April 4, 2014

Dr. Tim Brotherton

Editor

Journal of Critical Incidents

Dear Dr. Brotherton,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit our critical incident, “Kiva Zip: Mission Drift or Niche Extension?” to the Journal of Critical Incidents. We would like to thank the SCR conference discussants, scribe, and session chair for their comments. We have made all of the necessary revisions to the critical incident and to the teaching note and feel that with the reviewers’ help the paper is much improved.

We highlight the revisions made in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Starred Feedback from Reviewers on CI** | **Action** |
| Decide whether decision or descriptive | The case is a descriptive critical incident. |
| Tie first paragraph into big dilemma | Added new first and last sentence of the first paragraph addressing the key issues of mission drift and responsibility to stakeholders. |
| How did Kiva know people objected to mission creep? What was evidence of complaints? Make it clear it was on message boards. | In the second paragraph of the “Reaction” section, clarified that it was on message boards where the supporters’ objections were originally made.  In fourth paragraph of “Reaction” section, added sentence about how the story was picked up by media and bloggers. |
| How is this different from crowdfunding? | It is not different from crowdfunding.  Added mention of “crowdfunding for social good model” in first paragraph of Kiva Background section. |
| **Additional Feedback from Reviewers on CI** | **Action** |
| References in APA style | Done. |
| Grammar and spelling corrections | Done. |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Starred Feedback from Reviewers on TN** | **Action** |
| Bolster answers to questions. May want to reference other research. | Answers to all questions were revised and strengthened.  Reference to additional research was made in each response.  Furthermore, some questions were combined to eliminate redundancies. |
| Follow SCR format guidelines. | Follow the format as set out in <http://www.sfcr.org/docs/SCR_Manuscript_Guidelines_for_Authors.pdf> and in the Jim Goodman’s Challenge TN found at <http://www.sfcr.org/jci/docs/JCI_Sample_TN.pdf> |
| Measureable verbs in learning outcomes | From Bloom’s taxonomy:  In LO1 – Changed from “diagnose” to “identify” (Comprehension)  In LO2 – Changed from “diagnose” to “explain” (Comprehension), and from “attempting to delineate” to “infer” (Analysis)  In LO3 – Changed from “conduct” to “develop” (Synthesis)  In LO4 - Changed from “decide” to Propose and Defend (Synthesis and Evaluation)  New LO5 uses “discuss” (Evaluation) |
| Q1 – Is this a direct quote? Need reference. | Yes. This is a direct quote.  Reference added. |
| Q2 Clarify mission drift | Answer was expanded and includes more explanation and references. |
| Q5 What is normal responsibility? | Q5 was combined with Q3 as both dealt with the role of stakeholders in a non-profits operations.  A distinction is made between the Friedman-like claim that a corporation’s responsibility is based on claims of ‘maximizing shareholder value” and a non-profit’s multiple stakeholder environment. |
| **Additional Feedback from Reviewers on TN** |  |
| Research Methods not properly written. | Done. |
| Critical incident overview to 150 words | Done. |
|  |  |