

Re: Grievance against Sloan Lattis, OLR Inquiry No. 2016Ma00469

Sabina Burton <sabinaburton@live.com>

Tue 4/19/2016 7:59 PM

To:Nate Cade <nate@cade-law.com>;

8 attachments (3 MB)

3hrNiteCrs-screenshot.pdf; 682 - Lattis to Hawks.pdf; 682a - Lattis.jpg; 682b - Emails with Laufenberg - 4-7-15.pdf; 682c - Bemis leave days stolen.pdf; 682e - Hawks-Lattis exchange.pdf; 682f - Rqst for assistance fm Laufenberg.pdf; 682g - Files changed back.pdf;

Hello Mr. Cade,

Thank you for the clarification. I am just glad someone is following up on these incidents. I must say I am a bit worried though to learn that Lattis is connected to OLR. I fear this report will lead to more retaliation against me. I have been subjected to adverse employment actions for almost 3 years.

I reviewed the OLR page after the intake person mentioned an online submission process. I will attach some more evidence of Lattis' involvement in my case that I believe to have been questionable. I am not certain that you will get much usable documentation from UW-P. The university is good about misplacing or losing things. Several pages were removed from my DRB folder and of course the department and college does not make copies of evaluation forms.

Note: the red highlighted filenames correspond to exhibits attached to this email.

2013 GRIEVANCE INCIDENT

June 4, 2013 (Day 46): The Chancellor sent a letter to the grievance committee, and mailed a copy to me, asking the committee to re-do their findings of April 19, 2013 within a month. In the opening paragraph of his letter Shields stated that I had “filed a sex discrimination grievance with the Committee against the chair” of my department. To be accurate, the grievance I filed against Dr. Caywood stated that he “practices retaliation, sexual discrimination and favoritism.” Whether the board finds that sexual discrimination is apparent does not diminish the other charges against Dr. Caywood and those charges must not be ignored but they were ignored. The Chancellor and Lattis ensured that my other charges were swept under the rug. ([ZA-2 -Chancellor-response.pdf](#)). ([ZA - GrievanceCommissionFindings-4-19-13](#))

June 24 2013 – Drefcinski sent my grievance and Caywood’s response to Lattis with a few hand written notes on it.) Note that the heading of the package says “Grievance: Dr. Caywood, chairman of the department of Criminal Justice, practices retaliation, sexual discrimination and favoritism.” Lattis advised Drefcinski to ignore my charge of retaliation completely. ([Burton Gvnce against Caywood.pdf](#))

June 27, 2013 – Lattis sent a letter to Drefcinski. In this letter she derails the real issues of my grievance and directs Drefcinski away from a fair finding calling her corrupt actions “framing the issue.” This is not part of the grievance process. She did not talk to me. She did not make me aware that she was writing this document. I only found out about it after the grievance committee had issued their findings. The three issues that she wrote to narrow my grievance seriously misrepresented my claims. Lattis gave the committee three issues to “narrow” the grievance and in so doing guaranteed that my core issues were ignored. ([Lattis Letter to Drefcinski-6-27-13.pdf](#))

July 10, 2013 –The grievance committee issued a second findings. This second findings of the grievance

committee was far different from their first finding. It is far removed from the actual grievance hearing, which was audio recorded. It did not mention retaliation which was the major element of my grievance. It was influenced greatly by Lattis' letter to Drefcinski which misrepresented my grievance claims. In the findings the committee states that Lattis *advised* (emphasis added) the committee to narrow my grievance to three issues. She never asked me about this. She gave this advice purposefully to mislead the committee so that they would not give due consideration to my core grievances and it worked. Lattis did this maliciously and I believe she violated ethics codes in doing so. (ZA-5- GC 2nd Findings.pdf)

July 26, 2013: Chancellor Shields published his response to the grievance commissions second findings. His response does not address any of the demands in my grievance. The Chancellor's response was greatly influenced by Lattis' advice to the grievance committee which narrowed my grievance to three issues that misrepresented my claim. (ZA-6- Chancellor-Response-7-26-13 .pdf)

Since my situation was not improving and I had been given no assurance that I was even being taken seriously I filed my claim with the ERD several days later. But for Lattis' advice to Drefcinski I would not have had to file my claim with the ERD.

2014 GRIEVANCE INCIDENT

Oct 2, 2014 8:46 PM – Throop sent an email to Jennifer S Lattis which included an email I had sent on Oct 2, 2014. In my email I requested an investigation into Interim Chair Dr. Dalecki's actions and pointing out again that my grievance hearing against Dalecki was long overdue. (DenHerdertoLattisccShields-Oct2-2014email.pdf)

After she sent my email to Lattis Dean Throop disciplined me for sending my email to the chancellor.

On about October 7, 2014 Provost Den Herder sent an email to Lattis.

Lattis replied on Oct 7, 2014, 5:30 pm – Content was redacted. The next morning Den Herder sent an email to Chancellor Shields asking if he was O.K. with her email to Sabina Burton and he replied that it was fine.

The next day Provost Den Herder sent an email to Burton which denied her requested investigation and did nothing to correct the delays in her already long past due grievance hearing. This email was clearly reviewed by Lattis and I believe she advised Den Herder to send this email to me.

The denial of my requested investigation caused continuing retaliation and my requested grievance hearing was derailed due to unnecessary and unexplained delays. Another grievance I filed against Dean Throop, for her letter of direction, was delayed for 11 months and finally derailed. My 2014 grievances were never heard. The Provost and Chancellor would not have taken this action without Lattis' advice. Lattis advised the Provost to violate my due process rights and Chancellor Shields acquiesced because of Lattis' advice.

2015 HEALTH ACCOMODATIONS INCIDENT

4-30-15 – I received an email from Tim Hawks with an attached letter from Hawks to Lattis. Tim's letter politely asked for accommodations. (Accommodation Request.pdf)

5-13-15 –Lattis emailed Mr. Hawks, my attorney at the time. Hawks forwarded her email to me with the comment "So, now we see who is part of the problem." I knew Lattis was part of the problem a long time before then. She empowered the administration to harass me. I wrote back with some more info concerning the matter Attached to my email was a screen shot showing the 3 hour course. (Lattis blows smoke.pdf) (3hrNiteCrs-screenshot.pdf)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE – INCIDENT (June 2015)

June 27, 2015 at 7:19:19 PM CDT – Lattis sent an email to Hawks about time slips saying "*We recently learned that Dr. Burton submitted time slips for April in which she claimed no leave taken. However, she was not cleared to return to work until April 17. She must resubmit time sheets as soon as possible showing*

sick leave for the first half of April. We have some strong guidance from the Board of Regents that we must ensure faculty members are claiming leave time when they are not working during a semester. Please have Dr. Burton contact John Lohman in Human Resources as soon as possible to make arrangements for correcting this error.” Questions that came to my mind about this communication were: Why is Lattis getting involved in a simple clerical error? Why does the Lattis feel that this issue is so important that she sends the communication about it to my lawyer? Why does she do so on a Saturday evening when she had just recently learned of it? If there was a problem why didn't HR contact me about it? Who changed my leave entries? What was their motivation for changing it? Was it to mess up my 50th birthday on Mon Jun 29th during my summer vacation hoping to provoke me to an angry act for which they could fire me? (682 - Lattis to Hawks .pdf)

In her email Lattis directed my attorney to tell me to contact John Lohmann as soon as possible but John Lohmann was leaving the interim HR position on June 30th. That gave me only one day, my birthday and his last day on the job, to even contact him about the matter.

I believe Lattis was trying to build a false accusation against me that could be used to later fire me.

6-28-15 – I sent a photo of the computer screen showing the Absence Request History on my account to Tim Hawks. Note that it shows 8 hours on 4/1/15. This had been changed from my previous entries that were approved by Jane Laufenberg, HR, in April. (682a – Lattis.jpg)

Sun 6/28/15 8:09 AM – I sent proof that I had entered my leave correctly to my live.com account to preserve the evidence. (682b - Emails with Laufenberg - 4-7-15.pdf)

Sun 6/28/15 8:09 AM - I sent an email to Tim Hawks explaining that someone had done this sort of account manipulation before, to Danelle Bemis. In an email she sent to me on May 14, 2013 11:32:10 AM, Bemis wrote that Caywood had reported the incident. Bemis was fired a few months later. (682c - Bemis leave days stolen.pdf)

Mon 6/29/15 10:36 AM – Tim Hawks sent an email to Lattis, which included the photo I had sent him earlier, and asked for clarification of a peculiar contradiction. (682e - Hawks-Lattis exchange.pdf) (682a – Lattis.jpg).

June 29, 2015 at 12:23:22 PM CDT - I sent another screen shot to Tim Hawks showing that my account had been changed again to reflect the correct leave time. Somebody, I suspect Lattis, had changed it back. (682g - Files changed back.pdf)

June 29, 2015 1:27 PM - Lattis wrote “She (Burton) needs to claim sick leave for April 1 through April 16 (weekends excluded); probably one day at a time since it is difficult to figure out the multi day process and exclude weekends. They will, tomorrow, push back her April leave report and she needs to start over.” (682e - Hawks-Lattis exchange.pdf)

Monday, June 29, 2015 2:04 PM – I sent an email to Jane Laufenberg asking for assistance. (682f - Rqst for assistance fm Laufenberg.pdf)

June 29, 2015 2:19 PM – Lattis wrote “I think they have figured it out and Sabina needs to do nothing. It appears she filed more than one time sheet for the same period. They have deleted the April time sheet with no leave claimed and substituted the other one. Unless you hear otherwise from me, Sabina need do nothing further. Phew.” Lattis only backed off because I had proof. (682e - Hawks-Lattis exchange.pdf)

June 29, 2015 2:06:53 PM - Laufenberg responded to my email with “HI Sabina – You are all set. The rest of April is considered your May leave (you’re on the 9 month academic payroll calendar). You already did your May leave report. Thanks for checking.” (682f - Rqst for assistance fm Laufenberg.pdf).

Thank you.

SB

P.S.: I am attaching the remaining documents to a second email.

From: Nate Cade <nate@cade-law.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 12:05 PM
To: Sabina Burton
Subject: Re: Grievance against Sloan Lattis, OLR Inquiry No. 2016Ma00469

Ms. Burton

Than you for your email. I want to make sure you are not operating under any misconception of my "role" in this matter.

I am a Special Prosecutor for the Office of Lawyer Regulation. I only become involved in matters on behalf of OLR as an independent outside lawyer when OLR may have a conflict – such as in this case, as Attorney Lattis is somehow connected to the OLR System. Should could be on an investigative committee, a prosecutor, etc. I do not know. In fact, I have never heard of her (as I do not handle education law matters) and I have never met her. Thus, my sole job is to determine whether your grievance has merit to proceed, and if so, a committee would then bring charges. My role is no different than if there was an issue with a prosecutor in one county, and thus a prosecutor from another county would have to make a special appearance to avoid a conflict of interest. Thus, I am not "handling your grievance."

Again, I am only looking at the facts and determining if a basis exists to proceed. That is why I requested access to your employment records. Based on the notes in the file by the initial investigator through your complaint, it appears as if you allege, among other things, that Attorney Lattis, whether directly or indirectly, took an action against you that resulted in an adverse determination. I believe that such an allegation means you have put your employment files "at issue", and that I should review them to see if there is any merit as to that particular claim.

I may contact you at some point in the future about a telephone interview. I stress the word "may", as I have just started to review the documents in the file, and obviously, I am expecting more documents once your employment file is received.

I hope this clarifies what my role is in this matter.



Nate Cade
T 414.255.3802 • F 414.255.3804 • M 414.405.7801
PO Box 170887, Milwaukee, WI 53217
nate@cade-law.com • www.cade-law.com

From: Sabina Burton <sabinaburton@live.com>
Date: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 at 10:42 AM
To: Nate Cade <nate@cade-law.com>
Subject: Re: Grievance against Sloan Lattis, OLR Inquiry No. 2016Ma00469

Dear Mr. Cade,

Thank you for handling my grievance against Attorney Jennifer Sloan Lattis. Please let me know if or what documents you need. I have emails that my former attorney forwarded to me or cc'd me on as well as some screen shots that I can put together for you.

I composed a brief narrative for you and also attached a motion to court that I submitted recently that may provide some necessary background information.

Thank you for your attention.

Kind regards,

Sabina