

## Seeing Standards as Educative: Guidance for the Analysis and Design of State World History Standards

World history standards in the United States vary greatly from state to state. Some are loaded with events and people; some include only broad discussion of eras that should be addressed. Some states have made efforts to include more regions and peoples in their standards; others continue to focus mainly on Western narratives. Despite these differences, however, most state world history standards do not fully include the conceptual tools and the narratives that world historians often include in their work.<sup>1</sup> In fact, attempts at broadening perspectives and regions are often what are cited in news stories covering controversy over history standards.<sup>2</sup> Given the range of standards that currently exist (and will likely continue to exist to some extent) and the nature of the creation of standards in states with politicized contexts, what can educators and policymakers do to improve state world history standards? We ask this question knowing that standards in any history or other subject could also be improved. However, we feel that it is particularly important to focus on world history standards, given the issues of coherence and scope that they raise in trying to capture the history of the world. Additionally, many world history teachers have historically not had the same amount of preparation for teaching world history as U.S. history teachers may have had.<sup>3</sup> Studies have shown that history teachers do use state history standards for their instructional planning, even if feeling constrained by them.<sup>4</sup> Arguably, world history teachers may lean on state standards more—particularly if teachers are in schools or districts that have not developed world history curriculum.

In this article we draw on our research<sup>5</sup> over the past decade on the field of world history, history standards, and the decision-making of world history teachers to propose guiding questions for the analysis and design/revision of world history standards. In particular we argue that the inclusion of *educative features* in world history standards could guide teachers in making choices about what to teach in different state contexts. As discussed below, educative features include inserted text or graphics that provide

background information and suggestions for teachers as well as rationale for curricular elements.<sup>6</sup> This type of information could help teachers strengthen their content knowledge and create coherence from standards that may be presented as unconnected. In what follows we provide background for these issues before discussing three questions that we have developed to guide the analysis and creation of world history standards.

## Background

State world history standards are often written to include bulleted lists of content (e.g., events, people, phenomena) and disciplinary skills (e.g., corroboration, using evidence to support claims) that teachers should incorporate in their teaching. Although historians and history educators may view content and skills as interconnected and not necessarily distinct,<sup>7</sup> standards often present them in that manner. Additionally, the bulleted or list-like nature of standards documents may not help world history teachers see the connections between different time periods and different regions.<sup>8</sup>

Scholars who have studied state world history standards have found that they tend to privilege Western, white male narratives.<sup>9</sup> For example, Michael Marino and Jane Bolgatz's study of 23 state world history standards found that "the western civilization model of factual orientation and chronology prevails."<sup>10</sup> More recently, Tadashi Dozono's analysis of the New York world history standards found that they maintain an "order of White supremacy through epistemic violence and discursive grammars of violence."<sup>11</sup> A 2022 statement by the National Council for the Social Studies directly addresses the historic lack of geographic and cultural representation in state world history standards:

*Social studies standards should include world history content that focuses on the interaction of societies within a global context. Social studies standards should include the ideas, values, and experiences of both Western history and the history of the non-Western world. Any standards that focus primarily on European or Western history do a disservice not only to students from other backgrounds but to all students, who benefit from understanding the world so that they can best participate in a global economy.<sup>12</sup>*

Some states have kept world history standards "vague" in regard to content (e.g., by not including events or people), which may serve to avoid privileging particular cultures or regions and allow for a lot of choice for teachers.<sup>13</sup> However, without support, teachers may not know what world history content to choose to teach, which may in turn reinforce hegemonic narratives in textbooks and past standards documents (i.e., teaching what one is used to).

In our previous study examining how 260 teachers in 29 states reported use of state history standards (including world history), we found that participants most often indicated that they used standards a “great deal” to make history content choices.<sup>14</sup> However, teachers in contexts with required district or state assessments were almost twice as likely to report that they relied on state standards than those without such assessments.

As part of our study, we gave teachers a sample state world history standard centered on comparing political revolutions. We asked them to imagine they only had time to teach three revolutions and had them rank nine factors that would influence their choice of those three revolutions. The participants ranked “historical significance” the highest factor, followed by “potential for comparison” and then “student relevance” and “student interest.” Other factors such as the teachers’ own expertise and interests and the availability of resources were ranked lower. The highest-ranked factor points to an element that is generally incorporated into world history standards: historical significance. By including particular events in standards, there is an assumption of significance. Comparison is a central aspect of world history<sup>15</sup> and was also mentioned in the standard that we included in the study, so it makes sense that participants ranked it highly. The focus on the participants’ own students, which was not an aspect of the standard, indicates that teachers are indeed thinking about their students and local contexts in making content selections; however, standards may not provide help for teachers in making those selections related to student interest or relevance. The standard included in our study explicitly included choice for teachers, but in a related study, we found that only about half the states provide teachers with this type of choice in their world history standards.<sup>16</sup>

In what follows we build on this and other scholarship on history standards to present guiding questions for the analysis and creation or revision of world history standards (Figure 1). In doing so, we discuss our rationale behind each of the guiding questions and provide examples from state world history standards.

### **Questions to Guide the Analysis and Design of World History Standards**

#### **Do the standards:**

1. Align with current world history research by emphasizing a global perspective, with various regions and the interactions among them, at different scales?
2. Include chronological and topical mile-markers for teachers while also leaving room for flexibility based on teachers' students and communities?
3. Incorporate *educative features* that help teachers see the rationale behind the standards and support their implementation?

Figure 1, Guiding Questions for World History Standards

#### **1. Do the standards align with current world history research by emphasizing a global perspective, with various regions and the interactions among them, at different scales?**

For this first question, we posit that state world history standards could benefit from a closer alignment with the field of world history's approach to and organization of world history. In the first author's study of historians' writing in the *Journal of World History* across 18 years, she found that articles tended to focus on one or more of the following: case studies with interregional and/or global connections, cross-regional or cultural contact and exchange; cross-regional or cultural comparison, interregional patterns; or global patterns.<sup>17</sup> These heuristics align with much of the scholarship on defining, framing, and teaching world history.<sup>18</sup>

Douglas Northrop described world history as both having a focus on the "big picture" and different scales but also on mobility. He wrote: "The past is seen less as a collection of discrete stories (of particular places or peoples) than one fundamentally shaped by, and concerned with, the movements, relationships, and connections among them."<sup>19</sup> World history, Northrop continued, "brings multiple stories together, comparing and/or connecting individuals and communities that are separated in space or time. From this point of view, *any* particular group can be seen in both *relative* (relational, comparative) and *interactive* (mutually constitutive connective) terms."<sup>20</sup> Seeing world history this way involves not only considering different geographic scales (e.g., global, interregional, local) but also expanding narratives to include people and places that may have been previously omitted or marginalized in history textbooks and curricula.

Given that state world history standards in the United States have generally had a Western focus and often contain discretely presented content, what would standards look like that aligned more with the field of world history? There are some examples. Michigan’s high school world history standards state that they “encourage students to work with and across different scales of time and space to investigate patterns and developments over time while connecting more local patterns to larger interregional and global patterns.”<sup>21</sup> The introduction to the Michigan world history standards emphasize that these scales are “fluid” and “nested” categories. The numbered standards are organized by eras, each with “global or cross-temporal expectations” and “interregional or comparative expectations.” The eras also contain central questions that focus on such things as comparison and global convergence.

Even the titles of eras or sections in world history standards can signal an approach that aligns with the global nature of the field. For example, the Massachusetts world history standards include titles such as “Dynamic interactions among regions of the world,” “Interactions of kingdoms and empires c. 1000–1500 CE,” and “The global effects of 19th century imperialism.”<sup>22</sup> As a counter-example, the Georgia standards, particularly before 1500, appear to emphasize a civilizational and regional emphasis with titles such as “Examine the political, economic, and cultural interactions *within* the Medieval Mediterranean World between 600 CE/AD and 1300 CE/AD.”<sup>23</sup> Additionally, there are some world history standards that have global titles, but the content under them may not display a global approach.<sup>24</sup> Take, for example, the following two examples, again from the Georgia standards:

*SSWH15 Describe the impact of industrialization and urbanization.*

*a. Analyze the process and impact of industrialization in Great Britain, Germany, and Japan. [...]*

*SSWH16 Analyze the rise of nationalism and worldwide imperialism.*

*a. Compare and contrast the rise of the nation state in Germany under Otto von Bismarck and Japan during the Meiji Restoration. [...]*<sup>25</sup>

Both standards signify content focused on global patterns; however, the wording of the first substandard does not indicate that teachers should introduce comparison or contextualization in larger global patterns. Without more information, a teacher might first present industrialization in Great Britain, then Germany, and then Japan without making connections between them. The substandard from the second example, on the other hand, gets closer to a global approach with the terms “compare and contrast.”

Focusing both on global framing of world history standards and on connecting the content included in the standards would allow for standards to be more aligned with

world history scholarship. Drawing on the conceptual frames in this scholarship may help teachers make sense of, organize, and connect the vast scope of world history that they need to teach.

## 2. Do the standards include chronological and topical mile-markers for teachers while also leaving room for flexibility based on teachers' students and communities?

Teaching world history fully is impossible. It might be seen as an act of hubris to survey all or even half of human history in 180 instructional days. Therefore, as Peter N. Stearns wrote, world history teachers have to “DARE TO OMIT.”<sup>26</sup> However, it is clear both from our anecdotal experience and our prior research that world history teachers struggle to fit in all the significant material they would like to address in a course and decide what to select and omit. Given this challenge of breadth and significance, we designed our second guiding question to respect the need for **clarity** on what is historically significant and important for students to understand, while recognizing that some **flexibility** is needed to account for a range of factors, including teacher expertise and interest, community concerns and connections, and students' prior knowledge and interests.

Over the last 30+ years, a growing body of research literature has argued for the inclusion and recognition of students' diverse cultural backgrounds and resources in classroom teaching. There have been a number of refinements and variations on Gloria Ladson-Billings' original concept of culturally relevant pedagogy.<sup>27</sup> A culturally relevant or sustaining approach to history might include including projects such as oral histories with community members and centering students' racial and ethnic experiences in the curriculum.<sup>28</sup> State standards should be flexible enough to allow for the connection to teachers' students and communities, since as noted earlier, teachers have reported considering student interest and relevance when making content decisions.<sup>29</sup>

In our analysis of state history standards (both world and United States), we found that some states explicitly address the need for such flexibility.<sup>30</sup> We found quite a bit of variation across states, but some standards provided rationales for choice, including the ability to use local examples, meet the needs of students, utilize current events to illuminate historical concepts and themes, and allow teachers to innovate. While such rationales might help teachers know they need to include such considerations, they were often included in the front matter of the standards, which teachers may not refer to as much as the standards themselves.

Additionally, we contend that world history standards should not be devoid of content. Doing so can perpetuate the status quo. Instead, we see the value in standards presenting content guideposts while also leaving room for flexibility in response to local contexts. One example of providing guideposts to support clarity and coherence for teachers and students can be found in the New Jersey social studies standards. For each era of world history there are one or more “content statements” that precede each set of

standards and provide “big idea(s)” that can inform more specific content decisions, for example:

*The Emergence of the First Global Age: Global Interactions and Colonialism*

- *The methods of and motivations for exploration and conquest resulted in increased global interactions, differing patterns of trade, colonization, and conflict among nations.*
- *Colonization was inspired by the desire to have access to resources and markets, often at the expense of the Indigenous culture, population, and environment.<sup>31</sup>*

These big idea statements can provide teachers with clear learning goals and also highlight core concepts. Ideally, unit or era-wide understandings allow teachers to see what is salient in the historical record out of the wide array of choices, and furthermore to highlight aspects of history that are most relevant. In the example used here, if a teacher only discussed individual explorers and valorized their bravery (as is sometimes the case with such units of study), neither of these content statements would be met. An approach that centers the exploits of the explorers is likely to ignore much of the negative impact on Indigenous populations as well as fail to widen the lens to reveal the larger changes in global trade and interaction. Thus, the wording of the New Jersey content statements above may push teachers to bring in global connections and multiple perspectives.

### **3. Do the standards incorporate *educative features* that help teachers see the rationale behind the standards and support their implementation?**

A prospective teacher with whom one of the authors worked, when learning about using standards to guide instructional planning, remarked that they are like powdered milk—the meaning had evaporated, and it was up to the teacher to add the meaning back in. Many state standards documents, in concisely enumerating what should be taught, leave out information that might be useful to teachers in their planning. Could standards documents be a place for teacher learning? Scholars have found that the inclusion of educative features in curriculum can support teacher learning.<sup>32</sup> Although most of the literature on educative features for teachers has focused on curriculum, we do see potential for some of the ideas to apply to standards—not to have standards replace district, school, or teacher-created curricula, but to serve as a more useful tool to aid in the creation or revision of such curricula in the future. In particular, two of the educative features that Elizabeth Davis and colleagues have studied—content support and disciplinary practices—would be particularly useful in world history standards.<sup>33</sup> Content support features would allow teachers to see connections between the historical

content included in the standards, thereby building coherence. Disciplinary practices features would allow teachers to see how disciplinary practices in world history link to particular historical events, people, and phenomena.

We have already pointed to one example earlier in the Georgia standards in Question 1, where explicit language in the standard to make regional comparisons of industrialization might guide teachers to a more contemporary world history lens and approach. The very organization and wording of the standards can scaffold teacher learning, especially for historical time periods and regions areas that are new to them.

We implied other educative features in our discussion of Question 2 above: that standards should support teacher decision-making when selecting areas of focus and comparison. While not all (or even most) state world history standards detail explicit choices, the very nature of history means that such choices are an inevitable part of the planning process. One example of a standard that does provide an explicit choice comes from the Michigan standards:

*6.2.1 Comparing Political Revolutions and/or Independence Movements – compare and contrast the American Revolution, the French Revolution, and one other revolution or independence movement that occurred in a region external to Europe from the standpoint of political, economic, and social causes and consequences.*

***Examples may include but are not limited to:** case studies of Chinese, Haitian, Mexican and/or other Latin American revolutions; others who fought for a new political order against oppression, like Tacky’s War in Jamaica in 1760, the rebellion of Tupac Amaru in 1780, or the Indian Rebellion of 1857.<sup>34</sup>*

By providing both specifics of number and examples cases to draw from, this standard implicitly scaffolds comparisons and may open teachers’ eyes to significant revolutions that might be worthwhile to include for a number of reasons, including student connections and interests.

Another example of educative features can be seen in the Massachusetts standards, which provide a number of supports for teachers. These include an annotated list of suggested primary sources for world history in an appendix and, importantly, links to those sources on the same pages as the standards. The supports also include footnotes citing research and resources, supporting questions for each topic, and “clarification statements” for some of the standards. The clarification statements take several forms including listing possible cases that students could study (as in the Michigan example above) and indicating for teachers where standards and historical topics in one course or grade level are linked to another. In the following 6<sup>th</sup> grade world



history example, the clarification statement informs high school teachers of topics that were addressed in middle school to inform their choices:

*Give examples of exchanges of ideas and goods among ancient complex societies to c. 500 CE.*

*Clarification Statement: As a reminder of concepts studied in grades 6 and 7, teachers may choose to highlight topics such as the spread of agricultural practices, the adoption of religions, imperial conquests, or the first phase of trade along the Silk Roads among societies in Asia, Africa, and Europe.<sup>35</sup>*

Some of the Massachusetts clarifying statements also function to provide teachers additional content knowledge about the topic as in the following example:

*Describe the causes of 19th century European global imperialism.*

*b. the importance of slavery and slave-generated capital to the Industrial Revolution; the role of European traders, merchants, and buyers in making the slave trade profitable in North and South America and the Caribbean Islands*

*Clarification Statement: Students should understand that slavery in the Americas was an interconnected system, and that slavery did not just exist in the Southern states of the United States (see United States History 1, standards 20–21). They should learn that the largest number of enslaved African men and women brought to the Americas (an estimated 4.9 million from the 16th to the 19th century) were sold to buyers in Brazil to work on sugar and coffee plantations and in mining.<sup>36</sup>*

Here the clarification statement addresses possible misconceptions that students and teachers might hold about enslavement in addition to providing additional detail and connecting the standard to another course.

A primary challenge in considering adding educative supports for teachers is that no one wants longer standards! Many standards documents are already unwieldy; however, adding more supportive materials and structures might actually improve their usability. The solutions mentioned above lend themselves to integration within the standards, and the structural features that we suggest should not add much bulk. For features that are not as integrated, it is not hard to imagine a technological solution where there are either bookmarks within a pdf version of the standards or hyperlink connections to a website with additional curricular materials and background reading. Such links and support materials could provide information and rationale, for example,

for why a teacher might want to select one revolution over another as in the Michigan example above.

## Conclusion

The questions that we have developed are preliminary and designed to spark further discussion on how state world history standards can be improved. We realize that the state standards writing and revision process is complex and often highly politicized.<sup>37</sup> Teachers, teacher educators, and historians may be limited in their influence over state standards. However, given that there are examples of state standards that currently incorporate some of the features that we have highlighted, we do not feel it is beyond the reach of more states to do the same. Additionally, these questions provide a framework for analyzing existing world history standards and may help districts to work with those standards to design additional supports for teachers.

In conclusion, states can take steps to improve their standards for better fidelity to the current understandings and frame of the field of world history as well as improve the usability of the standards for the teachers who implement them in their classrooms. In relation to that usability, we see room for growth on the clarity of “big ideas” (structured either as statements or questions), which are sometimes obscured by the bulleted nature of standards. We also see room for improvement in indicating how teachers might meet such learning goals in a number of ways that are responsive to local concerns, including student interests.

A final caveat is that these questions are meant to be a starting place for those doing the hard work of refining and revising state standards. We have no doubt that there are additional useful questions and ideas in field of world history education, as well as policy and practice. We all share the goal of developing historically literate students, and we hope the conversation continues.

---

**Lauren McArthur Harris** is an Associate Professor of History Education at Arizona State University with appointments in the School of Historical, Philosophical, and Religious Studies and the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College. Her work focuses on representations of history in curricular resources and investigates how teachers teach history in schools. Harris is a former ninth grade world history teacher in Arlington, VA. She has published in journals such as *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, and the *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. Her most recent book is *Teaching Difficult Histories in Difficult Times: Stories of Practice* (with Maia Sheppard and Sara Levy, Teachers College Press, 2022), and she is the co-editor of *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning* (with Scott Metzger, 2017). She can be reached at [Lauren.Harris.1@asu.edu](mailto:Lauren.Harris.1@asu.edu).

**Brian Girard** is a Professor of Secondary Education in the School of Education at The College of New Jersey. He chairs the department of Educational Administration and Secondary Education and teaches courses in social studies methods and educational foundations in addition to supervising field experiences. A former middle school social studies and English teacher, his current research interests include world history teacher reasoning in instruction, teacher practices that develop of classroom communities, and the preparation of history educators. He can be reached at girardb@tcnj.edu.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> As Tim Keirn wrote in 2018, “scholars have shown that the curriculum of world history in virtually all states fails to be framed within the global perspective of current world history scholarship. ... In the few recent cases where the content of state world history curriculum has been modified, there are demonstrated attempts to represent world history from a global and comparative perspective.” Keirn goes on to provide examples of two state standards documents that are exceptions: Michigan that “pay[s] particular attention to global encounters and interactions” and California that “reinstates the history of Asia relative to the West and is attentive to larger spatial frames, such as Afroeurasia and maritime basins,” see “History Curriculum, Standards, and Assessment Policies and Politics: U.S. Experiences, in Scott Alan Metzger and Lauren McArthur Harris, eds., *The Wiley International Handbook of History Teaching and Learning* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 2018), 21; see also Lauren McArthur Harris, “Conceptual Devices in the Work of World Historians.” *Cognition and Instruction* 30, no. 4 (2012): 312-58

<sup>2</sup> See, for example Stephen Sawchuk, “Louisiana’s History Standards Got a Closed-Door Rewrite. What’s In and What’s Out,” *Education Week* (March 24, 2022), <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/louisianas-history-standards-got-a-closed-door-rewrite-whats-in-and-whats-out/2022/03> and Stephen Sawchuk, “Revising America’s Racist Past,” *Education Week* (January 18, 2022), <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/revising-americas-racist-past/2022/01>

<sup>3</sup> For example, Anne-Lise Halvorsen’s study of social studies teachers found that teachers reported only about 6% of professional development opportunities centered on world history, see “K-12 History Education: Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development.” In Jeffrey Passe & Paul G. Fitchett, eds., *The Status of the Social Studies: Views From the Field*, (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2013), 169-179. Ross Edmunds Dunn notes that only small percentages of university historians focus on areas of the world such as Africa and East Asia. See Dunn, “World History Around the World,” *The History Teacher* 55, no. 2 (2022): 219. Preservice teacher education programs have also not kept pace with the growth of the K-12 world history course. See Peter N. Stearns, “World History: Curriculum and Controversy,” *World History Connected* 3, No. 3 (2006), <https://worldhistoryconnected.press.uillinois.edu/3.3/stearns.html>.

<sup>4</sup> See for example Erin A. Bronstein, “‘It Isn’t in the Curriculum’: World History Teachers’ Views on Us Presidential Elections.” *The Social Studies* 111, no. 3 (2020): 123-32; Brian Girard, Lauren McArthur Harris, Linda Kay Mayger, Taylor M. Kessner, and Stephanie Reid, “‘There’s No Way We Can Teach All of This’: Factors That Influence Secondary History Teachers’ Content Choices.” *Theory & Research in Social Education* 49, no. 2 (2021): 227-61; Emma S. Thacker, John K. Lee, Paul G. Fitchett, and Wayne Journell, “Secondary Social Studies Teachers’ Experiences Planning and Implementing Inquiry Using the Inquiry Design Model,” *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas* 91, no. 4-5 (2018): 193-200.

<sup>5</sup> Girard et al., “‘There’s No Way We Can Teach All of This’: 227-61; Harris, “‘Conceptual Devices in the Work of World Historians’”; Lauren McArthur Harris and Brian Girard, “Instructional Significance for Teaching History: A Preliminary Framework,” *The Journal of Social Studies Research* 38, no. 4 (2014): 215-25; and Lauren McArthur Harris and Brian Girard, “Evaluating the Support of Teacher Choice in State History Standards,” *The History Teacher* 53, no. 4 (2020): 613-633.

<sup>6</sup> Elizabeth A. Davis and Joseph S. Krajcik, “Designing Educative Curriculum Materials to Promote Teacher Learning,” *Educational Researcher* 34, no. 3 (2005): 3-14; Elizabeth A. Davis, Annemarie Sullivan Palincsar, P. Sean Smith, Anna Maria Arias, and Sylvie M. Kademian, “Educative Curriculum Materials: Uptake, Impact, and Implications for Research and Design,” *Educational Researcher* 46, no. 6 (2017): 293-304.

<sup>7</sup> Christine Counsell, “Historical Knowledge and Historical Skills,” James Arthur and Robert Phillips, eds., *Issues in History Teaching* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 54-70.

- <sup>8</sup> Robert B. Bain, “Challenges of Teaching and Learning World History,” Douglas Northrop, ed., *A Companion to World History* (West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 111-127.
- <sup>9</sup> See for example Robert B. Bain and Tamara L. Shreiner, “Issues and Options in Creating a National Assessment in World History,” *The History Teacher* 38, no. 2 (2005): 241-72; Tadashi Dozono, “The Passive Voice of White Supremacy: Tracing Epistemic and Discursive Violence in World History Curriculum,” *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 42, no. 1 (2020): 1-26; Keirn, “History Curriculum,” 22; Michael Marino and Jane Bolgatz, “Weaving a Fabric of World History? An Analysis of U.S. State High School World History Standards,” *Theory and Research in Social Education* 38, no. 2 (2010): 366-94; Julio Noboa, “Missing Pages from the Human Story: World History According to Texas Standards,” *Journal of Latinos and Education* 11, no. 1 (2012): 47-62; Stewart Waters and Autumn Magliocca, “Times up World History: Broadening the World History Narrative,” *The Social Studies* 109, no. 4 (2018): 192-201.
- <sup>10</sup> Marino and Bolgatz, “Weaving a Fabric of World History?,” 389.
- <sup>11</sup> Dozono, “The Passive Voice of White Supremacy,” 1.
- <sup>12</sup> National Council for the Social Studies, “NCSS Statement on the Development of Social Studies Standards (September, 2022), <https://www.socialstudies.org/current-events-response/ncss-statement-development-social-studies-standards>
- <sup>13</sup> See Harris and Girard, “Evaluating the Support of Teacher Choice;” and Walter Russell Mead, *The State of State World History Standards*, (Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2006), <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED493852.pdf>
- <sup>14</sup> Girard et al., “There’s No Way We Can Teach All of This,” 238.
- <sup>15</sup> See Trevor Getz, “There’s No Comparison, So Why Compare?” *OER Project Blog* (April 1, 2021), <https://community.oerproject.com/b/blog/posts/there-s-no-comparison-so-why-compare>
- <sup>16</sup> Harris and Girard, “Evaluating the Support of Teacher Choice,” 619.
- <sup>17</sup> Harris, “Conceptual Devices in the Work of World Historians,” 321.

<sup>18</sup> See Bain “Challenges of Teaching and Learning World History;” Ross E. Dunn, *The New World History: A Teacher's Companion* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000); Trevor Getz, “Teaching World History at the College Level,” Douglas Northrop, ed., *A Companion to World History* (West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 128-139; Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Peter N. Stearns, *World History: The Basics* (London and New York: Routledge, 2011).

<sup>19</sup> Douglas Northrop, “Introduction: The Challenge of World History,” Northrop, ed., *A Companion to World History*, 7.

<sup>20</sup> Northrop, “Introduction,” 7, emphasis in the original.

<sup>21</sup> Michigan Department of Education, *Michigan K-12 Standards Social Studies: High School World History and Geography* (2019), 89, <https://www.misocialstudies.org/Standards/HSWorld.pdf>.

<sup>22</sup> Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, *History and Social Science Framework: Grades pre-kindergarten to 12* (Malden, MA: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 2018) 139, <https://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/hss/2018-12.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> Georgia Department of Education, *Social Studies Georgia Standards of Excellence* (Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education, 2021) 163, emphasis added. Also available at <https://lor2.gadoe.org/gadoe/file/cocoad9a-d88e-4864-b49b-1302099da16a/1/Social-Studies-K-12-Georgia-Standards.pdf>.

<sup>24</sup> For a discussion of the differences between employing the structure of world history and including world history content, see Stephen Jackson, *The Patchwork of World History in Texas High Schools: Unpacking Eurocentrism, imperialism, and nationalism in the curriculum, 1920-2021* (New York: Routledge, 2022).

<sup>25</sup> Georgia Department of Education, *Social Studies Georgia Standards of Excellence*, 165.

<sup>26</sup> Stearns, *World History*, 9, emphasis in the original.

<sup>27</sup> Gloria Ladson-Billings, “Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy,” *American Educational Research Journal* 32, no. 3 (1995): 465-91. See also Geneva Gay, *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2ed, 2010); Django Paris, “Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice,” *Educational Researcher* 41, no. 3 (2012): 93–97.

<sup>28</sup> For examples see Christopher C. Martell and Kaylene M Stevens, “Culturally Sustaining Social Studies Teachers: Understanding Models of Practice,” *Teaching and Teacher Education* 86 (2019).

<sup>29</sup> See Girard et al., “There’s No Way We Can Teach All of This.”

<sup>30</sup> See Harris and Girard, “Evaluating the Support of Teacher Choice.”

<sup>31</sup> New Jersey State Department of Education, *New Jersey Student Learning Standards for Social Studies* (Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Department of Education, 2020), 49. Also available at <https://www.state.nj.us/education/cccs/2020/2020%20NJSL-SS.pdf>.

<sup>32</sup> Davis and Krajcik, “Designing Educative Curriculum Materials to Promote Teacher Learning,” passim; and Davis et al., “Educative Curriculum Materials,” passim.

<sup>33</sup> Davis et al., “Educative Curriculum Materials,” passim.

<sup>34</sup> Michigan Department of Education, *Michigan K-12 Standards Social Studies*, 95.

<sup>35</sup> Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, *History and Social Science Framework*, 140.

<sup>36</sup> Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, *History and social science framework*, 152.

<sup>37</sup> Morgan Polikoff, *Beyond Standards: The Fragmentation of Education Governance and the Promise of Curriculum Reform*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2021).