

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

DEPARTMENT OF CITY CIVIL SERVICE SUITE 900 – 1340 POYDRAS ST. NEW ORLEANS LA 70112 (504) 658-3500 FAX NO. (504) 658-3598

CITY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BRITTNEY RICHARDSON, CHAIRPERSON JOHN KORN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON MARK SURPRENANT RUTH WHITE DAVIS ANDREW MONTEVERDE

AMY TREPAGNIER DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL

Thursday, March 6, 2025

Ms. Nicole May

Re:

•

Nicole May VS. Information Technology and Innovati Docket Number: 9625

Dear Ms. May:

Attached is the action of the Civil Service Commission at the Commission's meeting on Friday, 2/3/2025.

Yours very truly,

é,

Doddie K. Smith Chief, Management Services Division

cc: Kimberly LaGrue Max V. Camp file

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

NICOLE MAY, Appellant

Docket No. 9625

v.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION, Appointing Authority

ORDER

The Department of Information Technology and Innovation (ITI) moved for summary disposition of Ms. May's appeal pursuant to Civil Service Rule II, § 4.1, on the basis that Ms. May has no right of appeal as a probationary employee in the position of Information Technology Manager. The Commission heard oral argument on this motion at its special meeting on February 3, 2025. Ms. May appeared *pro se*. ITI's motion for summary disposition is denied.

Ms. May was promoted from Information Technology Specialist III to Information Technology Manager on November 1, 2023. Her probationary period in that position would have ended on October 31, 2024. ITI removed her from the position of Information Technology Manager and returned her to her permanent position of Information Technology Specialist III on June 15, 2024. Based on the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeal's recent decision in *Oliver v. Dep't of Finance*, No. 2024-CA-0290 (La. App. 4 Cir. 1/16/25), ITI failed to provide appropriate notice under Civil Service Rule VII, § 1.1 of the reason(s) Ms. May failed the working test period. Rule VII, § 1.1 provides that "[a]t any time during his working test period, after the first two months thereof, the appointing authority may remove an employee Upon the removal, the appointing authority shall forthwith report to the Director and to the employee removed his action and the reason therefore [sic]."

Ms. May also alleges that ITI failed to evaluate her at three months and to place her on a performance improvement plan, as required by Rule VI, § 4.7. The parties may address this issue at the hearing of this matter.

ITI's motion for summary disposition is DENIED.

rittney Richardson (Mar 3, 2025 17:43 CST)

BRITTNEY RICHARDSON, CHAIRPERSON

JOHN KORN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON

, C. Sur Mark C. Surprenant (Feb 18, 2025 12:36 CST)

MARK SURPRENANT, COMMISSIONER