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Executive Summary

All Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) are expected to enhance collaboration, coordination, and strategic planning at the community level in order to foster more welcoming and inclusive communities for newcomers. Therefore, LIPs are collective impact backbone organizations. They 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 their local or regional LIP community. A survey of partners measures each LIP’s effectiveness in doing so.

LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories (PNT) region whose Partnership Councils had been active for a year were to have administered the LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey during the fall of 2019 or winter of 2020, at a convenient time for each LIP. They were to have invited all members of their respective Councils, Immigrant Advisory Tables, and Working Groups or Committees to complete the survey. The intent is to evaluate each LIP’s effectiveness as a collective impact backbone organization in a consistent way across the PNT region. The results can be used locally for continuous process improvement and are rolled up regionally in this report for Immigrants, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, which funds LIPs across Canada.

Only eight LIPs in the PNT region successfully completed the annual survey. Among them, a total of 210 respondents started the survey and completed the first four mandatory questions. The final question was answered by 177 respondents. This ratio (177/210) can be used as a proxy for the online survey completion rate, which was 84.3%. However, it is the participation rate (surveys completed/invitations sent) that is much more important for LIPs to know to assess their partners’ engagement.

The results for the eight LIPs that successfully completed the survey have been combined and are presented in this report. Open-ended questions were not analyzed for the regional roll-up, as the content is specific to each LIP.

General Information on Respondents: Of the 210 respondents, there were 46 Council members, 49 Immigrant Advisory Table members, 68 Working Group or Committee members, and 15 people who sit on more than one of these groups. A total of 144 respondents indicated they were representing a partner organization. A total of 65 respondents have been involved with the Partnership for less than one year, 77 others have been involved for one to two years, 50 have been involved for three to four years, and 18 have been involved five years or longer. An overwhelming majority of respondents (202 of 210) believe it is important to have an Immigration Partnership in their community.

The Partnership’s Purpose: There is some uncertainty among Partnership members as to whether all members are committed to the LIP’s mission. Partnership members agreed that they have identified strategies and goals together, and that their LIP’s Action Plan reflects them.

The Partnership’s Performance: The highest rated indicator of Partnership performance was how staff communication builds support for the Partnership. Next highest were indicators about adding value to each other’s work and creating value for members. Slightly fewer respondents believe that members are working together to advance the Partnership’s goals. Even fewer believe the Partnership is meeting the objectives in its Strategic Plan.
The Partnership’s Operations: A large proportion of Partnership members found that decision-making processes encouraged collaboration, and other processes were effective at helping them reach agreement. Far fewer thought the Partnership used its Terms of Reference to promote accountability, or dealt with conflict in a positive way. Slightly fewer respondents agreed that all members were contributing time and resources to their Partnership, although some disagreed and many did not know.

The Partnership’s Member Capacity: A majority of respondents thought that Partnership members have the connections, skills, and knowledge to advance the Partnership’s goals. Far fewer thought they had the material resources needed to do so.

The Partnership’s Staff Capacity: A majority of respondents thought that Partnership staff have the knowledge, connections, and skills to advance the Partnership’s goals. Far fewer respondents thought they had adequate staff resources and fewer still thought staff had the material resources they need.

Next Steps Needed: In order of priority, respondents thought that in the next 12 months, Partnerships should: (1) support diverse newcomer voices, and provide members and the public with information about immigration and newcomers; (2) provide up-to-date information on policy changes and their implications; (3) engage organizations supporting the most marginalized newcomers; (4) provide evidence-based research; and (5) increase the Partnership’s capacity to participate at more community tables.

Organizational Impact: A total of 144 respondents who identified as organizational representatives in Question 2 were asked to respond to questions on organizational impact. These questions are at the heart of what immigration partnerships are intended to achieve: system change by and among partners that will improve newcomer settlement and integration. Many respondents report that their organization has been able to improve its support of newcomers through its involvement with the Partnership. However, in terms of overall system change, only half of respondents thought their organization had aligned it strategic direction with the Partnership’s strategy. Even fewer report that their organization has changed its programs or practices.

In conclusion, the Annual Survey used by LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories is 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 individually encouraged to celebrate and build upon their successes and make plans to address areas in need of improvement. This roll-up of the results for eight LIPs in the PNT region shows how a handful of the PNT LIPs are doing collectively on these key indicators. It may be useful for LIPs to compare their local results to the baseline regional data presented in this report.

With survey administration enhancements planned for 2020/2021, it is anticipated that almost all of the PNT LIPs will be able to more easily participate in the LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey in the coming year. It is also hoped that each LIP will be able to increase its own survey participation rate. Future reports should give a clearer indication of how well LIPs in the PNT region are doing as collective impact backbone organizations. The better each collective performs, the better the outcomes for newcomers in LIP communities across the Prairies and Northern Territories.
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PNT LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey: 2019/2020

Introduction

All Local Immigration Partnerships (LIPs) are expected to enhance collaboration, coordination, and strategic planning at the community level in order to foster more welcoming and inclusive communities for newcomers. Therefore, LIPs are collective impact backbone organizations. They convene community partners who, together, identify policy and systems change initiatives to undertake—within their own organizations and collectively—to help improve the immigrant integration process in the local or regional LIP community. A survey of partners measures each LIP’s effectiveness in doing so. See Appendix A for information on how this survey fits into the performance measurement framework used by LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories (PNT), an administrative region of Immigrants, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC).

A partners survey was pilot tested by some PNT LIPs during the 2018/2019 fiscal year. A working group of LIP coordinators was then formed to evaluate its effectiveness and revise it for use in the 2019/2020 fiscal year and beyond. The new, more comprehensive LIPs Annual Survey was pretested by 30 people (LIP coordinators, LIP partners, and researchers) in late August 2019, and modified slightly based on the feedback received. On September 26, 2019, online and hard copy versions of the final survey, complete with detailed instructions, were sent to all of the LIPs in the PNT region by the Calgary Local Immigration Partnership (CLIP).

LIPs in the PNT region whose Partnership Councils had been active for a year were to have administered the LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey during the fall of 2019 or winter of 2020, at a convenient time for each LIP. They were to have invited all members of their respective Councils, Immigrant Advisory Tables, and Working Groups or Committees to complete the survey. The intent is to evaluate each LIP’s effectiveness as a collective impact backbone organization in a consistent way across the PNT region. The results can be used locally for continuous process improvement and are rolled up regionally in this report for IRCC, which funds LIPs across Canada.

Only eight LIPs in the PNT region successfully completed the 2019/2020 annual survey. Several coordinators experienced difficulties related to setting up the survey software, but persevered. Others either did not attempt to set up the survey online or chose not to administer the survey.

All PNT LIPs should be aiming for a 100% response rate for the LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey since every person invited to complete the survey is actively engaged in their local or regional LIP. With the survey administration enhancements planned for 2020/2021, it is anticipated that all of the PNT LIPs will be able to more easily participate in the LIPs Annual Survey in the coming year. It is also hoped that each LIP will be able to increase their survey participation rates by, for example, including the “annual completion of the LIPs survey” in the Terms of Reference used for each of their partner groups.
Methodology

Each LIP in the PNT region with a Partnership Council that had been active for at least one year was expected to complete an annual survey at some point between late September 2019 (when the revised survey was distributed) and February 29, 2020. All participating LIPs were to load the survey into online survey software and send their LIP partners an e-mail invitation with a link to the online survey. For those LIPs whose partners wanted to complete the survey in hard copy, the coordinator was expected to collect the completed surveys and then enter the data into the online survey before the regional deadline of March 1, 2020.

Once the surveys were closed, a summary of the findings was to be downloaded in PDF and the raw data was to be downloaded in Excel. While these were for local use, LIP coordinators were also asked to send these to CLIP so the summaries could be posted on the LIPs website at https://LIPdata.ca and the raw data could be combined into a report for the PNT region.

There are a few newer LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories, whose Partnership Councils have not been actively working together for one year. They were exempt from administering the LIPs Annual Survey in 2019/2020 but are expected to have their partners complete it in 2020/2021. A number of other LIPs were also unable to participate for various reasons. The breakdown is shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Participation Status</th>
<th>Number of LIPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Completed the survey on time</strong> – Bow Valley, AB; Brooks, AB; Calgary, AB; Grande Prairie, AB; Pembina Valley, MB; Portage la Prairie, MB; Regina, SK</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did not load the survey due to issues with the survey software but completed it with assistance</strong> – Lloydminster, AB</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Lloydminster received 13 hard copy surveys. An online copy of the Calgary survey was created and customized for Lloydminster so the data could be entered and the reports downloaded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal – Surveys Used in this Analysis</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did not load the survey</strong> – Jasper, AB</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Jasper only received one hard copy survey so it was not used in this analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did not load correct questions onto the survey</strong> – Red Deer, AB</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Red Deer only uploaded 11 questions but they were not from the revised survey so despite receiving 37 responses to most of those questions, the results could not be used in this analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New LIPs (exempt)</strong> – Medicine Hat, AB; Eastman; MB, Moose Jaw, SK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did not complete the survey due to new Coordinator</strong> – Yellowknife, NWT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did not complete the survey due to new Council</strong> – Saskatoon, SK</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did not complete the survey due to staff departure</strong> – Wood Buffalo, AB</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No response to e-mail queries from CLIP about intent to complete the survey</strong> – Edmonton, AB; Lethbridge, AB; Winnipeg, MB</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total – PNT LIPs Operating in 2019/2020</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Administration Statistics

The eight surveys included in this analysis were administered separately, at different times over a five-month period, and for different durations. The number of invitations sent by each LIP was not collected from LIPs—although it will be requested going forward. As a result, we cannot calculate the regional participation rate for the 2019/2020 survey (surveys completed over invitations sent). For all eight participating LIPs, survey response rates were also likely less than desired, although not all LIPs have established Advisory Tables or Working Groups at their current stage of development. However, the low number of responses likely means that not all of the key partners involved with each LIP completed the survey. Each coordinator can assess that for themselves, based on how many survey invitations they sent out.

Among the eight participating LIPs across the region, a total of 210 respondents started the survey and completed the first four mandatory questions. The final question was answered by 177 respondents. This ratio (177/210) can be used as a proxy for the online survey completion rate, which was 84.3%. However, it is the participation rate that is much more important for LIPs to know to assess their partners’ engagement (completions/invitations). The results for the eight LIPs that successfully completed the survey have been combined and are presented in this report. The individual starts, completions, presumed dropouts, and completion rate proxies are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNT LIP</th>
<th>Started Survey</th>
<th>Completed Q-48</th>
<th>Presumed Dropouts</th>
<th>Completion Rate Proxy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bow Valley, AB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, AB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary, AB</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grande Prairie, AB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloydminster, AB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembina Valley, MB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage la Prairie, MB</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina, SK</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>84.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Analysis

The analysis that follows is for all nine sections of the LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey used in 2019/2020 by eight LIPs in the PNT region. LIPs could also add additional, locally relevant questions to the survey. The results are not included in this regional roll-up. Open-ended questions were not analyzed for the regional roll-up, as the content is also specific to each LIP. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review these results for their own LIP.

---

The first four survey questions were mandatory and were answered by 210 respondents. Based on the number of surveys that were begun, the number of responses per question (n-value) should be 210—except for Section H, which was only to be completed by the 144 people who identified themselves as an organizational representative in Question 2. However, that was not the case, in part because, beyond Section A, only one question was mandatory (Q-48).

For the PNT LIPs Annual Survey, the n-values for the 29 non-mandatory scaled questions in sections B, C, D, E, F, and G ranged from 178 to 194, with an average of 184 responses per question. The n-values for the 12 non-mandatory scaled questions in section H that were completed by organizational representatives ranged from 128 to 135, with an average of 132 responses per question. The n-value for each question is shown in brackets after the chart title.

The multiple-choice questions in Section A (Questions 1 through 4) were mandatory and were each answered by 210 respondents. The five-point scale used by all LIPs for Sections B, C, D, E, F (Questions 5 through 27) and Section H (Questions 35 through 46) assessed respondents’ agreement with each statement. These questions used a five-point scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. For this analysis, the responses for points 4 and 5 (‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’) were combined to derive an overall percentage for “agreement” with the statement. Because Immigration Partnerships in the region are at different stages of development, respondents could also choose n/a for Not Applicable for these scaled questions.

Section G (Questions 28 to 33) used a different five-point scale, where 1 = Definitely Not Important, 2 = Probably Not Important, 3 = Don’t Know, 4 = Probably Important, and 5 = Definitely Important. For this analysis, the responses for points 4 and 5 (‘probably important’ and ‘definitely important’) were combined to derive an overall percentage for “importance” of the statement. As with the other scaled questions, respondents could also choose n/a for Not Applicable for each of these questions. Question 34 was an open-ended question that allowed respondents to add other areas of importance that may have been missed.

Question 47 was another open-ended question that allowed all respondents to add additional comments. Question 48 was the only other mandatory question in the survey. It asked whether any comments made in Question 47 could be publicly shared. If not, they would only be seen by the LIP coordinator and other LIP staff who had access to the raw survey data. Open-ended responses to survey questions have not been analyzed for the region. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review the results for their own Partnership.

It is important to note that percentages are used in the charts that follow, rather than raw numbers. Using percentages provides an understandable order of magnitude that allows easier comparison between questions and with the survey results from individual PNT LIPs. Finally, throughout this report, local or regional Immigration Partnerships are referred to as “the Partnership.” The complete survey, including instructions, is provided in Appendix B.

QuestionPro survey software, which was used by CLIP, allows the use of “skip logic” to hide or show the questions in Section H based on who identified themselves as an organizational representative in Question 2. However, the version of SurveyMonkey used by most PNT LIPs does not allow the use of skip logic. Therefore, written instructions had to be added to the survey about who was or was not to complete the questions in Section H, hoping that respondents would follow those instructions.
Survey Findings

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. My role with the Partnership is as a member of: [mandatory question]

My role with the Partnership is as a member of: (n = 210)

- Partnership Council: 21.9%
- Immigrant Advisory Table: 23.3%
- Working Group or Committee: 32.4%
- One or more of these: 15.2%
- Other: 7.1%

This mandatory question was answered by 210 respondents. It is helpful to know the number of people in each target group who responded to the survey, not just the percentage. Respondents included 46 Council members, 49 Immigrant Advisory Table members, 68 Working Group or Committee members, and 15 people who sit on more than one of these groups.

2. In my work with the Partnership, I represent and speak for: [mandatory question]

In my work with the Partnership, I represent and speak for: (n = 210)

- A partner organization: 68.6%
- Myself as a community member: 30.5%
- Other: 1.0%

A total of 144 respondents who answered this mandatory question indicated they were representing a partner organization.
3. I have been involved with the Partnership for: [mandatory question]

A total of 65 respondents who answered this mandatory question have been involved with the Partnership for less than one year, 77 others have been involved for one to two years, 50 have been involved for three to four years, and 18 have been involved five years or longer.

4. Do you believe it is important to have an Immigration Partnership in our community? [mandatory question]

An overwhelming majority of respondents who answered this mandatory question (202 of 210) believe it is important to have an Immigration Partnership in their community. While respondents were invited to explain their choice, open-ended responses have not been analyzed for the region. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review the results for their own Partnership.
Questions 5 through 7 focus on the Partnership’s purpose in the previous 12 months.

5. All members are committed to the mission of the Partnership.

A total of 75.4% of respondents agreed that members are committed to the Partnership’s mission. While 5.8% disagreed, another 18.8% didn’t know if this was the case.

6. Together, members have identified strategic goals and objectives for the Partnership.

A total of 86.8% of respondents agreed that, together, members identified strategic goals and objectives for the Partnership. While 3.7% disagreed, another 9.5% didn’t know if this was the case.
7. The Action Plan developed by members reflects the Partnership’s strategic goals.

A total of **83.5%** of respondents agreed that the Partnership’s Action Plans reflects the Partnership’s strategic goals. While **5.3%** disagreed, another **11.2%** didn’t know if this was the case.

C. PERFORMANCE

Questions 8 through 13 focus on the Partnership’s **performance** in the previous 12 months.

8. Partnership members are creating new knowledge or insights together.

A total of **88.6%** of respondents agreed that, together, Partnership members are creating new knowledge or insights. Only **5.2%** disagreed and another **6.2%** didn’t know if this was the case.
9. **Members are working together to advance the Partnership’s goals.**

A total of 78.8% of respondents agreed that members are working together to advance the Partnership’s goals. While 5.3% disagreed, another 15.9% didn’t know if this was the case.

10. **The way the Partnership’s staff communicates with members builds support for the Partnership’s work.**

A resounding 91.2% of respondents agreed that the way Partnership staff communicates with members builds support for the Partnership’s work. Kudos to the participating LIP coordinators and their other staff members!
11. The Partnership is meeting the goals and objectives in its Strategic Plan.

A total of **69.3%** of respondents agreed that the Partnership is meeting the goals and objectives in its Strategic Plan. While **6.8%** disagreed, another **22.9%** didn’t know if this was the case.

12. The Partnership is creating value for the members it serves.

A total of **82.4%** of respondents agreed that the Partnership is creating value for its members. While **6.2%** disagreed, another **10.9%** didn’t know if this was the case.
13. The Partnership’s members are adding value to each other’s work.

A total of 82.8% of respondents agreed that Partnership members are adding value to each other’s work. While 4.7% disagreed, another 12.0% didn’t know if this was the case.

D. OPERATIONS

Questions 14 through 18 focus on the Partnership’s operations in the previous 12 months.

14. Decision-making processes encourage Partnership members to contribute and collaborate.

A total of 82.5% of respondents agreed that decision-making processes encourage Partnership members to contribute and collaborate. While 5.5% disagreed, another 11.5% didn’t know if this was the case.
15. The processes used by the Partnership help members to agree on strategies and actions.

A total of **79.2%** of respondents agreed that the processes used by the Partnership help its members to agree on strategies and actions. While **4.4%** disagreed, another **16.4%** didn’t know if this was the case.

16. The Partnership deals with conflict in a positive way (e.g., clear, respectful, transparent, timely).

Only **62.4%** of respondents agreed that the Partnership deals with conflict in a positive way (e.g., clear, respectful, transparent, timely). While only **3.4%** disagreed, another **28.1%** didn’t know if this was the case.
17. All members are contributing time and resources to the Partnership.

Only 62.1% of respondents agreed that all members are contributing time and resources to the Partnership. While 11.5% disagreed, another 25.3% didn’t know if this was the case.

18. The Partnership uses its Terms of Reference to promote accountability.

Only 63.1% of respondents agreed that the Partnership uses its Terms of Reference to promote accountability. While 6.1% disagreed, another 30.2% didn’t know if this was the case.
Questions 19 through 22 focus on the Partnership’s **member capacity** in the previous 12 months.

19. **Members have the knowledge** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

A total of **76.8%** of respondents agreed that members have the **knowledge** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While **6.1%** disagreed, another **16.0%** didn’t know if this was the case.

20. **Members have the skills** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

A total of **80.0%** of respondents agreed that members have the **skills** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While only **3.3%** disagreed, another **16.7%** didn’t know if this was the case.
21. Members have the **material resources** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

Only **60.0%** of respondents agreed that members have the **material resources** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While **11.1%** disagreed, another **27.8%** didn’t know if this was the case.

22. Members have the **connections** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

A total of **80.6%** of respondents agreed that members have the **connections** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While **3.9%** disagreed, another **14.4%** didn’t know if this was the case.
F. STAFF CAPACITY

Questions 23 through 27 focus on the Partnership’s staff capacity in the previous 12 months.

23. Partnership staff have the staff resources they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

Only 57.9% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the staff resources they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While 9.3% disagreed, another 31.1% didn’t know if this was the case.

24. Partnership staff have the knowledge they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

A total of 82.6% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the knowledge they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While 3.8% disagreed, another 12.5% didn’t know if this was the case.
25. Partnership staff have the skills they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

A total of 78.4% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the skills they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While 4.9% disagreed, another 11.9% didn’t know if this was the case.

26. Partnership staff have the material resources they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

Only 52.5% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the material resources they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While 11.6% disagreed, another 33.7% didn’t know if this was the case.
27. Partnership staff have the connections they need to advance the Partnership’s goals.

A total of 81.4% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the connections they need to advance the Partnership’s goals. While 6.6% disagreed, another 11.5% didn’t know if this was the case.

G. NEXT STEPS NEEDED

Questions 28 through 34 focus the importance of certain activities to further the Partnership’s goals in the next 12 months. While data have been combined for the region, it is recommended that each Partnership consider undertaking specific activities based on its own survey results.

28. Provide/continue to provide evidence-based research.

A resounding 93.3% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should provide/continue to provide evidence-based research.
29. Provide/continue to provide up-to-date information on relevant policy changes and their implications.

![Bar chart showing responses to importance of providing information on policy changes](chart1.png)

Fully 97.8% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should provide/continue to provide up-to-date information on relevant policy changes and their implications.

30. Provide/continue to provide Partnership members and the public with current information about immigration and newcomers.

![Bar chart showing responses to importance of providing information on immigration and newcomers](chart2.png)

Fully 98.9% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should provide/continue to provide members and the public with current information about immigration and newcomers.
31. Support/continue to support diverse newcomer voices in the community.

Again, fully 98.9% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should support/continue to support diverse newcomer voices in the community.

32. Engage/continue to engage organizations that serve the most marginalized newcomer populations in our community.

Fully 96.1% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should engage/continue to engage organizations that serve the most marginalized newcomer populations in the community.
33. Increase the Partnership’s capacity to participate at more community tables.

A total of 89.9% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should increase its capacity to participate at more community tables.

34. If there are other activities that you think are important to address in the next 12 months to further your Partnership’s goals, please list them here:

Open-ended responses have not been analyzed for the region. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review the results for their own Partnership.

H. IMPACT ON MY ORGANIZATION

The questions in this section were to be answered by organizational representatives only. QuestionPro survey software, which was used by the Calgary LIP, allows the use of “skip logic” to hide or show the questions in Section H based on who identified themselves as an organizational representative in Section A, Question 2.

However, the version of SurveyMonkey used by most PNT LIPs does not allow the use of skip logic. Therefore, written instructions had to be added to the survey about who was or was not to complete the questions in Section H, hoping that respondents would follow those instructions. Respondents who answered Question 2 by choosing “Myself as a community member” would have been asked to skip from Section G to Section I.

A total of 144 respondents identified as organizational representatives in Question 2, which means the n-value for this set of questions is lower than it was for the previous questions.
35. My organization now has a better understanding of newcomer needs.

A total of 78.5% of respondents agreed that their organization now has a better understanding of newcomer needs. While 8.5% disagreed, another 8.5% didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to 4.6% of respondents.

36. My organization now has a better understanding of strategies and practices that support newcomer integration.

A total of 76.9% of respondents agreed that their organization now has a better understanding of strategies and practices that support newcomer integration. While 7.7% disagreed, another 11.5% didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to 3.8% of respondents.
37. My organization provides/continues to provide training for staff to help them meet newcomers’ needs.

Only 69.0% of respondents agreed that their organization provides/continues to provide training for staff to help them meet newcomers’ needs. While 15.5% disagreed, another 7.8% didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to a further 7.8% of respondents.

38. My organization now has better access to resources to help with newcomer integration.

Only 67.2% of respondents agreed that their organization now has better access to resources to help with newcomer integration. While 13.3% disagreed, another 12.5% didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to 7.0% of respondents.
39. My organization now has better connections with other organizations working with newcomers.

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement](chart1.png)

A total of **80.5%** of respondents agreed that their organization now has better **connections** with other organizations working with newcomers. While **6.0%** disagreed, only **4.5%** didn’t know if this was the case. However, this question does not yet apply to **9.0%** of respondents.

40. My organization now collaborates/works together with other organizations working with newcomers.

![Bar chart showing responses to the statement](chart2.png)

A total of **80.9%** of respondents agree that their organization now **collaborates/works together** with other organizations working with newcomers. While **7.6%** disagreed, only **3.8%** didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to a further **7.6%** of respondents.
41. My organization has strategies/work plans to support the integration of newcomers.

A total of 80.3% of respondents agreed that their organization has strategies/work plans to support the integration of newcomers. While 7.6% disagreed, only 5.3% didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to 6.8% of respondents.

42. My organization is committed to the vision and mission of the Partnership.

A total of 81.5% of respondents agreed that their organization is committed to the vision and mission of the Partnership. While only 3.7% disagreed, another 9.6% didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to 5.2% of respondents.
43. My organization has aligned its own strategic direction to the Partnership’s Strategy.

Only **50.4%** of respondents agreed that their organization has aligned its own strategic direction to the Partnership’s Strategy. However, **18.8%** disagreed and another **18.8%** didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to **12.0%** of respondents.

44. My organization has committed to lead or implement actions in the Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan.

Only **64.4%** of respondents agreed that their organization has committed to lead or implement actions in the Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan. While **12.6%** disagreed, another **13.3%** didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to **9.6%** of respondents.
45. In the past 12 months, my organization **kept its commitments** to lead or implement actions in the Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan.

Only **67.9%** of respondents agreed that, in the past 12 months, their organization **kept its commitments** to lead or implement actions in the Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan. While **3.7%** disagreed, another **16.4%** didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to **11.9%** of respondents.

46. In the past 12 months, my organization **changed its programming or practices** because of its involvement with the Partnership.

Only **42.6%** of respondents agreed that, in the past 12 months, their organization **changed its programming or practices** because of its involvement with the Partnership. While **26.4%** disagreed, another **19.4%** didn’t know if this was the case. This question does not yet apply to **11.6%** of respondents.
I. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

In this section, respondents were invited to provide additional comments.

47. Please share any additional comments here:

Open-ended responses to survey questions have not been analyzed for the region. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review the results for their own Partnership.

48. A sample of these comments may be used in our reports to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) or in other communications. [mandatory question]

A total of 132 respondents (74.6%) provided consent to use the comments they provided in Question 47.
Summary Conclusions

All established LIPs in the PNT region invited members of their respective Partnership Councils, Immigrant Advisory Tables, and Working Groups or Committees to complete the LIPs Annual Survey to evaluate each LIP’s effectiveness as a collective impact backbone organization. The results can be used locally for continuous process improvement and are rolled up regionally in this report for IRCC, which funds LIPs across Canada.

The eight surveys included in this analysis were administered separately, at different times over a five-month period, and for different durations. Among the eight participating LIPs across the region, a total of 210 respondents started the survey and completed the first four mandatory questions. The final question was answered by 177 respondents. This ratio (177/210) can be used as a proxy for the online survey completion rate, which was 84.3%.

The 48 survey questions were divided to nine sections. The categories and number of questions in each section are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of Section</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. General Information on PNT Respondents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The Partnership’s Purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. The Partnership’s Performance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. The Partnership’s Operations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. The Partnership’s Member Capacity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The Partnership’s Staff Capacity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Next Steps Needed (1 open-ended)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Organizational Impact</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Additional Comments and Consent to Use Them</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the responses to the questions in each section follows.

General Information on PNT Respondents

1. This mandatory question was answered by 210 respondents: 46 Council members, 49 Immigrant Advisory Table members, 68 Working Group or Committee members, and 15 people who sit on more than one of these groups.

2. A total of 144 respondents who answered this mandatory question indicated they were representing a partner organization.

3. A total of 65 respondents who answered this mandatory question have been involved with the Partnership for less than one year, 77 others have been involved for one to two years, 50 have been involved for three to four years, and 18 have been involved five years or longer.
4. An overwhelming majority of respondents who answered this mandatory question (202 of 210) believe it is important to have an Immigration Partnership in their community. While respondents were invited to explain their choice, open-ended responses have not been analyzed for the region. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review the results for their own Partnership.

The Partnership’s Purpose

5. 75.4% of respondents agreed that members are committed to the Partnership’s mission; 5.8% disagreed; 18.8% didn’t know

6. 86.8% of respondents agreed that, together, members identified strategic goals and objectives for the Partnership; 3.7% disagreed; 9.5% didn’t know, and

7. 83.5% of respondents agreed that the Partnership’s Action Plans reflects the Partnership’s strategic goals; 5.3% disagreed; 11.2% didn’t know.

There is some uncertainty among Partnership members as to whether all members are committed to the LIP’s mission. Partnership members agreed that they have identified strategies and goals together, and that their LIP’s Action Plan reflects them.

The Partnership’s Performance

8. 88.6% of respondents agreed that, together, Partnership members are creating new knowledge or insights; 5.2% disagreed; 6.2% didn’t know

9. 78.8% of respondents agreed that members are working together to advance the Partnership’s goals; 5.3% disagreed; 15.9% didn’t know

10. 91.2% of respondents agreed that the way Partnership staff communicates with members builds support for the Partnership’s work

11. 69.3% of respondents agreed that the Partnership is meeting the goals and objectives in its Strategic Plan; 6.8% disagreed; 22.9% didn’t know

12. 82.4% of respondents agreed that the Partnership is creating value for its members; 6.2% disagreed; 10.9% didn’t know, and

13. 82.8% of respondents agreed that Partnership members are adding value to each other’s work; 4.7% disagreed; 12.0% didn’t know.

The highest rated indicator of Partnership performance was how staff communication builds support for the Partnership. Next highest were indicators about adding value to each other’s work and creating value for members. Slightly fewer respondents believe that members are working together to advance the Partnership’s goals. Even fewer believe the Partnership is meeting the objectives in its Strategic Plan.
The Partnership’s Operations

14. 82.5% of respondents agreed that decision-making processes encourage Partnership members to contribute and collaborate; 5.5% disagreed; 11.5% didn’t know

15. 79.2% of respondents agreed that the processes used by the Partnership help its members to agree on strategies and actions; 4.4% disagreed; 16.4% didn’t know

16. 62.4% of respondents agreed that the Partnership deals with conflict in a positive way; 3.4% disagreed; 28.1% didn’t know

17. 62.1% of respondents agreed that all members are contributing time and resources to the Partnership; 11.5% disagreed; 25.3% didn’t know, and

18. 63.1% of respondents agreed that the Partnership uses its Terms of Reference to promote accountability; 6.1% disagreed; 30.2% didn’t know.

A large proportion of Partnership members found that decision-making processes encouraged collaboration, and other processes were effective at helping them reach agreement. Far fewer thought the Partnership used its Terms of Reference to promote accountability, or dealt with conflict in a positive way. Slightly fewer respondents agreed that all members were contributing time and resources to their Partnership, although some disagreed and many did not know.

The Partnership’s Member Capacity

19. 76.8% of respondents agreed that members have the knowledge they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 6.1% disagreed; 16.0% didn’t know

20. 80.0% of respondents agreed that members have the skills they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 3.3% disagreed; 16.7% didn’t know

21. 60.0% of respondents agreed that members have the material resources they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 11.1% disagreed; 27.8% didn’t know, and

22. 80.6% of respondents agreed that members have the connections they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 3.9% disagreed; 14.4% didn’t know.

A majority of respondents thought that Partnership members have the connections, skills, and knowledge to advance the Partnership’s goals. Far fewer thought they had the material resources needed to do so.

The Partnership’s Staff Capacity

23. 57.9% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the staff resources they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 9.3% disagreed; 31.1% didn’t know

24. 82.6% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the knowledge they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 3.8% disagreed; 12.5% didn’t know

25. 78.4% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the skills they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 4.9% disagreed; 11.9% didn’t know

26. 52.5% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the material resources they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 11.6% disagreed; 33.7% didn’t know, and
27. 81.4% of respondents agreed that Partnership staff have the **connections** they need to advance the Partnership’s goals; 6.6% disagreed; 11.5% didn’t know.

A majority of respondents thought that Partnership staff have the knowledge, connections, and skills to advance the Partnership’s goals. Far fewer respondents thought they had adequate staff resources and fewer still thought staff had the material resources they need.

**Next Steps Needed**

28. 93.3% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should provide evidence-based **research**

29. 97.8% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should provide up-to-date information on relevant **policy changes** and their implications

30. 98.9% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should provide members and the public with current **information about immigration and newcomers**

31. 98.9% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should support **diverse newcomer voices** in the community

32. 96.1% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should engage/continue to engage organizations that serve the **most marginalized newcomer populations** in the community, and

33. 89.9% of respondents agreed that the Partnership should increase its capacity to participate at more **community tables**.

34. Respondents were invited to list additional activities the Partnership should undertake in the next 12 months. Open-ended responses have not been analyzed for the region. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review the results for their own Partnership.

**Organizational Impact**

A total of **144 respondents** who identified as organizational representatives in Question 2 were asked to respond to questions on organizational impact. These questions are at the heart of what immigration partnerships are intended to achieve—system change by and among partners that will improve newcomer settlement and integration.

35. **78.5%** of respondents agreed that their organization now has a better understanding of **newcomer needs**; 8.5% disagreed; 8.5% didn’t know; 4.6% said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

36. **76.9%** of respondents agreed that their organization now has a better understanding of **strategies and practices** that support newcomer integration; 7.7% disagreed; 11.5% didn’t know; 3.8% said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

37. **69.0%** of respondents agreed that their organization provides/continues to provide **training for staff** to help them meet newcomers’ needs; 15.5% disagreed; 7.8% didn’t know; a further 7.8% said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

38. **67.2%** of respondents agreed that their organization now has **better access to resources** to help with newcomer integration; 13.3% disagreed; 12.5% didn’t know; 7.0% said this does not yet apply to their Partnership
39. **80.5%** of respondents agreed that their organization now has better **connections** with other organizations working with newcomers; **6.0%** disagreed; **4.5%** didn’t know; **9.0%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

40. **80.9%** of respondents agree that their organization now **collaborates/works together** with other organizations working with newcomers; **7.6%** disagreed; **3.8%** didn’t know; a further **7.6%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

41. **80.3%** of respondents agreed that their organization has **strategies/work plans** to support the integration of newcomers; **7.6%** disagreed; **5.3%** didn’t know; **6.8%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

42. **81.5%** of respondents agreed that their organization is committed to the **vision and mission** of the Partnership; **3.7%** disagreed; **9.6%** didn’t know; **5.2%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

43. **50.4%** of respondents agreed that their organization has aligned its own **strategic direction** to the Partnership’s Strategy; **18.8%** disagreed; another **18.8%** didn’t know; **12.0%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

44. **64.4%** of respondents agreed that their organization has **committed to lead or implement actions** in the Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan; **12.6%** disagreed; **13.3%** didn’t know; **9.6%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership

45. **67.9%** of respondents agreed that, in the past 12 months, their organization **kept its commitments** to lead or implement actions in the Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan; **3.7%** disagreed; **16.4%** didn’t know; **11.9%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership, and

46. **42.6%** of respondents agreed that, in the past 12 months, their organization **changed its programming or practices** because of its involvement with the Partnership; **26.4%** disagreed; **19.4%** didn’t know; **11.6%** said this does not yet apply to their Partnership.

Many respondents report that their organization has been able to improve its support of newcomers through its involvement with the Partnership. However, in terms of overall system change, only half of respondents thought their organization had aligned it strategic direction with the Partnership’s strategy. Even fewer report that their organization has changed its programs or practices.

**Additional Comments**

47. In this section, respondents were invited to provide additional comments. Open-ended responses have not been analyzed for the region. Instead, LIP coordinators are encouraged to review the results for their own Partnership.

48. A total of **132 respondents** (74.6%) provided consent to use the comments they provided in Question 47.

In conclusion, the Annual Survey used by LIPs in the Prairies and Northern Territories is 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 individually encouraged to celebrate and build upon their successes and make plans to address areas in need of improvement. This roll-up of the results for eight LIPs in the PNT region shows how a handful of the PNT LIPs are doing collectively on these key indicators. It may be useful for LIPs to compare their local results to the baseline regional data presented in this report.
With survey administration enhancements planned for 2020/2021, it is anticipated that almost all of the PNT LIPs will be able to more easily participate in the LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey in the coming year. It is also hoped that each LIP will be able to increase its own survey participation rate. Future reports should give a clearer indication of how well LIPs in the PNT region are doing as collective impact backbone organizations. The better each collective performs, the better the outcomes for newcomers in LIP communities across the Prairies and Northern Territories.
Appendix A. Performance Measurement in the PNT Region

In the fall of 2017, a Performance Measurement Working Group was convened to determine the kinds of data and information that could 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 LIPs in the PNT agreed to use a Results-Based Accountability (RBA) framework, as recommended by IRCC.

They first agreed on the types of population data that would be reported for each LIP. Data for the PNT LIPs was ordered by the Calgary LIP (CLIP) from both the 2006 and 2016 federal census and loaded onto a reporting dashboard at https://LIPdata.ca. At IRCC’s request, CLIP will populate the dashboard with census data for all LIPs in Canada by the end of 2020.

The PNT LIPs also agreed to seek local data that measured progress on the unique strategic actions identified by each LIP based on local needs. However, it has been nearly impossible for LIPs to obtain high quality local outcome data.

The LIPs agreed to collect immigrant profiles as part of the “story” element typical of RBA reporting but also as a tool that could be used locally for positive messaging about immigrants and refugees. This was augmented with other success stories presented as articles and videos by IRCC’s #ImmigrationMatters campaign, all of which are linked on https://LIPdata.ca under the appropriate region or LIP.

In addition to population data and stories, RBA generally includes program results to show how individual programs are contributing to the changes sought for 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 newcomers.

Therefore, LIPs are collective impact backbone organizations. They 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. A survey of partners measures each LIP’s effectiveness in doing so.

A partners survey was pilot tested by some PNT LIPs during the 2018/2019 fiscal year. A working group of LIP coordinators was then formed to evaluate its effectiveness and revise it for use in the 2019/2020 fiscal year and beyond. The new, more comprehensive LIPs Annual Survey was pretested by 30 people (LIP coordinators, LIP partners, and researchers) in late August 2019, and modified slightly based on the feedback received. On September 26, 2019, online and hard copy versions of the final survey, complete with detailed instructions, were sent to all of the LIPs in the PNT region by CLIP.

LIPs in the PNT region whose Partnership Councils had been active for a year were to have administered the LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey during the fall of 2019 or winter of 2020, at a convenient time for each LIP. They were to have invited all members of their respective Councils, Immigrant Advisory Tables, and Working Groups or Committees to complete the survey. The intent is to evaluate each LIP’s effectiveness as a collective impact backbone organization in a consistent way across the PNT region.
In addition to the surveys, CLIP prepared and posted two *Survey Set-Up and Data Retrieval Guides* for LIPs to use with either QuestionPro or SurveyMonkey software. This was done because inconsistent preparation of online surveys had proved problematic during the pilot year. Different issues related to survey administration emerged during the 2019/2020 survey period, which will be addressed by CLIP on behalf of all PNT LIPs for 2020/2021. It is also hoped that each LIP will be able to increase their survey participation rates by, for example, including the “annual completion of the LIPs survey” in the Terms of Reference used for each of their partner groups.

The ultimate goal is to consistently administer the *LIPs Annual Collective Impact Survey* and roll-up the results for the region as a whole. CLIP is charged with the summary analysis for the region, at least through March 2022.
Appendix B. LIPs Annual Survey, 2019/2020

Key: Additional notes are highlighted in blue. Do not include them in the survey document.

[Before starting to copy and paste your survey into an online survey tool, replace XX with your LIP’s name or initials and change it to Black text. Change the year to the current fiscal year as needed. If you want to use your LIP’s name or abbreviation in the survey questions instead of “immigration partnership,” first make those changes in the Word documents (this one for the online survey, as well as the file for the hard copy survey if you will be using that). Do not change the font (Arial) or text size. The survey is set up for online use.]

XX Immigration Partnership (XXIP) – Annual Survey, 2019/2020

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for taking part in our annual survey of XXIP partners. It is only for members of our Partnership Council, Immigrant Advisory Table, or one of our Working Groups or Committees.

Your opinions are very important to us. The survey findings will identify strengths, needed improvements, and potential growth areas for the XX Immigration Partnership. This will help us track progress in key areas of our development as an Immigration Partnership and let us share how we are doing with others in our community.

The survey should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. If you are involved in XXIP because you represent an organization, please respond as a member of that organization. If you do not represent an organization, please answer as a community member.

Individual results will not be reported. Respondents will never be asked to name or identify themselves. The answers to scaled questions will be combined to report an average score for each question. Open-ended responses will be reviewed by LIP staff. Some “quotes” from the written comments may be used in our reports to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) or in other communications.

This survey is being used by all established Immigration Partnerships funded by IRCC in the Prairies and Northern Territories region (Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and the Northwest Territories).

Note: If you are completing this survey on a mobile phone, it will be easier to view it in landscape. However, it may be easier to add comments by using portrait view.

----------------------------------------[Insert a page break here in the online survey.]->---------------------------------------
A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Please select the answer that best applies.

1. My role with the Immigration Partnership is as a member of:  
   [mandatory question]
   a. The Partnership Council
   b. The Immigrant Advisory Table
   c. A Working Group or Committee
   d. One or more of the above
   e. Other – please describe:
   [mandatory response]

2. In my work with the Immigration Partnership, I represent and speak for:  
   [mandatory question]
   a. A partner organization
   b. Myself as a community member

3. I have been involved with the Immigration Partnership for:  
   [mandatory question]
   a. Less than one year
   b. One to two years
   c. Three to four years
   d. Five years or longer

4. Do you believe it is important to have an Immigration Partnership in our community?  
   [mandatory question]
   a. No
   b. Yes
   c. Don’t Know

Please explain:
[optional response – allow 8 rows of text]
The following questions use a five-point scale, where you can choose one of the following options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Don’t Know, Agree, or Strongly Agree.

Because Immigration Partnerships in the region are at different stages of development, you can also choose Not Applicable (n/a) if the question does not apply to your Partnership at this time.

The questions focus on the Immigration Partnership’s purpose, performance, operations, and capacity. Thinking about the work of the Immigration Partnership in the past 12 months, please check the answer that best applies.

### B. PURPOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>All members are committed to the mission of our Immigration Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Together, members have identified strategic goals and objectives for the Immigration Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The Action Plan developed by members reflects the Immigration Partnership’s strategic goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Members are creating new knowledge or insights together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Members are working together to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The way the Immigration Partnership’s staff communicates with members builds support for its work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The Immigration Partnership is meeting the goals and objectives in its Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The Immigration Partnership is creating value for the members it serves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Members are adding value to each other’s work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Insert a page break here in the online survey.]
### D. OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Decision making processes encourage members to contribute and collaborate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The processes used by the Immigration Partnership help members to agree on strategies and actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The Immigration Partnership deals with conflict in a positive way (e.g., clear, respectful, transparent, timely).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. All members are contributing time and resources to the Immigration Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Immigration Partnership uses its Terms of Reference to promote accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. MEMBER CAPACITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Members have the <strong>knowledge</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Members have the <strong>skills</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Members have the <strong>material resources</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Members have the <strong>connections</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. STAFF CAPACITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Immigration Partnership staff have the <strong>staff resources</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Immigration Partnership staff have the <strong>knowledge</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Immigration Partnership staff have the <strong>skills</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Immigration Partnership staff have the <strong>material resources</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Immigration Partnership staff have the <strong>connections</strong> they need to advance the Immigration Partnership’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These questions use a different five-point scale, where you can choose one of the following options: **Definitely Not Important, Probably Not Important, Don’t Know, Probably Important, Definitely Important.**

Because Immigration Partnerships in the region are at different stages of development, you can also choose **Not Applicable (n/a)** if the question does not apply to your Partnership at this time.

The next questions ask your view of the **importance of certain activities** to further the Partnership’s goals **in the next 12 months**, which your Immigration Partnership may consider undertaking. Please check the answer that best applies.

### G. NEXT STEPS NEEDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely Not Important</th>
<th>Probably Not Important</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Probably Important</th>
<th>Definitely Important</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Provide/continue to provide evidence-based research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Provide/continue to provide up-to-date information on relevant <strong>policy changes</strong> and their implications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Provide/continue to provide members and the public with current <strong>information about immigration and newcomers</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Support/continue to support <strong>diverse newcomer voices</strong> in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Engage/continue to engage organizations that serve the <strong>most marginalized newcomer populations</strong> in our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Increase our capacity to participate at more <strong>community tables</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. If there are other activities that you think are important to address in the next 12 months to further the Partnership’s goals, please list them here:

[optional response – allow 8 rows of text]
H. QUESTIONS FOR ORGANIZATION REPRESENTATIVES ONLY – IMPACT ON MY ORGANIZATION

[These questions will only appear online if people chose response “a” for Question 2.]

These questions use a five-point scale, where you can choose one of the following options: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Don’t Know, Agree, or Strongly Agree.

Because Immigration Partnerships in the region are at different stages of development, you can also choose Not Applicable (n/a) if the question does not apply to your Partnership at this time.

The questions are about the impact that your involvement in the Immigration Partnership may have had on your organization. Thinking about the work of your organization in the past 12 months, please check the answer that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My organization now has a better understanding of newcomer needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My organization now has a better understanding of strategies and practices that support newcomer integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>My organization provides/continues to provide training for staff to help them meet newcomers’ needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>My organization now has better access to resources to help with newcomer integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>My organization now has better connections with other organizations working with newcomers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>My organization now collaborates/works together with other organizations working with newcomers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>My organization has strategies/work plans to support the integration of newcomers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>My organization is committed to the vision and mission of the Immigration Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>My organization has aligned its own strategic direction to the Immigration Partnership’s Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>My organization has committed to lead or implement actions in the Immigration Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, my organization kept its commitments to lead or implement actions in the Immigration Partnership’s Strategy or Action Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, my organization changed its programming or practices because of its involvement with the Immigration Partnership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

47. Please share any additional comments here:

[optional response – allow 25 rows of text]

48. A sample of these comments may be used in our reports to Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC) or in other communications. [mandatory question]

I consent to the use of any of my comments from Question 47.

a. Please do not use any of the comments I made in Question 47.

[Only add Section J if you need to ask a couple of other questions related to your LIP. If not, just add the “Finish” button, which will take you to a final page where you can add a “thank you” message and LIP contact info.]

J. FINAL QUESTIONS – FOR YOUR IMMIGRATION PARTNERSHIP ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Add</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. Add question text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Add question text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Add question text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINISH [online only – takes you to a final page]

[On the last page of the survey, add the “thank you” message and some contact info for your LIP. For example, you could add your LIP’s Twitter URL, e-mail address, website URL, and so on. Make sure all the addresses used online have live links. Be sure to change the text for the added links to Arial 14 point and bright blue so it clearly looks like a link online.]

Thank you so much for completing our survey! We really appreciate it.