Moving towards organisational resilience: A practical application of the 'Whole System Approach' in the secure care sector

Kevin Pollock and James Gillespie

Abstract

Kibble is a Scottish specialist child and youth care charity and social enterprise. It has been a successful organisation since 1841, adapting and changing to maintain its ability to deliver relevant, high-quality services, in a high-risk and high-value sector. Kibble's organisational resilience is founded on sound risk management and learning from experiences. Since 2014, Kibble has introduced several related initiatives, including business continuity and enterprise risk management, improving resilience, and learning across the organisation. Key to its development as a learning organisation is its cohesive vision, open systems thinking, updating heuristic and practice models, team learning and improving individual capabilities while avoiding a blame culture when things go wrong. With this approach enhancing crisis-preparedness, Kibble continues to learn, develop, and provide high-quality services to support young people. However, there is limited research on organisational resilience and learning at establishments such as Kibble. This paper seeks to increase the body of knowledge and provide practical guidance for improving resilience and learning practice in the care sector. The Benchmarking Resilience Tool (BRT-13b) is introduced as an effective method for organisations to assess their resilience capability and address any performance gaps.

Keywords

Organisational resilience, learning, benchmarking performance

Corresponding author:

Dr Kevin Pollock, Academic Fellow, UK Emergency Planning College,

Kevin@PFResilience.com

Introduction

Since its establishment in 1841, Kibble has adapted and evolved to changes in the Scottish care and education system. Secure care is a high-risk and high-value service (Gough, 2016). In a changing environment, Kibble's priority remains the young people who need the most help. However, it is mindful that crises can occur when organisations fail to manage their risks effectively. Increasing crisis-preparedness requires changes to strategies, structures, culture, and people (Pauchant & Mitroff, 1992). For the purposes of this research, we adopt Schein's (2010) definition of organisational culture as the pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by the group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that worked well enough to be considered valid. In essence, not only does culture define the rules of the organisation but it also reinforces perceptions through its assumptions, understandings and implicit rules which govern workplace activity. Schein (2010) considered culture and leadership as conceptually intertwined or two sides of the same coin, and one could not be considered without the other. Therefore, as part of its journey towards organisational resilience, Kibble emphasised the important responsibility of organisational leaders to 'institutionalise' preparedness throughout the organisation (Kelly, 2007). This approach reflects how resilient organisations must anticipate, respond, and adapt to acute or sudden shocks and chronic or incremental changes and survive and prosper (BSI, 2014), which requires fully integrated policymaking and practices. Recognising that culture is capable of inhibiting changes to practices and behaviours, Kibble links its Organisational Resilience Policy to its strategic and management objectives and supports it with a change programme. In doing so, it considered that effective and sustainable outcomes require system-focused interventions tied to its business strategy (Schneider, 2000). This paper outlines the journey Kibble made in adopting a 'whole systems approach' towards organisational resilience and learning, and how it can be measured. It provides a practical approach, focused on the essential components of planning and adaptive capacity, embedded throughout the organisation.

Systems, learning and resilience at Kibble

The application of a systems approach to child protection services has been advocated (Munro, 2010; Kearney, 2013). The Scottish Government promotes a 'whole system approach' underpinned by Getting it Right for Every Child (GIRFEC, 2010) and The Promise (Independent Care Review, 2020). Interactions between system components create dynamics that influence the resilience of the whole system. The term resilience has many meanings in academic discourse (de Bruijne, Boin, & Eeten, 2010) and the components of a resilient social system vary between different layers, with distinctions between the individual, community, and institutions (OECD, 2013). Resilience is dynamic which makes measurement difficult at all levels. But making the case for investments in resilience requires facts and empirical evidence (Gall, 2013). Organisations can achieve resilience through an institutional approach to anticipating and preparing for crises and their consequences through knowledge, social collaboration, and innovation (Comfort, Boin, & Demchack, 2010). Key to resilience within an organisational system is learning. Residential childcare agencies exhibit many features of a learning organisation (McPheat & Butler, 2014). The five disciplines of a learning organisation at Kibble are its cohesive vision, open systems thinking, updating heuristic and practice models, team learning and improving individual capabilities while avoiding a blame culture when things go wrong (Senge, 2006).

Learning organisations are more resilient. They facilitate change, empower organisational members, promote collaboration and information sharing, create learning opportunities, and promote leadership development (Franco & Almeida, 2011). For the purposes of this study resilience represents the capacity of an organisation to manage risks and resources effectively. Kibble does this through adaptation of its actions, systems, and processes, to ensure that its core functions operate in a stable and significant relationship with its risk environment (Comfort et al., 2010). Vital is the capability to anticipate, respond, synchronise, and learn proactively (Provan, Woods, Dekker, & Rae, 2020). With Kibble's strategic vision and whole systems approach, it sees the 'big picture' and proactively scans the risk environment to anticipate and mitigate disruptive

events. Its organisational resilience structure ensures disparate parts of the organisation are synchronised when managing disruption. Importantly, all critical incidents and near-misses are reported and analysed to identify learning opportunities.

Kibble's journey towards becoming a more resilient and learning organisation was incremental and practical, recognising the complexity of the care sector. Each stage built on the lessons of the former. The foundation was the 2015 Business Continuity Management (BCM) policy. It provided a clear statement of Kibble's strategic leadership commitment and priority to improving resilience and learning. It set out the structure, roles, and responsibilities, including the subsidiarity principle of issues being resolved at the lowest possible level. The BCM system aligned to the international standard ISO 22301 and the Business Continuity Institute's Good Practice Guidelines. An important decision for the successful implementation of Kibble's BCMS was the appointment of an Executive Director responsible for business continuity at Board level. Support was provided by a BCM organisational coordinator with delegated responsibility for oversight to ensure cohesion across Kibble. At the operational level, each business unit appointed a local coordinator responsible for its business continuity plan.

Once the BCMS was established, Kibble aligned its Enterprise Risk Management System (ERM) to the requirements of the international risk management standard ISO31000, which defines risk as the effect of uncertainty on objectives. The ERM focused on the strategic business objectives and the actions necessary to mitigate potential risks or seize opportunities. The system was tailored to Kibble, mirroring existing arrangements and avoiding unnecessary bureaucracy. The ERM ensured the Board and Senior Management had visibility of Kibble's risk exposure. A vital action was the production of a dynamic corporate risk register with strategic risks reflecting Kibble's objectives, integrated with business planning, and executive responsibilities for risks and opportunities assigned to relevant directors.

The subsequent development of the Organisational Resilience Policy integrated business continuity and risk management with other functional disciplines,

namely security, crisis, and emergency response management. This created a multidisciplinary and holistic approach acknowledging different types of organisational activity contribute to resilience, while reducing duplication and bureaucracy and increasing learning opportunities. A crucial action in Kibble's successful implementation of the policy was experiential staff training using authentic and credible scenario simulation exercises, which provided opportunities to learn from crises without risk (Goldberg, Silverman, Samuelson, Katz, Lin, Levine, & DeMaria, 2015).

Having embedded the Organisational Resilience Policy, in 2020 Kibble conducted a benchmarking survey to critically assess its current resilience strategies and performance to address any capability gaps. A key decision was to use the Benchmark Resilience Tool (BRT-13b), which can be used to measure resilience in a range of organisations. Importantly it provides an assessment of staff behavioural traits and perceptions, therefore accessing the heart of the organisation's culture and beliefs.

Designed by Whitman, Kachali, Roger, Vargo and Seville (2013), the BRT-13b further developed previous research into organisational resilience measurement (McManus, Seville, Vargo, & Brunsdon, 2008; Stephenson, Vargo, & Seville, 2010; Lee, Vargo, & Seville, 2013). It is based on a two-factor model of organisational resilience — planning and adaptive capacity with thirteen resilience indicators listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Resilience indicators

Planning	Adaptive Capacity
Planning strategies	Minimisation of silos
Exercise participation	Internal resources
Proactive posture	Staff engagement & involvement
External resources	Information & knowledge
Recovery priorities	Leadership
	Innovation & creativity
	Decision making

Planning	Adaptive Capacity
	Situation monitoring & reporting

Research methodology

A qualitative approach combining document review, staff survey and semi-structured interviews, was adopted to ascertain the current level of organisational resilience at Kibble. The research proposal was approved following scrutiny by Kibble's Ethics Committee and complied with the British Sociological Association Guidelines on Ethical Research (BSA, 2017). Confidentiality of data and anonymity of the interviewees because of the sensitive nature of the research was assured. The data was interpreted by a combination of inductive and deductive approaches and triangulation enhanced its validity.

The research application preceded the COVID-19 pandemic, although the research was conducted during it. The document review began 15 May and continued throughout, the survey between 6 June and 12 July 2020, and the interviews between 19 August and 11 September 2020.

Kibble Quality Assurance sent an email link to the survey to 635 staff. The preamble explained, following approval by Kibble's Ethics Committee, the survey was part of a resilience project by an external researcher. One hundred seventy-nine were returned (28%), but 35 discarded, four failed to give consent, and 31 provided insufficient data. One hundred forty-four were completed correctly (23%). The completed questionnaires provided a range of opinions from the organisation, shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Survey responses

Organisational Role	Respondents	%
Board Member, Executive Director, Senior Leader	13	9
Operations & Service Managers	25	17
General Non-Management	102	71
Not Stated	4	3
N=144		

Visser, Krosnick, Marquette and Curtin (1996) found surveys with lower response rates (near 20%) yielded more accurate measurements than surveys with higher response rates (near 60 or 70%). Keeter, Kennedy, Dimock, Best and Craighill (2006) compared a study with a 25% response rate with that of 50% and found they were statistically indistinguishable. Moreover, Choung, Locke, Schleck, Ziegenfusset, Beebe, Zinmeister and Talley (2013) found a low response rate does not necessarily indicate non-response bias.

The survey used a 4-point Likert-scale to assess agreement with individual statements. The respondents score 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree. (See Appendix A for the associated benchmarking survey statements). Follow-up interviews with a purposeful sample of eleven respondents were also conducted. The interviewees represented Kibble services and included directors, managers, and staff. They were allocated an identifier R1 to R11. The interviews were thematically coded using organisational resilience indicators.

Findings

The two-factor model of organisational resilience: planning and adaptive capacity and the related resilience indicators and benchmark statements provided a thematic structure for the findings. Which are triangulated by interviewees comments and summarised below:

Planning strategies

Kibble's organisational resilience strategy included developing business continuity plans to manage its vulnerabilities in its risk environment. This required formal infrastructure changes to ensure timely feedback and decision making so that everyone understood the resilience principles. In effect, Kibble developed a culture change supportive of making mistakes as part of learning, building reliability, and trust. 'The one thing that Kibble did was align its strategic vision and underpinned it with an enterprise risk management approach to business continuity and all the other aspects around that, to its business plan...in line with the values of the organisation' (R11).

Participation in exercises

Kibble recognised that testing plans is critical, and resilience improves with adequate resources appropriately trained in their roles. Effective learning depends on balancing the experiences from the most recent crisis against existing knowledge and experiences (Renå & Christensen, 2020). This requires staff participation in regularly scheduled exercises designed to practice response arrangements and validate methods and plans. Using scenario building and exercises allows participants to integrate theory and practice. They learn experientially in realistic circumstances and gain awareness of their reactions in stressful situations (Blanchard & Thacker, 2013). 'The most useful training I've had since been involved with Kibble is attending a multiagency desk exercise…Testing is essential. You know it's amazing the gaps that the desk exercise can show up' (R6).

Proactive posture

A resilient organisation has the strategic and behavioural readiness to respond to early warning signals of change in its internal and external risk environment before they escalate into a crisis. Kibble's strategic leaders successfully shifted its cultural mindset by developing and investing in a risk-based approach to decision-making, supported by proactive scanning, and learning from experiences and emerging risks.

> I think before there was a lack of commitment and investment. You know 'it's not important attitude'. But that's changed with business continuity and risk management. Using experts to put systems in place. Looking at the organisation as a whole (R4).

External resources

Improving its organisational resilience required Kibble to understand the relationships and resources it might need from other organisations during a crisis. These include the emergency services, local authorities and other agencies who can provide specialist equipment and services. In addition, the

provision of formal reciprocal arrangements and mutual aid with other establishments in the sector. Together with planning, communication, and management to ensure access. To achieve this, Kibble appointed staff to work across unit boundaries to build relationships and enhance collaboration and coordination. They encourage participation within Kibble's resource network and promote mutual benefits that has led to more effective resilience outcomes. 'Tabletop exercises with multiagencies are exploring and groups are bringing it all together…we're all doing it, at all departments and levels, sharing knowledge, sharing expertise and experience. Communicating' (R5).

Recovery priorities

Kibble analysed and predetermined its priorities and minimum operating requirements in the event of disruptions. It ensured they were defined and communicated throughout the organisation. The critical services, recovery, and resource priorities were recorded and planned during the implementation of Kibble's Business Continuity Management System. These subsequently proved invaluable when preparing for the impacts of leaving the European Union and the pandemic. 'The corporate risks set priorities. The business continuity plans reflect them. There's a much more organised focused approach' (R2).

Minimisation of silos

Kibble promotes collaborative staff values. It recognised that silos prohibit the creation of shared views and communication and is a common cause of system failure. Breaking down silos fosters creativity and collaboration and productive staff relationships (Kowalski, 2017). To create a more collegiate approach to service delivery, Kibble critically examined all processes, procedures, and its culture to determine necessary changes that would enhance collaboration.

'Before, there was no organisational resilience at all. It was an ad-hoc approach with no understanding across teams. Now there's been a huge change…staff are

now much more aware what the systems about. Working together to help young people' (R10).

Internal resources

Crises are disruptive and bring uncertainty affecting the availability of existing organisational resources, which often leads to conflict among responders (Comfort et al., 2010). However, a common thread in resilient organisations is active and engaged management by highly trained professionals. As part of its approach to learning and development, Kibble proactively provided staff opportunities for personal growth. Staff are encouraged to take sensible risks to develop resilience and nurture partnerships that enables joint learning.

> After crisis we ask how can we prevent that from happening again? How can we mitigate some of the risk factors? What do we need to do as an organisation? Do we need to invest in terms of infrastructure? Do we need to bring someone in who's a specialist? Because we recognise that we may not always have all the information or the skills within the organisation. But at Kibble, I think we're really good at recognising where the gaps are and filling these gaps with the right people (R3).

Staff engagement and involvement

Kibble's resilience, and its long-term success is underpinned by its staff. They have been empowered to use their skills to solve problems and understand the link between their role and the organisation's success. The policy encourages a holistic understanding of staff contribution to resilience. '[It's a] collaborative approach with everybody involved…a synergy of skills, experiences and talents. Not just "their wee bit is alright". There's a positive attitude towards standards and practices at Kibble' (R8).

Information and knowledge

Kibble developed induction training and cross-departmental exercising to share information and knowledge. It created a single repository for Organisational Resilience. It uses standard language to record information and decision making. This has improved the analysis and quality of information being shared across services and with multiagency partners. Data analysis informs adjustments to the organisational resilience system and learning is evidenced by changes to policies, structures, training and behaviours.

> Make sure its recorded and you've got all that information. But it's not just about that. It's about how you interpret some of that data and start the lessons learned process or learning from previous incidents. It's a huge thing (R11).

Leadership

Leadership is of primary importance to organisational learning. Only leaders can create and reinforce a no-blame culture and encourage staff to learn from failures (Edmondson, 2011). The leader's perceptions, or their resilience ethos, will influence the approach taken by the organisation (Pearson & Clair, 1998). Kibble's senior leaders' strategic approach emphasises resilience and learning at the core of its decision-making and culture. This message has been proactively and publicly advocated throughout the organisation. It provides service managers and practitioners with the authority to implement change in the direction agreed.

> There's strategic leadership and ownership about risks and learning. You know, if we don't all understand each other's roles and the importance of learning we'll regress (R9).

Innovation and creativity

Because of the nature of crises, innovation, and creativity are critical response skills (Kendra & Wachtendorf, 2003). Resilient organisations have a high

adaptive capacity, can cope with change, and respond to it quickly and effectively. At Kibble, staff are encouraged to be confident in their professional expertise and contribution to achieving better outcomes. An induction programme has ensured staff share a common understanding of how changes in culture, systems, and practice enhance organisational resilience and crisis-preparedness.

> Across the organisation staff are able to step in and sort things. You're not just relying on people at the top. You've got people who can deal with things before they escalate. For me, Kibble, as part of the planning process and part of the training is ensuring a breadth of knowledge and having people who solve problems (R1).

Decision making

An essential characteristic of a resilient organisation is deference to expertise. Decisions should be delegated, not necessarily to those in command but to those with the most appropriate knowledge applicable in the circumstances (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2007). Kibble staff have the relevant authority to make decisions related to their work, with authority delegated to enable a crisis response. 'There's been a huge change in the last 5 years. Now decisions are made based on risks. It's systematic, thought through. Before it wasn't like that. Now there's more accountability' (R2).

Situation monitoring and reporting

In resilient organisations, situational monitoring and reporting is a notable characteristic (Hale & Heijer, 2006). Kibble requires staff to be vigilant about the organisation, its performance, and potential problems. They are encouraged to share good, and bad news about the organisation, including early warning signals, reported quickly to organisational leaders. Kibble's comprehensive BCM and ERM programmes formalised its incident escalation process with notification trigger points. A significant action was the establishment of a Resilience Committee which oversees and analyses risks and incidents for underlying trends and lessons. It has representatives from Kibble services with sufficient

knowledge, experience, credibility, and confidence to drive change to ensure the continuous improvement of resilience and learning. 'We need to remember that people will move on. We'll lose organisational memory. So we need to make sure that this continuous and is not a fad. It's important that people know what happened and why' (R7).

Conclusion

Successful organisational resilience and learning are inextricably linked. Kibble's adoption of a systems approach has improved its resilience and crisis-preparedness. It sees interdependencies, uses multiple perspectives to contextualise learning and improve organisational resilience. Kibble actively seeks learning opportunities by critically reviewing its incidents and practices. The strategic intention is to deliver feasible and practical benefits to improve outcomes. The evaluation of potential action is essential, measuring it against existing standards and practice.

However, Kibble recognises that making changes requires the investment of time, effort, and resources. It has responded by establishing a formal change programme, which includes linked funding. It draws on the experience and understanding that staff have of the organisational environment where the change is required. This engagement ensures staff understand and commit to its success, which allows Kibble to demonstrate that its learning is not based solely on policy. The use of benchmarking enabled Kibble to go beyond the policies and structures and delve into the heart of the organisation by understanding the perceptions and beliefs of its people in relation to organisational resilience. There is now empirical evidence that the organisational resilience policy has meant fundamental changes at all levels within Kibble. Not only to policy and procedures, but also culture, behaviour, and planning assumptions.

An essential aspect of organisational resilience and learning was the introduction of monitoring and measurement of expected outcomes. Not just in the initial stages but continuously to completion and after that to ensure sustainability. The critical point is Kibble, as an organisation that frequently analysis itself, is

aware of its current risk environment and its capabilities, which reduces the likelihood of failure and organisational crisis. To operationalise such learning, improve organisational resilience and be crisis-prepared, Kibble understands that: 'The strategies implemented in an organisation influence, and are influenced by, the organisation's structure and culture and the psyche of individuals' (Pauchant & Mitroff, 1992, p. 52).

In moving towards organisational resilience, Kibble understood the complexity of the care sector and adopted a practical approach, that was incremental and continuous. These research findings demonstrate that Kibble has taken key organisational actions that support resilience and learning and integrated them through the organisation's strategy, structure, culture, and its people. These also provide practical guidance for improving resilience and learning practice in the care sector. Organisations can achieve this by:

- Demonstrating a strategic commitment by leaders in proactively setting the vision and standards that values resilience and learning and is accepted as an organisational priority.

- Implementing a significant resilience and learning infrastructure with defined organisational responsibilities, which provides timeous feedback mechanisms, with resilience and learning objectives built into on-going operations, and part of personnel performance assessments.

- Creating a culture focused on continuous improvement, which critically monitors and evaluates against expected outcomes, reflected in changes to norms and practices, so embedding resilience and learning throughout the organisation.

- Communicating resilience and learning is everyone's responsibility, that all staff must be committed and involved, clearly understand their role and responsibility, and are trained and competent to do so.

References

Blanchard, P. N., & Thacker, J.W. (2013). *Effective training: Systems, strategies, and practices*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

BSA (2017). British Sociological Association Statement of Ethical Practice 2017. https://www.britsoc.co.uk/publications/ethics/

BSI (2014). BS65000, 2014, Guidance on Organizational Resilience. https://shop.bsigroup.com/ProductDetail?pid=000000000030258792

Independent Care Review (2020). *The Promise*. https://www.carereview.scot/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/The-Promise.pdf

Choung, R. S., Locke, G.R., Schleck, C.D., Ziegenfusset, J.Y., Beebe, T. J., Zinmeister, A. R., & Talley, A. J. (2013). A low response rate does not necessarily indicate non-response bias in gastroenterology survey research: a population-based study. *Journal of Public Health 21*(1), 87–95. https://doi.org10.1007/s10389-012-0513-z

Comfort, L. K., Boin, A., & Demchak C. C. (2010). Resilience revisited: An action agenda for managing extreme events. In L. K. Comfort, & A. Boin, & C. C. Demchak, (Eds.), *Designing resilience: Preparing for extreme events* (pp. 272-284). Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Press.

De Bruijne, M., Boin, A., & Eeten, M. (2010). Resilience: Exploring the concepts and its meanings. In L. K. Comfort, & A. Boin, & C. C. Demchak, (Eds.), *Designing resilience: Preparing for extreme events* (pp. 13-32). Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Press.

Edmondson, A (2011, April). Strategies for Learning from Failure. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/2011/04/strategies-for-learning-from-failure

Franco, M. & Almedia, J. (2011). Organisational learning and leadership styles in healthcare organisations: An exploratory case study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal 32*(8),782-806. https://doi.org.10.1108/01437731111183739

Gall, M. (2013). From social vulnerability to resilience: measuring progress toward Disaster Risk Reduction. *InterSecTions, 13.* https://doi.org.10.13140/2.1.1949.4568

GIRFEC (2010). A Guide to Implementing Getting it right for every child: Messages from pathfinders and learning partners. https://www.gov.scot/policies/girfec/

Goldberg, A., Silverman, E., Samuelson, S., Katz, D., Lin, H. N., Levine, A., & DeMaria, S. (2015). Learning through simulated independent practice leads to better future performance in a simulated crisis than learning through simulated

supervised practice. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*, *114*(5), 794-800. https://doi.org.10.1093/bja/aeu457

Gough, A. (2016). A safe future? Finding a way forward for the secure care sector in Scotland. *Scottish Journal of Residential Child Care*. *15*(1), 70-79. https://www.celcis.org/application/files/9416/2308/6837/008._2016_Vol_15_1_Gough_A_Safe_Future.pdf

Hale, A, & Heijer, T. (2006). Auditing Resilience in Risk Control and Safety Management Systems. In E. Hollnagel, D. D. Woods, & N. Leveson (Eds.), *Resilience Engineering Concepts and Precepts*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Kearney, J. (2013). In the Loop: A systemic approach to rethinking the child protection system. *Social Work & Social Science Review*, *16*(3), 99-111. https://doi.org.10.1921/swssr.v16i3.539

Keeter, S., Kennedy, C., Dimock, M., Best, J., & Craighill, P. (2006). Gauging the Impact of Growing Nonresponse on Estimates from a National RDD Telephone Survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *70*(5), 759-779. www.jstor.org/stable/4124225

Kelly, W. J (2007, February 25). Continuity Belongs in Business Planning Process. *Business Insurance*. Retrieved from: https://www.businessinsurance.com/article/20070225/STORY/100021202/Continuity-belongs-in-business-planning-process

Kendra, J. M., & Wachtendorf, T. (2003). Elements of resilience after the World Trade Center disaster: Reconstituting New York City's emergency operations center. *Disasters*, 27(1), 37-53. https://doi.org.10.1111/1467-7717.00218

Kowalski, M. (2017). Breaking down silo walls: Successful collaboration across library departments. *Library Leadership and Management*, *31*(2), 1-15. https://doi.org.10.5860/llm.v31i2.7202

Lee, A. V., Vargo, J. & Seville, E. (2013). Developing a tool to measure and compare organizations' resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, *14*(1), 29-41. https://doi.org.10.1061/(ASCE)NH.1527-6996.0000075

McManus, S., Seville, E., Vargo, J., & Brunsdon, D. (2008). Facilitated process for improving Organizational Resilience. *Natural Hazards Review*, *9*(2), 81–90. https://doi.org.10.1061/(ASCE)1527-6988(2008)9:2(81)

McPheat, G., & Butler, L. (2014). Residential child care agencies as learning organisations: Innovation and learning from mistakes. *Social Work Education*, *33*(2), 240-254. https://doi.org.10.1080/02615479.2013.770833

Munro, E. (2010). *The Munro review of child protection (part one): A systems analysis.*
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175391/Munro-Review.pdf

OECD (2013, May 10). *What does resilience mean for donors?*
https://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/docs/May%2010%202013%20FINAL%20resilience%20PDF.pdf

Pauchant, T., & Mitroff, I. (1992). *Transforming the crisis-prone organization: Preventing individual, organizational and environmental tragedies*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pearson, C. M., & Clair, J. A. (1998). Reframing crisis management. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(1), 59-76. https://doi.org.10.2307/259099

Provan, D. J., Woods, D. D., Dekker, S. W. A., & Rae, A. J. (2020). Safety-II professionals: How resilience engineering can transform safety practice. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, *195*, 106740. https://doi.org.10.1016/j.ress.2019.106740

Renå H., & Christensen, J. (2020). Learning from crisis: The role of enquiry commissions. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, *28*(1), 41-49. https://doi.org.10.1111/1468-5973.12269

Senge, P. (2006). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Century.

Schneider, W. E. (2000). Why good management ideas fail: the neglected power of organizational culture. *Strategy & Leadership*, *28*(1), 24-29. https://doi.org.10.1108/10878570010336001

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Stephenson, A., Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2010). Measuring and comparing organisational resilience in Auckland, *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, *25*(2), 27-32.

Visser, P., Krosnick, J., Marquette, J., & Curtin, M. (1996). Mail surveys for election forecasting? An evaluation of the Columbus Dispatch Poll. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60(2), 181-227. www.jstor.org/stable/2749688.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Whitman, Z. R., Kachali, H., Roger, D., Vargo, J., & Seville, E. (2013). Short-form version of the Benchmark Resilience Tool (BRT-53). *Measuring Business Excellence*, *17*(3), 3-14. https://doi.org.10.1108/MBE-05-2012-0030

About the authors

Dr Kevin Pollock completed a PhD in Crisis Management and Resilience at the University of Glasgow. He is an independent consultant at Pollock Ferguson Resilience and an Academic Fellow at the UK Cabinet Office Emergency Planning College. Dr Pollock has lectured at Glasgow Caledonian University and was Assistant Professor of Policing and Security, Rabdan Academy, UAE. He has conducted previous research projects for the UK and Scottish governments and published in several academic journals.

Jim Gillespie joined Kibble in 2014 as an Executive Director. In September 2016, after two years of service, he was appointed Chief Executive Designate, before taking over as Chief Executive in May 2017. In 2006, Jim was awarded a Butler Trust Award by HRH Princess Anne and has completed his Master's in Business Administration (MBA). He has previously published in SJRCC and other publications.

Appendix 1: Resilience indicators & benchmark survey statements

	Resilience Indicator	Benchmark Survey Statements
Planning		
1	Planning strategies	We are mindful of how a crisis could affect us.
2	Exercise Participation	We believe emergency plans must be practised and tested to be effective.
3	Proactive posture	We are able to shift rapidly from business-as-usual to respond to crises.
4	External resources	We build relationships with organisations we might have to work with in a crisis.

	Resilience Indicator	Benchmark Survey Statements
5	Recovery priorities	Our priorities for recovery would provide direction for staff in a crisis.
Adaptive Capacity		
6	Minimisation of silos	There is a sense of teamwork and camaraderie in our organisation.
7	Internal resources	Our organisation maintains sufficient resources to absorb some unexpected change.
8	Staff engagement & involvement	People in our organisation "own" a problem until it is resolved.
9	Information & knowledge	Staff have the information and knowledge they need to respond to unexpected problems.
10	Leadership	Managers in our organisation lead by example.
11	Innovation & creativity	Staff are rewarded for "thinking outside the box."
12	Decision-making	Our organisation can make tough decisions quickly.
13	Situation monitoring & reporting	Managers actively listen for problems.
Source: Whitman et al., 2013.		