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Executive Summary

The purpose of the housekeeping analysis was to collect, sort and analyze data on housekeeping staff absenteeism in order to determine its underlying reasons.

The goal of the project is to identify avoidable and unavoidable causes of absenteeism in the housekeeping department.

Classification and shift structure of the housekeeping staff, focusing on the absenteeism of its members, has never been investigated. Housekeeping management desires information on the total absenteeism and its breakdown into categories such as class and shift. Additionally, summary absenteeism information is also requested on the categories month, reasons and day of the week.

The approach used in our analysis of the project consisted of collecting the Absentee forms from eight supervisors which consisted of fifty eight employees, which is about twenty percent of the approximately total 300 employees that work for the University Hospitals. The Absentee forms indicated the number of hours that an employee has worked on each of their scheduled days and a reason for why they were absent. We sorted this data by the day of the week, class, shift, supervisor, month and the reasons for the absence. In addition to the data received, we conducted an extensive survey of the Housekeeping staff. The survey was designed to determine the general satisfaction level of the Housekeeping employees with their schedules and allow write-in comments pertaining to employee scheduling problems.
Most of the absences occurred near or during the weekend day of the shift. A possible schedule change would be conducive in decreasing the number of absences that occur during these weekend days. For example, having a rotating schedule, with the chance to have one of the weekend days off during the month for the shifts that have to work the weekend shift every week.

The monthly chart shows that the highest number of absences occur during the summer months of July and August. Knowledge of this information can allow management to make proper adjustments in employee scheduling during these periods.

Personal Day Time revealed that most of the employees use most of their three PDT's by the end of the first month. An incentive plan that would help alleviate this problem would be to offer an extra PDT if they were to keep all their PDT after a certain date. Another possibility would be to allocate only one PDT every four months.

Many of our initial hypothesis proved to be true but at the same time we revealed some startling conclusions. People tend to be more absent during the weekend days was expected, but we found out that higher pay and seniority does not necessarily bring about the happiest workers. Our survey indicated many were disgruntled with their working situation. Also many Monday-Friday workers were less satisfied then their counterparts that worked on the weekends. The study of the many charts and graphs are crucial to the full understanding for the underlying reasons to the high occurrence of absences.
Introduction and Background

Purpose

The purpose of the housekeeping analysis was to collect, sort, and analyze data on housekeeping staff absenteeism in order to determine its underlying reasons.

Goals and Objectives

Investigation can reveal the extent as well as identify avoidable and unavoidable causes of absenteeism in the housekeeping department. A possible change in housekeeping staff structure may prove necessary.

Background/Environment Affecting Project

Classification and shift structure of the housekeeping staff, focusing on the absenteeism of its members, has never been investigated. Housekeeping management desires information on the total absenteeism and its breakdown into categories such as class and shift. Additionally, summary absenteeism information is also requested on the categories day of the week, month, and reason.

Present housekeeping staff structure:

Classifications:
1. Wall Washer (WW): Highest seniority and top level custodian position
2. Custodian 2 (C2): Second level custodian position
3. Unit Custodian (UC): Level one custodian position
Shift Structure:

40 Hour Shifts: Monday-Friday team
     Sunday-Thursday team
     Tuesday-Saturday team

32 Hour Shift: Friday-Monday team

The necessary information to carry out the analysis will be provided through absentee forms which are completed by individual supervisors.

Key Issues/Alternatives

To locate available information in order to analyze causes and magnitude of housekeeping staff absenteeism.

To determine utilization of sick time and Personal Day Time (PDT), and vacation time as reasons of absenteeism.

To determine whether the present scheduling is satisfactory.

Approach and Methodology

The Absentee forms were collected from the Housekeeping Department on October 27, 1990. The Absentee forms consists of a yearly chart showing the number of hours that the employee has worked on a particular day throughout the year. If an employee was absent on a day that he was scheduled to work then a notation is made on the Absentee form indicating the reason - i.e. the employee was sick or using their Personal Day Time. On a separate sheet attached to the yearly calendar is a detailed summary of the excuses for the days in which they were absent or tardy. From these
Absentee forms our sample size consists of 58 employees which is about twenty percent of the approximately 300 employees that are currently working for the University of Michigan Hospitals. Our sample period was from January 1, 1990 to October 26, 1990.

All this information which consisted of 1421 absences were then manually keyed in on MicroSoft Excel and sorted by the different characteristics such as absences by the day of the week, class, shift, supervisor, month and the reasons for the absences. This data was then transported to a program made available by the University of Michigan called Systat which enabled us to analyze the data from a statistical viewpoint.

Initially the scope of our project was to also have a program implemented in the Housekeeping Department. With this in mind we started looking into a powerful data base system. We began an analysis on database systems that would serve the needs of the housekeeping department. After completing several interviews with Winnie Han of Compuware and Maralynn Pendorff of University of Michigan Medical Center Hospital Information Systems and a literature analysis of several database systems, we decided that the most optimal database would be a system called FoxPro. As the term progressed we later found that a system with the same concept was being implemented by a company called Kronos. Our group began to work with Bud Lane, the sales manager for Kronos, on trying to use their patented program for the purpose of our project. After visiting the computer facility in Novi and working extensively with the Time Accounting System, we found that the information provided, without much additional work by the programmers at Kronos would not
provide the necessary information that Mr. Grady currently needed for our analysis of Housekeeping absenteeism.

In addition to the data received, we conducted an extensive survey of the Housekeeping staff. The survey was designed to determine the general satisfaction level of Housekeeping employees with their schedules and allow write-in comments pertaining to employee scheduling problems. See Attached Analysis of Survey Results.

Current Situation

Currently Kronos has began to implement their system in the Housekeeping Department at five different locations around the Hospital which will allow the employees to use their badge to clock in and out. This information will then be transported to the main computer system which will log the amount of hours that the employee has worked. The advantage of this system is in helping the Housekeeping department become a paper free department.

Hypotheses

Analysis was designed to test the following hypotheses.

1) Monday thru Friday employees are absent less frequently than the other shifts on a percentage average basis of sampled employees.

2) Wall Washers are absent less frequently than employees of the two other classifications. This was hypothesized due to the
highest pay and lessor difficulty of work involved in the wall washer classification.

3) 32 Hour workers are absent more frequently than the 40 hour workers. This is based upon the assumption that the shift of 32 hour worker (Friday-Monday) would lead to the higher frequency of absences due to scheduling of work on both weekend days and reasoning that it is more desirable/convenient to work on week day versus weekend days.

4) Personal Day Time (A total of three allowed days) would be used excessively in the beginning of each year. This would lead to a greater frequency of absences in January and February.

5) Absences may be different according to supervisor because of varying supervisory techniques.

Findings and Conclusions

Preliminary discussion will involve cumulative data involving all sampled employees (a total of 58 employees and 1421 absences).
As can be observed from the above chart, the level of absenteeism is fairly constant throughout the week with exception of Friday and Sunday. On Fridays, the average days absent is 6.00 which is higher than the general average of 4.54. On Sundays, the average days absent is 3.65 which is lower than the average.
Absences by Classification

AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT PER PERSON BY CLASS

Averagedays absent per employee are based on a sample of 33 unit custodians, 22 custodian 2s and 3 wall washers totaling 1421 days absent. The chart above represents Since only 3 wall washers are represented in the sample, the chart above may not necessarily reflect accurate average days absent per employee such that a larger sample of wall washers would.
As observed from the above graph, Sunday-Thursday employees account for the least absences per person at an average of 20.1 absent days per employee. The highest ratio is seen in the Monday-Friday employee at an average of 28.4 absent days per employee. Ironically, this is opposite to the original hypothesis that employees desire to work during the week days and thus, would be absent less during these days. However, one must consider that certain
employees working Monday-Friday are absent for Union duty reasons. This fact may skew the data somewhat. The hypothesis that Friday-Monday employees would have a high average days absent ratio is not exemplified by the above chart. At an average of 24.4, Weekend employees do not possess an excessively high ratio.
As can be observed from the Absences by Month chart, months of July and August have the highest percentage of total absences. This may be due to vacation scheduling during the late summer months. These months are then followed by January, April and May. The months with smallest absenteeism are February, March and September. The month of October is not representative of employee absences since our sample period ends October 26, 1990.
Absences by Reason

Absences by Reason

ABSENCES BY REASON

ABSENCES

REASON

Reasons

1 = Excused/Not Paid
2 = Funeral
3 = Jury Duty
4 = Personal Day Time
5 = Sick Time
6 = Union Duty
7 = Unexcused/Not Paid
8 = Vacation Time
Vacation and sick time account for the majority of absences. These categories are then followed by excused/not paid category which accounts for over 10% of total absences. Personal Day Time approximately 10% of absences. Since each employee is given 3 Personal Day Time absences and the chart above represents 58 employees, it can be observed that most of all Personal Day Time absences are used up within 10 months. Unexcused/not paid absences account for about 5% of absences.
Absences by Day of the Week by Class and Shift
Unit Custodians:
Monday-Friday Employees

ABSENCES BY DAY OF THE WEEK FOR MONDAY-FRIDAY UNIT CUSTODIANS

Based on a sample of 109 absences from Jan 1- Oct 26, 1990.
Based on a sample of 5 Monday-Friday unit custodians.

This data was based on a sample of 109 absences. Friday has the highest percentage of absences with 30%. This agrees with our hypothesis that the highest number of absences will occur on the weekend.
Tuesday-Saturday Employees

ABSENCES BY DAY OF THE WEEK FOR TUESDAY-SATURDAY UNIT CUSTODIANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Absences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on a sample of 249 absences from Jan 1-Oct 26, 1990.

Based on a sample of 12 Tuesday-Saturday unit custodians.

This data was based on a sample of 249 absences. Saturday has the highest percentage of absences with 27% of the absences occurring on Saturday and 20% of the absences occurring on Friday.
ABSENCES BY DAY OF THE WEEK FOR SUNDAY-THURSDAY UNIT CUSTODIANS

BASED ON A SAMPLE OF 283 ABSENCES FROM JAN 1- OCT 26, 1990

BASED ON A SAMPLE OF 12 SUNDAY-THURSDAY UNIT CUSTODIANS.
This data was based on a sample of 103 absences. Saturday has the highest percentage of absences with 30% of the absences occurring on Saturday and 25% of the absences occurring on Sunday.
Custodian 2s: Monday-Friday Employees

ABSENCES BY DAY OF THE WEEK FOR MONDAY-FRIDAY CUSTODIAN 2'S

Based on a sample of 213 absences from Jan 1- Oct 26, 1990.
Based on a sample of 7 Monday-Friday Custodian IIs.

From the graph it can be observed that 23% of the absences occur on Friday as well as Tuesday. The absences on Friday are understandable but the high percentage of absences on Tuesday is puzzling.
Tuesday-Saturday Employees

ABSENCES BY DAY OF THE WEEK FOR TUESDAY-SATURDAY CUSTODIAN 2'S

Based on a sample of 185 absences from Jan 1-Oct 26, 1990.

Based on a sample of 6 Tuesday-Saturday Custodian 2's.

This data was based on a sample of 185 absences. From the graph it is evident that Saturday, the end of their shift has the highest percent of absences with 26%. This agrees with our hypothesis that the weekend will have the highest number of absences.
This data was based on a sample of 114 absences. From the graph it is observed that 30% of the absences occur on Sunday and that 24% of the absences occur on Thursday, the end of their shift. The high percentage of absences on Sunday agrees with our hypothesis.
Recommendations

1) Day of the Week

Most of the absences occurred near or during the weekend day of the shift, for example, a Sunday-Thursday shift had the highest percentage of absences on Sunday and the Friday-Monday shift had the highest percentage of absences on Saturday and Sunday. Therefore, we recommend an incentive plan for working weekend days; Another possibility is a shift change:

- One Sunday off per month for Sunday-Thursday shift
- One Saturday off per month for Tuesday-Saturday shift

2) Monthly Scheduling Changes

As seen in the Absences by Month Chart and the Excuses Summary, January and the Summer months of July and August are the months with the highest occurrences of absence. Knowledge of this information can allow management to make the proper adjustments in employee scheduling during these periods.

3) Personal Day Time

As seen in the data/chart in the Excuses Summary, Personal Day Time has been used (a total of 3 days) within the period of the first month of the year. An incentive plan may help to alleviate the excessive use of PDT time in January. An extra bonus PDT day could be given if the employee saves all three of his PDT time beyond a certain date (i.e. the 4th quarter of the year).
Another possible action would be to allocate one personal day time every 4 months. This would prevent an excessive number of PDT absences in the early months of the year.

**Action Plan**

The next phase will be to meet with Edward Grady and discuss our recommendations. Next, we would like to meet with Mr. Grady and the supervisors to discuss any possible changes with scheduling on a daily and yearly basis.
Further Analysis: Paid Absenteeism

A sample of 34 housekeeping employees' records of detailed summary of excuses for absences was further analyzed for more specific information on paid absences.

Reasons and days of absences, for the period from November, 1989, to October, 1990, were categorized into following areas.

1) Sickness 4) Family Obligation
2) Tardiness 5) Work Related Injury
3) Personal Day Time 6) No Ride/ Car Problems
RESULTS

The 34 randomly chosen housekeeping employees accumulated 434 paid absent days. The following graph represents a specific breakdown of these absences.

PAID ABSENTEEISM: EXCUSES

It may be observed from the graph that sickness, tardiness and personal day time account for 90% of all paid absences. Absences due to sickness, tardiness and personal day time are graphed by bimonthly periods on the following pages.
Absences due to sickness seem constant at approximately 12 days for each biweekly period with exceptions of January, first half of March and last half of August. The last half of January and the last half of August have 20 or more days of absences. The first half of March and last half of March have 5 or fewer days of absences due to sickness.

Tardiness pattern seem to have a relatively constant pattern where a low level of tardiness is followed by a higher level of tardiness in proceeding biweekly periods. However, an unusual peak of tardiness is observed on the first week of September. In this period, 12 absences versus an approximate average of 4 absences are observed.

With the personal day time excuse, it may be observed from the graph that significant percentages of absences take place at the beginning of the year. This percentage gradually drops until the month of March where the level absences remain constant through the month of April. Following April, number of absences due to personal day time decreases substantially and this level remains until the end of the year.
Housekeeping Employee Absenteeism

By Bimonthly Time Periods

Due to Personal Day Time

Based on a sample of 34 Employees
Housekeeping Employee Absenteeism Due to Sickness By Bimonthly Time Periods

Based on Sample of 34 Employees
Paid Absenteeism Only
APPENDIX B

ANONYMOUS SURVEYS

HYPOTHESIS

Anonymous surveys were distributed to the housekeeping employees to test the following hypotheses.

1) Employees in the wall washer classification would be more satisfied than employees in custodian II or unit custodian classifications. This was hypothesized due to the highest pay and least difficulty of work involved in the wall washer classification.

2) Employees with 40 hour (full time) schedule would be more satisfied than those with 32 hour (part time) schedules. This was primarily based upon greater job stability and better scheduling associated with the 40 hour (full time) employees.

3) Satisfaction ratings of employees would be similar between all buildings.

4) Employees with Monday through Friday schedules would be more satisfied than other employees. This is based upon reasoning that it is more desirable to work on week versus weekend days.

METHODOLOGY

An anonymous survey consisting of information on job classification, work schedule, building location and satisfaction responses, composed of both numerical ratings and written comments, was designed to test hypotheses regarding employee satisfaction. In the satisfaction responses section, employees were asked to rate their job satisfaction on the scale of 1 to 7 where
1 denoted dissatisfaction, 4 denoted neutrality and 7 denoted high degree of satisfaction. In addition, the employees were asked to identify difficulties and recommend improvements to their jobs. Appendix C contains a sample survey.

300 of these surveys were distributed to the supervisors of the housekeeping department and drop boxes were set up throughout various locations at the hospital to collect responses.

RESULTS

230 surveys, 76.7% of distributed surveys, were returned and their responses were analyzed. An extensive analysis was performed using 195 of these surveys. These 195 surveys consisted of responses from 100 unit custodians, 84 custodian IIs and 11 wall washers. General results from these responses are listed in the following.

A) Numerical Ratings

This section consists of numerical results from surveys. For analysis purposes, all satisfaction ratings were categorized into two categories, unsatisfied and satisfied.

Ratings: 1 through 3...........(denote) Unsatisfied

4 through 7...........(denote) Satisfied
1) The following chart represents overall satisfaction ratings of employees by job classifications.

### OVERALL SATISFACTION RATINGS BY CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>% Satisfied</th>
<th>% Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Custodians</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian II</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Washer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In numerically rating their job satisfaction, 84% of the unit custodians, 76% of custodian IIs and 64% of wall washers responded that they were satisfied. These numerical results contradict the hypothesis that employees in
the wall washer classification would be satisfied than employees in other classifications.

2) Following charts represent satisfaction ratings of employees by part time and full time schedules and job classifications.

**SATISFACTION PERCENTAGES BY JOB CLASSIFICATIONS**

![Graph showing satisfaction percentages by job classifications]

a) Part Time Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Custodian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian II</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Washer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Full Time Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>% Satisfied</th>
<th>% Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Custodian</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian II</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Washer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With part time employees, 86% of the unit custodians, 90% of custodian IIs and 100% of wall washers responded that they were satisfied. With full time employees, 85% of the unit custodians, 74% of custodian IIs and 60% of wall washers responded that they were satisfied. These results seem to contradict the hypothesis that full time employees are more satisfied than part time employees. (However, it should be noted that only one part time wall washer's responded to the survey and that his or her ratings may not represent other part time wall washers' satisfaction ratings.)
3) The following chart represents satisfaction ratings of employees by buildings covered by employees. This chart does not include results of buildings where less than six employees responded. 187 responses are represented below.

SATISFACTION RATINGS BY BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Satisfaction Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCHC</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED IN</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTT</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIB</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAUBMAN</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV. HOSPITAL</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction Percentages</th>
<th>% Satisfied</th>
<th>% Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCHC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED IN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAUBMAN</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV. HOSPITAL</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses of employees categorized by buildings indicate percentage of employees satisfied to be around or above 78%. When viewing responses from buildings with large number of employees, the percentage of employees satisfied and otherwise seem consistent. For example, percentages of satisfied employees from Mott, Taubman and University Hospital are 78%, 79% and 78% respectively. These responses support the hypothesis that employee satisfaction ratings would be similar between all buildings.

4) The following chart represents satisfaction ratings of University Hospital housekeeping employees by schedule categories. University Hospital employee responses were chosen for this analysis due to their representative nature of all survey responses. Total of 96 responses are represented below.

**SATISFACTION RATINGS BY SCHEDULE**

![Chart showing satisfaction ratings by schedule]

- **79%** for 40 hours /Mon-Fri
- **72%** for 40 hours /Sun-Thur
- **73%** for 40 hours /Tues-Sat
- **87%** for 32 hours /Fri-Mon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees by Schedule</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction Percentages</th>
<th>% Satisfied</th>
<th>% Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 hours/ Monday - Friday</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hours/ Sunday - Thursday</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hours/ Tuesday - Saturday</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 hours/ Friday - Monday</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfied employee percentages between full time employees with Monday through Friday, Sunday through Thursday and Tuesday through Saturday schedules do not seem to significantly differ. 87% of the part time employees' responses indicated satisfaction compared to 79%, 72% and 73% satisfied percentages of full time employees with Monday through Friday, Sunday through Thursday and Tuesday through Saturday schedules respectively. These results also seem to contradict the hypothesis that employees with Monday through Friday schedules would be more satisfied than other employees.

B) Written Responses

This section consists of summary of written responses from the housekeeping employees. All surveys were analyzed for their responses to questions regarding improvement recommendations and identification of difficulties encountered on the job. This section is very important in testing employee satisfaction hypotheses since employees were allowed to specifically
express their views. In addition, this section introduces potential areas where changes may be beneficial. See Appendix D for a list of specific comments.

1) Recommended Improvements

In response to a question which asked operators to suggest improvements to their schedule, majority responded that they would like to change their weekend schedule. Changes which were recommended were to have weekends, alternate weekends or rotating weekends off. These responses support the hypothesis that people consider working on week days more desirable than working on weekends. Therefore, it is probable that housekeeping employees consider the Monday through Friday schedule to be the most optimal.

Another frequent suggestion was to change 32 hour (part time) to 40 hour (full time) schedule. This suggestion seems to support another hypothesis which reasons that people desire a full time versus a part time schedule.

Some other recurring responses included changing five day to four day weekly work schedules, decreasing scheduled assignment areas and leaving the current schedule alone.

2) Difficulties Encountered

In response to a question which asked operators to identify difficulties encountered in their jobs, typical responses consisted of unrealistic magnitude of work assignment areas and lack of cooperation from other hospital and medical staff. Many employees commented that the area assigned was too large and that people did not clean up after themselves.
In addition, some employees responded that they encounter difficulties with lack of cleaning equipment and supplies. They stated that closets were not always stacked and linen bags and strings were not always available. Another frequent difficulty stated by some of the surveys was that other shifts did not fulfill their assignments.

Other problems included harassment from supervisor(s), inability to finish assignments due to discharges, frequent blood spills and overwhelming weight of disposals.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Results from surveys which consisted of numerical ratings and written comments provided some unexpected and conflicting as well as some expected results. In addition, these results introduced potential areas of improvement.

An unexpected result is from numerical ratings analysis which represented wall washers being less satisfied than employees in other classifications. This is contrary to one of the hypothesis which expected wall washers to be more satisfied than employees in other categories. A possible explanation may be that satisfaction decreases with passage of time despite other factors such as pay and difficulty of work assignments. Given the repetitive nature of housekeeping assignments, incentive factors such as pay may become less prominent with time passage. Since employees in the wall washer classification holds the greatest seniority, it is possible that they experience diminishing rate of satisfaction.

Conflicting results involve employee schedules. According to numerical ratings by employees, full time employees did not seem more satisfied than part time employees contrary to our hypotheses. In addition,
employees with Monday through Friday schedules did not seem more satisfied than other employees from numerical ratings. However, in written responses, employees seemed to desire to work on week versus weekend days and many suggested converting 32 hour (part time) schedule to 40 hour (full time) schedule. It may perhaps be more accurate to weigh written comments more than numerical ratings since many employees who rated themselves as satisfied wrote comments indicating that they prefer weekend days off and favored full time to part time schedules.

An expected result from the survey is that satisfaction ratings of employees seem to be similar between all buildings. This supports one of the hypotheses which predicted a consistent satisfaction level among employees working in different buildings.

Besides providing information on satisfaction of employees, survey responses also provided some useful insights. Primary items of interest consist of issues regarding lack cooperation between shifts, lack of cooperation from other hospital staff and unavailability of cleaning equipment and supplies. Improvements of these issues, cooperation and availability, should provide a healthier and more satisfactory environment for everyone concerned.

In general, this anonymous survey provided useful information and insights regarding employee satisfaction in the housekeeping department. However, due to a number of unexpected and conflicting survey results, no definite conclusions regarding employee satisfaction may be drawn. Therefore, results of these survey is used to supplement further analysis.
APPENDIX C

SCHEDULING SURVEY

The Housekeeping Department is interested in its scheduling system and hours worked in each area in the department. Please help us by filling out this short form and returning it to the designated drop box. Please do not include your name. Your responses will not be linked back to you. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. What is your current employment classification?
   
   a) Unit Custodian (UC)
   b) Custodian 2 (C2)
   c) Wall Washer (WW)

2. Your present schedule is:
   
   a) 40 hours/week, Sunday-Thursday
   b) 40 hours/week, Tuesday-Saturday
   c) 32 hours/week, Friday-Monday
   d) Other: hours/week: _____ days: _____

3. When does your current Work Shift begin and end?
   _______ to _______

4. Where do you work? (Building and Floors): ______________________________________

5. All things considered, how satisfied are you with your current time schedule. Please rate yourself on this seven point scale with "1" being "very unsatisfied" and "7" being "very satisfied".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very unsatisfied</th>
<th>neither satisfied nor unsatisfied</th>
<th>very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. On the average, how many days per month are you unable to work due to illness or other personal reasons? (Do not include vacation hours).________________________________________________

7. What day of the week are you unable to work most often? __________

8. Would you like a change in your work schedule? If yes, what changes do you recommend?

   ________________________________________________________________

9. What are some regular problems and difficulties you run into with your work schedule?

   ________________________________________________________________
**APPENDIX D**

*Housekeeping Scheduling Survey: Results of Open Questions:*

When asked, "Would you like a change in your work schedule? If, yes, what changes do you recommend?", weekends off, or alternate weekends off, was the most common response. Respondents also suggested changing the part-time 32 hour people to full-time 40 hour workers.

Typical verbatim comments (by category) for question 9 are as follows:

**Change in Weekend Hours:**
"I'd like alternating weekends off"/ "rotating weekends"
"Weekends off"

**Change in Scheduled Work Hours/ Work Days:**
"Yes! change 32 hour people to 40 hour"
"Work Monday-Friday"
"Work 4 days at 10 hours each"

**Additional Comments/Suggestions:**
"Please leave our work schedule alone. We have changed enough in the last two years. We are puppets."
"Going back to twelve rooms only"
When asked "what are some regular problems and difficulties you run into with your work schedule?", the most common response was that the area was too large and there was not enough time in the worker's schedule to finish the work assigned. Additionally, another common response was a complaint about the lack of cooperation from other hospital staff/ medical staff. The housekeeping employees feel that their job should be to maintain and that other staff members do not help them.

Typical comments are as follows:

**Amount of Work:**

"Area is too large/ too much to do and not enough time/ shortage of employees"

**Cooperation from rest of hospital staff:**

"The most common problem is the persons whom I clean after; they are not helping; I was under the impression that the sanity of the building was a joint effort and the housekeepers were here to maintain...I feel as if I am getting nowhere."

"Doctors/nursing-staff" (rudeness/ no cooperation, preventing work, not cleaning up after themselves)

"Sometimes grossly overworked due to kitchen staff help being turned over every 89 days (in NIB)."

**Supply Problems:**

"linen bags, strings, and equipment missing/ closet not always stocked"

**Problems with other shifts:**

"Getting calls to do what the night shift was supposed to do"

"I feel like I need more cooperation from the evening shifts in keeping the unit up to U of M standards"

**Additional Problems:**

"being singled out and harassed constantly"

"not finishing my schedule because of discharges"

"heavy trash"

"too many blood spills"
"no overtime"

"parking; $225 too much for 5.50/hour and 4.50 hour workers"

Additional Comments:

More team work: two people to work on each floor, one on each side of the hallway to get better quality work.

bonus for perfect attendance
UNIT CUSTODIANS (MONDAY-FRIDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 5 Employees)

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person

MONDAY: 1.60
TUESDAY: 1.20
WEDNESDAY: 1.40
THURSDAY: 1.40
FRIDAY: 2.40
UNIT CUSTODIANS (TUESDAY-SATURDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 12 Employees)

Days Absent per Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Average Days Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT CUSTODIANS (SUNDAY-THURSDAY):
AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 12 Employees)

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Average Days Absent per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT CUSTODIANS (FRIDAY-MONDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 4 Employees)

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person

FRIDAY: 4.75
SATURDAY: 5.75
SUNDAY: 4.25
MONDAY: 4.25

DAY OF THE WEEK
CUSTODIAN IIs (MONDAY-FRIDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT
(Based on 7 Employees)
CUSTODIAN IIs (TUESDAY-SATURDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 6 Employees)

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person

TUESDAY  WEDNESDAY  THURSDAY  FRIDAY  SATURDAY

4.17  3.83  3.83  3.67  5.00
CUSTODIAN II'S (FRIDAY-MONDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 1 Employee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days: Average Days Absent per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WALL WASHERS (MONDAY-FRIDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 3 Employees)

DAY OF THE WEEK

MONDAY  TUESDAY  WEDNESDAY  THURSDAY  FRIDAY

3.67  5.00  3.67  5.33  4.67
### CUSTODIAN IIS (SUNDAY-THURSDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT
(Based on 8 Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>Average Days Absent per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bar chart shows the average number of days absent per person for each day of the week from Sunday to Thursday.
UNIT CUSTODIANS (MONDAY-FRIDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 5 Employees)
UNIT CUSTODIANS (TUESDAY-SATURDAY):
AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 12 Employees)

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person

- Tuesday: 1.92
- Wednesday: 2.25
- Thursday: 2.58
- Friday: 2.67
- Saturday: 3.17

DAY OF THE WEEK
UNIT CUSTODIANS (SUNDAY-THURSDAY):
AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 12 Employees)
UNIT CUSTODIANS (FRIDAY-MONDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 4 Employees)

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Average Days Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURDAY</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUSTODIAN IIs (MONDAY-FRIDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT
(Based on 7 Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Average Days Absent per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUSTODIAN IIS (TUESDAY-SATURDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 6 Employees)
CUSTODIAN IIS (FRIDAY-MONDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 1 Employee)

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person

FRIDAY: 3.00
SATURDAY: 1.00
SUNDAY: 2.00
MONDAY: 3.00
WALL WASHERS (MONDAY-FRIDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT (Based on 3 Employees)

MONDAY: 5.00
TUESDAY: 5.00
WEDNESDAY: 4.67
THURSDAY: 3.67
FRIDAY: 5.33

DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person
CUSTODIAN IIS (SUNDAY-THURSDAY): AVERAGE DAYS ABSENT
(Based on 8 Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY OF THE WEEK</th>
<th>DAYS: Average Days Absent per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNDAY</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>