

The Integrated Resilience Paradigm: Fostering Optimal Quality of Life through Equitable Capacity Development

Executive Summary: Strategic Imperatives for 21st-Century Resilience

Community Resilience (CR) has evolved beyond a concept limited to disaster response, serving today as a critical framework for enhancing and sustaining the optimal quality of life within both geographical and relational communities. This report synthesizes research from public health, psychology, and behavioral science to establish that CR is fundamentally a measure of equitable day-to-day vitality and system cohesion, not just post-shock recovery capacity.¹

Key findings demonstrate that Pre-Event Community Functioning is critically undermined by chronic adverse effects, such as structural racism, making targeted investment in the Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) a prerequisite for effective resilience. Behaviorally, successful capacity building requires precision; generalized social cohesion must be strategically differentiated from task-specific collective efficacy components to stimulate protective action effectively, mitigating the risk of a false sense of security.²

Strategically, the past landscape of unprecedented federal funding, particularly from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA)³, must be leveraged to align physical infrastructure resilience (as guided by frameworks like the NIST planning steps) with public health mandates for equity. This strategic alignment, supported by dynamic system modeling (COPEWELL), allows policymakers to move beyond basic mitigation toward restorative, predictive investments that guarantee faster recovery and sustained well-being for all populations.⁴

Chapter 1: The Foundational Science of Community Resilience and Quality of Life

1.1 Defining Resilience as an Equitable System Function

The contemporary public health theory of Community Resilience (CR) posits a dual imperative, moving beyond the traditional focus on acute shocks. Modern CR is defined as the sustained ability of community systems to prepare for, withstand, and recover from acute shocks (such as natural disasters or pandemics), while simultaneously addressing and preventing the chronic adverse effects stemming from underlying structural issues.¹

This definition intrinsically links resilience to existing quality of life. The 15 key elements that allow a community to effectively "bounce back" after an acute shock are, in fact, strong indicators of that community's day-to-day vitality, social cohesion, and established social capital.¹ Therefore, achieving optimal quality of life is functionally synonymous with achieving a high state of **Pre-Event Community Functioning**.⁵

A true measure of CR requires a community's ability to cope, strive, and be supported through equitable access to buffers that address and relieve both chronic stress and acute adversity.¹ The implication of this dual focus is profound: focusing CR solely on responding to acute disasters is an incomplete and potentially harmful approach. If structural racism represents a chronic adverse condition¹, then communities struggling under high levels of chronic stress will inherently exhibit a lower.⁵ When an acute shock occurs, the resulting loss of functioning (Resistance) and the time required for recovery will be disproportionately prolonged in these already stressed populations. This systematic disadvantage demonstrates that systemic inequity acts as a resilience shock multiplier, negating the effectiveness of infrastructure investments unless root causes are addressed first. The definition thus demands that resilience policy pivot from simple mitigation toward mandatory, long-term equity investment.

1.2 Dynamic Systems Modeling: The COPEWELL Framework for Assessment

To effectively measure and model community resilience, static indicators are insufficient, often conflating resilience with the basic measure of community functioning. The COPEWELL conceptual framework provides a necessary advance by explicitly separating resilience from community functioning through a system dynamics computational model.⁶ This computational approach is essential for policy-makers and practitioners who need to accurately assess the impact of interventions on resilience.⁸

COPEWELL measures resilience through the quantification of a community's post-disaster ability to deliver essential goods and services, which is termed community functioning.⁵ The

framework identifies three crucial components of resilience measured across time () relative to baseline functioning ():

1. **Community Functioning (CF):** The pre-event capacity of the community to deliver necessary goods and services to its residents, representing the baseline quality of life.⁵
2. **Resistance:** The magnitude of the initial drop in functioning when a disaster (natural or human-caused) strikes.⁵
3. **Recovery:** The slope and timeline of the curve as it returns to pre-event levels of functioning.⁵

The system dynamics model developed through COPEWELL incorporates the accepted notion that disasters result from the interaction of events, populations, engineered infrastructures, ecosystems, and pre-event preparedness activities over time.⁴ This work is critical because it identifies all key components for both resilience and functioning, translating them into a computational model that includes connections and complex feedback loops.⁴ This dynamic approach allows for the prediction of community functioning after an event, using publicly available, county-level measures.⁴ This capacity allows policy-makers to simulate the time-course of community functioning across different areas and identify investments that demonstrably enhance system resistance and recovery, thereby providing quantitative justification for resilience spending.⁴

1.3 The Critical Role of Social Determinants of Health (SDOH)

The goal of building resilience capacity must commence with a detailed understanding of the root causes of health outcomes. Local health departments (LHDs) increasingly recognize that effective planning necessitates focusing on the social and physical conditions—the Social Determinants of Health (SDOH)—in which people live.⁹ These conditions, which include the availability of resources and supports in homes and neighborhoods, the quality of schooling, the safety of workplaces, and the nature of social interactions, broadly affect health and well-being.⁹ The unequal distribution of these conditions places significant obstacles in the path of health for many communities.

Integrating SDOH data into Community Health Assessments and Improvement Planning (CHA/CHIP) is crucial for developing robust community capacity plans.⁹ Several national and regional resources provide the necessary indicators to establish a robust baseline of

by mapping these determinants:

- The **AARP Livability Index** measures community quality across seven categories, encompassing health, the built environment, engagement, and opportunity.⁹
- The **County Health Rankings and Roadmaps** annually measure vital factors like high school graduation rates, unemployment, income, and access to healthy foods.⁹
- The **CDC Community Health Status Indicators (CHSI)** provide interactive health

profiles for every county, including key indicators of health care access, quality, and environmental factors.⁹

These comprehensive SDOH assessments provide the structural data necessary to operationalize resilience policy. While COPEWELL provides the dynamic outcome metrics (Resistance and Recovery time)⁵, SDOH data are the essential

input variables that describe the structural elements of .¹ By linking these static assessment tools (e.g., the Socioeconomic Conditions Index used in local projects like Atlanta’s NQOLH⁹) to the dynamic modeling tool (COPEWELL), policymakers can simulate the effectiveness of specific equity interventions. The strategic use of these linked measurements allows for the quantitative demonstration that addressing social determinants is not simply a desirable outcome, but a fundamental leverage point for successful, cost-effective post-disaster recovery.

Chapter 2: Behavioral Science and the Activation of Community Assets

2.1 Social Capital, Collective Efficacy, and Action

Community capacity development is deeply rooted in behavioral science, particularly the concepts of social capital and collective efficacy. While **social capital** refers to the reservoir of social resources (such as trust, networks, and norms) within a community², **collective efficacy** represents the group's active sense of its ability to achieve a specific objective.²

Collective efficacy provides a more meaningful perspective for examining preparedness and action than latent social capital alone.¹⁰ Research confirms that collective efficacy expands the definition of social capital by addressing the crucial question of *how likely* a community is to actually activate these resources for specific tasks, such as deciding to take preparedness actions against natural hazards.² Empirical analysis of catastrophic disasters, including the 1995 Kobe earthquake and Hurricane Katrina in 2005, underscores that the presence of robust social capital is instrumental in dictating both immediate resilience and successful long-term recovery.¹¹

2.2 Navigating the Nuances of Collective Action

Behavioral research provides a crucial caveat against treating collective efficacy as a singular concept, noting that its distinct components have differing—and sometimes contradictory—impacts on how communities perceive risk and execute protective action.² Understanding these differences is essential for designing effective community capacity

interventions.

The effects of the three primary components on risk perception and self-efficacy are highly differentiated:

1. **Social Cohesion:** While integral to communal well-being, social cohesion decreases general risk perception and fear. Crucially, studies show it has **no effect on self-efficacy**—the perceived ability of individuals to take protective action.²
2. **Efficacy Belief in Social Support:** This component directly increases self-efficacy.²
3. **Efficacy Belief in Citizen Groups:** This component, reflecting organized capacity, tends to increase both risk perception and fear.²

The strategic implication of these findings is that resilience training cannot solely focus on generalized "building trust" or enhancing cohesion. The empirical evidence reveals a functional contradiction: high social cohesion, while beneficial for reducing chronic stress and maintaining psychological well-being, may simultaneously create a dangerous sense of safety that leads to **under-preparation** for acute threats.²

Effective capacity development requires targeted programming. The combination of **efficacy belief in social support** and **efficacy belief in citizen groups** appears most promising for stimulating protective action.² This combination is successful because the group efficacy component first raises necessary risk appraisal and fear, which is then paired with the social support component to instill the confidence (self-efficacy) needed to cope and act. This sophisticated understanding of behavioral drivers allows interventions to use cohesion to establish buffers against chronic stress while leveraging specific group efficacy strategies to foster task-oriented skills for acute shocks.

The differential impacts are summarized below:

Table 2.1: Differential Impacts of Collective Efficacy Components on Risk and Coping

Component	Effect on Risk Perception & Fear	Effect on Self-Efficacy (Protective Action)	Strategic Implication for Resilience
Social Cohesion	Decreases	No Effect	Essential for psychological buffering against chronic stress; risk of false safety without

			task-specific efficacy. ²
Efficacy Belief in Social Support	Not specified (Indirect)	Increases	Crucial for boosting perceived ability to recover and reinforcing collective confidence. ²
Efficacy Belief in Citizen Groups	Increases	Positive Effect (When combined)	Promotes necessary risk awareness; vital for translating latent capacity into organized, protective action. ²

2.3 Relational Capital: Resilience in Diffused and Non-Geographic Communities

As contemporary communities increasingly organize around relational ties—encompassing like-minded or supportive groups often referred to as "tribes"—rather than strictly geographical boundaries, resilience policy must adapt its analytical focus.¹³ Traditional research often focused exclusively on formal, institutionalized civic organizations, struggling to explain how social networks are governed and how pro-social behavior is sustained when these formal structures are absent.¹³

The concept of **relationality** addresses this gap, providing a theoretical framework for a diffused mechanism of collective action in **non-centralized modes of network governance**.¹³ Relationality underscores how social connectedness, primarily mediated through **empathy**, drives collective action.¹³

When individuals establish a connection that fosters empathy, their decision-making shifts from being directed solely at individual utility maximization toward considering the "good of the other".¹³ The essential relational elements activated by this mechanism are termed **relational capital**, defined as an asset that communities can activate when facing environmental or other perturbations.¹³ This emphasis on relational capital ensures that resilience assets are recognized and strengthened even within digital or loosely knit affinity groups, promoting the sustainability of pro-social behavior without reliance on traditional

institutional oversight.¹³

For resilience policy focused on these modern, relational communities, there is a strategic need to shift investment focus. Instead of solely funding institutional centers (traditional social capital), investment must be directed toward fostering **direct interpersonal linkages** that cultivate tangibility and connection. This approach—fostering intersubjective interactions across particular ties—increases the inherent capacity for collective action and promotes an "ethic of care" across the network, regardless of geographic proximity.¹³

Chapter 3: Implementation Strategies and Capacity Building in the Real World

3.1 A Multi-Sectoral Approach to Resilience Planning (NIST Model)

To translate the principles of public health and behavioral science into tangible, sustainable community capacity, a structured and inclusive planning process is required. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) published the **Community Resilience Planning Guide for Buildings and Infrastructure Systems**, which outlines a six-step process for developing and implementing a resilience plan.¹⁴ This structured operationalization is crucial for aligning engineering standards with community needs.¹³

The six steps integrate social and physical systems planning:

1. **Step 1: Form a Collaborative Planning Team:** Requires forming a diverse team and establishing robust stakeholder engagement.¹⁴
2. **Step 2: Understand the Situation:** Involves characterizing the population, identifying social institutions, and assessing the dependencies of critical infrastructure systems (e.g., energy, communication).¹⁴
3. **Step 3: Determine Goals and Objectives:** Requires setting anticipated performance goals for both the community's social function and its built environment.¹⁴
4. **Step 4: Plan Development:** Focuses on identifying existing resilience activities and prioritizing the closure of identified resilience gaps.¹⁴
5. **Step 5: Plan Preparation, Review, and Approval.**¹⁴
6. **Step 6: Plan Implementation and Maintenance:** Includes initiating short-term implementation tasks.¹⁴

A critical consideration is the integration of social equity within this infrastructure framework. The NIST model, originating from engineering standards, explicitly requires linking social dimensions with building clusters.¹⁴ The successful execution of resilience plans demands that Steps 2 and 3 specifically prioritize the infrastructure dependencies of vulnerable populations

identified through SDOH assessments.⁹ If planning focuses solely on

system uptime without mapping this functionality to the *equitable access* needs of high-hardship areas (as determined by SDOH data), the resilience plan will inadvertently reinforce existing structural inequities, thus failing the modern definition of CR.¹ Therefore, the situational understanding and goal-setting phases must serve as the pivot points for achieving equity within the infrastructure model.

3.2 Community-Partnered Research and Capacity Building

Successful real-world resilience is built by establishing strong, day-to-day systems and deep collaborations between researchers, community leaders, and local stakeholders.¹¹ This convergence promotes the translation of scientific knowledge into actionable strategy.

Key implementation strategies identified through community-partnered research include:

- Expanding the community engagement skills of emergency responders.
- Increasing the preparedness knowledge base among public health workers.¹¹
- Utilizing mapping tools to accurately identify and prioritize potential areas of vulnerability in community resilience.¹¹
- Identifying and mentoring internal community resilience leaders.¹¹

Furthermore, intentional tools are necessary to ensure that practice centers on equity. The **Equitable Community Partnerships Reflection Tool** provides a structured mechanism for teams engaged in research and service delivery to assess and improve their practices across five dimensions: Shared Understanding, Collaborative Decision-Making, Meaningful Representation, Reciprocal Partnership, and Respectful Relationships.¹⁵ This structured reflection ensures that efforts to build community capacity intentionally move toward more just and equitable outcomes.

3.3 Academic and Practical Leadership in Resilience

Leading academic and research institutions play a vital role in advancing the knowledge base and informing public policy regarding community resilience. These centers often serve as transboundary convergence platforms, connecting knowledge with vulnerable populations and leveraging interdisciplinary "team science" approaches.¹⁶

Examples of institutional leadership include:

- The **GWU Center for Community Resilience (CCR)** focuses on translating resilience science into action by developing frameworks that align place-based investments specifically to **close identified economic and social gaps**.¹⁵ This work underscores the goal of improving health and social outcomes by addressing systemic inequities.¹⁵
- The **University of Washington Center for Disaster Resilient Communities (CDRC)** combines expertise from public health, engineering, policy, and tribal entities to inform

equitable disaster risk reduction policy and build a trained workforce.¹⁷

- The **Johns Hopkins Department of Environmental Health and Engineering** hosts the COPEWELL initiative, focusing on building a credible evidence base and applying systems dynamics to predict community functioning after disasters.⁶
- The **UCLA Center for Public Health and Disasters** promotes efforts to reduce the health impacts of disasters and global climate change, integrating diverse fields from social psychology to emergency medicine.¹⁸

Chapter 4: Policy Alignment and Financing Resilience Investments

4.1 Federal Funding Landscape for Climate and Community Resilience

The capacity to sustain resilient communities depends heavily on coordinated public policy and dedicated financial mechanisms. Federal policy has fundamentally shifted toward pre-disaster mitigation, recognizing that proactive investment is essential for long-term quality of life improvements, moving away from a reliance on post-disaster relief governed by the Stafford Act.³

Significant funding streams have been established to support this shift:

- **Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA, 2021):** Provides over \$50 billion specifically for resilience projects, boosting the resilience of critical infrastructure such as surface transportation (via the PROTECT Program), the electric grid, and drinking water systems.³
- **Inflation Reduction Act (IRA, 2022):** Allocates substantial resources for water and energy efficiency measures and, importantly, specific funding for tribal climate resilience efforts.³
- **Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) Program:** Established under the Disaster Recovery Reform Act (DRRA), BRIC provides communities with a reliable and dependable source of FEMA pre-disaster mitigation funding.³
- **Safeguarding Tomorrow through Ongoing Risk Mitigation Act (STORM Act, 2021):** Authorized state-based revolving loan funds, providing low-interest loans specifically for communities to implement mitigation projects.³

This massive influx of financial resources, particularly through IIJA and IRA³, presents a powerful, if temporary, strategic window to permanently dismantle structural inequities.¹ To maximize impact, investment strategies must ensure that these federal funds are explicitly channeled toward projects that simultaneously achieve engineering resilience (adhering to NIST steps) and close socioeconomic gaps (consistent with the GWU CCR framework).¹⁵ The scale of this investment requires rigorous application of the COPEWELL dynamic modeling⁴

to prove the long-term, equitable return on investment (ROI). Critically, resilience funding has thus become a central instrument of restorative economic development and social policy.

4.2 Policy Instruments for Sustaining Resilience Standards

Beyond direct funding, the federal government uses policy instruments to standardize and influence local capacity building.³

- **Standards and Codes:** While the federal government does not directly enforce building codes, it influences local action by providing best practice guidance and setting mandatory requirements for federally funded infrastructure (such as the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard).³
- **Insurance and Risk Pricing:** The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) incentivizes local mitigation through floodplain management strategies. FEMA's introduction of Risk Rating 2.0 provides property-specific flood risk pricing, which uses detailed data to better reflect actual risk, thereby creating a financial incentive for localized resilience improvements.³
- **Technical Assistance and Data:** The federal government provides crucial climate data, models, and planning tools. Resources like the **U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit** and the **Climate Mapping for Resilience and Adaptation (CMRA) portal** help local decision-makers accurately assess risk and design effective adaptation strategies.³

4.3 The Imperative for a National Resilience Strategy

Despite robust federal funding and technical resources, current federal resilience efforts are often fragmented and disparate, posing administrative challenges for state, local, and tribal governments.³ This complexity necessitates a coordinated governance structure.

There is a growing, bipartisan push for an overarching national climate adaptation and resilience strategy. Proposals have been introduced to authorize a **Chief Resilience Officer** position within the Executive Office of the President to lead the development and implementation of this strategy.³ Recognizing this necessity, the Biden Administration released its National Climate Resilience Framework in 2023, outlining key values, priorities, and objectives to guide a whole-of-government approach. The ultimate success of this approach depends on ensuring that federal efforts serve as a true partnership, helping communities design and implement resilience strategies tailored to their specific needs and vulnerabilities.³

Chapter 5: Measurement Frameworks for Optimal Quality of Life

5.1 Comprehensive Indicators for Community Capacity Assessment

Optimal quality of life must be rigorously measured by metrics that capture underlying system capacity () and the rate of recovery after perturbation. LHDs must move beyond simple health outcome measures to comprehensive indicators that capture the root causes encapsulated by SDOH.⁹

Assessment frameworks should incorporate a blend of general and specialized data resources to accurately map conditions related to equity and vitality:

- **AARP Livability Index:** Measures community sustainability and quality of life across seven interconnected categories, providing a holistic view of the built and social environment.⁹
- **County Health Rankings and Roadmaps:** Offer annual assessments of health factors, including economic stability, education, and social environments, vital for establishing the structural deficiencies of .⁹
- **Brookings Institution Metro Monitor:** Assesses the performance of major metropolitan economies based on growth, prosperity, and inclusion, providing economic vitality metrics that correlate strongly with resilience.⁹

Table 5.1: Key Data Resources for SDOH and Community Capacity Measurement

Resource/Tool	Primary Focus Area	Utility in Resilience Assessment
County Health Rankings and Roadmaps	Health behaviors, clinical care, social/economic factors, physical environment.	Essential for establishing Pre-event Community Functioning () baseline and identifying structural deficiencies. ⁹
AARP Livability Index	Housing, neighborhood, environment, opportunity, engagement, transportation.	Measures characteristics contributing directly to quality of life and community sustainability. ⁹
COPEWELL Model (System Dynamics)	Predicting the time-course of functioning after disaster (Resistance and Recovery). ⁴	Measures the <i>dynamic</i> outcomes of resilience investments; provides a quantitative metric for return on investment. ⁴
Human Impact Partners	Assessing the health and	Ensures resilience

(HIA Tools)	equity implications of proposed policies and projects. ⁹	investments intentionally address structural inequities upstream.
-------------	---	---

Linking these static SDOH resources⁹ with the dynamic system model (COPEWELL)⁴ allows communities to develop a truly predictive investment strategy. The COPEWELL model’s ability to calculate the resistance and recovery time provides a metric of success that transcends simple outcome indicators. By simulating how an investment in a specific social determinant (e.g., affordable housing) affects the recovery slope after an event, policymakers can select interventions that maximize recovery speed and minimize functional loss, thereby optimizing the investment toward long-term quality of life improvements. Resilience measurement thus becomes a predictive financial and social planning tool.

5.2 Operationalizing Equity Metrics

A core tenet of the integrated resilience paradigm is that success must be measured by the closing of economic and social gaps, particularly the wealth gap, as identified by research centers like the GWU CCR.¹⁵ Resilience is not achieved until vulnerable populations demonstrate disproportionate gains in.

To ensure that policy and practice achieve these outcomes, public health programs, such as the Resilience Catalysts in Public Health national collaborative, are focusing on evaluating strategies that address systemic inequities.¹⁵ This approach requires that all interventions—from infrastructure projects to behavioral training—are intentionally designed and implemented to achieve more just and equitable outcomes, ensuring that policy drives systems toward equitable results.¹⁵

Conclusion and Recommendations

Optimal quality of life, viewed through the lens of Community Resilience, is the result of a high and equitable Pre-Event Community Functioning (), coupled with maximized Resistance and Recovery capacity. This integrated paradigm requires the convergence of public health equity goals, precise behavioral science, and coordinated financial policy. The capacity to address chronic stressors, such as structural racism, is not merely adjunct to resilience; it is integral to determining and, subsequently, the trajectory of post-disaster recovery.

Based on the synthesis of academic and applied research, the following recommendations are presented for strategic policy direction and sustained capacity development:

Recommendations for National and Federal Policy Makers

1. **Establish Coordinated Governance:** Advance the implementation of a comprehensive national climate adaptation and resilience strategy, potentially led by a designated Chief Resilience Officer, to overcome the current fragmentation of federal efforts and ensure the efficient delivery of IJJA/IRA funds to communities.³
2. **Mandate Equitable Investment Modeling:** Require all federally funded resilience projects (e.g., BRIC, PROTECT) to utilize dynamic system modeling frameworks (like COPEWELL) integrated with local SDOH data.⁴ This is necessary to quantify and predict the return on investment based on reduced recovery time and demonstrated equitable outcomes for vulnerable populations.
3. **Prioritize Gap-Closing Finance:** Structure funding opportunities to explicitly align infrastructure investment goals (NIST planning steps) with the framework of closing economic and social gaps, thereby leveraging resilience funds as a mechanism for restorative justice and long-term socioeconomic stability.³

Recommendations for Community Leaders and Practitioners

1. **Implement Precision Behavioral Training:** Adopt targeted capacity-building programs that differentiate between the effects of social cohesion and collective efficacy. Utilize citizen group efficacy components to actively increase necessary risk perception, while pairing this with efficacy belief in social support to build self-efficacy for specific protective actions.² Programs must actively counteract the risk of a false sense of safety that can stem from high cohesion alone.¹⁰
2. **Invest in Relational Infrastructure:** Dedicate resources to mapping and strengthening diffused, non-geographic networks through initiatives that cultivate empathy and direct interpersonal linkages (relational capital).¹³ This is essential for building collective action in modern "tribal" communities that lack formal institutional governance.¹³
3. **Embed Equity into Planning:** Require the use of equity reflection tools (like the Equitable Community Partnerships Reflection Tool) throughout the resilience planning and implementation process to ensure collaborative decision-making and meaningful representation of vulnerable stakeholders, thereby operationalizing the mandate to address systemic inequities.¹⁵

Recommendations for Public Health Agencies

1. **Mandate SDOH Data Integration:** Standardize and mandate the use of comprehensive SDOH indicators (e.g., County Health Rankings, AARP Livability Index) within all Community Health Assessment and Improvement Planning (CHA/CHIP) processes.⁹
2. **Focus on Workforce Capacity:** Expand training for public health workers and emergency responders to enhance community engagement skills, ensuring they can effectively integrate social capital assessment and collective efficacy methodologies into their preparedness and response roles.¹¹

Works cited

1. Community Resilience: A Dynamic Model for Public Health 3.0., accessed October 4, 2025, https://hsrc.himmelfarb.gwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1333&context=educational_resources_research
2. Collective efficacy and natural hazards: differing roles of social cohesion and task-specific efficacy in shaping risk and coping beliefs - IDEAS/RePEc, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://ideas.repec.org/a/taf/jriskr/v23y2020i6p695-712.html>
3. Federal Resilience Policy - Center for Climate and Energy ... - C2ES, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://www.c2es.org/content/federal-resilience-policy/>
4. COPEWELL: A Conceptual Framework and System Dynamics Model for Predicting Community Functioning and Resilience after Disasters - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8743042/>
5. COPEWELL Framework | COPEWELL Partners | Composite of Post-Event Well-being, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://copewellmodel.org/copewell-framework-0>
6. Community Sustainability, Resilience, and Preparedness | Johns Hopkins, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://publichealth.jhu.edu/departments/environmental-health-and-engineering/research-and-practice/research-areas/community-sustainability-resilience-and-preparedness>
7. COPEWELL FAQs | COPEWELL Partners | Composite of Post-Event Well-being, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://copewellmodel.org/about/copewell-faqs>
8. COPEWELL: A Conceptual Framework and System Dynamics Model for Predicting Community Functioning and Resilience After Disasters - PubMed, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28633681/>
9. Online resources for assessing and measuring Social ... - NACCHO, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/SDOH-resources.pdf>
10. Collective efficacy and natural hazards: differing roles of social cohesion and task-specific efficacy in shaping risk and coping beliefs, accessed October 4,

- 2025, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13669877.2019.1628096>
11. Community Resilience and Public Health Practice - PMC, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3682626/>
 12. Full article: Collective efficacy and natural hazards: differing roles of social cohesion and task-specific efficacy in shaping risk and coping beliefs, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13669877.2019.1628096>
 13. Relationality: The Role of Connectedness in the Social Ecology of ..., accessed October 4, 2025, <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/20/5/3865>
 14. Community Resilience | U.S. Climate Resilience Toolkit, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://toolkit.climate.gov/community-resilience>
 15. Center for Community Resilience - The George Washington University, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://ccr.publichealth.gwu.edu/>
 16. CCRRIA Center for Community Resilience Research Innovation and Advocacy | UTRGV, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://www.utrgv.edu/ccrria/>
 17. Center for Disaster Resilient Communities - UW Research, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://www.washington.edu/research/research-centers/center-for-disaster-resilient-communities/>
 18. Home | Center for Public Health & Disasters, accessed October 4, 2025, <https://cphd.ph.ucla.edu/>