

Open Peer Review

Lowe, M. (2023, March). [Catalysts of Open Education in Colorado: A qualitative study of enabling forces in OE momentum, by M. Hey]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 132–135. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7651

Reviewer: Dr. Megan Lowe

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 lies within the scope of the journal, as its primary focus is the OE movement and its momentum in HE in Colorado.

Organization

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

Overall, the article does proceed logically. I do wish the Context, Research Design, and Methods section had used subheadings for a little more breaking up between those sections.

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?

Methodology and Approach are present in the article. However, I wish the author had provided more detail on the development of their sample. Yes, they indicate the primary inclusion criteria, but the rest of the recruitment process - that is to say, identifying the main informants - seems rather vague.

I wish that the author had elaborated more how they developed the two overarching themes. Were other themes considered? Were there themes that emerged but were not fleshed-out well?

The conclusion feels very thin, however, compared to the rest of the article. I feel like, given the density of results and discussion, that the conclusion should be expanded more.

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 style is fine. It is appropriately professional without being overbearingly formal or painfully full of jargon. It flows well.

Application:

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

Certainly. While it is taking a retrospective look at OE in Colorado, the themes - state-level support and community characteristics - indicate the importance and significance of those two components to how OE takes root and thrives. In states where OE might not yet be flourishing, and even at institutions where OE policy and practice are still taking shape, having those two contexts can be crucial to leveraging resources, seeking support, and developing strategies.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

This article does a great job of creating a coherent narrative of the emergence and development of OE in Colorado. Understanding the origins of the movement within that state can be helpful to the practitioners there for understanding why the movement looks the way it does and why policy there may appear the way it does. This can be beneficial in terms of understanding where challenges and barriers still lie and why they remain. This creates fertile ground for addressing those challenges and barriers moving forward.

The article is also well-written and flows well. It includes good direct quotations from the participants, representing their lived experiences with the movement. While they aren't real-time - and the author makes a well-placed statement about how this piece may result in the -construction- of an origin story in real-time rather than simply documenting or reconstructing that origin.

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

While I can appreciate conciseness and brevity, I feel like there are sections - like the Literature Review and Conclusion - that would benefit from expansion. Too few words can be as problematic as too many, but in a different way. I think it's important to show one's readers things, rather than just telling them, and one should not make the mistake of assuming that one's readers will make connections in the same way that the author does. I feel like the author could also emphasize how their research can help not just Colorado but also other states/entities in terms of OE. The author does, in fact, state in their introduction that "OE is not a formula to copy-paste elsewhere," and I totally agree with that. However, it does help to understand how the author envisions such a case study, in essence, providing context and insight to others - to answer that important question of "why should others care?" How does the author intend for other practitioners to use what the author has found?

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

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

1- Weak Accept
