Developing a graduate attribute: A principle based approach to the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework

Corresponding author

Dr Gisela van Kessel (http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6955-0727)

Program Director (Physiotherapy)

University of South Australia

GPO Box 2471, Adelaide, South Australia, 5001, Australia

Email: gisela.vankessel@unisa.edu.au

Telephone: +61 8 8302 2551

Associate Professor Margo Brewer https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9580-0390

Director Practice and Interprofessional Education (Faculty of Health Sciences)

Curtin University

GPO Box U1987, Perth, Western Australia, 6845, Australia

Email: M.Brewer@curtin.edu.au

Telephone: +61 8 9266 9288

Dr Murray Lane https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1571-030X

Learning designer (Research and Innovation)

Queensland University of Technology

GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia

Email: mc.lane@qut.edu.au

Telephone: +61 7 3138 7556

Berni Cooper

Strategic Lead: Career Development & Engagement

Queensland University of Technology

GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia

Email: berni.cooper@qut.edu.au

Telephone: +61 7 3138 9862

Professor Fiona Naumann https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5938-5035

Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching

Queensland University of Technology

GPO Box 2434, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia

Email: fiona.naumann@qut.edu.au

Telephone: +61 7 3138 9748

Abstract

This paper describes the principles used to create the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework intended to support academics to develop students' resilience as an important graduate attribute for higher education students. Enhancing student resilience requires a structured approach to learning that articulates the factors that are important for the building of resilience, in a format that reflects incremental development across the student journey. This paper describes the principles used to inform the development of the curriculum framework including the adoption of a systemic program approach that is strengths-based, learner centred and viewed through an ecological lens to support students' resilience over time. The three learning domains of knowledge, skills and application guide building resilience as a graduate capability. The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework provides an evidence based guide for university staff to embed strategies that develop student resilience in a planned, supportive and scaffolded way.

Introduction

Concern over the mental health and wellbeing of university students is a global phenomenon. Approximately 20% of the 1.3 million students currently attending Australian universities experience a mental health issue (Carter, Pagliano, Francis, & Thorne, 2017; Orygen, 2017). A survey of 28,000 students across 51 higher education institutions in the US found 45% felt a sense of hopelessness, 50% were overwhelmed by anxiety, 30% felt their depression was interfering with their ability to function, and 7% had contemplated suicide in the previous year (Kirsh et al., 2016). International students, who now account for one third of Australian university students, face significant cultural, social and psychological stressors which impact negatively on their mental health (Carter et al., 2017). Students from specific disciplines are also at higher risk for mental health issues. For example, Drybe and Shanafelt (2016) reported between 35% and 45% of medical students experience high levels of emotional exhaustion, while 45% to 56% had symptoms of burnout. It has been established that higher education students experience significantly higher levels of mental health issues compared to the general population (Henning et al., 2018). Students experiencing mental health difficulties are less likely to complete their course (Orygen, 2017) due to difficulties with disrupted thinking and concentration, low academic confidence, swings in mood and motivation, and difficulty with social relationships (Carter et al., 2017).

To date, research on university student mental health has adopted a deficit approach with a focus on distress, burnout and illness such as anxiety and depression (Bailey & Phillips, 2016). In contrast, the World Health Organization (1946) adopts a positive, strengths based view of health. They define health as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity" (World Health Organization, 1946). The seminal work of Seligman and Csikzentmihayli (2000) adopts a similar strength based view of health, describing psychological health in terms of positive human functioning and flourishing.

Wellbeing has been defined as "being at ease with oneself, having meaning and fulfilment, experiencing positive emotions, being resilient and belonging to a respectful community" (Campion & Nurse, 2007 p. 25).

Programs that address student health and wellbeing are needed across Australian universities (Veness, 2016) at the system, program, and subject level (Carter et al., 2017). Recognition of universities' responsibility in promoting the health and wellbeing of students and staff has grown in recent years. Following the International Conference on Health Promoting Universities and Colleges, attended by over 380 delegates from 45 countries and representatives from the World Health Organisation, the Okanagan Charter (World Health Organisation, 2015) was launched. The charter emphasises the interconnectedness between individuals and their environment and recognises the critical role health and wellbeing have in learning, productivity and engagement. The Charter calls for higher education institutions to "provide transformational teaching and learning environments that enable and inspire students, faculty and staff to become health engaged citizens and leaders locally and globally"(World Health Organisation, 2015 p. 6). The calls to action within the charter include embedding health in all campus policies, creating supportive campus environments, and supporting personal development. Closer to home, the Australian Health Promoting Universities Network was established in 2016 with 25 Australian universities as members. Health promoting universities are those that embed health in teaching, learning and research and create supportive environment in which students and staff flourish and succeed, and university graduates are resilient (Wright & Winslade, 2018). Student wellbeing has been incorporated into the accreditation standards of the Australian government's Higher Education Standards Framework (Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, 2017). The UK has a new higher education accreditation scheme focused on student safety and wellbeing know as ProtectED (https://www.protect-ed.org/). The health and wellbeing of students (and

practitioners) is also a priority of other groups including the Medical Deans, Australian and New Zealand (2017) and the National Academy of Medicine in the US (2017).

It is essential that these initiatives emphasise a whole-of-institution approach to ensure a shift from a deficit to a strengths based view and from a focus on the individual (student or faculty member) to include a focus on the social, cultural and environmental factors at play in higher education (Ennals, Fossey, & Howie, 2015; Taylor, Saheb, & Howse, 2018). In keeping with the Okanagan Charter's (World Health Organisation, 2015) inclusion of building resilience as a key element of their framework for action, several researchers encourage universities to focus on building resilience (Beltman, Mansfield, & Price, 2011; Brewer et al., 2019; Hartley, 2010; Howe, Smajdor, & Stockl, 2012; Reyes, Andusyszyn, Iwasiw, Forchuk, & Babenko-Mould, 2015; Sanderson & Brewer, 2017; Stallman, 2011). Students with high levels of personal resilience have lower psychological distress, greater wellbeing, transition more easily into university, and experience less stress in their first year of university (Carter et al., 2017). Resilience is critical to students' effective engagement in learning complex tasks, positive response to challenges, and optimisation of opportunities available to them (Baik et al., 2017). Resilience is also positively associated with student's overall satisfaction, academic success and employability (Brewer et al., 2019). Resilience can be defined as "a dynamic process of positive adaptation in the face of adversity or challenge. This process involves the capacity to negotiate for, and draw upon, psychological, social, cultural and environmental resources" (Brewer et al., 2019 p. 10).

Organisational change is needed for higher education institutions to embed wellbeing initiatives such as building student resilience into the curriculum. The curriculum is important in establishing "what will be taught, what students need to learn and the expected quality of that learning" (Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012), 7). The

effectiveness of any new curriculum initiative, however, depends on the engagement of academic staff and their willingness to change the way they design, teach and assess (de la Harpe & Radloff, 2008). As the context of higher education is one of uncertainty and constant change (Leibowitz, 2016) we propose that the provision of a curriculum framework will assist staff in understanding how to implement the change and embed resilience enhancement within the curriculum. Such frameworks serve a useful purpose in concepts, learning outcomes and learning experiences into the curriculum (Keating, 2018). The curriculum framework described in this paper outlines strategies designed at the program level that faculty can utilise to enhance student resilience. Universities are encouraged to supplement the framework with the system-based approaches called for as part of the Okanagan Charter.

In response to the documented need, the aim of this paper was to establish a framework to support academics and universities build student resilience capacity to meet the demands of the 21st Century learning and work environment. Developed as an outcome of the "Building Graduate Resilience for the 21st Century" project funded by the Australian Technology Network in 2017, the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework serves a useful purpose in articulating definitions, outlining learning outcomes and providing conceptual alignment across the curriculum.

Materials and methods

Background

The curriculum development training tool developed by IBE-UNESCO (2017) describes a five stage process beginning with evidence gathering, followed by preparation, development, implementation and evaluation phases. Consequently, the crafting of the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework was founded on a definition of resilience that was developed through a process that began with drafting an initial conceptualisation of resilience drawn from an in-

depth review of the literature. This initial resilience concept was presented to health professional educators at a conference for practitioners involved in the education and training of health professionals in Australian and New Zealand Association for Health Professional Educators (Brewer, Sanderson, van Kessel, & Barnard, 2017). Participants in the session (n = approx. 50) provided feedback on the initial draft which was used to cultivate a consensus driven definition and conceptualisation of resilience for the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework. Consequently, resilience in the higher education context is understood as "a dynamic process of positive adaptation in the face of adversity or challenge. This process involves the capacity to negotiate for, and draw upon, psychological, social, cultural and environmental resources". (Brewer et al 2019 p. 1114)

Further preparation for the development of the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework occurred through a consultation phase that included systematically searching, reviewing and rating currently available resources designed to develop resilience. These resources were added to the Enhancing Resilience website (www.enhancingresilience.com) for use alongside the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework. The findings from the literature and resources reviews were then synthesised with data on stakeholder perspectives gathered through interviews and workshops with educators, input and feedback from an external reference group, and consultation with an expert advisor.

The first two phases of evidence gathering, and preparation involved reviewing the literature and scanning websites for existing curriculum frameworks followed by a consensus building process that explored competing perceptions of resilience. Undertaking these tasks facilitated the authors reaching a common understanding of resilience within the higher education context, outlined above. This paper provides a detailed description of the approach used to implement the third phase of curriculum development.

Principle based process

The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework is based on a set of six principles drawn from resilience and education theories discussed below:

Using a strength-based approach

The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework was developed to support a change in the discourse on student resilience. The current literature emphasises interventions founded on a deficit model, and the need to "fix" students' mental health. By contrast, the proposed framework takes a strength based approach in line with a health promotion view of resilience as a salutogenic concept rather than a pathogenic concept (Antonovsky, 1996). This positions the teaching and learning of resilience to focus on student wellbeing and success, rather than as a process to manage student mental health problems. To this end the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework guides university leaders and educators to shift their focus from teaching and learning of resilience as psychoeducation targeting individual students to consider the local environmental context, they create that either supports or undermines resilience, and the broader context of the university and society.

Using an ecological framework

The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework applies an ecological approach to resilience that is built around three interconnected learning contexts (often depicted as spheres) as the theoretical foundation to teaching resilience (Smith, 2009). The ecological approach is a multifaceted perspective best depicted as concentric circles with each domains nested inside a larger setting. For instance, Belsky (Belsky, 1980) depicts these domains as the personal domain inside a microsystem inside an exosystem, inside a macrosystem. This has been applied to resilience in higher education by Brewer et al. (2019).

A learner-centred process

To support educators to maintain a learner-centred approach when teaching and assessing resilience strategies, the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework takes a constructivism pedagogy using Biggs and Tang's constructive alignment as a learner centred process (Biggs & Tang, 2007). "Constructive" refers to the perspective that knowledge is constructed through the activities of the learner (Biggs, 2014). "Alignment" refers to the consistent use of the same verb (drawn from learning taxonomies) (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) across each teaching activity, assessment and outcome (Biggs, 2014). Constructive alignment starts with a clear statement of the *intended learning outcome* for the student, not with the content the teacher is going to impart (Biggs & Tang, 2007). This approach allows the educator to devise learning activities and assessment tasks which align directly with the learning outcomes. Key to this process of alignment is the selection of terms that are learner centred and targeted at the level of the student. The structure of observed learning outcomes taxonomy was used to create categories that considered the level of the students' experience and allowed for increasing levels of complexity (Biggs & Collins, 1982). While chronological, the framework is not designed to intentionally tie to exact timeframes such as first year or final year, given that each student may progress at a different pace (Carew & Mitchell, 2002).

Addresses the learning domains of knowledge, skills and application

The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013) is a nationally recognised policy for regulated qualifications in Australian higher education and as such provides an integrated and nationally relevant structure and nomenclature on which to base the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework (Table 1). The AQF defines each qualification level in terms of discrete learning outcomes descriptors in a hierarchical structure from a Certificate Level 1 to Doctoral degrees at Level 10. The complexity, autonomy and extent of student achievement required to demonstrate the

accomplishment of degrees across Australia is set out in the AQF (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013). This level of achievement is articulated in the form of learning outcomes defined by the knowledge graduates are expected to understand, and skills and application they are able to demonstrate (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013). The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework mirrors this scaffolded approach through the development of a matrix to describe the progression of the student's construction of knowledge, skills and application of resilience in practice.

[Table 1 near here]

Enabling a systemic whole of program approach

A whole of program approach to curriculum design implies a systemic conceptual and practical integration across subjects and years of a student's development (Koester, Eflin, & Vann, 2006). Resilience should not be viewed as a discrete element in a student's development, but rather is embedded within the entirety of the student experience, through subjects and across all year-levels.

Promoting evidence based learning opportunities

The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework accesses and utilises existing knowledge on effective opportunities to develop students' resilience. Evidence for strategies targeting student resilience was gathered through systematic searches (Brewer et al., 2019; Sanderson & Brewer, 2017) and then organised within the framework structure.

Results

The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework was designed to enable a whole of program approach to building resilience as a graduate capability to be utilised across undergraduate program learning outcomes in curriculum development (Table 2). Learning outcomes of

increasing complexity scaffold the learning for the commencing student (Early Stage), for continued development (Middle Stage), for students ready to graduate (Later Stage) and those anticipating life beyond university (Future Stage). The learning outcomes enable staff to embed learning activities across the whole of a program, focusing on building students' understanding of resilience and maturing their resilience capabilities. A matrix was created to demonstrate how students can be scaffolded to progress from developing knowledge about resilience to developing skills that enhance resilience and thus have the capacity to apply knowledge and skills to support their resilience in times of adversity.

[Table 2 near here]

The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework was structured to provide a detailed model that offers specificity for academics in the development of learning outcomes for subjects (Table 3). The foundation was based on an ecological theoretical framework applied to resilience by Brewer et al. (2019) with three ecological learning spheres consisting of intrapsychic (the personal domain inside a microsystem), interpersonal (intrapersonal inside a mesosystem) and contextual (exosystem) domains. The macrosystem − the wider societal and political sphere − has not been included in the framework design.

[Table 3 near here]

The first domain describes the development of the students' intrapsychic abilities which included self-awareness, self-regulation, self-determination and self-care. A students' accurate self-awareness relies on their ability to reflect on their performance, receive and address feedback and overcome negative learning experiences by adopting a growth mindset. Self-awareness is supported by the students' ability to manage their emotional response to negative life and study events by regulating their thoughts, feelings and behaviours. A resilient student

also needs to have the capability to be future focussed through the effective setting of goals. Finally, a preventative focus is included as attention and prioritisation of self-care strategies centred on healthy behaviours such as good nutrition, exercise and sleep habits are important for student resilience.

The intrapsychic domain connects with the interpersonal opportunities that students need to support their resilience. The process of teaching and learning should consider how students can be supported to develop social connections and become effective collaborators. In addition to consider the method of teaching, the learning outcomes should enable students to learn how to establish a network of supportive relationships and connections with others, and are able to develop a sense of belonging (to their course, profession and/or institution) as they will have a greater capacity for resilience. Likewise, skills in teamwork and conflict management will develop the students' ability to collaborate and work effectively with others.

The last domain describes the essential contextual elements required for an effective physical and social learning environment within the institution. Effective and strategic leadership in the context of resilience is required to lead curriculum and policy development and to develop staff capacity that can then foster student capacity. The leadership and strategic vision require a common understanding of resilience and a commitment to its importance as a graduate capability for all students along with the resources to achieve this. This contextual domain focusses on the creating a supportive university environment which is essential to successful implementation of a resilience strategy for students. Appropriate formal and informal rules and regulations, physical resources, a supportive organisational culture, and social policies are needed that focus on providing different forms of support that includes academic, information, emotional and instrumental help. Academic support from university staff consists of enabling strategies that make explicit the frequently hidden curriculum staff have regarding expectations

of student self-management. This can include using a partnership approach with students leading to innovative curriculum design. Effective communication strategies have been recognised as vital in enabling resilience, and within the university context should have a focus on empowering the students' capacity to take control of their learning experiences via access to vital information regarding their studies. Similarly, emotional support plays a key role in resilience and relies on university staff encouraging students to utilise university support services, particularly counselling, when appropriate. Finally, instrumental support prompts university staff to consider how any existing tangible supports such as scholarships, fee relief and housing can be made accessible and available.

The learning outcomes were mapped to evidence based resources to support academics in the design and delivery of teaching, learning and assessment strategies that enable and target student resilience available at the Enhancing Resilience website (www.enhancingresilience.com). As this is still a nascent research area, much of the evidence is yet to emerge in both quality and quantity so the framework also includes suggestions from discussion papers.

Discussion

This paper describes a set of principles and how they were used to develop a framework that responds to a gap in the literature on resilience by providing a guide to university staff seeking to promote student resilience within the higher education context. The usefulness of the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework is dependent on the ability of academics to embed resilience building activities within the curriculum for their students, so it is worthwhile examining how the fourth phase of curriculum development i.e. implementation may occur (IBE-UNESCO, 2017). We suggest the implementation of the Graduate Resilience Curriculum

Framework is contingent on effective partnerships between the academics, student support staff and the students. It will rely on the provision of effective leadership to coordinate the process of implementation that includes determining the need for curriculum renewal, the method and practice of teaching, the selection of learning objectives that align to the students' progress, and the learning strategies, resources and evaluation. The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework encourages consideration of a whole of program approach that considers vertical and horizontal integration across student progression and resilience domains, but this requires a coordinated approach and may befit from a champion. Additionally, these domains allow institutions to begin curriculum development in a top down manner addressing the institutional context, or with a bottom up approach, promoting intrapsychic and interpersonal capabilities of students.

While the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework does not directly provide academics with teaching materials, it does provide the foundations on which to create assessment and teaching activities. The framework can also be used to determine the subjects that will be targeted to implement specific resilience strategies, and to enable the mapping of learning objectives, outcomes and assessments with a focus on the students' perspective. Learner focussed objectives clearly describe what the student will do in measurable terms that can then be clearly linked to assessment tasks. The mode of assessment can be informed by the theoretical foundation, the teaching objective and the learners' needs. For instance, assessing entry students' knowledge on intrapsychic strategies such as coping styles will require a different mode from assessing a more experienced students' coping behaviours and skills.

As with all scholarly work limitations need to be considered. The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework is presented as a product but it should be acknowledged that the development of curriculum is a subjective practice informed by social interests (Luckett, 2009). Bernstein pedagogic device guides a critique of curriculum to consider the production

(research), the recontextualization (the curriculum development) and the reproduction (teaching practice). The Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework is built on existing knowledge about resilience in the university setting however this literature is in its infancy and much of the quality of research is limited. The development of the foundational principles and the curriculum itself has occurred through an iterative discourse resulting in selectively appropriated, relocated and refocussed resilience knowledge influenced by the authors beliefs on who learners are and how learning occurs (Bernstein, 2000). There is therefore a limitation in terms of the relationship between power and knowledge of the authors and whether or not a plurality of voices, particularly the student voice has been empowered (Foucault, 1980). We therefore suggest that in the reproduction, or actual teaching delivery opportunities for co-design with students be prioritised to readdress this.

One further limitations is in the implementation of the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework as it relies on the wellbeing and resilience of academic staff which can often be compromised in this high pressure sector (Biron, Brun, & Ivers, 2008). Little is known about academic staff resilience and how this enables or undermines student resilience, indicating be a useful area for further research.

Conclusion

This paper described a set of six principles used to design the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework which supports academics in embedding resilience within subjects, courses and entire programs, to build resilience as a graduate capability. Academics have been given information on the six principle that underpin the design on the framework along with guidance on how to develop learning outcomes of increasing complexity that are scaffolded from the commencing student to the graduate. Guidance on how to move from students' awareness and knowledge of resilience to the ability to use resilience related skills in times of adversity is also provided. Importantly, the Graduate Resilience Curriculum

Framework supports academics to move from a narrow focus on intrapersonal skill

development of the student towards a broader ecological understanding of resilience that

enables the academic to make impactful changes to university structure and cultures thus

promoting resilience for the entire university community.

Acknowledgement

Declaration of interest statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. (Eds.). (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom¹s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman Australian.

Antonovsky, A. (1996). The salutogenic model as a theory to guide health. *Health Promotion International, 11*(1), 1-18.

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012). *The shape of the Australian curriculum version 4.0*. Sydney, NSW: Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority

Australian Qualifications Framework Council. (2013). *Australian Qualifications Framework* (Second ed.). South Australia: Australian Qualifications Framework Council.

Baik, C., Larcombe, W., Brooker, A., Wyn, J., Allen, L., & James, R. (2017). *Enhancing student mental wellbeing: A handbook for academic educators*. Canberra: Australian Government Department of Education and Training

Bailey, T. H., & Phillips, L. J. (2016). The influence of motivation and adaptation on students' subjective well-being, meaning in life and academic performance. *Higher Education Research and Development, 35*(2), 201-216. doi:0.1080/07294360.2015.1087474

Belsky, J. (1980). Child maltreatment: An ecological integration. *American Psychologist, 35*(4), 320.

Beltman, S., Mansfield, C., & Price, A. (2011). Thriving not just surviving: A review of research on teacher resilience. *Education Research Review, 6*(3), 185-207.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Lanham: Rowan &Littlefield.

Biggs, J. (2014). Constructive alignment in university teaching. *Review of Higher Education (HERDSA), 1*, 5-22.

Biggs, J., & Collins, K. F. (1982). *Evaluating the Quality of Learning - the SOLO Taxonomy*. New York: Academic Press.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). Teaching for Quality Learning at University Maidenhead. *Professional Educator*. Retrieved from https://www.austcolled.com.au/publications/

Biron, C., Brun, J. P., & Ivers, H. (2008). Extent and sources of occupational stress in university staff. *Work, 30(4)*, 511-522. PMID: 18725713

Brewer, M., Sanderson, B., van Kessel, G., & Barnard, S. (2017). *Should resilience be a key graduate capability to ensure work-readiness for the 21st Century?* Paper presented at the ANZAHPE Conference, Adelaide, South Australia.

Brewer, M., van Kessel, G., Sanderson, B., Naumann, F., Lane, M., Reubenson, A., & Carter, A. (2019). Resilience in higher education students: a scoping review. *Higher Education Research & Development, 1*.

Campion, J., & Nurse, J. (2007). A dynamic model for wellbeing. *Australasian Psychiatry, 15*(suppl 1), s24-s28.

Carew, A. L., & Mitchell, C. A. (2002). Characterizing undergraduate engineering students' understanding of sustainability. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 27*(4), 349-361.

Carter, M. A., Pagliano, P., Francis, A., & Thorne, M. (2017). Australian university students and mental health: viewpoints from the literature. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 3*, 1-25. Corpus ID: 158795968

de la Harpe, B., & Radloff, A. (2008). *Developing graduate attributes for lifelong learning: How far have we got?* Paper presented at the Lifelong learning: Reflecting on successes and framing futures. Proceedings of the 5th International Lifelong Learning Conference, Rockhampton.

Dyrbye, L., & Shanafelt, T. (2016). A narrative review on burnout experienced by medical students and residents. *Medical Education, 50*(1), 132-149.

Ennals, P., Fossey, E., & Howie, L. (2015). Postsecondary study and mental ill-health: A meta-synthesis of qualitative research exploring students' lived experiences. *Journal of Mental Health, 24*(2), 111-119.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hartley, M. (2010). Increasing resilience: Strategies for reducing dropout rates for college students with psychiatric disabilities. *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation, 13*, 295-315.

Henning, M. A., Krageloh, C. U., Dryer, R., Moir, F., Billington, R., & Hill, A. G. (2018). *Wellbeing in Higher Education. Cultivating a Healthy Lifestyle Among Faculty and Students.* London: Routledge.

Howe, A., Smajdor, A., & Stockl, A. (2012). Towards an understanding of resilience and its relevance to medical training. *Medical Education, 46*(4), 349-356.

IBE-UNESCO. (2017). *Training Tools for Curriculum Development: Developing and Implementing Curriculum Frameworks*. Geneva: IBE-UNESCO

Keating, S. B. (2018). The classic components of the curriculum: Developing a curriculum plan. In K. S. B & S. S. DeBoor (Eds.), *Curriculum development and evaluation in nursing education* (4th ed., pp. 81-105). New York: Springer.

Kirsh, B., Friedland, J., Cho, S., Gopalasuntharanathan, N., Orfus, S., Salkovitch, M., & WebbeR, C. (2016). Experiences of university students living with mental health problems: Interrelations between the self, the social, and the school. *Work, 53*(2), 325-335.

Koester, R. J., Eflin, J., & Vann, J. (2006). Greening of the campus: a whole-systems approach. *Journal of cleaner production, 14*(9-11), 769-779.

Leibowitz, B. (2016). The professional development of academics as teachers: Reconsiderations. In J. M. Case & J. Huisman (Eds.), *Researching Higher Education: International perspectives on theory, policy and practice* (pp. 153-170). New York: Routledge and the Society for Research into Higher Education.

Luckett, K. (2009). The relationship between knowledge structure ad curriculum: a case study in sociology. *Studies in Higher education, 34*(4), 441-453.

Medical Deans, A. a. N. Z. (2017). Student health and wellbeing. Retrieved from https://medicaldeans.org.au/priorities/students-health-and-wellbeing/

National Academy of Medicine. (2017). Action collaborative on clinician well-being and resilience. Retrieved from https://nam.edu/initiatives/clinician-resilience-and-well-being/

Orygen. (2017). *Under the radar: The mental health of Australian university students*. Parkville, Victoria: Orygen, The National Centre of Excellence in Youth Mental Health

Reyes, A. M., Andusyszyn, M. C., Iwasiw, C., Forchuk, C., & Babenko-Mould, Y. (2015). Resilience in nursing education: An integrative review. *Journal of Nursing Education, 54*(8), 438-444.

Sanderson, B., & Brewer, M. L. (2017). What do we know about student resilience in health professional education? A scoping review of the literature. *Nurse Education Today, 58*, 65-71.

Seligman, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-14.

Smith, S. R. (2009). A dynamic ecological framework for differentiating the primary curriculum. *Gifted and Talented International, 24*(2), 9-20.

Stallman, H. M. (2011). Embedding resilience within the tertiary curriculum: A feasibility study. *Higher Education Research and Development, 30*, 121-133.

Taylor, P., Saheb, R., & Howse, E. (2018). Creating healthier graduates, campuses and communities: Why Australia needs to invest in health promoting universitieS. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*. doi:10.1002/hpja.175

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (2017). Higher Education Standards Framework 2015. Retrieved from https://www.teqsa.gov.au/higher-education-standards-framework-2015

Veness, B. G. (2016). *The wicked problem of university student mental health*. Retrieved from Sydney, Australia: https://www.churchilltrust.com.au/fellows/detail/3865/Benjamin+Veness

World Health Organisation. (2015). Okanagan Charter: An international charter for health promoting universities and colleges. Retrieved from https://healthpromotingcampuses.squarespace.com/okanagan-charter

World Health Organization. (1946). Constitution of WHO: Principles. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/about/mission/en/

Wright, B., & Winslade, M. (2018). University staff and students are at high risk of ill health: Here's how to make sure they can cope. *The Conversation*. Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/university-staff-and-students-are-at-high-risk-of-ill-health-heres-how-to-make-sure-they-can-cope-101070

Table 1. Summary of how each principle was applied in the development of the Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework

Principle	Application within the development of the framework
To use a strengths-based approach to teaching resilience	Provision for resilience-building for **all** students, and the use of supportive and empowering language within the framework
To use an ecological framework that support students' resilience over time	Informed the three domain categories: intrapsychic, interpersonal and contextual
To support educators to maintain a learner-centred approach when teaching and assessing resilience strategies	Use of learning outcomes and SOLO taxonomy
To addresses the three learning domains of knowledge, skills and application to provide academics with a set of learning outcomes that can be embedded across curriculums to build student resilience	Focus of learning outcomes centred on knowledge, skills and application
To promote evidence based opportunities to learn about building resilience of graduates	All central concepts with framework are based on findings from existing literature, especially the categorisations within the domains
To enable a systemic whole of program approach to building resilience as a graduate capability.	The development of a practical framework with elements able to be embedded in existing program work curriculum planning documents across a range of developmental needs (early, middle, later and future)

Table 2. Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework: Program structure aligned with student stage of learning

	Early Stage	Middle Stage	Later Stage	Future Stage
Knowledge	The student will be able to identify and explore intrapsychic and interpersonal concepts, principles, and theories, and strategies of resilience.	The student will be able to explain the relationships between intrapsychic and interpersonal factors related to in the classroom.	The student will be able to integrate their knowledge of resilience and extend their use of strategies into different contexts.	The graduate will be able to extend their knowledge of resilience into diverse workplace contexts.
Skills	The student will be able to demonstrate basic intrapsychic and interpersonal skills required for resilience within subject tasks.	The student will be able to demonstrate intermediate intrapsychic and interpersonal skills related to resilience in the classroom.	The student will be able to demonstrate advanced resilience skills related to different contexts.	The graduate will be able to demonstrate advanced resilience skills related to workplace contexts
Application	The student will be able to use simple intrapsychic and interpersonal skills related to resilience within personal lives.	The student will be able to use intrapsychic and interpersonal skills related to resilience in the classroom.	The student will be able to use advanced intrapsychic and interpersonal skills related to resilience to respond to different contexts.	The graduate will be able to use intrapsychic and interpersonal skills related to resilience to respond to the complexity of the workplace contexts.

Table 3. Graduate Resilience Curriculum Framework - Learning Outcomes

DOMAIN	Definition	PROGRESSION Summary / Category	EARLY	MIDDLE	LATER	FUTURE
		Summary	*Recognise and describe resilience principles and concepts*	*Develop and explain relevant resilience capabilities*	*Apply, and integrate a broad range of resilience strategies*	*Apply and extend resilience capabilities beyond the university setting*
		Category				
Development of student capabilities						
INTRAPSYCHIC	Managing thoughts, feelings and actions	**SELF AWARENESS** (e.g. Guided reflection, Growth mindset, Meaning making, Self-awareness)	Identify individual strengths, values, and explore ways to build capacity and achieve goals	Develop self-assessment and reflection skills	Critically analyse, adapt and adjust own performance to improve learning outcomes when faced with adversity	Effectively apply self-assessment and reflection skills to enhance workplace performance despite experiencing adversity
		SELF REGULATION (e.g. CBT, Coping, Meditation, Mindfulness)	Recognise the importance of regulating thoughts, feelings and behaviour in maintaining resilience	Develop knowledge and skills to regulate thoughts, feelings and behaviour	Demonstrate the ability to regulate thoughts, feelings and behaviour, in unpredictable, complex and stressful settings	Demonstrate consistent regulation of thoughts, feelings and behaviour despite experiencing adversity
		SELF DETERMINATION (e.g. Sense of control, Proactive, Problem solving, Take action)	Recognise the importance of taking control, developing skills and working with others to increase personal learning outcomes	Develop competence over a range of skills that empower the student to achieve personal learning goals	Demonstrate ongoing autonomous prioritisation and achievement of goals even when faced with adversity	Demonstrate a commitment to lifelong learning and mastery of skills to manage adverse workplace situations

		SELF CARE (e.g. Work life balance, Recreation, Self-care activities, Stress reduction, Physical activities)	Identify a range of self-care strategies to manage set-backs and challenges	Develop and implement self-care plans to support coping with set-backs and challenges	Demonstrate the ability to adapt and adjust self-care plans to manage set-backs and challenges	Demonstrate leadership and flexibility in managing work place adversity in collaboration with others
INTERPERSONAL	Establishing and maintaining reciprocal relationships	**CONNECTEDNESS** (e.g. Sense of belonging, Build social connections, Mentoring, Leisure and social activities)	Recognise the role of relationships in being resilient in the face of adverse learning experiences	Demonstrate effective communication and relationship building capabilities that enable the effective connection with others	Connect effectively with a range other people in social, professional and learning communities at times of adversity	Demonstrate the ability to expand social capital by building and using supportive social and professional networks to manage adversity
		COLLABORATION (e.g. Teamwork, Conflict management, Staff-student learning communities, Peer support programs)	Identify the principles and concepts that underpin effective group work outcomes	Develop knowledge and skills for productively working in teams	Demonstrate group work skills to build functional teams that achieve positive outcomes in the face of adversity	Demonstrate the ability to remediate dysfunctional team performance in adverse situations
Development of supportive learning environments						
CONTEXTUAL	Providing supportive	**ACADEMIC SUPPORT**	Lead resilience related curriculum and policy innovation that is co-designed in partnership with students, scaffolds challenges and leads to authentic assessments			
		INFORMATION SUPPORT	Utilise communication strategies that provide clear information to students on learning and assessment expectations and responsibilities			
		EMOTIONAL SUPPORT	Create supportive environments through culture and structures that enable students to feel valued regardless of success or failure outcomes			
		INSTRUMENTAL SUPPORT	Provide staff and students with resources and training that builds resilience knowledge and skills			