

Open Peer Review

Hare, S. (2023, April). [The Creation of an OER to Restore and Maintain a Writers' Community at a Regional Public College, by D. Ehrenfeld & C. Iverson]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 201–204. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7863

Reviewer: Sarah Hare

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?

Yes, the article describes the creation process for an OER. The focus on using OER creation to build community and subvert hierarchies is novel and important.

Organization

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

The article proceeds logically. The introduction and literature review provide adequate context and help readers understand the purpose and scope of the project. The synthesis in both sections is strong and compelling. I found myself interested in learning more about writing processes and pedagogy.

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?

The framework that the authors utilize is effective. The way that they have connected to their project to Wegner's modes of belonging are strong and well-articulated.

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.

I made minor suggestions about word choice. Overall, the writing is clear, succinct, compelling, and interesting.

Application:

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

I think that this is weakest area of the article, particularly an article in a journal about Open Educational Resources (OER). As a reader, I find the project interesting and important, but I don't fully understand why an OER (in contrast to just a free PDF, for example) was important to the project and I don't have enough context to try to implement a similar project at my institution. How did licensing and permissions matter to the project? One way that the authors could answer this question is discuss how they envision others might go beyond re-use and enact some of the other 5 permissions. In this same vein, how did authors feel about their work being openly licensed? How did you educate them about that component and how did it impact (or not impact) general conversations about OER on the campus?

The processes inherent in this project are also unclear to me as a reader. A core assertion is that the OER helped build community on this campus, but a lot of the discussion is about celebration after the resource was compiled and published. Were there other community-building activities that happened during the development of the OER? It's okay if not—perhaps just be explicit? Answering this question might lead to addressing some of the other questions that the article prompts: who compiled the collection (the WAC committee?), who edited it, how did you solicit submissions, think about scope, etc.?

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The article is well-written and the literature review and introduction are thorough and compelling.

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

An emphasis or exploration of OER as an important component of the project is missing. There is also a lack of details about process. While I don't think readers expect a step-by-step process or all of the details, I think that this would be a stronger practice article with some general lessons learned and insight into the creation of the OER. See the above questions.

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?

Not Appropriate

Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

If this is a research paper, is the methodology appropriate? Does the article contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?

Sound

Overall Evaluation

2- Accept
