

<p>Officer responsible Leisure Unit Manager</p>	<p>Author Lesley Symington, Team Leader, Recreation & Arts</p>
<p>Corporate Plan Output: Recreation Promotion and Programmes</p>	

The purpose of this report is to advise the Board on the most effective utilisation of the allocation of \$30,000 from 1999/2000 Project and Discretionary Funding towards community recreation personnel in the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board area.

BACKGROUND

Following a review by the City Manager of leisure, community development, events and parks services, the Recreation and Arts Team was established within the Leisure Unit in July 1998 to deliver recreation across the city.

The team recognises that to deliver quality, relevant services personnel must be based within and have a good knowledge of local communities and community groups. In the other Community Board areas recreation personnel focus on a whole community board area (although we currently have only 3.9 FTEs for the six areas). Current staffing hours and workload are therefore making it extremely difficult to achieve the level of community involvement the team would like to achieve and this has led us over the last eight months to take the following actions and approaches:

1. The establishment of more efficient methods of delivering programmes - for example a small team now manages all community events across the city, whether they be the Kiwi Tri in Burwood/Pegasus or the “Kainga Family Fun Day” for Shirley/Papanui.
2. Actual delivery of programmes has moved away from team personnel being involved “hands on”, to more contracting of other providers and resourcing of local community groups. This enables team personnel to achieve more, recognises the contribution and ability of community groups and other established recreation providers, while still ensuring that the community receives high quality, safe and affordable programmes.
3. A request for funding from the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board for staffing.

The team is now establishing a metropolitan recreation programme (via a business plan) for Christchurch for the 1999/2000 year, which we hope will begin to address some of the gaps and inequities in recreation provision across the city, while also reflecting the differing and unique needs of different communities and Community Boards.

BURWOOD/PEGASUS RECREATION PROVISION

The Recreation and Arts Team currently has available funding for a 15-20 hour per week position (\$17,000) to service the needs of the Burwood/Pegasus communities.

Because the Board has been very active in providing community recreation programmes and events, the current workload and community expectations are very high (as evidenced by the recent request for the re-establishment of the Parklands Co-ordinator position).

This led the team to make its request to the Board for discretionary funding towards the extension of the available hours for recreation service delivery in the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board area. Funding of \$30,000 was allocated towards either a full-time position for the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board area in general or specifically within the Parklands and/or Aranui community areas. The funding was allocated subject to the Board viewing a job description for the position.

OPTIONS

Several options for recreation service delivery have been tried in the Burwood/Pegasus area over the last few years, including community-specific positions (for example Parklands and Wainoni/Aranui); then two positions focusing on the Burwood and Pegasus wards respectively; and finally one position for both Community Board areas. Each option has its advantages and disadvantages and these are captured below:

Option 1: Position Focuses on a Specific Community (eg Parklands, Wainoni/Aranui)

Advantages

- Community receives a high level of focussed, in-depth service delivery
- Community Recreation Advisor able to develop a high profile in the community and can “market” programmes
- Community Recreation Advisor has an excellent knowledge of the local community and community groups
- The community “owns” the position and supports the work of Council

Disadvantages

- The rest of the Community Board area “misses out”
- Community Recreation Advisor can become overly involved in hands-on delivery and non-appropriate tasks - eg taking community centre bookings, etc - particularly where the community has a poor volunteer infrastructure
- Community “ownership” can create difficulties when the area is fully developed and the position needs to move on to focus on other areas of need
- “Paid” versus “volunteer” conflict - having a paid Council employee working in the community can have a negative impact on volunteer involvement

Option 2: Position Focuses on a Ward Area

Advantages

- More equitable service delivery (ie than concentrating on one particular community)
- Focussed, in-depth programming delivered
- High profile for the Community Recreation Advisor and resultant ability to “market” the programmes
- Community Recreation Advisor has an excellent knowledge of the ward area and of local groups
- The community “owns” the position and supports the work of the Council
- Community Recreation Advisor is less “hands on” and therefore is able to pro-actively develop community management of recreation programmes

Disadvantages

- Community Recreation Advisor has less of an in-depth knowledge than if based in one community
- “Paid” versus “volunteer” conflict
- Creates a need for an equivalent position for the other ward area

Option 3: Position Focuses on the Whole Community Board Area

Advantages

- The Community Board area is equitably serviced
- Areas of need can be prioritised and dealt with strategically
- The Community Recreation Advisor position is required to be less hands on in order to be effective with resultant increased community involvement in recreation delivery
- More involvement of community groups in service delivery

Disadvantages

- Community Recreation Advisor has a more “generalist” knowledge of the community and community groups
- Lower community profile for the Community Recreation Advisor
- Less community “ownership” of the service
- Community Recreation Advisor able to achieve less due to size of the area to be serviced

CONCLUSION

Given some of the area-specific demands for service delivery in the Burwood/Pegasus Community Board area it is recommended that two 20 hour per week positions be established (total cost \$39,299 – based on \$18.46 per hour plus \$902 ACC fees), one to service the needs of the Burwood ward area and one to service the needs of the Pegasus ward. The generic job description is attached (*see page 59*).

This will allow for an equitable service delivery to Burwood/Pegasus residents while still enabling a specific focus on areas of need such as children and youth programming in the Parklands community.

Both positions will be community-based (work sites are yet to be finalised), but will not become involved in tasks such as community centre programming or hands-on service delivery. It is envisaged that the Burwood position could spend one day per week

focusing on the Parklands community, to assist with addressing the needs as have been outlined to the Community Board.

The balance of funding (\$7,700) will go towards the operational costs for each position (vehicle, photocopying, office expenses, etc) plus a small programming budget. Some additional programming funding can be provided by the Leisure Unit.

As mentioned earlier other recreation personnel focus on a whole Community Board area but we are always looking for better ways to deliver local recreation programmes. It will therefore be of value to trial this ward-based approach to ascertain the pros and cons of each and to recommend future best service delivery options. This will be done at the end of the 12 month period.

A detailed work plan including performance indicators will be presented to the Board for each position and reported against at 6 and 12 monthly intervals.

- Recommendations:**
1. That the \$30,000 allocated from Board Project and Discretionary Funding be allocated to two 20 hour per week positions, to service the needs of the Burwood and Pegasus ward areas respectively.
 2. That the ward based approach be reviewed at the end of 12 months and compared with a Community Board based approach, to ascertain the best future method for recreation service delivery.
 3. That a detailed work plan be submitted to the Board for each position.
 4. That the work plans be reported against at 6 and 12 monthly intervals.

Chairperson's Recommendation: That the aforementioned recommendations be adopted.