

X-Sieve: CMU Sieve 2.2  
From: lauwong@MIT.EDU  
Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2003 14:48:24 -0400  
To: mac-houseteam@mit.edu  
Cc: macdesk@mit.edu  
Subject: Re: For approval: Formal statement  
User-Agent: Internet Messaging Program (IMP) 3.1-cvs  
X-Originating-IP: 24.244.175.226  
X-Originating-Host:  
X-MIT-WebMail-Sender:  
X-MIT-WebMail-User-Browser: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 6.0; Windows NT 5.0; .NET CLR 1.1.4322)  
X-Spam-Score: 0.2  
X-Spam-Flag: NO  
X-Scanned-By: MIMEDefang 2.28 (www . roaringpenguin . com / mimedefang)

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.