

TIP No. 23-124-0622

## Army Wellness Centers Quarterly Program Monitoring Report Fiscal Year 2022, Quarter 2: January–March

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 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 Active Duty 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 of Senior Leaders, and the 2-mile run time criterion was established in order 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 2 (Q2)

*Note: The AWCs continue to experience significant shifts in service delivery because of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. This QPMR summarizes the FY22Q2 data, and demonstrates the AWCs' continued flexibility to adjust services, resume operations during the pandemic, and improve AWC utilization.*

### ❖ Utilization:

- **17,242** unique clients served by 33 AWCs.
- **33,879** visits to 33 AWCs.
- Overall ratio of **2.0** visits per unique client.
- Overall ratio of **2.0** services per visit.
- The overall utilization achieved for fully implemented AWCs was **78%**.
  - *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 Active Duty (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:

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

### ❖ Demographics:

- Majority of clients were male (**66%**), AD (**77%**), 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	
			Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4	Q1	Q2
RHC-Atlantic			7,412	10,063	9,603	28,408	6,146	6,007
APG	Small	AMC	173	200	265	566	254	242
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	1,111	1,576	N/A <sup>c</sup>	3,244	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	613
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	1,130	1,238	1,042	3,686	733	465
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	437	741	877	2,057	624	545
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	624	760	719	2,148	468	381
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	287	534	989	1,558	406	675
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	580	598	906	2,180	668	539
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	168	421	278	818	246	271
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	832	1,765	2,096	4,710	452	327
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	676	618	605	1,978	694	476
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	488	477	511	1,698	388	368
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	452	684	832	1,974	666	592
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	456	457	489	1,900	549	521
RHC-Central			7,624	10,566	9,905	29,496	8,648	6,795
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	538	691	658	1,693	808	701
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	619	875	815	2,281	858	869
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	1,376	1,774	983	4,701	991	959
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	438	528	687	1,735	519	487
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	385	281	293	897	231	376
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	450	522	733	1,717	651	901
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1,218	1,513	990	4,407	783	483
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	651	639	461	1,701	402	360
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	1,129	1,520	1,840	4,533	1,288	596
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	388	1,336	1,391	3,526	1,166	464
JBSA	Medium	AETC	432	898	1,060	2,470	978	600
RHC-Europe			1,551	970	932	3,872	1,365	1,269
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	183	276	415	898	352	287
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	539	442	295	1,289	305	308
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	31	57	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	590	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	907	395	356
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	239	252	223	759	257	318
RHC-Pacific			4,235	5,389	4,476	13,584	3,497	3,189
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	656	1,012	716	2,274	1,131	770
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	190	248	162	490	189	175
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	506	966	341	1,682	194	294
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1,214	1,716	1,797	4,848	1,188	909
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	1,669	1,449	1,462	4,320	795	1,042
Overall			20,806	26,930	24,878	74,515	19,642	17,242

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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	
			Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1-Q4	Q1	Q2
RHC-Atlantic			13,264	16,401	14,034	55,193	10,349	10,605
APG	Small	AMC	363	376	396	1,470	412	404
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	2,708	3,623	N/A <sup>c</sup>	8,776	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	937
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	2,092	1,553	1,240	7,249	1,103	815
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	888	1,597	1,703	4,816	1,253	1,231
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	1,080	1,153	1,236	4,570	859	646
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	478	802	1,404	2,858	736	1,125
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	967	824	1,332	3,908	1,016	912
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	294	718	577	1,839	554	583
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	1,156	2,191	2,362	6,066	619	574
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	1,027	969	1,002	3,646	1,117	914
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	714	672	754	2,863	622	621
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	888	1,237	1,367	4,139	1,148	1,095
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	609	686	661	2,993	910	748
RHC-Central			13,117	17,386	18,691	58,835	17,258	14,463
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	1,095	1,362	1,439	4,133	2,135	2,131
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	830	1,124	1,425	3,965	1,470	1,427
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	2,187	2,612	2,049	9,018	2,117	2,135
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	703	846	1,184	3,458	925	932
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	680	445	467	1,920	381	569
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	934	959	1,440	4,055	1,211	1,282
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	1,581	1,807	1,286	5,870	1,080	784
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	1,386	1,127	858	4,225	778	611
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	1,808	2,112	2,738	7,731	1,945	1,178
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	795	2,003	1,907	5,906	1,645	879
JBSA	Medium	AETC	1,118	2,989	3,898	8,554	3,571	2,535
RHC-Europe			2,616	1,724	1,553	7,623	2,462	2,430
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	271	425	717	1,610	628	554
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	949	744	463	2,662	502	500
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	33	137	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	880	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	1,458	726	748
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	516	555	373	1,860	469	628
RHC-Pacific			7,334	9,125	7,484	28,253	6,440	6,381
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	1,254	1,679	1,600	5,604	2,375	1,685
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	289	449	270	1,010	321	315
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	1,026	1,686	696	4,110	301	655
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	1,925	2,604	2,675	8,989	1,873	1,805
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	2,840	2,707	2,243	8,540	1,570	1,921
Overall			36,331	44,636	41,762	149,904	36,509	33,879

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4; FY21Q1-FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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:

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

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:

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

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	
			Q2 (%)	Q3 (%)	Q4 <sup>b</sup> (%)	Q1 (%)	Q2 (%)
RHC-Atlantic							
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	135 <sup>c</sup>

*Data source:* Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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 clients 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	
			Q2 (%)	Q3 (%)	Q4 <sup>a</sup> (%)	Q1 (%)	Q2 (%)
RHC-Atlantic			68	86	104 <sup>c</sup>	76	65
APG	Small	AMC	63	65	85	88	86
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	117 <sup>c</sup>	157 <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	52	45	66	59	44
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	51	69	91	67	66
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	47	100	88	46	46
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	41	46	150 <sup>c</sup>	79	80
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	84	71	95	109 <sup>c</sup>	98
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	25	62	62	59	62
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	100	190 <sup>c</sup>	253 <sup>c</sup>	66	61
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	89	84	107 <sup>c</sup>	119 <sup>c</sup>	65
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	62	116 <sup>c</sup>	161 <sup>c</sup>	133 <sup>c</sup>	66
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	77	107 <sup>c</sup>	97	82	59
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	105 <sup>c</sup>	59	71	97	80
RHC-Central			60	86	111 <sup>c</sup>	92	84
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	47	47	77	91	114 <sup>c</sup>
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	48	65	61	79	76
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	63	90	88	65	65
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	122 <sup>c</sup>	146 <sup>c</sup>	127 <sup>c</sup>	99	100
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	69	77	100	41	61
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	40	55	103 <sup>c</sup>	86	91
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	137 <sup>c</sup>	156 <sup>c</sup>	138 <sup>c</sup>	116 <sup>c</sup>	84
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	120 <sup>c</sup>	98	92	166 <sup>c</sup>	65
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	78	91	146 <sup>c</sup>	104 <sup>c</sup>	84
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	34	116 <sup>c</sup>	136 <sup>c</sup>	88	63
JBSA	Medium	AETC	32	86	167 <sup>c</sup>	127 <sup>c</sup>	108 <sup>c</sup>
RHC-Europe			75	75	111 <sup>c</sup>	66	87
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	23	74	153 <sup>c</sup>	134 <sup>c</sup>	119 <sup>c</sup>
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	82	64	99	54	53
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	15	N/A <sup>d</sup>
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	152 <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	N/A <sup>d</sup>	78	80
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	89	96	80	100	134 <sup>c</sup>
RHC-Pacific			91	105 <sup>c</sup>	123 <sup>c</sup>	106 <sup>c</sup>	91
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	109 <sup>c</sup>	145 <sup>c</sup>	171 <sup>c</sup>	127 <sup>c</sup>	120 <sup>c</sup>
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	50	78	58	69	67
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	89	97	149 <sup>c</sup>	64	70
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	83	113 <sup>c</sup>	114 <sup>c</sup>	100	97
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	98	94	120 <sup>c</sup>	112 <sup>c</sup>	82
Overall			68	89	110 <sup>c</sup>	87	78

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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 clients 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> 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*<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					
			Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2		
			Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria		Total #	Met Criteria	
				#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
RHC-Atlantic			1,083	503	46	787	413	52	585	323	55	612	313	51
APG	Small	AMC	5	3	60	11	5	45	14	7	50	21	14	67
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	254	58	23	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>
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>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	20	6	30
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	54	18	33	41	21	51	74	37	50	70	31	44
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	55	38	69	39	27	69	36	8	22	28	12	43
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	124	54	44	112	46	41	68	29	43	37	21	57
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	81	42	52	116	52	45	45	21	47	88	35	40
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	78	39	50	49	23	47	29	13	45	33	18	55
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	61	34	56	46	30	65	43	30	70	53	31	58
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	31	12	39	22	10	45	38	12	32	32	17	53
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	18	12	67	16	7	44	18	11	61	20	6	30
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	31	11	35	50	14	28	29	12	41	23	7	30
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	234	144	62	218	127	58	120	97	81	116	71	61
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	57	38	67	67	51	76	71	46	65	71	44	62
RHC-Central			763	415	54	868	435	50	637	349	55	719	392	55
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	116	70	60	140	87	62	95	53	56	60	39	65
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	106	55	52	66	25	38	38	18	47	41	22	54
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	118	71	60	111	55	50	107	71	66	80	57	71
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	24	14	58	88	57	65	42	29	69	76	51	67
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	33	22	67	14	7	50	15	11	73	15	8	53
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	68	24	35	120	48	40	91	37	41	138	64	46
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	57	26	46	37	20	54	40	18	45	76	38	50
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	81	36	44	85	44	52	67	35	52	88	38	43
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	40	25	63	37	18	49	19	12	63	18	9	50
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	82	49	60	65	23	35	34	22	65	64	32	50
JBSA	Medium	AETC	38	23	61	105	51	49	89	43	48	63	34	54
RHC-Europe			137	72	53	121	61	50	167	85	51	111	56	50
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	59	24	41	48	20	42	51	26	51	25	15	60
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	56	33	59	43	26	60	45	29	64	30	15	50
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	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>	6	1	17	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>	N/A <sup>b</sup>
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	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>	34	13	38	37	13	35
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	22	15	68	30	15	50	31	16	52	19	13	68
RHC-Pacific			487	230	47	282	148	52	206	90	44	264	133	50
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	8	4	50	30	10	33	11	5	45	6	4	67
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	18	11	61	21	13	62	22	6	27	18	10	56
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	22	7	32	0	0	0	4	1	25	0	0	0
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	145	82	57	86	45	52	90	43	48	104	53	51
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	294	126	43	145	80	55	79	35	44	136	66	49
Overall			2,470	1,220	49	2,058	1,057	51	1,595	847	53	1,706	894	52

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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									
	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2								
<b>1. Number of Unique Clients Served</b>												
AETC	898	1,060	978	600								
AMC	200	265	254	242								
FORSCOM	10,914	10,313	8,257	6,751								
MDW	618	605	694	1,081								
TRADOC	9,709	9,057	5,823	5,032								
USAREUR	970	932	1,365	1,269								
USARPAC	3,675	2,681	2,309	2,281								
<b>2. Number of Visits</b>												
AETC	2,989	3,898	3,571	2,535								
AMC	376	396	412	404								
FORSCOM	16,926	17,197	15,062	13,643								
MDW	969	1,002	1,117	1,851								
TRADOC	15,131	12,907	9,318	8,440								
USAREUR	1,724	1,553	2,462	2,430								
USARPAC	6,521	4,809	4,567	4,576								
<b>3. Ratio of Services per Visit</b>												
AETC	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1								
AMC	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.5								
FORSCOM	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9								
MDW	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.3								
TRADOC	1.7	1.7	2.0	2.3								
USAREUR	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.4								
USARPAC	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9								
<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	N/A	135 <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	86	167 <sup>a</sup>	127 <sup>a</sup>	108 <sup>a</sup>								
AMC	65	85	88	86								
FORSCOM	77	92	77	71								
MDW	84	107 <sup>a</sup>	119 <sup>a</sup>	65								
TRADOC	105 <sup>a</sup>	125 <sup>a</sup>	91	78								
USAREUR	75	111 <sup>a</sup>	66	87								
USARPAC	103 <sup>a</sup>	129 <sup>a</sup>	109 <sup>a</sup>	89								
<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>												
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Met Criteria</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>Met Criteria</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>Met Criteria</b>		<b>Total</b>	<b>Met Criteria</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
AETC	38	23	61	105	51	49	89	43	48	63	34	54
AMC	5	3	60	11	5	45	14	7	50	21	14	67
FORSCOM	1,106	615	56	949	502	53	729	414	57	657	361	55
MDW	18	12	67	16	7	44	18	11	61	40	12	30
TRADOC	824	347	42	660	328	50	462	240	52	654	337	52
USAREUR	137	72	53	121	61	50	167	85	51	111	56	50
USARPAC	342	148	43	196	103	53	116	47	41	160	80	50
<b>7. Client Satisfaction Ratings</b>					(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)				
AETC	97	99	98	96								
AMC	98	98	98	98								
FORSCOM	98	97	98	98								
MDW	96	98	98	98								
TRADOC	98	98	98	98								
USAREUR	98	98	98	99								
USARPAC	98	98	98	98								

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker, April 2021 export (FY21Q2), July 2021 export (FY21Q3), October 2021 export (FY21Q4), January 2022 export (FY22Q1), and April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

Notes: <sup>a</sup> 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% 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, Q2	
			Female (%)	Male (%)
RHC-Atlantic			37	63
APG	Small	AMC	48	52
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	37	63
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	31	69
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	38	62
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	29	71
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	34	66
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	47	53
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	44	56
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	40	60
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	41	59
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	35	65
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	34	66
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	33	67
RHC-Central			31	69
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	35	65
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	32	68
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	30	70
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	29	71
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	28	72
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	26	74
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	35	64
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	29	71
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	28	72
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	29	71
JBSA	Medium	AETC	42	58
RHC-Europe			40	60
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	32	68
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	48	52
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	42	58
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	37	63
RHC-Pacific			34	66
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	31	69
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	42	58
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	28	72
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	40	60
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	31	69
Overall			34	66

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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).

<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
Largest percentage

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

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2022, Q2						
			Active Duty (%)	Family Member (%)	Civilian (%)	Reservist (%)	Retiree (%)	Other (%)	Guard (%)
RHC-Atlantic			74	10	4	3	3	0	4
APG	Small	AMC	52	13	24	1	7	0	3
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	65	13	9	7	4	0	1
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	78	12	2	3	4	0	0
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	77	19	1	1	2	0	1
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	81	13	3	0	2	0	1
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	77	6	3	5	4	0	5
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	79	8	3	4	4	0	1
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	75	9	6	7	3	0	0
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	63	10	6	6	4	0	11
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	83	7	2	4	3	0	2
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	70	13	2	2	2	0	11
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	90	6	1	1	1	0	1
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	61	10	4	3	3	0	18
RHC-Central			77	9	3	6	2	0	3
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	58	9	8	16	2	1	5
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	81	14	1	1	3	0	0
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	85	7	2	6	1	0	0
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	71	7	4	1	5	0	12
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	88	10	1	1	0	0	1
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	61	11	1	20	0	0	7
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	83	9	4	0	1	0	3
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	84	11	4	0	1	0	0
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	87	8	3	1	0	0	1
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	91	5	2	0	1	0	1
JBSA	Medium	AETC	70	9	5	4	7	1	4
RHC-Europe			71	16	10	2	1	0	0
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	85	11	3	0	0	0	0
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	73	15	7	3	1	1	0
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	63	22	10	3	1	0	1
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	66	14	18	2	0	0	0
RHC-Pacific			85	10	2	1	1	0	0
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	87	8	3	0	0	1	0
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	72	16	9	1	3	0	0
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	84	11	1	1	2	0	1
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	79	14	2	2	3	0	1
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	91	7	2	0	0	0	0
Overall			77	10	4	4	2	0	3

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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).

<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
Largest percentage



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

Facility Name	Facility Size <sup>b</sup>	Command	FY 2022, Q2						
			Up to 17 (%)	18-25 (%)	26-35 (%)	36-45 (%)	46-55 (%)	56-65 (%)	66 and older (%)
RHC-Atlantic			0	29	37	21	8	3	0
APG	Small	AMC	0	7	25	34	22	9	2
Fort Benning	Medium	TRADOC	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Fort Belvoir	Small	MDW	1	10	27	35	19	7	0
Fort Bragg	Large	FORSCOM	0	28	41	19	9	3	0
Fort Campbell	Large	FORSCOM	0	41	37	15	6	2	0
Fort Drum	Medium	FORSCOM	0	45	35	14	4	2	0
Fort Gordon	Medium	TRADOC	1	32	41	17	5	3	1
Fort Jackson	Medium	TRADOC	0	14	50	22	9	5	0
Fort Knox	Medium	TRADOC	0	18	27	38	15	2	0
Fort Lee	Medium	TRADOC	0	31	37	21	8	4	0
Fort Meade	Medium	MDW	0	23	44	23	7	3	0
Fort Rucker	Small	TRADOC	1	39	39	14	4	2	0
Fort Stewart	Medium	FORSCOM	0	42	39	14	3	2	0
JBLE	Small	TRADOC	0	39	34	19	5	2	1
RHC-Central			0	30	36	23	8	2	1
Fort Bliss	Large	FORSCOM	0	21	38	25	10	4	1
Fort Carson	Large	FORSCOM	0	39	40	13	4	4	0
Fort Hood	Large	FORSCOM	0	38	38	19	4	1	0
Fort Huachuca	Small	TRADOC	0	35	38	16	6	4	1
Fort Irwin	Small	FORSCOM	0	47	33	17	2	0	0
Fort Leavenworth	Small	TRADOC	0	2	12	59	25	2	0
Fort Leonard Wood	Medium	TRADOC	0	22	51	21	5	0	0
Fort Polk	Medium	FORSCOM	0	46	36	14	3	1	0
Fort Riley	Medium	FORSCOM	0	46	36	13	3	2	0
Fort Sill	Medium	TRADOC	0	29	52	14	4	1	1
JBSA	Medium	AETC	0	21	34	25	12	6	2
RHC-Europe			0	31	36	21	9	3	0
Bavaria	Small	USAREUR	0	40	47	9	2	0	0
Landstuhl	Small	USAREUR	0	23	31	29	16	2	0
Stuttgart	Small	USAREUR	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>	N/A <sup>c</sup>
Vicenza	Small	USAREUR	0	32	33	22	8	4	0
Wiesbaden	Small	USAREUR	0	29	32	24	11	4	0
RHC-Pacific			0	36	38	18	5	2	0
Camp Humphreys	Medium	USARPAC	1	36	36	19	6	1	0
Camp Zama	Small	USARPAC	0	15	50	26	8	2	0
Fort Wainwright	Small	USARPAC	0	44	40	10	3	2	2
JBLM	Large	FORSCOM	0	28	39	23	7	3	1
Schofield Barracks	Medium	USARPAC	0	45	36	14	3	1	0
Overall			0	31	37	21	8	3	0

Data source: Army Wellness Center Health and Wellness Tracker April 2022 export (FY22Q2).

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).

<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
Largest percentage