

## Open Peer Review

Shannon, D.. (2022, October). [First review of the article Understanding mathematics instructors' perceptions of OER: A mixed methods study, by A. Freeman, H. Tang, & J. Geary]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 174-176. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7147

-----

**Reviewer:** Denis Shannon

**Recommendation:** Accept Submission

Review 1 of 2 (Completed 2022-07-08)

-----

### 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?*

This article fits directly in the scope for Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education. The topic discussed is related to open education, and it is certainly important, particularly as it relates to courses that are the most widely taken at many institutions.

### 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 and does proceed logically. I found it engaging and easy to read and comprehend.

### 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 methodology used in this article is appropriate for the problem addressed. I was pleased to see both quantitative and qualitative data was gathered for this work. The paper is well researched, factually accurate, and thoroughly investigates the existing literature related to the topic.

## 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 think the article flows very well, is concise, and is clear. I really don't see any issues with the writing style or flow.

## Application:

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

This article does provide practical examples of some of the reasons that OER are not more common in undergraduate mathematics courses. This information can be used by others doing research on OER in mathematics, or higher education in general. I think it also demonstrates areas of improvement for readers who may be considering or actually creating OER.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The article is well-written, engaging, and concise. The figures are easy to read and understand. It is also interesting to learn about some of the specifics of OER as it relates to mathematical instruction.

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

The only weakness I would mention is the small sample size. This could of course be strengthened by broadening the scope, perhaps including other schools, but this is of course a significant undertaking and I think the data that has been gathered for this study is good.

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*

Highly 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?*

Highly Sound

Overall Evaluation

3- Strong Accept

-----

# Open Peer Review

Shannon, D.. (2022, October). [Second review of the article Understanding mathematics instructors' perceptions of OER: A mixed methods study, by A. Freeman, H. Tang, & J. Geary]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 177-179. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7147

-----

**Reviewer:** Denis Shannon

**Recommendation:** Accept Submission

Review 2 of 2 (Completed 2022-08-29)

-----

## 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 article is in scope. It talks about adoption of OER for mathematics courses, which are widely taken.

## Organization

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

The article does proceed logically, and is very easy to read and comprehend.

## 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 methodology is appropriate for this study. Importantly, the authors used both qualitative and quantitative data.

## 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 has no issues that I could tell with regards to expression or flow.

## Application:

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

It does. I think it is especially illuminating to learn about the general attitude towards sharing that exists in the field of mathematics, which I wasn't aware of until I read this for the first time.

## What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

It's easy to read, and the focus is on a topic that's widely applicable across campuses.

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

I think all of the weaknesses that could be addressed have been, and the ones that could not have been acknowledged as areas for future study.

## 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?*

Highly 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

3- Strong Accept

-----