

Open Peer Review

Pate, J. (2023, April). [OER by Any Other Name, by A. Gamble & A. Schuler]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 96–99. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7849

Reviewer: Jennifer Pate

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?

This article addresses the use of a faculty listening tour at a mid-sized private university. Though the sample size is small, it is an interesting perspective on OER research, especially as the authors relate that the student body is "generally perceived to be wealthy", and some of the lecturer-level faculty participants highlighted concern with using OER making them more replaceable.

Organization

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

The article's structure follows a standard research format and is well organized.

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 literature review and referenced survey instruments used for formatting their survey instrument are strong. The research was approved to be exempt from the IRB, showing the authors did their due diligence with human subject research. The study was limited by a small participant pool that did not include faculty from the School of Engineering and the majority of participants were lecturer/senior lecturers. The authors note this in their study limitations and also note that faculty were primarily self-selected or recommended for this study, which can skew results. I do wish the authors had addressed why they did not record the interviews and instead only relied on note-taking.

Overall, the article is strong despite the small sample size and limitations. The conclusion and action items, such as renaming the OER program and changing how the library communicates about OER are solid. It would be a great addition to include a link to the Tisch OER Awards/Tisch Affordable Course Material Awards if there is one that is public-facing. Many OER practitioners/librarians love to look at other programs that are highlighted in the literature for comparison to their own programs or to help them create programs.

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 writing is strong and the article was clear with little to no jargon. Terms were defined before acronyms were used. This piece is accessible to experienced practitioners and to people new to the field.

Application:

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

The use of listening tours for qualitative data, as opposed to primarily quantitative surveys, is a fairly unique strategy for OER research. The authors refer to four known listening tours and this article builds on that body of research and shows strong application of the concept as well as actionable changes made based on the data. This article would be a good reference tool for other programs interested in adapting or replicating the study.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

The authors were clear about the objective and scope as well as the limitations of their study. The article is well-written and is applicable to all levels of OER practitioners who want to learn more about faculty impressions and understanding of OER.

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

The article would be stronger if a link to their OER program (now Affordable Course Materials Awards) was linked in the text. In addition, it would be good if the authors could address why they chose not to record the interviews for accuracy.

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?

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?

Highly Sound

Overall Evaluation

3- Strong Accept
