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Introduction

As the nature of the modern workplace continues to shift from one centered around the experience of employees, organizations must demonstrate to their employees that they care about them at every moment — both as organizational members and humans. Caring for employees starts with a whole person approach — viewing an employee from a holistic standpoint. Caring for employees also requires companies to think about how to support employees from a whole company perspective — what support, tools, resources, processes, etc. are in place to enhance their experience.

A caring culture is good for people, and good for business. For example, our research indicates that employee outcomes of organizational care include:

- Greater well-being
- Increased engagement in their work
- Higher sense of inclusion
- Greater intent to stay
- Increased likelihood to recommend their company as a great place to work
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Whole-Person Well-Being
Why it matters

What happens in one part of your life impacts all other parts

- 47% of employees say problems in their personal lives affect their performance (Bensingher et al., 2013)
- 37% of HR professionals agree employees miss work due to financial emergencies (SHRM, 2014)
- 50% of all illness in the US has stress has a contributor (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2000)
When organizations care for employees — in every part of the employee experience — employees can better care for themselves, their teams and their organization, leading to better people and organizational results.

- Managers
  - Teams & Peers
  - Networks
  - Environment
  - Tools & Programs
  - Leaders
  - Strategic Alignment
  - Culture

- Awareness
  - Mindset
  - Motivation & Intention Behavior
  - Social Connection
  - Resource/Support Utilization

- Turnover
  - Engagement
  - Well-Being
  - Inclusion
  - Other People Results

- Customer Satisfaction
  - Innovation
  - Other Financial Results
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When employees feel their organization cares about them as individuals, they are:

- 10x more likely to recommend their organization as a great place to work
- 9x more likely to stay at their organization for three or more years
- 7x more likely to feel included at work
- 4x less likely to suffer from stress and burnout
SmartHealth Program Overview

SmartHealth is Washington State’s voluntary and confidential well-being program, centered around the Limeade Results Model. The foundational focus is on the whole person, with additional resources, tools, and support mechanisms that help employees continuously improve their holistic well-being and overall experience at work.

This annual report provides detailed analysis and insights from the SmartHealth program as well as recommendations for ongoing improvement.
Well-Being Assessment

Any measure of well-being that is rooted in science must account for the many facets of well-being. The Limeade Well-Being Assessment (WBA) does exactly this. Developed in 2006, the Limeade Well-Being Assessment was the first of its kind and aligns with the science of positive psychology in measuring whole-person well-being.

If additional information on the Limeade Well-Being Assessment is needed, please contact the Washington Wellness team.
Program Participation 2020

**PARTICIPATION**

- **29.9%**
  - 101,756 REGISTERED EMPLOYEES
  - 57% is average across Limeade BoB

- **34.94%**
  - 35,554 MONTHLY ACTIVE USERS
  - 37% is average across Limeade Book of Business

- **57.8%**
  - 58,837 COMPLETED THE WELL-BEING ASSESSMENT
  - 68% is average across Limeade BoB

- **4.3/5**
  - USER SATISFACTION
  - 4.3 is average across Limeade BoB

**TOP WBA DIMENSION**

- **PHYSICAL**
  - Drinking Moderately
  - Self-Care

**EMOTIONAL**

- Positive Relationships
- Self-Acceptance

**BOTTOM WBA DIMENSION**

- **SLEEP**
  - Healthy Weight

**WORK**

- Work Meaning
- Self-Leadership
- Fit with Culture
- Belief in Company

*Top dimensions: The most numerous top scoring Well-Being dimensions for employees.*
*Bottom dimensions: The most numerous lowest scoring Well-Being dimensions for employees.*
Impact of Well-Being on at risk participants 2019-2020

43.3%
(2,096 of N = 4,844)
Moved well-being status from neutral or suffering to THRIVING

$3,844,064
REDUCTION in Costs
Disease burden costs decrease by $1,834 for every employee that moves into "THRIVING".

51.5%
(1,498 of N = 2,908)
IMPROVED their stress levels

$4,149,460
SAVED ANNUALLY
Disease burden costs decrease by $2,770 for every employee that moves out of stress risk.

Overall Well-Being = (% favorable year 2 - % favorable year 1) based on the favorability (strongly agree, agree = Thriving) to "Overall, I have Well-Being in my life."
Stress = (% favorable year 2 - % favorable year 1) based on the favorability (manageable vs. unmanageable) to "Please describe the level of stress in your life: manageable vs. unmanageable"
Impact of Engagement 2019-2020

-0.55%
Change in EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT
Employees from 2019-2020

13.1%
Decrease in EMPLOYEE TURNOVER
Employees from 2019-2020

419,848,719
SAVED ANNUALLY
Potential positive revenue impact for 13.1% less in turnover with Limeade users.

STRENGTHS
1. Skill and ability to:
2. Purpose in work:
3. Work contribution:

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT
1. Current stress levels
2. Balance of input and output
3. Realizing potential at work

TURNOVER RATES BY ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION
- Greater than 10 activities: 2.5%
- Between 5-10 activities: 3.8%
- Fewer than 5 activities: 6.0%
- No activities: 23.3%

Engagement = (% favorable year 2 - % favorable year 1) based on Its favorability (strongly agree) to "I feel personally engaged in my work."
Impact of Healthy Behavior 2019-2020

**EXERCISE**

17.74%  
(2,500 of N = 14,094)  
with low levels of EXERCISE + FITNESS improved to favorable levels  
Employees from 2019-2020

**SLEEP**

20.62%  
(3,276 of N = 15,890)  
with SLEEP ISSUES improved to favorable levels  
Employees from 2019-2020

**SmartHealth**

$330,650.00  
SAVED ANNUALLY  
For every employee that moves out of exercise & fitness risk, medical and workers’ comp costs decrease by $132.36 in 2019 US Dollars.

$3,966,810  
SAVED ANNUALLY  
For every employee that moves out of the risk categories, work loss productivity related costs decrease by $1,210.87 in 2019 US Dollars.

Sleep and Exercise & Fitness Source: Results are based on responses to these items in the Well-Being Assessment that measure Sleep and Exercise & Fitness levels. Low scores on both indicate insufficient sleep or physical inactivity. Year-over-Year employees are those who had assessment responses in both program years and had low scores in the first year.
Year-Over-Year Results
## Program Participation Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New Registrations</th>
<th>Registration (%)</th>
<th>Assessment (%)</th>
<th>Monthly Active Users (%)</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7,051</td>
<td>41.33%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>34.91%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>12,847</td>
<td>44.82%</td>
<td>60.80%</td>
<td>25.33%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>23,432</td>
<td>29.78%</td>
<td>57.83%</td>
<td>22.56%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>16,603</td>
<td>29.89%</td>
<td>57.82%</td>
<td>34.94%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level Completion Trends 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Level achievement as a percentage of the registered employee population*
## Overall Well-Being Results 2019-2020

**-1.0%**  
(274 of N = 28,674)  
Net change in well-being status from neutral or suffering to thriving  
Employees from 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WELL-BEING AREA</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL ELIGIBLE USERS 2019-2020</th>
<th>% CHANGE AMONG ALL ELIGIBLE USERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Well-Being Source:** Results are based on responses to the Well-Being Assessment item: "Overall, I have well-being in my life." (Overall well-being - transformed to 3 point-scale for thriving groups).  
**Well-Being Areas Source:** Well-being dimensions measured with the Well-Being Assessment are categorized into 4 life areas and averaged to create the area score. *N* sizes vary by dimension. See following slides for cohort size information. **Year-over-Year** employees are those who had assessment responses in in both program years, but it varies for each metric depending on completion rates.
# Emotional Well-Being Results 2019-2020

## Change in EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING Between 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Year-over-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating Life</td>
<td>28,466</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Your Abilities</td>
<td>28,463</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Level</td>
<td>28,463</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing Yourself</td>
<td>28,465</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Depression</td>
<td>28,464</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Stress &amp; Anxiety</td>
<td>28,464</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-0.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness &amp; Optimism</td>
<td>28,461</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Living</td>
<td>28,461</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships</td>
<td>28,461</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>28,463</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>28,461</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on program metrics please see "How Metrics are Calculated" in the Appendix for citations and footnotes.
## Work Well-Being Results 2019-2020

### Change in WORK WELL-BEING

-0.5%

Change in WORK WELL-BEING

Between 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Year-over-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Company</td>
<td>28,023</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Energized</td>
<td>28,084</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Culture</td>
<td>28,014</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the Flow</td>
<td>28,462</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>28,346</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making &amp; Keeping Commitments</td>
<td>28,460</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Support</td>
<td>28,078</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Leadership</td>
<td>28,459</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>-0.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Team</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Growth</td>
<td>28,064</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Meaning</td>
<td>28,102</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on program metrics please see “How Metrics are Calculated” in the Appendix for citations and footnotes.
**Financial Well-Being Results 2019-2020**

**FINANCIAL WELL-BEING**

2.2%
Increase in FINANCIAL WELL-BEING

Between 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORE FOR ALL ELIGIBLE USERS 2019-2020</th>
<th>% CHANGE AMONG ALL ELIGIBLE USERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Well-being</td>
<td>28,465</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on program metrics please see “How Metrics are Calculated” in the Appendix for citations and footnotes.
## Physical Well-Being Results 2019-2020

- **0.2%**
  - Change in PHYSICAL WELL-BEING
  - Between 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Year-over-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back Health</td>
<td>27,411</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Moderately</td>
<td>26,797</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise &amp; Fitness</td>
<td>28,464</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Blood Sugar</td>
<td>26,936</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Weight</td>
<td>22,133</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Health</td>
<td>27,798</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>28,464</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Care</td>
<td>28,461</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>28,462</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke-Free Living</td>
<td>27,446</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For details on program metrics please see "How Metrics are Calculated" in the Appendix for citations and footnotes.
### Other Health Dimensions

These two questions, “Overall how would you describe your health?” and “Do you have a personal doctor or personal care provider?” were added to the SmartHealth Well-being Assessment at the request of Healthier Washington.

1. **Overall how would you describe your health?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Do you have a personal doctor or health care provider?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Year-Over-Year Results of At Risk Users

- This section examines the change in SmartHealth participants who scored neutral-high risk at the beginning of the timeline selected.
# Overall Well-Being Results For At-Risk Users 2019-2020

**43.3%**
(2,096 of N = 4,844)
Moved well-being status from neutral or suffering to THRIVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WELL-BEING AREA</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORE FOR AT-RISK USERS 2019-2020</th>
<th>% CHANGE AMONG AT-RISK USERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Well-Being Source:** Results are based on responses to the Well-Being Assessment item: "Overall, I have well-being in my life." (Overall well-being - transformed to 3 point-scale for thriving groups).

**Well-Being Areas Source:** Well-being dimensions measured with the Well-Being Assessment are categorized into 4 life areas and averaged to create the area score. N sizes vary by dimension. See following slides for cohort size information. **Year-over-Year** employees are those who had assessment responses in both program years, but it varies for each metric depending on completion rates.

**At-Risk Users:** Those participants who did not have favorable responses in the starting year. For life area scores this is an composite score of < 3.5
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# Emotional Well-Being Results For At-Risk Users 2019-2020

## EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING

**9.2% Increase in EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING**

Between 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Year-over-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating Life</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Your Abilities</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Level</td>
<td>16,676</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing Yourself</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>15.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Depression</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Stress &amp; Anxiety</td>
<td>11,217</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness &amp; Optimism</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Living</td>
<td>10,343</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationships</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>9,504</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>3,164</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At-Risk Users:** Those participants who did not have favorable responses in the starting year. For life area scores this is an composite score of < 3.5
# Work Well-Being Results For At-Risk Users 2019-2020

**10.33%**
Increase in WORK WELL-BEING
Between 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Year-over-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Company</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Energized</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Culture</td>
<td>8,930</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Flow</td>
<td>4,211</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making &amp; Keeping Commitments</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Support</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Leadership</td>
<td>2,428</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Team</td>
<td>6,689</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Growth</td>
<td>7,376</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Meaning</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>13.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At-Risk Users: Those participants who did not have favorable responses in the starting year. For life area scores this is an composite score of < 3.5
## Financial Well-Being Results For At-Risk Users 2019-2020

**10.3% Increase in FINANCIAL WELL-BEING**

Between 2019-2020

### Average Score for At-Risk Users 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Year-over-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Well-being</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At-Risk Users:** Those participants who did not have favorable responses in the starting year. For life area scores this is an composite score of < 3.5
# Physical Well-Being Results For At-Risk Users 2019-2020

8.4% Increase in PHYSICAL WELL-BEING
Between 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Year-over-Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back Health</td>
<td>13,351</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Moderately</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise &amp; Fitness</td>
<td>14,094</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Blood Sugar</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>20.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Weight</td>
<td>14,492</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Health</td>
<td>6,688</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>8,343</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Care</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke-Free Living</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At-Risk Users**: Those participants who did not have favorable responses in the starting year. For life area scores this is an composite score of < 3.5
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How Metrics are Calculated

PARTICIPATION
1. Registered – Total number of employees that registered, and what % this is out of eligible population (total # registered / total # eligible)
2. Completed – What % of the above # of employees (i.e., those who registered) completed the WBA? (total # that completed WBA / total # that registered)
3. Weekly monthly user – On average (i.e., across all months in the last program year), what percentage of users tracked, joined, or completed one or more challenges/activities in the Limeade platform in any given month?
   i. E.g., Week 1 = 10% active users, week 2 = 20% active users, week 3 = 30% active users → 20% average weekly active users

KEY RESULTS
Note: Favorable responses on the items below = agree + strongly agree; Neutral = neither disagree nor agree; Unfavorable = disagree + strongly disagree

4. Well-Being - Responses to the well-being item ("Overall, I have well-being in my life.") need to be first transformed to a 3-point scale (thrive = strongly agree, neutral = neither agree nor disagree, and suffer = disagree + strongly agree).
   i. Δ Employees that are thriving = (% thriving 2 - % thriving year 1) on item "Overall, I have well-being in my life"
   ii. Associated financial metric: What % of those thriving in year 2 were in neutral or suffering the year prior? In other words, we are calculating the % of people who made the move from neutral/unfavorable into the "favorable" category (strongly agree + agree).
      a. According to Gallup, thriving adults (favorable responses) averaged an annual disease burden cost of $4,929 per person compared to $6,763 per person averaged by struggling (neutral responses) and suffering (unfavorable responses) adults. This saves an estimated $1,834 per person that moves into the thriving category. (Ott, B., 2010. The price of poor well-being. Gallup).

   b. Formula for $$ impact = (# of people who moved from neutral or suffering into thriving group X $1,834)

   iii. Table: Averages across all items in these given well-being areas for each quarter of the program year, separated by user activity (active users vs non-active users). YoY change = what is the % change from Q1 to Q4? (3.4 - 3.9 = +14.7%)
      1. Note: this table does not represent cohorts, but rather takes the average of all available data in a given quarter.

5. Turnover - Uses turnover rates from dashboard
   i. Δ Turnover% = (% turnover those who registered for Limeade - % turnover those that did not register for Limeade)
      1. The Center for American Progress calculates a typical cost of turnover equivalent to 20 percent of employee salary across an organization (for each 1% of turnover). "It is costly to replace workers because of the productivity losses when someone leaves a job, the costs of hiring and training a new employee, and the slower productivity until the new employee gets up to speed in their new job." (Boushey, H., & Glynn, S. J., 2012. There are significant business costs to replacing employees. Center for American Progress.)
   2. Associated financial metric: $$ impact formula = (Δ Turnover% x total number of employees) x .20 (average employee salary)
      a. Note if average employee salary unavailable, use national average
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6. **Engagement** – No need for scale transformation, uses item “I feel personally engaged in my work.”

   1. \( \Delta \text{Engagement} = (\% \text{ favorable year 2} - \% \text{ favorable year 1}) \) on item above

      1. According to a 2013 Aon Hewitt study, “The behaviors engaged employees demonstrate lead to positive outcomes in key business drivers like customer satisfaction, operational efficiency and revenue growth.” We calculate financial metric of this value based on factors including a company’s year-over-year change in engagement, global revenue and employee count and the study’s finding that a 5% increase in employee engagement is linked to a 3% increase in revenue growth in the subsequent year (i.e., each 1% increase in engagement is associated with a 6% increase in potential revenue growth). (Aon Hewitt, 2013, 2013 Trends in global employee engagement report).

   2. **Associated financial metric:** $$\text{impact formula} = (\Delta \text{engaged} \times .05) \times \text{(Company’s annual revenue)}$$

7. **Stress**: This item has a different scale than the others. Uses item “Which of the following best describes the current level of stress in your life?” The unfavorable responses (response of 4 and 5 — stress that is unmanageable — is what we will use for this impact formula)

   1. \( \Delta \text{in Stress} = (\% \text{unfavorable year 2} - \% \text{unfavorable year 1}) \) on stress item. This formula would compare the two years on the % of people who reported unmanageable stress.

      1. The European Agency for Safety and Health at Work found that “stress-related absenteeism, additional overstaffing, counterproductive work performance/poor performance and staff turnover” costs the US $2770 per employee. (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2014. Calculating the cost of work-related stress and psychosocial risks. European Risk Observatory Literature Review)

2. **Associated financial metric:** $$\text{impact formula} = (# \text{ of people associated with the } \Delta \text{unmanageable stress } \times \$2770)$$

   a. e.g., if there was a decrease of 10 people from the unmanageable stress group, this saved approximately $27,700.

**WHAT EMPLOYEES ARE SAYING**

These metrics compare employees who only took the WBA (non-active users) vs those who those the WBA and completed some activities (active users).

   1. **Recommend** = (\% favorable year 2 - \% favorable year 1) on item “I would recommend this organization to my friends as a good place to work”

   2. **Supported** = (\% favorable year 2 - \% favorable year 1) on item “Overall, my organization supports me in living a healthier life”

   3. **Committed** = (\% favorable year 2 - \% favorable year 1) on item “I am committed to this organization”

4. **Comments:** SAE manual pull

---
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PROGRAM PARTICIPATION
1. Data for program cohort: Percentages listed are of eligible.
2. Monthly Active Users: are those who tracked, joined, or completed one or more challenge/activity in the Limeade platform in any given month. This number is averaged for the year to arrive at the average monthly active users.

IMPACT OF WELL-BEING
1. Well-Being and Stress Source: Results are based on responses to these items in the Well-Being Assessment: "Overall, I have well-being in my life." (Overall well-being - transformed to 3 point-scale for thriving groups); and "Which of the following best describes the current level of stress in your life?" (Stress - transformed to unfavorable for those who experience high levels of stress). Year-over-Year employees are those who had assessment responses in both program years. N varies for each metric depending on completion rates.

IMPACT OF ENGAGEMENT
1. Engagement Source: Results are based on responses to one item in the Well-Being Assessment: "I feel personally engaged in my work..." (Engagement - transformed to 3 point-scale for engaged, neutral, and disengaged groups)
2. Turnover Source: Turnover information is derived from the eligibility file data. Those employees who were no longer in the eligibility file by the end of the year are coded as having turned over. Cost Engagement: Aon Hewitt (2013). 2013 Trends in global employee engagement report. Cost of

Turnover; Boushey, H., & Glynn, S. J. (2012). There are significant business costs to replacing employees. Center for American Progress.

IMPACT OF HEALTHY BEHAVIORS
1. Sleep and Exercise & Fitness Source: Results are based on responses to these items in the Well-Being Assessment that measure Sleep and Exercise & Fitness levels. Low scores on both indicate insufficient sleep or physical inactivity. Year-over-Year employees are those who had assessment responses in both 2017 and 2019 program years. N = 2,906, but it varies for each metric depending on completion rates.
IMPACT OF BIOMETRICS

1. **Biometric Data Source**: Results are based on verified biometrics collected from employees both program years. Year-over-Year employees are those who had assessment responses in both program years. N varies for each metric depending on completion rates.

2. **Cost of Systolic Blood Pressure**: Being at risk for either systolic or diastolic blood pressure is costly. We look at Systolic Blood pressure only in order not to duplicate the number of people and the associated costs. In addition, while we report risk shift for the entire at risk population, the savings are calculated based on moving out of some risk into low risk categories. Kirkland, E. B., et al. (2018). Trends in Healthcare Expenditures Among US Adults With Hypertension: National Estimates, 2003-2014. Journal of the American Heart Association, 7(11). Doi: https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.118.008731

3. **Cost of BMI**: Note that while we report risk shift for the entire at risk population, the savings are calculated based on moving out of the obese category and moving out of some risk to no risk categories. Source: Cawley, J., Meyerhoefer, C., & Biener, A. (2015). Savings in Medical Expenditures Associated with Reductions in Body Mass Index Among US Adults with Obesity, by Diabetes Status. Pharmacoeconomics, 33(7), 707-722. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-014-0230-2

OVERALL WELL-BEING RESULTS

1. **Well-Being Source**: Results are based on responses to the Well-Being Assessment item: "Overall, I have well-being in my life," (Overall well-being - transformed to 3 point-scale for thriving groups).

2. **Well-Being Areas Source**: Well-being dimensions measured with the Well-Being Assessment are categorized into 4 life areas and averaged to create the area score. N sizes vary by dimension. See following slides for cohort size information.

3. **Year-over-Year employees** are those who had assessment responses in both program years. N varies for each metric depending on completion rates.

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION, LEVELS COMPLETION TRENDS, INTEGRATION + PARTNERS, ACTIVITY STRATEGY

1. **NOTE**: % Assessment, Screening, Monthly Active Users are of ELIGIBLE users

limeade