

**Costs and Factors Associated
with Turnover among
Peer and Outreach Workers
within the
Young Men of Color
Who Have Sex with Men
SPNS Initiative**

March 2010

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Health Resources and Services Administration
HIV/AIDS Bureau
Special Projects of National Significance (SPNS)



Table of Contents

1 Abstract 3

2 Introduction..... 4

 2.1 Turnover as a Common Problem 5

 2.2 Turnover among SPNS Grantees 6

 2.3 Hypotheses 6

3 Methods..... 9

 3.1 Quantitative Data Sources and Analyses 9

 3.2 Qualitative Data Source and Analysis 13

 3.3 Limitations 13

4 Results..... 15

 4.1 Quantitative Findings..... 15

 Descriptive Statistics: Peer/Outreach Workers and Turnover Levels..... 15

 The Costs of Turnover 18

 Correlations between Enrollment Levels and Possible Explanatory Variables 20

 4.2 Qualitative Findings..... 22

 Salary 22

 Age..... 22

 Size of and Safe Spaces for the MSM Community 23

 Program Impacts of Turnover 24

5 What can grantees do to prevent high turnover? 25

 5.1 Hiring 25

 5.2 Supervision and Training..... 26

 5.3 Separation 27

 5.4 Structure the Position as a Short-Term Role: Using the BAS Model to Reduce
Turnover..... 28

6 Conclusion 29

7 References..... 30

8 Appendix A: The Turnover Tool 31

1 ABSTRACT

This exploratory analysis aims to understand the costs and correlates of turnover among peer/outreach workers employed by grantees within the Special Programs of National Significance (SPNS) Outreach, Care, and Prevention to Engage HIV Seropositive Young MSM of Color Initiative. Funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, HIV/AIDS Bureau from 2004 to 2009, this initiative was composed of eight grantees using innovative strategies to engage and retain HIV-positive young MSM of color into care. This analysis uses both quantitative and qualitative methods. The costs and correlates of turnover are investigated through examining survey data (from a turnover tool designed for this analysis), interview data, budget data, and grantee enrollment data.

Through quantitative analyses, the following statistically significant relationships were identified:

- Grantees that employed older peer/outreach workers tended to experience less turnover.
- Grantees that paid their peer/outreach workers more (when adjusted for cost of living) tended to experience less turnover.

These findings were also supported by grantee interview responses. This research culminated in identifying the following strategies implemented and/or recommended by grantees:

- Be explicit to potential candidates regarding position responsibilities and expectations.
- Consider hiring individuals familiar with the organization.
- Encourage the integration of peer/outreach workers into the project team.
- Address position challenges through training.
- Provide mentorship to peer/outreach workers beyond traditional supervision.
- Do not be overly lenient with peer/outreach workers who are not fulfilling their responsibilities.
- Consider making the position a short-term role.

2 INTRODUCTION

The Young Men of Color who have Sex with Men (YMSM of Color) Special Programs of National Significance (SPNS) Initiative included eight grantees nationwide that provided innovative outreach and prevention services to HIV-positive young MSM of color. These eight grantees were funded for 5 years (2004 to 2009) by the HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB) within the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). The grantees provided not only health care-related services, but also reported information about the clients they served and their health outcomes over time as part of a multisite evaluation. These evaluations are a central component of SPNS, which aims to fund and evaluate innovative models of HIV/AIDS care.

To promote program sustainability and replication, SPNS began incorporating cost studies into its evaluation activities. Turnover among peer/outreach workers was identified as a major issue, both by the SPNS YMSM of Color grantees and by the initiative's Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center (ETAC), the YES Center of George Washington University in Washington, DC. Turnover expends resources and places a substantial burden on remaining staff. Using quantitative and qualitative data, the research described in this report explores the costs and potential causes of turnover among peer/outreach workers. The goal is to provide information to current and future grantees to help them prepare for and manage peer/outreach worker turnover within their programs. Note that the term *peer/outreach workers* refers broadly to staff whose primary responsibilities include recruiting, retaining and interacting with clients, as defined by grantees. Although the precise definition of this role varies from one grantee to another, there is enough similarity across grantees to create a single category for the purposes of analysis.

In the remainder of this section, turnover is presented as a common problem in many human service areas, and the types of approaches that have been used to quantify the costs of turnover are reviewed. Finally, how the problem of turnover became clear in the context of the YMSM of Color Initiative is discussed, along with how it might be related to attributes of the peer/outreach worker position and to attributes of peer/outreach workers themselves.

2.1 Turnover as a Common Problem

Staff turnover is a common problem in social and human services. Certain areas, such as child welfare, experience annual turnover rates as high as 60 percent. In an extensive review of existing research on turnover among social workers, Barak et al. (2001) identified a set of problems related to the nature of human service positions which promote turnover, including employee stress, burnout, and poor organizational support. The high workloads coupled with poorly defined responsibilities of social work often create high levels of stress. While the topic of how position structure and work environment encourages turnover is more extensively studied within other human service fields, the existing research within HIV/AIDS care settings have shown similar findings. Felton (1997) conducted a review of research on burnout within health care professionals, a phenomenon known to contribute to turnover. Health care providers serving patients with AIDS were identified as a high-risk group for burnout, described as confronting “possibly the most difficult professional challenge” (p. 243). The complexity of HIV/AIDS patients’ care needs due to common co-morbidities, the difficulty of periodically seeing patients struggle with death and the social stigma associated with the disease all contribute to burnout among these staff. In a related study specifically focused on HIV/AIDS outreach workers, staff cited stress as the main driver of employee departures (Deren et al, 1992).

Research from social work environments indicates how damaging turnover can be to organizational functioning. The similarities between social work and HIV/AIDS outreach (such as the importance of client relationships and resource-stretched settings) suggest these findings may be applicable to this initiative. Barak et al. (2001) provided an overview of the negative impacts of turnover. First, it is expensive for organizations to search for and train replacement staff. Second, turnover undermines staff morale and client relationships. The inconsistent workforce in areas such as child welfare is believed to promote client distrust and to disrupt care. Third, the burden placed on remaining staff is exacerbated by labor shortages, not only when the organization loses employees, but also when new hires must adjust to their duties and to the culture of the organization. Barak et al. (2001) describe this as “the weary cycle of recruitment-orientation-production-resignation that is detrimental to the reputation of social work as a profession” (p. 627).

Researchers have explored quantifying the costs associated with turnover in various industries. Typically, costs are estimated by aggregating expenses related to departures, hiring and training. Jones has produced several studies that present models for evaluating the costs of turnover among nurses (1990, 2004, and 2005). Her 2004 research paper updated her former methodology and created a model using “human capital theory,” taking into account both direct costs, such as the materials and staff time needed for recruiting and training staff, and indirect costs, such as the decreased work productivity of new hires. Jones applied this methodology in later research (2005), and found that the costs of turnover in several health care environments ranged from roughly \$62,000 to \$67,000 per nurse. Hinkin and Tracey (2000) used similar methods in their study of the costs of turnover per individual within the hotel industry. This study estimated the costs of turnover for a front desk associate in two different locations, Miami and New York, surveying two hotels in each location. The total cost per individual ranged from \$5,700 to \$12,900. Both these evaluation models divided costs related to turnover into similar categories, including separation, recruiting, hiring, and reduced productivity.

2.2 Turnover among SPNS Grantees

YMSM grantees and the YES Center reported anecdotally that turnover can be a formidable problem among peer/outreach workers. There are several possible reasons for this. First, many program clients face complicated social, emotional, and financial issues, which may create challenging work environments for many peer/outreach workers. Second, peer/outreach workers tend to be among the lowest paid project staff, a fact that may increase their frustration levels and tendency to burn out. Third, peer/outreach workers in this initiative have typically had limited work experience prior to joining the programs and thus have had little exposure to professional work and the behaviors necessary to support it. Finally, expectations of peer/outreach workers may differ from those of program staff, especially given the challenges of the job and their relative inexperience with similar work environments.

2.3 Hypotheses

As described above, there is evidence to support the idea that turnover is costly and has negative effects. But the relevant body of research is small, particularly regarding turnover

among HIV/AIDS peer/outreach workers. The research reported here should therefore be seen as exploratory. Significantly, the hypotheses were developed at several stages of this research process. Anecdotal evidence from conversations with YMSM grantees and the YES Center suggested that turnover, particularly among peer/outreach workers, reduced the capability of programs to recruit and retain clients. The need to address this problem became the motivation to conduct an exploratory analysis of the issue. Initially, it was intended to collect only quantitative data on this topic, but grantees stated that they wanted the opportunity to explain the context and story behind this data. Thus the research became an iterative process that included elicitation of research hypotheses from former SPNS initiatives, feedback from current YMSM grantees and the YES Center, and published literature which informed the creation of the quantitative data collection instrument, the turnover tool (which will be described in greater detail in the next section). Once grantees completed the tool, staff interviews were conducted, which in turn provided further ideas for how to interpret and analyze the quantitative data.

Through this process, a set of factors was identified that might plausibly be associated with higher turnover among peer/outreach workers. These factors are:

- **Attributes of the peer/outreach worker position:** Because higher salaries and steadier work should encourage higher levels of commitment among peer/outreach workers, it was predicted that turnover rates should be lower among full-time, salaried peer/outreach workers than among their part-time counterparts.
- **Attributes of the peer/outreach worker hired:** Turnover rates should be lower among older peer/outreach workers than among their younger counterparts. Likewise, turnover rates should be lower among workers with more education and more work experience in this field. Age, education and work experience should all signal higher levels of maturity necessary to maintain a peer/outreach worker position.
- **Program location:** Many programs placed restrictions on the degree to which their peer/outreach workers can combine work with their social lives. Such restrictions can make the job more stressful, as peer/outreach workers struggle to maintain appropriate boundaries between work and leisure. These stresses, in turn, can lead peer/outreach workers to quit. Alternately, they can create more opportunities for peer/outreach workers to fail in their job duties, thus leading to forced separations. Boundaries between work

and leisure may be easier to maintain in larger communities, where the pool of YMSM is large enough to permit peer/outreach workers to perform their work duties and still socialize freely.

- **Client enrollment levels:** Programs that have high turnover rates may find it difficult to enroll clients, simply because they lack the staffing necessary to achieve acceptable enrollment levels. Conversely, programs that are having trouble enrolling clients may find it difficult to retain peer/outreach workers. Staff may leave if they feel discouraged about their ability to recruit clients, or there may be something about the way the program is run that simultaneously impedes recruitment and creates an environment that discourages peer/outreach workers from staying on for any length of time.

In addition, this analysis attempts to quantify the costs associated with the departure of peer/outreach workers – both the total cost per grantee and the cost per individual replaced. These costs were divided into the different activities associated with replacing an individual – separation, hiring, and training. Finally, the qualitative data from interviews was used to identify the best practices that different grantees have employed to minimize turnover rates.

3 METHODS

In this section, the data sources and the methods used to analyze those data are presented. Several ways in which this analysis might be limited are also discussed. The quantitative data sources and methods are presented first. Three quantitative sources were used: the turnover tool that asked a series of questions about turnover in grantee organizations; SPNS budget data; and client enrollment data provided by the YES Center. The qualitative data elicited from interviews with grantee staff is then described.

3.1 Quantitative Data Sources and Analyses

The primary source of information for this analysis was the turnover tool. This instrument collected information from grantees on the characteristics of the peer/outreach workers they typically employed, along with the activities and time they dedicated to recruiting, hiring, training, and supervising these workers. To protect the privacy of individual employees, the tool requested only general information about peer/outreach workers and program activities; it did not ask for information about specific workers. The tool was designed to answer a number of questions, including the following:

- What is the background of the program's typical peer/outreach worker?
- What recruiting and training methods does the program use?
- How much turnover among peer/outreach workers has the program experienced?
- Why do peer/outreach workers typically leave?
- When a peer/outreach worker leaves, how do remaining staff and clients react?
- Measured in materials and hours worked, how many resources does the organization devote to peer/outreach workers' departures, and to hiring and training new peer/outreach workers?

Development of the tool was based on existing research of models for measuring the costs of turnover and on feedback from YMSM grantees, HRSA, and the YES Center. The activities necessary to replace an employee – separation, hiring, and training/supervising – were identified from a review of the literature in this field (Hinkin and Tracey, 2000; Jones 1990 and 2004;

Tziner and Birati, 1996). A first draft of the tool was presented to grantee staff at the YMSM of Color Grantee Meeting in July 2008. During this session, grantees provided their feedback and suggested improvements, which were incorporated into the tool. A second draft was then emailed to grantee staff, who supplied additional comments via phone or email. Grantees were also asked which staff members they felt were best suited to complete the tool. With one exception, it was completed by each program's principal investigator or project manager/coordinator. The final version of the tool can be found in Appendix A (Section 8).

The information from the tool was used in conjunction with the grantees' annual SPNS budgets. As background to this data, the YMSM grantees were obligated to submit their annual budgets to HRSA for approval to secure their funding. These budgets comprehensively present all the major direct and indirect line-items associated with grantee program and research activities. For example, grantee annual budgets include information such as rent costs, staff and client travel cost, and salary information by staff position.

First, using the tool responses and budget data, estimates were drawn for the total cost of replacing one peer/outreach worker. The turnover tool asked each grantee to specify the number of hours that staff dedicated to recruiting, hiring, training and supervising, and separation of a single peer/outreach worker (in other words, the combined costs of all activities in the "life cycle" of a worker). YMSM grantee budgets for Year 4 were used to calculate the hourly wages of staff involved in replacing workers. Year 4 budgets were selected to provide salary information because the majority of the individuals listed on the tool were current grantee staff, and thus Year 4 (the grant year when the study initiated) contained the most up-to-date salary information for these staff. Program managers were asked to provide the SPNS salaries and FTEs of any individuals who did not appear in the budget. To calculate the total turnover cost per peer/outreach worker, the number of hours that staff worked on all peer/outreach worker activities was multiplied by their hourly wages, and then summed those values across grantee staff. This per individual cost was also used to calculate the total cost per grantee of peer/outreach worker turnover, based on the number of individuals that left each program.

Second, the relationship between turnover levels and possible explanatory variables was evaluated by running correlations between the total number of peer/outreach workers who separated from each grantee and eight variables, which were identified during grantee interviews

or taken from tool responses. An explanation of how those variables were constructed follows below. Note that these are grouped into the four categories used in the introduction.

- *Attributes of the peer/outreach worker position: Salary and position type.* To calculate the average annual salary of peer/outreach workers for each grantee, data are extracted from the YMSM grantees' budgets for grant Years 1 through 4.¹ The salaries were scaled so that they equaled one FTE, then aggregated and divided by four to produce an average annual FTE salary. Finally, adjustments were made for cost-of-living differences at the different grantee locations using an on-line cost of living adjustment calculator.² The turnover tool categorized staff along two dimensions, part-time versus full-time, and contract versus salaried.
- *Attributes of the typical peer/outreach worker hired: Age, educational attainment, and work experience.* All three of these variables were categorized into "bands." For example, for age, these bands included 18-21 and 21-25, for educational attainment, these included high school and high school plus some college, and for work experience, these included 1-2 and 2-4 years.
- *Population of the city in which the program was located.* Population figures were used as a proxy for the size of the YMSM of color community, on the logic that larger cities should have more YMSMs of color.
- *Total client enrollment.* The YES Center collected the number of clients that each grantee had enrolled in the multisite evaluation as of August 31, 2008 (when the tool was distributed). This information is presented in Table 3.1 (below).

¹ For AIDS Project East Bay (Oakland, CA), LA County (Los Angeles, CA) and Harris County (Houston, TX), budgets from all years 1 to 4 were not available or salary information could not be extracted from these budgets. Therefore only the available budgets were used to calculate the average annual salary.

² Since the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not break down cost of living by city and state, the following website was used to adjust for cost of living: <http://cgi.money.cnn.com/tools/costofliving/costofliving.html>

Table 3. 1: Client Enrollment by Grantee, as of August 2008

Grantee	# Enrolled in Multisite Evaluation
AIDS Project East Bay (APEB) (Oakland, CA)	15
Bronx Aids Service (BAS) (Bronx, NY)	43
Harris County (Houston, TX)	28
LA County (Los Angeles, CA)	45
MOCHA (Men of Color Health Awareness Project) (Rochester, NY)	3
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (Chapel Hill, NC)	52
Working for Togetherness (WFT) (Chicago, IL)	8
Wayne State University (WSU) (Detroit, MI)	28

Kendall’s tau was selected as the most appropriate analyses for this data. Because many of the measures collected through the turnover tool are not continuous, it would be inappropriate to use a standard measure of correlation, such as the Pearson product-moment correlation (Pearson’s r). Even when measures are continuous, as is the case for salary and population size, assumptions of normality are questionable at best. A robust alternative to Pearson’s r is Kendall’s tau, which computes correlations among ranks. Its only requirement is that data be ordinal. All of the measures – including those that are banded (such as age and educational attainment) – meet the requirements of ordinality. For example, peer/outreach workers in the 22-25 year age band are older than peer/outreach workers in the 18-21 year age band. (Position type is also ordinal, with part-time at the lowest end and full-time at the highest end.) Mechanically, the only adjustment that must be made before running the correlation is to assign each band into a numerical rank – for example, 1 for “less than high school,” 2 for “high school,” 3 for “some college,” and so on. Like Pearson’s r , Kendall’s tau ranges between -1 and +1, and can be tested for statistical significance. Note that any grantee that indicated “varies significantly” for its answer was dropped from that correlation (because it is not possible to assign ordinality to that choice), meaning that some correlations were based on fewer than seven cases.

Significantly, BAS was not included in the correlational analysis. Unlike the other grantees, BAS has implemented a short-term model in which peer/outreach workers established their own personal recruitment goals. A detailed description of this model is presented in Section 5.4. The markedly different model at BAS makes it difficult to compare to the other grantees and therefore BAS was excluded from the correlations (though their cost and interview data are presented in the results section).

3.2 Qualitative Data Source and Analysis

The quantitative data collected from the tool and budget analyses were supplemented with a series of 45-minute interviews. Interviews were conducted with the same staff who completed the turnover tool. With one exception, staff from all grantees participated in these interviews.³ These interviews allowed some clarification of answers to questions that appeared on the tool, and also an opportunity to ask new questions. Questions were tailored to the specific responses of a given grantee. In general, however, the grantees were asked to reflect upon the following issues:

- The responsibilities of peer/outreach workers and how they have changed over the course of the grant;
- The specific activities used to train peer/outreach workers;
- The circumstances that led to the program's voluntary departures and terminations; and
- The practices that have been adopted or should be adopted to help mitigate turnover.

Interviews were conducted primarily by conference call, with the exception of APEB, where the interviews were on-site and included the project manager and peer/outreach workers. The notes were compiled, and patterns were identified in grantee responses. In particular, responses were sought that would complement or illuminate the responses that grantees provided on the tool.

3.3 Limitations

The quantitative analysis is limited primarily by the small number of participating grantees. With at most seven cases (with BAS excluded, as noted above), effect sizes have to be

³ WFT was not interviewed due to the unavailability of their staff.

especially large for correlations to reach statistical significance. Even the qualitative analysis is restricted by the small sample size. Nonetheless, as is shown, some correlations do reach statistical significance, and the interviews suggest recommendations that may be of use to other Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program grantees as they attempt to address the problem of peer/outreach worker turnover.

The cost data also included several inherent limitations. The tool and interviews were designed to capture costs and staff information relevant to SPNS staff. The replacement process frequently involved staff who were paid through indirect costs or not paid at all by SPNS funding. Indirect costs were not taken into account in the cost per activity calculations because only salary information was used, despite the fact that overhead funds likely supported replacement activities at many programs. Moreover, the tool did not collect information on staff not paid for with SPNS funding, and thus this information was also not captured. Lastly, the use of budget data for salary information is less accurate than expenditure data.

4 RESULTS

To facilitate exposition the Results section is organized to mirror the structure of the Methods section. Section 4.1 describes the quantitative findings, including the costs of turnover and the correlations between turnover levels and potential explanatory variables. Section 4.2 describes the qualitative findings that emerged from the interviews with grantees.

4.1 Quantitative Findings

The descriptive statistics presented first lay the foundation for the analyses that follow. Much of the data discussed in this section originate from the turnover tool, but only a subset of these data are presented in tables. These tables primarily contain the data that serve as input to the correlation analyses, with findings reported later in this section. While the BAS model is described in Section 5.4 and BAS data is excluded from the correlational analyses, the descriptive statistics are presented both with and without BAS.

Descriptive Statistics: Peer/Outreach Workers and Turnover Levels

Table 4.1 presents the characteristics of the typical peer/outreach workers employed by each grantee. Note that there is considerable variation in the typical age of these workers, though most appear to be in the early 20s. The educational attainment of outreach workers is also quite variable. Perhaps not surprisingly given the entry-level nature of their positions, most peer/outreach workers appear to have between 1 and 2 years of work experience in the field (which, grantees explained, could have been gained from staff being former program participants). Grantees explained that the peer/outreach workers' role evolved within most programs over time, but typically included the core activities of outreach, client support, and encouraging client retention.

Table 4.1: Characteristics of Peer/Outreach Workers by Grantee

Grantee	Typical Age	Typical Education	Typical Work Experience	Total # Ever Employed (2004 – Aug 2008)	Current # Employed	Position Type	Adjusted Salary	Enrollment Aug 2008
APEB	22 - 25	High school + some college	3 - 4 Years	11	3	Part-time	\$30,977	15
BAS	18 - 21	Less than High school	1 - 2 Years	10	5	Part-time, contracted	N/A**	43
Harris County*	30 – 33; 34+	College degree; High school + some college	3 - 4 Years; 5+ Years	4	3	Full time, salaried + benefits	\$56,995	28
LA County	Varies	Varies	1 - 2 Years	2	1	Varies	\$47,918	45
MOCHA	22 - 25	Varies	1 - 2 Years	6	1	Full time, salaried + benefits	\$33,569	3
UNC	26 - 29	High school + some college	1 - 2 Years	5	2	Full time, salaried + benefits	\$38,867	52
WFT	18 - 21	Varies	1 - 2 Years	6	2	Full time, salaried + benefits	\$34,700	8
WSU	22 - 25	High school + some college	1 - 2 Years	7	3	Full time, salaried + benefits	\$35,279	28

* Harris County submitted two turnover tools, one for the Harris County Hospital District and one for Harris County Health and Human Services Department. When their answers differed, both are presented in this table. The salary information was average across the two sites.

** BAS employed peer/outreach workers on a short-term basis, paying them a stipend and not an annual salary.

Of the 51 peer/outreach workers ever employed by the eight grantees during Years 1 to 4 of the YMSM of Color SPNS Initiative, over half (29) left or were terminated as of September 2008 (Table 4.2). On average, each grantee lost 4.1 peer/outreach workers between the start of the grant and August 2008, ranging from 0 at BAS, to 9 at APEB. (Excluding BAS, the lowest losses were at Harris County and LA County, which lost one individual each.) Notably, the majority of departures (19) were terminations, typically due to misconduct and failure to fulfill position responsibilities. Ten voluntary departures were reported on the turnover tool. However, it became clear in interviews that many “voluntary” departures were not voluntary at all; rather, workers were given the option to leave or be terminated. Thus, the number of staff who actually left of their own volition is almost certainly smaller than the figures in Table 4.2 might suggest.

Table 4.2: Turnover Levels by Grantee

Grantee	# Staff Left Voluntarily	# Staff Terminated	Total Turnover
APEB	1	8	9
BAS	0	0	0
Harris County	1	0	1
LA County	1	0	1
MOCHA	1	4	5
UNC	1	2	3
WFT	2	4	6
WSU	3	1	4
Total	10	19	29
Mean incl. BAS	1.3	2.4	3.6
Mean excl. BAS	1.4	2.7	4.1

The typical peer/outreach worker remained with the program for 14 months. The longest time period that any peer/outreach worker had been with the program was 3 years and the shortest time period was 3 weeks. On average, it took grantees about 2 months and 3 weeks to fill vacated positions.

The Costs of Turnover

As Table 4.3 demonstrates, the total cost of replacing a peer/outreach worker varied markedly from grantee to grantee, from \$1,659 at LA County to \$24,981 at MOCHA. The median cost of replacing one peer/outreach worker was \$3,144 (excluding BAS: \$3,943). The “total staff hours” column displays the aggregated hours grantees spent on separation, hiring, and training activities, as reported on the turnover tool. Grantees tended to invest more resources in training than separation or hiring, even though staff stated that the average length of time to hire and train a peer/outreach worker was the same. Because training activities were associated with higher costs than hiring activities, this indicates that staff must have worked with greater intensity on training activities. Table 4.4 indicates that the total costs incurred by grantees due to turnover (their cost per replacement multiplied by the number of individuals who had left the program) also varied greatly. The costs presented in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 are largely incurred from staff time and not materials; the median grantee reported expense for materials was \$160 for the entire replacement process.

Table 4.3: Costs Associated with Replacing One Peer/Outreach Worker

Grantee	Separation Cost	Hiring Cost	Training Cost	Total Staff Hours	Total Cost per Replacement
MOCHA	\$8,367	\$11,024	\$5,591	1039	\$24,981
UNC	\$1,432	\$980	\$3,817	129	\$6,230
WFT	\$153	\$1,937	\$1,951	131	\$4,041
APEB	\$273	\$1,090	\$2,580	131	\$3,943
WSU	\$395	\$261	\$1,688	73	\$2,344
Harris County	\$163	\$1,086	\$1,052	43	\$2,300
LA County	\$25	\$780	\$853	35	\$1,659
BAS	\$90	\$224	\$627	32	\$940
Median excl. BAS	\$273	\$1,086	\$1,951	129	\$3,943
Median incl. BAS	\$218	\$1,033	\$1,820	101	\$3,144

Table 4.4: Total Costs Incurred By Grantees due to Peer/Outreach Worker Turnover

Grantee	Total Turnover	Total Cost
APEB	9	\$35,487
BAS	0	--
Harris County	1	\$2,300
LA County	1	\$1,659
MOCHA	5	\$124,905
UNC	3	\$18,690
WFT	6	\$24,246
WSU	4	\$9,376
Total	29	\$216,663
Median incl. BAS	3.5	\$14,033
Median excl. BAS	4	\$18,690

Why did turnover costs vary so dramatically across grantees? Two possible explanations emerged from the interviews with grantees and from presentations that YMSM grantees gave at SPNS grantee meetings. First, programs were situated within different types of host agencies. These host agencies often dictated the amount of internal resources that needed to be spent on the hiring process. Compared to their stand-alone counterparts, programs that were affiliated with universities and county departments reported having less control over the hiring process, as this was typically handled by a human resources department outside of the SPNS project. Such programs reported using fewer resources for this activity. For example, while MOCHA spent \$11,024 on hiring activities, WSU only spent \$261. However, because the cost calculations are solely based on staff salaries, the indirect rates which grantees are required to pay and which frequently support human resource activities are not captured. Thus, the figure WSU spent on hiring is likely artificially low. Moreover, some grantees opted to recruit staff from existing agency staff (LA County) or from networks of affiliated program participants (BAS and APEB), rather than conduct more costly external hiring searches. Second, some grantees were able to exploit free training programs due to their geographic locations and host agency settings. For

example, Harris County outreach workers completed a rigorous 2-week off-site CDC DIS training program and WSU sent their peer/outreach workers to a State training on HIV and STDs 101. In contrast, MOCHA and APEB had more informal training procedures which were mainly conducted in-house, and therefore had to be paid for in staff time.

Correlations between Enrollment Levels and Possible Explanatory Variables

As detailed in the Methods section (Section 3.1), turnover levels (Table 4.2) were correlated with seven candidate explanatory variables, repeated here for convenience:

- Attributes of the peer/outreach worker position
 - Salary (adjusted for cost of living)
 - Position type
- Attributes of the typical peer/outreach worker hired
 - Age
 - Educational attainment
 - Work experience
- Population of the city in which the program was located
- Total client enrollment

Of the seven correlations, only two proved significant at the $p < 0.01$ level: salary adjusted for cost of living and age. The inverse (negative) correlations indicate that lower turnover was associated with higher salaries and higher ages among peer/outreach workers. Tables 4.5 and 4.6 present the Kendall's tau results for all the correlations. Harris County submitted two completed turnover tools, one for their hospital district and the other for their department of health and human services, noting slightly different answers for certain variables, as Table 4.1 presents. To ensure that these different responses did not substantially change the correlations, the analyses were conducted twice, once using the responses from the hospital district and once using the responses from the department of health and human services. The correlations of significance, salary and age, remained the same in both analyses. The Kendall's tau and p-values for all correlations are presented below.

Table 4.5 1: Kendall’s Tau Correlation Results, Including Responses from the Harris County Department of Health and Human Services

Total turnover correlated with...	Kendall's tau value	P-value	# of cases
Salary Adjusted for Cost of Living	-0.90	0.007*	7
Program Enrollment	-0.24	0.548	7
Work Experience in the Field	0.00	1.000	7
Population	-0.14	0.764	7
Age	-0.67	0.070*	6
Education	-0.50	0.371	4
Staff-type	-0.33	0.242	6

Table 4.5 2

Table 4.5 3

* indicates this value is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 4.6: Kendall’s Tau Correlation Results, Including Responses from the Harris County Hospital District

Total turnover correlated with...	Kendall's tau	P-value	# of cases
Salary Adjusted for Cost of Living	-0.86	0.001**	7
Program Enrollment	-0.29	0.448	7
Work Experience in the Field	0.00	1.000	7
Population	-0.20	0.649	7
Age	-0.67	0.070*	6
Education	0.00	1.000	4
Staff-type	-0.33	0.242	6

* indicates this value is statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

** indicates this value is statistically significant at the 0.001 level.

Both of these correlations are corroborated by the qualitative findings of the interviews, which follow.

4.2 Qualitative Findings

Salary

Many grantees reported that salary was an important factor in encouraging retention among peer/outreach workers. Grantees felt that the combination of good salaries, high-quality benefits and set hours increased peer/outreach worker investment in the project. Budget analysis revealed that peer/outreach worker salaries were almost uniform across grantees, which was not surprising given all grantees received the same level of funding. However, when adjusted for cost of living, salaries for these staff varied, as presented in Table 4.1 above.

Since full-time status better allowed grantees to incorporate peer/outreach workers as team members, many grantees stressed that the structure of the position was a factor in peer/outreach worker success. Full time peer/outreach workers were exposed to more opportunities for cross-training. Integration into the research team most likely resulted in peer/outreach workers feeling more invested in the SPNS Project. Additionally, the more comprehensive work environment that differentiates contracted and salaried employees may have delayed burnout and improved the level of responsibility and discipline displayed at work. However, quantitative data did not link position status to lower rates of turnover.

Age

Grantees frequently indicated their peer/outreach workers lacked maturity and were unable to appropriately define work and social boundaries, which were major factors driving peer/outreach worker terminations. The interactions that peer/outreach workers had with their clients within this initiative straddled the border between their social and professional lives. Peer/outreach workers were charged with recruiting clients with whom they shared substantially similar backgrounds and experiences. They often interacted with clients and potential clients in social settings (bars, clubs, Internet chat rooms, student centers, etc.). According to grantees, these informal settings encouraged peer/outreach workers to adopt an informal attitude toward their work, which suffered as a consequence. On the turnover tool, grantee staff indicated that terminations were often due to “exercising poor judgment mixing work and personal space,” “failure to adhere to program/agency policies and procedures” and “misconduct.” Misconduct manifested itself in behaviors such as using project Internet sites or MySpace pages to communicate with friends. Blurred boundaries were often accompanied by compromised

confidentiality. One grantee's outreach staff noted that when peers tried to recruit from within their social networks, they placed themselves and their friends at risk of involuntarily revealing their HIV status.

Many of these issues followed as a consequence of the underlying tension of the nature of the peer/outreach worker position. The ages of peer/outreach workers made them especially susceptible to misconduct resulting from lack of boundaries as well as intense job pressures. As one staff member stated, "You're asking them to give up the ability to go out and get drunk at parties." Furthermore, young peer/outreach workers – especially when they are MSM of color – may be more prone to depression and substance abuse, both of which impair work performance. Finally, many grantees indicated that the problems associated with young peer/outreach workers were compounded by the ill-defined responsibilities of their positions. Peer/outreach workers were charged with a wide range of tasks, going well beyond street outreach, and their responsibilities often changed over time. Because the job in its final form may have departed from the job as it was originally described, it was difficult for peer/outreach workers to judge both their own readiness for the work and the cost to their personal lives.

Size of and Safe Spaces for the MSM Community

Staff from several grantees, particularly staff from UNC and MOCHA, described the unique retention and hiring challenges that programs face when located in rural and smaller urban localities. Such regions often lack an established, open MSM community and/or many safe spaces for MSM to socialize. The interviews suggested that these settings can result in higher turnover because the confidential nature of peer/outreach work often prevents workers from connecting with their peers socially and drawing essential emotional support from them. The program limited how peer/outreach workers could behave in their communities and when MSM communities are already small, a peer/outreach worker's position can dramatically undermine their social life, particularly when Internet dating is restricted.

This issue is compounded by fact that the pool of potential peer/outreach workers is smaller in these areas and consequently, more time and resources are required to fill vacated positions. MOCHA found this to be such a serious problem that they shifted to recruiting peer/outreach workers from outside the local community. While no statistically reliable relationship between population size and turnover levels was found, this could be due to the small sample size. However, it could also be due to the inherent complexity of creating an index

for size and openness for the MSM community, as well as the availability of locations for socializing. Further research on this subject is needed to explore this relationship.

Program Impacts of Turnover

Two potential programmatic costs of turnover were explored: whether turnover encourages clients and remaining staff to also leave the program. Intuitively, turnover may promote other staff departures through decreasing the quality of care for clients and increasing burnout among remaining staff. However, grantees did not express concern that turnover negatively impacted clients. On the tool, six of the eight grantees responded that clients are “never” or “rarely” more likely to drop out of the program in response to turnover among peer/outreach workers. Similarly, all grantees stated that they “never” or “rarely” lost information about clients when peer/outreach workers leave. Perhaps this suggests that grantee staff underestimated the impact peer/outreach worker turnover had on their clients, particularly because many of the departures were due to terminations. However, no correlation was found between enrollment and turnover.

Similarly, turnover was not seen by grantees as negatively impacting remaining staff. Only three grantees responded that they agreed with the statement “when a peer/outreach worker leaves, other peer/outreach workers are more likely to also consider leaving the program.” This response is particularly interesting given that at all but one program, responsibilities were transferred to remaining staff when an individual left, and on average it took about 3 months to find a replacement. Again, because most peer/outreach workers were terminated as opposed to leaving voluntarily, staff may not have felt overburdened when peer/outreach workers left. As stated by one grantee, it was “more difficult to work with them (peer/outreach workers) than without them.” However, because data on the degree of turnover among non-peer/outreach worker staff was not collected, whether the turnover in these staff was or was not correlated with turnover among peer/outreach workers could not be verified.

5 WHAT CAN GRANTEES DO TO PREVENT HIGH TURNOVER?

The interviews provided an opportunity for grantees to offer suggestions for minimizing turnover. Strategies that grantees either currently use or recommend using, based on what they had learned from working with peer/outreach staff, are presented below. Recognizing the important role these strategies can play in maintaining organizational health, the YES Center established annual outreach worker conferences which served as a forum for educating program staff to discuss the challenges of the position. In this section, potential best-practice recommendations are presented for hiring, for supervision and training, and for separation. In each case, the recommendations are supported with findings from the interviews.

5.1 Hiring

Be explicit about position responsibilities and expectations. Grantees often noted that peer/outreach workers had difficulty adjusting to the extensive scope and ill-defined responsibilities of the position. Many staff felt that it was important to create a rigorous interview process emphasizing the importance of job responsibilities and boundaries, and requiring candidates to meet the entire project team. Sometimes interviews involved role-plays to highlight these issues. For example, APEB asked candidates to react to scenarios such as the following: “Imagine you are counseling a person who has been having unprotected sex. What would you say?” Interviews at MOCHA even included a member of the target population on the interview committee. After being disappointed with the high degree of turnover at WSU, the project coordinator became more frank about the challenges of the position during interviews with new candidates. Interestingly, while several grantees expressed frustration with the very bureaucratic and time-consuming recruitment processes imposed by their host agencies, UNC indicated that this laborious process acted as a kind of filter, ensuring that candidates were serious about the position if they completed the process.

Consider hiring individuals familiar with the organization. To help ensure that potential candidates would be more likely to understand the challenges of the position, several grantees hired staff already familiar with the organization. Because LA County’s program included only one outreach worker, the management did not wish to take any risks with the individual they hired. Therefore, as soon as they experienced a departure, they hired a replacement outreach

worker from within the county agency. Similarly, several programs hired volunteer staff or former program participants. For BAS, hiring participants as “volunteer-stipend hybrids” proved very effective. By contrast, APEB reported more negative experiences hiring former program volunteers, who generally proved to be ill-prepared for formal, structured employment.

5.2 Supervision and Training

Encourage team integration. Many grantees reported that it was important to integrate peer/outreach workers into the project team by offering a decent salary with benefits, recognizing their input in the project’s development, and providing opportunities for cross-training. For example, WSU encouraged peer/outreach workers to shadow other project staff and attend relevant conferences. UNC noted that cross-training could compensate for the social sacrifices their peer/outreach worker had to make by providing them with valuable skills that would prepare them for further employment. MOCHA recommended that future grantees consider the degree to which the use of peer/outreach worker aligns with the mission of the organization. MOCHA’s mission prioritizes hiring staff that reflect their target community, a philosophy that promotes the integration of peer/outreach workers with the project team.

Address position challenges through training. Grantees provided many different types of training, depending on what was required by host agencies, and constrained by the set of available resources. For example, WSU and Harris County both sent peer/outreach workers to free, formal training, which these staff had to pass before starting their SPNS responsibilities. These standardized trainings focused on topics such as “STIs/HIV 101,” patient confidentiality and communication with clients. By contrast, BAS, MOCHA, APEB, and UNC all provided staff with more informal training in-house, which typically covered similar topics as the standardized trainings, but in a less comprehensive and more ad-hoc manner.

While grantees did not express strong feelings about whether training should be formal or informal, they did indicate that it was important to cover topics that would help peer/outreach workers confront challenges in the workplace. For example, to help their staff separate their work and personal lives, WSU carefully reviewed the agency’s protocols for cell phone usage, dress code and Internet behavior. While not instituted yet by any program, several grantees suggested that training include discussion of professionalism, as well as guidance and feedback on how to represent the organization appropriately (for example, when presenting to potential partner groups).

Provide mentorship beyond traditional supervision. Grantees uniformly agreed that working with peer/outreach workers required added supervision and mentorship, particularly for the younger staff that more closely resembled the target population. Several programs with high turnover observed that the demands of the position often exceed the capacity of young workers to handle those demands – in other words, peer/outreach workers were often being set up to fail. Several grantees implemented mentorship programs to help peer/outreach workers define and meet their personal and professional goals. In several cases this took the form of periodic one-on-one meetings. For example, at one program supervisors worked with peer/outreach workers to articulate a set of goals that the individuals wanted to achieve while in their position, such as to stop smoking marijuana or to complete their GED. UNC implemented an informal mentorship system. Supervisors discussed a range of issues with peer/outreach workers, including how to establish and maintain appropriate boundaries with clients. APEB recommended that future programs using peer/outreach workers incorporate higher-level staff with a background in youth development, because such staff would be better-equipped to supervise peer/outreach workers. Additionally, both MOCHA and WSU recommended that programs establish periodic “debriefing” for peer/outreach workers, so that they can productively vent about the concerns they have and the challenges they face in the workplace.

5.3 Separation

Know “when to say when.” While grantees have an obligation to support their peer/outreach workers, being overly lenient benefits neither them nor their staff. Within this initiative, peer/outreach workers were terminated following incidents such as arriving to work drunk, lying about outreach activities completed, and behaving inappropriately with members of the target population. Such incidents can seriously undermine program activities. One staff member noted that grantees should not provide peer/outreach workers with an unrealistic perception of what future employers will tolerate. Future grantees should be conscious of balancing support for peer/outreach workers with upholding the needs and responsibilities of the program.

5.4 Structure the Position as a Short-Term Role: Using the BAS Model to Reduce Turnover

The nature of the peer/outreach worker position at BAS was unique, and therefore the data from BAS was not included in the correlational analyses. BAS staff estimated their replacement expenditures, as demonstrated in Table 4.3, but their total cost due to turnover was \$0, as the program reported zero individuals had left. The program was able to report no turnover because peer/outreach workers were employed on a short-term basis. For their placement, peer/outreach workers had to indicate how many friends they thought they could recruit. Once a peer/outreach worker reached his target recruitment, his term of employment ended. Although a few individuals stopped recruiting before reaching their target, BAS praised their use of a “volunteer-stipend hybrid” position. In their view, the short-term nature of the position respects the difficulties adolescents face in committing to a position for long periods of time. The activities performed by peer/outreach workers evolved over the grant, from conducting surveys as “community ethnographic organizers” (CEOs) to recruiting clients from their social networks. The number of peer/outreach workers also decreased over time, from 10 to 5 to the current set of 2. However, because of its informal structure, BAS did not suffer from the turnover issues experienced by other programs; BAS reported that all the current rotating peer/outreach workers were part of the original 10 staff members. Thus, grantees may want to consider this type of peer/outreach worker model, particularly if they lack the internal resources necessary for mentoring peer/outreach workers.

6 CONCLUSION

Staff turnover presents a challenge in many service-oriented fields. To date, however, there have been relatively few studies of turnover in the field of HIV/AIDS care, especially on the topic of peer/outreach workers. This report represents an exploratory effort to understand the possible causes and consequences of turnover among these workers. The data sample utilized on this report comes from the eight grantees participating in the HRSA SPNS initiative targeted at young men of color who have sex with men.

As indicated in the tool designed to collect comprehensive data on peer/outreach workers, most grantees in the YMSM of Color Initiative had to confront challenges related to turnover. Replacing staff placed a substantial burden on grantees' financial resources; the median cost of replacing one peer/outreach worker was \$3,144. The lowest turnover levels were found among grantees who paid the highest salaries and employed the oldest workers. These findings were corroborated in a series of follow-up interviews with grantees. In those interviews, grantees located in smaller communities noted the importance to workers of having a large network from which their workers could both draw social support and recruit clients, without blurring the boundaries between the two spheres of life. Indeed, a blurring of personal and professional boundaries was very often the reason for separations between peer/outreach workers and grantees across the Initiative – whether workers left voluntarily, were terminated, or were told firmly that it would be wise for them resign.

The small sample size made it hard to detect statistically reliable correlations. Nonetheless, this analysis identified a set of patterns and potential best practices that will be of use to future grantees who employ peer/outreach workers. For example, it seems crucial that grantees hire older, more mature workers; that they pay them a good salary; and that they supervise and mentor them effectively. Given the important role that peer/outreach workers play in programs of this type, it is urgent that additional research be carried out with larger sample sizes across a broad range of contexts and initiative types.

7 REFERENCES

- Barak, M., Nissly, J. and Levin, A. (2001). Antecedents to Retention and Turnover among Child Welfare, Social Work and Other Human Service Employees. *Social Service Review*, 75 (4), 625-661.
- Deren, S., Davis, W. Tortu, S., Friedman, S., Tross, S., Sufian, M., Pascal, J., and Stull. C. (1992) AIDS outreach workers: an exploratory study of job satisfactions/dissatisfactions. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 4 (4), 328-337.
- Felton, J. (1998). Burnout as a Clinical Entity – Its Importance in Healthcare Workers. *Occupation Medicine*, Vol. 48, 237-250.
- Hinkin, T. and Tracey, B. (2000). The Cost of Turnover: Putting a Price on the Learning Curve. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Vol. 41, 14-21.
- Jones, C. (2004). The Costs of Nurse Turnover, Part 1: An Economic Perspective. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 34 (12), 562-570.
- Jones, C. (2005). The Costs of Nurse Turnover, Part 2: Applicable of the Nursing Turnover Cost Calculation Methodology. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 35 (1), 41-49.
- Jones, C. (1990) Staff Nurse Turnover Costs: Part II, Measurements and Results. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 20 (5), 27-31.
- Tziner, A. and Birat, A. (1996). Assessing Employee Turnover Costs: A Revised Approach. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6 (2), 113-122.

8 APPENDIX A: THE TURNOVER TOOL

The Costs of Turnover Among Peer and Outreach Workers

General Instructions

Thank you very much for participating in our evaluation of the costs associated with turnover among peer/outreach workers within the YCMSM SPNS Initiative! We hope that our findings will be informative for your program activities and planning, as well as for future grantees and HRSA.

Grantees have diverse program structures and the staff responsible for interacting with and recruiting clients into the program are given different titles at each program. We use the term peer/outreach worker throughout this tool to refer to the umbrella of staff whose primary responsibilities include recruiting, retaining and interacting with clients.

This tool is divided into five sections. Each section is described in more detail within the tool.

- I. Peer/Outreach Workers in Your Program
- II. Turnover in Your Program
- III. Separation Costs
- IV. Hiring Costs
- V. Training Costs

We anticipate that different staff will need to complete different sections of the tool and some sections will need to be completed by several staff. Staff should complete the tool individually and email their completed tools to Marika Johansson at the email address given below. We recognize that grantees have different program and staffing models and therefore we recommend that staff use their best judgment in which staff should complete the different sections. We offer suggestions at the beginning of each section on which staff might be the most appropriate to complete the section.

We ask that you complete this tool to the best of your ability and leave blank any questions that you feel you are unable to answer. We will compile all the tools from different staff members at one program. In going through the tool, we request that you respond to questions with your best estimates; we do NOT expect you to make any complex calculations (such as tracking staff hours) in answering these questions.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Name:

Title:

I. Peer/Outreach Workers in Your Program

Section purpose: to collect general information about the characteristics and backgrounds of peer/outreach workers within your program.

Best completed by: staff who directly supervise and interact with your program’s peer/outreach workers.

Instructions: several of the questions ask you to describe the “typical” characteristics of your program’s peer/outreach workers. For these questions, please select the option that best reflects your program’s peer/outreach workers or select “varies significantly.” For questions with multiple choice answers, please select only *one* response.

1) How many peer/outreach workers currently work for your program?

2) Which age bracket best describes the typical age of your peer/outreach workers?

Under 18

18 – 21

22 – 25

26 – 29

30 – 33

34+

Varies significantly

3) What is the typical level of education your peer/outreach workers have?

- Less than High School
- High School
- High School + some college
- College degree
- Graduate or clinical degree
- Varies significantly

4) How many years of past work experience (of any kind) do your peer/outreach workers typically have?

- None
- Less than 1 year
- 1 – 2 years
- 3 – 4 years
- 5 years or more
- Varies significantly

5) How many years of past work experience *in this field* do your peer/outreach workers typically have?

- None
- Less than 1 year
- 1 – 2 years
- 3 – 4 years
- 5 years or more
- Varies significantly

6) What is the typical time commitment of your peer/outreach workers?

Full-time, salaried with benefits

Full-time, contracted

Part-time

Part-time, contracted

Other: please specify

Varies significantly

II. Turnover in Your Program

Section purpose: to collect basic information about peer/outreach worker turnover within your program, such as how long peer/outreach workers are typically with your program and why peer/outreach workers leave your program.

Best completed by: staff responsible for directing and managing your program and staff who supervise peer/outreach workers.

Instructions: several of the questions below ask about how long peer/outreach workers are typically employed by your program; if your program does not record this information, please provide estimates in response to these questions. For questions with multiple choice answers, please select only *one* response, unless otherwise specified.

1) What is the total number of peer/outreach workers your program has employed throughout this YCMSM SPNS grant, including the peer/outreach workers currently with your program?

2) What is the longest time period a peer/outreach worker has been involved with your program, including the peer/outreach workers currently with your program?

3) What is the shortest time period a peer/outreach worker has been involved with your program?

4) What is the typical time period a peer/outreach worker has been involved with your program?

5) How many peer/outreach workers have left your program voluntarily?

6) What are the most common reasons that peer/outreach workers voluntarily leave your program? Please check all that apply.

- For further education
- For a better paid position
- For a position in a field that interests them more
- Because they had different expectations about what the position would entail
- Because they did not feel supported by the program
- Other: please specify

7) How many peer/outreach workers have been terminated or asked to leave your program?

8) What are the most common reasons that peer/outreach workers are terminated from your program? Please check all that apply.

- Their qualifications were a poor fit for the position
- They behaved inappropriately with clients/potential clients
- They could not be depended upon to complete their responsibilities
- Other: please specify

III. Separation Costs

Section purpose: to collect information about what happens at your program when a peer/outreach worker leaves and how staff and clients are affected by this change.

Best completed by: staff who supervise peer/outreach workers, and staff who regularly interact with clients, including peer/outreach workers.

Instructions: for questions with multiple choice answers, please select only *one* response.

1) Immediately following a peer/outreach worker's departure, typically their responsibilities are:

- Transferred to remaining staff
- Not completed until a replacement can be found
- Ceased, the position is terminated

Other: please specify

2) When a peer/outreach worker leaves, other peer/outreach workers are more likely to also consider leaving the program.

I strongly disagree

I disagree

I neither agree nor disagree

I agree

I strongly agree

3) When a peer/outreach worker leaves, it compromises the quality of relationships with clients.

I strongly disagree

I disagree

I neither agree nor disagree

I agree

I strongly agree

4) When a peer/outreach worker leaves, more clients drop out of the program.

Never

Rarely

Sometimes

Often

Always

5) When a peer/outreach worker leaves, we lose information about clients, such as contact information.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

IV. Hiring Costs

Section purpose: to collection information about how your program's recruits and what resources are spent on hiring activities.

Best completed by: staff responsible for managing and directing the program and staff involved in recruitment.

Instructions: for questions with multiple choice answers, please select only *one* response, unless otherwise specified.

1) Which hiring processes do your program manage and coordinate? Please check all that apply.

- Determining the qualifications for the position
- Posting advertisements for an available position
- Communicating with candidates
- Reviewing candidates' resumes
- Interviewing candidates
- Conducting background checks on candidates
- Selecting the candidate

2) From the time a peer/outreach worker leaves, how long does it typically take your program to fill that position?

3) Does your program typically recruit more than one peer/outreach worker at a time?

(Y/N)

4) How does your program recruit a new peer/outreach worker? Please select *all* that apply.

- Word of mouth by peer/outreach workers staff

- Word of mouth by non-peer/outreach worker staff
- On-line or newspaper job postings
- Poster and flyer adverts
- Through HIV care communities
- Other: please specify

5) For the recruiting method(s) that your program uses, please estimate the amount that is spent on each method. Please indicate N/A next to activities your program is not involved with.

- \$ On-line or newspaper job postings
- \$ Posters/flyers
- \$ Through HIV care communities
- \$ Other: please specify

6) During the process of hiring a new peer/outreach worker, what amount is typically spent on pre-employment checks, such as background checks, health exams, and reference checks?

\$

7) When a peer/outreach worker leaves, they are replaced by a peer/outreach worker with similar qualifications.

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

8) Our program has dedicated more staff time to recruiting than was originally planned before the project began.

- I strongly disagree
- I disagree
- I neither agree nor disagree
- I agree
- I strongly agree
- N/A: recruiting was not explicitly planned before the project began.

V. Training Costs

Section purpose: collect information about the resources dedicated to training a new peer/outreach worker and how staff and clients respond to this process.

Best completed by: staff who supervise and train peer/outreach workers and staff who directly interact with the clients, including peer/outreach workers.

Instructions: for questions with multiple choice answers, please select only *one* response, unless otherwise specified.

- 1) Please estimate the amount that is typically spent on training materials for a new peer/outreach worker? For example: background materials \$
- 2) Please estimate the amount typically spent on supplies for a new peer/outreach worker? For example: office supplies \$
- 3) How long does it typically take a new peer/outreach worker to become comfortable interacting with clients?
- 4) How long does it take for a new peer/outreach worker to be trained and transition to completing all their responsibilities independently?

5) Our program has dedicated more staff time to training than was originally planned before the project began.

- I strongly disagree
- I disagree
- I neither agree nor disagree
- I agree
- I strongly agree
- N/A: training was not explicitly planned before the project began.

6) Our program does not have adequate internal discussions regarding the training of peer/outreach workers.

- I strongly disagree
- I disagree
- I neither agree nor disagree
- I agree
- I strongly agree

7) Our program does not adequately evaluate our training of peer/outreach workers.

- I strongly disagree
- I disagree
- I neither agree nor disagree
- I agree
- I strongly agree

8) The strongest element(s) of our program's training process are: (please check *all* that apply)

- Our training curriculum
- Our informal training and supervision of peer/outreach workers
- The support/training new peer/outreach workers get from existing peer/outreach workers
- The YES Center's training workshops
- Other: please specify

9) Compared to an experienced peer/outreach worker, how often do clients become enrolled in either evaluation (local or multisite) when approached by a new peer/outreach worker?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Staff Time Spent on Separating, Hiring and Training Activities

Purpose: to estimate the total costs associated with separation, hiring and training by including the costs of staff time spent on separation, hiring and training activities.

Best completed by: any staff involved in separation, hiring and training activities.

Instructions: in the table on the next page, please estimate the *total* number of hours *each* staff typically spends on a given activity when *one* peer/outreach worker leaves or joins the program. For some staff these hours may be spread over a few days, while for others they may be spread over several weeks – we are asking for the *total* number of hours spent by each staff member on each activity regardless of the time period the hours are distributed over.

Activity	Total Number of Hours Per Staff When A Peer/Outreach Leaves the Program								
	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name
	Title	Title	Title	Title	Title	Title	Title	Title	Title
Training Costs									
Conducting formal training of a new peer/outreach worker E.g. HIPAA trainings									
Conducting informal training and added supervision of a new peer/outreach worker E.g. On-the-job training, shadowing and mentoring									

This report prepared for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, HIV/AIDS Bureau, under contract with the SPHERE Institute