**Authors' responses to reviewers' comments indicated by bullets:**

*The authors would like to thank the reviewers for taking the time to carefully review our manuscript and offer suggestions for improvement. We have addressed reviewer comments and critique, and revised the paper accordingly. We believe these changes have enhanced the quality of our paper and utility for the journal's readership.*

Reviewer A:

Paper Number:

3944

Purpose - Comments

Goals, Objectives, Rationale, Research Question, Hypothesis

Currently, the Introduction serves primarily to clarify terminology. Specific research questions are not articulated. And, the article purpose is located near the end of the Literature Review. Incorporating the rationale, purpose and the like into the Introduction will make the importance of this apparent at the outset.

* Introduction re-written to articulate research questions and incorporate the rationale and purpose.

Background - Comments

Theoretical Framework, Literature Review

The first mention of a specific theory related to this study (i.e.multimedia learning theory) is found in the Discussion. Better organizing the literature review to cogently incorporate theories related to student learning/satisfaction vis-à-vis instructional technology as well as the existing literature addressing faculty perceptions/beliefs in relation to student learning/engagement will improve flow. Given the nascent topic of interest, a set of theories that attempt to explain low levels of faculty use or delaying the integration of technology, for example, may be limited. However, are there any theories related to faculty motivation, for example, that may be instructive in the absence of a specific theory? Will the author proffer any theory(ies) based on the study findings?

* Literature review revised to include discussion of specific learning theories as found in the literature.
* Faculty motivation is discussed as an area for future research.

Methodology - Comments

Participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis

Generally, the Methods section is scant. Provide more thorough descriptions of the measures (i.e. continuous, categorical), sample survey questions and the like. Also, it is helpful to know the actual sample size of the study, response rate(s) and related factors that impact the size of the sample (i.e. not being able to exclude faculty involved in clinical teaching) before the Results section. Presently, this information is located in the Discussion section. Additionally, why is gender included as a variable? Does the literature suggest differences in instructional technology use among faculty by gender? If so, such research needs to be presented in the Literature Review.

* Description of the measures and sample question have been added to the Methods section.
* Discussion of gender as a variable has been added to Discussion section.

Findings - Comments

Data summaries, Statistical significance, assertions, themes

The current placement of the wave analysis (to address response bias) is awkward and complicates the Discussion section. Integrating the wave analysis discussion (and the accompanying table) into the Results section will afford readers the opportunity to more fully understand the study results. Alternatively, but less ideal, the author might consider placing the table in the appendix and making the wave analysis discussion more succinct. As an aside, the author might also consider re-working the current article to focus only on the dental and nursing school results given the significant factors associated with the medical school faculty (i.e.different expectations/methods for clinical teaching) and the low response rate.

* Wave analysis discussion moved to the Results section.

If possible, it would be helpful to know the overall averages of the characteristics captured in the study (i.e. gender, years worked at institution) for the total body of faculty at the institution in order to help contextualize some of the results. There are results presented as percentages, yet others are set out in parentheses without a clear indication as to whether the figures reported reflect numbers or percentages. It is helpful to view all results in tabular format even if the tables are placed in an appendix and discussion about some is limited.

* Percentages have been added where appropriate.

Additionally, consider appending a list of the types of software packages faculty identified in the study. Some packages may be unique to/more relevant for the health sciences (or not), but for readers interested in this subject, it may be helpful to be aware of the existing options.

* List of software packages added as an appendix.

Tables 1-3 in the Results sections can be improved with better formatting (i.e. font size, complete table on the same page) as well as clear labels. For example, Table 2 is labeled “Advantages for students and faculty accrued through the use of podcasting and lecture capture software.” If one were to just read the label, it is not clear if student or faculty perceptions are captured. In addition, placing themes/responses related to student advantages and disadvantages in one table and themes/responses pertaining to advantages and disadvantages for faculty in another is a more straight-forward and meaningful presentation.

* Tables have been reformatted and re-labeled for clarity.
* Page breaks have been added to keep each table on the same page

Conclusion - Comments

Discussion, Implications

The key study limitation—the low response rate—is clear in the Discussion. However, there are other limitations to be addressed. The study examines only full-time faculty. Examining part-time faculty is critical as well, especially given the increased use of part-time teaching faculty within the academy as a whole in recent years. Also, no distinctions are made for full-time faculty by tenure status (i.e. tenured, tenure-track, nontenure-track). Levels of support, teaching loads, resources for (additional) technology-based training, instructional “prep-time” and the like vary based on tenure status. Such factors undoubtedly have implications for instructional technology use. Additionally, the variable “years at institution” is very broad. It does not function as proxy for age or tenure status and thus, misses important dynamics. For example, facility with technology likely has some correlation with age. Younger faculty (i.e. “Gen Xers”) may have actually had experience with instructional technology as graduate students. It is possible that factors such as this make younger faculty cohorts more inclined (or possibly less hesitant) to learn and use instructional technology.

* Tenure-status and rank were not addressed in this study and may be important considerations for future study. We have addressed this in an expanded paragraph a the end of the Conclusion section.
* We aimed to keep questions to a minimum so as to not make survey too long.

Enhancement of the Discussion and Conclusion sections is necessary. Identifying clear “take away” points and their significance underscores contributions to the field. What are the implications of common themes shared among faculty and students? Institutions invest sizable resources into instructional technology and related software—how is it that some faculty are unfamiliar with either? Issues such as intellectual property rights, control over protocols, faculty “buy-in,” lack of systems/software standardization and the like all contribute to the effective use of instructional technology. Does the author have plans for further investigation? In addition to the “normative” lag time associated with the adoption of technology generally, what is the cost associated with the lack of systematic, objective data regarding student learning outcomes?

* These points have been elucidated further in the Discussion section.

Presentation - Comments

Format, style, organization

While the study yields some important findings, the article can be strengthened and better organized in order to increase potency. For example, it would be interesting to understand if the investment in instructional technologies differs by field/discipline as well as by institutional type (i.e. public, liberal arts) and size. The study does not shed light on this. However, if there are differences, illuminating them and positioning this study within that context only enhances the relevance of this work.

* These points have been considered as questions for future research in the Conclusion section.

Similarly, if specific data exist that suggest faculty teaching in the health sciences (relative to faculty teaching in other disciplines) might be more or less inclined to use instructional technologies for some reason, then highlighting such information will not only aid readers, but also contribute to this emerging research. In addition, the author suggests the study examines faculty within a “highly techno-centric” culture. (Please define the term). If, for example, the author were to delineate research that distinguishes between the use of instructional technologies within “high-tech” academic cultures and “low-tech” academic cultures, then the findings of this study could be situated within that context as well.

* Several of these points have been considered as questions for future research in the Conclusion section Techno-centric term replaced with an explanation of the culture of this campus.

Substance - Comments

Detail, Length, Scope, Coverage

This study is timely as an increasing number of colleges and universities are investing in instructional technologies (i.e. podcasting, lecture capture). These investments are often driven by things such as “competition” for students and/or massive open online course (MOOC) agreements, which are becoming normative within the academy. Nonetheless, the costs associated with instructional technologies are often high with respect to financial commitments, training and the like. Financial costs are apparent; costs associated with the faculty adoption of such technology (i.e. motivation, time needed to effectively integrate technology into courses), for example, are often less so. Thus, this study sheds light on factors that warrant more thorough consideration by academic decision-makers and faculty alike. Nonetheless, the manuscript format should be reexamined.

Page numbers are missing, the references (appear) to not be formatted properly, there is no running header, etc. More detail and better organization are needed. However, with the attention to comments and revision, it is possible for the study to make a contribution.

* Page numbers added and APA format applied.

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer B:

Paper Number:

3944-12696-2-RV

Purpose - Comments

Goals, Objectives, Rationale, Research Question, Hypothesis

The purpose of this paper, to identify faculty perceptions of lecture capture technologies as teaching tools in health sciences education, is a timely topic, and one that individuals in education, health care or otherwise, would find useful. Faculty perceptions of technology tools and online education and technologies in general are frequently not studied or found in the literature.

Background - Comments

Theoretical Framework, Literature Review

The literature review was very interesting and the author clearly established the case as to why the article can add to the literature. There was an extensive inclusion of the existing literature on the topic which clearly identified how much has been done on other areas other than the one proposed by the author.

Methodology - Comments

Participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis

This survey would be interesting to readers on this topic, and including that this tool had been piloted was useful and enhanced the significance of this article. I am a little curious though how if confidential, follow-up messages were sent to non-responders. I was also curious where this school was located if it was U.S. or other country.

* This is a function of the software and is now more fully explained in the Methods section.

Findings - Comments

Data summaries, Statistical significance, assertions, themes

I was immediately struck by the much lower response rate of the medical school and was glad to see this addressed in the conclusion. I thought the results were very well done. One question though was why percentages were shown in some results and not others. I personally liked seeing percentages rather than just numbers.

* Percentages have been added where appropriate

Conclusion - Comments

Discussion, Implications

I found it interesting that there were so many technologies in use on this campus and wondered if there were any instructional design/technology support working with the faculty or if the IT department provided any guidance. The analysis of the response rate was particularly interesting.

* On this campus, faculty are often ahead of the curve and are implementing and experimenting with technologies as they become available. While all schools and faculty have access to tech support - It is often on a school-by-school basis whether or not an instructional designer is available.

Presentation - Comments

Format, style, organization

I was unsure of the formatting was supposed to be APA or another style. If so, was not sure that the manuscript was formatted correctly.

* Page numbers added and APA format applied.

Substance - Comments

Detail, Length, Scope, Coverage

I thought this was an interesting well-written paper. There was a great deal of detail yet it was presented in such a way that made it interesting and informative to read. The manuscript was thorough in its coverage of the topic.

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer C:

Paper Number:

3944

Purpose - Comments

Goals, Objectives, Rationale, Research Question, Hypothesis

The introduction sets up the paper but needs to be much stronger. There are statements such as that these electronic means of delivering course content are "everyday" and is an accepted practice in health sciences but neither statement is supported with literature. The introduction does not clearly state the purpose of the project.

* References added to support these statements.
* Introduction re-written to articulate research questions and incorporate the rationale and purpose.

Background - Comments

Theoretical Framework, Literature Review

There is no theoretical framework for the study which is really limiting. What is the theoretical perspective that guided the authors in this project? Without a framework it seems really a simple survey of use/non use which might be interesting for the campus but limits its reach to a larger audience. The literature review needs more development and integration. In some ways it seems to be a counting of articles on the subject and some accumulation around major themes but I'm not sure that the gaps or purpose for this study are well supported by the review. The section that talks about faculty issues it is not clear where the faculty concerns that are raised and then somewhat refuted by the literature have come from. If it hasn't been studied how do we know what the concerns are?

* Literature review revised to include discussion of specific learning theories related to lecture capture as found in the literature.
* Often faculty concerns have been reported as "asides" in articles reporting research about student satisfaction with and use of lecture-capture technologies. Faculty may have been asked by the researchers to articulate their concerns, but the article's main focus was on students. Additionally, faculty were quite vocal about implications of instituting lecture-capture at our school and we hear from faculty in committee and council discussions across the campus as students have begun requesting access to recorded lectures.

Methodology - Comments

Participants, instruments, data collection, data analysis

I don't have major concerns with how the study was carried out but it is really limited in that it was only carried out on one campus and only with health sciences. The reason for this limited focus (particularly health sciences) is not clear. Also some minor things are that they say no personal info was collected but I'm not sure what they mean by that - might be better stated as limited demographic data were collected because they did collect info on gender, field, length of time teaching and on campus. Also while it was stated in the limitations it seems there was a clear distinction between the teaching roles and responsibilities when sending the survey. It would be good to know what the various roles are in these schools/colleges which provide some more context for the information gathered and would have helped in the targeting of the population.

* Explanation for limiting to health sciences programs has been added to Methods section
* Statement concerning demographic data collected has been re-written to be more precise.

Findings - Comments

Data summaries, Statistical significance, assertions, themes

I think the presentation of the data findings is fine but is overall limited by the study design. As stated earlier these data are limited by the fact that they are only from one campus and only three programs on the campus and there is an additional limitation of the response rate. Given the limitations I'm not sure there needs to be quite so much data shared and discussed.

Conclusion - Comments

Discussion, Implications

I think the discussion and implications are really limited by the design and data collection issues already discussed. The authors note the limitations given the response rate and think it is important the results are discussed in the context of the faculty as a whole not just those that responded. I'm not always clear if that is what they are doing. For example on I think page 13 - the document isn't numbered - the second paragraph states that "Lecture capture and podcasting software systems are in use at each of the schools we surveyed; yet one in five faculty reported that they did not know these systems were available and 30% do not use them as teaching tools. We found that of the 34% who do use these technologies, the majority are using lecture capture methods rather than pre-recording materials for their students." Are these percentages based on those who responded versus the faulty as a whole. I think this is an important distinction but one that might be difficult to capture because the authors were unable to separate out the various teaching loads. Questions about teaching load might have helped.

* We tried to address the response rate with the Wave Analysis. Our results report actual respondents, but the wave analysis attempts to demonstrate that waves 2 and 3 respondents are more like the non-responders – and some conclusions about the faculty as a whole may be made based on the outcome of that analysis

Presentation - Comments

Format, style, organization

Overall the paper still needs a good edit for flow and clarity. Particularly as I have noted above but there are a few typos and the writing overall needs to be tightened. I think a lot of the issues come from the real limits of the data that were collected. This is some interesting data but I'm not sure that the authors have made the case for the value and reach beyond their campus.

Substance - Comments

Detail, Length, Scope, Coverage

This might be better as a smaller focused highlight piece rather than at the length it is currently. So either it needs to be shortened with a tighter focus or stay as it is but with a major rewrite which better supports the results, conclusions and implications.