

Greetings, rmorton1 | [Logout](#)
ASCIT [DONUT](#)

Admin

- [Marketplace](#)
- [Masquerades](#)
- [Survey Permissions](#)

User Services

- [ARC Feedback](#)
- [Calendar](#)
- [Course Reviews](#)
- [Course Scheduler](#)
- [Course Planner](#)
- [Directory](#)
- [Marketplace](#)
- [Newsgroups](#)
- [Room Reservations](#)
- [Surveys and Voting](#)

ASCIT

- [Campus Positions](#)
- [Clubs](#)
- [Contacts](#)
- [Documents](#)
- [Suggestions](#)

Publications

- [The Tech](#)
- [little t](#)
- [Big T](#)
- [Totem](#)

Committees

- [ARC](#)
- [BoC](#)
- [CRC](#)
- [IHC](#)
- [ESC](#)

Account Management

- [New Account](#)
- [Recover Password](#)
- [Your Account](#)

ASCIT Survey and Voting Results

- [Current Polls](#)
- [Polling Results](#)
- [Manage Polls](#)

Results of the Responses to Changes in Residential Life

Description:

Here is current plan from the VPSA office titled 'Plan for the Future of Residential Life and Opening the Bechtel Residence' : https://studaff.caltech.edu/documents/71-bechtelplan-2-1-2018_final.pdf

Please read this plan over before responding to the survey. This survey is completely anonymous (UID and birthday are only used for verification).

Questions:

407 voter(s) in this survey/election

Questions Concerning Rotation

For all of the opinion questions, 1 is bad and 5 is good. 3 is neutral.

What are your opinions of a set of special rules, including the "Rotation Code" and "The Four Laws of Rotation"?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	12.29%	50
2	8.35%	34
3	18.92%	77
4	30.96%	126
5 (Strongly Like)	25.31%	103

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of transparency with respect to Rotation?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	10.81%	44
2	19.66%	80
3	29.48%	120
4	19.41%	79
5 (Strongly Like)	16.46%	67

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of an opt-in Freshmen Experience alternative to Rotation and the house

system?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	30.22%	123
2	21.38%	87
3	18.67%	76
4	14.00%	57
5 (Strongly Like)	14.00%	57

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of the number of Freshmen going into each House being dependent on its popularity with Prefrosh?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	31.94%	130
2	25.55%	104
3	22.85%	93
4	10.32%	42
5 (Strongly Like)	6.39%	26

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of Upperclassmen ranking Freshmen during the Rotation Process?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	9.58%	39
2	9.83%	40
3	14.74%	60
4	28.26%	115
5 (Strongly Like)	36.86%	150

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of Houses giving impressions (and not strict rankings) on Freshmen during Rotation?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	8.11%	33
2	17.44%	71
3	25.06%	102
4	25.31%	103
5 (Strongly Like)	21.87%	89

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of Houses having input in the Rotation process?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	2.46%	10
2	1.72%	7
3	4.67%	19
4	7.62%	31
5 (Strongly Like)	82.06%	334

Explain:
Results printed below

What are your opinions of having students (currently IHC) running Rotation?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	2.46%	10
2	2.46%	10
3	9.83%	40
4	13.02%	53
5 (Strongly Like)	71.01%	289

Explain:
Results printed below

What are your opinions on future rotations involving current students preparing online introductions in the form of video presentations to enable prefrish to rank their preferences before they arrive on campus?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	74.20%	302
2	12.78%	52
3	7.13%	29
4	2.21%	9
5 (Strongly Like)	2.46%	10

Explain:
Results printed below

What are your opinions of the proposed Advisory Committee on Residential Life running Rotation?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	59.46%	242
2	17.44%	71
3	14.99%	61
4	2.46%	10
5 (Strongly Like)	2.21%	9

Explain:
Results printed below

During your time as a prefrish, what were your overall opinions of Rotation?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	4.42%	18
2	6.63%	27
3	7.37%	30
4	35.14%	143
5 (Strongly Like)	45.70%	186

Explain:
Results printed below

What are your overall opinions of Rotation as an Upperclassman (if applicable)?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	7.62%	31
2	4.42%	18

3	15.72%	64
4	27.27%	111
5 (Strongly Like)	25.55%	104

Explain:
Results printed below

What are your overall opinions of the proposed changes to Rotation?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	66.09%	269
2	19.41%	79
3	3.44%	14
4	4.91%	20
5 (Strongly Like)	4.42%	18

Explain:
Results printed below

General Bechtel Questions

What are your opinions of an undergraduate four-year requirement to live on campus?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	70.76%	288
2	16.95%	69
3	8.35%	34
4	1.47%	6
5 (Strongly Like)	1.72%	7

Explain:
Results printed below

What are your opinions of the proposed new Advisory Committee on Residential Life (with student, faculty, and staff representatives)?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	28.01%	114
2	20.88%	85
3	38.33%	156
4	4.42%	18
5 (Strongly Like)	2.21%	9

Explain:
Results printed below

What are your opinions on the proposed Advisory Committee on Residential Life advising over house room pick procedures?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	53.07%	216
2	20.39%	83
3	18.18%	74
4	3.69%	15
5 (Strongly Like)	1.97%	8

Explain:

Results printed below

Which of the following do you agree with for how students should be selected for this committee?

Appointed by administration	4.67%	19
Appointed by IHC	46.44%	189
Appointed by ASCIT	30.96%	126
Elected by houses	84.77%	345
Elected by the student body at large	58.72%	239
Nominated by students and appointed by administration	19.90%	81
Other	3.19%	13

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of the expansion of the Faculty-in-Residence program?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	18.18%	74
2	14.74%	60
3	37.59%	153
4	15.72%	64
5 (Strongly Like)	6.88%	28

Explain:

Results printed below

What are your opinions of the current proposal to re-examine board?

1 (Strongly Dislike)	13.51%	55
2	12.78%	52
3	31.45%	128
4	18.67%	76
5 (Strongly Like)	17.20%	70

Explain:

Results printed below

Do you have any additional thoughts on how you want to be represented?

Results printed below

Demographic Information

What is your year?

Freshman	25.55%	104
Sophomore	23.83%	97
Junior	25.55%	104
Senior	23.10%	94

Supersenior	1.72%	7
-------------	-------	---

What is your house affiliation(s)?

Unaffiliated	2.21%	9
Avery	15.23%	62
Blacker	16.22%	66
Dabney	13.76%	56
Fleming	13.76%	56
Lloyd	10.81%	44
Page	16.22%	66
Ruddock	16.22%	66
Ricketts	10.32%	42

Open Ended Questions

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 144 responses

Rules like these added to the miasma that surrounded rotation my year (2016), and me all the more nervous about talking with friends/upperclassmen about what the best options for me would be. Modifying these rules in 2017 seemed to have helped the current freshman class.

I think the Rotation Code and the Four Laws of Rotation make rotation as fair and unbiased as possible. They are definitely essential to the rotation experience, providing all incoming freshmen with roughly the same experience and allowing them to develop their own opinions about each house and the housing system as a whole, rather than letting upperclassmen influence their decision. And from my experience, upperclassmen really do uphold these rules. Students understand the importance of these r

I greatly appreciate Rotation Rules. I ranked my houses based on who I thought I fit into and who I wanted to be most like while I matured in college.

I think they are well respected by the students and keep Rotation fair for all.

I like the Four Laws. It seems a bit much to ask incoming freshmen to try to give a "good representation" of themselves to the House; furthermore, frosh don't know the rotation code(?)

This allows the Prefrosh to form their own opinions on all of the houses, without influence from other Prefrosh or upperclassmen.

I had a good rotation period, and I believe these made that possible.

I think Rotation rules make sense; some people might say that it causes people to not get a complete picture of houses, but I think that it helps maintain civility and objectivity (which I am confident most people honor) while allowing people to see each house for its own merits. See the COUCH surveys for evidence.

The Four Laws of Rotation are essential to allowing prefrosh to create unbiased opinions of the houses by prohibiting upperclassmen from trying to unfairly bias prefrosh towards or away from

any houses and preventing prefrish from trying to game the system by learning/discussing picks strategies.

These rules work well to give prefrish an unbiased chance to experience the housing system.

I don't fully understand the point of this question. I feel it is leading and sets a negative tone for the rest of the survey. Writers of surveys should endeavor to suppress their opinions.

Ruins a major part of house culture

No upperclassman or new student should discuss rating strategies or past or future student picks procedures is maybe the only controversial one.

The others should definitely stay

The secrecy behind the process became irritating, particularly as Rotation week progressed.

I kind of was fine with upperclassmen not telling frosh about their opinions of other houses. I think it gave me a little more freedom to actually seek out what I thought about each house. While I know that this is hard to enforce, I personally did not experience rotation violations other than the one where the prefrish talk about the houses they like. It almost changed the way I rank houses, and I can say that I am happier with my first choice than the house that my rotation friends went to.

They help protect incoming frosh.

The rules help prevent speaking unfairly about other houses and communities you can't speak for.

I really appreciate these rules because they prevent houses from enforcing stereotypes and spreading false info about other houses in order to increase their yield. These rules make rotation fairer and happier, as only positivity is spread.

Although I appreciate students get an unbiased opinion of all the houses, I also feel like we have to hide information from the students that could be vital to their rankings.

They are necessary

It's a part of the experience. Yes, the system may be flawed in some ways, but the proposed changes are definitely NOT the way to fix them. They just take away from the integrity of and the experience that is Caltech's Housing System.

I'm not sure they are perfect but rotation rules (assuming that is what is being refereed to, I have never heard the terms rotation code or four laws of rotation) definitely serve a positive purpose.

I do not feel that upperclassmen should have the right to have input on where freshmen should go. I also don't think it should be a secret process.

Here are the four laws of rotation;

1. Upperclassmen may speak freely and truthfully about their experiences in and opinions of their House(s). Upperclassmen may not discuss stereotypes or rumors of any House except their own.

2. Upperclassmen may not provide special or extraordinary favors or services to new students. This includes alcohol and other drugs.

3. No upperclassman or new student should discuss rating strategies or past or future student picks procedures.

4. Any remaini

I think they allow prefrosh to develop a clear idea of what the houses are independent of stereotypes; they aren't 100% effective, but I think it's a good system.

I think they are a good thing overall: people can get the best first impression of a house by talking to its members. These rules sometimes hurt conversations by encouraging people to be overly cautious

Haven't thought about it enough.

Out of context, they seem iffy, but given the aftermath of rotation, the rules actually worked pretty well.

The current rotation rules are fair and effective, and having been on both sides of the process I see that they work well

I think rotation rules important partially because they ensure the prefrosh are given a fair impression of each house but also so that we can impress upon the prefrosh how seriously we take rotation and our core values such as the honor code.

During rotation, I really appreciated how Rotation Rules meant I could form my own opinions about the houses. As someone who rotated into a "less popular" house, this was very valuable to me. I was able to decide that I liked my house without the negative comments from my peers that started as soon as rotation rules ended.

Rotation is an integral part of Caltech culture. Its rules and customs are precious.

Those are not a thing.

Things we aren't allowed to know about (drinking/drug culture, what other houses' general opinions of another house are, etc) are a HUGE part of life here! I think rotation rules allow

houses to paint inaccurate pictures of themselves and can cause people to self select into houses they don't actually really fit in. I know my ranking would be drastically different now vs how I ranked during rotation (though I am in my first pick and my first pick would still be my first pick).

This works. As far as a system allowing people to select what's best for them in an unbiased way, I guess it's fine.

I fully support the current system of Rotation

People should be able to say what they want during Rotation. Why are Houses trying to cover up their weaknesses and pretending that stereotypes are false?

Rotation rules give prefrosh a chance to learn objectively about the traditions of each house and develop their own understand of the house culture.

The Rotation Code generally prevents prefrosh from trying to adjust their behavior to optimize their chances of getting into a house that they think they like, and thereby presenting a more honest image of themselves, by not making all the mechanics of Rotation obvious to prefrosh.

Currently students are not allowed to discuss their opinions of other houses. However, some houses break this rule and talk negatively about other houses. This makes the students like the rule-breaking house better and penalizes following Rotation Rules.

Rotation rules are unnecessary but I think rotation is.

It seems that most House stereotypes that might be spread without many rotation rules wouldn't much change the opinions of the prefrosh.

Not telling pre-frosh the stereotypes only helps them feel less bad if they end up in the wrong house, and does not actually help them pick the right one.

they seem to have worked well thus far in the Rotation process

They can be restrictive and it's frustrating not to be able to speak our honest opinions of other houses, but they're important for a freshman's fair judgement of all houses.

On one hand I understand the need for the rules of Rotation to not unfairly bias prefrosh towards any given hand. On the other hand this also can potentially force upperclassmen to give incomplete information about what life is like here.

It's the reason why I came here. If this were reformed, I would be inclined to discourage prospective students from this school.

They're removing the Houses say in picking frosh; and allowing far too great a percentage of frosh to not engage with the House system.

I'm annoyed that houses break Rotation rules, but I don't understand why Eco-Rotation was developed in 2010 only to admittedly never be fully implemented. If people didn't feel comfortable taking away on-campus alleys from Page or Ricketts after they lost the Holly or Hazzard County because it was too heavy-handed, why are we now moving to effectively

disband all houses?

I don't think the current system has a problem in this area.

I think, that when everyone adheres to these rules, freshman are able to get an unbiased opinion of the houses based on their interactions and experiences alone.

These rules are important to provide an unbiased view of houses to the prefrosh as possible, allowing them to make decisions for themselves.

I believe that the system does a good job not letting other houses

Rotations rules can be difficult but they make sense. I say this as a frosh who has not really interacted extensively with younger prefrosh yet, but I can clearly see their purpose. As a prefrosh, I was allowed to talk with others about my impressions of the Houses (new this year) and there was a certain House that got a pretty bad rap from the prefrosh I interacted with. It started as my least favorite House; when I submitted my rankings it was still in the bottom 3; now it is one of my favorite

My only concern is that if people knew the rules, they would be able to game the system.

Rotation rules for preventing upperclassmen from scaring prefrosh away from certain houses based on stereotypes are necessary.

I think that it is important to have rules about rotation in order for pre-frosh to make educated decisions about houses.

it works

There are certain houses that continuously break the rules, which makes them fairly useless.

I don't know what those things are but I think it's the rules of rotation currently

The Rotation Rules (no talking subjectively about other houses; no alcohol around prefrosh; no favors; etc) I think is an extremely good thing. I have no idea what the "Four Laws of Rotation" are supposed to be.

The current rotation rules work well. The vast majority of students end up really enjoying the house that they are sorted into. Additionally, prefrosh do not know the house cultures well enough before they have spent a larger amount of time at the university to make an informed decision about where to live, which is where rotation comes in. Students are also allowed to drop or apply for new house memberships after rotation. The laws of rotation prevent upperclassmen from disparaging other ho

Rotation rules are bullshit. Just because a set of rules is in place doesn't actually stop houses from breaking them. They should just be removed altogether.

It doesn't represent the views of the students, who submitted nothing for rotation changes to maintain rotation as is.

My feelings about this are a bit middling. I understand the reasons behind the Rotation Code,

but I personally dislike some of the rules. It's a system that I think should be revised, but not dismembered.

I don't see what it adds to the current set of rules.

These rules help make the process clearer and easier to walk through. It cuts down the sheer level of uncertainty and increases confidence/trust in the system.

The secrecy in how you can talk about houses is weird, but I do believe that it helped me get an honest impression of each house.

I think that current rotation rules are good for the House system. I think it is important to be open-minded about the houses before you have made a decision. I will however point out that the house culture tends to change after rotation. Personally, I think that the gap between the cultures is the bigger issue.

Rotation is fine already.

I think it helps prevent stereotypes of houses from being a factor in a freshman's opinion of houses, and helps keep things factual rather than permitting rumors to fly.

Even though students can currently go through rotation at the Houses, we cannot get a clear idea of the negatives of each House environment. Rotation rules encourage each House to portray themselves in the most positive light possible, which can sometimes hinder honest conversation. This does a dis-service to both the Houses and incoming students.

I like the idea of having a clear set of guidelines, but I don't like the restrictions on free speech

Rotation rules are in place so that the incoming frosh can get an unbiased perspective of each house and form their own opinions on the houses

I think that when Rotation rules are very effective when they are actually followed. They allow prefrosh to make decisions about the Houses without being influenced by upperclassmen. Thus, I think that strictly enforcing Rotation rules is a really good idea (which I think has already been implemented this year). Rotation rules should also be enforced with the prefrosh--this may be harder to do, but I think it would be very beneficial.

I don't really care

I feel like rotation rules evens the playing field and gives all of the houses an equal opportunity for frosh to figure out which house is the best fit for them.

I believe it is ultimately necessary to have a set of governing laws that keep order to the House selection process. However, I believe there is a point in amending the rules when/if the general student body disagrees with them.

The way this experience is depicted in the plan is misleading. The frosh are not being taken advance of and the house's consideration of each frosh is more to prevent people currently in the house living next to random people they might be uncomfortable with than to find "favorites" or treat it like a meat market.

They work better than could be reasonably expected.

It's successful in helping frosh gain an unbiased opinion of the houses.

I think that rotation is the best way to help students find not only the right house for students but also the place we can call a home. I felt comfortable and protected during rotation both as a prefrosh (incoming freshman) and on the other side as a sophomore.

Rotation rules help people get to know the actual environment of the houses better than rumors would.

While Rotation function as a process to accept house input into new members, it can at times devolve into gossip and displays of a mob mentality style meanness towards prefrosh.

I have no idea what this particular question is referencing and nobody in the room knew either

They prevent freshmen from judging a house by its stereotypes and let the students experience the house as it is. Rotation rules keep students from judging a book by its cover. Without rotation rules, many students won't even try to interact with a house before deciding they love or hate it, and if they make a decision about where they want to live before they've interacted with the house they've decided on, they're more likely to regret their decision later.

They're unenforceable and only stop the good guys.

It sets Caltech apart from other schools.

The Rotation Code and the Four Laws of Rotation were put in place to ensure that no prefrosh forms false notions about the houses and increase the effectiveness of Rotation. While there are some aspects that could be tweaked (allowing prefrosh to openly discuss their opinions with other prefrosh was never a good idea), these rules at their core are for the good of the prefrosh. They enable an incoming freshman to clearly see their options and decide which environment they want to belong to for t

I think that the current rotation rules are actually damaging - since students can't talk about houses that they aren't members of, houses can put forward whatever "face" they want during rotation without being kept truthful by outside assessment. This is especially true in the case of drug and alcohol culture in each of the houses, which prefrosh cannot truly see during rotation because the events are all dry, and people do lie to get frosh they want into their houses.

I am confused by what this question is asking. If it is referring to the current rotation rules I am in favor of them. My house is actively hurt by other people violating rotation rules and talking about houses beyond their own experience.

If not, the Betchdel plan is sufficiently vague that I cannot possibly have an informed opinion

In my time here at Caltech, I have never once heard them Rotation Rules be called these names. However, I believe that these rules have been put into place to avoid hurting peoples feelings as well as to smoothen out the Rotation process.

I value not biasing prefrosh

I think the current system of rotation is quite effective, but that some aspects are unnecessary. I wonder if rotation could work well without rotation rules or other forms of secrecy.

Overall the rules are important for prefrosh to be able to meet new people without bias and to feel safe during their first weeks on campus.

Do you mean Rotation Rules? Those seem pretty good, although I think people act like they are always followed even though they probably aren't (e.g., my house always gets criticized for attracting too few frosh even though no one has attempted to quantify how many of them were scared away by bad rumors as opposed to the house itself).

Rotation rules give every house a fair chance to attract the frosh that would fit them best.

I don't think rotation rules help prefrosh decide. They just shroud the whole process in secrecy.

Rotation is not representative of all aspects of a house, so it is important we regulate rumors during rotation.

Prefrosh gossip about the houses behind the back of the upperclassmen, and the upperclassmen are so preoccupied with rotation rules that they can't really defend themselves.

The Rotation Code basically says to be nice to frosh and not spoil anything for them. I support it.

I think that at times, rotation rules can get in the way of a student hearing unbiased, but sometimes unpleasant things about a house that may be somewhat subjective.

I thought the idea that the rotation code helped ensure fair results.

I believe that they are important to rotation as it is. However, I also believe that there are inherent problems with the rating of incoming students by current ones.

The Rotation rules are a fantastic idea in principle, but difficult to enforce in practice. All Houses play the game according to the rules that best suit them, including strategically breaking Rotation rules or falsely reporting other houses for such violations. Even if a person is censured for breaking rotation rules, this does not take back what they said or did to a prefrosh to bias them to or for some house (and often the prefrosh wouldn't know if an upperclassman did in fact violate rotat

I don't pay attention to house stuff anymore, so I don't really know what this is.

People should know more about the houses they're rotating into.

I think the problems the plan identifies with Rotation and the House system are real, and the plan to fix them is reasonable.

The idea of unbiasing students before they can meet the upperclassment is a good idea. Some houses follow the Rotation Code and other houses don't, which I think is very unfair to the houses that do follow it.

When people can't talk freely about their experiences in the houses, incoming prefrish don't get a good idea of what each house is like, because part of the house culture is how other houses view each other.

They can be vague sometimes, but these types of rules may be necessary as a reminder to only share your personal opinion and to recognize that your opinion is subjective, as well as to keep people from discouraging frosh from other houses.

The rules as they stand need work but are better than nothing.

Rotation rules can be annoying and hard to follow at times, but I think they're the least flawed way to keep Rotation as fair and unbiased a process as possible. Maybe these should be tweaked, but I don't think an argument about the specifics of Rotation Rules should be the central concern right now; Rotation even happening at all takes precedence. Perhaps we could agree with admin to change these rules as a compromise for keeping Rotation in place.

Allows prefrish to better interact with houses in an unbiased manner

I acknowledge that rotation as it is right now is not perfect, but it is damn near it, and I love it the way it is. Changing it would ruin Caltech.

Rotation is vital to house culture and rotation as an event is an exciting with clearly laid out rules to optimize fairness to everyone. I believe there may be flaws, but I strongly like the process in terms of its ability to sort students successfully.

This is part of what separates us from Greek life rushing.

The Rotation Rules, and even the presence of these rules that can get you in trouble, encourages people to stay quiet and therefore not totally honest about their house. It encourages an atmosphere of secrecy, which in all honesty, is actually taking advantage of the freshmen. They don't know they're being judged, and once they find out, it's honestly a feeling of being violated.

These rules allow prefrish to get a decent view of the house system.

Joe confused me a bit with his phrasing here; not exactly sure I ever heard these terms, but I think rotation works only if the rotation rules are followed.

A large part of why I came to Caltech is the house system. It's so unique to this school and I think that the way this school is fun academically is so unique and rigorous that it requires such a different social system. My house is my family and this really works because every house has its own way of having fun and relating to each other. There is no way to ensure this type of camaraderie through applications before people even meet with the people in each house. I always said during Rotation

this seems to help prefrish get unbiased opinions, but maybe at the cost of missing relevant information

The rules allow for fair play among the houses.

It's much better for rotation to be openly discussed than veiled in mystery.

Rotation rules shield students from seeing the true nature of houses, which is often revealed to them shortly after rotation ends or through experience later. Instead, frosh get most of their information from other frosh and from rumors. However despite of this I feel myself and people I'm friends with are happy with the house they rotated into.

I am somewhat confused by what those specific rules are but in general I believe the rules for rotation are good. Care has been taken in recent years to ensure as honest a process as possible while preventing houses from being negative.

I have strong opinions against certain aspects of strict rotation rules. For instance, most of the houses put on elaborate shows for prefrosh that do not represent day-to-day life in the house. While I am thankful that no one is allowed to openly slander another house, I think there needs to be a clause that pushes for more truthful representation of house life during rotation. A solution, in my mind, would be to give a week of extravagant rotation activities, and a normal week of dinners (chose

The way that this final decision has phrased these two things, they sound highly negative. I don't believe that if rotation and picks became governed by the administration, they should actually change these rules. Take for example the Rotation Code, which is essentially letting the prefrosh make their own decision. The Four Laws of Rotation that they mention also are used to make sure that no egregious behaviors are undertaken by upperclassmen to affect the prefrosh decision. I don't know how

They work well, keep Caltech interesting and alluring to prefrosh, and serve to get the students in the right houses for the most part.

Also helps protect refrosh.

Rotation rules are important because it ensures that students see each house for themselves. House cultures are very intricate and even two weeks is a short period to get to know each one. If rotation rules did not exist, the fact that an entire house's culture could be overlooked due to stereotyping, misinformation, and/or allowing the discussion of other houses in any way is incredibly sad.

I like these rules because it doesn't allow someone who doesn't know the house because they're not a part of it and don't live in it to influence the opinions of prefrosh. However, I do recognize that it doesn't allow other upperclassmen to talk to prefrosh about their experiences with a house, something that might not get talked about by the house to the prefrosh, which is why I do not strongly like it.

Hello! Today there will be backlash from the undergrads against the decision, no doubt. Houses and groups are organizing different events (Page's fuck-joe-shepard party, Blacker's Office Hours sit-in, Caltech Confessions and the meme page is being itself, etc.). I fear any event well-intentioned or not, or any meme funny or not may damage any prospects of reversing a decision due to rash behavior and hot-headed emotions.

I hear the IHC is fractured and divided on certain issues. Whether thi

Yeah I get the rules are in place as to not bias anyone towards picking any particular house. But chances are the pre-frosh is already biased towards particular houses that have traits he/she has anyways. Being more straight up about what your house is about seems more rational to me. No need to try so hard to figure out what any particular house is about, which may lead to some misconceptions and ultimately the pre-frosh choosing and ending up in a bad fit.

The fourth law shouldn't really count as a law.

I see no good reason that students shouldn't be allowed to talk about other houses; it's important to get those perspectives which you might not get otherwise. I definitely had false perceptions of certain houses due to the rotation rules.

Just like the honor code, it's a set of rules set in place to keep the balance and keep everything fair. Yes, some people skirt them, but that's only hurting themselves. In my experience as an upperclassmen majority of people take them very serious and it has a huge impact on rotation and making sure everyone ends up where they should be.

I believe there should be standards to guide rotation fairly, and that rotation should continue basically in its current form, but that Rotation Rules could be updated to allow for more honesty.

I think that the rotation system and the laws of rotation are what allowed me to choose and love the house I am in, and they've been my support system ever since.

Rotation could be improved, surely. However, removing rotation dissolves the best fabric of this institution.

ends up being counterproductive a lot of the time bc often the house during rotation is less representative of the house normally than upperclassmen opinions of the house

also can be potentially dangerous bc not all houses are safe spaces for all ppl, and it's not necessarily obvious to a lot of prefrosh

I don't know what this is. I like rotation rules though if that's what this means.

It allows houses to fairly represent themselves without giving opinions of others. Without these rules, the competition among houses would create resentment among the student community in order to make their house seem superior over others.

The Rotation formula has been strongly defined and shown to work better than alternatives

I think it helps minimize bias.

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 163 responses

The general feeling of being in the dark about the true nature of rotation - the judgement from upperclassmen, pretensions we were advised to put forth in order to make our choices perfectly clear, etc, made me, as a generally reserved person uncomfortable. In addition, I had no idea of the amount of time and effort I was expected to put into my "first-choice" house so as to rotate into it, even as I attempted to acclimatize to the new environment. This resulted in an ultimately

very poor rota

I think the secrecy around rotation is a necessary evil. While it may create anxiety, it is the best way to allow houses to put their input into which students would best fit into the culture, and the secrecy makes sure incoming students can't game or cheat the system. It also prevents them from knowing who was a factor in choosing them, which may cause even more anxiety in the end.

Trusting current students to play a part in choosing incoming students is essential, as they best know what k

It was definitely a shock to me when I found out that our faces were projected on a board in secret and upperclassmen discussed their interactions with us...fairly creepy honestly.

I understand that Rotation currently is not transparent. This is for the better because the frosh would not appreciate being openly ranked.

I respect that some aspects of Rotation need to stay black-box to keep it as fair and well-mediated as possible.

This is vaguely worded; like, transparency to frosh about how rotation works, or transparency to the House about how picks works? :? Sounds like a good thing either way? But at some point some things just need to get done in a small team.

When you have people judging other people, it's going to hurt everyone in the long run, so it's best to keep the process hidden. However, I do agree that the Prefrosh should have much more of a say in the Rotation process (I'm fine with getting rid of ranking from upperclassmen).

Transparency is always good, especially for something that will determine our next year.

Copying from above. I think Rotation rules make sense; some people might say that it causes people to not get a complete picture of houses, but I think that it helps maintain civility and objectivity (which I am confident most people honor) while allowing people to see each house for its own merits. See the COUCH surveys for evidence.

The most important part of Rotation is that both upperclassmen and the newly rotated frosh are happy with the outcomes. Historically, this has been the case without much transparency as to the inner workings of Rotation, and we should expect that to be the case in the future as well. I think that increasing transparency in Rotation will only increase the prevalence of attempts to game the system to a prefrosh's advantage (e.g. only going to one House's events and not developing any opinions

There should be more transparency not only within the house but across all houses.

For me, the lack of transparency over the exact details of rotation took a lot of pressure off me during the process. I didn't have to get bogged down in the details or try to game the system, and I could enjoy the houses without bias.

Rotation is not transparent and in a vacuum this is obviously a bad thing. Perhaps it is a

necessary evil.

Rotation should be much more transparent than it currently so as to not add more stress to an already overwhelming first week of college for prefrosh.

I understand why Rotation is kept a secret from prefrosh. If the way rotation works was spread to people, people might try to "game" the system by spreading their first choice from the others or what not, regardless of their actual preferences. Oh wait. I think they no longer have the 1 to 20 rankings. It's really interesting how you learn more and more about the process as you grow older. Also, it would be a little sad for prefrosh to think that people in the house don't like them.

I don't see the need to make rotation any more transparent. The system works. Everyone doesn't need to know everything/all the inner workings as long as it works.

I dislike the lack of transparency, but think the task it accomplishes is necessary. If I could change rotation, I would find a way to perform this task in some other way.

Frosh may not go through Rotation sincerely and act based on how they think things work instead of presenting themselves honestly to the houses and honestly appraising the houses.

I think the process needs to be kept more secret to prevent pre-frosh from trying to manipulate their way into a house, or from taking personal offence at not getting into a house and blaming it on a few people.

I believe the general rules of Rotation should fully known to all upperclassmen while their exact usage for each year's Rotation (i.e. the decision process for individual students) should only be known by Ex-Comm members. The freshmen should no as little as possible about the process from the upperclassmen's side.

It works for the best of everyone involved and only looks bad to those who are not directly involved (i.e. administration).

Much like many of the topics covered in this survey, whether or not rotation should be more transparent deserves a thorough and public investigation.

Pertaining as to the current status again I believe the current level of transparency is fairly close to ideal.

I dislike how it is currently kept so secret. I think people have a right to know about the system especially if the vast majority of people do rotation

I have mixed feelings on making it more clear to frosh that the houses are trying to figure out who the best fits for their houses would be as well.

Pro: In addition to being more transparent, it tells prefrosh that they should try and engage with the upperclassmen during house dinners and such, instead of goofing off on their phones. While I personally engaged as much as I could during rotation, I know now that isn't the case for everyone.

Con: It can cause prefrosh to misrepresent them

I think the way that the houses choose frosh could be less "smoke and mirrors", but I definitely believe that Houses should still be able to choose their frosh -- A lot of my friends express that if they ended up in their first choice houses, they would've been miserable. I think in some cases, Houses really do understand their culture better than frosh do and can therefore make decisions that benefit both parties.

I don't think rotation should be a totally transparent process to freshman. I think it's well communicated that rotation is about making friends and the process accomplishes that.

I think Prefrosh should know that houses ARE ranking them/whatever equivalent to that system is, but there can be some opacity to avoid people trying to "game the system"

Seems kind of bad to not have transparency?

Out of context, it seems iffy, but given the system of rotation, transparency would be fatal.

People find out how the system works eventually, and the current system has a good amount of transparency.

it would make them uncomfortable.

I think all the prefrosh understand that the upperclassmen must be deciding which prefrosh they think should be in their House and honestly I feel like that is sufficient. Knowing the exact process isn't beneficial so unless someone can come with a better plan that is just as effective, I think the way we've been doing things is just fine.

While I understand that a very secretive atmosphere could come off as bad to someone who is not a part of the process. However, I now appreciate that I was able to go through rotation without worrying about upperclassmen judging me.

I don't think a student should have full control over their house choice. Many times people in the Houses have a better feel for what House is best for an incoming student than the student may have. This is because it is very hard for an incoming student to learn the house culture during rotation, since it's a very short time period.

While I do not completely object to more transparency, I do not believe in a complete overhaul of the rotation process. Transparency can be appended to the process without completely changing it.

I think knowing what would happen behind the scenes as an incoming student would have increased my level of stress.

I believe that part of the fun is a secret process

There has been no transparency. Incoming freshmen should not be subject to a secret ranking procedure where they are being taken advantage of for the sake of protecting upperclassmen, who should be mature enough to deal with occasional discomfort.

After rotating into the house I realized that as a prefrish I would not have made the best fit house decision for me without the houses working behind the scenes. I think transparency is subjective and it's not necessarily beneficial to have prefrish know everything.

If the prefrish knew how much ranking/discussion goes into decisions regarding who to rotate, they would probably be more self-conscious and fail to properly represent themselves to upperclassmen.

If the current system stays it's better to be transparent about it, knowing rankings could cause self-confidence issues.

I would like there to be more transparency about rotation. Sometimes students feel rejected when they don't end up in their first choice House, when often that House did like them, but other houses liked them more or a less popular house liked them.

Rephrase this question. I don't like rotation, but if it has to exist, I'd want the black box garbage that happens well above the heads of people who aren't on house excomms to be revealed to everyone after their freshman year, so they know what exactly they're voting people in to do, and so they have an idea of how they ended up where they are in the first place without all the specific, possibly ugly details.

informing incoming freshmen of the judging process would be unnecessary information and may be overwhelming given other changes, it is better to let experienced students perform that process

I do wish that Rotation could be more transparent.

This question reads somewhat ambiguously so I will answer two ways, one for each way I can read this question.

If this is with regards to Administration's transparency with respect to Rotation then this is not even a question. Students were not made aware about this complete overhaul and tearing-down of Rotation until a few days prior to this document's release and was snuck in in a link on the page linked in the email, 9 pages down. In my opinion this looks like a political tactic which al

The current rules represent a special form of self-governance, a privilege many of us hold dear. The incoming students have a choice in where they want to be, and the current students are able to choose who we want to live with.

I have called for more transparency n the picks process myself, but I am dissappointed that Sheperd exploited that sentiment to destroy rotation completely.

If people know they have to impress us to get into the house, then it'll be even more of a shit show

I don't really care about transparency in Rotation. I fully understood what I was subjecting myself to at the time and had no illusions about what it likely involved. We're smart enough to get in here, anyone should be able to deduce what Rotation effectively involves.

Transparency already exists pretty much. I guess stuff could be talked about a bit more but I don't think the current level of transparency is an issue.

I wasn't aware of the frosh ranking procedures and I believe it could be quite subjective. I could be wrong.

Every experience I have of someone trying to 'game' rotation is a negative one (both for the residents of the house and the person themselves). Less transparent rotation is better because it allows the frosh to be themselves and find who they like, instead of trying to game a system. Secrecy helps with this a lot.

It's about as transparent as it should be.

While some portions of the present Rotation process may be considered as possibly fallacious; that is, there is always the possibility that a student may rotate into a house that they genuinely dislike and in which they may not function well in, I believe that the current system adequately addresses these concerns. While apparent lack of transparency during Rotation (i.e. some houses attempting to represent themselves in a different manner during Rotation than as usual) may contribute to the abo

As a prefrosh, I didn't realize until halfway through Rotation how much the Houses pick you (as opposed to just a sorting out of how to maximize prefrosh getting Houses they ranked highly). When I found this out, my second half of Rotation was stressful because I wanted to be sure the House I wanted would know who I was and would pick me. Only later - when I did get the House I marked first - did I learn that there are meetings daily of all the House members who want to come about the prefrosh,

But again, would want to make sure there is no way the information could be used to unfairly advantage some people.

It would be better if it could be not secret, but I understand there are reasons for making it so.

I think more information could be presented to the pre-frosh about how houses make picks, and the process should be known. The specifics of how each rotation class is selected for each house shouldn't be known, as it would compromise both house's and pre-frosh's ability to select houses/ rotation classes.

if we give too much transparency, prefrosh will try and manipulate the system, which ultimately is worse for them, as they may end up somewhere where they do not fit into the community.

Rotation should not be super transparent.

The placement into houses being behind closed doors is weird but I accept it

I'm not quite sure which polarity this question is worded with.

I currently like the (secretive) picks process, to be clear. It matches well.

Rotation rules allow for transparency in your own house, which you are informed about, and prevent you from talking about houses which you are not a member of, which is again not a bad thing.

None of the changes were expected or were discussed with the students.

I do wish there was more transparency. Again, I understand that there great reasons for this, but Rotation's secretive nature was quite irritating at the time. Not knowing the details of the picks process even as an upperclassman always sounded odd. Regardless, I think the system could be more transparent, but that it is sound as a whole.

In general, transparency is good and unnecessary secrecy is bad. However, hidden mechanisms in the context of Rotation is not secrecy for the goal of secrecy. It is to prevent gaming the system and give everyone a fairer chance to represent themselves and experience different living environments.

I'm not sure what this question really means. I don't think the rotation process I went through was bad.

I would be glad to know more about the rotation process, however I respect the decision of the IHC in making their decision about frosh house placement.

The only notion I agree with is that it should be made a little more clear that we will be explicitly ranking the prefrosh. This can be done in a short 10 minute presentation during Frosh Camp and never mentioned again - because it's awkward to hold conversations with someone if they're thinking about how you'll just rank them because of it.

More transparency would be fine if we didn't rank prefrosh. Ranking prefrosh and having transparency can make people feel pretty bad about where they end up.

Although transparency might lead people to try and game the system, I think that transparency might ease the burden of the stresses of rotating for freshmen. I think the honor code is a prized enough component of Caltech where gaming the system is not as much of a concern.

I think that rotation doesn't need to be such a black box.

Caltech's non transparent current Rotation system is just Greek life masquerading as a more inclusive system.

People should understand and be able to know how they are placed into houses.

It needs to be more transparent

I think some amount of non-transparency is needed so that students can be placed in a house where they truly belong.

I think secrecy is a large part of why rotation works so well for both the prefrosh and the houses.

It depends on what you mean by transparency. As a frosh, i was very clueless about Rotation and thus didn't "do it right" (for example, I did not go to the free dinners for my favorite house because I was absent for two dinners and went to those houses to make up for it). Thus, I think

it would be a good idea to give prefrosh tips on how to make sure they are placed in a house that they like or is right for them.

Caltech markets rotation as a friendly version of sorority/fraternity rush. I find it to be just as judgmental/secretive/isolating as rush.

I think that some level of transparency so that people know what's going on is important, but frosh shouldn't be burdened with knowing what people think of them.

I really think rotation has evolved over time to the point where it was for me. I believe it should stay that way and continue to evolve in the correct direction. I do not think this new transparency where rotation really isn't even rotation anymore is a step in the right direction. I believe it's the wrong direction.

I wholeheartedly believe that it is important to get open, honest opinions about the Houses, rather than having to discern the truth through constantly repeated questions and the subsequent motif responses. Rotation should be a time to get a variety of opinions on the houses from all perspectives, then evaluate those perspectives on the basis of your own.

I believe it should be transparent, however this is not that way. I, as a frosh, understood what was going on. It made sense to me. Everyone should be able to have that feeling.

Any lack of transparency is for the good of the incoming freshmen. The only reason anyone might find it to be a problem is if the other rules of rotation are not abided by. Furthermore, finding out that a house did not accept you is not generally an experience that causes lifelong trauma.

While it's probably true that making rotation more transparent increases the probability that prefrosh will try to game it, I don't think that that's necessarily a bad thing. As things currently stand, I have no reason to believe that house picks teams aren't trying to game it- and I am categorically opposed to giving some individuals more influence over the process than others.

Once you're a sophomore, the way your house chooses freshmen and how the IHC runs pick a becomes very clear. I've found that when freshmen are anxious about the process, upperclassmen are successful in mitigating that anxiety. There's no need to make rotation more transparent.

I think that rotation has enough transparency to make students feel comfortable, and not too transparent to create chaos.

What is good about people knowing the explicit details about why a group of people did or didn't want them?

This is one of my biggest gripes with Rotation. If the system doesn't hurt those whom it affects, then why keep its results private?

Rotation historically has worked for a vast supermajority of those who have gone through it. I feel like most (not all) large changes to it may have unintended consequences, especially since most other residential systems leave far from everyone happy

I believe the level of transparency regarding rotation is at approximately the right level. As a

prefrosh, I did not feel judged during rotation, and I didn't even know that people in the house other than the presidents had an impact on who was placed where. If I had known, it might have made me interact with the houses differently, and that would not have been a genuine reflection of my character, which would make it hard for both myself and the houses to figure out if I would thrive in the en

In no comparable institution at this school do we so systematically lie to and deceive anyone.

I think they should get rid of rotation rules and be more transparent but keep rotation.

I think rotation right now is at about the right level of transparency.

Strong communities, such as the houses, are built on a principle of kinship/brotherhood. Older generations graduate and make way for newer generations to continue their legacy. In the housing system, this legacy takes form in each house's distinct personality/culture. Of course, measuring a frosh's ability to fit in these cultures is very subjective and depends significantly on the opinions of current house members. This subjectivity can make the process very emotionally charged for both sides

Rotation doesn't need to be a transparent process because letting the prefrosh know we're talking about them behind their back is more stress than needs to be put on them but if we as upperclassmen don't spend time judging where frosh will fit in then they likely won't end up in the correct place so a certain amount of opacity is necessary.

It's incredibly shady. Freshmen don't know that they're being judged, so they can't consent to the process. If I had known what rotation truly involved, I wouldn't have wanted to be put through it.

There is probably a way to make rotation more transparent in a way that does not allow either the houses or the students to take advantage of each other but current students MUST ave consulted in order for this to work

I feel like the current method of having a complete black box is not necessarily beneficial, since it can allow for discrimination or or other undesirable methods. However, there also needs to be a balance. If hypothetically a person's top choice house had ranked them lowly, and that's why they may have gotten into a different house, there could be a lot of hurt feelings, which I feel like the black box avoids.

This idea seems to appeal to administration and has a chance of not completely undoing the process students have had decades to optimize. I can imagine a solution satisfactory to administration that retains house picks but does so in an open way.

I feel like the lack of transparency with how to process of Rotation is done is absolutely necessary in ensuring that it works because if it were completely transparent, that would make it easier for people to cheat the system to get into the house they want.

I think there are some aspects of rotation that should be kept under wraps - eg what is already.

It's unfair to keep the rotation process a secret, especially when upperclassmen are arbitrarily judging freshman.

A lot of rotation is kept secret and honestly I don't particularly care what goes on as long as we can satisfy as many frosh as possible

Some transparency is good, but not enough to impact how prefrosh interact in houses.

(admittedly without knowing much about what is behind the black curtain) I don't really get why it has to be super secret, and I don't think rotation procedures being more visible is a bad thing, but I also don't really have a problem with it

I think that the matching process doesn't need to be so secretive. Even as an upperclassman I have no idea what really goes on during picks and I'm not sure why it's so shrouded in secrecy.

The rotation system should be kept secret from freshman. It is part of tradition and is ingrained in the heart of Caltech as an institute. The freshman should not know how we rank or why we rank in the way we do. This would only cause freshman to try to appeal to the house in ways that may not be themselves.

I don't believe transparency or no transparency will significantly change the results of rotation.

If it appears to be uncomfortable to tell everyone what is said, it is because there is something uncomfortable happening. That being said, one can make an argument for the value of an uncomfortable thing.

Some degree of transparency in rotation is important, but there are good reasons that certain things are kept secret.

Having a better general idea of what goes on behind the scenes during sorting would have been nice, but I would not have liked to know all the details of the ranking system as a prefrosh, as that would have further increased the pressure to impress upperclassmen.

Lack of transparency is necessary for judgment to be applied without having to worry about nancing about the subject

One of the things I've hated both as a frosh and as an upperclassman is the shroud of secrecy that surrounds the entire process. There should be objective methods of allocating prefrosh to houses based on their preferences, rather than the incredibly subjective way in which the system is currently run.

The secrecy around rotation just makes it feel worse for people who don't want to be doing rotation.

I think the frosh know everything they need to.

I'd prefer more transparency with regards to the process, but I can understand the secrecy.

I find this aspect of Rotation as it is currently conducted particularly disturbing. I'm glad that future students will have a more transparent process.

Too many secrets

Upperclassmen need to have a say, and if that say would offend underclassmen, then they

shouldn't hear it. Otherwise, sure, please make rotation transparent.

I have always thought that transparency with respect to rotation is important. It will mean people are less trying to advertise as 'house' per say, and more advertising themselves as potential friends.

It's a black box and there's too much power given to upperclassmen over prefrosh with the idea that the upperclassmen know what's best for someone they've just met. Prefrosh are capable of choosing where they belong if given enough information, and shouldn't need to wonder who did/did not like them during rotation

Although frosh may feel like they are being judged, the truth is that each house wants the best for it and its frosh. Sometimes that means recognizing that a frosh is not a good fit for a house and would not be happy there; the upperclassmen know the house personality better having been there for years than the frosh does having been there for a week. Frosh are always welcome to interact and become members of any house, but having a good placement initially improves their college experience.

I think the current level of transparency is good, it lets prefrosh put their faith in the system and trust that whatever house they end up in wants them. If they are just randomly assigned (or know specifically how they are assigned), and don't get into their first pick, they're just going to feel rejected and feel like they don't like their house and their house doesn't like them.

Accountability is important, yes, but flooding the prefrosh with more information isn't going to help. They already have to process so much information as it is. (In practice, as an upperclassman, I have not seen Rotation abused in my house.)

I concede that there's an issue with a lack of transparency among houses during Rotation; each tries to put itself in its best light, and there's obviously going to be a discrepancy between the a house's projection of itself and its actual culture. That being said, this is a phenomenon that occurs—pretty much to the same degree—for each house, and so I think it sort of cancels itself out, so to speak, to yield no net effect. This is a sort of necessary evil, I think; and even in the ra

A transparent process is inherently unfair

I think the mystery of rotation is nice. I like the way it works, even when it doesn't work out perfectly.

I think the current rotation system would work if it the methods of selecting pre-frosh were transparent. It would be a much easier/and makes more sense to do this, than to do the proposed Shepherd plan.

There are definite flaws with the level of transparency during Rotation, both in terms of what incoming prefrosh see and what current students know about the process. Everyone should be kept informed and given realistic information without ruining the integrity of rotation rules. But this transparency doesn't have to be increased by gutting rotation as a whole or by taking away current student input.

It is difficult to balance transparency against gaming of the system and making some students feel unwanted. There should be oversight from some party to prevent house picks teams from abusing the system.

I trust the IHC to act in accordance with the honor code and to be as transparent as possible without compromising the process.

Transparency during Rotation would be fantastic!

Picks procedure should be public. Actual proceedings should still be private.

More transparency = more stress for incoming students. It's better for rotation to feel like a sorting hat whose mechanisms they don't need to worry about along with all the other adjustments to college life.

It's hard for prefrosh to know what to do to get to know houses if they don't know the exact amount of their input vs house input (ie I thought it was all house input for the most part when I was rotating, so I spent a lot of time at my favorite house, which caused me to not get to know the other houses well.

I think it is a bit of an ugly process how freshman are ranked, so I would probably not want to know

i would like the process to be more known, since it seems like that's doable without making it gameable.

Who cares if rotation is transparent

We need much more transparency.

Rotation is a tradition that perhaps could use some change such as making events voluntary but it should not be removed or replaced. House input is just as important as student input in matching students to houses.

If wish we were not so secretive about how the sorting process works. That being said, it is important that frosh are unable to figure out what the Houses thought of them.

This depends strongly on how you define transparency. I believe that houses should be more honest about who they are on a daily basis, but I don't think that properly addresses the question. I'm going to assume that transparency refers to what happens behind the scenes, within rankings meetings and picks team. While I do think prefrosh have a right to know what rotation means for them and for upperclassmen, I don't think they need to know exactly what goes on behind closed doors. To clarify,

I felt a lot of stress coming into Caltech simply because it was Caltech and I thought that I would have to start off well to end off well. Rotation added a bit of stress for me because I wanted to find a place to fit in, and also because half of the interactions I had were uncomfortable and awkward with at least a handful of people from every house. But I appreciated the nice upperclassmen who came to talk to me!

Impossible not to have some houses give false representations of themselves, wether rotation rules are in place or not. At least the current rules prevent stereo types from spreading.

Do need houses to give input on prefrosh so that the false representations do not end up hurting

the students.

Only way to do this is keep rotation ranking a secret.

I think transparency in the black-box portion of rotation will only lead to gaming of the system and a dishonest approach to rotation and rankings.

Confidentiality is absolutely necessary to maintain the integrity of rotation.

1. The identity of each house is incredibly complex. The reason for rotation's confidentiality is because a house's identity can never be adequately characterized to an outsider. The same applies to the administration and the public -- only those who have actually lived in a house have the knowledge and ability to select prefrosh who would thrive best in a house. Reducing rotation to a series of videos is a horri

I think the current system is not very transparent and it should be

The problem with having knowledge of exactly how the system works is that people will attempt to game the system. For instance, if I really want to be in House A, then I could go to Houses B-E and act poorly, like insulting upperclassmen, and then have my ranking be ABCDEFG. I won't be put in to FG because I ranked it so low, and I won't be put in to Houses BDCE if their upperclassmen have any input at all, so I have to be in A. Although transparency is important, having prefrosh know the exac

Depending on the future rules of rotation, transparency with a fixed set of rules encourages the system to be gamed.

I don't know what this question means. But I appreciate the current way it's implemented; while it would be nice to be fully transparent to everyone on campus, doing so would make honest expression difficult and potentially strongly hurt someone's feelings.

Implementation of a less secretive rotation system could certainly be carried out reasonably. However, an entirely transparent process is either going to be too depersonalized to be as effective a matching system as rotation in its current form, or it will lead to many upset freshmen trying to game the system or getting upset when they don't get into their first choice house and know exactly why.

The system we have for assigning students to houses works, and revealing the internal details might make it harder for upperclassmen to do their task, and makes it easier for incoming students to game the system

I STRONGLY disagree that rotation should be transparent. As a prefrosh, I had NO IDEA what was going on behind the scenes, and this is what led to me being put in the right house. If I would of known that they were watching my every move, i would of been a lot more artificial. This is why I ended up in the right house. Trust upperclassmen. Trust the UG population as a while.

communication makes ppl feel better. there's definitely some stuff that should be kept private with regards to rotation, but how it exists right now can feel very exclusive and alienating.

I think that Rotation can be more clear with pre-frosh what is happening and how decisions are made, and that there may be some oversight into making sure houses aren't being discriminatory. However, I don't think students should know (1) when they were picked and (2) what other houses think of them as that can hurt student morale.

Freshman may not like to hear about what goes on during rotation while they go through it, but the sense of secrecy and rules is necessary for the process to work properly. Rotation works well for the vast majority of students, and is dependent upon some level of secrecy. I believe that all students, once removed from rotation for some time, realize why it is necessary and should be maintained.

Rotation can be more transparent, but it should not be solely dependent on freshman choice—should take upper classman input. Due to the nature of "ranking", it might be good to keep it a "secret" to freshman to make some more comfortable.

The whole thing should be 100% transparent. A process that "cannot be transparent" as I have been told about rotation picks so many times before, is one that is flawed. If you're doing things you wouldn't want people to see, then you just shouldn't be doing them.

It can suck having to talk about people behind their back but it beats having a bland, generic dorm life model

Transparency can be used to demonstrate how well thought out rotation is.

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 176 responses

Rotation and the House System are hallmarks of Caltech and a shared experience that brings each year together and provide a common ground upon which to build relationships. They are also the most effective way I can imagine of attempting to find ready support as a freshman navigates Caltech academics.

I definitely think the Frosh Experience should be opt-in, as it provides them with a chance to opt-out of the house system with Bechtel. However, I am worried that this will prevent them from experiencing all the houses up close and giving them a chance to have an unbiased view on them. From my experience, if I had just stuck with the first house or two that I saw, thinking that I was fine with them, I would never have discovered my top pick. I think that there should be some way of experiencing

I think having an opt in choice to the house system is a good idea, but i also think freshmen should experience rotation to really try and get to know the houses before making an informed decision. I think having the option of not being in a house might take a lot of the pressure to really try and impress upperclassmen off. Also, it makes sure that everyone gets the chance to experience one of the biggest things that makes Caltech unique, which I really value as a student. Basically, i agree wit

I don't think we should get rid of Rotation. I understand that a few people may not want to participate at all in a housing selection based on social interactions. But rotating into a house based on mutual want from both the frosh and the house is a great way for people to develop. I did not get my first choice house, but I quickly realized that the house I rotated into was a much better fit for my personality. I know this because I am currently living in my first choice house

and I do not feel

I understand that not everyone likes / has a good time with Rotation.

Opt-in house system. I would like freshmen to participate in rotation to get to know the houses and meet people, but afterwards choose if they want to live in a house at all.

I think that the house system as it currently stands is very important in social structure. Thus, without the ability to undergo Rotation (visiting all the houses), it is hard to really understand how Caltech works. I believe that there should be an opt-out option available, but we should still highly encourage the Prefrosh to visit and learn about all the houses personally.

Rotation isn't for everyone.

I can understand where this would come from, but prefrosh can already opt out of rotation if necessary, and if not, it might well be good to see what the houses are like, to push the boundaries of the prefrosh's comfort zones to try out a new type of living. But there's also the aspect of choice; if a prefrosh is adamant that they don't want to do it, then perhaps we should let them. I'm kind of neutral on this; both ways seem reasonable.

While I enjoyed Rotation, I can understand that it may make others uncomfortable and it may be too much to handle. I personally think that this alternative is an excellent idea, and should be an option in the future.

I think that it is important to provide a good experience to prefrosh who are not a good fit for the House system, however I believe that those numbers are historically small in large part due to the fact that Caltech is known to have a strong House culture and that that House culture is the thing that sets Caltech apart from peer institutions with similar research profiles and larger sizes.

I think that the housing system is important enough to the Caltech student life that each student be introduced to those houses and have a chance to interact with a variety of frosh and upperclassmen in those environments. While no one should be forced to go through rotation, the process should be accessible even to people who are not interested in living in the houses and there should not have to be a distinct alternative .

Frosh are ill-informed about knowing what is best for them, although this already exists for individuals who choose to reject their assigned houses.

As long as it's opt-in it's the frosh's choice

I do agree there should be an option for freshmen who don't want to go through the whole Rotation process that doesn't involve such a high social cost.

Despite its faults, Rotation was a very valuable experience. Particularly, it allows new students to meet the rest of the student body and learn more about Caltech. Prefrosh should be required to go through some sort of Rotation process unless they specifically opt out for personal reasons.

I like some of the ideas presented here. But I personally think it needs a thorough revision. I like that prefrosh can choose whether or not to be in the housing system, as I can see how it might not work for people. I am a little worried about how the bed/room allocation will work for prefrosh

in regards to the housing situations they prefer.

I disagree with current students in the houses not being able to have a say in who they want to live with.

If it's what a freshman wants then they may as well have the choice, but it'll make it harder to have access to resources and community.

Some people find rotation really stressful, or don't feel like they belong to any of the houses. I think it would be a good idea to let those few people stay in Bechtel over the rotation period and afterwards, but I am sure that the vast majority of the incoming class would opt-in to normal rotation. In fact, most people I have spoken to and a lot of the current pre-frosh have said that one of the main reasons they chose Caltech was the rotation system.

Remain as is (opt for Rotation or not)

I actually have an idea to make the opt-out option of rotation seem more available. Before rotation begins, students decide they want to opt in or opt out. People that choose to opt out will meet with small committees of 3 to 4 people from each house during rotation week and ask questions and get to know the houses directly from members of those houses with no regulation/censorship from administration. This way they get an honest opinion of each house. This way students who want to opt-out still

I, among many of my peers, would just leave if there was no house system.

There is no need to change or offer alternatives to something that already works. I'm not going to take my clean car to the car wash.

There are only a few frosh who would truly be interested/benefit from that; house participation is opt-in. But when they need it, the house provides a support system. Also, many people who are not "into" the system probably see its benefits after experiencing it; from the outside looking in, there is no way to truly understand what the house system does for its undergraduates.

Students who don't like Rotation don't have to participate in any of the activities if they don't want to so it's already essentially opt-in.

Who the hell is gonna organize and plan this?

So long as rotation still exists as the vast majority choice I am ok if some should choose to opt out of it though I would strongly encourage them to rotate.

I think allowing people to opt out of experiencing the Rotation process is a horrible idea. I think allowing people to opt out of the housing system after experiencing Rotation and getting some of the idea of the houses is a very good idea. Unfortunately I can't select two things.

I mostly like it, provided that freshman aren't forced to choose it before going through rotation, and can later change to get house social membership even if at the end of rotation they elect

not to join a House

I think that Rotation isn't suited for everyone - but Rotation should still exist! Just because some people don't enjoy the House System doesn't mean it's not a valuable system that contributes to the uniqueness of Caltech culture.

I don't think this will be widely used. For the people who move to Marks Braun or off campus freshman year, a formalized system could be useful.

Rotation isn't for everyone. I think everyone who likes rotation should be ensured a spot in a House and everyone who doesn't should be ensured a spot elsewhere.

Seems like without details the system will be worse than current rotation is.

It should be made known the opting out is entirely fine and not social suicide. No one is going to judge a prefrash who opts out

Rotation, although it may be a lot of work for the students, make the students get to know a lot more people than they would have if the activities were opt in.

Frosh should have another option because we want everyone who doesn't enjoy the houses to be supported, but rotation should be the default and students should have the option of opting out (as they already do). It should just be made clear to frosh that they can opt out at any point.

if they dont want to do it they shouldn't have to.

I highly encourage the prefrash to give the House system a chance because I know I would regret it if I hadn't, but I acknowledge that it isn't for everyone so there should be a more mainstream way of opting out.

According to the COUCH data, approximately 5-10% of freshmen are unhappy with their house. I believe that if rotation were opt-in, more freshmen than this would be likely to opt-out. If Bechtel is anything like Marks/Braun in terms of atmosphere, the freshmen who end up there will not be able to access upperclassmen very easily, so they won't be able to get the academic help and advice that's so critical to their success.

I believe that Rotation should be kept as it is, with perhaps very slight modification. However, I respect the idea of an opt-in alternative, if and only if it is IN ADDITION TO rotation, not INSTEAD OF it.

Having a well-publicized option outside of the house system would definitely help those students for whom the house system doesn't work. But I really doubt it will be anywhere close to 56 students per year.

I think it would definitely help. Though rotation is "voluntary", it's not actually a viable option to skip events if you want to get the house you want.

I heard of housing systems before coming to Caltech and did not like them at that time, but after Rotation and living in my house for a while, I realized how much I like it. So I feel that it is highly likely that prefrash may not know housing systems without experiencing them and the voluntary Rotation will result in some students, especially those who are introverted or brought up in

different cultures, live out of houses without actually knowing if they like the housing system or not.

I think that its a good idea but only if students truely cant handle it

As a prefrish, I didn't have a clear appreciation of what being in a house really entailed. It is actually such an influential part of my daily life and mental health. I believe that there is a house for everyone and an invaluable part of the experience here. Prefrsh may opt out without really knowing what they're missing.

While having opt-out experiences may be a good idea, I think that for the vast majority of people Rotation is a positive and important process that facilitates the formation of communities within Caltech. People who opt-out of Rotation may lose social safety nets and chances to interact with people who share their interests.

While freshman should certainly not be made uncomfortable, Rotation allows everyone to get acquainted with the school and students should be strongly encouraged to participate.

Activities can be opt in but there should be some restriction to students deciding on a house early on and opting out of everything after that.

This seems a lot like MIT's system where students can choose to be in a more "normal" dorm or to participate in a sort of rotation, and that seems a really good balance.

Can't really have some frosh go through one thing and some go through another, they need to have the same experience to bond and also not wonder if they made the wrong choice in opting in or out.

seems unnecessary and difficult to maintain given crosstalk between freshmen

There are prefrsh out there who don't want to care about the houses so they should have the choice to not participate.

I understand that some people feel uncomfortable or anxious because of the Rotation process or simply do not want to participate in the house system, so my proposal is that it should be an option for those who wish to take it. That being said, I believe that the entire system should not be tore down. We do not have to take away Rotation from everyone to accommodate those who feel uncomfortable with Rotation, instead we should keep the benefits derived from Rotation and provide options and altern

It creates frosh who identify solely with Bechtel, which will ironically create a House itself. This portion may eventually turn Bechtel into another Avery, which is probably better that joes long term plan

If we don't force people who are less social to be social in the first two weeks of college, they are gonna have a bad 4 years

If it's presented as an alternative rather than supplanting it, we can't really fight that. There are always going to be people that don't easily fit into typical social environments, but this seems like forcing the vast majority to endure mediocrity so that malcontents might be marginally happier. The rights of a minority opinion always need to be respected, and legal concerns can

skew those weightings, but this new approach certainly isn't utilitarian.

It forces you to interact with people and make friends so you aren't alone at a new school. It helps people who would normally be too shy to interact to get the opportunity to meet people. If it were opt-in, many of these people who would benefit the most would probably not opt in because it would seem to be overwhelming.

This essentially turns the houses into fraternities, but if it is the better of two evils then sure. Also, there is no guarantee that the "5%" of students unsatisfied with the outcome of rotation would have chosen NOT to participate. So, it doesn't solve the hurt feelings part that admin seems so concerned with.

I think it'll chip away at the unique Caltech experience and perhaps make the community less tight-knit.

Though opt-in is not a bad system, it can lead to people not having the chance to open up to others.

I feel like it would weaken the bonding freshmen do with the rest of the house system

Gott wuefelt nicht mit dem Universum

- Einstein

What even is that

I do not see any benefit from housing freshmen all by themselves. Upperclassmen are not evil overlords intent on hazing people younger and weaker and more vulnerable than them. That's a pretty extreme way of putting it, but I just want to point out how ridiculous a point it is. Upperclassmen are fellow students who have simply already been through a year or more at Tech. They are there to ask questions to - say, about how to get a SURF, or what classes to sign up for - in a much easier-to-appro

Rotation isn't for everyone and we should recognize that.

A lot of people coming into Caltech have never really come out of their shell. I understand that you never want to force anyone to do anything, but a nudge to get to know people when you get into a new environment can help you form friendships and find a group. I know it can be uncomfortable and tiring, but I think rotation is a good thing.

Depends on how it was done. Making rotation opt-in seems fine, if it were implemented like at the end just check the box if you don't want a house. Making rotation opt-in by encouraging a significant fraction of the prefrish to ignore it completely seems really bad.

Rotation was already explicitly opt-in. Each house made it clear that it was not required, and every event was specified as opt-in. Therefore, I think changing rotation could continue this trend, but rotation should certainly not be phased out entirely.

Fine with it as long as houses still have some say in rotation

I believe that the housing system is an integral part of the Caltech experience, and that it is important for freshmen to at least try to participate in Rotation.

Not my choice but I think people should be able to decide to not be in houses during their frosh years

I think it would be good. I think the significant majority of people should default to rotation, but if after a day or two they aren't liking it, giving them the option to 'quit' and just get assigned somewhere to stay early would be good. To be clear, I think everyone should start with rotation; opting in to a different Freshman Experience should happen only after they've arrived at campus, at least.

There should be no alternative to the house system. The house system is the main reason many undergrads came to Caltech instead of another university; it is also a safety net for students given the level of rigor at Caltech. Rotation is an important part of the House culture, and so getting rid of it would fundamentally hurt the houses in which many of us find family and community.

I didn't understand caltech well enough as a prefrosh to decide my rotation experience for myself, and I don't think others did either.

This does improve some things, but worsens many others. Part of what makes Rotation great is that it allows people to experience each house for themselves so that they can make informed decisions about what house is best for them. People can technically opt out of Rotation now, and I think the best approach is to keep Rotation but make it more flexible. Perhaps we could use the video idea in the document to assign housing spots during Rotation. That way the people that don't want to participate

This will just siphon off participation from Rotation and give the houses even less data to work with.

I'm fine with people opting out of Rotation, but you cannot get an accurate idea of your house without really meeting the people and spending time there. so Freshmen Experience does not seem like it would be very effective.

So long as Rotation is maintained for those who opt-in.

I can understand that rotation could be stressful to some, and that in some ways it's comparable to rushing with frats. Having an alternative makes sense to me.

I don't think many frosh will opt-out. I also don't think there is a high social cost. People barely know each other the first week and I know plenty of people that did not go to Rotation dinners and did not experience a social cost.

Only, like, 5 people should opt out of Rotation per year.

As long as it's opt-in I think it's a great idea, especially as an alternative to the houses people refuse to be in. As a certain minimum cap, I think that's unfair to prefrosh looking for a stronger community in the houses.

I believe that freshman (and others) who do not wish to partake in Rotation and in the house system should be granted this option and allowed to make this choice.

Some students come to Caltech not exclusively because of the housing system, but because it's a world class research institution (particularly students of lower income backgrounds- Caltech has better financial aid than many peer institutions.) I think if freshmen don't care about the house system they should be able to opt out without significantly losing the ability to socialize with people, and I think the opt in freshman experience allows people to do that.

I think having it be opt in would be great.

This provides an acceptable alternative for people who do not want to go through the process of rotation while leaving the current system intact for people who like it.

I'm fine with frosh opting out of rotation, but I'm worried that this would be abused and frosh would be pressured to opt-out

I think if an alternative was presented in a better light (not as an alternative, but rather as one of two options) then more people who complain about rotation would be accommodated

As I understand it, nothing is going to happen to the House system as a whole. I think that a more transparent version of Rotation (i.e., transparent for the prefrosh) would solve the problem. I agree that it can be opt-in if some prefrosh are uncomfortable with the idea of interacting with many people at once, as some people are.

In conclusion, Rotation as a process is fine. What needs to change is how we and the prefrosh behave during it. We also need to have more resources/alternatives avail

I'm really split on this. As a prefrosh, I would have opted out of rotation had there not been such a "high social cost." I have no clue how we could reduce this "social cost," but I do wish that I hadn't had to go through rotation and could have just lived unaffiliated all four years.

I think that it should definitely be an option, but not the most common one. Even people who thought rotation was exhausting often ended up in a house that they love, and though rotation is tough to go through at the time, it ends up being best for everyone.

At this time, I'm neutral to the idea. I can certainly see both the possible benefits and cons to having an alternative experience.

This is just not Caltech. If you want to be unaffiliated, that option has always been there. It would detract from this school to put pressure on more people to be that.

I never felt like I truly fit in in my house, but then again it's nice to be in a house so that you can at least be socialized with a considerable amount of your peers.

Rotation is a miserable, exhausting slog- but that's going to be true of any effective method for meeting lots of people in a short period of time. Trying to ensure that as few people as possible are isolated when they actually need support is worth some unpleasantness at the start of the year.

I think freshmen should be allowed to opt out of rotation as long as those who don't opt out have

the quintessential rotation experience. This opt out function would be especially useful when there are frosh who already have title I can complaint against them, which is a problem we faced this year.

Rotation as a prefrosh was one of the brightest and most cheerful time at Caltech for me. It helped me create a lot of friends in all the houses, which created a diverse network for me. It helped me feel the culture of the houses and make the right decision that positively affects my experience at Caltech up to this day. I do not want any students to miss out on that experience.

Depends on the implementation. I would be in favor of something that preserves the integrity of the houses while taking the pressure off freshmen to impress the houses.

I think rotation is hard, but I think the aftermath of being in a house saved me. I don't think I would have gotten through frosh year without the support of my house.

This is a step to destroy Rotation, and this will lead to a gradual decrease in house personalities.

I am not opposed to this at all; in fact, I think it would be beneficial to the Caltech community and have for a long time.

People may get the wrong idea about how the houses work and assume they are all frat houses. By having Rotation, we can show freshman that everything is opt-in, non-hazing, community-building, and supportive of diversity. If there was an opt-out option, my parents would probably force me to unvoluntarily choose that option because they would not know any better.

It has a few merits, but overall, it is important that freshman have the support network and built-in community that a house provides, because caltech is a stressful environment, and sometimes frosh who aren't prepared for that are blindsided. While it might be possible to create/find a group of upperclassmen who would volunteer to check in on frosh who aren't in their house, the frosh might not be comfortable asking for help. Many students come into caltech thinking they should be able to do

This question has been horribly mangled to not represent what's really happening. Bechtel for frosh isn't an alternative opt in for the house system. It's a part of the system.

Everyone should experience it to meet new people who they otherwise wouldn't meet.

I think it might be good as a option, but also I think some freshman might opt-out with incomplete information. I honestly think everyone should try it out. College is about growing as a person and experiencing new things, and the Houses are extremely integral in personal growth. For example, my housemates and the House culture of openness and acceptance has helped me grow much more confident in myself.

I think a lot of frosh may be nervous and thus not opt in to rotation and regret it. The ability to opt out is enough to allow those who really don't want to rotated to not participate while keeking the default as participating.

You have to do rotation unless you want to be socially outcasted

While I support the idea of allowing frosh to opt-in to the house system, this should happen on campus after they have effectively seen all the houses. The worrisome aspect of this "opt-in Freshmen Experience" is how vague it is. Will each prefrosh still be able to fully know what they are opting out of without having dinner at each house? Some people find that all but one house are poor fits and would be missing out on experiencing the house system if they were to have never seen their house

I strongly believe in personal choice. I think Rotation can be preserved, though, just in an updated, more transparent form. The name doesn't have to be changed, and many of the house events and traditions can remain the same. The process just needs to be made more transparent and consensual.

Given that so many people come to the Caltech for the house system I feel these students would be in a minority. Already there are a few students with special needs that effectively makes them not participate in rotation and maybe having an explicit opt out option would feel more welcoming to them

I believe freshmen should be able to opt-out of rotation if they really need to, otherwise no.

I strongly believe Rotation is the best way for frosh to get to know the houses. From the surveys that COUCH and the IHC have sent out, it seems clear that there is only a small 5-10% who are unhappy about Rotation. For those people, I think that some other opt-in experience could be useful, but I don't think that means Rotation should be completely replaced.

There's no reason we should require freshmen to go through rotation. Bechtel is a good option for freshmen who would prefer to get settled immediately, while rotation can continue for those who want the house system experience.

While I do feel like the process of Rotation can be stressful and is filled with uncomfortable conversations, I feel like it is a necessary learning experience for people. Additionally, if they really dislike Rotation, its only two weeks of being uncomfortable and in the scheme of all four years at this institution, that is really nothing.

Sounds like every helicopter parent's dream

The House system and Rotation are essential to the character of Caltech. As a prefrosh, I probably would have chosen to opt out of Rotation, but now on the other side I am very glad that I did participate in it. It helped me meet new people and get to know the upperclassmen both in my house and in other houses that I otherwise would not have met.

I think freshmen should be given a viable alternative to the house system.

I think as a prefrosh it's hard to truly understand the effect the house is going to have on your life. I would never have guessed how much I would rely on members of my house for support, advice, and the feeling of a family away from home. At the time rotation and the housing system seemed to mostly a way to encourage a social life with house-themed activities to balance out Caltech. But in my 1.5 years here it has become so much more than that. I probably would have opted in to rotation but I

I think the house system encourages a LOT of shy people who didn't think they would be able to find friends (since there was no one like them in high school) to become more socially adjusted

members of society.

People should opt in or out of the house system only after rotation. It should be an option for prefrish on the ranking sheet.

I'm fine with freshmen having another option, though I doubt that many (1/4 of the class) would want to.

The house system is a very good way to develop a social support network very fast. A lot of incoming high schoolers don't realize how valuable that is.

If you haven't been through Rotation, how would you know what you're missing? I do NOT want to see Rotation repainted as some sort of "optional frat rush," it's really not, it's a way to meet tons of current students and chat with them. If the opt-in freshmen experience involves meeting and hanging out with hundreds of students in order to get to know the community, then it would be good, because you can't get that experience at any other time. And if the freshmen experience is like that,

This is an absolutely ridiculous concept. The housing system is an integral part of Caltech, it has been for nearly a century. When students make the choice to come to Caltech, they understand that we have a housing system, and, for a lot of the students, it is one of the reasons that they come here. To make rotation opt-in would mean that it would be very easy for people that find social situations difficult to slip through the cracks, end up in an unaffiliated housing situation and never reall

I think the rotation process makes the Caltech freshman class feel a much stronger sense of community. I really enjoyed the system.

I like a lot of it but cannot get behind the power of the Resident Life Advisory Committee or the intent to have students be placed before arriving on campus.

Personally I do like rotation a lot but I understand if some people would rather not participate in it.

A fully opt-in system would likely result in students only going to the events of a few houses that they think they might like/have heard good things about and not giving any other houses a chance.

Additionally, this makes the barrier to involvement in Rotation for highly introverted prefrish even higher, as such students would be unlikely to willingly opt in to so many social events.

make it opt-out

Without knowing what this alternative is, it's hard to make any judgments.

If I was a freshman, I would 100% choose such an alternative. If you don't feel like you fit in any of the houses, rotation is toxic. Some people need this, why not offer them the option?

Rotation is a necessary evil. Yes it can be awkward and scary as a freshman, but it's an

important part of what makes Caltech special, and very few people dislike it in the long run.

This is one of the most distinctive features of Caltech.

There are plenty of reasons to come to Caltech apart from the house system. While it is a valuable part of the Caltech experience, people should feel comfortable at Caltech without being forced to be a part of the house system in order to have a social life.

I think many students will opt-out their freshmen year and wish they hadn't. We could allow them to participate in rotation a different year.

In the past years, the upperclassmen of the house have been able to successfully and responsibly pick out which Freshmen would fit in which house. As an incoming freshmen, I know I would have been too intimidated to make this decision for myself. It was reassuring knowing that the upperclassmen were aware of what personality fits where. I recall many upperclassmen telling me during rotation that they rotated into a house they didn't put first, but they are beyond grateful now and couldn't imag

Let people who want to be in the houses be in the houses, and don't force people who want to be left alone to socialize. They'll have to figure it out at some point, but you can't make them.

I respect that some activities done by some houses may put frosh in an uncomfortable position and I think that they should have to option to skip these events. However, it is also good for frosh to get out of their comfort zone, since I know I would have skipped some events as a frosh because they intimidated me but I actually found them very enjoyable and met new people through them.

Rotation is what makes Caltech what it is. I would not have come here if it didn't exist, and I think many agree. I'm very strongly against this move. Calling it a euphemistic "Freshman Experience" is ridiculous and insulting to a process that (almost) the entire student body ultimately has faith in.

They should be allowed to opt in to rotation

I think this is a terrible idea. If I wanted a boring and normal school I wouldn't have gone to Caltech.

I think it is a fantastic idea to have another option for students who would prefer to opt out of rotation, and want another option outside of the House system. They should be given clear information about what each option is, how they are different, and not be pressured either way.

As long as there is the support network available for that sort of program

It's intuitive that we have this option.

With the Freshman Experience alternative, students will begin to pseudo-randomly filter into houses because they won't have an accurate perception of what living there will be like, will have no support on student side, and because administration will determine where they live without accurately knowing how well these students fit in a given environment. Over time, this will normalize all the houses and dissolve the house culture as we know it today, and we'll become a system of dorms that hav

I think an opt-out system is more appropriate. The default choice for freshman should be to do rotation, but if there are barriers to doing rotation for a few then they should be able to opt-out.

Opt-in decreases the stigma and stress of opting out.

Gives them choice to not be part of rotation while keeping rotation system which is unique to caltech

This would either greatly stereotype the houses or just be something that gets ignored.

Depends on particulars of implementation. I'm definitely supportive of an opt-out of the house system at the end of rotation, but I know several people who would have opted out if asked before they arrived on campus, but ended up loving the house system.

I think the option should exist (and kind of already does). It should be much more supported than what we currently have, as recommended by the Polaris Plan. Though, I think it would be good for students to also experience rotation before knowing that they want to opt out (as in, not forcing a decision on people, but letting them opt out at any time)

It's just two weeks. You can go to each house for an hour each night for two weeks and be absolutely fine. It's completely worth it in the end, even if it's annoying.

as long as anyone can opt in to normal rotation--i.e. no frosh has to live in Bechtel--this is good. otherwise it's robbing frosh of the incredible community that the houses provide.

Freshmen should not be the only choosers, as then house culture will be random and go to shit

I think rotation is a waste of time to achieve results that are arbitrary and often detrimental to students' well-being.

Rotation is a key part of Caltech and helps make the Houses who they are (as it was often described to me, the Houses are defined by their people not by traditions or appearances etc) so I really hope Rotation is kept as the House System is one of the ways Caltech sets itself apart and one of the reasons I decided to come here over other schools.

I think it is very important that we guard the house system for years to come; however, many students don't care about houses coming in and will not care in the future. My primary worry is that all houses will have a fraternity culture if rotating is not the norm; however, I think it would be mutually beneficial to students who don't want to deal with a House and to Houses that want to maintain a vibrant culture if those who do not care have an alternative.

I agree that there should be an option to opt out of Rotation activities void of stigma. Though I don't agree with allowing to pre-frosh to opt out of the house system altogether, I would also not be vehemently opposed. Where I take issue is the idea that the house system and rotation are such an offense to student life that they must be entirely destroyed. Again, I think that there can be a lot of good discussion on solutions to make pre-frosh feel more welcome when they arrive on campus. For in

Where will the freshmen be placed if they don't even try to meet the people in the dorm they might choose? And if a freshman who has opted out chooses one of the smaller houses, and

there are other freshmen who have participated that chose that house due to their own experiences with the people there, how will those preferences be weighted? It seems to me that if freshmen take the time to learn about the houses and the people that they would live with, they should really have priority, as they

Probably would not have participated as a pre-frosh myself, however I believe the current system helped me grow.

This makes the houses seem too much like greek houses.

Because some students may not be comfortable with the rotation process, e.g. being judged in certain ways, as recognized by the administration, rotation should be or feel mandatory in any way. The availability of freshmen beds in Bechtel means that a large number of freshmen have the freedom to live in neutral rotation-free housing without any social stigma.

If someone doesn't want to be a part of the House system, then they shouldn't have to be and they shouldn't be stigmatized for it. That said, if they want to take advantage of a Houses's events, then they should probably be part of the House in some way.

The housing system provides a sense of community which heavily fosters the collaborative learning environment the Caltech endorses. While marginalized students exist, encouraging an "opt out" experience undermines the ability of freshmen to integrate themselves into the community.

The house system isn't for everyone. Considering it's one of the two things that makes the Caltech undergrad experience unique, ideally most people enjoy it but it's good to have alternatives.

Some people could care less about what the houses are about. Rotation could make some feel awkward and like they don't fit into Caltech. The opposite of all this is also true. And that is why I strongly believe there should be an option given to pre-frosh as to whether or not they want to do Rotation or be immediately placed into Bechtel.

In my experience (both as a freshman and three years as an upperclassman), the house system and rotation play pivotal roles in personal development in individual students.

If freshmen don't want to do rotation they shouldn't have to. I think very few freshmen would choose to opt out.

Freshmen should have a choice in where they live; however, I feel a system which encourages people to try rotation will produce the best outcomes. As someone who has serious social anxiety--if I had been offered an easy "oh no worries you don't actually need to do rotation--you can just live here" option, fair chance I would have taken it. And that would have been a *terrible* decision. The house system is an integral part of the experience here, and opting out of it should not be something t

The whole point of rotation is for students to get a feel of the houses, and for the houses to see how well the students will fit in each house. Making this optional defeats the purpose entirely.

I don't find this the worse option in the world, but I don't think it should be pushed. I agree it should be there, but a lot of people benefit from rotations and being put in a social place of like

mindful people. For example, I know people who would have taken this opportunity just so that they could retreat into their room and never see the light of day, but being rotated into a house gave them the opportunity to have some social interaction and now they are a purely positive influence in the

Rotation is optional already, if Administration wants to sell it emphatically as opt-in it sounds as if they'll misrepresent the Houses as disorderly fraternities (as Shepard does in his plan) and steer the prefrosh away from them.

rotation gives you two weeks. you're not going to learn anything in two weeks.

While I personally love my house and rotation, I think for non-House loving students they may feel pressured to join rotation. Thus, we should try and find a way to not stigmatize it.

Frosh should be allowed to opt out of rotation if they are not comfortable with the setting. Alternatives to rotation are possible, and can be implemented without disrupting the current system.

I came to Caltech despite of the house system, not because of it. Having the option to skip it would be incredible.

Rotation should be opt-out, if anything (which it is). I understand that it can be 'social suicide' to not participate, but not having Rotation altogether would kill any existing social structures at Caltech

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 166 responses

This proposal seems downright unfeasible, since it can lead very easily to a distribution such as 1/5 of the freshman class in a given house and 10 freshman in another.

Prefrosh weekend is almost like a mini-rotation, and so I would expect that there would be biases from them beforehand, just like during rotation. During rotation, freshmen share their experiences with each house with each other and express their biases freely. I would not expect any different from the prefrosh.

This dependency isn't inherently good or bad; it's just there. It's just doing rotation earlier than it would normally be.

I feel Caltech brings in a diverse enough class that there are enough people who rotate into each house as the numbers currently stand. I feel it would be very difficult to coordinate room picks for the next year if the upperclassmen have to wait on the incoming frosh to decide where they want to live (without ever having experienced living there) to know what spaces are available to them the next year.

It's unfortunate that some houses aren't as popular as others, but I think it's up to each house to advertise themselves well. It's inevitable that some houses will be more popular than others, as people have different preferences and house cultures are so diverse.

Sounds physically impossible? Who's going to provide all the rooms in Blacker, for example, or

Fleming?

This makes room picks at the end of the year impossible to do. The logistics of allowing this just doesn't work. Also, this means that there's an inherent popularity of houses and I would rather not encourage this idea - there are benefits and detriments to every house.

Could induce a negative feedback loop. Also have to consider fit, just because everyone thinks it's cool doesn't mean that it's for everyone

In standout years, this would cause one house to have a very small freshman class, or, more likely, one house to have a very large freshman class, which would go against the idea of having inter-class mentorship and input.

I think that there should be a ratio....Houses like Lloyd and Blacker are very popular. Would that mean that they'd be filled with a lot of frosh? That would be disproportionate, as there would be less upperclassmen as a result. I personally think the best part of the house system is how easy it is to interact with upperclassmen, so I think this popularity would totally destroy this ideal.

A proportional system would simply not work as it is the case that some of the most popular houses are oversubscribed in terms of the number of prefrosh who rank them highly. Houses cannot and should not be overfilled with prefrosh simply because they are popular; the prefrosh who rank these oversubscribed houses highly (first for example), but are not selected to rotate into these houses must go somewhere.

More people living somewhere simply based off the fact that they think it's cool can be detrimental to the houses. If the number of prefrosh increased, some people already living in those houses may be pushed out or have to live with people who make them uncomfortable.

This will kill Houses.

For the next few years while changes are being phased in it may be difficult for the houses that are "less wanted". But after that, it makes complete sense

I don't think disproportionate amounts of frosh would help houses with acclimating students to Caltech. Also, it would be very difficult to portion rooms ahead of time for a variable number of frosh, and I don't see how this implementation would be better.

If a house culture is so unattractive that it has difficulty attracting prefrosh, then it should make changes accordingly so that it is able to fill all the beds in the house.

I have mixed feelings. Again, I am a little concerned working out bed/room allocations for people who might overwhelmingly prefer one house over another. I DEFINITELY DO NOT WANT a lottery system. I have friends who picked my house first and probably seem happier at the house they ended up in. I really don't understand how housing is going to sort through and place prefrosh into houses, especially if they don't know much about house culture. I definitely could not fit in some houses, and even

A lot of people don't like their house until a few weeks in and the impressions people get of houses during rotation are usually not accurate.

This would kill some houses when houses cannot fully portray their diversity of culture in the

span of Rotation. Also, attracting prefrosh could turn more into a popularity contest instead of an honest portrayal of each house.

I think each house should have a small range of frosh (e.g. 28-32) they can take in, otherwise if a house does 'badly' during rotation one year, their house may end up becoming smaller and smaller in size until it doesn't exist.

This makes no sense to me because what if there are 30 frosh in one house and 3 in another? We need some type of equal distribution that we can enforce.

The opinion of those already part of the house should be weighed no less heavily than that of incoming Prefrosh

Every house has something to offer, and has a culture & tradition that should endure; leaving it dependent on popularity opens up a whole slew of unfavorable possibilities (i.e. having a house "die out," or having too many people choose one house & not have enough room for people to experience living in the house, etc.)

This is mostly a bad idea. House culture is based on a sense of community. Many freshmen base their choices on what their idealized impression of college is like (hence why certain houses' free dinners draw a lot of prefrosh who would otherwise feel uncomfortable in the house environment). In other words, allowing everyone into their first choice house regardless of fit would

I believe that in the long term the house system might be better served by freshmen being evenly distributed as a continuing cycle that selects for those with the most extreme personalities to some houses would only make them more extreme while inducting large numbers students into houses that are less so will harmfully dilute that house's culture away.

I am honestly just not a fan of house culture so I'm not sure.

Dislike. Aside from the obvious logistical issues (and possibility of House radicalization from fewer members), pinning a House's survival to the prefrosh's rankings **STRONGLY** encourages them to lie about House culture (differently, to different frosh) during actual rotation to a tremendous degree. That invalidates prefrosh rankings, who will then be bitterly upset.

I think the current system does a good job of balancing encouraging houses to adjust their culture if it's going very badly (

I think it should be balanced, but not necessarily forced to be a certain number.

It seems like a necessary condition to maximize utility.

Popularity \neq quality experience.

Multiple houses are similar enough to one another that explaining the house through a video or some form of media other than direct experience will not suffice to distinguish between them. Also, during the school year, House personalities differ enough that letting prefrosh pick houses based on insufficient information will lead to prefrosh rotating into houses they would not have

rotated into given the current system, thereby causing yet more complaints about residential life.

My impression of Rotation is that number of Freshmen going into each House is not solely dependent on its popularity. It also depends on the preferences of the Houses. Rotation is not a popularity contest, because each house is unique and students are unique. The number of students correspond to the number of good fits. Sometimes the fit is not optimal when some houses run out of space, but students are put somewhere close to their top choices if possible. Letting the admin do this selection would

The number of members in a house needs to be proportional to its physical size. Making certain houses too big isn't fair to the other members of the house who will be less likely to be able to live there in the future. Also, it would be very difficult logistically to assign rooms without knowing how many frosh would be living there.

frosh shouldn't get put in houses they don't like.

My house is not very popular with prefrosh, but is very popular with upperclassmen. This is evident by the fact that our senior class has gained 10 members over the years. I believe, and know that many other believe, that our community is vital to its members, especially for the support it offers to the LGBTQ+ population, so I think it's a very important community to feed even if it is not always popular among the prefrosh.

This would make figuring out housing for upperclassmen a mess.

Despite the existence of rotation rules, biased opinions of the houses circulate among the prefrosh. Speaking from experience, prefrosh perceptions of houses can be skewed by sources other than the houses themselves. To base the number of rotating Freshmen on the popularity of the house immediately ensures the failure of houses viewed as generally less popular. This lack of popularity is not necessarily a result of the house itself having some glaring flaw but may simply be predicated on stereot

It could cause serious logistical problems if one house is wildly popular or unpopular. On the other hand, putting students in a house they didn't like much could cause other problems.

If prefrosh don't like a house, that is the house's fault

Prefrosh do not fully appreciate the significance of living in a house and even more so do not fully understand the culture and traditions of the houses. Their initial impressions may be inaccurate. Without input and selection from the upperclassmen, less compatible people may join a house, only to be unhappy later. I believe this kind of less informed sorting will cause the houses to lose their character over time.

In some ways this is a good idea, but if a house isn't popular for several years in a row then it won't fill its rooms.

That wouldn't work without kicking a lot of upperclassmen out of more popular houses and forcing them back into the less popular ones.

Difficult considering the number of bed spaces left for frosh is decided well in advance of them actually coming here.

could lead to detrimental positive feedback loops; perceptions of houses sometimes change as the year goes on

A lot of freshmen, myself included, don't even understand what the houses are like, so I didn't know I liked my house until I actually lived there and learned more about it from being more actively involved. My house certainly is very unpopular with prefrosh but I believe it is a house that prefrosh would like if they got the opportunity to be part of it.

No. A house can only survive

Should be the same regardless of popularity

Isn't this Eco-Rotation...?

Where alleys are lost both as punishment and as a practical reflection of the number of people who want to live in that house...?

It helps to be put with a group of people to hang out with initially even if you aren't great friends with them, just so you aren't alone. It also wouldn't be feasible to have the number of people in a house in a given year fluctuate so much because of how events and things are organized now.

Would throw a massive wrench into the room picks process, since upperclassman picks are made before freshman arrive (freshman rooms pre-allocated).

The prefrosh share their own opinions about the houses amongst themselves, which sort of gives rise to an 'orthodox' point of view. This creates peer pressure for getting into X house to stay with the same group of friends or avoid social deviation from these group of friends.

This is a terrible idea, because it helps reinforce house stereotypes and superficial 'culture' instead of building secure communities that are based on the solid bedrock of friendship and camaraderie.

It might also skew the house populations and make less popular houses suffer, despite there being many people who would want to change affiliations once getting to know the house a bit better.

I feel like the imbalance of the Prefrosh's opinion would be detrimental to the house system.

This is likely to lead to blatant imbalances in House populations, ceteris paribus.

This might lead to the elimination of certain houses.

The houses are not equally popular among prefrosh

One of my Rotation friends wanted to get into one House and got placed in a different House. Literally less than 24 hours later - moving day - she expressed to me how happy she was to be the House she was placed - Rotation picks knew her better than she knew herself. As a prefrosh, it felt like there was one House that everyone I talked to wanted to be in. It is completely unrealistic to put everyone in that House - both from a logistical perspective and

from an "is this actually the House wher

Some houses don't have a popular culture, and it doesn't make sense for us to force freshman into it because we want a house to survive.

I mean, it makes sense. What is the alternative, putting frosh in houses they don't like as much?

I joined a house I wanted to be in as a prefrosh, which was popular with prefrosh, after rotation. I realized the house I rotated into was actually better.

Having number of frosh dependent on popularity also could incentivize upperclassmen to scare frosh away if they want more beds in the house for themselves, though depending on Bechtel this could be less of a problem.

I think that this would present problems, making some houses disproportionately filled with freshmen, and others have very few freshmen.

The house changes you and you change the frosh. If you don't like the house, change it in your image.

Some houses lie in rotation so they'd just get a lot of frosh

I think a small amount of variation (+/- 5% maybe?) is okay, but it should be small.

As a prefrosh you do not have a true idea of what the houses are like; you can't until you have experienced them for more than a week and once the term picks up. I personally grew into my house and I am glad that I rotated into it. Popularity with the prefrosh is fleeting because they do not have a real idea of what the houses are like, and they can change houses after rotation if they really need to, though the proportion of students that do that is small.

I don't think this happens at all. Some houses are more popular on some years, and I didn't notice any of my fellow prefrosh deciding their house based on popularity.

There's not much that can be done with this as each house has a quota that needs to be filled. The new system does nothing to address this change other than recommending committee action, which is something that needs to be done anyway and is ancillary to Rotation.

There's no way that many people could live in Blacker...

Also this is not a sustainable model.

We grow a hell of a lot in our four years here. Some places that initially off-put us fresh out of high school can be the best places to let us develop, grow, expand as human beings. Making things a sheer popularity contest (and then also hurting the feelings of those who end up with a less popular and emptier house) could lead to some harsh consequences.

I understand that living space needs to be a consideration, but clearly placing pre-frosh where they want to be is optimal.

I think that if it helps the house maintain people that are more interested in the house, it will be a good change.

I fear that some houses may become more vacant. It also seems to imply that the current house members will lose their ability to identify student that they think fit the house very well.

Some leeway should be allowed with incoming frosh sizes, but this would require upperclassmen to move from a house into Bechtel after rotation, and that's cancerous.

The houses have limited capacity, so this can't happen--I don't think anyone's suggesting hat this happens.

I am concerned about houses that have struggled to represent themselves in a manner that is broadly appealing even though most of their members come to love their house. Some houses are far better at presenting themselves in a way that is widely well liked or at least neutral. I believe that even though the appeal of these struggling houses is more niche, they are also necessary to provide safe and supportive communities for the people who need such houses the most.

I think this could have some problematic implications for houses that become more popular after rotation.

I imagine that physical limitations prevent this from occurring, but disregarding that, some of the Houses could diminish over time, and the unique culture of each House would be diluted if there are too many people.

I see this being self perpetuating, with popular houses growing more and more popular, and I worry about its impact on South Houses which have more polarizing cultures than the North houses. Still, I think being sorted into a house with a more extreme culture when it's not something you want can be extremely detrimental by placing a lot of pressure on the student to fit in in ways that can be unhealthy (like participating in risky house activities that they may not have otherwise).

Total trash. Also sounds like a logistical nightmare with regards to upperclassmen room picks.

Prefrosh are not always given the correct impression of houses, and some houses, which are the only places a that some students would fit in, are less popular because they are not "normal" enough

Houses should not be punished by not having many frosh due to being unpopular during rotation.

We would have no way of ensuring beds for upperclassmen if this were the case. This would never work because the popularity of a house in a given year is very unpredictable.

it needs to be more balanced than this

If this happened that house culture would probably die within 2 years.

There are a number of problems with this approach: (1) Rotation becomes a competition in which Houses need to be actively appealing (perhaps not with their own culture) to prefrosh just to balance the distribution of where they'll end up, (2) The Houses that successfully appeal will likely end up with more students than they can support, and (3) As alluded to in (1), the Houses

may have to forsake their culture in order to popularize the House to a general body of prefrosh.

Frosh going into houses should be evenly distributed, as this creates better communities.

This seems reasonable to a point- but ~26 students is already a large enough group that community formation is difficult. Increasing the size of a frosh class by too much might end up creating a large group of people totally disconnected from the house they're nominally a part of.

This will disproportionately effect houses which are older with more distinct personalities. Many people don't like those houses immediately when they're actually a great fit for the house. Many south housers express that they might not have chosen their house within a week of freshmen year, but that their house helped them grow and became a great fit in the long run.

As someone who was once a prefrosh, the first few weeks of school (or online introductions) do not tell you enough about what it's like to live in a place.

All freshman should be able to live in the house if they want to. Living in the house as a freshman is crucial to meeting upper classmen and feeling like you belong to a community. If Freshmen go into any house and there is not enough room, some won't be able to live in the house and thus feel left out.

If this option is implemented, and some House has an absolutely terrible year popularity-wise, then first of all, how will the House have enough frosh to fill all of the beds, and second of all, the frosh will realize how few frosh are in that House compared to the other ones, and feel bad about being in an unpopular House.

Be careful about destroying a long term culture due to one or two bad years.

This is good... to a point. Forcing prefrosh into a house where they don't fit and are roundly disliked, though, just because they liked the house and said house was popular, could be the end result of this.

This may lead to houses giving a dishonest outward appearance to prefrosh in order to be more popular.

Over time this will have to happen. We can't keep forcing people in.

Avery consistently is the most popular with Prefrosh - which most likely means that Avery and Bechtel would be the most popular with them. Prefrosh are nerdy and quiet - Avery is the safe option. It allows them to study as much as possible. Their identity in high school almost solely rested upon being called "smart." Because not everyone can end up in Avery, they end up in other houses - and end up loving it. Because they are no longer the "smart" one, the house system provides them with an

People should not be forced to be apart of a house they don't like. However, all students have a place in one of the houses.

The rankings are skewed enough that certain houses will wind up with 80 frosh if the frosh get control.

I think Frosh should be able to simply leave certain houses out of their rankings. It would

eliminate pairings in which Frosh are completely unsatisfied with Rotation and if none of the houses that they ranked want the prefrosh in their community, said prefrosh can just live in Bechtel. Also, if not enough prefrosh like a house, they should not be forced into it; however, houses should not be forced to take prefrosh as this violates the houses' members' the right to choose who they live with.

I don't like any system that will mean Dabney and Ricketts end up rotating almost no frosh and probably eventually falling apart as a result.

People shouldn't be forced to live in houses that they do not want to be in. Houses with cultures that don't appeal to enough people should not be houses - they should be clubs.

Most houses are a good fit for most frosh.

Houses will drive away people if they don't have enough space/beds. And if houses room assignments change year to year it won't make architectural sense for a cohesive community to be built around a bunch of scattered holdings. I don't see logistically how this would work. If you live in a nominally booty house holding in a booty house alley you have to contend with booty house culture while being a member of booty house, and that's not super

The houses should get equal amounts of prefrosh regardless of how popular the house is.

I strongly dislike this being the only factor. I only marked 2 because I realize that this currently happens to some degree during regular Rotation. However, there are many other factors in play, and the IHC works hard to figure out the best placement.

If you actually started basing after solely frosh interest, it would be a disaster. While all the houses have unique and awesome personalities, some are definitely more visual than others. This method would give these houses more frosh which w

The houses need the quotas to be able to ensure that all houses remain intact. There are some houses that look less appealing during rotation than they are in reality. Those houses should still get a chance.

This is going to be how freshmen being sorted works regardless of whether or not we have Rotation.

Prefrosh r dum (sometimes)

I don't understand how this could possibly work logistically. I think most people are pretty happy with the house they end up with and it's always possible to be member of multiple houses and drop membership as well, so this seems unnecessary.

The most important part of rotating prefrosh into houses is how they get along with the existing members of the house. If the existing members of the houses have no say in which prefrosh they rotate, there is the strong possibility of freshmen finding they have chosen a bad fit and ending up uncomfortable in the house they are living in due to conflicting personalities. It is

impossible to fully characterize the houses through video alone, as meeting and speaking to the upperclassmen about their

Aside for the number of rooms issue this would cause, I think many would find that their first impressions of the house were not an accurate representation of living in that house. As a prefrosh I was super excited about everything and I think it did to some degree cause me to overlook the downsides to many houses that I ranked pretty high. Looking back I can see what a poor match I am for one of my top ranked houses and I'm very very happy I ended up where I did, but as a prefrosh I would not

All house interactions are optional, so houses can just act as dorms if need be.

This would effectively kill the houses that tend to be less popular during rotation.

Some houses don't come across as well during rotation. I think it's incredibly stressful for me, a student, to be socially being in charge of making prefrosh love me in addition to my classwork or else my house size gets cut.

It depends on how the houses represent themselves. Some houses take longer to get to know, while some may have more mainstream appeal, to be honest. But the house you rotate into need not even be the house you spend the most time in, you are free to hang out at houses as you wish, so I don't think it's a problem.

I think that Prefrosh end up ranking the houses based on where they think that they will enjoy living. In a way, this is popularity, because certain prefrosh will like the people from one house, while other refresh will like the people from another house. I don't think that people ending up in the wrong house simple because it is popular is a problem. This is mainly because the houses often can tell where a prefrosh would best fit. This is why the houses ranking refresh is ESSENTIAL.

If houses need to attract members rather than being guaranteed members, they must adopt to fit the student body. Thus, the student community will be much stronger and more people will have an enjoyable experience.

Sounds like a logistical nightmare to balance this with filling the rest of the house with upperclassmen

If certain houses have a string of years in which they are unpopular, their size and presence during future Rotations will be greatly diminished.

Imao, everyone would probably just go to whatever house they were in for PFW

I went back to read the old articles and minutes describing the Eco-Rotation system. It certainly seems like a more organic way to allow houses to change than a wholesale disbanding.

Each house has a limited physical space so this isn't very feasible

Indifferent.

Popularity of a house to frosh is not a substitution for finding the right place for each individual. Lots of frosh want to live in lloyd when they come to Caltech but that doesn't mean it's a good

place for all of them. There are plenty of students who are happier with the houses they were put in despite not ranking said house first

People shouldn't be forced into a house they don't like, if at all possible.

You'd get an all-frosh (or at least heavily-frosh) house. This is bad. Avoid this.

I think the freshmen should try to be divided equally amongst the houses like they fairly are now.

Great! If some houses don't get freshmen, then maybe they become upperclassmen houses, or an acquired taste, and that's fine.

It is hard fo prefrosh to get a good sense of the houses before living here, and they may not choose houses that would be a very good fit for them. While there are several houses that are fairly catch-all, there are several houses that, while niche and not as "popular," are really important for the people who rotate in, because there is an important support net that isn't in the other houses. Note: I am in one of the "catch-all" houses, not one of the niche houses.

We need to take into account how many people the house can support, and house population should not be determined by a 2 week popularity contest.

Each house only has a certain number of rooms, and an important part of house culture involves cross-grade relationships. If each grade has wildly different numbers of people, I can imagine all kinds of issues arising with house picks logistics, friendships across grades, some house on campus being more represented than others due to an imbalance of size, etc.

Sometimes prefrosh are not the best informed

Some houses that are not as popular traditionally are actually incredibly important environments and communities to have. Though this isn't the most attractive to prefrosh (very different setting than what they are used to coming from high school), there are a lot of other things about these places that should be considered (are people happy there later? does it provide an environment other places don't?)

We should not be forcing prefrosh to live in houses simply to fill a quota. You can argue that a prefrosh who initially rotated into a house they didn't necessarily like learn to really enjoy their experience there but that first forced association with a house is not necessary for students to really like a house later on.

If 8 frosh want to go to X house, then so be it.

Popularity with the prefrosh is arbitrary because they won't be well informed by an orientation week, and especially by some orientation videos before they even arrive. If this is done, Freshman are more likely to end up in an environment they will swiftly realize they are unhappy in (or this will occur with a greater percentage of students).

I think some houses will be become severely impacted and some will have few freshmen.

If no one picks into a house, its culture will change as the number of old members with the old culture declines and is gone within 4 years.

What are your opinions of the number of students admitted to each school being dependent on its popularity with applicants?

Haven't formed a strong opinion

Houses change over time. It also isn't really possible to do this without kicking upperclassmen out.

Could be a little good, but don't want some houses to be over crowded and some to be empty

Shouldn't be linearly proportional to popularity, but some response to how houses are ranked seems to be a good way to incentivize houses to operate in good faith during rotation.

Well, this is just a poor way of doing things that will lead to chaos and houses not filling. The current rotation ranking methods are still good imo.

There should be as many frosh in each house as they have rooms for. Prefrosh preferences only matter until capacity is reached.

How would there be enough beds to take in an excess of frosh?

this makes logistics a lot harder, but it seems more fair to the prefrosh and I'm not sure there's a compelling reason why the houses need to be similar in size

Cool houses will get cool kids

Houses need to have a balanced number of students of each grade

In a way this is completely fair and reasonable but also perceptions of houses are greatly influenced by the people from the house you talk to, which isn't always a large number, and how your friends talk about it, so it isn't ideal to mess up a house's number of incoming freshmen because everyone is trashing it for one reason or another.

While ensuring frosh are placed in the ideal house is a priority, putting more frosh in one House than another is not sustainable in the long term - Houses need consistent class sizes. Instead, we need a mechanism to make sure that more frosh are happy going more places. Thus, maybe letting one house take 4 more frosh one year is okay if the House that cannot fill is somehow forced to make changes that will allow it to take an appropriate number of frosh the following year. This would allow for s

This disgusts me. Historically, several houses have been very unpopular with prefrosh. While it seems reasonable to want to change the way those houses function, doing so would be an affront to diversity at Caltech. As it stands, again in my opinion, Dabney and Ricketts in particular are bastions of inclusiveness. I think they present themselves as very different from what is considered "normal" social behavior during rotation, but I don't think they should ever have to change. Picks, though

This doesn't make sense, as some houses are far oversubscribed in terms of interest, while others are under subscribed. What happens if there aren't enough bed spaces? What happens if there are more bed spaces?

What the hell are you thinking?

I think the current lottery system is fine.

Don't really get question here. Don't houses have quota? Can't have all frosh go into one house and none in another, would just cause houses to die.

As a member of Lloyd, if we did this, the only people living in the house would be frosh. (This is a slight exaggeration).

Less popular houses thrive off of the fact that they are guaranteed a certain number of frosh, most of which end up strong members of the house community, even if they initially had a poor impression of the house

I would like this idea within reasonable bound (e.g. Booty House takes x to y prefrosh, depending on its popularity that year). Allocating sufficient bedspaces would prove a challenge.

If a majority of pre-frosh like one particular house, maybe there is something that they are doing that other houses aren't. Keep up, other houses.

I think if houses are opt in, they'll be more like frats and douchier

Some houses are naturally liked a lot more during rotation just because of the nature of that house (they present well)--that does not mean proportionally many prefrosh will fit better into that house than other houses. This also creates a logistical nightmare for roompicks.

This sounds like a logistical nightmare, and not at all sustainable. Better to send students to their second or third picks than to cram a house full of freshmen.

This is total horseshit. Imagine 75 Frosh wanting to be darbs. Just, think for a second how that is a good idea.

I think this could be a possibility, and might have some support in Houses that not a lot of students want to rotate into (their membership would simply shrink and more people would get to live in the House) but Shepard includes language that blatantly implies a House hasn't been disbanded by eco-rotation. This could be a constructive idea, Joe Shepard turns it into a destructive one.

there's benefits but it sounds like a logistical nightmare, and might end up in a situation where some houses essentially disappear bc they don't have enough engaged members

Why would I force a kid who isn't like a house to have to go to a lesser house just to fill quota?

Wording of this statement is unclear. Houses should aim to be popular as to attract students, and as many students that would accurately fit the house culture should be included into the house, but house placement should not be decided on popularity. Houses know best who would fit into a house and should have an opinion on who they accept.

This is a stupid idea--what happens to the houses that aren't a big draw? Do they just deserve to die out?

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 195 responses

The attempt to judge a person's character over a 2 hour dinner and 1 hour dessert is intrinsically flawed, especially when the person might not be sure what aspects of their character are appropriate for the situation in the first place. Telling a frosh to "be yourself" is easier said than done. However, it seems to be a necessity in some form or the other for the concept of rotation to at all continue.

Upperclassmen know their houses the best and know what kinds of people fit in their houses the best. I think that while there may be some unfair bias attached to it, it is necessary in keeping the house culture. Like admissions, in the end, the college is the one that chooses you, because they know what is best for their own college. Houses know what kinds of people are best for their own house and thus are the most knowledgeable in making these decisions.

If there is worry about secrecy or

Ranking freshmen explicitly from 1-220 or whatever is unnecessary. It would probably be more useful to have a "bottom 50" or so of people who would not feel comfortable/like living in the House, and allow the sorting algorithm to do the rest.

As upperclassmen, we understand what an incoming frosh is feeling, how they are acting, and what they are looking for. We provide the best input because we were in their shoes within the last 3 years.

Freshmen don't always have enough time to accurately judge a house. Also, upperclassmen should definitely have a say in Rotation & the shaping of their house culture, and ranking freshmen is a primary way to do this.

A system open to exploitation. Rumors about Booty House picking frosh based on 'hotness' abound. Yet, upperclassmen reasonably want to preserve a sense of safety in their house by expressing concerns about freshmen that make them uncomfortable. Yet, avoiding the problem by putting the frosh in another house rather than confronting the frosh about unreasonable behavior doesn't seem like the perfect solution either. It's a tough question.

I dislike the idea of the houses meeting to talk about each prefrosh individually. This is just passing judgement on the Prefrosh that we just meant and only talked with for a few hours. Also, the idea that we're helping the Prefrosh by telling them where they would or wouldn't fit well isn't logical. Just because you think that a prefrosh wouldn't fit well doesn't mean that you can't be welcoming still. Not all of your friends have to be exactly the same.

However, beyond the ranking, I

Don't think that 'rank' is the right word. Houses are communities, and with the way rotation works, they have to decide whether prefrosh will fit in well with the existing community.

It can have problems, but based on my experience doing this, people maintain a high level of civility and respect for prefrosh during the process, so I think it's a valuable way to determine

whether prefrosh will fit into the house culture well, which helps ensure that they'll be comfortable where they'll end up.

To me, the upperclassmen know the house the best. They will know if a person will fit into the house, or if they will fit into a different house better. Honestly speaking, it would kind of break the house traditions if freshmen entered a lottery to get into their top house if their top house has so many frosh trying to get in but not enough positions. Lottery systems to me might be fair, but for all you know, someone could enter a house and end up extremely unhappy on bad luck. Is that really a

Given that Houses need input in Rotation, and that each House is not a monolith (that there will be differing opinions within a House on the fit of prefrosh), it is the case that there needs to be some way of finding the aggregate House opinion on the fit of prefrosh. Ranking the prefrosh may seem distasteful to some, but in my experience the rankings are not value judgements, but opinions on how prefrosh will fit in the particular community of the House and that is okay with me.

Awful.

In general, upperclassmen have more experience with the houses and a better idea of how students will fit in to the existing culture and who they can best support. I certainly enjoyed the fact that upperclassmen would also work to make sure I was in a welcoming community.

Maybe instead of ranking everyone, just include a list of people who the house thinks would definitely not be a good fit.

It's a stupid, warped system. My house strongly favors female frosh over male frosh in the ranking process. Something like 18 out of our top 20 picks this year were women. Furthermore, it is completely impossible to get a genuine impression of the character and personality of an individual in a few hours anyways.

Kinda weird...

I do not agree with the current numerical rankings of freshmen. Although it helps to have some sort of idea of which freshmen would or wouldn't do well in a house, exact ranking is not necessary.

As stated previously, this is the most stressful part of Rotation.

I think that it works very well in that people who make other people uncomfortable are barred from entering the house. I have friends who would have felt alienated had certain people joined our house (because of reasons like these prefrosh were not accepting of mental illness, or they did really sketchy things like steal alcohol from another prefrosh's room and then hit on her - I would not want to be around such people). And you only get that information from meeting the prefrosh and talking a

I believe it to be a necessity. I also don't think that people judge more during rotation than they do on a normal basis.

I think it is necessary. Perhaps not in a giant group, projecting peoples' faces on a board. But certainly, would like to have some sort of picks team.

Upperclassmen know better about what the House communities are like and who would have a good time in them or positively contribute to them. Prefrosh's impressions of what living in a House is like aren't always correct.

I feel like ranking is not necessary, but I do believe that houses should have input on where students rotate.

Upperclassmen know what kind of people would feel most comfortable in their house, and who may feel more at home in another house. Upperclassmen know a lot more about the houses than frosh can figure out in the rotation period, and i think this is one of the most important and successful parts of the rotation process.

Necessary

I could go either way. This is a point that I'm willing to compromise on.

It is necessary and for the good of both upperclassmen and Freshmen. This method avoids possible conflicts from arising later on.

I have yet to meet someone who, at this point, is not happy in their house. Also, if someone did not end up in a house they wanted to live in, they could have asked to move from the beginning. As someone who did not get their first choice, I am very glad the upperclassmen weighed in; I would not have been happy in my first choice. The upperclassmen are able to see & discuss where we each will fit in best and have the best experience. This system may seem flawed from the outside, but as a fro

I don't think Upperclassmen "judge" prefrosh in a bad way. They generally have more experience and are able to tell if someone would enjoy being a part of their house.

As far as I understand, not a single house does a complete ranking. In fact, only one house does any sort of substantial ranking whereas the other houses place prefrosh into tiers of fit.

I am assuming this means a strict ordered ranking. That seems slightly much to me but the houses still need their ability to make choices.

if upper classmen didnt rank prefrosh, the prefrosh will probably not get into the right house since they dont have a full view of what the house is like.

I think it comes off the wrong way.

If not for upperclassmen rankings, I would be a miserable friendless nobody in Avery. Okay, that's an exaggeration, but that doesn't change the fact that the House upperclassmen knew the Houses WAY better than I did and I'm extremely glad they put me in my #3 house instead of my #1.

In just rotation (and much more than that is implausible...), I was able to more or less figure out which houses were in my top third, bottom third, middle third of desirability. The upperclassmen rankings whe

I think there are some problems with this system, but as I mentioned above, sometimes the Houses really do understand their own culture better and can make a better decision suited for the freshman.

It's good because it allows upperclassmen to have a say in their house. It's really not as offensive as the Bechtel announcement made it seem: if a house ranks someone lowly, it's not a measurement of the Prefrosh as a person but rather a measurement of perceived house compatibility. Additionally, assigning numbers to Prefrosh makes it much easier to maximize utility, even if the numbers have some error.

You're like one of the worse judges of where you'll be happy and upperclassmen seem like they are better at helping. At least, it seems strictly worse to not have the upperclassmen RANK, but you can reduce the weight of their ranking in assignment or whatever.

Everyone forms first impressions of everyone else. Why are prefrosh allowed to rank and judge the houses, but the houses are not allowed to have opinions about the prefrosh? We're all human.

Everyone benefits. The upperclassmen have some say in who they're living with, so they don't end up with people they're uncomfortable with. The prefrosh benefit because upperclassmen have the knowledge to help them end up in a house that fits them well. The prefrosh benefit because they end up in a house where the upperclassmen they're living with want them and embrace them, because rotation helps insure that the upperclassmen want and are excited about their frosh. Everyone benefits from having a

its kinda but important. the frosh sometimes try to change who they are when they come here, not good in the long run for them if they're in a house they don't like.

Many people describe it as a necessary evil. I think it can seem bad to an outsider but at the same time, the ranking is just a metric to determine how well a prefrosh would fit into a given house based on the members' interactions with them. I can't think of a better system that would make everyone happy and get the job done.

This year was my first time rotating in a new class of freshmen. Having a ranking system allowed me to mark some students as "red flags" either because they made me or others uncomfortable or I could tell that they would be very harmful for the community. I found this very useful.

I can understand and empathize with the pressure of being ranked and wanting to impress the members of a desired house. However, the truth of the matter is that upperclassmen know the house character and the house atmosphere better than the Freshmen could hope to after a short Rotation period. Upperclassmen have the best interests of both the house and the student in mind and are better capable of assessing student fit and happiness than the students are.

Ranking might be a bit harsh or clinical, but it is a decent way of synthesizing the different opinions the many students of a house may have of each prefrosh.

I really felt very judged and ranked during rotation. I felt a need to "perform" to the point of social exhaustion for some perceived payoff later in to be accepted into the house that would ultimately allow for a lifestyle I wanted.

I believe it is necessary for the upperclassmen to do in order to maintain a strong and supportive house culture

Prefrosh don't necessarily know what house they would fit best into after just one week of going to the various houses (with just a few hours at each house)

Upperclassmen know what kind of person fits well into their house, since they've been living there for at least a year.

Upperclassmen know the perpetuated culture and environment of the house and are best equipped to make the most compatible student-house arrangements. This requires having some objective way to determine if a prefrosh would fit in and have a good experience at a house.

While I believe that the opinions of freshmen are undoubtedly important, I also believe that upperclassmen are often correct in assessing who would do well in a certain House environment and who would not. I think that ignoring upperclassman opinions will lead to more unhappy frosh, rather than frosh who are happier with their Houses.

While it seems extreme to an outsider, prefrosh simply do not see enough of the houses to know where they would be happiest. Upperclassman input helps to correct for prefrosh that would thrive in a house but (since they have few data points) rank it lower than they would after some time.

It's not a good system in terms of the fact that it objectifies Prefrosh but I think its necessary to be able to make picks in the most efficient way.

I can't imagine trying to choose an order of how much I love different prefrosh without some pretty stupid factors being utilized to choose who goes higher.

What's the point? Houses get people they "don't want" all the time, and these people end up becoming great members of the house community, just voted down like crazy at these ranking meetings for something stupid they said taken out of context.

part of the selection process, another beneficial factor to consider besides just the freshmen's opinions themselves

It seems pretty scummy to rate people behind their backs and pick which people are liked or disliked by upperclassmen.

As I mention later, without the houses, and thus upperclassmen, having input in Rotation the placement of freshmen into houses would be entirely a self-selective and asymmetric process. Some freshmen may have an impression of the house but the upperclassmen would know that this impression is not truly reflective of the house or that there is some other aspect which would make a given freshman not fit in as well as in another house, for example.

Sure, people are being ranked on both sides based on who they are. It may seem harsh, but it is the optimal situation. The houses have the incentive on being attractive to newcomers, and newcomers have the incentive to experience every house and present themselves well.

The upperclassmen should have a say into the kind of community they live in

Absolutely critical

It is absolutely necessary to have some input. Respecting the rights of the pre-frosh shouldn't come at the expense of the rights of current residents to opine on who they live with.

Upperclassmen have more of an idea who fits in each house than anyone else. They are the ones who lived there for so long already.

I feel like it is important for current members of the house to have a say in who else is going to join. This way if anyone makes a subset of the house uncomfortable can be brought up.

It is done in the best interest of the frosh, not the people doing the ranking. Currently, at least in my house, frosh are not ranked numerically, but by category (ie frosh who are would be a good fit/neutral/bad fit). Rankings are unrelated to how many people like them, but to how well the frosh would fit in the house.

Incredibly important as upperclassman should get a say in who lives with them. Allows houses to vet individuals who make them uncomfortable.

I feel it's very subjective, but I get that the upperclassmen also want to decide who they want to live with for the year as well.

It's a necessary evil. If someone wants to live with you, but you don't want to live with them Caltech shouldn't force you to live together. Both freshmen and upperclassmen currently have input on who lives in the house during the rotation process. Sure, every once in a while freshmen have to make compromises because they might not get into their initial top pick, but houses themselves often have to make compromises as well.

Fundamentally, not allowing upperclassmen a say in who lives clo

The houses should have a way to give input on the freshmen

I believe that ranking is essential to Rotation as we know it today, else inter-IHC selection of frosh would be substantially more difficult

The process of ranking freshmen is personally uncomfortable to me, but I understand why it's done. I do think that it's different if freshman are ranked one by one, or simply grouped.

Frankly, all upperclassmen know pretty well what houses the freshmen belong in

The rankings are NOT about how great or meh a frosh is to Upperclassmen -

they are NOT a ranking of personal worth. The rankings are about how well Upperclassmen of a certain House think each frosh would fit in with their House culture. This is an incredibly important distinction that should be emphasized to anyone and everyone who is told about ranking.

Also: I quote (well, paraphrase) an upperclassman at dinner last night: "For the 3 classes of frosh I have seen rotate into this House, w

I don't know how else we would gain house input

I've never been comfortable ranking people. The only time when it really seems justifiable, though, is when there are prefrosh that members of the house would not be comfortable living with (and there are a few of these each year). These would be the blatantly disrespectful prefrosh, or the prefrosh that do not respect personal space and seem to be threatening.

Prefrosh at the end of rotation have only been here a week and they don't know what the houses are usually like. Besides, upperclassmen should have a say in how their house changes composition, just like in membership meetings.

While I understand that there are concerns about how the ranking system may make some feel, I believe that there is no better way to select a class of pre-frosh to rotate into a house. Giving upperclassmen the ability to influence what pre-frosh rotate into their house is important to ensure that everyone rotates into a house with a culture that fits them, and with upperclassmen to whom they can relate.

The houses should have a say as well particularly because the members have been there for longer and know their houses better

I think its necessary to have an orthogonal force to just the freshman ranking the house. Say 50 frosh rank booty house as their number 1 choice. Who's going to decide which ~20 will get their first wish and which unlucky 30 will not? Admin???

I would not have self-chosen my house. My house has made me so much happier.

I think this is the best way to have input (two questions from now).

The upperclassmen know what the houses are like. The Freshman don't. Any one upperclassman can more or less tell where a prefrosh should be, and the ranking system, with multiple upperclassmen getting involved, and across house lines, normalises that and ensures that for the most part every prefrosh gets put in what is probably the best place for them.

As a prefrosh, I didn't understand the house system or where I would actually be happy and successful. The upperclassmen understood this better and I think should continue to rank us/future prefrosh.

These judgements are incredibly superficial. I know this from personal experience; someone who I knew would be a good fit for my house was rejected because they were a transfer student and "wouldn't be around for very long." Obviously, a better system needs to be introduced, but that should happen with student input!

Some houses could do or are doing more to address biases but that alone should not justify removing this element of Rotation. I think that it's kind of preposterous that a committee who hasn't talked to the prefrosh can make house rankings/assignments.

I think this is a horrible thing to take away. Upperclassmen in each house know best who will have the best fit and find the best family within their house, and they should have a say in which prefrosh rotate into their house. This is what's so cool about the house system -- the fact the current members choose their frosh leads to a continuity of culture and passing down of knowledge.

I'm not too fond of the ranking itself, but I lack a better mechanism for expressing a community's perspective on how they would feel (both in terms of enjoyment and comfort/security) living besides a potential new person.

Having the houses choose you is nearly as important as choosing the houses. I think this makes the bond between house members much stronger.

It is really not a surprise. It may be taken as "judging" but really the house has to make a decision. So, by nature of the process, students are sorted.

There's no other way to gather as much salient data. It seems gross at first, but if you think about it for two seconds, it's absolutely the only way to do it...

I think we need the ability to say we absolutely cannot have someone in our house, otherwise, I don't think rankings are necessary.

I think it is unnecessary to rank all the freshman.

The people currently living in a house should be able to pick who they live with

I like how Upperclassmen can freely discuss whether certain people would be good fits or not. However, during these processes the most outgoing often dominate the proceedings. In addition, the most outgoing of each House is in the public eye of the Freshman the most, leading to slight imbalances.

It's judgmental and I know some houses are better than others about the way they do it, but my house has, although it has good intentions, let this devolve into ad hominem groupthink about people that a current member of the house doesn't like. Example of this going wrong- there was a girl being discussed during a rotation meeting getting mostly positive feedback, then a popular house member said he had an unpleasant interaction with her, then several more people responded with their own negat

It sounds bad but the intentions are pure. Don't judge a process you haven't been a part of.

Going into college, it is hard to know exactly what you want from a house, and upperclassmen can often have a better idea.

While it is an uncomfortable experience, and should be reformed, it is critical to ensuring the best fit for the prefrosh. Houses can sometimes know that a prefrosh would do really well in their house, even if a prefrosh doesn't. also, rotating in a prefrosh that makes the upperclassmen feel unsafe is just as bad as rotating into a house that makes the prefrosh feel unsafe

Often houses are misrepresented or misinterpreted during rotation and frosh have a negative first impression, but the upperclassmen who know the true house culture are better judges of

frosh that would fit in well.

The upperclassmen understand how well a person will fit into the group.

Ranking is fine if we do it respectfully, which thankfully has been the case recently.

idk man i'm kinda uncomfortable with this

I feel like the house should have some input on who ends up in their house---it fosters friendships between classes and ensures that frosh end up in a house where they are wanted.

I think it's important to have a two-way system; the upperclassmen should consider their options and have a vote as much as prefrosh should when it comes to Houses.

Again, this is to prevent uncomfortable situations for upperclassmen. If a prefrosh has insulted or shown characteristics that make people in the house feel less safe, this becomes clear in the process (and is the most important thing to figure out).

It is necessary, simply as an effective way to organize the sorting. It is not an insult to anyone. It is not about disliking people. It is about choosing the people who would fit best in that environment.

I 100% hate this. Upperclassmen took very personal digs at the frosh and I felt that the rankings became more and more inappropriate as rotation went on. Also, the short amount of time that we have to talk to the frosh is nowhere near enough time to judge their entire personalities.

Rotation should be optimizing for putting together groups of people who like each other, not groups of frosh who like each other. The relative insignificance of age in forming social connections is one of the best parts about the house system, and that's only possible if the upperclassmen actually like the frosh who rotate in.

Absolutely necessary

Upperclassmen have better judgement than freshmen.

I think that it sounds much worse than it is. I was one of the upperclassmen that ranked freshmen this year, and it is very respectful and fair, and turned out to be a great way to compose a house of students who work well with each other.

As heartless as it feels, I think it helps keep people who haven't lived in the house and aren't able to tell whether they are good for it not end up in uncomfortable living environments in a qualitative way.

Its hard, but it works.

This should be REALLY obvious. If someone is roundly disliked by the upperclassmen of a house, rotation ending won't fix it. The houses need a way to filter out people who won't fit in socially in that house, and who therefore will have a miserable time at Tech in it. Similarly, people who are well liked and highly ranked are likely (not guaranteed) to have a better time, with a better support network for the stresses of this school.

The House community should definitely have input on who they think would or would not fit well in the house. This helps House cultures stay alive over all the years.

I think that strict rankings can be swapped out for impressions in almost all situations, so long as impressions is allowed to have tiers of compatibility with the house.

This is just bloody atrocious.

Also, Fleming is the second most popular house during rotation. Not everyone who thinks Fleming is their top choice (because it aligns with what they thought was popular in high school) is a good fit for Fleming. Their idiosyncracies would not be well received in the house. They form more meaningful relationships with students of the other houses (ie. the ones who rank Fleming 1 and Blacker 2 - it happens). When upperclassmen say "no they are not a good fit for Fleming - and then Blacker takes

Upperclassmen have a good sense of where students fit in.

At no point during my Rotation did I feel like I was being judged. I saw Rotation purely as a process for me to get to know the upperclassmen of the various Houses (and vice versa) and judge how well I fit into the Houses/how comfortable the House culture make me feel. The upperclassmen made me feel welcome and made an effort to reach out and talk to me. I was extremely shy freshman year (and am very shy around new people in general).

It seems weird but I would have been very unhappy in my first choice, and I love my second choice so I am eternally grateful that the upperclassmen realized that.

In order to build a strong community like the houses, existing members of the community should consent to the membership of prospective members. In the case of Rotation and houses, this takes the form of ranking freshmen. Without this objective measure of how much a house likes a prefrosh, the incoming prefrosh are far less likely to be as enthusiastically welcomed to their new home. This is because ranking focuses on how much you PREFER a prefrosh. It emphasizes expressing positive opinions reg

I HATE THIS. It's no better than rush, and it's made even worse because frosh don't know what's going on. It's often gross in that upperclassmen judge the appearance of freshmen and sexualize them as well.

The ability to redlist people from our house makes me feel safer. Our house has large minority populations and because we can rank frosh we can keep our safe inclusive environment.

To put this more concretely, there are people in my house that are openly LGBT within our house but not on campus broadly. Not having a safe place like that on campus would be awful for them and lgbt specific housing effectively outs these community members to the entire Caltech community which is pretty suboptimal

Although this process is not the best option, this process is required in order for the house system to flourish. I feel this way even as a freshman.

While the objective idea of "ranking a Prefrosh" may sound bad, in actuality it is a process that

works carefully to determine whether that Prefrosh would fit or feel comfortable living in the house. It's definitely not judging the person, merely their fit.

I dislike the manner in which the ranking is done. I believe that the president may need some sort of rankings to decide which freshmen the house wants, but that these rankings need not be public and need not be strictly 1-235 but rather could have buckets.

While it does seem a little gross in concept, I do understand that it is a necessary process and it gives the upperclassmen a say in who they want to spend their next few years with.

I see the advantages in terms of drawing in good fits, but I also think this creates lots of opportunity for bad things, since people almost certainly have implicit biases towards prefrosh based on race, gender, attractiveness, etc. It's also really hard on shy prefrosh or prefrosh who don't immediately start glomming their favorite house.

I think it's necessary. I will say that what goes on during rotation meetings is not shared with the incoming frosh for obvious reasons, and I don't think has at all affected the houses interactions with individuals who were ranked lower than others. Once the frosh are in the house no matter how they were ranked, our focus is befriending them and helping them find their place in our shared home.

Upperclassmen should not assign numbers, but should say if a frosh may fit in well.

It's not incredible but how else are we going to do it? It's important for the houses to express who we think would like our environment and who won't.

It's absolutely CRITICAL that upperclassmen be given a large say in who comes into the house. They are trying to decide who would make the best friends and neighbors, and who would fit in with the more nuanced culture of the houses that only upperclassmen would understand. Also, if upperclassmen feel like they got a say in picking freshmen, I believe that they will naturally feel more welcoming towards them, because they feel like "part of the house" already. If you had the choice to choose y

This is without a doubt the most important part of rotation. No matter what prefrosh think, the upperclassmen know the personalities of the houses better (mainly because of rotation rules). Because the upperclassmen know the personalities of the houses, they are much better equipped to aide in the process of placing students in houses. The members of each house want to live with people that they would get along with and who would fit into their house. Rankings present a firm and definite numeric

I think the upperclassmen rankings help ensure that students don't get misplaced into a house that they don't socially fit in as well.

It is kind of weird to rank people but it does help us better understand where we should place each frosh.

only way to make sure houses have right ppl

This is by far the worst part of rotation. It has been described by some as a "meat market", and I concur with that description. In the past, this was used to optimize the Rotation process for the houses, with less weight going to where the prefrosh would choose to live. I'm not sure why this

should be the goal - surely house continuity can be maintained even if we just go by the prefrosh choices.

Sitting in on some of the meetings my house holds for rotation has been for me a terrible exp

It feels wrong. It's a bizarre way to start your interaction with a whole new group of students.

It's important for maintaining house culture. It's infinitely better than having to constantly deal with individuals who just don't fit into a house socially.

I know this process isn't perfect. It can be toxic and leave people out but that does not mean that it needs an overhaul. I do not think that putting this job in the hands of administration makes it any better for the frosh or the houses. Caltech students are intelligent and mature people and should have been asked for more input regarding this decision. If there were concerns with specific aspects of rotation, they should have been brought up in a separate conversation. Not one that should have

It's a necessary evil.

This is NOT okay and never has been and never will be.

The conversations can turn rude, but we (lloyd) has cracked down on that. Upperclassmen know better than underclassmen if they'd fit or not, so they do need to find some way to share that.

Instead of ranks, there should just be a list and then the presidents discuss their lists.

This can only cause problems later, when people figure out what they've been ranked and when inevitably lower ranked people end up in a house they don't want to be in either.

The rankings are done as a way for a House to have a concrete idea of who they want in the house. Rankings provide a way for a House's picks committee to represent the entire House since it can be a lot to remember during the picks process. The rankings are not revealed to the frosh and therefore should not cause emotional distress.

Who better to help choose who lives in a house than the people who live there already? If we remove this system, we remove the "you get into a house that wants you specifically" part of the House system, which is important.

In my years here I haven't seen this system abused. I have seen it done fairly and for the benefit of the rotating students. I myself did not get my first choice, and I am very, very happy in hindsight that this is the case.

Again, this is a necessary evil. We need some quantitative way to measure someone's fit in a house. Ranking of frosh is in no way a reflection of how much we "like" them—it's purely a reflection of whether we think they would fit into our culture. I can remember both saying and hearing many times during Rotation, "[person's name] is super cool and fun—just not a Flem," and ranking them low, despite liking them a lot.

This better allows the house to have compatible people

I think often prefrosh don't fully understand what house they belong in, or just want to be in one because that's where their friends are, when in reality houses are much more than that. The fact that so many people are happy with what houses they rotate into speaks for itself, and there is a self correcting mechanism, as you can get social and full memberships at other houses too.

I never liked the rating process and felt judged as a prefrosh. I think this is an aspect of rotation we should seriously consider.

It is not necessary to make a ranked list of who people want in a house. Some may argue that it's more efficient this way but people are people, not just numbers.

"Better than a random number generator." You need some method of choosing a subset of frosh if too many want to live in a particular house. How is this controversial?

Upperclassmen don't rank freshman in a malicious manner - we want students that we believe will best fit with our house student body and will most enjoy our culture, and we select students that will be happiest with us accordingly. We do NOT rank freshmen based on who is coolest, best looking, or other superficial categories. It isn't a perfect system, but it'll work significantly better than a system of rotation that is determined by administration instead because they don't remotely know w

It might be awkward for a little directly after rotation ends, but I think it is important for upperclassmen to have a say on who will live with them. If a freshman ranks a certain house 1, but all the upperclassmen really dislike that freshman, they probably won't feel very welcomed into the house.

The report seems to misunderstand the purpose of the ranking. Its not about how cool we think a prefrosh is, its about whether we think they would be a good fit for the community, which shouldn't be a value judgment on any prefrosh

They have the choice where to go. We should have the choice of who to be with.

I hate it. These interactions are surface-level only, and do not tell somebody how a person might behave once in the house. Focusing on minutiae is an excuse to avoid having somebody you personally don't like in your house. And a lot of the times, people that don't get ranked high in many houses end up in Avery- what's up with that?

Just as freshmen get used to their house, upperclassmen can get used to the freshmen too. It's a 2-way street.

The only thing that freshmen should be j

College life has to be enjoyable for everyone for all four of their years. Also the prefrosh who think they would fit well in the house might not. It has to be mutual attraction between the prefrosh and upperclassmen for college life to be enjoyable for everyone.

I always thought this was a little odd

Some involvement from current community members in selection of new members of their community is essential for any community to maintain a real, distinct culture. I think there could be systems that don't involve some of the quantitative measures that people seem to object most strongly to, but any system that is actually responsive to thoughts of current house members requires them to meet and form opinions about incoming freshmen.

I feel like the word "rank" is kind of harsh. We're not ranking them as a person, but rather their fit into the house.

I understand how this can be a bad process. I myself sometimes feel bad about this. But I think it is a necessary evil for upperclassmen to decide who they want to live with and who would have a good experience in their house. I've heard some alumni opinion on this and honestly I think they make some great points. I think it would be a good idea to ask them to also provide answers.

It's a two way street. Plus, a lot of times, upperclassmen just know better who fits in what house.

There's no better way for the houses to gauge freshman than to have upperclassmen engagement.

I think it's nice to feel like you were wanted by the members of the house you rotate into

this is a really good way to get the house's impressions of someone into quantitative form. also, in practice, most of the factors that go into this seem to be fit with the house rather than some sort of judgment of the person

Needed to prevent strange people from coming into my house or people who don't fit.

The upperclassmen's rankings are based on such a short period of measurement and so brief an interaction, and are prone to so much error, as to be pretty much meaningless. Having the upperclassmen judging all the prefrosh is unhealthy.

It adds an incentive to go to the events and socialize with upperclassmen and it shows the freshmen placing their trust in upperclassmen (who know more about the Houses than the frosh) to place them where they belong and almost every time it is successful.

This puts too much emphasis on House preferences over frosh preferences. They're all fine froshies; the important thing is we help the frosh know which of the Houses they like they will fit the best into.

Two weeks is not enough time to really get to know a house. That said, upperclassmen do have a strong grasp on what the house does and who the people are. Plenty of influential people in the house did not initially put it as their first choice. Though I'm generally not a fan of older people telling me what's good for me, I do agree that in this case, upperclassmen know far better where people will fit in.

Although it may seem uncouth, judgement happens whether or not it happens during rotation. By allowing the houses to rank prefrosh during rotation, we allow the current residences of

houses a say of who they get to live with. I think this is important, as if you have a house filled with people whose personalities don't mesh very well, the house could be embroiled in fights, be completely silent or empty, or the house simply doesn't exist as a community.

As I didn't know this was the process when I'd entered Caltech, I guess I hope I made a good impression. After I found out, I didn't interact with enough freshman during Rotation to rank any myself.

While a little awkward, frosh never find out about how they were ranked (on leakage occurs if a frosh was ranked really well).

Need upperclassmen input to make sure student actually knows what getting into, in case the freshman missed the mark.

Upperclass rankings of prefrosh bring a significant additional amount of information into play and allow the communities in the houses to build themselves in a positive way via member selection and best-fitting.

It can easily turn terrible - this is undeniable. However, if guided right, possibly under the supervision of RAs like our House meetings were, it can be done appropriately. I believe that having upperclassmen input is absolutely essential for maintaining a good community in each of the houses.

I see it as a necessary and ultimately beneficial counterbalance to the fact that the prefrosh simply cannot form accurate impressions of the houses within the time allotted for rotation, even though it makes many upperclassmen uncomfortable to judge prefrosh.

Upperclassmen are most acquainted with house cultures and have the best sense of how well students would uphold that culture.

I'm not sure a strict "rank" is necessary as I've never seen how the rankings are used, but it's really important for finding the best fits.

Now this is just stupid. Some people get placed into the wrong houses simply because they had bad luck at rotation dinners and bumped into what I call "outliers" of each house that aren't exactly representative of that particular house culture. So while a particular pre-frosh should have fit in quite well, he/she got stuck with the wrong person at dinner. Of course, if the pre-frosh cared enough, he/she would go back to that house and talk to others, but 1) time may not deem that and 2) th

Again, in my experience, I have found consistently that freshmen are relatively bad at self-sorting into the Houses. As a senior, I have found that I can have a short conversation with a prospective student, 'prefrosh', or even upperclassman and determine their 'best-fit' our current House affiliation. I can spot who will do well in my House with near certainty, and those that don't rotate into my House (or the House I expect them to) have in every instance joined that House within a y

I understand that it is potentially offensive, but in my house, at least, it's never felt like we were 'ranking' freshmen by any amount of worth, only that we were trying to determine who would be happiest in our house.

Some prefrosh love a house and would make everyone in that house incredibly uncomfortable. Some prefrosh love a house and would be a perfect fit. This is not a thing you can tell from just prefrosh rankings. Without upperclassmen input, I feel frosh's general satisfaction with their houses would go down significantly.

Oftentimes upperclassmen know better than the incoming students do where they will best fit. Every year there are confused students who misunderstand certain houses, and if they were placed in said houses it would be a negative experience for both them and the entire house

Freshmen often don't know the inner workings and cultures of each house, so upperclassman input is an invaluable way to make sure that freshmen end up in the house that's right for them.

This is an ESSENTIAL part of ensuring the right people end up in the right place. Being a member of Blacker, ALOT of people want to be in the house but that doesn't always mean they would always make a good fund for the house, or wouldn't be happier elsewhere. Many of the people who do end up elsewhere end up a million times happier than Blacker Bc they belonged there and it happened Bc our UPperclassmen input who could see in them that there were a "x" house vs Blacker.

If this is done with more transparency and less secrecy I don't see it as a problem.

if you're going to keep rotation as an institution, you might as well keep rankings. otherwise it's not rotation. also in my experience, it's not like upperclassmen rankings have affected anything or caused lingering whatever after rotation. most ppl i interact with understand that first impressions are totally wrong and bc of that rotation ends up being an incredibly superficial process.

that being said, i can see why being judged by upperclassmen (and not being able to opt out of that

I don't really know much about the Tech end of it since I'm a frosh, but it's nice to know the house picked me because they wanted me/the upperclassmen thought I would fit in.

Upperclassmen simply know where prefrosh would fit in best. 2 weeks is not enough time to gain an accurate representation of the houses. However, a years worth of time, the time that the house members have, is. The ranking system works because the rankings are not necessarily based on how much you like a person, but rather on how well they would fit into a house. Prefrosh can like a house, but there is no way they can be knowledgeable enough about the house culture to know whether that is th

It's a requirement to get communities as tight-knit as we have here

Upperclassmen should get a say in who they want to live with. They also know the house culture more so they can gauge how well a student will adjust better than the student can.

The way this is done has always disgusted me. Meat market, indeed. It's gross, and not suited to the 21st century.

I strongly believe members of houses are quite good, on average, at determining potential fits

for their houses. I don't see why this needs to change

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 171 responses

I think this would be much better than the rankings, and I am in favor of this over the rankings. This should be implemented instead of getting rid of rankings altogether. House members should be allowed to provide input on their impressions of freshmen, and that input should be taken seriously. This is better than rankings and provides an alternative solution.

I don't quite know what impressions is supposed to mean. I agree that strict rankings aren't the best way to express the houses' interest in certain prefrosh, but I don't want to abolish it completely. I think the houses and their members have valuable opinions that should be voiced in some way.

Impressions are vague and there are many incoming freshmen. The only way to efficiently distribute rooms is to rank them.

Rankings are a pretty useful measure, as it eliminates any miscommunication - it's a straightforward way of saying "Yes, this freshman is a good fit for the house!" or "No, I think this freshman will benefit more from other house cultures..."

Qualitative descriptions are more humanizing, and do not require as much comparison between frosh as numerical rankings.

I like this idea much more than rankings. If we are able to submit opinions, these opinions will not need to be broadcasted to the entire house.

See previous response

This would be much harder to implement and I think it would effectively be interpreted the exact same way as currently. I can see the appeal, but I don't think it will improve anything.

I worry that impressions of prefrosh (as opposed to rankings) are limited in their ability to represent the aggregate House. House input is essential to Rotation, but I believe that giving impressions and not rankings will harm the House's ability to accurately assess the entire House's opinion on how prefrosh will fit into their community.

At least better than rankings.

While impressions might avoid some sort of direct comparison of students to each other, I trust the ability of Caltech students to separate fit in a house from an individual's value. A tiered system of rankings might be more useful here than individual rankings.

Possibly better, although I don't understand the question very well or how it might be implemented

it's kind of a slippery slope. impressions lead to rankings lead to judging ...

so, it's kind of hard to really end up differentiating between the two since people always rank

atleast in their heads that they would rather have one frosh over another.

That said, don't really have opinion either way

This would be a much better way of avoiding the problem of dehumanizing freshmen into numerical rankings. General impressions of how well freshmen would fit into the house would work better.

Houses should only be allowed to give impressions if they think particular prefrosh would not fit into their house, and they should be able to elaborate exactly why.

This seems really nice. That way we are not nitpicky about whether a prefrosh goes into a 1 or a 1.5 bucket, but we can rule out the people who would make people currently in the house uncomfortable (and maybe giving strong positive impressions of certain prefrosh?)

Yes please. This is exactly what I want.

There isn't much of a difference between impressions and rankings; in practice, rankings have to be impressions because it's impossible to actually rank >200 prefrosh you meet in two weeks.

I think impressions important solely for making sure that upperclassmen are comfortable with the freshman rotating into their house. There was a prefrosh this last year that literally gave me a panic attack and I would have had to move out of my house if he had rotated into my house. This is not because I dislike him, but because living with him would be detrimental to my mental health.

The ranking system would be much better as it is quantifiable, however this would still allow some input from people who know the houses (and who they would suit) better than anyone.

Inconvenient... try it and if it works it works but allow for ranking too

I think we should have the power to pick top 3 and bottom 3 for our house and also have veto power if a frosh has made members of the house uncomfortable.

It is necessary and for the good of both upperclassmen and Freshmen. This method avoids possible conflicts from arising later on. (should not be used as an alternative to rankings)

Why try to sugarcoat it? How would these impressions really be decisive and clearly able to be discussed if they were not rankings? 240 "impressions" don't really lend itself to an easy way to decide. It's not about the worth of a person, it's about where they will fit in best and where they will be the happiest. A student always has the option of becoming a member of another house as well.

I don't think there's much of a difference between impressions and rankings, but Houses should definitely have a say in the rotation process.

As I understand, no house in the past iteration of rotation provided a complete ranking of prefrosh down to the last person.

Furthermore, having been involved with the "ranking" in the previous two years of rotation, we are NOT ranking the prefrosh based on how much we "like" the prefrosh but on how well they would fit into the house environment and culture. "Poorly ranked" prefrosh receive such a designation because we believe they would not feel comfortable or enjoy being in the hous

I am assuming this means a binning system.

I just don't think upperclassmen should have a say.

That sounds like further reducing the useful information about House preference the upperclassmen can provide for no real gain.

Even if it's just 'impressions,' there will still be some that are better fits for a specific house than others. I don't see how this eliminates any 'feel-bad' issue--not that I think rankings are feel-bads, because they were actually very humanizing from my experience. I learned so much about the student body because we COULDN'T just submit the stats we had

This or rankings is absolutely essential. I feel like rankings is better, but this (essentially approval voting: pick all the Prefrosh who you would be ok with rotating) is better than no house input.

Impressions are inevitable and good for deciding where to spend the next ~4 years of your like.

What would houses giving impressions do? Would that be used in the decision regarding where the prefrosh will rotate into?

I am not sure what this question is asking. The Houses gives impressions of what their house culture is like during Rotation. Although the impression may be exaggerated, it helps the freshmen to get to know the houses.

Houses already form impressions on Freshmen. For my house, we talk about each freshman. Upperclassmen share their first impressions, conversations at dinner and events of the day. Then, this gets translated into a score based on everyone's opinion.

I think Ruddock's system of buckets works very well. This way you don't need to spend too much time comparing the prefrosh to each other, but there's still enough information for the house to fully express all of its preferences.

thats a pretty good idea.

I don't think this would be very effective and probably wouldn't sort the prefrosh into Houses as well as our current system.

This would still allow for "red-flagging" certain problematic students and "green-flagging" students who are a good fit, although it wouldn't allow for the same type of fine differentiating that rating does. I think this would be less effective than numerical rankings but would be a compromise I could agree to.

I think that the Houses should be the ones responsible for making the choices regarding who rotates in. Impressions are better than nothing, but it is not enough to ensure the happiest over-all student-house match.

This would make it more difficult to get an "average" idea of how the house as a whole feels about each new student.

This seems like a good way for the house to have input, but not with a controversial system of ranking.

Its necessary for the Houses to give impressions so that prudish match to the righr house

Not everyone will be happy at every house. Sometimes prefrash have incorrect impressions of the houses. Upperclassmen have a better understanding so their input is important. However, without rankings, there lacks an objective measure to make the best student-house arrangements.

If its all algorithm based, I don't see how this would work.

They would have to be pretty specific impressions or else they wouldn't be very beneficial to making picks.

This is the best way to do it. Houses get the input of saying who they already know and want, who they wouldn't mind knowing better, and who they would be truly uncomfortable with.

For the same reason I don't like rankings, I don't like impressions either - they're not fair and oftentimes outright wrong.

seems like it would just be the same thing as rankings, but in blocks

It's still pretty scummy to talk about people behind their backs in a group discussion, but this is necessary to figure out which people would fit best into the house environment.

Giving impressions is, in my mind, worse than strict rankings if we wish to address the issue that some subset of students feel uncomfortable and judged during rotation. The way the current process works is those impressions are given during the meetings and the house decides on numbers which reflect those. By giving impressions we would have to provide more detailed and potentially more judgemental information which additionally is hard to present as a consensus from a house as people in the ho

I thought this was a school which places great belief in epistemic validity. The current system allows us to arrive at certainty without doubt, and truth without error. Being able to exactly quantify our preferences makes the process much more efficient and leads to much more satisfactory results on both sides.

It forces Houses to think about why the frosh is a good fit (or not) for them. However, it is important to also simplify these thoughts in the form of "rankings" in order to bring to the table. We need both.

An impression is not enough to filter out people who wouldn't fit in a house

I'm confused as to what the difference is? Rankings and impressions should both lead to the same conclusion, except "impressions" sound more like "suggestions" and therefore easier to override and ignore by the Administration than objective quantities like a hard ranking. This only seems to increase ambiguity in the negotiating process between house leadership and the Administration, which always strengthens the position of those in power (Administration) by muddying the waters over what th

That's basically what already happens.

Would be a good alternative to ranking if that's the main concern with rotation

Not a bad system, but not good either. A ranking is much more concrete than impressions, and is much easier to factor a ranking in than an impression. Basically, quantitative is better than qualitative here because the number of students (~235) creates an intractable comparison problem if using only qualitative comparisons.

That's fine, as long as houses can express their opinions about the fit of the freshmen in some way.

$\omega \geq 2B$

or see above

Without choosing to some extent which prefrosh the Houses get, they will lose their cohesion

At the very least, the Houses need to give impressions on Freshmen. Years in college are years of incredible experience and self-searching, and Upperclassmen will see things in frosh that the frosh don't yet see in themselves.

Better, but i feel like the rankings are important to figure out how frosh will be placed?

Would depend on how it was implemented, but actually having a strict numbering of frosh is probably not needed.

Giving impressions still gives houses some ability to select their class, is important. I believe that ranking is superior, but giving impressions could still be a valuable way for upperclassmen to select their class of rotating pre-frosh.

I'm not sure if other houses do strict rankings, but if that discourages the "meat-market" impressions that some prefrosh get during rotation, I'm all for it.

I think it's a decent alternative to rankings, but ultimately harder for Picks to use and easier to twist.

We use the impressions we get during rotation to rank the prefrosh, but the ranking system is the more efficient way to put the prefrosh on a spectrum to sort them.

I'm not familiar with whether this happens or not, and I'm completely okay with that.

The rankings are useful only in the sense that they help to categorize the freshmen. Replacing them with "impressions" is far more vague than ranking. Both systems have problems, but this solution is worse.

Rankings are just a quantified, averaged version of impressions. Besides, the picks committee has longer notes on prefrosh going into the finals Pick meeting.

This would be better than having no input at all, but not preferable to rankings.

It's imperative that houses have input, especially because some prefrosh who like a particular house make can make a sizable portion of that house feel very uncomfortable and even unsafe. However, I do not know the best way to communicate preferences of a house besides rankings that allows each member of the house to contribute fairly equally.

I feel like this would be honestly comparable to rankings.

This is one of the things that seems like a good idea on paper. But, if the process will become an algorithm, its not like the impressions will make a difference.

Ex: I hear that students used to be able to rank 1 - 20 instead of 1 - 8. But the way people were sorted was simply a matter of 1 - 8.

Uhh... okay... how is that applicable in any system? A meeting where the leader goes "what did you guys think about prefrosh X" and Ruddock says "yeah okay" and Dabney says "yeah sure" and Blacker says "whatever"? Who gets that prefrosh??

I don't see why this would be useful, unless impressions can be "lots of people in this house would actively dislike having them here and they can't be in this house".

I think it is still important for houses to be able to give input on people they think would be particularly good or bad fits for the house. Being able to give input on bad fits is particularly important because the members of the house may recognize that their house culture would not positively contribute to the growth and development of certain freshman, and may actually be negative. This not only works to protect freshmen, but can also protect upperclassmen. There are instances where uppercla

(same as above)

See above- I see the same problems occurring.

Sounds good. Ruddock already does comments.

Better than nothing.

I feel this is more judging than rankings, and has less benefits

I think giving impressions would lead to ambiguities that could easily be solved by simply keeping a strict ranking system.

This modification is simply to make it sound better, ranking by number is just a simplification that

could be modified to this more "acceptable" format.

I think this would make the process of freshmen selection a lot less stressful, and would give the freshmen themselves a higher chance of liking the house in which they are placed. We do not know the freshmen as well as they know themselves, so if by our ranking they are placed in a house that they hate, they will leave it, and the ranking would have been pointless. Thus, the idea of Houses giving impressions rather than rankings is a very good one.

this is utter b.s.

i heard the impression that my house had of me, and it was straight up offensive

however, my house also has a diversity issue, and i clearly am in the minority

This is already essentially what happens

I worry about ambiguity, but if the entire system becomes transparent, it might be a better system? For the moment, I'm uncertain what would be best.

I mean, the most important thing is that the frosh being chosen for each house are people the house feels comfortable with and who feel comfortable with the house.

Already nobody remembers rankings, just general impressions of people, so this would not be a terrible change. The rankings are just there to quantify the impressions.

It's impossible to get to know all the frosh well enough to confidently rate them based only on my own experience, and I don't share other people's values often enough to be comfortable deferring to their votes directly.

As long as upperclassmen have a say in the freshmen who join their house.

I think it would make much more chaos and affect the houses later. If people will be mild about their impressions, Freshmen that do not fit in a particular house might end up in it, which would negatively affect both those Freshmen and that House.

STRONG 3

Houses should have a chance to interact with freshmen before they get sorted. I am unconvinced that freshmen know where they fit best.

The way my house does rotation is essentially the impressions method, we have impressions that allow us to sort frosh into categories of: frosh that we believe would thrive in our house, frosh that would do okay in our house, and frosh that would do badly in our house. At the end of the day, rotation is about finding the right house for the frosh, but sometimes frosh don't know a house well enough to see that certain personality traits of theirs make their success in a house much less likely. U

If we can't rank, then I guess impressions are the next best thing. But let's stick to ranking.

impressions?

Again, upperclassmen are much better at perceiving fit than prefrosh.

This is just a less effective and more negative way to rank prefrosh. Impressions aren't quantified and would instead lead to vague brackets like: excellent fit, great fit, good fit, perfect fit, bad fit, terrible fit, etc. The only prefrosh that would stand out would be the ones that the house definitely does not want, because when describing people negative feedback is typically more noticeable. If houses are going to have input on prefrosh, it should be via ranking. It fosters the most posit

It would be the exact same thing as it is now, just without numbers.

See above

Rankings are necessary in order to get a strong freshman class for the house.

While at first look this may sound better, I think it would only serve to still take choice away from the houses. Words are hard to work with and are not quantitative. With 240 Prefrosh to look through, merely having words would just become a zoo of information and hard to work with. When 4 houses call a person "nice" "easy to get along with", which house do you put them in?

I think input is entirely necessary for houses to have a say during rotation. I think the way in which input is collected needs to be considered carefully to avoid any problems with people being mean and/or outwardly judging frosh.

This could be a better method but I feel like this could lead to a Rotation system in which people aren't as happy.

What's the difference?

This solution still leaves the possibility of a poor fit.

That seems pretty useless tbh we don't get to know every single person well enough to write a paragraph on each. Also rankings reflect how much the house as a whole wants a frosh not just what some individual's impression was. I don't see how this information would be used to sort frosh it's too qualitative and incomplete

Not helpful. We do that anyway through our comment system.

If prefrosh can have impressions on a house, the house should have impressions on a prefrosh

given the pairing method is apparently an algorithm I feel like this would be difficult to use effectively but it's fine I guess

My impression was that my house kind of already does this.

Alternatively, there are a significant amount of prefrosh who leave zero impact on anyone. How do we leave impressions on them?

Rankings are much more meaningful than "impressions." The comments attached to the rankings are already the impressions. This would just be a way of reducing the meaning of rankings and would make the picks process much harder. Freshmen also give houses rankings, and I feel like that is helpful for them.

As mentioned above, The ranking system provides a numerical statement on the best fits for each house. This maximizes freshman and upperclassman happiness, because it ensures that the most amount of people end up in the house that they belong in.

This seems like a good compromise position.

While nicer in concept, impressions will be MUCH more difficult and time-consuming to parse through than numerical rankings.

why not rankings, more clear

In my mind, an ideal compromise would be to allow houses a short list of people (perhaps about ten) they would prefer to exclude, and perhaps another list of people they greatly desire. How much this should be allowed to override the preferences of the prefrosh is a detail that needs to be properly worked out.

you don't have to put a number next to someone to know if they're a good fit, but it helps establish a general consensus.

I think this has a tendency to make the system biased towards people. I believe having a personal element is important, but having results published in meetings with the house can be detrimental.

This would be preferable, imo.

Honestly, the only student "feedback" allowed should be either "I really think this person would fit in here" or "I am genuinely made uncomfortable by this person's presence." We should NOT be going through each prefrosh and discussing them, but neither should faculty members in what JShep has planned.

This is what Lloyd does in the first few steps of rotation. The final steps (ranks, picks) are probably unnecessary.

What does this even mean? I think the correct amount of upperclassmen input is really limited to necessary 'red listing' of someone who the house believes is actually hurtful to the community. Other than that, impressions don't seem like they have any place in the pick's process.

It might be beneficial for houses to say which freshmen they think would do well in the ir house.

Houses already give impressions of the frosh; that's how they determine the rankings- by compiling a profile of a frosh given their interactions with many different upperclassmen in the house.

Sure, absolutely. It's the same effect, but if it makes the system seem less nefarious then I'm all for it. The important thing is that the Houses have a say in who gets in.

This really depends on the house, and should be left up to the house.

This seems like an overly-PC way to approach a very nitty-gritty process. At a certain point, a house needs to decide whether it wants Person A or Person B.

This leaves too much up for administration decision. The choices belong in the houses

I think rankings are still better.

There are many important aspects of house feedback - are they comfortable with this person living next to them? will they be a safe member of the community? will they respect the other members? - that I think are helpful and are not strict rankings

I do not enjoy how during house rotation meetings that it can quickly turn into a gossip session. Kudos to the leaders that can handle this and shut this down.

Same as above

Impressions without an ability to gauge their fit will do nothing other than give freshman incomplete impressions of where their best fit might be. Even in the current rotation system, with rotation rules preventing unfiltered honesty about the nature of the houses, freshman don't have a complete impression of what the houses are genuinely like. That's where it's important for upperclassmen in the know to assist them in getting placed in the optimal environment.

General impressions are largely useless, we need some kind of categorization. Categories like Blacker may be better than an actual list like Ruddock, but we need some degree of specificity

Impressions do not convey how much the House wants/doesn't want a Frosh as a ranking does.

Impressions would be a great improvement.

I did not feel uncomfortable with upperclassmen ranking prefrosh. Getting rid of officially "judging" won't stop upperclassmen from talking about prefrosh anyways.

Helps the freshmen get in a house that will fit them best. The upperclassmen know the most about thirty house and which freshmen would like/dislike living in there house

Depends on how they're used. If the impressions are just provided to a small committee to use or not use as they please, I don't think they will have much of an effect. If the impressions are somehow input into a picks process or matching algorithm, this could be a decent compromise, but one that is still worse than actual rankings.

So ambiguous as to what this means...what's the level of input we'll be allowed to give? What's a middle ground between ranking and not ranking? I'd be all right if we were able to continue giving our top 30-40 prefrosh and our bottom 10, but maybe not ranking each person

That seems pretty similar to me. I would need more info.

It's absolutely fine if it is private. If these rankings are released during rotation, that's really bad.

I think houses often know better than prefrosh what house they would actually like

this is another useful way for the houses to assess fit, and it gets across the most important information (if someone's a great fit or terrible fit). it does lose some precision, though.

Sounds like the same thing to me

No real difference between this and ranking.

Although rankings would be easier to match using an algorithm, it feels wrong to rank frosh as if some are better than others because of how social they are.

I think this is crucial

Allowing Houses to consider whether or not a frosh would do well in the House is important to ensuring frosh are placed where they will be most happy. The limitations of a timely rotation process are sharply exasperated if those who know the Houses best are left out of the decision process.

Impressions would be fine, but in the end we need picks to have the final say. I do not believe that frosh should be allowed to choose their own houses based on inaccurate "videos", as admin has explicitly stated would be their ultimate goal. It's not like these rankings are absolute anyway. They are just a way of quantifying which prefrosh would fit best in which houses. They are simply a means to an end and can be adjusted accordingly.

Impressions are all we have of prefrosh in any case. If we can say whether a prefrosh would mesh well/ if people in the house would like to live with the prefrosh or if the prefrosh would make everyone in the house uncomfortable, it is important to know those impressions and opinions of future house mates.

What does this even mean? At some point in rotation we need to draw the line, impressions are often very inconclusive and just mean the president and vp will. have complete personal choice on the matter.

I think explicit rankings are necessary to optimize both Freshman and upperclassman community satisfaction and success.

This question is ambiguous since I don't know whether to rank it low (because I don't think it's enough) or high (because it's better than freshman-preference only or advisory committee options)

Qualitative impressions are hard to utilize and makes it difficult to make decisions compared to a numerical system.

In fact, one of the ranks teams for my House already partly did this: based on feedback on great/good/okay/bad fits and comments from the house, they ranked some people at the top so

that picks would have an idea, and then sorted the rest into general categories.

This question seems poorly worded, but I think that the more interaction the prefrosh have with the houses during rotation, the better the result

Depending on how large the impression bin sizes are (e.g. bad/neutral/good is almost completely useless) I would be okay with this, but the way picks are done might affect whether or not only have impressions is sufficient to complete the giant matching job necessary

Impressions could easily have no power on whether a frosh gets placed or not. If a frosh creeps out a lot of the house, it's kind of a hard thing to explain to admin...

Some houses already work with a more flexible/fluid 'ranking' system which is specifically designed to give only rough impressions of Freshmen during rotation (e.g. 'bucket' sorting in which Freshmen are categorized as great matches, next-best matches, or fine matches and, in some unusual cases, unacceptable matches).

how does that even work

The rankings are really just a way to keep track of our impressions via a number, so doing this would just make everything slower and not add anything valuable.

The rankings are really just a convenient way to do this? If it makes administration more comfortable not to have explicit rankings, that's fine, but we have explicit rankings because it makes it much easier to sort 235 people than "well we like this person a whole lot" or "this person made a couple people really uncomfortable but then a couple people disagreed with that."

This is a possibility which could serve to give input to the houses while avoiding blatant ranking. It's unfortunately harder to quantify impressions, and ultimately you can't take all of the people who you have good impressions of, so someone will have to make a decision about who gets in. This is best done by the houses themselves, since the people who best understand the environment are those in it

Doesn't sound bad, but rankings aren't that bad either.

This is be Better than admin doing it for us

basically same as above, but upperclassmen should have a say if there are frosh that they are uncomfortable with.

Rankings help to quantify impressions. With 235 students, general impressions are not specific enough to deem house fit.

It wouldn't end up being significantly different from the current system, which is deeply flawed and unacceptable.

It isn't Rotation without a picks process

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 171 responses

Basically what I said for the previous question. They definitely should have some kind of input if not a strict ranking.

If the Houses have no input, then they have no say in their culture. We want people who want us. We want to build a social community of the people living around us. If someone does not want to live with us, they always have the option of moving off-campus or Bechtel.

Rotation and the house system are strongly linked together, so houses should definitely have input.

In the end, no matter how much I support not having rankings, I do believe the houses should have some sort of input. These are still the dorms that we live in and the upperclassmen should be comfortable with the people that are moving in with us.

This impacts the houses. Why would they not have input?

Copying from above. Based on my experience doing this, people maintain a high level of civility and respect for prefrosh during the process, so I think it's a valuable way to determine whether prefrosh will fit into the house culture well, which helps ensure that they'll be comfortable where they'll end up.

Given that Houses vary in their popularity with prefrosh and their physical capacity to house newly rotated freshmen, it is essential that Houses be given input in the Rotation process, both to prevent the gaming of the system by prefrosh, and to deal with issues of oversubscription at any stage in the Rotation/picks process.

Houses should have some input.

Again, to form the best possible support network the houses should be able to voice their experience while placing prefrosh.

I like input from the houses. I agree it could be scaled back though.

Students should have input into who they spend time with, obviously.

The house should have some sort of input, since they are going to be living with those people for the next 3 or so years...

I definitely think houses should have some form of input, since it is impossible for a video or a dinner to give the freshmen a good understanding of the houses. It is sometimes necessary for upperclassmen to also provide their side of things.

As stated previously, houses should be able to have input in specific cases where particular prefrosh would not fit into the house.

I like, again, that we can rule out the people who would make people currently in the house uncomfortable. Also, houses are a community, and I guess we should make sure if we get along. There are cases when people won't like people. I would like to make sure, as welcoming as my house is, that in general the houses won't alienate prefrosh they don't happen to like.

I (along with the house) would like to decide who I live with.

Placing people I don't want to live with is equivalent to putting me somewhere I don't want to live.

Frankly, it's hard for prefrosh to fully understand every house during rotation. The houses sometimes know better. I say this only because I know students who after the fact have said that they would have been miserable if they had rotated into their first choice house.

Again, I think this is one of the most important parts of rotation, as the houses know who would feel comfortable and happy in them.

People can't just force themselves into your community... you don't get a vote into who you leave in the same house as, who you eat with, who you have parties with?

The rotation process is a central part to the social aspect of Caltech and the experience each student has here. Thus, we should have the MOST say in the process.

If houses aren't going to have input on rotation, then don't bother with rotation.

It is imperative to preserve the uniqueness and integrity of the house system.

The Houses are what makes Caltech unique and the stress from schoolwork bearable. If Houses didn't have input, the prefrosh who rotate in would not necessarily be good fits for the house and eventually the house will just be a random distribution of people, not a community like they are now.

In enacting the recent decision the administration has shown they have no understanding of the importance of rotation and thus I am even more certain than before that it should be student lead.

I think freshmen should decide the environment where they feel best.

No shit, Rotation is what lets the Houses exist and gives freshmen options.

Maybe give people the option to switch to Bechtel if they end up not liking their house? That's reasonable enough to me.

I think this is perhaps one of the most important aspects of Rotation; rotation works not only because prefrosh get to choose, but also Houses are able to "choose" prefrosh that will continue to uphold House culture.

The houses have unique identities. Upper class men impressions and house input help maintain these identities and create a more inclusive environment because the upper class men feel invested in the frosh. Without input these investments disappears and apathy will rise. If the worry is upper class men rejecting frosh, putting them into a house where they're not liked won't help anyone. Sacrificing this identity and homogenizing the house system isn't worth the perceived benefits.

I've found out that several houses I initially didn't like were better than expected after rotation. As long as people are mature about the process and try to optimize for where they think a Prefrosh will fit in, this is a good component of the system.

Um..... The houses are the ones rotating people and have the most experience with this thing and are best positioned to speak on how/if to improve it.

Houses truly do know which prefrosh will mesh with them most easily, and which prefrosh will mesh with other bodies more easily. Houses should have input.

Brand new Freshmen who have not formed an understanding of the Houses should not be the only voice in deciding on where they will live. Where they live also impacts the culture of the existing houses. The houses' input is extremely important to make a well-informed decision to better the entire community.

It's so critical for creating the close, supportive, cohesive community the Houses provide. Everyone benefits. The upperclassmen have some say in who they're living with, so they don't end up with people they're uncomfortable with. The prefrosh benefit because upperclassmen have the knowledge to help them end up in a house that fits them well. The prefrosh benefit because they end up in a house where the upperclassmen they're living with want them and embrace them, because rotation helps insure t

again, its important.

Rotation isn't just for the prefrosh; it's also for the existing members of the House too. Everyone who wants to be in a House will find their place somewhere and allowing the Houses to have input ensures the prefrosh can find the place where they belong with people who respect and understand them.

This is extremely important. Prefrosh do not always get fair impressions of the houses and may want to rotate into a certain house or houses for the wrong reasons. If this is allowed to go unchecked, many people could be harmed in the process. The current members of a house know their house culture best, and are better than the prefrosh at telling whether or not a certain individual could thrive in their community.

The Houses are actively involved in the Rotation process, and not including their input is completely unfair. That would be just as inconsiderate as disregarding the prefrosh' opinions.

We live, work, and play with the other students in our houses. This is our entire life. We need to have some say on who we spend 90%+ of our time with.

People are going to self select into a culture that fits them. People don't want to be where they're unwelcome. I think it's going to work out a lot better than people think it will.

This needs to happen. For house culture to survive, we need to have a way for the house to choose and advise on their class.

It is 100 percent necessary. Without it, house culture will die.

House must have input. No one knows life in the houses better than upperclassmen. They are

the best equipped to make sure frosh are happy where they end up.

It is critical to the continuation of House culture that the House is able to have input on how they attract frosh.

If houses don't have input then they end up with more people in their house that don't belong and either those people will tend to be less social or the house will be less like it used to be. Eventually all the houses will be similar enough for admin to say lets get rid of the house system completely.

It is essential to ensure both frosh and upperclassmen feel welcome and happy in their environment.

The house ends up shaping the person more than anything else. Almost anyone can live anywhere, and if they really don't like a house, they will rank it low when it comes time for them to rank.

current students understand house culture better than the images of it that incoming freshmen get in a week

Houses should at least have input because only they know whether a person would fit into that house's atmosphere and which people would enjoy living in the house.

It is vital to the spirit and individuality of the houses to have input in the Rotation process. The upperclassmen of any given house have an understanding of what the house culture has been like in the past, what the current house culture is like, and ways to improve and/or build upon the culture such as by expressing interest in prefrosh which they believe would fit in well and benefit the house. Without input from upperclassmen over the years I assert that it would be impossible to "maintain

As opposed to having no say in the conditions to which we are subject?

Upperclassmen should also get a say in the kind of community they live in, which will eventually include frosh.

ABSOLUTELY FUCKING ESSENTIAL. No one knows the house better than the house itself.

If you're not going to include house input, it's not Rotation, it's "Assignment" or something. At least buy a tattered old hat and wooden stool so we can do a proper Harry Potter-esque Sorting.

We should have a say of who is in our house!!

Everyone should have a say in who they spend their time with.

This is an essential part of Rotation in my opinion. It's crucial that the members of a house have an input into who we live with. I would be very unhappy if a freshman that I feel uncomfortable around ended up living next to me, especially if I wasn't even able to voice that concern.

Students know best how they want their college life to be.

Have you ever heard of Nyquist sampling?

Without choosing to some extent which prefrosh the Houses get, they will lose their cohesion

House culture exists not just for the sake of "the houses" being an entity, but to make sure every student on campus has a place they are welcome. Houses need to have input in rotation to ensure the continuation of that culture.

Rotation is about finding the best House for each prefrosh who wants to be a part of the House system. There is no one who knows the Houses better than the Houses know themselves...

This is crucial to maintaining house culture.

Rotation is about the Houses and about the prefrosh.

How on earth would anything even function otherwise?

I think it is vital to the house system, and the Caltech experience as a whole for houses to have input during the rotation process. If the houses have no ability to select their incoming class, then overtime the houses will all become more and more similar and homogeneous, until house culture is eliminated entirely. I believe that houses are a way for undergraduates to find a core group of people who enjoy similar things to them, and to whom they can relate. If this is taken away, students w

I think this is literally vital to the collective success at Caltech.

Again: I THINK THIS IS LITERALLY A VITAL FEATURE OF THE UNIVERSITY.

The prefrosh will be living in the Houses, and will affect the people around them and the culture of the Houses in the future. The members of the Houses should absolutely have input on who they will live with and who will affect their community.

I think the houses should be able to decide their own future and culture without admin input.

This is what makes the houses houses, pure and simple. It is challenging to make astute judgements in a short amount of time about who should live in houses. However, removing house input would be a gigantic mistake. If the house doesn't like someone that ends up in it, they would likely be ostracized and have a bad time. For that reason alone, the houses should have some say.

This allows upperclassmen to choose who they want to live with for the next year(s), and it allows for a cohesive family to built.

The houses are trusting communities, and if the houses have no input on who their members are, that trust will decrease, and the spirit of the house is at risk.

A house is a community. A community is a two-way street.

Self-explanatory. Jesus Christ. It's important that we have input in who we live with because otherwise they'll bully us, take advantage of us, or hurt us and our culture to their fullest extent.

Fuck that.

It's only necessary to keep people out that shouldn't be there.

At the very least, students and houses should have input in a process that will have significant impact on our community and day to day lives.

If the Houses do not have input, then House culture will be forced to drastically evolve. These changes will not necessarily be negative in the long-run, but current tradition-loving students will be heart-broken. (Personally I don't care for tradition since it's largely arbitrary, unfortunately)

I know why people think it's "necessary" for house input in the rotation process, but it ends up creating houses that are just echo chambers. Also, I think a lot of house members lack the maturity to discuss other people without being rude about it, and for everyone else, it's an uncomfortable and morally dubious experience to talk about and judge the prefrosh.

I think it's incredibly valuable to have a say in the makeup of your community.

Houses should be able to have some input on who enters the house to maintain some type of culture.

While it is an uncomfortable experience, and should be reformed, it is critical to ensuring the best fit for the prefrosh. Houses can sometimes know that a prefrosh would do really well in their house, even if a prefrosh doesn't. also, rotating in a prefrosh that makes the upperclassmen feel unsafe is just as bad as rotating into a house that makes the prefrosh feel unsafe

If houses do not have input during rotation, then students who may not get a glimpse of true house culture will be more likely to make uninformed decisions when ranking houses. Thus allowing houses to choose frosh would prevent frosh from feeling excluded or misplaced during the rest of the term.

There are no houses without house input on rotation.

We definitely should have some input, as the frosh should be placed in a house in which the upperclassmen liked them, or else everyone involved will be miserable.

Houses are built on rotation, so they should have input.

As I mentioned before, this is a bidirectional process, and both parties should have their opinions heard.

How could they not? We're already under enough pressure, why give us less choice about who we live next to. For most people, they've never lived away from home before and aren't super well adjusted either. Houses ease the process of making friends.

Rotation is about student life. The houses are central to student life. We love the houses.

So long as by houses, you mean the people in the houses as a whole. House leadership should have no extra say.

Essential

I personally think that it is the best way to ensure that the Houses are very close and connected from within, like a family.

Houses know better than either frosh or admin who would be comfortable living in the house.

The point of Rotation is for people to get into a house. thus the houses need to have input.

Without this, all Houses will become homogenous, and then what's the point of even having Houses and a Rotation process?

Houses should have a say as to which freshmen rotate in to their house. This prevents awkward social situations such as one in which none or very few of the house members like a freshman, but the freshman still rotates in anyways.

Isn't the whole point of rotation letting communities choose who would best fit?

This should be REALLY obvious. If someone is roundly disliked by the upperclassmen of a house, rotation ending won't fix it. The houses need a way to filter out people who won't fit in socially in that house, and who therefore will have a miserable time at Tech in it. Similarly, people who are well liked and highly thought of are likely (not guaranteed) to have a better time, with a better support network for the stresses of this school.

House input is fundamental to rotation.

There are some houses wherein some frosh will do quite poorly, and others they will excel in. If a frosh whose personality clashes with house culture in an irreconcilable way says they want to be a part of the house, the house should by all means be able to say "no, this frosh will not do well here because their values are orthogonal to ours."

This question is vague and can be interpreted in a thousand different ways.....this could go from houses having input on how it's run and being a part of rotation like having events, all the way to ranking prefrosh. I love the first and despise the second.

Rotation doesn't work without Houses having input.

Houses need to have input since they know who would fit in best.

It is extremely important that the Houses are comfortable with who is joining. The freshmen's comfort isn't the only thing that matters - we upperclassmen will have to live with the freshman too. For example, there was someone who really wanted to be in my House and who sabotaged Rotation such that they entered the House regardless of our input. They then were an active harm to the community, so if the current system (in which Houses do have input) could result in this, I'm worried about the

Again, prefrosh don't understand the nuances of the houses and the houses ought to have input on who will be living with them.

For reasons stated before, this is essential to making the houses work. As close-knit communities, every member should feel a common bond with the other members. The opinions of the Houses in Rotation forms a sense of kinship with incoming prefrosh and allows for

upperclassmen-frosh friendships and frosh-frosh friendships to flourish because of this house bond they share.

Upperclassmen honestly just know better than prefrosh about where they should end up so the upperclassmen rankings of prefrosh compatibility with their house are actually just strictly more important and accurate than the way the prefrosh rank the houses. Almost everyone I know within a term or so of rotation realizes they were incredibly naive as a prefrosh and admits that upperclassmen made the correct choice for them even if they didn't end up in their top choice of house.

I think students should always have a say in things that affect them. The houses can still have a role in rotation without ranking frosh - planning events, etc.

soliciting student input on student life is CRUCIAL

This part is extremely important and maintains house culture.

I believe this is vital. With out the houses having input into who rotates into them, the houses merely become residential dorms. They would lose their distinct culture and flavor and become much more uniform.

The houses know best what kind of person succeeds in their house, and perhaps more importantly, the houses know best what kind of person could disrupt the community. A prefrosh-house match in which the house does not like the student would make the house worse off and the student worse off.

Without input from the houses, I feel the threat of people "not fitting in" simply becomes worse. People may want to be members without truly knowing if they fit in with the current people, causing tension and perhaps causing them to be outcasts.

This is absolutely necessary.

Upperclassmen have a far better understanding of the character of their own house via living in it than a prefrosh can get through a video, so the opinion of upperclassmen on the fit of a prefrosh with the personality of the house should have nontrivial weight in the decision process.

It's silly to keep the process even secret from upperclassmen. It seems unfair for houses to have input because only the IHC knows how the process works.

It affects us the most I think houses should have a say in any changes made to rotation. I also think clear studies should be done and be made public so students know how large a problem may be.

Houses should be able to have a strong voice in whom they want in their house. The freshmen are so important to the culture of the house because they have more free time and everything is new to them. Allowing the houses to also rank the freshmen allows them to try to have the best environment in the house.

A house's job during rotation is to represent their house in their own special way.

I think college students have a better idea of what the college experience will be like than high

schoolers out of home for the first time.

Houses should ABSOLUTELY have major input in the rotation process. Freshmen entering the house profoundly influence house culture, and houses should be allowed to decide how they want to present themselves and who they regard as best-fits. The alternative, houses NOT having input, would just make these houses impersonal dorms.

How could this even be a question??? Why in the world would houses not be able to have input? They are the ones who will have to live and work with the freshman for their entire time at Caltech. If the members of the house really like some of the prefrosh, and think that they will be a great fit, chances are that both parties will benefit from that input from the house. On the other hand, if members of the house voice concern with a prefrosh and think that they will be a poor fit for the house,

I think the houses must have some say in the process so students don't get misplaced into a house culture they don't fit in. For instance, Page won't pick a study-hard student who doesn't like drinking, whereas a freshman who didn't realize Page drinks a lot might become misplaced.

Though I don't like rankings I think that the houses should have a say in how the process works.

Houses need to be able to have input on their incoming freshmen. Anything else erodes community, trust, and the honor code as a whole -- I trust my house mates, but I do not trust the entire undergraduate student body.

This is absolutely essential to preserving the environments and cultures each house has to offer. Often, prefrosh don't have as good of an idea of whether they would fit in to a house than the actual members of that house do.

I'm not sure what this question refers to. I believe that it's good to give the students (who after all, are the actual participants in Rotation) a say in how it is done. However, if this question is talking about Houses being allowed to choose their prefrosh - the Houses already have the opportunity to advertise during their rotation events. If they were really such good matches with particular prefrosh, do we not think those prefrosh would still rank that house highly? If not, then why should

It's the only thing keeping house personalities independent and self governing. Why even bother with a house system if a few unaffiliated individuals are just going to control it all?

I think it's necessary for a house to like their frosh for the frosh to have a positive experience. If the houses can pick their frosh you not only destroy the Caltech safety net but also weaken the Caltech honor code.

I mean, they kinda have to?

This is non-negotiable.

The members of the house know best what kind of students would fit in and what kind of students wouldn't want to be in that particular house. Thus, I think the house presidents and the ExComm should be heavily involved in the Rotation process.

As the people who live in the house, they are well suited to tell which frosh will belong, but can't

decide for the frosh. So input, but not decisions.

Or just make all houses like frats where it's all Tun by the houses and if you don't get in then oh well.

If the Houses do not have input in the Rotation process, it will cause more chaos because the House needs to mesh well with its frosh. The houses pick frosh based on how well they believe the frosh will be a good fit; without the input from the Houses there is no way for a House to maintain its identity.

This is the most important thing.

It has made Caltech what it is today.

Why should anyone else have an input?

I can't believe this is even up for discussion. OF COURSE a house should be involved in picking its own members! A house is not a dorm, and it is not just a general living community. It is a home, a place with a unique culture, and a place that, at a certain point, Admin should not be able to interfere.

100% necessary.

Houses must have input on the rotation process. Without house input, you'll lose house culture, and the bonds that make houses so close.

I think having house and student input is very important to ensure both the new students and their new community are happy with the arrangement. If students are not welcomed, then it isn't a helpful arrangement for them either.

The plan has left room for members of a house to have individual input for people they feel uncomfortable with except now instead of doing so in a public house meeting they presumably talk to the deans (?) about the instance and they move forward from there.

It's a matching process. We want to promote the best environments/microcosms, that cannot happen with uninformed voters.

The houses need to have an input so freshman can end up somewhere that they are liked and welcomed

This is basically the same as the ranking question? I think Houses should have minimal input.

Again, for house experience to be enjoyable for everyone the house has to like the prefrosh and the prefrosh have to like the house.

You want to be comfortable with the person sleeping next to you:

Houses are the rotation process.

This is kind of a no-brainer. Shouldn't students have control over who comes into their house?

this is absolutely critical to the house system. the picture of the houses that prefrosh get is, since they haven't lived here for at least a year like current students at the time of rotation, flawed and incomplete. i have seen several people who would be a terrible fit in the house expressing a strong interest based on misguided assumptions (and to a lesser extent, people uninterested who i think would do well here). the house having input lets us make better decisions for everyone, and preve

HOUSES NEED TO HAVE SAY OR HOUSE CULTURE WILL DIE

I think the houses exist to serve the students, not vice versa. Dividing the student population by arbitrary observable traits because MUH HOUSE CULTURE is pretty stupid.

House input is just as important as student input in the rotation process. It's two sided matching, so both sides should have a say!

Again, those who know the Houses best must have input.

I think this cannot be taken away. Prefrosh cannot know what a house is like without setting foot on the campus and meeting the people, let alone watching a doctored video of supposed "student life". At the very least, people who actually live in the house, who actually care about the well-being of the prefrosh, need to have a say in where they all end up. Admin and prefrosh alone can't possibly know what life is like in the houses.

The people in the house get to choose who they want to live with.

The Houses are the ones going through Rotation, and the members of the Houses are the ones who have the most experience with having gone through the Rotation and living in the House community. It is necessary for Houses to be involved.

This is why I came to Caltech

Upperclassmen know about their own houses much better than prefrosh, and prefrosh know much more about themselves. Personally, there is a lot about my house that I did not know about during rotation. I think that rotation should have equal input from prefrosh and upperclassmen. Having no house input will cause there to be many people who may realize they actually do not fit with the true house culture once they move in.

Also, house input is necessary for a house's identity to be maintained I

We must have this. Upperclassmen understand their house much better than prefrosh can, good and bad parts alike. Additionally, I believe that we should consider that the upperclassmen have needs as well. Something that happened this past year during rotation was that there were upperclassmen having interactions with prefrosh where they felt uncomfortable, but didn't say anything at first because it wasn't big enough to take to an RA, and they wanted to give the prefrosh the benefit of the doubt

This is absolutely necessary and beneficial to both the prefrosh and the upperclassmen

If prefrosh X likes house Y but house Y doesn't like prefrosh X, it doesn't do any good to have

prefrosh X rotate into house Y.

Houses should have input in as much as possible. They are the main bodies of student government.

Prefrosh do not know who else is rotating into a class in a given year. Rotation isn't just "we like this prefrosh and we don't like this other one"--it is selecting a group of ~30 people who you think will form a cohesive community and grow together and learn from each other.

The people in the Houses have lived there for at least a year. They understand house culture, and the general vibe, which has greatly contributed to the houses having such distinct personalities. This allows them to see how the prefrosh might fit in at the house. This, combined with the prefrosh's own input, is the best thing to ensure the student really gets along in their house.

Why is it even a question whether houses should have a say on how they will be presented to freshmen? The houses are full of students who have gone through the process, and know what provides the best outcome for incoming students. It would be absurd to remove the voice of the houses from rotation.

HOUSES HAVE TO GIVE INPUT. Without input we will get random people and with random people there is no way to ensure that culture continues on. Where will the community go with a group of randomly selected people? The answer, to hell

This is a key tenant of rotation, fundamental to the existence of the Houses, subverting it entirely but pretending the Houses continue to exist is insulting lunacy.

same as above

if you're going to keep a greek system might as well go full greek

The Houses are the most likely to know if I am a good fit for that house, and no one else. You have to be in a House to know it's culture.

A lack of house input would lead to unhappiness from the majority of the student body. Those incoming students would feel misplaced in a house culture they don't embody unless they somehow miraculously picked the right house after spending a few hours in it. The current house members would feel pressured to accept students that they know do not mesh with house culture, and will be forced to change their own way of life to do so. The end result is an eventual dilution of all house cultures and

The house knows if someone would fit better than they know themselves

House culture very obviously depends on Houses having input on their classes

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 147 responses

The amount of effort that the IHC and house governments put into rotation can never be equaled by administrators, who are too removed from the process and its outcomes. However,

they are helpful as a last resort in extenuating circumstances (in my experience).

I think that students that have been through Rotation themselves know Rotation the best, and can reflect on their past experiences with it to solve issues and concerns they had with it as a frosh or otherwise, while also highlighting the benefits. Students should run activities that involve tremendous interaction with other students.

We elect them to be our leaders; I assume they're fairly competent.

If any committee is to run rotation, i would greatly prefer its members to be current students in the house system. I believe they truly care about the value of a house system.

IHC is (ideally) one of the most effective ways of having direct and efficient student input in Rotation.

It's our business and we should have a hand in it. I understand if housing or administration would like to discuss though.

Rotation ultimately impacts students. Students should run, if at least not have a significant say in Rotation.

To have a non-student run rotation would defeat the purpose of having mature adults (students) very familiar with the situations students face deal with those situations. It raises the very real possibility of mis-handling problems due to not understanding them from the students' perspective.

The students know what rotation is, what the houses are like and what campus life/academic life is like. Who would possibly know better the stresses that we undergo? Who could possibly relate better to the feeling of not understanding a physics quiz? Similarly, the students who have undergone rotation know how it can get a bit crazy, and the kinds of things that incoming frosh may be worried about when picking a house. Things like rooms, or bathrooms, or food policies.

I truly feel that the

Students are most directly impacted by Rotation and have spent hours working to optimize the process. It is only right that they be allowed to introduce the prefrosh to a culture that they are most familiar with.

The IHC, in my experience, is oftentimes (although, not in every case) full of self-selected students who very clearly relish the secrecy and power their positions grant them. I often question whether the secrecy is really necessary to protect people or just the consequence of this critical selection bias. It's obvious that upperclassmen are evaluating you during Rotation, does knowing the specifics of how you are being evaluated really change how people are going to react to rejection? It is,

Personally haven't had any issues but i'm sure it could have repercussions for some

Student input is good, although perhaps more oversight would allow for more trust between administration and students.

Everyone on the IHC is very approachable.

Students understand house culture more than anyone else and have gone through the process. Also, we care because we're affected and I know we've been trying to improve the system (like changing to an electronic system so RAs might not potentially make mistakes). I appreciate admin's concern, but I am not sure how open they are to feedback and how much they care about students' wellbeing.

IHC is chosen by the student body, so I put my trust in them.

Students have a vested interest in our culture and community and making sure it's the best it can be.

The students live and breathe the houses. There's no other group of people more qualified to help people find their best house match than the students.

IHC is a representative so they can facilitate the process but they are not supposed to make decisions you don't know about... that's like if Congress didn't publish the proceedings of its votes... how would you know if you are really represented?

House elected people representing each house and giving input on rotation couldn't get any better in my opinion. They are the most informed and trusted individuals on campus and they are the best people to do it, not admin. Admin will never be able to understand the rotation system like we do.

The only people who should run rotation are those who have gone through it and know what it's like (i.e students).

It works well.

I think the current system of Rotation is not perfect but is better than any alternative it would be replaced with. However, having students run Rotation is better than no Rotation at all.

Again, in enacting the recent decision the administration has shown they have no understanding of the importance of rotation and thus I am even more certain than before that it should be student lead.

Its really unnecessary.

Students are the ones that have to live with the results of rotation.

Students are the ones that should be running it!

Caltech advertises itself as a school where students govern a big majority. We're adults who've shown ourselves to be capable of making these decisions.

Students know more about their houses and social life than any other group.

Don't see any advantage with non-students running things. See possible disadvantages like wanting to make decisions worse, but more defensible, etc.

Students know more what it's like to go through rotation and be a student at Caltech than admin does.

Students understand the process best, and students know what it's like to go through the process. Students also know what the other students want, and have incentive to do a good job. It has worked well for years, and has created a closer community within Caltech than any other peer institutions have.

who else is gonna run rotation.

The members of the IHC are the people we chose knowing they would be the ones to run Rotation. As leaders of the Houses, they are best fit to do this due to their personal experiences in the Rotation process and their role as representatives of their House's goals.

Students have seen both sides of rotation and therefore understand it better than administrators. Additionally, having a representative from each house to voice their house's specific concerns with regard to rotation is very important.

Students understand their houses, rotation, and what will be beneficial to the experience as a Caltech undergraduate better than the administration could ever hope to. Moreover, the students are the ones who have to govern and live in their houses. They should have control over who lives in them.

Having people who have gone through both sides of rotation running it means they understand the stresses and difficulties, as well as the current benefits from the system.

I think students are way more in touch with Rotation and need to maintain control of this.

It is the only way to do it correctly because students have the most information and investment in having it go off correctly.

The students understand student life. They know better than anyone how the houses are crucial to student community and emotional well-being.

Students are likely more knowledgeable on the opinions of both upperclassmen and prefrish than any committee would be, and so are more fit to run the process that sorts frosh into Houses.

I think it's important that students who have met prefrish during rotation have a say in which houses people end up in, not some random faculty reading general impressions of prefrish.

Well, I don't dislike students running it, I dislike that it's students who willingly keep it a secret from other students year after year, and people like me have no idea how it ACTUALLY works.

seems to be working, and they often understand the process and potential issues the best

The IHC has done a fine job running Rotation in years past in my opinion and I would like to see this group of students continue to run Rotation as it is an event which concerns and affects us

as students most directly.

Reasonable self-governance has been the hallmark of Caltech's undergraduate life.

The Dean's involvement only for 'exceptions' seems like a good system

I strongly like that the IHC runs Rotation. Unless the IHC acquiesced to these changes, in which case a new IHC should be elected to do a better job.

It worked out pretty well so far.

Students know who fits best into their houses, and students should have that power.

I would definitely rather have students run rotation than administration. Unlike administration, we actually have an understanding of what it means to live in a Caltech house. We have the best idea of how to run the process to maximize overall happiness.

It's good students have a say, but maybe there could be internal politics so an outside party providing input would be good too.

I believe that personal input from upperclassmen is vital for the success of Rotation, at least on an anecdotal level. As a prefrish, I had wishes to rotate into *Booty House* and was consequently disappointing when I rotated into Ruddock. Looking back today I realize that I would have been supremely unhappy as a full member of *Booty House* and find that Ruddock most closely matches my personality. I credit upperclassmen in Ruddock for having recognized that and selected me.

Students are the most educated, experienced, and exposed to Rotation. It is unreasonable to expect anyone else to run it.

...and the members of these Houses are students.

Students who have interacted with prefrish and understand the community of their house are in a better position to conduct rotation than anyone else. That's not to say they do it flawlessly, but no non-students could do a better job.

We know the houses better than admin will at any given moment in time.

The students are the ones closest to the situation and are the ones living in Houses.

This is too great a responsibility to trust admin with.

The house system, rotation, and the Caltech experience is designed for undergraduates. It should therefore, in order to represent the desires of the students, be run by the students. Transferring the privilege of controlling rotation to the administration would take away a core component of the house system, and of the Caltech experience.

I trust them. I think that non-students, even with purest intentions, would not be sufficiently in touch with the vibes of various houses to do Rotation well.

Admin does not interact with undergrads on a day to day basis. Undergrads interact with

undergrads on a day to day basis. Undergrads live with undergrads. Undergrads should run rotation.

The people who best understand how the houses work and who is happiest and successful in each house (the students) should run rotation.

The current students make strident efforts to do a good job, but are resistant to change. It's a mixed bag.

Students are directly involved in the housing experience, and they know best how to place freshmen.

I think that students, being that they actually live through it, should be the only voices running rotation.

IHC members are elected knowing that this is their job. Honestly, I trust the IHC a lot.

We are the only ones who know the ins and outs of what's going on. The RLCs are pointless hacks. The RAs are alright, but many of them will be brand new and should not outright run rotation. Administration has a collective IQ of 86 and will hurt more than help.

The presidents are elected by their houses to represent them.

I think the IHC is pretty complacent about Rotation and all the questionably moral things they have to do to sort people into houses, because most of the time it works well. However, people who are unhappy in their houses rarely voice their opinions and it can have really detrimental effects on them. I know a girl who swore she didn't want to drink through college and now drinks heavily and there's no way to prove it, but I would guess her house has an influence on it (the house drinks a lot).

Works pretty well imo. Not perfect, but we all know it'll never be perfect and still aspire to make it close.

Students who went through rotation will have concrete ideas on its strengths, weaknesses, and what should be changed.

Students know what students want and will thrive in better than administrators pushing an agenda. They live with these people, not just oversee them.

IHC does an efficient job of placing frosh into houses with minimal complaints.

Again, we are the ones who have to live with the prefrosh, and they have to live with us. We are the ones directly impacted, so we should be in charge.

idk man if it makes people happy then do it ̄_̄(ʘ)_̄/̄

Given that the entire system revolves around students in the first place, it makes sense to have students run it.

Students are the only ones with a vested interest in rotation going well, as opposed to going ok

and never disrupting anything. Admin does not have the student body's best interests at heart.

I don't trust that's administration can successful build a community like the one I have in my house because they don't understand the complexities of this community since they are so disconnected from student life.

IHC chairs are our chosen representatives, and we trust them much more than anyone else to run such an important event as rotation.

The students are the ones who experience this. Not the admin. We know what works and what does not based on experience. This is literally our lives.

I like the idea in principle, but we need to show that we are mature enough to conduct rotation respectfully.

How could a band of administrators individually care about 250+ students?

This gives autonomy to the process. The students are the ones living in the houses, not Joe Shepherd. Most administrators here didn't go somewhere with any comparability to Caltech's housing model.

If one or more of the faculty who attended Tech as an undergrad are willing, I would be supportive of them running it or overseeing the process.

I sincerely doubt an administration run rotation would produce the kinds of organic social groups we have now. I specifically like having the IHC run rotation because they can be pointed to as the ones who do rotation stuff when frosh ask to know how they're placed in a house, and therefore they will not feel uncomfortable during interactions with upperclassmen and misrepresent themselves during rotation.

Again this could mean so many different things. What does it mean to run rotation? To put students in houses? To plan the events? What does this mean?

Rotation doesn't work without students having input.

Students should be in charge.

We should run our own social lives.

They've been through it before and thus understand the process better.

No one understands the intricacies of the houses better than members of said houses, making them the best people to run Rotation. Also, it legitimizes the choices made during Rotation. If an outside force were to run Rotation, students would not feel as strong of a bond with the incoming prefrosh. Also, students interact a certain way with their peers. Since Rotation is a way of organizing students' interactions with other students it makes sense to have it run by students.

Students know what will be fun for students much better than admin ever will. Rotation, above

all, should be fun for freshmen.

students best understand student life. listen to the students. For the most part we are adults. We can make decisions on behalf of ourselves

Students enforce rotation rules very well.

Although I think that having a faculty member or two at the Rotation meetings could alleviate some issues with discrimination and such problems, I definitely think that overall rotation should be a student-led process. Just as so many of our other committees and boards are student-led, which allows the students to feel like the adults that they are, so should this one be.

The students need to be able to have a voice in how rotation works, because in the end it is a process for placing students in houses, which affects the students primarily. I am certainly not opposed to working with administration on this issue though, I'm just opposed to students being written out of the whole process.

We are the ones living and going through the process, and we'd like some input on who we live with. My housemates are my neighbors and my friends, and it's important that new members feel comfortable and that they make no one else uncomfortable.

Rotation is the cornerstone of student life, so it only makes sense for students to run it.

Our main focus when electing a president is how they would serve is during rotation. The members of IHC are passionate about their role and connected to the wants and needs of their houses. I can't think of better people to run rotation.

Rotation should be a student-run event because they represent the house system the best.

Students should obviously be running Rotation. Rotation affects them and their culture. The biggest impact of rotation is on the students, current and new.

The students are the ones actually living and working in houses, not administration. Administration, even if they went to Caltech at some point, doesn't understand the current housing system and how important rotation is to that system. The students should have a say in how their houses end up shaping out to be.

Students should definitely run the housing system because the housing system is for students.

not sure what this questions means- committee running entirety of rankings/stuff?

As I said, it's definitely desirable for the participants in Rotation to have a say in how it's run. I need to however add the caveat that the process often breaks down into factional squabbling - so perhaps the committee should consist of more than just the IHC, but also with some randomly selected members of each house.

It's important that houses and IHC remain autonomous, and controlling rotation is an important part of that.

I believe the students here are capable people. They can organize themselves in such a way that makes rotation good for everyone. They do not deserve to have this task taken away from

them because it has not been perfected yet.

I don't think that we have done a good job fixing the inherent problems with the current system of Rotation. I think the people on the IHC are often the students least inclined to acknowledge those problems, particularly that Rotation has the feeling of an opaque "meat market" in which Freshmen don't have much information or choice.

Students have to live with the new freshmen. We should have the final say.

The students elected for IHC are generally responsible and capable. They are mature adults and can handle the process of Rotation.

They have not done a good job in the past, it's time it changes. Unless you just go the route of frats.

The housing process is for the students and by the students. It is a process that the students know best since they have been through it already.

Better than admin

Rotation is an undergrad institution.

Administration is not living the student life

Same explanation as above. It's the students who will be living with freshmen; it should be entirely up to us, and them, who lives where. There should not be 3rd party interference in such an important and personal process.

The houses are student based, the process should be student run

Houses know how the students will fit in better than IHC will, so houses should run rotation.

How do you define running rotation?

I think it's still important for houses to hold house events during the first 2 weeks but I'm not sure to what extent you're getting at with this question.

I think faculty + staff can definitely begin helping with the logistics that are specifically house related activities.

We are independent undergraduates. This is Caltech.

I think it should be mostly student run, with maybe an administrative point person for really tough situations

By students, for students.

I don't think students have that much power anyways; in the end, administration holds the power to end/change Rotation. It's nice that students get some say though.

Rotation seems like a student thing and should be run by students, maybe with a little guidance from others though

Students understand the house system best, and administrators can't be trusted to run the system without eroding it further.

It feels like my peers are helping me decide where I belong, not admin.

Students should run rotation.

Again, they're our houses.

Administration does not understand the house system so I sure as hell would not want them choosing which house prefrosh end up in

since this only affects students, they know the most about it and are the only ones competent to run it.

Better than the administration who doesn't know shit

It's a student tradition and afaik admin should trust students to handle this kind of stuff as it has worked for many years.

Student governance is important to maintaining a vibrant undergraduate culture.

I feel like I'm just repeating myself, but only current students know what current student life is like. What bothers me most in the Bechtel document is that undergraduates were not cited as the driving factors in the decision (though the COUCH and IHC were grossly misrepresented and taken out of context). I'm sorry but grad students, staff, and admin do not have a right to tell us what does and does not need to change about student life without our input. For this reason, I am extremely uncom

We have our autonomy and we are far less removed from undergraduate life than administration or professors are

They've gone through it, they understand.

This is why I came to Caltech

They've done a good job so far. One thing that I felt as a prefrosh was that because I met all of the IHC in a fun, relaxed setting at frosh camp, I was comfortable talking to them about the issues that I had. Additionally, by hosting our own events and deciding what they were, I felt that we were able to successfully express our House.

No one knows student life better than the students. Faculty should have no binding power over rotation

With all due respect to administration, very few of them have demonstrated that their priority is

the student body's best interest. Rotation is an event that primarily affects students, and I would only trust students to do the best job possible (since they are the ones benefitting from it). I would be very uncomfortable as a prefrish if administrators decided which house I would live in; they have neither the requisite knowledge nor motivation to do what's right for the students and Houses.

Students understand student culture in a way that can never be done by an administrator. This is true with or without student houses.

Students know what works best for students, because they have gone through it. Giving full control to admin will only result in unhappiness among the student body and an ineffective rotation system.

We are caltech students, we are smart enough to govern ourselves.

something like rotation can only be run by students imo. that said, it's only rly gonna be good for a certain subset of ppl. those who aren't close with any members of any selection committee (which definitely happens with the IHC) will get shafted.

The Houses are essentially student run groups, so students should be running how we get placed in.

Students know best what works best for students. There is no one looking out for our own self interests better than ourselves.

There's no reasons for admins to be involved

Admin should have little to no role in the Rotation process, outside of making sure everything runs as usual

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 208 responses

I think that videos would definitely be good, and a way to alternatively introduce the houses, but there is a huge difference between watching a video on a house and then actually experiencing the house for yourself in person. It is a good stepping stone, but Rotation is still so essential. It is not until you step foot in the house and actually talk to its people that you realize whether or not you fit into the culture. Every house will try to make themselves seem good, and so students will nev

No one is going to get a real idea of personalities through a video. Speaking to people in person is way more informative.

I dont agree with this at all because i believe it is impossible to truly be able to present all facets of a house through an online presentation or video. I also think this will end up making certain houses vastly more popular than others if they simply have a more well put together presentation. I dont think frosh can make an informed decision like this.

This makes little sense. A video does very little to communicate what actually living in the house is like until you actually set foot into it.

That's a lot of work and processing to do. Also, it's much more intimidating for students to have

to prepare such formal introductions of themselves, as opposed to just meeting and talking to new people.

Seems to slant preferences toward who makes the shiniest lookin video, which can vary year to year based on who has the time to make a nice video. An imperfect snapshot of campus life in each house.

I don't believe that a video is any way representative of the house. This is promoting the idea that the houses are just a theme or just a certain type of people. In reality, there are many different people in each house and the only true way for a prefrsh to know whether or not they want to join a house is too get to know the people themselves. In addition, the houses change every year based on the people living in the house, so it's not really true to the houses if a video was made.

This is like rotation videos. From my perspective, those were not very representative of the actual culture. Immersion in the house environment is better.

This would provide a hilariously low amount of information. We already do rotation videos, but they're short, and give very little actual insight into what the house is like compared to actually visiting. Honestly, this seems really obvious.

As I explained in the rotation question below, a video isn't enough. When I first got into Caltech, I did a bit of research on the houses (I mean, it's on Wikipedia and I was curious). I did have a bit of a preconception, I will admit. However, all of those preconceptions were shattered and I realized you cannot just characterize a house like that. Each house may have certain characteristics that the residents can share, or may have specific traditions, but in the end it truly is the people th

Video presentations are very different from human interaction, and seeing as students will interact in person with fellow students during their time at Caltech and during their experience with the House system, it seems bizarre to suggest that video presentations could replace the experience of human interaction that makes the House system special.

A video is not enough. Anything short of speaking to the actual people of the house is not enough.

Some students experience pressures at home that they would not in orientation week, and this would affect their rankings, likely demonstrating parental choice rather than student choice and making the student more likely to be extremely uncomfortable, pressured, or hapoy and removing their chance to grow and make their own decisions.

This is stupid and clearly not thought-out at all.

You can't learn about a house from videos. Only from people.

it's not really going to do much imo since you actually have to be there...and preferences change when you're at home versus even in the first week you get there so what you see before you arrive might not be a good indicator of how you feel once you get here

I don't think online introductions would be sufficient for understanding the culture of the houses.

While it would be nice to have a permanent room immediately upon arrival, Rotation was a valuable experience and online videos would not have anywhere close to the same effect. In addition, houses can more easily hide certain parts of their cultures in videos, which would be very problematic.

I think this should not be the only basis. Based on rotation videos, you get some ideas of certain parts of the house, but based on Ruddock's video alone, I had almost no impression if I would fit into Ruddock especially as they focus on the extroverted members who talk a lot or do comedic acts on a regular basis. What made me even consider Ruddock was those conversations I had with the more introverted Rudds and hanging out with them, seeing what they're like. In order to get an impression of

1 video is not enough to accurately represent an entire house!!!!!!

Production quality will dictate prefrosh responses.

The experience of living or being in a house can't come across in an online introduction. Admissions might as well cancel tours and prefrosh weekend and only provide online information about Caltech.

It's incredibly hard to represent the culture of a house through a video. If anything, this will encourage students to listen to house stereotypes that are often inaccurate.

The qualities of each house can't be shown in a video. Frosh need to experience the houses for themselves, meet upperclassmen, and get to know the traditions and quirks first-hand. There is no way that the unique amazingness of each house can be squished into a simple video.

No, you can't really know someone until you interact with them... that's a two-way thing, same for the place

A video will normalize all the houses and also public videos will be regulated and censored by admin. Every video would have to be super vanilla with the way admin has been going these days. a 2-minute video will not give enough information for a student to make informed rankings.

What a pitiful idea. Have you tried online dating? What if I told you that you had to choose your spouse of the next four years based on a video? (And the spouse doesn't get a say in the matter!) Can you imagine the politics that's going to on for those videos, and how deep admin will want their hands in said videos?

This will in no way, shape, or form be enough to make a decision on. In addition, rotation is a once in a lifetime experience only Caltech undergraduates have; taking this away takes away from the house system.

Videos are definitely insufficient and perhaps useless in giving prefrosh accurate representations of Houses. Houses are made of people and to get an accurate impression, they have to interact with the people in each House and visit each House physically to get a feel for the atmosphere.

To suggest that a proper opinion could be made of the houses based on a video and not actual interactions is absurd.

I feel that rotation is not an effective use of time, so the sooner people get to adjust to their environments the better.

This is just cutting out even more of the actual knowledge of Houses for the people who will be entering them, resulting in either more disillusionment or the death of Houses (in which case everyone gets a crapshot and can't find anywhere they can avoid, say, people who like playing loud music.).

You can't capture House personality in a video.

Students can't get an accurate reflection of the houses without meeting the people within them. Rotation shouldn't be about making connections between people, not advertising.

I do not believe it is possible to get an accurate perception of a house through presentations alone without informal conversations with House members. Even houses that currently have rotation videos do not really use them to present their house's personality. If admin is set on making Rotation happen online, at least set up some sort of chatroom system where Prefrosh can chat with current members

Videos seem like a uniquely bad way to get the prefrosh to anchor to specific characteristics/use prejudice in deciding because it's a low information stream.

All houses are unique and cool in their own way, but some houses can more easily portray their personalities through media other than direct experience. This could lead to a large skew in house popularity, resulting in many unhappy prefrosh who didn't get their first couple of choices. Or the prefrosh would just be confused and pick randomly, which would destroy house culture entirely.

First of all, this would not fix the "popularity" issue of some Houses having more students than others. How can social media fully capture the culture of the Houses? Culture is heavily based on how people interact with each other. These interactions and behaviors cannot be fully captured by video. Furthermore, this endangers cultures by enabling censorship.

It won't give nearly enough information, and the prefrosh won't be able to have authentic interactions with upperclassmen. It also doesn't give the houses a say in their new members.

videos cannot compare to interacting with the people...

Videos are not the same as in-person interaction. House videos only give a surface level impression of House culture.

Making videos to represent house cultures effectively is entirely impossible. Even at schools where a similar system is used (ie MIT), students are allowed to change their dorm or floor once arriving on campus and experiencing them in person. This will undoubtedly lead to students ranking houses based solely on stereotypes, which is completely counter to the idea of rotation. Additionally, these changes would make it so that only prefrosh who had visited campus during PFW would be able to see th

It's difficult enough for an incoming student to learn a House's culture during Rotation. A silly video will not give the incoming student a fair shot at getting into the best house for them.

I am not totally convinced that even the current rotation process is long enough to help students learn about the houses. Downsizing this process will almost guarantee that students do not fit well with the houses they live in. Moreover, I disagree strongly with prefrish being entirely in control of their house placements.

This will most likely lead to stereotypes of the houses being the main driving force of prefrish opinions. It's impossible to distill a house culture into a video.

These will be too scripted and sanitized to give a good impression of each house.

You cannot get an understanding from online resources

The point of rotation is to get impressions of the houses from interacting with the members of the houses

Videos will not come close to delivering an accurate representation of life in the houses without talking to the actual residents and experiencing slices of house life during rotation.

A House's personality absolutely cannot be accurately portrayed in a short video.

House culture cannot be portrayed through video. This is terrible.

Really stupid, you can't get a real feeling for the house by just a video. It's important to actually meet the people of the house you want to live in. Some videos are more well made than others and will have an inaccurate affect on preferences.

You can't get a House impression from a video, however at MIT, students choose before hand where they want to live temporarily then do rotation, and that might work.

It's easy to lie on a video. There should be rotation, but we should just be trying to woo them into joining our house because we legitimately think it's the best place to live. They'll also feel less pressure because we're not judging them, they're judging us, but there's so many more of us.

seems like it could be a nice addition, but nothing beats experiencing the houses in person

Online introduction seems inadequate compared to actually participating in a house's culture.

As a preface, I don't necessarily believe having a video and rankings before they arrive is necessarily a bad thing, but it shouldn't be the final ranking. I vehemently believe it is impossible to capture the true spirit of a house and everything that comes with being a part of a house here at Caltech just by watching a video. It is not an issue of length, as I believe even a half hour or longer video would simply just not capture what it is like to physically be here and having the ability to

So we want to replace personally experiencing the houses with a video now? If there are dissatisfied students now, who claim that rotation behavior in the houses were not reflective of actual house culture, and I'm assuming they are the same people who are championing these proposed changes, then their grievances will only be exacerbated.

Interaction with the House give the most accurate impression of the frosh

FJS

By removing the interactive experience, doesn't this idea suggest that students will be even less likely to evaluate the house that best fits them, and that more students will end up being placed in the wrong environment? That would undercut the whole premise of promoting greater student satisfaction with Rotation, unless the end goal is really just making every environment equally bland and unobjectionable.

People need to choose their house based on the vibes they get in person, not over a video.

Preferences between houses should be based on actual interactions between people, not an advertisement. Would you want to pick a college solely based on the promotional videos they release?

A video cannot be a substitute for multiple dinners/deserts where the prefrish get to know the houses and more importantly house members.

Personally, before I came to campus for rotation, I had a preset ideas of which houses I would like (based on reading about them online and even watching past rotation videos on youtube). When I got here, I realized that I was completely wrong. I ended up in a house that was at the bottom of my rankings before I came here (it moved to the top while I was here) and I couldn't be more happy.

Furthermore, there is no way a video can give people an accurate idea of the house cultures.

I think it doesn't give a very tangible and concrete experience to make good decisions.

You need to meet the people to make any sort of judgement. Also saps time from the house more so than just showing up to dinner and talking to people. Basically, it screws the few people that are tasked with making the video and no one else does anything. So, you don't get the input of the entire house usually either and it won't represent the house truthfully. Video's can lie / misrepresent much more easily than people can.

A picture is worth a thousand words. A video is worth a thousand pictures. Nine videos are not worth two weeks of rotation.

Seeing the houses and talking to students was vital to me finding a good fit.

We are assuming frosh are competent and are able to make decisions based on videos

This is an even less accurate depiction of real life in all houses than Rotation can be. The best way to know where you want to be is to physically experience the environment

Videos are summaries. Summaries are stereotypes. The whole point of Rotation Rules are to eliminate stereotypes from defining the Houses to prefrish. Being able to talk - in person, in a casual conversation - to a variety of House members is the only way to truly see whether or not you fit into a house culture: not videos of cool construction, or fun beach and ski trips, or parties. The meme is true: my favorite thing about my House is "the people." You can't express that in a video.

Also:

If the rank their preferences but aren't sorted into the house before coming to Caltech, I would give this proposal a 2 instead of a 1.

It cannot possibly provide the information necessary to make that sort of decision

House videos are fun, but prefrosh can best form impressions of a House by actually talking to people in it and experiencing it in real life.

In my House, having fun one-on-one conversations with upperclassmen was what made prefrosh like us. Some things just can't be expressed through videos.

There's also a danger that having students decide while they're at home will mean their parents decide for them.

There is absolutely no way that the robust, and diverse cultures of each house can be represented in video presentations. Rotation is about finding the people that will make you happiest throughout four years at Caltech. While that decision does not dictate one's entire experience at Caltech, and it can be changed eventually, it is pivotal to having a great first term and first year. Having students use videos instead of Rotation is like trying to understand the mona lisa, when each pixel of

You can't get a feel for the house from a video...

It might be nice to give prefrosh a feel for the different houses before they arrive, but it might also be hard for prefrosh to get an accurate understanding of the houses without talking to people first.

Did the proposer of that ideal seriously think that people would be able to get a feel of the house system though a video with absolutely no face to face contact? This is a horrible ideal

Watch Ruddock video. See lies

I think videos before arriving would be okay on its own, but ranking before physically seeing the house is unacceptable.

They haven't experienced the houses. They can't be expected to make an informed decision. Additionally they are still living with their parents, and helicopter parents might bias their choices.

It is impossible to have an accurate picture of each house without physically meeting people from the houses. I would have ranked the houses completely different before Caltech yet I've been placed in a house that I'm very happy in (and I think others feel similarly). I don't see what is wrong with prefrosh rotating as we currently do other than knowing where one is going to live before coming here, which I don't think is important at all. It feels like the proposed plan is moving towards m

This is only a good idea if the preferences aren't permanent. There is no way

It's not the same as actually going to a house, seeing the ambience, and talking to real human beings. Some houses already have Rotation videos, many of which actually reveal the house's sense of humor because they can be drawn-on yarns instead of having to convey lots of factual aspects about the houses.

This simply cannot give an accurate representation of the houses. However, this is still preferable to prefrosh being randomly assigned houses.

I don't think a video is an adequate impression of each house. The reason I ranked the houses the way I did was largely due to my actual interactions with the houses, not the media they presented.

You cannot possibly know enough from a house by a video. It is literally impossible. I love the rotation event and these events gave me (by far) the best idea of what each house strives to be.

UCSC did that and I didn't watch any of the videos. I just clicked on the newest one with the nicest facilities. Horrific.

I question the ability of video presentations to properly present what it's like to actually interact with the people you are choosing to live with. Being able to meet upperclassmen and talk to them was a huge factor in how I personally decided on what houses I wanted to be in or not.

I don't think these would give holistic information. If they come out anything like rotation videos they won't be that informative.

This sounds like a great idea!

I don't mind this as a proposed way to let students know more about the house system, but it's not ideal. I think Caltech should make prefrosh weekend mandatory and have fee waivers available for students' flights so prefrosh have the opportunity to visit houses and rank their preferences.

It sounds stupid tbh

Such presentations will be unable to capture the house's culture completely.

This is like reducing all of rotation to rotation videos. Houses are made up of people, and it is impossible to get a reasonable opinion of a house without talking to its members

Video presentations could never capture a truly accurate depiction of house culture, social life, and traditions within houses. The incoming students need to physically talk with people in the houses to fully understand.

The houses cant be summed up by a video!!!!

Rotation videos, while fun, are definitely not informative of house culture. Not to mention, the prefrosh should actually meet upperclassmen in each house and be able to ask them questions in person (so that nothing is misinterpreted). All of my doubts were cleared up only after I asked

questions about rotation--not to mention, the quality of the rotation video should have nothing to do with how a prefrish selects a house. The idea of making prefrish select their home of four years based on a 20

i don't think i could have gotten to know any house through a video

This breaks rotation rules so hard---videos are never going to be an accurate representation of the houses.

I believe that the best way to get a first impression is to experience something first-hand; a video could be limiting to a prefrish's interpretation of each House.

The people make the houses. "Ranking" houses without meeting the people is absolutely absurd.

This will only result in more unhappy frosh, as a short video will give them an even more skewed and less realistic representation of the houses than what some believe rotation does.

Might be worthwhile for temporary housing assignments, but if you think there's an issue with houses having "rotation personalities", this would be a thousand times worse. Absolutely insane to replace rotation with videos.

Ridiculous simplification of a large and complex issue

However strong I love my house and am absolutely sure about my decision, I was not able to figure it out which house is great for me until a week into rotation, so a distantly received information about houses, as recently proposed, would most certainly not have been enough.

Do you only look at pictures of a house online before dropping hundreds of thousands on it, or do you want to walk through the place to get a feel for it first? If you wouldn't feel comfortable picking your environment based just on a website don't make other people do it.

They should meet the people before they get a first impression. The people are the most important part of the house, not the video that they put out.

The incoming frosh will make uneducated decisions and a larger portion of them will be unhappy.

Even Rotation doesn't present a complete picture of each House in order for prefrish to decide where they'd like to end up (which, in my eyes, is one of the weak points of rotation). This proposal would remove even more information from the prefrish body's decision-making process, as each House can choose literally any way to portray themselves.

Sounds like an advertising campaign. How honest could we be?

A video doesn't capture the experience of physically being in a house, eating dinner in the house, and talking with upperclassmen directly about their house.

If I chose my college solely based on a video, I definitely wouldn't have gone here. Rotation is short enough,,, how could a video show anything??

Real-life interactions are better.

Online introductions cannot accurately portray the culture of a house. Houses are rarely monoliths, so regardless of how well thought out a rotation video could be, there will never be one that represents all the subsets of people in the house. Also, the point of mandatory dinners at rotation is so that frosh give every house a chance. Video introductions open the door to many issues, such as refusal to watch videos from certain houses, or helicopter parents watching over a frosh's shoulder and

LOL a video does not describe a culture. It's also super polished and never represents all people of the house. This is so dumb.

Videos can be fake and you can't have social connections to a video.

It's impossible to give anywhere near a clear and accurate impression of House culture through videos, especially if we want the videos to be of reasonable length. Moreover, there's no way to ensure prefrosh will actually WATCH the videos by themselves as opposed to already being at dinner and just being asked to stay for another 5-15 minutes.

Several house videos I saw as a prefrosh were so generic that you could switch the names involved and no one would be the wiser, even though the houses had extremely different personalities.

The argument against online introductions is best viewed through the lens of committing to a college. When a senior is choosing her college, she can do plenty of research without visiting campus, but actually seeing the campus and meeting students is an invaluable experience to consider in her decision. The value of this experience is in its qualia, the subjective, qualitative properties of experiences. While visiting some aspects of campus might give her an uncomfortable "vibe" or a certain

I don't know how to express my feelings about this beyond the fact that it's probably the worst idea I've ever heard.

Rotation doesn't need to die, it just needs to be made more transparent and less judgmental. Without rotation, I don't think freshmen would meet as many upperclassmen - also upperclassmen would be less invested in meeting freshmen.

It would be so easy to take advantage of current students via misrepresenting yourself. It isn't interactive-frosh can't ask questions to us about what matters to them and vice versa with houses.

Yes social dinners during rotations introduces a bias, but instead of eliminating those biases the video idea replaces those biases with "who is good at making an interesting video". Different frosh have different time, money, and technology constraints.

I do not think this would be an effective method of letting the Prefrosh get to know the house. As I mentioned earlier, this would disadvantage houses with less visual cultures. Also, at least in my personal experience, House culture is so much more than what we do/what we could put in a video. It's the conversations we have, the sense of humor, the spur of the moment decisions.

None of these things can be effectively communicated over a video.

While this method has worked with varying lev

Nothing replaces talking to people

I find that talking to actual students is the most important factor in selecting a house, so I would like to preserve that.

There are no videos to properly capture the experience of meeting the people in a house. House life is not a series of highlights, it's most important to know if you can actually interact with everyone comfortably and have fun. Prefrosh need to be able to see what their day to day will be like, not just their "highlight reel".

I think MIT does this; how well does it work for them?

It is impossible to get a full sense of the character of a house through a video alone. Talking to upperclassmen allows prefrosh to get answers to questions that concern them personally that might be overlooked in a video targeted to the entire class.

Most people rank based in person interactions during rotation.

Rotation is stressful, people feel judged. This would allow for more diversity in the houses.

Who in a video is going to talk about the downsides to their house??? It allows for too much calculation and focus on presenting an image that will attract frosh. Rotation allows for face to face conversations that humanize the houses and allow for specific questions and concerns from both ends.

Think of how deceptive many advertisements can be. Rotation videos are just one part of the rotation process and should be as authentic as possible.

you can't learn about a house from a video.

My house is not the sort that can really be explained in a video presentation. The amount of conflict within the house over preparing something that reflects every individuals own opinion of the house would make such materials impossible to publish as a group.

This is nonsense. How can prefrosh know what a house is really like until they've met the people there? Does a video of Hawaii replace the experience of going to Hawaii?

I think that this would be a useful tool in aiding rotation as it currently stands. This would give refresh an ability to fully understand certain aspects of each house, but it should NOT be the sole method of ranking houses. There MUST be interaction between house members and prefrosh.

I think the videos will be highly inaccurate of true house cultures, thus removing the sense of community that a house provides.

I think if we did it this way we would still have to have some sort of process during Orientation for frosh to see other houses and have the option to change if they strongly felt they were in the wrong house.

Houses are the people in them. Without meeting the people, you have not met the house.

There is no way students can understand what the houses at Caltech are like until they actually experience them in person. This will also likely bias prefrosh toward the houses that are able/willing to put the most time into their videos.

LuL

house videos are to house culture what memes are to real life

I don't think it's possible to get a picture of a community without being there and experiencing it for yourself. Furthermore, I believe that many people choose houses based on the people they make friends with (either other prefrosh or upperclassmen) and you can't know that without being there.

My biggest issue with rotation is that I was a totally different person one year into college than I was when I first got here, and at that point I wished I went to a different house or wasn't quite so stuck. This is an awful idea.

They should have time to change their decision on site

Prefrosh don't know themselves, and they certainly can't gauge house personalities based on videos. There's so much you learn during rotation that can't possibly be expressed through a video.

Also, you're essentially trying to represent an entire house culture through the people willing/wanting to make a video for prefrosh. That creates a huge selection bias.

The house videos are meant to be funny and informative but they are in no way replacement for person to person interaction.

Those can be very misleading.

This is possibly one of the most ridiculous ways to get frosh introduced to the houses. They need to meet upperclassmen in person!

It doesn't properly give the students an impression. They need to be here and experience it.

This is exactly what the Rotation process seeks to avoid. The purpose of Rotation is to allow the frosh to get to know the Houses on their own through experience without any preconceived notions or stereotypes of what they are. In video presentations, a House may present itself in a way that a frosh thinks they would like, but the frosh may be unpleasantly surprised when they arrive on campus.

Dear god no, they can't get a good impression about the houses from videos. There's things about the houses that students can't or won't put into online presentations, so prefrosh will get an impression of the milquetoast version of the house, and may be shocked to see how it actually is.

I don't believe this will be effective, and it's just more stuff that will overwhelm the prefrosh.

This is so uncomfortable, who wants to film themselves like this? It will select for the wrong qualities. Face to face communication, in person, is not replaceable.

You can't get to know them through a video...

This does not fix the "Rotation is biased! Houses don't present themselves transparently!" problem at all; if anything, a house can present itself as even further from its reality via a video, rather than actually interacting with frosh.

Will not accurately reflect the culture and the people of the house, houses are very diverse

This is absolutely horrible. Can't think of a worse way to do it.

could give unfair representation

hard to judge a community based on a video - need interactions

wth - this is just a bad idea

Oh god. This was probably the worst part. Introduction videos are NOT enough for prefrosh to accurately rank their preferences. It will become a bunch of sorority-video like displays of how "perfect" each house is.

I think some complaints with rotation are that freshman don't always get enough info about houses in order to make an informed decision. I don't think we should reduce the amount of information freshman receive before they rank the houses.

There is no conversation between a video and the person watching it.

I don't believe any video will be a substitute for actually being on campus and talking to members of the house, especially if the video has to be approved by admin

Houses have qualities one cannot get from a video

I think freshmen should be able to decide once they get on campus, but an online introduction before they get there wouldn't hurt.

This would not give an accurate view of the houses.

You can learn much about a house from a video or descriptions. You need to be here and meet the people to know whether you belong in any particular house

Slightly better than absolutely nothing, but it's nearly impossible to get to know someone via

one-way communication. See also the prefrish profiles that are distributed to the houses - people don't get very clear or accurate impressions of prefrish from those.

I think giving more information to the prefrish beforehand could be all right. However, I think rotation should still happen.

That would be a terrible system. You can't learn anything about a house from a video.

It's so hard to get a good impression of someone in 5 minutes over a video introduction. Additionally, people often get to campus, try to be someone who they aren't, and this would only be worse in video introductions.

You can't possibly capture the culture of a house in a video. People will end up choosing their house based on what they have heard about it, which will emphasize the house stereotypes.

this is a horribly inaccurate way to introduce the houses. for one thing, ability to make a good video is unrelated to anything important about a house. also, it gives essentially no sense of what life in the house is actually like. it can't answer questions like "what is a typical day here like" or "why did you personally choose this house" or "what's your least favorite part of the house". i especially think it's dangerous because it doesn't give a good idea of a house's flaws, or f

Keep it as it is

Honestly, it'd have the same effect as all the stuff they're doing now, just with less work needed.

Rotation is how people should get to know the houses, by personally going to each house and having dinner there and talking to upperclassmen. Also a great opportunity to meet upperclassmen and your fellow frosh. Video presentations would be a huge step in the wrong direction and picking before you arrive on campus would make us more like MIT which isn't always a good thing.

You can't know a community until you've been there, this will negatively affect prefrish that can't make it to PFW

Given the importance of having House input on where frosh rotate, I do not see how this would work.

Videos, even more so than current rotation activities, would be deliberate misrepresentations of current house life. Even if they weren't, I don't think anyone can honestly say that certain houses wouldn't bring in far more support than others. The houses with the most support would be those that do not vary from current societal norms. While this is not inherently a bad thing, I am disappointed that Caltech would even consider supporting a process that actively disadvantaged part of its alre

Videos are no substitute to meeting people in person. Videos can only capture the "house" not the people within it and what it is like to interact with them.

That definitely would be cool; I mostly like the online introductions part. It's not only a chance to showcase House cultures, but also get out to the world as a whole how fun it is to be at Caltech. I'm neutral about the prefrish ranking their preferences.

Not accurate at all. Also rotation is a nice way to start of the year.

It's not enough. This school has a vibrant, interesting, and deep culture that just can't be summed up in a series of tacky and preppy videos. Freshmen need to see the houses to even get an inkling about them because there are so many unquantifiables that are hard to capture in a community like a house.

This is a poor idea because it doesn't allow pre-frosh to interact with upperclassmen at all and it doesn't allow them to ask direct or honest questions. Additionally, rotation is much more about connecting with different upperclassmen in houses, than it is about a house's sense of humor or activities, which is all that could be expressed in an online introduction.

There is no way to accurately convey house personalities in video format beyond shallow impressions of activity level and social norms. This is honestly worse than students coming in knowing nothing.

You can't learn about a house and its people by (a) video(s). The individual house rotation videos that were used in 2016 did not reflect, for the large part, the actual personality of the house. Furthermore, it will likely be the most extroverted and outgoing members making the videos, which will attract/detract newcomers based on the personalities of those members, not the house as a large.

It's hard to represent a living environment and human interactions on a video tape. As a supplement to the existing rotation system I'd perhaps roll my eyes and think it all very silly. If it were used as a replacement, I would instantly question the competency of whomever is responsible for the decision.

The videos mean nothing. Seeing videos of Caltech didn't convince me to go here. Talking to the people did. The Houses are no different.

While I believe this is a more direct way to communicate house culture, I do believe pre-frosh should be given a week to freely survey houses they already find interesting as they please. No mystery. They know what they are getting into and this surveying process could only help narrow their options. No more of that guessing nonsense.

I think just watching a video isn't a good enough impression for frosh about houses and doesn't enable them to pick a house in which they fit as well. This actually decreases transparency for the frosh about the houses.

This might work well for some houses, but for most I think you need to experience the atmosphere and the people first hand to develop a well informed opinion.

This is an extremely superficial way to run rotation. Some houses cannot properly present themselves in a propaganda video, and this is pretty explicitly just sorting people into houses by stereotypes.

Students being able to rank their preferences before arriving may be a good idea to place them for their rotation assignment, but should not be used to determine their permanent assignment. Parents would have much more influence than is appropriate, and students who are, for instance, gay but have not come out yet may not feel comfortable in picking an environment

which is suited to their needs

There is no video that can explain my house. This is why house input is important!

Videos are short, artificial, and misrepresentative. It is extremely important that incoming students experience the houses firsthand before they make a decision.

This is what peer institutes do, and it works for them, but not for us. We are way too small to do this efficiently.

A big pitch for all-fresh Housing was that rotation was too short. Shepherd somehow twists the focus group words around to imply that rotation should be replaced with a video? I'm disappointed.

I mean it really doesn't matter

You can't glean anything important from a video and if there was no rotation, you'd be able to find stereotypes about the houses everywhere, so you'd self-select that way.

Houses can't tell what a pre-fresh isn't like just from an application. For example, Houses with more LGBT safety nets would have a hard time figuring if a pre-fresh could make the house uncomfortable with homophobic remarks, or just feeling less comfortable to come out. Thus, we need to know what these students are like just as much as they need to know the house.

Terrible. Videos do not represent a way of life. Videos can be artificial and fail to paint a full picture. They force information upon a student rather than informing them of the things they actually want to know and would ask house members in person.

Videos give no real sense of anything

This is absolutely disgusting. Video introductions are far away from getting the vibes in person. There's a reason why we do PFW instead of sending promo videos to prospective students. It may be annoying to move after a week on campus but most upperclassmen help you and it's something people know they'll have to do beforehand.

I would guess that "knowing where you're going to live before you get here" isn't a major concern for most students.

You strictly CAN'T represent an entire house's culture with a short video that admin signs off on - it just won't work

You can't get an impression of a house in 5 minutes remotely compared to the impression you get after ten days on campus.

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 143 responses

Maybe in conjunction with the IHC and house presidents? In either case it is hard to believe that there will be not be a large amount of overlap between the two, so the committee seems largely redundant.

Separate groups should run housing and Rotation. They can cross-talk and discuss to optimize the outcome, but they are fundamentally different things.

If done correctly, it seems like a good way to create transparency and trust between students, faculty and staff.

I believe that there should be all members of IHC on the Advisory committee if it were to become a real thing. If you choose certain members of IHC, you won't really be able to gain the opinions of all the houses.

Don't know much, but it depends on the makeup of the committee and how much of a voice the students have.

It might be good, it might not. I'd need more details.

I think that self-governance in the Rotation process is vital. Unless the makeup of the Advisory Committee on ResLife is changed to include representatives from each House and living community (Marks, Braun, Bechtel) and that students are given final say in all decisions, I am extremely opposed to the AdCom on ResLife running Rotation.

The committee currently does not seem that it will have enough student input, the single most important factor in rotation.

Why don't we set up a committee to propose the members of the committee? This is the sort of thing that the IHC should just do.

what's that???

Don't know enough of the details, no comment.

I understand students being on them, but I am really not sure how much admin or faculty will listen to our concerns or input. It mostly depends on who's on the committee. If any admin or faculty are placed, I would like for it to be based partly on how well we can develop mutual trust and how much they care about us. I'm sure there's at least a few people out there (unfortunately, Dean Green is retiring).

Unsure

The Advisory Committee needs to have more student input than currently proposed because students are the ones who are central to all this and have a vested interest in our community and culture. The IHC is already composed of student leaders elected for this purpose and trusted by their peers to run Rotation.

You can't describe someone accurately if admin is listening to what you're saying

The majority of the committee should be students hands down.

Said committee will only ruin the rotation experience and make it so bad that the only alternative will be to get rid of it entirely in the coming years. Hmm...

It's fine as is

I don't like how the committee is picked by one person. It seems like there would be an unfair bias and the committee would not be representative of the opinions of the overall student body.

The houses/students should be the ones running rotation.

I still think that the people who actually have to live with the results should be the ones running with this.

That said, I'm having a hard time figuring out what this committee is going to be about or how it will be run from the proposal.

Who are these people going to be?

Rotation should primarily be an IHC event.

Ambivalent.

They're not connected to student life and don't relate to students or understand or listen to their concerns. They also tend to take heavy-handed actions without full knowledge. For example, see how Joe Shepard tried to pretend he was working with student leadership and then tried to hide the recent announcement and changes to rotation without consulting students.

Some people on the Advisory Committee won't be students who personally understand Rotation and the needs of the students. As Caltech students who are also adults, I think we should be allowed to govern ourselves regarding our own undergraduate life.

It is completely unacceptable to suggest a committee with more administrators than students, especially one where not every house is represented. It may be beneficial to add staff to the existing board (I have not been on the IHC and therefore cannot comment) but I very strongly believe that a committee governing something as unique to the undergraduate experience at Caltech as rotation should be majority students and must have representation from each house. The houses face very different challenges.

Students understand Rotation best.

My motivations for disliking this are evident from my previous explanations.

It would depend on who is on the committee. I feel very strongly that students must have a say.

It will not be as effective as students and it will not preserve house culture

No one really understands life within the houses without having lived there. Students are the ones who nurture their house community and they should get the full say in rotating freshmen to keep the culture and community of the house alive.

Similar to the answer about IHC running rotation, it's important for actual students who have actually met the prefrish to be making all the decisions.

I far prefer the current system to the idea of the new system.

Do we have no say? Must we be subject to figures of authority who have proven since time immemorial that they do not have the students' best interests in mind?

Joe Shepard is going to put people that agree with him on there.

How do i cope under a fucking totalitarian dictatorship

Someone has to be involved, but I'm unsure what's wrong with the current advisory group.

People who have not experienced rotation should not be placing people in houses. The people who live in those houses and who know what it is like are the best judges of what it is like in a house, and who would enjoy living there.

Rotation should be run solely by the IHC.

If students have majority of the say then I'm fine with it.

Seems scary. This quote could be construed to mean abolishing rotation:

A new Advisory Committee on Residential Life will be established to help implement the initial changes, provide ongoing assessment of Bechtel and the Houses, and make recommendations to the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) for further steps or improvements

Students by far have the most experience and exposure to the ins and outs of Rotation.

The Houses know the Houses best, and who would fit in there. Period.

Concerned that the houses will not be represented and undergrads will be left powerless

Seems like a slippery slope.

Admin's heart is in the right place (want to take care of the prefrosh), but how well will faculty actually know the prefrosh?

Students should run rotation.

As I explained above, Rotation is designed for the students, and therefore should be run by the students. There is no way that a group of administrators could make decisions about what the students want, better than the students themselves.

It would be okay, if it was entirely students. I don't need it to be IHC. But I strongly dislike the idea of non-students running it.

For the reasons I mentioned earlier, current undergrads, who live in the houses and know the houses, should be the ones running rotation, not the faculty and not admin.

I don't think a committee appointed by admin can run rotation correctly.

Don't have enough info to give a good answer. But it sounds alright if run by house members.

I'm not convinced that this Committee can gauge how well prefrosh would fit in a house, to be honest.

It should be run by the students that know the system and challenges of UG life at Caltech best.

More than just a few people have to "run Rotation"

I would not mind having the IHC + faculty oversight, but I do not believe the Advisory committee would be well equipped to tackle Rotation, especially with all the different aspects of Bechtel implementation they must handle.

If admin isn't living every day with the outcome of rotation, why should they get any say in that outcome?

I think such a committee will only reduce transparency and produce worse results.

I don't want an unelected committee that does whatever the VPSA wants running anything. We live in a representative democracy, not a dictatorship

IHC does a fine job. Why fix something that isn't broke.

We already have the ihc

Depends on who is in the committee--students or faculty? If faculty, I would like for it to be faculty who are from the counseling center or likewise, rather than from administration.

honestly idk

Admin doesn't know the houses/what the houses need and want like its students.

I feel that Rotation should be a student-run system; there doesn't seem to be a need for faculty to be involved.

This committee clearly will fail, as did the committees for student protection that created this plan.

See previous comments. Don't let anyone over thirty anywhere near this.

We already have the IHC

You can't artificially create a community which you aren't actively a part of

I do not think that non-students should make the decisions (or help to make the decisions) about rotation and house lives. One should have gone through this process himself/herself and experienced the house life in order to be fully qualified to make any decisions regarding rotation and houses.

If you mean the admin-run committee, that sounds like a good way for people who don't really know that much about what it's like to live in a house to end up making a lot of people really uncomfortable.

Like I said, this is student life. Student's should run student life.

Really don't have enough information - which in and of itself is a bad thing.

Admin doesn't know each house as well as the house members themselves. If you have not lived in the house, not to mention experienced rotation, you do not know the house, its personality, and its traditions.

Same reason as above

I don't think this committee would have a real understanding of what each house means.

I don't think people really understand what running rotation means.....

No, let students self-govern.

Also who is this committee??? We never get to see the names on this stuff, so Shepherd always takes the fall. One man can not make this decision. someone else is above him is pushing this.

How would they know anything?

Rotation and the House system are integral parts of STUDENT life. I don't understand why we have so little say as to how our OWN social lives will be run. I am opposed to the idea of an Advisory Committee on Residential Life UNLESS students have the majority of representation. Almost all of us are adults, and it's insulting to me that we're being treated like children who can't make our own decisions about how we want to live.

As long as students maintain majority control, I don't really care which students are in charge.

The fact that the Advisory Committee on Residential Life (ACRL), a committee that includes people who are NOT members of the undergraduate community and are not directly impacted by the choice made during Rotation, was suggested to run Rotation is troubling. While I am fine with "faculty and stakeholders from Student Affairs" sitting in on Rotation and ensuring that nothing too shady is going on, I am not comfortable with people outside the ug community making decisions that pretty much only i

Meh. Just keep it student-driven. Don't hire an army of new bureaucrats who don't get student life.

I need more concrete details about how this committee will work to have an informed opinion. Student opinions need to be considered: COUCH's recommendations, as I understand, we're solicited but not taken seriously. I am afraid of that happening again

As said before, this would eliminate house involvement in Rotation, which would decimate

house culture. Specifically, the advisory committee would have no way to meet and get to know all the different Prefrosh to really get an idea of where they would best fit.

Currently, we try to place people for PFW in houses that fit their personalities based on their pretty extensive interest sheet. However, in talking to many people about their experiences, most agree that those houses are not the best

I am fully opposed to this committee unless the IHC is part of it. If that happens, then the committee is fine because there will be input from each house. It's really a function of getting the right students on the committee, and I see no better option than the elected leader of each house.

Mysterious all-powerful committee hand-picked by the VPSA. I.e., no student input at all.

Rotation should be run by students because it is a deciding factor in the nature of student life. Allowing students to have control over the future members of our house goes back to the key value of choice that seems to be hypocritically emphasized in the Bechtel Plan.

It seems like their job is to assess and raise concerns. I fail to see how this coincides with running rotation.

I am not opposed to faculty being in the rotation process, but students must be the predominant force on the committee.

given the way this bechtel shit looks I strongly oppose anything run by joe shepherd having power

too little student representation

Leave Rotation to the students. Only students can really understand how Rotation impacts them and will be motivated to do what's best in consideration of other students.

Absolutely not. The students are the ones who are actually affected by the decisions made during rotation, so why would administration run rotation? Let the students run their houses and ensure that rotation runs smoothly.

I think the IHC should have responsibility over Rotation.

An unbiased committee is needed for Bechtel decisions, as it is meant to be an unaffiliated residence, but that committee's decisions should not be forced upon all the other houses as well.

I don't really know the expected makeup of such a committee - but I do think students should be given more autonomy.

Heavily dislike a committee handpicked by Joe, as opposed to elected or chosen by the student body (considering that we're the actual ones living in these residences)

Basically hands all power for all houses over to the advisory committee. If a house is behaving

poorly or has a bad relationship with this committee, the committee can basically change that house's culture without any repercussions.

You're literally stripping house personalities. Might as well just start calling them all "Betchel".

I just don't understand how admin could place students in an effective way when don't know what the frosh are really like or what the houses are really like due to not having interacted enough with either to place students.

I don't want faculty and student interactions entangled to the point of residency and social life - that makes me incredibly uncomfortable that a professor could have preconceived notions about me based on what I wrote on my interest sheet as an 18 year old.

This committee is a figurehead so that Joe Shepherd can do whatever he wants. The ratio of undergrads to whoever else is ridiculous.

The students are better able to run Rotation because they live in the house and share the experiences that the incoming freshman will have.

It is good that the admin is trying to work together with students to create a healthy Rotation process,

If it has every house represented by elected students, then ok. If it's just faceless bureaucrats that don't know the houses, then no.

For something like this to work, you would need trust between the committee and the students. Caltech has entirely lost this trust with the extremely dirty politicking employed in this whole mess.

Rule of the few?

Most of you never even went to Caltech for undergrad, you have no idea how the houses are. If you all agree to rotate into a house and spend 4 years in each of the houses then this would be plausible.

I feel like I've made my reasons clear, so I won't be redundant here.

Not there place

Needs to be student elected body

The committee is not a bad idea, but in the context of Shepards plan it sucks.

depends on how it is made - I definitely want student input and don't want these people to be cherry picked - they should be selected by a wide variety of students since they are representing the whole community

But this group really needs to be one that trusts one another and not faculty + staff vs the students

Change for the sake of change is ridiculous. The Polaris proposal included what would be best for students. If 5% of people don't like a system, you don't scrap the whole thing.

Current upperclassmen need to be involved or they will become apathetic. Part of the reason that houses can form tight knit communities across class levels is because upperclassmen feel invested in their freshman class

It should be student run

IHC and student leaders tend to have extreme views. An independent committee would ideally be more representative of the entire student body.

I don't have enough information to evaluate this new committees capability to replace the current hundreds of hours put into rotation.

Students understand the house system best, and administrators can't be trusted to run the system without eroding it further.

IHC should run rotation, maybe with faculty/staff advisors.

It's a student run process. It's always been like this. It's a big part of what makes Caltech.

the IHC does a good job and rotation should be run by students.

They are clueless and will not have the students best interests in mind

I believe that students will always be more informed on student opinions than a committee of faculty and staff could be.

I don't really care who runs rotation as long as it's changed as detailed.

I mean student say is important but it shouldn't just be a committee.

I am suspicious of the high percentage of admin and faculty and I am dubious that this committee will not do any judging. They have to, to put prefrosh into residences.

I am happy we've been given a sharp kick in the pants to streamline the rotation process. And I do think that some faculty involvement may be helpful to ensure that the unpopular but necessary decisions are made. But I still think that maintaining a vibrant undergraduate culture requires undergraduate leadership.

I still believe the houses should be in charge of rotation, and not some unaffiliated entity (even if it does include undergrads)--but more importantly, I am livid that after all this the VPSA would even consider now having full control over all rotation and student housing from here on (in the form of appointing members). I am not comfortable with having someone so opposed to student opinion in charge of student well-fare.

If this were to happen, student representation cannot be restricted to whichever undergraduates

Joe Shephard or the faculty know best. Everyone deserves a fair say in who they will be living with.

I ranked this at 1 because I'm not completely sure what "faculty" entails. Any faculty members should be faculty in residence, because they would actually interact with rotation. Additional members I'd like to suggest are RA's or RLC's, who have a more indepth knowledge of what's going on than others might. Lastly, students should be on the committee, at least one representative from each house to ensure that all houses are heard, and at least one more general student representative who c

I don't trust a committee in which students are a minority to in any way make informed choices about student life

Not enough details on this committee, or on what "running Rotation" would entail to answer this question.

I see no problem with the way the picks teams currently work.

It sounds like a thinly veiled excuse to take away autonomy from the students and to secure power for the administration in determining our social and living groups.

It's great to have students providing feedback and helping with decision making and implementation, but it seems a bit unnecessary.

This is literal cancer.

it doesn't seem like an improvement on the IHC, bc there's no way of making sure hat they're trusted by the student body or representative of them

Faculty and Admin don't understand the houses on the level students to. They should only watch and help limit discrimination, but admin won't make decisions that are as good for the house as actual members of that house will.

An advisory committee couldn't put the incredible amount of thought and consideration into rotation that the houses do.

What do they know?

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 169 responses

I definitely liked being able to interact with house members and getting the unbiased view of Houses myself. It is always much better to interact with members yourself than watching videos or hearing about encounters or stories from others. The rules kept it as unbiased as possible, and I truly like the house I am in. I think that there should be a way to opt-out (Bechtel), but I really think Rotation and the house system is what makes Caltech different. No other college that I know of has anyth

I thought it was a fun & cool way to experience the house system and make new friends quickly and efficiently. At the same time, it was slightly awkward and too short; although I think I made the right decision long-term, I don't think my impression of my house before I rotated into it was 100% accurate.

Also, fortunately for me, the decision was pretty easy to make, but I don't think that's true for all students. At the same time, I love the house system and think it's an essential part

It was tiring, but exciting. The rotation events were very cool and I looked forward to them. There was always the uncomfortable friction of having to present yourself to strangers though.

I liked being able to go around to all the houses during dinner and dessert and talk with the people themselves. It definitely changed my opinion because I got to know upperclassmen in Avery and changed my initial thought that I would rotate into Ruddock, which was based off of incomplete knowledge of the houses.

Pretty cool. Never felt pressured into doing anything.

Rotation was one of the most fun times of frosh year, honestly. I loved it, and it was very fun meeting all those new people and doing all those activities. If I could do it again, just for fun, I totally would. I'd love to meet and get to know even more people here at Caltech.

I would say that it was a bit tiring, having to juggle ventura beach, rotation immediately after and then classes and the rest of rotation. Perhaps shortening rotation may be an option...

HOWEVER, ROTATION OVERALL WAS AMAZING! It was a wonderful experience, in which I got to meet so many other people in my grade. In addition, I really got to meet many upperclassmen in all of the houses, something that wouldn't have happened had I just picked a dorm like in other colleges. To me, rotation is

I enjoyed learning about different Houses and spending time in each House. Although I did not feel like I would fit well with every House (and I still feel this way), I had some positive experiences during Rotation in all Houses. At times I needed to take breaks from social interaction, but I did not feel judged in any way during my Rotation.

I liked it. Did not know realize the House members quantitatively ranked us though.

I found it stressful at the time but really appreciate that it pushed me to interact with pretty much everyone on campus.

I thought it was stupid and still think it is.

It seemed fine, tbh i didn't really know what went on in the upperclassman side until later...but to me, it gave me an idea of what houses i liked better than others and how i felt after my first 2 weeks as a frosh matches how i feel now about the various houses and how i would have fit in them

It was very overwhelming, and hard to navigate. Trying to make friends within my class as well as starting classes and getting to know upperclassmen was a tough process in the first few weeks.

Rotation should end before classes begin, and it would have been much more pleasant to know that upperclassmen are not judging.

I had almost no problems, though I did hear about friends being put in the wrong house. I know I made the better choice for myself, though I was a little conflicted, especially at the end since Ruddock was one of my last dinners.

I found my niche rather quickly, so I have no negative memories of rotation. I knew that I was being judged, and I didn't mind it since I was also judging.

I had a good time

Rotation helped me get a strong impression of all the Houses.

I loved it. I had a really fun time meeting people from all the different houses and falling in love with my current house. I'm still close with the friends I made from the house I rotated out of, even though they're all in different houses. Rotation gave me a chance to appreciate every house and meet so many lovely people.

It was a little bit draining but it was enjoyable and overall very important to get to know some people and figure out where I will live and who I will spend my time with.

Although it was a tiring experience, it was worth it 100%. I was placed in a house where I would thrive the most, and rotation delivered that. The process works for those who want to put in the time for it.

I had an excellent experience meeting people and getting to know the different colors of Caltech.

I really value it as an experience. There are some aspects I even miss. I really enjoyed rotation.

I really enjoyed Rotation and without it, if I were only given Prefrosh weekend and the house videos, my ranking list of the Houses would have definitely been different and less accurate. I think Houses ranking students is a necessary component of Rotation because for me, I thought I would fit in to one house based on my impression of that house in a short amount of time. But the upperclassmen in the houses knew better than me and could tell that I fit in better in another house. I did not get i

It was stressful and exhausting but it was fun.

stressful. also i didnt realize that upperclassmen ranked us, and when i found out i was irritated.

I really disliked how I didn't know what I was getting into. I really wanted to go to professional school afterward and GPA mattered a lot, so I wanted someone to just tell me what quiet house I could go to to study more.

I was incredibly glad that there were real options in culture to choose from. I had had several 'college-like' dorm experiences before (taking place in actual college dorms, with alley of choice assigned at random), and the possibility of living in a dorm 100% of the time was by far the most terrifying part of coming into college for me. I had several previous 'college-like' experiences prior to arriving here when I lived in what was, simply, a dorm. They were inevitably highly

restrictive a

It was tiring, but it was fun learning about each house. I wasn't stressed about "impressing" the houses -- the one I would belong in would be impressed with who I am, regardless of whether or not I make extra effort.

I tried to keep an open mind throughout Rotation, and by the end (and even now) I would be happy in any of my top 5 picks. The events were fun, and I feel like I met and had good conversations and connected with several upperclassmen.

Seemed largely positive. Allowed me to interact with a number of people I wouldn't have otherwise and explore parts of my personality.

I found it extremely exciting to learn about all the different houses. The different activities and conversations need to be experienced first-hand, and not watched on video. I never had the impression that I was being 'rated' or 'judged'. I had the impression that the process was focused on the prefrosh, but that we should show interest to the houses that we like.

It's busy, but it's fun to meet people and I was excited to know that I was getting to know the houses well so that I would end up in a community that I got along with and that would support me for the rest of my time here.

It was very hectic but it was a lot of fun and I made a lot of good friends, especially upperclassmen who continued to counsel me and remain my good friends after Rotation.

Although I found rotation very tiring, I also found it extremely fun. It helped me meet exponentially more people than I would have met otherwise and I could tell that every house had put in an effort to make their events fun for the prefrosh. I also found rotation to be very rewarding because of the deep connections that I was able to forge with the people who would later become my housemates.

I greatly enjoyed Rotation. I appreciated the opportunity to physically go to each house and learn about them. Furthermore, I am extremely happy with my final placement which, might I add, was not my initial first choice. Had I been placed in my first or second choice house, I would not have been as happy as I am now. I value Rotation for being able to place me accurately in an appropriate place.

It was tiring, but fun, and it worked for me.

It was tiring, but I had a much better understanding of the housing system and each house after it.

It was fun and exciting.

Rotation was my best experience coming here. I got to talk to very distinct people, experience the cultures of the houses for myself, and find a place where I felt I belonged. It really solidified that the houses are unique with personalities, not just residential colleges like at other universities (eg. Yale, where without the Caltech house tradition I would go instead)

It was tiring but fun and exciting and very worthwhile.

I didn't like the feeling of being judged and ranked but afterwards I saw the necessity in the process.

It was stressful, I ended up in my first choice house and realized that I ranked incorrectly, I also learned that you're "not supposed to rank a house 3 but also GA into it"? and got actual reactions of shock when I told an upperclassman I did that, like how the hell was I supposed to know? Excuse me for wanting some measure of control over where I end up when it feels like a popularity contest that's dependent on how talkative and bubbly you can be for two weeks straight.

it was mostly just another week, albeit with much more socializing

While Rotation was tiring at times, overall I felt that it was a good experience where I met many people I consider to be very good friends of mine to this day.

I liked being treated as a fully autonomous adult with the privilege of choosing where I wanted to live.

I set my heart on Avery during PFW, actively avoided Ricketts, and had a good experience in the other houses.

It was nerve-wracking but meaningful, and I couldn't have been happier with how it ended up. The upperclassmen in Fleming saw the bigger picture and helped us shape groups within the house (I've already been to one wedding for the frosh group I rotated in with, and I'm a groomsman for another in April). We didn't need Administration to do this for us.

The process was tiring, but being able to experience each house firsthand through the events was very helpful.

It helped me get to know people and figure out what I liked and didn't like regarding where I live and who I live with.

I enjoyed rotation as I was able to meet a lot of people (underclassmen and freshman), and gain a very accurate idea of each of the houses. I honestly think that my perception of the houses at the end of rotation is the same as my current perception of all the houses.

It was a fun experience and I got to meet many other people I might not have otherwise met.

Was fun, a great start to caltech, and you really meet a lot of people. Tiring, but worth it as you can find people you like to hang out with. It's a meet and greet with everybody!

Rotation was an overall stressful time given the number of dinners and activities compressed within two weeks and the apparent constant need of socializing. However, back then I believed that these two weeks are invaluable for prefrosh to get to know the Houses.

I was a little overwhelmed, but it was okay. I came in thinking I wanted to be in a particular house because I stayed there during PFW, and it wasn't until the end of the rotation that I realized how bad of a fit that was for me.

I liked it because I had faith in the process that I would be placed in a house that I would enjoy

As I mentioned previously, the misinformation about picks I got made Rotation somewhat stressful. However, the dinners and events themselves I really enjoyed. Every House member I talked to was friendly and welcoming and wanted to show me the best of their House - while being honest about the negative aspects if asked. It was enough time to get a pretty good sense of where I would or wouldn't be happy... but by the end I was exhausted and glad it was over!

I was pretty homesick and just didn't enjoy any of my first weeks at Caltech, rotation included. It's not an easy process for a new student to go through.

I'm an extroverted person who loved talking to upperclassmen

Ran out of steam in last few days.

I get anxious in social situations with people I don't know, and it was tiring, but it led me to Ruddock, and I love it here.

It was great fun. I was happy I got to meet lots of people and make lots of friends. I would never have exposed myself to so much diversity on my own initiative.

Rotation was certainly slightly stressful, however, I found it incredibly exciting and freeing. The vibe of each house and its dinner was interesting and unique, and it was awesome to know that I would be able to have an influence in where I stayed. There were many houses that would have fit me, and choosing and being chosen felt good.

It seemed arbitrary at the time, but after a few months I realized how useful it could be.

Too damn long but that's inevitable

It was fantastic! I think I got generally very accurate impressions of the houses.

I was able to relax in the fact that even if I didn't make the right choices in my ranking, they would be corrected by the upperclassmen who knew the house system better than me; plus I got to have a better look at the houses for a week before making my choices.

Explained above.

It was easy for me to make my choice of house. I liked getting to know people during Rotation and talking to members of every house. I had few complaints about my experience.

As exhausting as it was, I feel that it was totally worth it.

Also, Rotation allowed me to meet people who ended up in other houses but who I still keep in touch with, which I could not have done if I were immediately placed in my house upon arriving at Caltech.

Sure, Rotation could be stressful and it has its flaws, but it let me see into the houses more, find the communities where I feel comfortable, see what kind of person I could become over the next four years. It enabled me to push myself towards an environment that would encourage me to grow and develop as a person rather than immediately sinking into the place that best matched who I was coming out of high school.

I thought the secrecy was weird, but I am very happy that I ended up where I did. I'm not sure I would have been as happy with my first choice.

I had a great time and met a lot of people from all the houses.

I'm a social guy and I really liked the ability to meet others in my class and in all the houses. I liked the idea that they'd rank us as much as we'd rank them, because I wanted a good fit.

It was stressful, but exciting to know that I would get to be in a family/community afterwards.

I enjoyed being able to meet people of all the different houses. However, as an introverted person I got pretty burned out by all the interaction. It would be good to find a way for Rotation to become more introvert-friendly.

The problem with Rotation is that the Houses don't portray their negative aspects. In addition, students can't talk about other Houses, which similarly seems dishonest - we can't even talk about other Houses' positive aspects, and who is to say we don't know the other Houses we hang out at?

Having to talk to people was exhausting, and it did feel like you had to impress people and talk to the "right people".

It was tiring but insightful. Definitely worked for me.

The process is somewhat flawed, but I got to meet a lot of people and get a concrete idea of what the houses were like.

It was what made me come to caltech in the first place

Rotation was the only reason I am currently happy with where I am living. Rotation helped me find my home. I could not imagine living in a sad place where rotation was not in integral part of the housing system.

Enjoyed getting to see all of the houses at dinner, which I would not have done if it were opt-in. Also thought that the secrecy enhanced the experience, as it made the process very exciting. I'm glad that we weren't placed strictly based on our house rankings, because at that point the houses knew us far better than we knew them.

I hated rotation as a prefrish, but I really liked it this past year. I think the IHC did a wonderful job of managing rotation this year, and I don't understand why we are attempting to fix something that isn't really broken.

i'm socially awkward af

Although it was exhausting at times, I truly feel like it is the best way for the majority of people to ultimately end up in a house they will love for the next four years

I quite enjoyed Rotation! My only concern was the near-secrecy of honest opinions about other Houses. I personally feel it's unwarranted; we should trust the prefrish to objectively take into account various perspectives.

I thought it was a necessary strain. I actually rotated into a house different from my current, and I still don't regret it. I met a lot of people who are important to me in a lot of houses, and rotation enabled me to find the place I wanted to be (even if I didn't know it at first).

I was not the most invested during rotation, but I ended up in a house in which I am happy. Flexibility is important and the houses are not so distinct that one type of person is incapable of living happily in any single one of them.

Incredibly draining, but without question worth the effort.

Stressful but fun, integral to my experience here and building life long friendships

I loved it. I felt like it was some kind of a summer camp where I was very much cared for. I definitely felt like upperclassmen were genuinely interested in getting to know me, and those people became my close friends in the future. Rotation was one of the best experiences I had at Caltech.

It was a lot of events which was a bit hard, but I think I ended up in a good place for me and maybe wouldn't have if I'd just gone in blind.

I was stressed, but mostly because I missed home and there was so many new people. But rotating into Ruddock was the best thing that happened to me. The members of my house supported me through a rough frosh year and have always been there for me since.

I found it enjoyable and welcoming - but others didn't. And that's enough to recognise that changes are needed.

The idea of rotating into a house with a distinct personality was very appealing to me and influenced part of my decision to come to Caltech.

Rotation wasn't easy but the experiences I had in my house (I did not end up in the houses I personally ranked first or second) justifies it easily to me. I found out later that many of the upperclassmen in the houses I was most interested in disliked me, and that persisted after rotation. Had they not been given a say in the process, I likely would have ended up in a house where I would have had no support network and few friends. And given the mental health struggles I have gone through as a

Great way to meet lots of people, fun events, awesome time

I had fun meeting new people who I otherwise never would have, I had fun meeting people who would eventually end up in other houses but who remained my good friends afterwards, I trusted upperclassmen to put me in whichever house suited me best, and that turned out perfectly for me. I honestly do not think I would have been as happy as I am if I hadn't rotated into this house.

It was fun and I landed where I wanted.

It was fun and I enjoyed getting to know all the houses and people.

It was tiring, but I enjoyed getting a good view of each House.

It was a bit stressful when I had to decide how to rank houses, but the rest of it was a ton of fun.

I found Rotation extremely welcoming. All of the upperclassmen wanted to get to know me and because of that I made a lot of long lasting friendships that would not exist at any other college. I felt very pampered as a prefrish and really excited to start college. I can honestly say that I was very hesitant/reluctant to come to Caltech. I wasn't sure if it would just be a bunch of antisocial nerds, but Rotation eliminated those worries. I thrive in social environments and while Rotation is exhau

I liked rotation a lot! It was fun, I enjoyed getting to meet so many people. But had I known I was being literally sized up like meat at the market, I wouldn't have enjoyed it as much. The fact that the process relies on secrecy is sketchy.

Rotation gave me an accurate representation of the houses and let me decide where I wanted to live which was largely a function of where I felt safe.

I did not feel like I could be myself in my preassigned house.

Although at times it was tiring and even stressful, I definitely enjoyed the experience and would choose to go through it again at a moments notice. I really enjoyed being able to see all the houses' varied personalities and meet tons of fascinating people. Through going through the process, although I rotated into one house, I now have friends in all of the houses.

I had no major problems with rotation, but I found it to be stressful and long. I think had I found houses I liked earlier I would've been more comfortable.

While I admit it was stressful to meet so many people, it was an important experience that allowed me to know where I actually felt comfortable. It was also a great feeling to know that where I ended up was where I was wanted.

I liked meeting upperclassmen and found that through talking to them, I was able to form my own opinions of the houses. I found that the preconceived notions of the houses I had gotten through the flyers I had received were only vaguely in line with their actual personalities, and completely changed the way I ended up ranking the houses. If I had had to choose my house based solely on provided materials (instead of speaking to the people I would potentially be living with) I would have ended up

Rotation was incredibly fun for me. I loved every single minute of it, even when visiting houses I knew I wouldn't fit. Watching people show me how excited they were about their house and how much they loved their culture and housemates made me long for a similar connection which I think I found in my house. I at no point felt obligated to participate in anything I did not want too - - and due to an injury I didn't participate in alot of things -- but felt free to sit back and watch.

Rotation was so much fun and I think that experiencing the houses was much more useful than watching videos. It also really helps to know which people you connect with, and videos do not suffice in this regard.

I liked rotation, got into my top 2 picks, and enjoyed seeing the other houses.

Stressful, but it helped me get to where I am today and I'm pretty happy.

Rotation was a way for me to gauge all the houses, and while it was too whirlwind to always be fun (socializing every day is difficult), I appreciated the attention and care upperclassmen put into it and regard it as an important and formative experience for my opinion about Caltech.

I loved rotation. I felt like I was able to meet a ton of people from different houses, and that gave me the opportunity to figure out where I would best fit. I honestly do not think that there is any way to improve on the system besides maybe getting rid of a select few rotation rules, including the interaction between upperclassmen and prefrish, and allowing for more transparent discussion of other houses.

I thought the process was amazing, because it united all the freshmen together as they learned about the houses, and because the upperclassmen were all eager to talk about their houses. Thus, it was really easy to make friends.

It was stressful and unpleasant at times but I'm glad for having gone through it.

I greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet both my fellow classmates as well as upperclassmen from all houses. It was however pretty stressful and it's clear to me that some people would not like such an environment.

Rotation was horrible for me. I feel like it stunts people's personal growth, and I feel like random assignment to houses would be preferable.

It was awkward but necessary. It's something everyone needs to do.

I enjoyed rotation but I know I am a social person. It was easy for me to meet others. I understand this is not as easy for other people. This is one of the flaws I find with rotation, but I do not think this system solves that problem. If you have students who are not outgoing, and get put into a house by admin that they do not fit into, they have even less footing to talk to those around them. Then you isolate people within the house and again, weaken the safety net.

I enjoyed the activities and getting to know other prefrish, but I resented the opaque process and the feeling that I was being judged and ranked.

I enjoyed it, wouldn't have as much if I knew I was being discussed each night.

I didn't really know what was going on - just that people were fun and nice to me.

It was a very nice way of meeting new people. I met a lot of new faces during Rotation. A lot of my friends at different schools complained that they never got a way to meet the rest of their grade, but I think rotation was a fun, efficient way of doing that. I also did not feel as though I was being ranked - I was just myself and let whatever happen happen. A lot of incoming freshman do not know that they are being ranked or scouted, so they act as themselves and enjoy the process.

I felt misled and didn't get into a house that was good for me, and had to leave.

I enjoyed going to all of the Houses and learning about their culture through their Rotation events.

I really liked it, I loved getting to know all the houses, I liked choosing a house, and I liked knowing that whatever house I got into chose me.

Meeting a lot of people in that short a time will be stressful on some level no matter what. It was reasonably fun, considering.

A lot of fun, made a lot of friends and upperclassmen were all very friendly. Did not realize I was being ranked (none of us did) and enjoyed my time a lot.

It was overall... exciting! I got to meet so many different people, get a taste for how many niche cultures Caltech has, and really decide for myself where I wanted to live and what kind of Caltech experience I wanted to have.

It seemed like by far the way to sort things even though it wasn't ideal

It was an amazing process. Yes, it may not be perfect for everyone, but it is amazing, and it is an embodiment of the caltech experience.

I found rotation stressful (and it wanted me to be much more extroverted than I want to) and disliked that I felt judged by other students. I think rotation aspects like this should be strongly reconsidered, but I don't know that completely removing the upperclassman opinions is the right way to go about that.

It was a lot of fun and was the only time in my time here that I was openly able to talk to people from every house. I felt no social pressure to do anything and enjoyed everything, maybe because I am naturally extroverted and outgoing, but I know that if I felt uncomfortable I had resources to talk to. Seeing PFW and Rotation is why I came here and I will stand behind that.

It was tiring, but the process works and it seems like the best worst way to do it

It was anxiety-inducing. I didn't learn much about the houses until afterward.

It's draining but definitely helped me figure out stuff about the houses.

I loved it. It was a lot of fun doing it and I am very happy with the house I ended up in

A broad intro to Caltech where you meet almost everyone was a great way to get acquainted, and that will be very hard to replicate with the incentive of matching houses on both sides.

Towards the end, I was very burnt out and all of the last house dinners blended together. I remember also having to deal with drunk upperclassmen at one house which was unpleasant. I think the new changes this year would help with the latter maybe. As for the former, I think we could potentially shorten rotation or make it before school starts.

I though going from house to house was a little annoying, but worth it in the end.

Even as an introvert, I thought it was good to have to talk to a wide range of people. I got a much better sense of the houses than I would have without Rotation, and it changed what my first choice (and eventual house) was.

i think i got an accurate impression of most of the houses, and i correctly identified where i would fit best. the problem of not knowing where i would live before arriving on campus was insignificant compared to how critical it is for me to have a good community for my four years here. i didn't have too much of a feeling of being judged by upperclassmen. it could be a bit exhausting, but I'm a naturally reserved person and anything that would let me meet enough upperclassmen to get a good imp

It was fun

I liked it until the end, when it bit me in the ass.

It's fun low stress and I got to socialize and meet a lot of people. Also helped me end up in the right house for me.

Seemed to run smoothly.

I was absolutely exhausted, and I am certainly not the most social of people. But the upperclassmen made me feel welcome beyond what I could have possibly imagined. I found friends and confidants in seniors to whom I'd have never talked otherwise, and I'm so very thankful for that. Part of the reason I love Caltech is that there is no inherent divide between prefrash and upperclassmen--and this is all due in part to the fact that when you first arrive on campus, they are all trying their best

I very much enjoyed rotation for getting to know the houses, meeting a lot of people, and making me be sociable in a way I never would have been otherwise.

In the end, the person that I've roomed with for the past two years and is a very good friend of mine was my roommate during Rotation. If anything, I'm very glad for that. And through Rotation I did meet upperclassmen who were encouraging and caring who I still talk to. So I do like that aspect; but sometimes, it was just the stress of having to talk to others and know make a good impression; and the stress of trying to find a place to fit in when you didn't feel like you necessarily did.

This is why I came to Caltech

It was exhausting, especially because I was very sick throughout. However, I had a lot of fun at each of the house's events, as well as the different activities and customs during dinner. At the end, I had little energy, so I didn't go to house activities that I wasn't up for, but plenty of my rotation friends didn't as well.

It was tiring, but exciting and I feel that it greatly benefited me in the long run.

Being relatively introverted and not outgoing, it was difficult to meet people, and by extension, get a sense of the houses. The timeline was too fast to get a sense of any of the houses. Contrary to the notes in the plan, I never felt pressure from the fact that I was being judged; I was in fact actively judging the houses myself during the time.

It's how I got to know the houses, the people living them, and really gave me friends and kept me from having to go through all of Caltech alone.

Really felt uncomfortable and that I didn't fit into Caltech. Eating felt like a chore and made me

not want to go to house dinners. I thought about eating off campus at times, but was too lazy so I just went to house dinners anyways.

It was fun and a great way to meet people from all classes. I enjoyed the house I ended up in.

It was stressful, but I met so many people I never otherwise would have, and I feel I learned a lot about Caltech as a whole.

It was an incredibly valuable and rewarding experience. My only complaint is that I didn't get to see some houses as deeply as may have been necessary.

I wasn't the biggest fan of rotation due to all the events during class week, however, looking back in it I'm so glad I went to all the events and I'm glad things worked out so perfectly.

could be only 1 week. 2 weeks is too long

I really liked it, but I'm the kind of person who would probably like a kind of lighthearted Greek system and live rotation was just doing fun activities and talking to ppl

I actually got to talk to and see all the houses and make my own opinions, rather than just following stereotypes or "their best effort". I got to sit in lounges and talk and actually learn about the house from members, and find out what they all liked.

The actual period of rotation isn't the greatest, but the result is so positive for so many people.

It was a horrible experience, very transparent for anyone with some situational awareness, and feeling like I was being judged for two weeks straight ruined any chance of a normal introduction to social life here.

Rotation was very good to me, but I understand it won't be to everyone. However, I don't think nuking the house system is the solution to this

From an admissions perspective, Rotation was one of the main selling points of Caltech. In tours it was clear that while tour guides liked Caltech, when they started talking about their houses people (particularly during prefrush weekend) really opened up about how much they liked their house.

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 115 responses

It's exhausting, and ranking prefrush is slightly depressing sometimes (having to rank a prefrush negatively is not the happiest thing!). I think it's necessary though, and it's nice that we all have fair and accessible input into Rotation.

I still believe that it's vital for the Prefrush to experience each house, but I really dislike the judging aspect of picks.

Again, it was a lot of fun, but not as much fun, because it wasn't as carefree. There was more responsibility involved - I knew that my decisions would have an impact on the lives of other people (prefrush), and so I felt that I had to make sure to be honest so as to make sure people would have a good time both during rotation and in the future. Also, there was less of the aspect of meeting people, since I know a much higher fraction of people now than when I was a

prefrosh.

I think that the concern about secrecy and social exclusion is legitimate. It reinforces the exclusive-for-exclusivity's-sake nature of the several of the houses (**cough**) Blacker (**cough**).

it seems slightly weirder once you know how the ranking actually works. but no real opinions either way. somehow, you do need to decide who lives where and it's better to live with people who are inclined to like you than random people

N/A

The meetings are long and can be a little disheartening, but I really like that people who don't make us uncomfortable don't end up in my house.

It's a great process. You meet new people and help decide who you are going to live with. Some say it is tiring for them, but I didn't really get that this much.

It's an exciting time, brings the house together, and although it can get stressful, we really put our all in it and make Caltech a unique experience. We want the best for the frosh.

I'm looking forward to participating in next year's rotation.

I'm not an upperclassman.

It was worth it in the end.

I think the ranking is really unnecessary.

Please see previous ask.

It's busy and a lot of work, but it's worth it to help the prefrosh find a house they'll be happy in and to ensure that the community stays strong with a new generation who will be supported and embraced.

The bucket system can be a bit controversial but I think it generally works out for the best. As someone who has been a part of Rotation as an upperclassman for the past two years, I accept this process as the means of obtaining the best outcome for everyone. Many others accept it and choose to continue it and for those who don't like it, they are not required to participate.

Again, I found rotation to be somewhat tiring but extremely fun and rewarding. I felt like I was able to meet and make a superficial connection with nearly the entire incoming freshman class, which I found amazing, as well as some stronger connections with certain prefrosh. The one part of rotation that made me somewhat uncomfortable was the process of compiling an overall ranking of the prefrosh because I was not previously aware of the extent to which prefrosh were ranked. However, I believe I

It's tiring, but it's also the only time I meet new people. It let's upperclassman get to know the incoming class as a whole, and is the only way I've made friends with students younger than me who ended up in a different house than mine.

N/A

Its exhausting but fun

N/A, frosh

It's garbage. The meetings are toxic (although they were better this year, something something mostly female IHC?). Regardless, it is very depressing to rank people when I know that it's very easy to get it wrong, and it's just a great reminder that you were ranked like that too.

an interesting way to meet most of the incoming students

I enjoyed rotation this past year as a sophomore. I felt that I was making a difference in my house by actively interacting with prefrosh and participating in the house meetings, knowing that my input would help shape what the house would look like for years to come.

Rotation is a stressful time, but it leads to the results we want.

I called for more transparency in Rotation, but I made sure to respect my other Averites and the frosh.

The only thing I dislike about Rotation is the dishonesty from Page and Ricketts that contributed to Eco-Rotation and this whole debacle. Gaming the system to polarize opinions against you and select whoever you want was an unfair strategy, and they should've been punished instead of being allowed to steal people that strongly disliked them in order to fulfill the need to draft someone at every round. I've heard this been fixed, and this should be allowed to work for a few years.

It seems like the process is pretty fair on the upperclassman side.

I very much appreciate getting a say into who will live in my house. This is also crucial for continuing the house culture which I absolutely cherish. As someone who is graduating this year, I am sad to think about coming back as an alumni if the house as I know it no longer exists. I would also be much less inclined to donating to my house and Caltech.

Was challenging but worth it.

See above comments on possible issues with the process

Stressful, but worth it.

Can be dragged out and long

Some of the sorting is arbitrary, because there is often limited interaction between a prefrosh and upperclassmen who care enough to make their voices heard. Some freshman aren't treated fairly by rotation, but overall they always end up doing quite a good job.

Feels like a necessary evil.

Tiring, and I don't like ranking people, but it leads to great new people joining the House.

It's not as fun, but just as important.

It seemed arbitrary when still a prefrash, but after a few months I realized how useful it could be.

NA

Too damn long but that's inevitable.

Frustrating. Definitely could be changed

It's wonderful to meet so many new people! And it's fun to talk about the whole experience with the prefrash, and to watch my house puts on its best face.

It works well and everyone enjoys it, plus it is a fundamental part of undergrad culture and is a safety net for people dropped in Caltech from less rigorous grade schools.

The picks process is superficial, but the process as a whole is fine.

It's not a perfect system and improvements can be made, but that is *not* a call to scrap the system. We work very hard to get to know the frosh and see who we'd want to live with and who we could thriving living besides us. The people we rotate become our family, so it's important that we get along.

N/A

It's a big pain, but totally worth it to get some folks in your house who are craving to uphold tradition and have a good time.

It's tiring and meetings aren't very good. Having rotation is important to make the correct decisions for prefrash. I wish more frosh ended up somewhere they were happy.

From the upperclassman side, I still get burned out, but I see it as a necessary thing to do for my house. I also enjoy meeting all the incoming freshman.

Anyone who talks to me probably won't get into the House because I'm not outspoken enough :(

I hate the meetings, I've seen people be really immature about them and say some pretty horrible things. I strongly dislike the secrecy behind the process of sorting people into houses and the lack of transparency.

I think it gets the job done, and we end up with the a continuous community of people who want to be part of our house legacy.

There are flaws, for sure, but they should be reformed before nuking the entire system

N/A

See the explanation above.

i think i've made it pretty clear that i don't like the house system ͇(ʘ)͇

N/A

Yes, it's stressful and parts suck. But it turns out decently, and in general, it has prevented people who have turned out to hurt the house from being a part of it (people who make others unhappy through their actions or words).

It is what everyone looks forward to in the beginning of the year. It is a time to bond. I still maintain many friends from other houses because of rotation. Other less unique events would not have solidified our friendships nearly as much.

See above.

Essential to continuing my community once i graduate

It is tiring, but it feels great to get to know most of the Freshman class through Rotation and genuinely help those Freshmen find the place they can call a home.

Rotation is hard, but it generally yields good results.

I ranked it lower than as a frosh because I found it a lot more tiring as an upperclassman. But I still appreciate the process a lot.

It's difficult to see so many people and interact with so many people for so long, and that has been somewhat bad for my mental health in the past. On the other hand, my house is fairly good at giving the prefrosh a fair treatment during the private meetings, which I'm given to understand isn't universally true (only from administrators' statements)

Exhausting but rewarding; sad when frosh judge my house harshly or aren't understanding

It's a lot of work, but it's fun and you get to meet the new frosh and tell them about your life at tech and in your house.

I love meeting people but hate hate hate the ranking and lying.

It's also tiring, but I enjoy showing off the qualities I love about my House.

As an Upperclassman, Rotation is about building your community and making sure everyone feels welcome. It's a great way to get to know everyone on this small campus and it fosters genuine care for prefrosh. You end up getting a healthily attached to your favorite prefrosh, fostering a strong mentoring relationship throughout the rest of your time at Caltech.

I don't like how creepy and rush-like it is. I think the houses would benefit from being a bit culturally "diluted" by allowing students to choose them instead of the houses choosing people to maintain their cultures. If the culture can't maintain themselves -i.e., if students coming into Caltech don't want to keep them up, they shouldn't exist.

Rotation lets me meet the incoming class even if they don't end up in my house. It's fun to have social activities during the first week. I am happy with the people we rotate into our house

I also really enjoyed Rotation as an upperclassman. The process that I saw confirmed what I had believed as a Prefrosh that the upperclassmen work hard to make sure you end up where you are supposed to be.

I think the system works but has some real moral issues. I hope that the proposed changes can be negotiated back towards the current form, but with changes to transparency, ranking, and opt-in/opt-out.

It's great to know new people, regardless of whether they end up in my house. It gives the ability to meet everyone, and also for me to have input on who I like and who makes me feel uncomfortable.

Why does the IHC have to keep it such a secret? It's really not.

The only part of rotation I dislike is how tiring it gets saying the same things over and over to different people. But I want to give everyone a chance to get to know us and maybe find their people here. I also got permission from another house to see one of their events I missed as a prefrosh but sadly ran out of time to see it :(maybe next year...

It takes a lot of time and is sociallu draning but its worrrh it.

Rotation can breed controversy, but it is important that it is discussed among upperclassman.

It's hard when freshmen hate you and your house because of some garbled bit of gossip their friend mumbled to them about it being full of druggies and whores.

As an upperclassmen, I can see the amount of time, discussion, and consideration that goes into making Rotation decisions, from the way we present ourselves to the way we try to get to know freshmen. We talk to everyone and really try to get to know them as individuals.

The current method of rotation, including rankings, is without a doubt the best way to keep the unique and important personalities of each house. It also ensures that people end up in the house that they best fit into.

As I said in a previous answer, while I do enjoy meeting the prefrosh, the incredible hostility - and even malice - in the remarks upperclassmen make about the prefrosh has really turned me away from the entire process.

The whole thing feels icky.

It's not perfect but it's sure as hell better than what other schools do. Plenty of students need their houses.

I think the emphasis on ranking prefrosh and keeping prefrosh in the dark is deeply problematic.

Way too much judgment

It's a rough system but is necessary and can be improved.

I didn't care enough about underclassmen and that's not fair to them because they should have

someone with their best interest sorting them into a house

Although we can't get to know every frosh individually, it is common that someone in the house has gotten to know every frosh. It is also common that the frosh who are particularly interested in the house spend more time there and thus get to know more people.

The system is a lot darker from the other end, and it needs work, but rotation is an important institution for the sake of both the prefrosh and the upperclassman, and it's what makes the House system work. Without it, we would be just like any other school, and less competitive for it.

Exhausting but worth it.

Obviously, it's not "fun." It's an extensive, grueling process and takes up a lot of time, but is ultimately rewarding to end up with an ideally matched set of new friends and members of the house.

My focus on rotation is to just have conversations with the prefrosh and I really try to not make them feel judged or that they have to conform (since that is what I disliked). There are things I think we should improve (no rankings) but also rotation gives new students a good idea of what the houses and people are.

Same as when I was a prefrosh, its tiring but I just dont see a better way to do it

As an upperclassman I realized that it's even worse that I thought as a freshman. Rotation is basically rushing in Greek life except in Rotation the freshmen don't even know they're being judged.

Again, it's draining.

It gets tiring, but in the end it's worth it and it's always reenergizing to meet excited new prefrosh.

I loved meeting all of the frosh! Even if they're not in my house, I feel like I know a good about about them and have become friends with many of them.

It gets tedious. But that hardly matters. Because it isn't for underclassmen.

although it's a lot of time and effort to give input on the prefrosh, and it can be exhausting to meet so many people, i think rotation is an extremely valuable component in producing the amazing community the houses provide, and its current form does that job well.

Also very fun

Weeks of distraction, passing judgment, projecting fake appearances, and sucking up--what's not to love?

There are inherent limitations in the process, and I do think streamlining it is smart. But I do think we have done a good job attempting to make the system as honest as possible.

Again, it's an exhausting and often heated process, but I have seen upperclassmen protect

prefrosh with their reputations on the line. Sometimes housing decisions cannot be made just by rankings alone. Student interactions must be taken into account. There are too many subjective variables to leave this all to what will essentially be an arbitrary decision on the part of the prefrosh (assuming rotation dies). I can't say this enough, but upperclassmen fight for what they think is best for pref

This is why I came to Caltech

It was time consuming and tiring, but I really enjoyed meeting so many prefrosh, many of which ended up in other houses. By having rotation, we are forced to get to know a wide variety of the prefrosh, who I would never know otherwise because I wouldn't live with them or take classes with them, so rotation increases Caltech's cohesiveness as a community. At the end, it was very rewarding to welcome the new class of frosh and have dinner with them.

Once again, tiring (for mostly the same reasons), but extremely rewarding in that it let me feel like I had helped build a strong and supportive community.

n/a

It's very tiring. If there were some way to make it less taxing on upperclassmen that would be amazing.

It is stressful, but I love how many freshman I know now who aren't in my house.

It helps us pick people we know we will get along with and will be healthy members of the house. That's why we do it. We do it because we want the best for everyone.

it's still doing fun activities and talking to people. it starts getting bad when i think about the implications of it, but it's quite fun on a surface level.

Somehow, rotation is worse from the other side. It's unpleasant and exhausting, and my house argues and argues during picks meetings- I've been insulted more times than I can count for daring to say I liked or disliked a given frosh that a majority of my housemates felt the opposite about.

It's dope

Not applicable

Questions Concerning Rotation: Explain:

There are 130 responses

I think... Rotation is fine as is, but I understand I have my own biases and there could be good alternatives.

Needs work. If the core message is to remove the impersonal and often dehumanizing process of ranking frosh, that's a message we can all get behind. How to do it should be discussed thoroughly.

I'm actually fine with getting rid of rankings. I believe that the purpose of a house is to promote interclass interactions and to provide a good support system. Even without rankings, it's possible to do so if the upperclassmen are still committed to being welcoming to the Prefrosh.

I personally had a good experience with rotation as it was. I was aware that the houses had some say in choosing their prefrosh but was unaware as to the extent.

I feel that the upperclassmen (including me) are responsible and mature in conducting rotation and in trying to ensure prefrosh have a good experience and will be able to have a good time in our house (personal compatibility is important!). Actually visiting the houses is crucial in getting a feel for their culture. I liked rotation as a prefrosh. Input from fellow students is important to avoiding decisions from people who might not be in touch with the situations we face. Numerical ranking is

Houses need to have input to Rotation, and it is my belief that ranking prefrosh is the best way to measure House aggregate opinions, while keeping in mind that rankings are not value judgements or judgements of character, but opinions on fit, something that is usually known better by upperclassmen than prefrosh. Increasing transparency around Rotation invites prefrosh and upperclassmen to game the system and decrease the total utility of the student body. In particular, the Rotation Code and th

Some changes that involved transparency of the less detailed aspects of rotation may be useful, but the proposed overhaul is objectively a bad idea.

It is good we are trying to change Rotation to better suit the needs of other people, but I think the changes went too far.

They aren't well thought-out but neither is Rotation. Just because something has always been done a certain way, doesn't mean its the best solution to a problem. It's pretty clear to me that the

i don't feel like the end results will be that much different or that we'll see much change...

Although I agree with the need for more transparency and swift changes, I do not think completely cutting House input out of the process would be a positive change for Caltech culture.

The changes are proposed with the best intentions. One part that definitely should be altered are rules that mandate living on campus/being on board.

I like that prefrosh can opt out if they wish, but I feel that the details are still a bit fuzzy and there's a lot of factors admin has not quite hashed out yet (like what if too many people want a house), and I definitely do not want lottery.

The changes weaken the culture and community of the Houses and in the long term ultimately destroy it.

My issue is how there was no discussion about these changes. I do believe there are changes to be made with rotation, but there should be a discussion between admin and students what that happens.

Don't change something that works.

These changes make it so that eventually the Houses will no longer be Houses with their own

culture and close-knit community, each House will just be a normal dorm like in other colleges where the people living together have little interactions with each other. Without the House system, there's no point to most of the events here, which are centered around the House system like Interhouses, Ditch day, interhouse sports, etc. The House system provides a support system that is essential for stude

This decision was made without consulting the student body as a whole, and while disregarding student input. In addition, the alumni of this institution were also not notified of this change. While Dr. Shepard has been the face of this change, I believe the actual source of these proposed changes to be Caltech's Board of Trustees. I think that this decision is clearly made by persons who have never experienced the community made possible by rotation or the rigors of Caltech's academic system.

These are not changes to rotation. The proposed changes are the end to anything resembling a real rotation system.

I think the houses should have less of a place in student life and freshman year.

I feel this is explained above.

Some of the decisions seem beneficial, but I am dissatisfied that (1) the changes were a surprise (2) they were proposed so last-minute. If we had at least a full year to discuss/provide feedback. I think rotation, while imperfect, should remain as-is until we have such an opportunity.

Above.

They're heavy handed and will severely damage the house system with little benefit. The house system is the best feature of Caltech. Houses support people through stressful times and are the most significant and effective element of the safety net. I've thought about suicide, and I probably would have taken my life if it hadn't been for the support I received through my house.

Upperclassmen input is important because it ensures that the community is strong, and because it ensures to the be

I dislike how people who aren't even part of the Rotation process insist on changing it without understanding that this is what we the undergrads have chosen to improve our own lives. I accept that no one should be forced to be a part of it, but a very, very large majority prefer this system and so it should be available for those who wish to be a part of it and continue it.

They demonstrate a fundamental lack of understanding of the underlying mechanisms. Joe Shepherd made references to outdated rules and processes and proposed completely unrealistic expectations for how the houses would be filled (with regard to the class composition of some houses, Dabney in particular). I find it completely disgraceful that Joe Shepherd would spend months taking student input on how to fill Bechtel and then release the decision over email at a previously undisclosed time and fil

The proposed changes to Rotation, particularly the idea regarding prepared house videos, are effectively a dilution if not a complete elimination of the current Rotation process. The contradict

the very nature of Rotation and threaten to destroy a vital part of the Caltech house culture.

I don't understand why we didn't get the same process that went into planning for Bechtel to make changes to rotation.

They will kill the house cultures which will eliminate a lot of what makes Caltech enjoyable.

These proposed changes are depressing and immensely disheartening. Rotation keeps the distinct cultures of the houses alive. Upperclassmen possess the understanding to best perpetuate house culture. Without the unique, supportive, empowering communities of the traditional houses, Caltech would not be a place I would want to stay over other equally academic institutions.

They went too far in what they are trying to do. With what they are implementing they are clearly trying to get rid of the house system in a few years. Also the house should be able to have as much of a say in choosing the student as the student does.

Get rid of house opinions, it's a step in getting rid of rotation, the houses will survive if we as current students make them survive.

such radical changes both seem unnecessary and represent a disregard for most students' wishes

First off, I feel that any changes to rotation should not even have been mentioned, let alone outlined and put forth in this document. To my knowledge there was a general consensus that this document would detail how Bechtel would be structured in terms of distribution of rooms by class, room and board plan details, etc. My opinion on the changes is mostly articulated in the question regarding upperclassmen input but I will reiterate it here. Without input from upperclassmen over the years I ass

BOOOOOO.

It's not Rotation. The end result might be similar, but allowing frosh to purely self-select without feedback seems like it will lead to more "aspirational" rankings based on who they want/feel pressured to be before even coming to Caltech. Regardless of my opinions on certain houses, they do offer an important refuge and support structure for marginalized students. Maybe prefrosh won't believe the strength of that support structure without participating in real Rotation, and won't feel com

Leave rotation alone - it is a separate issue. Let the frosh opt-out of rotation if they want to or opt out of living in the house they rotated into, but don't assume that 50 something frosh will do that. Let every frosh who wants to live in a house do so, and people can move to Bechtel afterward if they don't like it.

In order to use the hurt feelings of a few to push their own agenda, administration has succeeded in disrupting and anguishing a vast majority of the student body. Rotation and the House system is an amazing characteristic of Caltech, one of the reasons that drew me here. Giving the Houses no say in who lives there is completely ignoring the student population, and will lead to the extermination of House culture. I myself would most likely only donate to Caltech through my house's endowment, an

While I agree that there are some students who were unhappy with how rotation went and where they ended up, I do not think its fair to completely remove this process. Bechtel gives the students who did not feel like they belong in any house/or who feel uncomfortable by the rotation process a place to go. Rotation should remain the same for the rest of us.

Again, it chips away at the Caltech experience.

The opt-in is the only viable change in my opinion.

A pillow, thrown at 299 792 458 meters per second, can obliterate most, if not all, objects on the planet, including most, if not all, Techers. Even if it were actually a pillow.

Admin understands student life about as well as they would if they looked at the houses from the roof of CSS with binoculars

The proposed changes completely disregard the fundamental glue of House culture: personal connection. Relying on videos and interest sheets and the like is a poor substitute for prefrash getting to know House members and House members getting to know prefrash in person for a week and a half. Furthermore, removing the power of the Houses to choose which prefrash rotate in is a grave mistake: the Houses know themselves the best, and where each prefrash - whom they have taken great care to get to p

Rotation isn't perfect, but this isn't how we should fix it.

If rotation needs fixing, that is something you should talk about with students.

I think rotation should stay as it is, in order to keep the vibrant and unique house culture at Caltech alive.

I don't think it's fair to call it Rotation anymore.

They are an insult to the opinions of the undergrads given the town halls and focus groups and everything else we have done in an attempt to keep the status quo. They will destroy the house system, and serve to homogenise the school. The proposed changes will also, upon further reflection, likely disproportionately benefit incoming students from more privileged socioeconomic and racial backgrounds, in comparison to the current policies.

They were handled incredibly poorly and changes were made at the 11th hour without student or COUCH input. It's completely opaque and stands opposite to the Honor Code and our core Caltech values.

Stripping the houses of the power to influence who their members are is going to decrease the character of the house. The current system maintains a very close, if exclusive community, that makes it much easier to handle stress of other forms, at least for me.

It seems like the ideal behind the changes is that all houses ought to appeal to pre-frosh, and if they don't there is something wrong with the house. This is SO wrong. The houses are unique and close communities because they are so d

It seems to imply that houses are detrimental to Caltech. Yet, I would argue that houses and that the support of upperclassmen in my house are the reasons I succeed.

Fuck.

I'd be fine with it as long as we have a way to reject some prefrish from our house.

I do not think the idea of having freshman just use video presentations to make their decisions is sufficient. I do not think random assignment is a good idea. I do not think the number of freshman houses get should be dependent on their popularity. I think the currently proposed plan will negatively impact the most important parts of the house system and house cultures.

If implemented well, these changes can be very good, although they will also make current students pretty mad.

I feel the administration is doing as much as it can to protect the school's interests while trying to preserve some degree of undergraduate life. Last year, a dangerous incident happened because of a house organized activity and honestly, I would have expected administration to come down much harder on the house system and rotation after that than they currently are. I'm hoping a more transparent rotation will create more diversity in the houses, make the houses less of the only social framew

Rotation isn't a bad system. I worked very hard as the leader of my rotation meetings to make sure they went smoothly and were about finding good fits as opposed to blanketly judging character, and it worked.

I think that the proposed changes will kill the current housing system.

I do not support the nuclear option without trying incremental reforms first

The proposed changes would essentially abolish the current housing system by increasing the randomization of the distribution of frosh. Frosh will not get an accurate picture of each house and thus will be less likely to find a house where they truly belong. They will most likely end up feeling excluded and alone for the entire remainder of the year. In addition to the unhappiness of the frosh, the change would also extinguish any distinct culture in a house. The houses would have to adapt to ac

Rotation is not perfect, but it's good enough. It is a tradition and is a huge part of why the House system is the way it is. There are some minor changes that could fix all our problems, and we should implement those instead of tearing down the entire system and rebuilding it from scratch.

i like the sentiment (ie reducing social strain) but the results....questionable...

It will probably end house culture.

I don't believe these changes would be in the best interests of the student body -- at least not from my own view and those of people with whom I've spoken on the matter.

It's too drastic. Small changes at first would be fine, but this is just pulling the rug out from under us. They've already taken away so much freedom and choice from us by taking away the OCAs, please just wait to take away more.

I am not interested in "balanced and diverse" communities, and would have gone to another school if the housing system had been advertised as creating them. I want people who are weird in the same specific ways I am.

Rotation could use some changes and I am open to many, but completely replacing it is a mistake

As explained earlier, I do not think it would be sufficient for Freshmen to make the important decision of choosing a House and would thus destroy the strong family-like bonding inside the Houses.

Rotation almost always works. I believe these changes will reduce the success rate of rotation.

I think the changes to rotation are a step in the right direction. But I'm worried about whether sufficient thought went into choosing the right solution. i.e. for Bechtel there were focus groups, town halls, etc For changing rotation I haven't seen any evidence of the potential impacts of changes being looked into.

The video part is straight out preposterous as explained above

Students need better input on this decision. As the plan is currently, the houses with stronger cultures will be mellowed out over time. Traditions will not last as well.

I believe all of these changes would backfire in the form of less support for freshman, especially in Bechtel, a more frat-like feel in the houses, and far fewer people being placed into a living situation where they will be their happiest self.

No.

This is the worst thing I've heard this academic year.

The problem with Rotation is how to give prefrosh an accurate view of the Houses and vice versa. Getting rid of House input into Rotation does not solve this problem and just compounds the problems caused by any misunderstandings of the Houses by the prefrosh.

The proposed changes to Rotation seem to weaken system that has been painstakingly fine-tuned over the past 80 years to ensure the best possible experience for all members of the undergraduate Caltech community. While the ability to opt-out of Rotation is welcome, the rest of the changes don't seem to put the students' needs first and just make Rotation less effective.

I don't like the idea of switching to videos and killing the process of going from house to house. Rotation is a great way for freshmen to meet everyone at Caltech, at least briefly.

I dislike how Bechtel is being used to sneakily implement rotation changes without student consultation

I believe those changes decimate the process of rotation and also would eventually eliminate the house system as we now know it.

I like that we're changing rotation to some extent, but the proposed changes aren't nearly specific enough to be effective. I'm hopeful that nailing out the details will leave a system between the current system and tearing it all down and that the details will be decided by the IHC.

Student input is important for both the sake of the prefrish and the upperclassmen who then have to live with them.

The proposed changes remove all sense of choice for the upperclassmen and introduce the high likelihood of adding frosh to the house who (a) would get a misinformed notion of the characters of each of the houses, (b) would end up choosing their house without speaking to the people they would be living with, which obviously introduces the possibility of clashing personalities, and (c) introduces the possibility of adding frosh who make the existing members of the house uncomfortable due to differ

I don't see a reasonable way for frosh to be sorted into the houses anymore and I don't see why this needed to happen with Bechtel. Many of the changes are not caused by Bechtel which makes them feel like something that was supposed to be hidden rather than the result of clear communication between the undergrads and the admin.

These changes go against the spirit of rotation and student-faculty cooperation.

It has the potential to not be terrible I guess, but they have no plan so it's impossible to know just how bad it would be.

I just don't think this is the solution. Too much too fast.

Saying these are proposed "changes" is an understatement. The proposal destroys Rotation and everything it stands for. Why? I don't understand why one would remove an essential part of the culture and uniqueness of Caltech undergrad life. Rotation could use some student-proposed revisions, and is constantly undergoing tweaks, but I am **STRONGLY AGAINST** the version put forward by admin, which did not take student opinions into account, in my point of view. I feel like a majority of the student

No. Our rotation system is an integral part of the housing system and Caltech in general. Please do not destroy a tradition that has nothing wrong with it.

When I toured campus in high school, the unique cultures of the houses really stood out to me and made Caltech far more memorable than other colleges. I think the proposed changes will remove the unique cultures that houses have, basically converting them into normal dorms. The fun community aspect of Caltech will thus be lost.

The idea of altering the ranking system and other parts of Rotation is a good one to pursue, but completely taking the Houses' opinions out of the equation is a very bad idea. I do not support such a dramatic shift in the administration's involvement in the process.

Since I was a sophomore, I've strongly believed that reform needs to come to rotation. The system that was in place then heavily prioritized the desires of the House (again - based on just a few minutes of interaction with each prefrish) over those of the prefrish, such that many prefrish could end up in their worst choice houses. This makes people feel bad and

unwelcome, both in the house they are eventually rotated into, as well as other houses who didn't want them enough. I've always thought

I am strongly in favor of having an alternative to rotation.

You need to leave the governance of house cultures to the houses themselves. You can't have those decisions made external to the student body.

I appreciate frosh being able to choose out of rotation. I do not appreciate having rotation taken out of our hands

These changes will hurt undergrads.

I think this will make the houses like optional frats and will weaken the divisive house system which is good. But it's important to have options for people who don't want to be in a house.

Being in a house is arguably the best part of the Caltech experience. Without house input, houses will have an extremely difficult if not impossible time maintaining their identities. Rotation is a time where frosh get to experience the personality of each house, rather than just hearing about it in a video.

These changes essentially remove upperclassmen from having a say. This is bad for everyone, because it just will make a less stable and friendly living environment.

Caltech has lost my trust entirely. I no longer have any faith that this whole process will turn out well.

I'm pretty sure I've made myself abundantly clear.

See above

The proposed changes are terrible.

- want current student input

- want rotation to be student run

- there are things we should consider changing about rotation, and I think if student groups have time to consider this, we would be able to actually have some very positive changes (instead of having changes imposed)

This administrative panel is an insult to our (student) ability.

It's an improvement.

We need to come up with a real way to fight these issues that's constructive. We need to make compromises on other things to get rotation.

These changes will kill all House culture completely by the time four years have passed.

This will destroy house culture or make it extremely stereotypical. Upperclassmen won't care

about their house's frosh. It is also absurd to put a quarter of the class in Bechtel. I would be amazed if that many people wanted to go 4 years without having a house to do activities with, make friends, and learn from upperclassmen.

they would erode the unique cultures of people who get along well but are still diverse in favor of people who live together and share the superficial characteristics that can be gleaned by prefrosh. (this is especially bad if the prefrosh only see videos instead of talking to upperclassmen.)

The changes rectify most of the wrongs of rotation. I'm very happy with the proposed changes.

I don't quite dislike it as much as other people but I am not happy with trying to replace rotation or or admin handling roompicks or forcing that many students to live in Bechtel, particularly freshmen who would rather be in a House as that is part of the Caltech experience.

I like the framework (minus the online rotation) but I am worried about the attitude that the faculty seem to have. Fortunately, the only details available are largely unworkable so I still have hope we can reach a solution.

These are not changes. This is an attack on one of Caltech's most defining and beloved features. If this had been an explicitly undergraduate driven decision, I would roll over and accept our fate, but the fact is, it's not. This has never been the will of the undergrad population and I challenge the VPSA to prove me wrong. I agree that rotation needs revision. It doesn't always work well, but what has been proposed will not just destroy rotation. It will destroy everything that makes the hou

I don't want the opinion of the people living with the prefrosh to not matter, and I don't want the option of who we get to live with to be so far removed from out power.

I think the proposed changes to rotation will take away everything special and unique about housing at Caltech. If Caltech had been like this two years ago when I was applying, I wouldn't have.

The changes will kill the house cultures we have and turn us into just another mediocre or awful small private school.

I would like some of the changes if they were replaced by something else, such as getting rid of rankings and placing them with impressions. I think that removing upperclassmen input completely is a poor decision that is a detriment to both the upperclassmen and the prefrosh.

I actively dislike and disapprove of making prefrosh rank houses before they get to campus.

Having faculty and staff involved in rotation is fine as long as they allow for significant input.

Overall, I am disappointed

They are all extremely counter to student opinion (and academic research) on the optional way to induct new students into our campus culture

Eliminating the houses' choices of students encourages an eventual erosion of house culture, one of the most unique (and best) parts of the Caltech experience. Furthermore, upperclassmen

will usually have a better sense of how well a prefrish would fit into the house, as the prefrish may develop many misconceptions during the largely censored acquaintance process.

As expressed earlier, the only people I trust to look out for the students' (upperclassmen and prefrish) interest are the students themselves. The fewer others (faculty, staff, admins, etc) that are involved, the better I feel about the process.

I don't favor getting rid of rotation entirely. People who want that can still have that. I simply want an alternative like a regular dormitory for those who don't want to go through rotation. Life is much easier that way.

These changes are too drastic too fast and with too little student input.

Please do not remove house input from rotation!

Removing upperclassman input is a horrible decision; speaking from personal experience, prefrish don't know exactly what they want and where they'll fit, but upperclassmen have a better clue. Also, houses should be experienced firsthand, so that prefrish know what to expect from each house, and vice versa.

Without rotation there is no caltech magic anymore. Admin taking control will do nothing more than a random shot, or a overgeneralized view of trying to appease everything but will be taken too far, "put all the gay kids in Dabney Bc that's Dabney" quote from someone who was afraid this would happen

i don't like how the current rotation system works. it worked for me, bc i do somewhat like talking to people and being active in a community, but i know there's a ton of people who got destroyed by rotation and the housing system at caltech in general. there are definitely problems with the proposed system — houses should definitely still have some sort of input and a lot of things are so ingrained into social culture here that there's gonna be a ton of backlash, but like. i do think it

See above comments on prefrish picking before and how admin isn't the best for placing students.

Anything would be better than this. I think it's clear the students can't effectively run it, so I'm all for giving admin a shot.

fuck joe shepherd

General Bechtel Questions: Explain:

There are 207 responses

I don't think there should be a requirement to live on campus, as some may prefer living off-off as it may be cheaper and allow them to mature and gain individual identities. But I'm assuming that restrictions won't be placed on these students.

I think that Caltech-provided off campus housing is also good in some aspects for undergraduates. While some may dislike it because it keeps them from the houses, I think that there are certainly many that do enjoy it, as it can be that step between

Just...why.

This really inconveniences those that may have important personal reasons for living off campus. Also, a lot of people just enjoy living independently and this is making that freedom difficult.

This is ridiculous. I do not want to live on campus all 4 years. I do not want to pay for board for all 4 years. I have many allergies. I want to cook my own food and not have to pay extra for someone else to cook my food.

There are many students that want to live off-off, and there are a lot of life skills learned living off-off. Also, making students live on campus for a required four years is not healthy for students who need escape sometimes from the Caltech life.

Why? Seriously, why? People have a myriad of reasons for wanting to move off campus, and those cannot be fully anticipated by the school. Make on campus housing an option for everyone, but let off campus always be an option.

I currently live off campus and I will not be moving back on campus. I'm not sure if the poll that was sent out by IHC a while ago wasn't clear enough, but the expensive board/room plans are definitely key factors in why I moved off. Even though I will likely have a space in Avery next year because we regained our external bedspaces, I would not move back on. Thus, I believe that there are others like me and there should not be a requirement that everyone lives on campus for all 4 years.

I will likely live on / off (not off-off) all four years. This doesn't really impact me, though I recognize that it impacts others.

This undermines student choice, which is a key element (#4 in the released plan) that we are seeking to preserve and promote. I like that Bechtel will give people an option to live separately from the houses if they want, but we should also let students live independently if we want. We're adults, after all, and I think literally no university has a 4-year housing requirement. If anything, this might be a big thing that factors into people not coming here.

I'm a vegetarian and don't eat eggs. I love living in my house because I love being with the people in this house. However, I find the food extremely expensive and taxing on my family to pay for considering that I don't even LIKE the food often.

I cook most weekends, and enjoy cooking, so the option to live off campus was so appealing to me because I would have gone around junior year. That way, I would have been able to foster relations in the house and participate, but I get to live in

The current board plan is ridiculously expensive, this feels like another attempt to reduce student autonomy and takes away any chance to learn to live on our own.

I want to leave four years so this is pretty irrelevant to me. However, I know this would be bad for some people.

I don't think this is actually going to happen.

Board food is insanely expensive for an extremely low quality experience. Caltech is coercing students into paying for their overpriced, low quality board plan. We should have the option to live off campus like every other university.

it should be your choice of where you live - people have different reasons for wanting to live off campus - independence, food, money, etc. it's not fair to force people to stay here when their overall health/living/academics would be better if they could move off campus. and people are lazy, so would not necessarily petition to move off campus if that's what was required of them.

No, I found living off-campus to be one of the most valuable experiences I've had at Caltech. Learning to live on your own is super important at this stage of our lives, and living on-campus does not give students the ability to learn some of the skills they would need to do so. Although it's great that no student will feel pushed off-campus by poor room picks, requiring it would really inhibit the experiences of many students who want to try being independent and taking care of themselves.

Just like the required four years of tuition, this seems to be financially motivated.

I think we should have an option to live off campus. If admin wants us to be like our "peer institutions," I know several people in our "peer institutions" who live off campus. It might work better for some people.

I live off campus at the moment. It is more financially secure for me, I don't have to deal with board, and I get to have a dog. Getting rid of Off-campus as an option is a terrible!!! idea!!!! I love living off campus and my puppy and def helped my mental health. It should always be an option to live off-campus.

A four year live-on requirement with a mandatory board plan eliminates student choice and hurts students, especially students who benefit from living off board for monetary reasons,

Many students move off campus for financial reasons. Requiring students to be on board is negligent to their needs.

Some people can't afford the room and board plan.

This is not a prison... they are adults and should be allowed to choose where they live... look up "human rights"

Students shouldn't be forced to live anywhere, only guaranteed if they want to live on.

I see we're trying to turn Caltech into a seminary. Soon we'll report scientific breakthroughs "because the (insert your favorite religious text here) said so"

Off-campus needs to be an option. For those who find themselves cooking during term already because the food options are not to the specifications they need. It also is a great option for those who want a more independent type living experience. Board is expensive, even more so when one doesn't end up eating much of the food.

Unless the cost of living on campus is cheaper, this could add additional financial stress to already stressed students. I moved off campus specifically because it was cheaper to live off

campus, because I wanted to get a head start on building credit, and generally to cultivate independence. None of these concerns are addressed by the new housing plan. In addition, as a student who does not receive financial aid, the cost of college has been a huge source of stress, and moving off campus defini

I really liked the option to live off campus.

I enjoy living off campus. It let's me save money. Caltech putting unnecessary costs on it's students is unacceptable.

Being on board is very expensive; forcing students to stay on board is unfair.

Trust students to make decisions with their own lives. If they want to live off-off (assuming they have tried living on), admin shouldn't stop that.

WHY WHY WHY WHY WHY WHY WHY WHY would you ever require people to pay to stay on campus for 4 years.

If there is four-year requirement of living on campus, Caltech would look extremely unattractive compared to all the other prestigious colleges. Plus, we already have the 12 terms requirement.

Many people want the independence of living off campus to improve their living standards by cooking their own food, etc. No one should be forced into a way of living that they don't want.

I have heard concerns from many students that they live off-campus specifically to avoid the high cost of board. Implementing this rule will inevitably hurt Caltech's yield of low-income students, which I don't believe has been fully considered.

I personally have lived on campus all four years here. But, some people need to live off, by themselves, in order to function and work the best and to be their happiest. I think it will be a terrible thing to tell students looking at Caltech as their potential choice for undergraduate. The Caltech campus is small enough already, don't force people here. I think this could be terrible for some students' mental health.

Purely from a utilitarian perspective, I think that forcibly requiring students to live in one place or another would be wrong.

The plan says the goal is to maximize student choice. How does taking away our choices do that?

Students should be able to live off campus and especially off board if they so choose.

If the house system becomes less like it is now, which is what these changes are doing, then there is much less benefit to live on campus. Requiring 4 years is just a play for housing to make more money.

Board is not good. Going off campus also allows students more independence.

CDS staff is great, the food is not, and I'm really enjoying the lower cost better food off campus life.

seems extremely restrictive

I personally don't mind but I know not there are other people who would like to choice to live off.

This would be awful, not financially feasible for many, and the ultimate authoritarian infraction on our rights..

I'm not focusing on this as much as I am Rotation

There are way too many good reasons to want to live off-campus (finances, most importantly, and also the independence/lifestyle away from campus life that many students might want, especially as they become upperclassmen), that making live off campus exemption only would add a significant burden on many students.

I don't particularly care as long as the cost increases don't spiral out of control. People that want to leave will leave anyway by mentally checking out, people that want to stay will stay.

It should be up to the student. Seems like they are just trying to maximize profit.

Should never force anyone to live on campus for 4 years.

Also, forcing people to live on campus all four years is unreasonable unless the price for room/board decreases significantly. Both are too expensive, and need to decrease. Having actual options in the board plan, or not requiring people to be on it in order to live on campus would be better.

Many do not like the exorbitant costs of housing and board, thus it is unfair to force them to live on campus.

If I didn't get an on campus spot in my house, I would prefer to live in an off campus apartment. The only reason I wanted to stay on campus is so that I could live with the other members of my house.

I think it's a good idea to have all undergraduates accessible to one another on campus.

Only constrains people's options.

No.

I could not afford this, especially with a board requirement.

It should be an option, but not a requirement, with the addition of Bechtel, it is an option, but trying to make it a requirement is a dick move

I personally enjoy living off campus (noise, privacy, no board), but if I were guaranteed housing on campus for 4 years I wouldn't be upset about it.

Speaking as a frosh living in my House on campus, I know so many upperclassmen who live off campus. This is because the House I live in is such a tight community, and people come to the House to do work in the lounge or dining hall, to participate in conversation and announcements at dinner (even if not on board and eating the food), to participate in the great community we

have. There are others who do not come by as much, and that is their personal choice.
Enforcing four years on-campus living

Many students fit better off-campus and off-board than on-campus. I found my time off-board to be very valuable. This option should definitely be left open.

The on-campus dorms aren't compatible with everyone's lifestyle.

Moving off-campus improved my grades and my eating habits, and let me save money in the process. On top of that, I can enjoy peace and quiet around the clock, whenever I need it. No matter what you do, there will never be real peace and quiet in a dormitory.

If people want to live off, let them live off. That said, if people want to live on, they should be able to.

Isn't college supposed to be a time when kids become adults, and learn to be responsible? How can they do that if they have to plead their case just to be allowed to make their own adult decisions?

And for goodness sake don't thrust everyone into four mandatory years of CDS. Learning to cook for myself was the best thing that happened to me when I lived off campus.

Requiring students to live on campus for four years, and spend money on the board plan for four years is completely ridiculous. Students should have the option to stay on campus, but requiring them to is entirely pointless. In what way could an unnecessary restriction on freedom improve student life?

Going off is often cheaper. Board is garbage.

People should have the ability to live off-off if they want to. I fear that the application is a blatant ploy in which restrictions in living off-off will be progressively tightened until it is essentially impossible to live off-off. I also feel this is a blatant ploy by John Webster in order to make CDS more money, as by forcing everyone to live on-campus and all on-campus student to have board, he will have a virtual monopoly. All he cares about is his bottom line and profits to the institute.

I'm going to live on campus all four years. I've seen living off help people substantially

I actually would like it. The quality of Board should improve, though. (Not the price going lower: the quality should be better.)

Not everyone wants to live on campus, and not everyone has the means to afford living on campus all four years. It is both unreasonable and unjust to expect this from people of the diverse range of backgrounds that compose the current study body, and this proposed policy would impact the diversity and experience of future generations.

Students should at least have an option to move off campus, as in many cases on campus housing is more expensive than off campus, and it is the only way to go off the board plan.

Adults have to live by themselves and cook for themselves, and moving towards a requirement to live on campus is a move towards not preparing students for real life.

Furthermore I don't think financial considerations have been even considered. I think people move off campus to save money on room and board.

This is dumb. Lots of people enjoy living off-campus and I'm positive there would be empty spots in Bechtel if this requirement were not here. That's probably the only reason this requirement exists. Forcing people to live on-campus is bad too for people who are trying to save money or can barely afford the school.

Let people live off campus if they want to

We're adults. We should be able to make these decisions for ourselves. I would be okay with this if board were not a requirement.

Why should people -- adults -- be required to live on campus. If someone is more comfortable (socially, financially, physically, etc.) elsewhere, what's wrong with that?

fascism

I personally plan to live on campus all four years. However, I understand that imposing this is cost-preventative for some people.

\$\$\$\$\$\$CALTECH JUST WANTS MORE MONEY AND IT'S PATHETIC\$\$\$\$\$\$

Not ok unless Caltech is willing to pay for food and board.

Not all students want to live on campus. Many students choose to be off campus for the ability to have apartment-style living, and to avoid the board plan.

We should have options and the ability to choose. This is one of the core principles of the planning for Bechtel. I believe that this is also not currently part of the plan...?

Living on campus can be very expensive and if you are sensitive to noise/ want more private space, generally undesirable.

It seems like it will be fairly easy to petition to get out of (graduating early isn't too much of a hassle) but it would be better not have to petition.

I love living on campus but it's not for everyone, I see no need to require it.

People should have the opportunity to live off campus if they are not able to pay for room and board or decide they want to live off for other reasons.

people should have The freedom to live where they want

Just as the house system is not right for some people, Caltech housing and board is not right for some people, even if they are active members of the community

This place is not a prison. No one should be required to live here.

This should be a choice.

I don't mind, but this may be difficult for people who cannot afford on-campus housing, or for people who might want to live with their parents if they are from Pasadena.

utter bs, especially for us who don't want to be on board

board is pricey

I'm not sure if it would be wise to force undergraduates to live on campus -- at least not if they have to also pay for a meal plan bundled with it. I can understand the desire to make Caltech more "self-contained" however.

My favorite year here at Caltech was spent in the Chesters. I loved cooking for myself, I loved having an apartment to clean and straighten, I loved being in my own space. It's deeply painful to me that others won't get that with this plan...I would not want to go to this school knowing I had to live on campus all four years (all my friends at other colleges generally moved off for their last couple of years).

It's an obnoxious grab for money.

I am 21 with a cat and the ability to cook my own meals. I refused to live on campus when there isn't any option which isn't a dorm

I think it is nice to have that option but is also very unfair to all the students to force them living on campus and being on the board plan. Furthermore, it will affect a lot of students financially, since living off-campus turns out to be a generally a cheaper option.

This is so rude. If you're worried about filling rooms, admit a few more students, but don't take away student's choices based on some crappy argument about "improving choice". I would not have come here if this had been a requirement. This is so incredibly disrespectful and a clear statement by admin that they don't want financially challenged people to come to Caltech.

I want to be able to be independent if I want to. My goal is to live off campus for at least 1. year before I graduate because I want to learn how to cook, clean and manage an apartment with the support of my parents before I go to graduate school or get a job. I do not think I will be ready to enter the "real world" if I do not live off campus for at least 1 year.

The apartments were a way for students to live more like adults and cook for themselves and have a little more space and things like that. I don't understand why admin would want a, in my opinion, more immature student body to not have a chance to experience what real life is like a little more.

Forced CDS is annoying. Also, being able to live off-campus wasn't hurting anyone.

Hell no. The cost is ridiculous (speaking as an off-off campus resident)

There should be off-board options.

Living off campus was one of the best decisions I've made at Caltech.

This just straightout looks like a profit scam from a nonprofit institution

This completely disregards legitimate financial concerns I and many other students share. I would have to go into debt to live on campus all four years and the fact that administrators are dismissive of that makes me deeply angry.

More options are better; if people want to live on-campus, there should be room, but if a person wants to be off-campus, there should be nothing to prevent them

Almost all of the students at this institution are adults and should be treated as such. For those with dietary restrictions, even with specialized meals, the food they could make themselves with their own money while off board would feed them much better and make them much more satisfied than their on board options.

This would be bloody stupid to have. It worries me that it's vaguely hinted at.

Until Jon Webster learns how to cook real food, don't force people to eat your shit for four years. This is straight garbage and very dictator-y.

People should be able to decide for themselves.

This is the second-worst thing I've heard this academic year, behind only the new ""Rotation.""

There are plenty of legitimate reasons to live off-off. Now that board is mandatory for all on-campus and off-campus, this is one concern. Board is Not Good, to be polite. I have heard numerous people cite being off-board as a reason to live off-off. Additionally, living off-off gives people a quiet place to go to if they run out of social energy for the time being. Even in Bechtel, you will b

This violates the goal of maximizing "choice" that the Bechtel Proposal seems to emphasize. It's also not very financially flexible.

So many people have no interest in living on campus and being on board after their freshman year and forcing them to do that is really terrible.

This is the dumbest thing Caltech could do. Let us be adults, let us choose. Bechtel is not an adult living situation - it's a dorm. It isn't even suite or apartment style, and we'd have to be on board. I moved off-off because I want to live on my own. That's a choice I should have the right to make. If you're saying you're changing rotation for the sake of choice, then keep that ideal consistent.

I have both financial and dietary concerns about this. This does not align with the "choice" value of the COUCH committee

People should be able to move off if they'd like.

I feel like a requirement for a mandatory 4 years on campus is highly unnecessary and defeats the goal of having students become functioning adults. Also, with board being required for on-campus students, many times cost can also be a driving factor to live off campus. Without addressing those issues, I do not think a required 4 years is in anyway useful.

It's unnecessary. College students should have the freedom to choose where they'd like to live.

I will be living for 3 years off-off. I love the independence, and would not consider moving back on without the ability to not be on the board plan at all. I feel like this was a common sentiment among off-off students that was entirely ignored.

Sounds bad for poor people or people who dislike board

College is a time to mature and grow into an independent adult. Removing the option to live off campus is completely contrary to that idea.

This would be practically unprecedented in university housing systems, extending even further the injustice of removing off-board Caltech-affiliated housing options. As someone currently living in Caltech-affiliated off-campus housing due to the excessive cost of board, I strongly feel the effects of the decision to eradicate such housing options for undergraduates. For those of us choosing to be frugal by not purchasing the board plan, the administration has already made it very difficult to st

While it is convenient it takes away the benefit of cheaper living off campus and restricts people to dormlife for all four years. I am considering moving off off as a senior and would like to save money before I graduate

People should be allowed to live off campus and experience that. In addition, if you dont provide dinners on the weekends because you want "the students to go out to pasadena" then why are you forcing them to stay at caltech.

As a vegan, it was very important to me to have an on board caltech affliated board option.no I am faced with paying for a board plan that is very expensive and doesn't meet my nutritional needs, and having to haggle with pasadena landlords. It is clear to me that by doing this, caltech administration is sending a message that they only care about their bottom line.

People want to live off campus, and if they can get the work done, then why not let them.

doesn't impact me, shitty for people who want to live off

This is honestly the worst part of this proposal. I hate board, I don't like the options on, I love being off because it makes me feel like a real person and not just some kid in a constant slumber party.

i plan on living on-campus all four years but i recognize the importance of the choice's existence for mental health, financial, and accommodation reasons

You shouldn't force people to live on campus for 4 years. It makes sense to have them live on campus freshman year to help them adjust to college life, but after that you should allow them to live wherever they want.

Some people are just not cut out to live on campus. Some people desire the independence that comes with living off campus and cooking for yourself, caring for a house or apartment, and building on life skills that are unable to be worked on in an on campus living situation.

I think some undergraduates want to live off campus.

Personally I don't see myself living off campus, but I hope the process for people to live off campus is not too difficult.

This is ridiculous. There are plenty of good reasons to want to live off campus and removing that choice seems like basically just a moneymaking move...

This is a very unfair policy, as it limits people not only to a few housing choices, but also to the board plans, which are very unsatisfactory at this time.

This requirement would greatly limit students who want the experience of finding a place to live on their own and/or are not interested in engaging with any aspect of the undergraduate residential communities.

I live off-campus, and I have benefited greatly from this experience. Living in the Caltech bubble has its perks, but it also shelters and babies the students. I think Caltech would be much better off if more students lived off-campus, in fact.

Speaking as an off-campus person, I think it's incredibly valuable that people get a choice in their decisions

Living off campus is the best thing that's ever happened to me.

Stupid and limiting. If you provide a good on-campus living experience, you shouldn't have to force people to stick around.

This seems overbearing both legally and in relation to the Caltech honor code.

I live off because it's cheaper, more quiet, and the food's better.

This is utterly stupid. Housing, and especially Board, is already overpriced and uncomfortable, and this removes any competition with other housing. Moreover, living off-campus is a great opportunity to learn to live alone, pay bills, cook, and so on. Forcing students to "get permission" to live off-campus is ridiculously patronizing, and as the report explicitly acknowledges the only benefit is the financial one to Housing.

We should be able to live off omg

The email sent out ridiculously says that admin doesn't know why upperclassmen are moving off. We told them - they ignored us - I refuse to move back on until the problems (food) are fixed.

This so fucks over any one with a restricted diet who would have a cheaper existence off campus, better yet why would caltech do this to students with lower ability to pay?? I'm not

expecting financial aid to increase with any respect to this. But living off campus can save someone up to \$10,000/yr. That's a huge difference to people who are already on the edge of being able to afford Caltech.

It's safer and no one can steal board

As students get older and become more independent, many of them want their own space and to be able to cook meals and clean for themselves. Forcing students to live on campus for four years eliminates their ability to be independent and would then send them into the next step of life grossly underprepared by no fault of their own.

People can't afford this. This is ridiculous.

We joke about Caltech being a prison but please don't make it literal. Also, board is insanely expensive. Plus, there's a lot of value in learning to cook and take care of yourself.

I would be super depressed if I was forced to live on campus. I need to have my own space. I also could not afford to stay on the board plan.

Forcing us to be on board is financially difficult for many. Board is extremely expensive.

What!? Who does this even benefit? If a student chooses to live in an apartment, who is Caltech to say they can't?

The board plan is an outrageous requirement for this

Seems bad for low income students

many reasons this is not ideal for students

- expensive
 - some people prefer to live off campus
 - board shouldn't be required for all students
-

Students should have the option, even if Bechtel is a convenient option to remain on campus, because there are students that may not want to pay for board and that should be a choice.

This is stupid. Let students have the freedom to be able to grow up during their time in college.

Living off campus can be a major life/learning experience, and I don't see any reason why we should deny students that experience out of hand

Students need to have the independence to live off-campus if they so choose. Board is expensive as well and many students prefer saving money by going on a different food plan, but this will not be possible under this plan.

I like the opportunity to live on for all 4 years, but no one should be forced to.

Any non-academic requirements are harmful.

I'd appreciate it, but I know there are many people who want to live off-off.

Being required to live on campus would be extraordinarily detrimental to my ability to function as a Caltech student. The general Caltech population functions on a schedule that is unhealthy and unsustainable for student-athletes. Having the freedom to chose to separate myself from the general student body has been essential to my ability to succeed as both a student and an athlete.

Forcing people to live on campus is a bad idea; some people live off off because they don't enjoy living on, some do it for the food, some do it because it's cheaper. Mandatory housing seems like an unnecessary restriction.

Don't care too much. I like living on campus but I know some people who done. Also, cooking for oneself is nice, and not an option when living on campus

I lived on campus for four years by choice, but nobody should be forced to.

Nooooo :(. It excludes people who want to be off board for cost and health reasons. It ostracizes those with an esa, as bechtel will be esa free. It prevents people from gaining a valuable experience.

Off campus affiliated housing was one of the best parts of Caltech housing. It allows more independence and eases the transition from high school to adulthood.

I think it should be compulsory

If you want to pay to live off campus you should be allowed to. Leave the room for someone who actually wants to live on campus.

Is this actually a thing?

I think it's nice to have 4 years guaranteed but I would like the freedom to live elsewhere if I wanted

this is deeply unfair to people with tight financial situations, and prevents choice for no good reason.

Undergrads should be able to live wherever they want and be independent.

While board is expensive and we don't get as much out of it as we should, (more food options while keeping waiters is ideal), I personally was going to live on campus for 4 years anyways. But I do believe people should have a choice.

This is unprecedented and feels like a prison.

Refer to the thirteenth amendment to the United States Constitution.

At this point, I'm indifferent. I think people will be mad, but if Caltech ever gets its act together and makes a board plan that doesn't cost a fortune people might be ok with it. From what I've heard, most people would prefer to live off campus just so they don't have to pay for board.

I am already planning to live off-off next year, and it would be highly unfortunate if future classes didn't get the same options (and apparently privileges) that I have.

It's claimed that this is to improve affordability. As this isn't immediately an effective cost reduction to the current students, I can't really feel sympathetic to the cause. All I can see is that four-years requirement to live on campus is Room + mandatory Board, and seems tyrannical to enforce financially.

Just give people the option. What's the sense in requiring them, will just make people bitter.

Not only is this immensely restrictive on student choice and autonomy, it's also just plain discriminatory against low-income students. Also why should I be made to pay more for someone else to do something I might want to do myself?

This is ridiculous, and it was the one thing I was genuinely surprised by in the report. I understand and support a first year requirement - the transition to college is not easy, and frosh should be introduced into the community so that it lives right next door to them, as well as access to all its resources.

I am disappointed that the results of the housing survey were never released.

I also find this line from the report to be absurd: "...such as noise in the Houses, the cost of the board

This harms students who lack the means to pay for housing all 4 years, as well as those who desire independence from college life

It eliminates a student's choice to opt out of certain requirements of living on campus (ie board, option of housing, living under caltech housing rules, social proximity)

In the market, forcing/blackmailing people to use your products would be illegal. I'm appalled that Caltech is doing the same ("you must use our lodging and our food or you can't come here"). Students who are accepted to come here should be accepted because they can grow and learn here, and not because they're sources of income for Caltech or CDS.

It's BS. If you finish early, graduate early. This school is completely shit. They don't take AP/IB credit. They also don't take credit from anywhere not named Caltech. And then they make their classes way too impractical and unnecessarily hard for students. Some of us just want to get out there and have a steady job already. But no, you make it extra hard, drop our GPAs when we try to stick it out and not transfer, and then expect us to be happy with it? Why hinder us with this crap

This is absolutely unacceptable. This isn't even veiled--it's clear this is simply meant to fill the beds that they know would otherwise be empty because they're trying to force us into a residence hall no one wanted.

This is terrible. Living on campus is not affordable for all students, nor should it be required. Students are adults, and if they are responsible enough to want to live off campus should be allowed to do so

I see no reason students shouldn't be allowed to live off campus; it tends to be cheaper, it is more comfortable to some people, and it does not mean that a student simply ceases to show up on campus.

With this requirement, Caltech will officially become a prison. Can you even do this legally? With this in place, I will do everything in my power to ensure EVERY freshman knows this unjust rule exists. People are saying that it will be trivial to get a pass out if it, but if this is the case then why does the rule exist?

Living off off was the best decision for my mental health. CDS made my eating disorder really bad, and cooking for myself saved me.

A four year residency requirement shows a blatant disregard for student well being in favor of the Institutes finances. Tom Manion has told me that college dorms can be a profitable business when a critical mass of ~1200 students are served...requiring all 940 students to live on campus seems shamefully financially motivated. Also, admissions yield will likely fall. Plain and simple, prospective students already view Caltech as small and isolated with few of the freedoms that college life brings

room and board (especially board) are really expensive and also kind of trash. picky vegetarians often have barely anything to eat. forcing ppl to pay for things that they can't or won't use isn't great.

also, living off or off off is a really great way to gain independence and prep a little for life after college.

I don't think every student could afford it/want to be on board for that long.

Should be encouraged, definitely not required.

People should be able to live where they like, and eat where they like

People should be able to move off if they want to. (Food is bad on board, choices are very limited, and it's expensive) If they want to do some food option buffet thing like other schools at least try to get the diversity of food other schools have first.

I would live off every year if I could

I've lived all 4 years on campus and am happy with it, but I know people who would be extremely unhappy with it.

Some people dislike the taste of board. Some people want to actually learn to live in an apartment in the bridge of a college environment to a job environment.

It just eliminates options, some of which are important parts of the college experiences.

It just eliminates a reasonable choice for people. That's not a good thing.

There should be options but off campus housing isn't the most vital thing ever

This is a blatant slap in the face for all students who choose to live off-off for financial, emotional, and social reasons.

Such a requirement would be senseless, in my opinion - regardless of whether we now have the capacity to fit everybody on campus, forcing peoples' decisions on this seems wrong. Mandatory for freshmen is one thing, so they can get to know campus life well through an entire year. But after that, students should be allowed to choose for themselves. I especially dislike living on campus, and in all seriousness I'd probably go insane if I was forced to live on campus for the remainder of my time

For many people the board plan who struggle with money the board plan is too expensive. Forcing undergraduates to live on-campus all four years would make Caltech financially infeasible for people from poor socioeconomic backgrounds and decrease economic diversity in the student body.

General Bechtel Questions: Explain:

There are 96 responses

If the Advisory committee handles housing, I think it would make sense that they also dabble in Residential Life.

If done correctly, it seems like a good way to create transparency and trust between students, faculty and staff.

I'm not exactly sure what they're doing so I haven't formed an opinion yet.

Again, not really sure what this committee is supposed to do.

Sounds like it could be good, but I'd need to see specifics. Communication, especially collaboration, is probably good.

While staff and faculty input is necessary at some level, I do not believe there will be enough student involvement or student concerns heard in this committee.

You already asked this.

I think this committee will just be ruled by administration and students will get no say.

No comment.

(Same comments as above:)

I understand students being on them, but I am really not sure how much admin or faculty will listen to our concerns or input. It mostly depends on who's on the committee. If any admin or faculty are placed, I would like for it to be based partly on how well we can develop mutual trust

and how much they care about us. I'm sure there's at least a few people out there (unfortunately, Dean Green is retiring).

Only students should be on committees deciding these issues.

As long as there are equal voices within the group and the students are actually heard, I don't see an issue.

While I could imagine benefits from an advisory committee the suggestion that appointment of students to it may be unilateral with student advisers being simple suggestions/nominations is extraordinarily troubling.

It seems a bit too nebulous for me to give a good opinion on it, but what little I've read is not encouraging.

I think such a committee would be helpful overseeing any significant changes if any changes will be occurring.

Depends on how much student say there is.

I'm okay with the committee as long as they truly consider what the students want and need, and student representation is actually listened to.

While the committee itself does not seem particularly problematic in and of itself, I don't believe it's necessary.

Clearly, faculty and staff have not listened to students' complaints well enough already, otherwise I wouldn't be filling out this survey.

If students are properly and majorly represented, I am not against this committee and think that student-staff-faculty communication is desirable.

It depends greatly on how it works.

Same as above, how do faculty know what is best for student residential life. Even if they are alumni the house system has changed.

Joe Shepard is going to put people that agree with him on there.

I could see that committee being useful after a few iterations of the Faculty in Residence program, so that students and faculty have both had time to interact and understand each other. Implementing it now would make all sides feel adversarial.

Its purpose should be better defined and be less disruptive of current organization. Need more details to know for sure.

Should just be the IHC

A range of opinions is always good, but if it turns out into a monopoly by the staff, then of course not.

Don't like the connotations to rotation.

I'm not sure why Faculty should be involved...

Will the committee's suggestions actually be listened to, or manipulated and taken out of context?

We need to have a larger discussion about this, and this committee will promote that.

How well will faculty and staff actually know prefrosh?

It could be okay, if students have a significant say in who gets to be on the advisory, and if there are indeed enough students on it.

AS it is now, an unknown ratio of students, staff, and faculty hand-picked by Joe Shepherd is unacceptable.

Good idea if he actually would listen which I don't trust. We just saw him betray the COUCH. Why give him a handpicked committee?

The undergrads and RAs, who actually live with each other, should have the most input about living situations, not some board primarily composed of others.

See previous response?

Depends largely on how the Advisory Committee is selected and implemented.

Do not put faculty on it, because faculty members are straight up stupid. Did they go to a school like Caltech? No???? Then what the fuck do they have to say?

Why give the faculty and staff representatives if they aren't a part of residential life?

I like having a way to evaluate bechtel's success with all stakeholders, but it should be limited to Bechtel, not other aspects, and the students NEED to be elected

Residential life was perfectly fine before the proposed changes.

I'll like it if student voices are heard, listened to, and considered.

idk man

I think having a committee like this would be beneficial; it could help facilitate communication between the administration and the students on residential life, but I'm not sure what powers it should have.

The bureaucracy is expanding to meet the needs of the expanding bureaucracy.

Staff and faculty will be a hindrance to building a supportive community

As explained earlier, I do not think that the faculty and staff can make informed decisions in regards to the student life in the Houses since they do not have the experience.

Don't really know much about it.

This question could mean so many things. Do I approve that it exists? What it will do? Gah

Keep faculty out of our houses. We don't tell them how to live in their homes/what family members can stay in their guest room. Why, then, do they get to do that to us?

Should focus more on the students.

Please see my comment above. I find it INCREDIBLY insulting that our social lives are being micromanaged by people who are out of touch with us and our lives.

While the Advisory Committee on Residential Life would be useful for more objective tasks, but the delicate process of Rotation and management of house culture should not be delegated to this group since faculty and staff representatives do not have to live with and experience social repercussions of said choices.

I really couldn't care less.

Again: vague, I don't have high hopes that students will be listened to

The IHC handles rotation well.

Aside from room picks, I feel like this board would become another useless piece of beaurocracy.

I would like this committee a lot more if the IHC was a part of it.

Mysterious all-powerful committee hand-picked by the VPSA. I.e., no student input at all.

I don't see details on who this is and their exact role so it's hard to have an opinion, but as long as there is representation from each house and is mostly student focused then I don't see an issue.

Depends on who appoints the reps, and how much power they have.

as proposed, they would have too much power-- they should exist to support bechtel but running rotation and room distribution should be left to students and elected student reps (IHC)

The students are the residents, and should be in charge of residential life. I feel like admin is always trying to insert themselves into student decisions and exert control over the autonomy of the student body. Can anyone explain WHY admin should be giving their opinions on student life? What are your goals here, that you believe students are unable to figure out for themselves?

Again, dislike how they're chosen by Joe: It would be ok if students picked them.

Fine. I don't think students running everything has worked out so well.

Unnecessary. Literally no need for this.

No strong feelings either way

Again, this committee will just tell Joe what he wants to hear. If not, he will ignore them. They might as well not exist.

It is good that admin wants to work with students but I am not confident that the students' voices will be heard.

If it has every house represented by elected students, then ok. If it's just faceless bureaucrats that don't know the houses, then no.

Current system works great, future one gives the undergraduate population very little say on what happens; the faculty and staff have no idea how house life works.

I mean, sure, I have nothing against the creation of a new committee to discuss house matters.

As we've proven already, student involvement in smaller committees appears to have no influence

It depends how it is composed. I think it is important to have significant student input and representation from a wide variety of students (houses, people who like being off campus, people not involved in houses)

Same as above - it needs to be done well

Why the hell are staff involved?

Committees are good for input.

Seems redundant with IHC & ASCIT (which already have some redundancies), but without true elections so admin can choose whoever they find most friendly to their views.

If only Joe copied what we said in the report about what kind of group we wanted. We need to have a group talking about Bechtel and analyzing its (and the res life model's) long-term success. We should not have this same group be discussing rotation and other issues.

The problem is that staff and faculty have been notorious on not listening to students. So I worry that this will happen here.

I don't see what's wrong with what we have, and I don't like the fact that admin is trying to take more student responsibility.

Faculty and staff evidently do not understand what makes this place so wonderful and would try to tear it down

I don't really care

I'm not really sure what they're going to do but again students should have more than just a say in this as it is they and only they who are affected.

With regards to Bechtel, good, necessary for self-reflection. But we have a lot of committees that could do this already, why make a new one except to populate it with people sympathetic to Jshep?

My experience with staff is that they can be unreasonable and value their own idiosyncrasies over established norms. I think students should be allowed to run themselves, although I am comfortable with a process in which faculty have checks and balances.

For Bechtel, this seems reasonable, but if the VPSA thinks he can take control of the other houses with this committee, I think he is mistaken. I appreciate that the current system of IHC and excomm members makes decisions for both individual houses, and the student body as a whole.

While I am open to staff and faculty involvement in rotation (although why would they want to know where certain frosh live? They don't ask about it that much now, why in the future?) students have had more experience in running rotation, simply because we have been doing it for so long. It will be very very very rocky the next rotation if the staff and faculty don't at least get student input on how best to run events

Let them experiment with and run Bechtel, but they shouldn't touch Rotation, Roompicks (beyond bechtel procedure), or the Houses.

Unless the student representatives are chosen by election and the faculty actually and staff actually interact with the houses, then I cannot endorse this plan.

It has too much control and zero oversight. It will unilaterally and irrevocably change student life in ways that need to be discussed and decided by the campus community as a whole

Not enough information on specific operation of this committee to have an opinion.

Seems unnecessary, but taking student input is always a plus.

Roompicks should be kept the same and not interfered with by administrators

i don't think i know enough about it and what it'll do to comment

keep picks

General Bechtel Questions: Explain:

There are 122 responses

The houses manage their internal room picks quite satisfactorily in my experience, even if there are always disappointments. Even if changes are made with Bechtel/rotation, it doesn't follow that internal room picks needs to be changed as well, and seems rather a case of attempting to do too much too fast.

Sure? I need more details about how the room picks will work before I really know how to answer this part.

Houses should run their own roompicks because a lot of personal thoughts goes into making the houses and room arrangements a comfortable place for everyone and i dont think any committee can quite emulate that

I think that there's no reason why we should have to change our room pick procedures. They function well enough and if there are complaints, they can be made internally through the houses.

Depends on the extent of the advising. I think that the houses are best suited to run and modify their own room picks, as they know their own needs (especially with offices).

I think it could be fine, but I fail to see what's wrong with the current system.

In order to integrate the house room picks and fill bechtel it may be necessary to have communication between the houses but this is possible without input from a dissociated third party when some mechanisms already exist that can do this.

Lots of houses have really dumb ways of doing room picks. They are often even manipulated in the interest of the people writing the rules. I wouldn't be sad to see this standardized.

Caltech should be a place where students are responsible to determine their own policies with regards to these things. The whole point of the honor code is to trust students to act fairly, responsibly, and maturely. This extends beyond just academics, it applies to residential life. By trying to take over what was once student-run, administration is demonstrating that they don't trust us. This will have a negative impact on the Caltech community and the culture of mutual trust and respect that

once people are on the house, what does it really matter who lives in room 201 and who lives in 202...not sure why a committee is needed for that??

No comment.

Same as above: I understand students being on them, but I am really not sure how much admin or faculty will listen to our concerns or input. It mostly depends on who's on the committee. If any admin or faculty are placed, I would like for it to be based partly on how well we can develop mutual trust and how much they care about us. I'm sure there's at least a few people out there (unfortunately, Dean Green is retiring).

See above

They can advise it, but they should take input from house leaders as well.

I'll agree to this only when you we get an Advisory Committee on Faculty Life to approve or reject proposed bids for real estate purchased by faculty and staff.

While I believe my house's (as well as others though I know less about them) room pick procedures work fairly well I could imagine that a bad system of room picks could exist. However, I believe houses running their own room picks is hugely important and excessive outside interference would far more damaging than any likely system of room picks.

The house room pick thing is kind of silly it would be better if it were all standard and you could live pretty much everywhere.

I've always picked through Braun so feel not sufficiently versed in house picking to give an

opinion here.

Houses should be completely autonomous in their own room picks. Some room pick procedures are quite intricate and have evolved over the years to optimize utility.

house room picks seem like internal politics.

After seeing how the rotation changes were made, we can't trust administration not to completely roll over our needs.

Why should people who aren't even going to live in the houses and don't live undergrad life themselves be allowed to decide room pick procedures? It simply doesn't make sense.

Room picks are currently very house specific because the layouts of the houses are very specific. Especially if the faculty have as little understanding about the current room picks as Joe Shepherd has clearly demonstrated he has with his proposed filling for the houses in the Bechtel plan, I believe that the results could be disastrous.

I remain skeptical. As long as students are the ones with the primary power and are majorly represented, I think it can be valuable.

A more uniform procedure across houses might be helpful. But I don't trust that the changes will be ones that I agree with considering the decision just released.

Why should the committee have any affect on where in the house we live? If they try to "spread diversity" or something through room picks that is way too far and shows they care more about Caltech's impression than how students feel.

Different houses will need different rules as they currently stand, and I think room picks can continue to be run as they are right now.

would limit the say that students throughout campus (like those not on the committee) might have for better housing arrangements

This is an unnecessary change and the current system works fine.

Why can't house room pick procedures be decided by THOSE WHO LIVE IN THE HOUSE? Considering that those are the only people whom the decision affects????

Joe Shepard is going to put people that agree with him on there.

The unique layout of rooms in the South Houses lends itself to a kind of hierarchy created by student house governments. Destroying that and making it random... certain rooms facilitate certain personalities living there better.

WE DONT NEED MORE COMPLICATION IN THIS STUFF. The current issues with room picks are instantly resolved upon letting upperclassmen live in Bechtel, no other changes are really needed.

Again, the students in a house should choose who they want to live with, not some collection of faculty, and staff (albeit students are involved but likely their voices will take a backseat as they

have had in this decision)

This is just another step in removing our house right to govern ourselves. Each house has their own procedure - I see no reason why this needs to change.

Each house should be able to govern their own room picks - imo it's what makes houses different from one another.

Indifferent

I think standardizing room picks across houses is reasonable, but should still be run by students.

I think it would make sense to standardize it amongst all houses. I don't like change but this doesn't seem particularly helpful or harmful.

Wait so, why am I too stupid to pick my own room?

House room pick procedures are an internal affair. We already have a decent system in place, and we're willing to change it if a majority of house members think we should.

Room picks, like Rotation, define the culture of a house, and should be decided by the people in that house.

This is ridiculous, because house room picks make sure the people who will help run the house remain around to do so.

Houses should be able to hold their own picks procedures. This is simply administration fearing that Bechtel will not be filled.

There's some merit to making housing less annoying but I don't think this is the way to do it

Housing has long had a time agreement to not touch house room picks procedures. I've liked that; each house wants to weight and reward and exclude according to its own priorities, which the members of that house vote on. The current system, is democracy. Having admin reaching in and changing room picks per house would be awful.

Room picks work well to keep important house positions within the houses, and to allow upperclassmen to interact with the frosh before they graduate. Keeping picks within the houses is the best option.

I feel like the house should have the only say in who lives in the house to maintain the most open, comfortable, and intellectually stimulating community for the members.

Ditto?

Each house has its own systems crafted according to the way the house's excomm is set up.

Each house is different. Cookie cutter solutions lead to mass frustration.

I thought the room picks were fair

While I think it creates uniformity, I do not think the added bureaucracy will help. I think it will slow it all down and over complicate room picks.

See above. Fuck.

They just need to give enough freedom to each house and the way different positions in the house are different in some houses. I don't think it's necessary.

I believe there can be planning and recommendations, but picks should not be completely run by this committee, especially not in-house picks.

Room picks don't need oversight from people who don't live every day for a year with the outcome.

Room picks should be handled on a house by house basis using a house designed procedure.

What works for one house won't work for others. Let the people decide what works for them.

The room pick procedure has always been left up to the houses and has worked fine in the past. Allowing the houses to self govern allows people to feel that they have a voice and actually matter. By taking the houses' role in room picks, the Advisory Committee would be stifling student voices.

As long as it is "advising". not "controlling"

We know what is good for our houses. There is no need for faculty to get involved.

this seems unnecessary

This makes little to no sense. Room pick procedures should be dictated by the House.

The houses have each decided the most fair rules they can come up with and changing that just screws over the people who are currently here.

The scale is not large enough to express how strongly I dislike this. Give admin influence over room picks, and I'll take 100 to 1 odds that you eventually see reserved spots for students who work with admin. Any deviation from complete equality with regard to room picks is a moral outrage.

Being advised on something is generally a good thing but "advising" should not have any power over the final decisions. Traditions of the Houses should be preserved, and people holding positions should have the priority of getting the rooms, since they are more involved in the house and should be rewarded.

My house's room picks are very chill, so I don't feel that I'm in a place to speak on this.

Advising? Sure.

I don't know how this would work.

I agree that some room pick procedures have problems, but that should be up to the Houses to fix, not some committee that doesn't know anything about us or our needs.

Room pick procedures within the houses directly impact house culture, and thus have no place with the Advisory Committee on Residential Life, a body that includes members that do not have to live with the repercussions of their choices regarding house culture.

There's no way that a small committee of students and faculty should be allowed to decide everything about room picks in every house. It would be super impersonal and end up making a lot of people in the houses unhappy.

Honestly whatever. I don't care who does this as long as students are involved and listened to, and the process is fair.

See above

The houses handle room picks fine.

I believe that letting each house decide how their room picks work is an important piece of their self-governance. Each house has a different size and has modified their system to fit their house's needs. A committee making across-the-board decisions would not be able to take each of those concerns into consideration. Also, they would not know the members of the house to be able to effectively work out kinks that always occur. The house itself is much better equipped for that position.

If the IHC were on the committee, then I would have few problems with the faculty and staff being on the committee because I think the IHC would be able to convince the committee of their choices.

People may complain about room picks procedures, but at least now if they have a complaint, they can come to a consensus with their peers and enact changes at the level of house government. Giving powers to a mysterious committee hand-picked by the VPSA would just make the whiniest voices heard.

Each house has arrived at their room pick procedures for a reason. The process has been refined over the years, and that tradition should be respected.

What are the issues with house room pick procedures?

Let the houses be autonomous. We're doing just fine.

Room picks should be delegated to the houses, not the faculty.

Houses should be given room pick power. Within each house, and each alley, we know what rooms are quiet, which ones have strange shapes, which ones have a weird air vent, which ones are loud on garbage truck pickup days -- all of these things go into room picks and are pieces of advice passed around when choosing rooms. Only students know things like this.

Room picks already work... why are we changing this?

Students are mature enough to manage themselves.

While the committee may be necessary for placing students in Bechtel, there is no need for it to also place students in the houses. The current process of on and off campus picks is not a bad one, and placing all students would be an impossible task for a single committee.

People should get a choice and say in their own lives, as much as possible

Largely indifferent. Students running these things hasn't always worked out from what I can see.

Why should anyone other than the student body have a say over their own social preferences?

All the above reasons

See above. I have no faith in this committee.

If it has every house represented by elected students, then ok. If it's just faceless bureaucrats that don't know the houses, then no.

This is a house matter. I'll allow that Bechtel may be different, but I would not appreciate people who don't know the house and have no investment in it having any say in where I live.

Each house has their own room picks process. It works pretty well. Why interfere?

Houses should deal with their own traditions and cultures

Though I am a bit vary if lottery is better than stable matching. I think the logistics of how it will work will definitely need to be explored more. And it looks like that's the goal of the ACRL in the next few weeks.

Advising is more than fine. Running room picks without student input is NOT okay.

Why do they need to be involved? Each house has developed rules they feel are fair for their situation, why should admin upend that?

Let houses run their own picks.

Room picks are already pretty fair in my house, so doesn't really matter.

If there are specific problems, they should be handled with that house. All of the room pick procedures that I know about are public information.

Flies in the face of student self governance. One-off complaints of unfairness should be handled by the CRC, and systemic changes should be considered as bylaw amendments by the houses. No house should be forced to provide a room to non-members.

Houses should decide their own picks.

Should be a completely student run process.

Houses have always been independent, I don't see why they can't make their own decisions in whatever way they feel is right

room picks only directly affect the students, so the students are the only ones qualified to decide on procedures.

Don't really care

Let house traditions stand!

House roompicks are the least mysterious roompicks process, because they are algorithms and you can plan your four years around them. (The off campus one you have no insight into).

wtf? This sounds like a means of reducing House diversity without serving a less sinister purpose.

Again, I'm not ok with some dissociated entity, appointed by someone I do not trust in the least, deciding the fates of all undergrads on campus.

They seem so complicated. And what is the point of being a member of a house if I can live anywhere? I am a member of my house because I want to live with the people in my house.

To beat a dead horse, more non-students = less reliable

This is an attack on student life and autonomy. There is actually no reason to take away the ability for students to decide room picks procedures.

The houses are the ones affected by room picks, so they should be the ones who decide how they should occur. Some arbitrary advisory decisions may cause harm to houses, who would otherwise be fine.

this doesn't make sense. The reason I came to caltech was because we self govern. And you are overstepping your boundaries and violating this. If you are getting complaints that "X" house has unfair roompicks, address just them not everyone. Removing our right to select roompicks is like pulling the plug on houses. Allowing individuals to move from house to house will not only kill the sense of history associated with the house "Hell in Blacker is all frosh" but also it will kill communitie

with the other housing changes, idk if it's the best idea to change room picks as well

Each House has different pick needs and already effective systems. Once again, the house should be having a major role in this, not just admin.

Every house has its way of doing things, and some have even developed into more like a tradition (Ex: dabney frosh drawing tarot cards, rewind in blacker...etc)

Room picks should be run by students only

Represents another loss of opportunity for student government which has been slowly eroding for many, many years.

General Bechtel Questions: Explain:

There are 86 responses

The student body should be foremost in making these decisions. The concern is that elections/appointments often turn into popularity contests and hear the loudest voices, rather than the most diverse or reasonable ones (both of which are needed if the student body's opinions are to be taken seriously).

The people who best know which students would be appropriate for the committee are other students. We study with them, we talk with them, we live with them. We know who can best lead and represent the student body. As seen by the enormous response to this change, the students care immensely about the whole house system, including house picks, and will definitely pick students that act in the best interest of the students themselves, which is ultimately who this change affects, and who this change

Students need to have a say in student life/housing...

I still don't really know the purpose of the committee as it doesn't seem to have been hashed out completely, but since it has to do with student lives, the committee should be chosen by students.

Administration has their main say by appointing faculty / administrators. The students also need to have their say.

I emphatically think that there should be an option here to have some appointed by administration and some appointed/elected by the students. I think this would help ensure a diversity of voices and opinions on the committee. Probably like 80% elected/appointed by students and 20% appointed by admin or something.

Student input is the most important part of this committee and is less effective if not chosen by a significant portion of the student body.

This committee should just be the IHC.

i think voting by a larger population is good, but admin should have some sort of say just to make sure we don't have crazy people running the residential lives of 1000 people

Unless the administration involved demonstrates concern for our well being and consider our feedback, I would prefer that admin does not get involved in the selection. Else, I would be fine with all the options.

the students on this committee should have the faith of the student body behind them.

There should be input from all the Houses on who is on the committee (without larger Houses dominating).

These are matters for serious representatives of the student body

Said committee should not exist

If it must, the word "administration" should have nothing to do with it

If the system is implemented the students on it must be selected by students in some manner.

I think it could be a parallel voting system where some of the representatives are voted in a campus-wide STV-block and others are appointed by the administration.

Students have to live with this.

Does admin want some exterior committee deciding they must live with other people in their physical house, designed to 'diversify' their living experience, with no input from them?

Students should be deciding who is appointed.

Seems strange to have administration pick people because they could just pick people that agree with them.

Letting administration appoint the student representatives entirely undermines the motivation for having student representatives. If this is the case, we are better without student representatives because at least that wouldn't allow administration to create the sense that the student body as a whole agreed with the decisions they were making. Because the IHC is elected by the houses, I believe that this would be an appropriate way for representatives to be chosen. The same is true of direct ho

I do not think that the administration should be overly involved in house policies. The students are the ones who need to live in these houses and with each other. The students should have the primary say in who represents them.

I absolutely don't trust administration to choose this now.

Everything should come from students, with minimal control over rotation by Admin, faculty, or staff.

students must have some say in the committee that represents them, and individual houses often know people better than the student body at large would

I don't trust administrations hand in this. Anything but that.

Student body elections don't select a group that advocates for each house. People hold house positions on higher regard anyway.

It has worked for so many years, why fix it?

Administration should not pick the student representatives, they are already represented by the staff portion of the committee.

Should be the IHC so each house is represented by their most senior representative.

Students should have the say.

Representatives should be chosen by the people they represent. By definition.

We need representation from each house to place students, and we want to make sure these students are trusted by admin or they will be left powerless.

Anything requiring approval by a large number of students or approval by a group of elected student government is probably fine.

They should be decided by students (which excludes the "...by administration" options). I don't like "elected at large" because that is too much a large-scale popularity contest, which can create huge biases towards/against certain houses. I say this as someone who thinks my house would benefit from an at-large election; but I think other houses would lose out and I don't want that. Elected by house so that there's a certain proportional representation per house would be optimal.

If we have to have this committee, as much power as possible should go to the houses. Not everyone knows everyone from other houses, but for the most part everyone knows the people within their house, and can make more informed decisions.

The students must be involved in the selection. Otherwise the process will not be representative.

They need to represent the house and school from the ground up, not the top down.

NO ADMIN

In order to be responsible for representing students, we need to have elections

Houses need to have input somehow. If the Committee is actually going to be formed, then houses should at least have some say in who is going to represent their opinions.

Appointment by the IHC makes sense given that it is the binding body between the Houses; election by the Houses is a fair, democratic way of selecting students; and general election is an equivalent, albeit large-scale, means of selecting students.

Why is administration trying to make itself an integral part of this? Obviously, Rotation is overseen, but it's by the houses for the houses.

I don't think it should be completely up to the houses because elections are very often a popularity contest. This doesn't give students that aren't very active within the house system a chance to participate in campus wide committees.

If you want even the slightest chance that this committee will be anything but a rubber stamp for Uncle Joe, students need to be elected.

Students need to be included.

Let's present a student voice rather than a House's voice (or admin's for that matter).

Option six doesn't work because the administration, clearly showed here, does not respect

student decisions

Elections would be tragic.

We as students MUST have input into the students selected for this committee. If admin is the only voice, they could easily pack the committee with students who agree with their views but aren't representative of the student body as a whole.

Direct elections are the best way to select students for this. Students care more about their houses/social life than governing bodies that seem more removed from their lives. Elections through houses and the whole student body would reflect student opinion more effectively and also represent unaffiliated persons.

Pls democracy.

I feel like if this committee must happen, then just as BOC and CRC reps and other house positions are elected, so must these. This is the only way to assure a fair representation of student opinions.

Hopefully this will change, but as it stands I think the IHC needs to play a role, and having the IHC appoint people, perhaps from within themselves, seems safer.

This feels like something important enough that each house needs to have a say. And houses are the best and knowing who should represent them.

This should be a general election position.

They should not be appointed by admin. They should be elected by students. I think it's better for each house to elect its own reps.

I think people who know the students should elect them, and thus election by houses makes the most sense.

People active in student government at Caltech often tend to be fairly homogeneous in their perspectives - but there is a large minority of the community (perhaps even a majority) that do not share the same views. Having a combination of house selections as well as non-house elections seems to be a healthy compromise to allow everyone's voices to be heard.

If not elected by a house, this whole thing gets even more stupid. Then you're really throwing house culture out the window.

I would agree that not all students make great judges of who can live in what house. I feel like nominating people instead of allowing self selection is a good step in the right direction

The less Joe Shepherd has to do with it, the more I like it.

Students should be allowed a choice in their representatives on the committee. By electing some from each house by each house, the house can be confident that someone on the committee will have their best interests in mind.

Each house needs to be represented.

Administration does not deserve any of our trust at this point.

Anything that begins with the students.

should be a wide variety of student input to this

I understand if faculty and staff reps are on the committee, but the students on the committee should be picked by the students themselves.

We shouldn't offer anyone for this committee. Now is the point where we should refuse to participate further or to negotiate with Shepherd in particular

They should not be appointed by any organization, be it administration or IHC or ASCIT, without support from the students.

Some appointments are fine, but elections are important to get an accurate view of student input.

It honestly depends how much power this committee will have.

Each house should have a representative, and it should be the students decision.

an election by the students allows the most student input

I don't care

Houses know their people the best.

No admin ability to veto.

If students don't have full control over it is it really a student representative?

I quite frankly do not trust the current administration to make unselfish decisions at this time, and am uncomfortable having someone so biased and uninformed deciding who should be in power.

Ultimately, students who represented the student body should be those chosen by the student body. Then the student body can be sure to choose people who truly embody their ideals.

This committee should either just be the IHC or should contain the IHC itself as a strict subset with no other student members and a minimal number of faculty (not staff) members. My "Other" vote is my primary one.

IHC and ASCIT appointments would be acceptable if there is a time factor, otherwise elections should be held. Administration should not have input because they could choose students who reflect their goals and not the general student body's.

Election by an entire student body is an okay idea in concept, practically I feel like it would make representing distinct groups on campus more difficult. The selected people would likely concentrate with the majority block of votes, meaning the other ~40% could be left

unrepresented.

Absolutely not appointed by administration through any means. That just further consolidates power in administration that should remain in student hands.

I believe this committee should consist of the IHC, as they are the students each house has chosen to elect to their position that has historically been about rotation

A representative system doesn't mean a damn thing if the people being represented don't have a say in who represents them.

this should be as student body of a decision as possible imo

I would want to choose who represented my interests.

General Bechtel Questions: Explain:

There are 107 responses

The Faculty in Residence program is one of my favorite parts of living in Avery. The FIR families are wonderfully supportive, a pleasure to talk to, and add a great deal to the experience of living in an academic environment.

I like the idea of having faculty associate with the North and South houses, it's been nice for Avery. However, this is 99% because the current FIRs are angels; when a previous family lived here, their presence was invisible at best and negative at worst. Furthermore, faculty enthusiasm about this program should be gauged. Not sure what kind of family would like to live in some of the rowdier houses. I feel like FIRs are even annoyed with Avery's noise level at times.

Where do you guys plan to house these FIRs? Don't get me wrong, I love the Avery FIRs, but I don't see where new ones would be housed in the other houses.

Have not experienced. I would like to be treated as an adult capable of living on my own though.

No major opinion either way. Seems like it could be good.

I love the FIR's in Avery! They're so kind and wonderful! It's also nice knowing that there are full adults living in the house!

I don't have enough experience with faculty in residence, but I don't think it will be useful for the support network to have sympathetic upperclassmen replaced with out of touch faculty.

I've heard good things about it from Averites, what's inherently wrong with letting faculty into our lives?

seems like a good idea :)

I sincerely believe that FIRs and their families would not have a good quality of life in the other houses, especially the South houses.

This might work well, depending on how much the faculty want to interact with the students. My guess is to live with the students, they must be really interested in them. I currently think there is

a level of distrust and gap between admin, faculty, and students (myself included). This might help with that.

Only with approval of House voting to be renewed every year.

The houses should be asked if they are comfortable with a faculty to be living within the house because the social dynamic of the house could drastically change with a professor living in it.

It would be really cool. But seems difficult to implement...

I don't see the point. I live in Avery and I don't really feel any effect from having FIR's. They are neither a positive or negative.

The culture at caltech (staying up late, general quirkiness) isn't conducive for faculty student interaction, except in Avery. I do not believe that any of the other houses would be an appropriate place (or most college dorms in general for that matter) for families with children. Avery's mix of generally quiet and friendly residents made the FIR program (esp with Prof Rangel) a success, but this recipe could not be replicated anywhere else. Even in Avery, they had to remind people to be quiet

I see very little detail about the nature of said expansion and thus await actual details.

I really liked the Rangels!

I doubt it will work. Faculty are extremely busy.

Also. They haven't taken classes. This is a critical thing.

Putting Professors in college dorms provides no real benefit.

I don't understand where exactly they would live in the South Houses (RA apartments?) but have no real objection to having faculty around

Don't care.

The classes and campuses are small enough that students do not have trouble getting opportunities to interact with faculty. There is no need for them to live together.

Doesn't really matter to me

Where will they live? There is not a single room in the entirety of the South Houses where a Faculty-in-Residence could be housed unless one of the houses stopped having RAs. I imagine something similar is true of the North Houses. If this (terrible) idea was implemented, I would require that the students are able to give input, just as with the RA selection process.

I am not immediately in objection to this idea. However, I do think that having faculty in residence may have deleterious effects on student life. If students feel like they are never simply living among their peers and free to enjoy themselves accordingly, I believe they will miss out on an integral, treasured facet of the college experience.

leave campus.

There is nothing to complain about here! More student-faculty interaction would be great.

I would not be comfortable living with a faculty in my dormitory.

The South houses are small enough...

I think that the faculty may not be so happy. College life is different than life while employed. Sleep schedule, parties, activities, building OPI, etc. factor in this difference.

It's fine. Whatever.

I have interacted with FIR families and think it adds to the sense of community.

Seems like an Avery thing, no strong opinion as I don't live there.

I think it is a good thing, but I'm worried that not enough faculty will be interested

We already have RA's, we do not need Faculty in Residence

the faculty in residence program is one of maybe three reasons why i have not transferred

the rangels are everything

I haven't had enough experience with the Faculty-in-Residence program to offer an opinion.

Why would faculty ever want to do this??

Really seems like a way to expand the reach of admin's disciplinary arm, but I suspect it won't actually be that effective. Disrupting student life for a year+ for renovations would be awful.

I think it's weird. I don't want to be living with a faculty and their family. I don't want to worry about watching my language and behavior in front of little kids and their parents. I don't want to take classes with a professor who lives literally next door to me and may sometimes see me walking around the halls in my pajamas. I want my relationship with faculty to be professional. I don't want to feel the need to be "professional" when I am around my dorm room.

Could be cool.

As long as they keep to themselves, it's whatever.

We have enough faculty.

I have met many cool profs and am absolutely on board with more interactions between the undergraduate body and faculty. However, I'm concerned with the logistics of implementing this plan in the North and South Houses, which aren't equipped to house faculty.

The FIR program was the one reason I considered Avery.

Faculty-in-Residence is fine for Bechtel, I guess; however, I would like to express that I don't feel very comfortable with living with faculty. There should be a very clear divide between school and personal life and living with faculty blurs that line a bit too much for my tastes.

The living spaces in the residences aren't good enough for faculty... If I was a professor I would be pretty offended to have to live with a bunch of undergrads. Let the young people be young, let the old people be old, and let people choose where to live.

I don't see why they would be necessary, however, as long as they don't take student rooms to house the FIRs, I think they could add a positive touch to the houses. They could also act as MOSH since we don't currently have one.

I wish they had spent more time fighting for other pieces of this plan rather than expansion of faculty in residence. I don't see how this is a major benefit in any way.

As a member of both Avery and Fleming, I can say with absolute certainty that living with faculty makes me feel more restricted in my behaviour and uncomfortable around my friends. It does NOT promote the kind of faculty/student interaction it is meant to, and feels almost like an invasion of my private life. Personally, I find that it is important to my mental health to have some separation between work/school and my leisure time, and the FiR program only works to break down that barrier.

Avery's FIR programs works well.

I don't mind FiR but idk if they would enjoy living with us. We can be loud.

Neutral. Haven't experienced it first hand.

More professors on campus is always nice.

If I was a real adult, I wouldn't and shouldn't be forced to live around loud college kids, and I don't think they'd want me around either.

Caltech students are essentially adults and shouldn't need additional supervision. I think that the houses are too small to create distance between the students and the faculty, and sometimes that's necessary. If we're always being sheltered and don't get the chance to make our own mistakes, we'll never learn.

Seems unnecessary

If Faculty-in-Residence engage with students, I've seen it be a wonderful program.

It's okay but also feels like it's an attempt to baby sit us.

The Avery FIRs are awesome. They're very supportive and well integrated into the house.

Honestly I find it strange that faculty live in undergrad residences

The faculty don't want this, the students don't want this... who wants this? This is obnoxious.

Who the f**k are they going to get to live in the South houses?!?

How will they sleep in Ricketts??? Also they will probably get salty given how grumpy a lot of the profs are.

It's good to have faculty around and get to know them, I guess in some sense if they play the role well they could act as guardians.

I like the concept, I think it's a good idea. But i'm not sure how much of an effect it'll really have.

Takes up student rooms. Avery showed it wasn't popular. Limits student autonomy by having teachers be constantly with us.

I have lived in Avery and I love having faculty just down the hall. They do not disturb the students, and only improve quality of life!

Seems all right....confused on whether we have the money to make new FIR apartments....

I think it would be neat to have faculty in the house

i don't think this would affect much, so as long as faculty aren't taking up space in the houses (i.e. because they're living in the RLC apartment instead). if it's a replacing for the RLC program, it would probably be an improvement.

As someone living in Avery I like having FIR but sometimes it's also a problem because there are basically quiet hours due to them having families here.

Honestly as long as they don't take away bed spaces it's fine. But who really wants to live next to Booty House with children

I mean if they have room for every student they'll have more room than they need.

I have no problem interacting with faculty who care about our well-being.

I don't really know where the FIR would live. Would they take the current RLCs apartments? There's no space for FIRs in the North and South houses

The FIRs are nice! I think it'd be cool, as long as there isn't any mandatory kind of meet-and-greet of some sort. A relaxed, non-forceful process.

While I think it might be interesting in principle, I don't see how it happens logistically (architecturally) without leaving either the houses or the faculty unhappy. I also think students can be trusted to manage themselves and the only reason I find this interesting is for additional faculty interaction, not policing or enforcement in any way.

More interaction with faculty would be great, I just want to know where exactly they're planning to put them. Where is there room.

Students would be pressured to meet and abide to the expectations of faculty, and many of the more personal and intimate aspects of social life at the houses would be suppressed by those expectations, particularly in the southern houses where the culture/community are most

developed

I've enjoyed interacting with the FiR living in Avery, but it's really hard to find FiRs who would actually benefit the house. Given that it has been difficult to find two to fill the spots in Avery, I'm very doubtful that an expansion would prove beneficial.

Sounds like a great way to eliminate that many more beds in the North and South houses, and we can't even keep two FIRs in Avery--how are we gonna come up with six more?

Students and faculty, while they can be on good terms, cannot casually integrate into one housing. It just creates tension, and takes up significant amounts of living space which would otherwise be used by students.

I rotated out of Avery and FIR presence not only made me feel awkward but also forced myself to not be myself. As a college student, I enjoy the pleasures of swearing and other profanities, but I can't do this with kids running around. Putting a FIR in Any of the south houses kills the houses, AND takes away more rooms from students.

it really depends on the faculty in question, but the avery ones imo are a great addition to the community and support system

I don't really care tbh.

Doesn't matter. will highly depend on the specific faculty member

This could be a good idea

General Bechtel Questions: Explain:

There are 138 responses

Board should be opt-in. Even if all students opt-in, the price of board would still be EAT LEAST 1.5-2x the price of cooking or even eating out, which is not something that should be required.

Dont force us to board food if we dont want to.

It seems like the greatest change here will be the waited dinners, which Avery didn't have anyways, so I have no opinion.

I don't like the current board system with how expensive it is. I do appreciate the move to allow students the choice of all you can eat without dbal because there are definitely students that fit this plan more.

Doesn't affect me, but it does affect how others.

It certainly seems like new ideas could be good for this. The Anytime plan is widely popular among students as far as I can tell, and greater flexibility could be good. Since we're talking about "re-examining", it does seem like something that new ideas could be good for.

Student waiters vs. expanded Board options is a false dichotomy. Expanding Board options (including the options to be off Board, especially for students with allergies) is good, but that does not need to be at the expense of waited dinners in Houses that have them. Opening Chandler for dinners in particular would be a good way to bring undergrads, grad students, and

some faculty together in a relaxed environment.

Board absolutely needs more options if it will be required for all four years, though I wish the proposal included a more autonomous board plan.

Board is shit and should be reexamined.

I like that they're considering improving it, but it seems like they just want to get rid of house dinners to tear the house system apart.

most of my dbal goes to buying junk at the c-store...if it's unlimited, i'll be losing money (i already am :/)

I don't know the current proposal.

That's ok, but my biggest issue with the board is a little less about the variety or options available, it's the quality. CDS tries to please everyone with not just regular American food, but random fusion takes that please no one, like frying slabs of tofu which has almost no taste. I've taken to eating salads lately, which I guess is healthier, but I might request special meals. But also, while they are nice, I would prefer American food made somewhat acceptable (as someone raised on Indian

sure? one of the reasons I moved off-off was due to board's price tag. I probably would've moved off even if board was "better" but sure ya'll can re examine it.

Alternative board plans would benefit students and increase choice.

Waited dinners are such a huge part of house culture, and something that really brings everyone together. Getting rid of house dinners will make a lot of students feel isolated. I know that if we didn't have waited dinners, I probably wouldn't eat, so having this sense of community and family provided by waited house dinners is necessary.

Board is shit... hopefully they don't find a way to make it worse

IT CANNOT BE REQUIRED. People should have the option. Also, i believe having chandler serve dinner will take away from the community building of house dinners and I believe with this specific new addition, administration is trying to break the house system even more by slowly dissolving these communities by breaking up opportunistic bonding events, such as house dinner.s

Off-campus needs to be an option. For those who find themselves cooking during term already because the food options are not to the specifications they need. It also is a great option for those who want a more independent type living experience. Board is expensive, even more so when one doesn't end up eating much of the food.

I think waited dinners are an integral part of the South and North house cultures. I also oppose the proposal of dinner at Chandler instead house dinners. Dinner at Chandler basically destroys the house community because dinner is when people in the house regularly come together. I also would like to still have the option to use dbal.

Board is not perfect and I see no reason that it could not be improved though I could imagine

changes that would be very detrimental to the Caltech experience.

I'd love to have more options. I don't think that forcing everyone to accept a monopoly with no opt-out option will lead to that in a long term--that's just basic economics.

I do not want to force everyone to be on board, but if such a decision is made, board should be made more flexible (i.e. you can pay less to receive fewer meals)

Don't really care?

Board is already to expensive and many people including myself pay a lot to eat relatively little. The changes seem like a pretty unfair system to me.

While I agree that requiring board hurts low income students, the proposed changes hurt them more. For students who aren't eligible for work study, the most accessible campus job is being a waiter for house dinners. This is a great and flexible job that helps numerous students at the school.

The current board plan is lacking in high-quality, easily-accessible options for a number of students with dietary restrictions and preferences. Moreover, it is excessively rigid regarding mealtimes, making it difficult for many students to devote time to eating properly and healthily. I believe that it is due for re-examination.

I think it would be nice to have more options with board. But that's not what the proposal is offering, just a different forced board plan.

It doesn't change the fact that students will be required to stay on board.

House dinners are an important part of house culture and they should remain

I like the current unlimited plan. I just want CDS dinner to improve.

Board needs reform. It has low quality and is overpriced, and one of those things needs to change.

Tom Mannion, Peter Daily, and Jon Webster have had a positive vision for board, and it's improved drastically over the last decade. I trust their vision, largely because they've listened to student feedback.

It does need to be re-examined, but it needs to be made less expensive and more accommodating; the current experiments with it are doing the opposite.

While I welcome more choice in food, house dinners are another reason prefrash are drawn to Caltech (I myself was very excited to tell my friends about it). Furthermore, the combination of no house dinner and administration placing prefrash into the houses at their discretion, fosters an isolated atmosphere where interactions and community is absent

My only problem with it is that i'm a huge fan of house dinner. Removing house dinners would be a huge step towards destroying house culture.

If it's food quality, then sure.

Would like to keep waiters. Other than that it is fine.

Board should not be compulsory. And it should not be single tiered.

Phasing out waited dinners shocked me - they are such an integral part of community in the House system; when I visited as an admitted-off-the-waitlist student, attending a House dinner was by far the most distinct example of Caltech culture I experienced - much more than the one-on-one tour, or anything else. As for the food itself: obviously there are complaints - there are students who want better food and there are students who don't want CDS food and don't want to pay for it - and both wa

NO MORE WAITED DINNERS?!

Why is board a bajillion dollars. I'm a college student. I'll eat for \$25/day after I've paid off my student loans, not before.

Love me some unlimited dbal

Re-examining board is fine, but it doesn't need to be tied to Bechtel.

Board should be reexamined, and people should certainly not be required to pay for it if they have a preferred alternative.

board is disgusting honestly

I also feel this is a blatant ploy by John Webster in order to make CDS more money, as by forcing everyone to live on-campus and all on-campus student to have board, he will ave a virtual monopoly. All he cares about is his bottom line and profits to the institute.

Options are very nice

I do think it should be re-examined, yes.

People who live on should be able to choose their own board plan without being forced onto the new one.

I do think board should be reexamined, but not in the ways admin proposes, in particular getting rid of waited dinners. They should also add an option to opt out of the board plan.

People should not be forced to be on-board because it is expensive and people should have the right to cook for themselves.

It boggles my mind that "more options" means eliminating the declining balance. That's literally less options, and I like having the balance to buy toiletries and medicine from Red Door without having to pay out-of-pocket.

I appreciate the increased dinner hours and more open Open Kitchen. I also have been loving the new board plan. However, not everyone does well on board, and being off-board should be an option. Furthermore, it is really important to maintain the tradition of student-waited dinners because these allow for a time of community, of nourishment, of student employment, etc.

Personally, house dinners have done so much for upholding my mental health and keeping me from socially isolating myself because

Compulsory board is awful. I am happy to be on board, but it should not be a requirement to get an undergraduate degree from Caltech. It has nothing to do with learning, only money.

I am currently \$60 over on dBal. Why is it so expensive?

Board's fine, I like it, but I know a lot of people don't.

The waited house dinners are one of the two reasons I came to Caltech. Getting rid of them would seriously impede the way I see my house as my family.

I don't think getting rid of them would reduce the cost of board enough to make it affordable for everyone. I doubt anyone goes off-board because they can't buy enough food with dBal, so I don't think the Anytime plan will help either.

It is hard to put such a nuanced question on a 1-5 scale--I think board should absolutely be re-examined, but that the current ideas of "improvements" to board are all about giving students access to more food, when many students want less of this at a lower cost.

Many people go off campus to avoid board. For people who eat less, it is too expensive especially for the quality of food.

If we keep waited dinners, I'm strongly for it, but otherwise strongly against

I prefer the current board system. There are options for Chandler, which allows accommodates for different kinds of eating habits. The waited dinners are a key part of house culture and also provide students with campus jobs.

I strongly like the idea but I won't like anything unless you can live on campus while not being on board

I can understand why there is a desire to re-examine board, but I'm not sure how profound the effects will be.

No one needs all the food that's provided in the unlimited plan. The declining balance is far more useful, as it doesn't just provide the means to gorge yourself. I don't want to stuff my maw with food; I also want to buy tissues and medicine when I'm sick, food from the c store when everything else is closed. Why have a convenience store that you make really inconvenient??

The lack of an off-board option is completely stripping any choice from the undergraduates. People keep saying there will be a cheaper board plan available, but I highly doubt it will be cheaper than purchasing and cooking your own food.

I don't really care about board, as long as the changes don't screw over people financially.

I still won't pay for board

I do think there should be other board options, but I don't think what most people trying to avoid board want is more freaking food. Please make options for small people; it's really not fair to make us subsidize people who eat multiple times as much as we do.

We should get the opportunity to have a reduced board plan. Many students cannot cook at all, which is an invaluable life skill.

I think that re-examining board is a good idea, since a lot of people dislike it. However, I am strongly opposed to eliminating student waiters. Having student waiters is one of the only things I like about Caltech meals, and it is worrying that removing them was one of the only concrete suggestions for changing board.

Again, forced board is not great because of CDS, but the possibility of students using the Avery kitchen is a cool idea.

YES. Reduce the cost, please!

Please don't force me back on the board meal plan.

Board is Not Good. Please improve the food quality. I don't like the Anytime Plan though (it doesn't align with my needs) and don't support forcing people to be on one plan versus the other because, again, people should be able to choose which plan best fits their needs.

I'd love if open kitchen on weekends went until 4 or 5 pm, even if it opened an hour or two later.

While "The Anytime" and flexibility for dinner times are great, waited dinners are an valued aspect of Caltech culture. They provide a convenient way for students on work-study to make money and a healthy release for students to relieve stress.

Please RE-EXAMINE it, and then ALLOW US TO OPT OUT. It is ridiculous to think that you could force us to all live on campus and not provide any off-board, apartment-style w/ kitchen option. It's actually absurd. Get with the times: other universities have apartment-style housing. Let us be the adults we want to be.

Bechtel will not be filled unless board is significantly changed. Specifically: it should not be mandatory at its current price

I believe that Jon Webster has been working very hard to make sure that board becomes better. I think that re-examining its structure could be good if it would allow people to live on campus without having to pay full board. This would be ideal especially since most people will now be living on campus once bechtel opens.

I think board should be re-examined. I hope there are similarly drastic changes made to this system.

I like the decision to take another look at it, but I think it is going the opposite direction that people want. I want freedom in my food through the ability to eat wherever, and most importantly, cook wherever.

The board plan is an opportunity to introduce choices. Every other university is known to have multiple board options, so I don't see why we can't have that as well.

Board is too expensive and people shouldn't be forced to be on it.

It eludes me how the administration does not recognize the inordinate cost of the board plan, so let me spell out the math.

Board costs \$2135 per term. Each term, food is available for 10 weeks. Two days per week, only 2/3 meals are provided. This adds up to

$(3 \text{ meals} * 5 \text{ days}) + (2 \text{ meals} * 2 \text{ days}) = 19 \text{ meals/week}$

Not subtracting holidays, when food is not provided, or adding in the 2-4 buffer days at the edges of each term, we have

$10 \text{ weeks} * 19 \text{ meals/week} = 190 \text{ meals}$

The cost per mea

Board should not be mandatory, nor influence house life.

DO MORE. GIVE US A BOARD FREE OPTION PLEASE PLEASE

I think that the anytime dining plan is a fantastic idea, but there is no way that board should be mandatory for people living in Bechtel.

I like improved options but requiring all students to buy in 100% is wrong. Though I know that feasibility of a board program is difficult with so few students.

Personally I like being on board.

Waited dinners are a social core, and a lot of fun

Waited dinners are a huge part of my Caltech experience, and that's not an exaggeration. Without waited dinners, I'd probably spend about half the time I currently do with my friends.

While board definitely needs to be reformed, the current propositions still essentially require that most meals eaten by students be prepared by CDS. This is problematic for people with dietary restrictions, who generally dislike the types of food and the way it is prepared by CDS, or those who simply would prefer to prepare their own food.

None of the plans offered are cheaper or require that students eat fewer CDS meals to get their money's worth.

Since it's just a proposal to re-examine board without any concrete details, it's hard to have any opinions on the matter. Personally, when I lived on campus, I really enjoyed house dinners because it forced us to come together and to talk to the other members of the house - but in my house attendance at these dinners has dropped drastically, so it seems that most students don't really care for it.

We should re examine board, but not in these ways. Waited dinners should be kept

indifferent. Board is expensive and bad, I wish there were more options.

It's too expensive

Board is stupid and expensive, but this feels like a straw man to get the student body to accept the other propose changes.

Board needs some healthier options

Woohoo for board variations!!

The food sucks. Improve the food. You can change the plan around as much as you want but we will just have more or less access to the same crappy food.

If anything, I would love for board to shrink in its control over what I eat. For its cost, it's a really bad deal, and pushes me towards poorer eating choices. With the extraordinarily low number of student kitchens in Betchel, this will become an even bigger issue for students who just want the ability to cook their own food but still be involved in caltech student life. Board should not be mandatory, but it is because of our school size, and its cost borders absurd. The chiobani yogurt I ge

As students get older and want more independence, cooking their own meals is a vital part of living self sufficiently. In addition, health conscious students may want to control exactly what they are putting in their bodies. Having one kitchen for all of the students who want to do this is not sufficient.

The current board plan needs work.

Did not see

CDS has NOWHERE near enough variety and does not have the capability to have enough variety to ever make this a better alternative to living off. ESPECIALLY for the price

I like that their trying. But they can't just give us more food, they have to try making it cheaper to eat. And I do agree that the cost can be cut down if waited dinners disappear

Yea, board sucks. We are fixing that slowly. This is happening independently of Betchel.

Was there any significant plan?

Part of the reason people move off-campus is so that they can save money/tastebuds on food that they make themselves. Board should be opt-in in Bechtel so that it's an option for people who don't like CDS.

Being required to be on board was a large factor in my decision to move off campus. If people are going to be forced to live on campus with board, changes are necessary and students should have multiple food plan options.

Mandatory board is a bad idea, but understandable if everyone is required to live on campus for four years.

We need this.

Forcing students to live on the board plan or to move off-off is cruel. finding a 9 month lease is incredibly difficult and if paying \$2000+ a term for food is the only other option, students are trapped.

Board is absurdly expensive; while I think it works alright for me, it should be seriously reconsidered if there will be a 4-year board requirement

i like dbal because i purchase barcoded items frequently. i think waited dinners are very important to forging bonds between the students--they're the best time to hang out with members of my house that i might not know as well yet. more options for food would be nice; i'm not thrilled with the diversity of vegetarian options available.

More flexibility needed: I don't want to pay for lunch I don't eat.

As long as they keep student waiters, another nice Caltech tradition, we should not have to keep eating a below average cds dinner (although I admit they try hard) and overpaying for it. Also chandler needs more options or just more food options in general particularly at dinner where you either eat what they made that day or pasta. Does not bode well for picky eaters or in general if you don't like that particular day's food. Like Chouse is so much better.

I realize it is costly and need revision I am just not certain how much I trust administration to give students something they want rather than forcing something cheap down their throats.

I think the unlimited plan is great, but I think until there is an option to be off of board entirely while still living on campus, people are going to have problems. I understand that Caltech cannot police everyone who is and is not on board, and so I am not particularly frustrated with the rate of progress in this area. I appreciate that they have been making an effort.

It's absurd that there's no way to be off board

I enjoy unlimited board but I also have a lot of friends who prefer dbal

If by re-examine we mean you can live on-campus but be off board, then by all means.

But they need to up quality of food, not quantity.

I do think we need to re-examine board, but not in the way the published decision suggests.

I understand that board has few choices because of Caltech's small size, but our options as they are very expensive and of small quantity. There must be an option of reduced price board.

Specifically, I only approve of removing the requirement that students living on campus buy board

I'm glad board is being reexamined but the proposed changes seem to again, be in the interest of CDS and not in the interest of the students. More choices are great, yes, so keep the declining balance option AND offer the anytime balance. Have dinner options available, but don't cut out student-waited dinners. In general, have the evidence that plan A is overwhelmingly what the students want before forcing students into plan A. And have an opt-out option.

I like having choices of using dbal or having infinity. Also waiters make dinner interesting. Please don't ever phase them out...

Forcing everyone on campus and then not having a non-board option is genuinely classist. Caltech absolutely does not meet everyone's financial need, no matter what is claimed, and forcing people to buy Caltech's board plans is ignorant to a degree that confuses me. I am glad that there are other options besides full board being considered--but there must be an economical option introduced because the current caltech board plan costs about 5x as much as it costs me to feed myself off-campus.

I like the current dining system, and while I wouldn't object to having more options, I think any structural changes would only cause damage.

Board should not be forced upon people for 4 years. Ideally, it's required if you live on, but you shouldn't be forced to live on all 4 years unless you get special premission. That's horsehit and you know it

i hate board

idk what else to say

I think board is a major concern for many students.

Do not like the anytime plan. Debal allows more flexibility to get barcode items.

board sucks tbh

Board sucks, especially for anyone with a restrictive diet. It's a major waste of money.

Why should everyone be on board? That's a monopoly

General Bechtel Questions: Do you have any additional thoughts on how you want to be represented?

There are 86 responses

I think some of the proposed changes will be good, especially with respect to opt-in Rotation. The details still need to be worked out before I can give a proper opinion, though. However, required on-campus living is garbage.

I understand that the ideas on this proposal have probably been tossed around between the

admins for a long time and I'm glad that the admins seem to want to work out the details with students, but I believe there could have been a bit more transparency on the part of the admins before the proposal was released.

From what I've heard about the decision process, it seems that Shepherd largely left the COUCH and other undergrads out of the planning process. The rotation stuff, I've heard, was put in while the COUCH was told to not worry about it, and I find that to be really concerning.

This is the main thing for me, if they really believe that they had a transparent decision-making process that took and used input from the student body, then why is there so much dissatisfaction over the decision and

I would just like to stress the importance and capability of our current and future student governments should not be downplayed. Students are extremely effective at dealing with the issues they live with and need to be consulted and often the deciders for every aspect of residential life.

A few things:

First, as I have already said, opening a survey with a leading question is embarrassingly poor form and legitimately calls its results into question. I was put off by it and had to convince myself into filling this out on principle.

I would ask the IHC to seriously introspect into the nature of many of the institutions it intends to protect, especially Rotation. I see absolutely no problems with houses that change dynamically as the personalities of the students that reside in

Definitely would like to see the mandatory living/board parts removed.

I would like to be taken seriously and not ignored.

I am not attacking admin, while there is distrust between us. I am not booing anyone. I won't be destroying anything or take any other action that makes us look more immature and irresponsible than we are.

I would like my concerns to be heard and taken into account.

My house is my family, and all the proposed changes are trying to take that away.

I want the representatives of the student body to have a seat at the negotiating table, not be announced the answer pretty much at the same time that the newspapers get it. That's what student governance means. If you're gonna say you're student governance then do some damn governing.

Without the current house system, I would not have participated in student government at all.

Instead, I have been one of the most involved people in my house. There is a reason that events run by houses are much more popular and better attended than those put on by Caltech as a whole. Centralization of the student government would seriously degrade the student experience while simultaneously increasing administrative costs.

I believe also that Caltech needs to seriously make an effort to do

The way the current plan was proposed undermined the intelligence and trust of the undergraduate population and was an extremely disrespectful choice on the behalf of administration.

I don't know that I'm convinced students should have input on these decisions. I think that experiences/institutions change over time and I really didn't like the housing system and would have preferred a more normal experience with a better chance of being able to opt-out.

Please help!

I'm not directly hurt by this, but...

Admin went over all our heads with this decision -- they weren't transparent with what they were doing. Basically, this is telling us that we're incapable of making our own decisions. We're being disrespected to the highest degree with how they attempted to obscure a lot of the changes they wanted to be made. Not only did they not say anything about the rotation changes in their email, they gave the students on COUCH and IHC practically no heads up.

Rotation was a major reason I chose Caltech over other colleges and universities. I think the current House system is set up in a way that I get to find people I really belong with which would have been otherwise very difficult. This new proposed plan of getting rid of Rotation rules would abolish the distinct personalities of each house. I would be very disappointed if Rotation was no longer present at Caltech.

I think we should slow down and discuss any drastic changes. Changing rotation for even one year will have drastic effects reaching into the future.

I want to be represented by my student leaders and I find it truly disheartening that administration has decided to make all of these drastic decisions without even considering all of the data that the students worked so hard to gather. Don't pretend to listen to us and give us a chance to describe to you the lives we know we want and need if you're not going to listen in the end.

I would like to emphasize a relatively common occurrence among the student body. I have heard of at least 5 cases (over the past 36 hours alone) of students choosing "the wrong house" as their first choice during rotation. By this, I mean that students chose a house which would have ultimately made them less happy than their current house. I experienced this myself. I chose Blacker and Avery above Dabney, but I rotated into Dabney. After the initial disappointment of not getting my first choice

The house system is integral to Caltech and should be protected and allowed to thrive

I want to be able to live in a house, not a generic dorm.

I agree rotation should be changed, but this is way too far.

I won't lie and say there are no issues with rotation, there are. Rotation is not a perfect system and I concede that maybe it's time to revise it. But not like this. What was briefly referred to on the page regarding Bechtel as rotation being "reformed to maximize student choice and reflect our core values" is more of a gutting of the current system. Administration did not ask our opinion on these changes to Rotation and simply had them ride along the very reasonable proposal for Bechtel. M

Just negotiate with us in good faith. I know the students can be frustrating, but I'm not sure why Administration would be surprised by a hostile reaction when random things are supposedly thrown in at the last minute.

I want administration to show a scrap of respect and to show some acknowledgement/changes of the outrage the campus feels. Between IHC and ASCIT I will feel adequately represented.

I am completely against this complete overhaul of our rotation process. I have depended on my house time and time again at Caltech. It is the sole reason why I will look back at my time here with fondness. While Caltech is an incredible tech school with amazing opportunities, it is crucial that students have a community that we are comfortable in and where we can easily connect to each other. The uniqueness of the houses is what drew me to come here as it gave me comfort that I would enjoy my ti

No, but represent us or we'll secede

Overall I think the rotation process as it is right now is very successful and is a large part of why I chose to come to Caltech. Given the small nature of the school, I think it is imperative to have something like the housing system to create a functional social environment. To reiterate, I would not had come to Caltech had the current rotation/housing system not existed, especially if the proposed system was implemented.

I want the administration to genuinely listen to what students have to say.

I strongly disagree with administrations views and their actions. I do wish to see a completely unified response from IHC or ASCIT or other student leadership, which apparently appears to be paralyzed. We as students need to provide a uniform response simultaneously, not a scattering of individual responses

It's Jake Mattinson. I'm finding my ways to be represented. Hopefully the IHC is willing to group together to get at least a compromise worked out.

I want admin to actually value our opinions instead of pretending to and disregarding them. I also don't want to feel like certain houses get listened to more by admin, and if I put my put my house affiliation on this then my voice will not mean as much.

I don't think students have been represented and the plan proposed has blatantly ignored student opinions.

By an actual committee and not Joe Shepherd!

I think it is essential that current students have a say in who rotates into their house.

Required 4-years on campus has nothing to do with education. Students in good standing should be able to live how they want.

I really appreciated the effort of the COUCH.

LET IT STAY THE SAME.

The students who are vocal about this are probably really angry about it, and the more moderate reactions like mine are more likely underrepresented. Please consider that bechtel was going to be an all frosh house and administration conceded on that point, and I believe they're making as many concessions as they can about rotation in light of problematic events that have been caused by house culture. I'm upset they made the rotation decisions in secret and surprised students with them, but not

I enjoy the house system and, while it may need change, I would like the community that it supplies to be preserved

By students ho are elected, and have different bodies for different communities. It is not fair to one house that is different from the others to be forced to conform to what works for the others if it doesn't work for them

i think the four year residence requirement, four year board requirement, and four year enrollment requirement are utter bs

i don't think this could fly at literally any other institution, and i would not have committed to caltech had these been in place as a frosh

caltech is already taking enough of my money for not that much payoff

I like Rotation, though I believe it could use some adjustments. Rotation should remain bidirectional, an equal part judgement by students and by the Houses. However, I believe that the Rotation Rules should be augmented: Open, direct evaluation of the Houses is necessary to ensure that people understand what the House is about, rather than having to discern the truth out of the secrecy that presently governs Rotation Rules. I believe that having waiters in the Houses is part of the culture of m

I just would prefer if the people making decisions on undergrad life were undergrads. Some supervision would be fine, but honestly you're ruining a lot of what makes Caltech great with this new plan.

I love Caltech for being different from all the other Schools and having this incredible House culture in such a small community. House system was one of the biggest factors that affected

my decision to come here. I cannot imagine Caltech without the House system. I do not wish to live in a mediocre place without a strong distinct culture.

I want the administration to take into account student opinions. Yes we are young, yes we are immature, but at the same time this is our college experience. I did not understand what was happening with Betchel until it happened, and that is not ok. Administration must be transparent about how they will change my college experience. I love Caltech. It is my home.

Please don't fight for rotation for the sake of rotation. Fight for the House system if it's threatened but accept that many of us believe that rotation is fundamentally flawed.

The house system is part of what makes Caltech special and not like every other school in the country that is just competing for the most popular name. It allows smart but sometimes awkward kids such as myself to feel a sense of community for the first time in their lives. My house means the world to me as I came from a bad family and it was the first place I ever felt accepted. Yes there are issues that arise sometimes that make the houses an unhealthy environment but I think these can be easil

Give them hell

If you make committees, be prepared to listen to them.

Rotation should not be changed. I am extremely satisfied with how rotation went.

Please fight for all the things we hold dear, most especially Rotation and all the things that effects. However, with all the focus on rotation, please don't loose sight of the other things he has threatened as well.

Also, thank you so much for all the work you are putting into this! I know people have given y'all a lot of shit, but I want you to know that we know it's not your fault that this happened and that you'll do everything in your power to fix the situation.

Also, if the

I know there are a lot of people who would like to be involved, so I'm hoping the next IHC figures out how to get more students involved.

As a matrix group

They should not have opt out for on campus living. I have been living on Caltech off Campus and it's so much better.

Don't change rotation, it's fine how it is.

Joe Shephard seems to have unilaterally made decisions concerning the house system, which seems like a drastic overreach of power and a severe breach in trust.

Please express how disrespectful it was to ignore majority student opinions, falsely claim that student leaders were consulted before releasing this proposal, and to misrepresent the rotation process by cherry picking information. Thank you to our student reps for organizing this response.

Give more power to the students. We are young adults getting ready to go out in the world and change it. How do you expect us to be ready for that if we aren't even able to facilitate freshman placement in houses?

Please do not assume that all undergraduates love rotation and the way the house system currently is. The current and traditional system has failed many people, who only get more marginalized and isolated as time goes on. We don't all love the house system.

Get someone other than Joe Shepherd to talk to us. He does not care about undergraduates. He is the wrong person to be making these changes.

The housing system has allowed me to find my family here. I met a lot of people and bonded more with upperclassmen and other frosh alike than I would have without my house. I have met my best friends through my house. This system unique to Caltech is a large reason why I came here; when I came for prefrosh weekend, I loved how each house was a tight knit, self governing community. I am afraid that we will lose this sense of closeness by abolishing the House system as we know it.

I know a lot of people have said this, and I know it seems like hyperbole from some people, but the House System is why I came to Caltech. There are a lot of good schools out there, what set Caltech apart, beyond the academics, beyond the nobel laureates, beyond the honor code (all of which other colleges have) was the honor system. I hate to say it, but without the House System Caltech would not have been my first choice. It might not have even made it on my list.

Want to be represented please.

Please think rationally and know our place in this discussion. There is a non-trivial number of people who do not like rotation the way it is now and are open to re-examining it to this level. Hopefully this survey will reflect those sentiments.

Now is the time to spend our political capital. It's fine if Shepherd is mad. We need to attack this and not stop this until it's gone. People were quoted out of context, people were lied to about the content of the report. An administrator willfully lied to us. That is unacceptable and a clear violation of the honor code. He negotiated in bad faith, and we cannot accept him continuing in the role he currently has

Based on the reaction to the Bechtel announcement, I do not think IHC and ASCIT share my opinions regarding Rotation. I don't want to be grouped with these organizations.

I think students should form an independent committee to address concerns. This committee should decide what in particular they want to keep from the current Rotation system and why. These points should be shown to administration and examined to make sure they do not marginalize the students outside the house system.

Honestly, and this was not what happened with the COUCH subcommittee is was on.

Not by Joe Shepherd

None other than by students

What about giving Alums some formal power? I believe former students would be more trusted by students to make reasonable decisions, but more likely to prioritize the issues faculty cares about and students do not. Allowing them to formally mediate important decisions like the structure of rotation could work out quite well.

I want it to be known that Town Halls are not a place of discussion. They are a not a place where students can voice their opinions. They are a place where admin can tell us what is and is not happening. Honestly, I am very content with how we are being represented by COUCH and by IHC and ASCIT. The problem is that admin seems to continue to make decisions regardless of that representation. They have compromised on a lot of topics. I know they are capable of working together and functioning very

I would just like to point out that it feels as if Caltech has single-handedly made the decision to force undergraduates to either live on-campus or go off-off. Though understandable that graduate students also reserve the right to live close to campus, what is a good reason why Bechtel couldn't be a graduate student dorm as well?

Fucking take a hard stance and fight for it. Students roll over to admin far to often and far too willingly and if there's any time to fight, even if it's hopeless, it's now.

I strongly disagree with almost all aspects of the plan involving rotation, board and residency requirements, and the Advisory Committee as they stand laid out in the plan distributed to students. I can say with absolute certainty that I would not have come to Caltech if it had a four-year residency program. I feel betrayed, and reading this report felt like a slap in the face.

Every house deserves a voice in how their decades-old culture will adapt to these changes to student life. The advisory committee needs student reps from every residence

House life is a very important part of my life at Caltech and it will never be the same with the new rotation. I strongly support the rotation that I went through over the proposed plan.

(not particularly related to the topic)

To the IHC and COUCH members: Thank you for working for the students throughout this issue. A word of suggestion to y'all: fight for the student voice on this, but don't let it take over your life. Administration is quite obviously out to push their agenda on this issue, and they have the power to do whatever they want. If it comes to it, it doesn't matter how bad the outcome is for students so long as they get what they want. So please: do communica

Hello! Today there will be backlash from the undergrads against the decision, no doubt. Houses and groups are organizing different events (Page's fuck-joe-shepard party, Blacker's Office Hours sit-in, Caltech Confessions and the meme page is being itself, etc.). I fear any event well-intentioned or not, or any meme funny or not may damage any prospects of reversing a decision

due to rash behavior and hot-headed emotions.

I hear the IHC is fractured and divided on certain issues. Whether thi

I would like a focus not just on how terrible all these changes are, but on the immoral way they were presented.

I'm not opposed to change--but I would prefer if administration wishes to change rotation, they consult the students and try to come up with a solution we're both happy with instead of passing down a decision we were never even consulted on. The way this was carried out is honestly an honor code violation, and I *do not* say that lightly. The COUCH was obviously misled and frankl

I ask that administration listens to the many, many voices telling them this is a bad decision. Killing rotation completely neuters the housing system and can only result in student unhappiness, houses should be the ones with the main say in their own processes, and changing policies that the vast majority of students are happy with is not just unreasonable, it's insulting and destructive.

I don't want to simply repeat what others will likely say about this process being unfair and deceitful, but I would like to call to the IHC another deceitful and sneaky, but still relevant situation with administration. Joe Shepherd has quietly and mostly at last minute blatantly offered money (\$200 per student) to Ricketts House essentially to keep them from holding an Interhouse. It flies dangerously in the face of student government, ALL of the Houses, the Honor Code, and all that Caltech s

I think that regardless of how we are represented, the major issue is with representation being disregarded and misquoted when presented to actual faculty.

idk i just guess that

i know the way admin went about this was really bad and detrimental to student government and student advocacy at caltech in general, but

this change really could be beneficial to a lot of people, and overriding that bc of social beliefs or "lack of trust" seems a little

not great

Houses are not perfect; but the process and proposals are completely absurd and unilateral.

I think this whole thing is being overblown. Furthermore, I think most of the things addressed ARE strongly in need of changes, but the student body holds them as sacred for some reasons I've never had satisfactorily explained to me. I wish we could show some good faith in admin to try new things.

fuck joe shepherd

- [Register New Account](#)
- [Password Recovery](#)
- [Your Account](#)
- [Contact Developers](#)

Copyright © 2000-2018, Associated Students of the California Institute of Technology, inc.