FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 1: RECRUITMENT METRICS CASE STUDY

Case: Recruitment Performance at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Headcount at start of year = 220

b. Job offers made = 44

c. Job offers accepted (new hires) = 38

d. Total recruitment cost = GHS 228,000

e. Total days to fill all positions = 1,520 days

f. Headcount at end of year = 254

1.0 Headcount (Start of Year)

Result: Already given: 220 employees

2.0 New Hires

Result: Number of people who accepted offers and joined: 38 employees

3.0 Offer Acceptance Rate

Formula: Job offers accepted ÷ Job offers made × 100

Calculation: 38 ÷ 44 × 100

Result: 86.4%

NB:

a. 70% to 80% is considered acceptable.

b. 80% to 90% is considered strong.

c. Above 90% is considered excellent.

An Offer Acceptance Rate of 86.4% places Bridgepoint Company Limited in the strong range. This suggests that the company is attractive to candidates, compensation and conditions are competitive, and the recruitment process is converting offers into hires effectively.

4.0 Time to Fill

Formula: Total days to fill all positions ÷ Positions filled/Number of hires

Calculation: 1,520 ÷ 38

Result: 40 days per hire

NB:

a. 30 to 45 days is considered reasonable for frontline and operational roles.

b. 45 to 60 days is common for specialist, compliance, or managerial roles.

c. 60 to 90 days is more typical for senior management or highly technical roles.

d. Under 25 days consistently may suggest rushed hiring.

e. Above 60 days often signals bottlenecks, talent shortages, or process inefficiencies.

A Time to Fill of 40 days sits in the reasonable range. This suggests that recruitment speed is healthy and the organisation is filling roles without obvious delay or excessive pressure on quality.

5.0 Cost per Hire

Formula: Total recruitment cost ÷ Number of hires

Calculation: GHS 228,000 ÷ 38

Result: GHS 6,000 per hire

A Cost per Hire of GHS 6,000 gives management a clear benchmark for future hiring budgets and helps HR compare internal cost efficiency across hiring cycles.

6.0 Employee Growth Rate

Formula: (Headcount at end of year – Headcount at start of year) ÷ Headcount at start of year × 100

Calculation: (254 – 220) ÷ 220 × 100

Result: 15.5%

NB:

a. 0% to 5% usually means the organisation is stable but not expanding.

b. 5% to 15% is considered healthy and sustainable growth.

c. 15% to 25% signals rapid expansion.

d. Above 25% may be a warning sign if systems, supervision, and onboarding are not keeping pace.

A growth rate of 15.5% places Bridgepoint Company Limited in the rapid expansion range. This suggests that the organisation is growing strongly and needs HR systems, onboarding, and management capacity to keep up.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. The firm is expanding strongly at 15.5%.

b. Recruitment efficiency is healthy at 40 days per hire.

c. An 86.4% acceptance rate suggests the employer brand and offer package are competitive.

d. GHS 6,000 per hire provides a practical benchmark for recruitment budgeting.

FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 2: ATTRITION AND RETENTION METRICS CASE STUDY

Case: Attrition and Retention at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Headcount at start of year = 220
b. Headcount at end of year = 254
c. Employees who left = 32
d. Early leavers within 12 months = 11
e. Promotions = 20
f. Vacancies filled = 38
g. Payroll at start = GHS 11,880,000
h. Payroll at end = GHS 13,650,000

1.0 Average Headcount

Formula: (Headcount at start of year + Headcount at end of year) ÷ 2

Calculation: (220 + 254) ÷ 2

Result: 237 employees

Average headcount gives HR a more balanced base for calculating people metrics during a growth year.

2.0 Attrition Rate

Formula: Employees who left ÷ Average headcount × 100

Calculation: 32 ÷ 237 × 100

Result: 13.5%

NB:

a. Below 8% is low attrition.
b. 8% to 15% is moderate and generally manageable.
c. Above 15% is high and needs attention.

An Attrition Rate of 13.5% places Bridgepoint Company Limited in the moderate range. This suggests that exits are noticeable but still within a range many growing organisations can manage if causes are understood and controlled.

3.0 Early Turnover Rate

Formula: Early leavers ÷ Total leavers × 100

Calculation: 11 ÷ 32 × 100

Result: 34.4%

NB:

a. Below 20% is healthy.
b. 20% to 30% is moderate and should be monitored.

c. Above 30% suggests onboarding, role fit, or hiring quality issues.

An Early Turnover Rate of 34.4% is high. This suggests that a notable share of exits is happening in the first year, pointing to possible weaknesses in onboarding, role clarity, manager support, or candidate-job fit.

4.0 Turnover per Department

Department	Leavers	Turnover Share
Sales & Marketing	12	37.5%
Operations and Service Delivery	9	28.1%
Finance & Admin	6	18.8%
IT & Support	5	15.6%
Total	32	100.0%

This breakdown shows where the highest volume of exits is concentrated. Sales & Marketing accounts for the largest share of employee exits and should be prioritised for further diagnosis.

5.0 Internal Promotion Rate

Formula: Internal Promotions ÷ Vacancies filled × 100

Calculation: 20 ÷ 38 × 100

Result: 52.6%

NB:

a. Below 25% suggests limited internal mobility.

b. 25% to 50% reflects moderate internal progression.

c. Above 50% reflects strong internal mobility and succession depth.

An Internal Promotion Rate of 52.6% is strong. This suggests that Bridgepoint is filling a meaningful share of opportunities from within and that career progression is visible to employees.

6.0 Salary Change Rate

Formula: (Payroll at end of year – Payroll at start of year) ÷ Payroll at start of year × 100

Calculation: (GHS 13,650,000 – GHS 11,880,000) ÷ GHS 11,880,000 × 100

Result: 14.9%

NB:

a. Low single-digit payroll growth usually reflects a stable workforce with limited salary movement.

b. 5% to 12% often reflects moderate growth, inflation adjustments, and routine progression.

c. Above 12% usually reflects expansion, promotions, salary reviews, or all three.

A Salary Change Rate of 14.9% is significant but explainable in a growth year. It aligns with workforce expansion, promotions, and pay adjustments.

7.0 Retention Rate

Formula: Employees who stayed ÷ Headcount at start of year × 100

Calculation: (220 – 32) ÷ 220 × 100

Result: 85.5%

NB:

a. Below 80% indicates weak retention.

b. 80% to 89% reflects moderate but manageable retention.

c. 90% and above reflects strong workforce stability.

A Retention Rate of 85.5% indicates a fairly stable workforce, though the early turnover pattern suggests that retention quality is uneven across employee groups or tenure bands.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. Attrition at 13.5% is moderate for a growing organisation.

b. Early turnover at 34.4% is the biggest concern and points to onboarding or hiring quality gaps.

c. Internal promotion at 52.6% shows strong internal career mobility.

d. Payroll growth of 14.9% is consistent with expansion and promotions.

e. Retention at 85.5% shows a reasonably stable workforce overall.

FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 3: EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT METRICS CASE STUDY

Case: Employee Engagement at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Total employees at time of survey = 254

b. Survey respondents = 208

c. Average engagement score = 4.0 out of 5

d. Promoters = 118

e. Passives = 56

f. Detractors = 34

g. Employees in recognition and reward programmes = 146

h. Average manager feedback score = 3.9 out of 5

1.0 Employee Engagement Index

Formula: Average engagement score ÷ 5 × 100

Calculation: 4.0 ÷ 5 × 100

Result: 80%

NB:

a. Below 60% is low engagement.

b. 60% to 69% is moderate engagement.

c. 70% to 79% is good engagement.

d. 80% to 85% is high engagement.

e. Above 85% is very high engagement.

With an Employee Engagement Index of 80%, Bridgepoint Company Limited sits in the high engagement range. This indicates strong employee commitment, positive connection to the organisation, and a generally healthy work environment.

2.0 Pulse Survey Participation Rate

Formula: Survey respondents ÷ Total employees × 100

Calculation: 208 ÷ 254 × 100

Result: 81.9%

NB:

a. Below 50% is poor participation.

b. 50% to 59% is weak participation.

c. 60% to 69% is fair participation.

d. 70% to 79% is good participation.

e. 80% and above is strong participation.

A Participation Rate of 81.9% falls into the strong category. This suggests that employees are willing to share views, survey channels are trusted, and the results are credible for management decision-making.

3.0 Employee Net Promoter Score (eNPS)

Formula: (% Promoters – % Detractors)

Calculation: (118 ÷ 208 × 100) – (34 ÷ 208 × 100)

Result: +40.4

NB:

a. Below 0 is poor.

b. 0 to +10 is weak.

c. +10 to +30 is good.

d. +30 to +50 is very good.

e. Above +50 is excellent.

An eNPS of +40.4 places Bridgepoint in the very good range. This indicates that employees are proud to work for the organisation and are likely to recommend it to others.

4.0 Recognition and Reward Participation Rate

Formula: Employees participating in recognition programmes ÷ Total employees × 100

Calculation: 146 ÷ 254 × 100

Result: 57.5%

NB:

a. Below 40% is low participation.

b. 40% to 59% is moderate participation.

c. 60% to 75% is good participation.

d. 75% to 85% is strong participation.

e. Above 85% is excellent participation.

A Recognition and Reward Participation Rate of 57.5% is moderate. This suggests that recognition is happening, but it may not yet be broad or inclusive enough across all branches and roles.

5.0 Manager Feedback Score

Result: Already provided in the case: 3.9 out of 5, equivalent to 78%

NB:

a. Below 3.0 is weak leadership effectiveness.

b. 3.0 to 3.4 is fair but fragile.

c. 3.5 to 3.9 is good leadership performance.

d. 4.0 to 4.4 is strong leadership effectiveness.

e. 4.5 and above is excellent leadership.

With a Manager Feedback Score of 3.9 out of 5, Bridgepoint sits at the upper end of the good range. This suggests that line managers are generally supportive and effective, though targeted coaching could push performance into the strong range.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. 80% engagement indicates a positive employee climate, with room to improve further.

b. 81.9% participation gives management confidence in the reliability of the survey results.

c. An eNPS of +40.4 reflects strong employee advocacy.

d. Recognition participation at 57.5% suggests recognition exists but is not yet fully inclusive.

e. Manager feedback at 3.9 out of 5 points to solid leadership performance.

FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 4: EMPLOYEE EXPERIENCE METRICS CASE STUDY

Case: Employee Experience at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Average workforce = 237 employees

b. Working days per employee per year = 240 days

c. Total workdays lost due to absenteeism (Total Absence Days) = 2,844 days

d. Average working hours per day = 8 hours

e. Average hourly cost per employee = GHS 38

f. Employee feedback score = 4.0 out of 5

g. Workload satisfaction score = 3.5 out of 5

h. Workplace well-being index = 4.0 out of 5

1.0 Absenteeism Rate

Formula: Workdays lost due to absenteeism ÷ Total available workdays × 100

Calculation: 2,844 ÷ (237 × 240) × 100

Result: 5.0%

NB:

a. Below 2% is very low absenteeism.

b. 2% to 4% is a healthy and acceptable range.

c. 4% to 6% is moderate absenteeism.

d. 6% to 8% is high absenteeism.

e. Above 8% is critical and may reflect burnout, poor leadership, unsafe conditions, or weak policies.

An Absenteeism Rate of 5.0% places Bridgepoint in the moderate range. Attendance is still manageable, but there are enough lost days to justify action on workload, well-being, and branch-level pressure points.

2.0 Average Absence Days per Employee

Formula: Workdays lost due to absenteeism ÷ Average workforce

Calculation: 2,844 ÷ 237

Result: 12.0 days

NB:

a. 0 to 5 days is very low absence.

b. 6 to 8 days is a healthy and acceptable range.

c. 9 to 12 days is moderate absence.

d. 13 to 15 days is high absence.

e. Above 15 days suggests deeper systemic issues.

An average of 12 absence days per employee places the organisation at the upper end of the moderate range. This suggests that absence is not yet critical, but pressure is building.

3.0 Employee Feedback Score

Result: Already provided in the case: 4.0 out of 5, equivalent to 80%

NB:

a. Below 3.0 is poor.

b. 3.0 to 3.4 is fair.

c. 3.5 to 3.9 is good.

d. 4.0 to 4.4 is very good.

e. 4.5 and above is excellent.

A score of 4.0 out of 5 places employee feedback in the very good range. This suggests that employees generally view their work experience positively.

4.0 Workload Satisfaction Score

Result: Already provided in the case: 3.5 out of 5, equivalent to 70%

NB:

a. Below 3.0 is poor.

b. 3.0 to 3.4 is fair.

c. 3.5 to 3.9 is good.

d. 4.0 to 4.4 is very good.

e. 4.5 and above is excellent.

A Workload Satisfaction Score of 3.5 out of 5 places Bridgepoint in the good range, but only just. This suggests that workloads are generally manageable, though some teams may be feeling strain.

5.0 Workplace Well-being Index

Result: Already provided in the case: 4.0 out of 5, equivalent to 80%

NB:

a. Below 3.0 is poor well-being.

b. 3.0 to 3.4 is fair well-being.

c. 3.5 to 3.9 is good well-being.

d. 4.0 to 4.4 is very good well-being.

e. 4.5 and above is excellent well-being.

A Workplace Well-being Index of 4.0 out of 5 places the organisation in the very good range. This suggests that employees feel broadly supported, even though absence figures show that some practical strain remains.

6.0 Attendance Rate

Formula: (Total available workdays – Workdays lost) ÷ Total available workdays × 100

Calculation: (56,880 – 2,844) ÷ 56,880 × 100

Result: 95.0%

NB:

a. Below 92% is poor attendance.

b. 92% to 94% is fair attendance.

c. 95% to 96% is good attendance.

d. 97% to 98% is very good attendance.

e. Above 98% is excellent attendance.

An Attendance Rate of 95.0% places Bridgepoint in the good attendance range. This suggests that daily presence is stable overall, even though the cost of lost time is still meaningful.

7.0 Average Hourly Cost

Result: Already provided in the case: GHS 38 per hour

8.0 Cost of Absenteeism

Formula: Workdays lost × Working hours per day × Average hourly cost

Calculation: 2,844 × 8 × GHS 38

Result: GHS 864,576

A Cost of Absenteeism of GHS 864,576 shows why employee experience is not only an HR issue but also a financial issue. Lost time has a direct cost to the business.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. A 5.0% absenteeism rate is moderate but financially significant.

b. 12 absence days per employee suggest workload or well-being pressure in parts of the organisation.

c. Strong feedback and well-being scores contrast with absence data, indicating likely branch-level or role-specific issues.

d. The cost of absenteeism makes employee experience a business performance issue, not only an HR concern.

FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 5: PERFORMANCE METRICS CASE STUDY

Case: Performance Management at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Total revenue = GHS 51,600,000

b. Net profit = GHS 9,804,000

c. Average headcount = 237 employees

d. Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) = 228

e. Total employee-related costs = GHS 13,020,000

f. Average performance rating = 3.9 out of 5

g. High performers = 64 employees

h. Employees on PIP = 22

i. Employees successfully exiting PIP = 15

j. Employees who achieved goals = 184

k. Total transactions processed = 2,400

l. Transactions with errors = 84

m. Customer satisfaction in high-performing branches = 4.5 out of 5

n. Customer satisfaction in lower-performing branches = 3.8 out of 5

o. Total available hours = 182,400

p. Billable or revenue-generating hours = 124,272

1.0 Revenue per Employee

Formula: Total revenue ÷ Average headcount

Calculation: GHS 51,600,000 ÷ 237

Result: GHS 217,722 per employee

NB:

a. Revenue per employee is generally acceptable when it comfortably exceeds total cost per employee by a healthy margin.

b. Many well-run organisations aim for at least 2 to 3 times payroll or employee cost per employee in revenue contribution.

Revenue per Employee of about GHS 217,722 suggests strong productivity for a growing service business and provides a useful benchmark for future comparisons.

2.0 Profit per FTE

Formula: Net profit ÷ No. of FTEs

Calculation: GHS 9,804,000 ÷ 228

Result: GHS 43,000 per FTE

NB:

a. Boards focus less on the absolute figure and more on consistency, sustainability, and comparison across branches and units.

b. Profit per FTE should comfortably cover a meaningful share of employee cost per FTE to suggest healthy workforce productivity.

Profit per FTE of GHS 43,000 indicates that the workforce is not only productive in revenue terms but is also contributing to bottom-line performance.

3.0 Human Capital ROI

Formula: (Revenue – Employee-related costs) ÷ Employee-related costs

Calculation: (GHS 51,600,000 – GHS 13,020,000) ÷ GHS 13,020,000

Result: 2.96

A Human Capital ROI of 2.96 means that for every GHS 1 invested in employees, the organisation generated about GHS 2.96 above employee cost. This reflects a strong return on people investment.

4.0 Average Performance Rating

Result: Already provided in the case: 3.9 out of 5, equivalent to 78%

NB:

a. Below 3.0 is weak performance culture.

b. 3.0 to 3.4 is fair performance.

c. 3.5 to 3.9 is good performance.

d. 4.0 to 4.4 is very good performance.

e. 4.5 and above is excellent performance.

An Average Performance Rating of 3.9 out of 5 places Bridgepoint at the upper end of the good range. This suggests that performance standards are being met across much of the organisation.

5.0 High Performer Rate

Formula: High performers ÷ Average headcount × 100

Calculation: 64 ÷ 237 × 100

Result: 27.0%

NB:

a. Below 15% is low and may indicate weak performance differentiation.

b. 15% to 30% is a healthy and acceptable range.

c. Above 30% may suggest a very strong talent pool or possible rating inflation if sustained.

A High Performer Rate of 27.0% sits in the healthy range. This suggests that Bridgepoint is identifying top performers without over-inflating ratings.

6.0 PIP Success Rate

Formula: Employees successfully exiting PIP ÷ Employees on PIP × 100

Calculation: 15 ÷ 22 × 100

Result: 68.2%

NB:

a. Below 40% is low.

b. 40% to 70% is healthy and acceptable.

c. Above 70% is high.

A PIP Success Rate of 68.2% shows that performance management is functioning as a corrective and developmental tool, not only as a disciplinary process.

7.0 Goal Achievement Rate

Formula: Employees who achieved goals ÷ Average headcount × 100

Calculation: 184 ÷ 237 × 100

Result: 77.6%

NB:

a. Below 60% is low.

b. 60% to 80% is acceptable and healthy.

c. Above 80% is high.

A Goal Achievement Rate of 77.6% places the organisation in the acceptable and healthy range. This suggests that goals are broadly clear and achievable.

8.0 Billable Utilization Rate

Formula: Billable hours ÷ Total available hours × 100

Calculation: 124,272 ÷ 182,400 × 100

Result: 68.1%

NB:

a. Below 65% is low.

b. 65% to 80% is acceptable and healthy.

c. Above 80% is high.

A Billable Utilization Rate of 68.1% falls within the healthy range. This suggests that employee capacity is being used reasonably well without extreme overloading.

9.0 Quality of Work / Error Rate

Formula: Transactions with errors ÷ Total transactions × 100

Calculation: 84 ÷ 2,400 × 100

Result: 3.5% error rate, equivalent to 96.5% accuracy

NB:

a. Above 5% is high and unacceptable.

b. 2% to 5% is moderate and acceptable.

c. Below 2% is low and strong.

An Error Rate of 3.5% falls in the moderate but acceptable range. This suggests that quality controls are working, though there is still room to reduce rework.

10.0 Customer Satisfaction Linked to Employee Performance

Formula: Customer satisfaction in high-performing branches – Customer satisfaction in lower-performing branches

Calculation: 4.5 – 3.8

Result: 0.7-point difference

NB:

a. Below 0.3 points suggests a weak link.

b. 0.3 to 0.6 points suggests a moderate link.

c. Above 0.6 points suggests a clear and meaningful link.

A 0.7-point difference shows a clear link between employee performance and customer experience. Higher-performing branches are delivering better customer outcomes.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. Revenue and profit per employee show solid productivity for a growing organisation.

b. Human Capital ROI of 2.96 reflects a strong return on people investment.

c. A 27.0% high performer rate suggests healthy differentiation of talent.

d. PIP success at 68.2% shows that performance management is constructive.

e. Billable utilization is healthy, though there may still be room to optimise capacity.

f. The error rate and customer satisfaction gap reinforce the link between people performance and service outcomes.

FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 6: LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT METRICS CASE STUDY

Case: Learning and Development at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Average workforce = 237 employees

b. Total training hours delivered = 5,925 hours

c. Total training and development cost = GHS 948,000

d. Employees trained during the year = 182

e. Productivity before training = GHS 228,000 per trained employee

f. Productivity after training = GHS 255,000 per trained employee

g. Performance gain per trained employee = GHS 27,000

1.0 Average Training Hours per Employee

Formula: Total training hours ÷ Average workforce

Calculation: 5,925 ÷ 237

Result: 25 hours per employee

NB:

a. Below 15 hours is low and may signal limited capability development.

b. 15 to 30 hours is a healthy and acceptable range.

c. Above 30 hours is high and should be linked to measurable value.

Average Training Hours per Employee of 25 hours sits in the healthy range. This suggests that learning is being delivered consistently across the workforce.

2.0 Training Cost per Employee

Formula: Total training cost ÷ Average workforce

Calculation: GHS 948,000 ÷ 237

Result: GHS 4,000 per employee

NB:

a. In many service organisations, training cost is best judged by value and ROI rather than the absolute amount.

b. A moderate spend is acceptable when it produces measurable productivity gains.

Training Cost per Employee of GHS 4,000 is reasonable when viewed against the performance gains and strong ROI recorded in the case.

3.0 Performance Gain Value

Formula: Performance gain per trained employee × Number of employees trained

Calculation: GHS 27,000 × 182

Result: GHS 4,914,000

NB:

a. Performance gain should be measurable and linked directly to job output.

b. Organisations generally expect the total value created to exceed the training investment by a healthy margin.

A Performance Gain Value of GHS 4.914 million shows that the learning investment is producing measurable business value.

4.0 Training ROI (%)

Formula: (Performance gain value – Training cost) ÷ Training cost × 100

Calculation: (GHS 4,914,000 – GHS 948,000) ÷ GHS 948,000 × 100

Result: 418.4%

NB:

a. Below 100% is low or weak.

b. 100% to 200% is acceptable and healthy.

c. Above 200% is strong.

A Training ROI of 418.4% is very strong. This suggests that training is not only covering its cost but generating multiple times its value in measurable performance improvement.

5.0 Training and Development Access Rate

Formula: Employees trained ÷ Average workforce × 100

Calculation: 182 ÷ 237 × 100

Result: 76.8%

NB:

a. Below 50% is low access.

b. 50% to 75% is acceptable and healthy access.

c. Above 75% is high access.

A Training and Development Access Rate of 76.8% places Bridgepoint in the high access category. This suggests that learning opportunities are being extended to a broad share of employees.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. 25 training hours per employee show steady capability development.

b. GHS 4,000 per employee is justified by the measurable gains achieved.

c. Performance gains of GHS 4.914 million demonstrate strong business impact.

d. A Training ROI of 418.4% shows excellent value from the learning investment.

e. Access of 76.8% suggests learning is broad and relatively inclusive.

FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 7: DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION METRICS CASE STUDY

Case: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Total workforce = 254 employees
b. Male employees = 144
c. Female employees = 110
d. Average annual salary for male employees = GHS 61,500
e. Average annual salary for female employees = GHS 57,000
f. Leadership roles = 46 positions
g. Male leaders = 28
h. Female leaders = 18
i. Promotions during the year = 36
j. Male promotions = 20
k. Female promotions = 16
l. Total overtime cost = GHS 516,000
m. Male overtime cost = GHS 300,000
n. Female overtime cost = GHS 216,000

1.0 Workforce Diversity Ratio

Formula: Number of employees in a demographic group ÷ Total workforce × 100

Calculation: Male: 144 ÷ 254 × 100, Female: 110 ÷ 254 × 100

Result: Male 56.7%, Female 43.3%

NB:

a. Highly imbalanced means one group dominates the workforce significantly, often above 70%.
b. Reasonably balanced means no single group is far outside the broad 40% to 60% zone.
c. Well balanced means representation is close to parity.

Bridgepoint is reasonably balanced by gender at workforce level. This suggests that the main DEI focus should shift from entry-level representation to progression, leadership, pay equity, and workload distribution.

2.0 Gender Pay Gap (%)

Formula: (Average male salary – Average female salary) ÷ Average male salary × 100

Calculation: (GHS 61,500 – GHS 57,000) ÷ GHS 61,500 × 100

Result: 7.3%

NB:

a. Leading organisations aim to keep unexplained pay gaps below 5%.

b. A gap above 5% should trigger review of role mix, grade mix, progression patterns, and pay decisions.

A Gender Pay Gap of 7.3% is above the ideal threshold and should be reviewed. This does not automatically prove inequity, but it does justify a closer pay and grade analysis.

3.0 Average Salary by Gender

Result: Already provided in the case: Male average salary is GHS 61,500 and female average salary is GHS 57,000.

4.0 Representation in Leadership Roles (%)

Formula: Each diverse leadership group ÷ Total leadership roles × 100

Calculation: Male: 28 ÷ 46 × 100, Female: 18 ÷ 46 × 100

Result: Male leadership 60.9%, Female leadership 39.1%

NB:

a. Under-representation exists when leadership representation falls well below workforce representation.

b. Representation is reasonably aligned when it is broadly within about 10 percentage points of workforce composition.

c. Well balanced representation mirrors workforce diversity closely.

Female workforce representation is 43.3%, while female leadership representation is 39.1%. The 4.2-point gap is not extreme, but it still shows some slippage between workforce diversity and leadership diversity.

5.0 Promotion Rate by Gender

Formula: Promotions for each group ÷ Total employees in that group × 100

Calculation: Male: 20 ÷ 144 × 100, Female: 16 ÷ 110 × 100

Result: Male 13.9%, Female 14.5%

NB:

a. A difference of more than 5 percentage points between groups is concerning.

b. A difference within about 5 percentage points is acceptable but should still be monitored.

c. Very small differences suggest balanced progression outcomes.

Promotion rates are very close across men and women. This suggests that promotion decisions are broadly balanced in this case.

6.0 Overtime Cost Distribution (%)

Formula: Each group's overtime cost ÷ Total overtime cost × 100

Calculation: Male: GHS 300,000 ÷ GHS 516,000 × 100, Female: GHS 216,000 ÷ GHS 516,000 × 100

Result: Male 58.1%, Female 41.9%

NB:

a. Highly imbalanced overtime often means one group consistently carries a much heavier share without a clear role-based explanation.

b. Acceptable but monitored means the split broadly reflects workforce composition and operational need.

c. Well balanced means workload distribution is proportionate and consistently explainable.

The overtime split broadly mirrors workforce composition, though men still carry a slightly higher share than their workforce proportion. HR should check whether this is role-driven or reflects uneven workload allocation.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. Workforce gender balance is reasonably healthy.

b. A 7.3% pay gap warrants deeper review of role levels, progression, and pay equity.

c. Leadership representation is fairly close to workforce composition, but still not fully aligned.

d. Promotion rates are broadly balanced across both groups.

e. Overtime distribution should continue to be monitored to prevent workload concentration.

FACILITATOR ANSWER SHEET 8: ERGONOMICS METRICS AT BRIDGEPOINT COMPANY LIMITED CASE STUDY

Case: Ergonomics at Bridgepoint Company Limited

Data Provided

a. Average workforce = 237 employees
b. Working days per employee per year = 240 days
c. Total workplace injuries = 14
d. Manual handling strain cases = 5, with 7 lost workdays per case
e. Workstation-related neck and back strain cases = 4, with 9 lost workdays per case
f. Repetitive strain injury cases = 3, with 8 lost workdays per case
g. Total workdays lost due to physical discomfort = 426 days
h. Ergonomic risk assessments covered 180 employees
i. Head Office: 60 employees, average risk score 68
j. Contact Centre: 50 employees, average risk score 74
k. Operations Hub: 40 employees, average risk score 71
l. Branch Support: 30 employees, average risk score 63
m. Employees scheduled for ergonomic training = 165
n. Employees who completed ergonomic training = 141
o. Employees with work-related musculoskeletal disorders = 21

1.0 Workplace Injury Rate

Formula: Total workplace injuries ÷ Average workforce × 100

Calculation: 14 ÷ 237 × 100

Result: 5.9%

NB:

a. Below 2% is low.
b. 2% to 4% is moderate.
c. 4% to 6% is elevated and needs monitoring.
d. Above 6% is high and requires urgent management attention.

A Workplace Injury Rate of 5.9% is elevated. This suggests that health and safety controls need closer review, especially in the work areas where discomfort and strain are more common.

2.0 Lost Workdays due to Ergonomic Injury

Formula: Sum of lost workdays from ergonomic injury categories

Calculation: (5 × 7) + (4 × 9) + (3 × 8)

Result: 95 days

A total of 95 lost workdays due to ergonomic injuries is operationally significant. It shows that the problem is not only about discomfort but also about lost productivity and cost.

3.0 Average Ergonomic Risk Assessment Score

Formula: Weighted average of risk scores across assessed work areas

Calculation: [(60 × 68) + (50 × 74) + (40 × 71) + (30 × 63)] ÷ 180

Result: 69.5 out of 100

NB:

a. Below 40 indicates low ergonomic risk.

b. 40 to 59 indicates moderate ergonomic risk.

c. 60 to 74 indicates high ergonomic risk.

d. 75 and above indicates very high or critical ergonomic risk.

An average Ergonomic Risk Assessment Score of 69.5 places Bridgepoint in the high-risk category. This suggests that workstation design, posture, manual handling practice, or equipment setup needs structured intervention.

4.0 Absenteeism Rate due to Physical Discomfort

Formula: Workdays lost due to physical discomfort ÷ Total available workdays × 100

Calculation: 426 ÷ (237 × 240) × 100

Result: 0.75%

NB:

a. Below 0.5% is low.

b. 0.5% to 1.0% is moderate and should be monitored.

c. Above 1.0% is high and may reflect unresolved ergonomic or workplace health issues.

An Absenteeism Rate of 0.75% due to physical discomfort is moderate. It may look small as a percentage, but it still represents meaningful lost time that should not be ignored.

5.0 Ergonomic Training Participation Rate

Formula: Employees completing ergonomic training ÷ Employees scheduled for training × 100

Calculation: 141 ÷ 165 × 100

Result: 85.5%

NB:

a. Below 60% is low participation.

b. 60% to 79% is acceptable participation.

c. 80% and above is strong participation.

An Ergonomic Training Participation Rate of 85.5% is strong. This suggests that the organisation is securing broad participation in preventive learning, which is a positive sign.

6.0 Musculoskeletal Disorder Rate

Formula: Total employees with MSD cases ÷ Average workforce × 100

Calculation: 21 ÷ 237 × 100

Result: 8.9%

NB:

a. Below 3% is low.

b. 3% to 6% is moderate.

c. Above 6% is high and suggests workplace health risks need targeted action.

A Musculoskeletal Disorder Rate of 8.9% is high. This suggests that ergonomic risk is already showing up in employee health outcomes and should be addressed through both prevention and workplace redesign.

What These Numbers Tell Participants

a. The workplace injury rate is elevated and calls for closer safety monitoring.

b. 95 lost workdays from ergonomic injuries show real productivity cost.

c. A risk assessment score of 69.5 indicates high ergonomic risk exposure.

d. Physical discomfort is contributing to measurable absenteeism.

e. Training participation is strong, but the health outcomes show that training alone may not be enough.

f. The musculoskeletal disorder rate suggests that prevention, redesign, and follow-up action are needed.