

X-Sieve: CMU Sieve 2.2
From: "Joe Jacobs" <jsquared@MIT.EDU>
To: "Jeanette Fershtman" <jfershtm@mit.edu>
Subject: Fw: For approval: Formal statement
Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 15:53:11 -0400
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
X-Spam-Score: -4.6
X-Spam-Flag: NO
X-Scanned-By: MIMEDefang 2.28 (www . roaringpenguin . com / mimedefang)

Hey, can you please look into how this may be incorporated into our current letter? I agree with the point that we need to divulge a little more about the process, but we do need to be careful.

I have to get some things done immediately, so I don't have time to look at this at the moment. We might have to send out another draft for final approval or further revision.

Thanks,
Joe

----- Original Message -----

From: <lauwong@MIT.EDU>
To: <mac-houseteam@mit.edu>
Cc: <macdesk@mit.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2003 2:48 PM
Subject: Re: For approval: Formal statement

> Hi everyone. below is my reply to the housecomm letter sent out by the
ever-
> diligent Jeanette.
>
> -laurence
>
> To Whom It May concern:
>
> So i just looked at the draft of the letter.
>
> I do not approve it as is. The issues are glossed over:
>
> "However, on the night of this year's rush, based on the unforeseen
> implications of using computerized results, the Rooming Assignment Chairs
(mac-
> rac@mit.edu) chose to revert to the traditional Entry assignment system."
>
> The frosh need to be informed of what the "unforeseen implications" were.
> (Basically that the entries with the rooming chairs didnt like the results
of
> the computer algorithm even though the numbers were superior.)
>
> "The goal of MacGregor's in-house rush is to optimize the overall

happiness of
> all MacGregor residents."
>
> This is a clear lie since the average ranking with the computer system
(2.2)
> was 0.6 better than the average with the manual assignments (2.8). I
don't see
> how the manual system is optimal, when the numbers say it is not. And the
> argument that upperclassmen happiness is what makes the manual system
better is
> a dangerous argument since there is no quantitative way of showing this
across
> the board. With that argument it can basically be argued that any
assignment
> solution is optimal. And if that was in fact the argument used, it should
be
> stated unambiguously so to the frosh.
>
> Clearly, my comments are presented with my personal opinions (which I
stand by)
> and I do not expect them to be included intact. All I ask for (at least
> concerning the frosh's welfare) is some more specifics. The frosh were
done a
> serious injustice by the internal inconsistencies and lack of foresight of
> housecomm and deserve more than an ambiguous and empty letter of apology.
> Having been in a similar situation of distress concerning rooming
assignments
> my freshman year with pressure from housecomm and the Dahlehs for F-entry
to go
> coed, I do not feel that this apology letter as it stands is sufficient.
They
> deserve to know more about what exactly occurred during the process --
despite
> the possibility of causing some unrest. (Perhaps this unrest will
persuade
> more them to join the task force by inciting some sort of emotion?)
Either way
> it is something that we should be willing to face. It is the
responsibility of
> us all to deal with the situation in the best possible and most sincere
manner
> available to us, regardless of whether or not we want to deal with the
> results. It is the very least we owe to the freshman.
>
> -laurence
> the apparently never-missed ;-), MacG Desk Captain.
>