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1. Implement and evaluate models for improving worker health by combining:
   - Worksite health promotion (WHP)
   - Workplace safety & health (OSH)

2. To promote participatory approaches that engage all levels of an organization in the design of effective, sustainable workplace interventions.
CPH-NEW Healthy Workplace Toolkit: Program Goals

Promote PARTICIPATION of the workforce in the design of interventions

• Enhances job control, reduces stress
• Uncover root causes of injury, illness, poor health behavior

Design interventions that INTEGRATE workplace health protection (safety) and health promotion.

• Healthier work environment supporting healthier employee behavior
HITEC 1 (2006-2011)

1. Compared 2 approaches for integrating OSH and heath promotion:
   - Professional -- Administratively directed (top down)
   - Participatory -- Employee initiated, with joint employee-management oversight

2. Tested at 2 Department of Correction (DOC) facilities

3. Participatory site interventions included 2 weight loss programs, a cushioned insole program, and a civility program
## HITEC 2 (2011-2016)

### Two Participatory Intervention Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Team</th>
<th>Kaizen Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Design team (DT)</em> line officer lead intervention planning</td>
<td><em>Multi-level kaizen event team lead (KET)</em> intervention planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited time to plan and refine interventions</td>
<td>Limited time to plan and refine interventions (120 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure-COs only with Study Team Facilitator</td>
<td>Structure-COs, facility managers (Warden Captain), DOC upper management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can plan multiple interventions simultaneously</td>
<td>Plan 1 intervention at a time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Use IDEAS TOOL*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Intervention</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Improvement Linked to Design (BILD)</td>
<td>An <strong>ergonomic</strong> intervention addressed to procurement policies, and building design to support exercise and relaxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Work-related Injury Prevention through Ergonomics (SWIPE)</td>
<td>A <strong>safety intervention</strong> addressing CO injury related to <strong>inmate incidents</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to be Fit (W-2 BFIT)</td>
<td>A CO-developed program for <strong>fitness</strong> for duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Food through Education and Design (BFED)</td>
<td>A weight management program aimed at improved <strong>nutrition</strong> and altering the environment to affect eating patterns at work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HITEC 2 (2011-2016)

New CO Initiative
- 2 cohorts created from new recruit classes
  - One cohort received standard follow-ups post-academy:
    - electronic contact & periodic program activity
  - Other cohort received personalized follow-up and an assigned health mentor
Designing interventions with IDEAS is an iterative process.

**Step 1**
Understanding the problem

**Step 2**
Creating full set of possible solutions

**Steps 3,4**
Analyzing costs, benefits, barriers
Formulate alternatives

**Step 5**
Rating, selecting best option
IDEAS tool

Design Team
Step 1: Identify H&S Problem and Contributing Factors
Step 2: Set Measureable Objectives & Brainstorm Solution Activities
Step 3: Set Selection Criteria for Evaluating Solution Activities
Step 4: Apply Selection Criteria & Create 3 Intervention Alternatives
Step 5A: Rate Intervention(s)
Step 6: Implement Intervention(s)
Step 7: Monitor and Evaluate Modify if Needed

Steering Committee
Step 1: Identify H&S Problem and Contributing Factors
Step 2: Set Measureable Objectives & Brainstorm Solution Activities
Step 3: Set Selection Criteria for Evaluating Solution Activities
Step 4: Apply Selection Criteria & Create 3 Intervention Alternatives
Step 5B: Rate Intervention(s), Provide Feedback, & Select
Step 6: Implement intervention(s)
Step 7: Monitor and Evaluate Modify if Needed

Developed by Center for Promotion of Health in the New England Workplace with support from NIOSH grant #U19-OH008857

cphnew.uchc.edu

Intervention, Design, and Analysis Scorecard (IDEAS)
A planning tool for integrated worksite health protection/health promotion interventions
## Step 1: Identify a Health & Safety Concern and Contributing Factors

### General Health & Safety Concern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Issue:</th>
<th>Contributing Factors:</th>
<th>Sub-Issue:</th>
<th>Contributing Factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Developed by the Center for the Promotion of Health in the New England Workplace with support from NIOSH grant #U19-OH008857
**Step 2: Set Measurable Objectives & Brainstorm Solution Activities**

**Major Health & Safety Objective:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution 1:</th>
<th>Solution 2:</th>
<th>Solution 3:</th>
<th>Solution 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Activities / Components of Solution 1:</td>
<td>Specific Activities / Components of Solution 2:</td>
<td>Specific Activities / Components of Solution 3:</td>
<td>Specific Activities / Components of Solution 4:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by the Center for the Promotion of Health in the New England Workplace with support from NIOSH grant #U19-OH008857
### Step 3: Establish the Criteria for Evaluating Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope/Impact</th>
<th>Benefits/Effectiveness</th>
<th>Resources/Costs</th>
<th>Obstacles/Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who do you want to reach (e.g. one unit or the entire organization)? How many people should be affected? (describe both short term and long term)</td>
<td>What are the positive outcomes you want to achieve? (describe both short and long term)</td>
<td>What resources are currently available within the organization that should be considered? (e.g. time, money, personnel, etc.)</td>
<td>What obstacles/barriers exist that may interfere with intervention success?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Short term examples:** increased knowledge, behavior change, increased participation and satisfaction  
**Long term examples:** improvements in health, lower insurance claims, more health care utilization  

Design Teams may propose interventions that exceed the currently available resources if the benefits justify the resources needed/costs. Resources available should not limit Design Team brainstorming.
### Step 4: Apply Selection Criteria to Solution Activities and Create At Least 3 Interventions

**Intervention:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution Activities</th>
<th>Scope/Impact</th>
<th>Benefits/Effectiveness</th>
<th>Resources/Costs</th>
<th>Obstacles/Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List the activities that you want to include in this intervention</td>
<td>Who will this activity reach? How many people will be affected? Who do you want to reach (describe both short term and long term)</td>
<td>What positive outcomes will be achieved through this activity? (describe both short and long term)</td>
<td>What are the resources needed/costs of this activity? (e.g. time, money, personnel, etc.)</td>
<td>What obstacles/barriers could interfere with the success of this activity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed by the Center for the Promotion of Health in the New England Workplace with support from NIOSH grant #U19-OH008857
### Step 5A: Rate Intervention(s)

Rate the three intervention alternatives as High (H), Medium (M), or Low (L) relative to the selection criteria from Step 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Anticipated Scope/Impact (L/M/H)</th>
<th>Anticipated Benefits (L/M/H)</th>
<th>Resources Needed (L/M/H)</th>
<th>Anticipated Obstacles (L/M/H)</th>
<th>Priority ranking of interventions (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional notes to the Steering Committee (optional):**
### Step 5B: Rate & Select Intervention(s)

Rate the three intervention alternatives as High (H), Medium (M), or Low (L) relative to the selection criteria from Step 3 and select an intervention for implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intervention 1</th>
<th>Intervention 2</th>
<th>Intervention 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Scope/Impact (L/M/H)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Benefits (L/M/H)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources Needed (L/M/H)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipated Obstacles (L/M/H)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topics to discuss with Design Team regarding proposed intervention** (optional):

**Intervention(s) selected for implementation:**
# Design Team Intervention Approach - IAQ (BILD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Design Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>A medium security-level correctional facility in Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of activity/Intervention</strong></td>
<td><strong>BILD:</strong> IAQ intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor indoor air quality (IAQ) in a workplace can affect personal and organizational health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan IAQ interventions can help reduce employee discomfort and increase worker productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structures</strong></td>
<td>The <strong>Design Team</strong> consists of 5 Correctional Officers (COs) who participate in a one hour weekly meeting with a facilitator from the HITEC-II study team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The <strong>Site Steering Committee</strong> consists of supervisors (captains and deputy wardens) at the correctional facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of Interventions</strong></td>
<td>IAQ (BILD) intervention – 1 year (Started August 2013) still in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of meetings</strong></td>
<td>IAQ Intervention – 19 meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[link]
cphnew.uchc.edu
IAQ (BILD) Intervention-Measures

• Comprehensive walkthrough of the facility by an industrial hygienist who observed conditions and spoke with staff at their posts.

• Connecticut Department of Public Health’s “Tools for Office Buildings Program” workstation checklist.
IAQ (BILD) Intervention-Results

Facility Walkthrough findings of the industrial hygienist pertained to:

• Accumulated debris on air supply, vents, and return air grills.
• Poor IAQ in mechanical rooms and tunnels.

Recommendations from the industrial hygienist included:

• Increased frequency in cleaning of the HVAC system and of the stand-alone air circulation systems in order to minimize health and safety issues.
• Address IAQ related activities through a larger program, such as the DPH Tools for Office Buildings, to ensure sustainability and ongoing oversight.
Workstation Checklist-Surveys were collected from 43 staff members who completed the checklist. Results demonstrated that:

- 43% had concerns about general cleanliness (e.g. dust accumulation on horizontal surfaces and HVAC supply and return grills, and weekly vacuuming).

- 67% had concerns about excess moisture (e.g. condensation and stains on indoor surfaces, walls and ceiling tiles).

- 75% had concerns about thermal comfort (e.g. temperature not maintained at acceptable levels, drafts).
## IAQ (BILD) Intervention-IDEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Health &amp; Safety Problem/Issue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Air Quality (IAQ) problems throughout the Correctional Facility reported by staff contributes to absenteeism and presenteeism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-issues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Temperature swings and dust accumulation contributes to health and productivity problems (e.g. sinus infection, wheezing, asthma, absenteeism, and presenteeism).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humidity problems contribute to concerns (e.g. slips and falls during code response).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Safety Goal/Objective:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve air quality to reduce staff and inmate complaints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solutions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve temperature control to reduce temperature swings between shifts and areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve air quality by reducing circulating levels of allergens and irritants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review maintenance schedule to develop solutions to improve pre-existing schedule, and remove sources of dust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# IAQ (BILD) Intervention-IDEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention A</th>
<th>Intervention B</th>
<th>Intervention C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve temperature control to reduce temperature swings between shifts and areas</td>
<td>Improve air quality by reducing circulating levels of allergens and irritants</td>
<td>Review maintenance schedule to develop solutions to improve pre-existing schedule, and remove source of dust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention A**

- Keep AC running steady year around, which can help keep humidity levels constant.
- Have a designated officer in Housing Control Units trained and able to adjust the thermostat *(Activity already adopted).*

**Intervention B**

- Create a vent cleaning schedule or adjust pre-existing maintenance schedule.
- Incorporate annual dust cleaning as part of preventative maintenance.
- Elicit regular cleaning of already existing filters.

**Intervention C**

- Create publically displayed maintenance log sheet.
- Teach inmates how to clean vents and utilize existing machinery (i.e. Duct cleaning equipment).
- Review and optimize maintenance schedule along with maintenance staff.
## IAQ (BILD) Intervention-IDEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intervention A</th>
<th>Intervention B</th>
<th>Intervention C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve temperature control to reduce swings between shifts and areas</td>
<td>Improve air quality by reducing circulating levels of allergens and irritants</td>
<td>Review maintenance schedule to come up with solutions to improve pre-existing schedule, and remove sources of dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated scope/impact (L/M/H)</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated benefits (L/M/H)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources needed (L/M/H)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated obstacles (L/M/H)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention B is first priority. DT would like to implement this with support from management. Intervention C is also important and some activities could be adopted. Intervention A is last priority because one of the activities under the intervention has already been adopted.

**Rating Key:**
- H: Activities that make up an intervention alternative meets or exceeds what is stated in the selection criteria.
- M: Activities that make up an intervention alternative only partly accomplish what is stated in the selection criteria.
- L: Activities that make up an intervention alternative fail to accomplish what is stated in the selection criteria.
## IAQ (BILD) Intervention-IDEAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 5 (a)</th>
<th>Step 5 (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention (Solution)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Chosen by DT members</td>
<td><strong>Intervention (Solution)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Chosen by Site Steering Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing schedule in order to better remove sources of dust that get circulated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IAQ (BILD) Intervention-Lesson Learned

- Concerns are significant for the correctional facility staff.

- A participatory framework allows for worker involvement in design and implementation of interventions that are specific to their workplace settings and needs.

- The IDEAS tool:
  - Promotes ownership of, engagement with, and sustainability of proposed and implemented interventions, and may guide other studies that address health-based interventions in the workplace setting.
  - Allows for the opportunity of workers and management to work together to develop interventions to reduce exposure to poor IAQ.

- The findings of this intervention study could be applied to other workplace settings looking at improving IAQ.
CPH-NEW Healthy Worksite Participatory Program Website

Interactive Tools

Online readiness survey

CPH-NEW Readiness Survey

Please answer any of the assessments in this survey. When you are finished, click Generate Summary to generate a summary document.

Assessment 1
Senior Management Commitment
- Senior management is willing to commit to a participatory safety, health and wellness program for 9-12 months.
- Senior management has not yet made a commitment.

Comments

Assessments
- Assessment 1
- Assessment 2
- Assessment 3
- Assessment 4
- Assessment 5
- Assessment 6
- Assessment 7

Worksheets and Quick Reference Guides for Facilitators

CPH-NEW Healthy Worksite Participatory Program Website

cphnew.uchc.edu
Overall Study Strengths & Limitations

- Participatory nature of the design:
  - Union and Management support
  - 10 years of engagement
- Awareness
- Retirement and transfers
- Scheduling, staffing and overtime
- Budget
Summary & Conclusion

• Too early to conclude
• Severity of health risks among COs
• Willingness to change
• Organizational Culture
• Engagement & Sustainability
• National Effort
Health Improvement Through Employee Control II Study

Health Improvement Through Employee Control (HITEC II), also known as the UConn Department of Correction (DOC) study, is a continuation of a study that began seven years ago called "HITEC I." In HITEC I, the health and wellness of correctional staff was assessed along with two different methods of health promotion interventions. HITEC II is an intervention study that builds on the findings of our previous work and consists of a mentoring program for new recruits and two different participatory intervention activities. The study is planned to run until August 2016.

An interesting finding about the health of correctional staff was that, while new officers began their careers physically fit, within their first three years on the job their health deteriorated to a level similar to that of an officer who had been on the force for 15 or more years. Their rates of high blood pressure, obesity and depression were comparable to more experienced officers. These findings raised the questions, "Why does this happen?" and "Is something we can do to prevent the deterioration in health?"

What is the study all about?

In HITEC II, we are conducting new interventions with new officers in a web-based intervention site that will provide information and self-directed learning modules about health and wellness, and a mentorship program, which pairs a new officer with a new officer. The manager's role is to ensure the new officer's mentor is involved in a new officer's daily activities. The study is designed to address the negative health outcomes of new officers, reduce the rate of new officer turnover, and develop strategies for handling the stresses of the job.

HITEC II also addresses health promotion in the workplace, in addition to improving the health of new officers. The study will assess the impact of the mentoring program on the health of new officers and the impact of the web-based intervention site on the health of new officers.

In summary, HITEC II is an intervention study that builds on the findings of our previous work and consists of a mentoring program for new recruits and two different participatory intervention activities. The study is planned to run until August 2016.

To address these questions, HITEC II implements new strategies with new officers. A web-based intervention site will provide information and self-directed learning modules about health and wellness, and a mentorship program, which pairs a new officer with a new officer. The manager's role is to randomize the new officer to ensure the new officer's mentor is involved in the new officer's daily activities. The study is designed to address the negative health outcomes of new officers, reduce the rate of new officer turnover, and develop strategies for handling the stresses of the job.
Discussion Questions

• DOC/Facility level approach to health and safety.
• What is the current structure/governance to address health and safety at the DOC/Facility levels.
• Communication process at the DOC/Facility levels about health and safety issues.
• What is the process for identifying health and safety issues.
• Staff availability and knowledge of health and safety issues and interventions
• Managerial culture: time, resources, involvement in decision making, etc.
Health Improvement through Employee Control (HITEC) Research Team
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