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Agenda

• NBC EARF Findings – Is This Our Call To Action?
• Overview of Chestnut’s Workplace Outcome Suite (WOS)
• Tips For Practical Implementation of WOS
• Case Scenarios - Using The WOS To Prove Value
• Discussion
Is This Our Call To Action?

“Unfortunately, there is simply an insufficient amount of ongoing, credible research to prove the valuable contribution of EAP’s and related services to workplace productivity.”

Employee Assistance Research Foundation 2013
What’s Behind Curtain #3?
Challenges With Measuring Quality In EAP Industry

1. Quality cannot be inferred from utilization
2. Lack of transparency in metrics
3. Outdated or proprietary research
4. Difficulties correlating price with quality
5. Clinical vs. workplace outcomes
2012 EARF Survey

- 1\textsuperscript{st} publicly available benchmarking study based upon large and diverse sampling of EAP vendors

- Data collected from 82 external EAP vendors covering over 146 million lives

- Findings to be published late 2013 in JWBH
“On follow up surveys do you use a standardized and research-validated tool to measure EAP outcomes?”

Those EAP’s who produce outcomes, however, are demonstrating reduced absenteeism, improved job performance, and high customer satisfaction.
Validated Survey Tools Used

- Employer Measures of Productivity, Absence & Quality: 4%
- Work Limitations Questionnaire: 16%
- Health and Productivity Questionnaire (HPQ): 20%
- Stanford Presenteeism Scale: 20%
- Chestnut Workplace Outcome Suite (WOS): 28%
- Mostly internally developed tools: 36%
The Train Is Departing. Is your organization onboard?
CGP Workplace Outcome Suite

• Developed at the request of long term CGP client
• Developed by Chestnut LI research institute
• Data is reported to customer in a “scorecard” report
  – EAP Utilization - metrics of specific interest
  – Client vignette
  – Outcomes data
  – Claims data for MBH services (EAP is gatekeeper)
CGP Workplace Outcome Suite (WOS)

- Offered free to the EAP field with a license agreement

- Now used by more than 400 EAP’s worldwide

- In 2014 Dupont will become the 1st organization to systematically evaluate its global EAP by using WOS data
CGP Workplace Outcome Suite

Each scale can "stand alone"

**Absenteeism** - #hours away from work in past 30 days due to EAP concern

**Presenteeism** - extent to which problems inhibit or distract one from work

**Engagement** - measure of passion or "over" involvement with the job

**Life Satisfaction** - affective state of well-being

**Workplace Distress** - sense of “dread” about work
Implementation Challenges

- **Using the 25 item WOS vs. 5 item WOS**
  - 25 item takes 10-15 minutes to administer
  - 5 item takes 2-3 minutes but is less sensitive

- **Getting staff “buy-in”**
  - Counselors may be resistant to collecting data in session

- **Selling the WOS to clients at intake**
  - Calm even tone, engaged and non judgmental attitude
  - “Our goal is to minimize the impact of personal issues on job performance. We are conducting a brief survey to help us measure that. Would you be willing to participate?”

- **Emailed link to zoomerang survey may be an alternative**
Implementation Challenges

• 90 day follow up calls – 8-10 hours week investment needed
• Obtaining multiple client locator data is critical
• Current response rate = 40-50% (most employers aren’t concerned)
• Sample size > 200 required for statistical significance
• Most EAP’s don’t develop a process to monitor implementation
Proving Our Value
Case Study – CGP Workplace Outcome Suites

Pooled data from 15 EAP’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presenteeism*</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Engagement**</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction**</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Distress*</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample size=2878

Notes: *Lower scores are a better outcome. **Higher scores are a better outcome. All scales reflect statistically significant change (p<.0001).
Lesson Learned – Use simple non statistical data

- 24.25% Reduction
- 5.9% Improvement
- 20% Improvement
- 12.5% Reduction

Presenteeism*  Work Engagement**  Life Satisfaction**  Workplace Distress*

Pre-test  Post-test
Showing ROI ~ Calculating Cost Savings

- WOS absenteeism X 12 months
- Multiplied by estimated hourly wage
- Multiplied by number of EAP cases annually
- Compare to average annual EAP expenditures
• Analyzed B.O.B. results (n=466)

• Absenteeism reduced 3.45 hours per month or 41.4 hours/year

• Emailed PDF summary to existing customers

• Account manager followed up
Showing ROI
CGP Case Examples
$28,000 Profit

Small Employer

Total annual EAP expenditures: $19,000
Annual cost saving: $47,000
$12,000 Profit

Large Employer 1

Employer Specific WOS Data

Total cost of EAP program: $567,000.00
Annual cost savings: $579,000.00

“Thanks Todd. The numbers for reduction in absenteeism, as well as the decline of mental health services seem substantial. _______ VP of Benefits
$1 Million Profit

Large Employer 2

Employer Specific WOS Data

- Total program costs: $1,200,000.00
- Total cost savings: $2,200,000.00
$79,000.00 Profit

Large Employer 3

Employer Specific WOS data

Total cost of EAP program: $247,000.00
Total cost savings: $326,000
Absenteeism – Case Example of Monetizing Outcomes

- Average **28.3** hours decreased absenteeism post EAP intervention

- Average wage $67.31/hour x 28.3 hours x 731 cases

- $1.4 Million annual production savings (and) 20% > productivity reported 90 days post EAP