

## Open Peer Review

Vieger, R. (2023, April). [Combining Open Pedagogy and Undergraduate Qualitative Research, by K. Lissette Cespedes & J. Paradiso]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 277–280. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7885

-----  
**Reviewer:** Rayne Vieger

**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 discussed is open pedagogy and open educational practices, so it is within scope, and it's an important one. Many faculty are seeking better, more authentic, and more participatory ways to engage and assess students, so the topic and article is of direct use to them. It also begins to discuss a partnership between an instructional designer and a faculty member on an open pedagogy project, so this could be of interest to librarians and instructional designers seeking to partner together on related work.

### Organization

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

It follows the specified template for Innovative Practices, including structure and sections. The only section that felt like it could be possibly be placed later was the "PhotoVoice as Research Framework and Learning Tool," as this has some discussion of outcome/results, so it could be placed later. One thing I wondered is if the article would benefit from a more chronological format from project initiation, to process, to outcome, but this is just one possible approach.

### 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 paper is rooted in theory and analysis, but I did wonder if there were certain descriptions that could be expanded for those unfamiliar. For example, I was not familiar with PhotoVoice, and had to read up on that before proceeding through the paper. I wonder if even just a couple of sentences could be added about that qualitative research approach, and why a faculty member may consider it beyond the disciplines that typically use it. A definition of relational reflexivity with a reference would benefit the article. The "PhotoVoice as Research Framework and Learning Tool" explains some outcomes and conclusions early on in the article, but I wondered if there could be more added about student perception, impact or efficacy of the approach.

## 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 found the article easy to read overall. I think the only thing I'd suggest is strengthening the transition/connections between sections so that it doesn't feel disjointed, in particular the Higher Ed section transition to Pressbooks section. The citation for Hill-Collins, 2000 is missing in the References list, and the Dyke, M., 2015 citation is not in any parenthetical citation in the article.

## Application:

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

As mentioned, I wondered if more could be added on the process of the project. I do appreciate that it links out to examples and templates, but explaining practically how this was implemented, especially in an online environment, and especially in a high-enrollment course would be of use, since that is mentioned as part of the course design context early on. I often hear from faculty that they want to engage students in more authentic assessment and use open pedagogy, but the course enrollment is a barrier. Hearing strategies from the author about how to make this sustainable in a 300 person class seems really important here. For example, did students each individually contribute a chapter? Did they work in groups? Did the faculty member act as moderator/editor? What training did they require to get onboarded to the project? Lessons learned? As part of this, I also wondered how the instructional designer supported the project practically, which could be of interest to IDs and librarians interested in this work, but this may not be the author's focus.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The author clearly has a lot of experience and expertise with the PhotoVoice framework, and seeing the examples of student work is particularly helpful, as are the templates. The article is well researched and reads well.

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

Adding more discussion on the process to help guide others beyond the examples and templates would be really useful, so other faculty members can learn more about how they can practically implement something similar. If relevant for this project, more discussion about the role of the instructional designer in the partnership would be useful for other faculty support professionals seeking to partner on open pedagogy projects.

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?*

Clear

Peer Review Ranking: Contribution

*Contribution to Higher Education research and/or practice*

Contributes

## Peer Review Ranking: Research Assessment

*Are the conclusions sound and factually accurate? Does the column contribute knowledge or practical examples that will inform/improve others' practice or education?*

Sound

## Overall Evaluation

2- Accept

-----