

Dear members of IJ-SOTL editorial board,

Thank you and to the reviewers of IJ-SOTL for your careful review of our manuscript, “entitled “Becoming Inclusive Teacher Educators: Self-Study as a Professional Learning Tool.” We appreciate the feedback and opportunity to respond to the suggestions. In this letter, we describe how we addressed the issues raised in the reviews and the changes that we have made to the manuscript.

**Reviewer #1:**

1. However, it is almost inconceivable that, at a time in history when there is global concern about inequities in social systems such as education and public health, the authors did not explore more fully the importance of inclusive teacher education for classrooms that are demographically and socially diverse. Instead, the authors appear to focus primarily on ensuring inclusivity for students who are academically and cognitively diverse while only hinting (in lines 392 to 397) at the importance of inclusive engagement for those who are diverse based on their social identities (e.g. race, gender, (dis)ability, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc.). I believe that this manuscript would be strengthened by a brief discussion of the significant implications of extending the UDL principles of inclusion to socially and demographically diverse classrooms.

**Response:** In response, first, I would like to clarify that we have not considered a limited view of student diversity, particularly focusing on the social identities of these students. We view student diversity broadly, including all forms and aspects of diversity. However, the researchers in this self-study considered UDL principles to address student diversity specific to their classrooms. In the lines specific to this comment (in lines 392 to 397), the focus is on increasing student engagement through: “it is especially important to facilitate student engagement and develop pedagogies to create inclusive classrooms that will engage academically and socially diverse students.” As described further, “Students are engaged socially if they have a sense of belonging, and if they interact with peers, and if they get involved in social activities (Archambault, Janosz, Morizot, & Pagani, 2009).” And that true for all diverse students. Similarly, another way to engage students, as described in the same lines is “academically,” where students “are engaged academically when they participate in academic tasks and are cognitively invested in these tasks (Dunleavy & Milton, 2008; Willms et al., 2000). Both of these suggestions are application of UDL principles, and all forms of student diversity is addressed.

2. Finally, there are a few minor language and typographical errors that mar an otherwise readable manuscript.

**Response:** The manuscript is edited thoroughly to correct any language and/or typographical errors.

**Reviewer # 2:**

1. There are some edits in the cases, where some quotes are not encapsulated as quotations; lines 250-254 should be put in quotations. If lines 317-321 is a quote from Ryan, then it should be put in quotation. A quotation mark is missing at the start of line 341 which is the quote by Sarah. If lines 262-264 is a quote, then it should be marked as well in quotation.

***Response:*** The suggested changes have been made in the revised manuscript.

The revised manuscript is uploaded to the site with all changes in red. We think that these changes have improved the clarity of the manuscript. We look forward to your feedback regarding the publication decision.

Sincerely,  
Authors