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Do Health Promotion (Wellness) Programs Work?
What Do We Mean When We Say: A Wellness Program Works?

- “Make workers aware of their health and how it improves quality of life.”
- “High participation and engagement.”
- “Lose weight, stop smoking, exercise more.”
- “Medical claims costs should go down.”
- “Less absenteeism, fewer safety incidents.”
- “Attract the best talent.”
- “Happier workers with more energy.”
- “Create a culture of health.”
What Do We Mean When We Say: A Wellness Program Works? (con’t)

“Produce a positive return on investment (ROI)”
Why 'wellness' program scams cost employers and harm employees
Wellness At Work: Popular But Unproven

By Julie Rovner  |  December 9, 2014

If you get health insurance at work, chances are you have some sort of wellness plan, too. But so far there’s no real evidence as to whether these plans work.

One thing we do know is that wellness is particularly popular with employers right now, as they seek ways to slow the rise of health spending. These initiatives can range from urging workers to use the stairs all the way to requiring comprehensive health screenings. The 2014 survey of employers by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that 98 percent of large employers and 73 percent of smaller employers offer at least one wellness program. (Kaiser Health News is an editorially independent program of KFF.)
Do Workplace Wellness Programs Work? Usually Not

SEPT. 11, 2014

By Austin Frakt and Aaron E. Carroll

Most news coverage of the new Kaiser Family Foundation annual survey on employer-sponsored health plans has focused on the fact that growth in premiums in 2013 was as low as it has ever been in the 16 years of the survey. But buried in the details of the report are some interesting insights into how employers think about controlling health care costs. One example is that they’re very fond of workplace wellness programs. This is surprising, because while such programs sound great, research shows they rarely work as advertised.

Wellness programs aim to encourage workers to be more healthy. Many use financial incentives to motivate workers to monitor and improve their health, sometimes through lifestyle-modification programs aimed at lowering cholesterol or blood pressure, for instance. Some
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The RAND Study

In 2013, RAND published results from a federally funded study focused on workplace health promotion programs. The project was multifaceted and involved a literature review, site visits to companies, an employer survey, and analysis of a large multi-employer database comprising more than half a million employees whose medical and health risk records were analyzed over a period of several years, resulting in 1.8 million person-years of data. In media reports, the study purportedly “delivered a blow” to the wellness “industry” and “cast doubt” about programs’ effectiveness given the “grim” results.

Despite the media spin on the findings, the RAND study reported “significant,” “clinically meaningful,” and “long-lasting” improvements in employees’ weight, smoking status, and physical activity—but not in cholesterol values. In terms of financial outcomes, RAND found that participants had lower health care costs and reduced service utilization compared with statistically matched non-participants, but the results were not statistically significant. Therefore, the study authors were unable to conclude that the programs saved money, although they inferred that they were probably cost neutral. The small number of individuals included in subcomponents of the RAND studies (e.g., only 746 individuals were included in the smoking analysis and 12,127 in the cost analysis—out of 567,506 employees in the database) impacts the generalizability of results to the companies included in the study and to workplace health promotion programs in general.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Comment on “Do Workplace Health Promotion (Wellness) Programs Work?”

To the Editor:

In their article, Goetzel and colleagues offer a defense of workplace wellness programs. Because much of their discussion is based on a critique of our previous work, we wanted to comment on their assessment. First and foremost, we do agree that the workplace is an appropriate place to try and improve health-related behaviors. Our research mainly suggests that the current approach that many employers take does achieve this goal, but it does not make good business sense.

Wellness programs today rely heavily on identifying individuals at risk through biometric screening and questionnaires and counseling those individuals on behavior change. We have shown that program participants indeed accomplish significant reductions in health risks, albeit of a modest magnitude.1 But we have also found repeatedly that those changes do not translate into gross savings in the form of lower health care cost or reduced absenteeism, even after 7 years, let alone into net savings in the form of return on investment.2

Our interpretation of the findings is that the effect of the prevailing identification and counseling programs on health risk is too small and the ensuing effect on health care cost too distant to generate savings. Simply speaking, many programs try to address a public health issue with a medicalized intervention. At the same time, we agree with the authors that a systematic effort to instill a culture of health into the workplace has the potential to improve health and reduce cost, but caution that this theoretically attractive proposition has not been validated through empirical research.

In summary, we encourage employers to offer evidence-based and well-implemented wellness programs, but caution that they should watch program cost in relation to program effect closely, just as they do with every other investment.

Soeren Mattke, MD, DSc
Hangsheng Liu, PhD
RAND Health Advisory Services
RAND Corporation, Boston, Mass.
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Comment on “Do Workplace Health Promotion (Wellness) Programs Work?” (September 2014, Volume 56, Issue 9)

Response:

I wish to thank Drs Mattke and Liu for their letter. I am heartened to hear they agree that the workplace is an appropriate setting for instituting programs aimed at improving employees’ health and well-being. It enhances their performance on the job, lessens their likelihood of being ill or absent, and increases their willingness to stay with their jobs rather than look for work elsewhere. I would think that all of the above outcomes do make good business sense, for both the employer and the employee.

I worry that medical cost savings is the only metric used when judging whether a health promotion program is a good business investment. I believe that there is greater opportunity to see improvements in business metrics resulting from positive employee relations, higher worker productivity, and increased retention rates than from cutting health care costs. Furthermore, the emphasis should be on the value-on-investment from these programs. I question an ROI noted for program participants compared with nonparticipants.

The authors cite the PepsiCo study as an example of a program that did not lower health care costs or absenteeism even after 7 years. The analyses separated the effects of lifestyle and disease management. I would argue that a well-designed program would not separate these components, but rather combine them in a holistic fashion to achieve the best outcomes. Indeed, Mattke and Liu found that employees who joined both lifestyle and disease management achieved the greatest savings, $1920 per year. Also, of note, the authors found a significant program impact from lifestyle management on self-reported absenteeism, although the dollar value associated with...
Workplace Wellness Programs Study

Final Report
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Findings of the Rand Report

Program Impact on Health-Related Behaviors and Health Status

In an analysis of the CCA database, when comparing wellness program participants to statistically matched nonparticipants, we find statistically significant and clinically meaningful improvements in exercise frequency, smoking behavior, and weight control, but not cholesterol control. Those improvements are sustainable over an observation period of four years, and our simulation analyses point to cumulative effects with ongoing program participation. However, we caution that our analyses cannot account for unobservable differences between program participants and nonparticipants, such as differential motivation to change behavior.
Findings of the Rand Report

Health Care Cost and Utilization
In the RAND Employer Survey, employers overwhelmingly expressed confidence that workplace wellness programs reduce medical cost, absenteeism, and health-related productivity losses. But at the same time, only about half stated that they have evaluated program impacts formally and only 2 percent reported actual savings estimates. Similarly, none of our five case study employers had conducted a formal evaluation of their programs on cost; only one employer had requested an assessment of cost trends from its health plan. Our statistical analyses suggest that participation in a wellness program over five years is associated with a trend toward lower health care costs and decreasing health care use. We estimate the average annual difference to be $157, but the change is not statistically significant (Figure S.5).\(^1\)
## Sample Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Number of EmployeeYears</th>
<th>Number of Unique Employees</th>
<th>Number of Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aged 18–64</td>
<td>1,793,884</td>
<td>567,506</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. One or more full-year enrollment</td>
<td>1,351,478</td>
<td>428,974</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Active full-time</td>
<td>1,206,327</td>
<td>382,459</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not enrolled in HMO</td>
<td>1,039,136</td>
<td>327,024</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. With complete claims data</td>
<td>977,100</td>
<td>292,792</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Not pregnant during data year</td>
<td>951,112</td>
<td>287,694</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional criteria for analytic subsamples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Criteria</th>
<th>Number of EmployeeYears</th>
<th>Number of Unique Employees</th>
<th>Number of Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRA data available</td>
<td>611,862</td>
<td>232,037</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program participation data available</td>
<td>615,770</td>
<td>173,382</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI data available</td>
<td>306,950</td>
<td>149,844</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cholesterol data available</td>
<td>104,086</td>
<td>66,301</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise data available</td>
<td>109,487</td>
<td>58,858</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking status data available</td>
<td>111,912</td>
<td>61,486</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** RAND analysis of health plan claims and screening and wellness program data in the CCA database.

**NOTE:** Data on high-density lipoprotein and low-density lipoprotein are not complete.
Weight Reduction Results (N=3,924)

Figure 4.16: Cumulative Simulated Effects of Participation in a Weight Control Program on Body Weight over Five Years

- **No participation - male**
- **Participation - male**
- **No participation - female**
- **Participation - female**

Weight (pounds) vs. Year

- 2005
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- 2007
- 2008
- 2009
- 2010

95% CIs
Over Five Years... Participants: 36% → 27% Obese
Non-Participants: 36% → 40% Obese

Figure 4.17: Percentage Distribution of the Cumulative Simulated Effects of Consecutive Participation in a Weight Control Program on Employee Weight Status

SOURCE: RAND analysis of health plan claims and screening and wellness program data in the CCA database.
NOTE: Simulation results are based on continuous participation in 2006–2010 of the model estimation sample.
Smoking Results – 8%-29% quit rate (N=746)

Figure 4.12: Percentage of Smokers Who Continue Smoking After One-Year Participation in a Smoking Cessation Program, Compared to Nonparticipating Smokers

- Current year**: 100% participation, 71% no participation
- 2nd year**: 98% participation, 73% no participation
- 3rd year*: 97% participation, 76% no participation
- 4th year: 91% participation, 83% no participation

SOURCE: RAND analysis of health plan claims and screening and wellness program data in the CCA database.
NOTES: 2005–2010 data are from one employer; 746 propensity score matched pairs.
*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01.
Exercise Results – 2.5 → 4.0 Days/Week (N=2,303)
Cholesterol Results – No Difference (N=1,341)

Figure 4.20: Cumulative Simulated Effects of Cholesterol Program Participation on Cholesterol Levels
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©2008 Thomson Reuters
Cumulative PMPM Health Care Cost Differences: Partic Vs. Non-Partic = $65.50 (N=12,127)

Figure 4.24: Cumulative Simulated Effect of Wellness Program Participation on Total Health Care Costs per Health Plan Member per Month
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Inpatient Admissions

Figure 4.26: Cumulative Simulated Effects of Wellness Program Participation on Inpatient Admissions

Year
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No participation  95% CIs

Participation in 2006-2010  95% CIs
ER Visits

Figure 4.27: Cumulative Simulated Effects of Wellness Program Participation on Emergency Department Visits
Exclusive: 'Workplace wellness' fails bottom line, waistlines - RAND

BY SHARON BOGLEY
NEW YORK Fri May 24, 2013 6:35pm EDT
3 COMMENTS | Tweet | 127 | Share this | Mail | Print

A long-awaited report on workplace wellness programs, which has still not been publicly released, delivers a blow to the increasingly popular efforts, Reuters has learned, casting doubt on a pillar of the Affordable Care Act and a favorite of the business community.

According to a report by researchers at the RAND Corp, workplace wellness programs that pay for gym memberships and exercise classes had no impact on health care costs and saw a slight increase in health care expenses after participants started.
Study Raises Questions for Employer Wellness Programs

By ANN CARBON JAN. 6, 2014

If you work for a big employer — or even a small one — you probably have encountered some sort of workplace wellness program. You most likely filled out a health questionnaire, which may have led to a recommendation that you attend exercise classes, quit smoking or participate in telephone coaching to help you control diabetes or asthma.

The programs have become increasingly popular, as companies aim to lower their medical costs and lift productivity by promoting healthier behavior among workers. About half of employers with at least 50 workers offer them, as do 90 percent of employers with more than 50,000 employees, according to a study for the Labor Department by the RAND Corporation, a nonprofit research group. Some companies offer financial perks to employees who participate, like lower health insurance premiums, gift cards or even cash.
Secret RAND Report Trashes Employer ‘Wellness’ Programs

May 29th, 2013 by Morgan Downey

A Reuters story by Sharon Begley discloses a report from RAND Corp, provided to the US Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services. The study finds only a modest benefit in wellness programs.

It states, “According to a report by researchers at the RAND Corp, programs that try to get employees to become healthier and reduce medical costs have only a modest effect. Those findings run contrary to claims by the mostly small firms that sell workplace wellness to companies ranging from corporate titans to mom-and-pop operations.

RAND delivered the congressionally mandated analysis to the U.S. Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services last fall.

The report found, for instance, that people who participate in such programs lose an average of only one pound a year for three years.

In addition, participation “was not associated with significant
Managing Manifest Diseases, But Not Health Risks, Saved PepsiCo Money Over Seven Years

ABSTRACT Workplace wellness programs are increasingly popular. Employers expect them to improve employee health and well-being, lower medical costs, increase productivity, and reduce absenteeism. To test whether such expectations are warranted, we evaluated the cost impact of the lifestyle and disease management components of PepsiCo’s wellness program, Healthy Living. We found that seven years of continuous participation in one or both components was associated with an average reduction of $30 in health care cost per member per month. When we looked at each component individually, we found that the disease management component was associated with lower costs and that the lifestyle management component was not. We estimate disease management to reduce health care costs by $136 per member per month, driven by a 29 percent reduction in hospital admissions. Workplace wellness programs may reduce health risks, delay or avoid the onset of chronic diseases, and lower health care costs for employees with manifest chronic disease. But employers and policy makers should not take for granted that the lifestyle management component of such programs can reduce health care costs or even lead to net savings.
Disease Management

patient self-care knowledge and abilities. The ten conditions covered by the disease management program were asthma, coronary artery disease, atrial fibrillation, congestive heart failure, stroke, hyperlipidemia, hypertension, diabetes, low back pain, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Completion of a disease management program typically requires six to nine months, during which participants have a series of calls with a nurse that average fifteen to twenty-five minutes per call. Completion of a

Lifestyle Management

coaching for those with higher risk levels. In 2011 there were five distinct lifestyle management programs: weight management, nutrition management, fitness, stress management, and smoking cessation. Completion of a telephonic lifestyle management program involves a series of calls with a wellness coach over a six-month period.
The PepsiCo Program

PepsiCo introduced in 2003 what evolved into their Healthy Living program. Healthy Living is a wellness program made up of numerous components that include health risk assessments, on-site wellness events, lifestyle management, disease management, complex care management, a 24/7 nurse advice line, and maternity management. All PepsiCo employ-
Results

EXHIBIT 1

Aggregate Impact Of Lifestyle Management And Disease Management On Per Member Per Month Health Care Costs At PepsiCo, 2004-11
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Return on investment
Together, the lifestyle management and disease management components of Healthy Living returned an average of $1.46 for every dollar invested.

SOURCE Authors' analysis of PepsiCo health plan and Healthy Living program data. NOTES Cost estimates are adjusted by demographics, comorbidities, and calendar years based on propensity score matching and regression analyses. This exhibit assumes that members participated continuously during 2004-11; 2003 is the baseline year.
PepsiCo's workplace wellness program fails the bottom line: study

NEW YORK (Reuters) - A long-running and well-respected workplace wellness program at PepsiCo that encourages employees to adopt healthier habits has not reduced healthcare costs, according to the most comprehensive evaluation of such a program ever published.

Released on Monday in the journal Health Affairs and based on data for thousands of PepsiCo employees over seven years, the findings "cast doubt on the widely held belief" that workplace wellness programs save employers significantly more than they cost, conclude Soeren Mattke of the RAND Corporation and his co-authors. "Blanket claims of 'wellness saves money' are not warranted."
Study: PepsiCo's Wellness Program Falls Flat

A new study of the soft-drink giant’s wellness program finds it costs more money than it saves in reduced healthcare costs, but experts say such programs can still provide value apart from financial considerations.

By Carol Patton
Tuesday, January 21, 2014

For years, companies have been trying to determine the return on investment of their wellness programs with one particular question in mind: Are they worth the money and effort?

According to results from a 2013 PepsiCo study conducted by the Santa Monica, Calif.-based RAND Corp. and involving more than 67,000 employees enrolled in the company’s “Healthy Living” program -- specifically initiatives that encourage workers to adopt healthier lifestyles -- actually cost more money than they save the company.

But that’s still no reason for PepsiCo or other employers to abandon their wellness programs because they can’t afford to lose employees to rising healthcare costs.

©2008 Thomson Reuters
A Hospital System’s Wellness Program Linked To Health Plan Enrollment Cut Hospitalizations But Not Overall Costs

ABSTRACT Many policy makers believe that health status would be improved and health care spending reduced if people managed their health better. This study examined the effectiveness of a program put in place by BJC HealthCare, a hospital system based in St. Louis, Missouri, that tied employees’ eligibility to participate in the system’s most...
BJC Insurance-Based Wellness Incentive Program

The new program required that starting in January 2005, employees wanting to enroll in the most generous “Gold” plan needed to complete a web-based health risk assessment; sign a health pledge promising to maintain a healthy diet and exercise regularly; report their smoking status; and, for smokers, enroll in a smoking cessation program. If the employees did not complete these activities, they were prohibited from enrolling in the Gold plan.
BJC Results

EXHIBIT 2

Time Path Of Targeted Hospitalizations: Mean Inpatient Hospitalizations For A Targeted Condition At The Hospital System And Comparison Groups

Mean hospitalizations per month per 1,000 members

- Fortune 100 company
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- University

BJC
Study: BJC HealthCare's Wellness Program Cut Hospitalizations But Not Costs

Written by Molly Gamble (Twitter | Google+) | March 05, 2013

A new study in *Health Affairs* examined an employee wellness program at St. Louis-based BJC HealthCare, finding that it decreased hospitalizations for certain targeted conditions but did not save money for the employer in the short-term.

BJC HealthCare introduced its insurance-based wellness incentive program for employees and their dependents in 2005. It tied employees’ eligibility to participate in the system’s most generous “Gold” health plan to their participation in a wellness program, which included completing a health assessment, maintaining a healthy diet, exercising regularly and reporting their smoking status or enrolling in a cessation program.
98% of Large Businesses Offer Wellness!

WELLNESS EMBRACED

Employers continue to embrace the use of wellness programs as a strategy to create a healthier workforce and lower their health care costs over time.

A whopping 98% of large firms (with 200 or more workers) and 73% of smaller firms (with less than 200 workers) are offering at least one wellness program this year, according to a study by the Kaiser Family Foundation and the Health Research & Educational Trust.

"Wellness is a cornerstone to good health and lower cost overall," says Maulik Joshi, president of the Health Research & Educational Trust and senior vice president of research at the American Hospital Association. "Since 2009, more firms both large and small are offering wellness programs, and more firms are offering incentives to encourage wellness."

Under the Affordable Care Act, employers may increase an employee's premium contribution up to 30% of the cost of the health plan for not completing wellness programs, as long as the wellness program is reasonably designed and there are alternatives for workers who cannot meet the standard.

Companies seem fairly pleased with the impact that the incentives are having. At least 14% of all firms that provide incentives to participate in a wellness program said the incentives are very effective, and 36% said they are somewhat effective, the survey found.

Joshi added, "Employers are moving toward programs that raise the bar for everyone in terms of health."

The most common wellness initiatives are:
- flu shots (87% of large firms)
- employee assistance programs (79%)
- online resources for healthy living (77%)
- smoking cessation programs (64%)
- gym membership discounts or on-site exercise facilities (64%)
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Hold Your Horses!

Wellness gone wrong
When putting together a wellness plan, pay attention to how the EEOC defines liability
BY KATHLEEN KOSTER

In order to avoid costly litigation, employers need to carefully design their wellness program — especially when they reward participants with incentives and discounts on their medical coverage. The EEOC recently sued a Wisconsin employer, claiming the penalty the employer imposed for non-participation in its program was too significant. The EEOC also determined the wellness requirements were involuntary under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Employees and their advisers should pay careful attention to how the EEOC defines liability in this case, EEOC v. Orion Energy Systems. It is a reminder to stay in compliance with the Affordable Care Act’s rules for wellness as well.

“In terms of staying compliant under the ACA, the ADA and HIPPA to protect employees’ privacy, the more you focus on giving people multiple opportunities to participate, the more attractive your program is and the easier it is to stay compliant,” says Adam Cox, director of wellness, Heffernan Insurance Brokerage.

He advises employers to watch their program’s design and semantics. In other words, don’t suggest to workers that activities are mandatory in order to receive a premium discount.

In the EEOC case, the employer paid 100% of the health insurance premiums for employees who participated in its “voluntary” wellness program. If the employee chose not to participate, the employee paid 100% of the premiums. The program contained two components. First, employees completed a health risk assessment, and second, a “fitness” component involved completing a medical history questionnaire and exercising on the employer’s range of motion machines. The complaint also alleges that there was a $50 “penalty” for not participating in the fitness component of the wellness program.

This wellness program only offered one option for participation: the in-office motion machines. Not only could some employees have been medically unable to use these machines, but they also may not have been available to all shifts.

ACA requirements
Under the ACA, health contingent programs can come in two forms: “outcomes-based” and “activity-only.” Activity-only wellness programs require individuals to perform or complete an activity related to a health factor in order to obtain a reward, although a particular outcome is not required. In such programs, an employer must provide a reasonable alternative standard for obtaining the reward to individuals for whom it would
Challenges to Workplace Programs

Wellness Incentives In The Workplace: Cost Savings Through Cost Shifting To Unhealthy Workers

ABSTRACT The Affordable Care Act encourages workplace wellness programs, chiefly by promoting programs that reward employees for changing health-related behavior or improving measurable health outcomes. Recognizing the risk that unhealthy employees might be punished rather than helped by such programs, the act also forbids health-based discrimination. We reviewed results of randomized controlled trials and identified challenges for workplace wellness programs to function as the act intends. For example, research results raise doubts that employees with health risk factors, such as obesity and tobacco use, spend more on medical care than others. Such groups may
Penn State Controversy

On Campus, a Faculty Uprising Over Personal Data

By NATASHA SINGER

IMPROVING health while holding down health care costs is the kind of having-your-cake-and-eating-it combination that most people can get behind. In fact, both ideas are embedded in the Obama administration’s Affordable Care Act. But an uprising among faculty members at Pennsylvania State University over a new employee wellness plan is challenging at least some of the methods designed to achieve those aims.

Penn State administrators quietly introduced the plan, called “Take Care of Your Health,” this summer in the deadest part of the academic calendar. But that didn’t prevent some conscientious objectors from organizing a protest online and on their campuses, culminating last week in an emotionally charged faculty senate meeting. The plan, they argued, is coercive, punitive and invades university employees’ privacy.

The plan requires nonunion employees, like professors and clerical staff members, to visit their doctors for a checkup, undergo several biometric tests and submit to an extensive online health risk questionnaire that asks, among other questions, whether they have recently had problems with a co-worker, a supervisor or a divorce. If they don’t fill out the form, $100 a month will be deducted from their pay for noncompliance. Employees who do participate will receive detailed feedback on how to address their health issues.
Feds OK financial incentives for wellness programs

By Modern Healthcare | April 18, 2015

In a victory for business groups, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission said last week that employers can continue to use substantial financial penalties and rewards to nudge employees to participate in workplace wellness programs.

But the EEOC also proposed some safeguards for employees, including limits on the size of financial incentives, confidentiality of their medical information and prohibitions against firing workers who decline to participate in wellness programs or denying them access to the company health plan.

Financial incentives can range as high as 30% of the cost of premiums for employee-only coverage, the commission said. The proposed regulations are now open for public comment for 60 days.

Businesses say programs requiring workers to complete a health-risk assessment help them reduce their employee health benefit costs and improve their workers’...
Worksite Health Promotion Works! (When Done Right)
A Systematic Review of Selected Interventions for Worksite Health Promotion

The Assessment of Health Risks with Feedback

## SUMMARY RESULTS AND TEAM CONSENSUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Body of Evidence</th>
<th>Consistent Results</th>
<th>Magnitude of Effect</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits &amp; Vegetables</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.09 serving</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Fat Intake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Those Physically Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+15.3 pct pt</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-2.3 pct pt</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+3.8 pct pt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat Belt Non-Use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-27.6 pct pt</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SUMMARY RESULTS AND TEAM CONSENSUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Body of Evidence</th>
<th>Consistent Results</th>
<th>Magnitude of Effect</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diastolic blood pressure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Diastolic: –1.8 mm Hg</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systolic blood pressure</td>
<td>19, 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Systolic: –2.6 mm Hg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–4.5 pct pt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>6, 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–0.5 pt BMI</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–0.56 pounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% body fat</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–2.2% body fat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–2.2% at risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cholesterol</td>
<td>19, 8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–4.8 mg/dL (total)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL Cholesterol</td>
<td>8, 11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>+.94 mg/dL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–6.6 pct pt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Effectiveness of Worksite Nutrition and Physical Activity Interventions for Controlling Employee Overweight and Obesity

A Systematic Review

Laurie M. Anderson, PhD, MPH, Toby A. Quinn, MPA, Karen Glanz, PhD, MPH, Gilbert Ramirez, DrPH, Leila C. Kahwati, MD, MPH, Donna B. Johnson, PhD, Leigh Ramsey Buchanan, PhD, W. Roodly Archer, PhD, Sajal Chattopadhyay, PhD, Geetika P. Kalra, MPA, David L. Katz, MD, Task Force on Community Preventive Services

This review found that worksite nutrition and physical activity programs achieve modest improvements in employee weight status at the 6–12-month follow-up. A pooled effect estimate of −2.8 pounds (95% CI=−4.6, −1.0) was found based on nine RCTs, and a decrease in BMI of −0.5 (95% CI=−0.8, −0.2) was found based on six RCTs. The findings appear to be applicable to both male and female employees, across a range of worksite settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Body of Evidence</th>
<th>Consistent Results</th>
<th>Magnitude of Effect</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Risk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Productivity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT ABOUT ROI?
CRITICAL STEPS TO SUCCESS

- Financial ROI
- Reduced Utilization
- Risk Reduction
- Behavior Change
- Improved Attitudes
- Increased Knowledge
- Participation
- Awareness
HEALTH AFFAIRS ROI LITERATURE REVIEW

WORKPLACE WELLNESS PROGRAMS CAN GENERATE SAVINGS

By Katherine Baicker, David Cutler, and Zirui Song

ABSTRACT Amid soaring health spending, there is growing interest in workplace disease prevention and wellness programs to improve health and lower costs. In a critical meta-analysis of the literature on costs and savings associated with such programs, we found that medical costs fall by about $3.27 for every dollar spent on wellness programs and that absenteeism costs fall by about $2.73 for every dollar spent. Although further exploration of the mechanisms at work and broader applicability of the findings is needed, this return on investment suggests that the wider adoption of such programs could prove beneficial for budgets and productivity as well as health outcomes.
# RESULTS - MEDICAL CARE COST SAVINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average ROI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies reporting costs and savings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies reporting savings only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies with randomized or matched control group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies with non-randomized or matched control group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All studies examining medical care savings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Results – Absenteeism Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Average ROI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studies reporting costs and savings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All studies examining absenteeism savings</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Relationship Between Return on Investment and Quality of Study Methodology in Workplace Health Promotion Programs

Siyan Baxter; BNRN (Hons); Kristy Sanderson, BSc(Psych), PhD; Alison J. Venn, BSc (Hons), PhD; C. Leigh Blizzard, BEd (Hons), MSc, MEd, PhD; Andrew J. Palmer, BMedSci, MBBS

Abstract

Objective. To determine the relationship between return on investment (ROI) and quality of study methodology in workplace health promotion programs.

Data Source. Data were obtained through a systematic literature search of National Health Service Economic Evaluation Database (NHS EED), Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE), Health Technology Database (HTA), Cost Effectiveness Analysis (CEA) Registry, EconLit, PubMed, Embase, Wiley, and Scopus.

Study Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria. Included were articles written in English or German reporting cost(s) and benefit(s) and single or multicomponent health promotion programs on working adults. Return-to-work and workplace injury prevention studies were excluded.

Data Extraction. Methodological analysis was graded using British Medical Journal Economic

INTRODUCTION

Workplace health promotion (WHP) encompasses health promoting and illness prevention activities that are available in the workplace. Activities can range from single, one-off interventions (e.g., influenza vaccination) to multicomponent, multilevel health interventions. Economic evalu-
Criteria for Economic Evaluation of Interventions

Table 2

Study design
1. Was the research question stated?
2. Was the economic importance of the research question stated?
3. Was/were the viewpoint(s) of the analysis clearly stated and justified?
4. Was a rationale reported for the choice of the alternative programmes or interventions compared?
5. Were the alternatives being compared clearly described?
6. Was the form of economic evaluation stated?
7. Was the choice of form of economic evaluation justified in relation to the questions addressed?

Criteria for Economic Evaluation of Interventions

Data collection

8. Was/were the source(s) of effectiveness estimates used stated?
9. Were details of the design and results of the effectiveness study given (if based on a single study)?
10. Were details of the methods of synthesis or meta-analysis of estimates given (if based on an overview of a number of effectiveness studies)?
11. Were the primary outcome measure(s) for the economic evaluation clearly stated?
12. Were the methods used to value health states and other benefits stated?
13. Were the details of the subjects from whom valuations were obtained given?
14. Were productivity changes (if included) reported separately?
15. Was the relevance of productivity changes to the study question discussed?
16. Were quantities of resources reported separately from their unit cost?
17. Were the methods for the estimation of quantities and unit costs described?
18. Were currency and price data recorded?
19. Were details of price adjustments for inflation or currency conversion given?
20. Were details of any model used given?
21. Was there a justification for the choice of model used and the key parameters on which it was based?
Criteria for Economic Evaluation of Interventions

Analysis and interpretation of results
22. Was time horizon of cost and benefits stated?
23. Was the discount rate stated?
24. Was the choice of rate justified?
25. Was an explanation given if cost or benefits were not discounted?
26. Were the details of statistical test(s) and confidence intervals given for stochastic data?
27. Was the approach to sensitivity analysis described?
28. Was the choice of variables for sensitivity analysis justified?
29. Were the ranges over which the parameters were varied stated?
30. Were relevant alternatives compared? (i.e., Were appropriate comparisons made when conducting the incremental analysis?)
31. Was an incremental analysis reported?
32. Were major outcomes presented in a disaggregated as well as aggregated form?
33. Was the answer to the study question given?
34. Did conclusions follow from the data reported?
35. Were conclusions accompanied by the appropriate caveats?
36. Were generalisability issues addressed?
Newest ROI Literature Review

Relationship Between Return on Investment and Quality of Study Methodology in Workplace Health Promotion Programs. *AJHP*, July/August 2014.

- Fifty-one studies (61 intervention arms) published between 1984 and 2012 included 261,901 participants and 122,242 controls from nine industry types across 12 countries.

- Overall weighted ROI was $1.38 : 1.00$, which indicated a 138% return on investment.

- When accounting for methodological quality, an inverse relationship to ROI was found.

- Randomized control trials (RCTs) ($n = 12$) exhibited negative ROI, $-0.22 \pm 2.41 (\text{-.27 to -.16})$.

- **Conclusion.** Overall, mean weighted ROI in workplace health promotion demonstrated a positive ROI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies (N = 51)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Organization Size*</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Participant Control (no.)</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Time Value</th>
<th>ROI</th>
<th>BCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorized high quality (N = 15); quality score &gt;75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional health promotion programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groeneveld et al.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Wt, Ind</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-0.24†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper et al.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Local Gov.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>N, PA, Ind</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-0.71†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meenan et al.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>3346</td>
<td>3612</td>
<td>HRA, N, Wt, Ind</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-0.74†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEachan et al.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>GBP</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-4.30†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene et al.</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>El-Gas-Oil-W</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499#</td>
<td>CM, D</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.42†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naydeck et al.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1892#</td>
<td>HRA, Sm, N, Wt, PA, MH, CM, Dx</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.27†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taimela et al.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>HRA, Ind</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.47†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Non-exp</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Electricity-Gas-Oil-W</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412#</td>
<td>HRA</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1.49†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/dental programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At’kov et al.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>Vacc</td>
<td>EUR</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.40†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges et al.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>Vacc</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>-0.45†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen et al.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Vacc</td>
<td>AUD</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.92†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ROI indicates return on investment (calculated); BCR, benefit/cost ratio (calculated); RCT, randomized control trial; Model, modeled; Non-exp, nonexperimental (i.e., pre-post only, a before/after comparison group); Quasi, quasi-experimental (i.e., a nonrandomized comparison group); PS, public service; HRA, health risk assessment; Sm, smoking; PA, physical activity; MH, stress, resilience, life management, employee assistance program (EAP); Psych, psych distress, crisis management; Ind, individualized, personalized care; Vacc, vaccination; Screen, screening, health screening (i.e., cancer, mammogram, glucose, etc.); Dx, disease management, case management; Cog, cognitive; CM, cardiometabolic (changes in blood pressure, lipids, and cholesterol); N, nutrition; Wt, weight management; Dental, dental (light = 1 visit/7 yr, medium = 2–4 visits/7 yr, heavy = 5–6 visits/7 yr); R, risky behavior, substance abuse; SF, sleep and fatigue; Tmt, treatment either in a clinic or center using health professionals (doctors or nurses); SH, self-help resources; NS, not stated; USD, U.S. dollar; EUR, Euro; GBP, British pound; AUD, Australian dollar; FIM, Finnish markka; and CAD, Canadian dollar.
## Quasi-Experimental and Modeling Studies

### Categorized moderate quality (N = 14); quality score 50%–75%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Quality Score</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Cost (GBP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goetzel et al.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Electricity-Gas, Oil-Water</td>
<td>25,828</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker et al.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozminkowski et al.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>11,194</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills et al.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertera et al.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>29,315</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyman et al.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6413**</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldana et al.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Local Gov</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz et al.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golaszewski et al.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Categorized low quality (N = 22); quality score <50%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Cost (USD)</th>
<th>Cost (GBP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foote et al.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Quasi</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henke et al.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Model</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Large+</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>31,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Johnson & Johnson Study**
Estimating the Return-on-Investment From Changes in Employee Health Risks on The Dow Chemical Company’s Health Care Costs

Ron Z. Goetzel, PhD
Ronald J. Ozminkowski, PhD
Catherine M. Baase, MD, FAAFP, FACOEM
Gary M. Billotti, MS

Learning Objectives

- Recall the risk factors evaluated in the company’s health assessment program, and the effects of advancing age over the 10-year study period on employees’ risk factor profiles.
- Relate the degree of risk reduction to the company’s health care expenditures under three scenarios: a large and a modest impact of risk reduction efforts on health risk, and a “break-even” condition in which the company saves the same amount it invests.
- Conclude whether health risk reduction efforts are worthwhile to companies in terms of the financial pay back.

Medical directors often need to build a business case for investing in health promotion as part of a comprehensive health management strategy. Their business case can be greatly strengthened if it includes a projected return-on-investment (ROI). How to best formulate a compelling ROI analysis has been a challenge, and several investigators have commented on the topic. This article illustrates an approach used by staff at The Dow Chemical Company (Dow) to develop a credible ROI estimate as a component of their a business case for ongoing investment in the health and well-being of employees.
By Rachel M. Henke, Ron Z. Goetzel, Janice McHugh, and Fik Isaac

Recent Experience In Health Promotion At Johnson & Johnson: Lower Health Spending, Strong Return On Investment

ABSTRACT Johnson & Johnson Family of Companies introduced its worksite health promotion program in 1979. The program evolved and is still in place after more than thirty years. We evaluated the program’s effect on employees’ health risks and health care costs for the period 2002–08. Measured against similar large companies, Johnson & Johnson experienced average annual growth in total medical spending that was 3.7 percentage points lower. Company employees benefited from meaningful reductions in rates of obesity, high blood pressure, high cholesterol, tobacco use, physical inactivity, and poor nutrition. Average annual per employee savings were $565 in 2009 dollars, producing a return on investment equal to a range of $1.88–$3.92 saved for every dollar spent on the program. Because the vast majority of US adults participate in the workforce, positive effects from similar programs could lead to better health and to savings for the nation as a whole.
Editor’s Notes

What Is the ROI for Workplace Health Promotion? It Really Does Depend, and That’s the Point

A recent systematic review of the literature on the financial impact of workplace health promotion found that 46 of 47 programs saved money, 41 saved more than they cost, and that the returns on investment varied greatly based on the quality of the study methodology, year of publication, sample size, scope of the program, direct or indirect measurement of savings and costs, and several other factors. A close examination of the methodology of the single study that reported net financial loss illustrates the complexity of drawing conclusions from summaries of the literature without also examining the details. Next steps in advancing studies of the financial impact of workplace health promotion programs include developing a scale to measure methodology quality that is appropriate for workplace health promotion programs, and enlisting independent third parties to measured claims costs, rather than imputing them based on normal and customary charges or other methods. The authors reported 68 different mean ROIs to reflect weighting or unweighting of the sample, methodology quality rating, study design, location of the employer, year of publication, sample size, intervention focus, scope of the program, method to measure differences, source of the ROI calculation, direct or indirect measure of savings and costs, and method used to determine costs.

The responses to the article were widely divergent but not surprising. Scientists recognized its thoughtful structure and thorough nature. Critics of the field were delighted to see that the ROI among the highest-quality RCTs was less than 1.0 (.78), adding fuel to the flames of their claims that workplace health promotion programs do not save money. Blind loyalists to the field were distressed that any of the reported ROIs were lower than the ROI (3.27 from medical costs and 2.73 from absenteeism) in the widely cited meta-
Criteria for Evaluating Study Design
5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Good, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, 1 = Poor

- Randomized controlled trial (RCT) (experimental design) = 5
- Well-designed controlled trial without randomization (quasi-experimental design with adjustment for confounders) = 5
- Well-designed cohort or case-control study (quasi- and pre-experimental designs, with adjustment for confounders) = 4
- Multiple time series, correlation studies = 3
- Descriptive analysis – posttest only or pre-post = 2
- Modeling study with explicit assumptions = 2
- Expert opinion = 1
Promoting Healthy Workplaces
Case Studies – Companies That Do It “Right”

Johnson & Johnson  
Dell  
GRACO

citibank  
nextjump  
USAA

TURCK  
L.L.Bean

Industrial Automation  
LINCOLN INDUSTRIES
### Best Practice Companies

#### Table 4: Organizations Visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Headquarters</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Industry Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citibank</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>Banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell, Inc.</td>
<td>Round Rock, TX</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>Manufacturing software development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graco</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>Medical equipment, pharmaceutical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Industries</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Bean</td>
<td>Freeport, ME</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Jump</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>eCommerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turck</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAA</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>Financial services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methods, Issues, and Results in Evaluation and Research

A Return on Investment Evaluation of the Citibank, N.A., Health Management Program

Ronald J. Ozminkowski, Rodney L. Dunn, Ron Z. Goetzel, Richard I. Cantor, Jan Murnane, Mary Harrison

Abstract

Objectives. Citibank, N.A., initiated a comprehensive health, demand, and disease management program in 1994, using program services offered by Healthtrac, Inc., of Menlo Park, California. Program components included an initial screening of employees, computerized triage of subjects into higher and lower risk intervention programs, extensive follow-up with the higher risk subjects, and general health education and awareness building. The objective of this study was to estimate the financial impact of this program on medical expenditures.

Methods. A quasiexperimental design was applied comparing medical expenditures before vs. after the intervention for program participants and nonparticipants. The 22,838 subjects (11,194 program participants and 11,644 nonparticipants) were followed for an average of 38 months before and after administration of a Healthtrac health risk appraisal (HRA) instrument that triggered the start of the program. To adjust for selection bias to the extent possible with these data, multiple regression models were used to estimate the savings in medical expenditures associated with program participation. The resulting dollar savings were compared to program costs to estimate the economic return on the company’s investment in the program.

Results. The return on investment (ROI) was estimated to be between $4.56 and $4.73.

Purpose

Corporate worksite health management, health promotion, and wellness programs have often been sold to senior management with the promise that they will save money. The rationale for savings is derived from the intuitive belief that if employees improve their health habits and lead healthier lifestyles, they will become sick less often, use health care benefits infrequently, and spend more time at work being productive.

Increasingly, program supporters recognize the need for better research to support this economic argument for corporate health management. There are, however, several obstacles that stand in the way.
Highmark Study

The Impact of the Highmark Employee Wellness Programs on 4-Year Healthcare Costs

Barbara L. Naydeck, MPH
Janine A. Pearson, PhD
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Brian T. Day, EdD
Ron Z. Goetzel, PhD

Learning Objectives

- Identify those elements of the Highmark Wellness Program that gained the most participants in the course of the 4-year study period.
- Compare employees who chose to take part in the program with risk-matched non-participants in regard to total healthcare expenditures, annual increases in healthcare expenditures, and return on investment.
- Recall whether and in what way participation in wellness programs influenced spending for preventive care.

Objective: To determine the return on investment (ROI) of Highmark

According to Thorpe¹, about a quarter of the increase in healthcare spending in the United States between 1987 and 2002 can be explained by health conditions attributable to lifestyle changes among Americans, especially the dramatic rise in overweight and obesity rates. Reducing morbidity associated with behavioral and biometric risk factors is a public health priority for the nation.² Employers, too, are beginning to recognize that they play an important role in improving the health and well-being of their workers, and they can do so by providing evidence-based worksite health promotion programs.³

A 1999 survey of worksite health
Dell Study

Financial Analysis

An Evaluation of the Well at Dell Health Management Program: Health Risk Change and Financial Return on Investment

Shirley Musich, PhD; Tre’ McCalister, EdD; Sara Wang, PhD; Kevin Hawkins, PhD

Abstract

**Purpose.** To investigate the effectiveness of the Well at Dell comprehensive health management program in delivering health care and productivity cost savings relative to program investment (i.e., return on investment).

**Design.** A quasi-experimental design was used to quantify the financial impact of the program and nonexperimental pre-post design to evaluate change in health risks.

**Setting.** Ongoing worksite health management program implemented across multiple U.S. locations.

**Subjects.** Subjects were 24,651 employees with continuous medical enrollment in 2010–2011 who were eligible for 2011 health management programming.

**Intervention.** Incentive-driven, outcomes-based multicomponent corporate health management program including health risk appraisal (HRA)/wellness, lifestyle management, and disease management coaching programs.

**Measures.** Medical, pharmacy, and short-term disability pre/post expenditure trends adjusted for demographics, health status, and baseline costs. Self-reported health risks from repeat HRA completers.

**Analysis.** Propensity score–weighted and multivariate regression–adjusted comparison of baseline to post trends in health care expenditures and productivity costs for program participants and nonparticipants (i.e., difference in difference) relative to programmatic investment.

**Results.** The Well at Dell program achieved an overall return on investment of 2.48 in 2011. Most of the savings were realized from the HRA/wellness component of the program. Cost savings

PURPOSE

Employers offer health management programs as a defined strategy to improve employee health, mitigate rising health care costs, enhance employee morale and satisfaction, and increase productivity. A 2013 national employer survey by the Kaiser Foundation found that 77% of employers offering health care benefits also sponsored at least one wellness program. Given their popularity, and the advent of lower-cost online wellness programs, health management programs have increasingly migrated to midsized and small employers.

The value of health management programs to employers has been dem-
What Is Needed to Achieve Success?

1. Leadership commitment
2. Specific goals and expectations
3. Healthy company culture
4. Employee driven program design
5. Excellent communication
6. Smart incentives
7. Effective screening and triage
8. State-of-the-art interventions
9. Effective implementation
10. Measurement and evaluation
Creating a…

The Healthy Workplace

Balancing the Needs of the Organization and the Employee
This Is Hard!
Workplace Health Promotion (Wellness) Works – If You Do it Right!

Financial Outcomes
Cost savings, return on investment (ROI) and net present value (NPV).
Where to find savings:
- Medical costs
- Absenteeism
- Short term disability (STD)
- Safety/Workers’ Comp
- Presenteeism

Health Outcomes
- Adherence to evidence based medicine.
- Behavior change, risk reduction, health improvement.

QOL and Productivity Outcomes
- Improved “functioning” and productivity
- Attraction/retention – employer of choice
- Employee engagement
- Corporate social responsibility (CSR)
- Balanced scorecard
I’m Open to New Ideas…

One thing is for certain: the more profoundly baffled you have been in your life, the more open your mind becomes to new ideas.

- Neil deGrasse Tyson