

## Open Peer Review

Lowe, L. (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), 205–208. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7863

-----  
**Reviewer:** Louise Lowe

**Recommendation:** Resubmit for Review

-----

### 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?*

The overall topic has high value as it connects a campus community, open access, shared experiences through a common practice (writing).

### Organization

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

No, the article does not proceed logically. The literature review is disjointed and does not fully connect the purpose as intended.

### 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?*

It is not clear that there is a methods section or how Wenger's modes of belonging were applied or emerged. Bloom's theoretical framework may introduce another important concept.

It is not clear that there is a methods section or how Wenger's modes of belonging were applied or emerged. Bloom's theoretical framework may introduce another important concept. There are many conclusions made that are not supported by evidence from the project (examples) or literature.

We do not know how many people participated and if they were surveyed?

## 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.*

It was difficult to establish a timeline of events. Did anything like the Process exist before COVID on your campus? Was the OER created to continue an existing writing initiative? Was the Process created to "reconnect" due to COVID? When and why was the committee formed? What was the purpose of the committee?

## Application:

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

There is strong potential.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The overall concept and the project is interesting and worth reflection.

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

Too much storytelling. Perhaps too many threads or too much emphasis on COVID

Include more definitions to improve clarity or focus on one or two areas.

Relate modes of belonging and Bloom's framework to the actual project

Quotes and examples from participants would make this clearer and provide additional credibility to the benefits of using OER. Moreover, this would have been an opportunity to demonstrate how the modes of belonging were applied or examples of how the themes

Peer Review Ranking: Scope

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

Relevant

Peer Review Ranking: Clarity

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

Not 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

*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?*

Not Sound

## Overall Evaluation

1- Weak Accept

-----