



Health Impact Assessment of the Layoff and Bumping Process

Cincinnati Health Department Health Impact Assessment Committee
October, 2011

Table of Contents

Abstract

Introduction

- Purpose of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and the HIA Process
- Scope of the Study
 - Geographic
 - Health Impacts (Mental health, depression, coping, substance abuse, access to care, anger/violence, insomnia, fatigue, paranoia, worsened control of chronic medical conditions)
 - Work impacts
 - Research Methods

Discussion of the Health Impacts

- Review 2009 City of Cincinnati Layoff Documents
- Mental Health Impacts for the following classes of employees:
 - Terminated, bumped, layoff survivors, supervisors, and the employees who have to tell someone that they are being bumped or losing a job.
- Workplace Impacts
 - Cost/Benefit, Workplace Accidents, Productivity, Customer Service, Morale

Mitigation Recommendations

- Recommendations for Future Labor Contracts
- Recommendations for the City of Cincinnati Human Resources Department
- Recommendations for Employee Groups: Bumped, layoff survivors, supervisors, and the employees who have to tell someone that they are being bumped or losing a job.
- Best Practices

Summary of Recommendations

Acknowledgements

Cincinnati Health Department Health Impact Assessment Committee Members

Source Documents

Abstract

After reviewing literature concerning layoffs and downsizing and the mental health impacts on employees and survivors of the layoff process, we identified mental health impacts and work environment impacts. From the research studies in the literature we found that job insecurity leads to worse job attitudes and health outcomes including depression, increased alcohol consumption and increase in work injuries (Moore, Grunberg, Anderson-Connolly, & Greenberg, 2003). This report contains mitigation recommendations based on best practices for different employee groups affected by layoff and bumping (Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor, 1989). The following are 5 employee groups that we studied: terminated, bumped, layoff survivors, supervisors, and the employees who have to tell someone that they are being bumped or losing a job. Some of the recommendations include the following: post (display) retention and bargaining unit seniority on a monthly basis; institute an employee notification period; partner City Human Resources with Department supervisors to transition new employees who are bumped and demoted, and to train supervisors on successful methods to transition under stressful circumstances; contract with a placement service to provide career transition assistance; provide new employees with Initial and Interim Goals and Objectives for the position on the first day; make every effort for the supervisor to be in the office on the day that the new employee reports; facilitate two-way communications during the layoff and bumping process between senior staff and employees; and maintain visibility, and on-going, open and honest communications from senior level staff. This report also identifies 4 groups to implement the recommendations: City of Cincinnati Human Resources, supervisors, department senior level staff, and labor contracts.

Introduction

At the request of an employee of the City of Cincinnati, the Cincinnati Health Department (CHD) Health Impact Assessment (HIA) Committee commenced this study of the health impacts experienced by workers impacted directly and indirectly from the layoff or the bumping process. The purpose of this assessment is to determine the potential health impacts of the layoff/bumping process, and make recommendations to mitigate those impacts where possible.

Layoff occurs when an employee is dismissed from employment for an undetermined amount of time. In some cases the employee is not recalled back to work and the layoff is permanent. According to the Civil Service Commission (CSC) Rule 12, Sections 1-3, for the City of Cincinnati, layoffs can be implemented for the following reasons: lack of funds, lack of work, or job abolition. Lack of funds is the primary reason for the recent Cincinnati City layoffs in 2009 and 2011, which occurred as a result of reduction in tax revenues.

Bumping is termed “displacement procedures” in the CSC Rules. An employee who otherwise would be laid off has the right to displace another employee, in the same job classification series, who has fewer retention points (retention points are calculated based on a combination of seniority and performance evaluations) or bargaining unit seniority. Bumping can result in the displacement of more than one employee, even in cases where only one position was eliminated due to lack of funds, work or job abolition. The employee with the

Health Impact Assessment of the Layoff and Bumping Process

least retention points or bargaining unit seniority is laid off. Displacement for some employees may mean changing jobs and job responsibilities at the same rate of pay or demotion to a lower rate of pay.

Purpose of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) and the HIA Process

According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) the Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is used “to evaluate objectively the potential health effects of a project or policy before it is built or implemented. HIA can provide recommendations to increase positive health outcomes and minimize adverse health outcomes. The HIA framework is used to bring potential public health impacts and considerations to the decision-making process for plans, projects, and policies that fall outside of traditional public health arenas, such as transportation and land use.”

The HIA has a focus on health outcomes such as obesity, physical inactivity, injuries, mental health and social equity. The HIA follows six steps: (1) screening - identify projects or policies for which an HIA would be useful, (2) scoping - identify which health effects to consider, (3) assessment of risks and benefits, (4) developing recommendations, (5) reporting - present the results to decision-makers, and (6) evaluation - determine the effect of the HIA on the decision. HIA recommendations are voluntary.

Scope of the Assessment

The geographical scope of the HIA was limited to the City of Cincinnati. The health impacts studied are those related to mental health issues such as depression, coping, substance abuse, anger/violence, insomnia, fatigue, and paranoia. Also considered is access to health care issues. During the assessment process it was learned that there are further impacts to the work environment after the layoff process is complete, for those employees who were not directly impacted or who were indirectly impacted; these can include increases in non productive work time, work place injuries, and use of sick leave.

The discovery process used in this assessment includes the review of Civil Service Commission Rules, union contracts (AFSCME and CODE), and layoff communications between management and employees such as emails, newsletters, memos, and termination papers that have been used by the City of Cincinnati in the past. Mental health professionals are involved in this assessment and the HIA Committee reviewed literature and research on the topic.

Discussion of the Health Impacts

Review 2009 City Documents

The reviewed materials provided to supervisors/managers included a) an August 14, 2009 memo to the Department Directors and Division Heads from Hilary Bohannon, Director of Human Resources, and b) the Cincinnati City Manager’s Supervisor’s Resource Guide for Displaced/Laid Off Employees. These materials provide managers and supervisors with technical and practical steps to be taken when laying off an employee. However, the literature

does not adequately address health issues that may arise in the layoff/bumping process. Mental health issues are only addressed by mentioning that employees may call specific personnel (PEAP) for an appointment. There was also no mention of how to handle mental health issues of employees who were not laid off but were affected by the lay off/bumping process through fear of job loss or loss of a co-worker. Managers/supervisors may have adverse feelings or fears about giving a layoff notice to employees. The documents need to give clear definitions of what behavior is considered "normal" and what is considered "dangerous" or "abnormal" behavior when laying off employees.

The documents provided to CHD employees in 2009 included a) a "Notice of Layoff, Placement, or Displacement" letter; b) a personal note from the Health Commissioner, Dr. Maseru, c) the "City Employee Lay Off Support Resources Guide", and d) the August 2009 edition of the HR Connections newsletter from the Department of Human Resources which provided Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) about the bumping/layoff procedures. Similar to materials provided to managers/supervisors, the materials for laid off employees mention some available resources, but make no mention of mental health issues that may arise such as inappropriate coping, substance abuse, or depression. The employee materials did not provide the list of contacts for scheduling a counseling appointment that were included in the materials given to managers. The materials only address health in the realm of COBRA health care coverage, but not health effects such as worsened control of chronic diseases, that may occur for laid off employees. These materials, with the exception of the hand written note from Health Commissioner were concise but impersonal. Ideas for how to make these documents more helpful to employees and managers is provided in the recommendations section below.

Mental Health Impacts

Research indicates significant changes in physical and mental health for those employees who are laid-off as well as the "survivors" who remain on the job. A Finnish study found an increased risk of suffering mental health problems as indicated by an increase in the use of prescription drugs such as sleeping pills, anti-depressants and anti-anxiety medications (Kivimaki, Honkonen,Wahlbeck, Elovainio, Pentti, Klaukka,Virtanen, & Vahtera, 2007). This study concurs with others which found that survivors are demoralized. Their typical responses include shock and/or disillusionment, anger/hostility, depression and anxiety. Other researchers have found an increased risk of disability retirement among employees who kept their jobs.

The 'Post Downsizing Stress Syndrome' identified by the University of New Hampshire business professor, Barry Shore, in layoff survivors includes trouble concentrating on the job, irritability with co-workers, anger toward management, higher absenteeism, substance abuse, family problems, feelings of mistrust, health problems, negative attitude toward work and a sense of hopelessness. Dr. Shore identified the emotions of anxiety, fear, mistrust and paranoia which lead to problems of "sleep disturbance, overeating or under eating, headaches, increase in blood pressure, digestive problems, and a general feeling of anxiety, fatigue, and muscular tension. Fifty-five percent reported an increase in marital tension."

A British study evaluating the effects of privatization of a publicly operated power company found the typical reaction of employees ranged from "shock, guilt, and anger to

disbelief and worry". (Campbell, Worrall, & Cooper, 2000, p.15) The researchers concluded that there was a "culture shock" in that workers felt they had a "psychological contract" with the organization and had expected more security in the public sector. This generated an atmosphere that ran the gamut from "mistrust and demoralization to powerlessness and frustration." The most common reaction "tired and stressed"; other feelings included anger, worry, disappointment, anxiety, fear, and sadness, with a very few saying they felt "hopeful". (Campbell, Worrall, & Cooper, 2000, p.13)

The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) studied downsizing in the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), and found that workers had "reduced job commitment, low morale and low job satisfaction as well as "feelings of guilt, sadness and worry."(Pepper & Messinger, 2000) This study examined what they called the "survivor syndrome" and found:

- Workers who felt that the downsizing process was fair, and that communication was open and honest, reported fewer medical symptoms (e.g. headaches, shortness of breath, backaches), fewer symptoms of survivor syndrome, less stress, better mental health, and less job insecurity.
- Workers who were more directly involved with the downsizing process (i.e. delivered layoff notices, were laid off and then rehired, changed jobs/departments) reported more medical symptoms, lower mental health and more job insecurity.
- Workers in jobs with high workload demands but with low decision-making authority reported more medical symptoms, more symptoms of survivor syndrome, more stress, lower morale, and more job insecurity.
- Workers who experienced threats or acts of violence or harassment reported more medical symptoms and more job insecurity.
- Focus groups and interview data yielded several common themes:
 - Relationships between senior management and employees were strained and communication inadequate.
 - Workload was too high due to understaffing.
 - Job insecurity remains a significant concern for workers
 - The voluntary process used to downsize INEEL was seen as favorable by employees.

Survivors' typical reactions include a) worry about their job security, b) anger about the process, especially if communications are not clear or the process is not perceived as fair and equitable, and c) concerns about heavier workloads in the future. These feelings often result in a reduced commitment to the organization, decreased job satisfaction and an increased in employee turnover. It should be noted that external economic conditions affects employees' attitudes about being downsized in that they may feel that they have fewer options outside the organization when the economy is down and the job market tight. While this may encourage more survivors to stay put, they may feel more hopeless and helpless about their situation and may not have as much commitment to the organization.

Other research indicates that if employees feel they have little or no control, their outcomes are worse. If the employees have a good relationship with their immediate supervisor who delivers the "bad news", they have better outcomes. If the process is perceived as fair, employees have an easier time accepting the news and have better outcomes. These

findings have implications for organizations regarding how the message about impending/actual layoffs is delivered.

Factors affecting employees' reactions include:

- Whether layoff's process is perceived as fair and equitable
- The way individuals are notified
- The effectiveness of communication
- The after-care of the laid-off employees and survivors
- The interpersonal treatment received from line management.

Workplace Impacts

The primary stated purpose behind layoffs and downsizing is usually to cut costs and expenses. Generally, the short-term savings are immediately apparent and easy to gauge; but the long term costs are more difficult to assess and can often negate any savings which were gained from the initial layoff.

Downsizing has become commonplace today. Organizations usually downsize with the intention of saving money, remaining competitive, increasing shareholders profits and/or increasing productivity.

Models of downsizing include hiring freezes, which offer voluntary early retirement "buy-out" packages, reductions in force by lay-off, and mandatory reduction in hours or furloughs. While models that rely on voluntary downsizing are generally seen by employees as the least disruptive (and create the least morale problems), they may lead to their own set of problems for the organization. The organization may lose more employees than anticipated and may need to hire and train new employees which can be costly. The organization may also lose the "best and the brightest" who chose to leave the organization creating an unintentional "brain drain".

For the organization that implements downsizing through mandatory layoffs, there are inherent costs, for example, benefits need to be paid out to workers that are laid off. In addition, such organizations may have to contract with out-placement services. Outplacement consultants are hired to help laid off employees with resume writing, teaching them how to do a job search and networking, and may provide support group accommodations. Mandatory layoffs may result in a possible decrease in customer satisfaction and loss of customers that need to be calculated into the equation. If the downsizing involves changes in process and/or technology, there are additional costs for those changes. Downsized organizations also have to contend with decreases in productivity as the remaining employees learn new positions and adjust to a new environment or increased workload. In addition, employees who survive being laid off generally tend to focus inward and worry about job security rather than focusing outward on job performance.

While the intended goal of downsizing may be a "lean machine", this sometimes is not the end result. Organizations need to assess the results of downsizing especially to determine if the benefit is worth the cost; i.e. does it really save money? The goals of downsizing should be an integrated part of an overall strategic plan and it should be viewed as one of several management tools used to reduce costs and improve service.

One factor that may affect savings and long-term revenue, is employee flight. There is a tendency among employees who have seen repeated layoffs, or downsizing to take their skills to a more stable company. A study in 2000 from the University of Melbourne (Iverson & Pullman, 2000) and a 2003 study from the University of Colorado at Boulder (Moore, Grunberg, Anderson-Connolly, & Greenberg, 2003) both confirm that employee flight is a common response to job atmospheres where there is continual downsizing and layoffs. Furthermore, the Moore et al study noted that probability of quitting the job is proportional to number of layoff cycles an employee survives. There are costs associated with transferring and training employees, and potential rehire of employees who were laid off. Also costs are incurred by hiring new employees to fill vacant positions. In addition there may be intangible costs. Customer service will undoubtedly be affected during any layoff cycle due to understaffing, vacancies, and shifts to fill vacancies with inadequately trained personnel.

In 2007, Northwestern Airlines experienced an economic downturn and in turn laid off numerous pilots; coincidentally as the economic situation improved numerous flights had to be cancelled due to understaffing of pilots. An increase in lag time between customer service requests and actual response is inevitable when staffing is cut. In addition the employee is, and should be, considered an asset in jobs that require public relations and rapport with citizens. Not only are such skills difficult, if at all possible, to teach and train but layoffs shrink the pool of these skilled employees placing a greater strain on the survivors, which leads to customer neglect while diminishing productivity and effectiveness. This may cause damage to the organization's reputation.

Productivity and morale are linked, and downsizing detracts from both. Noted symptoms displayed by survivors include diminished job loyalty and enmity toward the downsizing process and loss of credibility in organizational leadership (Malik, Ahmad, & Hussain, 2010). The employee develops distrust in the information they receive from the employer, consequently paranoia and hysteria set in resulting in a sense of insecurity by which productivity and morale suffer. Absenteeism and medical claims also increase with layoff survivors, which in part can be attributed to stress and worry about job security, which also affects productivity (Rosch, 2001).

The increased workload also carries the danger of workplace accidents due to exhaustion and being overwhelmed by, and trying to become acclimated with, the new workload. The increased workload placed upon layoff survivors can at times be too much for employees to handle leading to mistakes, neglect, and other forms of workplace accidents. Two psychologists (Probst & Burbaker, 2001) noted in the results of a study that after a layoff or similar workplace adjustment, employees feel pressured when having to juggle competing jobs and often cut corners in an effort to keep productivity levels up.

Mitigation Recommendations

Recommendations for Future Labor Contracts

Retention points and bargaining unit seniority need periodic reassessment and posting: One problem that has caused concern and confusion in the past is the accuracy in calculation of retention points and bargaining unit seniority. Accuracy is vitally important to reduce the

unnecessary stress for employees who are identified for layoff based on faulty retention list calculations. Retention point lists and bargaining unit seniority lists are updated daily and available to the HR-City Staff. Therefore, it is recommended that these lists should be updated monthly and displayed, for example on the HR-City internet site, for all employees to have an opportunity to review so that employees can protest the list if they believe it is not accurate.

Notification period for individual employees: The labor contracts (as well as the CSC Rules) specify a notification period for the unions, but not for individual employees prior to layoff with the exception of firefighters. Firefighters are given a 10 calendar day notice under the terms of the Union contract.

A generous notification period can allow the employee to explore alternatives to unemployment such as furthering their education to enhance their skills or find alternate employment. Some employees may use this period to consider and prepare for a career change and apply to education programs. The notification period can allow the employee time to search for another job and refine their job search skills through networking, utilizing the Internet. The ideal outcome of the notification period would be for the employee to take charge of their future with adequate time for planning, networking, and budgeting. The U. S. Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act (WARN) requires private sector employers to give individual employees 60 days notice when large-scale layoffs are planned (Department of Labor, 1989). Research suggests that the waiting period can sometimes cause worsened stress, particularly if an industry responds by warning all employees rather than the ones who will ultimately be laid off. However, it is determined that the benefits to the employee outweigh the stress and it is recommended that the employee is given thirty calendar days and if this is not possible then no less than 10 working days notification prior to layoff or bumping.

Recommendations for the City of Cincinnati Human Resources (HR) Department

The first 2 recommendations for HR Policies and Procedures follow:

- Retention point lists should be updated monthly and displayed for all employees to have an opportunity to review so that employees can protest the list if they believe it is not accurate. This list should be posted, for example, on the HR-City intranet site. Prior to posting, the list should be promoted through the internet, newsletter, etc. and sent to all City employees.
- Update the HR Policies and Procedures and CSC Rules to recommend that programs give an employee thirty calendar days and if this is not possible then no less than 10 working days notification prior to bumping or layoff.

Partnership with HR – City: The final factoring of the layoff and bumping process is not started until City Council passes its' budget, afterwards individual departments identify the positions to be cut. This information is forwarded to the budget department for analysis of the cuts, and the final list of cut positions is forwarded to HR-City to start the layoff and bumping analysis.

The layoff and bumping protocol is an extremely complicated process and there are many factors that impact who is bumped into positions and who are ultimately laid off. Just as an example, per the Union contracts employees can bump back into a former position in a different City Department within certain time limits, and the newly bumped employee may also have rights to bump an employee somewhere else. All of the employee rights, legal factors, vacant positions and individual employees are taken into consideration by the HR layoff and bumping protocol.

It is a hardship for the employee and the workplace program when employees bump or are placed into positions for which they are minimally qualified and have no training, due to the bumping process. Failing to address this issue may in turn impact efficiency, morale, and customer service. Therefore, it is recommended that the HR-City partner with departments to transition the new supervisor, the existing staff, and the bumped employee. What we mean by partner, is conduct transition interviews to communicate to all parties the complexity of the process, communicate that the process is fair and impartial, and provide guidelines to supervisors to get the best results when integrating the new employee.

The HR-City directs the layoff and bumping process but does not follow-up with programs on the impact of layoffs. Hence, the HR-City should partner with departments in understanding the health impacts and program delivery impacts of the layoff and bumping process. It is recommended that the HR Director should develop a method to receive regular feedback from program managers on the impact of layoff and bumping on service delivery, morale, sick leave use, and workplace injuries through a standardized measure of these factors.

Layoff Process: Employees who perceive that the layoff process is fair have fewer health concerns related to the layoff and bumping process. Research has shown that employees' reaction to changes is improved with information.

Recommendations for changes to the City Employee Resources Guide (Resources Guide): The Resources Guide should be given to the employee at the same time as the layoff notification letter. The Unemployment Section of the Resources Guide should be expanded with much more information about the unemployment application process, health insurance coverage, lists of web sites related to classification series for job search, phone numbers and locations, how often unemployment checks are issued and latest information on unemployment compensation time limits and federal extension of benefits. The guide should include a section on access to health care for those employees who will lose health care coverage because of inability to afford the COBRA premiums. A list of health centers in Cincinnati and nearby Counties should be included. The Hamilton County website lists health centers in the vicinity when an address is entered in the box. This information should be provided as well as information about usual eligibility qualifications to utilize health center services.

The Job Search section of the Resources Guide should relate to the employees' field and classification. Here professional organizations, present job listings, industry newsletter information should be listed including contact information.

2009 HR Director Memo to Directors and Division Heads (Memo) – In paragraph 4, Directors and Division Heads were informed to send the layoff letter to the employee. It is not clear if the letter was to be sent to the employee's home address of record. The Memo should be revised to state the Resources Guide should accompany the layoff notification letter.

Health Impact Assessment of the Layoff and Bumping Process

Reword the last paragraph of the Memo on page 1 so that it conveys that it is to the employee's advantage to meet with HR-City staff individually to answer lingering concerns and address doubts about a fair process.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) – The FAQ should be updated and the date of last revision listed, particularly because personnel and COBRA information may have changed.

The overall assessment of the documents was that the tone seemed somewhat formal, and that the documents lacked information that would be useful for the layoff "survivors" (those indirectly impacted through the loss of co-workers or supervisors who had to convey the layoff information). HR- City should develop a "how to guide" to deliver layoff or bumping news to employees and work sections using best practices data.

Plan for an orderly layoff/bumping process: Through the extension of the layoff notification period to 30 calendar days if possible but no less than 10 working days, and the monthly posting of retention points, there will be time to determine seniority and bumping and to communicate the complex protocol to all. In addition, there will be time to form focus groups, host job fairs, and time to recognize and direct employees to PEAP for counseling. More importantly, employees who are scheduled to be laid off will have the opportunity to take charge of their personal situation, to gather more information that they need, and to search for new job or education opportunities.

City-HR should freeze hiring and promotions as soon as layoffs are projected which may be early in the year. During the hiring and promotions freeze, employees should be allowed to transfer laterally because this does not impact the total number of vacant positions. This will maximize the opportunity to place laid off employees in funded vacant positions through lateral transfer or demotion. The vacant unfunded positions can then be eliminated without dismissing the incumbent. Exceptions for hiring during the freeze are positions that are critical for running the program and grant positions where there is a deadline for starting the grant work.

HR-City should allocate funds necessary to contract with a placement service to coordinate some of the suggestions above related to preparing for a job search, interviewing skills, customizing information materials based on job classifications, and hosting job fairs. Private industries frequently offer stress management services such as enrollment in fitness centers. HR-City could coordinate classes that help with stress reduction (ex: yoga, laughter yoga, tai chi classes or form walking clubs) to help all employees cope with a layoff environment.

Recommendations for Employee Groups: Bumped, Layoff Survivors, Supervisors, and the Employees Who Have to Tell Someone That They are Being Bumped or Losing a Job.

There are some suggestions that will help all employee groups to be more comfortable with the outcome of the layoff and bumping process. All of the employee groups would benefit from senior leadership staff visibility so that every employee has the opportunity to meet a department leader at least once in their career with the City. Senior leadership staff visibility can also be in the form of a departmental email or newsletter. All of the employee groups should be familiarized with PEAP services to discuss their emotions in a confidential setting.

New Employee: Employees who are placed in a new position, with new job responsibilities, as the result of layoff placement or bumping, will need to be acclimated to the

new environment. The acclimation should begin with a transition interview with the new supervisor and a HR representative. The employee should be trained in the new position as soon as possible after they report. If possible, the employee should shadow another employee the first day on the job to make them feel more comfortable. The employee should also be given their copy of the Initial and Interim Goals and Objectives to detail what is expected of them in their new position so that there is no ambiguity about what is expected. The Departmental Welcome Committee should plan a welcome phone call or card to the new employee or schedule a visit to the work location to boost morale for the entire work section.

Supervisors should provide the new employee with the Initial and Interim Goals and Objectives for the position. Also, the supervisor should make every effort to be in the office on the day that the new employee reports or make arrangements for someone to meet and greet the new employee.

Supervisor: Supervisors will need training in successful methods to transition employees under stressful circumstances. The supervisor should recognize that the smooth functioning of the section will be impacted and every employee is likely to be impacted by changes whether loss of a team member or having a new employee placed in a position. Team building through shadowing, morning huddles, themed huddles and team based projects are some ideas to boost morale.

Morning huddles are weekly or more frequent meetings which can facilitate open communication and troubleshoot any areas or potential challenges for the team. Morning huddles are designed to motivate and can be fun. Themed huddles are also motivational and can be organized around a motivational or positive quote.

Survivors: Employees who are indirectly impacted by the layoff/bumping process may benefit from morale booster activities such as the welcome committee, employee huddles, framed mission statements, team based projects, mentoring program, and senior staff visibility.

Bad News: The supervisor or department head who must deliver the news that someone is to be laid off, bumped, demoted in lieu of layoff, etc. should be trained in best practices to deliver bad news. Studies have found that when the layoff is delivered by someone who has a good relationship with the employee, the employee receives the information with less stress. It would follow that when the supervisor or department head has a good rapport with the staff that they too will feel less stressful about their position. Hence, work must be on going, and occur every day to keep the lines of communication honest and open between co-workers. Anecdotal information suggests that supervisors would be the preferred person to notify if there is a good staff-supervisor relationship. There should be one source of information when explaining the layoff-bumping process.

Best Practices

The following best practices are recommended (Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor, 1989):

1. Senior leadership plays a vital role in downsizing so leadership should become involved early in the process and continue to actively participate. Employees perceive this as their source of communications during major downsizing actions.

2. Over-communication is impossible during layoffs. Honest and open communication is what employees want most. The communication must flow by two way communication with management and employees listening to each other.
3. Information not normally required in an organization's day-to-day operations becomes critical during layoffs. Employees need information to help them decide on a course of action.
4. Organizations that have successfully downsized provided career transition assistance to both separated and surviving employees. Successful downsizing depends on the workforce remaining after the downsizing. Trust and faith is promoted when the survivors perceive the process as fair and humanely administered. This empowers them to provide improved service.

Layoff and Bumping Summary of Recommendations

Human Resources' Responsibilities

1. Post retention (seniority) points and bargaining unit seniority on a monthly basis using all means available for example the City's intranet site.
2. Institute a notification period of 30 calendar days and if this is not possible then not less than 10 working days for all employees for bumping or layoff.
3. Partner with departments to conduct transition interviews with supervisor, employee, and work-sites when placing a new employee.
4. Freeze hiring and promotions as soon as layoffs are projected which may be early in the year.
5. Allocate funds necessary to contract with a placement service to provide career transition assistance.
6. Partner with departments to provide training for supervisors in successful methods to transition employees under stressful circumstances including morale boosting activities.

Supervisor Responsibilities

7. Provide the new employee with the Initial and Interim Goals and Objectives for the position on the first day or during the transition interview.
8. Make every effort to be in the office on the day that the new employee reports or make arrangements for someone to meet and greet the new employee.
9. Strive to maintain a good rapport with their staff at all times so that in stressful situations the delivery of bad news is easier for the supervisor and the employee.
10. Hold supervisors accountable for late or non-existent performance evaluations of their staff.

Senior Level Staff

11. Be visible and facilitate two way communications during the layoff and bumping process.
12. Maintain on-going communication with staff in an open and honest fashion that is about the need for layoff and bumping. It is impossible to over communicate with department staff during layoffs.

Acknowledgements

Harry Barnes, MBA, RS, Acting Director Human Resources, Cincinnati Health Department
Lisa Berning, BA, JD, Supervising Human Resources Analyst, Cincinnati Human Resources Department

Janet O'Hair, MBA, LISW, PEAP Coordinator, Cincinnati Health Department

Cincinnati Health Department Health Impact Assessment Committee Members

Mohammad Alam, Ph.D., Director of Environmental Services

Ellen Berninger, BA, School and Health Care Coordinator

Denisha Garland, MPH, RS, HHS, LRA, Public Health Educator

Marilyn Goldfeder, RN, MPH, Public Health Nurse 2

LiAnne Howard, MCP, MEd, Senior Administrative Specialist

Camille Jones, MD, MPH, Assistant Health Commissioner

Tunu Kinebrew, MPA, Vital Statistics Coordinator

Janet O'Hair, MBA, LISW, PEAP Coordinator

Darius Porter, BS, RS, Sanitarian

Richard Thornburg, MPH, RS, Supervising Sanitarian

Source Documents

- Amble, B. (2007). Downsizing a threat to mental health. Management-Issues; <http://www.management-issues.com/2007/1/18/research/downsizing-a-threat-to-mental-health.asp>.
- Business Professor Warns of Post Downsizing Stress Syndrome as Job Cuts Continue (2009). Newswise, University of New Hampshire; <http://www.newswise.com/articles/view/548303?print-article>.
- Campbell, F., Worrall, L., Cooper, C. (2000). The Psychological Effects of Downsizing and Privatisation. Wolverhampton Business School Management Research Center Working Paper WP001/00. University of Wolverhampton.
- Colvin, G. (2009). Layoffs Cost More Than You Think. <http://money.cnn.com/2009/03/16/magazines/fortune/colvin>.
- Employment and Training Administration, United States Department of Labor (1989). Workers Guide to Advance Notice of Closings and Layoffs. <http://www.doleta.gov/layoff/pdf/WorkerWARN2003.pdf>
- Iverson, R., Pullman, J. (2000). Determinants of Voluntary Turnover and Layoffs in an Environment of Repeated Downsizing Following a Merger: An Event History Analysis.
- Kivimaki, M., Honkonen, T., Wahlbeck, K., Elovainio, M., Pentti, J., Klaukka, T., Virtanen, M., Vahtera, J. (2007). Organizational downsizing and increased use of psychotropic drugs among employees who remain in employment. J Epidemiol Community Health, 61, 154-158.
- Malik, M., Ahmad, A., Hussain, S. (2010). How downsizing affects the job satisfaction and life satisfaction of layoff survivors. African Journal of Business Management Vol. 4 (16), 3564-3570.
- Moore, S., Grunberg, L., Anderson-Connolly, R., Greenberg, E.S. (2003). Physical and Mental Health Effects of Surviving Layoffs: A Longitudinal Examination. Workplace Change Project Working Paper WP-008. Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado at Boulder; University of Puget Sound.
- Pepper, L. D., Messinger, M. (2000). The Impact of Downsizing and Reorganization on Employee Health and Well-being at the DOE INEEL Facility. Brief Report of Research Grant Findings, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, INEEL Edition.
- Pillary, M. (2010). Effects of Downsizing and Tips for a Positive Outcome. Bright Hub; <http://www.brighthub.com/office/human-resources/articles/83670.aspx>.
- Probst, T., Brubaker, T. (2001). The Effects of Job Insecurity on Employee Safety Outcomes: Cross Sectional and Longitudinal Explorations. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology Vol. t, No. 2, 139-159.
- Rosch, P.J.,(2001). The Quandary of Job Stress Compensation. Health and Stress, 3, 1-4; 2010 American Psychological Association Practice Organization Fact Sheet.
- Serving the American Public; Best Practices in Downsizing, Benchmarking Study Report (1997). National Performance Review; <http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/papers/benchmark/downsize.html>.
- Shore, B. (1996). The Legacy of Downsizing: Putting the Pieces Back Together. Downsizing Strategy; http://downsizingstrategy.com/down_re.php?id=1.

Health Impact Assessment of the Layoff and Bumping Process

Spreitzer, G. M., Mishra, A. (1997). Survivor Responses to Downsizing: The Mitigating Effects of Trust and Empowerment. Marshall School of Business, University of Southern California; Michigan State University.