

TIP No. 23-125-0822

## Army Wellness Centers Quarterly Program Monitoring Report Fiscal Year 2022, Quarter 3: April–June

The Army Wellness Center (AWC) Quarterly Program Monitoring Report (QPMR) provides detailed program monitoring data for all AWCs within the enterprise program. These data inform whether AWCs are meeting established benchmarks, reaching their intended population, and delivering high-quality, standardized services to facilitate the fitness and readiness of our Force.

The following metrics are included in this report:

- ❖ **Demographics:** A summary of AWC clients' gender, age, and status to describe who is participating in AWC services, and determine if AWCs are reaching the intended target population. The primary population for AWCs is Active Duty (AD) Soldiers; however, the mission is also focused on supporting the Health of the Total Force, which includes Family members, Retirees, Spouses, and Department of Defense (DoD) Civilians. This metric helps to ensure AWCs are meeting that expectation as an enterprise and at the local installation.
- ❖ **Number of Unique Clients:** A count of each individual who participates in at least one AWC service, including metabolic testing, fitness testing, body composition analysis, biometrics, biofeedback, health coaching, and health education classes. This metric helps to ensure that AWCs are seeing a variety of unique clients across each installation per quarter.
- ❖ **Number of Client Visits:** A count of the overall number of AWC visits during the reporting period. This metric helps to ensure clients are utilizing health and wellness services.
- ❖ **Utilization Rates:** A measure of staff efficiency to determine whether AWCs are meeting identified performance standards. Health Educators at fully implemented AWCs (i.e., open for 1 year or longer) are expected to see 8.5 visits per day. This metric helps to ensure that AWC staff are focused on not only the quantity, but also overall quality of appointments.
- ❖ **Musculoskeletal (MSK) Injury Risk:** A measure to determine the extent to which AD Soldiers who visit the AWC for the first time meet the 2-mile run-time criteria for MSK injury risk. Reducing MSK injury rates among Soldiers remains a priority for Senior Leaders, and the 2-mile run-time criterion was established to systematically utilize AWC services to improve Soldier injury risk and enhance readiness.
- ❖ **Client Satisfaction:** A summary of AWC clients' satisfaction survey data after participating in AWC services to ensure AWCs continue to deliver high-quality, standardized services. Client satisfaction rates are associated with the likelihood of clients returning for additional services within the AWC, and also the likelihood that they will refer other program beneficiaries.

U.S. Army Public Health Center, Health Promotion and Wellness Directorate  
8252 Blackhawk Road, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21010  
410-436-5467 or DSN 584-5467

Approved for public release: distribution unlimited.

**Disclaimer:** The views expressed in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Department of Defense, Department of the Army, U.S. Army Medical Department or the U.S. Government.

The mention of any non-federal entity and/or its products is not to be construed or interpreted, in any manner, as federal endorsement of that non-federal entity or its products.

## OVERALL QUARTERLY SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022 (FY22) QUARTER 3 (Q3)

*Note: The AWCs continue to experience significant shifts in service delivery because of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. This QPMR summarizes the FY22Q3 data, and demonstrates the AWCs' continued flexibility to adjust services, resume operations during the pandemic, and improve AWC utilization.*

### ❖ Utilization:

- There were **18,422** unique clients served by 35 AWCs.
- There were **36,634** visits to 35 AWCs.
- The overall ratio of **2.0** visits per unique client.
- The overall ratio of **2.0** services per visit.
- The overall utilization achieved for fully implemented AWCs was **81%**.
  - *Target (100% utilization) = 8.5 visits per Health Educator per day for fully implemented AWCs (operational for ≥ 1 year).*
  - *The measure of staff efficiency for fully implemented AWCs changed in FY21Q4 (8.5 visits per day) from previous quarters, where Health Educators were expected to see 10.5 visits per day. This revised formula will be used to measure staff efficiency for AWC Health Educators at fully implemented AWCs for the foreseeable future.*

### ❖ Utilization by AD Soldiers Meeting Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT) 2-mile Run-Time Criteria for Musculoskeletal (MSK) Injury Risk:

- **52%** of AD Soldiers who visited the AWC for the first time during this reporting period met the criteria for MSK injury risk based on 2-mile run time.

### ❖ Client Satisfaction Ratings:

- The overall client satisfaction was high (**98%**).

### ❖ Demographics:

- The majority of clients were male (**65%**), AD (**76%**), and most were between the ages of 26 and 35 (**37%**), or 18 and 25 (**31%**).

## UTILIZATION

Table 1. Number of Unique Clients<sup>a</sup> Served

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2021			FY 2022		
			Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3
RHC-Atlantic			10,063	9,603	28,408	6,146	6,007	6,878
APG	Small	AMC	200	265	566	254	242	216
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	1,576	N/A <sup>c</sup>	3,244	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	640
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	613	622
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	1,238	1,042	3,686	733	465	586
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	741	877	2,057	624	545	632
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	760	719	2,148	468	381	518
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	534	989	1,558	406	675	626
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	598	906	2,180	668	539	433
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	421	278	818	246	271	328
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	1,765	2,096	4,710	452	327	578
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	618	605	1,978	694	476	490
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	477	511	1,698	388	368	338
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	684	832	1,974	666	592	457
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	457	489	1,900	549	521	424
RHC-Central			10,566	9,905	29,496	8,648	6,795	6,599
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	691	658	1,693	808	701	643
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	875	815	2,281	858	869	623
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	1,774	983	4,701	991	959	877
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	528	687	1,735	519	487	549
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	281	293	897	231	376	434
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	522	733	1,717	651	901	679
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1,513	990	4,407	783	483	533
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	639	461	1,701	402	360	335
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	1,520	1,840	4,533	1,288	596	563
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	1,336	1,391	3,526	1,166	464	379
JBSA	Medium	AETC	898	1,060	2,470	978	600	991
RHC-Europe			970	932	3,872	1,365	1,269	1,751
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	276	415	898	352	287	259
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	442	295	1,289	305	308	477
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	31	57	N/A <sup>c</sup>	258
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	907	395	356	457
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	252	223	759	257	318	303
RHC-Pacific			5,389	4,476	13,584	3,497	3,189	3,223
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	1,012	716	2,274	1,131	770	930
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	248	162	490	189	175	167
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	966	341	1,682	194	294	384
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1,716	1,797	4,848	1,188	909	808
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	1,449	1,462	4,320	795	1,042	934
Overall			26,930	24,878	74,515	19,642	17,242	18,422

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Each individual who participates in at least one AWC service is considered a unique client. The AWC services include metabolic testing, fitness testing, body composition analysis, biometrics, biofeedback, health coaching, and health education class attendance. Overall numbers of unique clients will be less than the sum of unique clients across quarters and/or less than the sum of unique clients across AWCs to the extent that the same client visited an AWC in more than one quarter and/or to the extent that the same client visited more than one AWC.

<sup>b</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

<sup>c</sup> The AWC facilities that did not have any Health Educators serving clients during the period are a result of staffing gaps, staff being absent for 30 or more working days during the period, staff not yet being trained to serve clients during the period, or other extenuating circumstances.

**Table 2. Number of Visits<sup>a</sup>**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2021			FY 2022		
			Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3
RHC-Atlantic			16,401	14,034	55,193	10,349	10,605	12,168
APG	Small	AMC	376	396	1,470	412	404	335
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	3,623	N/A <sup>c</sup>	8,776	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	1,067
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	937	1,064
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	1,553	1,240	7,249	1,103	815	968
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	1,597	1,703	4,816	1,253	1,231	1,295
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	1,153	1,236	4,570	859	646	865
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	802	1,404	2,858	736	1,125	995
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	824	1,332	3,908	1,016	912	890
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	718	577	1,839	554	583	689
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	2,191	2,362	6,066	619	574	930
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	969	1,002	3,646	1,117	914	1,067
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	672	754	2,863	622	621	465
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	1,237	1,367	4,139	1,148	1,095	950
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	686	661	2,993	910	748	588
RHC-Central			17,386	18,691	58,835	17,258	14,463	14,329
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	1,362	1,439	4,133	2,135	2,131	1,330
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	1,124	1,425	3,965	1,470	1,427	1,053
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	2,612	2,049	9,018	2,117	2,135	1,964
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	846	1,184	3,458	925	932	954
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	445	467	1,920	381	569	675
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	959	1,440	4,055	1,211	1,282	1,221
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1,807	1,286	5,870	1,080	784	799
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	1,127	858	4,225	778	611	506
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	2,112	2,738	7,731	1,945	1,178	1,464
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	2,003	1,907	5,906	1,645	879	675
JBSA	Medium	AETC	2,989	3,898	8,554	3,571	2,535	3,688
RHC-Europe			1,724	1,553	7,623	2,462	2,430	3,391
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	425	717	1,610	628	554	563
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	744	463	2,662	502	500	723
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	33	137	N/A <sup>c</sup>	572
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	1,458	726	748	971
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	555	373	1,860	469	628	562
RHC-Pacific			9,125	7,484	28,253	6,440	6,381	6,746
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	1,679	1,600	5,604	2,375	1,685	2,143
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	449	270	1,010	321	315	252
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	1,686	696	4,110	301	655	877
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	2,604	2,675	8,989	1,873	1,805	1,704
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	2,707	2,243	8,540	1,570	1,921	1,770
Overall			44,636	41,762	149,904	36,509	33,879	36,634

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Overall number of visits may be more than the sum of visits across quarters to the extent that the AWCs entered data into the Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker (AWCHWT) after data for each quarterly QPMR were exported.

<sup>b</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

<sup>c</sup> The AWC facilities that did not have any Health Educators serving clients during the period are a result of staffing gaps, staff being absent for 30 or more working days during the period, staff not yet being trained to serve clients during the period, or other extenuating circumstances.

**Table 3. Ratio of Services per Visit**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>a</sup>	Command	FY 2021			FY 2022		
			Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3
RHC-Atlantic			1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.2
APG	Small	AMC	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.5
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	1.5	N/A <sup>b</sup>	1.5	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	2.0
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	2.4	2.4
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.7	1.9	2.0
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.9
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	2.2	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.3
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.8	2.2
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.6
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.8	2.1	2.2
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.2	2.2
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.9	2.3
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.9
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	3.0	3.1	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.1
RHC-Central			1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.9	1.8
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.6
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.2
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.9
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.4	2.2
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.7	2.4	2.5
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.8	2.3
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.9	2.0
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.5	3.1	3.2
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.7	1.9
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.9	1.9
JBSA	Medium	AETC	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2
RHC-Europe			2.4	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.2
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.4	2.4	2.5
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.9	2.6
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	1.8	1.6	N/A <sup>b</sup>	1.9
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	1.7	2.0	2.2	2.0
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4
RHC-Pacific			1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.1
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	2.0	2.3	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.0
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.7	2.0
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	1.7	2.2	1.9	2.3	2.2	2.3
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.7	2.1	2.2
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.9
Overall			1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.0

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

<sup>b</sup> The AWC facilities that did not have any Health Educators serving clients during the period are a result of staffing gaps, staff being absent for 30 or more working days during the period, staff not yet being trained to serve clients during the period, or other extenuating circumstances.

❖ **Method:**

The number of visits that AWC Health Educators see per day is one way to measure AWC staff efficiency. The AWC Health Educators at newly implemented AWCs (open for < 1 year) are expected to see 6.3 visits per day, and AWC Health Educators at fully implemented AWCs (open for ≥ 1 year) are expected to see 8.5 visits per day. The measure of staff efficiency for fully implemented AWCs in FY22Q2 (8.5 visits per day) is a change from quarters prior to FY21Q4, where Health Educators were expected to see 10.5 visits per day. As a result, utilization for fully implemented AWCs in FY22Q2 cannot be compared to quarters prior to FY21Q4. This change aligns with Health Educators' new performance measures and will be used to measure staff efficiency for AWC Health Educators at fully implemented AWCs for the foreseeable future. The extent to which AWC Health Educators meet these targets (i.e., achieve 100% utilization) is calculated as a percentage of the benchmark number of clients that AWC Health Educators are expected to see per day and the number of productive days during the reporting period.

All client data associated with Health Educators who were absent for 30 or more working days or not yet trained to serve clients during the period are not included.

❖ **Formulas:**

The utilization for newly implemented AWCs is an index of the extent to which this expected benchmark is met:

$$\text{Utilization for Newly Implemented AWCs} = \frac{(\# \text{ visits during reporting period})}{(\# \text{ educators}) \times (\# \text{ productive days during reporting period})} \times (6.3)$$

6.3 visits per educator per day  
(6.3)

The utilization for fully implemented AWCs is an index of the extent to which this expected benchmark is met:

$$\text{Utilization for Fully Implemented AWCs} = \frac{(\# \text{ visits during reporting period})}{(\# \text{ educators}) \times (\# \text{ productive days during reporting period})} \times (8.5)$$

8.5 visits per educator per day  
(8.5)

Note: The number of productive days per quarter used to calculate utilization is 55. This number accounts for Federal holidays and an estimated maximum amount of annual and sick leave accrued per year, distributed evenly among four quarters. Both contractor and General Service (GS) employee leave is included in this formula and given equal weight. Specifically, the estimated maximum number of annual and sick leave days accrued per year is an average of contractor and GS employee leave accrual rates. As a result, utilization can be affected by variability in the ratio of contractors to GS employees within AWCs and/or by variability in the actual number of leave days taken. In addition, utilization will generally be lower at AWCs that provide relatively more services per visit compared to AWCs that provide relatively fewer services per visit.

**Table 4. Utilization Achieved for Newly Implemented AWCs (open for < 1 year)  
Target (100% utilization) = 6.3 visits per Health Educator per day**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>a</sup>	Command	FY 2021		FY 2022		
			Q3 (%)	Q4 (%)	Q1 (%)	Q2 (%)	Q3 (%)
RHC-Atlantic							
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	135 <sup>c</sup>	154 <sup>c</sup>

*Data source:* Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

<sup>b</sup> The AWC facilities that did not have any Health Educators serving clients during the period are a result of staffing gaps, staff being absent for 30 or more working days during the period, staff not yet being trained to serve clients during the period, or other extenuating circumstances.

<sup>c</sup> The AWC facilities with utilization over 100% have exceeded the target for the number of visits seen per Health Educator per day.



**Table 5. Utilization Achieved for Fully Implemented AWCs (open for ≥ 1 year)  
Target (100% utilization) = 8.5<sup>a</sup> visits per Health Educator per day**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2021		FY 2022		
			Q3 (%)	Q4 <sup>a</sup> (%)	Q1 (%)	Q2 (%)	Q3 (%)
RHC-Atlantic			86	104 <sup>c</sup>	76	65	70
APG	Small	AMC	65	85	88	86	72
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	157 <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	114 <sup>c</sup>
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	45	66	59	44	69
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	69	91	67	66	58
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	100	88	46	46	62
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	46	150 <sup>c</sup>	79	80	71
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	71	95	109 <sup>c</sup>	98	63
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	62	62	59	62	74
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	190 <sup>c</sup>	253 <sup>c</sup>	66	61	99
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	84	107 <sup>c</sup>	119 <sup>c</sup>	65	76
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	116 <sup>c</sup>	161 <sup>c</sup>	133 <sup>c</sup>	66	50
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	107 <sup>c</sup>	97	82	59	51
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	59	71	97	80	126 <sup>c</sup>
RHC-Central			86	111 <sup>c</sup>	92	84	86
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	47	77	91	114 <sup>c</sup>	76
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	65	61	79	76	75
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	90	88	65	65	73
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	146 <sup>c</sup>	127 <sup>c</sup>	99	100	102 <sup>c</sup>
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	77	100	41	61	72
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	55	103 <sup>c</sup>	86	91	87
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	156 <sup>c</sup>	138 <sup>c</sup>	116 <sup>c</sup>	84	85
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	98	92	166 <sup>c</sup>	65	54
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	91	146 <sup>c</sup>	104 <sup>c</sup>	84	78
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	116 <sup>c</sup>	136 <sup>c</sup>	88	63	48
JBSA	Medium	AETC	86	167 <sup>c</sup>	127 <sup>c</sup>	108 <sup>c</sup>	158 <sup>c</sup>
RHC-Europe			75	111 <sup>c</sup>	66	87	81
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	74	153 <sup>c</sup>	134 <sup>c</sup>	119 <sup>c</sup>	120 <sup>c</sup>
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	64	99	54	53	77
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	15	N/A <sup>d</sup>	41
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	78	80	104 <sup>c</sup>
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	96	80	100	134 <sup>c</sup>	120 <sup>c</sup>
RHC-Pacific			105 <sup>c</sup>	123 <sup>c</sup>	106 <sup>c</sup>	91	90
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	145 <sup>c</sup>	171 <sup>c</sup>	127 <sup>c</sup>	120 <sup>c</sup>	115 <sup>c</sup>
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	78	58	69	67	54
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	97	149 <sup>c</sup>	64	70	63
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	113 <sup>c</sup>	114 <sup>c</sup>	100	97	91
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	94	120 <sup>c</sup>	112 <sup>c</sup>	82	95
Overall			89	110 <sup>c</sup>	87	78	81

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Utilization during and after FY21Q4 cannot be compared to previous quarters because the number of visits Health Educators are expected to see per day changed from 10.5 visits to 8.5 visits beginning in FY21Q4.

<sup>b</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

<sup>c</sup> The AWC facilities with utilization over 100% exceeded the target for the number of visits seen per Health Educator per day. Utilization over 100% during and after FY21Q4 may be driven by the revised formula, where the number of visits per Health Educator per day changed from 10.5 visits to 8.5 visits.

<sup>d</sup> The AWC facilities that did not have any Health Educators serving clients during the period are a result of staffing gaps, staff being absent for 30 or more working days during the period, staff not yet being trained to serve clients during the period, or other extenuating circumstances.



## UTILIZATION AND 2-MILE RUN TIME

### ❖ Purpose:

To monitor the extent to which AD Soldiers who visit the AWC for the first time meet the 2-mile run-time criteria for MSK injury risk.

### ❖ Method:

Two-mile run time is an established measure of aerobic fitness.<sup>1</sup> Research shows that poor aerobic fitness, as indexed by a slow 2-mile run time, is a strong predictor of MSK injury.<sup>2</sup> For Two-mile run times exceeding 15:00 minutes for males and 18:00 minutes for females place Soldiers at risk for MSK injuries.

The data are presented in the following metric:

- Data Source: APFT 2-mile run-time data collected in the Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker (AWCHWT).
- Include: APFT 2-mile run-time data from AD Soldiers who participated in an AWC service for the *first time*<sup>3</sup> during the reporting period.
- Exclude: APFT 2-mile run-time data from any returning clients.

**Table 6. Musculoskeletal (MSK) Injury Risk Criteria**

	Meet Criteria for Risk of MSK Injury?	
	Yes	No
Male	APFT 2-mile run time > 15:00 minutes	APFT 2-mile run time ≤ 15:00 minutes
Female	APFT 2-mile run time > 18:00 minutes	APFT 2-mile run time ≤ 18:00 minutes

### ❖ Formula:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \text{Percentage of AD Soldier AWC} \\
 \text{clients who met the APFT} \\
 \text{2-mile run-time criteria for MSK} \\
 \text{injury risk at first visit}
 \end{array}
 = \left( \frac{\begin{array}{l} \text{\# of AD Soldiers who visited the AWC for the first time} \\ \text{during the reporting period and met APFT 2-mile} \\ \text{run-time criteria for MSK injury} \end{array}}{\begin{array}{l} \text{\# of AD Soldiers who visited the AWC for the} \\ \text{first time during the reporting period} \end{array}} \right) * 100$$

<sup>1</sup> Mello RP, MM Murphy, and JA Voge. 1984. *Relationship between the Army 2-mile run test and maximal oxygen uptake*. Army Medical Research and Development Command, Fort Detrick, Maryland.

<sup>2</sup> Jones BH, KG Hauret, SK Dye, VD Hauschild, SP Rossi, MD Richardson, and KE Friedl. 2017. Impact of physical fitness and body composition on injury risk among active young adults: A study of Army trainees. *J Sci Med Sport* 20(Suppl 4):S17–S22.

<sup>3</sup> Data from AD Soldiers who visited the AWC for the first time during the reporting period were used to capture an unbiased estimate of service utilization by the target priority population. Tracking the population of AD Soldiers visiting the AWC for the first time provides a unique opportunity to evaluate the impact of AWC service utilization on MSK injury risk over time.

**Table 7. Number of AD Soldiers who Visited the AWC for the First Time during the Reporting Period and Percentage of Total who Met APFT 2-mile Run-Time Criteria for MSK Injury Risk**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>a</sup>	Command	FY 2021			FY 2022								
			Q4			Q1			Q2			Q3		
			Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria	
	#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%			
RHC-Atlantic			787	413	52	585	323	55	612	313	51	603	315	52
APG	Small	AMC	11	5	45	14	7	50	21	14	67	20	13	65
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	32	13	41
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	20	6	30	19	6	32
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	41	21	51	74	37	50	70	31	44	86	32	37
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	39	27	69	36	8	22	28	12	43	13	5	38
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	112	46	41	68	29	43	37	21	57	47	20	43
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	116	52	45	45	21	47	88	35	40	81	45	56
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	49	23	47	29	13	45	33	18	55	17	10	59
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	46	30	65	43	30	70	53	31	58	39	23	59
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	22	10	45	38	12	32	32	17	53	66	42	64
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	16	7	44	18	11	61	20	6	30	24	13	54
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	50	14	28	29	12	41	23	7	30	21	6	29
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	218	127	58	120	97	81	116	71	61	100	64	64
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	67	51	76	71	46	65	71	44	62	38	23	61
RHC-Central			868	435	50	637	349	55	719	392	55	660	357	54
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	140	87	62	95	53	56	60	39	65	74	48	65
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	66	25	38	38	18	47	41	22	54	29	13	45
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	111	55	50	107	71	66	80	57	71	79	47	59
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	88	57	65	42	29	69	76	51	67	45	24	53
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	14	7	50	15	11	73	15	8	53	11	4	36
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	120	48	40	91	37	41	138	64	46	74	30	41
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	37	20	54	40	18	45	76	38	50	48	23	48
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	85	44	52	67	35	52	88	38	43	59	29	49
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	37	18	49	19	12	63	18	9	50	37	24	65
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	65	23	35	34	22	65	64	32	50	15	9	60
JBSA	Medium	AETC	105	51	49	89	43	48	63	34	54	189	106	56
RHC-Europe			121	61	50	167	85	51	111	56	50	178	87	49
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	48	20	42	51	26	51	25	15	60	55	30	55
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	43	26	60	45	29	64	30	15	50	25	14	56
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	6	1	17	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	25	18	72
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	34	13	38	37	13	35	53	15	28
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	30	15	50	31	16	52	19	13	68	20	10	50
RHC-Pacific			282	148	52	206	90	44	264	133	50	248	127	51
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	30	10	33	11	5	45	6	4	67	5	2	40
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	21	13	62	22	6	27	18	10	56	6	3	50
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	0	0	0	4	1	25	0	0	0	28	13	46
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	86	45	52	90	43	48	104	53	51	74	33	45
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	145	80	55	79	35	44	136	66	49	135	76	56
Overall			2,058	1,057	51	1,595	847	53	1,706	894	52	1,689	886	52

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

<sup>b</sup> The AWC facilities that did not have any Health Educators serving clients during the period are a result of staffing gaps, staff being absent for 30 or more working days during the period, staff not yet being trained to serve clients during the period, or other extenuating circumstances.

## CLIENT SATISFACTION RATINGS

### ❖ Method:

After participating in AWC services, clients are emailed a link to complete an online satisfaction survey that is administered through the AWCHWT. The survey contains 11 questions that assess clients' perception of their AWC experience, including staff competence, staff professionalism, service quality, and facility appearance. Each question is assigned a meaningful numeric value from 0 (lowest level of satisfaction) to 4 (highest level of satisfaction). An average satisfaction score is calculated across all 11 questions, and this average is then divided by 4 and multiplied by 100 to obtain a percentage-based client satisfaction rating.

### ❖ Formula:

Client Satisfaction Rating =  $((\text{average satisfaction score} / 4) * 100)$

**Table 8. Client Satisfaction<sup>a</sup> Ratings**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2021			FY 2022		
			Q3 (%)	Q4 (%)	Q1-Q4 (%)	Q1 (%)	Q2 (%)	Q3 (%)
RHC-Atlantic			98	98	98	98	98	98
APG	Small	AMC	98	98	99	98	98	98
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	98	N/A <sup>c</sup>	99	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	98
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	97	98
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	93	94	96	93	97	96
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	98	97	98	97	98	96
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	98	98	98	99	98	99
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	98	97	98	98	98	97
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	98	99	99	99	96	98
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	98	99	99	98	99	98
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	99	98	99	99	98	98
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	96	98	97	98	98	97
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	99	99	99	99	98	99
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	100	99	98	99	99	99
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	99	99	99	98	99	99
RHC-Central			98	98	98	98	98	98
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	97	95	97	97	97	94
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	98	98	97	98	98	98
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	98	98	98	99	98	99
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	99	98	99	98	99	98
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	100	99	99	98	98	100
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	99	99	98	96	96	98
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	99	99	98	99	99	99
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	98	95	97	96	99	98
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	98	97	98	98	98	98
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	98	98	98	98	98	99
JBSA	Medium	AETC	97	99	97	98	96	98
RHC-Europe			98	98	98	98	99	98
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	97	99	98	99	98	98
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	98	99	98	99	99	98
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	94	98	N/A <sup>c</sup>	98
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	99	97	99	99
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	98	97	98	97	98	99
RHC-Pacific			97	98	97	97	98	98
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	98	98	98	99	98	99
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	99	99	99	99	99	100
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	98	99	98	96	98	95
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	97	97	97	97	98	98
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	96	97	97	96	96	97
Overall			98	98	98	98	98	98

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> Clients complete satisfaction surveys on a voluntary basis. Newly implemented AWCs may not yet have data to include in analyses.

<sup>b</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

<sup>c</sup> The AWC facilities that did not have any Health Educators serving clients during the period are a result of staffing gaps, staff being absent for 30 or more working days during the period, staff not yet being trained to serve clients during the period, or other extenuating circumstances.

Shading Key			
Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	White
≥ 95%	< 95% and ≥ 90%	< 90%	No data

## QUARTERLY SUMMARY BY COMMAND

**Table 9. Utilization and Client Satisfaction by Command**

Command	FY 2021		FY 2022									
	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3								
<b>1. Number of Unique Clients Served</b>												
AETC	1,060	978	600	991								
AMC	265	254	242	216								
FORSCOM	10,313	8,257	6,751	6,474								
MDW	605	694	1,081	1,111								
TRADOC	9,057	5,823	5,032	5,501								
USAREUR	932	1,365	1,269	1,751								
USARPAC	2,681	2,309	2,281	2,415								
<b>2. Number of Visits</b>												
AETC	3,898	3,571	2,535	3,688								
AMC	396	412	404	335								
FORSCOM	17,197	15,062	13,643	12,774								
MDW	1,002	1,117	1,851	2,131								
TRADOC	12,907	9,318	8,440	9,273								
USAREUR	1,553	2,462	2,430	3,391								
USARPAC	4,809	4,567	4,576	5,042								
<b>3. Ratio of Services per Visit</b>												
AETC	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2								
AMC	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5								
FORSCOM	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0								
MDW	1.9	1.7	2.3	2.3								
TRADOC	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.2								
USAREUR	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.2								
USARPAC	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0								
<b>4. Utilization for Newly Implemented AWCs (open for &lt; 1 year) Target (100% utilization) = 6.3 visits per Health Educator per day</b>												
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)								
AMC	N/A	N/A	135 <sup>a</sup>	154 <sup>a</sup>								
<b>5. Utilization for Fully Implemented AWCs (open for ≥ 1 year) Target (100% utilization) = 8.5 visits per Health Educator per day</b>												
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)								
AETC	167 <sup>a</sup>	127 <sup>a</sup>	108 <sup>a</sup>	158 <sup>a</sup>								
AMC	85	88	86	72								
FORSCOM	92	77	71	70								
MDW	107 <sup>a</sup>	119 <sup>a</sup>	65	76								
TRADOC	125 <sup>a</sup>	91	78	79								
USAREUR	111 <sup>a</sup>	66	87	81								
USARPAC	129 <sup>a</sup>	109 <sup>a</sup>	89	90								
<b>6. Number of AD Soldiers who Visited the AWC for the First Time during the Reporting Period and Percentage of Total who Met APFT 2-mile Run-Time Criteria for MSK Injury Risk</b>												
	Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria	
		#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
AETC	105	51	49	89	43	48	63	34	54	189	106	56
AMC	11	5	45	14	7	50	21	14	67	20	13	65
FORSCOM	949	502	53	729	414	57	657	361	55	609	319	52
MDW	16	7	44	18	11	61	40	12	30	43	19	44
TRADOC	660	328	50	462	240	52	654	337	52	476	248	52
USAREUR	121	61	50	167	85	51	111	56	50	178	87	49
USARPAC	196	103	53	116	47	41	160	80	50	174	94	54
<b>7. Client Satisfaction Ratings</b>												
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)								
AETC	99	98	96	98								
AMC	98	98	98	98								
FORSCOM	97	98	98	98								
MDW	98	98	98	98								
TRADOC	98	98	98	98								
USAREUR	98	98	99	98								
USARPAC	98	98	98	98								

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), April 2022 export (FY22Q2), and July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Note: <sup>a</sup> The AWC facilities with utilization over 100% have exceeded the target for the number of visits seen per Health Educator per day. Utilization over 100% for fully implemented AWCs during and after FY21Q4 may be driven by the revised formula, where the number of visits per Health Educator per day changed from 10.5 visits to 8.5 visits beginning in FY21Q4.

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Table 10. Male/Female<sup>a</sup>**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2022, Q3	
			Female (%)	Male (%)
RHC-Atlantic			39	61
APG	Small	AMC	41	59
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	34	66
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	49	51
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	37	63
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	41	59
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	27	73
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	36	64
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	54	46
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	41	59
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	39	61
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	42	58
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	35	65
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	30	70
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	39	61
RHC-Central			33	67
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	35	65
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	39	61
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	30	70
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	30	70
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	28	72
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	28	72
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	34	66
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	32	67
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	31	69
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	31	69
JBSA	Medium	AETC	37	62
RHC-Europe			39	61
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	26	73
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	43	57
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	48	52
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	37	63
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	38	62
RHC-Pacific			32	68
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	27	73
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	36	63
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	30	70
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	40	60
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	29	71
Overall			35	65

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are based on the number of unique clients served. The largest percentages within each AWC and overall are shaded in blue. Newly implemented AWCs may not yet have data to include in analyses.

<sup>b</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

Shading Key
Largest percentage

**Table 11. Status<sup>a</sup>**

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2022, Q3						
			Active Duty (%)	Family Member (%)	Civilian (%)	Reservist (%)	Retiree (%)	Other (%)	Guard (%)
RHC-Atlantic			74	12	4	3	4	0	3
APG	Small	AMC	62	8	18	1	6	0	4
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	70	21	2	1	5	0	1
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	71	17	4	3	4	0	1
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	78	11	3	2	5	0	1
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	72	21	1	3	2	0	0
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	87	8	2	0	1	0	2
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	83	6	3	2	3	0	2
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	64	12	8	7	6	0	3
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	76	7	3	8	4	1	1
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	71	8	5	6	4	0	6
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	74	8	5	4	6	0	2
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	66	17	2	1	2	0	12
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	89	7	1	0	2	0	1
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	63	11	8	6	5	0	8
RHC-Central			75	10	3	4	2	0	5
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	63	9	1	11	5	2	10
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	70	19	5	1	4	0	0
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	85	7	2	4	1	0	0
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	61	8	4	1	5	0	19
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	88	10	1	0	0	0	0
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	61	11	7	15	1	0	6
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	79	7	3	1	0	0	9
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	83	9	6	0	1	0	0
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	85	9	4	0	1	0	1
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	85	10	2	0	2	0	1
JBSA	Medium	AETC	75	6	2	6	3	0	7
RHC-Europe			71	16	7	3	1	1	1
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	91	7	2	0	0	0	0
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	69	15	9	5	1	0	0
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	55	28	6	5	5	1	1
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	74	16	6	2	1	0	1
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	68	15	11	2	1	2	1
RHC-Pacific			83	10	3	1	2	0	1
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	89	7	2	1	0	1	0
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	74	14	7	1	2	1	0
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	79	11	5	1	2	0	2
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	74	15	3	2	4	0	1
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	89	8	2	0	0	0	1
Overall			76	11	4	3	3	0	3

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are based on the number of unique clients served. The largest percentages within each AWC and overall are shaded in blue. Newly implemented AWCs may not yet have data to include in analyses.

<sup>b</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

Shading Key
Largest percentage



Table 12. Age Group<sup>a</sup>

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2022, Q3						
			Up to 17 (%)	18-25 (%)	26-35 (%)	36-45 (%)	46-55 (%)	56-65 (%)	66 and older (%)
RHC-Atlantic			0	26	39	22	9	4	1
APG	Small	AMC	0	12	29	35	15	7	2
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	0	17	45	24	9	3	2
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	1	8	29	34	20	7	1
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	0	29	38	20	9	4	1
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	0	35	41	15	5	3	0
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	0	49	37	9	3	1	0
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	0	24	42	24	6	3	1
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	0	15	40	25	13	7	1
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	0	16	30	34	15	3	1
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	0	20	50	20	6	3	0
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	0	23	41	22	9	4	2
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	1	31	44	17	6	1	0
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	0	47	36	12	4	1	0
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	0	32	34	22	7	4	1
RHC-Central			0	30	37	22	7	3	1
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	0	29	36	22	7	4	2
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	0	33	38	17	7	5	1
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	0	40	37	17	4	1	0
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	0	33	40	16	5	5	1
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	0	47	36	15	2	0	0
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	0	2	17	56	21	3	0
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	0	21	53	20	5	1	0
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	0	42	39	12	6	1	0
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	0	39	41	15	3	1	0
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	0	32	50	13	3	2	1
JBSA	Medium	AETC	1	27	35	23	10	3	1
RHC-Europe			0	32	33	23	9	3	0
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	0	48	39	10	2	1	0
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	0	26	34	27	11	2	0
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	0	14	29	36	15	5	1
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	0	41	33	17	7	2	0
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	0	27	33	24	12	4	0
RHC-Pacific			0	42	37	14	5	1	1
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	0	51	30	14	4	1	0
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	0	31	43	18	8	1	0
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	0	44	37	11	5	2	1
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	0	30	41	16	7	3	2
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	0	46	38	13	3	1	0
Overall			0	31	37	20	8	3	1

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker July 2022 export (FY22Q3).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

<sup>a</sup> All percentages are based on the number of unique clients served. The largest percentages within each AWC and overall are shaded in blue. Newly implemented AWCs may not yet have data to include in analyses.

<sup>b</sup> Facility Size (Size of Beneficiary Population): Small (29K or less), Medium (30K to 77K), Large (78K or greater).

Shading Key
Largest percentage