



Collaboration and Academic Honesty	Collaboration and Academic Honesty
<ul> <li>Homework: Collaboration encouraged, but read/attempt on your own first. Writeup must be your own. List collaborators and any sources beyond notes or textbook at the top of each assignment.</li> <li>Honor code violations:         <ul> <li>Collaborating to write solutions</li> <li>Looking at another student's solutions</li> <li>Sharing your written solutions</li> <li>Use of solutions to same or similar problems found online or elsewhere</li> <li>I will refer every suspected violation to the academic honor board, no matter how "minor".</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Quizzes: Do entirely on your own. Use book, slides, notes. (I can see on Moodle when each student begins and ends the quiz.)</li> <li>Fourth Hour: Groups assigned randomly each session. Complete exercises with group.</li> <li>Exams: Take-home, open book and notes. No collaboration or outside sources (e.g. web).</li> <li>If in doubt whether something is allowed, ask!</li> </ul>
Tips	Stable Matching and College Admissions
<ul> <li>Start HW early! Talk to me, TAs, other students. Establish a weekly routine.</li> <li>Solving algorithms problems is a process. Solve over several days in small chunks, with discussion.</li> <li>Failure mode 1: attempt to complete in one sitting the night before HW is due</li> <li>Failure mode 2: sit and puzzle for many hours by yourself until you solve it</li> <li>Failure mode 3: read the problem, think for 5 minutes, declare it is too hard</li> <li>Solving problems and writing great proofs is a skill. Expect to practice and improve throughout the semester. It's normal to feel uncertain at first, especially about proofs.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Suppose there are n colleges c<sub>1</sub>, c<sub>2</sub>,, c<sub>n</sub> and n students s<sub>1</sub>, s<sub>2</sub>,, s<sub>n</sub>.</li> <li>Each college ranks all students and each student ranks all colleges. For simplicity, suppose each college can only admit one student. Example.</li> <li>Can we match students to colleges such that everyone is happy?</li> <li>Not necessarily, e.g., Mount Holyoke is everyone's top choice.</li> <li>Can we match students to colleges in a stable way?</li> <li>Stable: Don't match (c, s) and (c', s') if c and s' would both prefer to be matched with each other. Precise definition + examples on board.</li> <li>Yes! And there's an efficient algorithm to find that matching.</li> <li>Develop algorithm informally</li> </ul>
Propose-and-Reject (Gale-Shapley) Algorithm Initially all colleges and students are free while some college is free and hasn't proposed to every student do Choose such a college $c$ Let $s$ be the highest ranked student to whom $c$ has not proposed if $s$ is free then c and $s$ become matched else if $s$ is matched to $c'$ but prefers $c$ to $c'$ then c' becomes unmatched c and $s$ become matched else $r$ s rejects $c$ and $c$ remains free end if end while	<ul> <li>Analyzing the Algorithm</li> <li>Some natural questions: <ul> <li>Can we guarantee the algorithm terminates?</li> <li>Can we guarantee every college and student gets a match?</li> <li>Can we guarantee the resulting allocation is stable?</li> </ul> </li> <li>Some initial observations: <ul> <li>(F1) Once matched, students stay matched and only "upgrade" during the algorithm.</li> <li>(F2) College propose to students in order of college's preferences.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Can we guarantee the algorithm terminates?	Can we guarantee all colleges and students get a match?
<ul> <li>Yes! Proof</li> <li>In every round, some college proposes to some student that they haven't already proposed to.</li> <li>n colleges and n students ⇒ at most n<sup>2</sup> proposals</li> <li>⇒ at most n<sup>2</sup> rounds of the algorithm</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Yes! Proof by contradiction</li> <li>Suppose not all colleges and students have matches. Then there exists unmatched college c and unmatched student s.</li> <li>s was never matched during the algorithm (by F1)</li> <li>But c proposed to every student (by termination condition)</li> <li>When c proposed to s, she was unmatched and yet rejected c. Contradiction!</li> </ul>
Can we guarantee the resulting allocation is stable?	For Next Time
<ul> <li>Yes! Proof by contradiction.</li> <li>Suppose there is an instability (c, s) <ul> <li>c is matched to s' but prefers s to s'</li> <li>s is matched to c' but prefers c to c'</li> </ul> </li> <li>By (F2), c must have proposed to s before proposing and becoming matched to s'</li> <li>Since s isn't matched to c at the end of the algorithm, she must have rejected c's offer (either immediately or upon receiving a better proposal). By (F1), she prefers her final match c' to c. Contradiction</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Think about:</li> <li>Would it be better or worse for the students if we ran the algorithm with the students proposing?</li> <li>Can a student get an advantage by lying about their preferences?</li> <li>Read: Chapter 1, course policies</li> <li>Log into Moodle / Piazza, visit the course webpage.</li> </ul>