Table of Revisions for the Manuscript

In this table, I have noted the comments or suggestions and my response to those comments or suggestions. I have also highlighted the page(s) on which the revisions appear for those where a revision was required.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Page number | Comments or Suggestions | Response to the Comment or Revision |
| Reviewer #1 Comments and Suggestions |
| NA | C 1-1. This paper is well written and adds to the understanding of the principles outlined in the article. While I was reading, however, I kept thinking an example would really help the reader understand the process and theme of the paper.  | Response to C 1-1. See response to C 1-3 below. |
| NA | C 1-2. Then I got to the section on page 15 that starts with ... To Illustrate the work that has... and an example was provided. Then the next cycle was discussed with a different example.  | Response to C1-2. See response to C 1-3 below.  |
| NA | C 1-3. The paper would hang together much better if the example used through all the cycles was the same PoP that culminated in a dissertation of practice. It would be easy to discriminate each cycle and what is actually accomplished in each. I felt like the last section was repetitive of what was covered in the first section and the figures and the tables and that issue would be overcome with a good solid example that carried through all the cycles. | Response to C 1-3. I have taken this suggestion and used one example of a problem practice throughout the discussion of the various cycles of action research. See pages 11-19 where I have used Holly’s (pseudonym) PoP and written about it through the various cycles.  |
| Reviewer #2 Comments and Suggetions |
| NA | C 2-1. The authors are doing some interesting work with embedding AR throughout their EdD program. This work should be shared and the manuscript connects explicitly to CPED principles so is therefore of particular relevance to the readership of Impacting Education. However, I believe for this essay to be of value, it needs additional work. | Response to C 2-1. This is a comment without specific suggestions so I did not respond to it.  |
|  | C 2-2. Overall, what would be of most value to the readership of Impacting Education is understanding the ways cycles of AR have been enacted in the program, which the authors discuss, but the organization of the piece makes it challenging to follow at times, and I believe the description of the AR cycles could be further developed to be more explicitly exemplified for the reader.  | Response to C 2-2. I have reorganized the paper. I have minimized the part on the rationale for the four characteristics to move more quickly to explaining the cycles of AR on pages 10-20. I have provided much more detail about each of the cycles of AR on pages 10-20. |
|  | C 2-3. Regarding the organization of the piece, if one was to work backwards from the levels of headings used, with Level One Headings being the main ideas, and Level Two and Three headings as sub-ideas, the following would be the outline of the essay: [Outline omitted to save space.] | Response to C 2-3. See response to C 2-4 below.  |
|  | C 2-4. I do not think the organization is conducive to the most valuable part of the manuscript, which I believe to be the cycles of inquiry. The sub-headings under “Lessons Learned” are really not lessons learned at all, but a rationale and description of the AR process as it is enacted in this program and the program sharing how wonderfully these cycles of AR seem to be working for them.  | Response to C 2-4. I have minimized the part on the rationale for the four characteristics to move more quickly to explaining the cycles of AR on pages 10-20. I have provided much more detail about each of the cycles of AR on pages 10-20. I have renamed the section from Lessons Learned to Responding to the Challenge: Using Action Research … See page 8. |
|  | C 2-5. I suggest further exemplifying the cycles of AR, with a particular focus on how they build on each other. It was very useful on pages 15 and 17 when the authors provided one generic example of Cycle 0 (“badge” use in online community college courses) and a different example of Cycle 1 (using an inquiry-based instructional approach to science teaching in a biology classroom)… it would add tremendously to the clarity of the piece and the ability for the reader to envision how these cycles work over time to develop one examples from a single student and illustrate how the cycles emerged over time in the program.  | Response to C 2-5. I have taken this suggestion and used one example of a problem practice throughout the discussion of the various cycles of action research. See pages 11-19 where I have used Holly’s (pseudonym) PoP and written about it through the various cycles.  |
|  | C 2-6. In addition, there is not enough detail to understand the ways the dissertation in practice encapsulates each of the cycles. What are the exact requirements for the dissertation and in what ways, if any, does it differ from the AR cycles that come before it? Perhaps the dissertation is a “write up” of all the previous cycles as well as a culminating cycle? This would be useful information to know. For this piece to be of value, it would be important to know more about how these details play out specifically in practice.  | Response to C 2-6. I have expanded the description of the DiP to include how the work from the previous cycles of AR is incorporated into the dissertation. See bottom of page 18-19. |
|  | C 2-7. Finally, I suggest the authors offer some critique of their own program to be credible. Surely, their model (cycles of inquiry) does not play out spectacularly for every student in every circumstance, as the tone of the manuscript seems to imply … For example, what happens if a student changes positions half way through the program? How does that impact cycles that build upon one another? Are there any “outlier” students who this experience does not work as well for? What are some reasons for this? It would be a much more credible piece if the author(s) offer a more balanced view of the ways AR as signature pedagogy is working (and not working) for the students in their programs. What are the “growing edges” for conceptualizing an EdD program with action research as its signature pedagogy?  | Response to C 2-7. I have added a section in which I provide a critique of using cycles of AR. See pages 20-21. |
|  | C 2-8. I encourage the authors to revise and resubmit. | Response to C 2-8. This is a comment, which does not require a response.  |
| Reviewer #3—Debby Zambo Comments and Suggestions |
| 4 | C 3-1. are these your questions or are they below? do you need these here? | Response to C 3-1. I reframed the former questions (top of page 4) to be statements. Now, I have one set of questions. See page 4. |
| 4 | C 3-2. what work? It seems like your are toggling between an essay and a study which is it?  | Response to C 3-2. I have clarified that it is an essay. See page 4.  |
| 4 | C 3-3. why past tense? | Response to C 3-3. Consistent with our phone conversation, I am using past tense except for implications, which is aligned with APA style.  |
| 5 | C 3-4. move this definition up | Response to C 3-4. I moved this section on Inquiry as Practice to the top of page 5 from its original position on page 7 or 8.  |
| 6 | C 3-5. how do these ideas link to your findings – students say they become better inquires and your questions about sig pedagogy? | Response to C 3-5. This is a summary of the implications for newly (re)designed EdD programs based on Shulman et al. It would not be appropriate to interject other material here.  |
| 7 | C 3-6. so where’s the link to your program development and AR? | Response to C 3-6. This paper is based on the October 2016 call for Writing Fellows, which was about developing Inquiry as Practice skills. I am writing, here, about by using AR to accomplish that goal. The paper is not about explaining how CPED design concepts helped to design our program. That work was for the next group of Writing Fellows in June 2017, and I have written another manuscript about that matter.  |
| 8 | C 3-7. what is the point of this paragraph? To explain the design concepts (which you have done) or explain how they helped in your program design?  | Response to C 3-7. In this paper, the point is to explain them. This paper is about developing Inquiry as Practice skills by using AR to accomplish that goal and is based on the Call for Writing Fellows for October 2016. The paper is not about explaining how CPED design concepts helped to design our program. That work was for the next group of Writing Fellows in June 2017.  |
| 8 | C 3-8. once again this just reiterates CPED definitions – readers can find this on the website - what did they mean as you developed your program? | Response to C 3-8. In this paper, the point is to explain them. This paper is about developing Inquiry as Practice skills by using AR to accomplish that goal. The paper is not about explaining how CPED design concepts helped to design our program. That work was for the next group of Writing Fellows.  |
| 9 | C 3-9. doesn’t sustainable mean it’s lasting? so what is lasting –the effects of their actions and their perceptions of themselves as researchers – make this clear and provide examples | Response to C 3-9. I have clarified this by indicating the use of AR is sustainable in two ways as you noted in your comment and provided evidence for sustain-ability of its effects . See bottom of page 9 and top of page 10.  |
| 10 | C 3-10. is this another characteristic? | Response to C 3-10. I believe that “digging deeply” into a PoP is an as aspect associated with AR, but it is not the level of the other characteristics.  |
| 11 | C 3-11. what are these? above you talk about his criticism and implications | Response to C 3-11. Yes, I wrote about criticisms and implications, but I also included the “hallmarks” concepts for an ideal EdD program at about the bottom of page 6. I have clarified this sentence about hallmarks by including an appositive, “the criteria for strong doctoral programs.” See page 11. |
| 12 | C 3-12. repeated below | Response to C 3-12. I have clarified the reading of the Kvale and Brinkmann text to indicate students read selected chapters and complete the remaining chapters in a later course. See pages 12 and 15.  |
| 12 | C 3-13. be careful with claims | Response to C 3-13. I have revised this to make the language more tentative. See page 12.  |
| 15 | C 3-14. they read this 3X? | Response to C 3-14. I have clarified the reading of the Kvale and Brinkmann text to indicate students read selected chapters and complete the remaining chapters in a later course. See pages 12 and 15. |
| 20 | C 3-15. you say this above also | Response to C 3-15. I have revised the language a bit here on page 20.  |