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Executive Summary

All established LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories (PNT) region invited members of their respective Councils, Immigrant Advisory Tables, and Working Groups to complete a Primary Partners Scorecard to evaluate each LIP’s effectiveness as a collective impact backbone organization. Contacts who were not primary partners but who interacted with a LIP related to work on specific projects over the course of the year were invited to complete a Secondary Partners Scorecard.

This assessment is part of a pilot project in the PNT. The results can be used locally for continuous process improvement and can also be rolled up regionally for Immigrants, Refugees and Citizenshhip Canada, which funds LIPs across Canada.

Nine secondary partners were identified by the Calgary Local Immigration Partnership (CLIP) and invited to complete the Secondary Partners Scorecard. Since only two of them completed the survey, the findings have been suppressed and are not reported.

CLIP aims for a 100% response to the Primary Partners Scorecard, as do all PNT LIPS since every person invited to complete the survey is actively engaged in their local or regional LIP. A total of 125 people who are members of CLIP’s Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, or Working Groups were invited to complete the Primary Partners Scorecard online between February 1 and February 15, 2019. With 65 surveys completed—one of which was known to be a second submission—only 64 CLIP partners completed a survey, for an actual response rate of just 51.2%.

The 25 survey questions were divided into five sections—four of which were used by all PNT LIPs. These asked about the LIP’s purpose, performance, operations, and capacity. The final section was available to be used for questions specific to each LIP. CLIP added three questions related to social well-being, as requested by The City of Calgary, CLIP’s contribution agreement holder. For all 25 questions, survey respondents were asked to answer the questions in a way "that best represents CLIP today."

CLIP’s Purpose: About three-quarters of respondents agreed that members of CLIP share a common purpose (Q-1, 74%); have identified strategic goals and actions together (Q-2, 78%); and have plans that reflect CLIP’s goals (Q-3, 78%). What is concerning is that one-quarter of respondents are either neutral or disagree with the statements about CLIP’s purpose.

CLIP’s Performance: About three-quarters of respondents agreed that CLIP members add value to each other’s work (Q-5, 73%); are creating new knowledge and insights (Q-6, 75%); and are achieving more together than they could alone (Q-12, 73%). Fewer respondents (64%) agreed that members were working together to advance CLIP’s goals (Q-4) or believe that CLIP is creating value for its constituents (Q-8). Even fewer respondents agreed that members honour their commitments to CLIP (Q-10, 59%); that the way CLIP communicates with stakeholders builds support for CLIP (Q-7, 58%); or that CLIP is meeting its strategic goals and objectives (Q-11, 54%). Finally, only 25% of respondents agreed that CLIP is able to attract additional funds as needed.
**CLIP’s Operations:** Almost 80% of respondents agreed that decision making processes encourage members to contribute and collaborate (Q-13). In addition, 67% of respondents agreed that the work of CLIP is attuned to the comfort and energy level of its members (Q-17). Only 58% of respondents agreed that members reflected on the partnership experience and adjusted CLIP practice accordingly. Approximately half of respondents agreed that CLIP anticipates, surfaces, and addresses conflict when it arises (Q-14, 50%); that CLIP’s internal communication systems are serving it well (Q-15, 50%); that all members are contributing time and resources to CLIP (Q-16, 52%); and that CLIP has mechanisms in place to promote accountability among members (Q19, 47%).

**CLIP’s Capacity:** Although many respondents agreed that members have the skills needed to advance CLIP’s goals (Q-21, 72%), fewer thought members had the connections needed to do so (Q-22, 65%). Only 56% of respondents agreed that members have the material resources needed to advance CLIP’s goals (Q20).

The Collective Impact Scorecards used by LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories are intended to take a snapshot of how each LIP is performing as a collective impact backbone organization. Following a review of the findings, LIPs are encouraged to celebrate and build upon their successes and make plans to address areas in need of improvement. As with other PNT LIPs, the survey results for CLIP showed a number of strengths but also several specific areas that would benefit from increased focus in the coming year.
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CLIP Collective Impact Surveys: Winter 2019

Introduction

In the fall of 2017, a Performance Measurement Working Group was convened to determine the kinds of data and information that would be collected by Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) in the Prairies and Northern Territories (PNT), an administrative region of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC). The group was initially comprised of about half of the LIP Coordinators in the PNT, as well as two IRCC staff members based in Winnipeg. The group now includes the Coordinators of all 17 LIPs in the PNT and one IRCC staff member.

LIPs across the PNT agreed to use a Results-Based Accountability (RBA) framework, which had been recommended by IRCC. The LIPs agreed on the types of population data that would be reported for each LIP. This has since been compiled from both the 2006 and 2016 federal censuses and loaded onto a reporting Dashboard accessible through a password-protected PNT Data Portal on the CLIP website. LIPs also agreed to seek local data that measured progress on the unique strategic actions developed by each LIP based on local needs. In addition, the LIPs agreed to collect three immigrant profiles as part of the “story” element typical of RBA reporting but also as a tool that could be used locally for “myth busting” about immigrants and refugees.

In addition to population data and stories, RBA generally includes program results to show how individual programs are contributing to the achievement of desired changes to broader population health indicators. However, LIPs do not provide direct services or programming. All LIPs are instead expected to enhance collaboration, coordination, and strategic planning at the community level in order to foster more welcoming and inclusive communities for immigrants and newcomers. LIPs are collective impact backbone organizations that convene community partners who, together, identify policy and systems change initiatives they can undertake—within their own organizations and collectively—to help improve the immigrant integration process in the local or regional LIP community.

To measure the effectiveness of this convener role, two surveys were adapted for use by the LIPs in the PNT region. The Network Health Scorecard, which is widely used to measure the effectiveness of collaborative networks such as LIPs, was adapted for use with core members of each LIP. This became the Primary Partners Scorecard, a survey that was to be used by each established LIP with members of its governing Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, and Working Groups. A Secondary Partners Scorecard was adapted from one used by the Peel Newcomers Strategy Group for contacts who are not primary partners or core members of a LIP but who interacted with a LIP related to work on a specific project over the course of the year.

The PNT LIPs agreed to pilot these surveys during the 2018-2019 fiscal year and then revisit their effectiveness so they could be altered as needed for the 2019/2020 fiscal year. The ultimate goal is to consistently administer these surveys annually and roll-up the results for the region as a whole. The survey review and adjustment process will take place in June 2019. A more immediate goal is to have each LIP review the results with its Council members to identify areas of strength, as well as areas that may be in need of increased focus in the coming year.
Methodology

Two lists of potential participants were compiled—one for the CLIP Primary Partners Scorecard (see Appendix A) and one for the CLIP Secondary Partners Scorecard (see Appendix B). It was determined that several people who had peripheral interaction with CLIP staff during the year related to possible research holdings either were already involved with CLIP or had since joined a working group. As a result, they would be invited to complete the Primary Partners Scorecard and were not eligible to complete the Secondary Partners Scorecard.

A total of 125 potential participants were on the distribution list for the CLIP Primary Partners Scorecard, whereas only nine people were identified for the Secondary Partners Scorecard. Invitations to participate were sent by e-mail and included a link to the relevant survey, both of which were set up using QuestionPro software. Both surveys were open from February 1 to February 15, 2019. Data from each survey was downloaded for analysis on February 19, 2019.

Invitation Content

An e-mail invitation to complete the CLIP Primary Partners Scorecard was sent to 125 people by the CLIP Coordinator on February 1, 2019 and a reminder was sent on February 11. The reminder resulted in one known instance of a recipient completing the survey twice. However, as no identifying information was collected and more than one survey was completed within minutes after the reminder was sent, the second response could not be identified and removed from the data file. There may have been other instances where this also occurred.

The content of the initial e-mail sent to CLIP’s Primary Partners was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIP Partner Survey – please respond by February 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hello CLIP Council, IAT, and Working Group Members,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to know what you think of CLIP as a backbone organization that supports the work the community is doing to improve the settlement and integration of newcomers. We are asking you to complete a short survey. Survey responses will be used to identify strengths and areas of growth for CLIP, the Calgary Local Immigration Partnership. This will help CLIP track progress in key areas of CLIP’s network/partnership development. All members of the CLIP Council, Immigrant Advisory Table and all CLIP Working Group members are being asked to complete the survey. Your input is important as we work to build on our strengths and improve on our weaknesses with the ultimate goal of improving the lives of newcomers in Calgary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Primary Partners Survey is intended for members of CLIP Council, the IAT, and all CLIP working groups. We are asking each of you to complete the survey, which should take 5 to 10 minutes. The survey will be open from February 1 to 14 only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can take the survey by clicking on this link: Primary Partners Survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you so much for your support of the important work we are doing together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The content of the reminder e-mail sent to CLIP’s Primary Partners was:

---

**REMINDER: CLIP – Collective Impact Partner Survey – please respond by Feb 14**

Hello CLIP Working Group members,

Thank you to everyone who has completed the CLIP Collective Impact Primary Partners Survey. For those of you who haven’t yet, please complete the survey before the end of the day on Thursday. Your participation is critical to ensuring CLIP’s success as we move forward.

The Primary Partners Survey is intended for members of CLIP Council, the IAT, and all CLIP working group members. We are asking each of you to complete the survey, which should take 5 to 10 minutes. The survey will be open from **February 1 to 14** only.

**You can take the survey by clicking on this link:** Primary Partners Survey.

Thank you so much for your support of the important work we are doing together.

---

An e-mail invitation to complete the CLIP Secondary Partners Scorecard was sent to **nine people** by the CLIP Data and Information Coordinator on **January 31, 2019**. The content of the e-mail to the Secondary Partners was:

---

**Favour to Ask of Each of You – CLIP Secondary Partners Survey**

Hi Everyone,

Since I have come to know each of you through the UCNRN community table, I wondered if I might ask each of you for a small favour.

I am reaching out to you as secondary partners of CLIP—meaning that we have worked together on a project, in this case the UC NRN Community committee or on specific research. We are interested in learning how much you know about CLIP and how it relates to your own work. If you would be so kind, I would like to ask you to **complete a short survey** to this end. It is open now and will remain **active through February 15, 2019**. All responses are anonymous and will be aggregated to help us understand where we can improve.

**Link to Survey:** [https://clipsecondarypartners.questionpro.ca](https://clipsecondarypartners.questionpro.ca)

CLIP is required to survey its partners every year. The CLIP Coordinator will be contacting people who are CLIP’s primary partners—meaning those who are on the CLIP Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, or in a Working Group—to ask for their feedback on how CLIP is working as a collective impact backbone organization. All of the Local Immigration Partnerships in the Prairies and Northern Territories will be completing these surveys with their partners.

Thanks in advance for any assistance you can provide.
Primary Partners Scorecard – Survey Administration Statistics

CLIP aims for a 100% response to the Primary Partners Scorecard, as do all PNT LIPs since every person invited to complete the survey is actively engaged in their local or regional LIP. A link to the Primary Partners Scorecard was sent by e-mail to 125 people who are directly involved with CLIP as members of its Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, or one of its Working Groups.

QuestionPro survey software statistics showed that 65 surveys were completed. With one known to be a second submission, only 64 CLIP partners completed the Primary Partners Scorecard. This is an actual response rate of only 51.2%.

This is disappointingly low since all of the individuals who were asked to complete CLIP’s Primary Partners Scorecard are actively involved in CLIP in some way. To get a better understanding of the extent to how many of the members in each primary partner group are participating, it has been proposed that for the next survey, participants will be asked to indicate whether they are on Council, the Immigrant Advisory Table, or a Working Group.

Secondary Partners Scorecard – Results Suppressed

A link to the Secondary Partners Scorecard was e-mailed to nine people who are peripherally involved with CLIP as members of the University of Calgary’s Newcomers Research Network. According to the survey administration statistics generated by QuestionPro software, the survey was viewed twice, started twice, and completed twice. Due to the low response rate, the findings have been suppressed and are not reported.

Survey Analysis

The analysis that follows is for the Primary Partners Scorecard. Based on the number of surveys completed and the absence of “skip logic” that would hide any of the questions, the number of responses per question (n-value) should be 65. However, that was seldom the case because none of the questions were mandatory. It is also possible that people simply did not answer some questions because there was not an option to select “not applicable” or “don’t know.”

For the Primary Partners Scorecard, the n-values ranged from 60 through 65, with an average of 63. The majority of survey questions had an n-value of 64 (9 of 25) or 63 (8 of 25), followed by 65 and 62 (3 each), then 61 and 60 (one each). The n-value for each question in shown in brackets after the chart title.

It is important to note that percentages are used in the tables rather than raw numbers, even though the survey had less than 100 respondents (n = 63 on average). Using percentages allows easier comparison between questions and with the survey results from other PNT LIPs.

The five-point scale used by all LIPs for Questions 1 through 22 assessed respondents’ limited to total agreement with each statement. This is equivalent to a five-point scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. For this analysis, the responses for points 4 and 5 (essentially, ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’) were combined to derive an overall percentage for “agreement” with the statement.
When the survey tools are evaluated by the PNT LIPs, changing the scale labels to the more commonly used ‘disagree/agree’ ones will be discussed. Similarly, providing a ‘not applicable’ or ‘don’t know’ option will also be considered. In addition, there were no open-ended questions in this pilot survey. This may be reconsidered by the PNT LIPs when they review the effectiveness of the survey tool later this spring.

Finally, since CLIP is housed within The City of Calgary, three additional questions were added to capture feedback on various aspects of social well-being. The results for CLIP can be combined with the results for the same questions asked of stakeholders participating in other initiatives based at The City of Calgary. The extra questions used a four-point scale that ascends in the opposite direction than the responses to the CLIP questions. The charts for these three questions use The City of Calgary brand colour to further distinguish them from the variegated CLIP colours shown in the charts for the first 22 questions that are used by all PNT LIPs.

Survey Findings

Introduction and Initial Instructions

The introduction and initial instructions provided were:

Your answers to the following questions will be used to identify strengths and areas of growth for CLIP, the Calgary Local Immigration Partnership. This will help CLIP track progress in key areas of CLIP’s network/partnership development. All members of the CLIP Council, CLIP’s Immigrant Advisory Table, and all CLIP Working Groups are asked to fill out an individual scorecard. The results will be aggregated and reported for CLIP as a whole.

This scorecard is being used by all Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) funded by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada in the Prairies and Northern Territories Region. It is based on the Network Health Scorecard developed by Network Impact for use in the public domain.

Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start the survey now by clicking on the Next button below.

CLIP Primary Partners Scorecard – 2019

If you are completing this survey on a mobile phone, it will be easier to view in landscape.

Instructions

This survey uses a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = Not so Much and 5 = Totally!

Please select the button that best represents CLIP today.
1. **All members share a common purpose for CLIP.**

A total of 74% of respondents agreed that members share a common purpose for CLIP.

2. **Together, members have identified strategic goals and objectives for CLIP.**

A total of 78% of respondents agreed that, together, members identified strategic goals and objectives for CLIP.
3. **CLIP’s plans reflect CLIP’s goals.**

A total of 78% of respondents agreed that CLIP’s plans reflect CLIP’s goals.

**Network/Partnership PERFORMANCE**

4. **Members are working jointly to advance CLIP’s goals.**

A total of 64% of respondents agreed that members are working together to advance CLIP’s goals.

5. **Members are adding value to each other’s work.**

A total of 73% of respondents agreed that members are adding value to each other’s work.
6. Members are creating new knowledge or insights together.

A total of 75% of respondents agreed that, together, members are creating new knowledge or insights.

7. The way CLIP communicates with stakeholders builds support for CLIP.

Only 58% of respondents agreed that the way CLIP communicates with stakeholders builds support for CLIP.

8. CLIP is creating value for the constituents it serves.

A total of 64% of respondents agreed that CLIP is creating value for its constituents.
9. CLIP is able to attract additional funds, as needed.

Only 25% of respondents agreed that CLIP is able to attract additional funds as needed.

10. Members honour their commitments to CLIP.

Only 59% of respondents agreed that members honour their commitments to CLIP.

11. CLIP is meeting its strategic goals and objectives.

Only 54% of respondents agreed that CLIP is meeting its strategic goals and objectives.
12. Members are achieving more together than they could alone.

A total of 73% of respondents agreed that members are achieving more together than they could alone.

Network/Partnership OPERATIONS

13. Decision making processes encourage members to contribute and collaborate.

A total of 79% of respondents agreed that decision making processes encourage members to contribute and collaborate.
14. **CLIP anticipates, surfaces, and addresses conflict when it arises.**

Only 50% of respondents agreed that CLIP anticipates, surfaces, and addresses conflict when it arises.

15. **CLIP’s internal communications systems are serving it well.**

Only 50% of respondents agreed that CLIP’s internal communication systems are serving it well.

16. **All members are contributing time and resources to CLIP.**

Only 52% of respondents agreed that all members are contributing time and resources to CLIP.
17. The work of CLIP is attuned to the comfort and energy levels of members.

A total of 67% of respondents agreed that the work of CLIP is attuned to the comfort and energy level of members.

18. Members reflect on the network/partnership experience and adjust CLIP practice accordingly.

A total of 58% of respondents agreed that members reflect on the network/partnership experience and adjust CLIP practice accordingly.
19. **CLIP has mechanisms in place to promote accountability among members (e.g., agreements, understandings).**

Only 47% of respondents agreed that CLIP has any mechanisms in place to promote accountability among members (for example, by using agreements or terms of reference, or by coming to a mutual understanding about expectations of partners).

### Network/Partnership CAPACITY

20. **As a network/partnership, members have the material resources they need to advance CLIP’s goals.**

Only 56% of respondents agreed that members have the material resources the partnership needs to advance CLIP’s goals.
21. As a network/partnership, members have the skills they need to advance CLIP’s goals.

A total of 72% of respondents agreed that members have the skills needed to advance CLIP’s goals.

22. As a network/partnership, members have the connections they need to advance CLIP’s goals.

A total of 65% of respondents agreed that members have the connections they need to advance CLIP’s goals.
Additional Instructions

The instructions provided for the final three questions were:

CLIP is the backbone organization for a collaborative of community organizations, as you know. The City of Calgary is a member of the collaborative. As part of its own evaluation of community networks it is involved with, The City is gathering information on Social Well-Being.

As you answer these final questions, please note that they use a four-point scale—Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree—or N/A for not applicable.

City of Calgary Social Well-Being Questions

23. The CLIP Action Plan is helping to prevent social/community issues.

![Bar Chart: The CLIP Action Plan is helping to prevent social/community issues (n=61)]

A total of 85% of respondents agreed that the CLIP Action Plan is helping to prevent social or community issues.

24. The CLIP Action Plan is helping to remove barriers to participation in civic life.

![Bar Chart: The CLIP Action Plan is helping to remove barriers to participation in civic life (n=60)]

A total of 82% of respondents agreed that the CLIP Action Plan is helping to remove barriers to civic life.
25. The CLIP Action Plan advances the needs of diverse people through planning and delivery.

A total of 84% of respondents agreed that the CLIP Action Plan advances the needs of diverse people through planning and delivery.

### Summary Conclusions

All established LIPs in the PNT region invited members of their respective Councils, Immigrant Advisory Tables, and Working Groups to complete a **Primary Partners Scorecard** to evaluate each LIP’s effectiveness as a collective impact backbone organization. Contacts who were not primary partners but who interacted with a LIP related to work on specific projects over the course of the year were invited to complete a **Secondary Partners Scorecard**.

This assessment is part of a pilot project in the PNT. The goal is to review and adjust both surveys in the spring of 2019 and then to consistently administer them across the region in 2020 and beyond. The results can be used locally for continuous process improvement and can also be rolled up regionally for IRCC, which funds LIPs across Canada.

Nine secondary partners were identified by the Calgary Local Immigration Partnership (CLIP) and invited to complete the **Secondary Partners Scorecard**. Since only two of them completed the survey, the findings have been suppressed and are not reported.

A total of **125** people who are members of CLIP’s Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, or Working Groups were invited to complete the **Primary Partners Scorecard** online between February 1 and February 15, 2019. QuestionPro survey software statistics showed that **65** surveys were completed, with one known to be a second submission. Therefore, only **64 CLIP partners** completed a survey, for an actual response rate of **51.2%**.

- All PNT LIPS, including CLIP, aim for a 100% response to the Primary Partners Scorecard since every person invited to complete the survey is actively engaged in their local or regional LIP.
- Other LIPs, when faced with similarly poor response rates to partner surveys, have amended their Terms of Reference to include the completion of an annual survey as a requirement of participation by partners at all levels.
The 25 survey questions were divided into five sections—four of which were used by all PNT LIPs. These sets of questions asked about the LIP's purpose (three questions), performance (nine questions), operations (seven questions), and capacity (three questions). The final section was available to be used for questions specific to each LIP. CLIP added three questions related to social well-being, as requested by The City of Calgary, CLIP's contribution agreement holder.

For all 25 questions, survey respondents were asked to answer the questions in a way “that best represents CLIP today.”

CLIP’s Purpose:
1. 74% of respondents agreed that members share a common purpose for CLIP
2. 78% agreed that members identified strategic goals and actions together, and
3. 78% agreed that CLIP’s plans reflect CLIP’s goals.

- About three-quarters of respondents agreed that members of CLIP share a common purpose (Q-1, 74%); have identified strategic goals and actions together (Q-2, 78%); and have plans that reflect CLIP’s goals (Q-3, 78%). What is concerning is that one-quarter of respondents are either neutral or disagreed with the statements about CLIP’s purpose.

CLIP’s Performance:
4. 64% of respondents agreed that members are working together to advance CLIP’s goals
5. 73% agreed that members are adding value to each other’s work
6. 75% agreed that, together, members are creating new knowledge or insights
7. 58% agreed that the way CLIP communicates with stakeholders builds support for CLIP
8. 64% agreed that CLIP is creating value for its constituents
9. 25% agreed that CLIP is able to attract additional funds as needed
10. 59% agreed that members honour their commitments to CLIP
11. 54% agreed that CLIP is meeting its strategic goals and objectives, and
12. 73% agreed that members are achieving more together than they could alone.

- About three-quarters of respondents agreed that CLIP members add value to each other’s work (Q-5, 73%); are creating new knowledge and insights (Q-6, 75%); and are achieving more together than they could alone (Q-12, 73%).

- Fewer respondents (64%) agreed that members were working together to advance CLIP's goals (Q-4) or believe that CLIP is creating value for its constituents (Q-8). Constituents of a LIP consist of the partners involved in its activities. However, some respondents may have interpreted “constituents” to mean “newcomers” or “immigrants and refugees.” This may be something to discuss with members when the survey results are shared as this is something that could be clarified in subsequent iterations of the survey.
• Even fewer respondents agreed that members honour their commitments to CLIP (Q-10, 59%); that the way CLIP communicates with stakeholders builds support for CLIP (Q-7, 58%); or that CLIP is meeting its strategic goals and objectives (Q-11, 54%). These statements reflect issues with communication and possibly with a loss of momentum.

• This is not surprising. After two stable years of steady and enthusiastic progress, CLIP abruptly lost its coordinator in June 2018. The partners had three different coordinators in six months, with the current, permanent coordinator having been in place for less than three months at the time of the survey. It is to be expected that rebuilding trusting relationships with CLIP partners will take several months. Other protocols to improve communication and to build and sustain momentum and engagement may also be necessary.

• Finally, only 25% of respondents agreed that CLIP is able to attract additional funds as needed (Q-9). While some additional research funding was secured in 2017 and in-kind research support was provided in 2018, no additional funds have been secured recently, which accurately “represents CLIP today.”

**CLIP’s Operations:**

13. 79% of respondents agreed that decision making processes encourage members to contribute and collaborate

14. 50% agreed that CLIP anticipates, surfaces, and addresses conflict when it arises

15. 50% agreed that CLIP’s internal communication systems are serving it well

16. 52% agreed that all members are contributing time and resources to CLIP

17. 67% agreed that the work of CLIP is attuned to the comfort and energy level of members

18. 58% agreed that members reflect on the network/partnership experience and adjust CLIP practice accordingly, and

19. 47% agreed that CLIP has a mechanism in place to promote accountability among members (for example, by using agreements or understandings).

• Fully 79% of respondents agreed that decision making processes encourage members to contribute and collaborate (Q-13). In addition, 67% of respondents agreed that the work of CLIP is attuned to the comfort and energy level of its members (Q-17). As previously noted, however, only 64% of respondents agreed that members actually do work together to advance CLIP’s goals (Q-4).

• Only 58% of respondents agreed that members reflected on the partnership experience and adjusted CLIP practice accordingly (Q-18). This may be another area to discuss with members when the survey results are shared, perhaps providing opportunities for members to engage in some reflective practice exercises.

• Only about half of respondents agreed that CLIP anticipates, surfaces, and addresses conflict when it arises (Q-14, 50%); that CLIP’s internal communication systems are serving it well (Q-15, 50%); that all members are contributing time and resources to CLIP (Q-16, 52%); and that CLIP has mechanisms in place to promote accountability among members, such as agreements or understandings (Q19, 47%).
• These discouraging results may reflect the relative instability in CLIP that primary partners experienced over the past several months. These findings also provide additional discussion points for how to improve CLIP’s performance in the upcoming year, which may include amending the Terms of Reference used for CLIP’s Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, and Working Groups.

CLIP’s Capacity:

20. 56% of respondents agreed that members have the material resources the partnership needs to advance CLIP’s goals

21. 72% agreed that members have the skills needed to advance CLIP’s goals, and

22. 65% agreed that members have the connections they need to advance CLIP’s goals.

• Although many respondents agreed that members have the skills needed to advance CLIP’s goals (Q-21, 72%), fewer thought members had the connections needed to do so (Q-22, 65%). Only 56% of respondents agreed that members have the material resources needed to advance CLIP’s goals (OQ-20). Exploring any perceived lacks may be an important exercise when the survey results are shared with CLIP partners. This may help to identify how specific concerns could be rectified.

The City of Calgary’s Social Well-Being Questions

23. 85% of respondents agreed that the CLIP Action Plan is helping to prevent social or community issues

24. 82% agreed that the CLIP Action Plan is helping to remove barriers to civic life, and

25. 84% agreed that the CLIP Action Plan advances the needs of diverse people through planning and delivery.

In conclusion, the Collective Impact Scorecards used by LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories are intended to take a snapshot of how each LIP is performing as a collective impact backbone organization. Following a review of the findings, LIPs are encouraged to celebrate and build upon their successes and make plans to address areas in need of improvement. As with other LIPs, the survey results for CLIP showed a number of strengths but also several specific areas that would benefit from increased focus in the coming year.
Appendix A. CLIP Primary Partners Scorecard – 2019

What follows are screenshots of how the 2019 Primary Partners survey appeared in QuestionPro.
### Network/Partnership PURPOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not so Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All members share a common purpose for CLIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Together, members have identified strategic goals and objectives for CLIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CLIP’s plans reflect CLIP’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network/Partnership PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not so Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Members are working jointly to advance CLIP’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Members are adding value to each other’s work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Members are creating new knowledge or insights together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The way CLIP communicates with stakeholders builds support for CLIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CLIP is creating value for the constituents it serves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CLIP is able to attract additional funds, as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Members honour their commitments to CLIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CLIP is meeting its strategic goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Members are achieving more together than they could alone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network/Partnership OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not so Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Decision making processes encourage members to contribute and collaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. CLIP anticipates, surfaces, and addresses conflict when it arises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. CLIP’s internal communications systems are serving it well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. All members are contributing time and resources to CLIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The work of CLIP is attuned to the comfort and energy levels of members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Members reflect on the network/partnership experience and adjust CLIP practice accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. CLIP has mechanisms in place to promote accountability among members (e.g., agreements, understandings).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network/Partnership CAPACITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not so Much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. As a network/partnership, members have the material resources they need to advance CLIP’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. As a network/partnership, members have the skills they need to advance CLIP’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. As a network/partnership, members have the connections they need to advance CLIP’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLIP Primary Partners Scorecard - 2019

Final Questions

CLIP is the backbone organization for a collaborative of community organizations, as you know. The City of Calgary is a member of the collaborative. As part of its own evaluation of community networks it is involved with, The City is gathering information on Social Well-Being.

Instructions

As you answer these final questions, please note that they use a four-point scale—Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree—or N/A for not applicable.

Social Well-Being Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. The CLIP Action Plan is helping to prevent social/community issues.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The CLIP Action Plan is helping to remove barriers to participation in civic life.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The CLIP Action Plan advances the needs of diverse people through planning and delivery.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this scorecard so we can continue to improve how we work!

Twitter: @CalgaryLIP

Email: CLIP@Calgary.ca

Website: www.CalgaryCLIP.ca
Appendix B. CLIP Secondary Partners Scorecard – 2019

What follows are screenshots of how the 2019 Secondary Partners survey appeared in QuestionPro.

CLIP Secondary Partners Scorecard - 2019

Your answers to the following questions will be used to identify strengths and areas of growth for CLIP, the Calgary Local Immigration Partnership. This will help CLIP track progress in key areas of CLIP's network/partnership development.

You are being asked to complete this scorecard because you have worked with CLIP on a project in the past year, even though you are not a member of the CLIP Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, or a formal Working Group. Your honest answers will help us improve our performance.

This scorecard is being used by all Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) funded by Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada in the Prairies and Northern Territories Region. It is based on the Secondary Partnership Self-Assessment Tool developed by the Peel Newcomer Strategy Group.

Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start the survey now by clicking on the Next button below.

CLIP Secondary Partners Scorecard - 2019

If you are completing this survey on a mobile phone, it will be easier to view in landscape.

Instructions

The following questions use a four-point scale—Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Please choose the button that best represents your view of CLIP today.
CLIP has had an impact on my work by helping me to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand the need to have accessible and people-centered services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase my awareness of the importance of having a “newcomer lens” at decision-making tables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase my awareness of newcomer issues overall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am familiar with CLIP’s role:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. As a collective impact backbone organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. As a Local Immigration Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In supporting all organizations that serve newcomers, both within and beyond the settlement sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From my perspective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. There is value in the work I do with CLIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There is value in the relationships I have built with and through CLIP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My organization’s vision aligns or intersects with CLIP’s vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hours spent on CLIP each month:

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|

On average, how many hours do you spend working with, working on, and speaking about CLIP each month?

In-kind dollar value:

11. Please estimate the in-kind dollar value your average monthly hours contribute to CLIP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-kind dollar value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### My work would benefit if CLIP could:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Increase its capacity to participate at more community tables.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Provide/continue to provide evidence-based research.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Provide/continue to provide up-to-date information on relevant policy changes and their implications.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Increase its knowledge of the local labour market.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Enhance/continue to enhance local data availability and use (i.e., training webinars, or workshops).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Provide/continue to provide ongoing communication about immigration and newcomers.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Explore the link between the social determinants of health and pressing issues facing immigrants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Provide/continue to provide a diverse newcomer voice in the community.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Engage/continue to engage organizations that serve the most marginalized newcomer populations in our community.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Foster/continue to foster and build relationships with the settlement sector.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Foster/continue to foster and build relationships with mainstream organizations that also serve immigrants.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thank you for completing this scorecard so we can continue to improve how we work!*
Appendix C. QuestionPro Variables and Rates

A link to the Primary Partners Scorecard was sent by e-mail to 125 people who are directly involved with CLIP as members of its Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, or one of its Working Groups. According to the survey administration statistics generated by QuestionPro software,\(^1\) the survey was viewed 150 times (i.e., recipients clicked on the link to the survey) and started 93 times (i.e., the viewer clicked on the “Next” button on the first page and, therefore, a reference number was generated). This ratio (93/150) is sometimes referred to as an online survey response rate, which was 62.0% for the Primary Partners Scorecard. This is much higher than the average response rate of 24.8% that might be expected for an online survey.\(^2\)

Among the 93 surveys started, a total of 65 of them were completed (i.e., the respondent went through the entire survey, answering all mandatory questions, and then clicked on the “Done” button on the last page). According to QuestionPro, this ratio (65/93) provides an online survey completion rate of 69.9%.

For all practical purposes, however, online survey response rates and online survey completion rates are inflated and misleading. This is because all LIPs, including CLIP, aim for a 100% response to the Primary Partners Scorecard since every person invited to complete the survey is actively engaged in their local or regional LIP.

As noted, QuestionPro survey software statistics showed that 65 surveys were completed. Thus, with one known to be a second submission, only 64 CLIP partners completed a survey. This is an actual response rate of just 51.2% (64/125). This is disappointingly low since all of the individuals who were asked to complete CLIP’s Primary Partners Scorecard are actively involved in CLIP in some way. The survey administration information is summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Administration Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey was opened in QuestionPro</td>
<td>February 1, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey was closed and data was extracted</td>
<td>February 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct recipients of the survey invitation e-mail</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times survey was viewed (QuestionPro statistic)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys started (clicked “Next” on first page; reference number assigned)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online survey response rate (93/150) (FluidSurveys definition)</strong></td>
<td>62.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys started (clicked “Next” on first page; reference number assigned)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys completed</strong> (respondent answered all mandatory questions and clicked on “Done” at the end of the survey)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop outs (93 – 65) (survey was started but not completed)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online survey completion rate (65/93) (QuestionPro definition)</strong></td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time to complete, in minutes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIP – Actual Response Rate (net 64/125)</strong></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


QuestionPro describes its online survey variables and rates as shown below.

**Overall Participant Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viewed (Reset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop Outs (After Starting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated via Branching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation Errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data is captured on every click of the continue/submit button for the survey. It is important to understand what the different numbers mean in order to conduct a complete analysis of your survey results.

**What are the different statistics?**

- **Viewed**: This is the total number of users who click on the link for the Survey. Every time your survey is requested the view count is incremented and updated. The respondent does not necessarily have to start the survey. It also includes started and completed count.

- **Started**: This is total number of respondents that have started the survey. If your survey has branching or page-breaks, a response is recorded as "Started" if the "Continue" button on the first page is clicked.

- **Completed**: The completed count is all respondents that have gone through the whole survey and completed it, that is clicked on the Finish button on the last page of the survey.

- **Completion Rate**: This is equal to Completed Survey Responses divided by the number of Started Survey Responses.

- **Drop Outs**: This is the number of respondents who start the survey but do not complete the Survey.

- **Terminated via Branching**: If you have setup the branching in your questions to terminate the survey for a criteria then the number of terminated respondents will be displayed in this column. Please note that this column will only be displayed if you have setup branching to termination.

- **Validation Errors**: This is the number of times someone has encountered a validation error during the survey.

**NOTE**: The Survey Statistics are updated even when you are testing the Survey. Please make sure to delete the test survey data and to reset the statistics before making the Survey live.
Why is the Response counted as Complete even though Respondents have not answered all the questions?

By default Respondents can skip questions and proceed with the Survey and Complete it without answering questions. The Survey is considered complete when the Respondents click on the Finish/Submit button on the last page of the Survey. To avoid blank survey responses you can validate the Questions and make them required. For more information please check the Force a Response help link below.

---

Why does the total in my data analysis not match up with the total completed surveys?

The data-analysis represents all users who have chosen to answer a question. In some cases users do not answer all the questions. In such cases, the total count of users completing the surveys will be different than the data-analysis.

For surveys that do not have page-breaks or Branching the started count should be equal to the completed count. If the started count is more than the completed count, that number represents the “drop outs” after starting the survey.

---

How is the participation rate calculated?

The participation is a relative percent based on the total number of users who have taken any survey compared to your current panel size.

---

Why does the total responses for a question in my Frequency Analysis Report not match up?

The total responses to any question should be less than or equal to the Started count, but may not be equal to the completed count. If the respondents chose not to answer that question then the count will always be less than the Started count. If you have required answers to questions on your survey, and the total does not add up to the “started” or “completed” count, these are drop-outs where users have chosen not to answer the question after starting the survey.

---
