

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has been about collaboration as well as the development of a city profile. The success of this project has therefore depended on the involvement and support of a large number of people and we humbly acknowledge their contributions.

Many data sources were generously made available and used, including government departments', councils' records, community agencies' and Census data. The assistance of many people providing this data is appreciated, including Ann Richardson (School of Medicine and Health Sciences), Monica Jones (Ministry of Education), Toni Brownie (Canterbury Development Corporation), Sheila McBreen-Kerr (Ministry of Education), Kath Jamieson and Eight Cities Quality of Life Project Team, and the Local Services Mapping National Team (Child Youth and Family). We would particularly like to acknowledge the work of Richard Earl, Fleur Thorpe, Debra Hewitt and Sonya Gedson (Christchurch City Council) in pulling this data together and making sense of it.

The project team is also indebted to the many people who gave feedback and peer reviewed our drafts, including Julie MacDonald, Ann Richardson (School of Medicine and Health Sciences), Jan Francis (Mayors for Jobs), Chrissie Williams (Christchurch City Council), John Henderson (Ministry of Social Development), John Mather and Sheila McBreen-Kerr (Ministry of Education), Michael McNabb (Christchurch City Council), Lucy D'Aeth (Healthy Christchurch), Kaye Johnson (Canterbury Strengthening Families) and Peter Hegarty (NZ Police). Also the many others who

provided feedback along the way, such as Tuari Potiki and Mark Feary (Ngai Tahu Development Corporation), George Clark (He Oranga Pounamu), Olivia Papuni (Healthy Christchurch), John Harrington (Canterbury Youth Workers Collective), Ann Watkin (YCD), Tony Stanley (Child, Youth and Family), Sean Wheeler (Ministry of Education), Annie Birmingham (CDC), Michelle Oberg (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs) and members of the Canterbury branch of the New Zealand Association of Child and Family Support and Community Development Services.

Thanks too, to Garry Moore, Graham Condon and Ingrid Stonhill (Christchurch City Council), Rose Ryan and Paula Attrill (Child Youth and Family), Mark Solomon (Ngai Tahu), Evon Curry (Healthy Christchurch), and Paul Curry (Department of Internal Affairs) for their encouragement and challenges.

We would particularly like to thank Jo Forward (Christchurch City Council) and Beryl Starr (Child, Youth and Family) for their data entry and administration of survey responses. We would also like to thank Julie MacDonald, Jo Forward, Sonya Gedson and Richard Earl for their ongoing editing and reformatting of the material – often under time pressures.

Finally, thanks to everyone who provided invaluable information and insights through their positive participation in workshops, focus groups, interviews and surveys, including the many hundred community providers, local members of parliament, city councillors, network coordinators, council and government workers, managers and many others.

## PROJECT TEAM

# CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>KEY FINDINGS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>COMMUNITY MAPPING PROCESS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>11</b>
What do the Measures and Trends Tell Us?	13
What did People Tell Us about Health?	32
Conclusions	33
<b>SAFETY AND SECURITY</b>	<b>41</b>
What do Measures and Trends Tell Us?	43
What did People Tell Us about Crime and Safety?	53
Conclusions	54
<b>KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</b>	<b>57</b>
What do the Measures and Trends Tell Us?	59
What did People Tell Us about Knowledge & Skills?	72
Conclusions	73
<b>SOCIAL CONNECTEDNESS</b>	<b>79</b>
What do the Measures and Trends Tell Us?	81
What did People Tell Us about Social Connectedness?	93
Conclusions	94
<b>PAID WORK</b>	<b>99</b>
What do the Measures and Trends Tell Us?	101
What did People Tell Us about Paid Work?	111
Conclusions	112
<b>ECONOMIC STANDARD OF LIVING</b>	<b>117</b>
What do the Measures and Trends Tell Us?	119
What did People Tell us About Standard of Living?	129
Conclusions	130
<b>REFERENCE LIST</b>	<b>134</b>

# INTRODUCTION

The Community Mapping Project was an exercise in collaboration as well as an exercise in joint consultation and information gathering. The purpose of the Community Mapping Project was to find out more about the city's makeup and the social services that operate in Christchurch. The report includes information on local demographic and social trends, social service provision and funding as well as people's perceptions of key issues and strengths.

The information gathered is available to the wider community to facilitate greater coordination and service planning. This information is intended to provide a basis on which agencies can plan and determine their own priorities.

The project was a partnership between Child, Youth and Family, Christchurch City Council, Department of Internal Affairs, He Oranga Pounamu and representatives of various government departments (through Canterbury Strengthening Families Management Group), and community agencies (through Christchurch Safer Community Council and Healthy Christchurch).

We welcome any feedback you may have on the Community Profile - this may be about the methods used, the findings, the report format or suggestions for future mapping projects.

## AIMS

The project was initiated by Child Youth and Family as part of its Local Service Mapping initiative and by the Christchurch City Council as a component of its Long Term Council Community Plan Process. Other agencies, including Department of Internal Affairs, He Oranga Pounamu, representatives of various government departments (through Canterbury Strengthening Families Management Group), and community agencies (through Christchurch Safer Community Council and Healthy Christchurch) also collaborated on this project.

The Community Mapping Project aimed to identify:

- key demographic, social and economic measurements and trends
- current trends in government provision and resourcing of services, including outcomes sought, priorities and target groups
- current social services provision in the community; including range of providers, the targets and client profiles
- key stakeholder's perceptions of the local environment including, trends and issues, social outcomes and priorities, opportunities and limitations and effective interventions

It also aimed to

- review relevant reports to identify broad principles relating to provision and funding
- analyse the relationship between the trends and the current mix of services

## PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS

Mary Richardson - Christchurch City Council

Denise Frost (Kidd) - Child Youth and Family

Gilbert Taurua - He Oranga Pounamu

Nick Scott - Christchurch Safer

Julia Main - Department of Internal Affairs

Canterbury Strengthening Families Management

Sharon Torstonson - Healthy Christchurch Network

# KEY FINDINGS

This section combines the findings from the review of measurements and trends with the stocktake of service provision and stakeholders' perceptions, to build a picture of the issues and outcomes.

This section reports the findings in six categories based on the government outcome areas. These categories are:

- 1) Health
- 2) Safety and Security
- 3) Knowledge and Skills
- 4) Social Connectedness
- 5) Paid Work
- 6) Economic Standard of Living

Under each category we report on:

- summary of measures and trends
- common issues and perceptions from the consultation
- possible conclusions

This report is a summary, and does not aim to note every point found in the research process. The background information that led to the development of this report is available on the website. Separate reports provide the background and detailed findings. It is suggested that all these be read in conjunction with the report.

Reports are available at:

[www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/)

## COMMON CURRENT MEASURES AND TRENDS

Some common themes emerged across all outcome areas:

- Significant disparities in well being exist between different groups. Disparities are evident between social economic groups and between Māori and Pacific peoples and the general population. People with the lowest incomes and levels of education consistently have lower outcomes than do people in higher income and education brackets.
- Socio-economic disadvantage is linked to poorer health, education, employment, safety outcomes, and this is particularly marked in the

statistics for Māori. Māori have worse health than non-Māori even when deprivation is taken into account. This suggests there are other factors that lead to a gap between Māori and non Māori that go beyond socio-economic status.

- Trends are linked across all outcomes areas. Trends in education have linkages with trends in employment; with trends in income etc. While information is available about various trends relating to all these issues, it should be noted that the relationships between them are complex. It is difficult to ascertain which trends influence, and are influenced by, other trends, and therefore equally difficult to determine the most effective interventions and solutions to problems identified, and how they are linked.

## COMMON FEEDBACK ON CHALLENGES AND ISSUES

Some common themes emerged from consultation with stakeholders. Stakeholder respondents included representatives from the community provider sector, government agency frontline staff and managers, local government agency staff, local councillors and Community Board members, local Members of Parliament, Ngai Tahu and Iwi/Māori organisations, key sectoral networks and other key stakeholders.

### STAFFING

Most respondents identified that the quality of their staff was critical to the achievement of positive outcomes. Some specific staffing issues were raised and included:

- staff commitment
- appropriately trained and / or qualified staff
- adequate levels of staffing

The difficulty of recruiting skilled Māori staff was raised as an issue across all sectors.

The community sector highlighted the shortage of appropriate volunteers with the time and commitment. The shortage of male volunteers was particularly noted. This sector also considered that successful organisational structure, strong management, committed and skilled boards of management and committees were also critical factors of success.

The government sector highlighted the impact of

extremely high caseloads for staff, as well as the national shortage of people with specialist skills, as having an impact on positive outcomes.

## CONSULTATION AND COLLABORATION

Most respondents suggested that consultation and collaboration across, and between, sectors was essential in achieving positive outcomes and in planning for service provision.

Respondents identified that consultation was needed at all levels within organisations:

- internally between local and national staff
- internally between frontline workers and managers
- externally across the same sector
- externally across a number of related sectors

Respondents also identified that involving consumers in decisions around services and priorities was important.

Two models consistently submitted as examples of good collaboration were:

- Healthy Christchurch
- Canterbury Strengthening Families Management Group

## RELATIONSHIPS

Most respondents agreed that relationship building is a key factor contributing to positive outcomes.

Respondents also highlighted the benefits of services working closely with families, with schools and between agencies.

## CASE MANAGEMENT

A number of government agency respondents identified that the case management approach was contributing to positive outcomes, particularly for clients with complex needs.

## FUNDING

Resource limitations were highlighted by most respondents as a barrier to achieving positive outcomes. Many organisations reported that significant improvements to the standard of their service would be easily achieved if there was enough funding to supply adequate numbers of staff with the correct level of expertise. A particular issue in regard to funding limitations and stretched resources, is that it is difficult to attract qualified staff because the wages offered are not always comparable to those offered by other service providers, or agencies.

Some community providers reported that fundraising was encroaching upon service delivery time.

The community provider sector raised the need for evaluation/funding for evaluation in order to assist with service quality improvement and the associated improvement in outcomes.

Most local MPs and Local Authority stakeholders thought that the pool of money going into service provision was adequate, but that it needed to be better utilised.

## OUTCOMES

Respondents generally agreed on the following outcomes as being desirable for Christchurch:

- common goals between the state and local government
- transparency in decision making
- transparency in accountability
- adequate funding

# COMMUNITY MAPPING PROCESS

This project was initiated by Child Youth and Family as part of its Local Service Mapping initiative and the Christchurch City Council as a component of its Long Term Council Community Plan Process.

Child, Youth and Family (CYF) initiated Local Service Mapping in order to better respond to the needs of children, young people and families. It aimed to develop fairer and more open funding arrangements, to better combine statutory and non-statutory services, to better balance preventive and remedial work, provide more alignment of government and community social services for children and families, achieve a better relationship between CYF and local communities, and to encourage and promote co-operation between organisations engaged in providing services for children, young people, families and family groups.

Local Services Mapping is a locally-driven approach to services planning. Each community will implement the initiative differently. The process comprises 5 common key stages for matching services with needs in local communities:

- 1) shared vision of service provision
- 2) stocktake of local social service needs and current service
- 3) response planning
- 4) funding, service provision and accountability agreements and information sharing arrangements
- 5) outcomes review

The Community Mapping Project will provide the information for the second stage of the Christchurch Local Services Mapping process which is a stocktake of local social service needs and current service.

Under the new Local Government Act, the Christchurch City Council is required to develop a Long-term Council Community Plan covering all aspects of city life. The Long-term Council Community Plan will:

- describe the social, economic, environmental and cultural outcomes for the city
- describe how the City Council and other organisations will work to build that community
- explain what the Council will be doing for the next three years

- include the Council's business plan for the coming year, and look ahead for another 9 years

A Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) will be prepared every three years.

The other collaborative partners were involved in this project because of their own desires to develop a Community Profile as a basis for planning and prioritising. For example, the project may assist the Department of Internal Affairs with its sustainable communities initiative.

Other government agencies have been engaged through Canterbury Strengthening Families Management Group as the project is consistent with the Government's Statement of Intent regarding its relationship with the voluntary sector, Iwi/Māori and government's whole-of-community approach.

Communities and community groups have regularly stated their desire for greater collaboration and involvement in decision making. This has been reflected in various reviews and processes, including the government-commissioned review of CYF and the Ministerial Working Party on the Community and Voluntary Sector and the Healthy Christchurch Charter.

## METHODS

The project aimed primarily to use information that was already available; many agencies collect and report on measures and trends or have recently undertaken needs assessments that were able to be accessed.

Some primary research was undertaken to gather information on current service provision and stakeholders' perceptions.

The project sought the co-operation from other government agencies through Canterbury Strengthening Families Management Group, and it utilised existing networks and relationships to seek community agency co-operation.

There were a number of projects that were running concurrently with this project. Wherever possible, this project drew on the information gathered in those projects rather than duplicating it. For example, this project used information from the Big Cities Quality of Life Project, the Ministry of Social Development's Social Report, the Council's LTCCP project and the Healthy Christchurch health priorities work.

The methods used to gather the information are outlined below.

## 1. KEY DEMOGRAPHIC, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC MEASUREMENTS AND TRENDS

The key objectives of the demographic, social and economic data analysis were:

- to gain a picture of the demographic measurements and trends at the local level
- to identify the social and economic trends that may impact on future provision
- to gain a picture of the other trends affecting needs (including social, economic, health and safety) at the local level

This component of the project gathered information on Christchurch residents' health, knowledge and skills, living standards, social connectedness, participation in paid work and freedom from crime and violence. Indicators were used to provide information on levels of well-being, to monitor trends over time, to assess variation across the population and to make comparisons with other cities and with New Zealand as a whole.

Indicators were also used to report on how different groups within the Christchurch community are faring. Where possible, each indicator was broken down by age, gender, ethnicity and locality. It should be noted, however, that such breakdowns tend to accentuate average differences between groups and can obscure differences within groups. There is often considerable variation within groups. Obviously not all members of a population group will conform to the group average.

Ethnicity breakdowns are also problematic as definitions of ethnicity are inconsistent between agencies and frequently change over time. Ethnicity categories can also fail to distinguish between New Zealand citizens and recent migrants. Recent immigration reinforces the difficulty of providing an accurate picture.

Some of the indicators in this report are more robust than others; for example data on employment indicators has been gathered and analysed consistently over some time which adds confidence in its reliability. On the other hand, data on the incidence of mental illness is less reliable.

Every effort has been made to ensure accuracy in processing, analysing and reporting the information provided. However, the project is unable to guarantee that the information contains no errors.

A full report on social and demographic trends is available on the website: [www.ccc.govt.nz/LTCCP/CommunityOutcomes/WhatDoTheTrendsTellUs.asp](http://www.ccc.govt.nz/LTCCP/CommunityOutcomes/WhatDoTheTrendsTellUs.asp)

## 2. CURRENT TRENDS IN GOVERNMENT PROVISION AND RESOURCING OF SERVICES, INCLUDING OUTCOMES SOUGHT, PRIORITIES AND TARGET GROUPS

The key objectives of the stocktake of direct and indirect provision by the Government were:

- to gain a picture of the current and planned service provision by government agencies;
- to identify trends in the funding provided by government agencies, including levels of funding, funding priorities and funding targets

This component of the project involved a series of interviews with local managers of government agencies. The purpose of the interviews was to identify aspects of local service provision such as outcomes sought, target groups for services and the capacity for regional responsiveness. The interviews also attempted to identify the indirect provision of funding to the local community through contract/grant funding to external agencies including outcomes sought, target group and capacity for regional responsiveness in terms of these funding arrangements.

Thirteen managers were interviewed from the following agencies:

- Canterbury District Health Board
- Department of Child, Youth and Family Services
- Community Probation
- Department of Courts
- Ministry of Education
- Housing New Zealand Corporation
- Department of Internal Affairs
- Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs
- New Zealand Police
- Ministry of Social Development

For some agencies we were unable to arrange interviews. In these cases we sought information from the agencies' websites (Office of Ethnic Affairs, Te Puni Kokiri, Ministry of Youth Affairs and the Commissioner For Children).

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of information about services and funding represented in this report, neither the Community

Mapping Project Team nor individual members of this team take responsibility for the accuracy or not of the information contained.

A full report on government services is available on the website: [www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/Services.shtml](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/Services.shtml)

### 3. CURRENT SOCIAL SERVICES PROVISION IN THE COMMUNITY

The key objectives of the community social services stock take were:

- to gain a picture of current provision of social services in Christchurch, including types and range of providers, the targets and the client profiles
- to ascertain the future intentions of service providers

A survey was used to gather information about social service agencies in Christchurch. The survey attempted to gather generalised information on organisations' purposes as well as specific information on the various services that organisations provide. The respondents had the option of completing a postal survey or completing the questionnaire online through the website or via email.

There were problems associated with gathering this information in terms of identifying a) primary outcomes sought b) target group of services and c) geographical coverage of services.

In "outcomes sought" by community providers, a large number of providers considered their service was focusing on achieving a broad range of outcomes. Similarly in the area of "target group of services", providers tended to identify most or all members of the community as the specific target group for a specific service. In "geographical coverage of services" delivered by community providers, a large number of providers considered their service was focussed on achieving services across the entire Christchurch city. While, in some cases, providers could clearly be identified as providing services to anyone requiring their service, and that a broad range of outcomes could be identified within a city-wide service, in most cases providers could more reasonably be identified as targeting a specific client group (e.g., After-school OSCAR programmes could reasonably be identified as targeting primary school aged children) with one or two primary outcomes (e.g. a breast screening service could reasonably be identified as primarily focusing on health outcomes) and delivering a service within a particular part of Christchurch city. It is

recognised that targeting a specified client group may still provide benefits to the whole community and, similarly, a service primarily focusing on a specific outcome may well result in a range of positive outcomes to the client.

To assist with a whole-of-city approach to services planning in the future, there is potentially value to be added by obtaining some general agreement as part of this process regarding terminology and the purpose of information sought as well as an increased level of joint discussion in the preparation of the questionnaire.

A full report on community service provision is viable on the website: [www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/Services.shtml](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/Services.shtml)

### 4. KEY STAKEHOLDER'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT INCLUDING TRENDS AND ISSUES, SOCIAL OUTCOMES AND PRIORITIES, OPPORTUNITIES AND LIMITATIONS AND EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS.

The key objectives of the identification of key stakeholders' perceptions of key trends, desired outcomes, effective interventions and local solutions was:

- to gain service providers and government agencies feedback on gaps in service and additional service needs, effective interventions and local solutions
- to identify stakeholders perception of the key trends, gaps in services and funding, perception of the effectiveness in terms of positive outcomes, and how services could be improved

This involved qualitative data gathering including:

1. Self- completed questionnaires (structured) with community organisations
  2. Interviews (semi structured) with managers for government agencies
  3. Focus Group discussion with frontline staff from government agencies
  4. Interviews (semi structured) with key stakeholders
  5. Workshop with 120 community providers
- 4.1. Community Agencies Survey** - A survey was conducted across 200 Christchurch community and voluntary organisations. The survey sought information on groups' perceptions of:
- Factors limiting the ability of organisations to meet demands for service and to provide the standard and quality of service that they

would like to provide;

- The extent to which organisations see a need for additional services in their local community or sector;
- Key factors that lead to successful outcomes for clients and enabling organisations to function well.

The survey findings were discussed in the context of 4 other reports relevant to this survey. The first of these is the *Communities and Government: Potential for Partnership, Whakatapu Whakaaro* the report of the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party in April 2001 (Ministry of Social Development, 2001)<sup>1</sup>. The findings of the survey are also presented in the context of the *Christchurch City Council Community Funding Review Report*<sup>2</sup> community consultation findings. Part of this review, undertaken in 2002, was to seek the views of community organisations about funding issues. Reference is also made to the feedback from community organisations on the Council's draft *Statement of Intent*<sup>3</sup>. The Child, Youth and Family report, *Strengthening Social Services*, on the capacity, capability and viability of social services funded by that organisation is also of relevance to this survey<sup>4</sup>.

The detailed report is available at [www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#CommunitySector](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#CommunitySector)

#### **4.2. Interviews with Managers from Government Agencies** - Interviews were held with senior managers of government agencies located in Christchurch. The managers were asked their perceptions of:

- Direct services achieving positive outcomes, and the factors that help and hinder this success. They also gave their views about gaps in current services.
- The successful factors of funding arrangements (grants & contracts). They noted the critical factors contributing to this success, and also identified gaps in current grants and contracts.
- The opportunities for, and benefits of, collaboration. They also noted some of the barriers to increased collaboration.

The detailed report is available at [www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#GovernmentAgencies](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#GovernmentAgencies)

#### **4.3. Focus Groups with Frontline Staff of Government Agencies** — 5 focus groups with field workers and frontline workers of government agencies were held. These focus groups covered each of the following sectors i) employment ii) health, iii) kaupapa Māori, iv) education and v) safety and social connection. The purpose of the focus groups was to gain a wider understanding of trends affecting the people the frontline workers work with activities and processes that achieve positive outcomes for clients or target groups, critical factors of success, barriers to achieving positive outcomes and the perceived benefits or not of collaboration within and between organisations and sectors.

The detailed report is available at [www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#GovernmentAgencies](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#GovernmentAgencies)

#### **4.4. Interviews with Key Stakeholders** —Interviews were carried out with Ngai Tahu representatives, community and voluntary sector organisations, Christchurch City Council representatives and Christchurch Members of Parliament. The interviews sought information on stakeholders' perceptions of current trends, desired outcomes, critical factors for achieving the desired outcomes, barriers to achieving the desired outcomes and opportunities for collaboration.

The detailed report is available at [www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#StakeholderInterviews](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/People.shtml#StakeholderInterviews)

#### **4.5. Community Workshop** (120 agency representatives) - A workshop of community agencies was held to gather information on perceptions of trends affecting people, outcomes we should be working towards, critical factors contributing to positive outcomes and the barriers or limitations to achieving the desired outcomes including gaps in services. 120 people attended the workshop.

The detailed report is available at [www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/Documents/CommunityWorkshoprprd.pdf](http://www.library.christchurch.org.nz/communitymapping/Documents/CommunityWorkshoprprd.pdf)

Further information is also available from key partners' websites:

- Christchurch City Council [www.ccc.govt.nz](http://www.ccc.govt.nz)
- Department of Child, Youth and Family Services [www.cyf.govt.nz](http://www.cyf.govt.nz)
- He Oranga Pounamu [www.hop.org.nz](http://www.hop.org.nz)
- Christchurch Safer Community Council
- Department of Internal Affairs [www.dia.govt.nz](http://www.dia.govt.nz)
- Canterbury Strengthening Families Management Group [www.strengtheningfamilies.govt.nz](http://www.strengtheningfamilies.govt.nz)
- Healthy Christchurch <http://healthy.christchurch.org.nz/>

## DATA LIMITATIONS

The report on demographic, social and economic measurements and trends was limited to using

information/data sets that were already available. This in itself, has highlighted the significant gaps that exist in social statistics collection, both locally and nationally. For example, there appears to be a lack of consistent data collection and recording about offenders. There is also an inability within the systems that exist to follow an offender through the various systems and to identify the recidivist offenders and their characteristics. There is also a lack of statistical information and service evaluation by region and ethnicity to analyse and target responses to youth offenders.

The stocktake of current services provided by the community sector was limited due to the lack of common interpretations of 'outcomes', 'targets' and 'benefits'. It was also limited by the fact that many community providers do not gather specific client data (and therefore could not report on) relating to ethnicity, age and client locality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Social Development. (2001). *Communities and Government: Potential for Partnership, Whakatapu Whakaaro*. Report of the Community and Voluntary Sector Working Party.

<sup>2</sup> Christchurch City Council. (2003). *Background Report 1: Consultation Findings*. Community Finding Review.

<sup>3</sup> Christchurch City Council. (2001). *Draft Statement Of Intent*.

<sup>4</sup> Child, Youth and Family. (2003). *Strengthening Social Services*. Assessment of the capacity, capability and viability of Child, Youth and Family funded social services.