

3. REVIEW OF CIVIC AWARDS

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

The purpose of this report is to present to the Council the outcome of the review of Civic Awards, as requested by the Committee.

The report was considered by all Community Boards. Feedback from the Community Boards on the proposed changes and recommendations is contained in this report.

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

This report only relates to Civic Awards, not Community Service Awards.

BACKGROUND

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

The awards are advertised in July each year with nominations closing mid-August. Nominations are then 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 be referred to is often difficult to decide, 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 the City Promotions Team. 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 at a special Mayoral ceremony, usually in October or November. Each year between 25 to 30 successful nominees receive a Civic Award.

REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Community and Leisure Committee members requested that staff review the process of decision-making in relation to Civic Awards. Committee members felt that during the last few years there has been some unevenness in the decision-making process, brought about by variations 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 variations have meant that across the City, some very worthy nominations have possibly not been successful because they have been outweighed 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.

JUDGING PANEL

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 Service Award nominations can be referred by a Board for Civic Award consideration, if a Board feels the activities of the nominee are of metropolitan significance. This is possible as the Community Service Award process occurs a month or two before that of the Civic Awards.

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 Service Awards would be considered at a Community Board level.

BENEFITS OF A REVISED PROCESS

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 equally against each other, in a uniform manner, with consideration to 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 Service 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 TO COMMUNITY BOARDS

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 Civic Awards Judging Panel.
4. That a proposed Judging Panel be developed and recommended to the October round of Council meetings.

CONSIDERATION BY COMMUNITY BOARDS

Burwood/Pegasus Community Board

The Board decided that the recommendations should be adopted and to refer consideration of a possible representative to serve on the Civic Awards Judging Panel to the Board's Community Service Awards Criteria Working Party, for a recommendation to the Board as soon as possible.

Spreydon/Heathcote Community Board

The Board resolved:

1. That the present process for considering Civic Awards be maintained for the 2003 year.
2. That once the make-up of the Judging Panel is known information be reported back to the Board for consideration.

The **Hagley/Ferrymead Community Board** decided that the recommendations should be adopted.

The **Riccarton/Wigram Community Board** decided that the recommendations be adopted and nominated Lesley Keast to serve on the Civic Awards Judging Panel.

The **Shirley/Papanui Community Board** decided that recommendations 1, 3 and 4 be adopted.

The **Fendalton/Waimairi Community Board** recommended:

1. That the status quo be retained other than the maximum number of nominees able to be recommended by Community Boards be increased from six at present, to 10.
2. That the nomination of a Fendalton/Waimairi representative to serve on the Judging Panel be decided on in due course, if necessary.

Community and Leisure Committee

- Recommendation:**
1. That the present process for considering Civic Awards be maintained for the 2003 year.
 2. That the Community and Leisure Committee comprise the judging panel for Civic Awards from 2004 onwards.
 3. That a further report be prepared for the Community and Leisure Committee on a set of criteria for the Civic Awards.