|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **TRAUMA INFORMED SCHOOLS AND SETTINGS AUDIT** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Name of School or Setting: | | | | | | | | | | |
| Who completed the Audit: | Date of Audit: | | | | | | | | | |
| |  | | --- | | **Advice**   * Build in support and challenge, preferably before, and certainly to follow up the audit via your Virtual School or Educational Psychologist or other professional. * This audit is best done first by the leadership team, applying all questions to themselves and then by/for the whole setting, with the possibility of including the views of young people * The audit is a starting point. The next steps are to draw up your action plan to address issues.   **Definitions**  Consciously competent – good at it and can explain it to others  Cutting Edge – could share practice usefully with others  **Scoring**   * There are five points, which correspond to 20% each, to distribute per question. * Put the numbers where they fit best e.g. for Q5 if you feel that 20% of your staff are cutting edge and 80% know nothing about this put 4 in column 1 and 1 in column 5 and perhaps a comment ‘Ms X has done an MA, could train others.’ * You can apply this to yourself also in which case the % is about your confidence and consistency e.g. 4= ‘80% of the time I’m like this.’ | | | 1. **Pre Trauma Aware (New Area)** | | | **2) Trauma Aware (emerging awareness/competance)** | | **3) Trauma Sensitive (Competant and Aware)** | **4) Trauma Responsive (consciously competant)** | **5) Trauma Informed (Cutting edge)** | Evidence /Comments |
| **Individuals Knowledge** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Do staff have up to date knowledge of how children’s brains develop? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Do staff understand the effect of stress on the brain including their own? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Do staff know that their emotional state is the key determinate of the emotional climate in their classroom? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Do staff understand what trauma is and can they identify those in their classroom affected by it? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Do staff understand what attachment difficulty is and can they identify those in their classroom affected by it? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Individual’s Competence** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Are staff able to manage their own response to a child under stress in a way that helps the child to self regulate and feel safe? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are staff able to differentiate their strategies according to what is most effective with individuals? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are staff able to reflect on their own responses to stress, including recognising when they have gone into ‘fight, flight, or freeze’? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Can staff enable children to articulate and reflect upon their emotions? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Do staff work within the limits of their won competence and ask for help when they need it? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are staff able to manage behaviour through relationships (as opposed to relying upon external rules and sanctions to ‘manage’ behaviour for them)? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Teams** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Do teams recognise the different and complementary skills of team members in responding to children’s behaviour? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Do teams ask for and use support when they need it? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. How effectively do teams solve problems together when dealing with children with trauma and attachment difficulties? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are teams involved in training about the needs of children with attachment and trauma difficulties fully multi agency? (Do they include, parents/carers, psychologists, non-teaching staff, and others, school crossing staff, taxi drivers?) | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the teams that plan, implement and review strategies to support children with trauma and attachment difficulties fully multi-agency – including child (where appropriate), carers/parents, psychologists. CAMHS etc? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Do written plans (PEPs etc) reflect 15 and 16 above? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Environment** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Are there readily accessible spaces to allow children to self-regulate safely? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Does everyone know who can access these spaces? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Does everyone know the protocol for accessing these spaces? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Children and adults – direct support** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Does everyone have an identified support person when they need one? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. Are children and staff clear about when and how to go to their support person? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. How developed is the specialist supervision for staff working directly with children with trauma and attachment difficulties? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Senior Leaders – Summary** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. At what level would the SLT place itself as a team in relation to all the questions above? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. How well developed is the school’s strategy for supporting the learning of children with trauma and attachment difficulties? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. How well developed is the involvement of governors in the development of this strategy and training? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| 1. How well developed is the involvement of other partners, including parents and carers, in the development of this strategy and training? | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |
| **Totals** | | |  |  | |  | |  |  |  |