Effective Methods For Solving a Large-scale Resident Block Scheduling Problem with Multi-criteria Objectives

Junhong Guo William Pozehl Amy Cohn

Center for Healthcare Engineering and Patient Safety (CHEPS) Department of Industrial and Operations Engineering (IOE)

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Oct. 21, 2019



Oct. 21, 2019 2 / 17

Image: A match a ma

- Consider a personnel scheduling problem that assigns residents in a medical school to different service-specified rotations during the academic year
- Most research in the literature focuses on the modeling of the problem to generate valid schedules to achieve a well-defined objective
- Our work concentrates on handling the multi-criteria objectives of the problem to effectively produce high-quality solutions

Background

Training Model for Physicians



J. Guo, W. Pozehl, A. Cohn (UMICH)

Multi-criteria Block Scheduling

Oct. 21, 2019 4 / 17

Background

Training Model for Physicians



J. Guo, W. Pozehl, A. Cohn (UMICH)

Multi-criteria Block Scheduling

Oct. 21, 2019 5 / 17

Block

The planning horizon is evenly divided into a specific number of time periods. Each unit time period is also referred to as a *block*.

Image: Image:

3 ×

Block

The planning horizon is evenly divided into a specific number of time periods. Each unit time period is also referred to as a *block*.

Service

A service is a specialty in a specific unit in the hospital, e.g. AMB, ER, ...

Block

The planning horizon is evenly divided into a specific number of time periods. Each unit time period is also referred to as a *block*.

Service

A service is a specialty in a specific unit in the hospital, e.g. AMB, ER, ...

Rotation

A *rotation* is specified by a service and a duration in terms of blocks. That is, assigned residents should do the specific service for the given number of blocks consecutively.

Resident Block Scheduling

Assign each resident to a sequence of rotations during a given planning horizon, where specific requirements are satisfied.

Resident Block Scheduling

Assign each resident to a sequence of rotations during a given planning horizon, where specific requirements are satisfied.



(日) (同) (三) (三)

- Approximately 100 residents
 - Two programs: Pediatrics, Med-Pediatrics
 - Four Levels: PGY1, PGY2, PGY3, and PGY4
- There are 32 different rotations specified based on 24 different services
- The planning horizon is the academic year (July June) with time periods in a length of two weeks (i.e. in total 26 blocks)

Block Scheduling – Feasibility

Requirements

- Basic Assignment Requirements
- Resident Education Requirements
- Service Coverage Requirements
- Service Duration Requirements
- Resident Pairing Rules
- Spacing Rules
- Sequencing Rules
- Prohibitions
- Pre-Assignments

• The problem is formulated as an integer programming

Decision Variables

 X_{rat} Whether resident r starts to do a rotation a at time period t

 Y_{rst} Whether resident r is assigned to service s during time period t

• The problem is formulated as an integer programming

Decision Variables

 X_{rat} Whether resident r starts to do a rotation a at time period t

 Y_{rst} Whether resident r is assigned to service s during time period t

#Rows	#Columns	Solution Time
$\sim 200 K$	$\sim 150 K$	3 - 4 min

• The flexibility of the feasibility problem allows preferences to be considered

- The flexibility of the feasibility problem allows preferences to be considered
- Improve the satisfaction of residents on their annual schedules
 - Meet further educational goals for the career plan
 - Reduce conflicts against the plans in personal life
- Implicitly improve the quality of the care patients will receive

- The flexibility of the feasibility problem allows preferences to be considered
- Improve the satisfaction of residents on their annual schedules
 - Meet further educational goals for the career plan
 - Reduce conflicts against the plans in personal life
- Implicitly improve the quality of the care patients will receive
- Residents will submit a survey to indicate their requests on:
 - Electives
 - Vacation times
 - Free weekends
 - Etc.
- Residents will **uniquely prioritize** their requests into (up to) **18 levels** to specify their relative importance

J. Guo, W. Pozehl, A. Cohn (UMICH)

Oct. 21, 2019 11 / 17

Goal: construct valid block schedules that

- Satisfy resident requests as much as possible
- Maintain the fairness in terms of schedule satisfaction across all residents

Goal: construct valid block schedules that

- Satisfy resident requests as much as possible
- Maintain the fairness in terms of schedule satisfaction across all residents

Challenges

Prioritized requests introduce multi-criteria objectives to our problem

Goal: construct valid block schedules that

- Satisfy resident requests as much as possible
- Maintain the fairness in terms of schedule satisfaction across all residents

Challenges

Prioritized requests introduce multi-criteria objectives to our problem

- The definition of "as much as possible" Deny 2 (level-1) + 9 (level-2) requests V.S. 4 (level-1) + 3 (level-2) requests
- Take the **"balance"** into consideration Deny 8 requests of one resident **V.S.** deny 1 request for each of ten residents

Methods for Handling Multi-criteria Objectives Approaches - General Information

• The total number of requests across all residents in each level

1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	 Sum
100	98	99	94	52	52	47	47	44	 783

Methods for Handling Multi-criteria Objectives Approaches - General Information

• The total number of requests across all residents in each level

1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	 Sum
100	98	99	94	52	52	47	47	44	 783

• Minimize the number of requests denied in each level separately

1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th]
0	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	0]

Approaches - Collectively

	Evenly Obj. Val.
Evenly Wt.	118

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	•••
Evenly Wt.	7	13	16	14	18	15	10	11	6	

Approaches - Collectively

	Evenly Obj. Val.	Linearly Obj. Val.
Evenly Wt.	118	1,615
Linearly Wt.	120	1,503

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	
Evenly Wt.	7	13	16	14	18	15	10	11	6	
Linearly Wt.	1	7	15	14	15	15	16	13	9	

Approaches - Collectively

	Evenly Obj. Val.	Linearly Obj. Val.	Doubling Obj. Val.
Evenly Wt.	118	1,615	2,767,690
Linearly Wt.	120	1,503	1,546,894
Doubling Wt.	124	1,542	1,367,085

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	•••
Evenly Wt.	7	13	16	14	18	15	10	11	6	•••
Linearly Wt.	1	7	15	14	15	15	16	13	9	•••
Doubling Wt.	0	6	14	16	16	17	16	13	10	

Approaches - Collectively

	Evenly Obj. Val.	Linearly Obj. Val.	Doubling Obj. Val.
Evenly Wt.	118	1,615	2,767,690
Linearly Wt.	120	1,503	1,546,894
Doubling Wt.	124	1,542	1,367,085
÷	:		- - -
Hierarchical	124	1,542	1,367,085

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	• • •
Evenly Wt.	7	13	16	14	18	15	10	11	6	
Linearly Wt.	1	7	15	14	15	15	16	13	9	• • •
Doubling Wt.	0	6	14	16	16	17	16	13	10	
Hierarchical	0	6	14	16	16	17	16	13	10	

Approaches - Collectively

	Evenly Obj. Val.	Linearly Obj. Val.	Doubling Obj. Val.
Evenly Wt.	118	1,615	2,767,690
Linearly Wt.	120	1,503	1,546,894
Doubling Wt.	124	1,542	1,367,085
:	:	÷	÷
Hierarchical	124	1,542	1,367,085
RHier. (20%)	121	1,536	1,523,156

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	•••
Evenly Wt.	7	13	16	14	18	15	10	11	6	
Linearly Wt.	1	7	15	14	15	15	16	13	9	
Doubling Wt.	0	6	14	16	16	17	16	13	10	
Hierarchical	0	6	14	16	16	17	16	13	10	
RHier. (20%)	0	8	15	16	16	16	15	12	9	

Approaches - At Individual Level

	Evenly UB
Evenly Wt.	5

J. Guo, W. Pozehl, A. Cohn (UMICH)

Approaches - At Individual Level

	Evenly UB	Linearly UB		
Evenly Wt.	5	80		
Linearly Wt.	7	68		

Approaches - At Individual Level

	Evenly UB	Linearly UB	Doubling UB
Evenly Wt.	5	80	253,952
Linearly Wt.	7	68	245,760
Doubling Wt.	8	92	110,592

Approaches - At Individual Level

	Evenly UB	Linearly UB	Doubling UB	
Evenly Wt.	5	80	253,952	
Linearly Wt.	7	68	245,760	
Doubling Wt.	8	92	110,592	
Linearly w/ #Ctrl	5	68	245,760	
Doubling w/ #Ctrl	5	71	110,592	

Methods for Handling Multi-criteria Objectives Approaches - Integrated

Add constraints to ensure no one receives a much worse schedule

- No more than 5 requests can be denied for each resident
- No resident can receive a more than **110,592** penalty-score, in doubling weighted summation
- Apply the hierarchically process with a 20% relaxation for previous levels
- 9 Minimize the doubling weighted summation of the denied requests

Methods for Handling Multi-criteria Objectives Approaches - Integrated

Add constraints to ensure no one receives a much worse schedule

- $\bullet\,$ No more than 5 requests can be denied for each resident
- No resident can receive a more than **110,592** penalty-score, in doubling weighted summation
- Apply the hierarchically process with a 20% relaxation for previous levels
- Image Minimize the doubling weighted summation of the denied requests

1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	 Tot.	L.W.	D.W.
0	8	15	16	16	16	15	 119	1,526	1,523,116

Future Work

- Irreducible Inconsistent System (IIS)
- Ensure an efficient schedule for each resident
- Apply column generation techniques (e.g. branch-and-price) to speed up the solving process

Thank You for Your Attention

Q & A

J. Guo, W. Pozehl, A. Cohn (UMICH)

Multi-criteria Block Scheduling

Oct. 21, 2019 17 / 17