

Winter 12-20-2008

Enhancing Employee Recruitment Through Utilization of a Citywide Alternate Work Schedule in the City of Fremont

Amy Natalie Rakley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/capstones>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#)

**Enhancing Employee Recruitment Through Utilization of a Citywide
Alternate Work Schedule in the City of Fremont**

Amy Natalie Rakley

EMPA 396: Graduate Research Project in Public Management

Golden Gate University

Executive Master in Public Administration Program

December 20, 2008

Dr. Alan Roper, Instructor

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY
1001 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2968

Table of Contents

Abstract	4
Chapter One: Introduction.....	5
Historical and Contemporary Contexts	6
The Current Study	8
Hypothesis	9
Subquestions	9
Definitions	10
Overview of the Study	11
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	13
The Importance of Terminology	13
Issue Areas	14
Implications of demographic changes	14
Recruiting	16
Work-life conflicts	17
Job satisfaction	18
Chapter Three: Methodology	21
Identification of Jurisdictions with Citywide Alternate Work Schedules.....	21
Informant Interviews	22
Overview of the City of Fremont	23
Non-exempt employees	24
Exempt employees	25
Lack of centralized record keeping	27
Chapter Four: Results and Findings	28
Data Findings	28
2008 population and number of employees	28

Hours worked in a standard workweek	29
Recruiting materials and CAWS	30
Organizational benefits of CAWS	30
Single most important benefit	31
Organizational drawbacks from CAWS	32
Analysis of Findings	33
The hypotheses and subquestions 1 and 2	34
Subquestion 3	34
Chapter Five: Conclusions, Policy Recommendations, and Areas for Future Research.....	36
Conclusions	36
Does Fremont Have a De Factor Citywide Alternate Work Schedule?	37
Missed Opportunities	38
Policy Recommendations	39
Areas for Future Research	40
Final Thoughts	41
References.....	43
Appendices	
Appendix A-1: List of Cities.....	50
Appendix A-2: Email Message and Survey Questions	53

Abstract

This qualitative research study seeks to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between an organization's work schedule and employee recruitment. The author uses the City of Fremont, California as the focus of the study.

The following research hypothesis was employed in the study:

Hypothesis: Implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule would enhance the City of Fremont's ability to recruit employees.

The primary research method involved a survey, administered through the on-line SurveyMonkey tool, to 22 cities throughout the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area (and including one, the City of Tracy in San Joaquin County, a tenth county) which were identified as utilizing alternate work schedules for their city organizations. Responses from 15 cities provided information leading to a greater understanding of not only the specific issue of employee recruitment, as framed by the hypothesis, but also into other potential benefits and drawbacks which could result if the City of Fremont were to implement a citywide alternate work schedule.

The findings of the survey research, along with information from the literature review conducted for this study, provide strong support for the hypothesis.

The study concludes with policy recommendations and areas for further research which could build upon and enrich the current data findings.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Human capital – the employees of an organization and “the foundation of public service” (Ingraham, Selden & Moynihan, 2000, p. 55) – comprise the organization’s greatest asset “whose value can be enhanced through investment” (Hays & Sowa, as cited in Condrey, 2005, p. 97). While it may seem obvious that “any organization’s performance is largely dependent on the quality of its workers” (ibid., p. 97), what may be more critical are the daunting challenges to successful recruitment and selection that public organizations face today:

Successful recruitment and selection depend on an adequate supply of competent or educable workers, an effective information network that reaches the appropriate population of prospective employees, *a sufficiently attractive organizational environment to entice the desired job candidates*, a clear sense of organizational priorities, and a reliable means of choosing the applicants who are the most qualified” (emphasis added) (Hays & Sowa, as cited in Condrey, 2005, p. 97).

In addition to these challenges, “The reality of the marketplace is that there is a strong competition for talent, and the public sector must compete with the private sector for human resources with increasingly complex skills” (Ingraham, Selden & Moynihan, 2000, p. 55). Reynolds (1998) cites one study that recognized “the importance of an employee’s personal and family life is the *number one* driver of employee commitment” (p. 23), and highlights a second study by the Families and Work Institute which reported that “81% of employees surveyed were willing to exchange career advancement for flexible work arrangements” (ibid., p. 44).

Historical and Contemporary Contexts

This country has come a long way since 1972, when the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) became the first Federal agency to implement flexible schedules (University of Maryland, n.d.). With other Federal agencies following the lead of the BIA, and subsequent program evaluations revealing largely positive outcomes for both employer and employees, Congress passed the Federal Employee Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules Act of 1982, establishing alternate work schedules as an ongoing Federal program. The three-year sunset provision of the 1982 legislation was addressed by Congress when, in 1985, it passed Public Law 99-196 to sign the Act into law (ibid., n.d.), thereby making its provisions permanent.

The importance of this legislation includes the fact that “As the Nation’s largest employer, the Government, when it adopts a program like AWS, legitimizes the concept for many other employers who might otherwise have held back” (University of Maryland, n.d.). Indeed, throughout the public and private sectors, employers are focusing increased attention on concerns such as work schedules, flexibility, employee needs, job satisfaction, customer service, productivity, and energy and cost savings.

Fast forward to Fall 2008, as the country is nearing the end of a long and exhaustive process for election of the 44th President of the United States. On September 27, 2008, the U.S. House of Representatives adopts H.R. 1440, “Expressing support for designation of the month of October as “National Work and Family Month” (House of Representatives, 2008). Around the same time, the presidential campaign websites of

Democratic nominee Barack Obama and Republic nominee John McCain discuss each candidate's positions on work-life issues.

The website of the winning candidate, Barack Obama, and his vice-presidential choice, Joe Biden, contains the following brief summary of his position: "Restore Work-Family Balance: Obama and Biden will double funding for after-school programs, expand the Family Medical Leave Act, provide low-income families with a refundable tax credit to help with their child-care expenses, and *encourage flexible work schedules*" (emphasis added). (<http://www.barackobama.com/issues/family/>, Retrieved November 24, 2008).

Since "No other single actor in the political system has quite the capability of the president to set agendas in given policy areas for all who deal with those policies" (Kingdon, 2003, p. 23), it will be interesting to see if issues of work-family balance garner some level of attention and support, especially given the current enormous challenges facing the incoming Obama administration, and the country as a whole.

Roberts (2004) provides the context for consideration of a citywide alternate work schedule (the subject of this study) as part of a comprehensive benefits package that responds to increasing employee demands for employers' support of work-life initiatives:

Municipal government benefits packages are typically oriented toward core employee safety needs by emphasizing health, pension, vacation and paid time-off benefits. The traditional benefits package, however, insufficiently addresses the full spectrum of needs associated with a more diverse workforce. The absence of a competitive family-friendly benefits package presents serious strategic human resources management challenges (p. 1).

Roberts (2004) also distinguishes between the “purely utilitarian motives such as cost reduction and productivity increases” (p. 1) and the “normative orientation that centers on conceptions of quality of work life, gender equity, employee justice, promotion of civic capital, family life quality and child welfare” (p. 1) that can drive an organization’s decision to implement work-life initiatives. Organizations need not choose between normative and utilitarian motives; indeed, the current study’s findings suggest that multiple organizational, employee and citizen benefits can be garnered through the implementation of citywide alternate work schedules. These multiple benefits will be described later in this report.

The Current Study

Situated in this exciting and important national context, the current focused, qualitative research study seeks to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between an organization’s work schedule and employee recruitment. Using the City of Fremont, the author’s employer for the past 20 years, as the object of study, the hypothesis and subquestions which follow formed the framework and focus for the research that was undertaken.

In addition, this study places itself in the context of the research and literature on the vast array of interconnected issues relevant to the modern workplace, including recruitment and retention; employee benefits; job satisfaction; work-life balance; “family-friendly policies”; alternate work weeks; demographic changes in the work force, and the desire of public agencies to be viewed as an ‘employer of choice’ (Kelliher &

Andersen, 2008, p. 419; Anderson & Kabara, n.d., p. 1). Contemporary literature which addresses these topics is summarized in Chapter 2, *Literature Review*.

This study is important because Fremont's success in recruiting employees, in the competitive Bay Area market and in challenging economic circumstances, is critical to its ability to continue functioning as a highly effective organization. This study assumes that Fremont is, indeed, in competition with the other jurisdictions in the nine-county Bay Area for new employees, and, therefore, should seek to become an 'employer of choice', in order to maximize its ability to recruit and ultimately hire new employees

Hypothesis: Implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule would enhance the City of Fremont's ability to recruit employees.

Subquestions:

1. Do cities in the Bay Area with citywide alternate work schedules advertise the schedules as an employee benefit during recruitment?
2. Do these cities think that their citywide alternate work schedules enhance their ability to recruit employees?
3. Is the level of employee participation in the City of Fremont's recent Telework Program (which allows employees, on an individual basis, to request approval to work outside of city offices during a portion of the workweek) an indication that there is a growing organizational need for a citywide alternate work schedule?

In this study, the independent variable is “implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule”. The dependent variable is “would enhance the City of Fremont’s ability to recruit employees”.

Definitions

Individual vs. citywide alternate work schedules: This study makes an important distinction between ‘individual alternative work schedules’ (IAWS) and ‘citywide alternate work schedules’ (CAWS). Within the context of this study, “individual alternative work schedules” refer to “informal work arrangements negotiated by individual employees” (Glass & Estes, 1997, p. 303) which are approved on a case-by-case basis by each employee’s supervisor. As such, the IAWS is considered an employee *benefit*, not a right, and the supervisor maintains complete discretion to approve or deny the employee’s request.

By contrast, a “citywide alternative work schedule” is a “formally institutionalized” (Glass & Estes, 1997, p. 303) policy which establishes the days and hours that an entire organization considers its standard hours of operation (although with the exception of certain departments, such as police and fire departments, which may have different operational needs than the rest of the organization. For this reason, public safety departments are excluded from consideration in this study). For the purpose of this study, cities are considered to operate with a CAWS if their organization’s work schedule deviates substantially from a schedule of Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., considered a standard work schedule for public agencies in California.

The 22 cities surveyed for this study (see Appendix Table A-1) utilized a range of scheduling strategies for their citywide alternate work schedules, revealing that organizations need not be limited to common schedules such as a 9/80 or 4/10 work week. With a 9/80 work schedule, employees work a total of 80 hours over the course of 9 days, and have the tenth day (usually a Friday) off. With a 4/10 work schedule, employees work four, 10-hour days each week, and have the fifth day (usually a Friday) off. Both of these schedules are commonly referred to as 'compressed work schedules' (Facer II, Wadsworth, & Arbon, 2008; Office of Personnel Management (a), n.d.) or 'compressed work weeks'.

It should be noted that individual alternate work schedules and citywide alternate work schedules are not mutually exclusive. The potential for the utilization of both scheduling strategies by a jurisdiction is discussed later in this report.

Overview of the Study

This study is organized in four chapters following the introductory first chapter, as follows:

- Chapter Two - Literature Review: contains an overview of relevant literature;
- Chapter Three - Methodology: describes the research methodology used for the study;
- Chapter Four - Results and Findings: describes and analyzes the results and findings from the study's research; and

- Chapter Five - Conclusions, Policy Recommendations, and Areas for Future Research: states the study's conclusions and includes both policy recommendations and topics which could be the subject of additional research.

A list of references and appendices follow the last chapter.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

As discussed in Chapter One, in addressing the relationship between recruitment and a citywide alternate work schedule, this study is informed by contemporary research around interconnected issues relevant to the modern workplace. These issues include recruitment and retention; employee benefits; job satisfaction; work-life balance; “family-friendly policies”; alternate work weeks; demographic changes in the work force, and the desire of public agencies to be viewed as an ‘employer of choice. This chapter includes an overview of literature in some of these issue areas, and begins with a discussion of preferred terminology to be used in this study.

The Importance of Terminology

The literature in both the academic and professional communities is replete with a variety of terms describing policies and benefits which address employees’ personal and work lives, including ‘work-family balance’ (Facer II & Wadsworth, 2008); ‘work-life policies’ (Roehling, Roehling & Moen, 2001); ‘family-friendly policies’ (Salzstein, Ting & Salzstein, 2001); and the ‘family responsive workplace’ (Glass & Estes, 1997).

The author of this study supports the use of the phrase “work-life” as the most inclusive and flexible term relating to all employees, regardless of family status. The following discussion by Volk (1999) eloquently discusses the value of this linguistic distinction:

Work-life integration is the effort by employers and employees to balance the professional and personal lives of workers. Work-life benefits are benefits that accommodate

the changing demographics of the workplace and the changing demands placed on employees by their changing lifestyles and family considerations. Many employers call such benefits work-and-family or family-friendly benefits, but these more narrow terms may generate complaints from single employees. Work-life policies connote a broader attempt to deal with the stresses all employees confront in their lives and the impacts those stresses have on job performance. The term "work-life policy" also suggests that these policies are adaptable as the needs of employees change.

Work-life benefits reflect two complementary considerations. First, employers sponsor such programs out of a concern for the well being of their employees. They attempt to help employees balance competing demands arising from their jobs and personal needs and responsibilities. Second, *employers realize that such policies help attract and retain employees* (emphasis added) (p. 2).

Issue Areas

Implications of demographic changes: Considerable attention is being paid to the fact that there are currently four generations in the U.S. workforce of today. While different authors ascribe slight variations in the years that encompass each generation, and the percentage of their members currently employed, the following descriptions from Fraone, Hartmann & McNally (2008, p. 1) provide a reasonable overview for the purposes of this study:

- **Traditionalists:** born between 1922-1945 and comprising 10% of the work force.
- **Baby Boomers:** born between 1946-1964 and comprising 44% of the workforce.

- **Gen Xers:** born between 1965-1980 and comprising 34% of the workforce.
- **Millennials/Gen Y:** born between 1981-2000 and comprising 12% of the workforce.

Recruiting in the public sector (along with all other sectors) is vulnerable to the incipient talent shortage resulting from the dramatic drop in population of younger generations (Dychtwald & Baxter, 2007; Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007). Beginning in the 1970s, Baby Boomers began entering the workforce. This generation, numbering 78 million, drove workforce growth that remained strong throughout the 20th century. However, the subsequent generation of Gen X workers includes a mere 48 million members (Crumpacker & Crumpacker, 2007).

With increasing numbers of the Baby Boomer Generation eligible to retire (and, in many cases, actually retiring), the impact of the demographic reality of the succeeding generation's low membership supports the perspective that "Predictions of a talent shortage are dire" (Dychtwald & Baxter, 2007, p. 325) and that "The clear message for public employers is that the supply of qualified labor is very scarce" (Roberts, as cited in Hays & Kearney, 2003, p. 107).

In seeking to elucidate the implications of these changing demographics on the workplace, researchers are exploring and evaluating the values, preferences, and career needs of each cohort group (McDonald & Hite, 2008; Jurkiewicz, 2000; Smola & Sutton,

2002). Smola and Sutton succinctly explain the importance of this information to an organizations' success:

The subject of work value differences is an important one in today's organizational environment. As managers respond to the changing values of their employees, those value systems may ultimately affect organizational values. With the transition of one generation to the next into top leadership positions, organizations will be influenced by the next generations' values (2002, p. 367).

Given that "Perhaps the most pervasive research finding regarding young workers is their desire for balance in life" (McDonald & Hite, 2008, p. 87), it appears that "Alternative work schedules may provide organizations with a recruiting edge by broadening the labor pool and attracting qualified workers who cannot, or do not want to, work a traditional schedule" (Olmsted & Smith, as cited in Hammer & Barbera, 1997, p. 32). However, the City of Fremont may well be among the many organizations which are "still in the very early stages of formulating an organizational response to demographic shifts" (Fraone, Hartmann & McNally, 2008, p. 2), in spite of the use of IAWS by many employees in the organization.

Recruiting: "The top personnel management priorities for senior administrators today focus on recruiting/retention, motivation, training, work ethic, and change" (Jurkiewicz, 2000, p. 55). To address those priorities, studies note that "... employers are likely to be turning to flexible scheduling as an instrument for recruiting and retaining employees ... and for boosting job satisfaction and labor productivity" (Golden, 2001, p. 50). In addressing the competition between the public and private sectors, Davidson, Lepeak & Newman (2007) note

Many organizations are focusing on better marketing of the “work/life balance” available through public sector employment. By offering flexible work schedules and non-traditional work environments, public sector organizations often are able to attract professionals more interested in these perquisites than compensation” (p. 11).

These authors also note “Public sector organizations also often find themselves competing against not only private companies, but each other, in attracting potential employees” (ibid., p. 1).

However, the studies reviewed for this research paper have not explicitly addressed and analyzed the differences between IAWS and CAWS as strategies for recruiting and retaining employees. Instead, they acknowledge, “agencies need a full range of tools and resources to actively acquire and develop – through recruitment, training, and reward strategies – excellent talent and leadership” (Ingraham, Selden & Moynihan, 2000, p. 59). As mentioned previously, an organization does not necessarily need to choose between IAWS and CAWS; indeed, information received from some cities surveyed for this study (such as the Town of Hillsborough) seems to indicate that they utilize both scheduling strategies. Additional research would be required to shed more light on this intriguing question.

Work-life conflicts: Work-life (or work-family) conflict has been defined as “the degree to which ‘role pressures from the work and nonwork domains are incompatible in some respect’” (Greenhaus & Beutell, as cited in Facer II & Wadsworth, 2008, p. 167).

While there is a large body of literature based on studies of the tensions between the dual spheres of work and personal life, more study is needed to shed light on causal relationships. For example: “We understand that employees on a compressed workweek

schedule experience lower levels of work-family conflict, but further research is need to understand why that relationship exist. What is it about the compressed workweek schedule that leads to lower levels of work-family conflict?" (Facer II & Wadsworth, 2008, p. 176). A greater understanding of causality would likely enable organizations to make more informed decisions about implementing some type of CAWS or IAWS – or even both.

Glass & Estes (1997) discuss one of the challenges of conducting empirical research about organizations' policies in the following: "Another difficulty plaguing investigation of organizations' responses to family needs of employees is the inadequate measurement of work/family policies – some studies look only at formally institutionalized policies while others include informal work arrangements negotiated by individual employees" (p. 303). The limitations of the current study, due to time constraints, are in line with this observation; however, it is hoped that the research findings of this study will add to the body of knowledge addressing the distinctions between IAWS and CAWS and their benefits and drawbacks, particularly as they relate to recruitment.

Job satisfaction: One researcher notes, "There is an association between the presence of family-friendly benefits and their perceived importance and efficacy in promoting employee recruitment, retention and motivation" (Roberts, 2004, p. 11). Other studies show that there is a positive correlation between a compressed workweek schedule and job satisfaction (see, for example, Facer II & Wadsworth, 2008, p. 167). The linkages between job performance, job satisfaction and work-life balance is

explained by Salzstein, Ting & Salzstein in the following: "A perceived lack of work-family balance and its corresponding reduction in job satisfaction is further assumed to produce other negative job behaviors (such as absenteeism, impaired performance, and turnover) and is thus the primary impetus for adopting family-friendly programs" (2001, p. 457).

Researchers acknowledge that there is no 'one size fits all' approach to work schedules and achieving both employee satisfaction and employer needs; clearly, the huge variation in jobs, employers, and employees' individual characteristics and personal desires and needs, makes this an unattainable goal. As such, it is not possible to state whether individual or citywide work schedules are more desirable, in all circumstances, for all stakeholders.

One study (Tausig & Fenwick, 2001, p. 103) states

When alternate scheduling is voluntary, when the worker has some choice or control over the hours or days worked, such scheduling may be used to avoid or reduce work-life time imbalance. But when the scheduling is involuntary, and the worker has no choice as to time or days worked, working outside the standard shift may add to the imbalance of work-life demands.

On the other hand, the authors later note "... many workers on inflexible, but regular, schedules may achieve balance through the regularity of these schedules ... " (ibid., p. 116). These two statements, which appear to be in direct conflict with one another, point to the complexity of the issue, and highlight the importance for researchers, including this author, to be very mindful of personal assumptions and of

drawing conclusions that may be unsupportable by the limited data which all research studies provide.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Identification of Jurisdictions with Citywide Alternate Work Schedules (CAWS)

To gain information about the hours of operation of each organization, the Internet web sites of 102 incorporated cities and towns in the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay Area were visited. The number of cities and towns in each county are as follows: Alameda (n=14); Contra Costa (n=19), Marin (n=11); Napa (n=5); San Francisco (n=1); San Mateo (n=20); Santa Clara (n=15); Solano (n=8); and Sonoma (n=9). The City of Fremont is located in southern Alameda County. Although officially outside of the nine-county Bay Area, the City of Tracy, in San Joaquin County, was also included because Fremont's current Fremont City Manager implemented a CAWS for Tracy approximately 12 years ago.

Information was not collected for counties and other public agencies, such as transit agencies, water districts, school districts, and regional park districts, due to the limited time available for conducting this study.

When the hours of operation for City Hall were not available on the web site, the data was collected either via email or phone call.

Ultimately, 22 cities with citywide alternate work schedules were identified. The distribution by county is as follows: Alameda (n=2); Contra Costa (n=3), Marin (n=2); San Mateo (n=4); Santa Clara (n=5); Solano (n=2); Sonoma (n=3), and San Joaquin (n=1).

A survey questionnaire was developed using the *SurveyMonkey* survey tool (www.surveymonkey.com) and was sent to the 22 cities on November 18, 2008. A follow-up email to non-respondents was sent on November 24, 2008. By the deadline of November 26, 2008, responses were received from 15 cities, reflecting a response rate of 68%.

Appendix Table A-1, *List of Cities*, is organized by county and includes each city's population; position title of the employee who responded to the survey (described below); number of employees (excluding police and fire department staff), and details of each citywide alternate work schedule. Appendix A-2 contains the survey questions and the cover letter which accompanied them.

Informant Interviews

An informal, joint interview was held with two staff members in Fremont's Human Resources Department who are responsible for recruitment of new employees. These professionals emphasized that one way to become an 'employer of choice' is to provide flexibility in work scheduling to prospective employees (personal communication, November 18, 2008). One interviewee mentioned that 'the next generation' (i.e. Generation Xers) want to "fit work around their life". She also noted that individual alternate work schedules allow people to take care of life needs without having to take time off work. Both interviewees noted the extensive use of individually approved flexible work schedules throughout the organization. When asked whether they thought a CAWS would enhance their ability to recruit, neither answered affirmatively, while again noting the already high level of IAWS in the organization.

Nearly all of the employees in the Human Resources Department enjoy the benefits of an IAWS. The author of this study posits, then, that there is the possibility of some respondent bias by the two Human Resources staff members against CAWS, given the availability of IAWS as an employee option and the generally high level of support by many supervisors in approving IAWS requests.

Overview of the City of Fremont

The City of Fremont is a general law city with a 2008 population of 213,512 (State of California, Department of Finance, 2008). The city operates under the Council-Manager form of government, and includes the following departments: City Attorney; City Manager; Finance; Information Systems; Community Development (including Building and Safety, Code Enforcement, Engineering, Landscape Architecture, and Planning); Economic Development; Fire; Housing and Redevelopment; Human Services; Parks and Recreation; Police; and Transportation and Operations. The City's approved 2008/09 Operating budget shows approximately 920 full time equivalent positions in the City organization, of which 463 are in the Police and Fire Departments (City of Fremont, 2008, p. 189). Thus roughly half of the employees in the City organization work in departments other than the two public safety departments¹.

¹ These figures are approximate since the number of full time equivalent positions for the Police and Fire Departments shown in the Operating Budget includes some staff members, such as the departments' Business Managers, who are civilian employees. However, the number of civilian employees in the two departments is relatively small, and since the work schedules of at least some of the civilians would be affected by the unique operating needs of the departments, their positions are included in the overall departmental position figures and are therefore excluded from consideration in this study. For the purposes of this study, the most important concept is that Fremont employs

Non-exempt employees: City of Fremont non-exempt employees (i.e., employees who receive hourly wages and are subject to wage and hour laws, such as overtime pay) are represented by three bargaining units. Alternate work schedules are addressed in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) of all three bargaining units.

The MOU for the Fremont Association of City Employees (FACE, which represents approximately 240 employees) and Professional Engineers & Technicians Association (PETA, which represents approximately 26 employees) provide a process for request of an IAWS by represented employees. The process includes written request by the employee; response by the department head or designee within a specific time period and the requirement that the request either be approved or the reasons for denial explicitly stipulated (City of Fremont (a) and (b), 2007). The time period for response to the employee's request is stipulated as 20 days in the FACE MOU and 15 days in the PETA MOU.

The PETA MOU is unique among the three in containing language explicitly stating the organization's perspective and interests in considering the approval of IAWS requests:

An alternate work schedule may be a benefit to the employee and the City, but it is not an entitlement. Implementation of alternate work schedules will be dependent upon the operational requirements and the City, the department's customer service both internally and externally, and shall not increase the cost of doing business for the department or the City. If an employee's alternate

approximately 450 non-public safety employees whose work schedules could be subject to a citywide alternate work schedule, were one to be implemented.

work schedule is to be revoked or modified, the employee shall be given reasonable notice before the schedule is changed (City of Fremont, (b), 2007, p. 20).

The 2007-2009 Memorandum of Understanding between the City and Operating Engineers, Local Union No. 3 (OE3, representing approximately 115 employees), extended the Side Letter of Agreement from April 1, 1994, which provided for the implementation of a 9/80 work schedule, through the term of the current MOU (City of Fremont (c), 2007). The OE3 employees, who provide services such as construction inspection and maintenance of streets, parks and public buildings, alternate non-work Fridays so that there are always some employees working each Friday. Some achieve the 9/80 work schedule by taking alternate Mondays off.

When hiring employees who will be represented by these bargaining units, then, the City is in the position to use the alternate work schedule guaranteed by the MOU as a recruitment incentive.

Exempt employees: The Fremont Association of Management Employees (FAME) represents the City's management staff who are exempt employees (those employees who are exempt from certain wage and hour laws, such as overtime pay, and who receive an annual salary in equal bi-weekly payments). FAME represents approximately 90 employees and excludes at-will employees such as department heads. The FAME MOU does not include explicit provisions guiding an employee's request for an individual alternate work schedule (City of Fremont, (d), 2007).

In spite of the absence of a formal policy in FAME's MOU, informal discussions between this study's author and FAME employees has revealed the considerable number

of FAME employees who have successfully negotiated IAWS with their supervisors. As noted previously, one example is the Human Resources department, where all management staff work a 9/80 schedule. A second example involves several managers who supervise OE3 staff and who report to the Transportation and Operations Director. All of these managers work a 9/80 schedule. This can be viewed as a “trickle-up” effect on managers’ schedules from their employees’ schedules.

However, the manager who supervises the parks maintenance staff, who are also OE3 members, reports to the Parks and Recreation Director rather than the Transportation and Operations Director. In spite of the fact that his staff work a 9/80 schedule, this manager (unlike his peers) works five days a week, as required by his supervisor. This is an example of the difference between the discretionary nature of individual alternate work schedules and the managerial control afforded supervisors, and the equity that would be achieved among staff members through a citywide alternate work schedule.

When recruiting for management positions represented by FAME, therefore, the City can only state that a prospective employee can request an alternate work schedule, but that approval is entirely at the discretion of that employee’s supervisor. As such, the potential for an IAWS provides limited benefit as a recruitment tool, circumscribed by supervisory discretion.

Lack of centralized record keeping: Non-exempt employees are required to submit to the Human Resources (HR) Department a form that contains the details of their IAWS and the approval of their supervisor. Exempt employees are not required to submit

such a form. In the past the HR Department kept these approved forms in a centralized file. However, the forms are now kept in the individual employees' personnel files. Absent both a centralized file and information about the LAWS of exempt employees, the City lacks a comprehensive database of its workforce's work schedules. This database is a necessary prerequisite to assess the potential organizational impacts of the multitude of approved individual alternate work schedules in place throughout the organization. The database would also provide key data for an analysis of the potential benefits and drawbacks of implementing a citywide alternate work schedule in the City of Fremont.

Chapter 4: Results and Findings

Data Findings

As stated previously, 15 of the 22 cities responded to the survey, reflecting a response rate of 68%. This section contains summary data of the responding cities.. The following section, *Analysis of Findings*, describes and analyzes data in an effort to shed light on this study's hypothesis and sub questions.

2008 population and number of employees: The respondent cities range from the smallest (City of Cotati, 7,532 population and 15 employees) to the largest (City of Palo Alto, 63,367 population and 1,100 employees. Palo Alto provides utility, wastewater, stormwater, refuse and library services, which accounts for the unusually high number of employees for a city of its size (City of Fremont (e), 2008, p. 192).

Table 4-1 provides aggregated responses from the 15 cities concerning number of full-time employees (excluding police and fire employees):

**Table 4-1: Total Number of Full-time, Non-public Safety Employees
(Respondents: n=15)**

Under 30 employees:	3
30-60 employees:	3
60-99 employees:	1
100-150 employees:	4
150-200 employees:	3
Over 200 employees:	1

As can be seen, the City of Fremont, with a population of 213,512 and approximately 450 non-public safety employees, is considerably larger than the respondent cities. It should be noted that direct comparison among jurisdictions would require additional research about the departments and services that comprise each organization. This research is beyond the scope of this study.

Hours worked in a standard workweek: Table 4-2 summarizes the information about the 15 cities' workweeks.

**Table 4-2: Hours Worked in a Standard Workweek
(Respondents: n=15)**

Response	Percent	# of Responses
40 hours per week	53.3%	8
9/80 schedule over a 2-week period	53.3%	8
37.5 hours per week	13.3%	2
35 hours per week	13.3%	2

Appendix Table A-1, *List of Cities*, provides more detailed information concerning each city's workweek and the distribution of work hours over the course of a one week and two week period. The information contained in Table A-1 reveals three particularly noteworthy facts in the context of this study:

1. Respondents reported a wide array of citywide alternate work schedules .
2. Over half of the cities (eight out of fifteen) work a 9/80 schedule, with city offices closing every other Friday.

3. Over one-quarter (four out of fifteen) reported that some or all employees work fewer than 40 hours per week.

Recruiting materials and CAWS: Fourteen of the 15 cities (93%) reported that they included information about their CAWS in recruitment materials such as printed job announcements and on-line job postings. This information is assumed to be current, since all of the cities reported conducting recruitments in the past year and survey respondents are city officials in positions closely involved with recruitment, thereby ensuring a high level of reliability for the information.

Organizational benefits of CAWS: Respondents were asked to provide their opinion about benefits that their organization derives from the CAWS. Using a list of seven pre-selected benefits, the respondents could choose as many as they thought applicable. Results, arranged in descending order, are as follows:

**Table 4-3: Organizational Benefits of Citywide
Alternative Work Schedules
(Respondents: n=15)**

Response	Percent	# Responses
Enhances work-life balance for employees	93.3%	14
Improves employee morale	86.7%	13
Increases ability to recruit employees	80.0%	12
Provides extended business hours for customers	73.3%	11
Decreases absenteeism	40.0%	6
Increases productivity	33.3%	5
Reduces operating costs	26.7%	4
Don't know	0.0%	0

This data lends support to the hypothesis that a CAWS would enhance the City of Fremont's ability to recruit employees. The data is also consistent with Roberts' 2004 finding that "There is an association between the presence of family-friendly benefits and their perceived importance and efficacy in promoting employee recruitment, retention and motivation" (p. 11).

Single most important benefit: Respondents were asked for the single most important benefit of the seven choices provided in the preceding question. It is interesting to note that "Increases ability to recruit employees" was not listed as the 'single most important benefit' by any respondent, with the exception of one who listed it as a secondary benefit, following "increases employee morale". This respondent also listed "provides extended business hours for customers" as a third benefit.

**Table 4-4: Single Most Important Benefit of
Citywide Alternative Work Schedules
(Respondents: n=14)**

Response	Percent	# Responses
Enhances work-life balance for employees	50%	7
Improves employee morale	21%	3
Provides extended business hours for customers	21%	3
Reduces operating costs	<1%	1
Decreases absenteeism	<1%	1

(Note: Responses total more than 14 since some respondents provided more than one answer).

The respondents' feedback is generally consistent with the findings from Roberts' 2004 study of the benefits practices of municipal governments that "The personnel outcomes most effectively. . . promoted by the benefits package are employee retention (60.4 percent), enhancing work and family balance (58.1 percent), reducing turnover (57.5 percent) and enhancing job satisfaction (54.4 percent)" (p. 11).

Two respondents provided the following comments, which illustrate the potential for multiple benefits to an organization through the implementation of a CAWS:

"The reduced work schedule was originally implemented as a cost savings measure. From a management perspective, this is still the primary benefit with the secondary impacts being an added bonus for the organization." (Human Resources Manager, Town of Windsor).

"Enhance(s) work-life balance. This then improves employee moral (sic), which then improves productivity, which decreases absenteeism." (Director of Administrative Services, Town of Tiburon).

Additional inquiry would be required to gain more insight into these responses and their potential meaning to the City of Fremont's consideration of implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule.

Organizational drawbacks from CAWS: Nine respondents provided answers to the question "In your opinion, what drawbacks, if any, does your organization experience from the non-traditional work schedule? (Choose all that apply)." A tabulation of results is shown in Table 4-5. The survey provided seven choices in this close-ended question.

Table 4-5: Drawbacks Experienced from CAWS
(Respondents: n=9)

Response	Percent	# Responses
Difficulty scheduling meetings with employees	66.7%	6
Decreased customer service	44.4%	4
Decreased face-time with employees	33.3%	3
Decreased productivity	22.2%	2
Decreased work-life balance	11.1%	1
Decreased employee morale	0.0%	0
Decreased ability to recruit employees	0.0%	0

(Note: Numbers total more than nine since respondents could choose more than one response).

This information suggests that the cities' CAWS do not have a negative impact on the recruiting process. Additional research would be required to ascertain whether absence of response to this question from six people reflects the belief that their organization did not experience any drawbacks from the work schedule. This follow-up research could also shed light on the causal relationships between the citywide alternate work schedules and these negative organizational impacts, and whether other factors are partly or wholly responsible.

Analysis of Findings

This study opened with the following hypothesis and three subquestions:

Hypothesis: Implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule would enhance the City of Fremont's ability to recruit employees.

Subquestions:

1. Do cities in the Bay Area with citywide alternate work schedules advertise the schedules as an employee benefit during recruitment?
2. Do these cities think that their citywide alternate work schedules enhance their ability to recruit employees?
3. Is the level of employee participation in the City of Fremont's recent Telework Program (which allows employees, on an individual basis, to request approval to work outside of city offices during a portion of the workweek) an indication that there is a growing organizational need for a citywide alternate work schedule?

The hypothesis and subquestions 1 and 2: The high percentage (80%) of cities that identified the benefit of the CAWS in employee recruitment, coupled with the 0% of cities that viewed their CAWS as detrimental to employee recruiting, lend strong support to this study's hypothesis.

Based on the survey responses from the 15 Bay Area cities that currently utilized citywide alternate work schedules, and the high percentage (93%) that advertise the schedules as an employee benefit during recruitment, subquestions 1 and 2 can both be strongly answered in the affirmative.

Subquestion 3: On May 3, 2007, the City Manager of the City of Fremont issued an Administrative Regulation setting for the parameters of a citywide policy for telecommuting, or "teleworking". To date, three employees are teleworking (working at a location other than City offices) for a portion of their workweek, as approved by their individual supervisor. While it is beyond the scope of this study to explore the reasons

that more employees are not teleworking (whether, for example, supervisors are denying most requests), it is interesting to highlight some of the research findings of Cooper and Kurland (2002) concerning various factors which serve as barriers to telecommuting.

Cooper and Kurland (2002) cite 'employee isolation' as the most-cited obstacle to telecommuting: "Professionally, employees fear that being off-site and out-of-sight will limit opportunities for promotions and organizational rewards" (p. 512). This is important to both the employee and the organization, since "... both public and private employees perceive that professional isolation is inextricably linked to employee development activities" (p. 519). The authors highlight three specific development activities missed by telecommuters as "1) *interpersonal networking* with others in the organization; 2) *informal learning* that enhances work-related skills and information distribution; and 3) *mentoring* from colleagues and superiors" (emphasis added) (p. 519).

As Roberts (2004, p. 18) notes regarding employee utilization of work place benefits such as flexible work schedules and telecommuting:

The lack of utilization may be related to the absence of need . . . or reflect barriers in the workplace. Employees may avoid using family friendly benefits for fear of being labeled as less serious or committed (the infamous 'mommy track') as reduced workplace 'face time' attenuates promotion and advancement opportunities.

This perspective may help explain why more City of Fremont employees have not taken advantage of the telecommuting policy; however, this is merely conjecture on the part of this study's author. As such, it is difficult to draw any definitive conclusions about whether the current level of employee use of the telework policy indicates a growing organizational need for a citywide alternate work schedule.

Chapter 5: Conclusions, Policy Recommendations, and Areas for Further Research

Conclusions

While valuable insights into options and opportunities can be gained from the experience of other cities with citywide alternate work schedules, it is ultimately up to the City of Fremont to decide what would be the 'best practice' work schedule for the organization. As Volk (1999) notes,

Before developing a work-life program, employers need to find out what is needed and what will work in their organization. The first question employers should ask is *what goal they have in mind for the work-life strategy* (emphasis added). Do they want to develop a reputation as a desirable place to work? Is the intent to improve productivity, to reduce absenteeism, or to retain talent? Of course, all of these purposes are linked, but one may be more important at any given time. The point is that the employer needs to understand the goals of the program in order to design a program that will produce the desired results (p. 8).

The unique nature of the City of Fremont's organizational culture is a key element of the context within which consideration of a CAWS must be evaluated, in order to maximize the potential for success of the initiative. Volk (1999) astutely states

In other words, in addition to designing plans and programs or rewriting policies, a significant organization culture shift must occur if the principles and promise of work-life concepts are to take root and become not only accepted, but expected. In this changed culture, work-life policies and programs are not simply benefits that accommodate employees, but *management tools that can both improve the way the organization functions and positively impact the lives of its employees* (emphasis added) (p. 9).

Aligning the interests of the organization with the interests of the employees, therefore, can result in beneficial outcomes for both by increasing job satisfaction and enhancing the organization's standing as an employer of choice.

Lastly, while the information gathered from the cities surveyed for this study may lead one to conclude that smaller organizations utilized a CAWS more frequently than larger organizations, or that it is easier for smaller jurisdictions to implement a CAWS, these conclusions cannot be supported or refuted without additional research and analysis. This author notes, for example, the recent action of the Governor of Utah to implement a compressed work week schedule for state employees (Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 20008) as an example of a large public agency utilizing an alternate work schedule across the organization.

Does Fremont have a De facto Citywide Alternate Work Schedule?

The provisions of several City of Fremont Memoranda of Understanding, which results in hundreds of employees working a non-standard work week, combined with the many, informal discussions between this author and FAME employees about their IAWS, suggest that the City of Fremont may, in fact, have what could be described as a de facto citywide alternate work schedule. Due to the confidential nature of personnel files, and the limited scope of this study, this author was not able to analyze the cumulative impact of the MOU-sanctioned and individually approved alternative work schedules throughout the organization. This analysis would inform the City of Fremont's consideration of a citywide alternate work schedule. Clearly, the City would benefit from a better understanding of the impacts of the individual alternate work schedules on the

organization's ability to conduct its work efficiently and effectively and to serve both internal and external stakeholders.

Missed Opportunities

This study's research findings suggest that the City of Fremont may be missing the following opportunities:

- The ability to use a citywide alternate work schedule as a recruitment tool for all positions.
- The ability to improve public access to City offices through extended evening hours. With a considerable number of City employees currently at work until 6:00 p.m., there is an opportunity to enhance customer service between 5:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. This may benefit citizens whose work schedules preclude their ability to visit City offices during current operating hours.
- The ability to improve access to staff, both within and between departments and to external stakeholders such as citizens and other organizations and entities.
- The potential to reduce operating costs, if a CAWS were to include closure of most City offices for one or more days per month.²

Through implementation of a CAWS, the City organization could improve equity, or "employee justice" (Roberts, 2004, p. 1) among employees in enjoying the benefits of

² For example, under a 9/80 work schedule, it is less costly to extend the heating, lighting and cooling load of a building for an additional hour per day over the course of nine days than it is to heat, light and cool that same building for a full eight-hour day.

a CAWS. “Formal rules promise equal treatment; they define expectations; they tend to specify the limits of authority” (Selznick, 1969, as cited in Kelly & Kalev, 2006, p. 383). The trade-off may be a diminution of the current level of managerial control through their ability to approve or deny requests for individual alternate work schedules. In addition, as noted previously, it appears that an organization can implement a CAWS while still allowing its employees to request approval of an IAWS. The two are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Policy Recommendations

This study makes the following specific recommendations concerning the potential for implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule for the City of Fremont:

- **Develop a centralized database of current IAWS and evaluate data to identify trends across the organization and implications for a CAWS.** This database would provide baseline data for the recommendations that follow.
- **Utilize the centralized database to “develop and implement evaluation methods that can assess and measure intangible elements like . . . career satisfaction, work-life balance, and employability at an individual level”** (McDonald & Hite, 2008, p. 100).
- **Conduct an analysis of “. . . the work that needs to be done and the degree of interdependence between jobs”** (Goldenhar, 2003, p. 10). As identified by several cities surveyed for this study, a potential drawback of a citywide alternate

work schedule is “difficulty scheduling meetings with employees”. This feedback appears contradictory to what should be an organizational benefit of a CAWS – ensuring that most employees are at work at the same time. Follow-up research would be required to gain a more complete understanding of this issue and the implications for implementation of a CAWS.

- **Conduct a member survey of the City’s bargaining units to ascertain their interest in implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule.** “Employee associations and unions can be good sources of information; in fact, they are likely to initiate discussions on the matter” (Volk, 1999, p. 8).
- **Conduct a survey of stakeholders, including citizens, elected and appointed officials, and others to determine their interests and preferences.**
- **Consider a pilot program.** The States of Hawaii (Department of the Lieutenant Governor, 2008) and Washington (Thurston Regional Planning Council, n.d.) utilized pilot programs to assess the benefits and drawbacks of an organization-wide alternative work schedule.

Areas for Future Research

The limited time frame available for conducting this study precluded several research strategies that could have broadened and deepened the collection and analysis of data, and enhanced the author’s understanding of the issue. These strategies include:

- Dissemination of a survey to the 89 Bay Area cities that did not meet the criterion of operating under a citywide alternate work schedule. This survey could inquire

whether the cities were considering implementation of a citywide alternate work schedule and, if so, for what reasons. Specifically, this survey would focus on the cities' concerns about their ability to recruit, and positioning themselves as an employer of choice.

- Dissemination of a survey to professional recruitment firms, to solicit their perspective on the impact of a public organization's work schedule on its ability to competitively recruit in the Bay Area.
- A longitudinal survey of applicants when they are newly hired for City of Fremont positions, to establish the factors that led to their decision to apply for and ultimately accept their new position.
- A longitudinal survey of applicants who apply for, but are not hired, for City of Fremont positions, to establish the factors that attracted them to apply for the position.
- Collection of information concerning the complete benefit packages of the 22 cities contacted for this study, to inform a more detailed analysis of the role the CAWS plays in recruitment.

Final Thoughts

The hypothesis and subquestions forming the framework for this study focused on the issue of recruitment. However, the research findings revealed richer data and deeper insights into the potential benefits and drawbacks of a citywide alternate work schedule for the City of Fremont. As noted earlier, the City stands to gain a multitude of benefits

achieving a variety of linked purposes if it were to implement a citywide alternate work schedule. The potential for achieving these benefits, which are supported by the findings of this study, warrants serious consideration by the City's leadership.

References

Journal Articles and Books

Condrey, S.E. (Ed.) (2005). *Handbook of Human Resource Management in Government* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Cooper, C. & Kurland, N. (2002). Telecommuting, Professional Isolation, and Employee Development in Public and Private Organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 511- 532. DOI: 10.1002/job.145.

Crumpacker, M. & Crumpacker, J.M. (2007). Succession Planning and Generational Stereotypes: Should HR Consider Age-based Values and Attitudes a Relevant Factor or a Passing Fad? *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 36, No. 4, Winter 2007, 349–369.

Dychtwald, K. & Baxter, D. (2007). Capitalizing on the New Mature Workforce. *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 36, No. 4, Winter 2007, 325–334.

Facer II, R.L. & Wadsworth, L. (2008). Alternative Work Schedules and Work Family Balance: A Research Note. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 28, 166-177. DOI: 10.1177/0734371X08315138.

Facer II, R. L., Wadsworth, L. & Arbon, C. (2008). Cities Leading the Way: The Use of Alternative Work Schedules by Cities. Unpublished research paper. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

- Glass, J.L. & Estes, S.B. (1997). The Family Responsive Workplace. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 289-313. DOI:10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.289.
- Golden. L. (2001). Flexible Work Schedules: What Are We Trading Off to Get Them? *Monthly Labor Review*, March 2001. Retrieved November 9, 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Hammer, L. B. & Barbera, K.M. (1997). Toward an Integration of Alternative Work Schedules and Human Resource Systems. *Human Resource Planning*, 20, 28-36.
- Hays, S. H. & Kearney, R.C. (Eds.) (2003). Public Personnel Administration. Problems and Prospects. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ingraham, P.W., Selden, S.C. & Moynihan, D.P. (2000). People and Performance: Challenges for the Future Public Service – the Report From the Wye River Conference. *Public Administration Review*, 60, pp. 54-60.
- Jurkiewicz, C.L. (2000). Generation X and the Public Employee. *Public Personnel Management*, 29, 55-74. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Kelliher, C. & Anderson, D. (2008). For Better or For Worse? An Analysis of How Flexible Working Practices Influence Employees' Perceptions of Job Quality. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 419-431. DOI: 10.1080/095531908018955502.

- Kelly, E.L. & Kalev, A. (2006). Managing Flexible Work Arrangements in US Organizations: Formalized Discretion or a 'Right to Ask'. *Socio-economic Review*, 4, 379-416. DOI:10.1093/ser/mwl001.
- Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.
- McDonald, K.S. & Hite, L.M. (2008). The Next Generation of Career Success: Implications for HRD. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*. 10(1), 86-103. DOI: 10:1177/1523422307310116
- Reynolds, H.B. (1998). Midmanagement's Influence on Work/life Programs. *Employee Benefits Journal*, 23, 44-46.
- Roberts, G. E. (2004). Municipal Government Benefits Practices and Personnel Outcomes: Results from a National Survey. *Public Personnel Management*, 33(1), 1-22. Retrieved November 8, 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Roehling, P.V., Roehling, M.V. & Moen, P. (2001). The Relationship Between Work-Life Policies and Practices and Employee Loyalty: A Life Course Perspective. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22(2), 141-170. Retrieved November 9, 2008 from ProQuest database.
- Saltzstein, A.L., Ting, Y. & Saltzstein, G.H. (2001). Work-Family Balance and Job Satisfaction: The Impact of Family-Friendly Policies on Attitudes of Federal

Government Employees. *Public Administration Review*, 61, 452-467. Retrieved November 8, 2008 from ProQuest database.

Smola, K., & Sutton, C. (2002). Generational Differences: Revisiting Generational Work Values for the New Millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363-382. DOI: 10.1002/job.147

Tausig, M. & Fenwick, R. (2001). Unbinding Time: Alternate Work Schedules and Work-Life Balance. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 101-119. Retrieved November 9, 2008 from ProQuest database.

Volk, W. (1999). Work-Life Balance: Integrating Benefits with Expectation. *International City/County Management Association*, 31, 1-16.

On-line Resources

Anderson, M. W. & Kabara, K. (n.d.) The Results of the 2004 Employer-of-

Choice/Balance Work and Life Survey. Retrieved Nov. 3, 2008 from

http://www.das.state.ct.us/HR/Dev_Train/Employer-of

[Choice_Work_Life_Survey%20_2004.pdf](http://www.das.state.ct.us/HR/Dev_Train/Employer-of)

City of Fremont (a). (2007). Fremont Association of City Employees (FACE),

Memorandum of Understanding, 2007-2009. Retrieved November 21, 2008 from

<http://fremont.gov/Employment/MemorandumsOfUnderstanding/default.htm>

_____ (b). (2007). Professional Engineers and Technicians Association (PETA).

Memorandum of Understanding, 2007-2009. Retrieved November 21, 2008 from

<http://fremont.gov/Employment/MemorandumsOfUnderstanding/default.htm>

_____ (c). (2007). Operating Engineers, Local Union No. 3 OE3). Memorandum of

Understanding, 2007-2009. Retrieved November 21, 2008 from

<http://fremont.gov/Employment/MemorandumsOfUnderstanding/default.htm>

_____ (d). (2007). Fremont Association of Management Employees, (FAME)

Memorandum of Understanding, 2007-2009. Retrieved November 21, 2008 from

<http://fremont.gov/Employment/MemorandumsOfUnderstanding/default.htm>

_____ . (2008). City of Fremont 2008/09 Adopted Operating Budget. Retrieved

December 1, 2008 from

<http://www.fremont.gov/NR/rdonlyres/eesnsv6trsy62shyflsyrio2sknlncy7x7iferkgv>

kuz4zaxbkroudlmwrar2pnqrftjyhleq6zj6kpxd4sx2vqhxc/200809AdoptedBudget.pdf

Davidson, G., Lepeak, S., & Newman, E. (2007). "Recruiting and Staffing in the Public Sector: Results from the IPMA-HR Research Series". International Public Management Association for Human Resources. Retrieved November 12, 2008 from unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/ipma-hr/unpan027173.pdf

Department of the Lieutenant Governor. (2008). "State Starts Four-day Work Week Pilot Project". Press Release, July 31, 2008. Retrieved October 29, 2008 from <http://hawaii.gov/ltgov/news/releases/2008%20News%20Releases/july/state-starts-four-day-work-week-pilot-project>

Fraone, J.S., Hartmann, D., & McNally, K. (2008). *The Multi-generational Workforce: Management Implications and Strategies for Collaboration*. Retrieved November 4, 2008, from Boston College, Center for Work and Family website: http://www.bc.edu/centers/cwf/research/publications/meta-elements/pdf/MultiGen_EBS.pdf

Goldenhar, D. (2003). "The Benefits of Flexible Work Arrangements". *Advancing Women Professionals and the Jewish Community*, April 2003. Retrieved November 4, 2008 from <http://www.advancingwomen.org/files/4/154.pdf>

Governor's Office of Planning and Budget. (2008). *Initiative Performance Report Baseline Draft*. Retrieved November 3, 2008 from <http://www.utah.gov/governor/docs/Working4UtahReport.pdf>

Office of Personnel Management (a). (n.d.). *Alternative Work Schedule Definitions*.

(Handbook on Alternative Work Schedules). Retrieved November 7, 2008 from

<http://www.opm.gov/oca/aws/html/define.asp#CWS>

_____ (b). (n.d.). *Negotiating Flexible and Compressed Work Schedules*.

Retrieved November 9, 2008 from <http://www.opm.gov/lmr/html/flexible.asp>

State of California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. *2008 City*

Population Rankings. Retrieved October 21, 2008 from

http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/cities-counties_1-2007/documents/Rankcities_2008.xls

Thurston Regional Planning Council. (n.d.) *Commute Options: Compressed Work*

Schedules. Retrieved November 4, 2008 from

<http://www.trpc.org/programs/transportation/commutes/commute+options/flex+schedule/compworkweek.htm>

Alternative Work Schedules. Retrieved November 7, 2008 from University of Maryland,

Department of Women's Studies website:

<http://www.mith2.umd.edu/WomensStudies/GenderIssues/WomenInWorkforce/Work+FamilyNeeds/05alt-schedules>

U.S. House of Representatives, 100th Congress, 2nd Session (2008). *H.Res. 1440*.

Retrieved November 24, 2008 from

www.awlp.org/pub/NWFMresolution2008.pdf

Table A-1: List of Cities

County, Jurisdiction & Title of Survey Respondent	2008 Population ¹	Number of non-safety employees	Citywide Alternate Work Schedule	Hours/week and/or biweekly
Alameda County				
<i>City of Albany</i> (Human Resources Manager)	16,877	40	Mon. 8:30-7:00; Tues-Thurs. 8:30-5:00; Fri 8:30-12:30	40
Contra Costa County				
<i>City of El Cerrito</i> (Employee Services Manager)	23,320	95	Mon., Wed. & alternate Fri. 8:00-4:00; Tues. & Thurs. 8:00-6:00; closed alternate Fridays	37.5 (9/75)
<i>City of Pleasant Hill</i> (Human Resources Manager)	33,377	100	Mon.-Wed. 8:30-5:00, Thurs. 8:30-6:00; Friday 8:30-1:00	37.5 and 40
Marin County				
<i>City of Mill Valley</i> (Finance and Human Resources Director)	13,925	100	Mon.-Fri. 8:00-12:00 and 1:00-5:00; closed alternate Fridays	9/80
<i>Town of Tiburon</i> (Director of Administrative Services)	8,917	28	Mon.-Thurs. 9:00-5:00, Fri. 9:00-12:00	35 (Public Works: 40)
San Mateo County				
<i>City of Brisbane</i> (Senior Human Resources Analyst)	3,861	53	Mon., Tues. & Thurs. 8:00-5:00; Wed. 8:00-8:00; Fri. 8:00-1:00	40
<i>City of Foster City</i> (Director of Human Resources)	30,308	180	Mon.-Thurs. 8:00-6:00; Fri. 8:00-5:00; alternate Fridays off (Note: City Hall is open 5 days a week; however, staff alternate taking every other Friday off)	40
<i>Town of Hillsborough</i> (Human Resources Specialist)	11,272	No data	Mon.-Thurs. 7:30-5:30; Fri. 7:30-12:30	40

Table A-1: List of Cities

County, Jurisdiction & Title of Survey Respondent	2008 Population ¹	Number of non-safety employees	Citywide Alternate Work Schedule	Hours/week and/or biweekly
Santa Clara County				
<i>City of Cupertino</i> (Human Resources Analyst)	55,551	150	Mon.-Thurs. 7:30-5:30; Fri. 7:30-4:30 (City Hall is open 5 days a week; however, many employees are on 9/80 schedules with alternate Fridays off)	9/80
<i>City of Menlo Park</i> (Personnel and Information Services Director)	31,490	195	Mon.-Thurs. 7:30-5:30; Fri. 8:00- 5:00; closed alternate Fridays	9/80
<i>City of Palo Alto</i> (Human Resources Director)	63,367	1,100	Mon.-Thurs. 7:30-5:30; Fri. 8:00- 5:00; closed alternate Fridays	9/80
<i>City of Saratoga</i> (Human Resources Manager)	31,592	58	Mon.-Thurs. 7:30-5:00; Fri. 8:00- 5:00; closed alternate Fridays	9/80
Sonoma County				
<i>City of Cotati</i> (Director of Administrative Services)	7,532	15	Mon.-Thurs. 7:30-12:00 & 1:00-5:30; Fri. 8:00-12:00 & 1:00-5:00; closed alternate Fridays	9/80
<i>City of Sebastopol</i> (City Clerk/Program Manager)	7,714	20-25	City Hall public hours: Mon.- Thurs. 8:00-12:00 & 1:00- 5:00; Fri 8:00-12:00 & 1:00-4:00 Staff hours: Mon.-Thurs. 8:00-6:00; Fri. 8:00-5:00; off alternate Fridays	9/80
<i>Town of Windsor</i> (Human Resources Manager)	26,564	100	Mon.-Thurs. 7:00-6:00; closed every Friday	40 (4/10)

Table A-1: List of Cities

Non-Respondent Cities				
Jurisdiction	2008 Population ¹	Number of non-safety employees	Citywide Alternate Work Schedule	Hours/week and/or biweekly
City of San Pablo	31,190		Mon.-Fri. 7:40-5:00, closed alternate Fridays	37.5
City of Tracy	81,548		Mon.-Thurs. 8:00-6:00, Fri. 8:00-5:00, closed alternate Fridays	40 (9/80)
City of Rio Vista	8,071		Hours were not confirmed	
City of Suisun City	28,193		Mon., Wed. & Thurs. 8:00-5:00; Tues. 8:00-7:00; closed Fridays	
City of Union City	73,402		Mon.-Thurs. 8:00-6:00; Fri. 8:00-5:00 closed alternate Fridays	40
City of Pacifica	39,616		Mon., Tues., & Thurs. 8:30-5:00; Wed. 8:30-7:30; Fri. 8:30-1:30	
City of Los Altos Hills	8,837		Mon.-Fri. 7:30-12:00 & 1:00-5:30	
Sources:				
¹ State of California, Department of Finance				

Appendix A-2

Email Message and Survey Questions

Introductory email message:

Hello;

I am a graduate student in the Executive Master of Public Administration Program at Golden Gate University.

For my thesis project, I am conducting research about the relationship between the work schedules and recruiting practices of 22 cities located throughout the nine-county Bay Area. Representatives of each of these cities are receiving this message.

These cities are different from other cities in the region because they have an organization-wide work schedule that varies from the standard schedule of Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

I am interested in learning whether these "non-traditional" work schedules affect an organization's ability to recruit new employees. For the purpose of my research, I am excluding public safety (police and fire) departments from my survey and focusing on all other departments in your organizations.

I have prepared a brief, nine-question survey, which should take no more than 5-10 minutes of your time. I would greatly appreciate your contribution to my research project by completing this survey no later than Wednesday, November 26, 2008. Just click on the following link and you will be directed to the survey:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=z7I1BNWABME90LVs_2f7jTVg_3d_3d

If you have any questions, please contact me at 510.494.4363.

Thank you in advance for your time and support. If you would like to receive a copy of my final thesis paper, please let me know by sending an email directly to this address. I will be happy to send the paper to you in December, 2008.

Amy Rakley

Survey Questions:

1. Please tell me your position title and the name of your city.
2. Is information about your organization's work schedule included in recruitment materials, such as printed job announcements and on-line job postings? ___ Yes ___ No
3. In your opinion, which of the following benefits, if any, does your organization derive from its non-traditional work schedule? (Choose all that apply).
 - ___ Increases ability to recruit employees
 - ___ Provides extended business hours for customers
 - ___ Improves employee morale
 - ___ Enhances work-life balance for employees
 - ___ Reduces operating costs
 - ___ Increases productivity
 - ___ Decreases absenteeism
 - ___ Don't know
4. Of the factors checked in Question 3, which do you consider to be the SINGLE most important factor?
5. In your opinion, what drawbacks, if any, does your organization experience from the non-traditional work schedule? (Choose all that apply).
 - ___ Difficulty scheduling meeting with employees
 - ___ Decreased productivity
 - ___ Decreased employee morale
 - ___ Decreased face-time with employees
 - ___ Decreased ability to recruit employees
 - ___ Decreased customer service
 - ___ Decreased work-life balance

6. Has your organization conducted any recruitments (other than for public safety employees) during 2008?
☐ Yes ☐ No
7. If so, how many?
8. How many full time employees are in your organization? (Excluding police and fire employees).
9. How many hours do you work in a standard work week?
- ☐ 35 hours per week
- ☐ 37.5 hours per week
- ☐ 40 hours per week
- ☐ We work a 9/80 schedule over a 2-week period
- ☐ Other (please describe)

RECEIVED

FEB 11 2009

Golden Gate University, Univ. Library
536 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105