



Friday, January 26th

Daiyaan Ijaz

Employment Complaint Case Overview

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Introduction	3
Personal Background	3
Professional Summary	4
Hiring Process and Initial Expectations	4
Evidence of Hiring Process and Salary Negotiation Concerns	6
Overview of Employment History with Ford	6
Purpose of the Document	7
Timeline of Key Events	8
Start of Rapport with Thomas Kopczynski (5-1-23)	8
Interaction with Kulveer on Team Switch and Perception Issues (5-11-23)	9
Collaborative Challenges as Subject Matter Expert (5-10 and 5-11)	10
Understanding Team Dynamics and Communication: Insights from Thomas Kopczynski (5-11-23)	10
Navigating Micromanagement and Upholding Professional Boundaries (5-10-23 and 5-11-23)	12
Preserving Professional Integrity Amidst Perceived Sabotage (5-15-23 and 5-17-23)	13
Analysis of Management Response to Technical Problem-Solving (5-16-23)	15
Strategic Navigation of Technical Problem-Solving and Managerial Interaction (5-17-23)	16
Initiative and Problem-Solving During Development Roadblocks (5-18-23)	17
Proactive Leadership in Times of Stagnation	17
Situation Overview	18
Stepping Up to Unblock the Team	18
The Turnaround	18
Reflecting on Feedback and Professional Growth	18
Positive Developments and Ongoing Challenges (6-5-23)	20
Team Changes and Contractor Dynamics (6-9-23)	20
Anticipating Next Steps and Addressing Layoff Concerns (6-26-23)	20
Detailed Overview of the Conversation	20
Expressing Concerns About Workplace Credit and Recognition	21
Reduced Workload and Unclear Future (7-6-23)	21
Legal Analysis of Compensation Discrepancy and HTHD Classification (8-9-23)	21
Background of HTHD	22

HTHD Eligibility and Compensation Structure	22
Comparison of Salary Grades and HTHD Classification	22
Discrepancies in My Compensation	22
Exploring Potential Rotations and Addressing Compensation Concerns (08-08-23)	24
Continuous Engagement and Task Completion (08-09-23)	24
Documentation and Acknowledgement of Efforts (08-11-23)	25
Confirming Career Movements Outside Model-E (08-14-23)	25
Analysis on Divergent Management Styles and Employee Implication (08-15-23)	25
Strategic Engagement with HR (09-05-23)	26
Responses to Instability and Communication Gaps at Work (9-18-23)	27
Addressing Concerns of Neglected Growth and Communication Breakdown (10-2-23)	29
Search for Direct Answers	30
Advocacy for Professional Growth, Integrity, and Recognition (10-5-23)	30
Security Oversight and Collaborative Resolution	31
Subject of Blame	31
Prioritizing Integrity Over Promotion	32
Realization of Mistreatment	32
Ineffective Logging and Communication Breakdown	33
Proposed Solutions and Proactive Leadership	34
Conclusion and Call for Equitable Treatment	34
Advocacy for Equitable Communication and Recognition in HR Engagements (10-25-23)	34
Reflections on Management and Culture	36
Seeking Fair Compensation	36
Resilience in the Face of Disappointment	36
Professional Integrity and the Request for Clarity from HR Representative Brianna Hart (10-26-23 - 10/27/23)	37
Key Points	37
Brianna's Acknowledgment of Incorrect Hiring Level and Compensation	37
Resilience in the Face of Disappointment	38
Unmet Promises and Delayed Actions	39
Mixed Feelings Amidst Professional Deliverables (10-31-23)	39
Asserting Professional Agency Amidst Systemic Ambiguity (11-03-23)	39
Demonstrating Value While Navigating Corporate Inertia (11-07-23)	40
Negotiating Recognition and Respect in the Workplace (11-09-23)	40
Enduring the Dichotomy of Contribution and Recognition (11-11-23 to 11-13-23)	40
An Ongoing Journey for Equity and Acknowledgment (11-14-23)	40
The Illusion of Progress: Carrot on a Stick (11/16/23)	41
The Illusion of Progress: HR's Empty Promises and the Pursuit of Fairness (11/17/23)	42
Call with Kulveer (Transcribed Meeting Notes)	44
Call with Brianna, Kulveer, and Thomas (Transcribed Meeting Notes)	44
The Beginning of File Padding in the end of the call with Brianna, Thomas, and Kulveer	

(Transcribed Meeting Notes)	45
Betrayal and Mistrust: The Path to File Padding Allegations (11/27/23)	46
Navigating Smear Campaign	47
Managerial Analysis of Brianna Hart’s Conduct Within Call	48
Impression Management for Role Performance	49
Betrayal and Mistrust: The Silent Treatment (12/1/23 - 12/6/23)	50
Betrayal and Disillusionment (12/1/23)	50
Continued Silence and Skepticism (12/6/23)	50
Internal Conflict and Professional Facade	50
Reckoning with Feigned Ignorance: The Dissolution of Trust in Corporate Advocacy (12/12/23)	51
Zach Reaches Out for Inquiry (12/18/23)	53
Health Crisis and Communication with Kevin O’Sullivan (1/2/24)	54
Miscommunication and Misunderstandings Around Work Absence (1/3/24)	55
Conflicting Rotation Assignments and HR Communications (1/8/24)	56
Concerns About Rotation and Supervision (1/10/24)	59
Addressing Workplace Dynamics and Seeking Resolution - Feedback and Next Steps (1/11/24)	60
From Kulveer to Me	60
From Me to Kulveer	60
Melissa to Me	60
Juliana to Me	61
Performance and Coaching	61
Allegations of Bullying Date	61
Professional Conduct Date	61
Reaction to Management’s Approach	61
Commitment to Ford	61
Comfort and Safety in the Work Environment	61
Verification of Claims	61
Me to Jeff	62

Introduction

Personal Background

I am Daiyaan, currently serving as an Enterprise Technology Ford College Graduate at Ford Motor Company. My journey at Ford, which began on September 12th, 2022, has been

characterized by a deep commitment to delivering high-quality work in the Upfitter Integration System (UIS) within Model-E.

Professional Summary

As the subject matter expert in UIS on Auth Integration, I collaborated with the cybersecurity vehicle engineering team, product owners, and software engineers to implement and deliver the ICA and PCA solutions for product launches at various phases. My responsibilities encompassed explaining security changes to stakeholders in business nomenclature, presenting solutions to the security and FPI leadership teams, and coordinating with cross-functional teams to meet integration requirements. Prior to these accomplishments, I created the authentication system, which was a foundational achievement. Subsequently, I took on the role of guiding a new team—previously unfamiliar with our architecture—through the transition to a web application.

Hiring Process and Initial Expectations

Upon joining Ford Motor Company, I was offered the position of 2022 Information Technology Ford College Graduate which was for former interns within Information Technology (IT). The offer, with a base monthly salary of \$6,542.00 and positioned at General Salary Roll 5 (GSR), was initially allowed to expire as I was concurrently in the application process with another company. However, following a hiring freeze at that company, Ford reached out again with the same offer, which I then accepted.

The hiring process, as reflected in my experience and the company's documentation, lacked flexibility in negotiations. Despite my efforts to highlight that my skills and experience matched the criteria Ford sought for a higher salary grade, the conversation around this was effectively shut down. This initial interaction set a foundation that, in retrospect, lacked consideration for a long-term partnership based on mutual respect and recognition of skills and experience.

In the beginning, I was under the impression that my starting salary grade was set at SG5, a decision I accepted without full awareness of alternative possibilities. I came to understand that a starting position at SG6 could have been within reach, given my qualifications and experience. This realization surfaced after I revisited the details of my hiring process and was further cemented during conversations with Thomas Kopczynski, my advisor, and earlier interactions with my supervisor, Kulveer.

The revelation that my capabilities and contributions may have warranted a higher salary grade contributed significantly to my feelings of being undervalued. My attempts to address this with Kulveer were met with responses that emphasized the finality of the past decisions. Although Kulveer hinted at the potential for future positive changes, this did little to assuage the sense of initial oversight. As a professional committed to my career and self-respect, reconciling this past decision with future promises proved challenging. This ongoing concern prompted me to seek guidance from Thomas Kopczynski, hoping for a more actionable approach to resolving these issues and restoring my sense of professional worth.

The benefits package offered to me as a new hire included a range of options, including health care, retirement savings, additional services, and compensation and incentive compensation plans. The Annual Incentive Compensation Plan (AICP) was designed to reward employees for company and individual performance, with awards based on position level and performance. However, my salary grade and the subsequent AICP target were areas of particular concern, as they did not align with my expectations and the level of responsibility I assumed in my first rotation.

The overall hiring process, while standard in many respects, did not adequately consider my specific professional background and skills. This oversight in recognizing the full extent of my experience and capabilities set the stage for future challenges and a sense of being undervalued within the organization.

In another exchange, the document titled "external_hiring_negotiate_attempt_x2.pdf" contains a series of email exchanges I had with Bridget Horvath, a Recruiting Coordinator Team Lead at Ford Motor Company, spanning from August 16 to August 31, 2022. These emails revolve around my upcoming start at Ford, address verification for shipment of devices and paychecks, and completion of required forms like the drug test and health history form.

Crucially, the emails also include my continued efforts to negotiate my compensation package. Despite my earlier discussions with Adam Farley, as seen in the "Re_Ford FCG-Offer Discussion.pdf," I reiterate my request yet again for a salary reconsideration. I emphasized my belief in the value I bring to Ford and sought a conversation about my compensation, viewing my potential role at Ford as a long-term investment. I clarify that I do not intend to back out of the offer but want to understand my leverage in negotiating for what I perceive as my worth.

Bridget Horvath responds by reaffirming Ford's policy on the non-negotiability of starting salaries for Ford College Graduates (FCGs). She outlines the comprehensive nature of Ford's Total Compensation Package, including salary, benefits, mentoring, and development opportunities. She also mentions that all employees undergo a performance review at the end of the year, which could potentially lead to merit increases based on personal and company performance.

This document highlights the challenges I faced in trying to negotiate my starting salary and Ford's firm stance on their compensation policies for new graduates. It also reveals my determination to advocate for my perceived value while navigating the corporate recruitment process.

Evidence of Hiring Process and Salary Negotiation Concerns

During the offer discussion, I communicated my enthusiasm for joining Ford, along with a desire to negotiate based on my full-stack engineering background. I expressed that my unique experience was perhaps overlooked and sought an opportunity for verbal discussion to share my value. However, Ford's policy, as reiterated in email communications with Adam Farley and Bridget Horvath, emphasized that Ford College Graduates (FCGs) receive a set salary. These exchanges, including one on October 11, 2021, and subsequent discussions in August 2022, highlighted Ford's non-negotiable stance on FCG starting salaries. This approach, while standard for Ford, did not consider the individual merits and unique experiences I brought to the table. As noted in my email correspondence, "I want to be happy working for Ford knowing that I was taken seriously as that impression management is conducive to my role performance" (Email from Daiyaan Ijaz to Adam Farley, October 11, 2021). The rigidity of this policy and the lack of responsiveness to my requests for salary reconsideration based on my experience and technical competencies set a precedent for my subsequent experiences at the company, where I felt undervalued and not fully recognized for my contributions and capabilities.

Overview of Employment History with Ford

Since joining Ford Motor Company, my role has undergone significant changes. Initially, my responsibilities included low-value frontend tasks that, despite being within my competence, did not fully utilize my skills. This changed when I took on the individual task of delivering the product's authentication system — a project more aligned with my expertise and of higher value to the organization.

In this role, individually, I conducted a discovery phase which involved gathering integration requirements from cross-functional teams, assessment of our current implementation, and determination of the most effective architecture within the identified constraints. A task estimated to take 2-3 months and require the efforts of three contractors to fully deliver was executed and integrated by me in less than a week. For me, it was straightforward and was well within my wheelhouse of expertise.

After this milestone, I directed my attention mid-year to meeting the ICA and PCA security requirements for the authentication system. These requirements stemmed not from my implementation methods, but from the unique architecture of our application which presented novel security challenges. Given the absence of related issues and existing resources for mitigation, security relied on my background research and in-depth knowledge of authentication systems for developing effective solutions. My prior experience in independently creating an authentication system and an identity provider — skills I developed before joining Ford — proved crucial in addressing these challenges. This expertise allowed me to contribute significantly within Ford, underscoring my aptitude as the right person for this task.

Upon the successful completion of the PCA and once my initial responsibilities had been fulfilled, I channeled my efforts into the independent creation of the UIS Diagnostic Tool. This initiative was conceived and executed solely through my own volition, without any direct request from my supervisors, as a strategic use of my available time at the company. The tool was designed to enhance diagnostic capabilities within our internal framework and its development was a proactive measure to streamline our operations. The tool not only significantly benefited our internal team by optimizing our processes but also extended its utility to support cross-functional teams. Its successful integration across different departments demonstrated its value, reinforcing my commitment to Ford's success and my ability to drive innovation from within.

By the summer of 2023, I took on a crucial role in a new team formed to transition our software application to a cloud-based web platform. As the only member with in-depth knowledge of the product and a clear vision from the outset, my expertise was instrumental in steering this subset of our larger group through the intricate process of rearchitecting our software. Although the task was well within my wheelhouse — reflecting its high value to the business and the necessity of my insight for execution — it did not present a significant challenge due to my extensive experience and ability to remain in a state of 'flow.' Anticipating my transition to another rotation, I focused on implementing best practices for knowledge transfer to ensure the team's ongoing success without my direct involvement.

This journey has not been without its challenges. My tenure has been marked by a series of events that have led to feelings of disengagement and demotivation. These stem from what I perceive as unethical practices in management, passive undermining of my capabilities, a lack of accurate reward for my contributions, being led on without clear transparency, lack of communication, direction, and a general avoidance of addressing my concerns.

Purpose of the Document

The purpose of this document is to outline and detail the series of events and interactions that have culminated in my current state of disengagement and mistrust within Ford Motor Company. It aims to illuminate the erosion of trust between myself and my supervisor, characterize the response from the HR representative which I perceive as a smear campaign, and highlight the absence of actionable support from external resources within the Ford matrix.

Included are detailed accounts and transcriptions of my interactions with team-members, my supervisor, Ford College Graduate (FCG) advisor, adjacent managers, and the HR contact designated by my supervisor. Collectively, exemplifying the issues that have precipitated my current predicament. It is my intention to submit these accounts for your independent and impartial examination at Ford, with the aspiration of bringing these concerns to light and reinstating a culture of trust and ethical integrity in our workplace.

My primary objective is to vindicate my reputation and to seek prompt redress for the retaliatory actions undertaken by leadership, which I perceive as misconduct through the improper imposition of probation as a form of intimidation. Such actions have unjustly impeded my career progression in response to my legitimate and rightful expression of concerns.

Timeline of Key Events

This section is not meant to cast aspersions but to provide a factual recount of the events as experienced, highlighting the necessity for trust and respect in the professional expertise that each team member brings to the table. It serves to illustrate the challenges I faced in an environment that at times seemed not fully prepared to leverage my skills and experience to their fullest potential.

Start of Rapport with Thomas Kopczynski (5-1-23)

On May 1st, 2023, I initiated a conversation with Thomas Kopczynski, expressing my desire to explore the possibility of switching teams, as I believed it had been six months in my current role. During this interaction, I candidly expressed the challenges I was facing, particularly noting, "I have people micromanaging my work; I don't get a second." This statement was a reflection of the intense scrutiny and lack of autonomy I was experiencing, which significantly impeded my ability to manage my schedule and work commitments effectively. Thomas, acknowledging the busy nature of our roles, offered to set up a meeting later that week to discuss

these issues in detail. His understanding response, "You own your calendar, so if you set a time in the future, you should be able to keep that," highlighted his recognition of the importance of autonomy in managing one's work.

In addition to discussing logistical challenges, I also shared my aspirations and frustrations regarding my career trajectory and recognition within the company. I conveyed my concerns about being started at a lower salary grade (SG5) despite my extensive experience and achievements. This concern was encapsulated in my remark, "I think I'm struggling to not grow resentment, which isn't Kulveer's fault. I was recently reading (yesterday) that FCGs start as SG5 or SG6, and it had put a bad taste in my mouth." These words underscored my feeling of being undervalued and not taken seriously in terms of my professional capabilities and potential. Thomas provided a listening ear and support, suggesting he could speak to my supervisor to explore opportunities for growth, thus demonstrating his role as a FCG Advisor and advocate in my professional journey at Ford.

Interaction with Kulveer on Team Switch and Perception Issues (5-11-23)

On May 11th, 2023, I proactively approached Kulveer Virk to discuss my intention to explore opportunities in other teams after the completion of my current rotation. I communicated my commitment to a smooth transition, emphasizing my readiness to ensure stability and effective handoff of my work. My message was clear: "Kulveer, I have to let you know that I intend on exploring other teams after this first rotation is complete."

During this conversation, I expressed my concerns about the current working dynamics, particularly regarding the perceived micromanagement from Vivek. I articulated my need for autonomy to effectively execute my responsibilities: "Vivek needs to understand my boundary, and not tell others to distract me from getting real work done."

As the creator and subject matter expert of the authentication system, I had consistently delivered solutions that propelled the team forward. However, the entry of Vivek into our team's ecosystem marked the beginning of a phase where my work became subject to invasive scrutiny, often followed by undue criticism. The feedback loop, which was previously constructive and led to rapid development, began to stall as Vivek insisted on interjecting into processes that were already functioning optimally.

Kulveer's response highlighted a different perspective. He noted, "Other team members are hesitant to work with you, not sure." This was a point of contention, as my role largely involved independent work, and I did not regularly collaborate directly with these team members. Kulveer expressed his surprise at what he perceived as a change in my attitude, labeling it as "pure

arrogance." This label seemed to overlook the context of my work situation and the efforts I had made to maintain professional standards.

His advice was straightforward yet lacked a nuanced understanding of my experience: "You have to have a collaborative attitude, this is pure arrogance." This interaction underlined a discrepancy between my self-perception as a dedicated and technically competent professional and the perception held by some team members and my supervisor. Despite Kulveer's concerns, my objective remained focused on exploring new opportunities for professional growth within Ford, a decision driven by my aspiration to find a team environment more aligned with my working style and professional goals.

Collaborative Challenges as Subject Matter Expert (5-10 and 5-11)

My first rotation brought to light certain collaborative challenges, particularly highlighted on May 10th and 11th. My expertise in delivering the authentication system meant that I was often sought for technical guidance. However, this advisory role sometimes faced resistance, impacting the acknowledgment of my contributions.

In an interaction with a team member, Tina, I provided a solution to an issue she was facing. Despite providing an immediate and accurate solution to clear stale data and rectify login problems, my input was initially dismissed, prolonging the issue. This pattern of communication not only hindered the efficiency of our collaboration but also contributed to an environment where my expertise and input were not fully valued.

This pattern of context collapse was observed during my attempt to initiate the team switch with Kulveer. His feedback mentioned hesitancy from team members to work with me—a sentiment that seemed disconnected from my experience as I predominantly worked in solitude on my project components. Kulveer's characterization of me as exhibiting arrogance and lacking a collaborative attitude overlooked the context of my work and the challenges I encountered within the team dynamics.

It's important to clarify that my intention has always been to foster a productive and supportive team dynamic. The lack of acknowledgement for my contributions is not a reflection of my willingness to collaborate, but rather an indication of a disconnect between the skills and expertise I bring to the team and the recognition thereof.

On a positive note, this situation not only highlights my technical excellency but also underscores the importance of effective communication and trust within a team. The conversation with Tina, detailed in the chat logs and captured in screenshot evidence, serves as a

clear illustration of my ability to contribute substantially to resolving complex issues, even when facing initial skepticism.

Understanding Team Dynamics and Communication: Insights from Thomas Kopczynski (5-11-23)

Following my conversation with Kulveer on May 11th, I reached out to Thomas Kopczynski to discuss the feedback I had received about being perceived as hesitant to work with and the ensuing discussion about my intention to explore new teams. Initially, Thomas expressed curiosity about the reasons behind the perceived reluctance from my colleagues to engage with my solutions. As I elaborated on the day's events and my proactive approach to problem-solving, Thomas became more understanding of my position.

Thomas emphasized the importance of effective communication and questioned whether the assertiveness in my interactions could be misinterpreted. He advised on the delicate balance of being both assertive and receptive in communication, to ensure that while being objective, I also foster a positive team environment. He highlighted, "if ppl feel like u r making them small or less than, they will respond negatively," suggesting that I ensure my communication style was not contributing to the team's hesitancy.

Our dialogue took a philosophical turn when Thomas reflected on the nature of perception I brought up, recognizing that my views were shaped by direct experiences. He acknowledged this, yet also noted, "sometimes we jade ourselves," hinting at the possibility of a skewed self-perception. His remark "stuff just happens over time, you learn more" was not dismissive; however, it could be seen as a red herring, overshadowing the necessity to scrutinize underlying structural issues within the organization. While he acknowledged the personal growth that comes with time, this perspective may imply an acceptance of the status quo, which could inadvertently overlook problems with the underlying structure that warrant direct attention.

It was at that point I shared the interaction with Thomas. The detailed chat logs provided to Thomas reveal a gradual shift from his initial hesitation to a full understanding of the nuances of my situation. Thomas's response, "Why didn't she just clear the DB... like that is straightforward. Why did she go sideways?" underlined the absurdity of the situation. He recognized the emotional elements at play within team dynamics and advised on the potential impact of perception on collaboration. Thomas concurred that if I was consistently correct in my technical assessments, it would eventually become evident to the team. He counseled patience and suggested that over time, my technical accuracy would help in overcoming any negative perceptions.

Afterwards, I candidly expressed again that my age and how I'm perceived—a young individual, seemingly brash—play into how seriously I'm taken by the team. Despite my ten years of experience and tangible successes outside of Ford, my suggestions were often dismissed or my competence underestimated. However, Thomas posed a pivotal question: "Which is awesome, but why do you feel like they need to get it or care about these things?" As you read further into "Responses to Instability and Communication Gaps at Work," you'll find a deeper exploration into the mismanagement that uncovers how the compensation issue merely symbolized the ongoing disregard I faced—a young professional battling a corporate culture that seemed indifferent to my contributions and resistant to change. It was how I was being treated that led to me chasing after validation and proving myself here at Ford Motor Company.

You will find a similar dissonance reflected in the section "Reckoning with Feigned Ignorance: The Dissolution of Trust in Corporate Advocacy." This dissonance not only will show his inability to relate to my perspective but also signaled a lack of empathy for the challenges I faced. I will make the case that Thomas could not grasp the essence of my struggle, which was less about the promotion itself and more about the need for accountability, respect, and fair treatment within the company. This misalignment pointed to a broader issue of advocacy within the corporate structure, where the experiences of younger talent, like myself, are at risk of being misunderstood or disregarded, calling into question the foundational support systems purported to foster our growth and development.

However, this conversation with Thomas was pivotal in validating my experiences and provided perspective on the broader context of human relationships in a corporate setting. It underscored the complexity of interpersonal dynamics and the critical role of communication in not only solving technical problems but also in building and maintaining a constructive team atmosphere, which Kulveer failed to do.

Navigating Micromanagement and Upholding Professional Boundaries (5-10-23 and 5-11-23)

My workflow faced significant disruptions attributed to the actions of Vivek, a newly appointed technical lead. For weeks his involvement was characterized by what I perceived as unnecessary oversight, which I articulated as "babysitting" – a term capturing the essence of the scrutiny and control I was subject to. This period was notably marked by repeated instances where my professional judgment was second-guessed, and my autonomy compromised.

On May 11th, in expressing my intention to switch teams to Kulveer, I also articulated my need to work without interruption, highlighting the inefficiency introduced by Vivek's involvement: "Kulveer at this rate we aren't going to make progress... I'll let you make the decision, if Vivek should continue to babysit me along with his other devs, or I get real work done". This sentiment

was echoed in my discussion with Fernando, where I insisted on the need to focus, undisturbed, to meet project deadlines with quality results: "I appreciate you but I want to work alone moving forward... I was weeks behind when Vivek was on call with me".

The term 'babysitting' was objected to by Kulveer, yet I felt it accurately represented the overreach into my domain of expertise, as further explained: "okay what do I call someone micromanaging my decisions... their guidance has cost us weeks". The frustration was palpable as I felt the imposed oversight was derailing my efforts and the quality of work I was committed to delivering.

In my candid conversation with Fernando, I was met with a troubling narrative of 'a bunch of problems' by Vivek—problems that had not existed prior to his intervention. A narrative that painted problems where there were none, only to step in as the ostensible 'fixer'. His actions led not only to a bottleneck in my workflow but also gave rise to a perception among the team that the quality of my work was somehow flawed. With his failure to provide any burden of proof, this became a cause for concern to me, culminating in feelings of professional sabotage.

When detailing this issue to Thomas, his initial hesitation turned to agreement upon reviewing the chat logs, which showcased the extent of the unnecessary intervention I experienced from Vivek and his team. The constant involvement in my workday, characterized by prolonged calls and requests for screen sharing without contributing valuable input, significantly hindered my efficiency.

The interactions on record with Vivek further illuminate the situation. The incessant demands for meetings and walkthroughs, often at the expense of my other responsibilities, resulted in a substantial loss of productive time for me, which in turn, was a valuable loss for Ford Motor Company. This continued even after I had explicitly outlined the need for focused work time and indicated the detrimental impact of these interruptions on project timelines on a daily basis.

The profusion of these events brought disparity between the contributions I was making and the recognition—or lack thereof—that I received. These documented exchanges between myself, Thomas, Fernando, and Kulveer are not just anecdotal; they serve as a testament to the friction between the need for professional autonomy and the imposed micromanagement, which not only affected the progression of my work but also seemed to influence the perception of my character within the team.

Preserving Professional Integrity Amidst Perceived Sabotage (5-15-23 and 5-17-23)

During a pivotal week in May, specifically on the 15th-17th, I confronted the unsettling realization that my efforts to contribute effectively to the team were being undermined. This was not a mere inconvenience but a fundamental disruption that I previously could only liken to sabotage—a term I do not use lightly but one that captures the essence of my experiences.

The interference peaked when, during a routine standup on May 15th, I was once again drawn into a prolonged and directionless call right after which echoed past frustrations. Despite my attempts to communicate the necessity for undisturbed work time, I found myself engulfed in a five-hour call, an echo of past instances where my technical insight was overlooked. As I disclosed to Thomas Kopczynski on May 16: "spent 5 hours yesterday in one single call being babysat," a session that recycled futile approaches I had already discounted a month and a half prior. The irony did not escape me when, soon after being released from this unproductive hold, "I found the solution 20 minutes after standup... alone" — a testament to the efficiency of independent problem-solving over forced collaboration.

For clarity – ‘after standup’ means the contemporary day the message was delivered to Thomas (May 16th) and is not to be assumed as a discrepancy from the post-standup call on May 15 mentioned above.

These intrusive sessions were continuously marked by a lack of productive input and a palpable absence of technical understanding from those involved. The weight of these events compelled me to voice my concerns about feeling sabotaged.

Then came May 17th, this day felt akin to being a character in a real-life rendition of 'The Office', where the line between dry humor and my reality was blurred, leaving me feeling like I was not in on the joke. The ridiculousness of the situation was documented as I detailed my day to Thomas, echoing a script from a satirical sitcom yet filled with genuine frustration: "Yesterday I got called into a meeting at 11... worked on a solution for 1 hour... then finished that call at 3:48... started working... at 4:24 pm I'm asked for an update by Kulveer... I tell him explicitly I get no space... I'm solving things for other people they should understand and know how to do." For additional context on the timeline, our team's standup was at 10:00 AM. The hour I bargained for with Vivek in exchange for meeting after was spent working on a solution was a strategic move on my part, a result of foresight that precious time would be squandered in a drawn-out meeting. My comments, "they don't take it seriously, I have to repeat 50000x before consideration lmaoo," convey not just my exasperation but also the ludicrousness of having to champion the solutions I was brought in to provide. This account, reinforced by the chat logs shared with Thomas, is more than a list of complaints; it is a chronicled testimony of the need to persistently defend my professional acumen against counterproductive micromanagement. It

demonstrates the irony of my situation and further illustrates the detrimental effects of excessive supervision on my ability to deliver and the recognition of my role within the team.

My conversation with Thomas revealed the ongoing struggle with the newly appointed tech lead, Vivek, whose recent actions added layers of complexity to my work. "They are investigating an issue in standup I shared an answer to," I remarked, which pointed to the inefficiency of re-examining resolved matters, further exacerbated by Vivek's tendency to second-guess and unnecessarily prolong discussions. The recurring theme of needing to assert my technical solutions multiple times before they were taken seriously was not just a reflection of my situation but indicative of a broader issue within the team dynamics.

My vulnerability to Thomas, not out of caprice, but as a necessary step towards preserving the integrity of my work and wellbeing, I laid bare the reality of my situation: Vivek's imposition not only clouded my professional judgment but also unjustly placed my work quality under suspicion. The contrast between the periods before and after Vivek's involvement was stark; where once there was stability and progress, there now lay disruption and blame.

Analysis of Management Response to Technical Problem-Solving (5-16-23)

I faced a critical juncture in addressing a technical fix crucial to our project's success on May 16th, 2023. My dialogue with Kulveer Virk consistently showed my commitment to delivering a viable solution amidst a challenging environment. I conveyed my progress succinctly: "I'm working on a solution... it's easier solo... I'm making progress," which highlighted my preference for focused, independent problem-solving over collaborative efforts that had previously led to redundancy and inefficiency.

The response from Kulveer was one of anticipation: "I am counting on you," placing the weight of expectation squarely on my shoulders. My assertion that "what we did yesterday is what I did a month and a half ago, just repeated the same things I validated, but in front of others this time," pointed to the recurring theme of revisiting proven solutions, a pattern that diluted the value of my expertise and foresight.

However, Kulveer's response to this communication failed to address the core issue. The exchange took a turn towards logistics, with a proposed meeting at the Rotunda that I was unaware of. Kulveer's acceptance of my oversight and willingness to reschedule to the following week was a brief interlude in an otherwise high-pressure conversation focused on immediate technical deliverables. This sidestepped the substantial concern I raised. I had pointed out a recurring pattern of revisiting previously validated solutions, a practice that not only undermines the efficiency of our processes but also significantly devalues my professional expertise and the

foresight I bring to the team. Rather than acknowledging this pattern and its implications, the conversation was deflected towards logistics, specifically an upcoming meeting at the Rotunda.

This shift in focus from substantial technical concerns to logistical arrangements represents a strategic avoidance of engaging with the deeper issues at hand. It exemplifies a pattern of management behavior that places undue emphasis on immediate deliverables while disregarding the need for a strategic reassessment of how tasks and problem-solving are approached within our team. The pattern of revisiting proven solutions without acknowledging their initial validation by me points to a lack of recognition of my professional judgment and contributions.

Later in the day, the urgency in Kulveer's tone was evident: "Daiyaan, any update on the work you have been doing today for my 5:15 report out?" My response highlighted the constraints I faced: "I was brought into a call at 11... finished 3:25... was not given time to focus uninterrupted." The details of my technical intervention, "managed to force login auth in front of the browser," showcased my efforts to maintain functionality under less-than-ideal circumstances.

Despite the acknowledgement of my workaround for the login issue, Kulveer's insistence on witnessing the implementation directly reflected an oversight approach that, while understandable, added to the pressures of delivering within a tight timeframe. My candid plea for uninterrupted time—"I just need time uninterrupted to work to prove results"—was a clear expression of the need for space to apply my skills effectively.

Moreover, the lack of meaningful follow-up on these genuine concerns is indicative of a dismissal of the challenges I face in the work environment. This is compounded by the contrast between my demonstrated ability to efficiently solve problems independently, as opposed to the forced and often directionless collaborative efforts that have for some reason, only plagued me. This contrast, however, remains unaddressed in our interactions, suggesting a disconnect in understanding and appreciating my working style and strengths.

These repeated situations necessitate a change in strategy and acknowledgment from the management. It calls for a recognition of the identified pattern and a strategic shift in approach, allowing for greater autonomy in my work and a more effective utilization of my technical insights. This change is essential not only for the efficient progress of our projects but also for fostering a work environment that respects and values the unique contributions of each team member.

The conversation reached a finale in Kulveer's mention of a review by the chief architect, which I acknowledged while also setting expectations for the rapid development context: "It's not an amazing piece of code because I'm coding as fast as I can so any comment he makes is going to be deferred for refactor unless it affects functionality or optimization, or security." This day

exemplified the tension between delivering under the microscope of management and the necessity to uphold the integrity and security of the technical solutions provided. It highlighted the fine line that technical professionals often walk—balancing the demands of oversight with the need for the autonomy necessary to innovate and problem-solve effectively.

Strategic Navigation of Technical Problem-Solving and Managerial Interaction (5-17-23)

I aim to use this specific interaction with Kulveer as clear evidence that micromanaging was squandering company resources as I was well versed and those impeding on my work did not contribute a single line of code. Supporting screenshots will be provided. Early in the workday, I made a direct yet professional request to Kulveer Virk: 'I am once again requesting some time to work independently, without meetings or interruptions; please let me focus.' This request was an intentional effort to create an environment conducive to deep technical work, which is essential for tackling the complex challenges we face.

Kulveer's response was pragmatic, focused on actionable outcomes: "What are you working on today?" My reply was a detailed exposition of the technical challenges encountered with the Nest server, specifically the websocket disconnections during hibernate events. The depth of my explanation conveyed not only my grasp of the situation but also the complexity of crafting an immediate solution.

As I delineated the nuances of the `handleDisconnect()` function and its role in maintaining Nest server stability, Kulveer inquired about potential solutions. I immediately outlined several proactive strategies to address the issue, including advanced process tracking to discern the state of the user's browser.

Kulveer's inquiry into the behavior of websockets led to a real-time troubleshooting session, where I took practical steps to replicate and observe the issue, sharing my findings as they unfolded. This dynamic display of my technical capabilities highlighted my ability to devise solutions on the fly, even as I emphasized the need for dedicated time to refine and test these approaches thoroughly.

The dialogue culminated in a negotiation for the next day's standup, where I sought assurance of the necessary focus time: "Can I skip standup tomorrow or give my update and go focus tomorrow... I'll knock out the crashing stuff." This statement was more than a request; it was a commitment to address and resolve the pressing technical issues, demonstrating my ability to manage complex problems internally and deliver results promptly. My commitment to upholding the highest standards of technical excellence, coupled with the skill to navigate managerial

expectations, is a testament to my professional integrity and dedication to the success of our projects at Ford.

Initiative and Problem-Solving During Development Roadblocks (5-18-23)

Proactive Leadership in Times of Stagnation

On May 18, 2023, during a critical development phase, I was compelled to take decisive action to address a significant roadblock that had impeded the progress of the entire development team at Ford. FordPro, our primary application, had experienced downtime that lasted an entire day, leaving my colleagues unable to proceed with their assigned tasks. This disruption threatened to halt productivity and delay project timelines significantly.

Situation Overview

As the team grappled with the downtime, a sense of inertia had taken hold during a crucial team call. Discussions about the issue lingered without direction or resolution, and despite my other pressing responsibilities, I recognized the need for immediate and decisive action. The urgency was amplified by the impending deadline for a 12 o'clock meeting update, and the lack of initiative from other team members was palpable.

Stepping Up to Unblock the Team

Faced with this challenge, I proposed a development mode fix that would allow us to log into our application and continue working despite the downtime. When I saw that no one else on the team felt confident enough to tackle the issue and that our supervisor, Kulveer, had not responded to my suggestion to a solution, I knew I had to step up. I recall expressing my frustration and determination to Thomas, stating, "we just sat there talking so I just started sharing my screen and finishing the job." My refusal to succumb to unproductive passivity in times of perceived defeat.

The Turnaround

With a developer's intuition and a leader's resolve, I spearheaded the creation of a development mode fix. This strategic move not only circumvented the downtime but also salvaged the day's productivity. The next day's work, which saw my colleagues utilizing the branches I had resolved, was a direct result of my initiative. This incident was a clear reflection of my proactive stance and my refusal to let external circumstances dictate our team's efficiency.

My ability to lead by example and the impact of taking ownership in moments when it matters most was a constant theme shown. It highlights the importance of strong action bias in a team setting, especially in the technology sector, where delays can cascade into significant setbacks.

Reflecting on Feedback and Professional Growth

Amidst these triumphs, I reflect on feedback provided by Kulveer in my mid-year review. While recognizing my speed and efficiency in solution development, he suggested a need for systems thinking and patience. I take this feedback seriously, yet I believe it is essential to provide concrete examples when offering such advice. My track record at Ford is replete with instances where my proactive approach and technical foresight have been instrumental to our project's success.

Kulveer noted, "For improvement, following areas need to be looked into - I have noticed that you are very fast in developing a solution and sometimes jump while problems are still being defined." He urged me to adopt a more holistic view, recommending, "You are encouraged to explore systems thinking approach."

I welcome Kulveer's feedback, yet I maintain that my proactive and rapid solution development has consistently served Ford's interests well, especially during critical junctures. My track record speaks to a foresight that has often been acknowledged as highly valuable, albeit retrospectively. The incident on May 18th is a testament to how my swift actions prevented a productivity standstill, illustrating the practical impact of my solutions

It is worth noting that a substantial portion of my work—statistically speaking, at least 80%—transcends the confines of traditional task documentation like Jira stories. This is primarily due to the dynamic and fluid nature of the challenges I often address, which demand immediate and innovative solutions that aren't always premeditated within the scope of existing project structures.

Kulveer further advised on interpersonal dynamics, "Second area of improvement that can work for you is not coming across as frustrated when probed on the solution even though one had to sometime repeat or frame the solution in a way others can comprehend." This critique opened a dialogue about communication and the presentation of technical solutions in an accessible manner.

In the pursuit of resolving time-sensitive and complex technical issues, my solutions have at times been met with initial questioning and reluctance, particularly from those who hold senior titles within the organization. This skepticism often manifested as a feigned ignorance rather than a genuine probing of my methods, which subsequently required repetitive explanations on my part to advocate for the validity of my solutions. Despite these challenges, my commitment to

Ford Motor Company remains steadfast, and I continue to engage in meaningful discourse to ensure my technical contributions are understood and implemented effectively. With over a decade of experience and a substantial digital footprint that extends Ford's walls, I am dedicated to maintaining a standard of excellence in software development. My methodology for professional growth is iterative and resilient, unshaken by the need to reassert my expertise. I have devised comprehensive suites, frameworks, and libraries aimed at enhancing my colleagues' work and the developer experience. It is crucial to note that the feedback referencing perceived frustration is a misinterpretation of the context; it overlooks the difficulties I faced due to the dismissive attitude of some team members toward my expertise. My goal has always been to foster a collaborative environment, and I see these instances as opportunities to strengthen communication and trust within the team.

Positive Developments and Ongoing Challenges (6-5-23)

On June 5th, 2023, a conversation with Thomas Kopczynski brought some reassurance about the work environment at Ford. I mentioned the improved situation following Thomas's assumed intervention, noting that I had successfully completed all assigned tasks independently and without oversight. Despite ongoing issues with Vivek, my efforts to manage these interactions proved effective. Thomas confirmed having a positive discussion with Kulveer about me, indicating Kulveer's support despite areas for improvement. This interaction highlighted a shift in team dynamics and my ability to navigate complex workplace relationships effectively.

I speculate Thomas is the one that had stepped in to help my situation with Vivek which I appreciated.

Team Changes and Contractor Dynamics (6-9-23)

On June 9th, I discussed with Thomas the departure of several team members, particularly contractors, as our project neared completion. Thomas explained that such changes could be expected, especially as projects transition from development to production support phases. This conversation provided valuable insights into the nature of contract work and the typical ebb and flow of team composition in project cycles.

Anticipating Next Steps and Addressing Layoff Concerns (6-26-23)

On July 6th, 2023, a conversation with Thomas Kopczynski captured a critical moment in my journey at Ford, marked by feelings of frustration and vulnerability due to the dynamics with my colleague, Vivek.

Detailed Overview of the Conversation

During our interaction, I discussed my readiness for the next rotation, having completed the required Permanent Corrective Action (PCA) for our product's security aspects. This task, which I had ownership over, involved addressing a crucial aspect of our product's Auth layer, a responsibility that I completed well before the stipulated 90-day timeframe.

The discussion also touched upon the unsettling news of layoffs within Ford, a situation that was particularly concerning given the recent completion of our project. I expressed the need to compile a list of my accomplishments as a precautionary measure, in light of the company's direction to expect communications from HR.

Expressing Concerns About Workplace Credit and Recognition

A significant part of our conversation revolved around the challenges I faced with Vivek. I openly shared my feelings about the situation, stating:

- **Frustration with Credit and Recognition:** "Vivek came in, took lots of credit, and discredited me. From there, it was like whatever, man. I did all the work, I stepped up, took ownership. They would've needed 3 people to do my work."
- **Dismissal of Contributions:** I revealed a concerning incident where Vivek claimed that I hadn't contributed anything, a baseless assertion that completely overlooked my efforts and achievements. This claim was not only factually incorrect but also undermined the significant work I had put into the project.
- **Personal Resilience and Self-Recognition:** Despite these challenges, I expressed a strong sense of self-worth and accomplishment: "I know what I've done and how much it was and how much value it was. I'll be okay."

The dialogue on July 6th, 2023, not only reflects the complexities of workplace relationships at Ford but my ability to navigate these challenges during my first year in a professional corporate environment while maintaining a strong sense of self-worth and professional integrity.

Reduced Workload and Unclear Future (7-6-23)

By July 6th, I experienced a significant reduction in workload post-project launch, leading to concerns about job security in the wake of recent layoffs. Attempts to engage with my supervisor, Kulveer, about documenting my achievements were met with limited response, adding to the uncertainty. Thomas suggested viewing the situation as a potential fresh start, advising me to adapt to the new team dynamics and remain proactive in my role.

This series of conversations from June to July 2023 highly describes a dynamic and at times uncertain work environment at Ford. They highlight my ability to handle professional challenges, navigate changing team dynamics, and proactively prepare for future roles. While the situation with layoffs and team restructuring introduced elements of uncertainty, my proactive approach and Thomas's guidance provided a framework for navigating these challenges.

Legal Analysis of Compensation Discrepancy and HTHD Classification (8-9-23)

Before going into my personal experience within this section, I wish to remind you of some information. These background details, as well as discrepancies in my pay based on role and responsibilities are critical in equitable compensation and my contributions to Ford Motor Company.

Background of HTHD

The U.S. High Tech High Demand (HTHD) Program was designed as a response to changes in Ford's business model and external competition. It aims to attract and retain professionals in specific technical positions by offering a differentiated compensation program. The program is governed by the U.S. Compensation Office HR Operations and Senior Leadership, ensuring alignment with external market data and internal strategic priorities.

HTHD Eligibility and Compensation Structure

To be classified as HTHD, a position must match an external benchmark job, command a higher compensation in the marketplace, and show evidence of a pay premium over a sustained period [1][2]. HTHD positions include a range of technical roles, notably in full stack software development, UI/UX design, and engineering - areas aligning with my expertise [1]. HTHD employees are eligible for differentiated salary ranges, bonus targets, and stock awards [1][2].

Comparison of Salary Grades and HTHD Classification

The 2023 GSR HTHD Benefits Summary documents show significant differences between the salary grades for HTHD and non-HTHD positions. For instance, in 2023, the minimum annual salary for a Grade 5 HTHD position was \$63,120, increasing significantly for higher grades [3]. In contrast, the 2022 compensation plan for non-HTHD positions started at a lower minimum for the same grade [4].

Discrepancies in My Compensation

1. **Role Alignment with HTHD Criteria:** My role, involving highly technical full-stack software development, cybersecurity, and product ownership, aligns with the criteria for HTHD positions. Therefore, it appears that my role should have been classified as HTHD, making me eligible for higher compensation and stock awards [1] [2].
2. **Market Comparison and Compensation Disparity:** The significant gap between my initial compensation and the potential increase suggests a disparity that doesn't necessitate my access to Ford's external dataset, in contrast to the market benchmarks used by Ford for HTHD roles. My pay, in relation to my highly technical level of experience and contributions to Ford, is significantly below what any external resource could offer. This disparity raises concerns about equitable compensation, especially considering the critical nature of my work and its alignment with HTHD criteria.
 - a. The rotation list for Fall 2023 includes several positions classified as HTHD, which involve technical skills in areas such as software engineering and data analytics. Notably, roles similar to mine, requiring technical expertise in software development and cybersecurity, are classified as HTHD, suggesting that my role could also qualify for such classification [5].
3. **Internal Promotion and Compensation Adjustment:** The conversation with Thomas indicates that there is flexibility within Ford's system for promotions and compensation adjustments. However, it appears this flexibility was not fully utilized in my case, leading to a feeling of being undervalued.
 - a. During our conversation, Thomas highlighted the autonomy and authority of my supervisor, Kulveer Virk, to initiate promotions. He stated on August 8, 2023: "Kulveer can promo u at any time," suggesting a degree of flexibility and discretion within Ford's managerial structure for compensation adjustments. This point was critical in understanding the potential avenues for addressing my compensation concerns.
 - i. This was later verbally denied by Kulveer.
 - b. Additionally, Thomas's remarks underscored the possibility of pursuing an intra-band increase or advocating for a compensation adjustment outside the standard guidelines, subject to approval by the promotion board. He mentioned, "he [Kulveer] doesn't have to get approval ... he could fight for an increase outside guidelines, that would go to promo board for approval." This comment indicated the existence of mechanisms within Ford to address exceptional cases, which could have been applied in my situation.
4. **Initial Compensation Versus Market Value:** My initial offer letter, dated September 27, 2021, showed a starting salary that was not commensurate with the market value for similar HTHD positions at Ford. Given the critical nature of my work and its alignment

with HTHD criteria, there was a substantial gap in compensation with no external incentive for anyone to help me.

The Ford College Graduate Program details indicated two salary plans with differentiated ranges and bonus targets for HTHD positions, emphasizing the disparity between my current compensation and what could have been offered under an HTHD classification. The market data used by Ford for HTHD designations, benchmarked against top tech companies, further underscored the potential undervaluation of my role.

My experience here at Ford clearly highlights the need for a reassessment of my position and compensation at Ford. Reclassifying my role under the HTHD program and adjusting my compensation accordingly would not only recognize the market value of my skills but also the strategic importance of my work. The conversation on August 9th, 2023, was pivotal in bringing these discrepancies to light, emphasizing the need for Ford to realign its compensation structure with the value provided by technically skilled employees like myself.

References

- [1] High_Tech_High_Demand_(HTHD)_Overview.pdf,
- [2] U.S._HTHD_-_FAQs_-_ALL_Employees_Updated_v0722.pdf,
- [3] 2023-benefits-and-comp-GSR-sal-plan-2.pdf,
- [4] 2022-benefits-and-comp-GSR-sal-plan-1.pdf,
- [5] Fall_2023_ET_FCG_Rotation_List.pdf

Exploring Potential Rotations and Addressing Compensation Concerns (08-08-23)

My conversation with Thomas Kopczynski on this day centered around my curiosity for future rotations and how to navigate Ford's system to explore opportunities across different teams, particularly those with more incentive. Thomas clarified that rotations are automated and preferences could be submitted, but the final assignment is decided by an algorithm to ensure fairness.

I also raised concerns about compensation and the possibility of a lateral move to enhance my career trajectory. Thomas confirmed the existence of High Talent High Demand (HTHD) status, which I was considering due to a prior discussion with Kulveer, who mentioned a potential pay bump and staying on the current team. This was contrasted with my desire for recognition and value at Ford, reflecting on past efforts to negotiate my worth during the hiring process that were met with a rigid stance from the recruitment team.

Thomas suggested that any promotion or compensation adjustment would need to be discussed directly with Kulveer, who has the autonomy to initiate such changes at any time. He also

advised on the importance of the mid-year assessment conversation with Kulveer, where I could formally request a promotion or discuss further about HTHD status and its implications for my compensation.

This dialogue underscored the complexities of navigating career growth within Ford, balancing between seeking recognition for my contributions and understanding the procedural mechanisms in place for rotations and compensation adjustments.

Continuous Engagement and Task Completion (08-09-23)

On August 9th, I confirmed with Kulveer that I'd handle the updates to the flow diagram. I also sought to discuss my accomplishments at Ford, suggesting a brief meeting to focus on specific objectives. Kulveer's positive reaction to this proposal reflects a mutual understanding (or so I thought) of the importance of recognizing and discussing achievements, which is essential for professional development and maintaining motivation (or so I thought).

I ended up in a call with Kulveer and during this call, Kulveer asked me to get back to him on a decision whether or not I wish to stay in Model-E. I began my research and started the conversation to meet with Thomas to gather more information per Kulveer's suggestion.

Documentation and Acknowledgement of Efforts (08-11-23)

I continued to engage proactively with my supervisor, Kulveer, by providing thorough documentation of the work I had completed. I shared a detailed report on my authentication work for Jira, demonstrating my commitment to transparency and thoroughness. My message, "you will be very pleased regarding the document for Jira, the tool is finished," aimed to inform Kulveer of my progress and the completion of tasks assigned to me.

Kulveer's acknowledgment with a simple "Ok" perhaps understated the effort I put into my work, but it was a step in establishing a record of my contributions and asserting my role.

Confirming Career Movements Outside Model-E (08-14-23)

On August 14th, in response to Kulveer's request, I confirmed my decision via email to leave Model-E, trusting in his [Kulveer] guidance for my career development. The severity of this decision remained unknown to me, however, I met with Thomas before sending and had picked his brain to gather insight and conduct an independent SWOT Analysis based on the information I could capture from this call to help me make an informed decision... under the pretense that the

information and assumption in the SWOT Analysis were 100% accurate without discrepancies per my writing within the email where I sent Kulveer this decision.

This step was crucial, as it was Kulveer who initiated this crossroad decision. I was under the impression that this move was in line with his vision for my growth within Ford, expecting that he had my best interests at heart. This moment was significant as it represented my proactive stance towards my career progression, based on the premise that it was a collaborative decision aligned with my aspirations and the company's direction.

Analysis on Divergent Management Styles and Employee Implication (08-15-23)

On August 15th, Kulveer confirmed that Thomas and he had exchanged notes (after I inquired), and he reassured me that there was nothing further I needed to do regarding the rotation. When I asked if there was anything I needed to do on my part, he mentioned, "No, you will find the next rotation when carousel opens," and added that I would receive information on this in the coming days. My query to Kulveer was solely focused on my main and only concern and never had anything to do with finding my next rotation or anything to do with wanting to pick rotations out of Model-E. His unexpected shift to the topic of my next rotation, implied a decision about my departure from Model-E—a decision I only made with the presumption he was working behind the scenes in my best interest. This unusual direction in conversation seemed misaligned with my main concerns. Furthermore, when I sought updates on other important matters we had discussed, Kulveer's silence was disconcerting, leaving me without the responses I needed. His lack of engagement on these points left me hanging and emphasized a breakdown in communication at a critical juncture in my professional development.

On another note, since Kulveer didn't reply to an additional query via Slack, I reached out to Jeff during the evening. A notable contrast in workplace dynamics was observed. Jeffrey Dever, an adjacent manager, displayed a commendable understanding of work-life balance. When informed about a personal family event—the HELLA Family Picnic—that I was considering attending, Jeffrey responded positively, reinforcing the importance of family time. His message, "Go! We can circle back on Auth later. Be a wonderful Son and spend time with your family today my friend," was not only supportive but also respectful of my need for personal time.

In contrast, Vivek Sarada's approach that day was less considerate. Despite being aware of my family commitments, he insisted on a work-related code walkthrough, demonstrating a disregard for previously communicated boundaries. This was further evidenced by his persistent messaging, which implied an expectation for me to prioritize work over my commitment to family time. Vivek's lack of acknowledgment for my personal time highlighted a need for better understanding and respect for employees' work-life balance within our team dynamics.

The day's events painted a vivid picture of the divergent management styles and the implications these have on employee well-being and professional growth within the company.

Strategic Engagement with HR (09-05-23)

On this day, I navigated complex workplace dynamics and corporate procedures with a strategic approach to advocate for my rightful compensation. Despite facing inertia in the existing channels, I decided to employ the sociological principle of leveraging 'weak ties' to expedite the process. My initiative to directly engage with HR rather than depending solely on my supervisor's interventions was a calculated move to bypass the stagnation. This was articulated to Kulveer Virk, explaining the potential of this indirect approach to yield faster results:

- "Just because I have a strong connection with someone, does not mean I have the social capital to leverage that connection" (3:43 PM) "
- Another route to leveraging the strong connection, opposed to directly leveraging it is to go to a weaker tie" (3:45 PM)

This framing was crucial in securing Kulveer's support for the HR meeting: "Give couple of days to hear back" (3:48 PM). I highlighted my understanding of the nuances in organizational behavior and social network theory, which not only demonstrated my analytical thinking but also my proactive stance on personal career management.

Responses to Instability and Communication Gaps at Work (9-18-23)

The dialogue between Thomas Kopczynski and myself reveals a pattern of experiences that align with a traumatic response. The persistent feelings of uncertainty, compounded by Kulveer's opaque communication style and witnessing the abrupt dismissal of a peer who was of similar age, have been significant stressors. These, layered upon the isolation within a team of contractors, majority who have left and unfair treatment by seniors, have likely contributed to such a response.

In the professional context, a trauma response can manifest as heightened anxiety, hypervigilance to cues that might suggest job insecurity, or a strong emotional reaction to circumstances that remind one of past negative experiences. My only experience out of college, which is Ford, showed abnormal reactions, such as documenting achievements and seeking validation from Thomas, indicating a need for reassurance and recognition in a situation where I felt undermined and uncertain about my future at Ford. Especially from those at Ford whose authority I had previously recognized that would repeatedly let me down.

The events of September 18th, particularly evident in the detailed screenshots, highlight a deeply concerning pattern in my interactions with Kulveer. On this day, I expressed apprehension to Kulveer about a sudden GitHub access issue, fearing potential dismissal. Concurrently, Kulveer scheduled a “quick connect” meeting with me and I was receiving emails from Jira altering me that Kulveer is updating stories but notably refrained from responding to my messages about the issue. This cryptic behavior, a blend of silence and sudden engagement, contributed to a conditioning pattern that was further used to create and evoke a trauma response in me repeatedly. It felt intentional, leaving me to question whether it was designed to elicit a reaction, to make me appear irrational, or for some other undisclosed purpose. As I reflect on these events, I realize this pattern wasn't just disruptive; it seemed to be a calculated tactic to maintain a power dynamic and instill a sense of instability and uncertainty in me. This realization, uncovered later, is an example of the manipulative tactics that contributed to an environment devoid of the safety and stability essential for a healthy professional setting at Ford.

The interactions chronicled between myself and Thomas Kopczynsk, specifically on this day, show a drastic oscillation between the anticipation of promotion and the fear of layoff — a stark dichotomy that Thomas himself acknowledges with the statement, "cause we go from talking promotion to layoff?" This abrupt shift in narrative, coupled with Kulveer's failure to complete my mid-year review by the due date, as Thomas notes, "they were due on 8/31," exemplifies a pattern of managerial neglect and erratic communication. Moreover, this situation was exacerbated by the lack of sensitivity following layoffs just two months prior, highlights an escalating need for managerial training during these times, particularly for Kulveer, to address and mitigate such volatility in team dynamics.

Upon review, you will see that I yet again articulated the persistent feeling of being sidelined in the advancement process, despite easing off the promotion discussion as Kulveer began to communicate more actively. This is captured in my words, "I eased off on asking about the promotion because he started to communicate," and "I'm ngl [not going to lie] the problem with promotion is what I was feeling from when I read the contract and when I tried to negotiate in the beginning." My reflections here highlight an internal conflict — a recognition of my worth and the knowledge that the position I am fighting to be promoted to is one I believe I should have been hired into initially, diminishing the sense of achievement associated with this promotion. On top of that, as previously addressed, in the HTHD salary plan given the high stakes role I undertook and succeeded in despite not being protected from external factors which could have prevented me from doing so had I not shown resilience.

I would argue that while my response to these situations may appear on the surface to be an overreaction to an outsider, they are actually a reasonable response to the cumulative experience of inconsistent and opaque communication, as well as a lack of support from management. This pattern has potentially led to a workplace environment where my need for stability and clear

communication was not met, thus contributing to an ongoing sense of distress and uncertainty about my role and future at the company.

It is important to highlight not just the events themselves, but the lack of appropriate managerial response that exacerbated the situation. The aim is to demonstrate that the response from me was not one of victimization, but rather a rational response to the circumstances I was placed in, which required a higher level of support and clarity than was provided.

The term I've adopted working here, "cooler heads prevail," resonates as a mantra in the face of adversity, yet the frequency and context in which it's employed suggest an internalized coping mechanism to navigate a perpetually uncertain and unsupportive managerial landscape. This mantra was given to me by Thomas Kopczynski as my appointed Ford College Graduate Advisor, who I trusted.

I hope my recent discovery of this interaction being a trauma response can be used to advocate for changes in Ford's managerial practices to ensure a more transparent and supportive communication process.

Addressing Concerns of Neglected Growth and Communication Breakdown (10-2-23)

On October 2nd, 2023, a conversation with Thomas Kopczynski shed light on ongoing concerns about my situation at Ford, specifically addressing feelings of being overlooked and a lack of clear communication about my career progression.

I initiated the conversation expressing a sense of being "breadcrumb" - an analogy to describe how I felt led on without clear, definitive communication regarding my career trajectory at Ford. This included a lack of updates or responses about fixing my grade level alongside compensation changes due to my continuous and past contributions. This period of time contributed to a feeling of being sabotaged over time due to minimal interaction with my supervisor and not being assigned significant work for months.

Thomas assured me that this was not a case of sabotage but rather a potential misunderstanding due to the imminent end of my rotation. He suggested that the lack of substantial new assignments might stem from an expectation of my imminent transition to a new role within the company. However, he acknowledged my need for clarity and promised to follow up on the compensation issue, mentioning an ongoing freeze due to a strike but expressing intent to confirm alignment with senior management once the freeze ends.

During this conversation, I articulate my feelings of professional stagnation and the expectation that any exceptional efforts on my part were merely taken for granted at Ford. I expressed, "I just feel like I'm not growing and any crazy effort I do is just expected. I feel like I'm being stalled until v2 cloud is finished, to get the most out of me, then they have what they need." This statement underscores my perception of being utilized for my skills and efforts without corresponding growth or recognition for my talents.

Furthermore, I emphasized the duration of this situation, noting, "It has been months now." This comment highlights the prolonged period of uncertainty and lack of direction in my role at Ford. Additionally, I conveyed my eagerness for straightforward communication and tangible actions from the company, stating, "I'm not in a rush to receive anything or change compensation, but I want answers because it seems my efforts here are futile if I am not being shown there's room to grow here at Ford for someone with my background."

The conversation on October 2nd, 2023, with Thomas Kopczynski, highlights the need for Ford to address the concerns of high-potential employees like myself regarding career growth and communication. Ensuring clear, responsive, and proactive communication about career development is essential for maintaining employee engagement and satisfaction.

Search for Direct Answers

Based on my exchanged messages with Kulveer Virk on October 2nd, it is evident that I was seeking a definitive update regarding HR-related discussions. The conversation reveals a sense of frustration due to the lack of communication and a clear process, as I explicitly expressed a desire for a definitive "yes or no" answer, including a timeline.

Kulveer responds by referencing a note sent to HR on September 18th and suggests setting up a meeting with Brianna Krus to get an update and ask any questions, directing me to reference their conversation. He advised me to send a note or instant message to Brianna to initiate this dialogue.

The dialogue indicates that I had been feeling run around without much communication on the process or any updates, highlighting a gap in the communication chain. Kulveer encourages proactive engagement with HR, hinting that I should directly reach out and inquire to gain clarity.

I acknowledged this advice and considered reaching out after allowing some time to pass, indicating a desire to approach the situation with a "cooler head."

Advocacy for Professional Growth, Integrity, and Recognition (10-5-23)

The section encapsulates several key points:

- The value of the diagnostic tool I developed and its impact on workflow efficiency.
- The security risk was addressed through my initiative and collaboration, which was initially undermined.
- The struggle for acknowledgment from my peers and superiors, despite providing logical explanations and problem-solving.
- The cultural and systemic issues within the team that affect decision-making and recognition.
- The personal stance I've taken to prioritize integrity and job satisfaction over career advancement under a system that conflicts with my values.

On October 5, the engagement with Kulveer Virk revolved around identifying and resolving API errors. Despite the initial reception of "blank statements don't help" from Kulveer, I demonstrated the value of the diagnostic tool I developed. This tool has been instrumental in addressing workflow discrepancies, as noted when other team members started to adopt it and immediately saw its benefits (screenshots for proof). Despite the tool's proven benefits, as acknowledged by Uma and others, Kulveer's reluctance to utilize it suggested an oversight of the tool's value and my contributions.

Security Oversight and Collaborative Resolution

My attention shifted to address a security risk identified within the 'getowners' function, necessitating a collaborative response with a second opinion, Zalak (because Kulveer doesn't take my input seriously). Together, we agreed on the necessity to modify data retrieval methods to ensure a secure cloud-based approach, a testament to my proactive and security-conscious mindset.

This was never addressed, instead pushed under the rug.

Subject of Blame

When technical issues were mistakenly attributed to the refresh token mechanism I maintained, I clarified the distinction between token expiry and Kafka-related errors, as evidenced in our detailed conversation with Kulveer and Zalak Joshi. This distinction was critical in steering the focus towards the true source of the discrepancies, ensuring that we do not misallocate our troubleshooting efforts.

Despite initial skepticism, I provided a logical explanation of the interplay between Kafka and the refresh token system, emphasizing the importance of this relationship in the troubleshooting process we were engaged in. This technical clarification was necessary to guide our team towards the resolution of our issues. However, this instance also highlighted a concerning pattern within our team dynamics. As I mentioned to Kulveer Virk, 'Lot of people on our team don't like to admit or give credit but that's a personal thing.' This sentiment was expressed following the observation that despite presenting a well-reasoned argument to Zalak, there seemed to be a reluctance to acknowledge the validity of my contributions and the logical basis of my explanations.

In the specific context of the Kafka and refresh token issue, my ability to guide Zalak through the logic, as shown in the screenshot of our conversation, clearly shows technical expertise and my role as a problem solver within the team. Yet, despite this, I encountered a resistance to recognition, as indicated in my discussion with Kulveer: "Today she said differently...In my screenshot of the last message, I guided her by explaining logically."

Prioritizing Integrity Over Promotion

Thomas Kopczyński and I delved into the subtle pressures and unspoken rules that often dictate the trajectory of one's career path within the company. An underlying expectation was revealed: to maintain favor for potential promotions, one must often acquiesce to management's immediate demands, irrespective of any personal or professional growth opportunities that may arise. This was encapsulated in Thomas's observation, "cause u don't want to upset him for promo," which highlighted the delicate act of balancing one's aspirations with the perceived need to appease those in positions of authority.

The suggestion that an employee must choose between attending a professional development event and staying in the office for potential troubleshooting—a decision relayed to me through a conversation where the subtext was clear: to secure a promotion, one must be willing to forgo all else—is a narrative I reject. Thomas echoed this sentiment, indicating that such a stark choice is not a hallmark of effective management.

My response to this situation was one of self-affirmation and a clear stance against the prevailing corporate ethos that I found to be in conflict with my values. I stated, "It's okay, I checked out of promo," signifying a conscious decision to prioritize my well-being and professional integrity over the chase for a promotion within a system whose values did not align with my own.

Furthermore, I expressed a broader discontent with the systemic issues at play, "I don't agree with the system here," and reiterated my stance, "No worries about promo." This was not a decision made lightly, but rather a definitive stand for happiness and job satisfaction, "I'd rather

be happy," over the relentless pursuit of advancement that requires one to conform to practices that may compromise one's self-respect and personal boundaries.

In Thomas's words, "[...] it is a worry for me," he recognized the undue pressure placed on me. He concurred that requiring an employee to act as a "warm body" in lieu of meaningful contribution is ineffective management. Such insights were not just supportive but also an indictment of the prevailing culture that necessitates this discussion.

These exchanges underscore a critical junction in my career at Ford—choosing to advocate for a work environment where one's achievements and contentment are not mutually exclusive, and where success is not predicated on the forfeiture of personal boundaries or the blind pursuit of promotions.

Realization of Mistreatment

"Dude, someone [Vivek] messaged me when I had family obligations saying 'Either your family or your career, your choice'. Desensitized here man." (Daiyaan to Thomas, October 5, 2023). This quote elucidates the predicament faced and the subsequent advice received, which was crucial in reinforcing the need to maintain professional integrity without compromising personal values or self-respect. Thomas's response, "That is not how it is here" (Thomas to Daiyaan, October 5, 2023) acknowledges the inappropriateness of the situation, and serves to back up the assertion that the company culture may undervalue personal boundaries. Moreover, it yet again highlights the challenge of navigating a work environment that seems to impose a choice between personal commitments and professional advancement—a choice that I argue is a false and unfair dichotomy.

The belief that going above and beyond in one's role will naturally lead to recognition and advancement is, unfortunately, a disillusionment many face in the workplace. In my case, despite providing significant value and demonstrating exceptional commitment, the expected support and advancement were not forthcoming. This lack of reciprocity from Ford Motor Company, or maybe my supervisor, starkly contrasts with the considerable contributions I have made.

It is particularly disconcerting that it was only when I began to assert boundaries and prioritize self-respect that my career progression was negatively impacted. This turn of events is indicative of a workplace dynamic where unconditional extra effort is expected but not rewarded, and setting boundaries can lead to discrimination or a stalling of one's career.

This dynamic is not only demoralizing but also counterproductive, as it fails to foster a culture of mutual respect and support. The professional environment should encourage balance and reward employees fairly for their contributions, without forcing them to choose between their personal lives and their careers. The fact that I faced repercussions for asserting my self-respect illustrates

the need for a shift in such workplace attitudes and policies. I can pinpoint the start of this was from when I felt a lack of support in my career advancement and started to look at what I can control in my concerning situation, timestamped when I brought up that I'm going to leverage power-hour as part of my FCG benefits.

Ineffective Logging and Communication Breakdown

The removal of logging by junior developers (github.png & july2423_pt1.png - july2423_pt3.png) against my advice resulted in a chaotic phase for a sound troubleshooting environment. This situation was a direct result of disregarding expert advice and highlighted a systemic issue with communication and decision-making processes within the team.

This decision disregarded the structured and effective approach I had implemented for error handling. When logging was reintroduced, the absence of robustness in the new system created further confusion, which could have been avoided had my original warnings been heeded.

Proposed Solutions and Proactive Leadership

My responses throughout the day were not only reactive to the issues at hand but also proactive in suggesting improvements. At 5:50 PM, I offered to assist in refining our logging system by isolating scenarios, reminiscent of the thorough approach in my original implementation. This initiative was in line with my consistent efforts to enhance team efficiency and technical integrity, even when faced with resistance or indifference from certain managerial quarters.

Conclusion and Call for Equitable Treatment

These events underscore the necessity for equitable treatment and recognition of technical expertise within professional environments. I assert that my experiences and documented evidence call for a reassessment of my contributions and a recalibration of the professional respect accorded to me. It's imperative that my professional integrity be upheld and that my career development not be impeded by internal politics or mismanagement.

Advocacy for Equitable Communication and Recognition in HR Engagements (10-25-23)

The day began with an anticipation of a crucial HR meeting, as indicated by the beginning messages. The exchange began with a message from Brianna Hart requesting context for a scheduled meeting, which I provided, outlining my intent to discuss discrepancies in compensation in relation to my experience and value provided.

Despite our clear agreement on the meeting time, which was well-documented as shown in the email screenshot (email.png), the meeting was unilaterally rescheduled without my consent. This last-minute change, occurring less than ten minutes before our scheduled meeting, struck me as dismissive and a breach of professional courtesy. This incident did not occur in isolation but was symptomatic of a recurring pattern of bureaucratic impediments that I encountered when attempting to gain clarity on my career progression at the company. Such actions not only undermined the mutual respect necessary for professional collaboration but also hindered my ability to plan and manage my responsibilities effectively.

The conversations with Thomas Kopczynski reveal a shared frustration with the same HR representative. Thomas noted that he had been asking for updates for weeks with no success, indicating a systemic issue with communication and responsiveness from HR. The sentiment that "she prob unprepared" and the advice to play "the game here, deal w HR and kulveer/next supervisor and outsmart it and get what u need. OR u look elsewhere" suggests a work environment that necessitates strategic navigation to achieve fair treatment and recognition.

Thomas's comments, such as "pride can be VERY expensive," underscore the delicate balance between self-advocacy and the potential repercussions of challenging the status quo.

His [Thomas] observations, such as "oh that's the same gal I talked to" and "she prob unprepared," along with my own reflections on the situation being "controlled," suggest a work environment where preparation and genuine engagement may be lacking. Thomas's advice against directly calling out the unprofessional behavior as "not advised if u tryin to get her to help u 😊" and stating that "pride can be very expensive" reflects a workplace where upward feedback may be discouraged, and self-preservation may take precedence over open and honest communication. This atmosphere could potentially stifle innovation and the expression of diverse opinions, as it seems to favor a one-sided approach to feedback and does not encourage the sharing of genuine concerns.

I also speak on my experiences regarding a skip-level meeting on this same day hosted by Juliana Schnack, as described in my conversation with Thomas, further highlighting the challenges in providing honest feedback in a public setting. The notion that conducting such surveys can lead to inaccurate results, as learned in sociology 1000 (an introductory that references the book "Stat-Spotting: A Field Guide to Identifying Dubious Data"), indicates that the methods employed here may not be conducive to gathering genuine insights from employees.

In light of the broader context, Thomas's experience, along with Kulveer's note from 9/18, showcased a consistent lack of follow-through on HR's part, raising questions about their commitment to the professional development and concerns of employees. It is evident that I have consistently sought to assert my professional value and to engage with HR in a meaningful and

constructive manner. The incident on October 25 is a pivotal example of how the company's approach to these engagements can significantly affect employee morale and trust in the system

I want to emphasize the implications of such organizational behaviors. These actions undermine trust, signify a disregard for employee time, and can have a chilling effect on employee morale and engagement. The lack of timely and respectful communication from HR is not just an isolated incident but a reflection of systemic issues that require attention and rectification.

The case here is not simply about a rescheduled meeting but about what such actions symbolize in the larger context of employee relations. It is about the need for a culture shift towards one that values and actively recognizes the contributions of its employees, ensuring that they are compensated equitably and treated with the respect they deserve. It is about fostering an environment that encourages transparency, appreciates diligence, and honors commitments—a culture where employees do not feel the need to "play games" to receive fair treatment but can rely on a system that inherently supports their professional growth and well-being.

Reflections on Management and Culture

The shared messages also touch on the broader implications of management and corporate culture at Ford. The discussion about skip-level meetings and the need for genuine feedback mechanisms reflects a deeper concern about the authenticity of corporate initiatives for employee engagement. My observations that conducting surveys with visibility among all call participants can lead to inaccurate representations of employee sentiments reveal a critical eye on corporate practices for gathering feedback.

Thomas's reassurances and my responses illustrate a dynamic where I am striving to navigate corporate structures and cultural norms that may not always align with individual expectations for professional growth and recognition. This dynamic is a testament to the complexity of navigating career pathways within Ford Motor Company.

The narrative that unfolds from my messages is one of a proactive and determined individual seeking a fair and respectful professional landscape. The exchanges on October 25, and the broader ongoing conversations with colleagues and HR, are a microcosm of the challenges faced by employees in asserting their value within corporate structures that may not always readily acknowledge or reward it. These experiences shape my stance on the importance of self-respect, professional advocacy, and the pursuit of a workplace that aligns with my values and aspirations for equitable treatment and recognition.

By being expressive and vocal, I am advocating within this document for a professional environment where employees can communicate openly and be recognized for their contributions without the need for 'games' or strategic maneuvering. This advocacy is in pursuit

of a workplace where feedback is welcomed, and actions are aligned with the company's stated values of respect and professional growth.

Seeking Fair Compensation

A dominant theme in my discussion is the pursuit of fair compensation, not merely in monetary terms but also as a symbol of respect and acknowledgment of my contributions and expertise. This stance is juxtaposed against experiences of being underappreciated, further fueling the quest for a workplace that aligns with my values.

Resilience in the Face of Disappointment

Despite feelings of being treated as a "warm body" and the casual disregard for my input, I convey a resilient attitude. I express a readiness to adapt and play the 'game' by matching the energy I encounter, yet maintaining a cool head and a strategic approach to professional dealings. However, as an independent investigator, you should refer back to the first I mentioned 'cool head' within this document.

Professional Integrity and the Request for Clarity from HR Representative Brianna Hart (10-26-23 - 10/27/23)

My messages to Thomas on these days reflect a continued effort to address the lack of mutual respect and to seek answers regarding my professional standing. Thomas's suggestion to wait for Kulveer's response and my decision to take a more direct approach by engaging with HR illustrate an ongoing struggle for clarity and recognition.

The meeting with Brianna Hart on October 27th revealed a complex interplay of acknowledgement, limitations, and frustrations. While HR recognized the discrepancies in my situation, their responses were mired in systemic limitations and delays, exacerbating my feelings of being undervalued and stalled in my career progression. This conversation shows the need for more effective and responsive HR practices to address employee concerns promptly and fairly.

Key Points

1. **Career Progression and Compensation Concerns:** I voiced my frustration regarding the promotion to a position I believed should have been my starting point, showing the detrimental impact this has had on my career progression. Additionally, I brought up the contrast between my significant contributions and the compensation I received, particularly within the context of the High Tech High Demand (HTHD) program. This

disparity was especially pronounced when considering the alignment of my skillset and responsibilities with my remuneration. I also explicitly noted that new Ford College Graduate (FCG) employees are starting at salaries approximately \$15,000 higher than what I was offered, further highlighting the incongruities in Ford's compensation structure.

2. **HR's Acknowledgment of Issues:** Brianna Hart acknowledged the situation, indicating a recognition of the mismatch between my contributions and my current role. This acknowledgment, however, did not translate into immediate action or solutions.
3. **The Problem of Being Held Back:** I voiced my concern about being held back in my career progression, indicating that the primary issue was being hindered from moving forward.

Brianna's Acknowledgment of Incorrect Hiring Level and Compensation

Brianna Hart acknowledged the issues with my initial hiring level and salary:

1. "It sounds like this decision wasn't right from the beginning... you should have been hired in at a higher level from right from the very beginning..." (Brianna Hart)
2. She expressed an understanding of my situation and promised to prioritize this issue in her work, although she couldn't provide an immediate solution.

Failed Promise of Follow-Up and Systemic Change

Brianna committed to a follow-up within two weeks: "I promise I'm following up on this... I can commit to at least getting back to you within two weeks with at least a status check or hopefully a full response." She indicated a desire to involve the FCG program committee and recruiting for a holistic review, recognizing potential systemic issues affecting others in similar situations.

My Frustration and Advocacy for Myself

My frustration was evident throughout the conversation, emphasizing the need for fair treatment and recognition: "If I do get promoted... the opportunity cost of me being promoted now versus back then is I would waste a year..." I pointed out the discrepancy between my contributions and the recognition I received, highlighting the delay's impact on my career.

Brianna acknowledged my value and the advocacy from my leaders: "Your leaders clearly believe that you were delivering far beyond what would have been expected... So we're gonna figure it out."

This conversation showcased a classic case of a failure to promptly address my concerns, despite acknowledgment from HR. My explicit frustrations and advocacy for fair compensation were met with promises but lacked immediate and concrete actions. Brianna's acknowledgment of the issues with my hiring level and the delay in addressing these concerns underscored the systemic problems within the HR processes at Ford, revealing a gap between recognition and tangible outcomes.

Resilience in the Face of Disappointment

On another note, my dialogue with Thomas reflects my efforts to understand the company's processes and my own standing within it. I express a situation where Kulveer shares his screen on a call with me to ask for some guidance where I notice he was recording the call. I mention, "It's like this whole thing is to get me to react and Punk me out," showing concern for being strategically provoked rather than engaged in a respectful and productive manner. Thomas inquires, "wait he [Kulveer] was recording your call?" which suggests surprise and confusion about the need for such actions, hinting at unconventional management tactics. I expressed an understanding of potential motivations behind these tactics, stating, "I don't blame him for self-preservation." It is highly crucial to note that it could also be very possible he was recording for something that was not malicious, however, due to perspective built off my experiences, I leaned towards feeling of negative intent.

The conversation continues on October 27, 2023, where Thomas expresses his frustration with the HR process: "i told her [Brianna] weeks ago this isn't the case. i shared w her proof from the fcg committee." This indicates his own attempts to facilitate my situation have been ignored or unaddressed by HR, leading to an extended period of uncertainty for me.

Thomas's surprise at the lack of movement despite providing necessary information to HR underscores a systemic issue with follow-through.

Unmet Promises and Delayed Actions

My perception of being stalled until the completion of a major project was a source of significant discontent. "I just feel like I'm stalled until v2 for our team is done. Why else would this go on for 5 months," I stated, expressing my suspicion that the delays were strategically placed.

The exchange revealed a pattern of evasion and delay from HR, which contributed to an extended period of uncertainty and frustration for me. It highlighted the challenges employees face in navigating bureaucratic roadblocks within large organizations, where the slow pace and lack of transparency in addressing employee concerns can lead to disillusionment and dissatisfaction.

Mixed Feelings Amidst Professional Deliverables (10-31-23)

By October 31, 2023, there's a sense of resignation to the ongoing issues, tempered by a resolve to continue delivering value. I state, "I know I heard two weeks but I know I'm good." Despite my commitment to my work, there's an acknowledgment of the emotional toll this situation has taken: "I can't help but have mixed feelings I'm being played like a sucker as I do it."

Asserting Professional Agency Amidst Systemic Ambiguity (11-03-23)

On November 3, 2023, I discussed with Thomas the uncertainty around compensation and benefits, indicating a concern for how these may be affected by the ongoing negotiations about my position. I question, "Is there any risk in enrolling benefits right now? Or should I wait if there is a convo?" and Thomas reassures me that benefits enrollment is a standard process and advises me to proceed.

Demonstrating Value While Navigating Corporate Inertia (11-07-23)

A few days later, on November 7, 2023, my conversation revolved around the demonstration of a tool I developed, which was well-received by another team. This highlights my proactive contributions despite the lack of clear direction from leadership. Thomas's note to Kulveer implies that my situation is being acknowledged, yet there's a palpable hesitation to act: "he doesn't seem to want to budge much."

Negotiating Recognition and Respect in the Workplace (11-09-23)

By November 9, 2023, there is a sense of frustration about Kulveer's lack of communication, despite him having the capability to address the situation: "He offered me money straight up to stay on his team." Thomas seems to be aware of Kulveer's position, yet there's confusion about his inaction: "says he gonna move on it."

Enduring the Dichotomy of Contribution and Recognition (11-11-23 to 11-13-23)

In the days following, I express a candid reflection on the environment at Ford, where my efforts and initiatives are not met with the due credit or proactive engagement: "They don't wanna give credit," and I note the paradox of being advised on system-level thinking while already having developed a comprehensive framework.

An Ongoing Journey for Equity and Acknowledgment (11-14-23)

On November 14, 2023 12:14 AM, I articulate my key contributions and request Kulveer's input to quantify these achievements.

Despite my efforts, it appears my communications with Kulveer have not yielded the necessary outcomes. This ongoing ambiguity affected not just my daily work but also significant career-decisions long-term career decisions, such as my potential referral to Ross. "It's my first year finished out of undergrad; it's like let me fly," I expressed to Thomas, highlighting my readiness to advance and grow.

Thomas has acknowledged that I have done everything within my power, stating, "u have done all u can do rn." Yet, it's apparent that my proactive stance and the value I bring to the team are not reflected in the actions of my superiors. Thomas himself has recognized my value, noting, "he [Kulveer] knows yur value," but this has not translated into tangible recognition or progress.

The emotional toll of this situation cannot be overstated. I confided in Thomas about my feelings, saying, "I just want to be taken seriously without having to fight so hard." The effort required to be acknowledged is affecting my self-respect and causing undue stress.

The advice I've received from Thomas has been to lay low and wait, implying that any further efforts on my part would be fruitless at this point. "Yur best play is to be quiet, process yur thought and emotion and figure yur next move," he advised. While this may be a prudent approach, it does not address the core issue of being recognized for my expertise and dedication.

Adding to this, I expressed a poignant realization: "It feels like Ford wants me to leave and if that's the case and it's a scary topic for Ford to want that through this whole process, then I understand if it's delicate and all. It's like ok though 'cuz I don't mind doing it and no hard feelings or resentment." This reflection suggested an acceptance of a possible unspoken desire by Ford for my departure, a sentiment that further underlined the disconnect between my aspirations and the company's response to them.

Furthermore, technical decisions made by Kulveer have directly impacted my work and the perception of my expertise and integrity of the architecture designed. Thomas himself questioned Kulveer's involvement in areas where he should trust the experts: "why is kulveer making code decisions? he should trust the experts."

In summary, my position is clear: I seek an environment where my contributions are valued, my expertise is trusted, and my career trajectory is not hindered by unclear communications and unfulfilled promises. "I just wanna build but I need alignment cuz I wanna bang my head into the wall every time my word isn't valued due to other factors," I stated. It's in Ford's best interest to

leverage my abilities to their fullest potential, aligning the company's goals with my professional growth and satisfaction.

The Illusion of Progress: Carrot on a Stick (11/16/23)

Thomas's messages on this day, while initially seeming to offer hope with the promise of "good news coming," failed to materialize into tangible outcomes. His acknowledgment of the absurdity of me being continuously sidelined despite nearing the completion of our V2 project goal was a reminder of the carrot-on-a-stick approach that had become all too common for me. My trust in Thomas waned as I observed a recurring theme: his cryptic affirmations raised expectations but consistently led to disappointment. This pattern seemed to constitute a form of dishonesty by omission, particularly concerning the specifics of the 'good news' that ultimately led to the pivotal moment on 11/17/23.

My inquiries into the contractor costs, specifically questioning if "\$200/hour is accurate for external resource per head," were an effort to independently assess the value of my work in monetary terms. However, Thomas's response, "not rly," dashed any hopes of gaining clarity from within the organization, further compounding my feelings of being undervalued and overlooked.

The Illusion of Progress: HR's Empty Promises and the Pursuit of Fairness (11/17/23)

The events on November 17, 2023, unfurled with a startling revelation that came at the brink of my resignation. The morning was strained, the air filled with the finality of my decision to leave Ford, which I communicated to Kulveer. In a surprising turn, only at the mention of my departure did Kulveer bring up the promotion—a piece of information he had withheld while I stood at the crossroads of my career.

Early in the day, I conversed with Thomas, expressing my concerns and seeking advice on my situation with Kulveer, who had been consistently non-responsive. The conversations revealed a pervasive sense of disrespect; when I rhetorically asked why I couldn't reciprocate Kulveer's apparent disregard for professional courtesy, Thomas advised against it but recognized the absurdity, stating, "i mean, good logic but is it the right thing?" This exchange underscored the dilemma of navigating a work environment where mutual respect seemed to be a one-way street.

A significant phone call from Thomas a few hours later precipitated a crucial turning point in my perception of every stakeholder involved in my situation at Ford. This conversation unveiled the reality of the potentially limited changes in my situation, specifically the minimal percentage

increase in my compensation. This revelation was a contrast to previously aligned expectations and contributions, leading to a profound sense of disillusionment and disgust.

The call with Thomas, coupled with the realization of the inadequate compensation changes, propelled me to take decisive action. I proceeded to message Kulveer, expressing my intention to resign from Ford. This message to Kulveer was not just a reaction to the compensation issue but a culmination of ongoing frustrations, unfulfilled promises, and a lack of meaningful acknowledgment of my work and expertise. My communication with Kulveer was a direct response to the disrespect and undervaluation I felt, conveying a strong message about my unwillingness to continue in an environment that failed to appreciate and remunerate my contributions appropriately. It was at that point he replied, "I have already processed your promotion".

This withholding of critical information, revealed only in the eleventh hour, was indicative of a communication breakdown that had plagued my interactions with Brianna Hart and Kulveer Virk in matrix. The day unfolded with a sense of urgency to convene with all stakeholders on the topic, propelled by a 1pm call with Kulveer which left me seeking a meeting with Brianna to align our discussions and address the burgeoning concerns. My frustration was palpable, as similarly expressed in my 10am note towards Thomas prior to communicating my constructive discharge, "Cuz how disrespectful u gotta be to not address things w me and act like things are normal," highlighting Kulveer's oversight in volunteering me to lead a team retro while ducking me personally.

I was once again entangled in the all-too-familiar dance of delayed communication and rescheduled HR meetings. This pattern, which I had previously experienced with Kulveer and Brianna, continued to erode my trust in the system. Despite my proactive approach and open communication, the responses from HR and Kulveer were evasive and noncommittal, leading to a series of postponed engagements that cast a shadow of doubt over the sincerity of their intentions.

In the midst of this chaos, I asserted my intention to match the energy I had been met with. This declaration, while stemming from a place of disillusionment and self-respect, was met with Thomas's cautionary response, "not the way to go." It reflects the conflict between standing up for oneself and navigating the professional maze that had the illusion to favor patience over immediate action.

Reflecting on Thomas's previous guidance—"Ur advice led me to picking up heavy lifting yet again these past 5 months"—I realized the extent of my exertion under the guise of positive affirmations. The mantra "cooler heads prevail," which Thomas often recited, now echoed hollowly against the backdrop of empty promises and a lack of actionable support.

Ultimately, the call fell short of providing an immediate resolution or recognition of the systemic problems contributing to my disillusionment. Instead, it concluded with a future pledge to liaise with the relevant HR contacts. Ironically, this promise of future HR engagement is a commitment that has been repeatedly made in each of our previous interactions, yet it remains unfulfilled.

November 17th was a day of clarity mired in frustration—a pivotal point where the actions, or lack thereof, from Kulveer and Brianna crystallized the systemic issues within the company's communication and recognition practices. As the day closed, the irony was not lost on me: the very individuals who were to advocate for my professional growth were the ones who had inadvertently cemented my decision to move on. This was not just about a missed meeting or a delayed promotion; it was about seeking a fundamental respect that had been consistently absent, a respect integral to any professional's sense of worth and belonging.

Call with Kulveer (Transcribed Meeting Notes)

During the call, I stressed the need for precise quantification to support my case for a salary commensurate with my expertise and contributions. Kulveer's hesitance to validate my claims, a systemic issue with the company's recognition of value, as I emphasized, “I want numbers... because like the value that I provided is...”. The back-and-forth was a disconnect between my quantifiable achievements and the company's acknowledgment thereof.

Acknowledgment of Skills and Experience:

- **Kulveer:** "You have shown me your skills... You don't bring like fresh out of college graduate kind of skills... You have done and delivered things very fast."
- **Daiyaan:** "I'm not incoming like learning everything, you know? I'm coming here with the ability to learn anything immediately. And also the ability or not just that ability but I can draw on to 10 years of experience right?"

Promotion and Transparency Issues:

- **Daiyaan:** "If HR gave you information a week ago how is it fair that you didn't tell me about the promotion?"
- **Kulveer:** "HR told me that it would give 6%. I gave 6% and I was telling Jeff. I said this guy spends more money on things than you are giving it to him."

Corporate Constraints and Frustrations:

- **Kulveer:** "But that's why I was asking you to talk to this lady. No. HR and then the means of I got that... Sorry the offer or the promotion is not worth it."

- **Daiyaan:** "It's a joke. It's a joke. It's like realistically. It's a joke, right? It's kind of disrespectful."

Compensation Compared to Market Rate:

- **Kulveer:** "You are worth more. You are worth 150, 180, or 200K. So it is not in my control. I cannot decide your compensation or I cannot say that this guy's salary would be doubled or one and half times."

Call with Brianna, Kulveer, and Thomas (Transcribed Meeting Notes)

The meeting was crucial for discussing my compensation, career trajectory, and the ongoing challenges I had faced within the company.

During this meeting, I articulated my situation and concerns with clarity and detail. I explained my efforts to negotiate my salary upon hiring and how, despite my qualifications and experience, I was placed at a lower level than I deserved. This, in turn, affected my career trajectory and overall satisfaction with my role at the company. My statement to Brianna highlighted this discrepancy: "I'm going to stop there before I talk about other things."

Brianna, acknowledging my concerns, admitted her limited capacity to resolve these issues but committed to connecting me with the right HR personnel. Her response, "I can't solve that. But now that we understand where that lies... I can say, okay, who is the HR lead in IT? I already gathered that information," indicated a willingness to facilitate further discussions.

Kulveer's input during the meeting was more about acknowledging the efforts made so far rather than providing a direct solution. He reiterated the value I brought to the team and the attempts made to address my concerns through the promotion process.

However, the conversation also surfaced the systemic limitations within the company's structures. Brianna's statement, "I can't guarantee timing or outcomes of that discussion," reflected the bureaucratic challenges in making swift and impactful decisions that align with employee expectations and contributions.

Throughout the meeting, I maintained a focus on the need for transparent and actionable steps forward. My request for a timeline and specific next steps underscored my frustration with the lengthy process and lack of clear communication: "How long would that dialogue be? Because it just seems like it's taking a lot of time."

The meeting concluded with a plan to connect me with relevant HR leads and recruiters to further discuss my position and compensation. Brianna committed to setting up a meeting and ensuring the right people were in the room to address these critical issues.

"...I did try to negotiate. I advocated for myself... So I replied to that criteria and explained where my value comes in... So I try to prove it right? And beyond that if I do get promoted I get promoted where I could have started at right?" (Daiyaan)

"I will send an email. I will confirm with Thomas that I have the right people... And I will say what we would like to discuss..." (Brianna).

The Beginning of File Padding in the end of the call with Brianna, Thomas, and Kulveer (Transcribed Meeting Notes)

Brianna Hart expressed concerns about my method of engagement, suggesting that my approach was unprofessional and unfair. She stated, "But I'm not going to sit here and try to give you fake answers," indicating a reluctance to provide definitive responses. This statement, however, conflicts with her past actions, which have been characterized by delayed responses and scheduling issues, as well as discrepancies in information regarding the FCG program. This inconsistency in communication raises questions about the reliability and trustworthiness of the information provided by HR.

In response to Brianna's feedback, I emphasized that my approach was not probing or emotional, but a logical and necessary strategy given the historical communication barriers. My statement, "I don't think I was probing, but I was gathering as much information as I can," reflects my efforts to understand and navigate the complexities of my situation at Ford. I articulated the need for open and transparent communication, noting how the lack thereof had led to a 'context collapse' right from the initial hiring process.

The term 'context collapse', which I have two publications on, aptly describes the breakdown in communication and understanding between myself and HR. It refers to the misalignment and misunderstandings that arose due to the closed nature of communication, particularly stemming from the hiring process. This breakdown in communication has persisted, adversely affecting my ability to gain a clear understanding of my professional standing and the potential for career advancement within the company.

This dialogue with Brianna Hart thus reveals a broader issue within Ford's HR processes. It highlights the challenges I faced in securing clear, straightforward answers to crucial career-related questions. The conversation points to a need for more open, transparent, and timely communication from HR, which is essential for effectively addressing employee concerns and fostering a respectful and professional workplace environment.

Betrayal and Mistrust: The Path to File Padding Allegations (11/27/23)

The tension between employee advocacy and Brianna Hart's gatekeeping role came to a head on November 27th. As the narrative unraveled, my proactive approach—to come equipped with a detailed account of my experiences—was met with a call from Brianna Hart that felt like a segue into file padding rather than an honest attempt at resolution.

The email from Brianna Hart on November 27th, 2023, was laced with undertones of a preemptive strike. She expressed appreciation for my participation in the call and an eagerness to provide feedback. Yet, her message seemed to skirt the crux of the matter—my persistent quest for accurate quantification of my contributions at Ford. Brianna noted a distinction between being vocal in self-advocacy and what she perceived as my demanding nature, a narrative that I found to be misaligned with my intentions and the evidence at hand.

In my response, I addressed the misalignment, pointing out the discordance in Brianna's recounting of the call's purpose, which seemed to shift once I mentioned my previous communication with Kulveer. This deviation from open communication to a seemingly unilateral feedback session prompted my concern about potential file padding, a practice that could tarnish my professional reputation unjustly.

Despite Brianna's assertion of advocating for employees, the lack of tangible progress, and the suggestion of a behavioral pattern, cast a shadow over the genuineness of her intentions. This was particularly concerning given Kulveer's response to my email, which hinted at delays and a conveniently timed reassessment that aligned with my vacation—a tactic that felt like a deliberate attempt to postpone addressing my grievances.

Brianna's suggestion to discuss my concerns with IT FCG program leads felt like another layer of bureaucracy rather than a step towards resolution. My offer to provide a comprehensive context to avoid assumptions and prevent the collapse of context was met with a vague promise of a future meeting with unnamed stakeholders, leaving me in a state of limbo.

As I reflect on the events that transpired, the chasm between my pursuit for equitable recognition and the responses from Brianna and leadership grows wider. The narrative that unfolded was not just about the delay in a meeting or the absence of a promised promotion; it was about the fundamental respect and transparency that seemed to be missing from my interactions with Ford's HR and my supervisor.

The culmination of these events has left me navigating a corporate maze, where the very mechanisms designed to protect and advocate for employees seem to be used against me. As I continue to strive for fairness and acknowledgment, I am armed with the truth of my experience

and the knowledge that self-preservation is not just prudent, but necessary in the face of a system that may not always have my best interests at heart.

The complexity of the situation was heightened by the need to balance the pursuit of fair treatment and the avoidance of creating a "single story" (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D9Ihs241zeg>) that could potentially cause harm. This delicate balance between seeking justice for oneself and protecting others from collateral damage is a tightrope walk that many employees find themselves navigating in corporate environments that have bad actors.

Navigating Smear Campaign

Brianna Hart, representing HR, presented a case that suggested an imbalance in my approach, stating, "But the way that you are coming on to me today... is starting to get to the point where it is no longer professional." This feedback, however well-intentioned, failed to acknowledge the context of my inquiries—rooted not in confrontation but in a genuine quest for answers that had been consistently deferred.

I responded to this feedback not with defensiveness but with reflection and a reiteration of your commitment to a logical and fair process. "I don't think it's emotional. I think it's actually me being rational," I explained, dismantling any notion of emotional reactivity and highlighting your methodical pursuit of resolution.

Furthermore, I preemptively addressed potential misinterpretations by offering a detailed account of my experiences, ready to share documented events to provide holistic context. This action was not only proactive but also protective, safeguarding against the single-story phenomenon that can so often undermine an individual's narrative.

Despite my clear communication, the response from HR was to set another initiative with ambiguous intentions, prolonging the cycle of unfulfilled promises. "So I will, I promise I'm following up on this," Brianna conceded, yet this promise came without the substantiation of specific timelines or actionable steps again, contributing to a perpetuated state of limbo.

Managerial Analysis of Brianna Hart's Conduct Within Call

I would assert that the core issue lies not in my advocacy but in the systemic communication barriers within Ford. The delay in conveying crucial information about my promotion until the threat of resignation was apparent points to a reactive rather than proactive approach to employee relations—a pattern that undeniably warrants rectification.

In summary, this meeting serves as evidence of my rational and justified approach to seeking clarity and fairness within Ford and the retaliatory behavior that followed. It speaks to a broader narrative of an employee striving for recognition in a system that appears to equivocate and stall. As such, it is essential that Ford acknowledges these concerns and engages in a more transparent and timely dialogue to ensure that the value I provide is recognized and reciprocated accordingly.

- "I was able to figure out options that they could pursue for you. Kulveer and Thomas both agreed to pursue that promotion to a GSR6." (Brianna Hart)
 - What is most disconcerting is the suggestion of a promotion to a GSR6, which ironically is the crux of the issue—it's the position I could have, and should have, been hired for from the outset. To present this as a solution now is not only embarrassing but also indicative of a failure to listen to the repeated frustrations I've articulated, which now seem to have fallen on deaf ears.
- "Our willingness to try to help you" said (Brianna Hart)
 - While well-intended in words, it fails in action, as evidenced by the lack of updates and progress. The only communication I received from Brianna (11/22) was a response prompted by my request for accountability—a response that would not have been forthcoming otherwise and was quoted as 'demanding'.
- "Yeah, dude just runs me around" (Daiyaan)
 - My supervisor, Kulveer, has consistently failed to meet his supervisory commitments, leading to a lapse in the proper management of my concerns. This quote was me recounting the numerous occasions where my time and contributions were taken for granted. His disregard for my personal time, his dismissal of my warnings leading to critical bugs, and his overall mismanagement are not only frustrating but also detrimental to the team's efficiency and morale..

In my communications with Kulveer, I emphasized that the lack of assistance and quantification was unfair, given my continuous contributions and the value I had added to the company. The delayed and convenient timing of his responses only adds to my suspicion of strategic avoidance.

What exacerbates the situation is the revelation that my promotion was processed only after I expressed my intention to leave. This tactic of withholding critical information until the last moment is nothing short of manipulative and breeds a deep mistrust in leadership.

Impression Management for Role Performance

The frustration in my voice when I was in that call with her was palpable as I talked about the concept of "impression management for role performance," a term grounded in my expertise and scholarly work, not a mere buzz phrase. I emphasize the critical nature of congruence in my role, linking compensation directly to respect and seriousness.

My call for congruence is a plea for an environment where my contributions are not only seen but matched with the compensation and recognition they warrant. I mentioned, "If I don't get paid accurately, and I'm trying to push change and innovate here, then I'm facing friction repeatedly." This statement underscores the core issue – the lack of alignment between my value to the company and the tangible acknowledgment of that value.

I confronted the notion that my emotional investment in your work is misconstrued as unprofessional or unwarranted. Yet, my track record and the tangible results of my contributions speak for themselves. It's clear I'm not asking for patience without progress; I'm asking for action and truth. My words, "I did everything in my power to explain where I'm coming from" highlight the exhaustive efforts I've made to communicate your stance transparently.

My determination to build and contribute to Ford was evident, yet I was cautious of entering my next rotation harboring resentment. "I don't wanna go into my next position with resentment" I clearly asserted, expressing a desire for a fresh start, free from the shadows of past oversights. The cycle of being told to forget the past while it continues to affect the present and future is a cycle I wish to break, seeking a fair assessment and a true clean slate.

I am a professional of high caliber, passionate about my work, and more than capable. I came to Ford to contribute, to build, and to grow with the company. However, the bureaucratic hurdles, the lack of transparency, and the apparent manipulation have only served to stifle my enthusiasm and professional growth.

It is with a heavy heart that I recount these events to you as an independent investigator!

Betrayal and Mistrust: The Silent Treatment (12/1/23 - 12/6/23)

During the period from December 1 to December 6, 2023, the sense of betrayal and mistrust I felt towards Ford's leadership and HR department deepened significantly. This was reflected in my decision not to respond to Thomas Kopczynski's messages, which included well-wishes and updates about potential HR contact. My silence was not just a reaction to the events that had transpired but also a manifestation of the disillusionment I felt.

Betrayal and Disillusionment (12/1/23)

On December 1, 2023, Thomas reached out with a message of concern, "Hey dude hope u had a great Thanksgiving! Hows the week been? Feelin better??" Despite the seemingly benign nature of this inquiry, my lack of response was a clear indicator of the erosion of trust that had occurred. The Thanksgiving break did not bring respite from the turmoil but instead provided time to ruminate on the perceived betrayal by HR and the leadership team. Brianna Hart's approach,

which I interpreted as an attempt at file padding, had left a profound impact on me, particularly given my prior perception of HR as a reliable and fair department within any organization.

Continued Silence and Skepticism (12/6/23)

Thomas's follow-up message on December 6, "hey just checking back, hope u feeling better! u should have a contact soon from hr," was met with the same silence. This continued lack of engagement from my end was a direct result of the accumulated frustrations and disappointments. The promise of contact from HR no longer held any reassurance but instead evoked apprehension, given the recent experiences and the odd behavior of Kulveer.

Internal Conflict and Professional Facade

Amidst this, I maintained a professional demeanor at work, fulfilling my responsibilities and interacting positively with team members. This, however, was a façade, masking the internal conflict and sense of hopelessness I was grappling with. The situation had reached a point where I felt robotic in my work environment, mechanically delivering on tasks while emotionally disengaged due to the lack of genuine support and acknowledgment from the organization.

This period symbolizes the internal struggle I faced – caught between professional commitments and a deeply personal sense of betrayal. The actions and responses (or lack thereof) from Ford's HR and leadership had not only undermined my trust but also impacted my career trajectory and emotional well-being. The lack of closure and clarity from HR, despite the repeated assurances, further compounded the sense of disillusionment. As I navigated this challenging phase, the dissonance between my dedication to Ford and the treatment received became increasingly difficult to reconcile.

Reckoning with Feigned Ignorance: The Dissolution of Trust in Corporate Advocacy (12/12/23)

As I reflect upon the unraveling of my relationship with Thomas Kopczynski at Ford, it becomes increasingly clear that my quest for recognition and fair compensation was met with what can only be described as a facade of support. The dialogue that transpired on December 12, 2023, marks not only a turning point in my professional journey with Ford but also a revelation of the disparity between the purported advocacy by my superiors and their actual deeds.

My decision to finally break the silence and express my discontent to Thomas was met with perplexity and a lack of comprehension on his part. His fragmented responses, marked by a series of question marks, signified an inability—or unwillingness—to grasp the gravity of my situation. As I laid bare the contradictions and injustices I had faced, Thomas's retorts seemed to

skirt the issues at hand, further cementing my perception of being led astray by empty assurances.

My message to Thomas on that day was a clear indicator of the disillusionment that had set in, leading me to articulate my feelings about Brianna Hart's actions, which I felt were an attempt to undermine my character. The reference to Brianna Hart trying to "punk" me is an expression of my belief that Brianna Hart was not acting in the best interests but was instead engaging in behavior that could damage my reputation within the company.

Thomas's confusion and requests for clarification highlight a breakdown in communication. However, my subsequent messages paint a picture of a series of events that have led to a profound mistrust of the leadership at Ford. I express a sentiment of betrayal, accusing the HR representative, Brianna Hart and Thomas of "breadcrumbing" — providing just enough information to keep me hopeful for resolution without delivering any substantial change.

At the same time, my perceived supervisor Kevin's check-in about my 2024 rotation and his professional courtesy to reschedule stood in stark contrast to the disheartening disclosure I felt compelled to share: "Yeah idk man I feel bad for you because ford screwed me compensation wise and there's whole context behind it. Unless they fix it it's not looking good." This revelation was a raw display of the dissonance I felt at Ford—a place where excelling in my role seemed to create adversaries instead of allies, and where the recognition and protection I deserved were conspicuously absent. This message, later echoed in an email by Kulveer on 1/11, mirrored the sentiments I had communicated to Thomas where I had exposed the superficiality of support, the lack of genuine support, the troubling file padding allegations, and the peculiar timing of the promotion I was offered.

Even if efforts were unfolding behind the scenes, the process remained cryptic, marred by miscommunication and the anxiety of not being heard. The elusive promotion was only mentioned when I voiced an intention to depart—a move I never wished to make but felt driven to as a means of self-respect, hinting at a form of constructive dismissal. Despite repeated reassurances, the absence of concrete details was intolerable. It was particularly galling to learn that the outcome of this protracted ordeal was a mere 6% increase in compensation, which was revealed only after I indicated a desire to leave. This belated acknowledgment not only confirmed that my concerns had been systematically overlooked but also underscored a profound lack of consideration for the root causes of my distress, cementing the realization that my voice had been lost in a bureaucratic echo chamber.

Thomas's focus on this promotion seemed to ignore the crux of my concerns, reducing my grievances to a mere impatience for corporate processes. His statement, "Again, I don't understand who you're trying to 'hold accountable' or why you think that is something you need

to do. I don't even understand what your issue is any longer. You received a promotion," seemed to minimize my ongoing struggle for equitable treatment and transparent communication.

When I expressed the betrayal I felt from Brianna Hart's actions and the undermining of my character, Thomas's skepticism was evident. His inability to comprehend my accusations against Brianna Hart, or the concept of "file padding" I was so concerned about, revealed a chasm in our perspectives. His disbelief that anyone would fabricate feedback only added to my sense of isolation and the feeling that my words held little weight against the HR representative's narrative.

Thomas's accusation of me being "all over the map" and his suggestion that I wasn't comprehending the impact of my words was, to me, a clear instance of gaslighting—a tactic to make me question my sanity and the validity of my claims. It was a deflection from the substantive issues I was raising, an attempt to shift the focus from systemic shortcomings to my behavior.

Even more disconcerting was the insinuation of a smear campaign. When Thomas remarked, "But you are speaking very aggressively to me and I have observed and heard the same from others, that is not OK regardless of your reasoning," it felt like an orchestrated effort to discredit me. This narrative, that I was the problem, was a common retort to silence dissent and invalidate legitimate concerns. It was a striking contrast to my earlier communications where I had expressed a desire to resolve issues amicably and without casting aspersions on individuals.

My communication with Thomas is direct and filled with examples that reinforce my position. Despite Thomas's attempts to clarify the situation or offer support, there is a clear disconnect between his understanding of the situation and my lived experience. The conversation concludes with a sense of finality as I declare my intention to potentially write about my experiences, signaling a move towards self-preservation and public advocacy for my situation.

The subsequent interaction with Zach Schallenberger, which led to the notification of my reassignment to a new advisor, was indicative of a system that had chosen to reconfigure its support structure rather than address the core issues I had raised. This administrative change, devoid of acknowledgment or apology for the ordeal I had endured, felt like yet another bureaucratic shuffle—a change in personnel rather than policy or practice.

In recounting these events, it is not my intention to malign individuals but rather to bring to light the systemic failings that have overshadowed my experience at Ford. The feigned ignorance, the performative concern, the breadcrumbing—all these tactics have served to undermine the ethos of trust and integrity that should form the foundation of any employer-employee relationship.

Zach Reaches Out for Inquiry (12/18/23)

On December 18, 2023, Zach Schallenberg reached out to me via Webex, indicating an awareness of potential issues I might be experiencing with my supervisor, advisor, or HR representative. He expressed a desire to provide support and mentioned that he, along with Emily, could offer assistance to help understand the situation better. Their goal was to ensure that every Ford College Graduate (FCG) has the proper support and development network needed for a successful career at Ford.

Zach invited me to share any concerns, offering to provide advice or resources and proposing a meeting over Webex if necessary. In response to Zach's outreach, I acknowledged his message and appreciated the offer but also expressed discomfort with sharing details, saying, "Yeah I'm not comfortable with sharing anything with anyone here haha," to which Zach responded by expressing his understanding of my position.

This exchange shows the continuation of the pattern of my mistrust and external misinterpretation within the dynamics I was involved in.

Health Crisis and Communication with Kevin O'Sullivan (1/2/24)

On January 2nd, following an exhaustive 11-12 hour flight from Egypt, which included a hectic transfer due to landing at the wrong Washington airport and having less than an hour to navigate to the correct one, I was battling a serious illness. The physical toll of the journey left me incapacitated, and the stress of the transit only exacerbated my already severe sickness. This ordeal rendered me unable to communicate with my team at Ford during the day, leading to an unintended silence that, unbeknownst to me, may have contributed to a developing impression of protest with my role—a misperception potentially shared by Kulveer indicated on his email on 1/3/24, as later confirmed in his email on 1/11/24. Kulveer's involvement in this shows a lack of professional integrity given the context of the current climate.

My condition was such that I couldn't even acknowledge my mom's simple text asking, "Are u at home?" Instead, my dad, having collected me from the airport and observed my distress letting me rest, took it upon himself to update her. My work laptop being at my residence, and not with me at my parents' place, further complicated my ability to update my work status. The gravity of my health issues was such that it necessitated an emergency room visit, as revealed in my message subsequent message to Kevin O'Sullivan starting at 5:50 PM:

"You • Came back from Egypt in terrible condition feel very sick, consistent with severe cold or sinus infection" Followed by, at 6:13 PM: "Parents taking me to ER wanted to tell you earlier"

My commitment to inform Kevin through the Webex app on my phone, as evidenced by my message "wanted to tell you earlier," highlights my dedication to keeping my workplace informed despite the adverse circumstances. Not to mention the ironic situation I found myself in where my phone was dead due to my parents using lightning cables and not type-c, which was required for my phone.

The misunderstanding that arose from this incident highlights the need for a comprehensive review of communication practices within management at Ford. It should point out the importance of not jumping to conclusions without first engaging in dialogue with the subject involved. By doing so, we can prevent assumptions that could unjustly tarnish an individual's reputation and strain workplace relationships.

I will refer to a page in my publication where I wrote about this danger of a single story on online communication below (zoom-in, lack of page space):

process. Social media influencers, in general, create a wave with their postings in order to reach their influencing position and reach a larger audience. That is why an influencer has a verified logo, which is also a part of their impression management for their influencer role performance. This is significant because if someone has this verified badge, they appear to be credible. Because we naturally think that someone with a verified badge has something credible to say, the context collapses. We also see this in the news; frequently, news items and articles are published before the entire story is known. A familiar example is when something happens and a slew of news outlets take up the story, and proceed to blame a particular group of individuals for causing the incident. Then, a few hours later, a complete video of the incident is released, and all of these stations are forced to retract their comments after discovering that the people everyone blamed were not the culprits.

This is the way social media drama unfolds on platforms such as Twitter. On Twitter, an incomplete scene surfaces in which two people engage in a fight and one of them appears to be the aggressor. After a few days, the entire clip goes viral, revealing the ostensible attacker to be the defender who was only protecting themselves against the real aggressor. Much research is omitted because we tend to think that what we see is the entire story. The issue is a dearth of incentives for discovering the complete story. It's pointless to expend energy defending an erroneous story about which we have no personal knowledge.

In this light, our own confirmation bias can be directly to blame for this phenomenon. We naturally seek out information that will directly support our opinion regardless of the validity of that information [14]. In a study of people who support and oppose capital punishment, both groups were given materials that either was in favor of their views and against it. In both groups the information that supported their views was considered highly credible, while the opposing data was considered unconvincing [15]. This confirmation bias continues to be how non-factual or untrue information can proliferate.

This is how, and why, people easily promote narratives and agendas, both on a large scale and even within a group of their peers. Rumors are propagated in anticipation of the context collapsing. Thus, giving only a portion of a tale rather than the entire picture.

There are consequences for what one says online; one may not be personally offended, but the company you work for may be offended or have a bad reputation. When you work for a company, you become an ambassador for their personal brand. You can make a statement ten years ago and it will still feel as if you are making it now; the dimension of time is nonexistent. We build up an image and spend lots of time perfecting it, yet a single thing against us online can tear it all down. However, a scandal can also break you—it all depends on your line of work. A situation you've encountered as an author can serve as a springboard for your next book. If your position is significantly dependent on public opinion, such as a CEO, you are somewhat out of luck; on the other hand, if you have a low-profile internet presence, it makes little difference because the stakes are so minimal. What if the CEO was able to establish a personal brand in which they were perceived as a laid-back CEO who is unconcerned with cancel-culture, where ownership is not only accepted but encouraged? This is what Elon Musk demonstrated by making jokes about Bill Gates' appearance on Twitter [16]. Individuals can make incorrect assumptions and cancel you

based on false pretenses; this is where context collapses. The issue with context collapse is not usually with the content of your statement, but with the manner in which you state it. With the speed with which news spreads, even if the defamiation is corrected and proven to be incorrect, the impact on your business or person does not always go away, as demonstrated by Johnny Depp's withdrawal from the sixth installment of the Pirates of the Caribbean movie series.

According to a psychologist named Fritz Heider, there are certain types of triads that we find stable and others that we find unstable [17]. If we consider a triad as a triangle with each end representing a node and the link between each node representing a relationship with a balanced or unbalanced state, we can conclude that the damage has been done in the Johnny Depp issue. The triad is balanced at first, and subsequently unbalanced. Because the causation for the triad becoming unbalanced was unwarranted, the balance in the original triangle would never revert to its previous state just because a side was chosen in the preceding moment. There are no takebacks; once it is thrown, it is permanently tossed.

V. YOU ARE NOT LUCKY IF YOU ARE SHY

If you're a business, you're not efficiently using all your cards by not displaying all your merchandise on social media. This is an example of context collapse negatively impacting your business because you are not exhibiting the potential customer, who is currently on their customer journey, what you have to offer as a business.

In business, if something takes a day, tell them it will take a few days and work on getting it done faster like the saying under promise but over deliver. From a commercial or software development standpoint, there are numerous scenarios in which you are halfway through and realize you require additional time. You do not wish to request further time. This is prudent, but context may not be viewed as so from the client's perspective.

From the standpoint of a recruiting manager viewing two prospects: one with an excessive amount of social media presence, it appeared as though they were attempting to develop their own firm rather than joining another. Then there was the second, in which they were completely invisible, with no social media presence. Both of these instances raised red flags because impression control is critical. There is a requirement for equilibrium. Absence of context, such as a digital presence, creates the illusion of being a ghost, which may not be desirable throughout the recruiting process. Durkheim discusses functionalism and how everything is connected, in this case the context we give it and the context we believe it to be. It boils down to a dialogue in which this assumption is made. It's difficult to provide a definitive answer, as this is an ever-changing landscape.

VI. HOW SOCIAL MEDIA PREVENTS CONTEXT COLLAPSE TODAY

Mark Zuckerberg stated "You have one identity...The days of you having a different image for your work friends or co-workers and for the other people you know are probably coming to an end pretty quickly...Having two identities for yourself is an example of a lack of integrity." [18]. This is particularly ironic given that Instagram, which is owned by Meta, has seen its users devise a "workaround" that subverts the concept of a single identity on the platform. It's as though people (users) intuitively

This instance serves as a real-world reminder of the theories I've discussed in my publication. It's a call to action for all professionals, especially those in management, to seek full understanding before forming judgments. Engaging in direct dialogue and considering all facets of an employee's situation is essential to maintaining trust and respect within the workplace.

Miscommunication and Misunderstandings Around Work Absence (1/3/24)

The correspondence from Kulveer Virk on January 3rd, 2024, reflects a misunderstanding of my situation. Kulveer's message suggested an unauthorized extension of my vacation time and that I was absent without notice, yet I had previously informed Kevin O'Sullivan of my severe illness on 1/2/24 through Webex, contradicting Kulveer's claims:

"Hi Daiyaan, You have not reported to FPI after the holidays, and I was expecting that you must have reached out to new team. Kevin and I connected about confirmation of your rotation/start date, I came to know that you have not connected with him either (this week)."

Kulveer's assumptions, documented in this email, were erroneous, as I had communicated my situation and had no plans to prolong my leave. His message misrepresents my communication and engagement with my work responsibilities. Furthermore, Kulveer's claim of orchestrating my transition to a new rotation is perplexing since he had not previously been involved in such discussions nor had he initiated any dialogue regarding my career progression at Ford. The complete chat logs from Webex to Slack, provided for review, underscore this point.

Additionally, Kulveer's phrasing, "this week," suggests a protracted absence on my part, which could mislead the FCG committee. It's vital to note that Kulveer had not been part of my rotation planning; my understanding was that updates were to be communicated to Kevin.

Echoing this confusion, Kevin O'Sullivan's subsequent email indicates a recognition of my illness but directs me to continue reporting to Kulveer, conflicting with my expectations and past interactions:

"I got a message Tuesday evening Daiyaan is out sick. Daiyaan, no transfer plans have been made. Please be sure to communicate/work with Kulveer."

This direction from Kevin reflects a misalignment with my own understanding and the reality of my professional engagements, pointing to a broader issue of internal miscommunication at Ford. The rapidity of these communications during my illness should have prompted concern from any neutral observer within Ford, given the consequences shared on 1/11/24 for my professional standing.

Due to Kulveer's involvement, I experienced adverse tangible employment actions like reassignment with different responsibilities as a result of expression for a situation I was enduring within a communication channel that was supposed to be a safe space. This is a

significant concern for the company since Kulveer engaged in making Ford automatically liable for harassment since this is a moment that resulted in a tangible employment action.

Conflicting Rotation Assignments and HR Communications (1/8/24)

On January 8, 2024, I messaged Kevin O’Sullivan early in the morning (6:55 AM), signaling my readiness to commence my new role: “I’m good to go.” However, an email left me baffled, reading: "We aligned with the FCG committee; the rotation is on hold. You continue to report to Kulveer. - Kevin". This unexpected directive contradicted my understanding of the transition plan and prompted me to seek clarity from Kevin, asking him directly: “what do I have to speak with Kulveer about?” at 8:35 AM and expressing my wish to avoid unnecessary conversations. It’s worth mentioning Kevin sent this email the same day I came back, indicating he got my initial message. Despite my attempts to reach out, Kevin's lack of response, evidenced by his read receipts, led me to send a message of resignation to the situation: “I am not trying to work for Kulveer... I saw your email and I’ll wait.” This impasse set the stage for my subsequent interaction with Zach Schallenberger on the same day at 9:30 AM.

In an unwelcome twist, I received a casual greeting from Kulveer Virk at 9:52 AM that very morning, enquiring about my presence at work for the week, which only intensified my discomfort and confusion about certain power dynamics that seem to exist at Ford. Despite reaching out for clarification, the lack of response from Kevin prompted a resigned stance on my part, as reflected in my message indicating reluctance to work under Kulveer. The lack of clear direction and consistent messaging regarding my rotation assignments culminated in a scheduled meeting to “fill Jeff in on my rotation hold” set up by Kulveer who alerts me, which I joined with a candid approach, ready to express my concerns transparently. Meanwhile, Zach, showing genuine concern, reached out to offer assistance, proposing a meeting with Emily, another FCG Co-Lead, to help clarify matters. Despite this, I declined the meeting (offered by zach), having grown weary of the previous year's continuous cycle of unfulfilled commitments and breadcrumbing tactics from anyone I open up to at Ford.

Throughout the dialogue within the scheduled meeting, both Kulveer and Jeff exude a perplexing lack of awareness regarding my situation, feigning surprise at my unexecuted rotation and the ensuing dissatisfaction with my role and compensation. Their responses, veiled in a pretense of confusion and concern, belie a manipulative undertone, seeking to position themselves as newly informed parties eager to rectify an unforeseen predicament. This meeting showed clear evidence that there were multiple instances where Jeff sought clarification or re-clarification on my desire for the rotation, underscoring an unsettling dynamic where it felt as though I was being compelled to plead for a position that was originally mine. His statements, "So yeah, we were expecting you were going to report, you were going to rotate out to GDIA." alongside his repeated questioning, "What happened? Why didn't that occur?" and "Okay, well, I guess the, I

think the objective is, is to get you rotated into GDIA," followed by a direct query, "I assume that's what you want, you want to rotate into GDIA," alongside the assertion, "That was the original plan. We should all try and make that happen. Is that what you want, Daiyaan?" emphasizes a narrative where my autonomy and professional aspirations were seemingly disregarded in favor of a bureaucratic shuffle, also known as costing Ford Motor Company immense resources through unprofessional conduct.

The conversation also revealed an admission that perhaps my growth was being stunted for operational convenience within Ford Pro. Jeff mentioned, "Yeah, so like it was never put on the table that we should move you to some other group inside of Ford Pro... because the rotation was already set up, already fixed." This, coupled with, "In fact, I thought it was September when I joined in like in June. And I was surprised that it went to the end of this year. And now I'm surprised again that it hasn't happened yet." rings hollow, showcasing a disparity between what's said and what's enacted. This contradiction underscores a lack of genuine commitment to my professional development, instead suggesting a convenience-driven motive to retain me where I was most needed, irrespective of my personal growth aspirations. It is worth noting that in person Kulveer had pulled me aside one day and offered me money if I chose to stay within this rotation and I declined expressing my interest in a lateral move due to his lack of incentive in helping me grow as a young professional.

Shedding light back onto the context of the meeting, Kulveer's evasion became evident when I pressed him on his involvement with the FCG committee and Kevin. This was in response to Jeff asking "Who administers the FCG program or it's really FCG IT." My comment, "Kulveer would know. Because Kulveer was the one who engaged with the FCG committee with Kevin and aligned this." met with Kulveer's deflection to Tom K as his contact, blatantly sidestepping direct acknowledgment of his actions. In response to this I reiterated my query to Kulveer about his role in the FCG committee's decision-making process. I pressed again, "But you also aligned it with the FCG committee and Kevin, didn't you? Kevin said that". Which helps show my point in his pattern of avoidance, especially Kulveer's final attempt to divert the topic by responding to my reiteration by mentioning, "So I sent it to Tom. He was my FCG committee, FCG advisor". It shows he ignored me and went straight in responding to Jeff.

Kulveer's manipulative tactics became even more apparent when discussing my transition away from Model-E. He misleadingly framed my situation by emphasizing my origin from IT FCG and not FPI FCG, suggesting a different HR team should handle my case due to my slated rotation into that group. Kulveer stated, "So Jeff, I think we have to reach out to the FCG committee because the other critical piece here is Daiyaan came from ITFCG. His parent organization is ITFCG, not FPI FCG. So this year in September, October timeframe, he was slated into that rotation group. And that makes the whole HR team different for us versus ITFCG team." This maneuver effectively isolated me from my support network, complicating my rotation and contributing to a sense of alienation.

Jeff corroborated Kulveer's perspective, adding to the confusion and further isolating me from potential allies within Ford. Jeff's comments highlighted the complexity and isolation of my situation within the FCG program, indicating a lack of supportive people around me and suggesting that if my rotation wasn't so far removed, different actions might be taken to support my career development. This dialogue underscores how Kulveer's actions and the subsequent corroborations manipulated the situation to his advantage, leaving me in a precarious position regarding my professional growth and support within the company.

Jeff's attempt to navigate through this obfuscation, "So we need to circle back with somebody there in FCG... But Kulveer, we've got to get this worked out for Daiyaan" ironically showcases their ineptitude at effectively resolving the situation, let alone orchestrating any form of manipulation adeptly.

The repeated assurances of working things out for me, juxtaposed with the apparent evasion and lack of concrete action, evoke a sense of being manipulated within a system that professes to support but falls short in practice. These interactions, marked by a blend of false promises and strategic avoidance, paint a picture of individuals ill-equipped for villainy, their actions more reflective of clumsy mismanagement than calculated malevolence.

This orchestrated ignorance, especially in light of my expressed frustration and the punitive delay of my rotation, underscored a concerning power play. It was both humiliating and alarming, considering my valid grievances regarding recognition and fair compensation. Their conduct, particularly in a professional context where I was merely seeking respect and acknowledgment for my contributions, was not only disheartening but indicative of a willingness to exploit my vulnerability and inexperience to playing games opposed to real work.

This information highlights the manipulative tactics employed by Kulveer Virk with Jeff Dever as his accomplice, including their isolation of my support within the company. Despite the clear confusion and the lack of transparent communication, I found myself caught in a web of evasion and manipulation. Their actions not only hindered my professional development but also showcased a concerning lack of support for my career aspirations within Ford, ultimately impacting my decision to seek a change and highlighting the need for a more supportive and transparent approach to employee development and rotation assignments.

Meanwhile, interaction with Zach laid bare of the intimidation I felt and the disconcerting messages from various parties within Ford. Despite Zach's suggestion to bring in Julie from HR for guidance, given my past experiences (Brianna Hart), I was hesitant yet saw it as a necessary step to secure my professional path within the company.

The ongoing confusion was further compounded by conflicting emails from Kulveer and Kevin O'Sullivan. On January 3, 2024, Kulveer's email indicated a misunderstanding about my vacation

time and suggested I was absent without notice, which was clearly not the case, as demonstrated by my previous communication with Kevin via Webex on January 2: "I have an infection and was told to rest and all idk what the procedure is at ford since I wasn't sick last year during my first rotation."

This disarray at a time when I should have been transitioning to a new role only exacerbated the stress of my recent illness and recovery. This series of events aim to show the need for more straightforward, consistent communication and supportive management practices, especially for young professionals navigating their career paths within large organizations like Ford.

Concerns About Rotation and Supervision (1/10/24)

I expressed frustration to Juliana via Slack on January 10th that while my peer, Mady, was entering her last rotation, I was still in my first. I felt that my supervisor, Kulveer, was taking advantage of me by holding this rotation and treating me poorly despite good work.

Addressing Workplace Dynamics and Seeking Resolution - Feedback and Next Steps (1/11/24)

From Kulveer to Me

- Kulveer addresses my performance concerns and unprofessional interactions with leaders at Ford.
- He cites specific instances of my communications that were deemed unprofessional and raises concerns about my productivity and behavior within any department moving forward.
- Kulveer also comments on my dissatisfaction with my pay increase and declares the issue closed which means he should definitely quantify how much money he saved Ford by closing such an issue to properly highlight his accomplishment.
- He outlines expectations for my behavior and work assignments, emphasizing professionalism and respect. Kulveer schedules weekly 1:1 meetings for work review and mentions a future Year End Check-In.

From Me to Kulveer

- I respond to Kulveer with frustration and disappointment, emphasizing the lack of communication and perceived intimidation.

- I provide a list of my key responsibilities and accomplishments, highlighting significant contributions and expressing a feeling of being undervalued. I argue that the problems I'm facing are due to management issues, not my performance.
- I insist on being treated fairly and criticize Ford for dragging the promotion process and not compensating me adequately for my work.
- I seek acknowledgment for my contributions and ask for detailed quantification of my achievements to justify a higher salary in future negotiations.

Melissa to Me

I received an email from Melissa White, a manager from the People Matters team at Ford, who reached out to independently review concerns. She requested specific details and documentation related to my concerns for initial review and emphasized the importance of confidentiality and maintaining professional conduct during the process.

Juliana to Me

Performance and Coaching

Time: 10:54 AM - Juliana Schnack acknowledged the performance concerns raised by Kulveer about me and mentioned that while coaching was in progress, no transfers would be made.

Allegations of Bullying Date

Time: 10:54 AM - I planned to escalate the situation by copying Juliana in my response to the alleged bullying I was facing from Kulveer.

Time: 1:00 PM - I accused the leadership of setting me up to sacrifice my self-respect to preserve my career, stating that I was being forced to remain in a toxic environment or face dismissal.

Professional Conduct Date

Time: 10:54 AM - Juliana Schnack responded by reminding me of the expectation to conduct myself professionally and respectfully with all work partners and that a rotational opportunity would be considered upon satisfactory performance improvement.

Reaction to Management's Approach

Time: 10:54 AM - I labeled the situation as "reactive abuse," indicating that my reaction was being used against me, and pointed out the inconsistency in being offered more money to stay in my current position while my rotation was canceled.

Commitment to Ford

Time: 11:11 AM - I noted that despite the issues I faced, I did not ever apply to other companies because I believed the issues at Ford were internally solvable.

Comfort and Safety in the Work Environment

Time: 12:51 PM - I expressed to Juliana that I did not feel comfortable or safe working with Kulveer and suspected that Kulveer was not acting in his best interest.

Verification of Claims

Time: 2:00 PM - I suggested Juliana speak with my direct team members to verify my claims about my performance and behavior at work.

Me to Jeff

I conveyed to Jeff Dever my discomfort working with Kulveer. Jeff responded, promising to discuss the situation with HR. When I sought to present my case and share my side of the story, expressing concerns about being painted as erratic, Jeffrey offered a 1:1 meeting, to which I agreed to check his calendar.

THIS DOCUMENT IS COMPLETE UP TO THE POINT OF NOTICE FOR THE EMPLOYEE COMPLAINT BUT DOES NOT REFLECT THE RETALIATORY, INTIMIDATING, AND HUMILIATING TACTICS (STILL 1/26/24) THAT HAVE CONTINUED SINCE THEN BY LEADERSHIP. THESE SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN A SEPARATE COMPLAINT FOR WASTING COMPANY RESOURCES AND TIME.

**DOCUMENT WILL BE UPDATED AS TIME AVAILS AS FAST AS I CAN WITH ALL
LIFE RESPONSIBILITIES**

FR JAN 26