

Open Peer Review

Schneider, J. (2023, February). [Open Educational Resources: Collaboration between Community College Librarians and Faculty, by T. Hartsell, D. L. Hill, A. Smith, & J. Workman]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 176–179.
doi:10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7723

Reviewer: Jennifer Schneider

Recommendation: Accept Submission

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, absolutely. The article addresses ways in which faculty and librarian collaborations can help accelerate the use of open educational resources in a community college context and, perhaps, more broadly. Better understanding the variety of ways open educational resources can be supported and more fully adopted in community college and other college classrooms is a high priority. While its widely understood that expanded use and integration of open educational resources remove barriers for students, less attention is given to the barriers that often limit faculty adoption of open educational resources. Expanded understanding of the various types of partnerships, supports, and collaborations that might remove barriers to the use of open educational resources is a critical component of more wide-spread use and adoption.

Organization

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

Yes, the article is well-organized and proceeds logically. The article adheres to a common and generally accepted structure for studies of this nature.

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 article employs sound reasoning and adopts an adequate balance between description and critical analysis.

It would be helpful to clarify how OER is defined for purposes of this case study.

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.

The article flows well, with ideas presented in clear and logical ways. The literature review might be strengthened with additional synthesis. There are several points, especially in the Literature Review, where additional clarity at the sentence level regarding subject references would be valuable. Additionally, it would be helpful to review all sentences for more up-to-date citations and associated support. There are several points, including in the Literature Review and Methods sections where phrases (for example, "limited resources") might be more fully defined and developed.

Copy editing will help address clarity and some noted grammatical errors and typos.

Application:

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

This article summarizes the results of a qualitative, single-use case study that can inform and improve others' practice, especially as it relates to the development of additional partnerships and collaborations between faculty and librarians in similar ways. The article also includes a variety of implications for both practice and future research that both expand knowledge and offer practical suggestions that can inform and hopefully improve others practices surrounding the adoption of OER.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The article addresses a timely and critically important topic - that of how to promote, nurture, and sustain faculty-librarian collaborations that can increase the adoption of OER in community college classrooms. Beyond the value of the topic itself, the article provides an example of a model that might serve as a basis for study and experimentation at other campuses.

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

The article's Introduction section might be expanded. A few examples and points that might benefit from further detail follow.

There are a variety of definitions of OER. It might be beneficial for readers to review several definitions.

Similarly, the article references individual state and college initiatives that have provided incentives for faculty adoption of OER, but doesn't include any illustrative examples and/or details regarding the structure and/or relative success such initiatives.

While it might be true that comparatively fewer studies focus on the work of librarians to support faculty adoption of OER, the article might more fully summarize and highlights examples of this work and related studies in the literature review. This would be helpful as a compare and contrast analysis with the current study.

As noted, the importance of addressing costs at the community college level cannot be overstated. It would be interesting to see more current data on demographics in the years since COVID-19 first impacted enrollments. The current points highlighted in the Community Section section of the Literature Review are, perhaps, even further compounded now.

Similarly, it would be helpful to include citations to more recent studies throughout the Lit Review. Many of the cited studies are more than five years old.

Additional detail regarding the specific nature of the collaborations that were reviewed and studied would be beneficial, especially for readers interested in developing similar types of collaborations in their own campus communities.

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

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
