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Administrator Turnover in LTC Homes

- What is the typical turnover of Administrators in LTC Homes?
  - Typical rates in U.S.: 20-30%
  - Castle found 39% in New York and Pennsylvania (HCMR, 2006)

- What is the impact?
  - Admin and DOC turnover related
    - DOC turnover associated with lower quality (Anderson et al., HCMR 2006)
      and with retention of RN staff (see poster #76 Wodchis et al.).
    - …which is associated with quality in LTC (e.g. Zimmerman JAGS 2002)

Motivating our question:
- What factors are associated with high Administrator turnover in LTC Homes?
Research Goals and Objectives

- To determine the level of turnover among Administrators in Ontario LTC homes
- Examine what LTC home characteristics are associated with turnover.
Methods

Target Population:
All Ontario LTC Home Administrators (and DoC) (n=620)

E-mail participation request & on-line survey link

Partial Responders:
• 3 follow up e-mails
• 2 follow up phone calls

Non Responders:
• 4 follow up e-mails
• 1 follow up phone call

July 2008

Oct 2008
Variables

- **Dependent**
  - Turnover defined as: the number of Administrators who “left this home” over the past 3 years.

- **Independent**
  - Home characteristics
    - Chain affiliation
    - Management other than owner
  - DoC turnover
  - Human resource utilization
Data Analysis

- 49% Response rate (302)
### Results: Administrator Turnover

**Turnover in Participating Ontario LTC Homes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover &lt;=1</td>
<td>268 (88.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover &gt;1</td>
<td>34 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>302</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Administrator Turnover by Ownership

% of Homes
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## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrator Turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% Quantile (Q3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (Max)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

- Logistic regression model explained 49% of the variance ($r=0.4861$)
### ADMINISTRATOR TURNOVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Turnover (%) or median</th>
<th>High Turnover (%) or median</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin Turnover</td>
<td>268 (88.7%)</td>
<td>34 (11.3%)</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoC Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>237 (78.5%)</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>44 (15.1, 128.2)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>31 (10.3%)</td>
<td>28 (9.3%)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Affiliated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71 (23.5%)</td>
<td>9 (2.9%)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.6 (0.19, 1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>197 (65.2%)</td>
<td>25 (8.3%)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed by another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>221 (73.2%)</td>
<td>23 (7.6%)</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>2.5 (0.88, 7.1)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47 (15.6%)</td>
<td>11 (3.6%)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=3</td>
<td>38 (12.6%)</td>
<td>10 (3.3%)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>91 (30.1%)</td>
<td>14 (4.6%)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.25 (0.07, 0.89)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=4</td>
<td>139 (46%)</td>
<td>10 (3.3%)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.19 (0.05, 0.68)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.001
Key Findings - 1:

- Link between senior management turnover:
  - Admin and DoC
  - Homes where 2 or more DoCs had left in the past 3 years were 44 times more likely to have 2 or more administrators leave in the same period
Key Findings - 2:

- Being managed by another organization made it 2.5 times more likely that the home would have 2 or more administrators leave within the past 3 years.
Key Findings - 3:

- Administrators less likely to leave in homes where (administrator agrees/strongly agrees that) employees are supported through education and training for quality improvement.

Note:

**HR Utilization**: extent to which hospital employees are provided adequate education and training for quality improvement efforts — 4 items in scale ($\alpha = 0.79$);
Key Finding -4:

- Chain affiliation not significant in our model
Limitation

- Non responders may be due to vacancies (conservative turnover results)
- Response bias & error
  - Self-report
  - Did they complete it?
- Cross-sectional
Next Steps:

- Examine why administrators stay
  - Factors associated with retention
- Phase 2: staff data collection underway
  - Analyze staff perspectives regarding leadership, management, HR, quality improvement
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