



corona, janis <janislcorona@lewisu.edu>

Student Complaint

4 messages

Schackmuth, Dr. Kurt A. <SchackKu@lewisu.edu>

Fri, Aug 16, 2019 at 8:18 AM

To: "janisharris1982@yahoo.com" <janisharris1982@yahoo.com>, "corona, janis I." <JanisLCorona@lewisu.edu>

Dear Janis:

My name is Dr. Kurt Schackmuth. I work in the Provost's Office here at Lewis University and also serve as the University Ombudsman. I am responsible for handling concerns and complaints submitted via the University's formal Student Complaint Process<<https://lewisu.edu/welcome/studentcomplaints.htm>>. I am in receipt of the complaint that you submitted on August 15. I will investigate further and respond with additional information. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to let me know. Thank you.

Kurt Schackmuth, Ph.D.
Vice President for Mission
Associate Provost for Student Success

Lewis University <<http://www.lewisu.edu>> | Office of Mission & Identity<<http://www.lewisu.edu/omi>>
schackku@lewisu.edu<<mailto:schackku@lewisu.edu>> | 815.836.5810

[sallian Education]



image001.png
20K

corona, janis <janislcorona@lewisu.edu>

Mon, Aug 19, 2019 at 1:30 PM

To: "Schackmuth, Dr. Kurt A." <SchackKu@lewisu.edu>

Thank you Dr. Kurt. I will keep checking for any updates.

[Quoted text hidden]

Schackmuth, Dr. Kurt A. <SchackKu@lewisu.edu>

Wed, Aug 21, 2019 at 4:18 AM

To: "corona, janis I." <JanisLCorona@lewisu.edu>

Dear Janis –

I understand that the concerns you have about unfair grading have already been addressed by the department chair and the Dean of your college and that matter, in particular, has been settled. This is important, since the student complaint process is designed to address non-grade related issues.

In your complaint summary, you claim that the professor was “unethical, shows elements of bigotry.” Can you please provide me with examples or evidence of these claims? It is not clear to me in reviewing your paper how the professor has demonstrated bigotry, which is a fairly strong claim. Also, how has the professor been unethical?

Thank you for whatever follow-up and explanation you can provide.

Kurt Schackmuth, Ph.D.
Vice President for Mission
Associate Provost for Student Success

Lewis University <<http://www.lewisu.edu/>> | Office of Mission & Identity<<http://www.lewisu.edu/omi>>
schackku@lewisu.edu<<mailto:schackku@lewisu.edu>> | 815.836.5810

From: "corona, janis" <janislcorona@lewisu.edu>
Date: Monday, August 19, 2019 at 3:31 PM
To: "Schackmuth, Dr. Kurt A." <SchackKu@lewisu.edu>
Subject: Re: Student Complaint

Thank you Dr. Kurt. I will keep checking for any updates.

On Friday, August 16, 2019, Schackmuth, Dr. Kurt A. <SchackKu@lewisu.edu<<mailto:SchackKu@lewisu.edu>>> wrote:
Dear Janis:

My name is Dr. Kurt Schackmuth. I work in the Provost's Office here at Lewis University and also serve as the University Ombudsman. I am responsible for handling concerns and complaints submitted via the University's formal Student Complaint Process<<https://lewisu.edu/welcome/studentcomplaints.htm>>. I am in receipt of the complaint that you submitted on August 15. I will investigate further and respond with additional information. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to let me know. Thank you.

Kurt Schackmuth, Ph.D.
Vice President for Mission
Associate Provost for Student Success

Lewis University <<http://www.lewisu.edu/>> | Office of Mission & Identity<<http://www.lewisu.edu/omi>>
schackku@lewisu.edu<<mailto:schackku@lewisu.edu>><<mailto:schackku@lewisu.edu>><<mailto:schackku@lewisu.edu>>> | 815.836.5810

[sallian Education]

 **winmail.dat**
11K

corona, janis <janislcorona@lewisu.edu>
To: "Schackmuth, Dr. Kurt A." <SchackKu@lewisu.edu>

Thu, Aug 22, 2019 at 6:48 AM

Hi Dr. Kurt.







Of course, I can explain how she is unethical and shows signs of bigotry. I will attach the rough drafts and final report. She was supposed to guide me to a better result with each week of the feedback. Yet, she told me to put tables in the report but never said not to include final tables only. She said on a power point presentation or the rough draft or both that she said I shouldn't 'wish' I had data to use on the gene expression data that could be used for linkage analysis. On the surface, given that she grades overly critical, it explains how she feels I am a minority and female who doubts my success in life on potential work and rewards and only on wanting handouts like most arrogant and racist white races feel about minorities and women in academia or work trying to succeed. I don't know which week it was, but it was before the week 7 presentation. I remember because it was offensive but can't find which feedback it was as it was weeks ago but before the end of the report. I will find it and send it to you. It could have been in

an email or the copy right site retrieved. She also sent me an email about meiosis that wasn't discussed in my paper at all and explained proudly how she is Irish and Polish. She has used abusive language with telling me that I explain with redundancy when she said she wants to explain every step in the report. When she judged the number of rows on the data set when merging, she demonstrated she has no clue as to the reason the rows were duplicated when adding additional fields to smaller subsets to the same genes and samples though it was explained. She said that there aren't 2 M genes so something must be wrong with the setup-wrong! Because the report explained those were duplicate fields, and the samples were the same values, where the mean of the same values was taken per gene to get the 16 k genes that were unique (if a gene has 10 rows of 5.6 as values for one column sample, then taking the mean of $5.6 \times 10 / 10$ is 5.6). She doesn't seem to put weight on errors fixed to add to the grade, but looks for explaining her grading style with a rubric that she had me add off topic and lengthy information to. She said to add machine learning algorithm information about each algorithm used, when none of the papers I read did. She also said to explain each table before presenting it in the results which I did, but marked me off saying it wasn't synthesized. How did she want the information synthesized is a mystery, because for weeks 4- weeks 8 of the final paper and three rough drafts she never guided me to understanding what she means. So I still don't know what she means, yet she marked off more than half the points for it when I explained each table. She also showed me a table from a paper to use as an example image, which I did, and said when grading it wasn't stylized right. I have never had a professor not elaborate then make abusive marks on a paper based on information she never provided. As an advisor I would expect a higher professionalism and standard for guiding and advising students, but she seems to only make marks, point in the wrong direction and grade according to what is more time consuming to her.

Thank you so much for handling this.

[Quoted text hidden]

6 attachments

-  **Week 4 Progress Feedback- Janis Corona.pdf**
542K
-  **Rough Draft-pdf version-feedback-Janis Corona.pdf**
7810K
-  **Research_Presentation_UL_Risk_Genes-1563201075000.pdf**
7173K
-  **ProfSzcurekEmailsGradingAppeals.pdf**
200K
-  **email_final_report_edits.docx**
16K
-  **emails_Powers_meiosis_BG.pdf**
305K