



Seven 'Principles' for Successful Return to Work

Institute for Work & Health
Toronto, Canada
March 2007

Introduction: These principles have been developed from a systematic review of the literature completed in 2004 by Franche, which included both quantitative studies (Franche et al., 2005) and qualitative studies (MacEachen et al., 2006) and from other current research on return to work. The review focused on three outcomes: duration of work disability, costs of work disability, and quality of life of workers. Overall, the review found that workplace-based return-to-work interventions have positive impacts on duration and costs of work disability. However, only weak evidence was found to support that these interventions had a positive impact on workers' quality of life, suggesting the need for more research in this area. The seven principles are based on what is known to date and may change as new research evidence becomes available.

1. The workplace has a strong commitment to health and safety which is demonstrated by the behaviours of the workplace parties.
2. The employer makes an offer of modified work (also known as work accommodation) to injured/ill workers so they can return early and safely to work activities suitable to their abilities.
3. RTW planners ensure that the plan supports the returning worker without disadvantaging co-workers and supervisors.
4. Supervisors are trained in work disability prevention and included in RTW planning.
5. The employer makes an early and considerate contact with injured/ill workers.
6. Someone has the responsibility to coordinate RTW.
7. Employers and health care providers communicate with each other about the workplace demands as needed, and with the worker's consent.

Principle 1 *The workplace has a strong commitment to health and safety which is demonstrated by the behaviours of the workplace parties.*

Principle 1 Background

People may talk about what they believe in or support, but as the old saying goes, “actions speak louder than words” and research evidence has shown that it is ‘behaviours’ in the workplace that are associated with good return to work outcomes. They include:

- top management investment of company resources and people’s time to promote safety and co-ordinated RTW
- labour support for safety policies and return to work programming (for example, demonstrated by inclusion of RTW job placement practices in policies/procedures and/or the collective agreement)
- commitment to safety issues is the accepted norm across the organization

A systematic review done at IWH by Franche et al^(9,10,21) found evidence to support this in numerous studies^(1,6,12,19,20,29). Studies of disability management interventions where there was strong union support^(6,19,20,29) yielded positive results, i.e. reductions in work disability duration and cost. Results of qualitative studies^(3,4,7,11) included in the review spoke directly to this, e.g. pointing out that a labour/management collaborative approach in planning/implementing a RTW program can ensure there is no conflict between the collective agreement and the RTW process. During a roundtable discussion about the relationship between return to work and the “healthy workplace”,⁽¹⁴⁾ Andy King (Department Leader for Health and Safety, United Steel Workers of America) suggested creating a RTW strategy could be a natural point of collaboration for organized labour and management

Principle 2 *The employer makes an offer of modified work (also known as work accommodation) to injured/ill workers so they can return early and safely to work activities suitable to their abilities.*

Principle 2 Background

The Franche et al systematic review^(9,10) categorized the offer of accommodated work as a core element of disability management, leading to favourable outcomes. However, arranging appropriate accommodated work requires many considerations⁽²¹⁾. An awkward fit of the worker with a modified work environment can contribute to breakdown of the RTW process^(7,8,17), and should be avoided. In a recently published guide for employers⁽²⁸⁾, the Montreal Public Health Department states that where possible, it’s ideal to return a worker to their own work area where the environment, people and practices are familiar. In some cases it will be helpful to employ the services of someone with ergonomic expertise. The Franche et al systematic review^(9,10) suggests that ergonomic work site visits should also be considered a core disability management component. This would mean that when return to work planners are encountering difficulty in creating an appropriate modified job, ergonomic expertise should be made available.

Principle 3 *RTW planners ensure that the plan supports the returning worker without disadvantaging co-workers and supervisors.*

Principle 3 Background

Return to work planning is more than matching the injured worker's physical restrictions to a job accommodation. Planning must acknowledge RTW as a 'socially fragile process' where co-workers and supervisors may be thrust into new relationships and routines^(4,8,22). The qualitative component of the IWH review⁽⁹⁾⁽²¹⁾ indicated that if others are disadvantaged by the RTW plan, this can lead to resentment towards the returning worker, rather than cooperation with the RTW process. Two examples illustrate where RTW plans may cause problems:

- (1) The injured worker may have to deal with co-workers who resent having to take over some of his or her work and therefore feel that the worker has managed to get an 'easier' job.
- (2) Supervisors may be required to fulfill production quotas in spite of accommodating a returning worker, and may not have the work that such accommodation requires fully acknowledged^(3,4,8,12).

Workplaces that create individual RTW plans that anticipate and avoid these pitfalls will probably have better outcomes.

Principle 4 *Supervisors are trained in work disability prevention and included in RTW planning*

Principle 4 Background

Both the quantitative^(2, 6,15,19,20,25,29,30) and qualitative^(3,4,8,12,26) studies in the IWH systematic review^(9,10,21) support this principle. Supervisors were identified as important to the success of RTW due to their proximity to the worker and their ability to manage the immediate RTW work environment. Educating managers and supervisors in areas such as safety training or participatory ergonomics was also found to contribute to successful RTW^(5,6,12,19,20,29,30). Discussions with workers and supervisors who participated in interactive workshops at an Ontario health and safety conference⁽²⁶⁾ reinforced that when supervisors are left completely out of the RTW planning process, they feel ill equipped to accommodate returning workers. Dr. Glen Pransky⁽²³⁾ Director of the Liberty Mutual Research Institute for Safety in the U.S. reports positive results from a training program in which supervisors were given ergonomic and safety training, and taught to be positive and empathetic in early contacts with workers, and to arrange accommodations, follow-up and problem solve on a regular basis.

Principle 5 *The employer makes an early and considerate contact with injured/ill workers.*

Principle 5 Background

The Franche et al systematic review^(9,10) states that ‘early’ contact is a core component of most disability management programs, and thus associated with better RTW results. Contact ‘within the first week or two’ should be seen as a guideline only, as the actual time-frame may vary depending on the worker’s specific situation. Ideally the contact is made by the immediate supervisor as this helps the worker to feel connected to his/her workplace and colleagues. Pransky⁽²¹⁾ maintains that the contact should signify that the employer cares about the worker’s well-being, and should not involve issues such as discussing injury causation or blame. Also, if the worker feels that the contact is a reflection of the employer’s concern about finances and not about his/her health this can poison the RTW process. Finally, the worker’s general perception about their workplace and its concern for workers^(3,7,8,12,24,27) will influence how he/she responds to employer contact. The qualitative component of the systematic review⁽²¹⁾ indicates that in general, early contact is most successful when it builds on a workplace environment characterized by a shared sense of goodwill and confidence^(4,8,16,21,24).

Principle 6 *Someone has the responsibility to coordinate RTW*

Principle 6 Background

Studies in the Franche et al systematic review^(9,10,21) described successful RTW programs as involving a RTW coordinator whose responsibility it was to coordinate the RTW process^(1,2,5,6,12,13,17,25,30). The coordination role may be performed by someone in the company or by someone external but in either case, this coordination role involves:

- providing individualized planning and coordination which is adapted to the worker’s initial and on-going needs,
- ensuring that the necessary communication does not break down at any point,
- ensuring that the worker and other RTW players understand what to expect and what is expected of them⁽¹²⁾.

RTW players include workers, co-workers, supervisors/managers, healthcare providers, disability managers and insurers. As noted in Principle 2, consideration of the needs of these various players will facilitate the RTW process and help to ensure its success.

Principle 7 *Employers and health care providers communicate with each other about the workplace demands, as needed, and with the worker's consent.*

Principle 7 Background

The Franche et al systematic review ^(9,10) showed that contact between workplaces and health care providers reduced work disability duration. In these studies contact ranged from a simple report sent back to the workplace, to a more extensive visit to the workstation by a healthcare provider. On a case by case basis, the health care providers involved might include one or multiple providers (such as physicians, chiropractors, ergonomists or kinesiologists, occupational therapists, physiotherapists, or nurses). They can play a significant role in the RTW process as often the injured worker is looking to his/her health provider(s) for information about his/her condition and for return-to-work advice. It follows that the more these players understand about the workers' job and the workplaces' ability to provide accommodation, the better able they are to advise workers and participate in informed RTW decision-making. In straightforward situations, where the worker's return is uncomplicated, contact may not be necessary but in other cases, it should happen. Permission from the worker needs to be given for this contact to proceed. The degree and nature of the contact between the workplace and health care providers can vary depending on individual circumstances - for example:

- a paper-based information exchange (e.g. information on job demands and/or work accommodation options sent to the family doctor by the employer)
- a telephone conversation about work and job demands (initiated by either party)
- a workplace visit by a health care provider to view the work activities and converse directly with the supervisor or employer

Ideally, the worker should participate in the communications between HCP and the workplace.

In some cases a health care provider may be involved in delivering a fully integrated clinical and occupational approach to RTW, including medical assessment, follow-up and monitoring plus job-site evaluations and ergonomic interventions ^(5,6,18,28).

A qualitative study included in the Franche et al. systematic review ⁽⁸⁾ showed that employers who have difficulty contacting physicians, or who feel that physicians delay RTW, may end up second-guessing the worker's doctor when making judgments about the worker's recovery and ability to RTW. For that reason, family physicians who do not have time to consult with the workplace or make a workplace visit may benefit from having other rehabilitation and occupational health professionals act a 'bridge' between the workplace and healthcare system, i.e. provide the physician with succinct and essential information about the worker's job and workplace to assist with RTW planning.

How to Cite this Document:

Institute for Work & Health. Seven 'principles' for successful return to work. Institute for Work & Health [online document] 2007 March [cited 2007 May 2]: [8 screens]. Available from: URL: http://www.iwh.on.ca/files/seven_principles_rtw_2007.pdf.

References:

1. Amick BCI, Habeck RV, Hunt A, Fossel AH, Chapin A, Keller RB *et al.* Measuring the impact of organizational behaviors on work disability prevention and management. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2000;10:21-38.
2. Arnetz BB, Sjogren B, Rydehn B, Meisel R. Early workplace intervention for employees with musculoskeletal-related absenteeism: A prospective controlled intervention study. *J Occup Environ Med* 2003;45:499-506.
3. Baril, R. and Berthelette, D. Etudes et recherches. Components and organizational determinants of workplace interventions designed to facilitate early return to work. R-263, i-53. 2000. Montreal, IRSST.
Ref Type: Report
4. Baril R, Clarke J, Friesen M, Stock S, Cole D, Bombardier C *et al.* Management of return-to-work programs for workers with musculoskeletal disorders: A qualitative study in three Canadian provinces. *Social Science & Medicine* 2003;57:2101-14.
5. Bernacki EJ, Guidera JA, Schaefer JA, Tsai S. A facilitated early return to work program at a large urban medical center. *J Occup Environ Med* 2000;42:1172-7.
6. Bernacki EJ, Tsai SP. Ten years' experience using an integrated workers' compensation management system to control workers' compensation costs. *Journal of Occupational & Environmental Medicine* 2003;45:508-16.
7. Clarke J, Cole D, Ferrier S. *Working Paper #127 Return to work after a soft tissue injury: A qualitative report.* 2002.
8. Eakin JM, MacEachen E, Clarke J. 'Playing it smart' with return to work: small workplace experience under Ontario's policy of self-reliance and early return. *Policy and Practice in Health and Safety* 2004;1:19-41.
9. Franche, R.-L., Cullen, K., Clarke, J., MacEachen, E., Frank, J., Sinclair, S., and the Workplace-based return-to-work literature review group. Workplace-based return-to-work interventions: A systematic review of the quantitative and qualitative literature. Institute for Work & Health. 2004.
Ref Type: Report
10. Franche,R.L.,Cullen,K.,Clarke,J.,Irvin,E.,Sinclair,S.,Frank.J.etal (2005). Workplace-based Return-to-Work Interventions: a Systematic Review of the Quantitative Literature. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 15, 4, 607-631.
11. Friesen MN, Yassi A, Cooper J. Return-to-work: The importance of human interactions and organizational structures. *Work* 2001;17:11-22.

12. Habeck RV, Scully SM, VanTol B, Hunt HA. Successful employer strategies for preventing and managing disability
21906. *Rehab Counselling Bull* 1998;42:144-61.
13. Habeck RV, Hunt HA, VanTol B. Workplace factors associated with preventing and managing work disability
22330. *Rehab Counselling Bull* 1998;42:98-143.
14. Institute for Work & Health. Healthy Workplace Think Tank, hosted by the Institute for Work & Health, Toronto. 2004. 4.
Ref Type: Conference Proceeding
15. Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, Pohjolainen T, Hurri H, Mutanen P, Rissanen P *et al.* Mini-intervention for subacute low back pain: A randomized controlled trial. *Spine* 2003;28:533-40.
16. Kenny D. Barriers to occupational rehabilitation: An exploratory study of long-term injured workers. *Journal of Occupational Health & Safety - Australia & New Zealand* 1995;11:249-56.
17. Larsson A, Gard G. How Can the Rehabilitation Planning Process at the Workplace Be Improved? a Qualitative Study from Employers' Perspective. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2003;13:169-81.
18. Loisel P, Durand P, Abenhaim L, Gosselin L, Simard R, Turcotte J *et al.* Management of occupational back pain: the Sherbrooke model. Results of a pilot and feasibility study. 12229. *Occup Environ Med* 1994;51:597-602.
19. Loisel P, Abenhaim L, Durand P, Esdaile JM, Suissa S, Gosselin L *et al.* A population-based, randomized clinical trial on back pain management
12457. *Spine* 1997;22:2911-8.
20. Loisel P, Lemaire J, Durand M-J, Champagne F, Stock S, Diallo B. Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis of a disability prevention model for back pain management: a six year follow-up study.
24753. *Occup Environ Med* 2002;59:807-15.
21. MacEachen, E., Clarke, J., Franche, R.L., Irvin, E. (2006). The process of return to work after injury: Findings of a systematic review of qualitative studies. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment, and Health* August;32(4): 257-269.
22. Nordqvist C, Holmqvist C, Alexanderson K. Views of laypersons on the role employers play in return to work when sick-listed. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2003;13:11-20.
23. Pransky, F. Challenges in Return to Work Research: From concepts to outcomes. 2005. Plenary presented at the Institute for Work & Health, Toronto. 4-15-0005.
Ref Type: Conference Proceeding
24. Roberts-Yates C. The concerns and issues of injured workers in relation to claims/injury management and rehabilitation: The need for new operational frameworks. *Disability & Rehabilitation* 2003;25:898-907.

25. Scheel IB, Birger HK, Herrin J, Carling C, Oxman AD. Blind faith? The effects of promoting active sick leave for back pain patients: A cluster-randomized controlled trial. *Spine* 2002;27:2734-40.
26. Share, F. and Reardon, R. Return to Work: Part of Good Occupational health and Safety. 2004. 2004.
Ref Type: Conference Proceeding
27. Shaw WS, Robertson MM, Pransky G, McLellan RK. Employee perspectives on the role of supervisors to prevent workplace disability after injuries. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation* 2003;13:129-42.
28. Stock, S. Work-related Musculoskeletal Disorders Guide and Tools for Modified Work. 2005. Montreal Public Health Department.
Ref Type: Generic
29. Verbeek JH, Van der Weide WE, Van Dijk FJ. Early occupational health management of patients with back pain: a randomized controlled trial
23228. *Spine* 2002;27:1844-51.
30. Yassi A, Tate R, Cooper JE, Snow C, Vallentyne S, Khokhar JB. Early intervention for back-injured nurses at a large Canadian tertiary care hospital: an evaluation of the effectiveness and cost benefits of a two-year pilot project. *Occup Med* 1995; 45(4):209-214