

House Team Meeting 8/28/03

1. We did not change the entire process at the last minute. Joe and Michael Gray have spent months designing this algorithm and website in order to lessen the load the night of in house rush. Carl and I decided to give it a shot and if people were unhappy with it within the first hour, to scrap it and go back to the old system.
2. In order to make everything clear, the “two entries” you refer to repeatedly are A and G. We did, in fact, receive 100% first picks because a vast amount of freshmen chose us first. However, neither A nor G was satisfied with the output. A poll taken one hour into using the algorithm showed 2 entries were happy with it, 3 were unhappy, and 4 were indifferent.
3. The name of the game is maximizing *total* happiness. Unfortunately, the algorithm was not designed for that. The algorithm only took into account the freshmen’s preferences and gender restrictions within each entry. It maximized freshmen happiness, which does not coincide with entry/upperclassmen happiness. We were still going to allow for subsequent trades.
4. We did not feel comfortable implementing the computer system for the following reasons:
 - a. When Housecomm discussed the implementation of the computer algorithm to take place of the first round of trading, they agreed to consider it only if it took into account entry input. The system does not yet fulfill this requirement to HouseComm’s satisfaction.
 - b. Because HouseComm had not yet approved of the algorithm, we were forced to go by the Bylaws and follow the old system of in-house trading exactly. The results of last night were no different than what they would have been if the computer system never even existed.
5. In terms of the RACs who happen to “hail from the whining entries,” I’d like to remind us all that both Carl and I had to be approved by HouseComm for our positions.
6. I do not see how the RACs or Joe “bailed” at front desk. Move-in day has been historically hectic. The RACs, ExecComm, Bob, the desk workers, etc. all do what they can to alleviate the situation, but we hope most people are mature enough to realize that it takes time and patience to move in 105 freshmen new to the dorm and the campus.
7. The RACs admit that we made a mistake by letting entries know who they could have had through the computer algorithm before discarding the system. We should have made it more clear that it was only in its pilot phase and could not be implemented due to the Bylaws. Secondly, we apologize for not being completely clear on the rules stated in Bylaws before the night further progressed. Entry representatives were there much longer than they should have and will note that future RACs should make a conscious effort to avoid this in the future.
8. We suggest that all of HouseTeam spend time, apart from HouseComm meetings, to discuss this issue further. It is a major endeavor requiring the amendment of several Bylaws and must be done during the year, rather than over the summer. We recognize that the program requires extensive testing and is not ready to be used during in-house trading.