruction*, 26(3), 379–424; Kapur, M. (2016). Examining productive failure, productive success, unproductive failure, and unproductive success in learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 51(2), 289–299

Schleppenbach, M., Flevaris, L. M., Sims, L. M., & Perry, M. (2007). Teachers' responses to student mistakes in Chinese and US mathematics classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 108(2), 131–147;

Soncini, A., Matteucci, M. C., & Butera, F. (2021). Error handling in the classroom: an experimental study of teachers' strategies to foster positive error climate. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 36(3), 719–738.

Baumann, J. F. (1986). Teaching third-grade students to comprehend anaphoric relationships: The application of a direct instruction model.

Reading Research Quarterly, 21(1), 70–90; Brooks, M. D. (2016). Tell me what you are thinking : An investigation of five Latina LTELs constructing meaning with academic texts. *Linguistics and Education*, 35, 1–14;

Elleman, A. M. (2017). Examining the impact of inference instruction on the literal and inferential comprehension of skilled and less skilled readers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109(6), 761–781.

Cohen, E. G., & Lotan, R. A. (1997). *Working for equity in heterogeneous classrooms: Sociological theory in practice*. Teachers College Press

TNTP. (2021). Accelerate, don't remediate; TNTP. (2021). The opportunity myth.

Baumann, J. F. (1986). Teaching third-grade students to comprehend anaphoric relationships: The application of a direct instruction model.

Reading Research Quarterly, 21(1), 70–90

Brooks, M. D. (2016). "Tell me what you are thinking": An investigation of five Latina LTELs constructing meaning with academic texts. *Linguistics and Education*, 35, 1–14

Elleman, A. M. (2017). Examining the impact of inference instruction on the literal and inferential comprehension of skilled and less skilled readers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109(6), 761–781.

EDUCATOR SUPPORTS

Supporting Language Development

García, O., & Wei, L., (2014). Language, bilingualism and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education* (pp. 46–62). Palgrave Macmillan UK

Horst, M., White, J., & Bell, P. (2010). First and second language knowledge in the language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 331–349

Martínez, R. A. (2018). Beyond the English learner label: Recognizing the richness of bi/multilingual students' linguistic repertoires. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(5), 515–522

Salerno, A. S., Andrei, E., & Kibler, A. K. (2019). Teachers' misunderstandings about hybrid language use: Insights into teacher education. *TESOL Journal*, 10(3).

Walqui, A. (2019). Shifting from the teaching of oral skills to the development of oracy. In L. C. de Oliveira (Ed.), *The handbook of TESOL in K-12* (pp. 179–197). Wiley-Blackwell.