



Children and Youth
Planning Table
of Waterloo Region



Children and Youth
Planning Table
of Waterloo Region

2018-2019 Annual Survey Report

Children and Youth Planning Table 2018-2019 Annual Survey Report

Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|----|
| Summary..... | 3 |
| Full Report..... | 5 |
| Respondents | 5 |
| Network Outcomes | 7 |
| Informed..... | 7 |
| Engaged..... | 8 |
| Trusting | 11 |
| Organization and System Outcomes | 12 |
| Family Compass | 12 |
| Adult Allyship and Youth Engagement | 14 |
| Smart Waterloo Region..... | 15 |
| Voting Members..... | 16 |
| Backbone Support | 18 |
| Sustainability | 19 |
| Next Steps | 21 |

Children and Youth Planning Table 2018-2019 Annual Survey - Summary

There were 140 respondents to the 2018-2019 CYPT Annual Survey, for a response rate of 22.0%. This response rate is comparable to 2017. Compared to 2017, the CYPT has more members who participated in the annual survey who are new to the work. In 2017, all of the Voting Member representative respondents had been a member for at least 6 months, and in 2019, eight Voting Member respondents had joined within the last 6 months.

Generally, members are feeling informed of and engaged in the work of the CYPT. Members also find the CYPT environment to be a trusting one. However, in comparing how informed and engaged CYPT members feel themselves to be, and the level of trust in the CYPT environment between 2017 and 2019, the average score out of 5 decreased across the board (for all members, members from Voting Member Organizations, and for Voting Member Representatives).

Members were asked if they would like to be more or less engaged or if they would like to continue to be as engaged or involved with the CYPT as they currently are, and not a single respondent wants to be less engaged than they are currently. Most respondents shared they would like to continue to be as involved as they current are.

Looking specifically at the projects/initiatives that were a focus for CYPT in 2018-2019:

- Three quarters of respondents believe Smart Waterloo Region (SWR) increased the awareness of the importance of child and youth wellbeing in Waterloo Region.
- Two thirds of respondents feel as though SWR created a stronger connection between CYPT and the technology sector and increased the awareness of CYPT in the community.
- Service providers are using Family Compass to connect children, youth and families with whom they work to services or supports in Waterloo Region.
- Approximately two-thirds of survey respondents watched one or more videos or read/used any of the resources as part of the Less Telling, More Asking series, the large majority finding it to be very effective in building their adult allyship skills.

Voting Members believe the greatest benefit of being a Voting Member Organization is having a broader and richer community-wide perspective on child and youth wellbeing (94.1%) followed by having strong relationships and networks with those working in the child and youth wellbeing space (92.2%). Voting Member Representatives were also asked to reflect on how their organization contributes to the success of the CYPT. Voting Member Representatives feel as though their organization is most likely to champions system change (i.e. raising awareness and championing issues related to child and youth wellbeing and the value of working together) (92.2%), followed by building strategic partnerships and

trusting relationships within and across the system (90.2%). Voting Member Representatives feel as though their organization is least likely to contribute by maximizing and leveraging resources (68.8%).

Voting Member Representatives and members of CYPT Working Groups and Support Teams rated the overall effectiveness of the backbone support as 4.32 out of 5. “Providing direct support to the Steering Committee, Standing and Working Groups of the CYPT” and “Supporting and addressing the logistical needs of the CYPT” were rated the highest, at 4.58 and 4.59 out of 5 respectively.

As the CYPT plans for long-term sustainability, members shared what they have experienced or observed that would not have happened without the CYPT. They shared:

- The appreciation for the partnerships and collaboration opportunities that have arisen through CYPT participation
- The development of the youth engagement resources (Less Telling, More Asking) and the focus on meaningful youth engagement
- The benefit and value of being able to share data and resources
- The value of developing a shared vision and language across organizations

Members also shared where they think the CYPT has the greatest potential to make meaningful change in our community for children, youth and families. Many members raised the desire to begin work on the shared, concrete task of moving the needle belonging. Many members highlighted the need to tell our story and raise the profile of CYPT across the community in order to bring in new partners. Many members see the value of sharing data and resources as a prerequisite to improving child and youth wellbeing. Some members highlighted the potential for the collaborative to reach and engage traditionally disenfranchised communities and some members highlighted a hope that CYPT could leverage the power of the collective to secure funding.

Children and Youth Planning Table 2018-2019 Annual Survey – Full Report

The Children and Youth Planning Table (CYPT) is committed to ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement. As the CYPT continues to grow, evolve and build momentum it is key to the work to check-in and hear from those connected to and engaged in the work. In January 2020, members of the CYPT were asked to complete CYPT Annual Survey, reflecting on 2018-2019, as one way of collecting information and feedback from members. The following report is a summary of the 2018-2019 Annual Survey results.

In most cases, responses of 3 (“Somewhat”), 4 (“Quite a bit”), and 5 (“A great deal”) were combined when reporting responses.

A note: In 2017, only Primary Voting Member Representatives for Voting Member Organizations completed the questions for Voting Member Representatives. For the 2018-2019 Survey, both Primary and Secondary Voting Member Representatives completed questions specific to Voting Member Representatives.

Respondents

There were 140 respondents to the 2018-2019 CYPT Annual Survey. On January 1, 2020, the CYPT had 635 members which means the survey response rate was 22.0%, this response rate is comparable to 2017.

Of the 140 respondents, 113 or 80.7%, work for or represent a Voting Member Organization. Of those 113 individuals, 70 respondents are either the Primary or Secondary Voting Member Representative for their organization.

Table 1: 2018-2019 Annual Survey Respondents

| | Count | Per cent of Total Respondents |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| General Member | 27 | 19.3% |
| Member from a Voting Member Organization | 113 | 80.7% |
| Voting Member Representative | 70 | 50.0% |
| Total Number of Respondents | 140 | 100.0% |

Many of the respondents (43.6%) have been involved with CYPT for at least 3 years. Respondents who work for a Voting Member Organization have been involved with the CYPT for a slightly longer amount of time than general members. Compared to 2017, the CYPT has more members who are new to the work; there is a greater proportion of members who

have been involved with the CYPT for 1 year or less compared to 2017 (21.4% in 2020; 15.4% in 2017). In 2017, all of the Voting Member Representative respondents had been a member for at least 6 months, in 2019 8 Voting Member Respondents had joined within the last 6 months.

Table 2: Length of Time Respondents have been Involved with the CYPT, 2018-2019 Survey

| | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent | VM Organization Count | VM Organization Per cent | VM Representative Count | VM Representative Per cent |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Less than 6 months | 12 | 8.6% | 10 | 8.8% | 8 | 11.4% |
| 6 months to 1 year | 18 | 12.9% | 12 | 10.6% | 5 | 7.1% |
| 1 to 3 years | 34 | 24.3% | 28 | 24.8% | 17 | 24.3% |
| 3 to 5 years | 26 | 18.6% | 21 | 18.6% | 11 | 15.7% |
| More than 5 years | 35 | 25.0% | 30 | 26.5% | 20 | 28.6% |
| No Response | 15 | 10.7% | 12 | 10.6% | 9 | 12.9% |
| Total | 140 | 100.0% | 113 | 100.0% | 70 | 100.0% |

There were 49 respondents who had been a member of at least one CYPT Working Group or Support Team within the last two years, 14 of the 49 respondents had been a member of more than one CYPT Working Group or Support Team.

There were 46 respondents who had been a member of at least one CYPT Nested Group, 8 of those 46 respondents had been a member of more than one CYPT Nested Group.



Table 3: Respondents Participation in CYPT Working Groups, Support Teams or Nested Groups, 2018-2019

| CYPT Working Group or Support Team | All Respondents Count |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Data Research Evaluation Team | 16 |
| Smart Waterloo Region Advisory | 15 |
| Collective Impact Recommendation Working Group | 11 |
| Wellbeing Waterloo Region Social Inclusion Working Group | 11 |
| Sustainability Working Group | 7 |
| Communication Advisory Team | 6 |
| Governance Working Group | 5 |
| Virtual Access Team | 5 |
| None of the Above | 83 |
| Nested Group | All Respondents Count |
| Early Years Steering Group | 22 |
| Positive Parenting | 19 |
| Early Literacy Alliance of Waterloo Region | 15 |
| None of the Above | 86 |

Network Outcomes

The CYPT Theory of Change was recently revised to better articulate our approach and collective contribution to achieving our vision, mission and goals. The Theory of Change helps clarify the range of outcomes associated with the CYPT activities and has been organized according to who and where the outcomes are experienced. CYPT Network Outcomes are associated with network building and are related to participation and engagement in CYPT. It would be expected that CYPT member organizations along with Nested/Affiliated Group would experience these outcomes.

Informed

A large majority of respondents, 92.0%, feel informed on the work of the CYPT. Approximately 95% of members from Voting Member Organizations and Voting Member Representatives feel informed on the work. In addition to being informed of the CYPT, one member shared that “the Children and Youth Planning Table allows our organization to stay informed about initiatives in our community and to build relationships with other agencies through the meetings”.

In comparing how informed CYPT members feel between 2017 and 2019. The average score out of 5 decreased for all groups – all members, members from Voting Member Organizations and Voting Member Representatives, between 2017 and 2019.

Table 4: How Informed Respondents are on the Work of the CYPT

| Informed | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent | VM Organization Count | VM Organization Per cent | VM Representative Count | VM Representative Per cent |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 – Not at all | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 2 – Very little | 10 | 8.0% | 5 | 5.0% | 3 | 4.9% |
| 3 – Somewhat | 53 | 42.4% | 38 | 37.6% | 24 | 39.3% |
| 4 – Quite a bit | 51 | 40.8% | 47 | 46.5% | 25 | 41.0% |
| 5 – A great deal | 11 | 8.8% | 11 | 10.9% | 9 | 14.8% |
| Total | 125 | 100.0% | 101 | 100.0% | 61 | 100.0% |
| Informed | | 92.0% | | 95.0% | | 95.1% |
| Average 2019 | | 3.50 | | 3.63 | | 3.66 |
| Average 2017 | | 3.66 | | 4.02 | | 4.24 |

Engaged

Two-thirds of respondents, 68.8%, feel engaged in the work of the CYPT. Those from Voting Member Organizations are more engaged than general members at 77.2%. Voting Member Representatives are just slightly more engaged in the work of the CYPT at 78.7%.

In comparing how engaged CYPT members are in the work between 2017 and 2019 the average score out of 5 decreased for all groups – all members, members from Voting Member Organizations and Voting Member Representatives, between 2017 and 2019. One member shared that “it is often difficult to fully engage with CYPT because of our need to focus our attention for survival through major change, in a fall meeting there were many at the table that shared this same concern”.



Table 5: How Engaged Respondents are on the Work of the CYPT

| | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent | VM Organization Count | VM Organization Per cent | VM Representative Count | VM Representative Per cent |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 – Not at all | 7 | 5.6% | 2 | 2.0% | 1 | 1.6% |
| 2 – Very little | 32 | 25.6% | 21 | 20.8% | 12 | 19.7% |
| 3 – Somewhat | 53 | 42.4% | 49 | 48.5% | 29 | 47.5% |
| 4 – Quite a bit | 25 | 20.0% | 22 | 21.8% | 14 | 23.0% |
| 5 – A great deal | 8 | 6.4% | 7 | 6.9% | 5 | 8.2% |
| Total | 125 | 100.0% | 101 | 100.0% | 61 | 100.0% |
| Engaged | | 68.8% | | 77.2% | | 78.7% |
| Average 2019 | | 2.96 | | 3.10 | | 3.16 |
| Average 2017 | | 3.14 | | 3.33 | | 3.56 |

From past Annual Surveys, level of engagement increased by members' length of time involved. In 2018-2019, the newest members, those involved for less than 6 months, have the greatest proportion who feel engaged in the work (83.3%). 80.0% of members who have been involved for 5 years or more feel engaged in the work. This group has the highest average level of engagement with 3.34 out of 5.

Table 6: Level of Engagement by Length of Time Involved

| | Less than 6 months | 6 months to 1 year | 1 to 3 years | 3 to 5 years | 5+ years |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1 – Not at all | 0.0% | 5.6% | 5.9% | 7.7% | 5.7% |
| 2 – Very little | 16.7% | 44.4% | 29.4% | 26.9% | 14.3% |
| 3 – Somewhat | 33.3% | 44.4% | 47.1% | 46.2% | 37.1% |
| 4 – Quite a bit | 50.0% | 0.0% | 14.7% | 19.2% | 25.7% |
| 5 – A great deal | 0.0% | 5.6% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 17.1% |
| Engaged | 83.3% | 50.0% | 64.7% | 65.4% | 80.0% |
| Average 2019 | 3.33 | 2.56 | 2.79 | 2.77 | 3.34 |

Those who have participated on at least one Working Group or Support Team have a greater level of engagement than the members who have not participated on a Working Group or Support Team, with an average of 3.34 out of 5 compared to 2.76.



Table 7: Level of Engagement by Participation on CYPT Working Group or Support Team

| Engaged | At least 1 Working Group or Support Team | No Working Group or Support Team |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Average 2019 | 3.34 | 2.76 |

Respondents are engaged in a variety of ways. Reading the news from the CYPT, attending CYPT meetings and promoting Family Compass are the most popular ways respondents stay engaged in the work. Respondents from Voting Member Organizations are slightly more likely to support working groups.

Table 8: Ways in Which Respondents are Engaged in the CYPT

| | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent | VM Organization Count | VM Organization Per cent | VM Rep Count | VM Rep Per cent |
|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| Read CYPT news | 117 | 93.6% | 96 | 85.0% | 59 | 96.7% |
| Attend meetings | 85 | 68.0% | 76 | 67.3% | 52 | 85.2% |
| Promoted Family Compass | 77 | 61.6% | 69 | 61.1% | 42 | 68.9% |
| Intentionally share CYPT news | 67 | 53.6% | 57 | 50.4% | 43 | 70.5% |
| Engaged convo re: how work aligns CYPT | 66 | 52.8% | 58 | 51.3% | 36 | 59.0% |
| Participated on a Working Group | 41 | 32.8% | 43 | 38.1% | 20 | 32.8% |
| Partnered with other members on a project/initiative | 37 | 29.6% | 35 | 31.0% | 22 | 36.1% |
| Provided In Kind Space | 24 | 19.2% | 25 | 22.1% | 11 | 18.0% |
| Presenter at a CYPT meeting | 13 | 10.4% | 14 | 12.4% | 8 | 13.1% |
| Provided in-kind services or supplies | 12 | 9.6% | 13 | 11.5% | 5 | 8.2% |
| Intentionally offered training to others | 10 | 8.0% | 10 | 8.8% | 4 | 6.6% |
| Other | 4 | 3.2% | 5 | 4.4% | 3 | 4.9% |
| Total | 125 | | 113 | | 61 | |

Members were asked if they'd like to be more or less engaged or if they'd like to continue to be as engaged or involved with the CYPT as they currently are, not a single respondent wants to be less engaged than they are currently. Most respondents shared they would like to continue to be as involved as they current are.

Table 9: Members' Desired Level of Engagement Moving Forward

| | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent | VM Organization Count | VM Organization Per cent | VM Representative Count | VM Representative Per cent |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| More Engaged | 48 | 38.4% | 34 | 33.7% | 20 | 32.8% |
| Continue to be involved as I currently am | 63 | 50.4% | 55 | 54.5% | 32 | 52.5% |
| Less Engaged | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unsure | 14 | 11.2% | 12 | 11.9% | 9 | 14.8% |
| Total | 125 | 100.0% | 101 | 100.0% | 61 | 100.0% |

Trusting

Collective impact work acknowledges the need, energy and engagement of diverse voices. In order to authentically engage diverse partners, time and energy must be devoted to developing a sense of trust among members. Respondents were asked to rate how trusting they feel the environment of the CYPT is. From the responses, it can be noted that a great deal of trust is felt, with 99.2% of all respondents replying with “somewhat”, “quite a bit” or “a great deal”, 100.0% of members from Voting Member Organizations and the Voting Member Representatives felt the environment of the CYPT is trusting.

In comparing how trusting the CYPT environment feels to members between 2017 and 2019. The average score out of 5 decreased for all groups – all members, members from Voting Member Organizations and Voting Member Representatives, between 2017 and 2019.

Table 10: Level of Trust

| | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent | VM Organization Count | VM Organization Per cent | VM Representative Count | VM Representative Per cent |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 – Not at all | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 2 – Very little | 1 | 0.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 3 – Somewhat | 25 | 20.0% | 17 | 16.8% | 11 | 18.0% |
| 4 – Quite a bit | 69 | 55.2% | 58 | 57.4% | 36 | 59.0% |
| 5 – A great deal | 30 | 24.0% | 26 | 25.7% | 14 | 23.0% |
| Total | 125 | 100.0% | 101 | 100.0% | 61 | 100.0% |
| Trust | | 99.2% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% |
| Average 2019 | | 4.02 | | 4.09 | | 4.05 |
| Average 2017 | | 4.31 | | 4.36 | | 4.46 |

Organization and System Outcomes

When the CYPT Theory of Change was updated, it identified both Organization and System Outcomes. Organization Outcomes relate to the ways in which organizations operate in their design and delivery of programs and services, and in their engagement with children, youth and families. The outcomes reflect changes within organizations as well as changes in how organizations work with each other to improve service delivery and system navigation. These outcomes are expected to be experienced by each organization as well as by individual staff within those organizations. These outcomes also relate to improved service experience by children, youth and families. Broader System Outcomes are where CYPT moves into connecting with other networks, collaboratives and initiatives who have shared or complementary interests with CYPT within Waterloo Region and beyond. They also relate to broader awareness and engagement of those who may not be directly connected to (or aware of) the children and youth sector, like technology companies or local businesses. For the survey, Family Compass, Smart Waterloo Region and Adult Allyship were the focus.

Family Compass

Members were asked if they have experienced or witnessed youth, parents or colleagues learning about or connecting to services or supports through Family Compass. The most common groups to learn about or connect to services or supports were respondents' co-workers in their work with children, youth or families (31.3%). One member shared, "I share this resource daily with the families I support. It is a great way for families to explore what their needs may be and help them be connected to the right resource."

Many survey respondents also experienced or witnessed parents learning about or connecting to services for their children (30.6%). A CYPT member shared “families who enter Family Compass through the I Have a Concern door often find their way to our organization - either directly or through another organization determining that ours is a better fit.”

Almost a quarter of respondents have not experienced or witnessed anyone using Family Compass to learn about or connect to services and supports. Some members shared concerns about navigating Family Compass and wondered what level of digital literacy or reading level the site requires.

Table 11: Groups using Family Compass to Learn About or Connect to Services

| Experienced/ Witnessed | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Co-workers, in their work with children, youth or families | 46 | 31.3% |
| Parents for their children (of any age) | 45 | 30.6% |
| Yourself, in your work with children, youth or families | 38 | 25.9% |
| None of the Above | 33 | 22.5% |
| Parents related to parenting | 32 | 21.8% |
| Youth | 15 | 10.2% |
| Other | 8 | 5.4% |

Members were asked how they would like to see Family Compass evolve to better meet the needs of Waterloo Region. Suggestions generally fall into four broad categories:

1. A number of members feel that Family Compass needs to be better promoted so that more front-line workers and service users are aware of the service. Suggestions for promotion include more hard copy promotional resources and in-person outreach at staff trainings, etc.
2. Many members have found out-of-date information on Family Compass, and would like to find strategies to ensure accurate and complete information.
3. Some members expressed concerns about language: both the lack of French options, and the reading comprehension levels needed to make full use of the site. Designing a youth-friendly language version is suggested to lower the reading level required.
4. Some members have expressed a desire to see more information, such as data around usage over time or an internal evaluation, in order to make suggestions.

Adult Allyship and Youth Engagement

Given the focus of adult allyship and meaningful youth engagement for the CYPT in 2018-2019 and continuing into 2020, members were asked to reflect on the resources and capacity building CYPT has developed and their skills related to being an effective Adult Ally.

Approximately two-thirds of survey respondents watched one or more videos or read/used any of the resources as part of the Less Telling, More Asking series. Of those who did not watch, read or use the Less Telling, More Asking videos or resources shared they did not watch any of the videos or use any of the resources because youth engagement was not relevant to their day-to-day work, because they were unaware of the resource or because they did not have time to explore the resource at the time of the survey.

Table 12: Respondents Who Have Watched, Read or Used the Videos and Resources from Less Telling, More Asking

| | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent |
|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Yes | 79 | 68.1% |
| No | 37 | 31.9% |
| Total | 116 | 100.0% |

A number of members found the resource to be useful in developing their understanding of youth engagement, and affirming practices that already exist in their work. One member shared, “I think that it was a wonderful resource to use with folks. I have used it as a tool to remind myself of strategies that I use but may take for granted. I also plan on using it as justification to individuals who may not understand why I do what I do. To explain that there is sound reasoning behind these choices.” Many members reported sharing the resource with their team members who work directly with youth.

There were also some who did not find Less Telling, More Asking useful, sharing it was useful to them based on the type of role that they hold or organization that they belong to, or that they found the information in the resource to be too general to be useful to their work.

Table 13: Effectiveness of Less Telling, More Asking videos and/or resources

| Effective | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent | VM Organization Count | VM Organization Per cent | VM Representative Count | VM Representative Per cent |
|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 – Not at all | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 2 – Very little | 3 | 2.6% | 2 | 2.1% | 2 | 3.5% |
| 3 – Somewhat | 35 | 30.4% | 31 | 32.6% | 17 | 29.8% |
| 4 – Quite a bit | 31 | 27.0% | 27 | 28.4% | 17 | 29.8% |
| 5 – A great deal | 10 | 8.7% | 9 | 9.5% | 5 | 8.8% |
| N/A | 36 | 31.3% | 26 | 27.4% | 16 | 28.1% |
| Total | 115 | 100.0% | 95 | 100.0% | 57 | 100.0% |

Survey respondents were asked to rate their adult allyship skills. Knowing there will be continued investment into meaningful youth engagement and adult allyship in 2020 and beyond, this information will help as a baseline for future evaluation and reporting. Almost 80% of respondents feel they have strong adult allyship skills (Somewhat strong; Quite strong; Very strong). The average rating was 3.49 out of 5.

Table 14: Self-Rated Adult Allyship Skills

| Strength | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 – Not at all strong | 3 | 2.6% |
| 2 – A little strong | 8 | 7.0% |
| 3 – Somewhat strong | 45 | 39.1% |
| 4 – Quite strong | 28 | 24.3% |
| 5 – Very strong | 18 | 15.7% |
| Unsure | 13 | 11.3% |
| Total | 115 | 100% |
| Adult Allyship Skills | | 79.1% |
| Average | | 3.49 |

Smart Waterloo Region

Given the focus on Smart Waterloo Region (SWR) in 2018-2019, members were asked to reflect on the impact of SWR and to consider how SWR helped or hindered the work of CYPT. Three quarters of respondents believe SWR increased the awareness of the importance of child and youth wellbeing in Waterloo Region. Two thirds of respondents feel as

though SWR created a stronger connection between CYPT and the technology sector and increased the awareness of CYPT in the community. There were 8 respondents who felt SWR did not help CYPT in any way.

Table 15: Benefits of being Connected to Smart Waterloo Region

| | All Respondents Count | All Respondents Per cent |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Greater awareness in the community of the importance of child and youth wellbeing | 78 | 75.7% |
| Stronger connection to the technology sector | 64 | 62.1% |
| Greater awareness in the community of the CYPT | 63 | 61.2% |
| Meaningful engagement with youth | 53 | 51.5% |
| Stronger connection to new/less traditional partners | 49 | 47.6% |
| Maximizing and leveraging resources | 37 | 35.9% |
| Helped accelerate CYPT work and efforts | 25 | 24.3% |
| Meaningful engagement with children | 24 | 23.3% |
| Did not help | 8 | 7.8% |
| Total | 103 | 100.0% |

Roughly 25% of the Survey Respondents shared how SWR hindered the work of the CYPT. Members shared how they felt SWR hindered the work of the CYPT. The most common response was around the notion that SWR took time away from and sidetracked other conversations or projects, particularly our collective impact efforts related to belonging. There was a feeling that because of SWR, and the time and effort put into SWR, CYPT lost momentum in our own work. A handful of members shared that SWR overshadowed and assumed ownership of CYPT work and that it stretched CYPT resources even further than they already are.

Voting Members

Over the past couple of years, based on feedback from members, the role and responsibility of Voting Member Organizations has shifted to be more involved in the strategic direction of the CYPT. In 2018 the CYPT Charter, including the roles, responsibilities and the benefits of being a Voting Member Organization was updated. Voting Member

Representatives were asked to reflect on how their organization has benefited by virtue of being a Voting Member Organization of the CYPT.

Voting Members believe the greatest benefit is having a broader and richer community-wide perspective on child and youth wellbeing (94.1%) followed by having strong relationships and networks with those working in the child and youth wellbeing space (92.2%).

Table 16: Benefit of Being a Voting Member Organization

| By virtue of being a Voting Member Organization your organization... | 1- Not at all | 2- Very little | 3- Somewhat | 4- Quite a bit | 5- A great deal | Benefit | Average |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| ... has a broader and richer community-wide perspective on child and youth wellbeing. | 0.0% | 2.0% | 32.7% | 34.7% | 30.6% | 94.1% | 3.9 |
| ... has strong relationships and networks with those working in the child and youth wellbeing space. | 0.0% | 4.1% | 18.4% | 53.1% | 24.5% | 92.2% | 4.0 |
| ... has had opportunity for input and influence into how to best mobilize as one system for child and youth wellbeing. | 0.0% | 4.3% | 31.9% | 38.3% | 25.5% | 88.2% | 3.9 |
| ... has had opportunities for leadership and engagement with other leaders in the system of services and supports for children and youth. | 0.0% | 10.2% | 28.6% | 40.8% | 20.4% | 86.3% | 3.7 |
| ... has been able to avoid duplication in your work by having greater awareness of other child and youth wellbeing efforts. | 6.7% | 20.0% | 31.1% | 31.1% | 11.1% | 64.7% | 3.2 |

Voting Member Representatives were also asked to reflect on how their organization contributes to the success of the CYPT. Voting Member Representatives feel as though their organization is most likely to champion system change (i.e. raising awareness and championing issues related to child and youth wellbeing and the value of working together) (92.2%), followed by building strategic partnerships and trusting relationships within and across the system (90.2%). Voting Member Representatives feel as though their organization is least likely to contribute by maximizing and leveraging resources (68.8%).

Table 17: Voting Member Contribution to Success of CYPT

| | 1- Never | 2- Occasionally | 3- Sometimes | 4- Most of the time | 5- Always | Contributing | Average |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|------------|
| Championing systems change | 0.0% | 4.1% | 20.4% | 34.7% | 40.8% | 92.2% | 4.1 |
| Building strategic partnerships and trusting relationships within and across the system | 0.0% | 4.2% | 20.8% | 47.9% | 27.1% | 90.2% | 4.0 |
| Working together as a dynamic and resilient network | 0.0% | 8.2% | 30.6% | 32.7% | 28.6% | 88.2% | 3.8 |
| Mobilizing data, learning and insight | 0.0% | 16.3% | 34.7% | 38.8% | 10.2% | 80.4% | 3.4 |
| Building capacity for ensuring high quality and effective system experiences | 0.0% | 13.0% | 39.1% | 34.8% | 13.0% | 78.4% | 3.5 |
| Maximizing and leveraging resources | 8.7% | 15.2% | 37.0% | 23.9% | 15.2% | 68.6% | 3.2 |

Backbone Support

The CYPT staff provide dedicated backbone support to the collaborative. Voting Member Representatives and members of CYPT Working Groups and Support Teams rated the overall effectiveness of the backbone support as 4.32 out of 5. “Providing direct support to the Steering Committee, Standing and Working Groups of the CYPT” and “Supporting and addressing the logistical needs of the CYPT” were rated the highest, at 4.58 and 4.59 out of 5 respectively. While the

backbone support continues to be rated quite high, it should be noted that all scores dropped slightly between 2017 and 2019.

Some respondents shared comments on the effectiveness of and the importance of having a dedicated backbone team, one member said “the staff are the gas in the engine and ensure the forward momentum of the work. This is a complex undertaking and the organizational skills and communication skills of this small team is very impressive! This back bone support is critical to the success of the CYPT, in the past, in the present and in the future”.

Others shared where there are areas for improvement, one member shared “I would like to see more dialogue between partners and working on building closer relationships in the community with the CYPT” and another suggested “give [Working Groups] tasks or homework as applicable”, as “sometimes what [the backbone team members] do for the working group can be overpowering”.

Table 18: Effectiveness of the CYPT Backbone Team

| Functions of the Backbone Staff | 2019 | 2017 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Supporting and addressing the logistical needs of the CYPT | 4.59 | NA |
| Providing direct support to the Steering Committee, Standing and Working Groups of the CYPT | 4.58 | 4.71 |
| Helping to guide the vision and direction of the CYPT | 4.48 | 4.73 |
| Connecting the CYPT to other initiatives or collaborative in the community | 4.25 | 4.54 |
| Cultivating relationships throughout the community | 4.15 | 4.38 |
| Mobilizing resources | 4.13 | 4.44 |
| Facilitating communication and dialogue between partners | 4.07 | 4.48 |
| Average | 4.32 | 4.58 |

Sustainability

Members were asked what have they experienced or observed, thinking specifically about organizations and service providers, that would not have happened without the CYPT. There were four broad themes to members’ responses to this question:

1. Many members appreciate the partnerships and collaboration opportunities that have arisen through CYPT participation. One member shared, “The level of trust and transparency that exists between organizations and partners has been enhanced due to our involvement in the CYPT.”

2. Several members highlighted youth engagement, and the development of youth engagement resources. One member shared, “Opportunities to engage youth has [sic] increased. Events have been well thought out and intentional in it’s purpose to capitalize on youth voices.”
3. Some members expressed the value of being able to share data and resources, particularly for smaller member organizations.
4. Some members spoke to the value of developing a shared vision and language across organizations in Waterloo Region.

Members also shared where they think the CYPT has the greatest potential to make meaningful change in our community for children, youth and families. Members identified paths forward in five key areas to make meaningful change for children and youth in Waterloo Region. In addition to this, there were additional unique and potentially very impactful suggestions:

1. Many members raised the desire to begin work on the shared, concrete task of moving the needle on Sense of Belonging. One member summarized this excitement saying, “I think we have the potential to do some really meaningful collective impact work around sense of belonging. This is a concept that is mostly applied to adults and I think we have the potential to be really creative in how we apply this to children and youth! Once we understand how children and youth view and experience, we can develop tools and resources for all of us to use. I can’t wait to get this process underway!”
2. Many members highlighted the need to raise the profile of CYPT across the community in order to bring in new partners and legitimize the work.
3. Many members see the value of sharing data and resources as a prerequisite to improving child and youth wellbeing.
4. Some members highlighted the potential for the collaborative to reach and engage traditionally disenfranchised communities, particularly new Canadians.
5. Some members highlighted a hope that CYPT could leverage the power of the collective to secure funding.

One member remarked on the similar work of both the CYPT and Child and Youth Planning Council, saying, “I do think we need to continue to explore the role of the CYPT and the Child and Youth Planning Council. I am not sure we need two distinct tables and I would recommend the CYPC become of sub-group of CYPT with focus on Children and Youth at risk.”

Next Steps

The responses to the Annual Survey support the ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement of the CYPT. There will be a series of “sense-making” conversations with CYPT Steering Committee, Voting Members, Support Teams and Backbone Team to ensure we learn, grow and evolve as a collaborative.

CYPT is committed to sharing the results of the Annual Survey. The results have been shared as part of the 2018-2019 Annual Report and will be part of key reporting to the Lyle S. Hallman Foundation and the Region of Waterloo, as CYPT funders.