




Faculty Review of OER eTextbook

Reviewed Works: [English Composition I](#)

Textbook Author: [Adapted from multiple authors](#) with the Saylor Foundation.

Licenses:  *English Composition I* has been adapted from multiple authors and is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution- 3.0 International License](#), except where otherwise noted.

Course Number CENL 1013
[Louisiana Master Course Articulation Matrix](#)

Faculty Reviewer: Cynthia Bryant, Dean, College of Humanities and Interdisciplinary Studies, Southern University of Shreveport

Faculty Review:

Subject Matter

- Is the content accurate, error-free, and unbiased?
 - **Yes. It appears to be.**
- Does the content adequately cover the designated course with a sufficient degree of depth and scope?
 - **Yes. For the most part it provides sufficient information.**
- Does the content use sufficient and relevant examples to present its subject matter?
 - **Yes.**
- Does the content use a clear, consistent terminology to present its subject matter?
 - **Yes.**
- Does the content reflect current knowledge of the subject matter?
 - **Yes.**
- Does the content present its subject matter in a culturally sensitive manner? (e.g. Is the content free of offensive and insensitive examples? Does it include examples that are inclusive of a variety of races, ethnicities, and backgrounds?)
 - **Yes.**
- Please provide comments on any aspect of the subject matter of this content:
 - **The e-book provides a variety of examples that cover the typical rhetorical modes taught in first year Writing courses. However, the e-text English Composition 1 presents some debatable concerns: for instance, the segment “Editing and Proofreading” (under the heading “Overview of the Writing Process”) introduces editing and revising as adjoined phases although they are distinct events. Also, ambiguous explanations of the terms “paraphrasing” and “summarizing” appear in the division “Evidence,” which is under the heading “Using Sources.” Regarding content that ought to be included in the text, the designer should incorporate outlining as an essential prewriting practice. The student might be better equipped for the future as a result. Concerning documentation, the text patterns the 7th edition of the MLA format. This means that the documentation sections, including videos, require updating. Actually, most (if not all) videos in this text appear to be dated.**

Instructional Design

- Does the content present its subject materials at appropriate reading levels for undergrad use?
 - **Yes.**
- Does the content reflect a consideration of different learning styles? (e.g. visual, textual?)
 - **Yes. There are videos as well as extensive written materials.**
- Does the content present explicit learning outcomes that align with the course and curriculum?
 - **No. The learning outcomes are not readily present.**
- Is a coherent organization of the content evident to the reader/student?
 - **Yes. The Table of Contents is displays each section clearly.**
- Does the content reflect best practices in the instruction of the designated course?
 - **Somewhat. It presents the usual rhetoric modes found in Freshman Composition textbooks. However, the sections don't seem to be attached to any particular learning outcomes.**
- Does the content contain sufficient effective ancillary materials? (e.g. test banks, individual and/or group activities or exercises, pedagogical apparatus, etc.)
 - **No. There is no test bank. There are no activities. There are very few exercises.**
- Is the content searchable?
 - **Yes, but in a limited way. One must continue to return to the first page. There is no index.**
- Please provide comments on any aspect of the instructional design of this content:
 - **Although the design of the text is simple, it is not easily navigated. However, it does offer variation in the display of content. The text incorporates various activities, videos, and lessons: such strategy appeals to diverse learners.**

Editorial Aspects

- Is the language of the content free of grammatical, spelling, usage, and typographical errors?
 - **Yes**
- Is the content written in a clear, engaging style?
 - **Yes**
- Does the content adhere to effective principles of design? (e.g. are pages laid out and organized to be clear and visually engaging and effective? Are colors, font, and typography consistent and unified?)
 - **No.**
- Does the content include conventional editorial features? (e.g. a table of contents, glossary, citations and further references)
 - **There is a Table of Contents. However, there is no glossary. There is no index. There are no citations.**
- How effective are multimedia elements of the content? (e.g. graphics, animations, audio)
 - **There are several multimedia elements, but they are not situated in a functional manner. Near the end of the text, there are several videos, and each is attached to a grammatical lesson. This is useful.**
- Please provide comments on any editorial aspect of this content.
 - **The resource has numerous sentence skill errors. As a final point, the e-text offers a vague (and perhaps misleading) account of the central idea in the video Thesis Explained ("Expository Essay"). These concerns weaken the value of the textbook.**

Usability

- Is the content compatible with standard and commonly available hardware/software in college/university campus student computer labs?
 - **It is readily available via the internet.**
- Is the content accessible in a variety of different electronic formats? (e.g. .txt, .pdf, .epub, etc.)
 - **Not likely.**
- Can the content be printed easily?
 - **Yes.**
- Does the user interface implicitly inform the reader how to interact with and navigate the content?
 - **No. Outside of the table of contents, understanding how to navigate the ebook requires knowing how to return to the home page.**
- How easily can the content be annotated by students and instructors?
 - **The content does not seem to be easily annotated. It cannot be annotated using Nitro Pro, a frequently**

used pdf editor.

- Please provide comments on any aspect of access concerning this content.
 - **As indicated earlier, the text contains good content, but it needs to be more easily navigated. Since the resource cannot be annotated with a commonly used pdf editor (Nitro Pro) and cannot be easily printed, both teacher and student may consider English Composition 1 to be user-unfriendly. If the learner is unable to interact with the material, s/he may decline to read (and study) the text.**

Overall Ratings

- What is your overall impression of the content?
 - **The textbook could be more useful with a few adjustments to the layout.**
- How willing would you be to adopt this book?
 - **I have seen other texts that I like better. If presented with other choices, educators might choose otherwise.**

Overall Comments

- If you were to recommend this content to colleagues, what merits of the content would you highlight?
 - **The amount of video content is useful if appropriately assigned. This e-text invites the viewer, for the typescript and color schemes are visually pleasing. As well, the resource has some likable media elements although they appear to be passé.**
- What areas of this content require improvement in order for it to be used in your courses?
 - **As stated earlier, it is difficult to navigate and it needs an index. Designers should improve the content, usability, and editorial aspects.**



This textbook evaluation rubric was adopted from [COOL4Ed](#) and is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](#).



This Open Louisiana textbook review is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution Share Alike 4.0 International License](#).