

Item Worksheet—Item 7.3

Workforce-Focused Results

Relevant Key Factors

1. CC1: relationships, CC2: innovation, CC3: fitness.
2. 8889 team members; managers = “coaches”; sr. leaders = “sr. coaches.” Employee groups: 28% Call Center (HS diploma); 36% Warehouse & Fulfillment (HS diploma); 18% Corporate/Administrative (bachelor’s); 4% Marketing/Sales (associate/bachelor’s); 3% Purchasing (associate/bachelor’s); 6% IT (bachelor’s); 5% Operations Support (bachelor’s/cert/. All Call Center team members are fitness enthusiasts. Call Center team members hold fitness certifications. Tenure: 11% <= 1 yr; 25% 1-2 yrs; 18% 3-5 yrs; 27% 6-10 yrs; 19% >10 yrs. 42% Black; 38% White; 11% Hispanic; 6% Asian; 3% Other. No organized bargaining units.
3. Vary slightly by workforce segment; include teamwork, recognition, pride in work, opportunity to grow, communication, professional development/technical training (for IT & Ops Support).
4. Basic health/safety requirements, office environment; warehouse & fulfillment areas: required to training in hazard communications, lockout/tagout, lifting/handling, fire extinguishers. Team members who drive forklifts certified in forklift safety.
5. SC7: Retaining skilled team members in competitive boutique athlete market.
6. SA7: Highly engaged team members.

Strengths

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
X	The applicant’s workforce engagement results indicate strengthening of its strategic advantage of highly engaged team members. Overall engagement has increased from about 71% to about 82% over five years and exceeds the best-practice benchmark (Figure 7.3-12). Engagement by team member tenure also shows beneficial trends for all five cohorts, most significantly for the newest team members (Figure 7.3-13). Similarly, overall engagement has increased for all segments reported (Figure 7.3-14).	*****CONSENSUS—DOUBLED STRENGTH PER TEAM CONSENSUS. Identified by seven examiners, L, T, C, I. The applicant provides positive results relating to its workforce engagement. For example, Overall Engagement: Tenure (Fig. 7.3-13 shows positive levels and trends for most workforce segments. Overall Engagement (Fig. 7.3-14), Engagement: Communication (Fig. 7.3-15), Engagement: Teamwork (Fig. 7.3-16), and Engagement: Pride in Work (Fig. 7.3-17) all show beneficial levels and trends and better than best practice performance comparisons.	a(3)
	Workforce health and safety results show improvement, in some cases to 100% or benchmark levels. For example, improvements have lowered worker compensation costs from 6% to 2% of payroll (Figure 7.3-8), and injury rates are better than the benchmark (Figure 7.3-7). Safety, hazard communication, and lockout/tagout training, as well as forklift safety certifications, have been at 100% for two years (Figures 7.3-9 through 7.3-	****CONSENSUS—COMMENT STANDS AS IS. Identified by five examiners (Ex2, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) L, T, C, I. After a spike in FY2013, team member injury rate declined by 50% from FY2013 through FY2015 and currently is well below the OSHA benchmark (Figure 7.3-7). Along with the decrease in injuries, the costs for workers compensation decreased from 6% of payroll to 2% from FY2010 through FY2015 (Figure 7.3-8). Safety training for new hires, annual refreshers,	a(2)

++	Strength	Rationale	Item Ref.
	11). In addition, participation in WellFit has exceeded the benchmark for three years (Figure 7.3-21), supporting the goal of 80% participation.	hazards communication, lockout/tagout and forklift operation have all been at 100% compliance for the last two fiscal years (Figures 7.3-9 through - 11). In addition, team member participation in WellFit increased from ~ 42% to 70%, exceeding the AFPM Best Practice benchmark for the past three years (Figure 7.3-21) and well on way to SO of 80%.	
	The applicant demonstrates beneficial trends in its capability and capacity results for the workforce overall and some key segments. For example, first-year retention (Figure 7.3-1), which relates to a strategic challenge, improved from below 65% to more than 85% over three years as a result of improvements, including revising the orientation program and introducing behavioral interviewing. Recruiting Time to Fill and Referrals (Figures 7.2-2 and 7.3-3) also show beneficial trends.	<p>***CONSENSUS—COMMENT STANDS AS IS. REDUCED APPARENT CONFLICT WITH SEGMENTATION OFI.</p> <p>Identified by six examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex4, Ex5, Ex6, Ex7) L, T, I. Results provided to ensure appropriate levels of capability & capacity. Fig. 7.3-1—Retention: By segmenting data, identified low retention trends for 1st yr team members. Improvements included revising orientation & new FitBuddy program which led to positive trends in 1st yr retention from 64% in FY2013 to 85% in FY2015. Fig. 7.3-2—Recruiting Time to Fill: Due to ShapeltUp teams improved by 60% & Targeting Selection behavioral interviewing in 2014 to improve hiring decisions & positively impact retention. Time to fill exhibited a positive trend from 40 days in FY2010 to 15 days in FY2015. Fig. 7.2-3—Referrals (as a % of new hires): positive trend was exhibited from 15% in FY2010 to 31% in 2015. An indicator of workforce pride & loyalty & may be related to improved retention rate.</p>	a(1)
	Good levels and beneficial trends for workforce development results demonstrate a learning environment for the applicant's team members. Average training hours per FTE and tuition reimbursements have both improved and are better than the best-practice levels (Figures 7.3-25 and 7.3-27), even as the number of degrees and certifications has nearly doubled (Figure 7.3-28). These results are reinforced by results for perceptions of opportunity to grow and of professional development, which has increased from 68% to nearly 90% (Figures 7.3-22 and 7.3-23).	<p>***CONSENSUS—COMMENT STANDS AS IS.</p> <p>Identified by four examiners (Ex1, Ex2, Ex4, Ex7) L, T, C. Engagement Opportunity to Grow (Fig. 7.3-22) levels, trends, better than best practice performance. Engagement Professional Development (Fig. 7.3-23) levels, trends, better than overall performance for IT/Operational Support. Internal Promotions (Fig. 7.3-24) levels, better than best practice performance. Average Training Hours Per FTE levels, better than best practice performance. Tuition Reimbursements (Fig. 7.3-27) levels, better than best practice performance. Degrees & Certifications (Fig. 7.3-28) levels, trends.</p>	a(4)

Notes

****CONSENSUS—COMMENT DELETED a The applicant demonstrates beneficial trends for nearly all workforce focused results. Improving trends are present in 26 of the 28 results provided, indicating improvement in workforce capability and capacity, workforce climate, workforce engagement, and workforce development. The trends may continue to strengthen the applicants strategic advantage of highly engaged team members Identified by one examiner

(Ex1) relating to overall favorable trends in information presented by applicant for 7.3 Favorable trends for all measures presented except L&D Evaluations (7.3-26) where no trends are presented and Internal Promotions (7.3-24, which experienced a dip in 2013, but has otherwise shown sustained high performance.

FEEDBACK FROM TEAM INDICATED THIS STRENGTH SHOULD BE REMOVED AS IS BLANKET COMMENT COVERED IN MORE DETAIL IN THE OTHER STRENGTHS LISTED. THIS COMMENT WILL BE REMOVED FROM FINAL VERSION AND NOT DISCUSSED DURING CONSENSUS

*****Team—While the comment covers all of (a), is it strong enough to be the #1 strength comment? Or should we leave the comments 1-4 as is and eliminate this one?

Used all examiner comments in some form.

Opportunities for Improvement

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	<p>Workforce-focused results are missing for selected benefits, such as spot bonuses, smoking cessation, stress management, and alternative work schedules (Figure 5.1-3), as well as for the Talent Review System and Talent Development Program, leader development, skills and staffing needs, and the efficiency of the L&D System. Tracking these results may help the applicant understand the effectiveness of its approaches in meeting current and future workforce needs.</p>	<p>****CONSENSUS—COMMENT STANDS AS IS. MOVED COMMENT UP TO TOP SPOT AS SOME TEAM MEMBERS FELT THIS WAS MORE IMPORTANT TO THE APPLICANT THAN SEGMENTATION OR COMPARISONS.</p> <p>Missing results: Workforce climate, security, workforce service/benefits, Leader development Capacity needs. Identified by five examiners (Ex7, Ex2, Ex6, Ex1, Ex4)</p> <p>a(1, 2, 4) Identified missing results—Skills and staffing needs, leader development Spot bonuses, smoking cessation, stress management, alternative work schedules (from Fig. 5.1-3)</p> <p>*****Refined comment based on backup feedback.</p>	a(1,2,4)
	<p>Some workforce capability and capacity, climate, and development results are not segmented by the diversity of the workforce or by workforce groups and segments, including contract workers. Segmenting results in this way may help the applicant identify the distinct needs and expectations of different workforce groups and reinforce its strategic advantage of an engaged workforce.</p>	<p>****CONSENSUS—COMMENT STANDS AS IS. DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH DIVERSITY ISSUES DISCUSSED IN PROCESS ITEMS WITH CHANGES IN THE PROCESS ITEMS.</p> <p>Identified by six examiners (Ex2, Ex3, Ex7, Ex5, Ex4, Ex1) in some form for a, a(1), a(2), a(4).</p> <p>*****Refined comment for clarity per backup feedback.</p>	a(1,2,4)
	<p>Some workforce-focused results, such as those for workforce retention (Figure 7.3-1), unscheduled absences (Figure 7.3-3), and engagement (Figures 7.3-13 and 7.3-14), do not include relevant external comparisons. Comparing these results to those of other, appropriately selected organizations may help the applicant move beyond measuring the creation and maintenance of a productive, caring, engaging, and learning environment for all members of its workforce to adequately</p>	<p>*****CONSENSUS—REMOVED THE SECOND SENTENCE PER TEAM CONSENSUS. ADDED THE WORD “RELEVANT” TO THE FIRST SENTENCE. REWROTE LAST SENTENCE TO REFLECT WHY COMPARISONS ARE IMPORTANT TO THE APPLICANT. CHECKED FIGURES AND REFERENCED NEW FIGURES WITH NO COMPARISONS SINCE COMMENT REFERS ONLY TO RELEVANT EXTERNAL</p>	a

--	Opportunity for Improvement	Rationale	Item Ref.
	measuring and analyzing its performance within its competitive environment.	<p>COMPARISONS. REMOVED “MIXED RESULTS.”</p> <p>*****NOT SURE WHAT TO DO WITH THIS COMMENT.... SOME FEEDBACK AGREED WITH COMMENT, ONE TEAM MEMBER WANTED TO REMOVE REFERENCE TO “MIXED RESULTS” OR CLARIFY WHAT MIXED MEANS, AND ANOTHER ASKED FOR MORE SPECIFICS AS THE WORDING POTENTIALLY FEELING LIKE A PROCESS COMMENT. WILL NEED TO DISCUSS DURING CONSENSUS.</p> <p>Identified by two examiners (Ex7, Ex4). However, the team may want to not use this comment in light of the two more meaningful comments already in this section. Thoughts?</p>	

Notes

Used all of the examiner inputs.

Scoring

Score Value: 60

Score Range: 50–65%

Why shouldn't the score be in the range above or below the selected one?

***CONSENSUS—SCORE REMAINS SAME.

SOME TEAM MEMBERS FELT THAT THE 3 OFIs WERE FAIRLY SIGNIFICANT (LACK OF SEGMENTATION & COMPARISONS, MISSING MEASURES) AND FELT THE SCORE SHOULD BE 55. LEFT AT 60 PENDING CONSENSUS DISCUSSION.

Several organizational performance results reported, responsive to both basic and overall requirements with good performance levels (Le).

Trend data is reported, with some mixed trends evident. (T)

Little or no comparative information is reported for anything other than engagement (C).

Results reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of the organization's mission (I).

Didn't go down because results presented are good and were to the overall requirements. Trend data was reported, with a couple of mixed trends, but not adverse.

Didn't go up because of OFIs for missing results and segmentation. There is comparative data for the engagement survey, but not much else.