position between baseline and follow-up

21 peer workers and 7 supervisors never

responded to follow-up survey invitations

Online supplement. CONSORT flow diagram of site selection and allocation.

Requested participation from providers for the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health Sites that did not respond to outreach or did not employ peer workers were Enrollment excluded. 90 sites provided contact information for peer workers and their supervisors. 2 sites north of LA were interested and allowed to participate. 1 site decided not to participate before random assignment, with 1 peer worker and 1 supervisor 89 sites underwent randomization Allocation Allocated to training intervention: 44 sites identified Allocated to practice as usual: 45 sites identified 205 peer workers and 103 supervisors 170 peer workers and 62 supervisors 2 sites dropped out during baseline data 2 sites dropped out during baseline data collection (with 4 peer workers, 4 supervisors) collection (with 2 peer workers, 2 supervisors) 6 peer workers excluded as unpaid volunteers 2 peer workers excluded as unpaid volunteers for less than 15 hours per week for less than 15 hours per week 9 peer workers and 3 supervisors left their 4 peer workers left their position before position before baseline survey completion baseline survey completion 13 supervisors excluded because they did not supervise peer workers 186 peer workers and 83 supervisors from 42 sites 162 peer workers and 60 supervisors from 43 sites eligible eligible 136 peer workers from 39 sites and 63 supervisors 115 peer workers from 42 sites and 52 supervisors from 38 sites completed baseline survey from 40 sites completed baseline survey 18 peer workers and 3 supervisors at 6 peer workers at participating sites declined participating sites declined study invitation study invitation 29 peer workers and 17 supervisors never 41 peer workers and 8 supervisors never responded to survey invitations responded to survey invitations 3 peer workers dropped for unknown reasons Intervention 94 peer workers from 33 sites and 38 supervisors 3 peer workers from 3 sites and 0 supervisors from 28 sites attended 1 or more trainings attended 1 or more trainings (noncompliance) Follow-up and Analysis 91 peer workers from 32 sites and 44 supervisors from 78 peer workers from 35 sites and 42 supervisors 33 sites completed follow-up and were analyzed from 35 sites completed follow-up and were analyzed 24 peer workers and 12 supervisors left their 15 peer workers and 3 supervisors left their

position between baseline and follow-up

22 peer workers and 7 supervisors never

responded to follow-up survey invitations

Online supplement: Outcome measures used.

Site outcomes		
Peer supportive organizational climate – primary outcome, 6 items, 7-point Likert scale, $\alpha = .94$		
	Peer worker-reported organizational inclusion and support for peer workers	
	Perceived Organizational 'Lived Experience' Climate scale <sup>1</sup>	
	Administrators regularly organize events and activities to promote peer	
	nclusion and involvement.	
Recovery orientation of services – secondary outcome, 4 items, 7-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .96		
	Peer worker perceptions of the extent to which providers at their organization	
	reated service users with respect, helped them feel valued, communicated	
	nonestly, and provided equitable resolution of disagreements	
	Organizational Culture scale from Recovery Orientation of Services Evaluation. <sup>2</sup>	
	Service users feel respected by service providers.	
Supervisor outcomes		
-	$ma - primary outcome$ , 15 items, 5-point Likert scale, $\alpha = .74$	
	Supervisor reported negative attitudes towards people with mental health	
	problems including a desire to maintain distance, low possibility of recovery,	
	and dangerousness	
	Stigma scale <sup>3</sup>	
Item ex.   I	would feel unsafe around a person with a mental health problem.	
Perceived utility of peer support – secondary outcome, 3 items, 11-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .84		
	Attitudes about the utility of peer support	
	modified from a 12-step group attitudes scale <sup>4</sup>	
Item ex. II	n your professional judgement, how helpful is peer support?	
Supervisor job satisfaction – secondary outcome, 1 item, 5-point Likert scale		
Definition S	Self-reported job satisfaction	
Source II	ndividual Work Performance Questionnaire. <sup>5</sup>	
Item ex. C	Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?	
Supervision quality – secondary outcome, 11 items, 7-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .97		
Definition P	Peer perceptions of supervision effectiveness, supportiveness, and satisfaction	
Source S	Supervision Evaluation and Supervisory Competence Scale <sup>6</sup>	
Item ex.	Overall, supervision significantly enhanced my competence as a practitioner	
a	and professional.	
Proximal peer worker outcomes		
Supervisor/peer we	$corker\ relationship\ -$ secondary outcome, 12 items, 7-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .95	
Definition S	Supervisor-reported relationship quality and emotional bond with peer worker	
Source S	Safe base subscale of the Supervisory Relationship Measure <sup>7</sup>	
Item ex. [I	Peer worker name] and I have a good professional relationship.	
Discrimination experience – secondary outcome, 5 items, 4-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .96		
Definition E	Experience with discrimination related to mental health	
	Perceived Discrimination subscale of Internalized Stigma of Mental Illness scale <sup>8</sup>	
	People discriminate against me because I have a mental illness.	

Use of peer support – secondary outcome, 9 items, 8-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .86		
Definition	Time spent on peer support activities (e.g. peer mentoring, referring to self-help groups), relative to other tasks such as case management and clerical tasks	
Source	Created by authors	
Item ex.	When working, how much time do you spend on the following activities in a typical weekCase management.	
Distal peer worker outcomes		
Recovery – prima	ary outcome, 24 items, 5-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .94	
Definition	(a) personal confidence and hope, (b) willingness to ask for help, (c) goal and	
	success orientation, (d) reliance on other, and (e) not dominated by symptoms	
Source	Recovery Assessment Scale-Short Form <sup>9</sup>	
ltem ex.	I'm hopeful about my future.	
Work contributions – secondary outcome, 12 items, 7-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .92		
Definition	Peer worker productivity and work quality, as perceived by the supervisor	
Source	Trainee contribution subscale of the Supervisory Relationship Measure <sup>7</sup>	
Item ex.	[Peer worker name] is able to hold an appropriate work load.	
Peer worker job satisfaction – secondary outcome, 1 item, 5-point Likert scale		
Definition	Self-reported job satisfaction	
Source	Individual Work Performance Questionnaire <sup>5</sup>	
ltem ex.	Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?	
Work-related burnout – secondary outcome, 7 items, 5-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .85		
Definition	Sense of exhaustion and low energy because of work	
Source	Copenhagen Burnout Inventory <sup>10</sup>	
ltem ex.	Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?	
Sick leave and disability days — secondary outcome, 1 item		
Definition	Peer worker reported number of sick leave or disability days in past 6 months	
Source	Based on self-reported sick leave research <sup>11</sup>	
	How many sick leave or disability days have you had within the last 6 months?	
Brief symptom inventory – secondary outcome, 27 items, 4-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .97		
Definition	Assessed anxiety, depression, and other mental health symptoms	
Source	Subscales for Anxiety, Obsession-Compulsion, Hostility, Depression, and	
	Interpersonal Sensitivity of the Brief Symptom Inventory. 12	
Item ex.	Feeling fearful.	
Stress – secondary outcome, 6 items, 5-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .92		
Definition	Global self-reported stress	
Source	Perceived Stress Scale <sup>13</sup>	
Item ex.	In the past 30 days how often have you Felt that you were unable to control	
	the important things in your life?	
Social Support – secondary outcome, 3 items, 6-point Likert scale, $\alpha$ = .81		
Definition	Satisfaction with social support	
Source	Social Support Questionnaire <sup>14</sup>	
ltem ex.	How satisfied are you with the support you have when you need help?	

- 1. Jones N, Teague GB, Wolf J, Rosen C. Organizational climate and support among peer specialists working in peer-run, hybrid and conventional mental health settings. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2020;47(1):150-167.
- 2. Campbell-Orde T, Chamberlin J, Carpenter J, Leff HS. *Measuring the promise: A compendium of recovery measures (Vol. II)*. Cambridge, MA: Human Services Research Institute;2005.
- 3. Quinn N, Smith M, Fleming S, Shulman A, Knifton L. Self and others: The differential impact of an anti-stigma programme. *Stigma Res Action*. 2011;1(1):36-43.
- 4. Laudet AB, White WL. An exploratory investigation of the association between clinicians' attitudes toward twelve-step groups and referral rates. *Alcohol Treat Q.* 2005;23:31-45.
- 5. Koopmans L, Coffeng JK, Bernaards CM, et al. Responsiveness of the individual work performance questionnaire. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14:513.
- 6. Gonsalvez C, Hamid G, Savage N, Livni D. The Supervision Evaluation and Supervisory Competence Scale: Psychometric validation. *Aust Psychol.* 2017;52:94-103.
- 7. Pearce N, Beinart H, Clohessy S, Cooper M. Development and validation of the Supervisory Relationship Measure: A self-report questionnaire for use with supervisors. *Br J Clin Psychol.* 2013;52(3):249-268.
- 8. Ritsher JB, Otilingam PG, Grajales M. Internalized stigma of mental illness: Psychometric properties of a new measure. *Psychiatry Res.* 2003;121(1):31-49.
- 9. Corrigan PW, Phelan SM. Social support and recovery in people with serious mental illnesses. *Community Ment Health J.* 2004;40(6):513-523.
- 10. Kristensen TS, Borritz M, Villadsen E, Christensen KB. The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work Stress.* 2007;19(3):192-207.
- 11. Stapelfeldt CM, Jensen C, Andersen NT, Fleten N, Nielsen CV. Validation of sick leave measures: Self-reported sick leave and sickness benefit data from a Danish national register compared to multiple workplace-registered sick leave spells in a Danish municipality. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12(1):661.
- 12. Derogatis LR. *BSI Brief Symptom Inventory. Administration, Scoring, and Procedures Manual* 4th ed. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems; 1993.
- 13. Cohen S, Kamarck T, Mermelstein R. A global measure of perceived stress. *J Health Soc Behav.* 1983;24:385-396.
- 14. Sarason IG, Levine HM, Basham RB, Sarason BR. Assessing social support: The Social Support Questionnaire. *J Pers Soc Psychol.* 1983;44:127-139.