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HeadStart Kent aims to “by 2020 Kent young people and their families will have improved resilience, by developing their knowledge and lifelong skills to maximise their own and their peers’ emotional health and wellbeing; so navigate their way to support when needed in ways which work for them”

Young people have been clear on what they need to support their mental wellbeing, and HeadStart aims to focus on building a sustainable system where every young person in Kent will be able to say with confidence:

- People around me understand wellbeing and how to promote it
- My overall wellbeing is not impacted by the pressure to achieve and to be perfect
- There is always someone for me to talk to.

The HeadStart Resilience Toolkit aims to provide useful tools and models for schools to assess their approach to the building of resilience and wellbeing of children, young people, families, communities and their own school, so to develop further appropriate responses to build resilience in young people in their settings.

The Resilience toolkit developed by HeadStart Kent as part of the BIG Lottery Investment during 2014-2016 and has been tested by schools on a practical level. Greenwich University was asked to explore the rationale for the toolkit and ensure the approach is set within evidence base, and to make recommendations.

This report is an evidenced based review of the HeadStart Kent Resilience toolkit. The recommendations of this review along with changes recommended by schools and a youth setting, who tested it will support final version of resilience toolkit, which will be implemented through HeadStart Kent.

For more information please contact HeadStartKent@kent.gov.uk
Executive Summary

The main aim of this report is to provide an independent review of the draft Kent HeadStart Resilience Toolkit from an evidenced-based perspective.

This document is the report of that review and includes information and relevant published sources in regards to the Toolkit and its framework.

An extensive literature review from a variety of sources was conducted and included in this report under sections that consider:

- Introduction to resilience
- Rationale for the Toolkit
- Theoretical support for the Toolkit
- Academic resilience
- The whole school approach
- Existing frameworks and interventions
- Areas for consideration
- Limitations
- Conclusions
- Recommendations

The main conclusions of the review are that the Toolkit provides a useful, evidence-based framework to promote resilience within schools. Considerations and recommendations are included within and at the end of the report.

The main recommendations that may allow the Authority to strengthen and develop the Toolkit are outlined and include a need to focus upon:

- Clarity between models and examples of protective factors to cross-reference with domains model
- Incorporation of cultural sensitive themes and intervention
- The importance of supporting transitions and school-to-school communication
- Caution in the use of the term ‘academic resilience’
- Consideration of the role of virtual worlds and the benefits and risks in digital domains
- The importance of appropriate teacher training
- The role of interagency work and the need for a more standardised and stable programme
- A comprehensive evaluation carried out by external independent researchers.
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1. Methodology

In approaching the task of producing an evidence-based review of the Toolkit the present report made an extensive use of The University of Greenwich library databases.

Databases used included: platforms such as PsychARTICLES, EBSCOhost Research Databases, PsycINFO, Sage Journals and Science Direct.

When searching for journals and articles, searches were conducted within psychological and educational publications. The document made use of academic journals, reviews, independent reports, articles and documents that have produced both quantitative and qualitative findings.
2. Introduction to Resilience

The HeadStart Resilience Toolkit aims to provide useful tools and models for schools to improve their approach to the issue of pupils’ resilience and wellbeing, whilst enabling schools to become increasingly self-sufficient in addressing children and young people’s resilience. The Toolkit defines its use of the term ‘resilience’ as:

“Overcoming adversity, whilst also potentially, subtly altering, or even dramatically transforming (aspects of) that adversity”

Indeed, this definition of resilience displays some consistency with the general definitions of resilience within the literature, which describe it as the capacity to achieve good outcomes, or to ‘bounce back’ from adverse factors (Masten, 2001; Bonanno, Brewin, Kaniasty & La Greca, 2010; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1995), such as a lack of positive opportunities or difficult circumstances that may be caused by various mental, social, or physical deficits (Hidon, Smith, Netuveli & Blane, 2008). The importance of using correct terminology in regards to resilience has been outlined by Hart and Heaver (2013), who have argued that the use of the term, especially when used in school-based resilience frameworks has tended to be conceptually weak and as a result determining whether a framework is actually resilience-based can prove difficult.

Resilience is primarily a phenomenon that has been studied in children and young people and has tended to focus on individuals who are at risk from mental health issues, rather than focusing on how resilience is used as a coping mechanism against daily setbacks. Although resilience has previously been argued as an individual personality trait that is dependent on innate characteristics, it is now widely regarded as an outcome of various environmental conditions and influences that are formed by the child's own experiences, relationships and opportunities (Masten & Garmezy, 1985; Masten & Coatsworth, 1998; Schoon & Bartley, 2008), with such areas as the child’s family, peer groups, schools and community playing key roles in the formation of resilience.

2.1 Protective Factors

The Toolkit correctly refers to ‘protective’ factors in regards to building and strengthening resilience. The existing literature base commonly focuses on what is known as protective factors that contribute to positive outcomes despite risk and adversity (Bernard, 1995; Kirby & Fraser, 1997; Masten, 1994; Werner & Smith, 1992). These protective factors are vastly important when considering the effectiveness of any resilience based intervention or framework, as they are the fundamental building blocks of resilience formation. Protective factors that have been associated with resilience can be categorised into three broad domains: Individual Characteristics, such as self-efficacy, self-worth, problem solving skills, social competence and temperament: Interpersonal Factors, such as quality of family
support, friendships and peer groups: and lastly, a Supportive Community outside of the family environment that provides opportunity for positive involvement and the promotions of high expectations and achievement (Bernard, 1995; Masten & Reed, 2002). However, it has also been suggested that culture may also play an important role in facilitating resilience (Ungar, 2008).

2.2 Rationale for Toolkit

Establishing a clear rationale for the Toolkit is important, as it outlines the need and potential of a school-based resilience framework, evidence for which can be found throughout the literature base within the protective area of supportive community that includes schools as one of its aspects. For example, the literature clearly highlights that the individual characteristics of a child or young person are a significant factor in facilitating resilience, however, it is important to recognise that these characteristics will generally be products of environmental factors as resilience is primarily an ecological phenomenon (Greene, 2002; Jozefowicz-Simbeni & Allen-Meares, 2002; Richman & Frazer, 2001). This provides some support for the rationale of a school-based framework as schools are in a position to be arenas of wellbeing and resilience, as they possess the potential to harness and capitalise on many of the subsets of the protective factors of resilience (Brooks, 2006). Indeed, schools have increasingly been explored for their potential in regards to promoting and facilitating resilience in children and young people (Minnard, 2002; Henderson & Milstein, 2003; Challen, Machin & Gillham, 2014).

A further issue that may highlight the rationale for the Toolkit is that numerous innovations in school-based provisions have illustrated the key role that schools can play in mental health provisions that stress the importance of interagency work between the school and mental health specialists (Eames, Shippen & Sharp, 2016). However, despite the need for these partnerships between school and service, many local authorities have scaled back due to budget cuts and financial restraints. Therefore, the Toolkit and the integration of the framework within schools may assist in promoting wellbeing and resilience and also reduce the need for these services to be used. For example, interventions methods that have attempted to bridge the gap between mental health services and schools (see Team of Life Programme) have illustrated the success of health and education services partnerships. Additionally, finding ways to integrate these services into the school framework may also reduce the problems associated with the accessibility of mental health provisions, such as their clinical delivery and also the stigma around seeking help for mental health issues (Wolpert et al., 2015).
3. Theoretical Support for the Toolkit

The Toolkit appears to draw upon two theoretical models of resilience in the promotion and facilitation of resilience in schools: (1) The Resilience Domains Model and (2) The Academic Resilience Model, both of which are broad derivatives of various models and theories of resilience. Each of these are discussed in turn below. First the Resilience Domains Model and then the Academic Resilience Model.

3.1 Resilience Domains Model

The first model, Daniel and Wassell’s (2002) Resilience Domains Model views resilience through the context of the child, the family and the wider community, mirroring previous research suggesting the importance of these factors, and suggests that there are a further three ‘building blocks’ that underpin resilience in a child: a secure base, self-esteem and self-efficacy. The model also categorises the antecedents of these building blocks into a model for assessing resilience into six broad areas: social competencies, secure bases, education, friendships, talents and interests and positive values.

The Resilience Domains Model, although theoretically covering a great deal of factors that can promote resilience may be considered vague and narrow in its coverage of these protective resilience factors, and although the protective factors that facilitate resilience can be placed within the six domains, it may be beneficial to have these factors more explicitly stated within the framework so that teachers and school staff can make better use of the tools at their disposal to achieve maximum impact.

Regardless, the existing literature and theory does support the inclusion of these six areas, which will be discussed within the wider domains of individual characteristics, interpersonal factors, and supportive community.

Summarised below is a section on relevant research that has focused on various themes that overlap with the six domains of the Resilience Model. The report then turns to the Academic Resilience Model.
3.2 Individual Characteristics

The literature base clearly suggests that the individual characteristics that promote resilience are commonly outcomes from certain environmental conditions, and are unlikely to develop in a child without a relationship with at least one other adult with whom they feel loved and worthy (Emery & Forehand, 1994). However, a review of the literature does highlight some important individual factors that may affect resilience.

3.2.1 Social Competencies

The inclusion of social competencies is an important factor to highlight within the Toolkit as it consistently outlined in the literature as being a crucial resilience-building factor (Bernard, 1993; Kirby & Fraser, 1997; Masten, 1994; Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1998). The ability to interact socially with others has been suggested as a characteristic of a resilient child (Martinek & Hellison, 1997). Efforts to develop social competence should provide the environmental context and support framework that are essential for the development of resilience (Pianta & Walsh, 1998), which can be achieved by promoting parent and family involvement and reinforcing skills and achievements (Brooks, 2006).

3.2.2 Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy can assist individuals in highly stressful situations whilst also facilitating the development of motivation and goal achievement, and thusly, may influence decision-making throughout life (Betz, Klien & Taylor, 1996; Markham, Balkin & Baron, 2002). Schwararzer & Warner (2013) have suggested that self-efficacy may assist when showing resilience in the face of adversity, and by activating affective, motivational and behavioural mechanisms in adverse situations, self-efficacy beliefs may promote resilience and has therefore been viewed as an element of resilience (Rutter, 1987; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1995). Furthermore, general self-efficacy correlates with other components of resilience (Hinz, Schumacher, Albani, Schmid & Brahler, 2006).

3.2.3 Self-Worth

The importance of self-worth is also highlighted in the resilience framework as an important resilience factor. Indeed, Maslow’s (1984) hierarchy of needs outlined self-worth as an essential psychological need due to its importance in mental wellbeing, and maintenance of self-worth is central to many core psychological theories as a primary determinant of self-efficacy and mental health (Leary, Tambour, Terdal & Downs, 1995), and its preservation is important for psychological wellbeing (Greenberg et al., 1992). Self-worth has been argued to play a part in resilience on an individual level (Kumpfer, 1999; Masten & Coatsworth, 1998). Other research has also observed that resilient children and young people possessed higher self-worth and were less likely to be involved in risk-taking behaviours in comparison to those who were less resilient (Buckner, Mezzacappa & Beardslee, 2003; Gordon, Ingersoll & Orr, 1998).
3.3 Interpersonal Factors
The literature clearly outlines the importance of interpersonal factors, such as the benefits of a secure base, the advantages of a positive family life, caring and supportive relationships and friendships have on facilitating resilience. As previously mentioned, resilience is fundamentally an ecological phenomenon, and the role of the environment and relationships within it, especially the family, play a vital role in resilience (Morrison & Allen, 2007).

3.3.1 Secure Bases
The inclusion of a secure base in the model is appropriate considering the many protective factors that it can provide that are highlighted throughout the literature. For example, a secure base can encompass such benefits as caring relationships, social support, family and safe spaces, all of which will assist in nurturing the individual characteristics that are associated with resilience. Additionally, Daniel and Wassell’s Resilience Model emphasises that a secure base provides protective factors in regards to the individual, the family and the community.

3.3.2 The Family
The resilience literature repeatedly suggests that children cannot build resilience without love, support, and positive relationships, most importantly from their family or primary care environment (Newman, 2004). In light of this, the family and how the framework can assist in strengthening connections with the family and also promoting resilience and wellbeing should be a main focus of the Toolkit. Schools may play an important role by building links with families and helping parents be engaging and supportive of their children in regards to their education. Building communication between home and school may assist with increasing interactions between the child and their parents (Schoon & Bartley, 2008).

Effective parenting and good parent/child relationships are likely to have a significant effect on resilience, as this element has been shown to be the most significant predicative factor in changes to wellbeing, with positive relationships linked to improvements in behavioural and social wellbeing (Gutman, Brown, Akerman & Obolenskaya, 2010). Schoon and Bartley (2008) found that children from disadvantaged backgrounds that displayed resilience were more likely to have stable and supportive family relationships. Indeed, the most powerful factor that promotes resilience is the behaviour and attitude of the parents (Newman & Blackburn, 2002).

A school may be able to assist in promoting resilience by creating partnerships with parents, families and the community to increase the availability of resources for their pupils (Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1997; 1998). For example, schools can take a role in increasing family based resilience by promoting certain resilience factors that have been shown to contribute, such as parents showing interests and engaging with their child’s education, illustrating the benefits of the parent reading to their child, taking them out for activity days, getting them involved in volunteering, and offering them a high-quality educational environment at home (Schoon & Bartley, 2008; Friedli, 2009). Additionally, schools may also assist in developing parenting skills, such as illustrating the benefits of ‘authoritative parenting,’ which is characterised by
support, warmth and discipline (Gutman, Brown, Akerman, Obolenskaya, 2010). Finn & Rock (1997) suggested that involving family members in interventions are more effective that those aimed only at pupils, as parental involvement may also increase pupils’ commitment to school goals and their sense of meaning in their education and school life. Although there may be various challenges in how to encourage parents and wider families to become involved with schools, the Toolkit may consider such methods as utilising current activities and designing ways in which resilience can be incorporated. For example; parent teacher evenings, celebration and end of year nights where parents are invited, charity raising events, volunteering and community fairs, pupil musical performance evenings, and extra-curricular activities. Furthermore, there may also be features of the Toolkit that may have elements that can be part of the pupil’s homework. Additionally, research from the US has suggested such examples as parental education sessions on how to improve parenting, homes visits and in-home services and after school hours phone calls (Catalano et al., 2003; Eddy, Reid & Fetrow, 2000).

3.3.3 Caring and Supportive Relationships
The caring and supportive relationships within a secure base with a trusted adult are not only essential to a child’s development, but also provide an important form of protective resilience (Bernard, 1991; Pianta & Walsh, 1998; Schorr, 1997). The concept of caring and supportive relationships has firm roots in psychological theories of attachment. The importance of attachment theory in regards to resilience has been outlined by Rutter (1993) who addressed the issue of underlying mechanisms that underline the importance of ‘secure and harmonious relationships’, whilst also recognising ‘success in accomplishing tasks’ as essential components in the child’s formation of a self-concept. During the schools years, Masten and Coatsworth (1998) identified important development tasks such as social competence with peers, socially appropriate conduct, academic achievement and involvement with activities, and concluded that a caring and effective relationship with a trusted adult was indeed an important protective resilience factor. The quality of attachment may arguably be instrumental in the central areas associated with resilience; individual characteristics, interpersonal factors, supportive community, and to some degree, culture (Atwool, 2006).

3.3.4 Friendships
The role of friendships is highlighted in the Toolkit as an important factor that can assist in the building and promoting resilience. The literature that has explored the role of friendships is limited, however, there exists some evidence that peer contact can assist in resilience building (Hill, Strafford, Seaman, Ross & Daniel, 2007; Schoon, 2006) and that friendships can support an individual’s wellbeing (Gutman, Brown, Akerman & Obolenskaya, 2009). However, peer contact also brings with it the risk of bullying, which may undermine resilience in children and young people. The inclusion of friendships is clearly an important factor to highlight in the Toolkit, as it may include other benefits to areas of talents, interests and positive values that come with a friendship group that can be facilitated through peer mentor schemes.
3.4 Supportive Community

The presence of a supportive community and the various systems of care that are available outside of the family unit has also been suggested as playing a key role in resilience. Research has suggested that communities that foster resilience may also provide opportunities for children and young people to play a valued role in the community in which they reside (Luthar, 2006). Indeed, the role of schools, which is encompassed within this domain, has also been suggested as an arena for resilience to be promoted (Horton & Wallander, 2001) and thusly makes its inclusion within the Toolkit highly significant. As the Toolkit and framework are to be used within schools, the authors of the review focused on a number of potential resilience factors relevant to the school environment.

3.4.1 Teachers and School Staff

Interestingly, Matson and Coatsworth (1998) have suggested that children who lack a strong parental presence may be able to attain competence and guidance from a surrogate parental figure that serves in a nurturing capacity. For example, this could be an extended family member, close individuals in a community, or teachers and school staff. The role of teachers and school staff will not be as central of resilience building as that of the child’s parents and family. However, as the individuals at the frontline of the Toolkit will be teachers and school staff it is important to highlight the literature that suggests the potential for teachers and school staff for promoting resilience (Drennon-Gala, 1995; Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1998; Zimmermann & Arunkumar, 1994). Evidence shows that teacher support and guidance may play a key role in a child’s development of wellbeing and resilience (Schoon & Bartley, 2008; Hill Stafford, Seaman, Ross & Daniel, 2007; Gutman, Sameroff & Eccles, 2002). The results from a wide reaching meta-analysis found that positive teacher/student relationships were linked to an increase in cognitive, behavioural and emotional engagement in learning and also an increase in academic attainment, whereas negative teacher/student relationships were associated with poorer engagement and achievement (Roorda, Koomen, Split & Oort, 2011). Evidence has also shown that teacher support and guidance may play a role in a child’s development and resilience (Schoon & Bartley, 2008; Hill, Strafford, Seaman, Ross & Daniel, 2007; Gutman, Sameroff & Eccles, 2002).

3.4.2 The School as a Community Hub

The importance of the school may possess potential in building resilience beyond supporting, encouraging and recognising the achievements of pupils by acting as a community hub. By the school working to connect individuals with their community and services therein, the school may help build cohesion, cooperation and communication within the community, thereby potentially increasing community activities, it may be possible to increase both individual and community resilience. For example, by schools offering such activities as after-school clubs, extra-curricular activities, community based activities and outings, volunteer schemes, it may be possible to increase both individual and community resilience (Schoon & Bartley, 2008; Newman, 2004). In addition, it has been suggested that schools can also become places where children and their families can gain access to various services to connect and interact (Schoon & Bartley, 2008). The authors of the Toolkit
correctly incorporate elements of the Extended Schools initiative, which although not specifically designed to focus on resilience, produced positive outcomes such as family involvement, pupil achievement and community development (Cummings, Dyson, Mujis, Papps, Pearson & Raffo, 2007; Carpenter, Cummings, Dyson, Jones, Kassam & Laing, 2011).

3.4.3 School Belonging and Connectedness

Positive and supportive learning environments can help build connectedness to schools whilst also promoting engagement with learning. A sense of connectedness and feeling like one belongs to a school may be a significant protective factor for children and young people in fortifying resilience (Resnick et al., 1997; Jose et al., 2012). Adding to this, the research into risk and protective factors have shown that a sense of connectedness and belonging is possibly one of the most crucial protective factors in children and young people (Resnick et al., 1997). Castalano and colleague’s’ (2003) longitudinal research investigated the impact of two multi-component school connectedness interventions in primary schools, the result of which showed an increase in school bonding and achievement and a reduction in problem behaviours. Although this research has focused on the primary years, the results showed lasting positive effects in relation to improved academic achievement and also a reduction in risky behaviours during school years.

Many of the areas that encompass supportive communities and interpersonal factors share a theme with a sense of belonging. Social psychological theories have also suggested that feelings of belonging may also be central to the maintenance of self-esteem and self-worth (Hogg & Abrams, 1998; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), and is also another important individual protective factor outlined within the Resilience Domains and the literature as being a crucial resilience factor. Furthermore, Baumeister and Leary (1995) suggested that the lack of intimacy and connection with others causes a host of negative consequences, such as depression, anxiety, stress and physical and mental illness, and to avoid these consequences there is a motivation to maintain levels of social connectedness. The upkeep of connectedness and social bonds not only leads to fortification of positive emotions, but may also assist in shaping positive behaviours (McAdams & Bryant, 1987). In regards to research that has explored the role of resilience and pupils returning from multiple exclusions and managed moves, the authors of the report note a clear deficit in how belonging and connectedness can be facilitated in this context. However, exploring ways to keep these pupils involved in their school through communication, such as school newsletters and contact with teachers and school, may add consistency and feelings of connectedness during these times of upheaval.

An early ecological model of development by Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) illustrates how schools offer many opportunities for group involvement through their structure and place within the greater community context. For example, Osterman (2000) highlights three aspects of classroom practice that may have an impact on a pupils belonging and school connectedness: methods of instruction, teacher support, and authority relationships between teachers and students. Expanding on this, the role of supportive friendships and peer groups, an environment that promotes
confidence and identity, a positive school culture and an emphasis on talents, interests and future goals may also assist in promoting belonging within the school.

3.4.4 School Culture and Ethos
The culture and ethos of a school may also have an impact on resilience in children and young people, and is a factor that encompasses other factors, such as connectedness, belonging, school and community and the role of teachers and school staff. It has been suggested that schools can develop a culture where talking about emotions and addressing issues with mental health are the norm (Weare & Nind, 2011), whilst also contributing to feelings of belonging and connectedness to the school (Millings, Buck, Montgomery, Spears & Stallard, 2012). Additionally, research has also shown strong links between school ethos and positive culture and behaviour and learning (Millings, Buck, Montgomery, Spears & Stallard, 2012; Powell & Tod, 2004). A schools culture and ethos will again be strongly linked to the corresponding factors of teachers and staff, school and community and belonging and connectedness, with its major emphasis being focused on how the school can create a culture of positive values, supportive student and teacher relations, supportive peer groups, encouragement, individuality and the promotion of high expectations. The Toolkit makes a strong link with the importance on school culture and ethos, which is appropriate considering the importance of the role and its many crucial related concepts.

3.4.5 Education
The evidence base provides firm support for a focus on education in regards to building and promoting resilience within the Toolkit. For example, previous research has shown that those who do well academically are generally more resilient (Gutman, Brown, Akerman & Obolenskaya, 2010; Hill Strafford, Seaman, Ross & Daniel, 2007; Masten, Best & Garmezy, 1990). However, achieving academically may not be the only curriculum subject that assists in building and nurturing resilience. For example, research has shown that confidence in physical ability for boys during sport is also a resilience factor, along with more creative topics such as music and art which may also hold potential to assist resilience (Sacker & Schoon, 2007). Not only does this research suggest that achieving in other domains of the school curriculum may promote resilience, it also provides support for the inclusion of talents and interests within the resilience Toolkit. The benefits of this are that the Toolkit can design ways to incorporate resilience throughout the curriculum and not just in academic subjects. For example, giving praise and merit to creative achievements, displaying pupil art throughout the school, encouraging musical groups and getting the whole school involved in school sports teams as players or spectators. Overall, creating a culture that celebrates creative and sporting accomplishments as much as it does academic success.

3.4.6 Engagement
There is evidence that suggests beyond attendance, engagement may also assist in promoting resilience through positive school experiences (Newman, 2004). For example, it has been argued that high-risk children and young people who had a positive experience and enjoyed primary school are more likely to show
improvements in their general wellbeing (Gutman, Brown, Akerman & Obolenskaya, 2010). In addition, it has been suggested that schools can promote engagement and involvement through the use of strategies that encourage ‘dispositions of learning’ through creating ‘positive learning architecture’ (Duncan, Jones & Carr, 2008). By recognising and valuing pupil engagement, schools assist in promoting wellbeing and resilience.

3.4.7 Healthy Behaviours
The previous research suggests that resilience and risky health behaviours are interrelated, as those who lack resilience are more likely to engage in unhealthy or risky behaviours. Similarly, engaging in these behaviours is likely to increase vulnerability and reduce resilience. Therefore interventions or programmes that aim to reduce risky health behaviours may also increase resilience. There is good evidence that schools can impact on behaviours, decreasing the likelihood of young people taking up smoking, drinking, using drugs, eating badly and not exercising (Dobbins, DeCorby & La Rocca, 2013; Faggiano, Vigna-Taglianti, Versino, Zambon, Borraccino & Lemma, 2010). On an individual level, some interventions that promote behaviour change also have features that may increase resilience (Foxcroft & Tsertvadze, 2011). For example, school-based programmes to prevent smoking seem to be particularly effective when they focus on improving skills such as problem solving and self-esteem (Thomas, McLellan & Perera, 2013).

The next section will focus on the second model: Academic Resilience.
4. Academic Resilience

As well as general resilience, the Toolkit also utilises the concept of ‘academic resilience,’ which is defined in the Toolkit as:

“Pupils achieving good educational outcomes despite adversity”

Research shows that resilience is correlated with academic achievement and educational success (Werner & Smith, 1992). The evidence base for The Resilience Domains Model described above suggests that many of the separate protective areas may also assist in academic achievement, which may also be linked to resilience. However, the framework cited as reference for academic resilience in the Toolkit, The Resilience Framework which has been adapted from Hart, Blincow and Thomas (2007) relays similar information from the Resilience Domains Model, albeit in greater depth and more catered towards the intended user base of teachers and school staff.

As previously discussed, the use of the term ‘resilience’ that is used in a school-based framework that lacks conceptual foundations inevitably causes problems with the validity of the framework being resilience-based. The same may be said with the use of the term ‘academic resilience’ within the Toolkit. In line with this, Smith (2015) has recently argued that within the surge of resilience training and interventions in schools there exists a dissonance regarding the definitions and understandings of the term ‘academic resilience,’ which will not only make the framework less theoretically valid, but will also cause issues in attaining measurable outcomes.

Whereas the resilience research has primarily explored cases of extreme adversity, it may be argued that academic resilience may consist of more minor ‘day-to-day’ threats to wellbeing, such as exam anxiety and peer-pressure that exists within the school. Martin and Marsh (2008) have suggested that the ability to cope academically in regards to daily adversities may be viewed through the lens of ‘academic buoyancy’ in order to separate the term from a traditional view of academic resilience.

Academic buoyancy can be described as the ability of students to successfully deal with academic setbacks and challenges that are common within daily school life (Martin & Marsh, 2008). Although the term resilience may be used in different contexts, there is a tendency to associate low resilience with underachievement and a variety of other negative outcomes within the school environment. Conversely, academic buoyancy may be associated with the process of dealing with and isolating poor performance and achievement, and the ability to academically ‘bounce back’ after failure.

This dissonance within the literature base highlights a possible concern with the use of the term ‘academic resilience’ within the Toolkit. The general resilience research that underpins the Resilience Domains Model does highlight the links between
resilience and academic achievement. However, the Toolkit may potentially run the risk of being too overly stretched in its aims of addressing both issues of resilience and academic resilience, and over-loading the user with complex issues to address when implementing the framework.
5. The Whole School Approach

The authors of the Toolkit aim for a framework to adopt a whole school approach in order to achieve maximum impact. The whole school approach has been shown to be an effective method in previous resilience intervention studies (Weare & Markham, 2005). A whole school approach aims to modify the school environment in order to benefit the pupils, staff and families by the whole school acting as a hub for the community.

Whole school or universal interventions are defined as interventions that target the whole school population and that do not focus solely on individuals on the basis of perceived risk. Sutton et al., (2005) have suggested that the benefits of whole school/universal approaches are that they can reach a large number of individuals whilst also increasing inclusiveness in at risk individuals. School based-frameworks that use a whole school approach have been shown to contribute to increasing resilience (Stewart, Sun, Patterson, Lemerle & Hardie, 2004).

In practice, the whole school approach was a key element of the National Healthy Schools Programme (NHSP), which was designed to improve health and wellbeing within schools. The programme took action focused on four areas of emotional health and wellbeing, physical activity, healthy eating, and personal and social health education (PSHE). There is a fast growing evidence base highlighting the use of multi-dimensional school wide approaches, which are commonly used as an organising framework to assist schools to integrate action in the domains of school ethos and environment, curriculum, partnerships with parents, community and health agencies (Wyn, Cahill, Holdsworth, Rowling & Carson, 2000).
6. Existing Resilience Related Interventions and Frameworks

The Toolkit is wide in its scope of the protective resilience factors that it incorporates within its framework, which provide an array of supported theory and how it can be transported into the arena of the workings of a school system. However, previous exemplars of resilience related programmes have focused on more specific areas of resilience and wellbeing, as opposed to the multi-domain framework of the Toolkit.

6.1 The Team of Life Programme

The team of life programme was designed to encourage children and young people to recognise the strength and resilience in their ‘life teams’ (See Eames, Shippen & Sharp, 2016). The programme uses a universal sporting metaphor that has been used in a diverse array of cultures and contexts. In the UK, the programme was tested with a sample of secondary school children who were asked to think about who is in their ‘team of life’ by making a list representing significant people in their lives, for example, who they would have as their goal keeper, defender or striker whilst also stating their ‘goals.’ The findings of the programme that were published in a peer-reviewed journal suggests benefits relating to feelings of confidence, peer support and friendship, all of which are important factors when considering resilience within schools. Additionally, the use of an intervention with a universal theme such as sport makes this intervention very adaptable in terms of its cultural appeal.

6.2 Families and Schools Together (FAST)

Home school-links have been designed that aim to promote parental confidence and engagement (Newman, 2004), such as the Families and Schools Together (FAST) programme. The UK based programme, developed by McDonald (1988; 2009; see McDonald & Puniskis, 2013 for a review) from the University of Middlesex, works with children at primary school and their families by supporting them to improve their children’s skills in reading, writing and numeracy, whilst also encouraging good behaviour and positive attitudes. The FAST programme, reported through numerous independent reviews, has had such positive outcomes as a reduction in such factors as: emotional symptoms, conduct problems and peer problems, and an increase in parental involvement with education. This programme is relevant to the Toolkit in that it provides an example of how by building links with parents, the school can assist in parents taking more interest in their child’s education, whilst also promoting various protective factors associated with the family and education.

6.3 Strengthening Families Programme (SFP)

There is some evidence to suggest that ‘multi-domain’ interventions that include school, family, individual and community elements can have a positive impact on health behaviours. For example, the US based Strengthening Families Programme (Kumpfer, DeMarsh & Child, 1989; Kumpfer & Spoth, 1996), involves working with pupils and parents in order to reduce alcohol and drugs usage among pupils by building protective factors and reducing risk factors. A literature review of a number of interventions designed to impact behaviour, found that SFP was the most
promising family intervention in terms of reducing smoking, alcohol consumption and drug use after four years following intervention. The relevance of this to resilience is that many interventions that aim to promote healthy behaviours also work on an individual level by focusing on self-esteem and problem solving skills, both of which may be viewed as protective resilience factors. Although the original programme was used with children aged 6-9, it has subsequently been used in the UK for 10-14 year old pupils (SFP10-14; see Coombes, Allen, Marsh & Foxcroft, 2006 for an independent review).

6.4 Building Emotional Resilience Programme
An intervention based in Scotland, known as the Building Emotional Resilience Programme aimed to develop an integrated holistic approach to building emotional resilience and wellbeing that had a specific focus on supporting transitions between primary to secondary school. Through the use of resilience workshops for parents, promoting confidence and understanding about resilience amongst teachers and staff, using peer support to increase confidence in pupils, and enhancing the leadership skills of head teachers in the area of resilience. The programme managed to enhance pupils’ self-esteem and resilience attitudes, raise staff confidence in regards to promoting resilience, raise parent confidence in their ability to support, and also a presence of greater school focus on resilience and wellbeing (see McLean, Moodie & Stevenson, 2009 for an independent evaluation).
7. Areas for Consideration

This review has revealed a wealth of theory and research that provides a strong evidence base for the Toolkit. The literature review also revealed some important factors that may be areas to consider in the further development of the Toolkit and framework. The following is a summary of those areas.

7.1 School-to-School Communication

An important factor in how resilience can be promoted and built in schools is supporting transitions and school-to-school communication. Schools have an opportunity as sites of transition to provide a key chance to build resilience and reduce vulnerability (Newman & Blackburn, 2002; Weare & Markham, 2005; Jackson, Henderson, Frank & Haw, 2012). For example, the experiences of transitions between primary school and secondary school have been shown to affect health and wellbeing in the child’s future (West, Sweeting & Young, 2010). Indeed, transitions into school also offer a good opportunity to engage with and support parents (Brown, Kahn & Parsonage, 2012). However, transitions are also times of elevated risks, during which children can suffer emotional distress and a decline in progress and commitment to learning (Galton, Gray & Roddocck, 1999), which may also undermine their resilience. This stresses the importance of the framing in focusing on how information will be shared across organisations in order for schools to understand the background and circumstances of the children coming to their schools.

An understanding of the importance of transitions also highlights the issue of ensuring that interventions are correctly timed to increase their impact. For example, evidence suggests that there is a window of opportunity for influencing the course of development during times of malleability (Cicchetti, 2010; Masten, Burt & Coatsworth, 2006; Masten, Obradovic et al., 2006; Masten, Long, Kuo, McCormick & Desjardins, 2009). Timing an intervention well may also lead to long-lasting effects (Heckman, 2006).

7.2 Culture

A critical protective factor of resilience that is overlooked in the Toolkit is the role of culture. For example, studies across differing cultures have highlighted the role of culture, community values, historical context and geographical settings on response to adversity (Castro & Murray, 2010). Indeed, protective factors may exist within the roots of many cultural practices, such as: cultural and religious traditions and practices, rituals and ceremonies, and cultural community support services (Crawford, Wright & Masten, 2006). Similarly, among minority groups in society, factors such as strength of ethnic identity, competence and comfort in engaging with other groups, and cultural socialisation are significantly important when dealing with issues of discrimination and oppression within society (Szalacha et al., 2003; Wright & Littleford, 2002). The deviation from an individualistic view of resilience and more towards contextually situated frameworks has been propositioned by various cross-cultural researchers (Aponte, 1994; Boyd-Franklin & Bry, 2000). Indeed, many of the
individual characteristics that promote resilience may be products not of just the environment, but also contextual cultural practices and values.

Indeed, considering a resilience domain that addresses the importance of culture within the Toolkit may be highly beneficial to the overall impact of promoting resilience. Focusing on cultural sensitivity, religious diversity, and a school culture and ethos that promotes cultural tolerance and religious acceptance will contribute in nurturing the protective resilience factors associated with resilience. Additionally, the Toolkit can ensure that the interventions and methods deployed by teachers and school staff are universal in their themes. For example, the Team for Life programme illustrates a method that can be adapted to differing cultural and contextual factors.

### 7.3 Virtual Realms

An area that requires consideration is that of virtual realms and the digital world that includes such factors as social networking, E-learning, gaming and technology. Children and young people’s use of the internet has undergone rapid expansion over the past decade, with growing use of social networking sites, mobile technologies and gaming platforms. Changing modes of social interaction online and the integration of technology into all areas of life may provide both benefits to resilience, but also risks, such as cyber-bullying. This area of research is still in its infancy, and there is a clear deficit into what role the virtual world plays in children and young people’s resilience. However, there does exist some research that explores how various forms of technology can be used to improve mood, emotions and feelings of wellbeing.

The concept of individuals using diverse forms of media to regulate their mood and enhance their motivational and emotional states is rooted in the theory of Uses and Gratification (Ruggerio, 2000). This can be reflected in many young people considering the Internet and technology as playing a positive role in their lives that makes them feel part of a community online (Young Minds, 2015). Indeed, social media may provide and reinforce such protective factors as friendships and supportive relationships, whilst also functioning as an arena where individuals can seek help and advice in times of adversity.

Recently, there has been an increased focus of research into video gaming that has suggested that there may be a plethora of benefits, as opposed to the negatives of video gameplay. For example, Granic, Lobel and Engels (2015) recently argued that video gameplay might provide; cognitive benefits, such as problem solving skill, spatial awareness and creativity (Jackson et al., 2012); motivational benefits, such as the cultivation of a persistent, optimistic motivational style; emotional benefits, such as the promotion of positive emotions and mood (Russoniello, O’Brien & Parks, 2009; Ryan, Rigby & Przybylski, 2006), and; social benefits, such as group membership and wellbeing (Kaye, 2015). In regards to education, several studies exist on the learning outcomes associated with educational games (O’Neil, Wainess & Baker, 2005; Vogel et al., 2006).
The role of the virtual world and technology is vastly new in terms of its relevance and application to resilience. The benefits of these realms must be taken into consideration as well as the possible disadvantages and threats to resilience they may also possess. Schools may possibly use virtual realms and technology to promote resilience by instilling an online presence and positive online community via social networking, an online blog that is run by pupils that promotes talents and interests whilst communicating the positive values, culture and ethos of the school, using a wide variety of technology and online teaching aids, and also making sure that E-safety is taught by teachers who understand the potential risks to student wellbeing, and possibly resilience that exist in virtual realms.
8. Limitations

This review of the existing literature has also identified potential limitations and issues that may potentially affect the outcomes of any school-based resilience framework. Through identifying these limitations and issues, they may be used to inform the development of the Toolkit and strengthen its impact.

8.1 Environmental Constraints
Boisture (2003) has stated that an ecological model of resilience involves surrounding children and young people with a network of supportive and nurturing relationships that include the family, community and religious organisations that connect children and young people with caring and supportive adults who serve as positive role models whilst encouraging positive values and high expectations (Brooks, 2006). Although schools can be an influential part of such a network, they are one part of the environment that surrounds children. Families still have the major responsibility of nurturing their children. Indeed, the quality of the parent/child bond during infancy and preschool plays a major role in developing caring relationships with adults before the child reaches school (Durlak, 1998).

8.2 Teachers and School Staff Training
A recent, but widely criticised resilience programme called the UK Resilience Programme (UKRP) highlighted the importance of teacher and staff training. For example, a possible cause for the weak results of the programme has been suggested as a reduction in effect as a result of teacher implementation (Challen, Gillham & Machin, 2014), In other words, many of the interventions that can be employed to increase resilience rely on certain theoretical understandings of the models, not to mention the sheer complex nature of resilience as a phenomenon. Indeed, many interventions may produce significant results when administered by a trained psychologist/psychotherapist, but when rolled out by teachers and staff who have not received sufficient training in the area the effect is noticeably diluted. Therefore, this limitation highlights the need for the Toolkit to ensure that there is sufficient training for the teachers and school staff on how to use and integrate the models and concepts within the Toolkit.

8.3 Universal vs. Targeted Programmes
Another issue that has been highlighted is the issue of targeted vs. universal programmes in regards to how students receive resilience intervention. Simply put, how will pupils be ‘picked’ to engage in resilience training; will all pupils within the school be enrolled, or will it specifically focus on ‘at risk’ individuals. The literature highlights that a mixture of both methods of selecting pupil engagement can be beneficial in building resilience (Merry, Hetrick, Cox, Brudvold-Iverson, Bir & McDowell, 2011). However, the literature also suggests that using targeted methods, or specifically focusing on at risk pupils may also contribute to the stigma around the factors that cause risk, such as mental health or economic status. In other words, the pupil may feel singled out or possibly ashamed of being the only one of their peer group being enrolled in such a programme. Additionally, the issue of targeted
programmes outlines the possible danger of adding to the at risk child’s pre-existing situations and thwarting the chances of building resilience (Merry., et al, 2011; Offord, Kraemer, Kazdin, Jensen & Harrington, 1998). Although the Toolkit aims for the whole school approach, the authors must consider both the advantages and disadvantages of targeting at risk pupils for intervention.
9. Conclusions

9.1 Rationales and Approach
The HeadStart Resilience Toolkit aims to provide useful tools and models for schools to improve how they approach the issue of pupils’ resilience and wellbeing, whilst enabling schools to become increasingly self-sufficient in addressing children and young people’s resilience. There appears to be clear support for the rationale of a school-based resilience framework, given the opportunity schools have to engage with and support their children, families and the wider community, whilst also playing a role in reducing risk and building interagency connections. The use of a whole school approach will assist in the Toolkit achieving its aims, as the literature suggests it to have been an effective method in previous intervention methods (Weare & Markham, 2005).

9.2 The Models
The main model referenced within the Toolkit, Daniel and Wassell’s Resilience Domains Model, provides a useful template for teachers and school staff in assessing resilience. There is strong theoretical backing for the greater view of resilience (child, family, supportive community; Brown & Rhodes, 1991; Bernard, 1995; Matson, 2001), and the six domains: social competencies, secure bases, education, friendships, talents and interests and positive values.

However, as the literature reveals many of these domains are interrelated and overlap, which may be confusing for teachers and staff in how these concepts can be separated into themes of individual factors of resilience and interpersonal factors of resilience. The second framework referenced within the Toolkit, the Resilience Framework under the link of ‘Academic Resilience,’ however, does provide some useful information of more specific ways resilience can be nurtured within a school environment. Nevertheless, these models use differing terminology, which may again cause confusion when trying to cross-reference the models when planning school/class interventions and activities.

9.3 Academic Resilience
The Toolkit aims to incorporate a theme of academic resilience within the framework. Although the literature does suggest a correlation between resilience and academic achievement, the Toolkit is weak in how it separates these two themes. The general research into resilience highlights how various protective factors can contribute to both resilience and educational achievement despite adversity; however, the area of academic resilience in the literature is often viewed as differing to that of general resilience. For example, being academically resilient may be the ability to bounce back from minor daily setbacks in school life (bad grades, exam anxiety), whereas general resilience is more focused on chronic and major life adversities (poor family care, poverty, mental illness). A suggestion based on the literature would be to either incorporate the theme of academic buoyancy, which emphasises a focus on how to deal with minor setbacks in school life (positive
emotions, problem-solving skills), or to simply ‘play down’ the academic resilience component and reinforce the benefits of the education domain of the Toolkit.

9.4 Previous Interventions
The authors of this report thought it useful to outline a number of existing frameworks to highlight the importance of some protective factors that have proven to be successful in interventions when approaching the issue of resilience in schools, particularly the Families and Schools Together Programme and the Team of Life Programme. For example, the FAST programme highlights that the family is the most powerful factor in regards to resilience, and programmes that focus on the family will have the greatest impact on resilience. The Team of Life programme also shows how an intervention design to be used across differing cultures and context can be beneficial and how it can be applied across schools that differ culturally and socially.

These previous interventions have commonly focused on one area of protective resilience, whereas the current Toolkit incorporates a multitude of domains and factors of resilience. This approach may have the result of increasing a general awareness of resilience in pupils, families, teachers, school staff and the community that may be reflecting in qualitative investigations. However, when trying to quantitatively ‘pin down’ successful interventions or activities that the school has used to increase resilience, the openness and flexibility for schools to use differing methods may prove problematic due to inconsistency. Therefore, if the authors of the Toolkit are looking for a highly quantifiable and measurable outcome of the Toolkit it may be advised to prescribe concrete interventions and reduce the schools ability to use their own methods and interventions.

The previous resilience interventions have also highlighted an important matter in regards to the Toolkit and its intended users: teachers and school staff. The matter of appropriate training in understanding the theories and concepts of resilience, as well as confidence in themselves and head teachers in regards to resilience topics is vastly important when considering the reduction in effect of the UK Resilience Programme. Although it may seem obvious that professionals would be more efficient in administering resilience training, the effectiveness of the Toolkit would be increased with substantial teacher training and competence in resilience.

9.5 Areas for Consideration
A review of the literature highlighted some areas for consideration that have been either been overlooked in the Toolkit or are worthy of greater attention due to their important role in resilience. Although the Toolkit includes an emphasis on school culture and ethos, it does not take into the account the role of an individual’s cultural beliefs or contexts that may be more salient than a schools culture. The Toolkit does highlight the need for context in how schools will individually cater the framework for their specific school, however, a child or young person’s own culture also plays an important role in nurturing and forming resilience. Given that multiculturalism is such an important and relevant issue within our society, and that many students will differ in ethnic, religious and cultural backgrounds, the inclusion
of culture and its benefits, as well as the use of interventions that are culturally sensitive must be addressed.

Another consideration identified is that of helping transitions and school-to-school communication. The literature base has shown that transitions between primary and secondary school affect health and wellbeing in the child’s future (West, Sweeting & Young, 2010), and are also good opportunities to engage with parents and families (Brown, Kahn & Parsonage, 2012). Therefore, a recommendation for the framework moving forward would be to focus on how communication between schools can be developed and included within the framework.

Lastly, the vast and new area of virtual realms was also highlighted as an area for consideration. Indeed, such factors as social networking, E-learning, gaming and technology may play roles in building resilience, but also threatening resilience. There exists research that suggests individuals use forms of media to regulate emotional states (Ruggerio, 2000). Furthermore, recent research in social networking and video gaming suggest that previous enquiry has focused mainly on the negatives of these virtual domains, and that there may also be potential benefits in regards to wellbeing, self-esteem and feelings of social belonging (Granic, Lobel & Engels, 2015) and that these benefits may also have educational applications. Schools may possibly use virtual realms and technology to promote resilience by instilling an online presence and positive online community via social networking, an online blog that is run by pupils that promotes talents and interests whilst communicating the positive values, culture and ethos of the school, using a wide variety of technology and online teaching aids, and also making sure that E-safety is taught by teachers who understand the potential risks to student wellbeing, and possibly resilience in virtual realms.
10. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions of the present report the authors have summarised a list of recommendations with suggestions on how to adapt the Toolkit based on the evidence provided.

1. Clarity of Protective Factors within Toolkit
A review of the resilience literature has illustrated the vast amount of protective factors that exist within the wider domains of child, family and community. The Resilience Domains Model does contain six areas that are relevant to many of these concepts; however, the delivery of these is quite vague and reductive. A recommendation for the Toolkit would be to create a framework for how and where these factors can be facilitated that can be cross-referenced with the resilience domains. For example, the domain of ‘Positive Values’ can include school ethos and the enforcement of positive school values, teachers and staff and the encouragement of positive values within the class, families and importance of positive parenting and encouragement, and also the community and positive values associated with volunteer work. The second framework referenced in the Toolkit incorporates a similar approach, however, there are differences in the terminology which may cause confusion for teachers and school staff.

2. Culture
The role of individual culture is an important factor that has been overlooked by the Toolkit. A recommendation would be to ensure that all materials and methods used are culturally sensitive in regards to the language used and the themes they contain. Furthermore, ensuring that the school culture and ethos is one that promotes cultural and religious differences by creating an inclusive and supportive climate that appreciates the importance of religious, cultural and historical practices among pupils.
Furthermore, it is also recommended that the Toolkit explore the use of interventions that are universal in regards to cultural themes, such as the Team of Life Programme, as these methods have shown to be beneficial in an array of differing cultures and contexts.

3. Transitions
The literature base highlights that transitions from primary to secondary school are times of heightened risk to resilience, but also provide good opportunities for schools to engage with parents and families. The authors of this report recommend that the framework explores ways that school-to-school communication can be developed in order to capitalise on this important transitional period. Furthermore, open days, taster lessons and induction days can be used to connect with families and provide children with a sense of the school culture and ethos.
4. Academic Resilience
The authors of this report recommend caution with using the term ‘academic resilience.’ Indeed, resilience does provide some benefits in how children and young people can achieve good educational outcomes despite adversity, however, these factors will be that of general resilience that views adversity in its extreme cases. The literature outlines themes associated with ‘academic resilience’ as more focused on minor setbacks that occur in the daily school life of the pupil and are more appropriately described as academic buoyancy. Academic buoyancy explores ways to help pupils bounce back from such factors as exam stress, anxiety and failure avoidance by reinforcing internal cognitive appraisals that can be encouraged by positive emotions. The authors of this report recommend either ‘playing down’ the element of academic resilience and subsuming the benefits into the general theme of resilience or exploring the inclusion of academic buoyancy.

5. Virtual Domains
The use of technology and the Internet are now prominent factors in many children and young peoples’ lives and the authors of this report thought it appropriate to recommend that the role of virtual domains be considered. Although the role of the virtual world and how it relates to resilience is an extremely under researched area, various theories and findings from sociology, positive psychology and cyberpsychology illustrate not only the potential risks to resilience this virtual domain may contain (cyber-bulling, cyberostracism), but also how it may nurture and reinforce resilience. For example, social networking provides an arena for children and young people to connect and feel a sense of belonging, and videogame play may also provide certain cognitive, motivational, social and education benefits. Indeed, the Toolkit may capitalise on these suggestions by having an online student-run blog, a social media presence for school news and events, incorporating more technological teaching aids and introducing games such Minecraft to teach coding. Additionally, including information on online safety and online risk during PSHE sessions may also help in reducing the risks to resilience that may exist in the virtual domains. Also, the Toolkit may explore ways in which some of its elements may be used in a virtual capacity incorporated into a virtual learning environment.

6. Teacher Training
Previous research has suggested that appropriate teacher training is an issue that may affect the success of an intervention. Therefore it is recommended that teachers and school staff be provided adequate training in regards to the concepts of resilience and any methods or interventions that are chosen for their respective schools.
7. Interagency Work
Previous interventions have illustrated the importance of interagency work between schools and mental health services. The authors of this report recommend that the Toolkit explore how it can facilitate interagency work and communication between schools and mental health services, such as Early Help, Live it well, Social Services and numerous other services that are available throughout Kent. There may be ways in which the framework can utilise resilience interventions methods that aim to assist these interagency workings, such as the Team of Life Programme.

8. Stability of delivery of the Programme
Previous interventions have commonly focused on one element of resilience, however, the Toolkit focuses on a multitude of resilience related factors, with schools being able to explore interventions and methods that suit their individual contextual needs. As previously discussed, this method may yield qualitative findings such as an increase in the awareness of resilience, or feelings of general wellbeing. Conversely, when attempting to pin down the outcomes of the Toolkit quantitatively, the issue of consistency and stability will prove problematic when analysing the data. Therefore, it is recommended that the Toolkit apply a standardised approach in the interventions schools use to approach resilience and supply schools with set interventions which they must use, which would heightened the consistency and stability of the Toolkit, whilst also providing a means to compare data and strengthen the validity of the findings.

9. Evaluation
The Authors of the report recommend that a comprehensive evaluation be built in from the start of the delivery programme by an independent and external researcher. This will further assist in accurately measuring the outcomes of the programme.
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