

Open Peer Review

Gumb, L. (2022, October). [Review of the article OER state discourse: Adding equity to the cost savings conversation, by C. McCoy-Simmons]. Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education, 1(1), 137-140. doi:10.13001/joerhe.v1i1.7183

Reviewer: Lindsey Gumb

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?

This article is certainly in scope for JOERHE and provides important discussions highly relevant to open education.

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. Recommended structure and section guidelines - I would suggest adding Introduction and Literature Review headings to what you already have written as well as a Conclusion.

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 overall methodology is sound, however, there is one glaring issue. "... each text must include and define the term "open education resources" in order to set parameters on what resources were being promoted and how those resources were being determined. How a policy defined OER was not a factor as long as the phrase was used." -- This is the weakest quality of the methodology. It's confusing that one requirement was that the policy included and defined the term OER but that the definition wasn't taken into consideration. By not better understanding how the policies defined OER, the New Jersey legislation was used in the analysis. New Jersey's legislation is extremely problematic because, as the author quotes in the article, the state's legislation is intended to "expand the use of open textbooks and commercial digital learning materials in order to achieve savings for students enrolled in the institution." This particular legislation conflates OER with inclusive access, and allows institutions to use either to meet their savings goals. This legislation has been pointed out as a poor example and a "lesson learned" for the Open Ed community.

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.

This article flows well and is beautifully written. It's easy to understand with minimal policy jargon.

Application:

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

Yes! The article references state legislation and makes it easy to understand.

What are the stronger points/qualities of the article?

This paper offers a policy analysis, which the field of Open Education desperately needs more of! We need more understandings of how and why OER policy is crafted as well as what makes it work well (or not). I'm so excited for this paper and its potential impact.

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

Please see my above notes in the methodology section.

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

Highly 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

3-Strong Accept
