

TIP No. 23-122-1221

ARMY WELLNESS CENTERS QUARTERLY PROGRAM MONITORING REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2021, QUARTER 4: JULY–SEPTEMBER

OVERALL QUARTERLY SUMMARY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 (FY21) JULY–SEPTEMBER

Note: The Army Wellness Centers (AWCs) experienced significant shifts in service delivery because of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, with many AWCs seeing a decrease in the number of visits and utilization at the beginning of the pandemic. Over the course of the pandemic, the number of unique clients served by the AWCs, the number of visits to the AWCs, and overall AWC utilization steadily increased and appeared to stabilize at levels comparable to pre-pandemic data in the second half of FY21. This Quarterly Program Monitoring Report (QPMR) summarizes the FY21 quarter (Q) 4 data, and demonstrates the AWCs' continued flexibility to adjust services, resume operations during the pandemic, and improve AWC utilization.

❖ Utilization:

- **24,878** unique clients served by 31 AWCs.
- **41,762** visits to 31 AWCs.
- Overall ratio of **1.7** visits per unique client.
- Overall ratio of **1.7** services per visit.
- The overall utilization achieved for fully implemented AWCs was **110%**.
 - *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 in FY21Q4 (8.5 visits per day) is changed from previous quarters, where Health Educators were expected to see 10.5 visits per day.*
 - *The overall utilization achieved for fully implemented AWCs is greater than 100% because AWCs have exceeded the target for the number of clients seen per Health Educator per day.*

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

- **51%** 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.

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.

❖ **Client Satisfaction Ratings:**

- Overall client satisfaction was **high (98%)**.

❖ **Demographics:**

Majority of clients were male (**71%**), AD (**82%**), and most were between the ages of 18 and 25 (**44%**) or 26 and 35 (**35%**).

OVERALL YEARLY SUMMARY FOR FY21

The following summarizes the data from the AWC Health and Wellness Tracker (AWCHWT) for FY21Q1-FY21Q4:

❖ **Utilization:**

- **74,515** unique clients served by 34 AWCs.
- **149,904** visits to 34 AWCs.
- Overall ratio of **2.0** visits per unique client.
- Overall ratio of **1.7** services per visit.
- The measure of staff efficiency for fully implemented AWCs in FY21Q4 (8.5 visits per day) is a change from previous quarters, where Health Educators were expected to see 10.5 visits per day. As a result, the overall utilization across FY21Q1-FY21Q4 for fully implemented AWCs was not calculated.

❖ **Client Satisfaction Ratings:**

- Overall client satisfaction was **high (98%)**.

UTILIZATION

Table 1. Number of Unique Clients^a Served

Facility Name	Facility Size ^b	Command	FY 2021				
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4
RHC-Atlantic			6,260	7,412	10,063	9,603	28,408
APG	Small	AMC	149	173	200	265	566
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	939	1,111	1,576	N/A ^c	3,244
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	1,307	1,130	1,238	1,042	3,686
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	358	437	741	877	2,057
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	546	624	760	719	2,148
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	113	287	534	989	1,558
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	475	580	598	906	2,180
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	142	168	421	278	818
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	241	832	1,765	2,096	4,710
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	386	676	618	605	1,978
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	460	488	477	511	1,698
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	290	452	684	832	1,974
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	858	456	457	489	1,900
RHC-Central			6,278	7,624	10,566	9,905	29,496
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	97	538	691	658	1,693
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	400	619	875	815	2,281
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	1,530	1,376	1,774	983	4,701
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	456	438	528	687	1,735
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	171	385	281	293	897
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	267	450	522	733	1,717
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1,028	1,218	1,513	990	4,407
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	487	651	639	461	1,701
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	575	1,129	1,520	1,840	4,533
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	867	388	1,336	1,391	3,526
JBSA	Medium	AETC	403	432	898	1,060	2,470
RHC-Europe			1,027	1,551	970	932	3,872
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	123	183	276	415	898
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	249	539	442	295	1,289
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	31	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	31
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	376	590	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	907
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	248	239	252	223	759
RHC-Pacific			2,400	4,235	5,389	4,476	13,584
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	624	656	1,012	716	2,274
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	N/A ^c	190	248	162	490
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	343	506	966	341	1,682
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1,027	1,214	1,716	1,797	4,848
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	406	1,669	1,449	1,462	4,320
Overall			15,957	20,806	26,930	24,878	74,515

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, January 2021 export (FY21Q1), April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), and October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

^a 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.

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

^c 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^a

Facility Name	Facility Size ^b	Command	FY 2021				
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4
RHC-Atlantic			11,398	13,264	16,401	14,034	55,193
APG	Small	AMC	332	363	376	396	1,470
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	2,436	2,708	3,623	N/A ^c	8,776
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	2,361	2,092	1,553	1,240	7,249
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	620	888	1,597	1,703	4,816
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	1,097	1,080	1,153	1,236	4,570
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	172	478	802	1,404	2,858
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	782	967	824	1,332	3,908
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	204	294	718	577	1,839
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	356	1,156	2,191	2,362	6,066
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	647	1,027	969	1,002	3,646
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	723	714	672	754	2,863
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	647	888	1,237	1,367	4,139
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	1,021	609	686	661	2,993
RHC-Central			9,586	13,117	17,386	18,691	58,835
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	236	1,095	1,362	1,439	4,133
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	542	830	1,124	1,425	3,965
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	2,169	2,187	2,612	2,049	9,018
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	725	703	846	1,184	3,458
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	327	680	445	467	1,920
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	717	934	959	1,440	4,055
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1,196	1,581	1,807	1,286	5,870
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	853	1,386	1,127	858	4,225
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	1,073	1,808	2,112	2,738	7,731
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	1,201	795	2,003	1,907	5,906
JBSA	Medium	AETC	547	1,118	2,989	3,898	8,554
RHC-Europe			1,729	2,616	1,724	1,553	7,623
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	196	271	425	717	1,610
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	509	949	744	463	2,662
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	33	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	33
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	576	880	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	1,458
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	415	516	555	373	1,860
RHC-Pacific			4,298	7,334	9,125	7,484	28,253
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	1,073	1,254	1,679	1,600	5,604
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	N/A ^c	289	449	270	1,010
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	693	1,026	1,686	696	4,110
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1,783	1,925	2,604	2,675	8,989
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	749	2,840	2,707	2,243	8,540
Overall			27,011	36,331	44,636	41,762	149,904

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, January 2021 export (FY21Q1), April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), and October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

^a Overall number of visits may be more than the sum of visits across quarters to the extent that the AWCs entered data into AWCHWT after data for each quarterly QPMR were exported.

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

^c 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 ^a	Command	FY 2021				
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4
RHC-Atlantic			1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7
APG	Small	AMC	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.2
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	1.4	1.4	1.5	N/A ^b	1.5
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.4	1.2
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	2.3	2.2	2.2	1.7	2.0
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.6
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	2.5	2.7	2.4	2.7	2.5
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	1.9	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.3
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.9
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.8
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	1.9	2.7	3.0	3.1	2.6
RHC-Central			1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.7
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	2.0	1.8	2.1	2.2	2.1
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.8	1.6
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	1.8	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.9
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	1.9	1.8	2.4	2.2	2.1
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	1.8	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.2
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	1.5	1.9	1.6	1.5	1.6
JBSA	Medium	AETC	1.6	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2
RHC-Europe			2.1	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.2
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	2.3	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.0
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.5
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	1.8	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	1.8
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	1.7	1.8	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	1.7
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4
RHC-Pacific			2.0	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.2
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	N/A ^b	1.6	1.6	1.9	1.7
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	2.0	1.7	1.7	2.2	1.9
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.6
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	2.1	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7
Overall			1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, January 2021 export (FY21Q1), April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), and October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

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

^b 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 FY21Q4 (8.5 visits per day) is a change from previous quarters, where Health Educators were expected to see **10.5 visits per day**. As a result, utilization for fully implemented AWCs in FY21Q4 **cannot** be compared to previous quarters. This change aligns with Health Educator’s 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:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \boxed{\text{Utilization for Newly Implemented AWCs}} = \frac{\text{(# visits during reporting period)}}{(\# \text{ educators}) \times (\# \text{ productive days during reporting period})} \times \boxed{6.3} \\
 \begin{array}{l}
 \text{6.3 visits per} \\
 \text{educator per} \\
 \text{day} \\
 \downarrow \\
 \boxed{6.3}
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

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

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \boxed{\text{Utilization for Fully Implemented AWCs}} = \frac{\text{(# visits during reporting period)}}{(\# \text{ educators}) \times (\# \text{ productive days during reporting period})} \times \boxed{8.5} \\
 \begin{array}{l}
 \text{8.5 visits per} \\
 \text{educator per} \\
 \text{day} \\
 \downarrow \\
 \boxed{8.5}
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

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 Fully Implemented AWCs (open for ≥ 1 year)
Target (100% utilization) = 8.5^a visits per Health Educator per day**

			FY 2021			
Facility Name	Facility Size ^b	Command	Q1 (%)	Q2 (%)	Q3 (%)	Q4 ^b (%)
RHC-Atlantic			56	68	86	104 ^c
APG	Small	AMC	57	63	65	85
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	105 ^c	117 ^c	157 ^c	N/A ^d
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	58	52	45	66
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	27	51	69	91
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	47	47	100	88
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	15	41	46	150 ^c
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	68	84	71	95
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	18	25	62	62
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	31	100	190 ^c	253 ^c
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	37	89	84	107 ^c
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	125 ^c	62	116 ^c	161 ^c
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	56	77	107 ^c	97
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	177 ^c	105 ^c	59	71
RHC-Central			40	60	86	111 ^c
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	8	47	47	77
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	19	48	65	61
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	47	63	90	88
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	126 ^c	122 ^c	146 ^c	127 ^c
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	28	69	77	100
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	31	40	55	103 ^c
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	104 ^c	137 ^c	156 ^c	138 ^c
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	74	120 ^c	98	92
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	46	78	91	146 ^c
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	69	34	116 ^c	136 ^c
JBSA	Medium	AETC	16	32	86	167 ^c
RHC-Europe			43	75	75	111 ^c
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	17	23	74	153 ^c
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	44	82	64	99
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	6	N/A ^d	N/A ^d	N/A ^d
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	100	152 ^c	N/A ^d	N/A ^d
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	72	89	96	80
RHC-Pacific			68	91	105 ^c	123 ^c
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	186 ^c	109 ^c	145 ^c	171 ^c
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	N/A ^d	50	78	58
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	40	89	97	149 ^c
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	77	83	113 ^c	114 ^c
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	43	98	94	120 ^c
Overall			49	68	89	110 ^c

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, January 2021 export (FY21Q1), April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), and October 2021 export (FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

^a Utilization for 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 in FY21Q4.

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

^c The AWC facilities with utilization over 100% have exceeded the target for the number of clients seen per Health Educator per day. Utilization over 100% in 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.

^d 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.¹ Research shows that poor aerobic fitness, as indexed by a slow 2-mile run time, is a strong predictor of MSK injury.² 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 AWCHWT.
- Include: APFT 2-mile run-time data from AD Soldiers who participated in an AWC service for the *first time*³ during the reporting period.
- Exclude: APFT 2-mile run-time data from any returning clients.

Table 5. 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:

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

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ 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 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

Facility Name	Facility Size ^a	Command	FY 2021											
			Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4		
			Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria	
				#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
RHC-Atlantic			749	333	44	771	376	49	1,083	503	46	787	413	52
APG	Small	AMC	11	6	55	8	4	50	5	3	60	11	5	45
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	91	20	22	97	31	32	254	58	23	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	111	45	41	83	43	52	54	18	33	41	21	51
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	48	25	52	67	37	55	55	38	69	39	27	69
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	141	61	43	128	65	51	124	54	44	112	46	41
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	26	15	58	49	22	45	81	42	52	116	52	45
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	74	35	47	64	28	44	78	39	50	49	23	47
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	33	18	55	45	25	56	61	34	56	46	30	65
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	42	18	43	40	22	55	31	12	39	22	10	45
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	17	10	59	16	5	31	18	12	67	16	7	44
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	52	24	46	43	14	33	31	11	35	50	14	28
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	67	39	58	87	57	66	234	144	62	218	127	58
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	36	17	47	44	23	52	57	38	67	67	51	76
RHC-Central			662	352	53	776	388	50	763	415	54	868	435	50
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	11	7	64	93	58	62	116	70	60	140	87	62
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	84	43	51	108	48	44	106	55	52	66	25	38
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	272	144	53	170	96	56	118	71	60	111	55	50
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	25	14	56	26	14	54	24	14	58	88	57	65
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	25	16	64	34	16	47	33	22	67	14	7	50
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	37	9	24	51	19	37	68	24	35	120	48	40
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	17	8	47	25	13	52	57	26	46	37	20	54
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	62	36	58	95	45	47	81	36	44	85	44	52
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	59	32	54	64	31	48	40	25	63	37	18	49
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	46	29	63	68	27	40	82	49	60	65	23	35
JBSA	Medium	AETC	24	14	58	42	21	50	38	23	61	105	51	49
RHC-Europe			111	48	43	212	104	49	137	72	53	121	61	50
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	34	17	50	39	19	49	59	24	41	48	20	42
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	32	14	44	85	47	55	56	33	59	43	26	60
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	1	0	0	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	23	5	22	53	19	36	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	21	12	57	35	19	54	22	15	68	30	15	50
RHC-Pacific			280	145	52	550	246	45	487	230	47	282	148	52
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	38	20	53	7	6	86	8	4	50	30	10	33
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	N/A ^b	7	3	43	18	11	61	21	13	62
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	22	10	45	26	11	42	22	7	32	0	0	0
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	147	78	53	144	60	42	145	82	57	86	45	52
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	73	37	51	366	166	45	294	126	43	145	80	55
Overall			1,802	878	49	2,309	1,114	48	2,470	1,220	49	2,058	1,057	51

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, January 2021 export (FY21Q1), April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), and October 2021 export (FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

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

^b 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 7. Client Satisfaction^a Ratings

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

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, January 2021 export (FY21Q1), April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), and October 2021 export (FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

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

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

^c 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 8. Utilization and Client Satisfaction by Command

Command	FY 2021											
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4								
1. Number of Unique Clients Served												
AETC	403	432	898	1,060								
AMC	149	173	200	265								
FORSCOM	6,786	8,553	10,914	10,313								
MDW	386	676	618	605								
TRADOC	5,844	6,413	9,709	9,057								
USAREUR	1,027	1,551	970	932								
USARPAC	1,373	3,021	3,675	2,681								
2. Number of Visits												
AETC	547	1,118	2,989	3,898								
AMC	332	363	376	396								
FORSCOM	11,708	14,859	16,926	17,197								
MDW	647	1,027	969	1,002								
TRADOC	9,533	10,939	15,131	12,907								
USAREUR	1,729	2,616	1,724	1,553								
USARPAC	2,515	5,409	6,521	4,809								
3. Ratio of Services per Visit												
AETC	1.6	1.2	1.1	1.1								
AMC	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.3								
FORSCOM	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7								
MDW	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.9								
TRADOC	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7								
USAREUR	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.2								
USARPAC	2.2	1.8	1.8	1.9								
4. Utilization for Fully Implemented AWCs (open for ≥ 1 year) Target (100% utilization) = 8.5 visits per Health Educator per day												
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)								
AETC	16	32	86	167 ^a								
AMC	57	63	65	85								
FORSCOM	43	63	77	92								
MDW	37	89	84	107 ^a								
TRADOC	69	73	105 ^a	125 ^a								
USAREUR	43	75	75	111 ^a								
USARPAC	62	94	103 ^a	129 ^a								
5. 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												
	Total	Met Criteria		Total	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria	
	#	#	%	#	#	%		#	%		#	%
AETC	24	14	58	42	21	50	38	23	61	105	51	49
AMC	11	6	55	8	4	50	5	3	60	11	5	45
FORSCOM	1,027	526	51	1,073	556	52	1,106	615	56	949	502	53
MDW	17	10	59	16	5	31	18	12	67	16	7	44
TRADOC	479	207	43	552	238	43	824	347	42	660	328	50
USAREUR	111	48	43	212	104	49	137	72	53	121	61	50
USARPAC	133	67	50	406	186	46	342	148	43	196	103	53

Table 8. Utilization and Client Satisfaction by Command (continued)

Command	FY 2021			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
6. Client Satisfaction Ratings	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
AETC	95	97	97	99
AMC	99	99	98	98
FORSCOM	98	98	98	97
MDW	98	95	96	98
TRADOC	98	99	98	98
USAREUR	99	98	98	98
USARPAC	97	98	98	98

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, January 2021 export (FY21Q1), April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), and October 2021 export (FY21Q4).

Notes:

^a The AWC facilities with utilization over 100% have exceeded the target for the number of clients seen per Health Educator per day. Utilization over 100% in 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.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 9. Male/Female^a

Facility Name	Facility Size ^b	Command	FY 2021, Q4	
			Female (%)	Male (%)
RHC-Atlantic			27	73
APG	Small	AMC	37	63
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	20	80
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	26	74
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	25	74
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	24	76
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	38	62
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	40	59
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	21	79
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	38	61
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	35	65
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	22	78
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	37	63
RHC-Central			30	70
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	36	64
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	35	64
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	29	70
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	27	73
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	34	66
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	30	70
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	28	72
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	34	64
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	18	82
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	26	74
JBSA	Medium	AETC	45	54
RHC-Europe			37	62
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	28	72
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	43	57
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	47	52
RHC-Pacific			31	68
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	37	62
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	47	53
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	25	75
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	32	68
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	27	73
Overall			29	71

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker October 2021 export (FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

^a 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.

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

^c 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
Largest percentage

Table 10. Status^a

Facility Name	Facility Size ^b	Command	FY 2021, Q4						
			Active Duty (%)	Family Member (%)	Civilian (%)	Reservist (%)	Retiree (%)	Other (%)	Guard (%)
RHC-Atlantic			79	6	3	4	1	0	6
APG	Small	AMC	61	9	24	1	4	0	2
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	90	4	4	0	1	0	0
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	87	10	0	0	1	0	0
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	87	9	2	1	1	0	0
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	84	4	4	3	2	0	2
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	80	5	1	11	1	0	1
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	69	10	5	11	3	1	0
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	62	2	1	10	1	0	24
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	76	8	4	3	2	1	6
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	81	9	3	2	2	0	3
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	93	5	0	0	1	0	0
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	74	14	3	1	3	0	4
RHC-Central			83	7	3	3	2	0	1
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	72	11	5	7	3	1	1
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	78	15	2	1	3	0	0
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	89	6	1	2	1	0	0
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	82	6	5	1	3	0	3
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	82	15	1	1	1	0	0
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	67	14	4	11	1	0	3
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	90	3	1	3	1	0	3
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	80	9	8	0	1	0	0
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	94	3	2	0	0	0	0
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	90	4	1	1	1	0	3
JBSA	Medium	AETC	70	9	3	9	7	0	2
RHC-Europe			75	12	7	2	2	1	0
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	88	6	3	0	2	0	0
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	68	15	8	6	0	2	0
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	60	21	14	1	2	0	0
RHC-Pacific			87	7	2	2	1	0	1
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	86	8	4	0	0	0	0
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	48	27	19	6	1	0	0
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	87	9	1	0	2	0	1
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	85	7	2	3	2	0	1
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	93	4	1	1	0	0	0
Overall			82	7	3	3	2	0	3

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker October 2021 export (FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

^a 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.

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

^c 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
Largest percentage

Table 11. Age Group^a

Facility Name	Facility Size ^b	Command	FY 2021, Q4						
			Up to 17 (%)	18-25 (%)	26-35 (%)	36-45 (%)	46-55 (%)	56-65 (%)	66 and older (%)
RHC-Atlantic			0	45	34	13	5	2	0
APG	Small	AMC	0	11	27	33	19	7	2
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	0	41	41	12	4	2	0
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	0	47	37	11	3	2	0
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	0	48	38	11	2	1	0
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	0	31	43	17	6	2	0
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	0	13	54	19	10	5	1
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	0	26	27	31	14	1	1
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	2	74	17	6	1	1	0
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	0	33	37	21	6	2	1
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	1	49	35	10	3	2	0
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	0	52	33	11	2	1	0
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	0	32	37	19	7	4	1
RHC-Central			1	44	35	14	5	2	1
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	2	30	36	20	10	2	0
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	0	41	41	12	4	2	0
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	0	43	38	15	4	1	0
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	1	52	28	9	4	3	2
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	0	38	41	18	2	0	0
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	0	7	36	42	14	1	0
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	3	53	33	8	2	1	0
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	0	41	35	14	5	3	1
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	0	58	33	7	2	0	0
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	2	54	35	7	1	1	0
JBSA	Medium	AETC	1	30	31	21	10	5	3
RHC-Europe			0	35	34	19	10	3	0
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	0	40	36	14	7	3	0
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	0	32	33	21	12	2	0
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c	N/A ^c
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	0	26	33	24	13	3	0
RHC-Pacific			0	43	36	15	4	2	0
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	0	38	37	18	4	2	0
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	0	17	39	24	15	4	1
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	0	50	38	7	3	1	0
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1	44	34	15	4	2	1
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	0	45	38	14	3	0	0
Overall			1	44	35	14	5	2	0

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker October 2021 export (FY21Q4).

Legend: N/A = not applicable.

Notes:

^a 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.

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

^c 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
Largest percentage