

Summary of Levels of Service Results: Point of Contact Surveys 2020-2021

CAUTION: pre 2015-2016 results have been provided for general information only. Significant question changes were made across all measures in 2015-2016 to reflect a more detailed customer focus component in level of service measurement. Pre 2016-2017 data cannot be compared directly to later results.

NOTE: some pre 2018-2019 results have been adjusted to align with current LOS performance standards (footnotes below indicate which results this affects). To view unadjusted results, see previous years' results tables

Activity Group	Activity	Performance Standard	LTP Performance Standard	2020-21 LOS Target	2020-21 LOS Target Met	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Top and Under Performing Services in 2020-21	Survey Result 2020-21	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2020-21	Survey Result 2019-20	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2019-20	Survey Result 2018-19	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2018-19	Survey Result 2017-18	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2017-18
Citizens and Communities	Citizen and Customer Services	2.6.7.1 Citizen and Customer expectations for service response are delivered in a timely manner – walk in	Yes	At least 95%				97% ^{a1}	95%	99% ¹	100%	98% ¹	99%	97% ¹	98%
		2.6.7.2 Citizen and Customer expectations for service response are delivered in a timely manner – email	Yes	At least 75%				71% ^{a1}	59%	75% ¹	62%	70% ¹	48%	72% ¹	60%
		2.6.7.3 Citizen and Customer expectations for service response are delivered in a timely manner – telephone	Yes	At least 85%				92% ^{a1}	93%	89% ¹	78%	85% ¹	82%	90% ¹	91%
	Libraries	3.1.5 Library user satisfaction with library service at Metro, Suburban and Neighbourhood libraries	Yes	At least 90%				95%	97%	95%	97%	94%	96%	95%	96%
	Recreation, Sports, Community Arts and Events	2.8.5.2 Produce and deliver engaging programme of community events	Yes	At least 80%				% ¹		79% ¹	86%	81% ¹	75%	84% ¹	86%
		2.8.6.2 Support community based organisations to develop, promote and deliver community events and arts in Christchurch	Yes	80%				92%	89%	88%	89%	90%	87%	79%	73%
		7.0.3.2 Support citizen and partner organisations to develop, promote and deliver recreation and sport in Christchurch	Yes	80%				88%	90%	87%	79%	76%	74%	NA	NA
		7.0.7 Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of facilities	Yes	At least 80% 5.6 score (CERM Survey)				6.1	NA	6.0	NA	6.0	NA	NA	NA
Parks, Heritage and Coastal Environment	Parks and Foreshore	6.0.3 Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Parks (community parks)	Yes	≥ 80%				63%	69%	57%	69%	67%	69%	59% ²	70%
		6.2.2 Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Parks (Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale)	Yes	≥ 95%				97%	98%	97%	98%	96%	98%	96% ²	98% ²
		6.3.5 Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Parks (regional parks)	Yes	≥ 80%				85%	91%	81%	90%	79%	85%	72% ²	78%
		6.4.3 Cemeteries administration services meet customer expectations (interment application response times)	Yes	100%				100% ³	100%	95%	100%	60% ³	60% ³	100% ^{2,3}	100% ³
		6.4.5 Cemeteries administration services meet customer expectations (interment application process)	Yes	100%				100% ³	100%	100%	100%	80% ³	60% ³	100% ^{2,3}	100% ³
		6.4.4 Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Parks (cemeteries)	Yes	≥ 85%				86%	92%	65%	85%	78%	91%	80%	89%
		6.8.4.1 Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Parks (Hagley Park)	Yes	≥ 90%				98%	99%	94%	93%	97%	98%	NA	NA
		6.8.5 Satisfaction with the range and quality of recreation opportunities within parks	Yes	≥ 85%				78%	NA	75%	NA	74%	NA	73% ²	NA
		10.8.1.1 Provision of a network of publicly available marine structures that facilitate recreational and commercial access to the marine environment for citizens and visitors (marine structure facilities)	Yes	90%				80%	76%	70%	81%	55%	80%	65%	77%
		10.8.1.5 Provision of a network of publicly available marine structures that facilitate recreational and commercial access to the marine environment for citizens and visitors	Yes	≥ 50%				71%	76%	65%	81%	71%	80%	NA	NA

		(equitable access for recreational, commercial and transportation purposes)													
		19.1.6 Delivery of Environmental, Conservation, Water and Civil Defence education programmes	Yes	95%				100%	99%	100%	98%	100%	98%	99% ²	98% ²
Regulatory and Compliance	Resource Consenting	9.2.7 % satisfaction of applicant with resource consenting process	Yes	70%				73%	62%	69%	63%	74%	65%	70%	55%

a In 2020-2021 three separate levels of service were added to represent each of the customer service channels

1 Sample may include non-residents of Christchurch

2 This score has been adjusted to allow comparability with current LOS scoring (ie. the same aggregate measures have been used for both years) (NB: 6.4.3 and 6.4.5 2017-2018 scores are indicative only due to slight question wording changes between that year and current scores)

3 Caution must be taken in interpreting this result due to small sample size (n=13)

	LOS target met		LOS target not met		Data still being collected or analysed by business units
	Baseline result or target to be set		Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use consistent with LOS result (within 5%)	NA	Deleted Level of Service or no information available
	Top performing services (85%+ satisfaction)		Moderate performing service (between 50% to 84% satisfaction)		Under performing services (less than 50% satisfaction)
	Increase in satisfaction score by 4% or more since last year		Satisfaction score remained same or within 3% of last year		Decrease in satisfaction score by 4% or more since last year
	Key performing services that other services could learn from (90%+ satisfaction) (exemplars)				

Additional Service Satisfaction Results

Service	Detail	2017-18 LOS Target	2017-18 LOS Target Met ⁴	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Top and Under Performing Services in 2020-21	Survey Result 2020-21	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2020-21	Survey Result 2019-20	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2019-20	Survey Result 2018-19	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2018-19	Survey Result 2017-18	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2017-18	Survey Result 2016-17	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2016-17
Community Development and Capacity Building	Community development projects are provided, supported and promoted	90%				88%	71%	82%	73%	80%	73%	83%	72%	88%	72%
Community Facilities	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of Council operated community facilities	80%				84%	73%	82%	66%	76%	61%	77%	62%	81%	74%
External Communications	Provide external communications and marketing that are timely, relevant, accurate and cost effective	67%				82%	76%	61%	57%	59%	48%	66%	61%	54%	46%
Sports Parks	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of sports parks	90%				80% ¹	89%	73% ¹	85%	73% ¹	84%	68%	83%	64%	79%
Governance and Decision Making	Percentage of residents that understand how Council makes decisions (users of governance services)	NA	NA			36% ²	39%	42% ²	36%	37% ²	36%	32% ²	31%	43% ²	33%
	Percentage of residents that feel the public has some or a large influence on the decisions the Council makes (users of governance services)	NA	NA			24%	39%	33%	36%	28%	36%	20%	31%	33%	33%
Public Transport Infrastructure	Ensure user satisfaction with the number and quality of bus shelters	≥ 70%				84%	92%	71%	83%	70%	88%	73%	82%	72%	76%
	Ensure user satisfaction with appearance, safety and ease of use of transport interchange(s) and suburban hubs	≥ 90%				93%	98%	91%	94%	93%	98%	89%	97%	90%	94%

1 This score is based on an average of range of sport support facilities, sports park condition and information provided for sports parks

2 This score is based on an aggregate measure of 'understanding of Council decision making' (a. understanding of how Council makes decisions, and c. accuracy of information about Council decisions, and c. prompt and timely information about decisions). This aligns with the calculation of LOS 4.1.18 'understanding of Council decision making' measured through the General Service Satisfaction Survey (for residents generally). If the single 'understanding' question (a.) only is used for users of governance services, the satisfaction score would be: 57% in 2019-2020, 61% in 2018-2019, 51% in 2017-2018, 60% in 2016-2017 and 57% in 2015-2016

3 In 2015-2016, this measure did not include suburban hubs

4 The 2017-2018 level of service target is the last available target set for these services (included in the 2015-2025 LTP). If the 2017-2018 level of service target was applied to the current result, would the service have passed the 2017-2018 target?