

# Student Proposal: Diversity and Inclusion in the Computer Science Department

Katie Bramlett<sup>1</sup>      Oliver Broadrick<sup>2</sup>      Linnea Dierksheide<sup>3</sup>      Alyssa Ilaria<sup>4</sup>  
Sam Kusner<sup>5</sup>      Catherine Meadows<sup>6</sup>      Sreya Nalla<sup>7</sup>      Marshall Thompson<sup>8</sup>  
Steven Yoon<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Co-Chair, Women in Computer Science (WiCS)

<sup>2</sup>Undergraduate Teaching Assistant (UTA)

<sup>3</sup>UTA

<sup>4</sup>President, SEAS Student Peer Advisory Network (SEASSPAN)

<sup>5</sup>Vice President, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM); LA

<sup>6</sup>Undergraduate Representative, Curriculum Committee; UTA

<sup>7</sup>Senior Class Representative, WiCS

<sup>8</sup>UTA

<sup>9</sup>President, ACM

-

28 February 2021

## 1 Introduction

To foster a diverse and inclusive community, the Computer Science Department (CSD), needs to develop and enforce a plan that is reflective of student beliefs and values. Written by students, this proposal provides specific recommendations, goals, and initiatives to the CSD to constructively improve inclusivity for all. When addressing such matters, we recognize and support the importance of placing value on voices by including the thoughts and ideas of all students, from all backgrounds. Therefore, we distributed a survey to gather thoughts and suggestions from students, as well as quantitative information. So far, we have received responses from 63 students, approximately 25% of CSD undergraduates.

**Outline** The remainder of this document is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the survey and its quantitative results. Proposed actions are presented in Section 3.

## 2 Survey

To create an accepting, inclusive working and learning environment, we must first foster a space for meaningful participation from people of all backgrounds. Conducting an (optionally) anonymous survey allowed us to articulate a proposal, founded upon diverse ideas and perspectives, that outlines a diversity-oriented strategy for promoting an inclusive culture within the CSD.

The survey was distributed using multiple platforms. Flyers with QR Codes were posted throughout the fourth floor of the Science and Engineering Hall. Posts were made in online forums of at least one course for each undergraduate class (freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior). Several Undergraduate Teaching Assistants made announcements to their students about the survey, projecting the QR Code and giving time for students to fill it out. Lastly, the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) and Women in Computer Science (WiCS) chapters distributed the survey to their members via email.

## 2.1 Questions

The survey contained the following 10 questions:

1. Please rate the inclusivity of this department based on your experience.
  - *The options for this question are the integers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 where 1 is labeled as “Poor” and 5 is labeled as “Excellent”.*
2. Please share any ideas for how we can make our department more inclusive.
3. If you can identify a problem with the inclusivity of our department but have no ideas for ways to improve it, you are still welcome to share your thoughts here if you would like.
4. Your name? (only if you want your responses to be publicly associated with your name)
5. Pronouns?
6. Gender identity?
7. Race/ethnic group or groups?
8. Disability status?
9. Anything else?
10. Class? (2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, other?)

## 2.2 Quantitative Results

The survey yielded some interesting quantitative results that can be used to further our understanding of these issues. As of writing, 63 responses have been submitted in the 6 days for which the form has been available. This is roughly 25% of the 261 total undergraduates in the CSD. Figure 1 shows that females and non-binary students tend to rate inclusivity lower than males. Figure 2 shows the average inclusivity rating of several racial and ethnic groups. Finally, Figure 3 shows a decline in average inclusivity rating with expected year of graduation, in other words, with undergraduate class.

Average Inclusivity Rating by Gender Identity




Figure 1: Mean inclusivity rating by gender identity. The number of responses that identified themselves in one of these categories is respectively 23, 29, and 2.

Average Inclusivity Rating by Race / Ethnic Group




Figure 2: Mean inclusivity rating by self-described race/ethnic group. The number of responses that identified themselves in one of these categories is respectively 24, 17, 4, 3, and 3.

Average Inclusivity Rating By Class




Figure 3: Mean inclusivity rating by undergraduate expected graduation year (class). The number of responses that identified themselves in one of these categories is respectively 20, 22, 6, and 10.

## 2.3 Qualitative Themes

Comments from surveyed students covered a range of both positive and negative feedback and ideas. Items mentioned by students included a broad interest in more community engagement events, a desire for increased communication about ongoing diversity and inclusion efforts, and active changes to progress towards a more diverse student body and faculty. Common themes of dissatisfaction that were raised included a lack of support for DSS students, unequal treatment of CSD organizations, a belief that certain faculty members lack care and respect for inclusivity efforts, and a need to support students struggling with their mental health. To address these raised concerns, and using the ideas generated by survey responses, we propose

tangible measures for the CSD to cultivate an inclusive culture in Section 3.

## 3 Proposed Actions

The following items are presented in no particular order.

### 3.1 Classroom Environment

Active inclusivity efforts in the classroom are necessary to both correct existing disparities as well as to establish a tone that prioritizes diversity and inclusion. The efforts listed below should be made explicit by professors at the beginning of each course for increased transparency and understanding. This includes but is not limited to:

- *Syllabus Diversity & Inclusion Statement.* As with the common religious accommodation, academic integrity, and DSS statements in course syllabi, faculty should be required to include a diversity and inclusion statement. This statement should provide contact information for university and SEAS-level resources available to students, including resources for reporting bias-related acts to entities outside of the CSD (i.e. reporting options with the GW Office for Diversity, Equity, and Community Management). This statement in particular should be communicated clearly at the beginning of courses to all students, not just written in the course syllabus, to convey that inclusion in the classroom is a priority. A sample syllabus statement is as follows:

“It is my intent that students from all diverse backgrounds and perspectives be well-served by this course, that students’ learning needs be addressed both in and out of class, and that the diversity that the students bring to this class be viewed as a resource, strength and benefit. It is my intent to present materials and activities that are respectful of: gender identity, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, nationality, religion, and culture. Your suggestions are encouraged and appreciated. Please let me know ways to improve the effectiveness of the course for you personally, or for other students or student groups.”<sup>1</sup>

- *Assigning Groups for Class Projects.* Professors should not be allowed to assign groups based on academic ability, gender, sexuality, race, disability status, or religion. Groups should be assigned accordingly: (a) randomly, (b) by the choices of students, or (c) in accommodation of special cases including but not limited to a protective measure in the event of prior discriminatory behavior within a group.
- *Group Work Evaluations.* Peer evaluations for group assignments should be given after all group assignments or, in the case of long-term projects, given periodically throughout the term. These evaluations should include a section that specifically asks about inclusion within the group dynamic (i.e. Are your group members treating you with respect? Do you feel like your thoughts and contributions are valued by your group members?). Professors should review these evaluations in a timely manner and engage with groups who identified issues. In particular, such cases should be met with concrete, appropriate consequences.
- *Anonymous Reporting.* Students should have an accessible platform for (optionally) anonymous feedback for each course. This could manifest as an anonymous form for reporting biased behaviors, giving feedback about inclusion efforts in the classroom, etc. This feedback should be frequently monitored by the instruction team and addressed as soon as possible.
- *Office Hours.* Office hours, often hosted in casual, common spaces where other students may linger, can potentially breed intimidating, exclusive environments. In order to enhance the accessibility of instructional team help during office hours, the CSD should assist instruction team members in reserving classroom spaces. Hosting office hours in a classroom setting will improve the ability of instructors to more fairly distribute their time to all students in attendance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brown University Diversity and Inclusion Sample Statement Sourced from Clemson University Document “Diversity and Inclusion Syllabus Statements” published at “clemson.edu”.

- *DSS Students.* Professors should have (student-optional) recurring check-in meetings with DSS students to ensure they have proper resources, to check on their progress, etc.

### 3.2 Instruction Team Training

Undergraduate Teaching Assistants (UTAs), Learning Assistants (LAs), Graduate Assistants (GAs), and professors should receive the same diversity and inclusion training (i.e. group training from the GW Office for Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement) prior to interacting with students as a member of the instructional team.

### 3.3 Diversity and Inclusion in our Curriculum

The CSD ethics course, required for all Computer Science undergraduate students, should include a unit on diversity and inclusion in computing. This includes but is not limited to learning how to recognize and address unconscious bias, why diversity in engineering is crucial, opportunities and resources within the CSD, and how to have conversations about diversity and inclusion efforts.

### 3.4 Undergraduate Research Outreach

All students should be aware of and feel comfortable in pursuing research opportunities with faculty. In order to increase accessibility of faculty and boost awareness, opportunities should be displayed and distributed in a public manner. This includes but is not limited to a poster displayed outside the CSD office with research opportunities and faculty contact information, promoted research talks and panels from students and faculty, and announcements to classes about research opportunities.

### 3.5 Mindful Pronoun Usage

Proper use of gender identity terms, including but not limited to pronouns and preferred names, is an essential measure for fostering an inclusive environment. The CSD should normalize pronoun usage in a top-down approach, leading by example. This includes but is not limited to including pronouns in faculty biographies on the CSD website, in email signatures, in Zoom names, etc. Additionally, when conducting introductions in the classroom, faculty can introduce themselves and provide their pronouns and encourage students to do the same, if comfortable. All correspondence and distributed forms from the CSD should include proper options to provide pronouns and gender identities.

### 3.6 Conscious Hiring

The Department should make a conscious effort to interview and hire faculty candidates and student teaching staff from diverse backgrounds who share a commitment to upholding diversity and inclusion values. This includes asking candidates about their experiences with and interest in implementing inclusivity efforts, as well as ensuring our faculty and student instruction teams are reflective of a diverse community.

### 3.7 CSD Student Organizations

- *Funding Guidelines.* The CSD should develop and publicize a clear process for requesting and receiving funding for student organizations.
- *Introductions and Equal Treatment.* To encourage and increase participation in CSD organizations, WiCS, ACM, and future organizations in the department should have equal endorsement by faculty. This includes but is not limited to organization introductions by student representatives at the beginning of freshmen courses, faculty attendance at organization-sponsored events, and equal advertisement of organization engagements by the CSD.

### **3.8 Diversity & Inclusion Committee**

The CSD should form a Diversity and Inclusion Committee that is composed of both faculty members and student representatives. This committee should monitor progress for the above proposed items and host regular forums with faculty and students to communicate the progress of and source feedback about ongoing initiatives. The faculty advisor(s) for ACM and the faculty advisor(s) for WiCS should both sit on this committee to increase relations between the CSD and student organizations.

## **4 Conclusion**

This document does not provide a complete review of the problems that exist in the CSD nor does it provide a complete set of actions that the CSD can take to improve its diversity and inclusion. This document provides an initial set of student-generated data and recommendations to initiate a conversation between both students and faculty to improve the CSD for all.