

Open Peer Review

Cole, A. (2022, October). [Review of the article Programmatic characteristics of open education initiatives at U.S. post-secondary institutions, by J. Bull & M. Gibney]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 205-207. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7143

Reviewer: Alison Cole

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 – synthesizes available information about characteristics of OER initiatives in the U.S. while adding to the conversation with new survey data.

Organization

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

Yes, the article follows submission guidelines.

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?

Clear expansion on pre-existing work and the presentation mentioned in the introduction.

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.

Some issues with APA Style – page number font, running head case, title missing from page 2 instead of “Introduction”, title on the title page should be bold. Minor errors in in-text citations (ones that should be et al., missing or misplaced punctuation); Double-check reference citations - corporate authors and capitalization errors, if two have the same author – the earlier publication should be listed first. In APA style all direct quotes should have locator information. Senak & Donaghue reference is not cited in the text. Make sure all text is black (some is gray). Formatting/APA errors do not affect expression or flow.

Application:

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

Yes

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

This research pulls together existing studies and survey data about OER initiatives while contributing to the conversation from different types of institutions (not just well-funded ones), there is a wide point of view. I am looking forward to seeing what comes out of the planned secondary research article.

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

Would like to see the survey questions and survey data included as an appendix.

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?

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?

Highly Sound

Overall Evaluation

3- Strong Accept
