

**Kitsap Strong's Collaborative Learning Academy:
A Program Evaluation**

Melissa Cummings

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Public Health

University of Washington
2022

Committee:
Allen Cheadle
Amy Hagopian

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:
Health Services

@Copyright 2022
Melissa Cummings

University of Washington

Abstract

Kitsap Strong's Collaborative Learning Academy: A Program Evaluation

Melissa Cummings

Committee:

Allen Cheadle, PhD

Amy Hagopian, PhD, MHA

Abstract: Participants from the 2019-2020 Collaborative Learning Academy (CLA) cohort were asked to tell stories in five domains about the most important way their relationships changed with themselves, their students, their colleagues and supervisors, and their district since participating in the CLA. Analysis of the program was aimed at answering 3 main research questions:

1. Overall, did the CLA participants make positive efforts to implement trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA?
2. What are the factors that made implementing trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA more likely?
3. Did some schools do better than others at implementing trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA?

Analysis of the interviews revealed participants had made efforts to implement trauma informed practices after attending the CLA. They had dedicated time to training teachers on social emotional learning (SEL) theory and had provided tools such as fidget toys, regulation spaces and alternative

classroom seating. They were using circle meetings in the classroom and during staff meetings. They were more likely to implement trauma-informed practices if they reported a high level of support, especially from their colleagues, school leadership and district leadership. They were still struggling on how to engage parents and the lack of support from parents was holding back implementation. Participants in the CLA also struggled with implementing the CLA strategies because only 3-4 staff members attended the CLA and were responsible for dissemination to the rest of the school. Of the 3 schools, one school was outperforming the other two at implementing trauma-informed practices; factors responsible included more district goal alignment, more resources dedicated to SEL, buy-in from other colleagues and more support from parents.

As an evaluator, I made recommendations to increase the effectiveness of the CLA program based on the analysis of the interviews. The CLA program would likely be more successful if it increased district, colleague, and parent involvement in implementing SEL in schools. I also recommend schools amend their mission to declare their commitment to becoming trauma informed schools. The CLA might provide more implementation modeling to the schools to aid with logistics of implementing trauma-informed practices in their schools. Finally, I recommend the CLA program develop a system for measuring program outcomes.

Introduction

Background

Much research has been done proving the link between Adverse Childhood Events and long-term social, emotional, and physical health outcomes in adults.¹ The term Adverse Childhood Events (ACEs) encompasses many experiences such as abuse, neglect, unstable home life, loss of a parent, parental drug use, etc.² Research has shown that the most effective way to counteract and prevent the harm done by ACEs is to promote stability in the child's larger social circle and community including within the school.³ Social Emotional Learning (SEL) programs within schools have been shown to be one of the best ways to provide support and nurture resilience in children experiencing ACEs.⁴ Social emotional skills have also been shown to be strongly related to how well a child does academically and how likely they are to succeed in life post-graduation. Yet, even with all the literature regarding ACEs and SEL programs, the United States still has the lowest rate of SEL programs within schools out of 32 high-resource countries studied.³

Many schools are not focusing on the development of SEL programs because of lack of resources and the expertise needed to implement these measures, which often involve an overhaul of the current school structure. The support of community-based organizations can be a good resource for school districts wishing to incorporate SEL into their curriculums. Community based organizations often have the expertise and time to develop workshops and other mechanisms for implementing SEL programs in schools. Because focusing on SEL is still a relatively new concept for school districts and community organizations, models for implementation are still in the early stages of development and piloting.

Program Description

The Collaborative Learning Academy (CLA) is a program administered by Kitsap Strong, a nonprofit organization in Kitsap County, WA. Kitsap Strong was founded by Kitsap Community Foundation, Kitsap

Public Health District, United Way, and the Suquamish Tribe in a joint effort to alleviate poverty and increase resilience in the community through the reduction of Adverse Childhood Events (ACEs).⁵ The CLA is a 9-14 month education program to train leaders in the community on responding to ACEs. The goals of the program are to have participants:

1. Develop a “shared knowledge & language” about ACEs/NEAR sciences (Neuroscience, Epigenetics, ACES, and Resilience)
2. Develop an increased understanding of the connection between various social issues (drug use, homelessness, poverty, mental health, etc.)
3. Increase their knowledge of community resources and resiliency building efforts/activities
4. Explore new ideas/strategies for helping clients affected by ACEs
5. Start challenging their “mental model” (deeply held beliefs, assumptions, thoughts) about people who have experienced ACEs

Initially, the CLA cohorts consisted of community-based organizations, but the most recent cohorts have been made up of staff from public elementary and middle schools. In the past two years, CLA cohorts have been made up of representatives from schools from three districts within Kitsap County. Each school that participated sent a team of 3-4 staff members made up of the school principal, other support staff such as school counselors or reading specialists, and a teacher representative. Participants learn about the science behind how adversity and trauma harm both the brain and lifelong health in general. They are taught techniques and strategies for building resilience. They are not expected to implement the techniques and strategies during the CLA program. The school teams received stipends to support their participation by way of substitute teacher fees and travel reimbursement. Each team also received a kit at the end of the year with many of the books/curriculum, tools etc. used or referred to throughout the CLA.

Besides the 5 primary goals of the CLA, the program for schools focused on additional student-centric lessons and strategies. The program educated participants on an expanded definition of trauma beyond the typical ACEs training and impacts of that trauma that can be seen academically, behaviorally, and in social/emotional relationships. The curriculum emphasizes the science behind the dysregulation of the central nervous system and the window of tolerance which can cause emotional or physical outbursts. It explored equity and implicit bias and their relationship to historical trauma and our own self-awareness. It emphasized the importance of the participant's own self-care and wellbeing. It also trained them on identifying their own everyday triggers and stressors. The CLA also provided the schools participating with many guides to regulation activities and tools to use with students.

Methods

Evaluation Design

An in-depth qualitative approach was used to evaluate how the CLA shifted the thinking and behavior of participants and their schools. The evaluation was conducted between June and August 2020. The goal was to interview at least 10 participants from the 2019-2020 cohort. The interviewees were each asked the same 5 questions about their relationship with the current COVID-19 pandemic life, self, students, colleagues and supervisors, and school district (Appendix I). The questions were open ended to encourage story telling. There were follow-up questions available as prompts if the initial question did not illicit enough content from the interviewee. A leading question about the participant's experience regarding the COVID-19 pandemic was added to establish common ground between interviewer and interviewee, as it deals with a common experience, and to acknowledge the pandemic's large effect on public schools.

The interviews and subsequent analysis were used to answer three primary evaluation questions:

1. Overall, did the CLA participants make positive efforts to implement trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA?
2. What are the factors that made implementing trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA more likely?
3. Did some schools do better than others at implementing trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA and why?

Sampling and Recruitment

10 participants from the CLA's 2019-2020 cohort were interviewed from June-August 2020. The interviewees were from 3 schools (2 elementary and 1 middle) in the 3 districts that participated in CLA. Each school's principal was interviewed along with 2-3 other staff members (see Appendix II for details). Interviewees were all female between the ages of 30 and 65. All were white except for one person of color, similar to the demographics of Kitsap county (82.5% white).⁶ The interviewees were recruited on a volunteer basis and were given a gift card for their participation.

Interviews were conducted after the close of the school year, during the summer months when the staff were not seeing students. All interviews were conducted via online video call because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Interviews lasted between 30 and 90 minutes.

Interview questions

Each interviewee was asked the same 5 questions and encouraged to tell stories about their experiences.

1. Can you tell me a story about the most important way in which your life has changed as a result of COVID-19? What kind of experiences have you had, either positive or negative?
2. Can you tell me a story about the most important way your own life has changed in the past year, for better or for worse, before COVID and after CLA training?

3. Can you tell me a story about the most important way your relationship with your students and their families has changed in the past year, for better or for worse, after CLA trainings and your school team meetings?
4. Can you tell me a story about the most important way your relationships with colleagues and supervisors have changed in the past year, for better or for worse, after CLA trainings and your school team meetings?
5. Can you tell me a story about the most important way your thinking about your educational philosophy as a teacher/administrator has changed in the past year, for better or for worse, after CLA trainings and your school team meetings?

If an interviewee struggled with responding to a question, they were prompted with optional follow up questions (See Appendix I for a complete version of the instrument).

Data analysis

Each interview was recorded and transcribed for analysis. The qualitative analysis focused on searching for themes in the interviews that were relevant for answering the three primary research questions. An iterative process was used with a draft list of themes identified and then refined through conversations with others on the project team.

Results

Results are organized by the three evaluation questions, with each section including a summary of the themes along with tables with the themes and illustrative quotes. Question 1 results describe the concrete changes made in the schools to implement trauma-informed care. Questions 2 and 3 focus on the factors responsible for the success or failure of those efforts

Question 1: Overall, did the CLA participants make positive efforts to implement trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA?

A number of efforts were made by participants to make changes in their schools related to trauma-informed practice (see Table 1 for representative quotes describing those changes). Schools created new infrastructure such as alternative optional seating in classrooms and safe spaces where students could go to if they needed to leave the classroom for emotional reasons. They made fidget toys and other objects available to students to help them cope with anxiety, sensory and attention disorders. An effort was made by the schools to create time dedicated to focusing on SEL curriculum both to train staff and incorporate SEL practices into the regular classroom curriculum. The schools also implemented practices to boost the personal relationships between staff, students, and families such as having staff greet all students as they enter the school every morning and learning all students' names.

Some interviewees described school efforts to provide positive feedback to students and deemphasize negative discussions about students, with the intent to both build students up in the classroom and change the overall environment within the school to be more positive. Many also made an effort to ensure that their students had relationships with other staff besides just their direct classroom teacher, which gave them an alternative adult to turn to for support. All the schools who participated in the CLA had started using "Circle" meetings both when meeting with staff and within classrooms with students. Finally, the school leadership made personal care a focus, encouraging their staff to take care of their own needs and be kind to themselves, including mindfulness training. Some schools had worked on mindfulness units with some staff members, as well.

Table 1. Practices implemented in schools as a result of the CLA initiative

<i>Themes</i>	<i>Representative quote</i>
Infrastructure: Setting aside physical spaces for recovery/regulation	"We have agreed to 'regulation spaces.' And those looked different in every classroom. But we had done a lot of work with the staff around what does that mean, and what does it look like, and what's the appropriate way to use it." – <i>Elementary2 Principal</i>
Using play objects to facilitate conversations	"(Kitsap Strong) came and was talking about ACEs and practiced the fidgets with us, and so they really got to understand that these are tools, not toys." – <i>Elementary2 Interventionist</i>
Building relationships between students and non-teaching staff	"I sent a handful of staff to restorative circle training and intentionally included some classified staff, my security guard, my ASB bookkeeper, you know, people that kids naturally go to because they're not anyone really in charge of them, they're just like this great person I get to hang out with sometimes. And I have intentionally use them as mediators, they run circles, they've got their own group of kids that come see them and that they're the touch person for, for their own regulation and support in the school." – <i>Middle1 Principal</i>
Providing praise and positive feedback	"Another one was 'praise publicly, correct privately', which seems like an easy thing to do and it is not." – <i>Middle1 Principal</i>
Adding social emotional blocks to the curriculum	"We have an SEL block for everybody. And so that was a huge thing for us to go from, here it is, we have it here in our schedule, everyone does it." – <i>Elementary1 Instructional Support Specialist</i>
Implementing "circles" for staff and students	"I think one of the ways it shifted is I mean, not that I haven't done this before, but we do a lot of circles in our building, like it's... circles are done within our classrooms. And so then, for me, in terms of our relationships with our staff, we would do circles for some of our Wednesday morning staff meetings." – <i>Elementary1 Principal</i>
Promoting personal care; e.g., mindfulness training	"We had a couple staff meetings where we talked about mindfulness or ways that teachers could integrate mindfulness in the classroom. We were going to do a book study on the 'Hope' book, with the guy who came to talk to us." – <i>Elementary1 Counselor</i>

Question 2: *What are the factors that made implementing trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA more likely?*

Both individual and contextual/environmental factors contributed to the implementation of trauma-informed practices (see Table 2 for representative quotes). On an individual level, some participants had attended extra trainings to expand their knowledge of the principals taught during CLA. Some had even conducted trainings for other staff members. Another important factor was the support they received from their own families and friends. Participants often referred to their strong support network outside of work as an important part of their ability to cope with stress at work and as a personal motivator to

deal with difficult situations. Participants also drew from their own experiences with trauma as a driver for implementing trauma-informed practices for their students. In general, participants who seemed to have strong social connections and self-awareness were more likely to have the motivation to implement the lessons from the CLA trainings.

Contextual factors also played a role in the implementation of trauma-informed practices at the school. One key factor was the leadership of the principal. Participants often remarked that their principals were the ones driving the transition to trauma-informed practices. Besides support from their principal, strong support from their district made it more likely that the schools were successful at implementation. Strong support from the district seemed to be associated with strong support from the principal, suggesting that the principals were more prepared to implement SEL programs in their schools when they had alignment with district goals and programs. Colleagues buy-in was another supporting factor; participants were more likely to feel motivated to implement practices when their colleagues were supportive and interested in joining. Having dedicated staff to help model the techniques such as circles, calming spaces, fidget toys, etc. helped many schools with colleague buy-in and implementation. Some interviewees also mentioned the importance of having staff or programs that were connected to school whose purpose was addressing trauma, such as mental health therapists and other interventionists.

It was also clear from the interviews what contextual factors were holding schools back from implementing trauma-informed practices, and these were often a lack of the supportive factors mentioned above. For example, one factor frequently mentioned was the lack of district support and funding. Many participants did not feel that their districts were in alignment with the philosophies that the CLA were teaching, which made many barriers to implementation. Lack of funding was an issue and they interviewees often mentioned that the district wasn't giving them the resources they needed to receive training.

Another support factor that participants felt was often absent was parent involvement and engagement. Many of these participants found it hard to bridge the gap between school and home and get the parents more involved. If a participant was successful at involving the parents and educating about trauma-informed practices, they were more likely to speak positively about the outcomes of the interventions they were attempting with individual students. Many of the failures that were mentioned, i.e. struggling students dropping out of school, often hinged on the success of the attempts to involve parents.

Finally, participants discussed the difficulties in implementing what they learned in CLA schoolwide. Since only 3-4 individuals from each school attended the CLA, it was up to them to teach the rest of the school. They were not provided more time or resources to accomplish this and were still expected to juggle their regular duties along with teaching trauma-informed SEL techniques to all their colleagues, students, and parents. Many struggled with concrete implementation strategies, especially if there was resistance from other school staff. The middle school participants spoke about the difficulty in translating what they were learning to the middle school environment. There was a feeling that the lessons and implementation strategies were geared more toward the elementary schools. The schools that were more successful with implementation had done a lot of work to create concrete strategies and programs. They had put in many hours and resources into implementation.

Table 2. Individual and contextual factors contributing (positively and negatively) to implementation of trauma-informed care

<i>Themes</i>	<i>Representative quotes</i>
Individual	
Attending additional trainings related to trauma-informed care	“I belong to a group called DKG, they're key women educators. So I did training with them a couple times. One was on the ACEs, just what they were and what they do to children and adults. You know, just getting them familiar with the system. The second time, we did one on restorative circles based on the work with I did with sound supports. We also gave those same presentations to the paras. We did that for the parents too, the same two presentations we did for DKG.” – <i>Elementary1 Instructional Support Specialist</i>

<i>Themes</i>	<i>Representative quotes</i>
Having supportive social networks	"I have such an amazing network within my family. My mom is a lifetime educator. She retired, rehire in CK still, she's negotiated their entire contract as an association leader. And so, we have a lot of those conversations. And then my husband is just an amazing rock and listener and totally supports what I do in education and realizes how all-encompassing this principal job is. Because it is all encompassing. And so his support has been amazing." – <i>Elementary1 Principal</i>
Relating their own experiences with trauma	"I actually experienced some pretty intensive trauma this fall. And in a very weird way, the CLA actually helped prepare me for that because I felt like I wasn't crazy. And that this is what trauma does. And this is normal." – <i>Middle1 Interventionist</i>
Building more self-awareness	"And just my own like, pausing, that just the pausing to take a second to realize, like, is this a trigger for me? And that was another big thing I took from CLA, was just figuring out your own triggers." – <i>Elementary2 Teacher</i>
Context	
Positives	
Principal leadership	"The leadership has a great deal to do with that. And you know how (New Principal) approaches that is... everything's her attitude. And she makes you want to do the same thing; she makes you want to be that teacher. She's pretty fabulous." – <i>Elementary1 Instructional Support Specialist</i>
Buy-in from other colleagues	"So, we started with a committee and we invited any staff member that wanted to be a part of it to come and have a voice. And so, we were a little nervous when we started that we wouldn't have very many people that were really on board with it. And I think 22 teachers showed up to that first meeting." – <i>Elementary2 Principal</i>
Dedicated staff time to implement	"Our interventionist was able to model a lot of that work, and then teachers were willing to take it over when she was spending less time in the classroom. So, we've gone in the last two years from having her in every classroom every week, teaching lessons with the teachers in there, depending on the grade level, she would go in for four to six weeks at a time, once a week to teach a specific skill and then not being the rest of the time." – <i>Elementary2 Principal</i>
Alignment with district goals and practices	"And they are hitting us hard as a whole district and I mean that in the best way possible, but with Aaron Jones about equity, with John Norland about Character Strong, and Clayton Cook. And so much of our professional development now is focused on SEL. And we're moving to restorative practices, which I love. We did start training." – <i>Elementary2 Interventionist</i>
Negatives	
Lack of district support	"So, the district support was not really there. In terms of like CI3T and systems. I don't think that they really understood what we're really trying to do with CI3T. It just seemed like... I think they recognize it, it was a lot of work, like they're like, 'Oh, this document looks really cool.' But I don't think they really kind of understood the need for district support." – <i>Elementary1 Principal</i>
Lack of parent involvement	"If there was some way that we could work in tandem at my school because I wanted to set up some parenting classes or something where the knowledge that I got could be imparted to the parents because I feel like that is where it's going to have to be to make our future." – <i>Elementary1 Teacher</i>
Lack of concrete implementation strategies	"It's challenging to know, like, how do we provide, you know, that training and that information, especially if you just give them some tools, that's nice. But if you don't understand the background of why the tools are important, it doesn't really mean much, and it just feels like you're giving teachers another thousand things to do, which they balk at, and so do I, unless you understand why. But having the time to explain why has been a challenge." – <i>Middle1 Interventionist</i>

Question 3: Did some schools do better than others at implementing trauma-informed practices after attending the CLA?

Of the three schools, one (Elementary2) did significantly better at implementing trauma informed practices, for many of the contextual reasons mentioned above in the discussion around Question 2. The practices noted in Question 1 were implemented more widely and enthusiastically in Elementary2, and seemed more likely to be sustained. Key factors responsible for the relative success of Elementary2, and the struggles of the other two schools are summarized with illustrative quotes in Table 3.

A key success factor was district support. Elementary2 respondents felt that their district was supportive of their efforts and were better aligned with their SEL goals. Because their views of their district were so positive, they may also feel more supported when working with their students and this may have boosted their motivation toward taking action with students, which reflected in their implementation of trauma-informed practices being significantly better than the other two schools. By contrast the other 2 schools (Elementary1, Middle1) saw their districts as disinterested or negative about trauma informed practices. They felt that the districts' goals were not aligned with the CLA and that they did not provide the funding to attend trainings and implement new practices.

Resources, including money and time, were another key factor. Elementary2 respondents had time set aside for both formal trainings and relationship building while in the other 2 schools the time was limited and trauma-informed practices were often pushed off the agenda. And money was found to support the program at Elementary2 while the others mentioned a struggle to find funding.

Two additional factors contributing to the relative success of Elementary2 were buy-in from colleagues and parent support. As momentum was built at Elementary2 that fed the interest of other colleagues who then engaged with the activities. The lack of early momentum and leadership at the other two

schools meant that other colleagues were less likely to engage. And parent involvement was part of the culture at Elementary2 which facilitated their engagement in the trauma-informed work.

Table 3. Comparing strong vs. weak implementers

Themes	Representative quotes	
	Elementary2	Elementary1/Middle1
District support/ alignment	<p>“I think the district is just on point with their training right now.” – <i>Elementary2 Teacher</i></p> <p>“We've been given the trust and the freedom to go forward with this work, knowing that it is in alignment with the district beliefs.” – <i>Elementary2 Principal</i></p>	<p>“I don't know that we have a really clear, consistent support district wide, but I am hopeful that is kind of shifting and changing.” – <i>Middle1 Counselor</i></p> <p>“Do I think that people who are in charge of supporting me as far as like my bosses and things, do they really understand it? They don't. Because how could they really? Right? They haven't been through it.” – <i>Middle1 Principal</i></p>
Time for implementation	<p>“I have never spoken to a lot of these teachers. And then once we were put in the same “house” (a group of teachers and students from across the school.), we actually took the time to get to know each other. And we realize we were meant to be in this house together because of our characteristics and everything. And we've actually built a lot of relationships that I never would have taken the time to do before.” – <i>Elementary2 Teacher</i></p>	<p>“And we, during staff meetings, would do little snippets of things related to what we learned to roll out sort of what was happening. As you know, time is so valuable, and our little snippets sometimes got pushed off and didn't get carried through with.” – <i>Elementary1 Teacher</i></p>
Funding	<p>“The district had also been funding us to go through training from the Act program.” - <i>Elementary2 Teacher</i></p>	<p>“There's never enough money, let's just put that out there now, there's never enough money for what I feel like our kids really, truly need.” – <i>Middle1 Teacher</i></p> <p>“I immediately go to, ‘No, no one's giving me extra money to make this happen in my school.’” – <i>Middle1 Principal</i></p> <p>“A lot of our problems are funding to go to these things. We have no money to go to these things and then once you're there, you know, like you said, how do you transfer that knowledge to other people? How do you simulate that to the folks? Is always a challenge. Time is a challenge.” – <i>Elementary1 Instructional Support Specialist</i></p>

<i>Themes</i>	<i>Representative quotes</i>	
Colleague buy-in	<p>“So many of our staff from all over district were signing up for this because they wanted to be a part of it, which I loved because I'm like, Oh my gosh, so many people are open to this. Then they're interested and they want to know what they can do, even in a classroom setting, because that's honestly where the most change needs to happen.” – <i>Elementary2 Interventionist</i></p> <p>“Our staff actually, for the most part, you know, there's always one or two, but for them, for the most part our staff was really excited about those strategies.” - <i>Elementary2 Teacher</i></p>	<p>“So, the staff members who were a little bit afraid of circles are saying, ‘Oh, I just don't have enough time to do that. It's going to take too much time.’” – <i>Elementary1 Principal</i></p> <p>“You're working with so many different individuals. And some are really receptive, some are not. And that can be a problem.” – <i>Elementary1 Teacher</i></p>
Parent involvement	<p>“So, I usually get really close to my parents, if they allow me, some of them don't, you know, want that teacher parent relationship. But yeah, for the most part I invite parents into my classroom all the time.” – <i>Elementary2 Teacher</i></p>	<p>“We're working on some mindset shifts as a staff, but there does tend to be a, ‘families don't care, they're not involved.’” – <i>Middle1 Interventionist</i></p> <p>“If we can somehow engage the parents in this knowledge in a positive way that doesn't make them feel like we're like setting them up because they're in this classified group of people that you know.” – <i>Elementary1 Teacher</i></p>

Summary and Recommendations

This evaluation used a qualitative approach to assess the impact of the Collaborative Learning Academy training program on trauma-informed practice in three schools and to understand factors that made it more or less successful. Several practices were implemented ranging from the use of fidget toys to facilitate conversations to embedding trauma informed care into the regular curriculum. One of the three participating schools was significantly more successful at implementation than the other two, largely because of contextual factors such as principal leadership, district support, and buy-in from colleagues.

The following are recommendations based on the success factors identified by the evaluation:

District involvement: It was apparent from the interviews that implementation of the CLA trainings was more successful at the school whose district was also in line with the goals of the CLA program. The two other districts struggled because they did not feel supported by their districts in the goal to implement trauma-informed practices in their schools. Therefore, involving the districts in the CLA trainings would be an ideal way to ensure that the goals of the district and the individual schools were better aligned.

District and school mission change: The school that succeeded the most with implementation of practices from the CLA had undergone an entire school mission change to become a trauma informed school. They held meetings and created programs within the school to reinforce their new mission. This created clear expectations for staff, students and parents and created a schoolwide environment to support trauma informed practices. Their new mission also closely aligned the with the districtwide shift to implement more trauma informed programs. For these reasons, to be successful at implementing the CLA practices, a mission change at both the school and district level is key.

Colleague involvement: Since each school sent 3-4 staff members to the CLA, it was up to them to train the rest of the staff on the things they learned. Many interviewees struggled with disseminating this information to their colleagues. When the school lacked colleague buy-in, they were less successful at schoolwide implementation. To aid with successful schoolwide implementation, the CLA should either provide full staff trainings or provide their participants methods and strategies to train other staff members.

Implementation modeling: The participants from the CLA not only struggled to train other staff at their schools, but they struggled with implementation practices in general. The schools that were able to come up with solid implementation models were more successful, but that took heavy lifting on their

part. The CLA could provide schools with planned models for implementation to relieve some of this burden.

Parent involvement: To fully address students' ACE's, they must be supported by their community, especially their parents. Interviewees were asked about how the schools were involving parents in their trauma informed practices and most responded that there was very little parent involvement. The CLA should include a session focused on parent involvement that gives the participants strategies for educating parents and increasing their involvement in the school's trauma informed practices.

Measured outcomes: Currently the CLA lacks a method to show the effectiveness of their intervention program. It is important they come up with a system to measure outcomes that will show the value of their program and where improvements could be made. With measured outcomes, they will be able to tell what parts of the programs they should continue to build on and what parts should be modified.

References:

1. Anda, R. F., Felitti, V. J., Bremner, J. D., Walker, J. D., Whitfield, C., Perry, B. D., Dube, S. R., & Giles, W. H. (2006). The enduring effects of abuse and related adverse experiences in childhood. A convergence of evidence from neurobiology and epidemiology. *European archives of psychiatry and clinical neuroscience*, 256(3), 174–186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-005-0624-4>
2. Rariden, C., SmithBattle, L., Yoo, J. H., Cibulka, N., & Loman, D. (2021). Screening for Adverse Childhood Experiences: Literature Review and Practice Implications. *The journal for nurse practitioners : JNP*, 17(1), 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nurpra.2020.08.002>
3. Biglan, A., Van Ryzin, M. J., & Hawkins, J. D. (2017). Evolving a More Nurturing Society to Prevent Adverse Childhood Experiences. *Academic pediatrics*, 17(7S), S150–S157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2017.04.002>
4. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: a meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child development*, 82(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
5. Kitsap Community Foundation. Collaborative Learning Academy (CLA). Kitsap Strong. <https://www.kitsapstrong.org/cla-page>.
6. U.S. Census Bureau (2021). QuickFacts Kitsap County, Washington. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/kitsapcountywashington/PST045221>.

Appendix I – Interview Questions

Domains	Interview Questions
1 Relationship with COVID-19 new world	<p><i>Can you tell me a story about the MOST IMPORTANT way in which your life has changed as a result of COVID-19? What kind of experiences have you had, either positive or negative?</i></p> <p>Sample Follow-Up Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where did this happen? When did this happen? Who else was involved? • How did this experience make you feel? What were you thinking at the time? • What did you do, specifically? What did that involve or require of you? • Did the CLA Kitsap Strong training on trauma/resilience help with your online work experience while school was still in session? If so, how? If not, why not? • Why did you choose to share THIS experience?
2 Relationship with SELF before COVID, after CLA	<p><i>Can you tell me a story about the MOST IMPORTANT way your own life has changed in the PAST YEAR, FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE, before COVID and after CLA training?</i></p> <p>Sample Follow-Up Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you believe caused this change? Where did this happen? When did it happen? Was anyone else involved? • Did the CLA training affect your life outside of school? How? • How did this experience make you feel? What were you thinking at the time? • Why did you choose to share THIS experience?
3 Relationship with students at your school before COVID, after CLA	<p><i>Can you tell me a story about the MOST IMPORTANT way your relationship with your students and their families has changed in the PAST YEAR, FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE, after CLA trainings and your school team meetings?</i></p> <p>Sample Follow-Up Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where did this happen? When did it happen? Who was there? • How did this experience make you feel? What were you thinking at the time? • Did the CLA training effect your relationships with students, parents? How? • Why did you choose to share THIS experience?
4 Relationship with colleagues and supervisors at your school before COVID, after CLA	<p><i>Can you tell me a story about the MOST IMPORTANT way your relationships with colleagues and supervisors have changed in the PAST YEAR, FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE, after CLA trainings and your school team meetings?</i></p> <p>Sample Follow-Up Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you believe caused this change? When did it happen? Was anyone else involved? • What challenges or support did you get from colleagues and supervisors? • How did this experience make you feel? What were you thinking at the time? • Why did you choose to share THIS experience?
5 Relationship with school district and OSPI: educational philosophy (values, mission) after CLA	<p><i>Can you tell me a story about the MOST IMPORTANT way your thinking about your educational philosophy as a teacher/administrator has changed in the PAST YEAR, FOR BETTER OR FOR WORSE, after CLA trainings and your school team meetings?</i></p> <p>Sample Follow-Up Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do other educators and the district share your philosophy? Can you provide examples? • When did it happen? Why? Was it CLA-related? Was anyone else involved? • How did this experience make you feel? What were you thinking at the time? • What challenges did you confront? How did you respond to this change? • Why did you choose to share THIS experience?

Appendix II – Interviewee profiles

Interview ID	Interview Date	School Code	Title/Role	District Code	Length
001	7.13.20	Elementary01	Instructional Support Specialist	D01	0:55
002	7.13.20	Elementary01	3rd grade teacher	D01	0:59
003	7.16.20	Elementary01	Principal	D01	1:01
004	7.20.20	Middle01	Reading Intervention Teacher	D02	0:42
005	7.27.20	Elementary02	Principal	D03	1:00
006	8.21.20	Elementary02	2nd grade teacher	D03	0:50
007	8.21.20	Elementary02	Interventionist	D03	0:46
008	8.27.20	Middle01	Principal	D02	0:47
009	8.27.20	Elementary01	School Counselor	D01	0:33
010	8.28.20	Middle01	Science Teacher	D02	0:29