



Report from the Student Non-Academic Grievance Committee

TO: Greg Singleton
Interim Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

FROM: John McConnell Ajay Thompson
Timothy Leszczak Daniel Law
Bettina Shank Brooklyn White
Ashley Kautz Susan Conner
Jessica White

DATE: March 15, 2023

Reporting Party: Heather Goodmancave, Former Student

Complaint:

Appendix A contains the complaint that Heather Goodmancave submitted on January 29, 2023.

The purposes of the Student Non-Academic Grievance Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) are to:

- 1.** Hear students' grievances and complaints about the actions and performances of University personnel in non-academic matters.
- 2.** Determine the validity of the grievance or complaint.
- 3.** Report their findings to the appropriate supervising authority.
- 4.** Recommend action to be taken.

Meeting with Heather Goodmancave (Complainant):

The Committee met with Ms. Goodmancave on February 13, 2023. Ms. Goodmancave reported that she has been an APSU student since 2010 and finished her Master's degree in 2020. In the Fall of 2021, she started the PsyD in Counseling Psychology program with four other students, together comprising the second cohort in the program. Ms. Goodmancave identifies as a student of color, one of two in the cohort.



On January 29, 2023, she submitted a Discrimination and Harassment Complaint to LaNeeça R. Williams, Chief Diversity Officer and Title IX Coordinator in the Office of Equity, Access, and Inclusion. Ms. Goodmancave shared this complaint with the Committee and detailed much of what is included within this complaint. The Committee proceeded to focus on the non-academic aspects of the complaint, with the Office of Equity, Access, and Inclusion overseeing the other aspects of the complaint.

Ms. Goodmancave, along with the other student of color, were assigned to Dr. Daniel McKelvey as his advisees, and she reported that certain clinical trainings were initially not afforded to them as those to the other cohort members. Specifically, Ms. Goodmancave reported that she was not initially made aware of specific clinical trainings that were offered by Dr. Shatto, another faculty member in the program. These clinical hours are recorded on a system called Time2Track which helps them gain licensure, and Ms. Goodmancave reported that she was not afforded a comparable number of clinical hours as some of her peers.

Ms. Goodmancave recounted another instance where students were offered, in November of 2021, a professional development opportunity in Virginia. This was communicated to students via email. Ms. Goodmancave reported that, although she had expressed interest in attending, she was not picked for the trip.

Ms. Goodmancave stated that, prior to the start of the second year of the program, she requested a change in advisor, a request that she said was refused. Ms. Goodmancave stated that she wanted Dr. Leake, the director of the program, as her advisor but that, a few weeks after she was refused, Dr. Leake took on another student.

Ms. Goodmancave reported that she received an “I” in her course with Dr. Shatto and that a presentation was needed to complete the course. Ms. Goodmancave stated that, although she was ready to deliver the presentation, Dr. Shatto informed her, in a group including three other people including her advisor, Dr. McKelvey, that she did not have to give her presentation. Ms. Goodmancave stated that Dr. Shatto later denied having made that statement.

Ms. Goodmancave reported that on November 22, 2022, she was observing a therapy session being conducted by another student where she intervened with the client after she could not find the attending psychologist, Dr. Shatto. Ms. Goodmancave believed that she was wrongly cited an ethical violation for this breach in protocol.

Ms. Goodmancave detailed some personal circumstances involving her ex-husband that contributed to her difficulty in the program.



Meeting with Leah Walker (Current Student):

The Committee met with Ms. Walker on February 27, 2023. When asked about professional development opportunities that are available within the program, Ms. Walker stated that most of the opportunities for training are associated with a faculty member's specialty area but they are still emailed to all students. Ms. Walker gave an example: all students were given the opportunity to attend a training session in Virginia that was paid for by department faculty but some students interested in this opportunity had not taken relevant prerequisite courses. Those students were given supplemental training in order to prepare them for the Virginia trip.

Ms. Walker stated that training opportunities are sent via email from program faculty members to all students in the three cohorts to gauge student interest regardless of the origin of or the funding for the opportunity. She also reported that students are given a deadline (usually 1-2 weeks later) by which to respond to the initial email so that the faculty can decide if there are enough interested students.

Meeting with Dr. Erynne Shatto (Program Faculty Member):

The Committee met with Dr. Shatto on February 27, 2023. When asked about procedures related to running out of space or funding for students to participate in professional development activities, Dr. Shatto stated that there has never been a case to her knowledge in which more students have asked to be a part of an opportunity than they could accommodate. Dr. Shatto indicated that if this situation ever does arise in the future, the department would likely try to find a way to accommodate as many students as possible and that there are several avenues for funding that the students can pursue (departmental travel grant, student research grant, etc.).

Dr. Shatto stated that students express an area of interest when they apply to the program, with the understanding that this interest can change along the way. The students are then assigned to an advisor with a similar area of interest or practice.

When asked about the process by which professional development opportunities are advertised to the students, Dr. Shatto stated that core faculty will meet to discuss any opportunities that are more focused on certain areas and they make a decision as to whether the opportunity will be sent to all students or to a specific group. Dr. Shatto provided an example: there was an opportunity to assist schools in Humphreys County, TN. Dr. Shatto met with core faculty and they made the decision to offer this opportunity to all students, so all students across the cohorts were invited to express their interest and participate. She stated that opportunities are sent to students via email and the students are asked to respond with an expression of their interest in participating.

Dr. Shatto stated that extra training sessions provided to the students do not typically cost money, rather the faculty provide their time and expertise.



In regards to Incomplete grades, Dr. Shatto stated that all students receive an Incomplete in practicum courses in order to maintain their malpractice insurance. For other courses, students are given the time stipulated by APSU (1 year) to finish any incomplete coursework and the program faculty meet to determine what support can be offered to the student. When asked about forms pertaining to the Incomplete grades, Dr. Shatto explained that there is a remediation plan form that is used in cases where there is evidence that things need to be addressed outside the bounds of one single class (example: multiple Incomplete grades).

When asked if there was anything else that she would like to share with the Committee, Dr. Shatto shared the following information:

- The program is driven by a mentorship model so that the students can develop a professional identity. As such, training does not look the same for every student as they choose and develop their areas of interest.
- Mentorship meetings include planning for internships and future job positions.
- APSU offers rich training experiences for all students in the program as the students will be competing with others from across the U.S. for internships.
- Students on average spend about 75-80 hours per week on school-related activities, and therefore could not say yes to every opportunity. Mentors work with students to identify the best opportunities for their particular goals.
- Every student is given the opportunity to build the best possible CV for their future plans.

Meeting with Dr. Valerie Leake (Program Director):

The Committee met with Dr. Leake on February 27, 2023. Dr. Leake provided the following enrollment information when asked about student retention:

- First cohort (2020) 2 of 5 students are still enrolled.
- Second cohort (2021) 3 of 5 students are still enrolled.
- Third cohort (2022) 3 or 3 students are still enrolled.
- Currently interviewing 4 students for the next (2023) cohort.

When asked to explain the process of assigning advisors to students, Dr. Leake stated that incoming students are asked to report their area(s) of interest when they apply to the program. Students from the first and second cohorts were assigned based on alignment with faculty interests, and students were informed that their area(s) of interest may have to shift in order to better align with their advisor. Students from the third cohort were also asked to rank faculty members based on preference during their interviews. If students express any concerns after their first year in the program the student can request a new advisor. If both the current and potential advisor approve of the change, the student can update their advisor assignment by completing the form outlined in the PsyD Student Handbook.



Dr. Leake stated that she has personally spoken to each student who has chosen to leave the program and that any information gleaned from these interviews is kept within the department. Students complete an anonymous program evaluation form each year for the faculty to review.

When asked about student fees associated with the program, Dr. Leake stated that there are program fees that the students pay each semester, and that these fees are frequently used for student professional development. Dr. Leake provided the following examples: course fees have been used to pay for all students to attend a virtual conference and to fund presentations and training sessions that all students could attend. Course fees are also used to pay for the software Time2Track as well as to pay for individual counseling for the students in the program.

When asked about any policies or procedures that might be in place to ensure that each student receives equal opportunities to partake in additional training or clinical hours, Dr. Leake stated that while it is not possible to be completely equitable based on the differences in faculty research areas, the more general opportunities that can benefit all students are offered to everyone.

Dr. Leake explained that if faculty identify a student who is struggling with basic knowledge or skills or who is impaired in any way, they may recommend that the student take a leave of absence or extend their program and take less coursework at a time. The program is currently three years of coursework plus one year of internship. Faculty are working on alternative pathways for students who need more time to complete the program. Program faculty suggest 2,000 clinical hours in preparation for applying to internships. Clinical hours are logged on Time2Track, supervisors sign off on hours as they are logged, and Dr. Leake must sign off on total hours as students apply for internships.

When asked about the process by which students can apply for financial assistance to participate in professional development activities, Dr. Leake stated that the PsyD Student Handbook explains the process for applying for additional funds from the College of Graduate Studies at APSU. If students are unsuccessful in their attempt to acquire this funding, the department tries to provide some assistance.

On March 2, 2023, Dr. Leake provided some additional information in response to her questions during the interview, and this additional information is contained in Appendix B.

Meeting with Dr. Daniel McKelvey (Program Faculty Member/Student Advisor):

The Committee met with Dr. McKelvey on February 27, 2023. When asked if any opportunity gaps exist for students depending on the advisor they are assigned in the program, Dr. McKelvey stated that there are no gaps but there are differences in the training opportunities that the students will participate in due to areas of interest. He stated that all students have the opportunity to fulfill their needs in the program regardless of advisor.



Dr. McKelvey stated that if a situation arises in which the student has interests that do not align with their advisor, the faculty try to find areas of interest that overlap with the advisor or connect them to another advisor that is more familiar with that particular area of interest.

When asked about perceived differences in the resources that advisors can offer their students, Dr. McKelvey acknowledged that each faculty member has their own area of interest that dictates what that advisor can offer to their students, but that despite the differences in the topic or nature of the individual opportunities, all advisors are able to offer resources to their students.

When asked about the procedure for students that receive an Incomplete grade in his course, Dr. McKelvey stated that in some cases, an informal agreement is worked out with the student but these incomplete grades must be resolved in a timely manner as each course builds upon the knowledge of the previous courses.

Meeting with Drs. Eva Gibson and Jessica Fripp (MS Counseling Faculty):

The Committee met with Drs. Gibson and Fripp on February 27, 2023. When asked about their understanding of the equitability of access to professional development activities for students in the PsyD program, Drs. Gibson and Fripp stated that while they are not intimately familiar with the program's policies and protocol (Drs. Gibson and Fripp are housed within the same department as the PsyD program but not within the program itself), they are aware of professional development opportunities that are shared with all students in the program. Dr. Gibson affirmed that there is a departmental committee dedicated to reviewing and awarding student requests for additional funding.

When asked about their perception of equitability within the program, Drs. Gibson and Fripp stated that there are fewer mentors of color and therefore additional barriers might exist for students of color in so far as the students may not be aware of resources or support systems that they can access and the department might not be aware of additional opportunities that they could extend to students.

Dr. Fripp suggested that a newsletter or weekly announcement be disseminated to all program students in order to ensure that all students are being made aware of all opportunities.

Meeting with Dr. Nicole Knickmeyer (Department Chair):

The Committee met with Dr. Knickmeyer on February 27, 2023. Dr. Knickmeyer affirmed that programmatic course fees paid by the students are allocated to provide a variety of resources for the students including but not limited to professional development opportunities, assessment tools, and personal counseling. Dr. Knickmeyer stated that there are also funds available from the



department that students could apply for and that to her knowledge, every student who has applied for these funds received them.

When asked about any existing exit interview protocol when students leave the program, Dr. Knickmeyer stated that Dr. Leake meets with every student who chooses to leave for any reason and that documentation is kept within the department for review.

When asked about any existing protocol for a situation in which students might have a conflict with Dr. Leake (students would normally reach out to the Program Director, but in this case Dr. Leake is the Program Director), Dr. Knickmeyer stated that Dr. Leake has made every effort to resolve conflicts and issues as they arise, and that student support is a top priority. As outlined in the PsyD Student Handbook, if the student is unsuccessful in resolving the issue with their advisor and the Program Director, the students can meet with the Department Chair (in this case, Dr. Knickmeyer). Dr. Knickmeyer stated that in the future as students graduate from the program they will receive an anonymous survey in which they have the opportunity to share any last concerns.

When asked about the lack of advisors within the program that are people of color and opportunities for mentorship outside of the program, Dr. Knickmeyer stated that mentorship regarding coursework should come from someone within the program, thereby eliminating the possibility of having an advisor or mentor who is a person of color (as the department is currently staffed to this date). Dr. Knickmeyer stated that increasing diversity is a priority for future hires but that they are having a hard time staffing the program. Dr. Knickmeyer further clarified that a student's committee chair must be a program core faculty member, but that they can choose faculty from outside the program to be committee members; however, she noted that there is still a lack of diversity in qualified faculty.

When asked if students are potentially at a disadvantage if their advisor does not offer supplemental training sessions, Dr. Knickmeyer stated that the program faculty strive to make sure that opportunities are equitable and that over the course of their time in the program all students will get a similar number of impactful opportunities.

When asked about protocol in place regarding Incomplete grades, Dr. Knickmeyer stated that in cases where remediation plans are put into place with a student, any outstanding assignments are included in the remediation plan but that she was unsure if all faculty involved fill out a separate Report of Incomplete Grade Form.

When asked if there was anything else that she would like to share with the Committee, Dr. Knickmeyer shared the following information:



- On behalf of the program, she believes that everyone in the program has gone the extra mile to provide student support.
- In regards to this particular student, several meetings were held with the student and with faculty to try and resolve concerns and issues.

Meeting with Jordan Minchew (Former Student):

The Committee met with Ms. Minchew on March 1, 2023. Ms. Minchew reported that she dropped out of the inaugural cohort for the program due to not having, before entering the program, a good understanding of the demand in workload (e.g., with clinicals), courseload, and other requirements of the program. She and the other students realized it was a new program and changes were being considered and made, but she still decided on leaving the program a second time.

Ms. Minchew reported that advising was uneven, but that was expected given the varying experience across faculty in the program. Opportunities for extra training and professional development were communicated well via email or in person, whether through advising or in class. Ms. Minchew reported that there was no exit interview when she left (the first time), but the new program director did solicit feedback from her when she returned.

When asked what recommendations she would have for the program, Ms. Minchew said that increased transparency for expectations and being more student-focused would be desirable.

Findings:

The Committee met on three separate occasions to interview multiple individuals (students, faculty, program director, department chair) who may have been directly or indirectly related to the non-academic aspects of the student's grievance. These individuals provided information to help the Committee understand the non-academic aspects of the student's grievance as well as help the Committee formulate the findings. The information below are the findings based on what the Committee heard from each of the individuals who were interviewed. The findings have been categorized into four different themes and these themes will guide the recommendations in a latter section.

Finding A: Reporting a Grade of "I"

1. The Committee found that the PsyD Student Handbook explicitly describes the process when an "I" is awarded in a didactic course; however, there were inconsistencies with some faculty about awarding an "I" in a didactic course. In other words, some faculty were aware of the "I" grade while others were not and there did not appear to be consistency across the individuals interviewed. There was, however, a consistent



response as it related to awarding an “I” in a practicum course. The Committee found that all students will receive an “I” in practicum to maintain malpractice insurance. Based on what the Committee was told, students must be enrolled in a course in order to be covered by malpractice insurance.

Per the PsyD Student Handbook (p. 27, para. 2), “If a student receives an “I” in a course, they must complete the requirements determined by the instructor by the specified date in the subsequent semester or, per university rules, the grade becomes an “F” and the student may be immediately removed from the Program. IPs are expected grades for internship, directed study, and dissertation until the requirements for each of these classes are met.”

2. The Committee found that not all faculty submit the Report of Incomplete Grade Form for didactic courses and that there are inconsistencies in submitting Report of Incomplete Grade Form for didactic courses.

Finding B: Trainings/Opportunities for Students

1. The Committee found that the faculty had a clear and consistent message related to the various trainings and professional development opportunities for students. Based on the interviews, all individuals responded that trainings/opportunities are communicated via email and it is the responsibility of the student to respond to emails expressing an interest.
2. The Committee found that information related to professional development and expectations of the student related to professional development is located in the PsyD Student Handbook.
3. Faculty indicated trainings are specific to the faculty’s area of expertise (i.e., a faculty may have expertise working with children, so their training opportunities may be specific to that population). Similarly, a student in the program can express an area of interest and will be paired with a faculty member based on the area of interest. This pairing/advisor-advisee relationship is intentional to provide the student with the best experience and exposure to their area of interest. Because of this, each student may have more or fewer training opportunities; it all depends on the availability of training based on the area of interest. The faculty, however, did not feel one student was at an advantage/disadvantage based on the trainings/opportunities they were provided.



4. The Committee learned from program faculty that certain competencies are necessary for specialized trainings and that some students may not have the skills/competencies necessary (or foundational knowledge) to participate in certain trainings/opportunities.

Finding C: Assignment of Academic Advisor

1. The Committee learned that the pairing of students with an advisor is based on overlapping research interests/areas of interest/expertise. During the admission application process (for Fall 2020 and Fall 2021 cohorts), students indicate their areas of clinical interest and are paired with faculty with similar interests. The student is required to stay with their assigned academic advisor their first academic year but will have an opportunity to request a different academic advisor after the first year (policy related to this is discussed in the first semester CPSY 8001 Colloquium class but the “one academic year rule” could not be found in the PsyD Student Handbook). The program outlines a formal process for submitting a request to change their assigned advisor using a form that is included in the appendix of the program handbook.
2. The Committee also learned that the process of advisor assignment has changed since the program’s inception in Fall 2020. As of Fall 2022, the faculty in the program have a Doctoral Interview Day which results in students being assigned an advisor based on numerous factors such as number of current advisees, overlapping research interest/expertise, and workload.

Finding D: Exit Interview/Survey

1. The Committee found that the program has an exit interview and the exit interview is conducted by the program director.
2. The exit interview is one on one, but the Committee did not find any information related to alternatives for exit interviews. For example, what does the program do if the student and the program director do not have a good relationship or if the student is leaving the program because of the program director?
3. The Committee did not find any information related to a Qualtrics exit interview, nor did the Committee find any information related to frequent feedback. For example, instead of waiting until a student leaves the program, should there be more frequency to gauge the level of program satisfaction?
4. The Committee did not find any information related to a mid-year satisfaction survey.



Recommendations:

The Committee makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation A. Use the “Report of Incomplete Grade” form for documenting “Incomplete” grades.

It is recommended that, for the reporting of “I” in a course, the “Report of Incomplete Grade” form should be used following the guidance found in the 2022-2023 Faculty Handbook, p. 23:

When an instructor chooses to assign an “Incomplete,” the instructor must complete the “Report of Incomplete Grade” form located on the Secure Faculty Forms site detailing what assignments the student must complete, the percent values of these assignments toward the final course grade, and a schedule for submitting these assignments. One copy of the form must be filed with the chair of the department in which the faculty resides while a second copy shall be filed with the administrative assistant to the chair and a copy given to the student. Faculty are required to complete the “Report of Incomplete Grade.” This form is to be completed by the instructor at the time of assigning a grade of “I”.

Recommendation B. Centralize the dissemination of information concerning professional development opportunities.

The PsyD program has a process for communicating professional development opportunities that was shared by students and faculty during the interview process. The program has designated that each faculty member communicates training opportunities to students via email. Training prerequisites vary by opportunity; however, it is expected students should reply to the aforementioned emails to express interest. The expectations for student involvement in professional development opportunities are clearly outlined in the PsyD Student Handbook (see p. 45); however, the predetermined method to communicate opportunities is not detailed.

While expectations related to professional development are clearly stated in the PsyD Student Handbook, it is the Committee’s recommendation that the program improves communication of these opportunities by creating a newsletter or similar alternative that consolidates opportunities in a single location. Since professional development is expected from students, it is encouraged this method of communicating opportunities is also mentioned in the PsyD Student Handbook. It is recommended the newsletter includes other professional development information outlined in the PsyD Student Handbook (i.e., Town Hall program meetings, program events, travel grant opportunities, conferences, trainings, etc.). By creating a uniform method from one source, students can more easily know where, when, and from whom the communication of this information will be provided. The Committee recognizes that faculty and staff are already challenged with high workloads, so it is encouraged that this be a task assigned to a Graduate



Assistant or similar student position. The program director can determine a date by which faculty should have submitted relevant information to be included in the newsletter. The student can then consolidate information into the monthly newsletter and email it to all cohorts by a predetermined date. The hope of this Committee is that this consolidated method of communicating opportunities streamlines the process of disseminating professional development opportunities for students and faculty alike.

Recommendation C. Clarify advisor assignment process in program documentation.

Per the PsyD Student Handbook (p. 19, para. 1), “The advisor is appointed by the Program Director at the time of the student’s admission into the Program after consulting with incoming students and faculty.” However, this statement can be unclear to students how and why a student is assigned to a specific academic advisor. *The Committee recommends adding further information and/or explanation about the advisor assignment process.* An example statement could be, “The match between an advisee/advisor is determined based on several factors such as overlapping research and clinical interests between the student and faculty member, faculty member’s areas of expertise, and faculty member’s current advisee load in order to cultivate mentorship, professional development, and student growth.” The program could additionally state student interests are gleaned from their admission application and Doctoral Interview Day to perform the match.

Per PsyD Student Handbook (p. 19, para. 1), “Students may opt to change advisors in the Program subsequent to discussing this matter with both the original and potential new advisors (see Appendix D for the Change of Advisor Request Form).” However, this statement does not specify when students may request an advisor reassignment which makes it unclear what the policy is and when students are eligible to submit a request. Per Dr. Leake, students may request a new advisor after one academic year and they learn about this opportunity in the first semester CPSY 8001 Colloquium class and from their advisor. *To provide students transparency and a clear understanding of the academic advisor reassignment process, the Committee recommends revising the policy to include the one academic year rule in the PsyD Student Handbook and/or on the Change of Advisor Request Form.* This would remove any possible confusion for students if they did not attend class, provide consistency in the understanding of this policy, and also provide potential new PsyD students information on how advisor reassignments are performed.

Recommendation D. Use anonymous student surveys during and upon exit of program.

It is recommended students are afforded the opportunity to provide program experience feedback during the program via an anonymous survey. It is recommended that students receive one additional survey at program completion via an exit survey. It is recommended the surveys align and include key experiences such as:



- Advising Experience
- General Expectations
- Training Opportunities
- Clinical Experience Opportunities
- Clinical Hours
- Faculty Support
- Administrative Support
- Area for Open-Ended Comments



Appendix A

Austin Peay State University
APSU Discrimination and Harassment Complaint Form

Submitted on January 29, 2023 at 5:31:42 pm CST

Nature	Race/Color Discrimination
Urgency	Urgent
Incident Date and Time	2021-09-20 4:00 PM
Incident Location	Wesley Foundation APSU Psychological Science and Counseling Center

Reported by

Name:	Heather Aline Goodmancave
Title:	Doctoral Student/ GRA
Email:	hgoodmancave@my.apsu.edu
Phone	9312064312
Address:	15 Gows Ln #5631
	[UNAUTHENTICATED]

Involved Parties/Witnesses

Erynne Shatto ()

Person of Concern	She
-------------------	-----

Valerie Leake ()

Respondent	She
------------	-----

Daniel McKelvey ()

Respondent	He
------------	----

Tyler Tims ()

Witness	He
---------	----

Cherilyn Padgett ()

Witness	She
---------	-----

Leah Walker ()

Witness	She
---------	-----

Kari Barnes ()

Witness	She
---------	-----

Questions

Please provide a detailed description of the incident/concern using specific, concise, objective language (who, what, where, when, why, and how).

I am an alum of Austin Peay State University. I was recently kicked out of the Psy D. program due to several discriminatory acts via my department. I began my education in Fall 2010. I have since obtained my bachelor's and master's degrees in social work. I graduated from APSU with my master's in social work Summer 20' with a 3.7 GPA. Afterwards, in Fall 21' I was accepted into the doctoral psychology program. I was one of the five students in the second-year doctoral program. These students included Mayme Siders, Kari Barnes, Leah Walker, Cherilyn Padgett, and me (Heather Goodmancave). Both Cherilyn and I are women of color. Cherilyn is African-American and I am Korean-American. The other women in my class are caucasian women. The first cohort, above us, initially had five students in my first year until September 21' when all students were informed that three of the five students had left the program. The students soon found out the three women left the program due to aggressive racial discrimination against one female student of color, Sierra. The two other women were caucasian; however, left the program due to feeling uncomfortable. This left only two students who were caucasian males in the first cohort above me. I had not felt any discrimination during my first two months of the program; however, the discrimination against both Cherilyn and I were being done to us before we were even admitted and behind the scenes. Both Cherilyn and I were assigned to Dr. Daniel McKelvey who recently graduated from his own doctoral program while the other three women were assigned to Dr. Leake and Dr. Shatto. Both Dr. Leake and Dr.

Shatto have plenty of experience while Dr. McKelvey is not even licensed. This felt like both Cherilyn and I were purposely put with a mentor who had no experience due to our obvious difference with the caucasian students. Within the mentor sessions with Dr. McKelvey, both Cherilyn and I stated to each other and to others that we were getting nothing from Dr. McKelvey other than him asking us how we were doing with our coursework. I did not find out that the three women, although they were assigned different mentors, were a part of a "mentoring" called a LAB that was being taught, conducted, and overseen by Dr. Shatto. These labs have taught these three girls VARIOUS expensive trainings. It also gave them an INFLUX of hours for their Time2Track; as well as, so many other benefits. Cherilyn and I were NEVER asked to join this lab and did not learn of this lab until September 2021 when it came to light via a phone call from Cherilyn who was told by Tyler Tims that the three girls and Brian were receiving additional expensive trainings conducted by Dr. Shatto and that she stated that she did not want to spend her money training Cherilyn and I. We both informed Dr. Leake who unprofessionally took up an entire class speaking to all five women about what was going on in September; therefore exposing the situation to all people instead of conducting her own individual research. This created a DIVIDE between the other three caucasian women and Cherilyn and I. It created a HOSTILE educational environment where the other girls did not want to be near Cherilyn and I. I believe that this was what Dr. Leake was attempting to do since she made an entire class of Cherilyn and me basically accusing the girls of receiving preferential treatment. The girls were offended and supposedly reported Cherilyn and me. The three women denied that they were getting anything additional that Cherilyn and I were not getting. They lied. They admitted to lying. They lied to Cherilyn and me but Dr. Leake already knew. They were told to lie to us by Dr. Shatto. In that same class period, I made Cherilyn go to speak to Mrs. LaNeeca Williams at Title IX to tell her what was going on. A few days after Dr. Leake sent an email stating that these girls were in a lab because they were all Dr. Shatto's mentees (Mayme was Dr. Leake's mentee and still received all lab trainings) and that it was up to Dr. Shatto to decide who she spends her money on since the funding for the trainings were strictly coming out of Dr. Shatto's pocket. Due to Dr. McKelvey's inexperience, he could not offer Cherilyn and I any trainings. When he found out that Cherilyn and I knew about the lab, he offered us information to the Asian and African-American Psychological Association. To this date, the only benefit Cherilyn and I received from being Dr. McKelvey's mentees were participating in conducting a training for Clarksville City Council on 10/21. Again, Dr. McKelvey does not have a special lab where we benefit from additional trainings that could help us further OUR EDUCATION (in our classes) and in our CAREERS (additional hours on our VITE, Time2Track, experience). Cherilyn and I did not file a form via Maxient when this occurred; therefore, it was not further pursued. Two months after the first incident occurred, on 11/21, Dr. Shatto informed all students that she and a few other students were invited to go to Virginia to work in a clinic for additional hours and experience. She stated that the only criteria was that we the students verbally inform her as well as send her an email. Cherilyn and I did both; however, we were not picked to go on the trip. Leigh and Mayme went on the trip. Leigh informed Cherilyn that she got another additional training and that she was once again told to not tell Cherilyn and me specifically. This training helped Leigh advance through one of the Spring 22' courses; therefore, putting her far above in curriculum compared to the other students. In the Summer 22', I was assigned to assist Dr. Shatto with initiating the opening of the clinic. Mayme, Dr. Shatto, and I were the only people to have the keys (there were only three keys). Mayme dropped out of the program in Spring 22', so Dr. Shatto had two keys, and asked me to put my key in a lockbox that was available to all students. As soon as summer 22' started, Dr. Shatto removed the lockbox key; therefore, making it nearly impossible to enter the clinic to do my required hours. I was told to communicate with Dr. Shatto to see when she was in the office so that I had to schedule around her. She would have frequent days where she was late or never came; therefore, I would be less in hours and never really understood when I could go to the clinic. After I expressed my concerns, Dr. Shatto agreed to allow me to do work-from-home hours. Additionally, in July 22 the A/C in the clinic went out putting another barrier to me entering the building to complete my hours. Dr. Shatto made the faculty believe that I was unwilling to do my hours at the clinic, when if I had not had the barrier of her removing the key or the A/C outage I would have happily been at the clinic. Prior to the fall 22' semester starting, I asked Dr. Leake and Dr. Knickmeyer if I could change my mentorship to another professor. I wanted Dr. Leake as my mentee but she stated to both Dr. Knickmeyer and I that she had a busy schedule and could not take me. A few weeks later she took Lynn, a caucasian female, while telling me essentially that she did not want me. I wanted a different mentor who could help me more than Dr. McKelvey's "check-ins." He also was late to several check-ins or did not show up. Both Dr. Knickmeyer and Dr. Leake stated that I had no other choice than to keep Dr. McKelvey. August 23' in the Fall 23 semester, I was on a remediation plan to finish my courses with an assigned "I";

therefore, being behind due to personal issues, I had to go part-time and take classes with the newest incoming class. In my course with Dr. Shatto, she excused me from the first class stating that she would only go over the syllabus and that I didn't need the first class because it is the same information. What she had not told me until the third or fourth class is that I have an entirely DIFFERENT syllabus than the other students in my course (Abraham, Lynn, etc). My syllabus included trainings that I had to show certificates of. I was not informed of the trainings until near the midterms. Dr. Shatto had stated December 2022 that she was going to fail me anyways since I did not turn those certificates in on time when I was NOT AWARE. I felt that she purposely mislead me and planned to fail me due to miscommunication. If she had failed me, my remediation plan would be useless. She did fail me. She did not even mention this until the last remediation plan meeting with me Dr. Leake, and Dr. McKelvey.

The meeting prior on 11/22, all faculty agreed that I was doing good on the remediation plan. She did not mention that she planned to fail me due to her not communicating with me about the trainings that I was specifically only assigned that had me late until she explained it to me around midterms. Additionally, I informed both Dr. Shatto and Dr. McKelvey that I was ready to present both of their presentations which ended my remediation plan successfully. I told them both in person and in front of others that I was ready to present. Dr. Shatto stated in front of me, Cherilyn, Dr. Clemens, and Dr. McKelvey that I only needed to present for Dr. McKelvey's presentation and that should be sufficient. I was well aware of the remediation plan so I remember asking her if she was sure. She stated yes in front of EVERYONE. The next day I presented for Dr. McKelvey. I had both presentations done two weeks prior since I asked weeks prior to presenting. I had both presentations done and ready to go. In the last remediation meeting, she stated that she had not stated that and I was lying. Dr. McKelvey knew she was lying and kept his head down. Dr. Leake yelled at me throughout the last meeting and stated that I was not a psychologist like Dr. Shatto and I had no room to state that she lied. Dr. Leake also insinuated that I did not have a disability in that meeting. Soon afterwards, Cherilyn told me that Dr. McKelvey stated that both she and I were being treated unfairly.

Additional information includes: I was going through extreme domestic violence with my cop ex-husband in my first semester. Dr. Shatto was one of the first to see me continually go to classes with bruises on my arms. In November 21, I filed an Order of Protection against my ex-husband. I soon dropped the Order due to inability to provide secure housing for my daughter and I due to only making 300\$ bi-weekly in the program. The program does not allow for us to work additional jobs to be self-sufficient. After I dropped the Order, my ex installed cameras in my house without my knowledge. On Christmas, he held me hostage for 6 hours and after he told me he would rather be with his mistress I threw my computer and slapped him. I suffered extreme physical, emotional, and sexual abuse from my ex for years. The faculty acknowledged that I was going through extreme distress and allowed me to have I's in a few courses; thus, starting my first remediation plan. I was not aware that my remediation plan was not completed by August 22' when I received two more remediation plans. Throughout the Fall 22 semester, I went to many meetings on the remediation plan and FINISHED the remediation plan by Thanksgiving 22'; however, even with forms stating that I was considered a student with disability, Dr. Leake, Dr. Shatto, and Dr. McKelvey stated that they decided to fail me. Once they told me that they were failing me the first week of December 22, I completely stopped turning in my assignments since they already came to a conclusion. Dr. Shatto has stated to SEVERAL students that she has a scoring rank system for all of her students. She threatened me via email in late October that my "actions have consequences" and then she lied about the presentation and purposefully miscommunicated and instilled VARIOUS BARRIERS.

Dr. McKelvey stated that although I was considered done on his remediation plan that he would NOT count the experiences in my essay because they were new experiences. He never told me that new experiences in the essay would not be sufficient until the last remediation plan.

I additionally had an incident in November where I was observing a student conduct therapy for a community member. This therapy was very intense and the client/ community member left the meeting halfway through crying and running towards the door. I witnessed this occur via computer monitors. I attempted to find Dr. Shatto in the building. I went both upstairs and downstairs and could not find Dr. Shatto. I informed Kar to text Dr. Shatto since I deleted her number months prior due to uncomfortableness. I made the decision to provide support to the student and his client. When I went outside I saw the client on the pavement and her husband and the clinician/student both hovering above her. I stated SPECIFICALLY, "Could you guys please move so I could talk to her?" This was not meant in the way of me stating could you men. I use guys to refer to multiple people. The clinician/student was upset because I stated guys. He has known me for months and obviously knows how I speak. I have no idea why he took that meaning me saying the men need to leave. As soon as I got to the client/ community member, she was sitting on the pavement. I consoled her and I pat her

back. I assured her that everything was okay. I calmed her down enough to where she was able to stand back up. Dr. Shatto came outside near the end of me calming the client down. Dr. Shatto convinced Dr. Leake and everyone else that my actions were UNETHICAL. I STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT I PROPERLY CONSOLED A HIGHLY DISTRESSED CLIENT; compared to her therapist who stood above her hoovering her.

I am appalled and disgusted with the actions of ALL professors in the Psychology Doctoral department. Both Cherilyn and I have asked for help on multiple occasions. We were gaslighted and ignored by Dr. Knickmeyer and Dr. Leake. We have spoken to Dean Singleton and Dr. Knickmeyer in SEVERAL occasions. Dr.

Knickmeyer told me that I was lucky to even be in the program with the amount of I's and ignored my frustrations with Dr. Shatto and Dr. Leake. I believe Dr. Knickmeyer ignored the treatment that I was facing because Dr. Shatto brings grants and opportunities to APSU; although she is a racist. I believe that Dr. Leake created a hostile discriminatory clique with Dr. Shatto and Dr. McKelvey where their wrongful actions go unnoticed. The entire psychology department knew of the unfair and racial discrimination that we were both facing. The professors who were women of color offered Cherilyn and me options and opportunities since the Psy D. department would not.

I am pursuing this to the maximum extent in court.

Has the incident been reported to Campus Police or local Law Enforcement? If so, please include as much detail as possible to include report number if known.

No, the incident was not reported to the police.

Did you require medical assistance? If so, please include as much information as possible and to also include the medical facility.

No, however, treatment endured by Shatto, Leake, and McKelvey has caused emotional and some mental concerns. This also caused me HOUSING instability and FOOD INSECURITY. I can not find a job last minute to account for the loss of income from the program and housing that was provided from the program.

Are you requesting supportive measures? If so, please include as much information as possible for your request.

Academic Support (e.g., tutoring, retaking exams/classes, changing courses sections, etc.)

Do you give consent for a release of information shared directly with your Advisor? (Sexual Harassment Complaints Only)

Yes

Pending IR #00019183

Submitted from 199.30.113.200 and routed to LaNeece R. Williams (Chief Diversity Officer & Title IX Coordinator). No routing rule matched. Routed to default recipient.

Re: Supervision at 9

Shatto, Erynne H. <shattoe@apsu.edu>

Thu 11/3/2022 8:04 AM

To: Goodmancave, Heather A. <hgoodmancave@my.apsu.edu>

Hi Heather. Supervision is important and you are free to make your own choices. It sounds like you are not prepared to have supervision today. If you feel you need that hour to juggle other things, that is your decision. Just understand that all decisions have consequences. See you next week.

-Dr. S

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Goodmancave, Heather A. <hgoodmancave@my.apsu.edu>

Sent: Thursday, November 3, 2022 7:52:42 AM

To: Shatto, Erynne H. <shattoe@apsu.edu>

Subject: Supervision at 9

Good morning Dr. Shatto I have supervision at nine. I have a soap note to catch up on and plenty of homework. Can I use supervision time today to do the soap note and send it?

Heather A. Goodmancave

PsyD Student

APSU

hgoodmancave@my.apsu.edu



Appendix B

Clarification of Some Issues from Interview 2/27/23

Policy Development and Student Involvement

In August 2021 (2nd year of the program), the current program director and another faculty member joined the program, creating a core faculty for the Psy D program although there were more hires still outstanding. Outside of a basic curriculum, no policies or handbook for the Psy D program existed to that point. Faculty began to meet for program meetings weekly, and students selected a representative for each cohort to attend the open portion of the program meetings. This process is discussed on p. 18 of the current version of the Student Handbook. Student representatives are charged with disseminating information from these meetings to their cohorts and from their cohorts to the program faculty, and notes from the open portion of the meeting are posted in a TEAMS folder accessible by students and faculty. Beginning in Fall 2021, during these meetings policy was proposed, crafted, refined, and agreed on, resulting in the first version of the Psy D Student Handbook completed in April 2022. The handbook then was submitted to our accreditation consultant, minor changes were requested and made, with written acceptance of the changes requested and obtained from students. This resulted in the current version of the handbook. The handbook is posted on the program website and in a program D2L course shell accessible by all students and faculty. Students sign the Handbook Agreement (p. 4 of the handbook) stating that they have read and agree to abide by the policies of the handbook on entering the program. Additional opportunities within the program for dissemination of information and changes in policy are during the weekly clinic meeting and the annual retreat as well as with more informal opportunities.

Assignment of Advisors

At the beginning of Fall 2021, students of the cohort of 2020 and 2021 were assigned initial advisors based on overlapping research interests/areas of expertise. Concurrently policy was being crafted during program meetings for the possibility of changing advisors. The resulting policy and procedure are noted in the handbook on p. 19 and in Appendix D. For the cohorts from 2021 and going forward, this and other policies and procedures are discussed in CPSY 8001, the first-year colloquium course that meets weekly for the first year. Beginning with the cohort of 2022, potential students interview with faculty on Doctoral Interview Day and create a rank ordered list of faculty with whom they wish to work, and faculty review these when deciding whether to accept applicants into the program. Faculty will accept students based on a



number of factors, including but not limited to number of current advisees, research area overlap, and other workload issues.

Professional Development

Numerous opportunities for professional development exist during the course of a program of study in the Psy D program. Please see p. 45 of the handbook for expectations for students in professional development over the course of their program of study. Numerous opportunities exist for students to participate in all levels of professional development including membership in professional organizations (e.g., Tennessee Psychological Association, American Psychological Association and others), outreach opportunities (e.g., Light Up the Night at Ft. Campbell), conference attendance (National Multicultural Summit, Southeast Psychological Association, etc.) and trainings (e.g. MMPI-3 training, AACEPT Training for neurodivergent clients). Many are funded for all individuals wishing to attend, either through course fees or through grant funding. Others are provided gratis by faculty as per their areas of expertise. These are disseminated during program meetings, clinic meetings, and via email, and students are not required to attend, though all of the above and many more were available to all students. Some opportunities are course-, advisor-, and/or student-research interest-specific, such as when in Fall 2021, Dr. McKelvey's advisees created and disseminated a civility training for members of the Clarksville City Council, or when as part of the Military Psychology course students attended a conference to present a poster based on a needs survey conducted as part of the course, or currently as former students from the Health Psychology course participate in the writing of a grant related to the clinic. Students are required to complete some of these activities by the end of their program as referenced above, but are free to choose how to accomplish these goals. All junior faculty have written or been part of grant projects, with two of the three currently on funded projects, and the third planning to reapply. These projects all have student roles for activity and funding. The program director (the only tenured faculty member) is in the process of writing a grant that, if funded, will also have roles for students involving activity and funding.

Clinical Hours

Students are all expected to complete and document various types of clinical activity during their tenure in the program. The department pays for tracking software called Time2Track to ease the burden of documentation for students. All students engage in numerous clinically-related activities that count toward the hours that they will submit on their internship applications, even those not engaging in direct clinical services at any time. These activities could include group supervision during practicum class and clinic meeting, didactics, observation of other clinicians, outreach, scoring of assessments administered by other clinicians, etc.