March 29, 2013

TO: Current Issues in Education Editor

FROM: Cristian Lieneck, PhD, FACMPE, FACHE, FAHM

Assistant Professor, Health Administration

Texas State University-San Marcos

Eileen Morrison, EdD, MPH, CHES, LPC

Professor, Health Administration

Texas State University-San Marcos

Larry Price, PhD

Professor, Psychometrics & Statistics

Texas State University-San Marcos

RE: Letter of Reconciliation #2 for Submission #1052

Dear Editor,

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to revise and resubmit our article, “Criterion-Referenced Exit Examinations: An Institution’s Internal Process for Psychometric Analysis.” We have found the peer reviewers’ comments very informative and advantageous towards the improvement of the article. Each individual made important contributions towards the work.

Please find attached a line-item table which specifically addresses each peer reviewers’ suggestion and/or request for change with the article. Every comment was analyzed by the authors and all efforts were made to adhere to each suggestion as best as possible. Again, we are very thankful and appreciative of their hard work in reviewing the piece and feel that their contributions have improved the final product.

Please feel free to contact me at any time, on behalf of our article team if there are any questions. Thank you again for your time and providing us the opportunity to revise and resubmit our work.

Sincerely,

Cristian Lieneck

Attachment: Line-Item Report of Peer Reviewer Comments, Submission #1052

Attachment

Line-Item Report Addressing Peer Reviewers’ Comments/Request for Changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Peer Reviewer Comments | Author Comments/Implemented Changes |
| Peer Reviewer #1 | |
| The article needs revision in research writing style for easy comprehension. The article should have a clearly stated conceptual framework or research simulacrum, theoretical framework and a substantive review of literature about work related to the present study. | Agreed. This is a very important note about the article and attention to the comment is provided here, as well as changes in the article (noted below) to ensure better reader comprehension.  The article is not a typical research article, therefore not allowing for a true scientific research study methodology, or typical research article headings. Because of this, the authors did their very best in following a standard research article conceptual framework (problem definition, purpose, literature review, methodology, data collection and analysis). Serving more as a case study to demonstrate the rigorous process of program comprehensive exam formulation and item level analyses, the paper’s headings and sub-headings have now been adjusted to follow a more standard conceptual framework/research simulacrum, and theoretical framework.  Re: literature review. Following the prior comment, the authors further highlighted the extensive literature review and work regarding the present study (specific to the field of healthcare administration education) in the paper by specifically identifying the Literature Review section. Based on previous peer-review comments, additional statistical and educational references were cited throughout the case study to assist the reader with outside resources regarding psychometric analysis methodology and CTT. |
|  |  |
| Peer Reviewer #2 | |
| The limitations of the study should be stated at the beginning so as to forewarn the reader that the study sample size is small and only descriptive statistics can be gathered. Hence the paper is just a case study of test development in Program X. | This has been addressed/further stressed in the Introduction section of the article on page 3. |
|  |  |
| Peer Reviewer #3 | |
| 1. Page 8, paragraph 2, line 6: “…with the remaining questions eight questions covering…” Consider revising it to read, “…with the remaining eight questions covering…” | This has been revised. |
| 2. Page 8, paragraph 3, line 6: “…specifically wording…” Consider revising it to “…specific wording…” | This has been revised. |
| 3. Page 13, paragraph 3, line 2: “…some descriptive , item…” Check the space between the word ‘descriptive’ and the comma (punctuation mark). You may need to review the whole statement if need be. | This has been revised. |
| 4. Page 16, paragraph 2, line 8: “…exams examination process…” Consider revising the repetition unless it’s deliberate. | This has been revised for better clarity. |
| 5. Page 18, paragraph 2, line 2: Check the spelling of ‘Cronhbach’ | This has been corrected. |
| 6. Page 23, paragraph 2, line 3: “…and at other areas that affect retention of information.” Consider revising the phrase. | This has been revised. |
| 7. Page 26 , heading: Consider changing “Examine” to “Exam.” | This has been revised. |