

Open Peer Review

Gwozdz, L. (2023, April). [Cultivating Shared Knowledge of OER, by J. Thompson & J. Peach]. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 2(1), 266–268.
doi:10.13001/joerhe.v2i1.7203

Reviewer: Lindsey Gwozdz

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Scope, Objectives, Content

Is the column 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 piece is in scope for a JOERHE Innovative Practices article.

Organization

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

Yes, the column proceeds logically and adheres to the guidelines.

Approach and Conclusions

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 column 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?

There were some areas that would benefit from citations to support claims.

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 was one of the strongest parts of this submission.

Application:

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

Yes, the column provides a practical example that could inform/improve others' practice or education.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the column?

Sharing their program materials is extremely helpful for others to reference and build upon/customize.

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

I think if you're going to include a literature review, it needs to be strengthened. For me it was the weakest part of the column. The title could also be misleading. If you're going to include the word sustainability, I would expect the literature review to cover that topic as well and to make the connection between training everyone/making OER sustainable. I know that YOU know that training everyone makes this work more sustainable, but I don't think you've explained it enough for the reader! :)

I also found myself going back to the goal listed in your abstract: "Our goal for the training was to integrate the philosophy of open educational resources and its approaches into librarians' everyday work," and I kept looking for examples of how this was done. I think including some concrete examples of how your peers executed this assignment would be super helpful for so many in the field to hear about!

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 column proceed logically?

Very 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
