Higher Learning Lab · Free research resource · CC BY-NC 4.0

Guardians of the Record: Precision Methods in Care-Centered Documentation

Bjorn, Genevive (Higher Learning Lab)

Published 2025-11-13 by Higher Learning Lab, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, Dover, Delaware.

Canonical version: https://www.higherlearninglab.org/portfolio/guardians-of-the-record-precision-methods-in-care-centered-documentation/

Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0.

By Higher Learning Lab

Citation: Bjorn, G. (2025). *Guardians of the record: Precision methods in care-centered documentation*. Higher Learning Lab. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23541070

Introduction

Qualitative documentation—such as case notes, clinical records, and research field notes—plays a critical role in education, health care, and child welfare. In the context of vulnerable populations (e.g., children in foster care), these records are used not only for day-to-day care coordination but are also aggregated to inform policies and practices[1]. Ensuring ethical standards in how we document qualitative information is essential to protecting participants, upholding data quality, and improving outcomes. Below, we explore key ethical themes—such as informed consent, privacy/confidentiality, data integrity, reflexivity, and trauma-informed practices—drawing on peer-reviewed research from the past 20 years. Each section summarizes the findings and recommendations, followed by a case study that demonstrates these principles at the intersection of child welfare, education, and pediatric care.

Key words: documentation, education, health care, foster care, youth, qualitative methods

Informed Consent with Vulnerable Children

Informed consent is foundational for ethical practice, signaling respect for children's dignity and their right to have a say in matters affecting them[2]. When documenting information or conducting qualitative research involving minors, especially those in foster care, special consent procedures apply. Children cannot legally consent on their own; typically, a parent or legal guardian's permission is required, alongside the child's assent (the child's affirmative agreement) when feasible[3][4]. In foster care, the "parent" may be a state agency or court-appointed guardian, which complicates consent processes. A recent systematic review found no consistent standard for obtaining informed consent in minimal-risk studies involving foster youth—different studies required various combinations of caseworkers, foster parents, biological parents, judges, or guardians ad litem to consent[5]. About 88% of those studies sought the foster youth's own assent[6], reflecting the importance of including the child's voice. The authors recommended that consent in such cases involve whoever has legal authority and

understands the youth's best interests, while avoiding overly burdensome procedures [7]. A clear consensus or policy on consent requirements would facilitate ethical participation in research by foster children[7].

Key elements of **informed consent** with children include:

- **Comprehension:** Explaining the purpose and procedures in age-appropriate language so the child can understand what participation or documentation entails[8].
- **Voluntariness:** Ensuring the decision to participate (or share information) is made freely, without coercion or undue influence[9].
- **Assent and Ongoing Consent:** Gaining the child's assent in addition to guardian consent, and **renegotiating consent over time**. Children should know they can withdraw or dissent at any stage[10][11].
- **Informing of Rights:** Clarifying what confidentiality means, and that saying "no" will not result in punishment. This reinforces autonomy and aligns with children's rights under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (e.g., the right to be heard in decisions, Article 12)[12].

In practice, obtaining informed consent in a school, clinic, or child welfare setting may require coordination. For example, a social worker might seek a court's or agency's permission for a foster child to be interviewed for a study, and also explain the process to the child to get their assent. Ethically, all parties should be **fully informed** about how the child's information will be used, and the child should be as involved as possible in decisions about their participation[2].

Privacy and Confidentiality

Respecting privacy and confidentiality is paramount when documenting sensitive information about children[13]. Professionals must protect what a child shares and control who can access records. This involves secure data storage, de-identifying information in reports, and sharing details only on a need-to-know basis. **Best practices** include:

- **Confidential Record-Keeping:** Keep case files and notes in secure systems; use pseudonyms or initials in research reports to anonymize identities[14][15]. For instance, a school counselor's qualitative notes about a foster child's behavior

should be stored in a protected file and not casually emailed or left visible.

- **Limiting Disclosure:** Obtain consent before sharing a child's information across systems. Even though collaboration between schools, healthcare providers, and child welfare agencies is crucial for holistic care, it must be done lawfully and ethically. Only authorized individuals (e.g., a foster care caseworker, the child's therapist, or teacher) should receive pertinent information, and even then, only what they need for the child's benefit[13][16]. If, for example, a pediatrician needs to inform a school of a child's medication or trauma triggers, proper releases should be in place.
- **Clarifying Limits to Confidentiality:** Children and caregivers should be informed that some issues cannot be kept confidential. If a child discloses abuse or serious harm, the professional is mandated to report it, even if that means breaking confidentiality[17][18]. Ethically, this should be explained in a gentle, non-frightening way. For example, a researcher might say: "What you share is private, except if you tell me someone is hurting you or you want to hurt yourself—then I might need to get help to keep you safe."
- **Cultural Sensitivity in Privacy:** Be aware of different cultural or community norms about privacy. In some contexts, families or foster communities may operate more collectively, and a child might expect information to be shared with certain relatives or figures. Researchers and practitioners should navigate these expectations carefully, always centering the child's **best interests** (a core principle in UNCRC Article 3) while upholding ethical standards[19].

Ultimately, maintaining confidentiality builds trust. Children (especially those who have been in foster care or institutional settings) need to trust that their stories and personal details will not be misused. Upholding privacy is an expression of the ethical principle of **non-maleficence**—doing no harm by preventing unauthorized disclosure that could lead to stigma or emotional harm[20].

Data Integrity and Accuracy in Documentation

Beyond individual ethics, qualitative documentation must be **accurate, thorough, and unbiased** to serve its broader functions. Case notes and records from educators, healthcare providers, and child welfare workers become part of administrative

data that drive decisions about interventions, funding, and policy[1]. If the data are incomplete or distorted, there is a risk of flawed decisions that can adversely affect children's lives[21]. Peer-reviewed research underscores several challenges and recommendations regarding data integrity:

- **Completeness and Standardization:** For documentation to be useful at a system level, it should capture all relevant information in a consistent format[22]. In practice, this means a teacher writing an incident report or a social worker logging a home visit should follow guidelines so that key data (dates, observations, actions taken) aren't left out. Standardized templates or training can help achieve this completeness[22].
- **Bias and Omission:** Studies have found that *who is documenting and under what conditions* can introduce bias. For example, child welfare workers may under-record details if they perceive an allegation of maltreatment as less severe [23]. Personal beliefs or implicit biases about families' race or background can also skew assessments and what gets written down[24]. At the systemic level, high caseloads and a lack of cultural competence training contribute to inconsistencies in records[25]. Such biases embedded in case files can propagate through aggregate data—potentially magnifying disparities (e.g., underreporting of Indigenous children's needs, as found in Canadian child welfare data)[26][27]. Ethically, professionals should strive for objectivity and self-awareness in documentation (more on reflexivity below), double-checking that they report facts and relevant context rather than assumptions.
- **Transparency about Audience:** Interestingly, knowing who will read a record can affect *how* it is written. One study noted that workers might choose not to record certain information or soften their language if they know a case file could be accessed widely [28]. This highlights an ethical tension—while it's prudent to be respectful in language, omitting critical details out of fear of judgment can compromise data integrity. Organizations should create an environment where staff feel safe to document truthfully, and where records are used constructively (not punitively against the worker or child).
- **Impact on Policy and Care:** Inaccurate documentation doesn't just affect one case—it can mislead policy. In the rationale for their national study of Canadian child welfare recording, Pollock et al. (2025) caution that biases and errors in frontline recording may yield distorted statistics, which, in turn, misinform practice and policy at higher levels [29]. For

example, if trauma-related behaviors are frequently mislabeled as "misconduct" in school records, aggregate data might show a high rate of "behavioral problems" and prompt punitive policy responses, rather than trauma-informed supports. Thus, maintaining high-quality, honest documentation is an ethical responsibility that ultimately benefits broader decision-making and resource allocation[30].

To promote data integrity, experts recommend **training and supervision** focused on quality recording, the use of checklists or review systems to catch omissions, and fostering a culture of reflection to mitigate bias [25][24]. By treating documentation not as a perfunctory task but as a professional duty tied to outcomes, practitioners can improve both individual case management and the reliability of data that shape policies.

Reflexivity and Bias Awareness

Reflexivity is a crucial ethical practice in qualitative research, primarily when power imbalances exist (such as when adult professionals document the lives of children). In qualitative research terms, reflexivity means continuously examining how the researcher's or practitioner's own perspectives, assumptions, and interactions influence the data and its interpretation[31]. Rather than pretending to be a neutral recorder, one acknowledges one's role in the process. This concept, prominent in the last two decades of social science research, carries several ethical implications:

- Researchers and practitioners are encouraged to **document their impressions and thought processes** alongside raw observations[31]. For instance, a fieldworker in a foster home might note, "I was feeling frustrated by the child's refusal to speak, which might have affected how I asked questions." By recording such reflections, one can later distinguish between the child's data and the adult's internal reactions.
- Reflexivity is tied to **ethical vigilance**. An "ethical reflexivity" approach urges constant awareness of power dynamics and the rights of child participants[32][33]. Children, especially in vulnerable situations, have historically been viewed as passive subjects. Modern ethics emphasize treating children as active participants with equal consideration[32]. Practically, this means being mindful: Are we interpreting a child's story through a biased lens? Are we imposing our own narratives? Reflexive self-questioning can prevent unintentional misrepresentation or harm.

- In settings with foster children, power asymmetry is a given—adults hold authority. Reflexivity calls on those adults (be they researchers, teachers, or social workers) to **consciously flatten that hierarchy**when possible. For example, a researcher might share their notes or preliminary interpretations with youth advisors or the children themselves to check for accuracy ("Does this sound like what you meant?"), thereby validating the child's perspective. This practice aligns with the idea of **"ethical symmetry"**, where a child's feelings and interests are given as much weight as an adult's[32].
- Reflexivity also improves **data trustworthiness**. By critically analyzing how data are produced, one can account for potential biases in the final analysis[31]. In professional practice, a caseworker who regularly engages in reflexive supervision (discussing their reactions and decisions with a mentor or team) is more likely to identify biases (e.g., realizing they write more negative comments about teen boys than girls, or about certain ethnic groups) and correct them. This self-correction leads to fairer documentation.

In summary, reflexivity is an ethical mindset of **self-scrutiny**. It requires humility—accepting that one's own background (culture, training, mood, etc.) can color documentation—and proactive strategies (journaling, peer debriefing, seeking children's feedback) to ensure the documented qualitative material remains as authentic and respectful as possible[31][34]. By doing so, we not only produce better research but also model respect and transparency in everyday educational and clinical documentation.

Trauma-Informed Documentation Practices

Children in foster care often have histories of trauma, abuse, neglect, loss, or other adverse experiences. A trauma-informed approach acknowledges these experiences and adapts practices to avoid re-traumatization and support healing. **Trauma-informed documentation** means recording information in a manner that is sensitive, factual, and focused on the child's needs and context, rather than on judgment or blame [35]. Key recommendations from emerging literature and practice include:

- **Use Neutral, Factual Language:** Describe behaviors and events objectively, without derogatory labels. For example, instead of writing "Child threw a tantrum for no good reason," a trauma-informed note might read, "Child became extremely upset and cried for 15 minutes when a loud bell rang, displaying signs of distress (covering ears, yelling)." This

phrasing sticks to observable facts and hints at a trigger (the loud noise) rather than casting the child as "problematic." Documentation should focus on *what happened* and the *child's responses*, not subjective moral judgments[35].

- **Note Trauma Triggers and Context:** Whenever possible, connect the dots between a child's background and their behavior or feelings. For instance, if a foster youth refuses to sleep in their bed and opts to sleep on the floor, a caseworker might document this along with a note that the child previously slept on floors during a neglectful period—indicating a possible trauma-linked comfort behavior. Recognizing these patterns in writing helps ensure care plans are responsive (e.g., a therapist reading the notes will know to address that trauma history). As one guide emphasizes, records should highlight *triggers or concerns observed* during interactions[35] so that subsequent caregivers or professionals can approach the child with understanding.
- **Avoid Graphic Details and Retraumatization:** While accuracy is crucial, there is often a delicate balance in documenting traumatic events. Professionals should include enough detail to be useful (e.g., noting signs of physical injury, general nature of abuse) but avoid gratuitous specifics that could be re-traumatizing if the child or others read them. Moreover, children's testimonies or narratives should be handled with care—ideally, **in the child's own words** whenever possible, and only after establishing trust and safety. A *survivor-centered* documentation approach means the child's comfort and well-being take precedence over exhaustive data collection[36][37]. For example, a psychologist performing a trauma assessment might note "Child disclosed experiencing violence in past foster home (details in confidential addendum)," keeping the main file focused and flagging that further detail exists but is protected.
- **Empowerment and Strengths:** Trauma-informed practice isn't only about handling bad stuff gently; it's also about recognizing resilience. Ethical documentation should capture the child's strengths, coping strategies, and positive developments. A teacher might document that a student used a calming technique (such as deep breathing) during a moment of stress, highlighting the child's progress. This balanced approach ensures that records do not paint the child solely as a victim or a bundle of issues, but as a whole person with agency and potential. It aligns with **rights-based approaches** that support child autonomy and well-being[37].

- **Consistency and Training:** Research indicates a lack of standardization in trauma-informed documentation across many settings [38]. Hence, institutions are beginning to provide tools and checklists (for example, trauma-informed forms review processes[39]) to guide staff. Training professionals across sectors—teachers, nurses, social workers—in trauma-informed principles helps create a common language. By emphasizing empathy and inclusive language in documentation, organizations seek to ensure every note or report contributes to a safer environment for the child. As a practical tip, some agencies encourage writers to imagine how the child (now or in the future) or the child's loved one might feel reading the record. If the wording could cause unnecessary hurt or shame, it likely needs revision.

In sum, trauma-informed documentation intertwines ethics and care. It requires vigilance to avoid compounding trauma through our words and to be intentional in how we frame each child's story. This not only protects the child's psychological safety but also produces records that are more useful for planning effective, compassionate interventions. Trauma-informed records help interdisciplinary teams to coordinate approaches that foster trust and healing, rather than inadvertently triggering or alienating the child.

Case Study: Coordinated Ethical Documentation in Practice

Background: *Aiden* is a 10-year-old child in foster care who is navigating the education and health care systems. He has been in two foster homes and currently lives with a foster mother, *Ms. Lee*. Aiden attends a public elementary school and has weekly visits with a pediatric therapist for anxiety. He has a history of early childhood trauma (exposure to domestic violence) and struggles with concentration and occasional outbursts in class. This case study illustrates how professionals in child welfare, education, and health care apply qualitative documentation methods ethically to support Aiden.

Informed Consent and Assent: Aiden's social worker, *Mr. Rivera*, is coordinating a new school-based behavioral intervention for him. Before anything begins, Mr. Rivera ensures proper consent is in place. Legally, the child welfare agency (as Aiden's guardian) must consent to services and the sharing of information between the school and health providers. Mr. Rivera contacts the agency's legal guardian to obtain written consent for Aiden to participate in the intervention

and for relevant data (like therapy progress notes and school reports) to be shared among the team. He also visits Aiden to explain in child-friendly terms what the plan is: "We have a helper at school who will work with you on feeling better when you get upset. Is that okay with you? You can tell us anytime if you don't want to do something." By seeking Aiden's **assent**, Mr. Rivera honors the spirit of informed consent, making sure Aiden knows he has a say. Aiden agrees with a nod. This process exemplifies how **autonomy** is respected even when formal consent involves multiple adults—Aiden's voice is included, not overlooked[2][7].

Privacy and Confidentiality Measures: Once consent is secured, information sharing begins under strict confidentiality. The school principal and Aiden's teacher, *Ms. Carter*, receive a summary of Aiden's background prepared by Mr. Rivera. The summary notes that Aiden has experienced trauma and anxiety, but it omits unnecessary personal details (e.g., it doesn't describe the violence in detail) to protect Aiden's privacy. It only states, "Aiden has some challenging memories from early childhood that can make him feel unsafe or upset in certain situations." Ms. Carter is advised that this information is confidential and is to be used only to tailor Aiden's support plan. Similarly, Aiden's therapist, *Dr. Nguyen*, is given a copy of the school's behavioral reports. To maintain privacy, the reports use initials instead of full names for other students involved in incidents, and they are transmitted via a secure, encrypted email system. Everyone involved has been briefed on **the limits of confidentiality.** For example, if Aiden mentions any new abuse or danger, that information will be reported to authorities immediately (as required by law). All parties—Mr. Rivera, Ms. Carter, Dr. Nguyen, and Ms. Lee (foster mother)—meet and agree on a communication protocol: they will hold monthly team meetings to discuss Aiden's progress rather than exchanging daily, detailed records, thereby minimizing the frequency with which sensitive information is circulated. This coordinated approach upholds confidentiality while ensuring the **circle of care** has the information needed to help Aiden[13][14].

Data Integrity and Objective Recording: Ms. Carter begins a daily journal to track Aiden's behavior and classroom triggers. Following training in qualitative observation, she writes objective, detailed entries. For example, instead of writing "Aiden was bad in class today," she logs: "**10/12, 9:30 am:** Aiden left his seat and crawled under the desk after the fire drill alarm sounded. He stayed there for 5 minutes, covering his ears. When I gently spoke to him, he said, 'Too loud…scary.'" Such documentation captures the event factually (time, action, child's quote) and provides context (the loud

alarm as a trigger). Later that day, she writes: "**10/12, 1 pm:** Aiden got upset when asked to read aloud. He crumpled his worksheet and yelled, 'I won't!' After a break in the calm corner, he explained he felt 'nervous to read.'" These notes avoid judgmental language and ensure **accuracy and completeness**—anyone reading them can understand what happened and why. Mr. Rivera also keeps case notes from his home visits. During one visit, he notices the foster mother struggling to get Aiden to sleep in his own bed. In his documentation, he notes: "Foster mother reports Aiden often chooses to sleep on the floor next to his bed. This might relate to past experiences; will consult therapist." By recording this, Mr. Rivera adds a piece to the puzzle regarding Aiden's behavior, which Dr. Nguyen can work on in therapy. All these records are dated and signed, and they follow agency guidelines (each entry is reviewed by Mr. Rivera's supervisor monthly for thoroughness). The commitment to data integrity means that, over time, Aiden's file becomes a reliable source of information. It can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention and even contribute to statistics—for instance, if the program succeeds, the documented results might justify policy expansion for other foster children in schools[29].

Reflexivity in Practice: Throughout this process, the professionals engage in reflexivity. Dr. Nguyen, the therapist, reflects on her own reactions in session. In one note, she writes privately (for herself): "I noticed I felt very protective when Aiden talked about his past. Need to ensure I'm empowering him, not pitying him." By acknowledging this, she guards against inadvertently treating Aiden as helpless—an attitude that could slip into her documentation or therapy if unchecked. Ms. Carter attends a peer group for teachers of trauma-affected students where she shares and examines her experiences. She realizes she initially interpreted Aiden's desk-hiding as defiance or refusal to follow rules. Through discussion, she recognizes this as a misinterpretation influenced by her expectation that students "follow protocol" during drills. She adjusts her perspective and notes going forward that such actions are *fear responses*, not willful misbehavior. This **reflexive practice** improves the way she documents and responds to Aiden—her later entries explicitly mention when a behavior seems tied to anxiety. Mr. Rivera similarly journals about his case management: after meetings, he writes down any biases he feels. In one instance, he caught himself focusing more on adverse incidents than positive progress when talking to the team. As a corrective step, his subsequent report started with Aiden's improvements (e.g., "no outbursts for 3 days after implementing breathing exercises") before listing remaining challenges. This conscious self-monitoring and course correction embody reflexivity, ensuring that Aiden's story is told fairly and empathetically[31].

Trauma-Informed Documentation in Action: All parties make an effort to be trauma-informed in their notes and communication. When the team develops Aiden's individualized education plan (IEP) addendum for behavior, they phrase the goals and present levels in a trauma-sensitive manner. The IEP document states: "Aiden experiences anxiety and fear in certain situations (e.g., loud noises, being called on unexpectedly). These reactions are rooted in past traumatic stress.

Strengths: Aiden is creative and shows kindness to classmates; he responds well to one-on-one encouragement.

Supports: Provide warning for fire drills, offer noise-cancelling headphones, and allow Aiden a quiet space when overwhelmed." By including strengths, the documentation avoids painting Aiden as merely a "problem child." It also directly ties supports to trauma triggers, demonstrating how understanding the trauma leads to specific accommodations. In therapy progress notes, Dr. Nguyen similarly documents without stigmatizing: rather than "Patient refused to talk about his father," she writes, "Patient was hesitant to discuss certain family memories today; respected his pace and focused on coping skills." This respects Aiden's boundaries (empowerment is a core trauma-informed principle) and avoids negative wording such as "refused," which could be interpreted as non-compliance. Over time, these trauma-informed documents serve another purpose: they educate everyone who reads them about *why* Aiden might behave a certain way and *how* to respond supportively. Ms. Lee, the foster mom, is given copies of key summaries. She admits that before, she thought Aiden was just being difficult at bedtime, but reading the notes about trauma triggers helped her understand his needs. She adjusts her approach (letting him keep a nightlight and some pillows on the floor) to make him feel safe. This illustrates how ethical documentation can directly influence care—by spreading a trauma-informed understanding, it aligns the efforts of family, school, and healthcare with the child's best interests.

Outcome and Reflections: Six months later, Aiden is doing better. The school reports show a decline in behavioral incidents. In a wrap-up meeting, the team reviews the documentation to evaluate the intervention. Because the records were detailed and consistent, they can track patterns (e.g., after introducing headphones and calming strategies, Aiden's fire-drill meltdowns stopped). Dr. Nguyen presents a brief report to the child welfare agency, using Aiden's case (with identifying details removed) as evidence that trauma-informed, collaborative approaches improve foster children's school adjustment. This contributes to a proposal for funding similar

programs in other schools—a direct line from **ethical documentation to policy influence**. The agency's administrators, seeing the clear documentation of both challenges and improvements, approve an expansion of the approach.

The case of Aiden demonstrates how qualitative documentation methods and ethics come together in practice. By securing informed consent, respecting confidentiality, keeping accurate and unbiased records, engaging in reflexivity, and using a trauma-informed lens, the professionals created a comprehensive picture of Aiden's needs and progress. This ethical groundwork built trust with Aiden and among the team, enabled more effective coordinated care in the present, and generated knowledge to inform better practices for the future. The lessons from Aiden's story reinforce what the research tells us: **when we document with care and ethics, we amplify children's voices and improve the systems designed to help them**.

References

[1] [21] [22] [23] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [29] [30] [40] Pollock, N. J., Yantha, C., Tonmyr, L., Jewers-Dailley, K., & Morton Ninomiya, M. E. (2025). Child welfare worker perspectives on documentation and case recording practices in Canada: A mixed-methods study protocol. *PLOS ONE, 20*(1), e0316238. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0316238

[2] [3] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] Ethical Research Involving Children. (n.d.). Informed consent. UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti. Retrieved November 1, 2025, from https://childethics.com/informed-consent/

[4] [5] [6] [7] Greiner, M. V., Beal, S. J., Allen, A., Patel, V., Meinzen-Derr, J., & Antommaria, A. H. M. (2018). Who speaks for me? Addressing variability in informed consent practices for minimal risk research involving foster youth. *Journal of Health Disparities Research and Practice, 11*(4), 111–131. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34377600/

[13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] Ethical Research Involving Children. (n.d.). Privacy and confidentiality. UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti. Retrieved November 1, 2025, from https://childethics.com/privacy-and-confidentiality/

[31] [32] [33] [34] Ramos, A. C., Heite, C., Riepl, A., Weissberg, L., Bingham, N., Küng, Y., Roggensinger, A., & Steiner, J. (2025). Ethical reflexivity in research with (migrant) children: Dealing with power

asymmetries to build up more participatory approaches. *Societies, 15*(7), 171. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15070171

[35] Reed, A., Tremblay, B., & Wiersma, G. (2023). Chapter 9: Trauma-informed care. In *Community and public health nursing instructor guide*. VIVA Open Publishing. Accessed November 1, 2025, at https://viva.pressbooks.pub/cphnursing-instructor/chapter/chapter-9/

[36] [37] Physicians for Human Rights. (2024). *Child-centered documentation toolkit*. https://phr.org/our-work/resources/child-centered-documentation-toolkit/

[38] Zufer, I., Fix, R. L., Stone, E., Cane, R., Sakran, J. V., Nasr, I., & Hoops, K. (2024). Documentation of trauma-informed care elements for young people hospitalized after assault trauma. *Journal of Surgical Research*, *296*, 665-673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2024.01.030

[39] Trauma Informed Oregon. (2025, February). Trauma informed review: Assessing documentation & forms. https://traumainformedoregon.org/wp-content/uploads/Trauma-Informed-Documentation-Forms-Review-Process.pdf