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**REVIEWER 1**

Goals, objectives, questions, and overall hypothesis are strong. The rationale is anecdotally strong; knowing this because I work closely with nonprofits. However, I would like to see some newer resources included (Murphey & Mitchell is six years old). I was a bit confused on why Canadian nonprofit data was pulled into the mix, especially since the low percentages do not quantitatively provide strong support for the rationale. Is there US data that's stronger?

**Response: It seems the evaluation literature is still evolving around the direct impact of/need for program evaluation however, we have added additional US sources: Christensen & Ebrahim, 2006; Benjamin, 2012.**

Background: Because the process of CCBP is closely related to service-learning and Community-Based learning, I’d like to see more literature from scholars in those fields pulled in – especially around interpersonal skills. There is lots of data out there on this. Community-Campus partnerships for Health is a great place to search for comparative data (don’t let the “health” name mislead you).

**Response: Simons and Cleary added on page 2.**

Again it would be good to eventually include the community partner experience, which could spawn another paper just on that.

**Response: Thank you for the suggestion. Given the length of the current paper an additional paper reporting the experience of the community partners will be considered.**

Good. Easy to read and follow:

**Response: Thank you.**

Manuscript has sufficient/not excessive detail and length to develop basis for conclusion and contribute to SoTL literature. I think including Community-Based learning as part of the SoTL conversation is crucial, and I feel that this paper gives solid ideas to those who would want to implement this type of hands-on experiences within their courses.

**Response: Thank you.**

**REVIEWER 2**

Goals, Objectives, Rationale, Research Question, Hypothesis: These were stated clearly in the abstract and introduction, then repeated in the conclusion. They are well established in the work. However, if the title is assumed as the ‘logical’ conclusion ultimately supported by the premises (the goals and objectives), then there exists a disconnect between what this paper’s title leads one to believe it will establish, and what is actually presented in the context of the work. In other words, the title intimates students’ and organizations’ evaluation capacity will be increased, and the increase will be quantitatively established and presented here; however, this paper provides no such evidence and is instead a narrative descriptive of a pedagogy, and summary and analysis of self-reported assessment data. None of this is illustration that any actual capacity building has occurred.

**Response: Thank you for this suggestion. Title has been changed from “Increasing Student and Organizational Evaluation Capacity through Collaborative Community-Based Program Evaluation” to “Increasing Student Evaluation Capacity through a Collaborative Community-Based Program Evaluation Teaching Model**”

Theoretical Framework, Literature Review: The theoretical framework and literature review are sound for the limited scope of what actually becomes established in this paper.

**Response: Thank you.**

Participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis: Again, this paper is a description of a well-seasoned pedagogy and a light and compressed analysis of assessment data. For this limited scope, the variables and methods are adequate and reasonably applied.

**Response: Thank you.**

Data summaries, statistical significance, assertions, and themes: This presentation would have been far more interesting and impactful had it actually addressed and accomplished what its title intimated it would-presenting evidence of growth in evaluation capacity of students and organizations. Simply creating the course, the s-1 project-implementing it and the majority of stakeholders reporting “I liked it-it made me understand application in the real world, ‘ etc. does not automatically translate into that growth in capacity. The students may be presented new tools and an opportunity to apply those in a field setting; however, without critical analysis of longitudinal data with regard to their subsequent professional accomplishments in the area of evaluation, no real evidence Is presented that growth in capacity has occurred. The authors present only self-reported, indirect assessment data. Likewise, no longitudinal data is presented that illustrates real growth in organizational capacity in evaluation other than the prima facie fact that finally, someone other than the overworked organization staff is on site to develop, implement and analyze evaluative data. How else-in the end-does this increase the organization’s capacity? What happens when students no longer go? What steps have been taken to ensure capacity building within the organization itself?

**Response: While we understand the reviewer’s concern, capacity for an organization can be defined and addressed in many different ways. Based on the experience of the authors in working with nonprofit organizations the opportunity to work with 20-40 students to evaluate a program increases capacity in that it allows for an organization to achieve what can’t be otherwise with the staff resources available and provides feedback that allows them to expand/improve their program objectives. This is also supported by the literature. Additionally, feedback from our partner organizations stress that in the absence of this opportunity it would not have been possible for them to conduct such an extensive program evaluation with the current staff resources and skills. The strength of this analysis lies in the fact that the authors are examining 10 years of feedback from graduate and undergraduate students to determine the impact of this teaching model.**

Discussion, Implications: In the end, the reader is left wondering about several points.

First of all, like so many other studies such as this, conceptual and application bridging is incomplete between the singular circumstances and experiences of the authors and the wider range of situations and dispositions of the readers. Solidifying broader relevance and operationalization would strengthen the presentation here.

**Response: There are few studies such as this that examine over ten years of data. Though the data is self-report a considerable number of studies report the utility of self-reported data as an accurate measurement. Additionally, qualitative studies are a useful attempt to understand how well this still relatively new model teaches program evaluation to future practitioners.**

Also, too much time is spent of the “step-by step’-some of which could be handled more efficiently through bulleted formatting in pagination or a utilization of a wider variety of appendices. Note: the first two tables ought to be converted to appendices. The third should remain where it is located within the paper.

**Response: Tables and appendixes were added upon the suggestion of the first round of reviews. Additionally, first round reviewers requested more step by step within the body of the manuscript.**

More time ought to have been spent in the discussion of actual agencies, projects, and student/organization accomplishment in evaluative capacity.

**Response: An additional paper will be considered to focus on agency feedback.**

The strongest portion of the paper was in the final paragraphs of the Conclusion-with solid points being made about preparation, time and level of commitment to secure success for the project.

**Response: Authors agree this is one of a number of strong points in this paper.**

More time should be spent in this section in a discussion of how the invest of such time and energy can benefit a faculty member on track for P&T-more discussion should be given over to how these experiences enhance the faculty portfolio beyond occupational capacity building.

**Response: Although, this is a good point the authors would like to remind the reviewer that the focus of this paper was on student evaluation capacity not on promotion and tenure. Further, promotion and tenure requirements differ tremendously across institutions making it difficult to speak to this issue in a few sentences or less.**

Again, as noted before, in the end, the real task at hand as presented in the title was to illustrate how the presented pedagogy facilitated capacity building. What was actually presented was the pedagogy and its assessment, but what was missing even at the end was the crucial evidence any capacity building had occurred.

**Response: The authors thank the review for pointing out that the title does not reflect the body of work contained in the manuscript. The title has been amended.**

Comma usage, comma usage, comma usage. They do not appear where they should; they appear where they should not. Please conduct a comprehensive, grammatical review with special attention paid to comma usage. Also, please revisit reference page form. Some entries are troubled.

**Response: Manuscript was edited prior to submission.**

Coverage: Manuscript has sufficient/not excessive detail and length to develop basis for conclusion and contribute to SoTL literature.

The authors need to revisit this work, consider changing the title to more accurately reflect what is actually accomplished din the presentation, and consider moving forward in this endeavor to develop a method study with which to establish what the title states is presented here.

**Response: As suggested we have created a title that adequately address the goal of this study.**