



## City Service Commission APPEAL OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION FORM

Pursuant to Rule XIV (Discharge, Appeal, Hearing), Section 2 of the Rules of the Board of City Service Commissioners (the Commission), a regularly appointed employee who has passed his/her probationary period may appeal a discharge, reduction (involuntary demotion), a second suspension within six months of a former one or any suspension exceeding fifteen working days in length. The time limit to file an appeal ends at 4:45 p.m. on the third business day following receipt of written notification of the disciplinary action. An appeal is filed when it is received and time-stamped by the Department of Employee Relations on behalf of the Commission. The Department of Employee Relations is located at City Hall, 200 East Wells Street, Room 706, Milwaukee, WI 53202-3515. An appeal may also be filed by electronic transmission to the following email address: [elmoor@milwaukee.gov](mailto:elmoor@milwaukee.gov) by FAX to the following number: (414) 286-0203, Attention: Elizabeth Moore.

Appellants are encouraged to review the **Guidelines for Disciplinary Appeals to the City Service Commission** located at: <http://city.milwaukee.gov/der/csc/FormsDocs>

**Please complete the form below to appeal a qualifying disciplinary action.**

I appeal the following disciplinary action, pursuant to Rule XIV, Section 2 of the Rules of the Board of City Service Commissioners (*check one*):

- ☒ Discharge
- ☐ Reduction in classification (involuntary demotion)
- ☐ Second suspension within six months of a former one (Date of 1<sup>st</sup> suspension: \_\_\_\_\_)
- ☐ Suspension exceeding 15 days

I received written notification of the disciplinary action that I am appealing on: 09/18/2023. Please attach the disciplinary notice for the action that you are appealing. **Please attach a brief statement indicating the basis of your appeal.**

This appeal is dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2023.

Signature of appellant: D'Lana Reed

Name of appellant (please print):	D'Lana Reed
Appellant's Department/Division:	Common Council City Clerk
Appellant will be represented by:	
Contact information (phone number): (email address):	Phone: Email:
<b>Appellant's Contact Information:</b>	
Primary phone number:	4143248819
Address:	4429 W Keefe Ave Milwaukee, WI 53216
Email:	Wdlana09@icloud.com

**Please write a brief statement indicating the basis of your appeal (attach to Form):**

**I am appealing the discharge action taken against me on the grounds that there is a lack of evidence to support the need for yet another discharge. It is very clear retaliation has taken place seeing as how the same rules being implied that I violated are the same as the first discharge although improvements have been made following the original appeal hearing. The rule violated and paragraphs cited are unsubstantiated. Reason 1 citing paragraphs I and K indicate insubordination and refusal to perform the duties required however physically handing out survey cards to every customer is not in the SOP or job description for which I was employed. Management put much emphasis on following the SOPs to ensure that I was performing the job correctly. The sole purpose of the survey cards when they were reintroduced to the department was to gain feedback from customers upon their completion of services rendered by the department. I expressed to management immediately that the requirement of this, only from me, was not beneficial to what was indicated as being the purpose of the survey and explained that even if they were given out that does not guarantee feedback would be given. I did attempt during my second week back to address this outlandish requirement by making a sign encouraging customers to take a survey card and thanking them for their feedback. Mr. Cooney was unhappy with this as it went around his attempt at bullying, but it still satisfied getting customers to take survey cards, after this he had them almost entirely removed from the front office which was counter productive to encouraging feedback from customers. To the other point of refusal to do end of day check-ins this was never a guideline in my PIP and management was extremely aware and acknowledged the fact that August was the slowest month so it wouldn't be likely that I would have any task. So yet again Mr. Cooney's attempt at bullying was denied although he continued to make it an issue.**

**Reason 2 citing paragraph Q and R indicate refusal to comply with department rules and absences/tardiness without excuse. Since my return on 7/17/2023 I have had 2 tardy's that were mere minutes due to unforeseen traffic issues and they weren't until I had already been back for 6 weeks. There have been no deviations to my schedule and any accounts of me going to break or lunch late were documented and explained and were all less than 5 minutes with the exceptions of the ones that I had to notify management about. I have no control over someone else coming to cover me late and in some cases my coverage asked to use the restroom before covering me, so I obliged the request of my coworkers as it is the humane thing to do. Regarding me arriving early my PIP indicated that an email needed to be sent on or before 8am every day when I arrived so I was arriving around 7:56am and would start my day from the point that I had to log on to send the email, I didn't log on and then not continue to work or check my emails. So now me being early and tracking my time is being considered an issue when originally it was me being a few minutes late. Clearly there is no right way in Mr. Cooney's eyes to be present for work, which is a large testament to the fact that he did not want me to again be employed with the city of Milwaukee let alone his department.**

**Reason 3 citing paragraph K indicating incompetence or failure to perform duties required is unsubstantiated. I'm not sure how me speaking to my coworker is a violation of this nor did I interrupt said coworker considering she was just having a non-work-related conversation with a supervisor and then continued that conversation with myself and another coworker. This is very clear retaliation and an attempt to alienate me from every other employee in the department. Said coworker is also very confused and perplexed as to the implication of me interrupting her when she was having the same conversation with others outside of myself because it was regarding her running for an aldermanic seat again.**

Reason 4 citing paragraph J indicating offensive conduct or language towards the public or other employees has no actual documentation or examples to support the claim. Using hearsay as an example especially when it's being reported by a supervisor who is assisting another supervisor in their attacks and bullying is inadmissible. Since my return I have not received any official complaints from customers or fellow coworkers as to me mistreating them. The only person that would argue me being offensive is Mr. Cooney and this is solely based on his desire to again have me removed from my employment with the city of Milwaukee.

Reason 5 indicating that I did not meet over 50% of the action plan in the PIP is entirely false and I have a preponderance of evidence to in fact support that I was meeting 80% of said PIP, not to mention there was still 5 weeks left as it was to go until 10/17/2023. This means there was still a substantial amount of time for the remaining 20% to be accomplished. This is yet another clear example of the retaliation being taken against me by Mr. Cooney as he is very blatantly refusing to acknowledge the improvements that have been made and instead focus on the one item from the action plan that was solely put in place to attempt to garner negative feedback from customers about me. The customer surveys that have been received that directly reference or mention me have been nothing but positive, I have positive feedback from coworkers regarding my helping citizens gain information that they wouldn't have otherwise received had it not been for my assistance. I expressed my concerns about retaliation the day I returned to the office as it was very clear I was not being welcomed back to be successful but rather to find a way to remove me yet again and this time have it stick in the eyes of the commissioner's. All my cries for help and reported complaints were ignored and here I am again a mere 2 months after returning having to appeal a wrongful discharge because I was put back under the same supervisor who very clearly did not want me employed there.

The standard of service for the position is not being carried throughout the office. My coverage when I am away from the front desk or out of the office is not required to follow the same SOP guidelines that I am nor are they considered as an unsatisfactory employee for the same things that initiated this unwarranted attack against me. PIP or not, others are not held to the same standard, that is an SOP guideline and it's a very clear indication that retaliation was occurring. There are very clear examples of biased and unfair treatment that is carried out with the sole goal of being able to discharge me. If my counterpart or others were held to the same standard there would be no employee for the front desk and 2 less specialist. It is very clear what the goal was here through all of this. I returned under the impression that I would actually be given a fair chance to show and prove that I belong with the city and that I was an asset to the department, I was very sorely mistaken because it didn't matter how good I was at my job or how much improvement I showed, Jim Cooney just needed a way to document situations that he orchestrated to "show" that I didn't belong.