

## Open Peer Review

Lachaine, C. (2023, May). [Reimagining Leadership In Open Education: Networking to Promote Social Justice and Systemic Change, by K. Cangialosi, C. Goller, K. Grewe, T. Tang, R. Taylor, D. Tyler, R. Vásquez Ortiz, & E. Zenon]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 72–75. doi: 10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7865

---

**Reviewer:** Catherine Lachaine

**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, this article is within the scope of the journal. It addressed open education and networking from the perspectives of social justice, leadership, and support for marginalized students. These subjects are of current interest in the open education field.

### Organization

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

The article proceeds logically and follows the recommended structure for the Articles section of the journal.

### 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 accurate, and the authors have used three sets of data, surveys, participant reports, and participant quotes (quantitative and qualitative), to do their analysis. More information about the development of the surveys and the type of questions that were asked of the participants could be useful to better understand the methodology. Also, more information about the content of the report could be useful.

The qualitative reports were coded using the thematic analysis method. Table 1 presents the categories generated from this analysis. The authors present 3 categories of evidence to support the features and accomplishments of the RLOE network, but 19 categories are presented in Table 1. It is unclear if they are directly related. An explanation of how they've grouped those categories to come up with the three main ones could help clarify the method. Therefore, how were the 3 categories of evidence (under Results) generated?

The authors use statistical methods to analyze their survey results. I would suggest the addition of a sentence or two on these processes and why they are reliable and valid.

The article doesn't mention any limitations. Can we generalize the conclusions of the article? Were there any disparities between the experience of US participants and Canadian participants? Things to improve for future cohorts? Lessons learned?

The authors clearly know about the subjects covered in the article and they've referenced relevant literature. But more details about how social justice, in practice, is achieved in the context of the network could benefit the article.

## 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 reads well, and the references follow the APA citation style. No issues with writing style or references are to be noted.

## Application:

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

This article, with its focus on networking and open education, presents a current topic in open education, where the concept of “open collaboration” is still being defined. As a North American network supported by an international organization (OE Global), I think it is important to share the knowledge and expertise acquired to improve our practical implementation of “open collaboration”.

The focus on marginalized communities is essential to really see the benefits of open education for all.

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

One of the qualities of this article is its overall topic, which discusses the benefits of participating in a network of leaders or emerging leaders in open education to promote social justice. Social justice is not something that we achieve without the support of others. The focus on higher education marginalized student communities, in the US and Canada, is also important to address equity issues in higher education systems and directly linked to social justice.

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

The article is strong, but one weaker point is that the authors don't provide a lot of examples of initiatives, practices, and strategies to bring social justice into higher education that has been implemented following the participation of leaders in the network. For example, the article concludes with this statement:

“Centering students and breaking down traditional hierarchical models of leadership allowed all network members, including marginalized members, to see themselves as leaders and enabled the majority of them to create and implement a variety of open education strategies aimed to improve learning outcomes for the underserved and underrepresented students on their campuses”.

As a reader, I am interested to learn more about those strategies to inform my practice. It is not always clear how the marginalized voices of students are included in OEP.

The article also mentions:

“By building a community network that humanizes practices, RLOE laid the foundation for transforming systems in a sustainable way”.

### 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?*

Sound

Overall Evaluation

2- Accept

-----