

The Co-production of the Roots Framework: A Reflective Framework for Mapping the Implementation Journey of Trauma-informed Care

Steven Anthony Thirkle^{a*}, Angela Kennedy^b, Petia Sice^c and Paras Patel^b

^a Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Baddiley Clark Building, Richardson Road, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX, United Kingdom

^b St. Nicholas Hospital, Jubilee Rd, Cumbria, Northumberland Tyne and Wear NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle-upon Tyne NE3 3XT, United Kingdom

^c Department of Computer and Information Sciences, Faculty of Engineering and Environment, Ellison Building, Ellison Place, Northumbria University, Newcastle City Campus, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE2 1XE, United Kingdom

*Corresponding author: Steven Anthony Thirkle, Population Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4AX, United Kingdom. ORCID ID - 0000-0002-6115-6637. E-mail: steven.thirkle@newcastle.ac.uk Telephone: 07955593737

Abstract

Background: The trauma-informed care programme at the Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys Foundation NHS Trust identified a need to evaluate the ongoing service-wide trauma-informed care implementation effort. An absence of staff, service user and system-related outcomes specific to trauma-informed care presented barriers to monitoring the adoption of trauma-informed approaches and progress over time across

25 the Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys Foundation NHS Trust. This paper describes the co-
 26 production of a new self-assessment tool, Roots, a discussion-based framework that
 27 facilitates learning and improvement by reflecting on positive or negative examples of
 28 trauma-informed services.

29 **Methods:** Using secondary data obtained from an affiliated national trauma summit
 30 and instruments found in literature, domains and items were co-produced with the
 31 help of trauma-informed care leads, NHS staff and service users. The research design
 32 consisted of community-based co-production methods such as surveys, focus groups,
 33 and expert consultations.

34 **Results:** Adopting trauma-informed care requires enthusiasm and commitment from
 35 all members of the organisation. Services must adapt to meet the dynamic needs of
 36 staff and service users to ensure they remain trauma-informed; this must be done as a
 37 community.

38 **Conclusions:** Following an extensive co-production process, the Roots framework
 39 was published open-access and accompanied by a user manual. Roots can provide
 40 both qualitative and quantitative insights on trauma-informed care implementation by
 41 provoking the sharing of experience across services.

42 **Keywords:** *Trauma-informed Care; Implementation; Evaluation Framework; Self-*
 43 *assessment; Co-production.*

44

45

46

47

48

49 **1. Introduction**

50 Trauma-informed care has seen various implementation efforts; many have seen local
51 success; others have failed to provide sufficient evidence (1–4). Trauma-informed
52 care is an evolving organic system model (5,6). It requires a paradigm shift in thinking
53 for service providers to deliver care that is rooted in the understanding of the
54 widespread prevalence and effects of trauma on people (7). An informed
55 conceptualisation of trauma is threefold: the trauma *event*, acknowledging that
56 traumatisation can occur when psychological/social integrity is threatened; how the
57 event is *experienced*; and the *effects* of the event (7). This shift in thinking and
58 conceptualisation of trauma constitutes trauma-informed care. All members of the
59 organisation must embrace the constituents of trauma-informed care for the system
60 model to be of significant benefit; it must not be imposed upon individuals but rather
61 emerge from individuals who experience the organisation (8,9). For systemic
62 adoption, many organisations require concrete evidence of the benefits that trauma-
63 informed care provides (10,11). These benefits are numerous; however, they are often
64 not quantifiable. This does not serve the implementation of trauma-informed care
65 well, as service providers are requesting effective techniques for implementing the
66 necessary changes and specific examples of what it means in practice (10).
67 Establishing the need to develop metrics that can be used in qualitative and
68 quantitative ways to demonstrate the effective implementation of trauma-informed
69 care and realise the benefits that this systemic and individualistic change can provide
70 (11). Calling for a development process bespoke to the organisation, as trauma-
71 informed care is an emergent paradigm (3,8).

72 Organisational culture change demands individuals to follow suit and to sometimes
73 abandon personal principles (12–14). A frictionless change requires the consideration
74 of affect, sub-groups, personal and existing organisational values, and the quantity and
75 quality of support from leadership (8,9). Factoring in complexity concepts such as

76 emergence, self-organisation, and the sensitivity to initial conditions can assist in the
77 understanding of human systems and utilising previous developments can save time
78 and help co-construct a bigger picture of what it means to be trauma-informed (15,16).
79 This article provides basic information on the Roots framework so that future work
80 can benefit; it uses a similar reporting structure provided by Jung et al. (2009); as a
81 result, readers are given a topographical view of the framework (9).

82 **2. Background**

83 At the Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys (TEWV) Foundation NHS Trust, Dr Angela
84 Kennedy, with the help of other key figures, established the trauma-informed care
85 programme to implement trauma-informed care into services. Large-scale training and
86 service-change efforts were proving successful. However, an efficient implementation
87 and evaluation method was seen to be missing. Research and development efforts
88 were identified as being necessary to investigate potential solutions. The project that
89 emerged had one aim: To co-produce an integrative framework for data collection,
90 analysis, and interpretation. The objectives to reach this aim were threefold. The first
91 was to identify a relevant body of knowledge and investigate similar approaches that
92 have sought to evaluate trauma-informed care. The second was to co-produce an
93 evaluation framework that is bespoke to the United Kingdom. The third was to
94 produce documentation for practical use. Three fields from the literature helped
95 construct the narrative. These were organisational culture change, complexity theory,
96 and trauma-informed care. The organisational culture change literature is highly
97 applicable to trauma-informed care (8,9). Trauma-informed care can be viewed as a
98 culture and the change required is a cultural one. Complexity theory can offer an
99 informative view of culture - recognising that culture is a complex phenomenon that
100 emerges in the interactions between actors is conducive to successful change
101 (15,16,18). Within the trauma-informed care literature, previous frameworks were
102 identified; these were systematically evaluated (1–3,19). The Roots tool emerged from

103 a co-production approach to development with staff and service-users being consulted
104 at each stage.

105 **2.1. The Implementation of Trauma-Informed Care**

106 Trauma-informed care is socially constructed in the environment (9). It is manifested
107 and brought to life by the inhabitants of the service. Significant system change is
108 required for the implementation of trauma-informed care. This change marks a shift in
109 thinking from *what is wrong with you* to *what happened to you*. This is an essential
110 step to begin the narrative of care (7). All facets of the organisation must engage in
111 this transformation for trauma-informed care to recognise success. Adaptations to the
112 physical environment, raising awareness, and training staff are relatively minor steps
113 in comparison to the tidal-wave requirements of change on systems and care processes
114 (20).

115 **2.2. Roots – A Discussion-Based Framework That Facilitates Learning and** 116 **Improvement by Reflecting on Positive or Negative Examples of Trauma-** 117 **informed Services.**

118 Roots is a developmental framework that uses insights from organisational culture
119 change, human behaviour, complexity theory, and trauma-informed care evaluation.
120 Roots was developed in the United Kingdom and was released in April 2021. There
121 are currently two versions available. One for staff and another for service users. Both
122 versions are identical with only changes made to terminology for accessibility
123 purposes. The definition or conceptual model of Roots is as follows: for an
124 organisation to be trauma-informed, it needs to apply trauma-informed principles and
125 culture in practice. Adopting a systems-wide value model requires enthusiasm and
126 commitment from all members of the organisation. As organisations and individuals
127 within the organisation change, the service must adapt to meet the dynamic needs of
128 staff and service users to ensure they remain trauma-informed (9). Communication

129 and clarification of these values, across teams, departments, buildings, or trusts will
130 assist in providing individuals with the self-knowledge that is often missing, i.e., *how*
131 *are we adhering to the principles of trauma-informed care that we, as a group, have*
132 *selected as being relevant right now?* and *how are we able to improve in the areas*
133 *that we are not doing so well in?* The intended purpose of Roots is to map the
134 implementation journey of trauma-informed care. The tool is for staff, service users,
135 and teams to think about what might make up trauma-informed care in their areas. It
136 takes the form of a word document that is completed by the facilitator on the
137 discussion of each item. Roots is comprised of 54 items answered quantitatively using
138 a RAG (red, amber, and green) rating, and qualitatively by prompting for reasons of
139 applicability and examples in practice. These items are shared among seven domains:
140 Safety (11 items), Language (8 items), Social (7 items), Trauma-specific Interventions
141 (7 items), Empowerment (7 items), Whole System (6 items), and Compassionate
142 Leadership (8 items). The set of practice points for reflection by the group challenges
143 thinking and enables discussion. The *applicable to service* column is asking for the
144 reason why this item needs to be applied in service to facilitate trauma-informed care.
145 However, each item is indicative and may not be applicable in every setting. The
146 *implementation* column is the RAG rating which asks the user how trauma-informed
147 they believe their service is with regards to the item in question. The *example* column
148 asks for examples as to why the service may or may not be delivering trauma-
149 informed care. Reflecting on each practice point can stimulate positive or negative
150 examples and provide meaningful information. The act of assigning a colour can
151 allow the individual or service to reflect on their current standing with trauma-
152 informed service delivery. This can also prompt and motivate individuals and services
153 to improve delivery. Providing examples can be useful for clarity and comparison.
154 The level of measurement used in Roots is ordinal.

155 Items were generated by using a combination of surveys, focus groups, expert
156 meetings, and secondary data. The domains within Roots were obtained from the
157 National Trauma-informed Care Community of Action's implementation report titled:
158 *Creating a Narrative for Trauma-Informed Service Transformation* which emerged
159 from a summit of clinicians, managers, leaders, people with lived experience,
160 researchers, and other interested parties on Thursday 28th March 2019 (21). An
161 investigation into the literature uncovered previous approaches. These instruments and
162 frameworks were studied, and domains were taken from four prominent frameworks
163 which were then compared at a trauma leads meeting with the domains that emerged
164 from the national trauma-informed care summit. At the same meeting, trauma leads
165 were provided with definitions on the summit domains and asked to provide a set of
166 standardised questions (items). These items were then shared with psychologists to
167 translate for staff accessibility purposes. Further translation was required for the
168 service-user version and so the staff version was shared with an expert by experience
169 group. Both staff and service-user versions of the framework were then issued to
170 wider audiences at the NHS trust using surveys to further articulate the forms. Trauma
171 leads meetings were used to discuss the results and changes were decided on. Focus
172 groups were then arranged to pilot test the framework. These were conducted with
173 staff; trauma leads and their staff members in their respective services, and a small
174 group of service-users. Prior to the focus groups, the service-user framework was
175 modified to reflect a third-person perspective rather than what was seen to be a
176 confusing first-person one; this was the only significant modification made to the
177 framework since the initial translation. Items were not reduced or modified further as
178 they were voted as being essential to remain in the framework. Due to resource
179 restrictions, it was not possible to conduct a follow-up assessment on the
180 psychometric properties of an instrument (reliability and validity). However, focus
181 group data would suggest strong face validity, acceptability, and feasibility. The

182 framework does have the potential to be susceptible to bias if the facilitator is part of
183 the team or has an agenda. This can be mitigated by using external facilitators. There
184 are no norms attached to the Roots tool. However, these can be created locally if
185 group comparisons are desired. Roots has no formal method of calibration. Informal
186 methods can be set by users of the tool to ascertain accuracy. There is currently no
187 data recorded for further tests of reliability such as internal consistency or
188 reproducibility (test-retest and inter-observer). The content, criterion, predictive,
189 convergent, discriminant, cross-cultural, and dimensional validity of Roots remains
190 untested. Roots is designed to be sensitive and open to change, the tool must reflect
191 the needs of the individuals it serves.

192 The Roots tool was co-developed, and pilot tested in mental health care settings.
193 These services included the community, prison services, adult wards, and CAMHS
194 (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services). However, Roots has the potential to
195 be deployed in any setting, with changes made to the language and the exercise.

196 **3. Statement of the Problem**

197 The Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust has been implementing
198 trauma-informed care for many years. Early implementation efforts took the form of
199 care pathways. In 2009, the trauma-informed pathway was designated as the first
200 clinical link pathway. This pathway differed from clinical routes in that it was relevant
201 regardless of the diagnosis of trauma. Instead of encouraging talents that the
202 workforce cannot supply, the trauma-informed pathway encourages staff to use their
203 skills in trauma-informed ways. This empowered staff when they realised that this
204 meant they could offer something critical to service users. A business case was
205 developed by the trauma-informed care lead, Dr Angela Kennedy, for a formally
206 funded project to embed trauma-informed care into services. A goal of the project was
207 to integrate trauma-informed care into policies, programmes, and local systems and

208 contribute to the evidence-base for trauma-informed care. The trauma-informed care
 209 programme at the Tees, Esk, and Wear Valleys NHS Foundation Trust realised the
 210 need for an evaluation and implementation framework to make progress with this
 211 trauma-informed system change. Checklists have been created and measurements
 212 have been conducted previously regarding trauma-informed change, but never in the
 213 United Kingdom. The NHS is a unique system in that it represents a large number of
 214 individuals spread out over many localities. The TEWV NHS Foundation Trust is one
 215 of the largest specialist mental health and learning disabilities trusts in the country,
 216 with an annual income of £380 million and a workforce of over 6700 staff operating
 217 from around 100 sites in Durham, Teeside, North Yorkshire, and York and Selby.
 218 TEWV NHS provide a range of inpatient and community services to 2 million people
 219 living in County Durham, the Tees Valley, Scarborough, Whitby, Ryedale, Harrogate,
 220 Hambleton and Richmondshire. TEWV NHS services are spread out over a wide
 221 geographical area of around 3600 square miles, inclusive of coastal, rural, and
 222 industrial areas (22). The geographical nature of the TEWV NHS Foundation Trust is
 223 conducive to complexity. All NHS trusts are subject to stringent ethical procedures
 224 and research involving staff and service-users undergo strict ethical clearance
 225 procedures. An implementation and evaluation framework unique to these particular
 226 circumstances that was able to navigate strict ethical boundaries was essential.

227 **4. Methods Used During the Development of the Roots Framework**

228 The collaborative development of the Roots framework was a five-step process.
 229 Firstly, a literature review was undertaken to investigate similar approaches. These
 230 other approaches were evaluated using an existing culture instrument review
 231 framework (17), and were then compared with the domains that emerged from the
 232 national trauma summit at a trauma leads meeting. Items were generated at the same
 233 meeting and were taken to surveys with staff and service users to confirm articulation.
 234 Focus groups were held with one service user group and five different staff services.

235 These were used to further articulate and pilot test the framework in practice. The
236 process can be seen in Figure 1.

237

238 **Fig.1** – Methods used during the co-production process of Roots

239 The design of the Roots framework stemmed from the ongoing work of the trauma-
240 informed care programme. This meant that the research design evolved alongside
241 programme implementation. Monthly meetings with trauma leads contributed
242 significantly to the research design. The trauma leads are select individuals who
243 represent trauma-informed care in their respective services. They were instrumental in
244 the facilitation of various developmental facets, including access to various staff and
245 service user groups. Approximately twelve trauma leads would usually be present at
246 each meeting. The first phase of this study was an evaluation of other similar
247 instruments and frameworks (9). The literature contributed to expectations and other
248 considerations for trauma-informed service evaluation; including the use of principles
249 or domains for which both implementation and evaluation can revolve. Meanwhile,
250 the trauma-informed programme was a joint-organiser of a national trauma summit
251 titled: *Creating a Narrative for Trauma-informed Service Transformation* (21). The
252 goal of this summit was to respond to calls from people with lived experience of
253 trauma in services and the challenge of trauma being included in the new NHS 10-
254 year plan. It was arranged as a forum to share ideas for good practice and an
255 opportunity to network with others who are motivated towards similar goals. This was
256 held on Thursday 28th March and brought together clinicians, managers, leaders,
257 people with lived experience, researchers, and many others. Attendees were asked to
258 think of a specific positive example that they have experienced, witnessed, or been
259 involved in. The aim of this was to tap into individual wisdom and creativity and to
260 explore the multiple dimensions of what it means to be trauma-informed and share

261 concrete examples that can be replicated by others. A report was drafted titled:
 262 *Developing Real-World System Capability in Trauma-informed Care: Learning from*
 263 *Good Practice* (21). In this report, seven domains were observed as having emerged
 264 from the summit, these were: 1) Safety, 2) Human Experience Language, 3)
 265 Empowerment, 4) Healing Interventions, 5) Responsive System Design, 6)
 266 Compassionate and Transformational Leadership, and 7) Relational Reparation (21).
 267 These domains were significant to the Roots framework as they had been developed
 268 with individuals that have experienced UK health systems. The domains were used
 269 but their wording was amended to better reflect local services. The revised domains
 270 were: 1) Safety, 2) Language, 3) Social, 4) Trauma-specific Interventions, 5)
 271 Empowerment, 6) Whole System, and 7) Compassionate Leadership.

272 **5. The Co-Production of Domains and Items**

273 At a trauma leads meeting, the seven domains were judged against the domains taken
 274 from the literature. Four instruments were selected for this process, the Attitudes
 275 Related to Trauma-Informed Care (ARTIC) (1), the Creating Cultures of Trauma-
 276 informed Care (CCTIC) (4), the TICOMETER (2), and the Trauma-informed Practice
 277 (TIP) Scales (19). These were identified as being relevant and empirically tested.
 278 During the meeting, the trauma leads worked through a slideshow that presented the
 279 domains from the literature alongside the domains from the summit and were asked to
 280 determine encapsulation. Encapsulation was confirmed if one or more of the summit
 281 domains captured the meaning used in the language of the domains from the literature.
 282 Table 1 presents the ARTIC comparison, Table 2 presents the CCTIC comparison,
 283 Table 3 presents the TICOMETER comparison, and Table 4 presents the TIP Scales
 284 comparison. The left column represents the domains from the instruments found in the
 285 literature, and the right column represents which domain from the summit that trauma
 286 leads felt captured the meaning of the corresponding domain from the literature. This
 287 process was held to determine if the summit domains were appropriate for use. The

288 trauma leads all agreed through consensus that all domains from the four instruments
 289 were captured by one or more of the domains from the summit. However, trauma
 290 leads felt as though staff wellbeing should represent the eighth domain.

291 Table 1 – ARTIC Comparison

ARTIC	SUMMIT
Underlying Causes of Problem	Social Context, Language
Behaviour and Symptoms	
Responses To Problem Behaviour and Symptoms	Safety, Social Context, Trauma-Specific Interventions
On-The-Job Behaviour	All
Self-Efficacy at Work	Safety, Whole System, Compassionate Leadership, Empowerment
Reactions to the Work	Trauma-Specific Interventions
Personal Support of TIC	Safety, Whole System
System-Wide Support for TIC	Whole System, Compassionate Leadership, Safety, Social Context

292 Table 2 – CCTIC Comparison

CCTIC	SUMMIT
Safety	All
Trustworthiness	Safety, Language, Empowerment, Whole System, Social Context
Choice	Empowerment, Safety, Social Context
Collaboration	Empowerment, Whole System, Social Context, Safety
Empowerment	Empowerment, Language, Whole System

Trauma Screening Process Safety, Language, Empowerment,
Trauma-Specific Interventions, Whole
System

293

294 Table 3 – TICOMETER Comparison

TICOMETER	SUMMIT
Building Trauma-Informed Knowledge and Skills	All
Establishing Trusting Relationships	All
Respecting Service Users	Whole System, Safety, Language
Fostering Trauma-Informed Service Delivery	All
Promoting Trauma-Informed Policies and Procedures	Whole System, Language

295

296 Table 4 – TIP Scales Comparison

TIP SCALES	SUMMIT
The Environment of Agency & Mutual Respect	Social Context, Safety, Empowerment, Language
Access to Information to Trauma	Trauma-Specific Interventions, Safety, Empowerment, Language
Opportunities for Connection	Empowerment, Trauma-Specific Interventions, Social Context
Emphasis on Strengths	Social Context, Trauma-Specific Interventions, Language, Safety

	Cultural Responsiveness & Inclusivity	All
	Support for Parenting	Trauma-Specific Interventions, Social Context, Safety
297		
298	At the same meeting, trauma leads were asked to develop up to 10 items per domain.	
299	Trauma leads worked through a slideshow that presented definitions of each domain.	
300	Four items were generated for the domain safety. Six items were generated for the	
301	domain language. Four items were generated for the domain social. Six items were	
302	generated for the domain Trauma-specific Interventions. Eleven items were generated	
303	for the domain empowerment. Seven items were generated for the domain Whole	
304	System. Eight items were generated for the domain compassionate leadership. Four	
305	items were generated for the domain staff wellbeing.	
306	The results of this meeting were shared with the trauma-informed care programme	
307	team. The items underwent translation to accommodate common language used by	
308	staff for purposes of familiarity and accessibility. This discussion contributed to the	
309	removal of some items and the addition of others. The requested domain, staff	
310	wellbeing, was removed as it was voted unnecessary in respect of it being represented	
311	across the other domains. As two forms were needed, one for staff and another for	
312	service users, the translated items were then sent to an experts by experience group	
313	working from the Recovery College in Durham, United Kingdom. The experts by	
314	experience group worked through the items and translated them for service user	
315	accessibility.	
316	Both forms, existing only as items, were then placed into two separate SurveyMonkey	
317	surveys. Convenience, criterion, and snowball sampling methods were used for the	
318	recruitment of participants. Staff and service-user samples were recruited through	
319	trauma leads who distributed information on the study. When participants registered	

320 interest, the trauma leads then distributed further information through a participant
321 information sheet and a web link to the survey. The surveys asked participants to
322 prioritise the items and leave feedback on articulation. The addition of a RAG rating
323 added a quantifiable indicator to the survey. The staff form was distributed to staff
324 members, and the service-user form was distributed to service users. The inclusion
325 criteria were as follows: staff are identified as being available, engaged in the TEWV
326 NHS trust, and chosen or recommended by those aware of the study. Service users are
327 identified as being available, involved in the NHS trust, and selected by staff. The
328 exclusion criteria were as follows: no affiliation with the NHS TEWV Foundation
329 Trust, under the age of 18 or over the age of 65, or at imminent risk of harming
330 themselves or others. Recruitment was difficult as national restrictions were imposed
331 as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. The results were analysed using Microsoft Excel
332 to determine priority. A trauma leads meeting was held to discuss these results and it
333 was voted that all items should remain in the final framework, mainly due to high
334 applicability. Although the survey results contradicted this for a few items, the
335 presentation of the survey was questioned for confusion.

336 A quality assurance process took place and involved confirming meaning across items
337 in both staff and service user forms with the research team. The framework was
338 drafted as a table, in which there are four columns: practice point for consideration
339 (item), applicable to service (reason), implementation status (RAG rating), and
340 example (justification). The set of practice points for reflection by the group
341 challenges thinking and enables discussion. The applicable to service column asks
342 why this item needs to be applied in service to facilitate trauma-informed care.
343 However, it is recognised that each item is indicative and may not be applicable in
344 every setting. The implementation column is the RAG rating and questions the user on
345 how trauma-informed they believe their service is with regards to the item in question.
346 The example column asks for examples as to why the service may or may not be

347 delivering trauma-informed care. Reflecting on each practice point can stimulate
348 positive or negative examples and provide meaningful information. The act of
349 assigning a colour can allow the individual or service to reflect on their current
350 standing with trauma-informed service delivery. This can also prompt and motivate
351 individuals and services to improve delivery. Providing examples can be useful for
352 clarity and comparison.

353 Pilot tests were held with both forms with staff and service user sample groups. Five
354 full-length evaluation exercises were held with staff, and one rudimentary exercise
355 was held with service users. Staff focus groups were evaluating the framework and the
356 exercise, whilst the service user group was evaluating the framework. Service users
357 felt empowered when discussing the items of the framework and agreed that the
358 majority of items were essential. Staff found the exercise helpful, and all services
359 requested the completed framework to begin actioning items.

360 A user manual was created to facilitate instructions and to contain the Roots
361 framework. This is now published open access on the Future NHS community
362 platform for practitioners and researchers as long as they have an NHS or public
363 health England email address.

364 **6. The Roots Framework Learning Model**

365 The Roots framework uses insights from complexity theory. This is recognising that
366 human change is complex because there is rarely one right way of doing something.
367 The service will need to adapt to meet each individual's needs and remain responsive
368 over time. These complexity principles guide the use of Roots towards change and
369 evaluation: change in individuals or organisations is rarely linear. A reflexive
370 approach that evolves is of benefit. There is not a *one size fits all* interpretation of
371 trauma-informed implementation. Different settings need to define what is needed for
372 them through methods of co-production. Different teams within an organisation,

373 different individuals within teams, and different service users may all display or
374 perceive different strengths concerning the implementation of trauma-informed care.
375 Roots allows for the bringing together of different narratives towards a wider picture.
376 The items emerged from previous examples and are created to be both generic and
377 specific but not exhaustive. New ones can be created as long as they are tangible and
378 observable. Roots needs to be embedded within a learning organisation framework
379 accompanied by an attitude of respect to ensure that progress can be made.

380 **7. Study Limitations**

381 In the UK, there are many restrictions placed upon social and healthcare research.
382 Research studies must navigate strict ethical standards. In many cases, these standards
383 can form boundaries for what is possible in research. As trauma-informed care is a
384 relatively new concept in the UK, pioneering research must first take the first steps.
385 These initial studies must take place so that more elaborate studies can follow. As
386 Roots is the first trauma-informed evaluation framework to emerge out of the UK,
387 many aspects of the study were impeded. The Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS
388 Foundation Trust has a workforce of over 6700 staff operating from around 100 sites
389 in Durham, Teesside, North Yorkshire and York and Shelby (22). This study is unable
390 to claim to be fully representative as the samples used were often limited to
391 convenience, and the actual number of participants was low. To achieve a confidence
392 level of 99% for a population size of 6700 with a 5% margin of error, 604 staff
393 members must have been involved in the study. For service users, an ideal sample size
394 with the same parameters would be inclusive of 663 participants. In combination, a
395 repeated study would need to consult at least 1200 participants to be statistically
396 significant. The use of qualitative data helps mitigate this through practicality and
397 transparency. The research team had ultimate control over the end-product, meaning
398 that key stakeholders at both staff and service user levels should have been involved in
399 signing off the product. The service user focus group is a good example of this, there

400 were questions raised over some items, but this was not regarded in the finished
401 version. The development of Roots also took place during the Covid-19 pandemic and
402 data collection began when the UK was put under lockdown – this caused delays to
403 the study as all non-covid related research received suspensions from the NHS. There
404 is also a distinct lack of any form of psychometric testing – delays to research and
405 resource expiration made it impossible to continue working on Roots.

406 **Further Work**

407 Roots is the United Kingdom’s first foray into the evaluation of trauma-informed
408 services. Much of the precursory work is already done in the United States of America
409 (USA). However, UK healthcare services are delivered very differently than they are
410 in the USA. The development of Roots provides perfect foundations for future work,
411 either using or building on Roots. One of the fundamentals of UK-based development
412 is the practicalities of set-up. Establishing long-term commitment and navigating strict
413 ethical standards are two of the arrangements that must be considered. Acquiring
414 health research authority approval through a completed Integrated Research
415 Application System (IRAS) should be completed early, and applications should be
416 thorough to ensure acceptance. Before use, a thorough psychometric assessment of the
417 tool should be prioritised to ensure reliability and validity. Self-assessment
418 maintenance should be carried out with exceptional regard to the language used. A
419 dynamic self-assessment should be co-produced; the contents of which change with
420 time to ensure consistent reliability with the people they serve.

421 **Conclusions**

422 The co-production of the Roots framework involved staff and service-users from the
423 Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys Foundation NHS Trust and also utilised secondary data
424 from a national trauma summit titled: *Creating a Narrative for Trauma-informed*
425 *Service Transformation*. Relevant secondary data, trauma-informed care programme

426 lead meetings, surveys, focus groups, and consultations with staff and service users
 427 constituted the research design. The development of Roots was an experimental
 428 process and the research evolved alongside the progression of the trauma-informed
 429 care programme at the Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys Foundation NHS Trust. Roots is
 430 published open-access and is supported by a user manual.

431

432

433

434 **DECLARATIONS:**

- 435 • Ethics approval and consent to participate – The United Kingdom's Research
 436 Ethics Committee of the National Health Service's Health Research
 437 Authority gave ethical approval for this work. Informed consent was obtained
 438 from all individuals included in the study where necessary.
- 439 • Consent for publication – The authors affirm that human research
 440 participants provided informed consent where necessary for publication of
 441 data collected.
- 442 • Availability of data and material – Not Applicable
- 443 • Competing interests – All authors certify that they have no affiliations with
 444 or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest or
 445 non-financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this
 446 manuscript.
- 447 • Funding – This work was made possible by support from the Tees, Esk and
 448 Wear Valleys Foundation NHS Trust and Northumbria University. Funding
 449 bodies had no influence on the study.
- 450 • Authors' Contributions

- 451 ○ CONCEPTION: ST, PS and AK
- 452 ○ METHODOLOGY: ST, PS, AK and PP
- 453 ○ DATA COLLECTION: ST
- 454 ○ INTERPRETATION OR ANALYSIS OF DATA: ST
- 455 ○ PREPARATION OF THE MANUSCRIPT: ST
- 456 ○ REVISION FOR IMPORTANT INTELLECTUAL CONTENT: ST,
- 457 PS, AK, and PP
- 458 ○ SUPERVISION: PS, AK, and PP
- 459 • **Acknowledgements:** This work was made possible by support from the
- 460 Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys Foundation NHS Trust and Northumbria
- 461 University..

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471 **References**

472

- 473 1. Baker CN, Brown SM, Wilcox PD, Overstreet S, Arora P.
474 Development and psychometric evaluation of the Attitudes Related to
475 Trauma-Informed Care (ARTIC) scale. *School Mental Health*.
476 2016;8(1):61–76.
- 477 2. Bassuk EL, Unick GJ, Paquette K, Richard MK. Developing an
478 instrument to measure organizational trauma-informed care in human
479 services: The TICOMETER. *Psychology of Violence*. 2017;7(1):150–
480 7.
- 481 3. Richardson MM, Coryn CLS, Henry J, Black-Pond C, Unrau Y.
482 Development and evaluation of the trauma-informed system change
483 instrument: Factorial validity and implications for use. *Child and*
484 *Adolescent Social Work Journal*. 2012;29(3):167–84.
- 485 4. Fallot RD, Harris M. Trauma-informed services: A self-assessment and
486 planning protocol. Washington, DC: Community Connections. 2006;
- 487 5. Sweeney K, Griffiths F. Complexity and healthcare: an introduction.
488 Radcliffe Publishing; 2002.
- 489 6. Sweeney A, Clement S, Filson B, Kennedy A. Trauma-informed
490 mental healthcare in the UK: what is it and how can we further its
491 development? *Mental Health Review Journal* [Internet].
492 2016;21(3):174–92. Available from:
493 [https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/MHRJ-01-2015-](https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/MHRJ-01-2015-0006)
494 [0006](https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/MHRJ-01-2015-0006)
- 495 7. Sweeney A, Filson B, Kennedy A, Collinson L, Gillard S. A paradigm
496 shift: relationships in trauma-informed mental health services. *BJPsych*
497 *Advances*. 2018;24(5):319–33.
- 498 8. Thirkle SA, Kennedy A, Sice P. A Case for TIC: A Complex Adaptive
499 Systems Enquiry for Trauma Informed Care. *International Journal of*
500 *Systems and Society (IJSS)*. 2018;5(2):1–12.
- 501 9. Thirkle SA, Kennedy A, Sice P. Instruments for Exploring Trauma-
502 Informed Care. *Journal of Health & Human Services Administration*.
503 2021;44(1).
- 504 10. Yatchmenoff DK, Sundborg SA, Davis MA. Implementing Trauma-
505 Informed Care: Recommendations on the Process. *Advances in Social*
506 *Work*. 2017;18(1):167–85.
- 507 11. Jennings A. Models for developing trauma-informed behavioral health
508 systems and trauma-specific services. Alexandria, VA: National
509 Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, National
510 Technical Assistance Center for State Mental Health Planning. 2004;

12. Johnson A, Nguyen H, Groth M, Wang K, Ng JL. Time to change: A review of organisational culture change in health care organisations. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*. 2016;
13. Whelan C. Organisational culture and cultural change: A network perspective. *Australian & New Zealand journal of criminology*. 2016;49(4):583–99.
14. Parmelli E, Flodgren G, Beyer F, Baillie N, Schaafsma ME, Eccles MP. The effectiveness of strategies to change organisational culture to improve healthcare performance: a systematic review. *Implementation Science*. 2011;6(1):33.
15. Stacey R. The emergence of knowledge in organization. *Emergence, A Journal of Complexity Issues in Organizations and Management*. 2000;2(4):23–39.
16. Seel R. Emergence in organisations. Retrieved November. 2003;29:2006.
17. Jung T, Scott T, Davies HTO, Bower P, Whalley D, McNally R, et al. Instruments for exploring organizational culture: A review of the literature. *Public administration review*. 2009;69(6):1087–96.
18. Snowden DJ, Boone ME. A leader’s framework for decision making. *Harvard business review*. 2007;85(11):68.
19. Goodman LA, Sullivan CM, Serrata J, Perilla J, Wilson JM, Fauci JE, et al. Development and validation of the Trauma-Informed Practice Scales. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2016;44(6):747–64.
20. Evans J. Person-centered care and culture change. *Caring for the Ages*. 2017;18(8):6.
21. Kennedy A. Developing Real World System Capability in Trauma-informed Care: Learning from Good Practice. 2020;
22. TEWV NHS. NHS Jobs - Employer Information [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct 7]. Available from: https://www.jobs.nhs.uk/xi/agency_info/?agency_id=122252

