

Open Peer Review

Beznosko, D. (2022, October). [Review of the article Case study exploring the development of a quality open education clinical microbiology lab manual and online experiential lab course, by N. Lindsey, J. Pate, & L. Blankenship]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 68-70. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7181

Reviewer: Dmitriy Beznosko

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?

The topic is about the design of the online lab for the microbiology class. OER materials and approach to the lab are discussed. The topic is important in the view of the continuing pandemic.

Organization

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

The organization is logical and well structured. It may be even a bit excessive giving some details that might be common knowledge, and detailed description of the QM and OER framework etc. If no page limit, can leave as is.

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?

reference to the methodology of using the framework of QM and OER are explained, the quality is checked against the standards of QM. No survey of the students was conducted.

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.

easy read, references are present. its MLA, not IEEE, is that what it needs to be?

Application:

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

yes, shows the work done to adopt the microbio lab for the online students and provide them experience as close to in-class as possible

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

the overall idea and description of the work done

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

students opinion/feedback is lacking

no data is provided on the student performance, comparison between how at home students did in terms of tests/grades/participation, any metrics?

I understand that a survey is a possible idea for the next semester, but some assessment data should be provided!

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?

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
