RESEARCH BRIEFS · RB-025

Coordinator Turnover and Workforce Stability Across the Site Network

Clinitiative Health Research March 2026

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

1. Key Findings

2. Drivers of Turnover Across the Tenure Lifecycle

3. Operational Consequences of Turnover

4. The Capacity Pod Staffing Model

5. Strategic Implications

6. Conclusions

Executive Summary

The Workforce Crisis Behind the Enrollment Crisis

Clinical research coordinators are the operational foundation of trial execution. They are the primary point of contact for participants, the principal source of source data, and the operational interface between investigator decisions and sponsor expectations. When coordinators leave, the consequences ripple outward: enrollment slows, source documentation suffers, retention erodes, and remaining staff absorb workload increases that often trigger further departures. Despite this centrality, the coordinator workforce has been treated as an afterthought in industry investment discussions until very recently.

The industry data are unambiguous. The Society for Clinical Research Sites' recent surveys report coordinator turnover rates of 35-61%, depending on geographic region and site type — a dramatic shift from pre-pandemic rates that hovered between 10% and 37%. The estimated cost of replacing a single coordinator ranges from $50,000 to $60,000, encompassing recruitment, onboarding, training, and the

productivity gap during ramp-up. The Association of Clinical Research Professionals has characterized the current state as a "clinical research workforce crisis," with persistent gaps in trained investigators, coordinators, and data professionals.

This research brief examines coordinator turnover and its operational consequences across 52 Clinitiative network sites from January 2024 through March 2026. The analysis quantifies turnover rates, identifies the operational decisions that meaningfully reduce turnover, measures the enrollment and data quality consequences of turnover events, and benchmarks the impact of structured staffing models — specifically the "capacity pod" approach — against the traditional study-team assignment model that dominates the industry.

1 Key Findings

Network-level turnover data and the operational outcomes of different staffing models converge on a clear conclusion: turnover itself is partially structural, but its consequences are largely manageable through deliberate staffing design.

Table 1. Key figures

Figure	Measure	Detail
28%	Network Coordinator Turnover Rate	The Clinitiative network reports an aggregate 28% annualized coordinator turnover rate across 52 sites, against an industry range of 35-61%. The gap reflects the network's investment in retention programs but also indicates that turnover remains a meaningful operational risk that cannot be eliminated entirely under current labor market conditions.
41%	Disruption Reduction (Capacity Pods)	Sites operating capacity-pod staffing models — core FTEs with flexible bench support — reduced turnover-driven enrollment disruption by 41% relative to sites using traditional study-team assignment. The protection is structural: when one team member departs, study continuity is maintained by other pod members who already know the protocol.
$54K	Median Replacement Cost	The median total cost of replacing a coordinator across the network was $54,000, consistent with the SCRS industry estimate of $50-60K. The figure includes external recruitment, internal HR time, training and certification, and a productivity gap that averages 4-5 months before a replacement coordinator reaches full operational productivity.
9.2 mo	Median Tenure at Departure	Departing coordinators had a median tenure of 9.2 months at departure, with a bimodal distribution: a cluster of departures within the first 6 months (typically driven by job-fit mismatch) and a second cluster after 18+ months (typically driven by career advancement to CRA, project management, or sponsor-side roles). Retention interventions must address both clusters distinctly.

2 Drivers of Turnover Across the Tenure Lifecycle

Turnover is not a single phenomenon. Coordinator departures cluster around distinct points in the tenure lifecycle, and the contributing factors at each point are different. Effective retention design requires interventions targeted to the relevant lifecycle phase.

Onboarding (Months 0–3)

The first 90 days carry the highest hourly attrition risk. Departures during this window are driven by job-fit mismatch — new hires discovering that the actual role demands differ from their prior expectations, particularly the volume of regulatory documentation, the pace of protocol-specific learning, and the emotional weight of patient-facing work. Sites with structured 90-day onboarding programs that include shadowing, gradual study assignment, and mentor pairing experience 60% lower onboarding-period attrition.

Early Tenure (Months 4–12)

Coordinators in their first year of full study responsibility are sensitive to workload-pace fit. Sites that assign new coordinators to three or more concurrent studies before they have completed two full study cycles experience early-tenure attrition rates 1.8x higher than sites that limit early-tenure portfolios to one or two studies. Pacing matters more than total workload — coordinators who progress steadily through expanding responsibility report higher satisfaction than those who are immediately given large portfolios.

Mid-Tenure Plateau (Months 13–24)

Coordinators in months 13-24 enter what survey responses repeatedly describe as a “competence-without-growth” phase: they have mastered the core role but have not yet been given the development opportunities that would extend their tenure. Sites that introduce structured development conversations, certification support (ACRP, SOCRA), and special-project assignments during this window experience 47% lower mid-tenure attrition than sites that treat the period as a steady-state.

Advancement Window (Months 18–36)

The second cluster of departures concentrates at months 18-36, when experienced coordinators are recruited by sponsors and CROs offering sign-on bonuses and compensation packages substantially above site-level budgets. SCRS guidance has explicitly identified this dynamic, and survey responses confirm it: 64% of coordinators departing in months 18-36 moved to sponsor-side, CRO, or vendor roles.

Sites cannot match sponsor compensation in most cases, but can extend tenure through career-path clarity and senior coordinator roles that recognize advanced responsibility.

Long-Tenure Anchor (Months 36+)

Coordinators who pass the 36-month mark become long-tenure anchors — annual turnover in this cohort drops to under 9%. These coordinators are disproportionately valuable to operational continuity, sponsor relationships, and new-hire mentoring. Sites that explicitly identify and invest in their long-tenure cohort — through senior coordinator titles, mentor compensation, and conference-attendance budgets — sustain the workforce stability that downstream studies depend on.

3 Operational Consequences of Turnover

Replacement cost is the most cited consequence of coordinator turnover, but it is not the largest. The most operationally significant impacts appear in enrollment, data quality, and retention metrics during the transition period.

Enrollment Pause

Studies losing their primary coordinator experience a median 6-week enrollment pause while responsibilities are redistributed and replacement coordinators are onboarded. In active enrollment periods, the pause translates to 3-7 lost enrollments per affected study. Cumulative across a multi-study portfolio, coordinator turnover can shift enrollment completion timelines by weeks per study.

Data Quality Dip

Source-data quality metrics — query rates, missing-data percentages, and protocol deviation incidence — deteriorate measurably in the first 90 days after a coordinator change. Query rates rise 28% on average and missing-data rates rise 19% during this window. Quality recovers as replacement coordinators reach full operational competency, but the temporary dip can influence interim analyses and DSMB reviews.

Retention Erosion

Participants whose primary coordinator departs during their study show 14% higher drop-out rates over the subsequent 6 months than participants who experience no coordinator change. The coordinator-participant relationship is a meaningful determinant of retention, and continuity is a tangible operational

asset. This effect was strongest in studies with frequent participant contact and weakest in monitoring-only follow-up phases.

Sponsor Communication Drag

Sponsor and CRA communication latency increases during the transition: median response times to monitoring queries rise from 1.8 days to 4.6 days in the 90-day post-departure window. The delay reflects the replacement coordinator's need to build context on study-specific history that the departing coordinator carried implicitly. Detailed handoff documentation reduces but does not eliminate this drag.

Remaining Staff Workload

Remaining staff absorb redistributed workload during the gap between departure and replacement productivity. Survey responses from staff who experienced a teammate departure report a median 22% increase in personal workload during the transition window. This workload spike is the strongest predictor of follow-on departures within the same team — a single coordinator departure increases the probability of a second departure within 6 months by 1.7x.

Cumulative Site Reputation

Sites with sustained high turnover face reduced feasibility selection. Sponsors and CROs increasingly request coordinator tenure data as part of feasibility assessments, and sites with median tenure below 12 months are filtered out for high-complexity protocols. Workforce stability has shifted from an internal HR concern to an externally visible competitive variable.

4 The Capacity Pod Staffing Model

The most operationally significant finding from the network analysis is the differential performance of capacity-pod staffing relative to traditional study-team assignment. In the traditional model, individual coordinators are assigned to specific studies and become single points of failure: when they depart, the study loses its operational backbone. In the capacity-pod model, a core team of FTEs collectively maintains continuity across a defined study portfolio, supplemented by a flexible bench of CRAs and coordinators activated during enrollment peaks and study startup.

The 23 network sites operating capacity-pod models experienced 41% less turnover-driven enrollment disruption than the 29 sites using traditional study-team assignment. The mechanism is structural: when a pod member departs, the remaining pod members already have working knowledge of the affected studies and can immediately backfill responsibilities. Replacement onboarding becomes a capacity

expansion rather than a continuity crisis. The flexible bench also allows sites to manage workload spikes without permanent staffing increases, reducing the burnout that drives early-tenure attrition.

The capacity-pod model is not free. It requires upfront investment in cross-training, more deliberate documentation, and a slightly larger core FTE footprint than the traditional model would justify on a per-study basis. The investment pays back through reduced turnover disruption, lower replacement costs, and stronger feasibility positioning. Sites that have transitioned report that the model also improves coordinator satisfaction by reducing single-coordinator burden and supporting more predictable workloads — itself a contributor to retention.

5 Strategic Implications

Sites cannot resolve the structural drivers of coordinator turnover unilaterally — competitive labor markets and sponsor-side compensation pressure are industry-wide forces. But sites can substantially reduce the operational consequences of turnover through staffing design, lifecycle-targeted retention investment, and explicit recognition of long-tenure coordinators as institutional assets. The data show that workforce stability is a designable outcome, not a fixed property of the labor market.

For sponsors, the implications are equally meaningful. Feasibility processes that rely solely on enrollment-history metrics miss the workforce stability signal that increasingly predicts execution quality. Sponsors who weight coordinator tenure and staffing model into site selection — and who provide budgets that support competitive site-level compensation — invest in the operational continuity their studies depend on. SCRS's public correspondence with industry on this topic reflects a broad reset in sponsor-site economic relationships that is still unfolding.

For the industry as a whole, the workforce crisis is the operational constraint that determines whether the next generation of trial designs — AI-augmented recruitment, decentralized elements, real-time monitoring — can actually be executed at scale. The technical innovations matter less than the human infrastructure that runs them. Investment in coordinator workforce stability is, in this sense, the highest-leverage operational investment available across the clinical research enterprise.

6 Conclusions

Coordinator turnover at industry-prevalent rates is operationally incompatible with the timeline, quality, and complexity expectations placed on modern clinical trials. The Clinitiative network's 28% rate against an industry range of 35-61% demonstrates that deliberate retention investment can move the dial — but the residual rate is still material, and the more strategically important lever may be the staffing model that determines whether turnover becomes a disruption or merely a transition.

Sites operating capacity-pod models with strong onboarding programs, lifecycle-targeted development investments, and explicit recognition of long-tenure coordinators are sustaining the workforce stability that the next decade of trial execution will require. The investment is non-trivial but the alternative — continued exposure to 50%+ annual coordinator turnover — is, in operational and financial terms, far more costly than the structural changes that prevent it.