



# Report: IIMHL/IIDL Participants Questionnaire: 2022 Leadership Exchange

## Overall Summary



WordItOut

<b>Response Rate</b>	38% (355 responses out of 928 match and hub participants)	
<b>Respondents Profile</b> (n=342)	73% were first time attendees (n=250)	
<b>Home Country of Visitors</b> (n=267)	27% New Zealand	6% Netherlands
	18% Canada	6% Republic of Ireland
	15% USA	5% England
	9% Australia	1% Northern Ireland
	7% Scotland	<1% Sweden
	12 (~5%) visitors also attended from: Fiji, Germany, India, Israel, Kenya, Kiribati, Niue, Poland, Samoa, Tonga, Ukraine	
<b>Quality of information sent by IIMHL/IIDL for preparation for the Exchange</b> (n=350)	71% rated 4 or 5, with 5 being excellent	

## Section 1: The Leadership “Match”

Question	Response (0 = poor, 5 = excellent)	
Quality of hosts’ preparation prior to the Match (n=261)	75% rated 4 or 5	
Three key benefits from the Match (whether you were a host or visitor) (n=228)	<b>Networking:</b> making connections, meeting others working in a similar space/area of interest  <i>“Connecting with people from other countries who have similar passions and interest areas”</i>	
	<b>Learning:</b> sharing of ideas/diverse perspectives, resource and tool sharing  <i>“Sharing knowledge and perspectives with people around the world”</i>	
	<b>Access</b> to new information/global perspectives  <i>“New sources of relevant information (data, journal articles, links) from hosts and other visitors”</i>	
Preferred size of Match to contribute to learning (n=253)	<b>Match Size</b>	<b>Responses</b> (0 = poor, 5 = excellent)
	0-3 people (n=39)	67% rated 4 or 5
	3-10 people (n=32)	70% rated 4 or 5
	10-20 people (n=135)	76% rated 4 or 5
	20+ people (n=65)	61% rated 4 or 5
<b>Additional comments related to the Matches</b>  <b>Australasia/Pacific Islands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very difficult to engage in discussion online and explore areas of interest outside of presentation.</li> <li>• Very little time to connect and learn from each other. This was the result of being virtual and having so many guest speakers.</li> <li>• There was little in the way of connection. 90 mins doesn't allow much time to connect via an online meeting. We also did not get to meet the people that participated in the match in a physical sense.</li> <li>• Pretty difficult to connect via zoom – face to face matches are the learning space.</li> <li>• Being online had some challenges but it worked really well overall, meant some people could take part who would not have done otherwise. Missed the face-to-face contact but the time constraints meant that was added focus and desire to make the most of the time together.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The virtual format was disastrous for the match concept which previously for me has been the highlight of the entire event. This year, due to the limitations, the match was of little value.</li> <li>• I found the online schedule a bit confusing.</li> <li>• Having people from around the globe needing to link virtually and find ways to have real conversations was a struggle both into time zones and size.</li> <li>• The topic was excellent, and the technology worked well but it is impossible to compete with the value of being in the same room.</li> <li>• The matches are usually the highlight of IIMHL. Without the ability to connect in person the value was limited.</li> <li>• I look forward when we meet in person, that aside you met the spirited and welcoming approach from years back and we felt connected with each other in sharing information.</li> <li>• Virtual match was a disaster and of minimal value.</li> </ul>
<b>North America</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think returning to in person will lead to a better experience</li> <li>• I loved it, and I found the virtual match format to be excellent. That said, I would also advocate for in-person matches going forward if possible, or a mix.</li> <li>• I did the match virtually. I find that in the past doing them in person is the way to go. I learn more in person, and in person I am more present.</li> <li>• This work is so important and makes a real difference. The online experience is not the same for networking but still valuable.</li> <li>• Excellent event however I missed the international networking in person and hope we can all gather in one location in the Netherlands!!!</li> </ul>
<b>Europe</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wonders of digitally engaging over multiple time zones was a key benefit from the Match.</li> <li>• If times could be different for different sessions to at least try to accommodate different time zones, that would have been nice.</li> <li>• The timings were difficult, I understand this was due to time zones but some variation on those timings would have been good.</li> <li>• The times were just not right, I could not attend most of them because of other plans in the evening, but also the strain on my mental health (logging in at 9pm after a busy work day)</li> </ul>

## Section 2: Regional Hubs

## Australasia/Pacific Islands Hub in Christchurch, New Zealand

(n=115)



WordItOut

Question	Response (0 = poor, 5 = excellent)
"Match Report" session rating	62% rated 4 or 5
3 highlights from regional hub experience	<b>Networking:</b> making connections, meeting others working in a similar space/area of interest  <i>"Networking with other like-minded individuals, both professional and lived experience attendees"</i>
	<b>Speakers/presentations</b>  <i>"The speakers were interactive and were able to connect with the audience"</i>
	<b>Accessibility/inclusivity</b>  <i>"The real feel of accessibility inclusivity and resilience as a focus and in the set up of the venue and programme"</i>
2 ways in which regional hub experience could be improved	Additional opportunities for networking and/or casual social time  <i>"Lack of social opportunities - would have been great to have a mixer or social evening. a big part of the value of IIMHL/IIDL is the personal connections and relationship building."</i>

	<p>Better representation of diverse perspectives, particularly lived experience content/involvement</p> <p><i>"It felt disconnected from the innovation happening. I would like to see more community groups being offered the chance to share their experiences."</i></p>
<b>Regional Hub venue rating</b>	76% rated 4 or 5
<b>Opportunity to network and connect with others</b>	75% rated 4 or 5
<b>Relevance of the content to your work/life</b>	65% rated 4 or 5

## North America Hub in Washington, DC

(n=61)



WordItOut

Question	Response (0 = poor, 5 = excellent)
"Match Report" session rating	79% rated 4 or 5
3 highlights from regional hub experience	<b>Networking:</b> making connections, meeting others working in a similar space/area of interest  <i>"The casual, welcoming environment that enabled people of all ages and backgrounds to connect with one another"</i>
	<b>Diversity</b> of voices and content (particularly youth, lived experience, indigenous, and climate change)  <i>"The diversity of voices throughout the sessions"</i>
	<b>Learning:</b> new, innovative & global information  <i>"Informative and innovative keynote sessions with great speakers"</i>
2 ways in which regional hub experience could be improved	Additional opportunities for networking  <i>"More discussions and engagement opportunities with peers"</i>
	More diversity in participation  <i>"Attendance by more people of color and from low resource countries"</i>

<b>Regional Hub venue rating</b>	62% rated 4 or 5
<b>Opportunity to network and connect with others</b>	97% rated 4 or 5
<b>Relevance of the content to your work/life</b>	90% rated 4 or 5

# European Hub in Dublin, Ireland

(n=62)



WordItOut

Question	Response (0 = poor, 5 = excellent)
"Match Report" session rating	67% rated 4 or 5
3 highlights from regional hub experience	<b>Networking:</b> making connections, meeting others working in a similar space/area of interest  <i>"Networking and discussions with international colleagues"</i>
	<b>Diversity of content</b>  <i>"The variety of talks and showcase of projects/initiatives"</i>
	<b>Speakers/presentations</b>  <i>"The speakers were very informative and there was a range of choices for sessions"</i>
2 ways in which regional hub experience could be improved	More interaction/opportunity for discussion & networking  <i>"More interaction! There were only plenary sessions, hardly any opportunity for Q&amp;A or reflection by the audience. So more breakout sessions, more theme driven networking spaces, more time for outside activities/movement, etc."</i>
	Better time keeping of sessions  <i>"Keep the sessions to time to allow maximum time for networking"</i>
Regional Hub venue rating	76% rated 4 or 5



<b>Opportunity to network and connect with others</b>	93% rated 4 or 5
<b>Relevance of the content to your work/life</b>	73% rated 4 or 5

## Section 3: Ongoing IIMHL/IIDL Activities

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response (yes/no)</b>
Involved in one or more IIMHL/IIDL topic/theme-related collaborations/activities (n=262)	54% yes
Able to tap into international expertise (n=263)	84% yes
Ongoing contact with people I met (virtually, via email, or in person) (n=265)	86% yes

## Section 4: Planning for 2024

A total of 194 participants responded to “3 key topics I would like included in the 2024 matches.” There was a wide variety, as well as specificity, within these responses. A few common topics were related to:

- Youth mental health (particularly school-based mental health)
- Aging population(s) and mental health
- Environment and impact of climate change on mental health
- Use of data in practice to make change
- Indigenous frameworks
- Disabilities
- Lived experience/peer-led services
- Equity and racism
- Suicide prevention
- Employment support
- LGBTQ+ mental health
- Digital mental health/technology
- Housing and homelessness
- Role of family/family leadership
- Impact of COVID-19
- Veteran/military population(s)