

Publishing Committee Meeting  
Minutes  
February 16, 2005

Attending were committee members Mark Long, Jan Osburn, Lance Zimmerman, Laura Krasienko, Cecilio "C" Acosta, Sharon Sexton, and Jean Norwood. Also attending was invited guest Nick Cram.

No agendas were distributed; the sole purpose of the called meeting was to discuss (and then vote to approve or not) the textbook proposal for *Basic Electronic Troubleshooting for Biomedical Technicians* submitted by Nick Cram and Selby Holder of TSTC Waco's BET department.

Laura Krasienko noted that the voluminous proposal materials—completed textbook proposal form, syllabus for class in which the textbook is to be used, brief table of contents, expanded table of contents, and sample chapter—had been distributed the day prior to the meeting and that to allow for ample time to review said materials earlier distribution would be needed in the future. Mark Long apologized for the late delivery and said that in the future proposal materials would be distributed in a more timely fashion.

Nick Cram was introduced and he provided an overview of the *BETBT* textbook project. He stated that this was a book that was needed both at TSTC Waco and Harlingen. (Additional sales are also projected at Texas A&M where he teaches a class each fall that will adopt this book.) Current books on the market are out-of-date and their styles lean toward equations and complex theory. Instead, his and Selby's book will focus on practical knowledge that biomedical techs need to know to do their jobs. The book will also be lab-exercise intensive with many photos and illustrations to relate concepts. A conservative estimate was that 500 copies would constitute a two-year print run.

The floor was then opened to questions/discussion about the book proposal under consideration.

Jan Osburn asked if there might be a market for biomedical techs already in the field. Nick stated that this book would be an excellent reference guide for techs on the job as well as those prepping for BMET (re)certification.

Lance Zimmerman asked if there would be a lab book/manual. Nick said that lab sheets would be at the end of each chapter to be completed, torn out, and turned in. (Jan suggested wire coil binding so that the book would lay flat.) This would also, Nick said, make the books single use. Discussion ensued as to how fair this would be to students who failed the class then would be forced to buy another copy of the book when retaking the class. Mark stated that given particular goals of the textbook initiative—mid-range prices (\$50 to \$70) for books with materials that better dovetail with curriculum in classes—that buying another copy of the book shouldn't be as much of a burden as opposed to a situation where its price was in excess of \$100.

Lance also asked about the review process for the manuscript's content. Nick stated that Selby Holder was providing much of the initial review. In addition, Mark noted that a password-protected Web site would be set up so that materials could be reviewed by instructors at Waco and Harlingen as well as experts in the field that Nick provided access to. Lance suggested having student review as well to see how they felt about the presentation of materials in it. At this point Sharon Sexton brought up the subject of readability: determining the specific reading level of any manuscript to make sure it would be suitable for our students. Mark said that nothing formal had been done on this point but that he would look into different options to try and chart this.

Jean Norwood asked how the issue of plagiarism and/or copyright violation was being dealt with. Mark said that as far as illustrations, charts, schematics, and other graphic figures went that there was little chance of problems because Publishing Office interns were producing those from scratch. As for content issues, as long as a technical fact or concept was mentioned in three different sources it would then be considered common/public knowledge. The English department uses Turnitin.com to check for student plagiarism, Mark said that he would check and see if there was an equivalent publishing-specific service that would provide this type of checking as well.

At 4:35 Nick left to teach his night class at Texas A&M.

Mark asked if there were any other questions before voting on the proposal

Laura indicated she had a couple questions unrelated to the book proposal under consideration. First, she wanted to know if this committee was the be-all and end-all for approving textbook projects on campus. That is, if a proposal was approved by the committee was it a "go" no matter what and, if the committee turned down a proposal, was there any mechanism for appealing that decision? Also, she wanted to know where—other than at the beginning of the book proposal form—the committee's charge/functions were detailed. Mark said that there was no official process for appealing a decision—pro or con—made by the committee although informally parties could probably contact John Spradling, Vice President for Student Learning, or Elton Stuckly, Jr., TSTC Waco President. As for more information about the Publishing Committee's role, it was pointed out that the *COP Development of Copyrighted Instructional Materials* (distributed at the first Publishing Committee meeting) details the formation and duties of the Publishing Committee.

There being no other discussion, Lance made a motion to approve the *Basic Electronic Troubleshooting Guide for Biomedical Technicians* textbook proposal. Sharon seconded the motion. The proposal was then unanimously approved.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.