

# Five Years of Institutional Gaslighting

— *Serious Unprofessional and Unethical Misconduct of the DGS*

This attachment was written at an earlier time (as a consolidated version of the 80-page attachment submitted to the Chair on March 13, 2025). Due to the emotional stress experienced at that time, it may contain subjective assumptions or emotionally influenced expressions.

I have made every effort to accurately present the facts, but I acknowledge that some parts may reflect the psychological pressure I was under when writing.

If you need further clarification or wish to verify any information, please feel free to contact the author.

*This document aims to highlight broader systemic issues stemming from repeated instances of mismanagement and unprofessional behavior by Zosia Krusberg in her role as Director of Graduate Studies (DGS). The purpose is not personal grievance but to advocate for accountability and systemic improvements to ensure fairness, transparency, and support for all students.*

The Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) in each department is entrusted with the critical role of supporting graduate students — guiding their academic progress, advocating for their needs, and fostering an environment of mentorship and integrity. Yet, under Prof. Krusberg's leadership in the UChicago Physics Department, this role has been systematically distorted into a mechanism of control, manipulation, and exclusion.

What should have been a position of support has instead become **a focal point of harm** — where decisions are made without consultation, mentorship is replaced with surveillance, and dissent is subtly punished under the guise of professional oversight. For five years, this pattern of misconduct, driven by Prof. Krusberg's approach to graduate mentorship, has remained concealed behind the language of care and the appearance of institutional diligence, creating a quiet, persistent culture of **gaslighting** that isolates and disempowers students.

This document outlines the patterns, practices, and impacts of this deeply unethical governance under Prof. Krusberg, drawing from documented incidents and personal experiences, to expose how the very role meant to uplift students has been used to erode their academic and personal well-being. It is crucial to recognize that the harm caused is not an isolated incident but a **prolonged, systematic misuse of authority** within the DGS position — one that must be addressed to restore integrity and trust within the department.

It is precisely because Physics Chair employed a power form of *delegated disempowerment*, that Prof. Zosia Krusberg, as DGS, came to **wield real operational power**. By positioning the DGS as the primary executor of policies and decisions — without consistent oversight or accountability — the Chair effectively created a power structure where Prof. Krusberg's discretionary actions became institutional norms. As a result, the DGS role transformed from supportive mentorship into a central point of informal governance, where **surveillance, control, and punitive measures were enacted under the guise of professional oversight**.

## Patterns of Misconduct and Mechanisms of Harm

### 1. Systematic Neglect and Withholding of Support

One of the most striking and consistent patterns of misconduct under Prof. Zosia Krusberg's leadership as DGS is the **deliberate neglect** and **systematic withholding** of essential academic support. Instead of fulfilling the

fundamental responsibility to guide and mentor graduate students, the DGS role was repeatedly used to **isolate**, **delay**, and **obscure** critical academic processes.

DGS **systematically ignored** critical emails during academic crises, strategically silencing students when support was most needed. When visibility from administrators or faculty increased, the DGS would suddenly re-engage — **not with the student**, but with supervisors or authority figures, shaping narratives behind the scenes while still ignoring direct student communication.

- No academic guidance or progress review was provided from 2020 through dismissal in 2025.
- Repeated email inquiries were ignored for years. No PhD-related conversation occurred despite urgent needs.
- Resource referrals and documentation requests were routinely deflected or denied.

This lack of basic communication not only caused confusion and uncertainty but also reflected a dismissive attitude toward an essential student request. This lack of response from the DGS not only disrupted the planned communication but also added unnecessary stress and raised doubts about their commitment to supporting students. Moreover, this incident set the tone for subsequent interactions, establishing a pattern of unresponsiveness and negligence that persisted throughout my academic experience.

## 2. Manipulative Use of Institutional Power

One of the most disturbing patterns under Prof. Zosia Krusberg's leadership as DGS was the **manipulative use of institutional power** to enforce disciplinary actions without procedural integrity. Rather than serving as a fair and supportive advisor, the DGS utilized her administrative authority to **unilaterally impose punitive measures**, bypassing the foundational principles of academic due process.

Major disciplinary actions — including probation — were **imposed without ever conducting a single investigatory conversation**. There was no meaningful dialogue, no formal hearing, and no written rationale presented for my side to address. The DGS applied her assumptions as conclusions, enforced through formal documentation but never backed by a participatory process.

Key administrative actions (e.g. forced probation, committee intervention) were carried out without notice, consultation, or input from the student, and often in response to third-party narratives, never verified or investigated.

- **No investigatory dialogue:** Probation letters and punishments were issued without a single one-on-one discussion.
- **Third-party narratives over student input:** DGS weaponized bureaucratic steps (e.g. 5th-year check-in forms, committee deadlines) as tools of retaliation rather than support.
- **Absence of procedural safeguards:** At no point was student given an opportunity to respond to allegations, provide context, or present perspective before actions were finalized.

The DGS often used her positionality as both academic advisor and administrator to act without clear boundaries. This duality allowed her to punish, silence, or ignore without accountability, while shielding herself under the appearance of “doing what’s best for the student.” What looked like bureaucratic routine was, in fact, sustained personal erosion.

Offers of “support” were frequently used to justify intrusive or inappropriate interventions made without consent or consultation. This was not framed as a recommendation, but imposed as a decision “in your best interest” — a recurring rhetorical pattern that allowed intrusive control to masquerade as mentorship.

### 3. Performative Advising & Strategic Visibility

Another defining pattern under Prof. Zosia Krusberg’s leadership as DGS was the use of **performative advising** — selective, surface-level engagement designed to maintain professional appearances while withholding meaningful support. Help was routinely offered only when faculty members, higher-level administrators, or other observers were present, creating the illusion of involvement and care. In reality, this visibility-driven behavior masked a deeper pattern of inaction and neglect. In private, the DGS defaulted to **silence, dismissal, or procedural obstruction**.

Behind **closed doors** and **black-box online meetings**, the DGS’s approach was marked by persistent silence, deflection, or procedural obstruction. When students sought help in moments of difficulty or confusion, requests were met with vague assurances, delayed responses, or outright avoidance. This private disengagement stood in **stark contrast** to her public posture of concern and mentorship.

- **Visibility-driven behavior:** Meetings were offered or support extended only in contexts where others (e.g., faculty committees, administrators) might observe or be copied on communications.
- **Private disengagement:** Outside of performative settings, responses were delayed, minimal, or completely absent — especially during academic or emotional crises.
- **Procedural obstruction:** Requests for basic information, documentation, or clarification were met with ambiguity or redirecting tactics that slowed academic progress.
- **No continuity of care:** Each engagement was treated as isolated, with no follow-up, record of support, or integrated advising across time.

This two-faced dynamic — public support, private neglect — was not incidental. It functioned strategically to protect the DGS’s institutional reputation while disempowering the student. When support was performative, it became a tool for optics, not a mechanism for care. The outcome was a sustained pattern of **isolation under the guise of mentorship**, where students were left to navigate uncertainty alone while external observers saw only curated moments of guidance.

### 4. Excessive Suspicion, Punitive Inclinations, and Nitpicking

One of the most troubling patterns under Prof. Zosia Krusberg’s leadership as DGS is her excessive suspicion toward students and a strong inclination to impose punitive measures without justification. Rather than fostering a supportive environment, Zosia frequently focuses on scrutinizing minor issues and penalizing perceived shortcomings, creating a hostile academic atmosphere.

The DGS has demonstrated a tendency to accuse students of misconduct without adequate investigation. In one case, she reported two students for cheating without verifying the actual content of their work. A review later showed their answers were entirely different, disproving her claim. This baseless accusation caused stress and damaged the students’ academic confidence, highlighting her quickness to judge rather than support.

The DGS (along with DUS) consistently prioritizes fault-finding over mentorship. She fixates on minor errors, often escalating them into disciplinary matters rather than offering guidance. This punitive focus discourages students from seeking help, as they fear being blamed rather than supported.

- **Erosion of Trust:** Students feel targeted rather than guided, weakening the mentor-mentee relationship.
- **Mental Health Impact:** Constant fear of unwarranted discipline leads to stress and anxiety.
- **Systemic Issue:** A punitive culture persists unchecked, damaging academic integrity.

This pattern of excessive scrutiny fosters a culture of fear, where students feel constantly at risk of unjust punishment. Instead of promoting growth and exploration, students become overly cautious, focusing on self-protection rather than academic progress.

## 5. Narrative Control and Strategic Information Withholding

A pervasive mechanism of harm under Prof. Zosia Krusberg's leadership as DGS was her consistent **manipulation of narrative** and **selective control of information**. Rather than creating transparent, collaborative channels for communication, she cultivated an opaque environment in which critical decisions, judgments, and impressions were shaped without student knowledge or input — then formalized without accountability.

This control over narrative functioned on two levels: first, by carefully managing what information reached faculty or administrators; and second, by ensuring the student remained **excluded from key conversations**, thereby stripping them of the ability to clarify misunderstandings or correct mischaracterizations.

- **Communication behind the student's back:** The DGS discussed students in private emails, forming conclusions without their input, creating a narrative that shaped perceptions unfairly, while the student remained unaware of how their situation was being framed institutionally.
- **Withholding context and documentation:** Essential information — including committee feedback, probation rationales, or relevant timelines — was either delayed, summarized vaguely, or never disclosed at all. This allowed the DGS to remain the sole interpreter of events, leaving the student unable to verify, contest, or prepare.
- **Shaping perception through selective disclosure:** When external parties (e.g. deans, advisors) were involved, the DGS often portrayed her actions as responsive or supportive, omitting the procedural failures and prolonged disengagement that preceded them. This created a curated version of the story that reflected institutional values, not lived experience.

What appeared to others as reasonable or measured responses were, in reality, constructed narratives that omitted context, excluded the student's voice, and disguised prolonged misconduct as care. The DGS maintained tight control over who knew what, when, and how — ensuring that her version of events always reached others before the student's own account could be heard.

This was not mere administrative efficiency. It was a pattern of narrative preemption designed to protect the DGS's institutional image while neutralizing dissent. By controlling the information ecosystem, she was able to cast reasonable student concerns as confusion, defiance, or dysfunction — all while positioning herself as neutral or benevolent.

This dynamic was especially harmful because it operated invisibly. Unlike overt misconduct, narrative control often leaves no clear trace, only the downstream consequences: unchallenged misjudgments, lost trust, and reputational erosion. The harm is real, but difficult to document — and that is precisely what made it so powerful.

## 6. Dark Assumptions, Offensive Probing, and Forced Concern as Control

A recurring pattern in Prof. Zosia Krusberg’s behavior as DGS is her tendency to interpret situations negatively, projecting **personal biases** onto students. This often leads to punitive actions, invasive questioning, and the misuse of forced “concern” as a tool of control rather than genuine support.

The DGS frequently makes negative assumptions about students’ intentions without evidence, often **escalating minor issues into formal complaints**. Prof. Krusberg’s approach often includes invasive questioning framed as “concern,” which feels more like surveillance than support.

- When a student hesitated to answer her intrusive questions, she accused them of “**hiding**”, ignoring their visible discomfort and escalating the situation further.

By projecting her own insecurities onto students, Zosia creates a hostile environment where any reaction can be misinterpreted as dishonesty or resistance. This behavior causes emotional distress and erodes trust, as students feel judged and constantly at risk of unfair accusations.

## 7. Neglect of Basic Responsibilities and Misplaced Priorities

Prof. Krusberg repeatedly fails to fulfill fundamental duties as DGS, often neglecting core responsibilities while prioritizing superficial or performative tasks. This pattern creates inefficiencies and undermines both teaching and administrative processes.

Prof. Krusberg frequently forgets critical tasks, requiring TAs to remind her of basic duties such as scheduling meetings or providing necessary guidance.

- During the 2023 summer quarter, TAs had to repeatedly step in to manage course logistics, adding undue burden to their workload.

Instead of prioritizing effective support, Zosia invests excessive effort in maintaining appearances, such as focusing on reporting minor issues rather than addressing fundamental problems.

- During a 2024 exam, she focused on reporting potential misconduct while neglecting basic logistics, leading to confusion over start times and unmarked answer sheets.

It is essential to reassess Zosia’s management practices, ensuring that foundational responsibilities take priority over superficial tasks. Implementing clearer oversight would help prevent similar disruptions in the future.

## 8. Sacrificial Victims, Concealment, and Retaliation

Prof. Krusberg frequently uses students as scapegoats to maintain her standing, framing punitive actions as being “for their benefit” while disregarding their actual needs. This manipulative pattern includes making

decisions without consultation, concealing critical facts, and retaliating when students advocate for fair treatment.

The DGS often imposes punitive measures under the guise of support, primarily to appease external pressures or maintain her own reputation. Prof. Krusberg frequently hides critical information and distorts facts to discredit students who speak up. When I advocated for fair TA assignments, she framed my efforts as problematic, blocking opportunities and labeling me as resistant.

These actions create a hostile environment where students feel targeted and powerless, discouraged from advocating for themselves.

**Targeting Female Students:** There are indications that Zosia disproportionately targets female students, making unfounded accusations and inappropriate inquiries.

- She accused a female student of cheating without evidence, which was later disproven, suggesting a bias that harms academic confidence.

It is essential to investigate how Zosia's decisions are made and to establish safeguards against retaliation. Addressing these patterns is crucial to restoring fairness and trust within the department.

## 9. Psychological Harm and Emotional Negligence

Beyond the procedural misconduct and institutional manipulation, Prof. Zosia Krusberg's actions as DGS inflicted **deep psychological harm** and violated core standards of professional ethics. While her role demanded attentiveness to student well-being, she consistently responded to emotional vulnerability with cold detachment or dismissive formality. This pattern reflected not only emotional negligence but an abdication of her basic ethical responsibilities.

Additionally, the emotional harm was not just a result of direct negligence but was compounded by a persistent pattern of **gaslighting and manipulation**. Through systematic distortion of facts and controlling narratives, DGS led students to question the legitimacy of their experiences, resulting in ongoing psychological stress and self-doubt.

In many cases, institutional delays or structural failures were attributed to student shortcomings, despite being caused by the DGS's own inaction or withholding of information. These misrepresentations further damaged the student's credibility, compounding both procedural and reputational harm.

Meetings that should have offered support often became **sources of emotional injury**. In one particularly distressing instance, while the student was visibly crying and in clear psychological distress, the DGS continued speaking in a clinical, emotionally distant tone — offering no acknowledgment of the student's state, let alone compassion or concern. The silence around emotional needs was not accidental; it was structural and routine.

- **Emotional neglect:** The DGS failed to recognize or respond to visible distress, even in face-to-face meetings where the harm was apparent.
- **Gaslighting and invalidation:** When concerns about neglect or harm were raised, they were minimized or reframed as misunderstandings, casting doubt on the student's experience. For instance, when students expressed dissatisfaction or discomfort, DGS (along with DUS) often responded with dismissive comments such as "Are you sure you're not overthinking it?" or "Perhaps you're just

misinterpreting the situation." Such responses not only disregarded genuine concerns but also created an environment where students began to doubt their perceptions and emotional responses.

- **Shifting Blame:** Zosia routinely deflects attention from her own failures by shifting responsibility onto students. For example, delays in forming my thesis committee were a direct result of her negligence, yet she framed these issues as stemming from my lack of initiative. This systematic blame-shifting created a persistent sense of self-doubt and guilt, as students were left questioning whether their struggles were a result of personal failings rather than systemic issues. The mental burden of being portrayed as the problem, rather than a victim of neglect, caused long-term stress and eroded self-worth.

These repeated failures were not merely lapses in interpersonal care — they were **violations of professional ethics** central to any advising relationship. The DGS routinely disregarded her:

- **Duty of care:** Failing to provide a safe, respectful, and responsive environment for academic and emotional development.
- **Neutrality in conflict:** Using her authority to escalate, rather than mediate, tensions — especially when she herself was the source of conflict.
- **Transparency:** Withholding critical information while shaping narratives behind the scenes.
- **Equity:** Providing selective access to support and resources, often favoring institutional optics over student needs.

Perhaps most troubling was the **discrepancy between her public image and private behavior**. The DGS maintained a visible publication and advocacy record on student equity, mentorship, and academic inclusion — work that stood in sharp contradiction to her actual conduct. This gap between professed values and lived experience not only eroded trust but amounted to a **professional misrepresentation of competence and care**.

The cumulative effect was not just academic disruption but sustained emotional trauma — inflicted through a posture of authority that was never balanced by empathy, accountability, or ethical consistency.

## Conclusion

Prof. Krusberg's actions as DGS have systematically undermined the fundamental purpose of mentorship, replacing support with control and guidance with punishment. Her deliberate neglect, misuse of authority, and manipulative practices have not only caused profound harm to individual students but have eroded the academic integrity of the entire department. This pattern of misconduct is not just a failure of leadership — it is a betrayal of the academic values that the DGS role is meant to uphold.

When the person entrusted with mentorship uses their authority to control, neglect, and punish — that is not support; it is **systemic abuse**. It operates subtly, masked by procedural formality and performative concern, but the harm it causes is profound and lasting. This pattern of misuse thrives not through overt hostility, but through **quiet manipulation** and **unchecked power**, leaving students isolated and silenced.

This is how harm persists in academic spaces: not through open conflict, but through professional veneer and institutional indifference. When power can be wielded without accountability, students become invisible: their

struggles dismissed, their voices ignored. What happened to me is not an isolated case; it is just one that came to light.

It is time to end the cycle of quiet harm and ensure that support roles truly serve those they are meant to protect. Let this record be a step toward accountability — so that no more students are abused, manipulated, marginalized, and erased behind closed doors under the guise of institutional authority.



# Detailed Account of Misconduct

## 1. Failure to Respond to Basic Communication for initial Appointment (2020.9.14)

One of the most striking and consistent patterns of misconduct under Prof. Zosia Krusberg's leadership as DGS is the **deliberate neglect** and **systematic withholding** of essential academic support. Instead of fulfilling the fundamental responsibility to guide and mentor graduate students, the DGS role was repeatedly used to **isolate**, **delay**, and **obscure** critical academic processes.

- During my first scheduled appointment with the DGS, I reached out in advance to confirm the meeting time and location, but I received no response.

This lack of basic communication not only caused confusion and uncertainty but also reflected a dismissive attitude toward an essential student request. This lack of response from the DGS not only disrupted the planned communication but also added unnecessary stress and raised doubts about their commitment to supporting students.

Moreover, this incident set the tone for subsequent interactions, establishing a pattern of **unresponsiveness** and **negligence** that **persisted throughout my academic experience**.

## 2. Course Registration Mismanagement and Neglect (2020.12-2021.9)

One of the most egregious examples of professional neglect under Prof. Zosia Krusberg's leadership as DGS was the **severe mismanagement of course registration** — a fundamental responsibility that directly impacts students' academic progress and mentorship. The mishandling of my course registration not only caused significant confusion and delay but also led to serious misunderstandings with my PhD supervisor, ultimately undermining my academic relationships and research trajectory.

At the beginning of my enrollment, I had multiple email discussions with the DGS to confirm my selection of the year-long research course PHYS 335. Despite these confirmations, the DGS later appeared to have **no record or understanding** of my chosen course, even asking me again at a later time which course I would like to select.

- Despite multiple confirmations with the DGS regarding my registration for a specific year-long research course at the beginning of my enrollment, I was not registered for the course and received no notifications or follow-ups **throughout the year**.
- As a result, I was completely lost in this course, despite reaching out early in an attempt to clarify my standing and expectations. The absence of guidance and follow-up left me uncertain about how to proceed, which led to a lack of direction throughout the year. As a result, I was unable to complete the course on time and only submitted the required report three months after the official deadline.
- After the course supervisor directly contacted the DGS regarding my registration and progress in the course, the DGS **still failed to act** or provide any resolution.

This lack of guidance and follow-up from the DGS significantly delayed my academic progress and disrupted my research plans. The negligence demonstrated in this case reflects a **fundamental failure** to fulfill the responsibilities of a graduate program director. This **deliberate inaction** shows not only negligence but a disregard for professional collaboration with other academic staff, further exacerbating the issue. The lack of

course registration and the subsequent delays caused by the DGS created unnecessary confusion and strain in my academic environment.

Due to the mismanagement of this course and the associated delays, my relationship with my PhD supervisor was negatively affected. My PhD supervisor initially perceived the delays as a lack of commitment or organization on my part, leading to misunderstandings and a breakdown in our professional relationship. Leading to further breakup of relationship soon after. The cascading effects of this mismanagement have caused significant setbacks in my research and have impacted my ability to receive adequate guidance and support from my primary mentor.

Beyond the immediate impact, this delay resulted in repeated misunderstandings and criticisms from my PhD research supervisor, who continued to **reference the missed deadline as a failure on my part**. Despite the fact that this issue arose solely due to the DGS's negligence, I was repeatedly blamed for the delay, which severely damaged my professional relationship and undermined their trust in my capabilities. This ongoing criticism created a tense and unsupportive academic environment, negatively affecting my confidence, mental health, and ability to focus on my research.

The failure to properly register me for a critical year-long research course, despite multiple confirmations and documented email exchanges, is not just a simple oversight — it reflects a **blatant disregard for academic standards and professional collaboration**. The consequences of this negligence were far-reaching, damaging my reputation within the department and creating a cascade of professional setbacks that lasted well beyond the initial registration period.

### 3. Failure to Provide Meaningful Support During Personal Difficulties (2021.3-6)

During a period when I was struggling due to a personal accident and feeling emotionally low, one of the DGS's colleagues (Stuart) noticed my condition and directed me to the DGS for support.

- Unfortunately, the DGS's response was limited to **superficial concern**, without offering any meaningful assistance or follow-up to address my situation.

As a graduate program director, the DGS had an obligation to provide guidance or at least connect me to appropriate resources during this difficult time. Their lack of meaningful action reflects a disregard for student welfare, particularly when the issue was explicitly brought to their attention by a colleague.

This lack of support not only left me feeling neglected but also contributed to my continued emotional struggles, which negatively impacted both my mental health and academic progress.

Such behavior highlights a broader pattern of indifference and irresponsibility in the DGS's approach to student well-being, undermining the trust and support that students should be able to expect from their program leadership.

### 4. Coldness, Bias, and Detrimental Interventions (2022.4)

After my relationship with my first supervisor broke down, I was in a state of emotional distress and reached out to the DGS via email for advice. However, their response was marked by coldness and a lack of empathy. Instead of providing any meaningful insight or mediation, the DGS chose to accept my supervisor's emotionally

charged reasoning, effectively portraying me in a negative light. This bias further exacerbated the situation and left me feeling unsupported and unfairly judged.

During a subsequent meeting with the DGS, I placed significant trust in them and disclosed my carefully considered career plans and aspirations. Sharing these plans was deeply personal to me, and I had hoped to receive constructive guidance to help me navigate my academic path. Instead, I was met with nothing more than a generic and uninspiring statement of encouragement. For years afterward, the DGS failed to provide any meaningful guidance or follow-up, leaving me to feel ignored and unsupported. This betrayal of trust significantly undermined my confidence and progress.

Subsequently, the DGS unilaterally and forcibly enrolled me in a time-consuming and complex English course under the pretext of “helping me.” This decision was made without any effort to consider my professional goals or consult me on its relevance. Despite my explicit protests and objections, the DGS **dismissed my concerns and imposed their decision**, seemingly out of bias or indifference. This forced intervention not only consumed valuable time and energy but also interfered with my research and long-term career goals.

- **Lack of Engagement with My Career Goals and Academic Progress:**

Despite sharing my carefully considered academic progress and career goals with the DGS, I received no meaningful suggestions or guidance. I was not heard, nor were my aspirations ever taken seriously. Over the years, the DGS consistently ignored my concerns, failing to provide any acknowledgment or constructive advice regarding my stated goals.

- **Failure to Address Academic Impact:**

Even as my academic progress was visibly affected by the circumstances surrounding my PhD journey, the DGS never checked in or initiated discussions about my situation. Their persistent neglect left me to manage the consequences of these disruptions entirely on my own, without the support or intervention expected of a program director.

- **Biased and Uninvestigated Judgments:**

When issues arose, the DGS failed to investigate the situation or hear my side of the story. Instead, they chose to **uncritically accept** emotionally charged or random reasons presented by others, demonstrating a clear bias and a lack of professional diligence.

- **Unilateral and Misguided Decisions:**

Without consulting me or seeking confirmation, the DGS imposed their assumptions about what they deemed appropriate for me. This included **forcing decisions and actions**, such as enrolling me in programs that neither aligned with my goals nor addressed my needs.

- **Impact on Career Goals:**

Since the start of my PhD program in June 2020, I had maintained a clear career goal and actively sought guidance to align my academic progress with this objective. However, my career aspirations were **completely ignored, dismissed, and undermined** by the DGS’s actions. Rather than support or facilitate my goals, the DGS’s behavior significantly hindered my progress.

- **Timeline of Delay:**

The neglect and obstruction persisted for nearly three years, from June 2020 to February 2023, during which I was left to navigate these challenges exactly exerted by DGS on my own. It was only through my own efforts that I eventually identified a path forward, despite the significant delays caused by the DGS’s behavior.

This forced intervention highlights a pattern of biased and dismissive behavior. The DGS’s refusal to engage meaningfully with my concerns, coupled with their unilateral decisions, has caused direct and long-term harm to my academic and professional development. Their actions reflect a failure to fulfill their responsibilities as a program director, contributing to delays in my academic progress and further exacerbating the challenges I faced.

The DGS's actions show a fundamental disregard for my autonomy and priorities as a student. By imposing a program that neither aligned with my career goals nor supported my academic progress, the DGS significantly **wasted my time and energy**, which could have been better directed toward my research and long-term objectives.

The DGS's actions led to further severe complications, including delays in my academic progress and other cascading issues. This pattern of negligence, bias, and forced interference demonstrates a **systemic failure** to uphold their responsibilities and a disregard for the well-being of students.

## 5. Abuse of Power and Long-Term Unfair Treatment (since 2022.3)

Following my forced removal from the lab under disrespectful and coercive circumstances, the DGS **deliberately concealed** my situation from colleagues, including those responsible for TA assignments. Worse, they may have **spread negative comments** about me, influencing my colleagues' perceptions and attitudes toward me.

This concealment or defamation led to a shift in my colleagues' attitudes, resulting in ongoing **public criticism and nitpicking** during my TA duties, which lasted for four years.

- I was frequently subjected to public blame and harsh scrutiny, which created a hostile environment and left me feeling isolated and unfairly judged. This not only affected my emotional well-being but also had a detrimental impact on my professional reputation within the department.
- In addition to the public criticism, I was forcibly assigned the most burdensome and time-consuming TA tasks, significantly heavier than those assigned to my peers.
- Over four years, I was required to handle an excessive workload, including trivial and repetitive tasks, while also being assigned additional responsibilities beyond what was typical for other TAs.

This unfair treatment not only distracted me from my research but also delayed my academic progress significantly. The constant nitpicking and public blame created a **hostile working environment**, exacerbating the emotional distress I was already experiencing.

By hiding my circumstances and fostering a biased view of me among colleagues, the DGS **systematically isolated** me and **undermined my ability** to function effectively within the department. This behavior reflects a severe abuse of power and a failure to uphold fairness and equity in management, resulting in an inequitable distribution of work and a disregard for fairness.

## 6. Failure to Provide Meaningful Support During a Critical Situation (2022.4)

During a time of significant distress caused by my forced removal from the lab and its associated challenges, the DGS failed to provide any meaningful resources, suggestions, or support to help me navigate this difficult period. Despite her knowledge of my overwhelming situation and her position of privilege and responsibility, she offered no practical assistance or tailored advice.

- Instead of addressing my specific needs, the DGS persistently **marketed her own preferences**, pressuring me to accept them regardless of my objections. My protests and concerns were completely ignored, leaving me feeling unheard and dismissed at a time when meaningful support was urgently needed.

- In stark contrast, my peers—who were not in positions of authority—offered far more constructive and practical suggestions than the DGS. Her lack of helpful remarks or acknowledgment of my difficulties underscored her unwillingness to fulfill her responsibilities as a program director.
- When clear issues arose in my TA tasks due to the overwhelming workload and my personal struggles, the DGS made no effort to check in with me or provide assistance. Instead, she chose to further punish and blame me for these difficulties. Her lack of interaction and punitive approach not only failed to address the root problems but also severely damaged my mental health during an already critical time.

Moreover, the DGS actively concealed the facts of my situation from other representatives, leading to a sustained misunderstanding of my circumstances among other PSD representatives lasting for years. This concealment resulted in years of unjustified negative impressions of me, further exacerbating my professional struggles and isolation within the department.

## 7. Forced Registration and Unfair Treatment in English Course (2022.6.23)

The DGS completely ignored my protests and concerns, unilaterally registering me for a highly time-consuming English course without my consent. She claimed this would be a "good experience" for me, yet failed to consider my actual circumstances, needs, or objections.

- Without consulting me, the DGS directly coordinated with the English department to fix my session schedule, leaving me no say in the matter. This disregard for my input further demonstrated her lack of respect for my autonomy and decision-making.

When I sought to adjust my session schedule to better accommodate my situation, my request was met with a dismissive and unpleasant response from the English department. Their refusal to accommodate my needs in any way added to the overall sense of helplessness and frustration.

- The instructor for my assigned session was a highly demanding individual who exhibited clear hostility towards me.
  - **Overwhelming and Arbitrary Assignments:** The course assignments were excessively burdensome, often including irrelevant and unnecessarily complex tasks. Given my already fragile mental state, completing these assignments became an enormous challenge, yet I persevered and submitted them to the best of my ability.
  - **Refusal to Accept Late Submissions:** Despite the unreasonable workload and my evident struggles, the instructor refused to accept any late submissions, showing no empathy or understanding of my situation.
  - **Unjust Accusation of Plagiarism:** At the end of the course, the instructor accused me of plagiarism in my podcast draft, a baseless and humiliating claim that further damaged my morale and reputation.
  - The standards used to evaluate my podcast draft were excessively rigid and inconsistently applied. By those same standards, nearly **every** student's podcast would have been labeled as plagiarism, making the accusation not only unfair but also fundamentally flawed.
- This revelation underscores the arbitrary and punitive nature of the course evaluation process, which prioritized punishment over constructive feedback or support.
- The fact that I was singled out for such harsh treatment, despite putting significant effort into my work, further highlights the unfairness and hostility I experienced.
- While this issue originated within the English course, the DGS's role in forcibly registering me for this class and failing to support me throughout the ordeal amplified its negative impact. Without proper consultation or understanding of my circumstances, the DGS placed me in a situation that was both unnecessary and damaging, with long-term consequences for my academic and emotional well-being.

Despite my efforts to produce a well-written podcast draft with proper citations and care in using my own words, the instructor subjected my work to excessively strict scrutiny.

I included all sources I referred to, properly quoted sentences with quotation marks, and meticulously cited online materials. However, the instructor rigidly interpreted the standards in a manner that ignored the overall quality and effort I put into my work.

The instructor publicly accused me of plagiarism, presenting an accusation document filled with overwhelming and intimidating highlights in red, black, and yellow.

- The accusation was disproportionate and unnecessarily harsh, aiming to humiliate rather than address the issue constructively. It was clear that the instructor had not fully reviewed my submissions or properly verified their claims, as they overlooked the fact that I had included specific assignments that were alleged to be missing.

Following the accusation, I reached out to the instructor via email multiple times to seek clarification and address the concerns raised. However, the instructor failed to respond to any of my emails regarding the accusation.

After a significant delay, the instructor sent a dismissive and unhelpful reply, stating, **“Sorry I missed your email. Please reply to all.”** This response showed a lack of accountability and respect for the serious nature of the accusation and further exacerbated my frustration.

Despite my coursework achieving 85%, the plagiarism accusation was used as justification to fail me for the entire course. This outcome was both unjust and disproportionate, ignoring the significant effort I had put into the course under extremely challenging circumstances.

The plagiarism accusation was entirely baseless and unjustified. The accusation itself was humiliating and damaging to my reputation, yet it was used as grounds to nullify my otherwise passing grade, resulting in an unwarranted failure for the course.

- The DGS, who had unilaterally enrolled me in this course against my protests, failed to provide any meaningful support or address the hostile treatment I experienced.
- This outcome underscores a systemic failure to ensure fairness and accountability in the course evaluation process. Neither the instructor’s unprofessional behavior nor the unjust accusation of plagiarism was appropriately addressed, leaving me with no recourse to challenge the result.
- **Failure to Evaluate Course Suitability:** The DGS’s decision to unilaterally register me for this course, without understanding or considering the course’s standards and potential impact, reflects a serious lack of judgment.
- **Amplifying the Course’s Unfair Practices:** By forcing me into a course with such flawed and punitive evaluation practices, the DGS directly contributed to the stress, humiliation, and delays I experienced.
- **Systemic Issues in Decision-Making:** This incident exemplifies the DGS’s broader pattern of neglecting student needs, making unilateral decisions, and failing to provide support when issues arise.

The forced registration in this English course added an enormous and unnecessary burden to my already overwhelming academic workload. This course, with its excessive demands and toxic environment, significantly hindered my ability to focus on more meaningful academic pursuits, delaying my progress and impacting my research.

- The lack of understanding and empathy from both the DGS and the English department amplified my emotional distress, leaving me feeling trapped and unsupported.

- This incident caused significant damage to my academic record and professional reputation, delaying my progress and creating unnecessary obstacles to achieving my career goals.
- The intimidating and dismissive handling of this accusation inflicted severe emotional distress, leaving me feeling unsupported and unfairly targeted.
- This experience also highlights systemic issues in the institution's handling of plagiarism accusations and course evaluations, particularly the need for fairer processes and constructive communication.

The DGS's decision to impose this course, coupled with the English department's dismissive behavior and the instructor's hostility, shattered my trust in the institution's ability to act in the best interest of students.

The unjust accusation of plagiarism, in particular, was deeply damaging to my confidence and academic reputation, making it even harder to recover from the situation.

This entire experience highlights a broader systemic issue of ignoring student voices and imposing decisions without consultation. The DGS's actions reflect an abuse of authority, while the English department's rigid and unprofessional behavior exacerbates the problem, leaving students like me vulnerable and unsupported.

## **8. Neglecting My Needs While Actively Appeasing the English Department (2022.8-12)**

After the plagiarism accusation was made against me, the DGS took an active role in communicating extensively with the English department. Rather than supporting me or addressing my concerns, she prioritized appeasing the English department to de-escalate the situation on their side.

- The DGS completely ignored my side of the story and made no attempt to engage with me regarding the accusation or to understand the circumstances surrounding it. Despite my repeated efforts to seek clarification and support, I was left entirely unheard and dismissed.
- **Abandonment of Student Advocacy:** By ignoring my concerns and neglecting to provide any support or representation, the DGS failed in her fundamental duty as a program director to advocate for and support students during disputes.
- **Worsening Emotional Distress:** Her lack of acknowledgment and support left me feeling completely abandoned and powerless, exacerbating the emotional toll of the plagiarism accusation.
- **Reinforcement of Systemic Bias:** This incident highlights a systemic issue where institutional dynamics and appeasement are prioritized over fairness and accountability, leaving students like me vulnerable to unfair treatment.

Her actions demonstrated a clear bias and disregard for my well-being as a student under her responsibility. Instead of acting as an advocate or mediator, the DGS focused solely on maintaining the department's internal dynamics, further isolating me during an already stressful and unjust situation.

This behavior reflects a pattern of prioritizing institutional relationships over student advocacy, which not only failed to resolve the issue fairly but also deepened the emotional and professional harm I experienced.

This situation is consistent with the DGS's broader pattern of neglecting student concerns and taking unilateral actions that exacerbate rather than resolve conflicts. It underscores her failure to fulfill her role as a fair and supportive figure in the academic system.

## **9. Forceful Control Under the Pretext of Support (2022.8)**

Without prior consultation or communication, the DGS forcefully registered me for a time-consuming English course and only notified me after the decision was finalized. This action was not supportive in any way; rather, it represented a continuous form of personal control over my academic decisions.

- The DGS justified this decision by assuming it would be a "good experience" for me. However, as the events unfolded, it became clear that the course was fundamentally unsuitable for a third-year physics student like me. The course's structure and demands were never intended for someone at my academic level, and its imposition only served to hinder my progress.
- The DGS's reasoning behind this decision completely ignored the real issues at hand. Even if there were communication challenges, would taking an English course have resolved them? The core problem was never about communication; it was about the lack of thoughtful engagement and meaningful support.
- Instead of analyzing the situation or understanding my needs, the DGS moved forward with her own assumptions, applying her personal will to my situation without any consideration of its suitability or impact.

This decision significantly delayed my academic progress by consuming time and energy that should have been dedicated to my research. The DGS's authoritarian approach to student management, prioritizing control over genuine support, left me feeling disrespected and emotionally distressed during an already difficult time.

This incident highlights a systemic issue in the institution's approach to student support, where decisions are made unilaterally and based on misguided assumptions, rather than through thoughtful engagement and collaboration with the student.

## 10. Unjust Academic Probation and Forced Tasks (2022.10)

After the incident with the English course, the DGS **completely ignored my emails** seeking help or requesting a meeting to discuss my situation. Instead of offering support, she **escalated** the matter by **unilaterally** placing me on **academic probation**.

The academic probation was imposed without a fair or constructive evaluation of my circumstances. Instead, it felt punitive, with no regard for the overwhelming burden I was already carrying.

- As part of the academic probation, I was required to complete a series of additional tasks, despite already being under significant pressure. During that semester, I was:
  - Managing an exceptionally heavy TA workload.
  - Completing my own academic coursework.
  - Attending another compulsory English writing course, also **forced upon me by the DGS**.
  - Undertaking the tasks mandated by the academic probation, which only added to my already overwhelming responsibilities.
- These forced tasks were not designed to support my academic progress but instead acted as further punitive measures. They demonstrated a lack of consideration for my academic and mental well-being.

One of the tasks imposed on me was to find a new advisor. While I had my own preferred research direction and potential advisors in mind, this process is deeply personal and requires careful consideration.

However, under the pressure of fulfilling the probation requirements, I was forced to contact "placeholder" just to meet the **arbitrary criteria** set by the DGS. This not only wasted my time but also undermined the integrity of the advisor-student relationship, which should be built on mutual trust and shared academic interests.



The DGS's actions demonstrated a complete disregard for my autonomy and professional development. Instead of helping me find a meaningful and aligned research path, she imposed artificial tasks that diverted my focus from genuine academic progress. Her lack of engagement with my academic goals and circumstances further highlights her systemic neglect and misuse of authority.

- The forced tasks disrupted my academic focus and delayed my research progress.
- The probation measures added unnecessary stress and consumed valuable time that could have been better spent on meaningful academic pursuits.
- Being placed on academic probation without fair consideration of my situation, coupled with the overwhelming burden of forced tasks, left me feeling humiliated, unsupported, and deeply frustrated.

The experience eroded my confidence in the department and my ability to advocate for my own needs within an unsupportive system. The DGS's approach to academic probation reflects a systemic issue of power imbalance, where punitive measures are used without proper evaluation or understanding of the student's needs and circumstances.

Instead of providing guidance or support, the DGS's actions prioritized control and punishment, undermining the principles of academic mentorship and development.

## 11. Unilateral Punishment Without Communication (2022.10)

The DGS imposed academic probation on me without engaging in any prior communication or dialogue to understand my situation. Despite my repeated attempts to reach out through emails seeking help or requesting a meeting, she **entirely ignored my concerns**. Her refusal to communicate or even acknowledge my messages created a sense of abandonment and further exacerbated the difficulties I was already facing.

Without any consultation or discussion, the DGS unilaterally imposed a series of academic probation measures. These tasks were not only arbitrary but also punitive, failing to address or support my actual academic needs. This complete disregard for dialogue demonstrates an authoritarian approach, where the DGS prioritized **enforcing her personal will** over genuinely addressing the root issues.

By neglecting her duty to communicate and collaborate with me, the DGS misused her authority to impose penalties without justification. Her actions were not aligned with the principles of fairness, mentorship, or support expected of her role. Instead of acting as an advocate or problem solver, she unilaterally applied measures that served to control rather than assist, further marginalizing me during a period of significant distress.

- The DGS's refusal to engage with me eroded any trust I had in the institution's ability to act in the best interest of its students.
- Her actions left me feeling unheard, isolated, and powerless, with no opportunity to explain my side of the situation or seek alternatives.
- The lack of communication compounded the emotional toll of being placed on probation. I was left to face these punitive measures without clarity, understanding, or guidance, which only deepened my sense of frustration and helplessness.
- The punitive tasks imposed by the DGS, were disruptive and diverted my focus from meaningful academic pursuits. This unilateral decision-making delayed my progress and undermined my ability to succeed.

## 12. Prolonged Trauma and Pain, Persistent Neglect (2022.4 - 2024.10)

What the DGS called a “good experience” readily turned into a deeply painful and traumatic ordeal that has lasted for years. Instead of offering any meaningful help, her actions directly contributed to my ongoing distress, hindering my academic progress and emotional well-being.

Far from providing support after the first accident, she continued to impose additional burdens on me, exacerbating my already fragile state. Her actions destroyed any semblance of mental peace, adding insult to injury and pushing me further into a spiral of helplessness and pain.

- All the negative outcomes of this situation—my trauma, delays, and emotional pain—were entirely predictable from the beginning. Her actions were forceful, conducted without any effective communication, and directly against my will.
- Despite these obvious red flags, she still proceeded to forcefully enroll me in a writing class that was never mandatory. This decision demonstrated a complete lack of care for the potential harm her actions could cause and an unwillingness to consider my circumstances.

This entire ordeal, from June 2022 to March 2023, resulted in **ten months of wasted time**, filled with helplessness, emotional wounds, and traumatic experiences.

The emotional and psychological toll of this experience cannot be overstated. It has left scars that take years to heal, constantly resurfacing in the form of **nightmares and anxiety**. This pain compounded the lost time—every month felt like three months of suffering due to the intense distress and helplessness I endured.

- The continuous burdens and trauma hindered my ability to focus on meaningful academic work, delaying my progress and creating additional obstacles for my research and professional development.
- The forced enrollment in the two English courses, which was both unnecessary and unsuitable for my needs, consumed time and energy that could have been directed toward my actual academic goals.
- The prolonged trauma and helplessness caused by her actions destroyed my mental peace and created a lasting emotional burden.
- The lack of communication and forceful nature of her decisions added layers of insult and humiliation, leaving me feeling powerless and unsupported.

The DGS’s actions reflect a systemic misuse of authority, prioritizing her personal agenda over the needs and well-being of students.

Her disregard for effective communication and the predictable negative consequences of her decisions demonstrates a profound neglect of her responsibilities as a program director.

### **13. Ignored and Isolated in the Aftermath of the English Course Incident (2022.12-2024.1)**

Throughout the aftermath of the plagiarism accusation and the issues surrounding the English course, the DGS and the English department engaged in extensive discussions without including me. Despite being the central party affected by the situation, I was entirely ignored and excluded from these conversations.

I attempted to reach out to the English department directly to resolve the issue, but they appeared to be completely aligned with the DGS. This created a power imbalance that left me feeling isolated and helpless, with no meaningful way to advocate for myself.

- When a critical meeting was scheduled between myself, the English department, and the DGS to address the situation, the DGS **deliberately found excuses not to attend**. Her absence further demonstrated her lack of commitment to resolving the issue fairly or supporting me during a pivotal moment in the process.
- This deliberate avoidance not only delayed the resolution but also amplified my sense of abandonment, leaving me to face an already hostile English department without any support or representation.

After the incident was formally “resolved,” the DGS **ceased all communication with me** for approximately **two years**, from late 2022 to early 2024. During this time, she made no effort to check on my academic progress, emotional well-being, or recovery from the traumatic experiences she had helped perpetuate.

This prolonged period of silence and neglect further solidified her pattern of **abandoning students after imposing burdens on them**, reflecting a profound failure to fulfill her role as a program director.

- Being excluded from discussions between the DGS and the English department stripped me of my agency and ability to advocate for myself. The alignment between the two parties left me feeling powerless, forced to accept decisions that were made without my input or consent.
- The DGS’s deliberate avoidance of key meetings and refusal to engage with me during the resolution process deepened my feelings of isolation and abandonment. This further compounded the trauma caused by the initial incident, extending its emotional toll over a prolonged period.

The DGS’s two-year period of neglect left me without guidance or support during a critical time in my academic journey (she did not actually ever provided any for me). Her lack of involvement hindered my ability to recover from the setbacks caused by the English course incident and delayed my academic progress further.

#### 14. Superficial and Insensitive Attempt at Contact (2024.1)

After completely ignoring my situation and providing no communication or support for nearly two years—from late 2022 to early 2024—the DGS **unexpectedly reached out** to me as if nothing had happened.

Her message, which casually thanked me for my past contributions, was devoid of any acknowledgment of the trauma and setbacks caused by her actions or the lasting impact of her neglect.

- This superficial outreach was not accompanied by any attempt to address or apologize for her previous actions, including:
  - The forced enrollment in an unsuitable English course.
  - The exclusion and isolation I experienced during the aftermath of the plagiarism accusation.
  - The additional burdens and academic probation she imposed without justification or communication.
- Her message failed to recognize the emotional and academic toll these actions had taken on me, further demonstrating her inability—or unwillingness—to take accountability for her role in the harm caused.

This casual, surface-level communication came across as disingenuous and insensitive, further exacerbating my feelings of frustration and abandonment.

Instead of offering genuine support, reconciliation, or acknowledgment of past failures, the DGS’s message felt like an attempt to absolve herself of responsibility without engaging in meaningful dialogue or addressing the damage caused.

The sudden and casual nature of the DGS's message reopened emotional wounds from the years of neglect and mistreatment, reminding me of the unresolved trauma I had endured. Her failure to acknowledge the harm caused further emphasized her indifference to the lasting impact of her actions.

- This superficial outreach reinforced my lack of trust in her ability to genuinely support students or take responsibility for her mistakes. It highlighted a pattern of avoiding accountability while maintaining a facade of engagement.

The DGS's failure to address the core issues or acknowledge her past actions squandered an opportunity to repair the damage done. Instead, her message served as **a reminder of her ongoing failure** to fulfill her responsibilities as a program director.

### **15. Sudden Course Requirement Notice Without Prior Discussion or Academic Follow-Up (2024.6.5)**

Despite my strong academic performance in my first year (earning all A grades) and the emergence of significant academic and personal challenges in subsequent years, the DGS never initiated any discussion or follow-up about my academic progress.

Over the years, as my situation became increasingly difficult, the DGS ignored my struggles and failed to provide any meaningful guidance or support to help me address these challenges.

- In June 2024, the DGS **abruptly sent an email** (her usual way) stating that I was missing certain course requirements, despite having provided no prior guidance or oversight on my academic plan.
- This sudden notice came without any prior discussion or acknowledgment of the obstacles I had faced in completing my coursework. It highlighted her complete neglect of her role in monitoring and supporting students' academic progress.

The DGS's email was not only untimely but also completely disconnected from the reality of my situation. After years of neglect and failing to engage in meaningful dialogue about my academic journey, this sudden intervention felt arbitrary and inconsistent.

Her approach lacked context, care, or understanding, further exacerbating the sense of disorganization and lack of accountability in her handling of student support.

### **16. A Pattern of Acting Without Understanding or Engagement (all years)**

The DGS has consistently demonstrated a pattern of imposing punitive measures or issuing sudden notifications without any prior understanding or engagement with my situation.

She has repeatedly shown a lack of knowledge about my academic progress, personal challenges, or even basic details of my circumstances. Despite this, she regularly acts unilaterally, enforcing punishments or making demands without seeking input or context.

- **Academic Probation Without Communication:** The DGS placed me on academic probation and imposed a series of burdensome tasks without discussing my circumstances or even responding to my requests for help. This action was taken without understanding my needs or providing any meaningful support.

- **Forced Enrollment in Unsuitable Courses:** She forcefully enrolled me in courses under the pretext of "support" without consulting me or evaluating whether the courses were appropriate or beneficial for my academic goals.
- **Sudden Notification of Missing Requirements:** In June 2024, she abruptly emailed me to say I was missing certain course requirements, despite years of neglecting her responsibility to monitor or guide my academic progress. This notification came without prior discussion or acknowledgment of the challenges I faced in meeting these requirements.

The DGS's approach reflects a systemic failure to engage with or understand the students under her responsibility. Instead of fostering dialogue or providing proactive guidance, she relies on sudden, uninformed actions that create confusion, stress, and further disruption.

Her behavior consistently disregards the principles of fairness and collaboration, instead prioritizing control and punishment over meaningful support.

The DGS's sudden and uninformed actions have repeatedly created unnecessary stress, confusion, and frustration. Each instance of her acting without understanding has compounded my emotional distress and undermined my trust in the institution.

Her punitive measures and sudden notifications have repeatedly disrupted my academic progress, forcing me to divert time and energy away from meaningful academic pursuits to address arbitrary demands or recover from the impact of her decisions.

This pattern of neglect and uninformed decision-making has eroded my trust in her ability to provide genuine support or fulfill her role as a program director. It highlights a systemic issue in how students' needs and challenges are managed within the program.

## 17. A Pattern of Control, Neglect, and Disrespect (all years)

The DGS consistently ignored my words and requests, insisting on her own thoughts and actions without considering my perspective or circumstances.

She failed to respond to multiple requests for in-person meetings, refusing to engage in meaningful dialogue. This lack of communication left me feeling abandoned and unsupported in navigating my academic journey.

- The DGS never demonstrated any genuine interest in my academic progress. She did not check in on my status, discuss my goals, or provide any guidance.
- When I initially shared my thoughts on academics with her, her response was deeply disappointing, showing a lack of understanding or care for my aspirations.
- Over the years, she has consistently neglected to discuss or monitor my academic journey, leaving me to manage everything on my own while enduring the hindrances and burdens she imposed on me.

The DGS's interactions with me have been characterized by a desire for control and an emphasis on pushing for progress, but without respect or genuine support. This lack of respect has manifested in **repeated public insults and pressure**, which have persisted for years. Her actions prioritize control and punishment over meaningful engagement, creating an environment where I felt uncomfortable sharing any progress with her.

Rather than taking accountability for the harm caused by her actions, the DGS has consistently retreated from her responsibilities and ignored me entirely. Despite already trampling on my academic and personal life, she has made no effort to rectify the damage or offer meaningful support.

Her focus has remained on **applying pressure and nitpicking students**, rather than offering constructive or supportive guidance.

My academic progress was left completely unattended. I had to independently monitor and manage every aspect of my journey, all while dealing with the additional burdens and hindrances imposed by the DGS.

She only expressed interest in my course requirements or fifth-year check-in forms **at the last minute**, with no prior discussions or planning. Her involvement has been reactionary and punitive, rather than proactive or supportive.

The DGS's lack of respect and engagement left me feeling isolated and unsupported, undermining my confidence in sharing progress or seeking guidance. Her actions created a hostile environment where I had to navigate my academic journey alone, with little to no institutional support.

## **18. Exaggerating Minor Issues While Ignoring Core Responsibilities (2023.12)**

On December 11, 2023, I inadvertently failed to reply promptly to an email from a lecturer. The DGS **immediately escalated the situation** by sending an email with the subject line "Important," copying both the dean and my current advisor.

This overreaction was entirely disproportionate to the nature of the issue, as the delayed response to the lecturer's email was minor and easily resolvable. Rather than addressing the matter constructively, the DGS chose to involve senior figures, creating unnecessary stress and embarrassment.

This incident reflects the DGS's habitual approach of amplifying trivial matters instead of addressing her core responsibilities. Rather than working directly with me to resolve the issue in a constructive manner, she chose to involve senior figures, reinforcing a punitive and controlling dynamic.

While she acted swiftly to highlight a minor oversight, she has consistently failed to engage with far more critical aspects of my academic progress, such as providing guidance on essential milestones like committee formation and fifth-year check-ins.

- The public nature of this escalation, coupled with the emotional toll of the situation, directly disrupted my ability to focus on my research. The involvement of senior figures like the chair and my current advisor created an unnecessary sense of urgency and stress, distracting me from my ongoing projects.
- This incident is part of a broader pattern where the DGS's actions have repeatedly diverted my attention away from meaningful academic work to address arbitrary demands and the fallout from her decisions.
- The unnecessary escalation caused significant stress and anxiety, particularly given the involvement of senior figures. The public nature of her communication felt humiliating and undermining, leaving me feeling unsupported and vulnerable.
- By involving senior figures in such a trivial matter, the DGS potentially strained my professional relationships with both the chair and my current advisor. This escalation distorted the perception of my behavior over a minor oversight and placed me under unnecessary scrutiny.
- The emotional toll and distractions caused by this incident directly hindered my ability to focus on my research. The DGS's pattern of unnecessary interventions has consistently created obstacles to my academic progress, delaying meaningful work and forcing me to prioritize damage control over research advancement.

## **19. Public Humiliation Over Five Years: A Source of Trauma and Nightmare (all years)**

For five years, the DGS has repeatedly subjected me to public humiliation, escalating even minor issues in ways that undermine my dignity and create unnecessary stress.

Her actions, such as copying senior figures like the dean and my advisor in trivial matters, have fostered an environment where I feel scrutinized and unsupported, rather than encouraged and guided.

Over time, the DGS herself has become a significant source of trauma for me. Her persistent pattern of controlling, punitive, and humiliating behavior has left deep emotional scars, making her not just a figure of authority, but a constant source of stress and fear in my academic journey.

- The sense of vulnerability and helplessness her actions have caused has profoundly affected my confidence, well-being, and ability to focus on my research and studies.
- The DGS's behavior has not only disrupted my academic progress but has also infiltrated my personal life, becoming a recurring nightmare that affects my mental health.
- Her actions have left me with lasting emotional wounds, replaying in my mind as moments of humiliation and disrespect that are difficult to heal. This emotional toll continues to hinder my ability to fully engage in my work or plan for my future.

The persistent humiliation and disregard for my dignity have eroded my confidence and self-worth, leaving me with a profound sense of fear and unease in academic settings.

Her behavior has turned what should have been an enriching academic journey into a prolonged period of emotional struggle, with moments of public embarrassment and disrespect leaving lasting scars.

The constant stress and fear caused by her actions have significantly hindered my ability to focus on meaningful academic work. Each instance of public humiliation further delayed my progress, diverting my energy away from research and into coping with the emotional toll of her actions.

The DGS's actions have created an environment where I feel unable to freely express concerns, share progress, or seek guidance. This has not only affected my academic development but also contributed to a sense of professional isolation and vulnerability.

## **20. Trampling on My Life While Telling Sweet Lies of Concern (all years)**

The DGS consistently trampled on my life and well-being through her controlling, punitive, and dismissive actions, all while perpetuating the sweet lie of "concerning students."

Her behavior demonstrates a stark contradiction: presenting an image of care and support while consistently imposing additional burdens, punishment, and insult on students like me, even when I was doing my best to meet expectations under extremely challenging circumstances.

- Despite working hard and producing quality work, I faced continuous unrecognition, unfounded accusations, and harsh academic probation measures.
- The environment created by the DGS sent a deeply demoralizing message: even responsible and diligent efforts that meet acceptable standards only lead to more punishment and insult. It leaves one questioning: **"What is the good of being good?"**

For nearly two years, I was unable to register for classes, suffering through a tough and horrible experience caused by the DGS's actions and neglect.

During this time, I struggled to focus on my research and push forward any progress, as the overwhelming burdens imposed by her actions consumed my mental and emotional energy.

- The extra tasks and burdens imposed by the DGS cost me an enormous amount of time, leaving me exhausted and emotionally drained.
- The continuous cycle of unrecognition, accusations, and probation destroyed my mental health, forcing me to navigate an academic environment filled with hostility and humiliation.
- The overwhelming experiences significantly hindered my ability to maintain consistent performance across various aspects of my academic life.
- As a result, my academic record does not reflect my true potential, with suboptimal outcomes caused by the distractions, stress, and lack of support I endured under the DGS's oversight.

Being unable to register for classes or focus on research for nearly two years has had a lasting impact on my academic trajectory, delaying my progress and creating additional barriers to achieving my professional goals.

## **21. Avoiding Dialogue and Weaponizing Past Mistakes to Suppress Resistance**

Despite my repeated efforts to openly express dissatisfaction with the prolonged assignment of heavy yet simple courses, the DGS deliberately avoided any direct communication or face-to-face meetings with me.

Her avoidance of meaningful dialogue further demonstrated her unwillingness to address my concerns constructively, leaving me isolated and unsupported in resolving these issues.

### **Weaponizing Feedback from My Advisor**

- To suppress my resistance and protests, the DGS circumvented direct communication by contacting my research advisor instead. Under the pretense of checking my academic progress, she used this feedback as leverage to organize and control my behavior, effectively undermining my ability to advocate for myself.
- This tactic not only placed unnecessary pressure on my advisor-student relationship but also served as a method of intimidation, creating a hostile and manipulative environment.

### **Exploiting Past Academic Struggles**

- The DGS further sought to discredit me by bringing up a D grade I received in a past course. This grade was a result of the overwhelming difficulties I was experiencing at the time, during which I submitted only one assignment and was unaware of how to withdraw from the course.
- Instead of acknowledging the broader context of my struggles or providing constructive support, the DGS used this past mistake as a tool to shift blame onto me, further justifying her oppressive actions and discrediting my protests.

### **Suppression of Academic Freedom**



- By avoiding direct dialogue and using my advisor's feedback as leverage, the DGS undermined my ability to freely express concerns or resist oppressive practices. This created an environment where advocacy and resistance were met with punishment rather than understanding.

The DGS's manipulative tactics, combined with her use of past struggles to shift blame, exacerbated the emotional and psychological toll of an already overwhelming situation.

Her refusal to address my concerns directly left me feeling powerless and humiliated, further compounding my sense of isolation and frustration.

The DGS's involvement in my advisor-student relationship created unnecessary tension and pressure, potentially straining a critical academic partnership that should have been focused on research and collaboration rather than conflict.

The continued assignment of heavy but simple courses, combined with the DGS's resistance to meaningful dialogue, further delayed my academic progress and hindered my ability to focus on research and meaningful academic work.

## **22. Using Past Struggles as Leverage to Suppress Protests (2024.10.9)**

In a meeting intended to address TA responsibilities, involving the DGS, one of her colleagues (Stuart), and myself, the DGS used my past struggles as leverage to suppress my protests and diminish my credibility.

The meeting, which was already emotionally charged for me, quickly turned into a platform for her to criticize and demean me, rather than discussing the intended topic or providing any constructive guidance.

- Despite my visible emotional distress, including crying and expressing frustration, the DGS continuously interrupted and criticized me throughout the meeting.
- Her remarks were not only dismissive but actively demeaning, filled with language that sought to belittle and suppress my voice. Each interruption and negative comment further escalated my emotional pain and frustration, leaving me feeling completely powerless.

Although the meeting was scheduled to discuss TA responsibilities, the DGS never addressed the intended topic. Instead, she derailed the conversation, using it as an opportunity to further suppress my protests and undermine my concerns.

After inflicting significant emotional harm, she abruptly ended the meeting, stating that she had another commitment to attend, leaving the discussion unresolved and my mental state in disarray.

### **Severe Emotional and Psychological Damage**

- This meeting, meant to provide clarity and support for my TA tasks, became a source of deep emotional trauma. The persistent interruptions, criticism, and demeaning remarks from the DGS left me feeling attacked, humiliated, and silenced.
- The experience exacerbated my existing stress and mental health challenges, creating a lasting sense of vulnerability and despair.

### **Suppression of My Voice and Advocacy**

- By weaponizing my past struggles and using the meeting as a platform for criticism, the DGS effectively suppressed my ability to advocate for myself or address the legitimate issues I was raising.
- Her actions undermined my confidence in future discussions, leaving me hesitant to speak up for fear of further humiliation and suppression.

### **Breakdown of Trust and Purpose**

- The DGS's refusal to address the meeting's intended purpose—TA responsibilities—demonstrated a lack of accountability and respect for the process. Her actions eroded my trust in her ability to provide meaningful support or foster constructive dialogue.

## **23. A Painful and Unprofessional Meeting: Trampling on My Well-Being (2024.10.9)**

During a meeting intended to discuss TA tasks, the DGS acted in a highly unprofessional manner, constantly interrupting my words and making remarks that were deeply bothersome.

Given my already fragile state—I was crying, irritated, and visibly distressed—her persistent interruptions and nitpicking only exacerbated my emotional pain. Stuart was also present at the meeting, witnessing her behavior.

- The meeting, intended to address specific TA-related tasks, devolved into a session where the DGS used the opportunity to blame me and criticize me without providing any relevant or constructive information.
- Her behavior reflected a consistent pattern of looking down on me and manipulating situations to align with her personal preferences, disregarding both the purpose of the meeting and my well-being.

### **Denial of Responsibility and Gaslighting**

- Despite her previous acknowledgment of my contributions and even thanking me for my efforts, the DGS denied her role in creating the issues I faced and insisted on blaming me for them instead.
- This gaslighting behavior further undermined my confidence, leaving me feeling invalidated and unjustly attacked.

The meeting left me with a growing sense of hatred toward the DGS, as her actions felt like a deliberate attempt to trample on my life and destroy my well-being. This intense emotional turmoil has persisted, making it nearly impossible for me to forgive her. The hate has consumed my thoughts, keeping me awake at night and haunting me with nightmares throughout the year.

The overwhelming stress and emotional pain caused by this meeting have taken a toll on my mental health, leaving me drained and unable to move past the incident. The continued replaying of the meeting in my mind has hindered my ability to focus on my work, damaged my motivation, and affected my overall quality of life.

The DGS's unprofessional and manipulative behavior has completely eroded my trust in her ability to lead or support students. This meeting, like many of her actions, reinforced the hostile environment she created, making it difficult for me to engage constructively with her or the institution.

## **24. Denial of Responsibility and Persistent Gaslighting: A Deeply Harmful Pattern (2024.10.9)**

Despite acknowledging my past contributions and even expressing gratitude for my efforts, the DGS later denied her role in creating the challenges I faced.

Her actions displayed a consistent refusal to take accountability for her decisions and behaviors, instead shifting the blame onto me. This refusal to acknowledge her part in the situation not only invalidated my experiences but also reinforced a narrative that I was at fault for circumstances beyond my control.

### **Gaslighting as a Tool of Control**

- The DGS's behavior extended beyond denial—it was a deliberate form of psychological manipulation. By insisting that I was to blame for issues she had caused or exacerbated, she created a distorted reality where I was made to feel guilty and responsible for failures or setbacks that were not mine to own.
- This gaslighting behavior further deepened my emotional pain and confusion, as I was left questioning my own perceptions, decisions, and worth. It became increasingly difficult to separate my actual shortcomings (if any) from the fabricated accusations and manipulations she perpetuated.

### **Undermining Confidence and Well-Being**

- The repeated denial of responsibility and use of gaslighting tactics had a profoundly damaging effect on my confidence and well-being.
  - Each instance of her blaming me for her actions chipped away at my sense of self-worth and ability to trust my own judgment.
  - I was left feeling invalidated and attacked, unable to defend myself against accusations that were unfounded but presented as indisputable truths.

### **Strategic Use of Gratitude and Blame**

- The DGS's approach of alternating between moments of apparent gratitude and abrupt shifts to criticism or blame was particularly insidious.
  - By occasionally acknowledging my efforts, she created a false sense of validation, only to use it later as leverage to discredit me.
  - This strategy reinforced a dynamic of control, where her approval and acknowledgment were fleeting and conditional, further destabilizing my ability to advocate for myself.

The constant gaslighting and denial of responsibility caused significant emotional trauma, leaving me with feelings of helplessness and despair. I struggled with nightmares, insomnia, and a persistent sense of anger and frustration that made it difficult to focus on my work or find peace in my daily life.

The manipulation undermined my ability to trust my own perceptions and decisions, creating a lasting impact on my confidence. This erosion of self-trust extended into other areas of my academic and personal life, making it harder to recover from setbacks or believe in my own abilities.

### **Toxic Academic Environment**

- The DGS's actions fostered a toxic environment where I felt constantly scrutinized, devalued, and unsupported. This hostile atmosphere not only impeded my academic progress but also contributed to a sense of professional isolation and vulnerability.
- Gaslighting is not just a misunderstanding or mistake—it is a deliberate strategy that undermines a person's mental stability. The DGS's use of this tactic magnifies its harm by combining it with her positional authority over students.
- By denying responsibility and blaming you, she stripped away your ability to advocate for yourself and left you without the autonomy to navigate your academic challenges independently.

Her behavior highlights how power imbalances can be exploited to control and suppress students, perpetuating a cycle of harm while evading accountability.

## **25. Failure to Follow Through: Ignoring Thesis Committee Support for Years (2022.2.7)**

On February 7, 2022, the DGS sent a group email regarding the formation of thesis committees, stating that follow-up emails would be sent to provide further guidance.

However, over the course of **five years**, no such follow-up email was ever sent to me. This complete lack of follow-through on a critical academic requirement reflects a profound neglect of her responsibilities as a program director.

- The formation of a thesis committee is a fundamental milestone for any graduate student, serving as the foundation for research oversight and academic progress.
- By failing to provide further communication or guidance, the DGS left me without the necessary structure or support to proceed effectively with this critical academic requirement.

This incident is not an isolated case but part of a broader pattern of neglect and unprofessionalism. The DGS has repeatedly failed to communicate effectively or provide the support promised in her emails and statements.

Her failure to follow through on this key responsibility further underscores her disregard for students' academic needs and her role as a leader within the program.

- The absence of follow-up communication or guidance regarding thesis committee formation caused significant delays in my academic progress. Without a clear structure or roadmap, I was forced to navigate this critical process on my own, losing valuable time that could have been spent advancing my research.
- The lack of follow-through created ongoing uncertainty and stress, as I was left without clarity on how to proceed or whom to approach for guidance. This added to the emotional toll of an already challenging academic environment.

The DGS's **failure to provide promised communication** reflects a systemic issue of accountability within the program. Her neglect of such a critical responsibility has had a cascading effect on my academic journey, highlighting broader deficiencies in how student support is managed.

## **26. Neglect or Exclusion? A Five-Year Gap in Critical Academic Support (2022.2.7)**

On February 7, 2022, the DGS sent a group email regarding the formation of thesis committees, promising further guidance through follow-up emails. Despite this promise, I did not receive any such communication over the **five years**.

This lack of follow-up could initially be viewed as negligence. However, the prolonged and systemic nature of this behavior raises serious questions about whether it was part of a broader pattern of **exclusion** or even **discrimination**.

The absence of communication on such a fundamental academic matter isolated me from critical support and resources, disproportionately affecting my ability to make progress compared to peers who may have received timely guidance.

- If other students in the program received the promised follow-up or individualized support, the DGS's failure to include me in this process reflects a form of **selective engagement**.
- Such selective behavior goes beyond mere oversight and suggests potential **bias** or **discriminatory exclusion**, which could stem from preconceived notions, personal biases, or deliberate neglect toward certain students.

This incident aligns with a broader pattern in the DGS's interactions with me, where she consistently avoided direct communication, denied me opportunities for dialogue, and acted in ways that marginalized my academic experience.

Her consistent failure to support me, paired with her punitive and dismissive behavior in other instances, suggests that this exclusion was not incidental but part of a deeper pattern of disregard or bias.

- The absence of follow-up guidance on thesis committee formation delayed my academic progress significantly, leaving me without the structural support necessary for research oversight and advancement.
- Compared to peers who may have received timely assistance, I was placed at a distinct disadvantage, losing valuable time and momentum in my academic journey.

The lack of inclusion in critical academic communications left me feeling isolated and excluded from the academic community. This sense of exclusion compounded the emotional toll of navigating an already challenging academic environment, undermining my confidence and trust in institutional support.

If this behavior extended beyond me, it highlights systemic inequities in how academic support is distributed. If it was targeted, it reflects a clear case of **discrimination**, where certain students are marginalized based on subjective or biased criteria.

## **27. From Neglect to Blame: Using Her Own Failures to Threaten Further Punishment (2024.12)**

In December 2024, after years of failing to provide any communication regarding thesis committee formation, the DGS suddenly and unreasonably demanded that I and my advisor submit the fifth-year check-in form.

This form is entirely predicated on having an established thesis committee—a milestone I was unable to achieve due to her neglect and failure to fulfill her responsibilities as a program director.

- Despite being fully aware that I lacked a thesis committee due to her prolonged neglect, the DGS had the audacity to blame both me and my advisor for the missing form.
- To further escalate the situation, she threatened to impose another **probation** on me, using her own failures as leverage to punish me for circumstances she created. This behavior reflects a profound misuse of authority and a complete lack of accountability.

This incident is emblematic of a broader pattern in the DGS's behavior, where she deflects responsibility for her own failures onto students and weaponizes their struggles to maintain control.

By threatening probation, she not only shifted blame but also created unnecessary stress and fear, further hindering my ability to recover from the setbacks caused by her initial neglect.

- The DGS's sudden demand and accompanying blame exacerbated the emotional toll of her years of neglect. Her threats of probation added layers of stress and anxiety, further damaging my mental health and ability to focus on academic progress.
- Her behavior reinforced feelings of frustration, helplessness, and humiliation, as I was held responsible for issues rooted in her long-standing neglect.

By involving my advisor in this blame game, the DGS placed unnecessary pressure on my advisor-student relationship, straining what should have been a collaborative and supportive dynamic.

This interference undermined trust and created additional barriers to effective communication and academic progress.

Her failure to facilitate thesis committee formation delayed my ability to complete key academic milestones, such as the fifth-year check-in process. This, in turn, extended the timeline of my academic program and compounded the negative impact on my research progress.

## **28. Fellowship Offer Under Pressure: A Contradictory Gesture After Years of Neglect**

In the winter semester of 2025, the DGS offered me fellowship support for the first time. However, this gesture did not reflect genuine concern or proactive support. Instead, it appeared to be a reactionary move, likely motivated by the pressure of my potential formal complaints to higher authorities.

This offer was made without any explanation or apology and was communicated through a cold and impersonal document. Such an approach further demonstrated her indifference to students' well-being.

- **Years of Neglect:**
  - Over the past several years, I endured academic delays, psychological trauma, and significant hardships, during which the DGS showed no concern or offered any meaningful support.
  - Despite being fully aware of my struggles, she ignored my needs and only decided to provide financial aid when faced with the pressure of potential accountability. This sudden gesture is inconsistent with her history of indifference and appears insincere.
- **A Superficial Attempt at Compensation:**
  - This fellowship offer seems more like a symbolic effort to mitigate the potential consequences of her actions rather than a genuine attempt to address the harm caused.
  - She made no effort to acknowledge her neglect or take further steps to repair the damage done to my academic progress and well-being.
- **Fear of Accountability:**
  - It is likely that the DGS recognized my ongoing communications with the department chair and program head, which might lead to a formal complaint. The fellowship offer seems to be a defensive measure to construct an image of "supporting students."
- **Deflecting Attention:**
  - By offering this fellowship, the DGS could attempt to present it as evidence of her support and deflect scrutiny from her long-term neglect. This behavior risks being perceived as manipulative rather than genuinely supportive.

While the fellowship provides financial assistance, it cannot undo the academic delays, psychological trauma, and personal struggles caused by her prolonged neglect.

At the times when I needed the most support, the DGS remained indifferent and controlling. Offering fellowship now, under pressure, does little to rebuild trust or repair the harm caused.

This gesture only highlights the injustice I faced, as it feels more like a calculated move to serve her own interests rather than addressing the needs of students.

The contrast between the years of suffering and this sudden "gesture of support" exacerbates my frustration and disappointment in her leadership.

- This event underscores broader systemic issues within the institution:
  - A lack of timely and sincere student support.
  - The tendency to prioritize self-preservation over addressing legitimate student needs.
  - The use of reactive measures rather than proactive support to resolve problems.

**Neglect and Deflection:** She consistently ignored my struggles and delayed actions until external pressures forced her hand.

**Superficial Gestures:** Her efforts appear designed to protect her position rather than address the harm done to students.

**Systemic Implications:** This highlights the need for institutional reforms to ensure that support mechanisms are student-focused, transparent, and held accountable.

## **Overall Reflection on the Past Five Years (2020 Autumn - 2024 Autumn)**

Over the past five years, Zosia's actions have been defined by a pattern of applying pressure and punishment, often without effective communication, prior investigation, or any meaningful effort to understand my situation. She has consistently demonstrated a lack of awareness of my academic progress, asking intrusive and uncomfortable questions without context or follow-up. Instead of engaging in constructive dialogue, she imposed measures she assumed would be helpful, but they were often forcefully applied, counterproductive, and detached from my actual needs.

Her approach was marked by a blatant disregard for my well-being. She frequently punished and publicly humiliated me, all while ignoring my input and treating my voice as irrelevant. During the most challenging and vulnerable moments of my academic journey, she remained silent, standing by without offering support or guidance. Her occasional "check-ins" were superficial, seemingly intended only to maintain appearances in front of higher authorities. Behind the scenes, however, she ignored my struggles, abused her position, and perpetuated a cycle of neglect and control. These are not subjective impressions but documented facts supported by substantial evidence.

### **1. Persistent Neglect and Failure to Address My Needs**

Throughout this period, my needs, aspirations, and circumstances were entirely ignored. Zosia repeatedly disregarded my attempts to communicate my career goals and the support I required to achieve them. Instead, I was burdened with unnecessary and arbitrary tasks that were neither mandatory nor aligned with my academic trajectory. These impositions were deeply damaging, reflecting her apparent preference for controlling and punishing students rather than providing genuine support.

For instance, in October 2022, I was forcefully assigned to two lab sessions, including night sessions, while also being required to take my own coursework, fulfill probationary tasks, and attend English classes that were imposed without consultation. This workload was extreme, unreasonable, and unsustainable, leaving me overwhelmed and unable to focus on my research or personal goals. My protests were ignored, and my attempts to express what I truly needed were met with deaf ears.

### **2. Punishment and Denial of Opportunities**

In August 2024, my application for advanced courses was denied on the grounds that I had not held discussion sessions. This was a direct consequence of the forced lab assignments and overwhelming schedule imposed by Zosia, which left no room for fulfilling such requirements. The denial not only punished me for circumstances beyond my control but also further delayed my academic progress.

This pattern of punishment extended beyond academic tasks. Zosia frequently resorted to public humiliation, blame, and nitpicking, creating a hostile and demoralizing environment. At no point did she acknowledge the impact of her actions or take steps to mitigate the harm she caused.

### **3. A Reactive and Superficial Gesture of Support**

In winter 2025, Zosia offered me fellowship support for the first time. While this should have been a positive development, it felt more like a reactionary gesture made under the pressure of my communications with higher authorities. The fellowship came too late to address the immense damage already inflicted during the most difficult years of my academic journey. Delivered through a cold, impersonal document, this "support" only highlighted the inconsistency and superficiality of her actions.



Rather than addressing the root causes of the harm or acknowledging her neglect, Zosia appeared to use this gesture as a means of deflecting accountability and presenting an image of supportiveness to her superiors.

#### **4. Manipulation, Denial, and Escalation**

Zosia's refusal to acknowledge her role in worsening my situation has been a persistent issue. Despite clear evidence of her neglect and unprofessionalism, she continued to deny responsibility, shifting blame onto me for the consequences of her actions. Her insistence on denying the harm she caused, while simultaneously maintaining control over my academic life, created a toxic environment that stifled my progress and eroded my confidence.

Her actions were not isolated incidents but part of a broader pattern of neglect, manipulation, and escalation. By imposing excessive workloads, withholding meaningful support, and resorting to public humiliation, she systematically undermined my well-being and academic potential.

#### **5. Emotional and Academic Consequences**

The cumulative impact of Zosia's actions has been extraordinary and profoundly damaging. I endured prolonged academic delays, severe mental health challenges, and repeated instances of public humiliation. Her actions pushed me to the brink of collapse, and at times, I found myself dangerously close to breaking under the weight of it all.

Despite these challenges, I worked tirelessly to navigate my academic and career goals independently, squeezing precious time out of an intense and unreasonable schedule. This required extraordinary effort and resilience, but it came at great personal cost. My academic record does not reflect my full potential, as my performance was consistently hindered by the additional burdens, lack of support, and constant stress imposed by Zosia.

### **Conclusion: An Escalating Cycle of Harm**

The actions and behaviors I have described are not isolated or exaggerated but part of a consistent and well-documented pattern. Over five years, Zosia has failed to provide the guidance and support expected of her role, opting instead to impose control, punishment, and humiliation. Even when faced with clear evidence of her mistakes, she has repeatedly retreated from accountability, insisting on blaming me while perpetuating her unprofessional behavior.

Her actions have created a hostile and unsupportive environment that has significantly hindered my academic progress and severely impacted my well-being. While I have received fellowship support for the winter of 2025, this token gesture comes far too late to undo the years of harm I have endured. Instead, it serves as a reminder of the profound failure to address my needs during the most critical and challenging times of my academic journey.

The need for accountability is clear. The damage caused by Zosia's behavior extends beyond my individual case, highlighting systemic issues that must be addressed to ensure future students are not subjected to the same neglect and harm.

*The fact that I could stand here today, stating these words, alive, is already a miracle after such experiences.*

## Quantified Time Lost Due to Systematic DGS Failures and Neglect (2020–2025)

### PHYS 335 issue1 (2020.12)

- No reply to my email asking for meeting information, leaving me without critical details about the course.
- Failed to provide any information or expectations about the class during the meeting, making it impossible for me to understand the scope or requirements of the project.
- Claimed that I was enrolled in the class and asked me to submit a proposal, but showed no awareness of my actual enrollment status or progress in the class.

#### Effect:

- I was completely lost in this class despite reaching out for clarification at a very early stage, which demonstrates her lack of communication and awareness regarding the students' academic needs.
- This created a sense of isolation and confusion, as I had to navigate the class without any clear expectations or guidance.
- The lack of direction severely hindered my ability to make meaningful progress on the PHYS 335 project, delaying my overall academic trajectory.

#### Additional Notes:

- This incident reflects a broader pattern of negligence and mismanagement, where she failed to respond to basic student needs or ensure proper oversight of academic progress.
- The confusion and lack of expectations also negatively impacted my collaboration with peers and instructors involved in the project, as I was unable to align my efforts with the course requirements.

#### Delayed Time:

- As a year-long project, this fault on her side caused a six-month delay in my ability to work towards the intended outcome of the PHYS 335 class.
- **Delayed Time: 0.5 years.**

## PHYS 335 issue2 (2021.9)

- Failed to register me for the class, leaving me without formal enrollment or recognition throughout the course.
- Ignored my situation and provided no support in addressing the significant delay in the submission of my project report.
- Offered zero assistance in facilitating communication with course administrator, even when cc'ed on emails that explicitly requested her intervention.
- Completely neglected my case throughout this year-long class, failing to provide any oversight, advice, or follow-up.

### Effect:

- My advisor at the time, Tian Zhong, continuously blamed me for this issue, repeatedly bringing it up during 2021.6–2022.4.
- This contributed directly to the early and escalating breakdown of my working relationship with him, ultimately culminating in my forced removal from his lab in 2022.
- Her lack of involvement not only delayed the resolution of this matter but also exacerbated tensions between me and my advisor, creating an environment of misunderstanding and conflict.

### Additional Notes:

- The complete lack of registration and follow-up reflects a systemic failure in her duties as DGS, as students rely on her to facilitate enrollment, resolve academic delays, and mediate with advisors when necessary.
- The fallout from this issue extended beyond the PHYS 335 class, as it negatively impacted my standing with my advisor and created a hostile and unproductive working environment.

### Delayed Time:

- Wasted three months (2021.5.24–2021.9.5) after the deadline, during which the year-long project was already completed but unresolved due to her inaction.
- **Delayed Time: 0.25 years**

### Personal Accident (2021.3–6)

- My condition was first noticed by her colleagues, who directed me to her for support, believing she was the appropriate person to help.
- Despite this referral, her responses were superficial, indifferent, and lacked any sense of urgency or professionalism.
- Responded with plain words and generic sympathy, without providing concrete help, follow-up, or meaningful check-ins about what I was going through.
- Demonstrated consistent negligence and incompetence, leaving the issue unresolved and me without support during a critical time.

#### Effect:

- The lack of meaningful support extended the period of depression and emotional distress, which significantly impacted my ability to focus and work efficiently.
- This neglect not only prolonged my struggle but also eroded trust in her ability to provide support in her role as DGS.
- The repercussions lasted through most of 2021 (March to December), during which I operated at 50% efficiency or lower, struggling with the side effects of this prolonged period of emotional and psychological strain.

#### Delayed Time:

- The compounded inefficiency over 10 months equates to approximately 5 months of lost progress.
- **Delayed Time: 0.4 years.**

### Excluding me from important notification (2022.2.7)

- On February 7, 2022, she sent a department-wide email regarding “thesis committee members,” promising follow-up emails within six months. However, I never received any of the follow-up emails or further communications from her, not just within that timeframe but throughout the entirety of the following five years.
- The lack of communication about forming a thesis committee is a clear deviation from her responsibilities as DGS. This omission had catastrophic consequences for my academic progress, as forming a thesis committee is a foundational step for all PhD students.
- The exclusion of crucial notifications regarding thesis committee formation directly prevented me from completing the fifth-year check-in form, a critical institutional requirement. This omission is not merely an oversight; it reflects serious unprofessional conduct with potential implications of exclusion or discrimination.
- Similar exclusions from important email notifications have occurred multiple times throughout my program, creating a pattern of negligence and unprofessionalism.
- Despite her clear failure to fulfill her duties, she blamed me for the resulting delays, showing no accountability for her own role in this issue.

#### Effect:

- Her complete failure to include me in critical communications directly caused my thesis committee to remain unformed for years. This resulted in zero progress on committee-related milestones, leaving me unable to submit the fifth-year check-in form.
- This lack of progress is entirely attributable to her failure to provide necessary guidance, communication, and follow-up, as well as her unprofessional behavior in excluding me from vital information.

#### Delayed Time:

- This negligence directly delayed my academic progress for **three years** (from my second year to my fifth year), as the absence of a thesis committee prevented me from advancing in my PhD milestones.
- **Delayed Time: 3 years.**

### Advice meeting (2022.4.1)

- Despite openly sharing my academic progress, challenges, and long-term career goals, which had been clearly defined since the start of my PhD program in June 2020, she failed to provide any meaningful suggestions, feedback, or guidance.
- My concerns were dismissed outright, and I was not taken seriously throughout the meeting. Her indifference made it clear that she did not view my academic goals or progress as a priority.
- She completely ignored the deteriorating state of my academic progress, which was already severely affected by prior disruptions, and failed to discuss any actionable steps to address my situation.
- Made no effort to investigate the details of my case or understand my perspective, choosing instead to uncritically believe and rely on vague or unfounded explanations from other parties without any validation or follow-up.
- Imposed her personal assumptions about what was “appropriate” for me without consulting me, obtaining my confirmation, or aligning her actions with my academic and career objectives. This approach was not only dismissive but also fundamentally at odds with her professional responsibilities as DGS.

### Effect:

- My PhD program began with a clear career goal, defined in June 2020, that was central to my academic journey and aspirations. However, her persistent neglect, lack of support, and unprofessional conduct left this goal entirely unaddressed. I was forced to navigate my career direction independently, with no guidance or institutional support, despite her role explicitly requiring her to advise and assist students in achieving their academic and professional objectives.
- This failure to engage or provide meaningful input significantly hindered my ability to progress towards my goals, forcing me to spend years finding my own path while overcoming additional barriers caused by her mismanagement.
- Her behavior fundamentally contradicted her professional obligations, as she neglected her role as an academic advisor, prioritizing control and superficial actions over genuine support and understanding.

### Delayed Time:

- From June 2020 to February 2023, I was left without any effective guidance or actionable advice, causing a significant delay of **2.6 years** in making progress towards my clearly defined career goal. This represents a profound loss of time and opportunity during critical stages of my PhD program.
- **Delayed Time: 2.6 years.**

### Advice Meeting (2022.4.1) (continued)

- Despite being fully aware of my challenging situation, she failed to provide any resources or suggestions that could have been genuinely helpful.
- While I was clearly overwhelmed and struggling, she focused on promoting options she personally favored, pressuring me to accept them despite my objections and clear protest.
- My peers, who lacked her institutional authority, offered far more practical and constructive suggestions than she did. Her lack of meaningful input, despite her privileged position to access institutional resources, further highlighted her negligence.
- She entirely ignored the clear dysfunction in my TA tasks at the time, choosing not to check in or address these issues. Instead, she added punitive measures and blame, which severely impacted my mental health at an already fragile point.
- She left my case completely unattended. Not only did she fail to provide any meaningful support in this critical situation, but she also actively concealed my circumstances from other representatives, resulting in a persistent bad impression of me among other PSD representatives for years.

#### Effect:

- Despite being the first person I turned to during this crisis, I received no solid or effective help from her. Instead, she imposed her personal preferences for support without considering their appropriateness or relevance to my specific needs.
- This frustrating and dismissive interaction set off a chain reaction, creating profound negative effects over the next four years. These effects manifested in multiple aspects, including ongoing struggles with TA tasks, delayed coursework progress, and significant hindrances to my research focus and productivity.

#### Delayed Time:

- Time wasted without access to proper resources or information for finding a new advisor: **0.5 years.**
- Time-intensive introductory course assignments over four years significantly hindered my research progress: **1.5 years.**
- Negative effects on focus and coursework due to compounded stress and mismanagement: **1 year.**
- **Delayed Time: 3 years.**

## Forcefully register (2022.6.23) writing session (2022.10.13)

- I was forcefully registered for the AEPP and writing class without any prior communication or consultation. The registration was only communicated to me at the last minute, leaving no room for discussion or adjustment. This was not support but rather a continued exercise of personal control over me.
- Without any investigation into my situation or regard for my well-being, she engaged in discussions and coordination with the other side (the ELI) while completely ignoring my perspective. For instance, she determined that the early session was preferable without consulting me about my availability, demonstrating a pattern of neglect and disregard for my input. I was left entirely at the mercy of their decisions.
- The justification for this decision was framed as providing a "good experience," but the course itself was ill-suited for a third-year physics PhD student. It was clear from the outset that the writing class would not address any actual communication issues I may have faced, nor was it aligned with the core academic challenges I was encountering at the time.
- Her actions demonstrated zero care or thoughtfulness about my situation. Instead, she applied her personal will to force this decision upon me without understanding or considering my needs, goals, or current state of mind.

### Effect

- What was described as a "good experience" turned into a significant source of pain and trauma, with lasting effects that hindered my academic progress for years.
- Rather than providing any meaningful help, she added more burdens at a critical time when I was already struggling with unresolved issues from the initial accident.
- This decision shattered my mental peace, exacerbated existing injuries, and compounded my difficulties. These additional burdens were entirely avoidable had there been proper communication or care.

### Delayed Time

- The trauma and stress caused by this experience resulted in countless hours of wasted time and mental anguish, significantly delaying my ability to recover and make progress.
- The forced registration in a writing class, which was never mandatory or necessary for me, contributed to ten months (June 2022–March 2023) of wasted time. Given the emotional toll and helplessness I experienced, this period had a multiplied negative impact on my progress.
- **Delayed Time: 2.5 years.**



### Forcefully put to probation (2022.10.1)

- I was forcefully placed on probation and required to complete a series of punitive tasks, all without any prior communication, consultation, or investigation into my circumstances.
- This decision was imposed unilaterally, disregarding my input, perspective, or well-being, and was framed under the guise of “concern for students” while in reality trampling on my life and mental health.
- The probation measures were not only unnecessary but were also applied arbitrarily and without justification, further compounding the challenges I was already facing due to previous delays and mismanagement.

### Effect

- Completing the additional tasks required under probation consumed an extraordinary amount of time and effort, leaving little room to focus on meaningful academic progress.
- The psychological toll of this probation was devastating. I was subjected to continuous unrecognition, accusations, and pressure, despite my consistent efforts to meet expectations and produce work of acceptable quality. This created a profound sense of futility—when good work only results in more punishment, it undermines the very motivation to strive for excellence.
- For nearly two years, I was unable to register for classes, leaving me further isolated and disconnected from the academic environment. This period was marked by an overwhelming sense of helplessness and struggle as I attempted to regain focus and push forward my research progress.
- The cumulative impact of these overwhelming experiences significantly damaged my ability to perform consistently. The probation period left a lasting mark on my academic record, preventing me from achieving my full potential and hindering my long-term progress.

### Delayed Time

- The time lost due to being on probation and the resulting disruptions extended over a period of **two years**, during which my academic progress and mental well-being were severely compromised.
- **Delayed Time: 2.5 years.**

### Ignore request (2022.9.30) Course requirement (2024.6.5)

- Repeatedly ignored my words, emails, and requests, while insisting on her own assumptions and decisions without consulting me.
- Refused to reply to my explicit request to meet or talk, avoiding any meaningful discussion about my academic progress or challenges.
- Showed a consistent lack of interest or care for my academic progress, never initiating discussions or providing guidance despite clear indications that I was struggling.
- When I initially shared my academic goals and progress with her, her response was dismissive and deeply disappointing, providing no actionable advice or acknowledgment of my efforts.
- Treated me in a controlling and disrespectful manner, continuously applying pressure and imposing decisions without consultation. This pattern of public insult and disregard for my input has persisted for years.
- Rather than offering support, she exerted pressure and control, completely neglecting her responsibilities to check in on my academic status or well-being. Her actions made me extremely uncomfortable sharing any progress with her, further isolating me academically.
- Consistently avoided accountability for her actions, retreating from the consequences of her failures while ignoring my requests for resolution or support. This negligence left me to manage all aspects of my academic progress independently, despite the significant hindrances caused by her behavior.

### Effect

- My academic progress was left entirely unattended for an extended period. I had to navigate every milestone on my own, despite the obstacles and delays caused by her mismanagement.
- She only addressed critical requirements, such as course requirements or the fifth-year check-in form, at the very last minute, without any prior discussion or guidance. This lack of planning and communication severely hindered my ability to meet institutional expectations.
- Her primary focus seemed to lie in punishing or nitpicking students rather than providing meaningful support or mentorship, creating a hostile and obstructive academic environment.

### Delayed Time

- From the breakup of my advisor relationship on **2022.9.30** to **2024.12.23**, I experienced over two years and three months of academic stagnation due to her neglect and lack of guidance.
- This period (and arguably my entire five years in the program) was characterized by being unattended and unsupported, with no opportunity to form a thesis committee or begin the fifth-year check-in process.
- **Delayed Time: 2.25 years.**

## urgent (2023.12.11)

- Without any prior communication with me, she publicly blamed me in a manner that lacked both professionalism and respect. This pattern of public reprimand and criticism has persisted for years, contributing to a toxic and demoralizing environment.
- At that specific time, I was making significant progress on a research project, reaching a productive and promising phase. However, upon receiving her message, the weight of all past traumatic experiences struck me again. The realization that the person responsible for so much harm was still actively affecting me left me overwhelmed and emotionally destabilized.
- Her behavior has become a recurring source of trauma and distress for me. It is not just her actions, but the power dynamic and her recognition by others that amplify my sense of helplessness. I felt trapped, unable to protest or confide, and constantly questioning whether it was my fault. Processing these complex emotions drained a substantial amount of my energy and mental strength.
- This incident disrupted my ability to focus entirely, and my research progress came to a standstill. My advisor can confirm that this event marked the abrupt end of a period of peak productivity, causing a long-term interruption to my work.

## Effect

- The interruption of my research progress at such a critical and productive phase was profoundly damaging. The psychological toll of this incident not only halted my work but also caused significant perturbations in my relationship with my advisor, which persisted for nearly a year.
- This event reinforced a cycle of fear and mistrust, further complicating my ability to recover and refocus on my academic goals.

## Delayed Time

- The disruption caused by this incident resulted in a delay from **December 2023 to September 2024** as I struggled to regain my footing and repair the damage to my progress and professional relationships.
- **Delayed Time: 0.8 years.**

### Painful meeting (2024.10.9)

- The meeting, which was intended to address TA tasks, devolved into a deeply unprofessional encounter. Despite my visibly distressed state—I was already crying, irritated, and overwhelmed—she constantly interrupted my words, made dismissive and bothersome comments, and failed to provide any relevant or constructive information regarding the meeting's agenda.
- Stuart was present, but even his presence did not deter her from displaying a pattern of unprofessional behavior. She turned the meeting into a platform for blaming and nitpicking, focusing on criticizing me rather than addressing the actual purpose of the discussion.
- She consistently looked down on me, using the meeting to assert control and push her personal agenda. Her actions seemed less about resolving TA-related matters and more about manipulating the situation to align with her preferences, all while disregarding the toll it took on my well-being.
- At one point, she outright denied actions she had previously taken and attempted to shift blame onto me. This behavior was particularly disheartening, as it contradicted prior instances where she had acknowledged and even thanked me for the same efforts she now criticized.

### Effect

- This meeting exacerbated the emotional distress I was already experiencing, leaving a profound and lasting impact on my mental health. The unresolved frustration and pain from this encounter contributed to recurring nightmares and persistent feelings of hate and anger, which affected my ability to focus and maintain a healthy state of mind.
- The psychological toll of this interaction created a significant barrier to my academic progress, as the emotional aftermath continued to haunt me long after the meeting.

### Delayed Time

- The emotional and mental strain caused by this incident disrupted my focus and productivity for at least **six months**, during which I struggled to regain my composure and academic momentum.
- **Delayed Time: 0.5 years.**

## Overall Experience with DGS (2020 -2025)

Over the past five years, Zosia's actions have been characterized by a persistent pattern of applying pressure and punishment without effective communication, prior investigation, or a clear understanding of my academic situation. She demonstrated little to no knowledge about my studies, yet consistently asked intrusive and uncomfortable questions. She imposed measures she personally deemed helpful in a forceful and arbitrary manner, often without my consent, while disregarding my input and concerns. These measures frequently manifested as public insults, excessive demands, and punitive actions, leaving me feeling ignored, controlled, and humiliated.

When I faced critical moments of difficulty, Zosia chose to remain silent, standing by and watching without offering support. Her sporadic "check-ins" appeared performative rather than genuine, often coinciding with external oversight. When under scrutiny, she pretended to fulfill her responsibilities; otherwise, she ignored my situation entirely and continued her unprofessional and harmful behaviors. These are not subjective impressions but are backed by documented evidence of her actions over the years.

My real needs and aspirations were repeatedly ignored and dismissed. I was forced to complete numerous additional tasks that were neither mandatory nor aligned with my academic goals, simply to satisfy her desire for control and her tendency to impose punitive measures on students. At the same time, I had to independently pursue my career goals, which required immense effort and perseverance over several years. This involved overcoming barriers created by her mismanagement, extracting precious time from an overwhelming schedule, and managing the mental toll of a hostile academic environment, all while navigating through misinformation and misleading advice provided by her.

Zosia's imposition of arbitrary requirements and excessive workloads further exacerbated my struggles. For example:

- In Autumn 2022, I was forcefully assigned to teach two lab sections, including night sessions, while simultaneously managing my required classes, a writing course imposed without my consent, and the tasks listed in the probation letter. None of these were requested by me or suited to my needs.
- In August 2024, I was denied the opportunity to enroll in advanced courses under the justification that I had not held discussion sessions, despite my overloaded schedule being entirely a result of her decisions.

Even as I look forward to receiving fellowship support in Winter 2025, this marks the first institutional support I have received from the department in five years. By now, the most challenging and critical times have already passed. During those years, I endured relentless punishment, excessive workloads, public humiliation, and blame, with no regard for my well-being. If I had not demonstrated exceptional resilience, I would not have survived such an experience. Indeed, there were moments when I felt dangerously close to the edge.

All of these listed actions and their profound effects can be directly traced back to Zosia. Despite the extraordinary and severe consequences of her actions, she repeatedly retreated from accountability, denied her role in creating these issues, and consistently blamed me for outcomes that were the result of her own failings. Her persistent unprofessionalism not only worsened my academic challenges but also deepened the systemic problems within the program.

## Other Effects

My concrete research work in Tian's lab, spanning from Summer 2019 to Winter 2022, remained largely unrecognized. Despite investing significant time and effort during this period, I was ultimately pushed to leave the lab in an unprofessional and harsh manner. This contributed to **2.25 years** of wasted time dedicated to lab work with no tangible outcomes, as well as an additional **1 year** required for mental recovery from the trauma and distress caused by this experience. Importantly, this is not an isolated personal incident, as similar patterns were observed in other members of the group, reflecting systemic issues within the lab environment.

The cumulative wasted time caused by Zosia's mismanagement and misconduct can be broken down as follows:

**0.5 years** (PHYS 335 Issue 1) + **0.25 years** (PHYS 335 Issue 2) + **0.4 years** (Personal Accident) + **3 years** (Advice Meeting) + **2.5 years** (Forceful Registration) + **2.25 years** (Ignored Requests & Course Requirement) + **0.8 years** (Urgent) + **2 years** (Forceful Probation) + **0.5 years** (Painful Meeting) + **3 years** (Exclusion from Important Notifications)

**= 15.2 years**

In addition to the above, my time in Tian's lab contributed another **3.25 years** of wasted effort and recovery.

**Total Wasted Time: 15.2 years + 3.25 years = 18.45 years.**

## Reflection

The enormity of this number—**18.45 years of cumulative wasted time**—might seem unbelievable, but it reflects the compounded effects of systemic failures, mismanagement, and unprofessional conduct. It underscores the extraordinary challenges I have faced, challenges that nearly derailed my academic journey entirely.

The fact that I can stand here today, sharing my experiences and continuing to pursue my PhD, is nothing short of a miracle. These years were not just "lost time"; they represent profound emotional, academic, and professional setbacks that required exceptional resilience to overcome.

## Conclusion: The Broader Implications of Systemic Failures

The behaviors and patterns described above extend far beyond individual cases, reflecting a deeper systemic failure that has significant implications for the department, the institution, and the broader academic community. These issues are not isolated instances but rather symptoms of a culture where unchecked authority and a lack of accountability allow harmful practices to persist.

The immediate impacts on students—academic delays, psychological harm, and damaged reputations—are severe enough, but the ripple effects are equally troubling:

1. **Erosion of Trust in Academic Leadership:** When authority figures fail to prioritize fairness, transparency, and student well-being, the foundational trust between students and the institution is undermined. This erosion of trust discourages students from seeking help, reporting issues, or engaging openly within the academic system.
2. **Long-Term Harm to Academic Careers:** The affected students may carry the consequences of these experiences throughout their careers, facing setbacks in professional opportunities, delayed publications, and impaired confidence in their academic abilities.
3. **A Toxic and Divisive Culture:** The creation of a hostile environment—where some students are unfairly privileged while others are left to struggle—divides the student body and discourages collaboration and mutual support. This division weakens the department's academic ecosystem and undermines its potential for collective excellence.
4. **Reputational Damage to the Institution:** When such practices are allowed to persist, they tarnish the reputation of the department and the institution as a whole. Prospective students and faculty may view these issues as indicative of a broader cultural problem, reducing the department's ability to attract and retain top talent.
5. **Missed Opportunities for Systemic Reform:** These patterns highlight the urgent need for systemic changes, such as improved oversight mechanisms, leadership accountability, and a culture that prioritizes equity and inclusivity. Addressing these issues is not merely about rectifying past harm; it is an opportunity to ensure a better, more supportive environment for future generations of students.

In light of these challenges, the importance of addressing these systemic issues cannot be overstated. It is critical to recognize the profound and far-reaching impacts of such behaviors, not only on individual students but also on the integrity and future of the academic institution. By taking decisive action to investigate and resolve these matters, the department can begin to rebuild trust, foster a healthier academic culture, and reaffirm its commitment to the success and well-being of all students.

*This document is not just a testimony but a call for accountability. It is submitted as part of a broader effort to document institutional harm and encourage transparent reform within academic governance at UChicago.*

No student should need to lose years of their life, their dignity, and their health just to prove that harm occurred.

What I endured was not a matter of miscommunication. It was a systemic behavioral pattern — masked in professional language, reinforced through silence, and protected by institutional ambiguity.

Let it be named.

**Submitted May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025**