TA assignments:

0. Agarwal S - 8
1. Aggarwal M - N/A
2. Ahmed M - 8
3. Arora A - 14
4. Arora I - 7
5. Bhamidipati M - N/A
6. Boehm S - 12
7. Browne L - 3, 15
8. Cassway R - 12
9. Chandra D - 11
10. Chandrashekhar S - 6, 10
11. Chenthilkannan A - 14
12. Duzgun Z - N/A
13. Gong J - 7, 15
14. He C - 13
15. Hegde N - 2, 11
16. Hsiao A - 0
17. Kedharnath S - 4
18. Kota S - 1, 9
19. Kulik J - 12
20. Kurra P - 0, 4
21. Lanman K - 5
22. Levi Cc - 4, 12
23. Merkle S - 16
24. Nidadavolu A - 11, 16
25. Noto S - 12
26. Nukala S - 1, 9
27. Pogrebitskiy D - 5
28. Ritcheson S - 13
29. Rivera A - 5
30. Senthil Kumaran C - 15
31. Shah F - 2
32. Shenoy P - 2
33. Shiflett A - 6
34. Shroff R - 10
35. Sreepada S - 8
36. Stochaj K - 12
37. Sukhatankar S - 1
38. Thakkar P - 11, 16
39. Tunney B - 3, 10
40. Waterson R - 0
41. Weigel V - 10
42. Yang R - N/A

Section Assignments:

0: Hsiao A, Kurra P, Waterson R
1: Kota S, Nukala S, Sukhatankar S
2: Hegde N, Shah F, Shenoy P
3: Browne L, Tunney B
4: Kedharnath S, Kurra P, Levi Cc
5: Lanman K, Pogrebitskiy D, Rivera A
6: Chandrashekhar S, Shiflett A
7: Arora I, Gong J
8: Agarwal S, Ahmed M, Sreepada S
9: Kota S, Nukala S
10: Chandrashekhar S, Shroff R, Tunney B, Weigel V
11: Chandra D, Hegde N, Nidadavolu A, Thakkar P
12: Boehm S, Cassway R, Kulik J, Levi C, Noto S, Stochaj K
13: He C, Ritcheson S
14: Arora A, Chenthilkannan A
15: Browne L, Gong J, Senthil Kumaran C
16: Merkle S, Nidadavolu A, Thakkar P

Chosen Solution Evaluations:

overallocation	conflicts	undersupport	unwilling	unpreferred
0	0	1	0	3

This solution was selected for its ability to effectively minimize key objectives, achieving a total penalty score of 4. The primary focus was on eliminating overallocation, conflicts, and assignments to unwilling sections, as these categories needed to score 0 to ensure the schedules required no additional adjustments. In other words, over allocating a TA, time conflicts, assignments to unwilling sections are higher level issues that could break the schedule altogether, whereas the other two, while still important, can exist with penalties. Undersupport, while a secondary priority, was minimized to a manageable score of 1 without compromising the solution's feasibility.

Although we prioritized assigning TAs to their preferred sections, some trade-offs were necessary. A few TAs were assigned to less-preferred but acceptable sections to optimize the overall solution. This approach strikes a balance between meeting the critical objectives and maintaining flexibility, ensuring that all schedules are functional and efficient.