

Serious Unprofessional and Unethical Misconduct of the DGS

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

- 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)

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.

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.
- 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.

- **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 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 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.

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)

Forced Registration Without Consent

- 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.

Dismissive and Inflexible Response from the English Department

- 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.

Unreasonable and Hostile Treatment by the Instructor

- 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.

Excessively Harsh Standards for Podcast Evaluation

- 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.

Public and Intimidating Accusation of Plagiarism

- 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.

Lack of Professionalism in Communication

- 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.

Unfair Outcome, Course Failure Due to an Unfair Accusation

- 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.

Lack of Institutional Support and Accountability

- 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.

Academic and Emotional Strain

- 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.

Erosion of Trust and Confidence

- 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.

Systemic Failures in Addressing Student Needs

- 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.
- 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.
- **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.

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)

Ignoring My Requests and Escalating the Situation

- 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.

Forced Tasks During an Overloaded Semester

- 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.

Forced Requirement to Find a New Advisor

- 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.

Disregard for Academic Autonomy and Professional Development

- 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.

Academic and Professional Setbacks

- 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.

Emotional and Psychological Toll

- 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.

Systemic Misuse of Authority

- 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)

Complete Lack of Communication

- 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.

Arbitrary and Punitive Measures

- 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.

Abuse of Authority

- 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.

Breakdown of Trust

- 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.

Escalation of Emotional Distress

- 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.

Academic Disruption

- 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 (2022.4 - 2024.10)

A “Good Experience” That Became a Long-Lasting Trauma

- 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.

Predictable Negative Outcomes Ignored

- 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.

Delayed Time and Emotional Toll

- 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.

Academic and Professional Setbacks

- 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 English course, which was both unnecessary and unsuitable for my needs, consumed time and energy that could have been directed toward my actual academic goals.

Emotional and Psychological Damage

- 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.

Misuse of Authority and Neglect

- 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 demonstrate 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)

Exclusion from Discussions

- 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.

Avoidance of Key Meetings

- 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.

Long-Term Neglect After the Incident

- 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.

Loss of Agency and Power

- 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.

Amplified Emotional Distress

- 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.

Professional and Academic Setbacks

- 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)

Sudden Contact After Years of Neglect

- 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.

Lack of Accountability or Recognition of Past Issues

- 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.

A Further Insult to Injury

- 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.

Emotional Reopening of Wounds

- 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.

Continued Lack of Trust

- 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.

Missed Opportunity for Reconciliation

- 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)

1. Complete Lack of Academic Follow-Up

- 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.

2. Sudden Intervention Without Context

- 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.

3. Arbitrary and Inconsistent Involvement

- 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)

A Consistent Pattern of Ignorance and Punitive Actions

- 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.

Examples of Sudden and Punitive Actions

- **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.

A Systemic Failure to Engage with Students

- 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.

Emotional and Psychological Toll

- 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.

Disruption of Academic Progress

- 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.

A Breakdown in Trust

- 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)

Ignoring My Input and Requests

- 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.

Lack of Interest in My Academic Progress

- The DGS never demonstrated any genuine interest in my academic progress. She did not check in on my status, discuss my goals, or provide 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.

Desire for Control and Public Insult

- 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.

Avoidance of Responsibility

- 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.

Academic Progress Left Unattended

- 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.

Emotional and Professional Isolation

- 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)

Escalation of a Minor Issue

- 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.

A Consistent Pattern of Unnecessary Escalation

- 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.

Direct Impact on My Research

- 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.

Emotional and Psychological Distress

- 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.

Disruption of Professional Relationships

- 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.

Hindrance to Research Progress

- 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)

A Persistent Pattern of Public Humiliation

- 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.

Becoming a Source of Trauma

- 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.

A Nightmare That Stays With Me

- 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.

Long-Term Emotional and Psychological Damage

- 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.

Disruption of Academic Focus and Progress

- 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.

A Hostile and Unsupportive Environment

- 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 Hypocrisy of "Student Concern"

- 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.

Continuous Punishment Despite My Best Efforts

- 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?"**

Prolonged Academic Disruption

- 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.

Wasted Time and Destroyed Mental Health

- 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.

Damage to Academic Performance and Potential

- 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.

Prolonged Academic and Professional Delay

- 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

Avoiding Direct Communication

- 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.

Emotional and Psychological Distress

- 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.

Erosion of Academic Relationships

- 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.

Prolonged Academic Delays

- 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)

A Painful Meeting Turned Into a Tool for Suppression

- 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.

Persistent Interruption and Verbal Attacks

- 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.

Complete Avoidance of the Meeting's Purpose

- 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)

A Meeting That Intensified Emotional Distress

- 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.

A Lack of Professionalism and Purpose

- 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.

Emotional Trauma and Lingering Hate

- 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.

Psychological and Physical Exhaustion

- 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.

Erosion of Trust and Professional Relationships

- 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)

Persistent Denial of Responsibility

- 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.

Emotional and Psychological Toll

- 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.

Long-Term Damage to Self-Trust

- 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.

Deep Emotional Manipulation:

- 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.

Erosion of Advocacy and Autonomy:

- 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.

Amplification of Power Imbalance:

- 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)

Lack of Follow-Through on Critical Communication

- 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.

Prolonged Neglect of Thesis Committee Formation

- 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.

Pattern of Communication Failures

- 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.

Delayed Academic Progress

- 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.

Increased Stress and Uncertainty

- 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.

Systemic Lack of Accountability

- 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)

Beyond Neglect: A Potential Pattern of Exclusion

- 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.

Discrimination Through Selective Engagement?

- 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.

A Pattern of Isolation

- 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.

Delayed Academic Progress

- 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.

Psychological and Emotional Isolation

- 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.

Systemic Inequities

- 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)

Hypocrisy in Demanding Fifth-Year Check-In Forms

- 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.

Blame and Threats Following Her Own Neglect

- 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.

An Unjust Pattern of Deflection

- 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.

Emotional and Psychological Distress

- 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.

Disruption of Academic Relationships

- 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.

Prolonged Academic Delays

- 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

Fellowship: A Reactionary Gesture Rather Than Genuine Support

- 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.

Contradiction Between the Fellowship Offer and Long-Term Neglect

- **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.

Potential Motivation: Mitigating Pressure from Complaints

- **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.

Irreparable Damage and Suffering

- 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.

Reinforcement of Injustice and Frustration

- 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.

Questioning the System of Support

- 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.