

citizens
planning
board



portland model cities

CITY DEMONSTRATION AGENCY
5329 N.E. UNION AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97211
288-8267

Grievance Committee
September 24, 1973

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Marcus Glenn. The following Board members were present or arrived before the meeting adjourned:

Burnett Austin
Jack Deyampert
Marcus Glenn

LeRoy Patton
Harry Ward

The following Board members were absent:

Opal Strong
Gregg Watson

Ella Mae Gay

Staff present: Andy Raubeson and Gail Myers

Mr. Glenn asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes. The Committee stated no.

Mr. Glenn thanked Mr. Raubeson for getting the information requested by the Committee.

Mr. Glenn stated that the first thing on the agenda was to try to prepare a letter to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Ward stated that the main thing in the material we received would be the time elements. The fact that we would not want to do anything that would cause an employee to be delayed in time to the extent that he could not pursue a matter according to their contract. In the contract it states ten (10) days.

Mr. Austin stated that the Committee should stipulate in the letter that they don't want the employee to feel that if he is wrong they are going to ratify his wrongness.

Mr. Raubeson explained to the Committee that the City negotiated a contract for two (2) years last year; the addendum is for one (1) year and wages are negotiated each year. Mr. Raubeson suggested that the Committee invite the Model Cities employees Union Representative, Mr. Darnell Lowery to their meeting and also he felt that Mr. LeRoy Albert the Residential Employment and Training Supervisor, since he is responsible for employment, training and employment opportunities.

Mr. Ward stated that the only thing the the Union Representative could tell them would be maybe some questions which would be foreign in their minds. He stated that they will not interfere with their union activities.

Mr. Raubeson replied that the only reason he suggested the Union Representative attending was to let the union know that the Committee is not trying to supersede their role.

Mr. Raubeson stated that the Union Representative at Model Cities is Mr. Darnell Lowery, who is also a staff member.

Mr. Deyampert asked if they would have any problems if the Committee operates as a bi-lateral unit?

Mr. Raubeson stated that reassurance to the union could be covered in the letter.

Mr. Ward suggested that a copy of the letter be sent to Mr. Lowery, and if he had any questions they could invite him to the meeting.

Mr. Austin stated that he though the Committee was set up to keep grievances from going to the Union.

Mr. Glenn stated that he didn't think the Committee was established so that an employee couldn't go to the union.

Mr. Austin replied that the purpose was that we would be in between the employee and the union.

Mr. Deyampert stated that he though that the Committee was a centralized body between the person and the union and management.

Mr. Glenn clarified that when there is a grievance procedure within the union and they treat it one way, he felt that the union's procedure would vary from the Committees. If there is a difference of opinion between the union and this Committee he felt that the Committee should meet as soon as possible to iron these things out.

Mr. Patton stated that he felt the Committee should clearly define their goals from the start.

Mr. Austin responded that if an employee and his supervisor settled a grievance on their own level, then the Committee would never know about it. If the grievance goes beyond the Supervisor it would go to management. Then if it wasn't settled on that level, it might come to the Grievance Committee.

Mr. Glenn stated that was correct.

Mr. Ward stated that the Committee is not a part of the grievance procedure. If an employee has a complaint and he goes to his supervisor and it goes to management and management sustains the supervisor, then if that employee feels that the Committee can be of assistance to him, then the employee has the privilege of coming to the Grievance Committee. Mr. Ward then proceeded to site examples.

Mr. Raubeson said that the employee would at least want to quote the Committee if they are on the employees side.

Mr. Austin asked if the Union Representative would be invited to hear a grievance?

Mr. Ward replied that he may be or he may not be.

Mr. Glenn stated that once an employee has exhausted internal remedies; he then has a right to appeal to this Committee and his union.

Mr. Ward replied that a employee can also withdraw his grievance within the ten (10) days in which it is filed.

Mr. Patton stated that this will help to stay out of crisis areas.

Mr. Glenn stated that the main thing is to settle the dispute as soon as possible.

Mr. Ward replied that 85% to 90% of the problems can be solved without a formal grievance filed.

There was further discussion regarding the role of the Personnel Hiring Committee and the Grievance Committee.

Mr. Glenn suggested deferring the letter to the Executive Committee until they can get a full Committee present.

Mr. Ward stated that in order to expedite matter he suggested Mr. Raubeson drafting such letter and they could discuss it at the next meeting.

Mr. Raubeson stated that he would draft a letter and present it to the Chairman before he presented it to the Committee.

The next Grievance Committee meeting is to be held on October 1, 1973, at 6:00 P.M. Room #226, Model Cities.

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

Minutes are subject to approval.

P/G Com.

citizens
planning
board



portland model cities

CITY DEMONSTRATION AGENCY
5329 N.E. UNION AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97211

288-8261

TO: Personnel/Grievance Committee

FROM: Marcus Glenn, Sr., Chairman

RE: Committee's Tasks

DATE: August 1, 1974

As Chairman of the Personnel/Grievance Committee I feel it is our role to work with staff, union and the City Civil Service Commission to assist in writing new job classifications for CDA employees and make sure that employees who are transferred from the CDA Program to City, County, etc., are treated fairly.

Our duties also will consist of making a report to the full Citizens Planning Board for their approval and assistance.

Also, I feel that this Committee should have a close working relationship with the union until the transition period is completed, and up to this point this has not happened.

Marcus Glenn, Sr.
Chairman

MG:g1m

cc: Jamison/Director
Robertson/CP Coordinator
Glenn/Author/Chairman

THE CITY OF
PORTLAND



OREGON

November 29, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

MILDRED SCHWAB
COMMISSIONER

MODEL CITIES
AGENCY

ANDREW RAUBESON
ACTING DIRECTOR

Mr. Marcus Glenn, Chairman
Model Cities Representative Committee
707 N.E. Knott Street
Portland, Oregon

Dear Chairman:

I have been employed in the Model Cities program for three years and three months. I was employed as a Planning Assistant in the Social Department on September 8, 1970. I was upgraded to a Specialist I in the Evaluation Department in January, 1973. During this time I have received favorable recommendations of my performance from both Cy Yancey of the Social Department, and Ms. Andrea Sharp of the Evaluation Department.

A formal request was sent in the form of a Memo to Mr. Andrew Raubeson on October 15, 1973, requesting that I be upgraded. The Memo has been in his office for over six weeks with no response. The Evaluation Department has an open slot for a Specialist II. Also funds available from the slot of one Senior Steno, thereby making additional monies available within Evaluation which could be utilized for upgrading two Specialists II. I am 36 hours away from receiving my degree in Psychology. O.E.O. guidelines state "a degree or experience". The experience I have; the degree I am working on.

Evaluation department, having 35 projects to monitor and evaluate, is understaffed with only two Specialists I and one Specialist II. Model Cities was designed as a training program whereby individuals could receive training, experience, and education to be upgraded and eventually move into other higher components.

Personally I felt that the request was legitimate and demands attention as soon as possible.

Respectfully yours,

Patsy P. Ollison
Patsy P. Ollison

5329 N.E. UNION AVE.
PORTLAND, OR. 97211
503/238-8261

DATE: October 16, 1973
TO: Mr. Andrew Foubeson
CDA Director
FROM: Ms. Angela B. Sharp
CDA Evaluation
RE: Staff Salary

Ms. Patricia P. Ollison and Ms. Barbara A. Patrick asked me if it was possible for them to procure an increase in status before Model Cities terminates, thereby giving them additional ability to obtain better employment when that time comes.

They personally felt that an increase was justified for the following reasons:

1. The additional amount of work that they are responsible for due to a cutback in staff (a reduction of seven to four).
2. The supervision of Work/Study Students that is their responsibility.
3. Ms. Patrick has her degree in Psychology and her present position of Specialist I does not require one.
4. One Evaluation Specialist II slot is open, along with the slot of one Senior Steno; thereby making additional monies available within Evaluation that could be utilized.

Do you think that the City will consider their status and allot an increase??

Respectfully,

ARS 

Pay hikes given agency figures

The salary of Elvin D. Roberts, acting director of Model Cities Agency, was raised to \$19,365 by the Portland City Council Wednesday. His salary had been \$18,242.

Walter Kunst, a Model Cities planning assistant, was given a salary increase from \$8,986 to \$9,233.

THE CITY OF
PORTLAND



OREGON

October 31, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

MILDRED SCHWAB
COMMISSIONER

MODEL CITIES
AGENCY

ANDREW RAUBESON
ACTING DIRECTOR

Mr. Marcus Glenn, Chairman
Model Cities Representative Committee
707 N. E. Knott Street
Portland, Oregon 97212

Dear Chairman:

I have been employed in the Model Cities Program for approximately two years. For six months I was employed as a Planning Assistant in the Physical Department. In July of 72, I was upgraded to a Specialist 1 in the Evaluation Department. During this time I have received favorable recommendations of my performance from both Mike Henniger of the Physical Department and Andrea Sharp of the Evaluation Department.

A formal request was sent in the form of a memo to Mr. Andrew Raubeson on October 15, 1973, requesting that I be upgraded to a Specialist 2. The memo has been in his office for a period of thirteen days with no response. The Evaluation Department has an open slot for a Specialist 2 and I have the educational background, experience, and training to move into that slot. To be upgraded would afford me the opportunity of having a better chance of getting a comparable job in the city structure. More important, it would allow another person to move into the department as a Specialist 1 and receive the type of experience that will enable him to find a better job.

Having 28 projects to monitor and evaluate, the department is understaffed, with only 2 Specialist 1's and 1 Specialist 2. Model Cities was designed as a training program whereby individuals could receive training, experience, and education to be upgraded and eventually move into other city components. I feel that the request was legitimate and demands attention as soon as possible.

Respectfully Yours,


Barbara A. Patrick

cc: Mr. Andrew Raubeson
Author/Patrick

5329 N.E. UNION AVE.
PORTLAND, OR. 97211
503/288-8261

Portland Model Cities Agency - a demonstration program
Interoffice Memorandum

DATE: October 16, 1973
TO: Mr. Andrew Raubeson
CDA Director
FROM: Ms. Andrea R. Sharp
CDA Evaluation
RE: Staff Salary

Ms. Patricia P. Ollison and Ms. Barbara A. Patrick asked me if it was possible for them to procure an increase in status before Model Cities terminates, thereby giving them additional ability to obtain better employment when that time comes.

They personally felt that an increase was justified for the following reasons:

1. The additional amount of work that they are responsible for due to a cutback in staff (a reduction of seven to four).
2. The supervision of Work/Study Students that is their responsibility.
3. Ms. Patrick has her degree in Psychology and her present position of Specialist I does not require one.
4. One Evaluation Specialist II slot is open, along with the slot of one Senior Steno; thereby making additional monies available within Evaluation that could be utilized.

Do you think that the City will consider their status and allot an increase??

Respectfully,

ARS 

citizens
planning
board



portland model cities

CITY DEMONSTRATION AGENCY
5329 N.E. UNION AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97211
288-8261

TO: LeRoy Patton, Chairman
CPB Executive Committee

FROM: Marcus Glenn, Chairman
Model Cities Employees Representation
Committee

RE: Approval of Letter

DATE: October 2, 1973

Attached you will find a letter to all Model Cities employees from the Model Cities' Employees Representation Committee, being submitted to the Executive Committee for your approval.

The Model Cities Employees Representation Committees invites the Executive Committee to make any corrections which they deem necessary, and then notify the Committee as to the changes being made.

The Committee would also like to bring to your attention the change in the Committee's name. The Committee decided to change the name from the Grievance Committee to Model Cities Employees Representation Committee.

After approval is received from the Executive Committee the attached letter will be sent to all Model Cities employees.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Marcus Glenn, Sr. (glm)

Marcus Glenn, Chairman
Model Cities Employees Representation Committee

glm

citizens
planning
board



portland model cities

CITY DEMONSTRATION AGENCY
5329 N.E. UNION AVENUE
PORTLAND, OREGON 97211
288-8261

TO: All Model Cities Employees

FROM: Model Cities' Employees Representation Committee
Marcus Glenn, Chairman

DATE: October 2, 1973

As you may know, the Citizens Planning Board has established and the Chairman has appointed a grievance committee. We have had several meetings and wished to make our availability known to every employee of the Model Cities staff. You should know that we do not see ourselves as a substitute for your union nor any other avenues of appeal that now exist. What we hope to do is to act as a liaison between employees and management.

We would like to stress that we intend to strive for objectivity and employees are advised that they are not to expect our automatic concurrence in their grievances. The Committee has established and the Executive Committee has approved the following procedures:

- 1) No grievances will be heard by this Committee until all available remedies are exhausted. For example, if your grievance is with your department supervisor you should first try to reconcile the difference at this level. If you are still not satisfied you should appeal to the CDA Director. If your case has still not been resolved to your satisfaction, you may then ask for a review by the Model Cities Employees Representation Committee.
- 2) In order to be heard by the Committee you must request a hearing in writing, addressed to the Chairman of the Model Cities Employees Representation Committee. This request must include a brief description of your grievance and a copy of it should be forwarded to the CDA Director's office.
- 3) Our hearings will be as informal as possible and we will keep all information confidential. The Model Cities Employees Representation Committee will attempt to bring

about agreement but, if this should prove impossible, we will then make recommendations to the Executive Committee of the Citizens Planning Board.

- 4) The Committee will make every attempt to hear grievances promptly and to render an opinion in as short a time as possible. For this reason we will not have regularly scheduled meetings, but will meet on the call of the Chair when we have business to conduct.
- 5) The employee should not overlook the fact that there exists a ten-day time frame to formally file his/her grievance for union participation. Therefore, in using this Committee it has to be prior to the ten-day limit for formalizing and union participation.

Sincerely,

Marcus Glenn, Sr.
(glm)

Marcus Glenn, Chairman
Model Cities' Employees Representation Committee

glm