

The Trauma Responsive Schools Implementation Assessment (TRS-IA) was developed by the Treatment and Services Adaptation Center for Resilience, Hope, and Wellness in Schools in collaboration with the Center for School Mental Health. The assessment was created using the RAND/UCLA Modified Delphi Approach—a commonly used evidence-based strategy for developing quality measures. Employing this approach, developers engaged a panel of national experts in a consensus process to identify and refine best-practice guidelines for trauma-responsive school implementation. Furthermore, guided by a community-participatory framework, on the ground school administrators and teachers from various regions of the country were consulted to ensure the assessment was culturally-sensitive and could be easily used by busy school personnel. The TRS-IA is an evidence-informed self-assessment that can quickly and efficiently to identify trauma responsive programming and policy domains of strengths, as well as areas with greater room for improvement.







Treatment and Services Adaptation Center for Resiliency, Hope, and Wellness in Schools



This assessment measures eight key domains of a Trauma-Responsive School:

- (1) Whole School Safety Programming
- (2) Whole School Prevention Programming
- (3) Whole School Trauma Programming
- (4) Classroom-based Strategies

- (5) Prevention/Early Intervention Trauma Programming
- (6) Targeted Trauma Programming
- (7) Staff Self-Care
- (8) Community Context

Each domain contains multiple questions which are rated on a scale from 1 (least trauma-responsive) to 4 (most trauma responsive).

This measure can be completed by an administrator and/or other designated school staff in one sitting. Please record the name(s) and role(s) of the person(s) completing this questionnaire.

If you are completing this assessment for a district, please answer the questions for the schools in your district.

	WHOLE SCHOOL	SAFETY PLANNING			
1. How comprehensive is your scho appropriate frequency, uses a struc		ent of campus physical	safety (e.g., conducted at an		
1	2	3	4		
Minimally comprehensive, only addresses immediate dangers			Very comprehensive		
2. To what extent are students routinely supervised in a developmentally-appropriate way across campus (including lunch rooms, hallways, playgrounds) recognizing that strategies vary by elementary, middle, and high school?					
1	2	3	4		
Staff inconsistently watches students			Routine monitoring across entire campus		
3. To what extent does your school/ harm to another student or staff?	district have a clearly	defined strategy to det	ermine when a student may present		
1	2	3	4		
No defined process			Clearly defined process		
4. To what extent have school staff	been trained in bullyi	ng prevention strategies	s?		
1	2	3	4		
School staff are encouraged to prevent bullying on campus, but no training has been offered.			There is a school-wide approach with appropriate training for educators in bullying prevention strategies.		
Whole School Safety P	rogramming Total Sc	core: /4 = M	ean Score:		





TSA



WHOLE SCHOOL PREVENTION PLANNING				
1. To what extent does your school/di	strict have a clearl	y defined process for stu	dents to report concerns about	
peers (e.g., that a peer who may harn	a themselves or oth	ers) to staff?	-	
1	2	3	4	
No defined process exits for			Both students and staff know the	
students to report concerns about			process for students to report	
peers.			concerns about peers.	
2. To what extent does your school/di health records among relevant partie			aring academic, legal, and mental	
			4	
I No defined process evists	2	3	4	
No defined process exists.			A clearly defined process exists.	
3. To what extent do you survey a rai	nge of stakeholders	s (e.g. parents, staff, scho	ol resource officers, security	
officials, and students) about their pe	rceptions of your s	school's/district's climate	2?	
1	2	3	Δ	
No assessment of climate.	2	5	Assessment of all stakeholders	
4. How routinely do you conduct an a	assessment of your	school's/district's climat		
	·			
1	2	3	4	
Never			At least some stakeholder groups	
			assessed on a routine basis (at least once per year)	
			(at least once per year)	
5. To what extent has your staff been				
in a manner sensitive to students with	1 trauma histories?	? (alarms that may elicit	reaction)	
1	2	3	4	
Teachers and staff are			Teachers and schools staff have	
encouraged to be sensitive to			received training in a specific	
trauma exposure during			strategy for being sensitive to	
emergency drills.			trauma exposure during emergency drills.	
6. To what extent does your school/distri	ct have clearly defin	ed and articulated behavio		
1	2	3	4	
There are no defined school-			School-wide behavioral	
wide behavioral expectations.			expectations have been defined	
Teachers have independent			and communicated to students in	
behavioral expectations.			a consistent and ongoing manner.	
7. To what extent has your school sta	ff been trained in ខ	strategy for reinforcing	behavioral expectations?	
1	2	3	4	
Teachers are encouraged to			School staff are trained in and	
reinforce behavioral expectations			utilize a clearly defined approach	
but no defined strategy exists.			to reinforce behavioral expectations	
Whole School Safety Pro	ogramming Total 6		ean Score.	
whole School Salety I I	'5' anning Total S	// = M	cui 5000.	







WHOLE SCHOOL TRAUMA PROGRAMMING			
1. To what extent have teachers and/o following a traumatic event (i.e Psych			notional support to students
1	2	3	4
Teachers and other school staff are encouraged to support students but no organized training has been provided.			Teachers and other school staff have been trained in a specific approach and utilize it when necessary.
2. To what extent does your school/di	istrict have clearly	y defined discipline policies th	at are sensitive to students
exposed to trauma?			
1	2	3	4
Some teachers may take trauma exposure into account when taking disciplinary action.			Clearly defined disciplinary procedures that are trauma sensitive.
3. To what extent have school securit	y personnel (scho	ol resource officers, school po	lice, security force) been
trained to identify symptoms of trau			
1	2	3	4
I Security staff are an ecure and to	Z	3	·
Security staff are encouraged to identify and interact with			Security personnel have been trained in a specific approach to
students using methods that are			identify and interact with students
trauma-informed and avoid re-			using methods that are trauma-
traumatization.			informed and avoid re-
			traumatization.
4. To what extent has your school/dis arise on campus.	trict established a	and follow a restorative appro	ach to resolving conflicts that
1	2	3	4
Teachers and other school staff	2	5	Clearly defined approach.
are encouraged to help students			Clearly defined approach.
resolve conflicts but no single			
defined strategy exists.			
5. To what extent does your school/di behavior and academics)?	istrict educate sta	II about trauma and its effect	on students (impact on brain,
1	2	3	4
Minimal. Addressed through a			Substantial Attention (ongoing
brief one-hour in-service			educational opportunities).
6. To what extent does your school/di students? (ex. de-escalation, referral)		n skills for interacting with a	nd supporting traumatized
1	2	3	4
Minimal-Addressed through a			Substantial Attention (ongoing
brief one-hour in-service.			educational opportunities).

Whole School Safety Programming Total Score: _____/6 = Mean Score: _____/6







	CLASSROOM-BA	SED STRATEGIES	
1. To what extent have teachers bee	n trained in the incor	poration of Social En	notional Learning (SEL) principles
into their work with students?			
1	2	3	4
Teachers are encouraged to incorporate concepts into their work but have not been trained in a specific approach.			Teachers and other school staff have been trained in a specific approach and utilize it when necessary.
2. To what extent has school staff be when a student may become deregu		potential triggers for	r students and ways to de-escalate
1	2	3	4
Teachers are encouraged to create safe and calm classrooms but have not received training for doing so.			Teachers have received a thorough training in strategies fo keeping classrooms safe and calm.
3. To what extent does your school/ students in the classroom?	listrict have a clearly	defined approach for	r providing behavioral support to
1	2	3	4
T 1			Clearly defined approach.
Teachers are encouraged to find ways to support children in the classroom.			
ways to support children in the classroom.	listrict have a clearly	defined approach to	integrate a student's trauma history
ways to support children in the classroom. 4. To what extent does your school/o	district have a clearly	defined approach to	integrate a student's trauma history 4









1	2	3	4
Does not do so at all			Does so routinely for all student receiving mental health assessments.
Does your school/district implem BITS, SSET, Bounce Back)?	-		ds of kids suffering from trauma (i.e.
l No specific intervention is implemented.	2	3	4 Routinely implements a specifi Evidence-based Practice (EBP) for students who have experienced trauma.

1. When multidisciplinary teams meet to address a student's performance, to what extent is there a clearly defined approach for examining trauma exposure as a contributor to student performance?				
1	2	3	4	
No defined process			Trauma exposure is routinely integrated into these discussions	
5	0	-	cternal community mental health	
^c	0	-	xternal community mental health 4	
2. To what extent does your school/di agencies to refer students who have b 1 No established relationships.	0	ma?		
agencies to refer students who have b 1	0	ma?	4	

Whole School Safety Programming Total Score: _____/2 = Mean Score: ______









STAFF SELF CARE FOR SECONDARY TRAUMATIC STRESS					
1. To what extent does your school/district have a standard approach for building staff awareness of compassion fatigue and STS which include providing tools for self-monitoring and building self-care strategies.					
1	2	3	4		
No Approach			Standardized approach.		
2. To what extent does your school/ trauma?	district facilitate pee	er support among staff w	orking with students exposed to		
1	2	3	4		
No defined strategies. Teachers			Clearly defined strategy for		
provide support when they notice			supporting peers.		
a colleague in distress.					
3. To what extent are there professi	onal resources avail	able for staff on campus	?		
1	2	3	4		
No resources.			Resources specific to secondary		
			traumatic stress		
Whole School Safety Programming Total Score:/3 = Mean Score:					

L

COMMUNITY CONTEXT					
1. School staff have been trained t	to be responsive and co	onsiderate of cultural issue	es (i.e. language barrier,		
undocumented status)	2	3	4		
No training			Teachers and other school staff have been trained in a specific approach and utilize it when necessary.		
2. To what extent are racially and ethnically sensitive resources and services made available to the families of students receiving tier 2 and 3 interventions.					
1	2	3	4		
No supports available.			Routine incorporation of supports		
3. To what extent does your school about trauma and its impact. 1 No engagement	l/district identify oppo 2	ortunities to engage familie 3	4 Ongoing engagement (several meetings each school year)		
4. To what extent does your school health centers) to further support		ships with community-tru			
1	2	3	4		
No partnerships identified			Contracted partnerships with several organizations		
Whole School Safety Programming Total Score:/4 = Mean Score:					
SAMHSA		tment and Services Adaptation Center esiliency, Hope, and Wellness in Schools	Center for School Mental Health		

Mean Scores by Domain

The team can enter the mean score by domain in the table below and then check the box in the far-right column if that domain is determined to be a priority area.

Domain	Mean Score	Priority Area?
Safety Planning		
Prevention Planning		
Trauma Programming		
Classroom Strategies		
Prevention/Early Intervention		
Targeted Trauma-Informed Programming		
Staff Self-Care		
Community Context		







