**Summary of Revisions:**

***We made significant revisions to the methods section, which address most of the questions outlined by reviewer B. We also added two sentences to the introduction section (p. 1), which signals to readers the cross case study structure early-on to readers and helps orient them to the structure (pp. 10-11). On pages 11-14, we have included three clearly titled sections to offer readers a clear sense of our individual data collection and analysis as well as our process for shared cross-case analysis.***

***We removed the comment, ““Likely due to the outreach strategies, group members tended towards inquiry-based approaches to teaching and shared a commitment to working towards equity and social justice,” and believe we resolved other issues of describing significance of our data in our revisions to the methods section.***

***We changed many of the section headings to be more descriptive and accurate. These are highlighted in red. In the Background section, we added sub-section titles that were more specific: “Neoliberal Initiatives in the School District of Philadelphia” and “Teacher Inquiry as a Mode of Resistance.” We moved more detailed description of our two cases to the methods section, which we believe resolves the issue of more description of the two-fold nature of the study later on.***

***In terms of defining terms or concepts, we took out references to Foucault; moved the discussion of inquiry communities to the “Background” section and offered a concise definition on page 4; and removed neoliberalism from the conceptual framework and included a description of neoliberalism and neoliberal reform in Philadelphia to the “Background” section (pages 2-4).******Before discussing various nuances of feminist pedagogies, we draw on Shrewsbury to provide a concise definition on page 8. On pages 15 and 18, we provide an overview and summary of the range and variation of how this theme is expressed before going into detail in that section. We’ve also changed the title of the section (p. 15) to be more descriptive.***

Required revisions:  
  
Both reviewers had questions about the background and character of the study. Given the complexity of introducing two studies, conducted at two different sites, by two different researchers, it will be helpful to walk the reader through how the research was designed, how data was collected, how the project was facilitated, how the two of you did (or did not) collaborate and how your own positionality informed the project.  
  
Reviewer B goes into some elaborate detail, inquiring into the nature of the methodology. While you do not have to address all of their questions, it is a good outline of the kinds of questions that will help clarify the nature and significance of your methodology. Therefore, please take a careful look  
at their questions, especially the following:

How were teachers/inquiry groups were selected/recruited?  
Was participation voluntary? (9 out of 46 participated but the entire 46  
are described, so of the 9,  
What were their racial demographics  
Why is this information important to the study?  
“Most were placed in the Excel..” Which were specifically?  How many of  
the 9 that actually participated were at Excel, and where were the other  
ones?  
With regard to the data collection selection it says five agreed to  
participate from the list serv, are these 5 different from the 9 above  
mentioned?  
How and where was data observed “In the School District of  
Philadelphia”?  
Sample, Joel Becca, etc? What are the criteria selection, and are these  
pseudonyms?  
Method sections says two cases, what are the cases? (Designed groups?  What  
was the design of the research study?  Was it intentional to set up a  
comparative case study?)  
In the findings section, autobiographic mandates: “Several African  
American”, in the data it says there were 10 total, and the sample  
explication is confusing, so does this section makes a claim that isn’t  
supported by your data sample? How many were there out of the actual sample  
that was recruited for the study?  
- The explanation of autobiographical mandate is defined first as teachers  
drawing on their experiences of marginalization, and then it’s argued that  
it is expressed as inclusive classrooms, so how does the Kayla data support  
this mixed definition of the code/theme?  
  
Second, with regard to the organization of the paper. Some of the subject headings do not fully capture the content in those sections. Consider revising and collapsing some. Also, in the discussion, could the Philadelphia context be labeled and separated from the Penn section since they were different sites. There may still be overlapping themes, but just to help clarify the two-fold nature of the study.   The section outlying the groups should be organized more clearly as well.

Third, please review how the significance of data is discussed. For example, you note that “Likely due to the outreach strategies, group members tended towards inquiry-based approaches to teaching and shared a commitment to working towards equity and social justice.” This is not  
self-evident and requires some more discussion. There are few points like this, where more discussion will help readers see your analysis and conclusion more clearly.

***We removed the detail above from the manuscript***

Fourth, there are several places where greater explanation and connection  
is needed. Please define and elaborate on the following terms or concepts in  
ways that connect back to your wider argument:  
  
Foucauldian discussion of power and resistance. – We took out references to Foucault.  
  
“Inquiry communities” – ***We moved the discussion of inquiry communities to the “Background” section and offered a concise definition on page 4. We believe discussion of inquiry communities fits better in this section (pages ---).***  
  
 Neoliberalism – ***We removed neoliberalism from the conceptual framework and included a description of neoliberalism and neoliberal reform in Philadelphia to the “Background” section (pages 2-4).***

“feminist pedagogies” – ***Before discussing various nuances of feminist pedagogies, we draw on Shrewsbury to provide a concise definition on page 8.***   
  
“autobiographical mandate” (there seem to be multiple dimensions to  
this term, in at least one place could you explain them all?) – ***On page 15, we provide an overview of the range and variation of how this theme is expressed before going into detail in that section. We’ve also changed the title of the section (p. 15) to be more descriptive.***   
  
This is an insightful study and an important contribution! I truly look forward to receiving your revisions. Please resubmit by February 1st. In the mean time feel free to contact me (or the other editors) if you have any questions.  
  
All the best,  
  
Khuram

Required revisions:

First, there is agreement that the methods section should be further

developed. Both reviewers had questions about the background and character

of the study. Given the complexity of introducing two studies, conducted at

two different sites, by two different researchers, it will be helpful to

walk the reader through how the research was designed, how data was

collected, how the project was facilitated, how the two of you did (or did

not) collaborate and how your own positionality informed the project.

Reviewer B goes into some elaborate detail, inquiring into the nature of the

methodology. While you do not have to address all of their questions, it is

a good outline of the kinds of questions that will help clarify the nature

and significance of your methodology. Therefore, please take a careful look

at their questions, especially the following:

How were teachers/inquiry groups were selected/recruited?

Was participation voluntary? (9 out of 46 participated but the entire 46

are described, so of the 9,

What were their racial demographics

Why is this information important to the study?

“Most were placed in the Excel..” Which were specifically?  How many of

the 9 that actually participated were at Excel, and where were the other

ones?

With regard to the data collection selection it says five agreed to

participate from the list serv, are these 5 different from the 9 above

mentioned? (KATHLEEN)

How and where was data observed “In the School District of

Philadelphia”?

Sample, Joel Becca, etc? What are the criteria selection, and are these

pseudonyms? (KATHLEEN)

Method sections says two cases, what are the cases? (Designed groups?  What

was the design of the research study?  Was it intentional to set up a

comparative case study?)

In the findings section, autobiographic mandates: “Several African

American”, in the data it says there were 10 total, and the sample

explication is confusing, so does this section makes a claim that isn’t

supported by your data sample? How many were there out of the actual sample

that was recruited for the study?**- RESOLVED**

- The explanation of autobiographical mandate is defined first as teachers

drawing on their experiences of marginalization, and then it’s argued that

it is expressed as inclusive classrooms, so how does the Kayla data support

this mixed definition of the code/theme?- RESOLVED

Second, with regard to the organization of the paper. Some of the subject

headings do not fully capture the content in those sections. Consider

revising and collapsing some.

Also, in the discussion, could the Philadelphia context be labeled and separated from the Penn section since they were different sites. There may still be overlapping themes, but just

to help clarify the two-fold nature of the study.   The section outlying the

groups should be organized more clearly as well.

Third, please review how the significance of data is discussed. For

example, you note that “Likely due to the outreach strategies, group

members tended towards inquiry-based approaches to teaching and shared a

commitment to working towards equity and social justice.” This is not

self-evident and requires some more discussion. There are few points like

this, where more discussion will help readers see your analysis and

conclusion more clearly.

Fourth, there are several places where greater explanation and connection

is needed. Please define and elaborate on the following terms or concepts in

ways that connect back to your wider argument:

“Inquiry communities” - KR - KATY LOOK IN INSIDE-OUTSIDE

“teaching as a deliberative (not technical) profession, knowledge generation for practice from practice, and the value of local questions and uncertainties in grappling successfully with issues of teaching and learning at all levels” (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009, p. 21)

Neoliberalism- RESOLVED

“feminist pedagogies”  - KR

feminist pedagogy is engaged teaching/learning - engaged with self in a continuing reflective process; engaged actively with material being studied; engaged with others in a struggle to get beyond our sexism and racism and classism and homophobia and other destructive hatreds and to work together to enhance our knowledge; engaged with the community, with traditional organizations, and with movements for social change (Shrewsbury, 1993, p. 166)

Shrewsbury also says:

* members learn to respect each other’s differences rathaer than fear them (p. 166).
* “the classroom becomes an important place to connect with our roots, our past, and to envision the future” (p. 166)
* “the vision includes a participatory democratic process in which at least some of the power is shared.” (p. 166)
* She organizes her discussion into three concepts: Community, empowerment, and leadership

Shrewsbury, C. (1993).  What is feminist pedagogy?  Women’s Studies Quarterly, 1997… - kr will check this if we use it…

“autobiographical mandate” (there seem to be multiple dimensions to

this term, in at least one place could you explain them all?)

KATHLEEN

This is an insightful study and an important contribution! I truly look

forward to receiving your revisions. Please resubmit by February 1st. In

the

mean time feel free to contact me (or the other editors) if you have any

questions.