

Agenda:

- ESF updates
- updates from JoeG
- updates from admin on housing redesign
- updates on housing algorithm development
- EC's thoughts on compliant housing systems

Roll call: all present.

ESF updates

ESF chairs: to confirm, ESF is only one day now (Saturday). We will not be able to beautify Transparent Horizons. There are several opportunities to volunteer for ESF in multiple roles. Check your emails and sign up to do a multitude of cool things.

Updates from JoeG

Last week, JoeGcomm took place. This is a meeting with Joe, hall chairs, and exec. Sabina is the new JoeG whisperer. We will be hosting residents over the summer. With the new no-smoking policy in place, 4W and 5E will be closed for a majority of the summer for cleaning. Rooms with carpet will be worked on and therefore temporarily uninhabitable. Murals will not be affected. The RAC will try to accommodate those who are displaced during the summer. Residents of these halls can also request for other renovations or repairs to be made while they're being worked on. Residents with suggestions or concerns should message their hall chairs, Sabina, or JoeG.

Updates from Admin on Housing Redesign

Adriana's meeting with Cindy, Suzy, Sandy, and Carrie last week was primarily concerned with implementing a new housing process this fall. Admin doesn't like terms like "greasing" nor do they like the fact that freshmen are assigned in rounds. They much prefer upperclassmen input on sets of freshmen rather than individual frosh.

We discussed multiple characteristics in comparing our mutual selection system with an algorithm. Mutual selection strives to increase total information. An algorithm leaves halls with little flexibility if it comes to freshmen who show up in every generated sets. Mutual selection creates diversity in ways that an algorithm cannot feasibly accomplish. Admin likes our strong community participation and sense of caring for the health of the dorm. Although admin fails to accept our system, they do approve of its benefits, and they have been willing to compromise with us as a result.

- What Adriana is looking for comments on:
 - Is the switching idea better than RP+?
 - Is there a better system that you can think of that does not pick frosh in any order AND has a single-sided selection algorithm making the first decision?
 - How can we deal with some of the unfairness of switching?
 - What analysis do you want to see from the coding team?

- Clarifying questions about their motivations and guidelines
- What Adriana is NOT looking for comments about:
 - Our current system is better. We should just keep that.
 - Why are they like this, this is so unfair
- Limit comments along the lines of:
 - Have you thought about making this argument (yes i have, also we are no longer at this point in the process)
 - Have you thought about just telling them to screw it?

Discussion:

The compromise system offers a lot more flexibility than straight RP+ and may actually work for us. We need to have a statement on how will will review the success of the new process in the future. Trying to use RP+ with switching may exacerbate the problems that we do have or don't exist under mutual selection (halls fighting with each other, the process being more focused on individuals, the freshmen's interests not being prioritized). We should focus on the fact that the algorithm is largely inflexible. How can we realistically ensure a healthy amount of diversity with an algorithm? The aesthetics of trading freshmen for one another is terrible. We should let go of the mindset that we can tune an individual freshman's placement. How are we defining maximum happiness and the success of this algorithms? What will the process of hard punting look like under the new system? Hard punting is approaching the house team to request that an individual not be placed on a hall for a grievous reason. Soft punting is not permitted. There are other ways to modify the algorithm to get past the inflexibility that tends to occur. Can we make a list of contingencies to try to preemptively speculate a legitimate reason why freshmen should be switched or why upperclassmen should have any say in the composition of sets? Yes, this will be in our guiding principles. What is the path backwards if this system fails? We may not be able to return to our current system, but hopefully something similar. Great emphasis should be placed on how we collect and analyze the satisfaction data afterwards. When it comes to this kind of thing, the experiments that DSL conduct, there isn't really evidence of turning back. Race quotas are bad and illegal. No one is suggesting race quotas. If we do RP+ with switching, perhaps we can remove the <7 restriction such that trading will be actually beneficial. We should get a prenup with DSL in the case that the new system fails. Sandy: From Friday's meeting, I have a sense that admin is willing to present a mea culpa if the new system is in fact worse. What's the timeline, chief? We should present a final decision on our housing process by July. The plan for next HouseComm is looking like we're going to present possible algorithm modifications, guiding principles, and metrics by which we may evaluate the success of our systems.

Updates on Housing Algorithm Development

Components of the algorithm residents want to be explored: gender constraints, runtime, capping the number of times freshmen are allowed to show up in a hall's solution sets.

HouseComm adjourned.