

3. REVIEW OF CIVIC AWARDS

Officer responsible Community Relations Manager	Authors Dave Adamson, DDI 941-8775, Julie Battersby, DDI 941-8780
---	---

The purpose of this report is to bring to each community board, for its consideration, a proposed revised procedure for the process of considering nominations for Civic Awards. The Community and Leisure Committee of Council has requested a review be carried out on the management process for Civic Awards. This report is prepared to seek consultation on the proposed changes to the process of decision making for future Civic Awards.

Purpose of the Awards

Civic Awards are presented annually by the Christchurch City Council, and are presented for voluntary good deeds done over a period of time, which have a positive benefit for the whole metropolitan area of Christchurch. The administration of Civic Awards is coordinated by the City Promotions Team. Up to 45 nominations are considered annually for Civic Awards.

In comparison to Civic Awards, Community Awards are presented for voluntary good deeds done over a period of time, which have a positive benefit for the local Community Board area. The whole process for Community Awards is administered by each Community Advocacy Team, with the final presentation of the awards being made by each Board.

This report does not relate to the administration of Community Awards.

Background

Civic Awards have been an annual event in Christchurch City Council since 1991. The administration of Civic Awards was originally carried out by the Secretariat and, since 1996, has been handled by the City Promotions Team of City Council.

Present Process of Award Administration

The awards are advertised in July each year with nominations closing mid-August. Upon closure, nominations are forwarded to the Community Board in whose area the good deeds were done, or if this is difficult to decide on, the area in which the person/organisation resides. Which Community Board a nomination should go to is often difficult to decide on, and it is not uncommon for Community Advocacy Team staff to hand over to another Community Board a nomination they feel is better suited elsewhere. Community Boards consider the nominations and feed back their recommendations to City Promotions. The Community Board recommendations are then forwarded to the Community and Leisure Committee for discussion, prior to confirmation by the Council.

The Civic Awards are awarded in a special mayoral ceremony, usually in October or November. Each year between 25 to 30 successful awardees receive a Civic Award.

Request for Review

Community and Leisure Committee members have requested that staff review the process of decision making in relation to Civic Awards. Committee members have felt that during the last few years there has been some unevenness in the decision-making process, brought about by variances in the quantity and quality of nominations provided to each Community Board for their consideration, and the fact that nominations were being considered by six different groups. These variances have meant that across the city, some very worthy nominations have possibly not been successful because they have been out-weighted by others at the Community Board consideration phase. A factor affecting this is that a maximum of six nominations can be recommended by each Community Board.

As Civic Awards have a metropolitan focus, it is considered appropriate to assess them all against the same criteria by the one committee or panel. As is the practice at the moment, each year some Community Award nominations can be referred by some Boards through for Civic Award consideration, if a Board feels the activities of the nominee are of metropolitan significance. This is possible as the Community Award process occurs a month or two before that of the Civic Awards.

Judging Panel

The review of the process for considering nominations for Civic Awards would mean that a Civic Award judging panel would be developed to consider all nominations. The judging panel would be selected to include people from right across the geographical community of Christchurch, knowledgeable in voluntary work and committed to ensuring the celebration of people who make a difference.

This process would ensure metropolitan awards are considered at a metropolitan level and Community awards would be considered at a Community Board level.

Benefits of a Revised Process

A revised process of considering all nominations for Civic Awards by one committee will ensure ease of administration. In addition it will mean that only two committees will be involved in the consideration of nominations, as opposed to the present six boards and one committee. Without doubt the most important thing it will achieve is that all nominations will be considered equitably against each other, in a uniform manner, which considers the city as a whole, as opposed to six individual areas.

The administration process for the management of the Civic Awards will mean that staff can ensure criteria is being interpreted consistently, by being present during the consideration of all nominations.

Conclusion

Civic Awards are awarded to residents who have volunteered a substantial amount of time and energy to a project(s) that benefit the city as a whole. To ensure all nominations are judged through a fair and reasonable process, it is logical to have a judging panel developed that can judge all nominations through the same criteria and at the same time. The judging panel would include people from all geographical areas of Christchurch city.

Staff believe this is best achieved by encouraging the members of the Community Boards to support the proposal whereby the Community Awards are judged and awarded by Community Boards, and the Civic Awards are judged by a newly formed judging panel and awarded by the Christchurch City Council.

Staff

- Recommendation:**
1. That the present process for considering Civic Awards be maintained for the 2003 year.
 2. That Community Boards consider this report and provide feedback on the proposal for a new judging process for Civic Awards from 2004 onwards.
 3. That each Community Board be invited to nominate a possible representative to serve on the Judging Panel.
 4. That a proposed judging panel be developed and recommended to the October round of Council meetings.

Chairman's

- Recommendation:**
1. That the Community Board receive the report and provide feedback on the proposal for a new judging process.
 2. That the Board nominate one member as its representative on to the Judging Panel.