

New Initiatives 1

Please start with this much food

Toasted italiano contains pork

Mediterranean Veggie = vegetarian

→ **1 sandwich**

Please sit in groups of 8-12
Officers/advisors please spread out!

Announcements

1. More volunteers needed for MindSET I
 - a. Work with 3rd-5th graders (K12 service hours!)
 - b. Sunday 10/4 from 2-5 pm, EECS 1303
2. Eminent Engineer nominations due before 10/23
 - a. Reach out to Nicolas Oncken (tbp.secretary@umich.edu)

Announcements

ENGINEERING STUDENT- FACULTY MIXER

HOSTED BY THE TAU BETA PI ENGINEERING
HONOR SOCIETY

Thursday, October 1
12PM - 1:30PM
EECS Atrium

*Open to all engineering
students! Lunch provided!*

- Find faculty advisors for project teams
- Explore potential minors
- Get involved in interdisciplinary research
- Inquire about graduate studies in a major different than your own
- First years: if undecided, talk with students and faculty across disciplines



RSVP

Questions? Contact tbp.president@umich.edu

Agenda

1

Group Topics

3

Group
Presentations

2

Small Groups

4

Feedback

Group Topics

New Service
Events

Role of Advisors

Engaging with
Faculty

Expanding Advisor
Eligibility

Communicating
DA/PA Requirements

Leadership Credit

Small Group

Discussion

1. Open the NIJ Workbook at fbpmig.org/nij-workbook
2. Find the tab for your assigned group
3. Put the names of everyone in your group on the 1st page of your tab and start developing ideas/solutions



Group Presentation

Get ready to present what you **S**
discussed in your small groups.

I encourage electees and
non-officer/advisor actives to
lead presentations!

Feedback



tbpmig.org/nii-feedback



Sign-in

TBPineapple



Links

New Service Events

Group Members: Ava Martin, Taylor Lewis, Julia Kirkey, Justin French, Laura Lemerond, Noelle Whitmore,

One of the benefits of having a large chapter is that we are able to offer a wide range of service events for our members.

Guiding Questions:

- 1. What broad categories of service events do we not yet offer (but should)?*
- 2. What other (student) organizations can we partner with for service events? This could include organizations that aren't engineering-focused.*

Community Support (food and other needs) Service Events— similar to knitwits but we dont offer much other than that

- On campus - could collaborate with other orgs easily (SWE, HKN, major specific honor societies)
 - Making care packages
 - <https://www.washtenawshelter.org/donation-options> <- super local, right by downtown. Accepts donations with some restrictions, and requires contacting them before with what you plan to donate. May be an option to reach out and ask if we could make care packages with their approved items
 - They also have opportunities for volunteering at the shelter
 - write letters to inmates: <https://writeaprisoner.com/>
- Off campus
 - food gatherers community kitchen: <https://www.foodgatherers.org/get-involved/volunteer/community-kitchen/>
 - Breakfast at st andrews: <https://breakfastatstandrews.org/>

Animal Service Events

- [Humane society](#)
 - Groups of up to 10
 - 3 hour program
 - 10 mins from north campus
- [Leuk's Landing \(Feline Leukemia cats and kittens\)](#)
 - 2 hours
 - 8-10 people

- 10 mins from north campus
- [local creature conservancy](#)
 - 20 mins from north campus
 - Contact staffing@thecreatureconservancy.org for group opportunities

Role of Advisors

Group Members: Lexi, Niloy, Nicolas, Caitlyn, Dhruv, David, Chaison, Khushal, Isaiah

Within the chapter, each officer position is fairly well-defined in terms of what their responsibilities are. However, the role of advisors is not as clear. This has come up a lot when discussing term lengths for advisors.

Guiding Questions:

- 1. What do you think advisors currently do for the chapter? I encourage your group to let electees answer this question first, then non-officer actives, then officers, then advisors.*
- 2. What expectations should we have for advisors of the chapter? Be specific.*
- 3. What are the pros and cons of having shorter term limits for advisors? The current limits are up to 3 years (6 semesters) for a standard advisor and exactly 2 years (4 semesters) for the chief advisor.*

Many electees didn't know advisors even existed or vaguely remembered them from the first meeting

Question: What happens if somebody with 3 or less semesters left is elected to chief advisor?

Can someone run if they have less than 2 years left?

- For example, if someone has 3 semesters left as a standard advisor, and they run for a 4-semester chief advisorship. Do they have to run for advisorship again after 3 semesters or does being chief advisor renew their term?

What happens if an advisor unexpectedly has to leave?

Advisors typically make sure outgoing leadership shares information with incoming leadership.

How is this done in other clubs?

- Old TBP club: A lot of times it is a document or a series of transition meetings (smaller club)
- Old TBP club: A lot of institutional knowledge was gained in a less intense leadership position (smaller club)
- Old TBP club: The document was very effective, but doing it the first time was difficult, people typically knew where they are (shared google drive)
- Toastmasters: The large club was divided into smaller sub-clubs, with a head leader over it and several sub leaders. They held transition meetings/trainings and had very strong

documentation. This was very effective. They held large events, and experienced members would hold breakout groups to train newly elected people for each role. The sub-clubs didn't have much money, but the overall club had a lot of money (with a treasurer for each). President helped with interpersonal conflicts + culture of professionalism (higher conflicts could go to state level)

- Project teams here often have leadership stay after they step down to serve an advisory role (unofficial) and successor is chosen by current lead in some positions. Had an officer to mediate conflicts, could further escalate to university level.
- Autonomous Robotic Vehicle: Information shared to incoming leadership through transition meetings over the summer, mostly within each subteam. Previous members/leads frequently lurk in Discord to answer questions from new leads and members about projects from their time on the team. Subteam leads and club leadership are elected by whole team (not just their subteam), and assistant leads are elected by the subteam. We have a designated engineering director who ensures subteams are working in sync.

There is very little established procedure for sharing knowledge about advisors - what is their actual job? How do we remove one? Who even are they?

We think it is important members can elect every advisor - 3 years feels long given students get a practical max of 3 years here

No formal complaint process or accountability - elections is the only platform for giving feedback

Should we limit the # of advisors based on # of ab voting position? What do advisors outside of ab voting do? We don't know. Need more transparency. (Require statement to run of advisorship (public in bio) and goals?)

Title of advisor feels misleading—things like maintaining the website are completely handled by advisors, so who are they advising in that capacity?

Electees (who didn't know much of advisorship until now) like idea of shorter terms for accountability

They have lots of institutional knowledge - drive access, voting setup, website, etc., that could arguably be done by anyone who is trained, but requires training and commitment (should we invest in this?)

FERPA requirements - do we need advisors for PII (especially for the website? Can students do this at all? Can non-university-employees do this?)

Electees really lack knowledge on advisors -- maybe they need more info (they are concerned with the level of undefined/unchecked power advisors have). Could be part of electee quiz or first/third gen?

Overall advisors play a key role but need more transparency, definition, and evaluation of their existing roles, and more accountability to students

Engagement with Faculty

Group Members: Catherine, Frank, Bernie, David, Matthew, Cap, Joe, Sofia, Elise

This semester we are helping run the first Engineering college-wide student-faculty mixer. We also initiate a small number of faculty to our chapter as Eminent Engineers each year.

Electees: How do we currently engage with faculty?

Catherine: explained the SF Mixer and stated that we don't have many other events with the Faculty.

Cap: Order of the Engineer and Leaders and Honors Convocation

Guiding Questions:

1. How can we increase our chapter's interactions with faculty members?

- Types of events: Coffee Chats, Research Based Mixer, seminars, grad student research presentations
 - Drop in chats, larger talks w/Q&A, or 1 faculty with 2-5 students... basically just ask faculty what they'd be interested in doing
- Get more eminent engineers
- Have Tau Bates personally talk to the professors they IA/GSI for or work in their lab and invite them. Give some sort of reward for a successful invite (service hour, leadership credit, ...)
- Ask members what seminar topics they'd like to hear about, and then reach out to faculty and ask if anyone is interested in presenting about that topic
- Group coffee chats (same benefit as a 1 on 1 but it uses less of the professor's time and more students can participate at once)
- Research presentations

2. How can we maintain positive relationships with faculty members?

- Free food
- Feedback forms at the end of faculty-related events to show them that we value their involvement
- Written thank you notes
- Have set dates during the semester, delegated to an officer, where faculty can expect to hear from TBP

3. What do we have to offer faculty? What do they have to offer to us?

- Pool of people they can hire for IA/GSI positions, or research positions
- Can talk to us to hear our student perspective
- Swag

Expanding Advisor Eligibility

Group Members: Zhedong Zhao, Brian Ferguson, Clayton Bone, Chongjian Gao, Peter Cao, Gonçalo Cardoso

Bylaw I.2 of our chapter bylaws defines who is eligible to be an advisor:

SECTION I.2. ADVISORS The chapter must maintain a minimum of four advisors, as stipulated in C-VI,7 of the Constitution of the Tau Beta Pi Association. An advisor must be an initiated member of Tau Beta Pi. Additionally, advisors must be a faculty member, a national official, an alumni of MI-Γ with appropriate chapter experience, a graduate student with appropriate chapter experience, or a former chapter president. One of the advisors must serve as the chapter's Chief Advisor. This advisor will be selected by the advisors biannually for a two year term. The advisors are responsible for ensuring chapter continuity.

Recently, there was an attempt to expand eligibility and clarify vague wording (deletions in red, additions in green):

“The chapter must maintain a minimum of four advisors, as stipulated in C-VI,7 of the Constitution of the Tau Beta Pi Association. An advisor must be an initiated member of Tau Beta Pi. Additionally, advisors must be a faculty member, a national official, an alumni of MI-Γ with appropriate chapter experience, a graduate student with appropriate chapter experience who has been a TBP member for two or more semesters (including their initiation semester), or a former chapter president, or a member who has served two or more terms as a chapter officer. One of the advisors must serve as the chapter's Chief Advisor. This advisor will be selected by the advisors biannually for a two year term. The advisors are responsible for ensuring chapter continuity.”

These changes did not pass the necessary vote. However, many people are interested in adopting such changes to our bylaws.

Guiding Questions:

- 1. What constitutes “appropriate chapter experience” that would enable someone to fulfill the duties of an advisor?*
- 2. Should undergraduates that have not previously served as president be eligible to be advisors?*

1. What is “Appropriate chapter experience”:
 - Leadership/service hours akin to DA/PA status rn + project lead / chair / officer experience?

- Administrative experience? It is useful for advisors to have had experience with the advisory board. Should we have more pathways to get such experience or are current pathways enough/well measurable?
 - The proposed amendment for graduate students severely limits the ability of masters students to become advisors. Perhaps consider other options such as non-officer leadership experience, DA/PA status, etc? Or one term as an officer? Both the existing bylaws and the proposed amendment implicitly consider graduate students to be more well prepared to be an advisor.
2. Undergrad
- It seems reasonable to have a method for undergraduates (referred to just as “members” in the amendment) to have a route to being an advisor other than solely serving as chapter president. However, not all officer positions equally qualify one to serve as a voting member on the advisory board, so perhaps one of terms should be as an advisory board officer (voting or non-voting).

General comments: the existing bylaw and the proposed amendment are somewhat difficult to read. Consider explicitly referring to undergraduate members as such, rather than just “members”; possibly break out the eligible categories into a bulleted list?

Communicating DA/PA Requirements

Group Members: Owen Holleman, Oliver Sturn, Steve Gelety, Daniel Yuan, Anthony Trovato, Qingyu Hu, Kaushal Kumar, Kushaal Sharma

People have asked that DA/PA requirements be communicated better for both electees and actives.

Come up with a way that we can more clearly and effectively communicate the details of these requirements to electees and actives.

Guiding Questions:

1. When is the best time to communicate DA/PA requirements to electees and encourage them to push themselves to achieve electee DA/PA status?

- *Second General meeting - gives them enough time to get them by the end of that term; at the same time, it doesn't overload the new electees with information if it was during the first general meeting. Maybe just mention that so and so is a thing; don't elaborate and keep it simple to not overwhelm them.*
- *Based on previous records, understand when electees, on average, get done with their basic requirements and make an announcement in the next general meeting just reminding them again as to what DA/PA would entail and how many hours they plausibly would need to fulfill it.*

2. Do current electees know what the requirements for electee DA/PA are (or at least where on the website they can find that information)?

- *The requirements are seen on the website, but it's unclear whether it is applicable for the first electee term or not*
- *Recommend a hyperlink on the "Track My Progress" page to explain more about DA/PA program/perks*

3. What are the changes in DA/PA requirements between electees and actives? How can we make these changes clearer to new actives?

- *Electees - 32/53 hours, Actives - 15/33 hours*
- *Since this is for the new actives, this could be emphasized in the first actives meeting. Again, this would be another slide showing a table with all the differences as a redline of some sort. Bring up briefly in the second Actives meeting again.*

Leadership Credit

Group Members: Drew, Akshay, Vishal, Surya, Devavrath, Yunhee, Ruyi Wang, Chittin Varunav Ravi

Obtaining a leadership credit is a requirement for achieving DA/PA status. An electee/active can earn a leadership credit by being an officer, chair, project lead, or being an active member of a chapter committee (e.g., PD committee, K-12 outreach committee).

Electees are allowed to substitute 3 additional service hours for the leadership credit to obtain electee DA status. Currently electee PA, active DA, and active PA status **do not allow for substitutions**.

Guiding Questions:

1. Should the chapter allow substitutions for electee DA?

- Yes because electees might not be fully prepared to take on leadership. They already demonstrate considerable engagement by hitting DA hour requirements
- Not allowing substitutions might encourage more early leadership engagement
- Need to better explain the role of leadership credit to electees

2. Should the leadership requirement for DA be the same as for PA? Should we require additional leadership credits, or should some positions count as a “greater level of leadership” than others?

- Maybe count some positions as giving multiple leadership credits vs others giving fewer
- Shouldn't be the same because the workload for leading a single project is much less effort than, say, being an officer (i.e. 1 credit for DA, 2 for PA)
- Would make more sense if PA needed more leadership credits
- PA status introduced in 2011 with same leadership requirement as DA, hasn't changed since

3. Currently the executive committee and committee chairs determine the minimum required involvement necessary to get a leadership credit for each committee separately (see Appendix G.1 of the bylaws). Should there be some across-the-board minimum standard for involvement that individual committees are able to increase?

- Could give more leadership credit for committee members that do more work (i.e. career fair)
- Could institute a maximum number of credits recorded (i.e. career fair chairs get two credits, but max of two even if they're also officers). Only relevant if DA/PA credits are different
- Limiting the number of leadership credits you can earn might discourage extra participation
- Maybe give partial leadership credit for events with multiple leads to value quality of individual contributions