

Interactive comment on “An evaluation of short Earth Science CPD for trainee primary school teachers” by Denise Balmer

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 22 July 2020

General comments

An interesting informative paper. Or is it meant to be an article?

I'd recommend minor revisions. The content may well be of interest to the readership

Specific comments

The presentation of findings and analysis seem disjointed where reorganising and changing table 4 to incorporate the findings of the themes would make easier reading of these data

A summary of the earth science across the curriculum of the primary stage in England (KS1 and KS2) would be beneficial in a table so readers may understand the concepts

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



expected to be delivered.

Technical comments

Affiliation: It is the Department of Curriculum, Pedagogy and Assessment, CPA.

And it should say UCL IOE., not the other way around, that is the style meant to be used Abstract

Is it not a paper?

And surely not derived but could just say the paper investigates

Page 2 line 3 auspices. Does not sound appropriate. Surely leadership?

Line 27. Some 15 years is vague. Is there not a start and finish date?

Line 34 is it a paper or an article, I am unfamiliar with this publication. The It examines the potential. . . . Which was part of a larger study (Balmer, D. 2019) and put in refs and have this in the references?

Line 50. This part is very vague, inset one example is.

Line 53

Is this true? Pedagogy is part of delivering information. It is useful to know the level of the understanding of the 4 sciences of these teachers before the 'treatment' was this done at the start as part of ESEU protocol? I would remove the sentence 'Many local. To pedagogy. It is too bland. The next sentence reported by Welcome trust stands. Perhaps a consideration of the disjointed way in which earth science is scattered amongst the three science traditionally taught in England. when the participants were probably at school Could be mentioned.

Line 58. Non-science background?

Line 62 The data analysis is in methodology, not here, thus delete sentence

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Page 3. Line 71. In Southern England?

Page 4. Line 105 Pilot study? Surely this is irrelevant. It is the, line 303. Why?

Page 13 e data she collected, and which is reported.

Line 118 more information about the analysis here. How were the determining themes acquired, read, and a reducing of categories??

Line 124. this could put more authoritatively. The analysed data show (table 1) number of ... and Line 125. Barley 1/5th. insert the % here

page 6 line 163. a significant increase? (by what?)

Page 8. Line 1i98. Again, and example of the categories I it seems a little disjointed t have the methodology mentioned here again but I am not familiar with the format of papers in this platform. AH they appear on page 9, 211-223 or have them in the table with constituent members underneath the major themes heading, would be much easier to read. Now are the themes derived from Table 5. So, take 5 would be altered with these lines before the table.

Page 9. Line 242. Good as opposed to bad or evil vocabulary surely author means appropriate and relevant to years groups

P 10 line. 257. On first use of these initials they need writing out. non-English readers may not be familiar, like wise after saying what ESEU is the acronym should be KS 1. And other refs Page 13 line387

As. Former Ofsted inspector and biologist I dispute this. A few facts are delivered in bytes! I agree with the authors further comments!

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-26>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

