Open Peer Review

Reviewer: Yang Wu

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Scope, Objectives, Content

Is the article in scope for Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education? Does the topic discuss an element related to open education, open data, open access, or other open topics? Is the topic an important one, or is it trivial or of low priority?

Making OER discoverable through improved metadata that can overcome descriptive and technical barriers is a major problem in increasing their use in higher education. By exploring this issue and proposing a solution to it the article and its topic addresses an important element of OER in higher education and is within the scope of JOERHE.

Organization

Does the article proceed logically? As applicable, does the article adhere to a recommended structure and the section guideline?

The article is well organized, proceeds logically and adheres to the structure and section guideline of the journal. One suggestion I have is to have the authors reorganize their article slightly and submit it as an innovative practices article. The article is a case study, and its length is more appropriate to the guidelines of an innovative practices submission. The article is well organized, proceeds logically and adheres to the structure and section guideline of the journal. One suggestion I have is to have the authors reorganize their article slightly and submit it as an innovative practices article. The article is a case study, and its length is more appropriate to the guidelines of an innovative practices submission.

Methodology, Approach, Conclusions

The methodology for data gathering and analysis should be appropriate for the problem addressed. Inferences from data should be sound--the author should not reach unsupported conclusions. Not all papers will use a scientific research methodology, but all should employ sound reasoning and an adequate balance between description and critical analysis. Consider: Is the article factually accurate? Is it clear the author knows, or has investigated, previous work on the subject of the article? Has the author failed to reference recent or seminal work on the subject?

This article is about an innovative practice relating to OER discoverability rather than a research based writing. It is focused on the development of a hybrid metadata standard for OER, initial efforts to test it in an institutional repository and no data was collected. The short literature review in the article is factually accurate and highlights issues the paper wants to stress, such as difficulties in creating a metadata standard for OER that is applicable to all repositories for such materials. It is not an extensive analysis of the broader literature on OER and discoverability/metadata but does the job. This would be acceptable for an innovative practices article, which places less emphasis on having an extensive literature review, but there are some aspects of the literature review that can be improved. The article claims on page 3 that Adams, Ruen et al. and Boland have raised concerns at the 2022 OpenEd Conference presentation regarding how a metadata standard can be developed to make OER more accessible. The details of their discussions and their relationship to the Georgia Southern University project should be elaborated on.

If this work should be published as a regular article then a larger literature review is needed. Please see my comments in the "What are the weaker points/qualities of the article?" section on what should be added.

Writing Style, References

Please indicate whether there are problems with expression or flow, but do not comment about grammar or basic edits. Do NOT take the time to do copy editing - that will be handled later in the process. However, general comments pointing out problems with style or format are useful.

Overall, this article is succinct, has good flow and is well written, with little grammatical errors. (There are some spacing issues, and one place where the "OER Metadata Rosetta Stone" title could be italicized etc.) It also adheres to the APA format for references. A suggestion I have with regard to references is for the authors to include in-text citations in the article, stating which page they got specific information from. This would be particularly important for the quotations in the article, from the Bothmann work and the SPARC OER Metadata Rosetta Stone. These works are numbered, and the pages in them that the article got the quotes from should be cited.

Application:

Does the article contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?

Yes, the hybrid metadata standard developed by Georgia Southern University provides a good, practical example for improving the discoverability of OER. It can inform, inspire and assist other OER practitioners interested in enhancing the discoverability of OER materials. If successfully tested at the Georgia Southern University repository, the hybrid metadata standard can also be applied to other repositories and will improve the larger discoverability for OER materials, benefiting the broader OER community.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The stronger qualities of the article are its proposed solution for a metadata standard for OER, which could enhance the discoverability of OER overall. The article is also brief, clear and to the point.

What are the weaker points/qualities of the article? How could they be strengthened?

There are several aspects of the paper's argument that could be further strengthened:

1. Collaboration between technical, public service and other librarians in the development of the hybrid metadata standard.

On page 2 the article mentions that public and technical services librarians often struggle to collaborate effectively in making OER discoverable. It seems to provide a solution for this, showing how a Digital Scholarship, Research Services, Collections Management, and a Discovery Services Librarian can work together to enhance the discoverability of OER. However, the article does not address issues of collaboration faced during the project and best practices for addressing them. This aspect of the project could be elaborated on.

2. Expand on the literature review (If the writing is to be published as a regular JOERHE article).

The literature on OER and discoverability/metadata is over a decade old, yet the article only quotes a limited number of publications and conference presentations from 2020 on. Greater discussion of works published prior to 2020, particularly relating to developing a common metadata standard on OER would strengthen the article.

3. Making the article more understandable to a non-technical services audience

The article calls for collaboration between technical service, public service and other types of librarians in making OER more discoverable. In this spirit it should perhaps explain in further detail and in less specialist terms how the hybrid metadata standard was created, making it more understandable to non-technical service librarians and OER practitioners. For example, more description of the specifics of the IEEE-LOM metadata scheme and the OER Metadata Rosetta Stone could make the article and its hybrid metadata standard more understandable for a more general OER audience.

Peer Review Ranking: Scope

Does the topic discuss an element related to open education, open data, open access, or other open topics?

Highly Relevant

Peer Review Ranking: Clarity

Clarity of expression and flow? Does the article proceed logically?

Very Clear

Peer Review Ranking: Contribution

Contribution to Higher Education research and/or practice

Contributes

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

If this is a research paper, is the methodology appropriate?

Appropriate

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

Are the conclusions sound? Does the article contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?

Sound

Overall Evaluation

2- Accept