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| **Reviewer Recommendations** | **Revisions** |
| Title Misleading: In this case, diversity only reflects student academic & behavioral differences. Does not account for cultural differences. | Title changed to “Role-Playing an Inclusive Classroom: Using Realistic Simulation to Explore Differentiated Instruction.” |
| **INTRODUCTION** |  |
| It could be helpful to add a few citations to support some of the assertions made in this section (e.g. that credential students tend not to see differentiation in real classrooms—is there any literature that supports this claim? Or is this just based on student observation and feedback?).  | Added citations p.1, lines 11, 16, and 18. |
| This section could be strengthened by having a theoretical tie-in introduced at the outset—just two or three tie-ins would help. Otherwise, the introduction can sound more like a personal narrative oreditorial than an academic paper addressing a broader topic, which this most certainly is. And an important topic at that. | Added citations p.1, line 21 and p.2, line 20. |
| **LITERATURE REVIEW** |  |
| Could use further discussion of the literature about teacher education programs and the covering of exceptional children as a part of the curriculum | Added section: from p. 5, line 8 until p.7, line 9. |
| This section probably needs more smoothing out than others. There are some awkward sentence structures in a couple of areas that impede understanding. For example:"An argument for differentiated instruction that is referred to frequently in the literature (Anderson 2007; Manning, Stanford, and Reeves, 2010; McTighe & Brown, 2005; Santamaria & Thousand, 2004; Subban, 2006) is the suggestion by Tomlinson (1999) that teachers need to find ways of taking full advantage of every student’s ability to learn." The point of the sentence gets lost in the verbiage. | Significant revision of the first paragraph on page 3, including:A rewriting of the sentence specifically commented on by the reviewer (p.3, lines 2-3);deletion of individual words throughout the paragraph that seems to weigh the language down; and a partial rewriting of the last sentence (lines 9-10).In other parts of the literature review:reworking of sentences on p. 5, lines 4-5 and line 7;deletion of words on p.5, line 16;rewriting and condensing of sentences p. 5, lines 21-23;deletion of part of a sentence on p. 6, lines 1-2;deletion of various words on p.6, lines 2-3.  |
| Since social-emotional considerations are addressed later in the paper and are a large part of what the students recognized and learned about duringthe role-play, it seems that some discussion of literature in that area might be worth including in this section as well (e.g. social-emotional learning, Responsive Classroom approach, etc.). Then it would tie in nicely when that topic comes up later in the paper.  | Added section: from p. 4, line 11 until p.5, line 3. |
| **CONTEXT** |  |
| Need more demographic data on pre-service teachers | Added information on p.7, lines 13-15. |
| I’m not really clear about the program itself— it’s only mentioned as a “Master’s” program, and yet the students are also referred to as preservice teachers, so it sounds like it’s a teacher credential program as well? Are the programs one and the same? Need to clarify. | Added information on p.7, lines 12 and 17. |
| **INTERVENTION AND STUDENT LEARNING SECTIONS** |  |
| Table 1: Charles is referred to as “she” | Change of “her” into “his” for Charles in Table 1, p.9 |
| Not sure Table 3 needs to be presented as a table, since the information provided there is very brief. A paragraph for each type of feedback (or even one paragraph total) would likely suffice. Or types of feedback could be bulleted, perhaps? | Deletion of Table 3, p. 15. Added summary of information previously reported in Table 3 on p.15, lines 1-2. |
| **DISCUSSION OF CLASSROOM ACTIVITY & ANALYSIS** |  |
| Does not include any reflection of what pre-service teachers took away from the activity and how it may impact them in their own classrooms | Added section (entitled “Student Reflections”) from p.15, line 3 until p.16, line 11. |
| Lacks conclusion | Added section (entitled “Conclusion”) from p.16, line 12 until p. 17, line 15. |
| It would be helpful to have a section title to set this off from the previous sections. | Added section titles on p. 13, lines 7 and 8; p.15, line 3. |
| This section would again be strengthened by revisiting some of the literature tie-ins that support your points. The theoretical constructs on which this study/activity is based seem to be missing. By beefing that up, the points you’re making would carry that much more weight. As it is, you only mention the “gurus” in the literature in the lit review, but their work needs to be woven throughout for the most effective argument. Just adding phrases like, “Related to McTighe and Brown’s assertion that…” or “Building on the concept of…” at appropriate pointswould strengthen the important points and observations you make. | Added references to the literature:p.12, line 20;p. 13, lines 13-15;p.13, lines 20-21;p.14, lines 9-10;p.14, lines 21-22;p.15, lines 12-14;p.16, lines 6-7;p.16, lines 15-16p.16, line 21. |
| Some readers might challenge this approach to lesson planning, claiming that with 5 or 6 sections to teach per day, such customization would becumbersome and unrealistic. What would you say to counter such claims? | Added section from p.16, line 15 until p.17, line 5. |