

Summary of Levels of Service Results: Point of Contact Surveys 2024-2025

NOTES: In 2021-2022 minor question wording simplification occurred across many measures and while the changes did not impact the intent of the questions, some caution is needed when comparing results to earlier years. Some pre 2021-2022 and 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	Level of Service Measure of Success	Type of Measure	2024-25 Performance Target	2024-25 Target Met	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Higher and Lower Satisfaction Services in 2024-25	Survey Result 2024-25	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2024-25	Survey Result 2023-24	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2023-24	Survey Result 2022-23	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2022-23	Survey Result 2021-22	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2021-22
Communities and Citizens	Citizens and Customer Services	2.6.7.1 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for walk in services	Community	At least 85%				99%	98%	98%	97%	98%	95%	97%	92%
		2.6.7.3 Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for phone contacts	Community	At least 85%				86%	89%	88% ¹	85%	90% ¹	92%	90% ¹	88%
	Libraries	3.1.5 Maintain library user satisfaction with the library service	Community	At least 90%				96%	97%	95%	95%	96%	98%	94%	95%
	Community Development and Facilities	4.1.27.1 Customer satisfaction with the delivery of community support, resilience, development, and recreation initiatives	Community	80%				83%	78%	86%	76%	79%	66%	81%	71%
	Recreation, Sports, Community Arts and Events	2.8.5.2 Customer satisfaction with the content and delivery across delivered events	Community	At least 80%				78%	83%	88%	80%	89% ¹	75%	82% ¹	76%
		2.8.6.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council event support	Community	At least 80%				95%	88%	86%	76%	83%	85%	90%	78%
		7.0.3.2 Customer satisfaction with the quality of Council recreation and sport support	Community	At least 80%				94%	88%	93%	85%	87%	76%	85%	75%
		7.0.7 Customer satisfaction with the range and quality of facilities	Community	At least 80%				91%	92%	92% ⁶	92%	91% ⁶	93%	94%	NA
Strategic Planning and Policy	Communications and Engagement	4.1.10.1 Resident satisfaction that our external communications, marketing and engagement activities are timely, accurate, relevant and clear	Community	73%				78%	79%	73%	64%	72%	67%	65%	59%
Parks, Heritage and Coastal Environment	Parks and Foreshore	6.0.3 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Community Parks	Community	≥ 60%				55%	73%	54%	69%	61%	80%	56%	69%
		6.2.2 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Garden Parks – Botanic Gardens and Mona Vale	Community	≥ 90%				99%	95%	99%	94%	99%	97%	99%	97%
		6.3.5 Customer satisfaction with the recreational opportunities and ecological experiences provided by the City's Regional Parks	Community	≥ 80%				89%	86%	88%	87%	84%	80%	90%	89%
		6.4.4 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Cemeteries	Community	≥ 85%				87%	87%	85%	98%	84%	90%	72%	80%
		6.4.5 Customer satisfaction with cemetery administration services	Community	≥ 95%				100%	100%	95% ⁴	93% ⁴	97% ⁴	93% ⁴	95% ⁴	95% ⁴
		6.8.4.1 Customer satisfaction with the presentation of Hagley Park	Community	≥ 90%				98%	87%	95%	96%	97%	95%	97%	91%
		10.8.1.1 Customer satisfaction with the availability of public marine structure facilities	Community	≥ 60%				71%	90%	75%	81%	65%	79%	67%	72%
		19.1.6 Teacher satisfaction with the delivery of Environmental, Conservation, Water, and Civil Defence education programmes	Community	≥ 95%				100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%

Regulatory and Compliance	Strategic Planning and Resource Consents	9.1.15.2 Customer satisfaction with quality Case Management Services	Management	80%				87%	82%	98% ⁷	97%	NA	NA	100%	NA
		9.2.7 Customer satisfaction with the resource consenting process	Community	70%				79%	69%	86%	79%	71%	69%	77%	67%
Transport	Transport	10.3.7 Maintain customer satisfaction with vehicle and personal security at Council off-street parking facilities	Community	≥ 50%				72%	85%	78% ⁵	90%	77% ⁵	79%	82% ⁵	84%
		10.4.4 Improve customer satisfaction with public transport facilities (quality of bus stops and bus priority measures)	Community	≥ 73%				79% ⁸	91%	69%	85%	76%	91%	72%	83%

1 Sample may include non-residents of Christchurch. Prior to 2023-2024, LOS 2.6.7.2 was measured using three questions: time taken to respond; email being clear, professional; and easy to understand and email efficient way to communicate. From 2023-2024 onward, the level of service was measured using two questions: email efficient way to communicate; and email ease of contact as these two questions better reflect what the business unit is aiming to measure. Therefore, pre 2023-2024 data is not directly comparable. However, using the pre-2023-2024 methodology the result in 2023-2024 was still 68% satisfied

2 This score has been adjusted to allow comparability with current LOS scoring (ie. the same aggregate measures have been used for each year)

3 Caution must be taken in interpreting this result due to small sample size

4 From 2021-2022 onward, sample includes resident customers of cemetery support services (eg. who purchased plots) as well as funeral directors and monumental masons. From 2022-2023 onward, the ease of use question is asked of all funeral directors but only resident customers who had someone buried or interred

5 From 2022-2023 onward, the LOS is measured via the point of contact survey. Prior to 2022-2023 the official LOS score came from the General Service Satisfaction Survey result (2022 GSS: 52% satisfied, 34% neither and 8% dissatisfied). Official pre-2022-2023 results are not comparable with results from 2022-2023 onward as the General Service Satisfaction Survey was carried out online, included non-users of parking buildings and was not restricted to assessment at two facilities. From 2022-2023 the survey was carried out onsite at two facilities only. In 2021-2022, a trial survey was carried out onsite at the Art Gallery and Lichfield parking buildings with the following results which are comparable to results from 2022-2023 onward: 82% satisfied, 12% neither and 5% dissatisfied. The 2020-2021 result was recalibrated to exclude non-users of Council parking facilities (non-users had a satisfaction score of 38%)

6 Prior to 2022-2023, LOS 7.0.7 was measured via the University of South Australia's CERM Survey. Measurement of the LOS was moved to in-house point of contact surveying in 2022-2023. Pre 2022-2023 results show the overall satisfaction percentage rather than the CERM score









7 Surveyed via Residents Survey point of contact surveying from 2023-2024 onward. The case management service started in 2015-2016

8 Results cannot be compared to previous years due to question changes

	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
	Higher satisfaction services (85%+ satisfaction)		Moderate satisfaction services (between 50% to 84% satisfaction)		Lower satisfaction 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 higher satisfaction services that other services could learn from (90%+ satisfaction) (exemplars)				

Additional Service Satisfaction Results

Service	Detail	Old LOS Target ⁴	Old LOS Target Met ⁴	Satisfaction Score Trend Since Last Year	Higher and Lower Satisfaction Services in 2024-25	Survey Result 2024-25	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2024-25	Survey Result 2023-24	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2023-24	Survey Result 2022-23	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2022-23	Survey Result 2021-22	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2021-22	Survey Result 2020-21	Effort / Ease of Interaction or Use 2020-21
Email Customer Services	Citizens and customer satisfaction with the quality of the service received for email services	75%				72% ^{1a}	74%	68% ^{1a}	71%	74% ^{1a}	72%	76% ^{1a}	73%	71% ^{1a}	59%
Community Facilities	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of Council operated community facilities	80%				87%	85%	84%	87%	81%	78%	80%	73%	84%	73%
Sports Parks	Deliver a high level of customer satisfaction with the range and quality of sports parks	90%				73%	85%	67% ¹	85%	67% ¹	87%	70% ¹	87%	80% ¹	89%
Regional Parks	Overall customer satisfaction with the presentation of the City's Parks - Regional Parks	≥ 80%				83%	86%	86%	87%	81%	80%	88%	89%	85%	91%
Marine Structures	Customer satisfaction with marine structure facilities (presentation)	90%				67%	90%	71%	81%	62%	79%	61%	72%	80%	76%
Governance and Decision Making	Percentage of residents that understand how Council makes decisions (users of governance services)	NA	NA			51%	NA	46% ³	NA	45% ³	NA	42% ³	NA	36% ³	39%
	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			33%	NA	35%	NA	34%	NA	33%	NA	24%	39%

	Percentage of residents that feel they can participate in and contribute to Council decision making (opportunities to have a say) (users of governance services)	NA	NA			55% ⁵	NA	48%	NA	49%	NA	46%	NA	NA	NA
	Percentage of residents that feel they can participate in and contribute to Council decision making (processes easy to engage with) (users of governance services)	NA	NA			42% ⁵	NA	48%	NA	40%	NA	43%	NA	NA	NA
	Percentage of residents that have confidence the Council makes decisions in the best interests of the city (users of governance services)	NA	NA			28%	NA	19%	NA	23%	NA	27%	NA	NA	NA
Transport	Ensure user satisfaction with appearance, safety and ease of use of transport interchange(s) and suburban hubs	≥ 90%				84%	97%	84%	96%	80%	97%	89%	96%	93%	98%

1a Sample may include non-residents of Christchurch. Prior to 2024-2025, this was a level of service in the LTP. Prior to 2023-2024, LOS 2.6.7.2 was measured using three questions: time taken to respond; email being clear, professional; and easy to understand and email efficient way to communicate. From 2023-2024 onward, the level of service was measured using two questions: email efficient way to communicate; and email ease of contact as these two questions better reflect what the business unit is aiming to measure. Therefore, pre 2023-2024 data is not directly comparable. However, using the pre-2023-2024 methodology the result in 2023-2024 was still 68% satisfied

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

2 This score has been adjusted to allow comparability with current scoring (ie. the same aggregate measures have been used for both years)

3 This score is based on an aggregate measure of 'understanding of Council decision making' (a. understanding of how Council makes decisions, b. 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)

4 The Old LOS Target is the last available target that had been set for these services (ie. included in the 2018-2028 or 2015-2025 LTPs). If that level of service target was applied to the current result, would the service have passed that target?

5 Caution must be used when comparing these results to previous years as the measurement scale has changed from a satisfaction scale to an agreement scale and pre 2024-2025, the score combined both the opportunities to have a say and the process ease of use questions. The opportunities to have a say question now includes reference to adequacy of opportunities. Results from previous years have been recalibrated to separate opportunities to have a say and ease of use questions