1. **What are two or three significant considerations from your role as SGA rep that should be considered?**

I think that regardless of if the CollegeAdmit program works effectively, students deserve to have another human review their application and make the decision to admit them or not. The time and effort that every student puts into writing their essays and crafting their portfolios for college applications should not be disrespected; it is such that I believe the question of manual application review for student applicants is not up for debate. It is *required* that we offer them a chance, and that chance being another human who may feel for them, and make the best judgment for them. Additionally, there is no guarantee that the CollegeAdmit program has a 100% efficacy rate. There will be mistakes. While there always exists inconsistencies in human nature, I would rather put my trust in the human spirit than an algorithm, churning away.

2. **What is a significant ethical consideration of this stakeholder about whether to recommend or not?**

As I said before, we cannot be sure that the program will always make the correct judgment on an application. Perhaps an applicant who would have been admitted had a human reviewed their application is denied by the machine: what then? Where is it correct for an AI to make a life-changing decision for a young, aspiring student?

3. **As the SGA rep role, what is your decision? ONLY Yes OR No**
   **If "Yes,** the admissions office should proceed with the use of CollegeAdmit,"
   **then describe the circumstances under which the app's use would be appropriate.**
   **If "No**, the admissions office should not proceed with the use of CollegeAdmit,"
   **then describe the conditions or situations under which the app would NOT be appropriate to use.**

No. The use of this program is not appropriate in any instance aside from perhaps using it to offer a second opinion on the candidacy of an applicant.

4. **What role did CS knowledge/expertise play in your recommendation?**

My knowledge about how AI is created and how it never has a 100% success rate strongly influences my decision here, especially since we are talking about a significantly important decision. While perhaps the CollegeAdmit program may have a 95% match with what typical, human-based admissions decisions would be, that is still a 5% difference. In this day and age, that could mean thousands of students receiving wrong answers. Even for the university/college this is detrimental: students who have no business being admitted could be admitted as part of that "5%."

5. **In what ways has this activity changed how you view your ethical responsibilities as you create technology/software during your time as a student and in your professional career?**

I think that this activity has helped me see how some decisions cannot be made solely by AI. To do so would be inappropriate, and in some sense, cruel. While technology/software is certainly a powerful tool that we all use in our lives, it is just that: a tool. We are responsible to make those tools for the betterment of humankind, and if that means making a tool ethically right instead of optimally correct, we must choose the ethical solution. To ensure that the software we create cannot be misused to cause distress or harm to another.