

Response to reviews:

Reviewer 1 Comments

1. The scientific approach around data collection is outstanding, particularly rich utilizing a mixed methods lens. This reviewer is a bit concerned however about a couple of issues: first, the focus on agri-science education can often be very insular with specific populations. Meaning, the groups talk to themselves, about themselves which then limits the change that can occur. Second, and related, many of the citations are extremely old and don't represent current/broader disciplinary thinking around diverse groups in these fields, why urban enrollment is still limited, etc. Perhaps this is embedded in the design and just not as explicit in the proposal, but this reviewer would like to see how the team plans to reach the unreached. How does the team propose to collect data that will truly inform the project regarding incorporating agriscience into the areas where it's missing, and to the populations most frequently underrepresented? Talking to exemplars is a great start, but limited because they are still exemplars of a status quo.

We appreciate this critique and have taken steps to make reaching a broader audience more explicit in the methods of the study. References have updated and expanded to address this concern. In particular, we have made the following changes:

- Objective 1: we will include a purposeful sample of administrators from diverse schools (e.g., rural, urban, comprehensive public high schools, career and technical education centers, magnet schools, etc.) in our survey. (*p.12, #3*)
- Objective 2: we have included science teachers who have been awarded the DuPont Pioneer Excellence in Agricultural Science Education Award from the National Science Teachers Association in our sample to gain insight from teachers who are teaching agricultural science in science classes. (*p.14, last paragraph*)
- Outreach plan: Our population to survey to identify professional development needs has been modified to include science and math teachers. Additionally, participants will be asked to indicate levels of and barriers to collaboration among agriscience, science, and math teachers. (*p.18, 1st paragraph of Outreach Plan*)

Reviewer 2 Comments

1. Proposal refers to some projects in the past as if still ongoing e.g. "The research project, W-1006 Agricultural Literacy, focuses specifically on evaluation of Agriculture in the Classroom program and is set to terminate in 2012."

This particular reference has been updated. The proposal has also been reviewed for additional oversights of a similar nature and these have been corrected. (*p.5, 2nd paragraph*)

2. Proposal mentions 3 universities (UFL, UArk, VaTech) but only participant listed is from MichState? Is the scope of the collaboration enough to accomplish the objectives or should other scientists be invited to participate?

Not all team members have completed the process for joining the temporary project associated with this proposal, but we anticipate this being remedied if the project is approved. Faculty members from multiple states were involved in the development of this proposal as listed in the narrative:

Objective 1: “Faculty from Virginia Tech, Michigan State U., U. .Florida, and the U. Arkansas will provide leadership for this part of the project.”

Objective 2: “The following states will be included in the completion of this component: FL, KY, SC, VA, WV”

Objective 3: “The following states will be included in the completion of this component: FL, SC, AR, OK, PA, WV, KS, MI”

Reviewer 3 Comments

1. The background information upfront was lengthy and could have been shortened. The space could have been used to provide a logic model, which would have been helpful in presenting an overview of the project.

The background information has been edited to be more focused and concise. We value the suggestion to include a logic model and will take this into account in future proposals. *(p. 1-4)*