



Photo: Peckson & Peckson, 2018.

Christchurch context and earthquake	6
Effects on not-for-profits	6
Recovery	7
Research Aims	9
Methods	9
Location Attributes	13
Co-location	16
Collaboration	17
Accessibility	18
Service Provision	20
Increased need and complexity of client issues	20
Loss of other services	21
Financial challenges	22
Adaptive capacity	22
Visions for the central city	24
Relationships between governance and not-for-profits	24
Looking forward	25

Executive Summary

Background

The research partner is Sharon Torstonson of the Social Equity and Wellbeing Network (SEWN). The Canterbury Earthquake Sequence that began in 2010 resulted in 80% of Christchurch's central city buildings requiring demolition. Not-for-profits consequently needed to find new premises, and adapt to changes across the sector.

Objective

This research aims to understand changes in not-for-profit locations, and how this may have

Introduction

The research is being conducted in conjunction with Sharon Torstonson, the executive officer of the Social Equity and Wellbeing Network (SEWN), which promotes wellbeing by supporting, informing, and lobbying for Christchurch not-for-profits.

reflection
Christchurch suffered a series of earthquakes beginning in 2010 with the most devastating occurring on 22 February 2011. 185 people lost their lives and the city's infrastructure was substantially damaged. Impacts were especially devastating within the central city where the majority of buildings needed to be demolished, resulting in many not-for-profits having to relocate, or close. For not-for-profits in the central city this changed the way their network operated, affecting both clients and staff, and relationships between other organisations and governance agencies. In many instances the not-for-profit sector has had to adapt to face heightened and more complex client demand, as well as a number of other challenges that have tested service delivery and general day-to-day functioning.

as
This report captures the state of the not-for-profit sector seven years after the 22 February earthquake in 2011. It expands upon past work on the Christchurch not-for-profit sector that is now over three years old. The main objective is to enquire into the impact of spatial changes to the not-for-profit sector, including whether not-for-profits are content in their current locations, perceive themselves as accessible and able to serve their client bases. Special consideration is given to establishing whether there is a relationship between not-for-profit functioning and central and non-central locations, and if there is a preference to be located in the central city. Following reflection on not-for-profit operation in isolation, co-location by means of hubs, and collaboration by means of being located in close proximity to other organisations, are

Not-for-Profit Roles

The central purpose of not-for-profits is to acquire and deliver benefits to groups within society, particularly society's most vulnerable (Bryce, 2005). As this is d

Christchurch conte

admissions, and an 100% increase in the number of children who have been referred for services (CDHB, 2017). Other changes in demand include an increase in need for particular services over others, for instance, the demand for Aviva's assistance in family violence matters remains at double the pre-earthquake levels (Shirlaw, 2014), and cases of heightened complexity are more prevalent. For example an increase in overcrowding was found to correlate with more children exposed to poverty-related sickness (Shirlaw, 2014). These rapid changes have been identified as having a substantial impact upon not-for-profit service provision, with several having inadequate means to address discrepancies in demand (Hutton, Tobin & Whiteford, 2015). However, it is important to note that mental health changes are replicated on a national level, with a 2016 survey of 280 organisations noting that 65% of

Methodology

A mixed method approach was chosen, to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. This was to enable comparisons across organisations and the identification of trends, but to also understand the unique perspectives of each organisation which will have been differently affected by the earthquakes.

Firstly, interviews were conducted with four not-for-profit organisations, and three members of governance entities, to understand their opinions and needs in more depth. Following this, a survey was released to gather larger amounts of quantitative data. This was done to gather the opinions of a wider range of organisations, and indicate patterns across the sector. Anecdotal evidence is used throughout the report from both interviews and surveys.

A database of 157 not-for-profits was created from

including members of Christchurch Community House. The research partner also shared the survey in network newsletters and to other organisations that may be interested, thus a sample size is unable to be calculated.

Organisations in the database were categorised into 12 groups according to *The International Categorisation of Not-for-Profit Organisations* (Salamon & Anheier, 1996; see for definitions of each category):

- Culture and Recreation
- Education and Research
- Health
- Social Services
- Environment
- Development and Housing
- Law, Advocacy and Politics
- Philanthropic Intermediaries and Voluntarism Promotion
- International
- Religion
- Business and Professional Associations, Unions
- Other

These categories were used as a rough guide as some organisations bridge several categories, however it ensured that the survey was sent to not-for-profits that provide varying services and may have different opinions or needs.

Interviews were undertaken to get a general understanding of not-for-profit opinions and their post-earthquake circumstances. Three of the not-for-profit interview participants were selected from the database as they were identified by the research partner as willing participants and

Regenerate Christchurch. Cllr. Phil Clearwater is the Chair of the Social and Community Development Committee along with other local body roles, with many years of social work experience. Dr. Duncan Webb MP also has a background in the not-for-profit sector including working with the Howard League for Penal Reform and is the Member of Parliament for Central Christchurch. Chris Mene is the General Manager of

Discussion

27 not-for-profit organisations responded to the survey.

Location

as comfort or design features (). Proximity to the central city was also rated highly,

The locational benefits, disadvantages, plans to relocate and ideal location

Collaboration

Strong network relationships across the sector have been identified as increasing resilience (Whitman, et al., 2013; Stevenson, 2014). This is supported by Chris Mene of Regenerate Christchurch:

“I think that if you have not-for-profits who want to make the most out of value for money, achieving in a complex and complicated environment, I would then rate the importance of

Parking and buses were rated as beneficial when available to premises () and a disadvantage when not available (). Central city organisations highlight the benefits of public transport availability; however, many state that a lack of parking makes accessibility difficult for clients and staff.

“We are close to bus exchange which is good for all the young people that use our space after-hours” - Canterbury Youth Workers

“I don't hold meetings here anymore really... because people can't find parking and because they can't walk to the meeting” - SEWN

Non-central organisations appear to have more parking available, but sometimes find public transport networks challenging.

“I think we are further away from the bus exchange, so some clients will have to take two buses” - Women's Centre

Cllr. Clearwater sees a solution in improvements to public transport networks, which would reduce parking difficulties and better connect peripheral organisations:

“The key is good [public] transport because that would give [not-for-profits] more flexibility where they choose to locate to because locating in one central place does not suit all agencies.” - Cllr. Clearwater

Accessibility is seen to improve with increased public visibility. This is so clients may find the service easily, and can make drop-in visits when they are going past.

“Many people gain the courage to approach us just from having walked or driven past us” - Unknown respondent

“...this is the first time ever in our thirty plus years that we're on ground floor and so visible. So it kind of increases the traffic for us.” - Women's Centre

Improved visibility may aid in generating a norm around the use of not-for-profit services, which may have a positive effect on wellbeing in society.

In other comments, not-for-profits mentioned the need to become more flexible and mobile, especially when dealing with their client base.

“...it is advantageous for us to work out in the community because we are going out to our people, to our clients rather than expecting them to come to us, as was the case before”. - Restorative Justice

Others have become more online-based, such as the Japanese Society of Canterbury which

Governance perspectives

Visions f

L

Limitations

Most participants were members of SEWN and Community House, or had their email readily accessible online; thus, organisations excluded from the email list were not able to participate.

Certain service provision categories were not represented in the responses as much as others. Social Services organisations were well represented, while only one Law, Advocacy and Politics organisation was included, and no Religious organisations responded. This may limit the representativeness of the findings.

Respondents may have viewed the central city as having different boundaries than those defined in this research.

The way in which some questions were phrased meant that they were open to different interpretations. Asking whether not-for-profits had plans to relocate neglected to account for whether relocation was desired. The initial wording of current/previous addresses neglected to ask for a specific address; thus, this was answered with a general area. In addition, respondents often did not detail their current or previous locations, or both; thus, murb

issue, including difficulties

References

- Aldrich, D.P. (2012). *Building resilience: Social capital in post-disaster recovery*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Berry, J.M., and Arons, D.F. (2003). *A Voice for Nonprofits*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Brown, K. (2014). Global environmental change I: A social turn for resilience? *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(1), 107-117. DOI: 10.1177/0309132513498837
- Bryce, H.J. (2005). *Players in the public policy process: Nonprofits as social capital and agents* (1st ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Canterbury District Health Board (2017). *Canterbury DHB continuing to perform well despite increased demand and funding challenges*.
<http://www.cdhb.health.nz/News/Pages/Canterbury-DHB-continuing-to-perform-well-despite-increased-demand-and-funding-challenges.aspx>
- Canterbury District Health Board (2018). *Community in Mind*. Retrieved from:
<https://www.cph.co.nz/your-health/community-in-mind/>
- Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (2014). *Community in Mind: Strategy for rebuilding health and wellbeing in greater Christchurch*. Christchurch: Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority.
- Christchurch City Council. (2015). *Christchurch District Plan*. Christchurch: Christchurch City Council. Retrieved from:
<https://districtplan.ccc.govt.nz/pages/plan/book.aspx?exhibit=DistrictPlan>
- Christchurch City Council (2018). Building Activity and Vacant Land. Accessed 30/05/2018. Retrieved from:
<https://www.ccc.govt.nz/cms>

Pena, A.A., Zahran, S., Underwood, A., and Weiler, S. (2014). Effect of natural disasters

Appendices

Appendix A. Not-for-Profit interview Questions

1. Have you relocated since the Canterbury earthquake sequence that began in 2010?
2. How many times have you relocated? 1 W R
3. What is your current location, and what factors influenced this location choice?
4. Is your current location permanent, or do you have plans to relocate?
5. What are the nMs to ~~can~~

Appendix B: Phil Clearwater Interview Questions

1. What is your vision for a socially resilient city, and do not-for-profits have a role within this?
2. How would you describe the roles and responsibilities of not-for-profits in Christchurch, and has the earthquake sequence altered how this network operates?
3. Have the needs of the individuals who access these services changed post-earthquake?
4. How do you rate the importance of collaboration and co-location among Not-for-profits?
5. Do you see the council as having an organisational role in not-for-profit location and collaboration, or should these factors be left for not-for-profits to organize as a separate entity from government?
6. Do you think location within the city centre is useful for not-for-profits, or do you think they can work effectively at their current locations in more suburban areas?
7. With your experience in transport and infrastructure planning, do you think that Not-for-profits that are located in the suburbs are accessible by a variety of transport modes?
8. CERA's initial plans for the city centre did not provide formal/structured space for Not-for-profits as part of the rebuild process. Will the council consider addressing whether there is a need for a formalized central space for not-for-profits?

Appendix C: Dr. Duncan Webb Interview Questions

1. What is your vision for a socially resilient city, and do not-for-profits have a role within this?
2. How would you describe the roles and responsibilities of not-for-profits in

Appendix E: Online Survey Questions

1. What is the name of your organisation, and where is it located? (please provide address)
2. ~~What~~ What category best describes your organisation? (Select all that apply)
3. Has your organisation relocated since the Canterbury earthquake sequence that began in 2010? (If no skip to Question 7)
4. How many times have you relocated?
5. What was your location pre-earthquakes? (please provide address)
6. Describe how the locations of your sites have changed?
7. What are the benefits/disadvantages of your current location?
- 8.

