

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

Denise Balmer

denise.balmer1@ntlworld.com

Received and published: 26 September 2020

I thank the two referees for the time and consideration they have put into reading my paper, and their constructive criticism. I believe I have taken on board their comments and made appropriate amendments throughout.

Response to Referee 2 My apologies for getting the affiliation incorrect, this has now been amended. Line 3 has been amended, and a start/finish date included at line 27. The section at line 34 has been rewritten as has the section around line 53 with the inclusion of where earth science topics are located in the curriculum at lines 34–40. Line 59 background has been replaced with term non-scientists and text rewritten. Comment re line 62 not understood as the phrase is within the introduction. Line 71

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



– in England stands. The workshops took place throughout England during 2009-2015. Line 105 Reference to the pilot study has been removed. Line 118. Extra detail has been inserted Line 198 Extra detail inserted Line 242 Good replaced with word 'useful' Line 257 The referee is entitled to their opinion. I can only say that my 40 years of experience working in schools with primary teachers has given me insight into how many of them feel about teaching science. I have worked with teachers and trainees in the north and south of England. I believe have made amendments and added information as suggested throughout, and hope the paper is now acceptable.
(Dr) Denise Balmer

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

