Student-Department Matching System: A Novel Approach to Equitable and Satisfactory Pairings

Hamit Efe Çınar
Computer Science, Year 4
efe.cinar@sabanciuniv.edu

Eylül Öykü Şen
Computer Science, Year 4
eyluloyku@sabanciuniv.edu

Project Supervisor: Prof. Esra Erdem
Computer Science and Engineering

Fall 2024-2025

Abstract

This project proposes a novel student-department matching system that prioritizes equity, academic alignment, and diversity while integrating sophisticated algorithmic and survey-based methodologies. By leveraging tailored surveys, clustering techniques, and a modified Gale-Shapley algorithm, the system aligns student preferences and academic strengths with departmental needs and diversity goals. The design process has encompassed the development of utility functions to quantify satisfaction, cluster-based frameworks to enhance flexibility, and mechanisms to incorporate diversity constraints directly into the matching algorithm. Although the implementation phase is ongoing, the project's comprehensive design illustrates the feasibility of a balanced and effective matching process. This approach ensures equitable distribution across departments while maximizing satisfaction for students and faculty, addressing the multifaceted challenges of modern higher education allocation systems.

Contents

1 Introduction

The increasing complexity of student-department matching systems necessitates innovative solutions that consider not only academic performance but also diversity and personal preferences. Educational institutions often grapple with balancing individual satisfaction, departmental priorities, and equitable representation, particularly as they aim to enhance enrollment efficiency and inclusivity. Traditional allocation methods frequently oversimplify these challenges, neglecting the intricate interplay between student preferences and institutional goals.

This project introduces a novel student-department matching framework designed to address these limitations. The system integrates academic performance metrics, survey-derived preferences, and diversity goals into a cohesive algorithmic structure. By adopting advanced methodologies such as clustering and utility optimization, this framework ensures that student strengths align with departmental expertise while promoting equitable representation.

The design phase of the project has culminated in several key contributions:

- Development of tailored surveys for students and faculty to capture preferences, academic strengths, and diversity indicators.
- Formulation of utility functions that incorporate both personal and academic factors, enabling quantifiable satisfaction metrics.
- Implementation of clustering techniques to enhance the flexibility of matches, ensuring students align with the most suitable departmental clusters.
- Integration of diversity goals to meet institutional objectives, balancing a variety of representation across departments.

While the algorithm's implementation is ongoing, its design draws from well-established theories, including constraint programming and the Gale-Shapley algorithm, adapted to handle the complexities of modern educational contexts. The subsequent sections provide a detailed overview of the methodologies employed, the system's architecture, and its envisioned applications in optimizing student-department matching processes.

2 Methods

2.1 Survey Design

The survey component is critical to capturing student preferences, academic strengths, and diversity indicators. It consists of structured questions designed to assess competencies and interests across various academic fields $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k\}$. For each student s_i, their responses r_{s_i,q_j} to survey questions $Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_r\}$ are normalized to the range $[0, 1]$. These responses contribute to field scores using the formula:

$$f(s_i, f_k) = \sum_{q_j \in Q} r_{s_i,q_j} \cdot w_{q_j,f_k},$$

where w_{q_j,f_k} represents the weight of question q_j for field f_k. This enables a quantitative representation of a student's alignment with different academic fields.

On the faculty side, preference weights w_{p_i,f_k} are collected for each professor p_i, indicating their emphasis on specific fields. These weights are aggregated to define departmental preferences:

$$w_{d_j,f_k} = \sum_{p_i \in P_{d_j}} w_{p_i,f_k},$$

where P_{d_j} is the set of professors in department d_j.

2.2 Capacity Constraints

While there are no strict capacity limits for departments at our university, suggested capacities are provided by professors to ensure that departmental resources, such as course capacities, faculty availability, and infrastructure, are sufficient for the students allocated to each department. These suggested capacities are processed to compute normalized capacity values for each department and its clusters.

2.2.1 Calculation of Department Capacities

For each department $d_j \in D$, professors provide suggested capacity values cap_{p_i,d_j}, where $p_i \in P_{d_j}$ represents the professors in department d_j. The average capacity for a department is calculated as:

$$\text{cap}_{d_j} = \frac{\sum_{p_i \in P_{d_j}} \text{cap}_{p_i,d_j}}{|P_{d_j}|},$$

where $|P_{d_j}|$ is the number of professors in the department.

To normalize these capacities relative to the total number of students $|S|$ at the university, the department's normalized capacity $\text{cap}_{d_j,\text{norm}}$ is computed as:

$$\text{cap}_{d_j,\text{norm}} = \frac{\text{cap}_{d_j}}{\sum_{d_k \in D} \text{cap}_{d_k}} \cdot |S|.$$

2.2.2 Distribution of Cluster Capacities

Departments are subdivided into clusters $C_{d_j} = \{c_{j,1}, c_{j,2}, \ldots, c_{j,m}\}$, each consisting of a subset of professors $P_{c_{j,k}} \subseteq P_{d_j}$. The capacity of each cluster $c_{j,k}$ is determined by distributing the department's normalized capacity $\text{cap}_{d_j,\text{norm}}$ proportionally based on the number of professors in the cluster:

$$\text{cap}_{c_{j,k}} = \text{cap}_{d_j,\text{norm}} \cdot \frac{|P_{c_{j,k}}|}{|P_{d_j}|}.$$

2.2.3 Matching Constraints

The capacities calculated for departments and clusters are used as constraints during the matching process. The number of students matched to a department d_j and a cluster $c_{j,k}$ must satisfy:

$$\sum_{s_i \in S} x_{s_i,d_j} \leq \text{cap}_{d_j,\text{norm}}, \quad \forall d_j \in D,$$

$$\sum_{s_i \in S} x_{s_i,c_{j,k}} \leq \text{cap}_{c_{j,k}}, \quad \forall c_{j,k} \in C_{d_j}.$$

Here, x_{s_i,d_j} and $x_{s_i,c_{j,k}}$ are binary decision variables indicating whether student s_i is matched to department d_j or cluster $c_{j,k}$, respectively.

2.2.4 Normalization and Practical Implications

The use of normalized capacities ensures that the matching process adheres to practical resource limitations without imposing rigid upper limits that might restrict flexibility. By distributing capacities proportionally among clusters based on the number of professors, the system achieves a balance between departmental priorities and available resources.

This methodology ensures that students are allocated in a way that optimally utilizes resources while maintaining fairness and efficiency in the matching process.

2.3 Matching Algorithm Design

The matching algorithm is designed to optimize the assignment of students $S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n\}$ to departmental clusters $C_{d_j} = \{c_{j,1}, c_{j,2}, \ldots, c_{j,m}\}$ within departments $D = \{d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_m\}$. The process aims to maximize the overall satisfaction score U_{overall} while adhering to constraints on capacity, diversity, and iterative improvements over matchings. Stability is ensured at each iteration, and a threshold parameter determines the stopping condition.

2.3.1 Clustering within Departments

Departments are divided into clusters based on professor preferences and expertise. Professors in a department d_j provide weights w_{p_i,f_k} for fields $F = \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k\}$, which are used to group them into clusters. The clustering process includes:

1. **Data Collection:** A matrix is constructed where each row represents a professor $p_i \in P_{d_j}$, and each column represents their weight w_{p_i,f_k} for a specific field f_k.
2. **Clustering Algorithm:** Algorithms such as K-means or hierarchical clustering group professors into clusters $C_{d_j} = \{c_{j,1}, c_{j,2}, \ldots, c_{j,m}\}$. Each cluster specializes in a subset of fields.
3. **Cluster Weights:** The weight for each field f_k in a cluster $c_{j,k}$ is computed as:

$$w_{c_{j,k},f_k} = \sum_{p_i \in c_{j,k}} w_{p_i,f_k}.$$

2.3.2 Student Alignment with Clusters

Each student s_i is associated with a field score $f(s_i, f_k)$ for each field f_k, derived from their academic grades, survey responses, and a penalty mechanism. The field score incorporates penalties assigned by professors for grades below specified thresholds in key courses. These penalties ensure that students with insufficient foundational knowledge in specific fields are penalized during the alignment process.

Field Score Calculation The field score $f(s_i, f_k)$ for a student s_i in a field f_k is calculated as:

$$f(s_i, f_k) = \sum_{q_j \in Q} r_{s_i,q_j} \cdot w_{q_j,f_k} + \sum_{c_l \in C} G_{s_i,c_l} \cdot w_{c_l,f_k} - \text{Penalty}_{f_k}.$$

Here:

- r_{s_i,q_j} is the normalized response of student s_i to survey question q_j, where $r_{s_i,q_j} \in [0, 1]$.
- w_{q_j,f_k} is the predetermined weight of survey question q_j for field f_k, with:

$$\sum_{f_k \in F} w_{q_j,f_k} \leq 1.$$

- G_{s_i,c_l} is the normalized grade of s_i in course c_l, stored as $G_{s_i,c_l} \in [0, 1]$ (e.g., $\text{A} = 1.0, \text{A-} = 0.9, \text{B+} = 0.8$, etc.).
- w_{c_l,f_k} is the weight of course c_l for field f_k, based on its relevance to the field.
- Penalty_{f_k} aggregates penalties assigned by professors for grades below thresholds, as detailed below.

Penalty Mechanism Each professor assigns penalties to courses c_l within their expertise, specifying a grade threshold $\text{Threshold}_{c_l,p}$. If a student's grade G_{s_i,c_l} falls below this threshold, a penalty is applied. The penalty levels range from 1 (mild) to 5 (severe), with penalties normalized to match the grade scale.

For a cluster $c_{j,k}$, the most severe penalty $\text{Penalty}_{c_l,c_{j,k}}$ assigned by any professor in the cluster is used. The total penalty for a field f_k is calculated as:

$$\text{Penalty}_{f_k} = \sum_{c_l \in C} \max_{p \in c_{j,k}} \left(\text{Level}_{c_l,p} \cdot \max(0, \text{Threshold}_{c_l,p} - G_{s_i,c_l}) \right),$$

where:

- $\text{Level}_{c_l,p}$ is the penalty level assigned by professor p for course c_l.
- $\text{Threshold}_{c_l,p}$ is the grade threshold specified by p.
- $\max(0, \text{Threshold}_{c_l,p} - G_{s_i,c_l})$ ensures penalties are applied only when the grade falls below the threshold.

Alignment Score with Clusters The alignment score $S(s_i, c_{j,k})$ of a student s_i with a cluster $c_{j,k}$ is:

$$S(s_i, c_{j,k}) = \sum_{f_k \in F} f(s_i, f_k) \cdot w_{c_{j,k},f_k},$$

where $w_{c_{j,k},f_k}$ is the cumulative weight for field f_k within cluster $c_{j,k}$, aggregated from the preferences of professors in the cluster:

$$w_{c_{j,k},f_k} = \sum_{p_i \in c_{j,k}} w_{p_i,f_k}.$$

Example Scenario Consider a student s_1 with:

- Grade $G_{s_1,c_1} = 0.6$ in course c_1,
- A penalty threshold $\text{Threshold}_{c_1,p} = 0.8$ set by a professor with $\text{Level}_{c_1,p} = 3$,
- Survey response $r_{s_1,q_1} = 0.9$ with $w_{q_1,f_k} = 0.4$,
- Course weight $w_{c_1,f_k} = 0.6$.

The penalty for c_1 is:

$$\text{Penalty}_{c_1,c_{j,k}} = 3 \cdot (0.8 - 0.6) = 0.6.$$

The field score is:

$$f(s_1, f_k) = (0.9 \cdot 0.4) + (0.6 \cdot 0.6) - 0.6 = 0.36 + 0.36 - 0.6 = 0.12.$$

If $w_{c_{j,k},f_k} = 0.7$, the alignment score is:

$$S(s_1, c_{j,k}) = 0.12 \cdot 0.7 = 0.084.$$

Normalization Field scores $f(s_i, f_k)$ are normalized across all fields to ensure comparability:

$$f'(s_i, f_k) = \frac{f(s_i, f_k) - \min(f(s_i, f_k))}{\max(f(s_i, f_k)) - \min(f(s_i, f_k))}.$$

This detailed approach ensures that grades, penalties, and survey responses are seamlessly integrated to calculate accurate alignment scores, reflecting the student's preparedness and interests.

2.3.3 Iterative Cluster-Level Matching

The matching algorithm proceeds iteratively:

1. **First Matching:** Identify the matching M_1 that maximizes the overall satisfaction score U_{overall}, adhering to the constraints:

$$\text{Maximize} \quad U_{\text{overall}}(M_1) = \sum_{s_i \in S} \sum_{c_{j,k} \in C_{d_j}} \left(S(s_i, c_{j,k}) + \beta \cdot G(s_i, c_{j,k}) \right),$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{s_i \in S} x_{s_i,c_{j,k}} \leq \text{cap}_{c_{j,k}}, \quad \forall c_{j,k} \in C_{d_j},$$

$$\sum_{s_i \in S_{g_k}} x_{s_i,c_{j,k}} \leq \text{diversity\_goal}_{c_{j,k},g_k}, \quad \forall g_k, \quad \forall c_{j,k}.$$

Here, $x_{s_i,c_{j,k}}$ is a binary decision variable indicating whether s_i is matched to $c_{j,k}$.

2. **Subsequent Matchings:** For $M_2, M_3, \ldots, M_t$, each matching maximizes $U_{\text{overall}}(M_k)$ while excluding previously found matchings:

$$M_k \cap M_{k'} = \emptyset, \quad \forall k' < k.$$

This ensures that subsequent matchings explore alternative optimal assignments.

3. **Stopping Criterion:** The iterative process halts when:

$$U_{\text{overall}}(M_k) < \text{threshold} \cdot U_{\text{overall}}(M_1),$$

where threshold $\in (0, 1)$ is a percentage that determines the minimum acceptable satisfaction score relative to the best matching.

2.3.4 Stability and Refinement

A matching is stable if no unmatched student-cluster pair $(s_i, c_{j,k})$ exists such that:

$$S(s_i, c_{j,k}) > S(s_i, c_{j,l}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s_i \in S} x_{s_i, c_{j,k}} < \text{cap}_{c_{j,k}}.$$

The algorithm iteratively refines rankings and re-evaluates assignments to ensure stability.

2.3.5 Output Ranking and Evaluation

After the iterative process, the matchings are ranked by their overall satisfaction scores:

$$U_{\text{overall}}(M_1) \geq U_{\text{overall}}(M_2) \geq \cdots \geq U_{\text{overall}}(M_t).$$

For each student s_i, the output includes their assigned cluster $c_{j,k}$, the associated satisfaction score $S(s_i, c_{j,k})$, and aggregate diversity and capacity metrics for their cluster.

This iterative matching framework ensures that the system explores multiple optimal matchings while adhering to constraints and maintaining stability.

2.4 Diversity Goals

To promote equity, diversity goals are incorporated into the matching process. For each department d_j and diversity group g_k, the proportion of students from g_k is constrained by:

$$\sum_{s_i \in S_{g_k}} x_{s_i, d_j} \leq \text{diversity\_goal}_{d_j, g_k},$$

where S_{g_k} represents the set of students in group g_k, and $\text{diversity\_goal}_{d_j, g_k}$ is the target proportion of group g_k for department d_j. These constraints ensure that the allocation process aligns with institutional diversity priorities.

2.4.1 Diversity Criteria

Some of the following diversity criteria are to be considered in the definition and application of $\text{diversity\_goal}_{d_j, g_k}$:

- **Gender Balance:** Representation of male, female, and non-binary students to promote inclusivity.
- **Academic Percentiles:** Representation of students across different academic performance levels to ensure a balanced distribution of high and average performers.
- **Socioeconomic Background:** Inclusion of students from various socioeconomic statuses, including first-generation college students and those from underprivileged backgrounds.
- **Ethnicity and Cultural Background:** Ensuring representation across diverse ethnic and cultural groups to foster a multicultural environment.
- **Geographic Diversity:** Incorporation of students from different regions or countries to bring varied perspectives to departments.
- **Field-Specific Interests:** Encouraging representation of underrepresented groups in specific academic fields, such as women in STEM disciplines.
- **Learning Styles:** Balancing visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners to enhance collaborative and adaptive classroom dynamics.
- **Extracurricular Participation:** Including students engaged in sports, arts, or community service to foster holistic contributions to the department.
- **Special Needs and Accessibility:** Ensuring inclusivity for students with disabilities or special needs by accommodating their requirements.
- **Age Diversity:** Representation of mature students returning to education alongside younger cohorts.

- **Language Proficiency:** Balancing students with varying levels of proficiency in the medium of instruction to ensure equitable participation.
- **Work Experience:** Incorporating students with prior professional experience to enrich classroom discussions and projects.
- **Research or Innovation Potential:** Identifying students with unique research interests or creative problem-solving abilities to foster innovation.

2.4.2 Implementation of Diversity Constraints

Diversity goals are iteratively refined to balance feasibility and institutional objectives. The following steps are taken:

1. **Analysis of Historical Data:** Diversity proportions are derived from past statistics and adjusted for current objectives.
2. **Survey Responses:** Student membership in diversity groups is determined using responses to tailored survey questions, such as socioeconomic status and interest in underrepresented fields.
3. **Dynamic Refinement:** Diversity constraints are adjusted iteratively during the matching process to ensure proportional representation without violating other allocation objectives.

2.4.3 Handling Missing Diversity Information

In situations where some students choose not to disclose their information regarding certain diversity criteria, the following approach is adopted:

- **Assumption of Majority Membership:** If a student s_i does not provide information for a specific diversity criterion g_k, they are assumed to belong to the majority group for that criterion. For example, in the case of gender, if the majority group is male, s_i is classified as male for the purpose of diversity constraints.
- **Minimal Impact on Constraints:** This assumption minimizes disruptions to the allocation process, ensuring that the system continues to meet diversity goals while respecting students' privacy choices.
- **Transparent Communication:** Students are informed about this policy during the survey process to ensure transparency and allow them to make informed decisions about sharing their information.

This approach balances the need for comprehensive diversity data with respect for individual privacy. By assuming majority membership for students who opt not to share their information, the system ensures fairness without imposing penalties for non-disclosure.

2.5 Future Methods for Evaluating Algorithm Performance

To ensure the effectiveness and reliability of the student-department matching algorithm, future evaluation methods will focus on both quantitative metrics and qualitative feedback. These methods aim to assess the algorithm's precision, fairness, stability, and alignment with institutional goals.

2.5.1 Human Subject Case Studies

A key method for evaluation involves conducting case studies with a diverse group of participants, including students, faculty, and administrators. The process includes:

- Simulating realistic matching scenarios using mock datasets that represent typical student preferences, academic strengths, and diversity factors.
- Collecting feedback via surveys, which include Likert-scale ratings and open-ended questions, to assess the participants' satisfaction with the matchings.
- Measuring qualitative aspects such as perceived fairness, alignment with personal preferences, and the usability of the system from the stakeholders' perspectives.

2.5.2 Quantitative Metrics for System Utility

The following quantitative metrics will be used to evaluate the algorithm's performance:

- **Satisfaction Score:** Calculate the average satisfaction for all students:

$$\text{Satisfaction}(M) = \frac{\sum_{s_i \in S} \sum_{c_{j,k} \in C_{d_j}} S(s_i, c_{j,k})}{|S|}.$$

- **Diversity Deviation:** Assess how closely the resulting matchings align with diversity goals:

$$\text{Diversity Deviation} = \sum_{d_j \in D} \sum_{g_k \in G} \left| \frac{\sum_{s_i \in S_{g_k}} x_{s_i,d_j}}{\sum_{s_i \in S} x_{s_i,d_j}} - \text{diversity\_goal}_{d_j,g_k} \right|.$$

- **Stability Index:** Evaluate the stability of the matchings by ensuring no unmatched student-cluster pair $(s_i, c_{j,k})$ can improve satisfaction without violating constraints:

$$\text{Stability Index} = 1 - \frac{\text{Number of Unstable Pairs}}{\text{Total Pairs}}.$$

- **Capacity Utilization:** Measure how effectively the algorithm uses department capacities:

$$\text{Utilization}(d_j) = \frac{\sum_{s_i \in S} x_{s_i,d_j}}{\text{capacity}_{d_j}}, \quad \forall d_j \in D.$$

2.5.3 Controlled Experiments

Controlled experiments can be conducted to compare the performance of the proposed algorithm against baseline methods such as random assignments or simpler preference-based systems. Statistical tests, such as paired t-tests, will be used to compare satisfaction, fairness, and efficiency metrics across different approaches.

2.5.4 Visualization and Feedback Analysis

Interactive visualizations, such as heatmaps and bipartite graphs, will be developed to represent the matching results. These visualizations will help stakeholders:

- Understand the distribution of matchings, satisfaction scores, and diversity alignment.
- Identify potential bottlenecks or mismatches in the allocation process.

Feedback from stakeholders on these visualizations will be used to refine the algorithm's output presentation.

2.5.5 Long-Term Impact Assessment

To evaluate the algorithm's impact beyond the initial matchings:

- Track the academic performance, retention rates, and satisfaction levels of students over multiple semesters.
- Assess how well departments meet their diversity goals and capacity targets over time.

2.5.6 Statistical and Comparative Analyses

To further validate the system:

- Conduct statistical analyses to determine correlations between algorithmic outputs (e.g., satisfaction scores) and real-world outcomes (e.g., academic success).
- Compare algorithm performance across different parameter settings, such as varying thresholds or diversity goals, to identify optimal configurations.

These future evaluation methods will provide a comprehensive understanding of the algorithm's effectiveness, ensuring it meets both academic and institutional goals while adapting to evolving needs.

3 Results

At this stage of the project, the results primarily focus on the outputs of the system's design and the preliminary steps towards implementation. While the matching algorithm is still under development, the design phase has provided key insights into the feasibility and theoretical performance of the system.

3.1 Survey-Based Field Scores and Preferences

The survey design successfully captures both student and faculty preferences. Preliminary tests of the survey normalization process confirm that field scores $f(s_i, f_k)$ provide a robust measure of student alignment with academic fields. Aggregated professor preferences w_{d_j,f_k} ensure that departmental priorities are represented in a balanced manner.

3.2 Clustering and Alignment Metrics

The clustering process groups professors within departments based on shared academic interests and teaching strengths. Using sample datasets, clustering algorithms (e.g., K-means) demonstrated effective differentiation of expertise areas, such as "Machine Learning" and "Theoretical Computer Science." Early simulations indicate that student alignment scores $S(s_i, c)$ consistently rank clusters appropriately, supporting the flexibility goal of matching students to clusters rather than rigid department-wide structures.

3.3 Utility Function and Diversity Representation

The utility function successfully integrates student satisfaction and diversity contributions. Initial validations using synthetic data show that $U_{\text{overall}}(M_k)$ reliably reflects the trade-offs between academic alignment and diversity. Diversity goal constraints were tested with mock demographic distributions, achieving proportional representation across clusters and departments.

3.4 Filtering and Ranking Outcomes

Filtering low-utility matchings based on a predefined threshold effectively narrows the candidate pool to high-quality matchings. Rankings generated for departments align well with intuitive expectations, reflecting the designed balance of student preferences and departmental capacities.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

The development of a student-department matching system presents significant opportunities to enhance fairness and efficiency in higher education allocation processes. This project integrates survey-based preferences, clustering, utility functions, and diversity considerations to create a balanced and equitable framework.

4.1 Key Contributions and Innovations

The system's design introduces several novel features:

- A tailored survey process that quantifies student and faculty preferences across multiple fields.
- Cluster-based matching that improves flexibility and adaptability for students and departments.
- A utility function that captures both academic alignment and diversity goals, ensuring comprehensive satisfaction metrics.
- The integration of diversity constraints, promoting proportional representation without sacrificing alignment quality.

These innovations address the shortcomings of traditional matching systems, which often neglect the multifaceted nature of student preferences and institutional priorities.

4.2 Challenges and Limitations

The project faces several challenges, primarily in the implementation phase:

- **Algorithm Complexity:** Balancing competing objectives, such as diversity and satisfaction, while maintaining computational efficiency.
- **Data Availability:** Ensuring that sufficient and reliable data are available for survey responses and various distributions.
- **Scalability:** Adapting the system to handle large data sets while maintaining performance and accuracy.

These challenges are being addressed through iterative refinement of the algorithm and extensive testing with synthetic and real-world data.

4.3 Future Directions

Once implementation is complete, the system will be evaluated using both simulated and real-world scenarios. Potential extensions of the project include:

- Incorporating additional diversity metrics, such as socioeconomic and geographic factors.
- Adapting the system for use in other allocation problems, such as job placements or course assignments.
- Leveraging machine learning techniques to further refine clustering and preference modeling.

4.4 Conclusion

The student-department matching system represents a significant advancement in educational allocation methodologies. By combining cutting-edge algorithmic techniques with a deep understanding of institutional priorities, the system promises to deliver fair, flexible, and efficient matchings that benefit students and departments alike. The integration of clustering, utility functions, iterative matching, and diversity constraints ensures that the system aligns with both individual preferences and institutional goals.

Key contributions of the system include:

- A cluster-based approach to department representation, enabling greater flexibility and alignment with diverse student preferences.
- The incorporation of comprehensive diversity goals to ensure equitable representation across demographic, academic, and socioeconomic dimensions.
- An iterative matching process that explores multiple optimal matchings, enhancing the overall satisfaction while respecting constraints on capacity, diversity, and stability.
- A utility framework that quantifies satisfaction at both the individual and aggregate levels, providing clear insights for decision-making.

As implementation progresses, the potential of this framework to transform allocation processes in higher education will become increasingly evident. The iterative design ensures computational efficiency while enabling the exploration of high-quality solutions, and stability checks guarantee that no unmatched pair could improve satisfaction. These features make the system robust, adaptable, and aligned with the evolving needs of modern educational institutions.

Future work will focus on testing and validating the system with real-world data, further refining the diversity metrics, and exploring applications to other allocation scenarios such as job placements and course scheduling. The project demonstrates how algorithmic innovation can address the multifaceted challenges of student-department allocation, ultimately fostering a fair and resource-efficient environment.

In conclusion, this student-department matching system lays a strong foundation for scalable and equitable resource allocation in higher education. By prioritizing equity, diversity, and satisfaction for all stakeholders, the system holds the promise of making a meaningful impact on institutional practices and student experiences alike.

References

Gale, D., Shapley, L. S. (1962). College Admissions and the Stability of Marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1), 9-15.

Roth, A. E., Sotomayor, M. A. O. (1990). *Two-Sided Matching: A Study in Game-Theoretic Modeling and Analysis.* Cambridge University Press.