Open Peer Review

Reviewer: Elizabeth Nelson

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?

Yes - the article discusses balancing outreach for OER, course reserves, and a campus-specific inclusive access program, with an eye specifically toward assessing what isn't working on their campus and leading to lower engagement from faculty. This is an important topic as more inclusive access programs (along with open-washed programs coming directly from publishers) start appearing on all of our campuses to supplement, compete with, or potentially derail open education initiatives. It's important to be aware that our faculty aren't aware of the differences between these programs, just as they aren't always aware of how course reserves work - not in the same way that a librarian would be, at least - and might make assumptions or ignore things that could lead to them choosing more expensive or inaccessible materials for their students than necessary.

Organization

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

Yes, the article proceeds logically. My only concern in this area is that the discussion feels a little vague - I'm not sure exactly what the authors are intending to draw out there. I think there is good information in the discussion section as is - it's more that how it's presented leaves me making assumptions about what the authors want me to understand, instead of feeling that I clearly understand what they wanted me to get (as I did throughout the rest of the paper).

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?

No concerns here that I found, especially since the conclusions being drawn only pertain to the faculty at this institution. (However, I think it would be reasonable to include some discussion at the end of the article about how the findings here might serve as a reminder to other librarians working with open education on the importance of clear and consistent outreach to faculty and the benefits/challenges of partnering with other initiatives on campus to do this. This information isn't lacking, but right now I think it's just implied - if you wanted to make it more explicit, I think it would be reasonable to do so.)

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 couldn't help but catch a few small copy-editing things - mostly just extra spaces - as I went through. But overall, I appreciate the writing style here! It's clear and concise, but still gives enough detail to be easy to follow. I left comments throughout on some sections that felt unclear to me, where I wasn't sure if I was getting the message I was supposed to be getting, or where I wanted more details.

Application:

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

I would definitely say so! I think this article will help others anticipate obstacles to large-scale course material outreach and plan how to address these in their own contexts.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

Love the writing style - concise, clear, and easy to follow, but still interesting to read! The data analysis is laid out nicely as well. I also think it's incredibly valuable for us to share assessments that reveal

problems to be addressed - as I mentioned above, it helps others think about their own strategies, but it's also a good reminder for all of us to assess, adapt, and share what we're learning for everyone's benefit.

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

The discussion feels a little disorganized or unclear, compared to the rest of the article. As noted above, I left specific comments throughout the article for a few other places where the phrasing confused me or raised questions. Overall, though, I didn't notice any major issues!

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?

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?

Highly Sound

Overall Evaluation

2- Accept