Responses to editors’ and reviewers’ suggestions for change:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Reviewer** | **Reviewer’s Comments** | **Authors’ Response** |
| 1 | Editors, reviewer | [Editors]  Based on the reviewers’ feedback, we are especially interested in seeing clarifying the organization and flow of the article to highlight the innovative practice you are describing.  [Reviewer]  Interesting paper, but as I said earlier, it doesn’t feel like anything new is presented in this paper. It’s been well established that faculty learn best from each other and are more likely to implement what they hear from their peers. We know faculty are busy so programming has to be structured for flexibility. | Thank you for raising this point. We see the innovative element of the work we describe in this manuscript as the pop-up learning community, which structured the Teaching Exchange series in particular ways while still drawing on established practices of bringing instructors together to talk about teaching.  We have revised the text to elaborate on the pop-up structure of the Teaching Exchange, introducing the notion of a pop-up learning community earlier in the text (pp. 1-2), defining ‘pop-up’ and how we used this to frame the Teaching Exchange (p. 7), and finally, discussing how this structure mitigated anticipated barriers to instructor participation in the Teaching Exchange (pp. 10-11), as well as the benefit and adaptability of the pop-up learning community structure (pp. 11-12) to other institutions. |
| 2 | Reviewer | The study describes collecting feedback and participant data but does not mention IRB approval or ethical considerations for working with human subjects. Explicitly addressing whether ethical review processes were followed… is needed. | The feedback we gathered from instructors participating in the Teaching Exchange was for quality assurance purposes, to ascertain whether the Teaching Exchange series addressed instructors’ desire for more support for teaching large classes online. This involved instructor participants completing an anonymous survey following the final session. We were careful in how we gathered quality assurance feedback, using an anonymous survey, analyzing aggregate data, and keeping the survey brief to respect instructors’ limited time.  Since this feedback was for quality assurance purposes, an institutional ethics review board (REB / IRB) application process was not required. This adheres to the [identifying information redacted by editor] for Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans. Specifically in [identifying information redacted by editor] this work falls under [identifying information redacted by editor], which states, " [identifying information redacted by editor—but it clearly indicated review was not needed]." |
| 3 | Reviewers | The discussion of implications is insightful but would benefit from a clearer focus on how this model can scale or adapt to other institutional contexts. Specifically, the study needs to address the feasibility of applying the "Teaching Exchange" to other contexts. It may be helpful to include a section discussing potential barriers to participation and how they were addressed (or could be mitigated in future iterations). It could also be helpful to provide concrete recommendations for scaling the model to larger institutions or adapting it for different teaching contexts.  ---  Yes. [The introduction and conclusion] both stay focus on the core purpose of the paper. The introduction and abstract describe an aspiration that others could benefit not only from the scholarship but concretely in planning similar programs. The conclusion is brief and could benefit from further exploration of the opportunities and challenges of implementing the program and reflections from the authors on what they might change in a future iteration. | As per these suggestions, we have revised the final section of our manuscript, originally entitled Outcomes and Findings, to Reflections and Recommendations (pp. 10-16). In this section, we speak to barriers / challenges (pp. 10-11), and opportunities / benefits (pp. 11-12), as well as concrete recommendations (p. 13-16) for adapting and scaling the Teaching Exchange to other institutions further to their needs and resources. |
| 4 | Reviewer | The manuscript relies heavily on text and tables but could benefit from additional visualizations. For instance: Graphs or charts summarizing participant feedback and attendance trends. See the following: “Ultimately, the majority of the 83 participants participated in one or two sessions in the series (55% and 21%, respectively), while a smaller proportion attended three to five sessions (20% combined), and 4% attended all offered sessions.” Including direct quotes or examples of participant experiences would add richness and depth to the narrative. | We received feedback from two reviewers regarding our use of tables and other visualizations. One reviewer indicated that they “did not feel the need for additional graphics,” and another reviewer provided the comment included here. We are grateful for these perspectives, and have responded by complementing the summary of participation with a pie chart (Figure 1, p. 12) and added Table 2 (p.14) to summarize decision points that readers can consider in scaling the Teaching Exchange.  While we appreciate the suggestion that we include direct quotes or examples of participant experiences, this is not within the scope of the paper, which focuses on the pop-up learning community framing and design process. As well, it is not something that we are able to do given the quality assurance focus of this project. Thank you for your understanding. |
| 5 | Reviewer | The inclusion of students as contributors and active members of the community is an interesting element to this approach, particularly given the justification for the exchange was in response to student needs. It comes up at the end of page 3 without prior introduction and caught me by surprise. Including it earlier - perhaps in who the “we” are in establishing the exchange or when defining the community in the CoP? | Thank you for noting this. Further to your suggestion, we have mentioned our student contributors earlier in the text in the introduction, when initially describing the project and those involved (p. 2). |