Comments from Conference (and how addressed)\* for “Harassment: I’ve Left, Do I Still Come Forward?” Now titled “I’ve Left, Do I Still Come Forward”

Critical Incident

1. Start with 1st person, you finished with third\*

*We have reviewed the critical incident and made sure everything was in the third person.*

1. Maybe compact further

*Per the reviews, we have tightened up the language.*

1. Could go in direction of case
   1. Nepotism
   2. Harassment religion/weight
   3. Whistleblowing (ethical decision)

*As suggested by reviewers, we have eliminated the nepotism aspect and concentrated on the harassment and ethical decision making.*

1. CI need to pick 1 focal point

*We decided to focus on Harassment issues and the ethical decision making. We believe that decision makes the CI more focused. This was not an essential discussion point and we thought keeping the harassment and ethical decision aspects could make the CI appealing to a broader range of classes.*

1. Paragraph 1 of intro combine with paragraph 1 of experience = good hook

*We combined the two paragraphs and moved the experience heading.*

1. Separate fact from opinion\*

*Introduced more quotes from inferred opinion.*

1. What did Jenna do along the way helpful

*We added more detail about Jen(na) contacting and discussing her treatment by the coach with her teammates, family, assistant coaches and finally the Athletic Director. We are not in possession of any other information that indicates what other steps she may have taken to resolve her problems with the coach.*

Teaching Note

1. Clean up Learning Objectives, number, overlap\*

*We took the suggestions from the discussants at the session and reduced the overlap (fewer objectives) and introduced used Bloom’s taxonomy to restate the remaining objectives.*

1. Question 6—problem to answer

*We eliminated this question when we focused the CI. Nepotism is no longer discussed.*

1. Combine Questions 1 & 2

*We combined 1 and 2 in the learning objectives and questions.*

1. Select direction—if choose nepotism must expand on nepotism a lot.\*

*We eliminated nepotism to keep the CI focused.*

1. Lots of good court cases available on religious discrimination

*We have included a couple of religious discrimination cases in the references as well as information from a longer review article on religious discrimination.*

1. Sports management potential course

*We mention this as a potential course. However the focus is on ethical decision-making and harassment.*

1. Identify model in question. Combine 1 & 2, Eliminate 4 & 5, Combine 3 and 6

*We have combined the questions as suggested. We have eliminated 4 and 5 per suggestions as they were focused on nepotism.*

1. APA and Guidelines\*

*We have revised the References so they are in APA style. We have reviewed and conformed to the Guidelines of SCR.*

\*Considered essential for revision.

Additional Changes

1. Removed “harassment” from title, one participant suggested it gave away too much and should be part of the class analysis/discussion.
2. We also changed the names of the parties involved in order to better hide their identities.