



Faculty Review of Open eTextbooks

The [California Open Educational Resources Council](http://www.cool4ed.org) has designed and implemented a faculty review process of the free and open etextbooks showcased within the California Open Online Library for Education (www.cool4ed.org). Faculty from the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California were invited to review the selected free and open etextbooks using a rubric. Faculty received a stipend for their efforts and funding was provided by the State of California, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Textbook Name:

An Introduction to Philosophy



License:



An Introduction to Philosophy by Dr. Philip A. Pecorino is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/)

Find it: [eTextbook Website](#)

Textbook Authors:

Dr. Philip A. Pecorino

Reviewed by:

Anita Silvers

Institution:

California State University, San Francisco

Title/Position:


Professor

Format

Reviewed:

[Online](#)

A small fee may be associated with various formats.



Date Reviewed:

December 2015

California OER Council eTextbook Evaluation Rubric

CA Course ID: [PHIL 100](#)

Subject Matter (30 possible points)	N/A (0 pts)	Very Weak (1pt)	Limited (2 pts)	Adequate (3pts)	Strong (4 pts)	Superior (5 pts)
Is the content accurate, error-free, and unbiased?			X			
Does the text adequately cover the designated course with a sufficient degree of depth and scope?		X				
Does the textbook use sufficient and relevant examples to present its subject matter?			X			

Does the textbook use a clear, consistent terminology to present its subject matter?		X				
Does the textbook reflect current knowledge of the subject matter?		X				
Does the textbook present its subject matter in a culturally sensitive manner? (e.g. Is the textbook free of offensive and insensitive examples? Does it include examples that are inclusive of a variety of races, ethnicities, and backgrounds?)		X				

Total Points: 8 out of 30

Please provide comments on any aspect of the subject matter of this textbook:

- This was made for one of the CUNY community colleges. It is 15 years old. It omits diverse perspectives. No feminist philosophy; In some places explicitly labels philosophical positions as Christian; Troglodyte view of LGBT.
- All Intro to PHIL courses should include primary texts. This one is flawed because only primary texts available free on line are made included, so coverage of standard Philosophical Introductory primary text content is unbalanced. To compensate, there are links to multiplicities of non-primary text articles on such topics. These are of quite different quality and sometimes contradict each other. Inappropriate for teaching Intro to PHIL.
- Some material conveyed by non-captioned video, so inaccessible to hearing impaired. Completely non-navigable by screen-readers for visually impaired.
- Many links broken. Some video lectures inaudible.

Instructional Design (35 possible points)	N/A (0 pts)	Very Weak (1pt)	Limited (2 pts)	Adequate (3pts)	Strong (4 pts)	Superior (5 pts)
Does the textbook present its subject materials at appropriate reading levels for undergrad use?			X			
Does the textbook reflect a consideration of different learning styles? (e.g. visual, textual?)		X				
Does the textbook present explicit learning outcomes aligned with the course and curriculum?		X				
Is a coherent organization of the textbook evident to the reader/student?				X		
Does the textbook reflect best practices in the instruction of the designated course?		X				
Does the textbook contain sufficient effective ancillary materials? (e.g. test banks, individual and/or group activities or exercises, pedagogical apparatus, etc.)		X				
Is the textbook searchable?			X			

Total Points: 11 out of 35

Please provide comments on any aspect of the instructional design of this textbook:

- There is no instructional design. This is just an online collection of materials related to standard Intro to Phil topics.

Editorial Aspects (25 possible points)	N/A (0 pts)	Very Weak (1pt)	Limited (2 pts)	Adequate (3pts)	Strong (4 pts)	Superior (5 pts)
Is the language of the textbook free of grammatical, spelling, usage, and typographical errors?	X					
Is the textbook written in a clear, engaging style?	X					
Does the textbook 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?)	X					
Does the textbook include conventional editorial features? (e.g. a table of contents, glossary, citations and further references)		X				
How effective are multimedia elements of the textbook? (e.g. graphics, animations, audio)		X				

Total Points: 2 out of 25

Please provide comments on any editorial aspect of this textbook:

- This is not a textbook of the sort presumed by the questions.

Usability (25 possible points)	N/A (0 pts)	Very Weak (1pt)	Limited (2 pts)	Adequate (3pts)	Strong (4 pts)	Superior (5 pts)
Is the textbook compatible with standard and commonly available hardware/software in college/university campus student computer labs?				X		
Is the textbook accessible in a variety of different electronic formats? (e.g. .txt, .pdf, .epub, etc.)	X					
Can the textbook be printed easily?		X				
Does the user interface implicitly inform the reader how to interact with and navigate the textbook?			X			
How easily can the textbook be annotated by students and instructors?		X				

Total Points: 7 out of 25

Please provide comments on any aspect of access concerning this textbook:

- Your form fails to ask about access for visually impaired and hearing impaired students. The text is not accessible to either. Some content is conveyed by non-captioned video, so is inaccessible to hearing impaired. I think the text is completely non-navigable by screen-readers. Nor could this very old text be made accessible.

Overall Ratings	Not at all (0 pts)	Very Weak (1 pt)	Limited (2 pts)	Adequate (3 pts)	Strong (4 pts)	Superior (5 pts)
What is your overall impression of the textbook?		X				
How willing would you be to adopt this book?	X	Strong reservations (1 pt)	Limited willingness (2 pts)	Willing (3 pts)	Strongly willing (4 pts)	Enthusiastically willing (5 pts)

Total Points: 1 out of 10

Overall Comments

If you were to recommend this textbook to colleagues, what merits of the textbook would you highlight?

- This is unadoptable

What areas of this textbook require improvement in order for it to be used in your courses?

- There are no merits

We invite you to add your feedback on the textbook or the review to [the textbook site in MERLOT](#)
(Please [register](#) in MERLOT to post your feedback.)



For questions or more information, contact the [CA Open Educational Resources Council](#).



This [review](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](#).