

# A Trauma-Informed Care Model: Addressing Adverse Childhood Experiences in Patients with End-Stage Kidney Disease

Tiffany Breckenridge, LICSW, DSW, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN

---

*In the healthcare field, there has been increased recognition of the long-term consequences that adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) have on the health and well-being of people. It is imperative that a trauma-informed care (TIC) approach is utilized in the treatment of patients with end-stage kidney disease (ESKD) because of high rates of non-adherence and health risk behaviors. The purpose of this article is to explore current nephrology practices and TIC approaches utilized in the healthcare field. A TIC approach, through a health-belief model lens specific to the ESKD population, can be introduced by providers to better assess and treat patients. Implications for practice include standardization of TIC in social work practice, better outcomes for patients, and ongoing research considerations.*

---

## INTRODUCTION

Adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) are a public health crisis in the United States. ACEs are defined as are exposures to physical, sexual, or emotional abuse; neglect; violence; parental incarceration; substance use/misuse; and suicide (Felitti et al., 1998). Studies have shown that people exposed to ACEs are more likely to engage in health-risk behaviors (Campbell et al., 2018; Chanlongbutra, Singh, & Mueller, 2018; Felitti et al., 1998). Due to these health-risk behaviors, there is a strong correlation between ACEs and chronic health conditions, which includes, but are not limited to, diabetes, high blood pressure, and cardiovascular disease (Chanlongbutra, Singh, & Mueller, 2018; Felitti et al., 1998). Diabetes and high blood pressure are also the two leading causes of end-stage kidney disease (ESKD), which are related to poor health management and health-risk behaviors that often continue after diagnosis (Baines & Jindal, 2000; Clark et al., 2014, Leggat et al., 1998).

Similar to the challenges associated with ACEs, chronic health conditions, and health-risk behaviors, people with an ESKD diagnosis often struggle with adherence issues to treatment recommendations, such as attending dialysis treatments, medication management, and diet and fluid restrictions (Chironda & Bhengu, 2016). While there is almost no research on ESKD as related to ACEs, there is evidence that trauma-informed care (TIC) models are effective in the care of patients with chronic health conditions (Evans & Coccoma, 2014). The implementation of a TIC model for patients with ESKD is essential, as they are at higher risk of death due to health-risk behaviors and adherence issues (Baines & Jindal, 2000; Clark et al., 2014).

The purpose of this conceptual article is to explore current social work nephrology practices and the possible adaptation of TIC approaches when treating patients with ESKD. A

TIC model can be introduced through the lens of a health-belief model lens by social workers to better assess and treat patients with ESKD.

The health-belief model identifies a person's beliefs and perceptions about their health. These perceptions and beliefs predict their responses and behaviors related to their disease (Hayden, 2019; Stevenson, 2014). A person's perceptions and beliefs are influenced by their culture, heritage, education, experiences, race, or attitude (Hayden, 2019). Employing the health-belief model helps guide the structure of a TIC model for patients with ESKD, as they have unique needs and challenges that are often tied to their perceptions and beliefs related to their disease. Further, the health-belief model aims to assist social workers in understanding that trauma may be affecting a person's health choices. The health-belief model promotes the knowledge that health may be improved by identifying a person's beliefs about themselves and their health conditions, and the relationship of these beliefs with exposure to ACEs.

In this article, an argument is made for the assessment of patients with ESKD for ACEs, and for the implementation of a trauma-informed care model through the lens of a health-belief model, both being critical to their health and well-being. This development of an ESKD-specific TIC model includes initial and annual assessments for ACEs, as well as the use of TIC interventions. In understanding health-related behaviors of patients with ESKD, this model shifts focus from the person's internal characteristics and issues toward considering the effects of adverse experiences during early childhood and development. This allows social workers to better understand, treat, and care for patients with ESKD who may have histories of trauma. Additionally, this can produce better health outcomes through increased adherence behaviors for patients with ESKD than with current social

---

**Corresponding author:** Tiffany Breckenridge, LICSW, DSW; 2115 Summit Ave, St Paul, MN 55105; [tiffany.breckenridge@stthomas.edu](mailto:tiffany.breckenridge@stthomas.edu)

work practices and interventions. Moreover, further research needs to be conducted, specifically in the field of social work, on TIC for patients with ESKD. The additional research may produce more evidence for the need for TIC models and inform practice and policies.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### *Health-Belief Model*

The health-belief model is essential to recognizing the connection between health-risk behaviors and ACEs, and to implementing a trauma-informed care model for patients with ESKD. The health-belief model functions on the principle that a person's beliefs and perceptions about their health will determine their actions and decisions related to their health (Chou & Shih, 2018; Hayden, 2019; Rosenstock, 1974; Stevenson, 2014). There are three concepts that will be used in this framework; they are *perceived seriousness*, *perceived benefits*, and *perceived barriers* (Chou & Shih, 2018; Hayden, 2019). These concepts are influenced by a person's beliefs, values, culture, race, and experiences, including exposure to ACEs (Hayden, 2019).

The concept of *perceived seriousness* assumes that a person will address their health condition if they perceive it as serious enough to warrant attention (Chou & Shih, 2018; Hayden, 2019; Stevenson, 2014). Patients with ESKD who have experienced trauma may not fully recognize the seriousness of their condition and increased risk of death. Despite health discussions, some patients who have been exposed to trauma may struggle to recognize that nonadherence to treatment recommendations places them at serious risk (Chironda & Bhengu, 2016; Tuot et al., 2013). To best comprehend adherence barriers, it is important that providers understand a person's perception of the seriousness of their illness and that ACEs may be associated with these maladaptive behaviors (Evans & Coccoma, 2014; Waite & Ryan, 2020).

The concept of *perceived benefits* assumes that in order for a behavioral change to occur, a person would need to perceive the benefits of a new health behavior outweighing the cost of continuing the old behavior (Hayden, 2019). Patients with ESKD who have experienced ACEs may have difficulty seeing the benefits of changing risky behaviors to healthier ones. People who experience trauma may have an unconscious self-identity of being "damaged" and without self-value that may make it challenging for them to see the benefits of a behavioral change (Evans & Coccoma, 2014; Hornor et al., 2019; Waite & Ryan, 2020). Through a trauma-informed and health-belief-driven model of care, social workers may assist patients in recognizing the perceived benefits of a behavioral change. This may be done by helping people develop an awareness of their initial reasoning behind the maladaptive behaviors (Waite & Ryan, 2020). This may assist people with recognizing the maladaptive behaviors, engaging in healthier

coping strategies, and perceiving the benefits of changing one's health-risk behaviors.

The concept of *perceived barriers* assumes that if a person perceives an obstacle to a behavior change, they are less likely to change the behavior (Hayden, 2019; Stevenson, 2014). If the problem is viewed as too much to overcome, then the person is more likely to continue the maladaptive behavior (Hayden, 2019; Stevenson, 2014). People who have been exposed to ACEs may struggle with the ability to logically evaluate situations and will construct barriers to changing the health-risk behaviors. While motivation is essential, a person's belief in their ability to change and perception of the value of the behavior change are equally important (Hayden, 2019; Stevenson, 2014).

Uncovering the perceptions of patients with ESKD about their health and how they connect to ACEs may help them address health-risk barriers and reduce adherence issues. ACEs may negatively affect a person's perceptions and beliefs about their health, due to toxic stress. People who have experienced ACEs are more likely to experience avoidant behavior related to their health, due to maladaptive coping mechanisms (Evans & Coccoma, 2014; Hornor et al., 2019; Waite & Ryan, 2020). The health-belief model serves as a roadmap to recognizing the impact of trauma histories on patients with ESKD and the barriers these histories create. More importantly, the model can be used as a guide for social workers and providers to acknowledge that nonadherence to treatment recommendations is not an intentional act of defiance, but instead it may be a survival coping mechanism.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs)*

In 2016, 34 million children were exposed to one or more ACEs (Bethell et al., 2017). ACEs refers to exposures to traumatic experiences in children between the ages of 0 to 17 by a caregiver or parent (Felitti et al., 1998). These traumatic exposures are separated into four groups: (a) abuse (i.e., emotional, physical, or sexual); (b) neglect (i.e., physical and emotional); (c) household challenges (i.e., domestic violence; parental/caregiver incarceration; chemical misuse/dependency, separation or divorce of caregivers, and parental/caregiver mental health challenges); and (d) community violence (Bethell et al., 2017; Centers for Disease Control & Prevention [CDC], 2019; Felitti et al., 1998; Waite & Ryan, 2020). The ACEs score is a calculation of each of the above categories that a person may have experienced (CDC, 2019). Each exposure in a specific category accumulates a higher ACE score.

A seminal study by Felitti et al. (1998) brought widespread attention to the connection between ACEs and long-term chronic health issues in adulthood. A strong correlation was

found between the development of chronic health conditions, risky health behaviors, and the number of ACEs experienced by a person (Felitti et al., 1998). These studies found a “graded dose-response” between an increased number of ACEs and the leading causes of death in the U.S. (Bethell et al., 2017; Felitti et al., 1998, p. 250). A dose-response means that with an increase in the number of ACEs a person experiences, the more likely they are to develop chronic diseases and they are also at an increasing risk for mortality (CDC, 2019; Felitti et al., 1998). Therefore, as the number of ACEs increased, the health-risk behaviors also increased, which created a higher risk of developing chronic health conditions, such as ESKD, and mental health issues (Felitti et al., 1998).

### ***ACEs, Toxic Stress, and Health***

Toxic stress is defined as repeated exposures to tremendous amounts of stress hormones in the body, which may affect a person’s development during childhood (Evans & Coccoma, 2014; Hornor et al., 2019; Waite & Ryan, 2020). Due to toxic stress from exposures to ACEs, people are at greater risk for chronic health conditions and premature death as a result of high-risk behaviors (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019; Chanlongbutra et al., 2018; Hornor et al., 2019; Loxton et al., 2019; Merrick, 2018; Slack et al., 2017; Sonu et al., 2019). As repeated exposures to toxic stress affect the body and mind, a person may be predisposed to physical and mental health issues (Waite & Ryan, 2020). This toxic stress exposure also disrupts a person’s ability to “self-regulate” and influences their abilities to self-soothe, build stable relationships, manage compulsions, and learn (Waite & Ryan, 2020).

Toxic stress from ACEs disrupts a child’s neurobiological responses and rewires the circuitry of the brain (Waite & Ryan, 2020). This creates a dysfunction of the body’s regulatory response to stress and formulates maladaptive responses to stress (Waite & Ryan, 2020). These are not chosen responses, but instead are the brain’s way of adapting to chronic stress. As a result, this increases health-risk behaviors and promotes mental and physical health conditions, such as anxiety, depression, high blood pressure, obesity, and diabetes (Evan & Coccoma, 2014; van Duin et al., 2018; Waite & Ryan, 2020). This is important as high blood pressure and diabetes are also strongly connected to the development ESKD (United States Renal Data System [USRDS], 2019).

### ***End-Stage Kidney Disease***

End-stage kidney disease (ESKD) is a chronic health condition that results in both kidneys failing. When a diagnosis of ESKD is acquired, the person will need a transplant or dialysis to sustain life, as their kidneys are no longer filtering toxins out of the body (Mayo Clinic Staff, 2020; MedlinePlus, 2018; National Kidney Foundation [NKF], 2021). Dialysis requires people to be connected to a machine three times a week or more to live (NKF, 2021). If a person does not start dialysis or

receive a kidney transplant, death becomes imminent. While ESKD is not a new health condition, it continues to affect many people in the U.S. (USRDS, 2018).

In 2018, there were 785,883 patients in the U.S. with a diagnosis of ESKD compared to 746,557 cases in 2017 (NKF, 2021; USRDS, 2018). The leading causes of ESKD include diabetes, high blood pressure, heart disease, family history of ESKD, and obesity (CDC, 2021). Of the 746,557 people diagnosed with ESKD in 2017, 33.4% received no preventative care related to chronic kidney disease (CKD) (USRDS, 2019). Additionally, 65% of people received a diagnosis of ESKD due to diabetes and high blood pressure (USRDS, 2019). Many patients with ESKD struggle with adherence because of mental health issues which increase their risk of death (Ozen 2019; Tsur et al., 2019). However, there is little consideration of the causes of these health-risk behaviors, such as ACEs.

### ***ESKD, Adherence, and Mental Health***

On average, people with ESKD have a life expectancy of five to 10 years if they do not receive a kidney transplant (NKF, 2021; O’Hare et al., 2019). Even though some patients may live longer than 25 years, there are high rates of mortality that occur within the first year of dialysis (Brito et al., 2019). While various factors may contribute to early mortality in patients with ESKD, some may struggle with adherence and mental health challenges that contribute to premature death (Ozen 2019; Tsur et al., 2019). Studies have shown that between 50% to 80% percent of patients with ESKD engage in health-risk behaviors, such as nonadherence to treatment recommendations (Baines & Jindal, 2000; Clark et al., 2014; Leggat et al., 1998).

People who receive a diagnosis of ESKD experience many lifestyle changes. These changes include fluid and diet restrictions, completing dialysis three or more times a week depending on the modality of treatment, and medication management (Chan et al., 2014; Clark et al., 2014; Cohen & Kimmel, 2018; Ozen, 2019). If patients do not follow each of the treatment recommendations, they are at an increased risk of developing additional comorbidities, more hospitalizations, and death (Clark et al., 2014; Cohen & Kimmel, 2018; Ozen, 2019). Additionally, patients who do not adhere to treatment recommendations are viewed by providers as non-compliant or resistant to treatment.

Providers often label people who do not adhere to treatment recommendations as non-compliant (World Health Organization [WHO], 2003). However, they often do not consider other factors that may be unconsciously influencing the health behaviors of patients. While there are many causes of non-adherence, patients with ESKD who experience significant adherence issues are more likely to struggle with their mental health (Baines & Jindal, 2000; Clark et al., 2014). Studies found that people with ESKD are three to four times

more likely to experience depression (Bezerra et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2016; Treadwell, 2017). In a study by Bezerra et al. (2018), 58% of patients with ESKD and 47% of all CKD patients presented with depression. Further, other studies have found that between 27% to 45.7% of dialysis patients experienced ongoing anxiety, which affects their compliance and treatment (Cukor et al., 2007; Shafi & Shafi, 2017). The severity of depression and/or anxiety symptoms significantly increases a person's risk of mortality (Chironda & Bhengu, 2016; Khan et al., 2019; Kimmel et al., 2000). This is due to poorer health outcomes, nonadherence, and health-risk behaviors, as people often feel a perceived lack of control over their health and an inability to manage their disease sufficiently (Brito et al., 2019). This is one of the key factors as to why master's level social workers are required to be involved in the care of patients with ESKD, to address their psychosocial needs, which should include assessment for ACEs (Browne et al., 2014).

### **ESKD and Social Work Practice**

Social workers perform a fundamental role in the interdisciplinary team's care of patients with ESKD and understand the complexity of human behavior that affects health outcomes. Social workers in nephrology partner with nephrologists, nurses, physician assistants, dietitians, other medical staff, and patients to provide comprehensive care planning for each patient (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services [CMS], 2020). The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (2020) mandates that master's level social workers must be involved in the care of patients with ESKD to address psychosocial needs. Social workers address many components of patients' needs, such as quality of life, mental health, adherence issues, relationship concerns, end-of-life planning, grief and loss, coping and adjusting, conflict management, and financial challenges (Browne et al., 2014).

## **NEPHROLOGY SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE**

### **Assessment Process**

Social workers in nephrology are required to complete "peopleized" psychosocial assessments of patients' overall well-being and quality of life. Through these comprehensive assessments, social workers can identify the strengths, challenges, and barriers that a person with ESKD may be experiencing (Browne et al., 2014). A key focus of a psychosocial assessment is to evaluate patients for mental health disorders and other issues. Due to the increased risk of depression in patients with ESKD, screenings in the assessment process are required (CMS, 2020). CMS requires yearly depression screenings due to an established connection between depression, lower quality of life, adherence challenges, and mortality (Browne et al., 2014; CMS, 2020; Shirazian et al., 2017). The Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9; Kroenke et al., 2001) is the most widely used

measurement instrument to assess depression in people with ESKD (Browne et al., 2014). If patients present with moderate or severe depression, social workers must rescreen people and develop interventions to address the depressive symptoms (CMS, 2020). Social workers in nephrology are not required to screen for any other mental health disorders annually, which may result in gaps in care for patients.

While assessing for depression is vital due to various physical and mental health risks (Chironda & Bhengu, 2016; Kimmel et al., 2000), there is often little consideration of the potential root cause of mental health and health-risk challenges, such as ACEs. For example, ACEs may affect a person's health behaviors, which then could increase their risk of kidney disease, depression, and other chronic health conditions. Without considering the impact that ACEs and past traumas have on adherence and mental health in patients with ESKD, this group is vulnerable to other chronic health conditions and premature death (Waite & Ryan, 2020). Social workers, with their knowledge of the negative impact of trauma, should be at the forefront of standardizing trauma-informed care practices with patients diagnosed with ESKD.

### **Trauma-Informed Care (TIC)**

Trauma-informed care (TIC) is defined as the recognition by providers and organizations that trauma is pervasive, training staff is essential to recognizing trauma signs and symptoms, and trauma-informed approaches should be incorporated into policies and practice (Evans & Coccoma, 2014). Trauma-informed care (TIC) was developed by Harris and Fallot (2009) in the belief that past traumatic experiences continually affect people psychologically, emotionally, and physically throughout their lives. TIC is a "paradigm shift" in the delivery of mental and physical health services and interventions, as it assumes that everyone has experienced trauma (Evans & Coccoma, 2014). TIC does not necessarily attempt to remedy the traumatic history but instead focuses on caring for patients in the realization that trauma significantly affects people and their health (Fallot & Harris, 2009). Under this concept, histories of trauma should be recognized by health-care providers and shift away from a pathological perspective, "What's wrong with you?" to the survivor perspective, "What happened to you?" (Evans & Coccoma, 2014, p. 1). This is done through the *realization* of the pervasiveness of trauma, *recognizing* the signs and symptoms of trauma in patients, *resisting* re-traumatization of people, and *responding* through trauma-informed policies and procedures (Fallot & Harris, 2009; SAMHSA, 2014). From this perspective, trauma-informed care includes the organizational implementation of six principles. These principles guide the implementation of a TIC approach that recognizes the impact of trauma on people with ESKD and recognizes that non-adherence is not deliberate disregard for their health.

### **Trauma-Informed Care: SAMHSA Six Key Principles**

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2014) identified 10 key principles, six of which were selected to guide implementation of the TIC approach. These six key principles are: (a) *safety*; (b) *trustworthiness and transparency*; (c) *peer support*; (d) *collaboration and mutuality*; (e) *empowerment, voice, and choice*; and (f) *cultural, historical, and gender issues* (Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], 2014). These principles are important, as they place emphases on developing a practice that moves away from pathology to one that recognizes the impact of trauma on people with ESKD. The intent of these principles is to lay the foundation for social workers to create a TIC model to better serve noncompliant patients with ESKD who have traumatic backgrounds.

Creating an environment of *safety* ensures people are physically, emotionally, and psychologically secure (Fallot & Harris, 2009; Harris & Fallot, 2001; SAMHSA, 2014). This means that organizations need to create an environment of safety for patients and staff (SAMHSA, 2014). If people do not feel safe and secure with providers, they may be less likely to engage in services necessary for their health and well-being (Evans & Coccoma, 2014). *Trustworthiness and transparency* aim to develop trust between people and their care team through openness, clarity of practice, expectations, boundaries, and clear communication (Fallot & Harris, 2009; Harris & Fallot, 2001; SAMHSA, 2014). The current medical model is often one-sided toward the provider and may create distrust, boundary challenges, and a lack of communication. In a TIC model, a provider's interactions are patient-centered and transparent, with the goal of creating a mutually trusting relationship between providers and people (SAMHSA, 2014).

*Peer support* allows people to experience security and hope by narrating their stories of trauma to foster healing and recovery (SAMHSA, 2014). Providers can create safety through peer support by developing collaboration and mutuality. *Collaboration and mutuality* encompass a partnership between patients with ESKD and the interdisciplinary team that gives power back to the patient (Fallot & Harris, 2009; Harris & Fallot, 2001; SAMHSA, 2014). People need to be aware of the power they hold to improve their lives and providers can help in this realization by allowing patients to have power in their choices. Through collaboration and mutuality, people can feel empowered to use their voices and identify their care options (SAMHSA, 2014). *Empowerment, voice, and choice* describe patients' abilities to choose options and control their own healthcare (Fallot & Harris, 2009; Harris & Fallot, 2001; SAMHSA, 2014). The person's strengths are recognized and enhanced instead of focusing solely on their mistakes or compliance issues. For providers to ensure that people feel empowered, they must also realize the cultural, historical, and gender issues that also arise in working with people. For example, if a female patient is from a culture where men are

viewed as the decision-makers or hold rights over women, then empowering this patient without this cultural awareness may be difficult. *Cultural, historical, and gender issues* must also be recognized in a TIC model, as they can also be closely tied to trauma histories (SAMHSA, 2014). Providers should actively remove biases related to cultural components, such as age, gender, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, religion, disability, and sexual orientation in working with people in the healthcare settings (SAMHSA, 2014).

This SAMHSA model using each of the key principles can be used to develop a TIC perspective with patients with ESKD. It allows people with ESKD to feel psychologically and physically safe and elicits trust through collaborative communication with social workers and the care team (SAMHSA, 2014). This may increase adherence and improve patient outcomes, as the care team focuses less on labeling patients as noncompliant and more on developing mutual support and trust (SAMHSA, 2014). Understanding the impact of ACEs and trauma histories enables providers to understand that health-risk behaviors of patients with ESKD are more likely coping mechanisms due to past traumatic exposures. This will assist social workers in providing responsive services to patients with ESKD and recognizes that these actions are not a conscious disregard for their health.

## **DISCUSSION**

Since the seminal study by Felitti et al. (1998), the association between chronic health conditions and ACEs has received significant attention in the behavioral health and healthcare fields. Providers recognizing this should implement a TIC model for patients with ESKD. This section reviews SAMHSA's six principles for the implementation of a trauma-informed model of care and identifies a trauma-informed model of care specifically for use in the treatment of patients with ESKD (TI-ESKD).

### **Trauma-Informed Care: Creating a Model for ESKD: Guidance Practices for Implementation of TIC**

SAMHSA (2014) offers directions for the application of a TIC approach within organizations and is guided by six of the 10 *key principles* (SAMHSA, 2014). The guiding principles are core values of TIC.

SAMHSA (2014) also identified ten guidance *practices* for implementation of TIC within organizations or practice settings. For the TI-ESKD model, six of the 10 guidance practices are included: (a) *governance and leadership*; (b) *policies, practices, and procedures*; (c) *physical environment*; (d) *cross-sector collaboration*; (e) *screening, assessment, treatment services*; and (f) *training and workforce development*. The guidance practices for implementation are focused on how organizations effectively implement TIC. These assist in the design and execution of a trauma-informed ESKD (TI-ESKD) model of care to improve services for the ESKD population.

**Table 1** depicts SAMHSA's Trauma-Informed Model of Care for ESKD: SAMHSA's six guidance practices for implementation; the SAMHSA suggestions for incorporating these TIC model guidelines; and the actual utilization of a TI-ESKD model of care.

### ***Governance and Leadership in the TI-ESKD Model of Care***

Those in authority within an organization will need to support implementing a TI-ESKD model of care (SAMHSA, 2014). This will require a "champion" to initiate and advocate for changes in policies, practices, and procedures (SAMHSA,

**Table 1: A Trauma-informed Model of Care for ESKD (TI-ESKD)**

SAMSHA Trauma-informed Care (TIC) Guidance Practices for Implementation	SAMSHA Trauma-Informed Care (TIC) Model	Trauma-Informed End-Stage Kidney Disease (TI-ESKD) Model of Care
a. Governance and Leadership	Leaders in the organization will need to support the implementation of a TIC approach. A champion is often responsible to lead and monitor the application of TIC within the organization.	Nephrology social workers should be champions for the implementation of a TI-ESKD model of care. If resistance or reluctance occurs from leadership and/or staff, social workers should continue to advocate for necessary changes to include TIC practices.
b. Policies, Practices, and Procedures	Current policies, practices, and procedures in organizations should be reviewed and altered to include TIC.	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) policies, practices, and procedures for the care of patients with ESKD should be explored, and TIC practices should be embedded in the organizations policies, practices, and procedures. Social workers should explore and advocate for changes in organizational policies, practices, and procedures that recognize the pervasiveness of trauma, focus on safety, highlight the importance of patient involvement in organizational changes, and that are culturally sensitive.
c. Physical Environment	Providers and their staffs should create safety in their physical and social-emotional environment, including collaboration and transparency between patients and staff.	Dialysis units and nephrology office spaces should be physically and social-emotionally safe for staff and patients. Collaboration and transparency are important elements of these environments. Patients are active participants in their care and have a voice in their treatment decisions. Social workers can help the care team recognize how a collaborative environment promotes safety and trust.
d. Cross-Sector Collaboration	All staff should collaboratively understand the impact of trauma and importance of a TIC approach.	All nephrology providers' staffs should understand the impact of trauma on patients with ESKD and its connection to adherence issues. They need to work in partnership with patients and other interdisciplinary staff to address the complex needs of patients and ensure "peopleization" of plans of care.
e. Screening, Assessment, and Treatment Services	All patients receiving services from the organization should be screened, assessed, and treated for trauma.	Nephrology social workers should use the ACEs screening tool (Aces Aware, 2021) and assess patients for trauma. Further, social workers should standardize the use of ACE screenings and assessments yearly. Social workers should incorporate TIC goals and interventions in patients' plans of care to best address their needs. Social workers should share this information with interdisciplinary teams so that other members are able to incorporate TI-ESKD interventions. Partnerships with mental health providers specializing in trauma should be obtained and retained.
f. Training and Workforce Development	All providers and staff should be trained about the impact of trauma on people and the importance of TIC practices.	All interdisciplinary team members and staff should be trained in TIC practices. Nephrology social workers are often well equipped to provide education and training on TIC, the impact patient trauma may have on staff, and self-care practices for other team members and staff. If they are not, outside assistance to provide TIC training would be beneficial.

2014). Social workers should be at the forefront of advocating for implementing a trauma-informed care model. Social workers are equipped with knowledge and skills regarding the impact of trauma and the need for interdisciplinary changes in practice for the best patient outcomes. In current healthcare, the medical model has a heavy focus on disability and impairment, and the psychological aspects of a person are treated separately, often with little consideration of the impact of psychological issues on physical health (Swaine, 2011). Due to this medical model being a common approach, social workers will need to continue to advocate, often in the face of resistance or reluctance of other staff in their organization. With the buy-in from other staff in the care team, TIC policies, practices, and procedures should be discussed, changed, and implemented as a team approach.

### ***Policies, Practices, and Procedures in the TI-ESKD Model of Care***

Current policies, practices, and procedures should be reviewed and revised to include TIC which are integral to the successful deployment of the TI-ESKD model (SAMHSA, 2014). While each organization has different policies, practices, and procedures for patients with ESKD, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) requirements are consistent (CMS, 2020). CMS requires many practices to be put into place when working with patients with ESKD to optimize health outcomes (CMS, 2020). While these range according to the responsibilities of each discipline, they also include interdisciplinary approaches and interventions. Social workers should lead in reexamining current CMS policies, practices, and procedures, and research how a TI-ESKD model of care may be adapted to these requirements.

### ***TI-ESKD Model of Care and the Physical Environment***

To develop a sense of safety, organizations must be mindful of the physical environment (SAMHSA, 2014). From staff to patients, everyone should perceive the physical space as open, collaborative, and be free from psychological and physical hazards (SAMHSA, 2014). In the care of patients with ESKD, it is imperative that patients feel safe and be free from harm. The physical environment for patients with ESKD should be examined and altered to provide safety and comfort. For example, a unit's temperature, harsh lighting, music choices, etc., should be altered to be more comfortable and welcoming for patients, as these may be potential sources of trauma triggers. Additionally, the physical environment should encourage collaboration and transparency (SAMHSA, 2014). Under a TI-ESKD model, patients are provided with the opportunity to discuss their needs and the barriers to their care. This approach removes the perception of defiance and blame and requires the medical team to view patients as active, collaborative partners in developing a care plan instead of the team making decisions for them. Social workers can advocate for the importance of patients being participants in their care and

help the care team recognize how a collaborative environment promotes emotional safety and trust (Levenson, 2017).

### ***TI-ESKD Model of Care Cross-Sector Collaboration***

Cross-sector collaboration requires that all involved in patient care have a universal understanding of the impact of trauma, and that the components of TIC are understood (SAMHSA, 2014). Utilizing a TI-ESKD care approach, providers learn how trauma may hinder a person's adherence to recommendations and their health choices. By implementing a TI-ESKD care approach, providers collaborate with patients to meet their "peopleized" and complex needs. This includes enlisting the trauma-informed expertise of other interdisciplinary team members to reach the best health outcomes for patients. Providers also have opportunities to realize the impact of trauma and assist patients in connecting to mental health services that provide trauma-specific interventions. In order for this to be successful, patients will need to be screened and assessed for ACEs so appropriate treatments and referrals are implemented.

### ***ACEs Screening, Assessments, and Treatment Services***

SAMHSA (2014) advocates for the screening, assessment, and treatment of trauma in a healthcare organization setting. People with histories of trauma or ACEs may not initially disclose the trauma due to shame, distrust, or anxiety about divulging the experiences (McGregor et al., 2010). However, it is vital that the screening, assessment, and treatment be implemented at some point in their care. Therefore, under a TI-ESKD care model, nephrology social workers should screen and assess people with ESKD annually, similar to the requirements for administering the PHQ-9 annually (Kroenke et al., 2001). If assessment and screening for ACEs are standardized in the care of patients with ESKD, social workers will have the ability to identify people who may require trauma-specific interventions. Additionally, social workers are best suited to incorporate "peopleized" TIC goals and interventions into their care plans for optimal treatment outcomes. Social workers should also share these findings with the interdisciplinary team to ensure that TI-ESKD interventions are addressed in each area of the patient's plan of care, which will require all providers and staff to be adequately trained in TIC practices.

### ***Training and Workforce Development in TI-ESKD Model of Care***

For a TIC model to be implemented, all providers must be trained in the utilization of TIC practices (SAMHSA, 2014). Social workers are best equipped to provide TIC education and training to staff. In the event staff are not trained, nephrology social workers should engage in TIC training and pass on the information and education to other providers. Social workers should also advocate for mandatory TIC training for new staff and annual competency education. Further, social workers have the ability to educate patients with ESKD on TIC, self-care, and secondary trauma care (SAMHSA, 2014).

## IMPLICATIONS

### *Recommendations and Implications for Social Work Practice*

Social workers need to advocate for implementation of TIC practices for patients with ESKD and in many other areas of the medical field that address chronic health conditions. The utilization and standardization of a TI-ESKD model of care will improve outcomes for patients with ESKD, as it addresses why adherence issues may be occurring. This will help patients and providers develop partnerships to address these challenges. This could decrease negative health outcomes and premature death in patients with traumatic histories. If the TI-ESKD model of care is implemented, it will create a safer environment for patients that moves away from pathologizing their choices and toward trauma-specific interventions.

### *Need for Future Research*

Ongoing research is needed on the impact of trauma on patients with ESKD and other chronic illnesses. To this author's knowledge, there are no current studies that examine the correlation between ACEs and ESKD. This is crucial to understanding the influence of trauma on adherence and the provision of trauma-informed interventions within care plans. This knowledge will inform training, policies, practices, and procedures in the care of patients with ESKD. Further research is needed to explore nephrology providers' and staff perceptions and awareness of ACEs and implementation of TIC. The author is in the process of completing research exploring nephrology providers' current knowledge of TIC, its utilization, and where improvements may be made. Lastly, ongoing research is needed to evaluate and improve the TI-ESKD model. This may be done through assessing, tracking, and monitoring the outcomes of the current model and evaluating efforts to improve it. This will ensure that the TI-ESKD model of care is being utilized effectively and as intended.

## CONCLUSION

Both ESKD and ACEs have a significant impact on the lives of people, which puts them at considerable risk of premature death. Due to ACEs, patients with ESKD may be at a higher risk of mental health issues, adherence issues, and lower quality of life due to health-risk behaviors. Nephrology social workers are required to address the mental health challenges of patients with ESKD, with specific attention paid to depression. While addressing depression and other mental health issues is essential, it is equally critical to assess ACEs and implement interventions to best serve patients with ESKD. Therefore, a TIC model should be developed for patients with ESKD in each unit, as they are often labeled non-compliant. If a TI-ESKD model approach is implemented for patients with ESKD, it may enhance adherence, quality of life and reduce their risk for mortality. Additionally, providers may better understand

that adherence issues may be connected to a person's trauma histories and not blatant disregard for their health.

A TI-ESKD model of care can only be implemented effectively if all healthcare team members, not just social workers, receive education and training related to ACEs and TIC. This is a paradigm shift for many nephrology providers, as they are not often provided with education or training on TIC or ACEs during academic studies or continuing education. Menschner and Maul (2016) advocated for a standardization of TIC education in their academic studies of clinical staff and, at the very least, continuing education hours related to TIC practices. This would strengthen the providers' competency in and practice of TIC and would positively affect patients' lives (Menschner & Maul, 2016). If TIC practices are utilized, they may reduce long-term effects of trauma on patients with ESKD, improve health outcomes, and reduce costs associated with health-risk behaviors that may be perpetuated by a person's traumatic history.

**Author Note:** *Tiffany Breckenridge is a Doctor of Social Work candidate at the University of St. Thomas in St. Paul, MN. Tiffany practices as a clinical nephrology social worker in Rochester, MN, and is a licensed clinical social worker in Minnesota and Wisconsin. There are no conflicts of interest.*

## REFERENCES

- Aces Aware. (2021). Adverse childhood experiences questionnaire for adults. <https://www.acesaware.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/ACE-Questionnaire-for-Adults-Identified-English.pdf>
- Baines, L., & Jindal, R. (2000). Non-compliance in patients receiving haemodialysis: An in-depth review. *Nephron*, 85, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000045622>
- Bethell, C. D., Davis, M. B., Gombojav, N., Stumbo, S., & Powers, K. (2017 October). *Issue brief: A national and across-state profile on adverse childhood experiences among U.S. children and possibilities to heal and thrive*. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. <https://www.greatcircle.org/images/pdfs/aces-brief-101717.pdf>  
<http://www.cahmi.org/projects/adverse-childhood-experiences-aces/>
- Bezerra, C., Silva, B., & Elias, R. (2018). Decision-making process in the pre-dialysis CKD patients: Do anxiety, stress, and depression matter? *BMC Nephrology*, 19(98), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12882-018-0896-3>



- Brito, D., Machado, E., Reis, I., Carmo, L., & Cherchiglia, M. (2019). Depression and anxiety among patients undergoing dialysis and kidney transplantation: A cross-sectional study. *Sao Paulo Medical Journal = Revista Paulista de Medicina*, 137(2), 137–147. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-3180.2018.0272280119>
- Browne, T., Peace, L., & Perry, D. (2014). *Standards of practice for nephrology social work* (6th ed). National Kidney Foundation: Council of Nephrology Social Workers (CNSW). [https://www.kidney.org/sites/default/files/CNSW%20SOP%206th%20Ed\\_FINAL\\_July2014.pdf](https://www.kidney.org/sites/default/files/CNSW%20SOP%206th%20Ed_FINAL_July2014.pdf)
- Campbell, J. A., Farmer, G. C., Nguyen-Rodriguez, S., Walker, R., & Egede, L. (2018). Relationship between people categories of adverse childhood experiences and diabetes in adulthood in a sample of US adults: Does it differ by gender? *Journal of Diabetes & Its Complications*, 32, 139–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdiacomp.2017.11.005>
- Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (CDC). (2019). *Preventing adverse childhood experiences (ACEs): Leveraging the best available evidence*. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/preventingACES.pdf>
- Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (CDC). (2021). *Chronic kidney disease in the United States, 2021*. <https://www.cdc.gov/kidneydisease/pdf/Chronic-Kidney-Disease-in-the-US-2021-h.pdf>
- Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). (2020). *CMS ESKD measures manual for the 2020 performance period*. <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/ESKD-measures-manual-v52.pdf>
- Chan, K. E., Thadhani, R. I., & Maddux, K. W. (2014). Adherence barriers to chronic dialysis in the United States. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology (JASN)*, 25(11), 2642–2648. <https://doi.org/10.1681/ASN.2013111160>
- Chanlongbutra, A., Singh, G., & Mueller, C. (2018). Adverse childhood experiences, health-related quality of life, and chronic disease risks in rural areas of the United States. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 7151297. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/7151297>
- Chen, S., Wang, I., & Lang, H. (2016). Risk of major depression in patients with chronic renal failure on different treatment modalities: A matched-cohort and population-based study in Taiwan. *Hemodialysis International*, 20(1), 98–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hdi.12334>
- Chironda, G., & Bhengu, B. (2016). Contributing factors to non-adherence among chronic kidney disease (CKD) patients: A systematic review of literature. *Medical & Clinical Reviews*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.21767/2471-299X.1000038>
- Chou, Y. J. & Shih, C. M. (2018). Using the health belief model to predict those seeking treatment for hypoactive sexual desire disorder among premenopausal women. *Taiwan Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 57(6), 791–795. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjog.2018.10.003>
- Cohen, S. & Kimmel, P. (2018). Management of non-adherence in ESKD patients. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology (CJASN)*, 13(7), 1080–1082. <https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.13331117>
- Clark, S., Farrington, K., & Chilcot, J. (2014). Nonadherence in dialysis patients: Prevalence, measurement, outcome, and psychological determinants. *Seminars in Dialysis*, 27(1), 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sdi.12159>
- Cukor, D., Coplan, J., Brown, C. D., Friedman, S., Cromwell-Smith, A., Peterson, R. A., & Kimmel, P. L. (2007). Depression and anxiety in urban hemodialysis patients. *Clinical Journal of the American Society of Nephrology (CJASN)*, 2(3), 484–490. <https://doi.org/10.2215/CJN.00040107>
- Evans, A., & Coccoma, P. (2014). *Trauma-informed care: How neuroscience influences practice*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315815572>
- Fallot, R. D., & Harris, M. (2009). Creating Cultures of Trauma-Informed Care (CCTIC): A self-assessment and planning protocol. The Anna Institute; *Community Connections*. <https://www.theannainstitute.org/CCTICSELFASSPP.pdf>
- Felitti, V., Anda, R., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D., Spitz, A., Edwards, V., Koss, M., & Marks, J. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 14(4), 245–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797\(98\)00017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(98)00017-8)
- Harris, M., & Fallot, R. D. (2001). Designing trauma-informed addictions services. In M. Harris & R. D. Fallot (Eds.), *Using trauma theory to design service systems* (pp. 57–73). Jossey-Bass/Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.23320018907>
- Hayden, J. (2019). *Introduction to health behavior theory*. Jones & Bartlett Learning LLC. [http://samples.jblearning.com/9781284125115/9781284159134\\_FMxx\\_Print.pdf](http://samples.jblearning.com/9781284125115/9781284159134_FMxx_Print.pdf)

- Hornor, G., Davis, C., Sherfield, J., & Wilkinson, K. (2019). Trauma-informed care: Essential elements for pediatric health care. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care*, 33(2), 214–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedhc.2018.09.009>
- Khan, A., Khan, A., Adnan, A., Sulaiman, S., & Mushtaq, S. (2019). Prevalence and predictors of depression among hemodialysis patients: A prospective follow-up study. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1), 531. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6796-z>
- Kimmel, P., Peterson, R., Weihs, K., Simmens, S., Alleyne, S., Cruz, I., & Veis, J. (2000). Multiple measurements of depression predict mortality in a longitudinal study of chronic hemodialysis outpatients. *Kidney International*, 57(5), 2093–2098. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1755.2000.00059.x>
- Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 16(9), 606–613. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x>
- Leggat, J., Orzol, S., Hulbert-Shearon, T., Golper, T., Jones, C., Held, P., & Port, F. (1998). Noncompliance in hemodialysis: Predictors and survival analysis. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases*, 32, 139–145. <https://doi.org/10.1053/ajkd.1998.v32.pm9669435>
- Levenson, J. (2017). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work*, 62(2), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001>
- Loxton, D., Townsend, N., Dolja-Gore, X., Forder, P., & Coles, J. (2019). Adverse childhood experiences and healthcare costs in adult life. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 28(5), 511–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2018.1523814>
- McGregor, K., Glover, M., Gautam, J., & Julich, S. (2010). Working sensitively with child abuse survivors: What female child sexual abuse survivors want from health professionals. *Women & Health*, 50(8), 757–755. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03630242.2010.530931>
- Mayo Clinic Staff. (2020). *End-stage kidney disease: Overview*. <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/end-stage-kidney-disease/symptoms-causes/syc-20354532>
- MedlinePlus. (2018). *Medical encyclopedia: End-stage kidney disease*. <https://medlineplus.gov/ency/article/000500.htm>
- Menschner, C., & Maul, A. (2016). *Key ingredients for successful trauma-informed care implementation*. SAMHSA website. [https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/programs\\_campaigns/childrens\\_mental\\_health/atc-whitepaper-040616.pdf](https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/programs_campaigns/childrens_mental_health/atc-whitepaper-040616.pdf)
- Merrick, M. (2018). Prevalence of adverse childhood experiences from the 2011–2014 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System in 23 states. *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA): Pediatrics*, 172(11), 1038–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2018.2537>
- National Kidney Foundation (NKF). (2021). *Kidney disease: The basics*. <https://nkf.egnyte.com/dl/h2PeqRLmEB/>
- O’Hare, A., Tamura, M., Lavalley, D., Vig, E., Taylor, J., Hall, Y., Katz, R., Curtis, R., & Engelberg, R. (2019). Assessment of self-reported prognostic expectations of people undergoing dialysis: United States Renal Data System study of treatment preferences (USTATE). *Journal of the American Medical Association: Internal Medicine. (JAMA Internal Med.)*, 179(10), 1325–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.2879>
- Ozen, N., Cinar, F. I., Askin, D., Mut, D., & Turker, T. (2019). Nonadherence in hemodialysis patients and related factors: A multicenter study. *The Journal of Nursing Research*, 27(4), e36. <https://doi.org/10.1097/jnr.0000000000000309>
- Rosenstock, I. (1974). The health belief model and preventive health behavior. *Health Education Monographs*, 2(4), 354–386. <https://doi.org/10.2307/45240623>
- Shafi, S., & Shafi, T. (2017). A comparison of anxiety and depression between pre-dialysis chronic kidney disease patients and hemodialysis patients using hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 33(4), 876–880. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.334.12656>
- Shirazian, S., Grant, C. D., Aina, O., Mattana, J., Khorassani, F., & Ricardo, A. C. (2017). Depression in chronic kidney disease and end-stage kidney disease: Similarities and differences in diagnosis, epidemiology, and management. *Kidney International Reports*, 2(1), 94–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ekir.2016.09.00>
- Slack, K., Font, S., & Jones, J. (2017). The complex interplay of adverse childhood experiences, race, and income. *Health & Social Work*, 42(1), E24–E31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/hsw/hlw059>

- Sonu, S., Post, S., & Feinglass, J. (2019). Adverse childhood experiences and the onset of chronic disease in young adulthood. *Preventive Medicine, 123*, 163–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.03.032>
- Stevenson, M. (2014). Health behavior change theories and models: Understanding the process of behavior change. In Snelling, A. (Eds.). *Introduction to health promotion* (Chapter 4). John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). (2014). *SAMHSA's concept of trauma and guidance for a trauma-informed approach*. [https://ncsacw.samhsa.gov/userfiles/files/SAMHSA\\_Trauma.pdf](https://ncsacw.samhsa.gov/userfiles/files/SAMHSA_Trauma.pdf)
- Swaine, Z. (2011). Medical model. In: J. S. Kreutzer, J. DeLuca, & B. Caplan. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of clinical neuropsychology*. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-79948-3\\_2131](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-79948-3_2131)
- Treadwell, A., A. (2017). Examining depression in patients on dialysis. *Nephrology Nursing Journal, 44*(4), 295–307.
- Tsur, N., Menashe, I., & Haviv, Y. (2019). Risk factors before dialysis predominate as mortality predictors in diabetes maintenance dialysis patients. *Scientific Reports, 9*(1), 10633–10638. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-46919-w>
- Tuot, D. S., Plantinga, L. C., Judd, S. E., Muntner, P., Hsu, C. Y., Warnock, D. G., Gutiérrez, O. M., Safford, M., Powe, N. R., & McClellan, W. M. (2013). Healthy behaviors, risk factor control, and awareness of chronic kidney disease. *American Journal of Nephrology, 37*(2), 135–143. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000346712>
- United States Renal Data System (USRDS). (2018). *2018 USRDS annual data report: Executive summary*. [https://www.usrds.org/2018/download/v1\\_00\\_ExecSummary\\_18.pdf](https://www.usrds.org/2018/download/v1_00_ExecSummary_18.pdf)
- United States Renal Data System (USRDS). (2019). *US Renal Data System 2019 annual data report: Epidemiology of kidney disease in the United States: Executive summary*. [https://www.usrds.org/2019/view/USRDS\\_2019\\_ES\\_final.pdf](https://www.usrds.org/2019/view/USRDS_2019_ES_final.pdf)
- van Duin, L., Bevaart, F., Zijlmans, J., Luijckx, M., Doreleijers, T., Wierdsma, A., Oldenhinkel, A., Marhe, R., & Popma, A. (2018). The role of adverse childhood experiences and mental health care use in psychological dysfunction of male multi-problem young adults. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 28*(8), 1065–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-018-1263-4>
- Waite, R., & Ryan, R. (2020). *Adverse childhood experiences: What students and health professionals need to know*. Routledge.
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2003). *Adherence to long-term therapies: Evidence for action*. [https://www.who.int/chp/knowledge/publications/adherence\\_introduction.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/chp/knowledge/publications/adherence_introduction.pdf?ua=1)