

Michigan Gamma chapter Second Actives Meeting

2 March 2021

# Happy Tau Beta PiTuesday!



#### President - Marianne

How are we running Second Actives in the pandemic?

- If you are an electee, please sign off this call.
- Sign in <u>now</u> so we can track quorum







#### President - Marianne

- What day should we do 3rd Actives?
  - We don't want to conflict with your mental wellness day!
  - Wednesday 3/24, or Thursday 3/25?
  - Start Poll



#### Secretary-William

Sign in now:

tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

- We are still looking for Eminent Engineer Candidates!
- If you would like to nominate someone, please send:
  - A short paragraph of why you want to nominate them
  - A resume or CV if you have one handy
- Submit your nominations at tbp.secretary@umich.edu
- Please do not notify your nominee of this nomination (you may reach out to them once we confirm their eligibility)





#### EVPs - Arjun & Judy

Sign in now:

tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

- Apply to be a career fair chair!
  - Great way to get involved in one of the largest events on campus!
  - tbpmi.ga/cf-chair-app
  - Due March 21st at 11:59 pm
- Thank you to people who served on a Leaders and Honors Committee
  - Hours assigned on website, contact us if there's a mistake





#### **EVENTS TEAM**

#### Service Coordinator - Kritika

- 1. Check the website for upcoming events, we'll be adding more throughout the semester
  - a. You need to have ResponsiBlue and proof of weekly COVID testing to attend in-person events
  - Asynchronous options: Public Health Service Initiative,
    Knitwits, Smithsonian Digital Volunteering
- 2. It's not too late to sign up as a project leader!!
  - a. Zooniverse, Cancer center card making, collaborate with HKN
  - b. <u>http://tbpmi.ga/projectlead-app</u>



Tau Beta P

#### Sign in now: tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

### **EVENTS TEAM**

## K-12 Outreach - Simon and Erik

- Check out our Linktree! tbpmi.ga/k12
- If it has been two years since you elected...
  - Submit Background Checks!
  - Complete YPT training!

#### **Near Future:**

- Sign up to be an AP Tutor!
- Virtual Merit Badge Day 3/13
- First MindSET module 3/20
- Virtual Cub Scouts Day 4/11



### **EVENTS TEAM**

#### Activities - Dion

Sign in now:

tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

- Virtual Game Night (Kahoot Trivia) w/ NSBE
  - Friday 3/5, 5 6 pm
  - Sign up on the website!
- Virtual Escape Room
  - Saturday 3/6, 1 3 pm
  - Full
  - Sign up for the next one (3/20)!
- Coming soon...
  - Virtual Scavenger Hunt w/ oSTEM
  - Virtual Game Night (Skribbl)







Let me know if you have any ideas for activities!

#### Sign in now: tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

#### **EVENTS TEAM**

#### Campus Outreach - Atishay

- As always, sign up for tutoring if you are interested!
  - 1-1 Tutoring: <u>tbpmi.ga/tbptutoring</u>
  - AP Tutoring: <u>tbpmi.ga/ap-survey</u>

• Virtual Jeopardy Tournament - March 12, 6-8 PM

- Sign up on website if interested in facilitating
- Please invite non-TBP members to sign up
- tbpmi.ga/jeopardy





**CHAPTER TEAM** 

#### Chapter Development - Kate

- New Initiatives 3
  - Next Tuesday 3/9 at 6:30PM
  - We will be talking about our chapters DEI efforts
  - All are welcome!
- tbp.chapterdevelopment@umich.edu





**CHAPTER TEAM** 

#### Membership - Abby

- Sign-up for TBPals is now open!
- It's fun, easy, and you get free food via reimbursement!
- The Google form is linked below
- https://forms.gle/fmfHEdXDHwPCMUQh9





### **CHAPTER TEAM**

### Publicity - Maxwell

Sign in now:

tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

- Submit your photos/ videos into the Semester Photo/ Video Contest @ <u>https://tinyurl.com/TBPhotosVideos</u> You get .25 service hours for each of your first four photos! Just take a photo during events you attend throughout the semester!
- Follow us on Instagram!
  - @tbpmig
- TikTokBP is here! Please follow @tbpmig!
- tbp.publicity@umich.edu





# CANDIDATE REVIEW!

# **ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER**

#### **Basic Structure**

- Motion
  - "I move that the chapter do a thing."
  - Debate
  - Amendment
    - "I move to amend the motion to read..."
    - Debate
    - Amendment
      - Vote
    - Vote
  - Vote



Sign in now: tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

# **ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER**

#### Points

#### Interrupt:

• Point of **order** 



Sign in now: tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives

- The chair is doing something procedurally wrong
- Point of **personal privilege** 
  - Text on the screen is too small, Speaker is too quiet

#### Speak before others waiting:

- Point of information
  - Factual question, Current state of debate
- Point of parliamentary inquiry
  - Would an amendment be in order? What magic words should I say?

### **TBP Voting Rules**

#### Who can vote?

Sign in now:

tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives



Active membership: undergrads + grads + alumni, all of whom have met active requirements either this semester or last semester - Can make motions, points, and discuss / debate.

National dues changes + election of candidates: <u>students only</u> Votes recommending candidates to 3rd actives: <u>students only</u>

We will be using the Zoom Polling feature to vote tonight.





#### Maintaining Quorum



We must maintain quorum in order to continue voting. Please stay here until the end!

If you must leave, sign out with the same google form:

Sign out here: tbpmi.ga/w21secondactives Electee Character Evaluation

#### Vice President(s)

• Thank you for participating in interviews!





#### MI-G Bylaw IV.1(g):

"The first meeting ("Second Actives") focuses on the character of the candidates for membership and must be held following the character interviews described in Appendix A or B as appropriate. In a closed session, the active members hold a discussion and vote on each prospective new member's character, the outcome of which must be reported to the candidates and to the second election of candidates meeting, as a recommendation on how to consider the character of those assessed. Those candidates recommended by the Vice President or the Graduate Student Vice President may be considered as a group. Active members will be given the opportunity to remove any questionable candidates from the group. All questionable or not-recommended candidates must be voted on individually. To be recommended for election, a candidate must receive a three-fourths (3/4) vote of the active membership present at the meeting. Active members, whether undergraduate or graduate students, are eligible to vote on new members."

#### See: THE ELIGIBILITY CODE OF THE TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION (Adopted by the 1926 Convention)





THE ELIGIBILITY CODE OF THE TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION (Adopted by the 1926 Convention)

In order that there may be a more uniform basis for selection of members for Tau Beta Pi, these suggestions are offered. It is expected that a copy of this statement be given each active member before every election, and it may at times serve as a general expression of our policy in the selection of members.

It is the purpose of the Society to mark in a fitting manner those who have conferred honor upon their alma mater by distinguished scholarship and exemplary character as students, or by their attainments as alumni.



THE ELIGIBILITY CODE OF THE TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION (Adopted by the 1926 Convention)

Distinguished scholarship, while the primary requisite for admission, must not be considered the sole criterion.

After the scholastic requirements have been fulfilled, the selection shall be based on integrity, breadth of interest both inside and outside of engineering, adaptability, and unselfish activity.

. . .



# THE ELIGIBILITY CODE OF THE TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION (Adopted by the 1926 Convention)

We consider that true integrity is the sine qua non for membership in Tau Beta Pi, that it transcends in importance scholarship, activity, and every other qualification. Without private and public integrity, we believe that no organization is worthy of existence. Under integrity, we include honor and high standards of truth and justice.

Breadth of interest sufficient for eligibility in this Association will enable people to maintain their positions in their community by the exercise of qualities other than engineering ability.



THE ELIGIBILITY CODE OF THE TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION

True engineers must be able to adapt themselves ingeniously to all circumstances and conditions, making them conform to the desired purpose.

The rating of people on the degree of unselfish activity manifested, is intended to indicate that Tau Beta Pi believes that none can become worthy engineers without the welfare of associates, organizations, and the community at heart.



# THE ELIGIBILITY CODE OF THE TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION

It is furthermore expected that they display willingness to aid and assist in worthy causes by their actual campus record. However, the fact that people may not have shown unselfish activity to an appreciable degree throughout their courses of study is no infallible indication that they would not if the opportunity offered. The most conspicuous illustrations of this are those students who are self supporting, for which due allowance must be made and due credit given.



# THE ELIGIBILITY CODE OF THE TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION (Adopted by the 1926 Convention)

In fine, it is in this capacity for the unstinted giving of their best, without thought of remuneration, that we believe lies one of the most sensitive tests for determining candidates' rights to bear the name and wear the Bent of Tau Beta Pi.

### **Review of Potential Outcomes**



Option	Outcome	
Recommend	Character recommendation for Third Actives election to membership (still need to complete the rest of the electee requirements)	
Do Not Recommend	Can't be elected at Third Actives (can re-evaluate later if needed)	
Take No Action	Wait until Third Actives to allow them to show exemplary character through service and other interactions with the chapter	

#### Undergraduate Eligible Candidates

Aamir Samdani Andrew Chen Anne deCastro Annyn Howle **Ari Singer** Arianna Wu Benjamin Adam Levy **Caleb Daniel Styles Daniel Liu Daniel Orion Malow** Pert **Elizabeth Hoyt Emily Victoria Britton** Ethan J Davis Jackson Laird Zboril

Jacob Slimak Jacob Victor Miller James Brynn Jayanth Tatikonda **Jedidiah Ethan Shapiro** Pienkny John Yu Joseph Edward Chinoski Joseph Shangraw Kate Wenxuan Shen Luke Wassink Mark Wassink Martin Rosen Matthew Arrieta Maxfield Guy Arnson





#### Undergraduate Eligible Candidates



#### Isabella Hartman

Interviewed by Maxwell Weng and Braden Saltus

Some concern due to answer to follow-up question on case study. Recommendation: not sure.

Follow-up interview by Marianne DeBrito and Megan Busch, **would recommend** to 3rd Actives



#### Undergraduate Eligible Candidates



#### Comments by Maxwell Weng:

Even after the interview, I am still not sure if this electee has the integrity needed for a member of Tau Beta Pi. Drawing from the eligibility code of our association, an electee's integrity "... transcends in importance scholarship, activity, and every other qualification. Without private and public integrity, we believe that no organization is worthy of existence. Under integrity, we include honor and high standards of truth and justice." While this electee carefully considered and weighed all options for the first case study with the integrity of a member of Tau Beta Pi, she seemingly demonstrated a lack of this integrity needed during a follow-up guestion from my fellow interviewer on the second case study. The question asked is what action Chuck should take if the professor in the classes decides to let the plagiarized work "slide" so to speak and not punish anyone. The electee responded that Chuck should not do anything and just take this as a lesson learned for the future. I believe that this is an inappropriate and unethical response as Chuck still has not only a moral but also an ethical responsibility to hold himself and his team members accountable. Only after my fellow interview shared the possibility of reporting the professor to the honor council did this electee recognize this as a possible option. This hiccup during the case study along with her expressed external reasons for acting with integrity (i.e. to follow the rules, as compared to internal reasons for acting with integrity such as to be true with one's own moral compass) in the short answer questions, in particular to her response to what the difference is between cheating and collaborating, give me reservations to be confident that this electee has the integrity needed as a member of Tau Beta Pi. For the reasons above, I would really appreciate it if this electee would submit a response to the short answer question "Why does the College of Engineering have an honor code?" (which she chose not complete), so that I may better understand this electee's character and whether she has the integrity to be a good candidate and ultimately a member of Tau Beta Pi.



Tau Beta Pi

#### Undergraduate Eligible Candidates



#### **Comments by Braden Saltus:**

Candidate did not fill out the question related to why the College of Engineering has an honor code. Candidate also did not fill out the guestion of why diversity is important. I had asked that the candidate respond to one of these guestions and for the sake of time we did not discuss why the College of Engineering has an honor code. In the candidates other responses, it seemed that the candidate thought of honor as something that was determined by another source, and when asked about what actually is a breech of honor or what we be the harm of not being honorable, candidate gave somewhat vague responses. When asked to follow up on the candidates response of exemplary character is a quality in role models candidate said that the responsibility to have exemplary character is internal, as in one is responsible to oneself to exhibit exemplary character. This response indicates that the candidate does have an understanding of an interpretation of the meaning of honor. In a follow up to the case-study 2, I asked the candidate what they would do if the professor decided not to punish the group so as not to tarnish their future careers. Candidate responded, after a bit of thinking, that they would likely go along with the professor and decide to just take it as a lesson in the future, but also noting that this would be very improper conduct for the professor and would set a bad example for young engineers. When I asked would you try to go over the professor's head and report it to the honor council, the candidate said that they would consider it. Ultimately, I marked not sure because I would like to hear more, or for someone to hear more from this candidate about why the honor code exists and consider why it is important to be honorable and exhibit exemplary character. I think a little bit of it was the time constraint on our interview. The candidate did answer the "correct" responses for the questions on the slideshow, but I didn't sense that the candidate had much of an internal meditation on why those rules should exist or should be followed. I don't know if another interview is necessary, or a request for those questions to be answered would be sufficient. But I was not sure that the candidate had an internalized grasp of the importance of honor and exemplary character

#### Undergraduate Eligible Candidates



#### Isabella Hartman

#### Comments by Marianne DeBrito:

In my opinion, our 40-minute interview with Isabella went perfectly. I asked her about the College of Engineering's honor code since the previous interviewers didn't get the chance to talk about it. She said that the honor code holds students to the high standard that we should expect from a professional engineer, not just an engineering student - to me, this shows that she values and respects the honor code personally as a moral standard and expectation for her future. I asked her about cheating vs. collaboration outside of academics, and she had a good sense that cutting corners or acting dishonestly as a professional engineer jeopardizes lives and careers. She noted that this guestion caught her off guard in her first interview, and she was much more satisfied with her answer this time around. During the case study, Isabella's answers always focused on honest communication as the most important step, both with the FAA and Deborah, and she could not be convinced to send the code with the bug in it. She took her time understanding the situation and thinking about her responses, and also understood the motivation for one who would act differently than she; I thought this open-mindedness yet firm moral compass was impressive. I wholeheartedly recommend Isabella - I think she was a little nervous for her first interview, but her guestionnaire responses and interview with Megan and me both displayed fantastic character with eloquence, humility, and conviction.

#### Undergraduate Eligible Candidates



#### Isabella Hartman

#### Comments by Megan Busch:

I would be totally comfortable recommending Isabella to membership. Her character interview with me and Marianne raised no concerns. Her responses to the short answer were well thought out and displayed a commitment to integrity and a great awareness of the consequences when engineers don't adhere to these values. Her response to the Honor code question and cheating vs collaboration displayed strong character values and were well reasoned. She noted in her first interview that she was caught off guard and liked her answer more this time around. Additionally, when asked about the shared responsibility aspect of the Honor code she stated she believed that it was necessary due to the collaborative nature of much of engineering work and that we all must work together to maintain the standard of integrity in the field. In response to the case study she took the time to ask follow-up questions to and make sure she understood the question and the proper procedures to report misconduct in that field of engineering. She was very aware of the consequences of knowingly submitting the defective product and refused to compromise on reporting the problem to ensure that no one could be hurt by it and even when that possibility was removed she still chose not to compromise her morals to maintain the company's reputation, justifying her choice morally as well as considering real life implications in engineering if that was a common practice. Furthermore, when asked about what she deemed an "acceptable level of risk" for a product she made, she acknowledged her own potential bias in deciding that and stated she would adhere to industry standards if she ever needed to do that.



#### Graduate Eligible Candidates

Candidate	Interviewer 1	Interviewer 2	Outcome
Yaswanth Cherivirala	Kritika lyer	Paige Jackson	Recommend
Charles Coutteau	Kelly Crumley		Recommend
Jin Jeon	Varun Chakrapani		Recommend
Renuka Kumar	Michael Benson	Peter Lindes	Recommend
Pengchao Liang	Paige Jackson	Ying Liu	Recommend
Elliot Phillips	Varun Chakrapani	Michael Benson	Recommend
Ruixuan Zhang	Varun Chakrapani		Recommend

#### Sign-In Code



#### **TBPecorino** \*Pecorino (n): an Italian cheese!