Midwest Electric, Inc.

Reducing Stress Management in Teams

Jack J. Phillips and Patricia P. Phillips



P. O. Box 380637 Birmingham, Alabama 35238-0637 Phone (205) 678-0176 Fax (205) 678-0177 roiresearch@mindspring.com

www.jackphillipscenter.com

This case was prepared to serve as a basis for discussion rather than to illustrate either effective or ineffective administrative and management practices. All names, dates, places, and organization have been disguised at the request of the author(s) or organization. This case is featured in Measuring Return on Investment, Vol. 2 (1997), a casebook published by the American Society for Training and Development, Alexandria, VA.

Copyright © 1998 by Jack Phillips Center for Research. No part of this case may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without written permission of the Center.

MIDWEST ELECTRIC, INC. (A)

Reducing Stress Management in Teams

Midwest Electric, Inc. (MEI) is a growing electric utility serving several Midwestern states. Since deregulation of the industry, MEI has been on a course of diversification and growth. Through a series of acquisitions, MEI has moved outside of its traditional operating areas and into several related businesses.

MEI has been experiencing significant workplace changes as it is transformed from a bureaucratic, sluggish organization into a lean, competitive force in the market place. These changes have placed tremendous pressure on employees to develop multiple skills and perform additional work. Employees, working in teams, must constantly strive to reduce costs, maintain excellent quality, boost productivity, and generate new and efficient ways to supply customers and improve service.

As with many industries in a deregulated environment, MEI has detected symptoms of employee stress. The safety and health function in the company suggested that employee stress has lowered productivity and reduced employee effectiveness. Stress is also considered to be a significant employee health risk. Research has shown that high levels of stress are commonplace in many work groups, and that organizations are taking steps to help employees and work groups reduce stress in a variety of ways. The vice president of human resources has asked the training and education department, with the help of the safety and health department, to develop a program for work groups to help them alleviate stressful situations and deal more productively and effectively with job-induced stress.

Because of its size and sophisticated human resource systems, MEI has an extensive database on employee related measures. MEI prides itself as being one of the leaders in the industry in human resources issues. Needs assessments are routinely conducted and the HR vice president is willing to allow sufficient time for an adequate needs assessment before proceeding with the program.

Questions for discussion:

| 1) | What is the purpose of the needs assessment? |
|----|--|
| | |
| | |
| 2) | Which specific sources of data should be utilized? Which data collection methods would be appropriate for each source? |
| | |
| 3) | Identify potential Level 4 business needs. |
| | |
| 4) | How could a Level 3 needs assessment be conducted? |
| | |
| | |

MIDWEST ELECTRIC, INC. (B)

Needs Assessment

The overall purpose of the needs assessment was to identify the causes of a perceived problem. The needs assessment would:

- Confirm that a problem does exist and provide an assessment of the actual impact of this problem.
- Uncover potential causes of the problem within the work unit, company, and environment.
- Provide insight into potential remedies to correct the problem.

The sources of data for the needs assessment included company records, external research, team members, team leaders, and managers. The assessment began with a review of external research that identified the factors usually related to high stress and the consequences of high stress in work groups. The consequences uncovered specific measures that could be identified at MEI.

This external research lead to a review of several key data items in company records including attitude surveys, medical claims, EAP utilization, safety and health records, and exit interviews. The attitude survey data represented the results from the previous year and were reviewed for low scores on the specific questions that could yield stress related symptoms. Medical claims were analyzed by codes to identify the extent of those related to stress induced illnesses. Employee Assistance Plan (EAP) data were reviewed to determine the extent to which employees were using provisions and services of the plan perceived to be stress related. Safety records were reviewed to determine if specific accidents were stress related or that causes of accidents could be traced to high levels of stress. In each of the above areas, the data was compared to the previous year to determine whether stress related measures were changing. Also, where available, data were compared to expected norms from the external research. Finally, exit interviews for the previous six months were analyzed to determine the extent to which the stress related situations were factors in an employee's decision to voluntarily leave MEI.

A small sample of employees (10 team members) were interviewed to discuss their work-life situations and uncover symptoms of stress at work. Also, a small group of managers (5) were interviewed with the same purpose. To provide more detail on this input, a 10% sample of employees received a questionnaire to explore the same issues. MEI has 22,550 employees with 18,220 non-supervisory team members.

Summary of Findings

The needs assessment process uncovered several significant findings:

 There is evidence of high levels of stress in work groups caused by MEI's deregulation, restructuring, and job changes. In essence, the change in the nature of work has induced high levels of stress in most work groups.

- Stress has lead to a deterioration in several performance measures including medical costs, short-term disability, withdrawals (absenteeism, turnover), and job satisfaction.
- Employees are often not fully aware of stress factors and the effect that it has on them and their work.
- Employees have inadequate skills for coping with stress and adjusting to, managing, and eliminating highly stressful situations.
- Managers have more insight into the causes of stress but do not have the skills or mechanisms to deal with most stressful situations.

Program Planning and Evaluation

Several inherent factors about work groups and data at MEI influenced the program and its subsequent evaluation. MEI is organized around teams where groups are not usually identical. However, many teams have similar performance measures. The HR database is rich with a variety of measures and data on employees and work unit factors. Because of the team environment and the important role of the team leader/manager, the program to reduce stress must involve the management group in a proactive way. Any efforts to reduce stress must shift much of the responsibility to participants and thus reduce the amount of time off the job. Job pressures in the deregulated environment provide fewer off-the-job opportunities for meeting and development activities.

Questions for discussion:

| 1) | What type of program should be developed to reduce stress at MEI? (Nature of scope duration, features) |
|----|--|
| | |
| 2) | Is this the type of program that you would select for an ROI calculation? |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| 3) | Complete the data collection plan for this program. |
|----|---|
| | |
| 4) | Complete the ROI analysis plan for this program. |
| , | |
| | |

Program: Stress Management for Intact Groups Responsibility: Jack Phillips Date: January 15, 1997

Evaluation Plan: Data Collection

| Level | Broad Program Objective(s) | Data Collection Method | Timing of Data Collection | Responsibilities for Data Collection |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| I Reaction, Satisfaction and Planned Actions | Positive ReactionSuggestions for ImprovementsPlanned Action | Standard Questionnaire 21 Day Action Plan | End of One Day CourseEnd of Course | FacilitatorFacilitator |
| II Learning | Personal Stress Awareness Coping Strategies Stress Reduction Skills | StressMap® Self Assessment Facilitator Assessment | Prior to CourseEnd of CourseEnd of Course | FacilitatorFacilitatorFacilitator |
| III Job Application | Change Behavior to Reduce Stress Develop Group Action Plan and Communicate to Group Access Internal/External Resources Application of Skills/Knowledge | Completion of 21 Day Plan Conference Call Follow Up Session Review Records Follow-up Questionnaire | 21 Days After Course 21 Days After Course 1-2 Weeks After One Day Course 6 Months After Course 6 Months After Course | No Report Facilitator Facilitator/Manager Program Coordinator External Consultant |
| IV Business Impact | Reduce Medical Care Costs Reduce Absenteeism Reduce Turnover Increase Productivity Increase Job Satisfaction | Group Records Group Records Group Records Group Records Follow-Up Questionnaire | 6 Months After Course | Program Coordinator Program Coordinator Program Coordinator Program Coordinator External Consultant |

Copyright 2000 The Jack Phillips Center for Research

Program: Stress Management for Intact Groups Responsibility: Jack Phillips Date: January 15, 1997

Evaluation Plan: ROI Analysis

| Data Items Medical Health Care Costs - Preventable Claims | Methods of Isolating the Effects of the Program Control Group Arrangement Trendline Analysis | Methods of Converting Data • Direct Costs | Cost Categories • Needs Assessment • Program Development | Intangible Benefits Improved Communication Time Savings Fewer Conflicts | Other Influences/Issues Match Groups Appropriately Limit Communication with Control | Communication Targets • Program Participants • Intact Team/Manager |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| Absenteeism | Control Group Arrangement Trend Line Analysis | Supervisor EstimationStandard Value | Program Materials Participant Salaries/Benefits Participant Travel (if applicable) Teamwork Improvement in Problem Solving | • Participant Salaries/Benefits • Participant Travel (if applicable) • Improvement in Problem Solving • Check for Building During in Problem Solving • Monitor | | Senior Manager/ Management in Business Units Training and |
| Employee Turnover | Control Group Trend Line Analysis | External Study - Cost of Turnover in High Tech Industry Management Review | Facilitator Meeting Facilities (Room, Food, Beverages) Program Coordinator | | Activities During Program • 6 Groups will be Monitored | Education Staff Safety and Health Staff Senior Corporate Management |
| Employee Job Satisfaction | Control Group Arrangement Management Estimation | Management Estimation | Training and Education OverheadEvaluation Costs | | | Prospective Team Leaders |
| Employee/Group Productivity | Control Group Arrangement Trend Line Analysis | Standard ValuesManagement Estimation | | | | |

Copyright 2000 The Jack Phillips Center for Research

MIDWEST ELECTRIC (C)

Program Design

While several approaches could be feasible to satisfy this need, four issues surfaced that influenced program design:

- A skills and knowledge deficiency exists and some type of learning event was necessary.
- Several stress management programs are commercially available which may avoid having to develop a new program from scratch.
- Managers need to be involved in the process to the greatest extent possible.
- Because of the concerns about time away from the job, the actual classroom/formal meeting activities should be limited to one or two days.

With this in mind, the program outlined in **Exhibit 1** was designed to meet this important need.

Why ROI?

HR/HRD training programs usually targeted for an ROI calculation are those perceived to be adding significant value to the company, and closely linked to the organizational goals and strategic objectives. The ROI calculation is then pursued to confirm the added value. Based on the results of the ROI analysis, these programs may be enhanced, redesigned, or eliminated if the ROI is negative. Stress management can be different. If the ROI analysis yields a negative value, the program may not be discontinued but may be altered for future sessions, particularly if behavior changes are not identified in the Level 3 evaluation.

At MEI, this program was chosen for a ROI calculation for two reasons. First, the HR, and Training and Education departments were interested in the accountability of all programs, including stress management. Second, a positive ROI would clearly show management that these types of programs, which are preventive in nature, can significantly contribute to the bottom line when they are implemented and supported by management.

Because the program can be expensive if applied to the entire company, it was decided to try it on a limited basis to determine its success and then make a decision to either adjust, discontinue, or expand the program to other areas in MEI. The ROI methodology provides the best information to make that decision. Six groups were planned.

Data Collection Plan

Exhibit 2 shows the data collection plan for the stress management program. Broad objectives were established for Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4 data collection. The data collection plan is comprehensive but necessary to meet all of the requirements at each of the four levels of data collection. The timing and responsibilities are detailed. For measuring learning, three tools were used. The **StressMap®** is one measure of learning in the awareness category. Completion of

this provides insight into stress factors and stress signals. In addition, built into the one-day program is an end-of-course self-assessment to measure learning. Finally, the facilitator has a brief checklist to indicate the extent of learning for the group.

At Level 3 data collection, the completion of the 21-day plan provides some evidence that the participants have changed behavior to reduce stress. A conference call is planned with the facilitator, team manager, and the team twenty-one days after the course. The provides a review of issues and addresses any concerns or barriers to further implementation. A follow-up session is planned with the team, co-facilitated by the manager and facilitator, approximately one to two weeks after the one-day program, to discuss changes in behavior and address barriers. To determine the extent to which the participants are using internal or external resources to address stress related problems, records of those requests will be reviewed for approximately six months. Finally, a detailed follow-up questionnaire is planned six months after the program to collect both Level 3 and 4 data. This questionnaire will capture sustained behavior changes, indicate barriers to improvement, and identify impact measures for both groups and individuals.

Group records reveal changes in medical costs, absenteeism, turnover, and productivity six months after the program. In addition, increased job satisfaction will be determined from the follow-up questionnaire which will be administered six months after the program (i.e., the same questionnaire described earlier).

ROI Analysis Plan

Exhibit 3 shows the ROI Analysis Plan. For most data items, the method to isolate the effects of training will be obtained in a control group arrangement where the performance of the group involved in the program will be compared to a carefully matched companion control group. In addition, for most of the data items, trend line analysis will be utilized. Historical data are projected in a trend and compared with the actual data to determine the impact of the program.

The methods of converting data involve a variety of approaches including tabulation of direct costs, using standard values, using external data, and securing estimates from a variety of target audiences. The cost categories represent fully loaded costs for the program. Expected intangible benefits from the program are based on the experience of other organizations and other stress reduction programs. The communication target audience shows six key groups ranging from corporate and business unit managers to participants and their immediate supervisors.

Questions for discussion:

| 1) | resources are needed to accomplish this? | what tools and |
|----|--|----------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| 2) | What criteria should be established to set up the control groups so that the groups are matched appropriately? |
|----|---|
| 3) | Identify the major issues and topics planned for the follow-up questionnaire to be administered six months after the program. Include questions to capture the impact of the program on participants and the group. |
| | |
| 4) | What response rate would you expect from the questionnaire and how can it be improved? |
| | |

Stress Management for Intact Work Teams

Departments or work groups of 10 or more people who are committed to improving the satisfaction and effectiveness of their teams will benefit by this more comprehensive approach to Stress. The process uses the **StressMap**[®] tool as the starting point. Managers and representative employees will participate in focus groups to identify work satisfiers and distressors and then will collaborate on alleviating systemic sources of stress.

What Group Members Will Learn:

- Identify sources of stress and personal response to them.
- That individuals have the ability to make a difference in their lives.
- How to take the first steps to enhance personal health and overall performance.
- How to access resources, internally and externally, to help teach personal goals.

What the Group / Manager Will Learn:

- Group profile of sources of stress and response patterns.
- Additional information on sources of both work distress and work satisfaction will be obtained through focus groups. Themes will be identified where possible.
- New stress reduction skills specific to the needs of the group.
- Participate in development of recommendations for next steps to take to improve work satisfaction and productivity.

Highlights:

- Through completion of a comprehensive self assessment tool called **StressMap**® individuals will be able to immediately score themselves on 21 stress scales dealing with work and home life as well as learn about their preferred coping styles and the thinking and feeling patterns that impact their ability to manage stress. Anonymous copies of each members **StressMap**® will be compiled to create a group score.
- A 3-4 hour **StressMap**® debriefing session designed to help individuals better interpret their scores will be followed by a 4 hour module suited to the needs of the group (such as situation mastery, changing habits, creating climate for agreement). Total of one day.

Precourse Requirements:

• Management commitment to the process. Employees to complete the **StressMap**[®] tool and submit a confidential copy.

Length and Format:

- Lead time of 3 to 4 weeks minimum for preparation and communication.
- Consultant on-site a day and a half.

• Initial follow-up 1 to 2 weeks later on-site or by phone to senior management. Subsequent follow-up on impact of the initiative to occur as negotiated. 3-4 hours of telephone follow-up included.

Cost:

• **Approximately** \$xxxx (plus taxes) US per group of 8 to 25 \$xx US per set of materials. Travel and living expenses for consultant are additional.

Program: Stress Management for Intact Groups Responsibility: Jack Phillips Date: January 15, 1997

Evaluation Plan: Data Collection

| Level | Broad Program Objective(s) | Data Collection Method | Timing of Data Collection | Responsibilities for Data Collection |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| I Reaction, Satisfaction and Planned Actions | Positive ReactionSuggestions for ImprovementsPlanned Action | Standard Questionnaire21 Day Action Plan | End of One Day CourseEnd of Course | FacilitatorFacilitator |
| II Learning | Personal Stress Awareness Coping Strategies Stress Reduction Skills | StressMap®Self AssessmentFacilitator Assessment | Prior to CourseEnd of CourseEnd of Course | FacilitatorFacilitatorFacilitator |
| III Job Application | Change Behavior to Reduce Stress Develop Group Action Plan and Communicate to Group Access Internal/External Resources Application of Skills/Knowledge | Completion of 21 Day Plan Conference Call Follow Up Session Review Records Follow-up Questionnaire | 21 Days After Course 21 Days After Course 1-2 Weeks After One Day Course 6 Months After Course 6 Months After Course | No Report Facilitator Facilitator/Manager Program Coordinator External Consultant |
| IV Business Impact | Reduce Medical Care Costs Reduce Absenteeism Reduce Turnover Increase Productivity Increase Job Satisfaction | Group Records Group Records Group Records Group Records Follow-Up Questionnaire | 6 Months After Course | Program Coordinator Program Coordinator Program Coordinator Program Coordinator External Consultant |

Copyright 2000 The Jack Phillips Center for Research

Program: Stress Management for Intact Groups Responsibility: Jack Phillips Date: January 15, 1997

Evaluation Plan: ROI Analysis

| Data Items Medical Health Care Costs - Preventable Claims | Methods of Isolating the Effects of the Program • Control Group Arrangement • Trendline Analysis | Methods of Converting Data • Direct Costs | Cost Categories • Needs Assessment • Program Development | Intangible Benefits Improved Communication Time Savings Fewer Conflicts | Other Influences/Issues • Match Groups Appropriately • Limit Communication with Control | Communication Targets • Program Participants • Intact Team/Manager | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Absenteeism | Control Group Arrangement Trend Line Analysis | Supervisor EstimationStandard Value | • Participant • Impro | Estimation • Participant Salaries/Benefits • Participant Travel • Improvement in Problem Solving | Participant Salaries/Benefits Participant Travel (if applicable) Improvement in Problem Solving Check for Teal Building Init During Programment in Problem Solving Monitor | Group • Check for Team Building Initiatives During Program | Senior Manager/ Management in Business Units Training and |
| Employee Turnover | Control Group Trend Line Analysis | External Study - Cost of Turnover in High Tech Industry Management Review | Facilitator Meeting Facilities (Room, Food, Beverages) Program Coordinator | | Activities During Program • 6 Groups will be Monitored | Education Staff Safety and Health Staff Senior Corporate Management | |
| Employee Job Satisfaction | Control Group ArrangementManagement Estimation | Management Estimation | Training and Education OverheadEvaluation Costs | | | Prospective Team Leaders | |
| Employee/Group Productivity | Control Group ArrangementTrend Line Analysis | Standard ValuesManagement Estimation | | | | | |

Copyright 2000 The Jack Phillips Center for Research

MIDWEST ELECTRIC, INC. (D)

Management Involvement

Management involvement was a key issue from the very beginning and was integrated throughout the design of the program. The manager serves as the team leader for the program, although a facilitator provides assistance and conducts a one-day workshop. **Exhibit 4** illustrates the tool used for identifying initial problems as the work group began utilizing the Stress Management program. With this brief questionnaire, the manager identifies specific problem areas and provides appropriate comments and details. This exercise allows program planning to focus on the problems and provides guidance to the facilitator and the team.

Manager responsibility and involvement for the process is illustrated in **Exhibit 5**. This handout, provided directly to the managers, details twelve specific areas of responsibility and involvement for the managers. Collectively, initial planning, program design, and detailing of responsibilities pushed the manager into a higher profile position in the program.

Control Group Arrangement

The appropriateness of control groups was reviewed in this setting. If a stress reduction program is needed, it would be appropriate and ethical to withhold the program for certain groups while the experiment is being conducted. It was concluded that this approach was appropriate because the impact of the planned program was in question. Although it was clear that stress-induced problems exist at MEI, there was no guarantee that this program would correct them. Six control groups were planned. The control group arrangement was diligently pursued because it represented the best approach to isolate the effects of the program, if the groups could be matched.

Several criteria were available for group selection. **Exhibit 6** shows the data collection instrument used to identify groups for a control group arrangement. At the first cut, only those groups that had the same measures were considered (i.e., at least 75% of the measures were common in the group). This action provided an opportunity to compare performance in the six months preceding the program.

Next, only groups in the same function code were used. At MEI, all groups were assigned a code depending on the type of work, such as finance and accounting or engineering. Thus, each experimental group had to be in the same code as the matched control group. It was also required that all six groups be spread over at least three different codes.

Two other variables were used in the matching process: group size and tenure. The number of employees in the groups had to be within a 20% spread and the average tenure had to be within a two year range. At MEI, as with many other utilities, there is a very high average tenure rate. Although other variables could be used to make the match, these five were considered to be the most influential in the outcome. In summary, the following criteria were used to select the two sets of groups:

• Same measures of performance

- Similar performance in the previous six months
- Same function code
- Similar size
- Similar tenure

The six pairs of groups represented a total level of employment of 138 team members for the experimental groups, and 132 team members and six managers for the control groups.

Data Collection

Exhibit 7 shows the data collection instrument for participants. A similar, slightly modified instrument was used with the managers. In all, 73% of the participants returned the questionnaire. This excellent response rate is due, in part, to a variety of actions taken to ensure an appropriate response rate. Some of the most important actions were:

- The team manager distributed the questionnaire and encouraged participants to return it to the external consulting firm. The manager also provided a follow-up reminder.
- A full explanation of how the evaluation data would be utilized was provided to participants.
- The questionnaire was reviewed during the follow-up session.
- Two types of incentives were used.
- Participants were promised a copy of the questionnaire results.

Results: Application

The application of the program was considered an outstanding success with 92% of the participants completing their 21-day action plan. A conference call at the end of the 21 days showed positive feedback and much enthusiasm for the progress made. The follow-up session also demonstrated success, because most of the participants had indicated changes in behavior.

The most comprehensive application data came from the six-month questionnaire administered to participants and managers. The following skills and behaviors were reported as achieving significant success:

- Taking full responsibility for your actions.
- Identifying or removing barriers to change behavior.
- Applying coping strategies to manage stressful situations.
- Responding effectively to conflict.
- Creating a positive climate.
- Acknowledging a complaint properly.

Coworkers were the most frequently cited group in which relationships had improved through use of the skills, with 95% indicating application improvement with this group.

Barriers

Information collected throughout the process, including the two follow-up questionnaires, indicated few barriers to implementing the process. The two most frequently listed barriers were:

- Not enough time.
- The work environment does not support the process.

Management Support

Manager support seemed to be quite effective. The most frequently listed behaviors of managers were:

- Managers set goals for change and improvement.
- Managers discussed how the program can apply to the work group.

Results: Impact

The impact of the program was very significant with regard to both perceptions and actual values. On **Exhibit 7**, the follow-up questionnaire, 90% of the participants perceived this program as a good investment for MEI. In addition, participants perceived that this program had a significant influence on:

- Employee satisfaction
- Absenteeism
- Turnover
- Health care cost
- Safety and health cost

This assessment appears to support the actual improvement data outlined below. For each measure below, only the team data were collected and presented. Since managers were not the target of the program, manager performance data were not included. An average of months five and six was used consistently for the post-program data analysis, instead of the sixth month, to eliminate the spike effect.

<u>Health Care Costs</u> Health care costs for employees were categorized by diagnostic code; thus, it was a simple process to track the cost of stress-induced illnesses. Although there were few differences shown in the first three months after the program began, by month five and six an average difference of \$120 per employee per month was identified. This was apparently due to the lack of stress-related incidents and the subsequent medical costs resulting from the stress. It was believed that this amount would be an appropriate improvement to use. The trend line projection of health care costs was inconclusive because of the variability of the medical care costs prior to the program. A consistent trend could not be identified.

<u>Absenteeism</u> There was significant differences of absenteeism in the two groups. The average absenteeism for the control group for months five and six was 4.65%. The absenteeism rate for the groups involved in the program was 3.2%. Employees worked an average of 220 days. The trend line analysis appeared to support the absenteeism reduction. Because no other issues were identified that could have influenced absenteeism during this time period, the trend line analysis provided an accurate estimate of the impact.

<u>Turnover Costs</u> Although turnover at MEI was traditionally low, in the last two years it had increased due to significant changes in the workplace. A turnover reduction was identified using the differences in the control group and experimental group. The control group had an average annual turnover rate for months five and six of 19.2%. The experimental group had an average of 14.1% for the same two months. As with absenteeism, the trend line analysis supported the turnover reduction.

<u>Productivity</u> Control group differences showed no significant improvement in productivity. Of all the measures collected, the productivity measure was the most difficult to match between the two groups, which may account for the inconclusive results. Also, the trend line differences showed some slight improvement, but not enough to develop an actual value for productivity changes.

<u>Job Satisfaction</u> Because of the timing difference in collecting attitude survey data, complete job satisfaction data were not available. Participants did provide input on the extent to which they felt the program actually influenced job satisfaction. The results were very positive, with a significant influence rating for that variable. Because of the subjective nature of job satisfaction and the difficulties with measurement, a value was not assigned to job satisfaction.

Results: Intangible Benefits

Several intangible benefits were identified in the study and confirmed by actual input from participants and questionnaires. The following benefits were pinpointed:

- employee satisfaction
- teamwork
- improved relationships with family and friends
- time savings
- improved image in the company
- fewer conflicts

No attempt was made to place monetary values on any of the intangibles.

Monetary Values

The determination of monetary benefits for program were developed using the methods outlined in the ROI Analysis Plan. A standard value has routinely been used at MEI to reflect the cost of

an absence. The value is 1.25 times the average daily wage rate. For the experimental group, the average wage rate was \$123 per day. The six team managers estimated a larger value of \$174. For employee turnover, several turnover cost studies are available which reveal a value of 85% of annual base pay. As expected, senior managers felt that this cost of turnover was slightly overstated and preferred to use a value of 70%.

Program Costs

Calculating the cost of the program follows the categories outlined in the evaluation plan. For needs assessment, all of the costs were fully allocated to the six groups. Although the needs assessment was necessary, the total cost of needs assessment, \$16,500, was included. All program development costs were estimated at \$4,800. The program could possibly be spread through other parts of the organization which would ultimately be prorated across all the sessions. However, the costs were low because the materials were readily available for most of the effort and the total development cost was used. The program materials were \$95 per participant.

The salaries for the team members averaged \$31,980, while the six team managers had average salaries of \$49,140. The benefits factor for MEI is 37% for both groups. Although the program took a little more than one day of staff time, one day of program time was considered sufficient for cost. The participants travel cost (\$38 per participant) was very low because the programs were conducted in the area. The facilitator cost, program coordination, and training and development overhead costs were estimated to be \$10,800. The meeting room facilities, food, and refreshments averaged \$22 per participant. Evaluation costs were \$22,320. It was decided that all of the evaluation costs would be allocated to these six groups. This determination was extremely conservative since the evaluation costs could be pro-rated if the program was implemented over other areas.

Questions for discussion:

| What are the total monetary benefits for the program? |
|---|
| |
| What is the total cost of the program? |
| |
| |

| How could the results be communicated to various groups? |
|--|
| |
| Should this study influence policies and practices? |
| |
| |

Manager Input: Potential Area for ImprovementStress Reduction For Intact Work Teams

Before you begin the Stress Reduction program for your team, it is important to capture specific concerns that you have about your work group. Some of these concerns may be stress related and consequently may be used to help structure specific goals and objectives for your team. For each of the following potential areas of improvement, please check all that apply to your group. Add others if appropriate. Next to the item provide specific comments to detail your concerns and indicate if you think that this concern may be related to excessive stress.

| | Employee Turnover. Comments: |
|----------|---|
| | |
| | |
| | Employee Absenteeism. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Employee Complaints. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Morale/Job Satisfaction. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Conflicts With the Team. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Productivity. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Quality. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| 1 | Customer Satisfaction. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Customer Service. Comments: |
| | |
| | W I D II G |
| | Work Backlog. Comments: |
| ч | |
| | Delever Community |
| | Delays. Comments |
| | |
| | Other Areas. List and Provide Comments: |
| | Other Areas. List and Provide Comments: |
| _ | |
| | |

Manager Responsibility and Involvement Stress Management For Intact Work Teams

With the team approach, the team manager should:

- 1. Have a discussion with the trainer to share reasons for interest in stress reduction and the desired outcome of the program. Gain a greater understanding of the **StressMap**® and the OD approach. Discuss recent changes in the work group and identify any known stressors. This meeting could be held with the Senior Manager or the Senior Management Team.
- 2. Identify any additional work group members for the consultant to call to gather preliminary information.
- 3. Appoint a project coordinator, preferably an individual with good organizing and influencing skills who is respected by the work group.
- 4. Send out a letter inviting the group to participate in the program with personal endorsement and signature.
- 5. Allocate 8 hours of work time per employee for completion of **StressMap**® and attendance at a **StressMap**® debriefing and customized course.
- 6. Schedule a focus group after discussing desired group composition with the facilitator. Ideal size is 10 22 participants. Manager should not attend.
- 7. Attend the workshop and ensure that direct reports attend.
- 8. Participate in the follow-up meeting held after the last workshop, either in person or by conference call. Other participants to include are the HR representative for your area, the Safety and Health representative for your area, and your management team. The trainer will provide you feedback about the groups issues and make recommendations of actions to take to reduce work stress or increase work satisfaction
- 9. Commit to an action plan to reduce workplace distress and/or increase workplace satisfaction after thoughtfully considering feedback.
- 10. Communicate the action plan to your work group.
- 11. Schedule and participate in a 21 day follow-up call with the consultant and your work group.
- 12. Work with your team (Managers, HR, Safety and Health, Facilitator) to evaluate the success of the action plan and determine next steps.

Manager Input: Group Measures and Characteristics Stress Management For Intact Work Teams

To measure the progress of your team, a brief profile of performance measures for employees and your work group is needed. This information will be helpful to determine the feasibility of using your group in a pilot study to measure the impact of the Stress Management program. Changes in performance measures will be monitored for six months after the program.

Listed below are several categories of measures for your work group. Check the appropriate category and please indicate the specific measure under the description. In addition, indicate if it is a group measure or an individual measure. If other measures are available in other categories, please include them under "Other".

Key Performance Measures

Group Characteristics

Number in group _____.

Average tenure for group _____ years. Average job grade for group _____.

| Performance | Measure | Description of Measure | Group Measure | Individual Measure |
|------------------|---------|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Category | 1. | Measure | Measure | Measure |
| Productivity | · · | | | <u> </u> |
| | 2. | | U | U |
| Efficiency | 3. | | | |
| | 4. | | | |
| Quality | 5. | | | |
| | 6. | | | |
| Response Time | 7. | | | |
| | 8. | | | |
| Cost Control/ | 9. | | | |
| Budgets | 10. | | | |
| Customer | 11. | | | |
| Satisfaction | 12. | | | |
| Absenteeism | 13. | | | |
| Turnover | 14. | | | |
| Morale/ | 15. | | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 16. | | | |
| Other | 17. | | | |
| (Please specify) | 18. | | | |
| | 19. | | | |
| | 20. | | | |

Stress Management for Intact Work Teams Impact Questionnaire

| OBJECTIVES | Failed | Limited Success | Generally Successful | Complete Successfu |
|--|--------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| PERSONAL | | 200000 | | |
| • Identify sources of stress in work, personal, and family worlds. | | | | |
| Apply coping strategies to manage stressful situations. | | | | |
| Understand to what degree stress is hampering your health and performance | | | | |
| Take steps to enhance personal health and overall performance | | | | |
| Access internal and external resources to help reach personal goals | | | | |
| GROUP | | | | |
| • Identify sources of stress for group | | | | |
| Identify sources of distress and satisfaction | | | | |
| Apply skills to manage and reduce stress in work group | | | | |
| Develop action plan to improve work group effectiveness | | | | |
| Improve effectiveness and efficiency measures for work group | | | | |

| 3. | Please rate, on a scale of 1-5, the relevan (1) indicating no relevance, and (5) indicating no relevance. | ance of each of the program elements to your job, with icating very relevant. |
|----|---|---|
| | StressMap® Instrument | Action Planning |
| | Group Discussion | Program Content |
| 4 | Please indicate the degree of success in | applying the following skills and behaviors as a result |

4. Please indicate the degree of success in applying the following skills and behaviors as a result of your participation in the Stress Hardy Program.

| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
|----|---|----|--------|------|-------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| | | No | Little | Some | Significant | Very Much | No Opportunity To Use Skills |
| a) | Selecting containable behavior for change | | | | | | |
| b) | Identify measures of behavior | | | | | | |
| c) | Taking full responsibility for your actions | | | | | | |
| d) | Selecting a buddy to help you change behavior | | | | | | |
| e) | Identifying and removing barriers to changing behavior | | | | | | |
| f) | Identifying and using enablers to help change behavior | | | | | | |
| g) | Staying on track with the 21 day action plan | | | | | | |
| h) | Applying coping strategies to manage stressful situations | | | | | | |
| i) | Using control effectively | | | | | | |
| j) | Knowing when to let go | | | | | | |
| k) | Responding effectively to conflict | | | | | | |
| 1) | Creating a positive climate | | | | | | |
| m) | Acknowledging a complaint properly | | | | | | |
| n) | Reframing problems | | | | | | |
| o) | Using stress talk strategies | | | | | | |

| When did you first use one of the skills from the program? |
|--|
| During the program |
| Day(s) after the program (indicate number) |
| Week(s) after the program (indicate number) |
| Indicate the types of relationships where you have used the skills. |
| ☐ Co-workers |
| ☐ Manager or supervisor |
| ☐ MEI employee in another function |
| □ Spouse |
| □ Child □ Friend |
| ☐ Other: (list) |
| |
| PERSONAL CHANGES |
| What has changed about your on-the-job behavior as a result of this program? (positive attitude, fewer conflicts, better organized, fewer outbursts of anger, etc.) |
| |
| |
| |
| Pagagnizing the changes in our own behavior and paraentions, places identify any specific |
| Recognizing the changes in our own behavior and perceptions, please identify any specific personal accomplishments/improvements that you can link to this program (time savings, project completion, fewer mistakes, etc.) |
| personal accomplishments/improvements that you can link to this program (time savings, |
| personal accomplishments/improvements that you can link to this program (time savings, project completion, fewer mistakes, etc.) |
| what specific value in U.S. dollars can be attributed to the above accomplishment improvements? While this is a difficult question, try to think of specific ways in which the specific |
| what specific value in U.S. dollars can be attributed to the above accomplishment improvements? While this is a difficult question, try to think of specific ways in which the above improvements can be converted to monetary units. Use one year of data. Along w |
| personal accomplishments/improvements that you can link to this program (time savings, project completion, fewer mistakes, etc.) What specific value in U.S. dollars can be attributed to the above accomplishment improvements? While this is a difficult question, try to think of specific ways in which |
| |

| PERSONAL CHANGES (continued) |
|--|
| 11. What level of confidence do you place on the above estimations? (0% = No Confidence, 100% = Certainty) % |
| 12. Other factors often influence improvements in performance. Please indicate the percent of the above improvement that is related directly to this program % |
| Please explain. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| GROUP CHANGES |
| 13. What has changed about your work group as a result of your group's participation in this program? (interactions, cooperation, commitment, problem solving, creativity, etc.) |
| 14. Please identify any specific group accomplishments/improvements that you can link to the program (project completion, response times, innovative approaches) |
| 15. What specific value in U.S. dollars can be attributed to the above accomplishments/improvements? While this is a difficult question, try to think of specific ways in which the above improvements can be converted to monetary units. Use one year of values. Along with the monetary value, please indicate the basis of your calculation. |
| \$ Basis |
| |
| |
| 16. What level of confidence do you place on the above estimations? (0% = No Confidence, 100% = Certainty) % |
| 17. Other factors often influence improvements in performance. Please indicate the percent of the above improvement that is related directly to this program |
| |
| |
| |

| | o you think this program represented a good investment for MEI? Yes □ No □ |
|---|---|
|] | lease explain. |
| | |
|] | What barriers, if any, have you encountered that have prevented you from using skills or nowledge gained in this program? Check all that apply. Please explain, if possible. Not enough time The work environment doesn't support it Management doesn't support it |
| | The information is not useful (comments) Other |
| | Which of the following best describes the actions of your manager during the Stress Management program. |
| | Very little discussion or reference to the program |
| | Casual mention of program with few specifics |
| | Discussed details of program in terms of content, issues, concerns, etc. |
| | Discussed how the program could be applied to work group. |
| | Set goals for changes/improvements. |
| | Provided on-going feedback on the action plan. |
| | Provided encouragement and support to help change behavior. Other (comments) |

21. For each of the areas below, indicate the extent to which you think this program has influenced these measures in your work group.

| | No Influence | Some Influence | Moderate Influence | Significant Influence | Very Much Influence |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| a) Productivity | Innuciec | Illiuclicc | Imiuciicc | Innuciac | Imidence |
| b) Efficiency | | | | | |
| c) Quality | | | | | |
| d) Response Time | | | | | |
| e) Cost Control | | | | | |
| f) Customer Service | | | | | |
| g) Customer Satisfaction | | | | | |
| h) Employee Turnover | | | | | |
| i) Absenteeism | | | | | |
| j) Employee Satisfaction | | | | | |
| k) Health Care Costs | | | | | - |
| 1) Safety and Health Costs | · | | | | - |

| | Please cite specific examples or provide more details. |
|-----|--|
| | |
| | |
| 22. | What specific suggestions do you have for improving the Stress Management program? |
| | Please specify. |
| | □ Content |
| | □ Duration |
| | □ Presentation |
| | □ Other |
| | |
| 23. | Other comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | |

MIDWEST ELECTRIC (E)

Monetary Benefits

The total economic benefits are illustrated in **Table 1**.

TABLE 1 ANNUAL MONETARY BENEFITS FOR 138 PARTICIPANTS

| | | | Annual Improvement |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| | Monthly Difference | Unit Value | Value |
| Medical Costs | \$120 | | \$198,720 |
| Absenteeism | 1.45% | \$153.75 | \$67,684 |
| Turnover | 5.1% (annualized) | \$22,386 | \$157,553 |
| | | TOTAL | \$423,957 |

The medical costs are converted directly. A \$120 per month savings yields a \$198,720 annual benefit. Other values are as follows:

Unit Value for an Absence \$123 x 1.25 = \$153.75

Unit Value for Turnover \$31,980 x 70% = \$22,386

Improvement for Absenteeism 138 employees x 220 workdays x 1.45% x \$153.75 = \$67,684

Improvement for Turnover 138 employees x 5.1% x \$22,386 = \$157,553

No values were used for productivity or job satisfaction.

Program Costs

The costs for the program are detailed in **Table 2**.

TABLE 2 PROGRAM COSTS

| COST CATEGORY | TOTAL COST |
|--|------------|
| Needs Assessment | \$16,500 |
| Program Development | 4,800 |
| Program Materials (144 x \$95) | 13,680 |
| Participant Salaries / Benefits Based on 1 day 138 x \$123 x 1.37 and 6 x 189 x 1.37 | 24,108 |
| Travel and Lodging 144 x 38 | 5,472 |
| Facilitation, Coordination, T&E Overhead | 10,800 |
| Meeting Room, Food, and Refreshments 144 X 22 | 3,168 |
| Evaluation Costs | 22,320 |
| TOTAL | \$100,848 |

The costs were considered to be fully loaded with no proration except for needs assessment. Additional time could have been used for participants' off-the-job activities. However, it was concluded one day should be sufficient (for the one day program.)

Results: ROI

The return on investment and the benefits/cost ratio are shown below.

BCR =
$$\frac{\$423,957}{\$100,848} = 4.20$$
ROI =
$$\frac{\$423,957 - 100,848}{\$100,848} = 320\%$$

Although this number is considered to be very large, it is still conservative because of the following assumptions and adjustments:

• Only first year values have been used. The program should actually have second and third year benefits.

- Control group differences were used in the analysis which is often the most effective way to isolate the effects of the program. These differences were also confirmed with the trendline analysis.
- The participants provided additional monetary benefits, detailed on the questionnaires. Although they could have been added to the total numbers, these benefits were not included since only 23 participants of the 144 supplied values for those questions.
- The cost are fully loaded.

When considering these adjustments, the value should represent a realistic value calculation for the actual return on investment.

Communication Strategies

The communications follows the strategy outlined in **Table 3**. Three separate documents were developed to communicate with the different target groups in a variety of ways.

TABLE 3
COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

| Communication Document | Communication Target | Distribution |
|--|--|--|
| Complete report with appendices (75 pages) | Training And Education Staff Safety and Health Staff Intact Team Manager | Distributed and discussed in a special meeting |
| Executive Summary (8 pages) | Senior Management in the Business Units Senior Corporate Management | Distributed and discussed in routine meeting |
| General Interest overview and Summary without the actual ROI calculation (10 pages) | Program Participants | Mailed with letter |
| Brochure highlighting program, objectives, and specific results | Prospective Team Leaders | Included with other program descriptions |

Policy and Practice Implications

Because of the significance of the study and the information, two issues became policy. Whenever programs are considered that involve large groups of employees or a significant investment of funds, a detailed needs assessment will be conducted to ensure that the proper program is developed. Also, an ROI study is conducted for a small group of programs to measure the impact before complete implementation. In essence, this influenced the policy and practice on needs assessment, pilot program evaluation, and the number of impact studies developed.

Stress Management for Intact Work Teams

Departments or work groups of 10 or more people who are committed to improving the satisfaction and effectiveness of their teams will benefit by this more comprehensive approach to Stress. The process uses the **StressMap**[®] tool as the starting point. Managers and representative employees will participate in focus groups to identify work satisfiers and distressors and then will collaborate on alleviating systemic sources of stress.

What Group Members Will Learn:

- Identify sources of stress and personal response to them.
- That individuals have the ability to make a difference in their lives.
- How to take the first steps to enhance personal health and overall performance.
- How to access resources, internally and externally, to help teach personal goals.

What the Group / Manager Will Learn:

- Group profile of sources of stress and response patterns.
- Additional information on sources of both work distress and work satisfaction will be obtained through focus groups. Themes will be identified where possible.
- New stress reduction skills specific to the needs of the group.
- Participate in development of recommendations for next steps to take to improve work satisfaction and productivity.

Highlights:

- Through completion of a comprehensive self assessment tool called **StressMap**® individuals will be able to immediately score themselves on 21 stress scales dealing with work and home life as well as learn about their preferred coping styles and the thinking and feeling patterns that impact their ability to manage stress. Anonymous copies of each members **StressMap**® will be compiled to create a group score.
- A 3-4 hour **StressMap**® debriefing session designed to help individuals better interpret their scores will be followed by a 4 hour module suited to the needs of the group (such as situation mastery, changing habits, creating climate for agreement). Total of one day.

Precourse Requirements:

• Management commitment to the process. Employees to complete the **StressMap**[®] tool and submit a confidential copy.

Length and Format:

- Lead time of 3 to 4 weeks minimum for preparation and communication.
- Consultant on-site a day and a half.

• Initial follow-up 1 to 2 weeks later on-site or by phone to senior management. Subsequent follow-up on impact of the initiative to occur as negotiated. 3-4 hours of telephone follow-up included.

Cost:

Approximately xxxx (plus taxes) US per group of 8 to 25 xx US per set of materials. Travel and living expenses for consultant are additional

Program: Stress Management for Intact Groups Responsibility: Jack Phillips Date: January 15, 1997

Evaluation Plan: Data Collection

| Level | Broad Program Objective(s) | Data Collection Method | Timing of Data Collection | Responsibilities for Data Collection |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| I Reaction, Satisfaction and Planned Actions | Positive ReactionSuggestions for ImprovementsPlanned Action | Standard Questionnaire21 Day Action Plan | End of One Day CourseEnd of Course | FacilitatorFacilitator |
| II Learning | Personal Stress Awareness Coping Strategies Stress Reduction Skills | StressMap®Self AssessmentFacilitator Assessment | Prior to CourseEnd of CourseEnd of Course | FacilitatorFacilitatorFacilitator |
| III Job Application | Change Behavior to Reduce Stress Develop Group Action Plan and Communicate to Group Access Internal/External Resources Application of Skills/Knowledge | Completion of 21 Day Plan Conference Call Follow Up Session Review Records Follow-up Questionnaire | 21 Days After Course 21 Days After Course 1-2 Weeks After One Day Course 6 Months After Course 6 Months After Course | No Report Facilitator Facilitator/Manager Program Coordinator External Consultant |
| IV Business Impact | Reduce Medical Care Costs Reduce Absenteeism Reduce Turnover Increase Productivity Increase Job Satisfaction | Group Records Group Records Group Records Group Records Follow-Up Questionnaire | 6 Months After Course | Program Coordinator Program Coordinator Program Coordinator Program Coordinator External Consultant |

Copyright 2000 The Jack Phillips Center for Research

Program: Stress Management for Intact Groups Responsibility: Jack Phillips Date: January 15, 1997

Evaluation Plan: ROI Analysis

| Data Items Medical Health Care Costs - Preventable Claims | Methods of Isolating the Effects of the Program Control Group Arrangement Trendline Analysis | Methods of Converting Data • Direct Costs | Cost Categories Needs Assessment Program Development | Intangible Benefits Improved Communication Time Savings Fewer Conflicts | Other Influences/Issues Match Groups Appropriately Limit Communication with Control | Communication Targets Program Participants Intact Team/Manager |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Absenteeism | Control Group Arrangement Trend Line Analysis | Supervisor EstimationStandard Value | Program Materials Participant Salaries/Benefits Participant Travel (if applicable) | TeamworkImprovement in Problem Solving | Group Check for Team Building Initiatives During Program Monitor Restructuring | Senior Manager/ Management in Business Units Training and |
| Employee Turnover | Control Group Trend Line Analysis | External Study - Cost of Turnover in High Tech Industry Management Review | Facilitator Meeting Facilities (Room, Food, Beverages) Program Coordinator | | Activities During Program • 6 Groups will be Monitored | Education Staff Safety and Health Staff Senior Corporate Management |
| Employee Job Satisfaction | Control Group ArrangementManagement Estimation | Management Estimation | Training and Education OverheadEvaluation Costs | | | Prospective Team Leaders |
| Employee/Group Productivity | Control Group ArrangementTrend Line Analysis | Standard ValuesManagement Estimation | | | | |

Copyright 2000 The Jack Phillips Center for Research

Manager Input: Potential Area for Improvement Stress Reduction For Intact Work Teams

Before you begin the Stress Reduction program for your team, it is important to capture specific concerns that you have about your work group. Some of these concerns may be stress related and consequently may be used to help structure specific goals and objectives for your team. For each of the following potential areas of improvement, please check all that apply to your group. Add others if appropriate. Next to the item provide specific comments to detail your concerns and indicate if you think that this concern may be related to excessive stress.

| | Employee Turnover. Comments: |
|---|---|
| | |
| | Employee Absenteeism. Comments: |
| | Emproyee Aosenteeism. Comments. |
| _ | |
| | Employee Complaints. Comments: |
| | |
| | M 1/110 c C c C |
| | Morale/Job Satisfaction. Comments: |
| _ | |
| | Conflicts With the Team. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Productivity. Comments: |
| _ | |
| | Quality. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Customer Satisfaction. Comments: |
| | |
| | Customer Service. Comments: |
| | |
| | |
| | Work Backlog. Comments: |
| | |
| | Delays. Comments |
| | y |
| | |
| | Other Areas. List and Provide Comments: |
| | |
| | |

Manager Responsibility and Involvement Stress Management For Intact Work Teams

With the team approach, the team manager should:

- 1. Have a discussion with the trainer to share reasons for interest in stress reduction and the desired outcome of the program. Gain a greater understanding of the **StressMap®** and the OD approach. Discuss recent changes in the work group and identify any known stressors. This meeting could be held with the Senior Manager or the Senior Management Team.
- 2. Identify any additional work group members for the consultant to call to gather preliminary information.
- 3. Appoint a project coordinator, preferably an individual with good organizing and influencing skills who is respected by the work group.
- 4. Send out a letter inviting the group to participate in the program with personal endorsement and signature.
- 5. Allocate 8 hours of work time per employee for completion of **StressMap**® and attendance at a **StressMap**® debriefing and customized course.
- 6. Schedule a focus group after discussing desired group composition with the facilitator. Ideal size is 10 22 participants. Manager should not attend.
- 7. Attend the workshop and ensure that direct reports attend.
- 8. Participate in the follow-up meeting held after the last workshop, either in person or by conference call. Other participants to include are the HR representative for your area, the Safety and Health representative for your area, and your management team. The trainer will provide you feedback about the groups issues and make recommendations of actions to take to reduce work stress or increase work satisfaction
- 9. Commit to an action plan to reduce workplace distress and/or increase workplace satisfaction after thoughtfully considering feedback.
- 10. Communicate the action plan to your work group.
- 11. Schedule and participate in a 21 day follow-up call with the consultant and your work group.
- 12. Work with your team (Managers, HR, Safety and Health, Facilitator) to evaluate the success of the action plan and determine next steps.

Manager Input: Group Measures and Characteristics Stress Management For Intact Work Teams

To measure the progress of your team, a brief profile of performance measures for employees and your work group is needed. This information will be helpful to determine the feasibility of using your group in a pilot study to measure the impact of the Stress Management program. Changes in performance measures will be monitored for six months after the program.

Listed below are several categories of measures for your work group. Check the appropriate category and please indicate the specific measure under the description. In addition, indicate if it is a group measure or an individual measure. If other measures are available in other categories, please include them under "Other".

| Performance | Measure | Description of | Group | Individua |
|-------------------|----------|----------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Category | | Measure | Measure | Measure |
| Productivity | 21. | | | |
| | 22. | | | |
| Efficiency | 23. | | | |
| | 24. | | | |
| Quality | 25. | | | |
| | 26. | | | |
| Response Time | 27. | | | |
| | 28. | | | |
| Cost Control/ | 29. | | | |
| Budgets | 30. | | | |
| Customer | 31. | | | |
| Satisfaction | 32. | | | |
| Absenteeism | 33. | | | |
| Turnover | 34. | | | |
| Morale/ | 35. | | | |
| Job Satisfaction | 36. | | | |
| Other | 37. | | | |
| (Please specify) | 38. | | | |
| | 39. | | | |
| | 40. | | | |
| Froup Character | istics | | | |
| verage tenure for | group ye | ears. Group function | on code | |
| verage job grade | | | | - |
| lumber in group _ | | | ational level | |

Stress Management for Intact Work Teams Impact Questionnaire

| OBJECTIVES | Failed | Limited Success | Generally Successful | Completely Successful |
|---|--------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| ERSONAL | | | | |
| Identify sources of stress in work, personal, and family worlds. | | | | |
| Apply coping strategies to manage stressful situations. | | | | |
| Understand to what degree stress is hampering your health and performance | | | | |
| Take steps to enhance personal health and overall performance | | | | |
| Access internal and external resources to help reach personal goals | | | | |
| <u>GROUP</u> | | | | |
| Identify sources of stress for group | | | | |
| Identify sources of distress and satisfaction | | | | |
| Apply skills to manage and reduce stress in work group | | | | |
| Develop action plan to improve work group effectiveness | | | | |
| Improve effectiveness and efficiency measures for work group | | | | |

If yes, please describe the success of the plan. If not, explain why.

| | StressMap® Instrument | | A | ction Plan | ning | | |
|-----|---|------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| | Group Discussion | | P1 | ogram Co | ontent | | |
| | se indicate the degree of succes e Stress Hardy Program. | ss in appl | ying the fo | llowing sl | cills and behav | viors as a | result of your |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | | No | Little | Some | Significant | Very Much | No Opportunity To Use Skills |
| o) | Selecting containable behavior for change | | | | | | |
| q) | Identify measures of behavior | | | | | | |
| r) | Taking full responsibility for your actions | | | | | | |
| s) | Selecting a buddy to help you change behavior | | | | | | |
| t) | Identifying and removing barriers to changing behavior | | | | | | |
| u) | Identifying and using enablers to help change behavior | | | | | | |
| v) | Staying on track with the 21 day action plan | | | | | | |
| w) | Applying coping strategies to manage stressful situations | | | | | | |
| x) | Using control effectively | | | | | | |
| y) | Knowing when to let go | | | | | | |
| z) | Responding effectively to conflict | | | | | | |
| aa) | Creating a positive climate | | | | | | |
| ob) | Acknowledging a complaint properly | | | | | | |
| cc) | Reframing problems | | | | | | |

dd) Using stress talk strategies

| 5. | List (3) behaviors or skills you have used most as a result of the Stress Management program. | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 6. | When did you first use one of the skills from the program? | |
| | During the program Day(s) after the program (indicate number) Week(s) after the program (indicate number) | |
| 7. | Indicate the types of relationships where you have used the skills. | |
| | □ Co-workers □ Manager or supervisor □ MEI employee in another function □ Spouse □ Child □ Friend □ Other: (list) | |
| 8. | PERSONAL CHANGES What has changed about your on-the-job behavior as a result of this program? (positive attitude, fewer conbetter organized, fewer outbursts of anger, etc.) | nflicts, |
| 9. | Recognizing the changes in our own behavior and perceptions, please identify any specific personal accomplishments/improvements that you can link to this program (time savings, project completion, fewer mistakes, etc.) | r |
| 10. | What specific value in U.S. dollars can be attributed to the above accomplishments/ improvements? What difficult question, try to think of specific ways in which the above improvements can be converted to units. Use one year of data. Along with the monetary value, please indicate the basis of your calls. | monetary |
| | Basis | |

| PERSONAL CHANGES (continued) |
|--|
| 11. What level of confidence do you place on the above estimations? (0% = No Confidence, 100% = Certainty) |
| 12. Other factors often influence improvements in performance. Please indicate the percent of the above improvement that is related directly to this program |
| Please explain |
| |
| GROUP CHANGES |
| 13. What has changed about your work group as a result of your group's participation in this program? (interactions, cooperation, commitment, problem solving, creativity, etc.) |
| 14. Please identify any specific group accomplishments/improvements that you can link to the program (project completion, response times, innovative approaches) |
| 15. What specific value in U.S. dollars can be attributed to the above accomplishments/improvements? While this is a difficult question, try to think of specific ways in which the above improvements can be converted to monetary units. Use one year of values. Along with the monetary value, please indicate the basis of your calculation. \$ |
| Basis |
| |
| 16. What level of confidence do you place on the above estimations? (0% = No Confidence 100% = Certainty) <u>%</u> |
| 17. Other factors often influence improvements in performance. Please indicate the percent of the above improvement that is related directly to this program |
| Please explain |
| |
| 18. Do you think this program represented a good investment for MEI? Yes□ No□ |
| Please explain |
| |

| . What barriers, if any, have you program? Check all that apply ☐ Not enough time ☐ The work environment doesn't supp ☐ The information is not use ☐ Other | esn't support ort it ful (commen | lain, if possibli it ts) | e. | m using skills (| or nowledge gai | ined ir |
|--|--|--|--|------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Which of the following best de ☐ Very little discussion or re ☐ Casual mention of program ☐ Discussed details of program ☐ Discussed how the program ☐ Set goals for changes/impn ☐ Provided on-going feedbact ☐ Provided encouragement at ☐ Other (comments) | ference to the with few spum in terms on could be appovements. It is on the action of support to the support to | e program ecifics of content, issued to work on plan. of help change | es, concerns, e group. behavior. | | anagement prog | gram. |
| . For each of the areas below, in your work group. | dicate the ex | tent to which | you think this p | program has inf | luenced these r | neasur |
| | No | Some | Moderate | Significant | Very Much | |
| m) Productivity | Influence | Influence | Influence | Influence | Influence | - |
| n) Efficiency | | | | | | |
| o) Quality | | | | | | |
| p) Response Time | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| - P | | | | | | |
| r) Customer Service | | | | | | |
| s) Customer Satisfaction | | | | | | _ |
| t) Employee Turnover | | | | | | |
| u) Absenteeism | | | | | | |
| v) Employee Satisfaction | | | | | | |
| w) Health Care Costs | | | | | | |
| x) Safety and Health | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | | |
| Please cite specific examples of | r provide mo | re details | | | | |
| Costs Please cite specific examples of the content | ou have for i | mproving the | Stress Manage | ement program | Please specify | y |
| ☐ Presentation | | | | | | |
| □ Other | | | | | | |
| . Other comments: | | | | | | |