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Executive summary

In September 2010, and in February and June 2011, significant and destructive earthquakes struck Christchurch. CORE Education was contracted by the Ministry of Education 23 May 2011–22 July 2011 to scope and report on the impact of the earthquakes on participation in early childhood education (ECE) specifically in relation to education provision in Christchurch East.

Data was collected from 80.4% (82 of 102) of open ECE services, 78.5% (11 of 14) of services either closed or on suspended licence due to damage and 100% (8 of 8) playgroups located in east Christchurch. Data was also collected from 75% (15 of 20) ECE services located outside of Christchurch (comparison group), ninety-six (96) parents/whānau and twenty-three (23) organisations and community groups. The ECE service data collected related specifically to one week in March 2011.

Recommendations were developed collaboratively with the Ministry of Education (the Ministry) to support planning for the recovery and renewal of the ECE sector in Christchurch. This report details the project’s background, scoping approach, methodology, key outcomes and findings, and recommendations.

Section one of this executive summary focuses on the impact of population movement on ECE participation and capacity by comparing 2010 and 2011 ECE participation data. The perspectives of parents/whānau and organisations about barriers and solutions to ECE participation both pre- and post-22 February are presented.

Section two focuses on the impact of Christchurch quakes on ECE services in terms of wellbeing, finances and recovery strategies to gain an understanding of the current capability of the ECE sector as recovery progress begins.

Section 1: Impact on ECE participation

As a result of the event on 22 February ECE services in Christchurch closed for a minimum of two weeks. A large number remained closed for an extended period of time beyond two weeks. During this period many families/whānau left their damaged homes, particularly in Christchurch East. When ECE services reopened many experienced significant loss of enrolments.

Participation rates in ECE in Christchurch have declined at the same time as ECE capacity has increased. ECE locations in Christchurch East have been affected more than other parts of the city. Comparative ECE data indicates Māori and Pasifika children are represented in the lost enrolment data at higher levels than Pākehā/NZ European.

The expected future movement of families/whānau from Christchurch East has the potential to further impact negatively on participation rates. ECE services outside of Christchurch East may experience a lack of capacity in the near future as east families/whānau face relocation and seek new ECE services. Many of these affected families include those from lower socio-economic, Pasifika and Māori groups.

The impact on viability and sustainability of ECE provision in Christchurch East may decrease the range of choice for the families/whānau remaining. In all locations across Christchurch ECE provision will need to respond to changing community demographics. A coordinated approach between the Ministry, ECE sector and organisations working with families/whānau in the area would help to ensure ECE sector operational decisions are well informed and responsive to community demands for ECE participation.

Pre-existing barriers to ECE participation have increased in complexity by the affects of the earthquakes in Christchurch. Many proposed solutions offered by parents/whānau and organisations/community groups point to improvements ECE services themselves could address, while others require external consideration.

Continued focus and attention by the Ministry on providing ongoing communication is essential. The ECE sector expressed a need to be kept informed of Christchurch recovery planning and decision making, particularly in relation to public transport changes, population movement and new property developments.

Access to information for families and community agencies about the benefits of ECE participation, how to enrol and where ECE services have capacity will support considered and informed choice about enrolling children in ECE.
Recommendations

Participation: planning and strategy

1. Recommendation: Ongoing monitoring of the establishment, re-establishment and continuity of a diverse range of ECE services across Christchurch to ensure the needs of priority groups (lower socio-economic, Māori, Pasifika) are met, and parental choice of EC service is retained. This should include closely monitoring enrolments of children as the population shifts in Christchurch to identify areas where additional capacity is required. A risk is that there will be an imbalance between ECE supply and demand in some locations across Christchurch.

Where monitoring identifies significant changes support should be provided for:

   a. ECE provision and priority should be given to plans to locate ECE alongside other social agencies/organisations, for example, schools, rest homes, and social service or health groups, thus adding value for families attending the service.

   b. Provision of Crown land for ECE services required to relocate due to land damage, building damage, depopulation or changing demographics included in any strategic planning for schools.

2. Recommendation: Children’s movement into, and out of, ECE services should be tracked so that destinations of families/whānau are known, and the ECE sector as a whole could work strategically to respond quickly to changing demographics. The ECE sector would be in a stronger position to support transitions that families need to make.

3. Recommendation: Any education network planning should include a global view of education, from ECE through to tertiary.

4. Recommendation: ECE services should consider and be encouraged to include additional adult space in ECE services so that any new or rebuilt centre can offer space as a community meeting place and support venue for families/whānau.

Provision of information

5. Recommendation: The benefits of ECE participation should be promoted to Christchurch communities.

6. Recommendation: A resource should be developed, possibly web-based, to provide information about ECE services in Christchurch. This could include locations, service types, service capacity, links to funding/subsidy information etc. Parent/whānau, ECE services, government agencies, non-governmental organisations and community groups would use the resource to support the current goal of participation in ECE.

7. Recommendation: Information is provided to support children transitioning from Christchurch ECE to centres/services in other parts of New Zealand.

8. Recommendation: The outcomes of this scoping project are disseminated to target participants in summary form as soon as possible.

9. Recommendation: Information is developed to support ECE services planning to establish in Christchurch to make sound and informed decisions.

10. Recommendation: The Ministry considers the inclusion of ECE in its rollout of ultra-fast broad band in schools to improve the ECE sector’s ability to effectively support transitions and relationships within, and beyond, communities.
Section 2: Impact on the capability of ECE services

Participation in ECE services is supported where ECE services are financially secure and provide quality programmes that are responsive to local communities. The Christchurch earthquakes posed a risk to both ECE staff and management capability as many personal and professional challenges were faced. This scoping project explored the impact of the earthquakes on the wellbeing of staff, children and families/whānau and on the financial situation of ECE services to identify future impacts on ECE participation in Christchurch. ECE service capability was further investigated by looking to the ways in which services were responding by implementing recovery strategies.

The wellbeing of staff, children and families/whānau is an on-going issue that has potential to impact on ECE services’ ability to provide a responsive education service for their community. Many ECE staff are reported to be overtired while also concerned about the fluctuation in roll numbers and resulting impact on staffing. Continued fluctuation in ECE roll numbers across Christchurch over the next few years is likely.

A significant number of children and families/whānau are transitioning between ECE services, both within and out of Christchurch. ECE staff are dealing with larger numbers of transitioning children and families than normal at a time when staff wellbeing is of concern.

As a result of family/whānau relocation in Christchurch, the ethnicities, ages and numbers of children enrolled in individual ECE services are likely to change.

Successful transitions out of and into ECE services are important for supporting children’s wellbeing and engagement in learning. Assistance may be needed for ECE services, umbrella organisations and community groups to support families/whānau to overcome the barriers to participation following relocation.

The financial viability of affected ECE services is a concern. Many ECE services in Christchurch have been financially impacted due to unforeseen reductions in roll numbers alongside quake-related additional expenses.

Christchurch is on the cusp of a significant relocation of both population and community services. ECE services in locations with expected population movement need to begin planning for inevitable changes.

Recommendations

Professional learning, advice and support

11. Recommendation: Initiatives to support educators to plan for and respond to changing demographics to ensure that the quality of children’s education and care is given priority at all times. This could include:

   a. Additional resourcing for professional support/development (PD) targeted to educators experiencing large numbers of transitioning children (for the period of land rezoning).

   b. Support to develop recovery strategies and/or strategic plans for decision-making around the ongoing viability of services. Support needs to focus on strategic planning/recovery strategies, financial management, HR support in terms of staffing/employment/redundancy.

   c. Additional resourcing for PD targeted to educators experiencing significant changes to the demographics of the children in their care to support teaching and learning in mixed age groupings/environments, and responsive teaching and learning in culturally diverse communities.

   d. Continuing the facilitation of regular network opportunities to provide professional support for Christchurch educators and management.

12. Recommendation: A designated ECE Project Manager is engaged to work with ECE services, organisations, playgroups and parents/whānau to guide and promote successful participation in ECE during the extended phase of family/whānau home and ECE relocation, and to implement...
initiatives which respond to the changing needs of the community and sustain and increase participation.

**Support for affected services.**

13. **Recommendation:** The current ECE funding provisions be reviewed and consideration given to how best to:
   
   a. Enable flexibility in attendance without financial loss.
   
   b. Aid pastoral care in ECE communities by enabling staff to spend more time with affected families and those transitioning in and out of services.
   
   c. Support ECE services to keep fees manageable or to reduce or remove fees for families/whānau in crisis. Services could retain a small percentage of discretionary places on their regular roll.
   
   d. Support services where there are large numbers of children and families/whānau transferring away from the service. For example, funding levels could be retained for up to six (6) weeks after each child leaves the centre due to earthquake-related reasons.
   
   e. Support the operation of a service and teaching and learning in difficult circumstances, for example, teacher release, strategic planning/recovery planning, advice and guidance.

14. **Recommendation:** Explore the provision of free access to counselling services children, families/whānau and ECE staff.

15. **Recommendation:** Continue welfare support to ECE services and adapt these services to meet the changing needs of the sector over the next two years.

16. **Recommendation:** The Ministry continues to work with Te Kōhanga Reo Trust to support the sustained participation of tamariki and whānau in kōhanga Reo in and around Christchurch.
Overview of project

In February and June 2011, significant and destructive earthquakes struck Christchurch. These earthquakes were preceded by the September 2010 Darfield Earthquake. These events, together with the thousands of aftershocks associated with these larger earthquakes, have had a profound and unprecedented impact on the people, property, land and businesses of Christchurch and Canterbury, and this includes the network of early childhood education services within Christchurch.

The damage to Christchurch is widespread, with over 330,000 claims submitted to the Earthquake Commission (EQC) Canterbury-wide. The greatest damage to housing and land has occurred in east Christchurch. It is the participation of children and their families/whānau in centre-based early childhood education (ECE) and Ministry-funded playgroups in this part of Christchurch, many of which can be described as serving low socio-economic status communities that is the focus of the scoping project associated with this report.

CORE Education was contracted by the Ministry of Education from 23 May 2011 until 22 July 2011 to scope, report and develop recommendations, in conjunction with the Ministry of Education, of participation in early childhood education and gaps in education provision in Christchurch east. The contract between CORE Education and the Ministry of Education was guided by two expected outcomes for the project:

1. Community engagement and data collection/analysis.
2. Report and recommendations.

The scoping project involved surveying one-hundred and two (102) open ECE services and 8 Ministry-funded playgroups in east Christchurch, fourteen (14) ECE services that were closed due to the impact of the 22 February earthquakes, and a comparison group of twenty (20) ECE services outside of east Christchurch. In addition to these surveys twenty-three (23) ECE umbrella organisations, non-government organisations (NGOs) and Work and Income personnel, and ninety-six (96) parents and whānau were interviewed.

Data for this report also draws on information from the Ministry of Education’s Aranui Pasifika regional participation project consultation report, July 2011. The Ministry’s senior adviser worked collaboratively in Pasifika contexts with a CORE Education facilitator to reduce confusion about the two projects in communities, and to reduce the number of additional meetings for key Pasifika people already stretched by their responsibilities in communities. Where data from the Aranui Pasifika project has been included in this report it is identified with the reference APP.

The following report presents the data collected and collated from the three layers of participants surveyed and interviewed under a series of themes. Specifically, movement of children by enrolments away from, and into ECE centres and playgroups; participation of children in centres and playgroups; the capacity of services in terms of available spaces and waiting times; the financial impact on ECE services; the impact on the well-being of staff, children and families; and planned recovery strategies.

This report includes a range of recommendations to the Ministry of Education. Recommendations relate to the issues of participation: planning and strategy; provision of information; professional learning, advice and support; and support for affected services.

Success of this project largely hinged on the ability of CORE Education personnel to obtain accurate and representative information from a diverse community, together with the good will and support of the many ECE teachers, management and umbrella organisations, community groups, NGOs, Work and Income personnel, parents and whānau and Ministry of Education personnel who contributed to this project. Every person involved in this project has been affected by the 2010/2011 earthquakes, and continues to be affected in some way.
The scope of the project

The scope of the project included consulting with non-governmental organisations and community groups, including early childhood education umbrella organisations and Work and Income personnel, centre-based early childhood services, Ministry-funded playgroups in the Burwood-Pegasus and Hagley-Ferrymead Wards, and parents and families/whānau. Home-based services were not included in this project. At the time of writing this report, the Ministry of Education was in consultation with the home-based early childhood education community of Christchurch.

The scope of this project did not allow time for complete analysis of the data collected. All data has been presented in this report to enable interested parties to view and analyse according to their focus.

CORE Education is confident that the content of this report reflects the aspirations of communities to engage children and families/whānau, of and from Christchurch, in early childhood education.
The approach

An overview of the various phases of the project is mapped out in figure 1. The project was initially based on a seven-week timeframe – 23 May to 30 June 2011 – however, this timeframe was extended by three weeks following two large earthquakes on 13 June. The project concluded with the submission of this report on 22 July 2011.

Each overlapping phase of the project was designed around the two central outcomes:

- Community engagement and data collection/analysis.
- Report and recommendations.

The 10-week process of implementing these phases included ongoing consultation with the Ministry of Education.

Process for community engagement, data collection, analysis – contract outcome 1

The geographical area referred to in this report includes 102 early childhood centres, 14 early childhood centres that closed following the 22 February earthquakes, and eight (8) playgroups. Many of these ECE services may be described as servicing lower socio-economic status communities, with many parts of this geographical area seriously affected by the 22 February 2011 earthquakes and subsequent earthquakes. A map of the geographical areas referred to in this project is included in the appendices (appendix 1).
In addition to the 102 open and 14 closed ECE centres identified to participate in this project, a group of 20 centres were selected across Christchurch city to provide a comparative sample. This ‘comparison group’ has been used to help identify trends that may be unique to east-Christchurch centres and playgroups, or possibly universal to the ECE sector in Christchurch.

The Ministry of Education developed the surveys to be used for open east Christchurch (appendix 2) and comparison centres (appendix 2), playgroups (appendix 3) and closed centres (appendix 4) in consultation with CORE Education project personnel.

Interview questions for non-governmental and community groups (appendix 5), and parents and families/whānau (appendix 6), were developed by CORE Education personnel in consultation with the Ministry of Education.

CORE Education personnel took responsibility for collecting all ECE centre, NGO and community groups and parent/whānau data. The Ministry of Education took responsibility for collecting all playgroup data.

**CORE Education processes**

The focus of the first phase (weeks 1–2) of the project was on preparing data collection tools (including surveys and interview questions), establishing research protocols, engagement with existing data, and establishing contact with initial target participants (for example, ECE umbrella organisations and non-governmental organisations and community groups).

Specifically the CORE Education project team:

- Developed and distributed a memo via email to all the target participants (appendix 7).
- Contacted and talked to as many ECE umbrella groups and community groups/agencies as possible in the short timeframe.
- Developed systems for documenting and collating data (including utilising online survey/management tools to collect and collate data).
- Finalised and formatted survey/interview questions.
- Distributed surveys to the target open, comparison, and closed centres.

The second phase (weeks 3–7) involved data collection and ongoing analysis with agencies, umbrella organisations, communities, early childhood settings, parents, caregivers and families/whānau. Data collection became progressively more focused as the project team analysed data and moved from seeking data from a broader organisational to individual level. Survey questions and techniques undertaken were developed and adapted for different groups, as necessary, to ensure engagement and that data collected returned the information the Ministry sought.

Specifically in weeks 3–5 the project team:

- Began analysing initial data to form a view of where further data needed to be sought.
- Met with the Ministry to share data and seek new data and advice where appropriate.
- Contacted, via email and phone, all ECE services yet to complete a survey.
- Continued to gather and process data from surveys returned by target ECE services and community groups.

In weeks 6–7 the project team:

- Identified a selection of target parents, families/whānau and caregivers to collect in-depth data from.
- Liaised with the Ministry to identify gaps in data and areas where further information was needed to test out recommendation ideas and/or generate new data.
- Contacted, via email, phone or face to face, all ECE services yet to complete a survey.
• Continued to gather and process data from surveys returned by target EC services, parents, families/whānau, and/or community groups.

The third phase (weeks 8–9) involved updating information from survey respondents following the 13 June earthquake and collecting parents, families/whānau data.

Specifically in weeks 8–9 the project team:
• Contacted and conducted a short interview with a selection of target families/whānau.
• Talked directly with parents and families/whānau over two days in Northlands Mall about their ECE circumstances – a short survey was used to collect data.
• Contacted, via email, phone and meet face to face all ECE services yet to complete a survey.
• Continued to gather and process data from surveys returned by target ECE services, parents/whānau, and/or community groups.
• Completed data collation and documented a first draft report.
• Met with the Ministry to review the draft report and recommendations.

Process for developing the report and recommendations – contract outcome 2

An iterative approach to the development of the final report and recommendations was adopted. The report was shaped and determined by ongoing analysis of the data, gathered alongside collaboration between the project team and the Ministry.

The final phase (week 10) involved the CORE Education project team drafting the final report, based on ongoing analysis, before a final analysis of the overall data, developing and finalising recommendations in negotiation with the Ministry and submitting the final report.

Specifically in week 10 the research team:
• Completed processing data from surveys returned by target ECE services, parents/whānau, and/or community groups.
• Worked together to analyse data and formulate draft recommendation ideas.
• Met with the Ministry to discuss and formulate recommendations.
• Completed final report draft and recommendations.

Working in communities

Success of this project largely hinged on the ability of CORE Education personnel to obtain accurate and representative information from a diverse community. In order to do this, the team was guided in the following ways:
• Information gathered needed to come from a range of local, ‘grassroots’ representatives. This required project members to quickly develop a rapport with a range of groups and individuals in Christchurch east communities. CORE Education had the benefit of a project team with well-established relationships with, and strong connections to, Christchurch east ECE communities.
• Personnel involved needed a working understanding of early childhood education. All but one of CORE Education’s project team was a fully qualified early childhood teacher with considerable knowledge of early childhood education.
• Many target non-governmental agencies, community groups, and parents, families/whānau seemed more comfortable discussing rather than documenting their responses, hence the preference for
semi-structured interviews over surveys. Semi-structured interviews also had the capacity to ‘drill down’ and, therefore, resulted in richer information being gathered.

- Data gathering methods used were flexible enough to accommodate different cultural preferences and customs for sharing information. For example, many Māori and Pasifika preferred to spend time talking about other matters before the discussion becomes focused. Allowing time for this to take place was necessary, as rushing into a topic can be considered pushy. For this reason, our approach was to interview people where and when it was most comfortable for them.

- We acknowledged that the issue of children’s non-attendance may not be easy for some families/whānau to discuss, and it was important that these families/whānau did not feel that the process was judging them negatively. Careful consideration was given to this in selection of personnel to be involved and in the framing of the questions.

- To fully understand the patterns of participation and migration it was important to gather information on the enablers, as well as the barriers, to early childhood attendance. These were taken into account when selecting the individuals and groups to be interviewed.

- Venues such as marae, churches, service providers, and local public gathering places (that is, Northlands Mall) were utilised. The aim was to encourage discussion and debate on the issues surrounding the project. This then lead to discussion on the value of such a project and suggestions concerning community participation.

- Kaupapa-Māori research seeks to address the needs and expectations of participants. Therefore, acknowledging those needs and expectations at the outset of the project, and developing a strategy for achieving this, was vital. The project team sought guidance on how best to achieve this from the community.

- At any stage throughout the project, the project leader and project manager were accessible and available to answer participant’s questions. Where negative attitudes toward research or the project’s value were expressed, such comments were noted and treated with respect.

- Given the central importance of relationships or whakawhanaungatanga, the project team exercised flexibility in all situations, allowing participants to contribute to shaping the data gathering process.

Given the nature of the project, it was important to take a multi-faceted approach to engaging communities so that a wide range of views were represented. Integral to the success of community engagement in this project was the attention paid to socially and culturally responsive approaches to the scoping exercise. The short timeframe of this contract limited the ability of the project team to organise and orchestrate large community gatherings. The ways in which Christchurch east communities were engaged are described below.

**Community awareness**

Public awareness occurred through word-of-mouth and discussion of the project at ECE community forums (for example, the Ministry regional updates, Futures Network meetings, NZEI meetings) as the project team engaged with existing community contacts in Christchurch east. A simple emailed memo explaining the project, introducing the project team and CORE Education, was sent to all relevant organisations and ECE services in Christchurch.

**Engaging community groups**

The project team had prior connections with many of the key personnel in local community groups (for example, Pasifika Trust, Methodist Mission, Pasifika Evaluation, local churches). Where new relationships needed to be forged, the project team sought guidance from these groups as to their preferred ways for participation (for example, Runaka, church groups etc).
**Engaging ECE providers**

The project team utilised existing relationships to speed up the process for engaging with ECE umbrella groups. With a foundation of sound relationships, many of the service providers responded positively to phone conversations and email in the first instance. Most ECE service providers met face to face with project team members to undertake more in-depth interviews.

**Engaging ECE centres**

The project team used existing and familiar communication processes to establish early contact with ECE settings in the Christchurch east area. The team used their established email network system and an up-to-date phone list in combination with the Ministry contact lists. Established relationships with many of the managers and supervisors in the target area were used to contribute to the success of the survey returns.

The project team ensured the diversity of ECE services was represented in the data by monitoring the initial responses to data requests. Follow up contact was made to service types that were under-represented in the initial survey returns. Where face to face visits were necessary to individual settings, the project team were sensitive to timing visits to those ECE centres impacted by the February and June earthquakes, due to closures and damage, as well those directly impacted by the land reports.

**Engaging parents/whānau, aiga, caregivers**

The predominant approach to engaging parents, families/whānau, aiga was informally, face to face in Northlands Mall, and at a community event.

In addition, a small number of Pasifika aiga were interviewed in their child’s early childhood centre by the Samoan member of the project team.

**Target participants**

Three groupings of participants were targeted to provide the information for this project: Non-Government organisations/community groups, ECE services and parents/whānau. This section provides a description of each group of participants.

**Non-governmental organisations and community groups**

The Christchurch Ministry of Education office and the CORE Education contract team selected non-governmental organisations and community groups according to their involvement with families/whānau of children aged 0–5 years, their presence within Christchurch east communities, and to assure representation of Māori and Pasifika groups. A total of 27 non-governmental organisations and community groups, and one government organisation, were contacted. Twenty-three (23) of these were interviewed to gather perspectives about the changing nature of ECE participation in Christchurch eastern locations following the 22 February earthquake and related information. The Ministry of Social Development’s Work and Income, was included in this group as it proved to hold pertinent information in relation to the goals of the project.

Figure 2 lists the organisations and community groups included in this scoping project.
### Organisation

- ABC Management Christchurch
- Aranui Community Trust
- B4 School Services
- Barnardos
- Christchurch Community Childcare Association
- Cook Island Community
- Early Start
- He Oranga Pounamu
- Kiddicorp Christchurch
- Canterbury Westland Kindergarten Association
- Kindercare - Beckenham Office
- Methodist Mission
- Nga Maata Waka
- Ngai Tahu - Ngai Tuahuriri Runaka
- Ngai Tahu - Rapaki Runaka
- Pacific Trust Canterbury
- Pasifika Hub. Aranui
- Canterbury Playcentre Association
- Samoan Congregational Church - Hoon Hay
- Samoan Congregational Church - Wainoni
- Shirley EFKS (Samoan church)
- Woolston EFKS (Samoan church)
- Tongan Church
- Te Kohanga Reo Trust – Te Waipounamu
- Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust
- Te Puna Oraka - early years services
- Work and Income Coordinators

The range of organisations interviewed included good representation from Māori, Pasifika, health services and ECE umbrella group service providers. A description of the non-governmental organisations and community groups can be viewed in appendix 8.

Interviews were undertaken face to face and followed the structure of a series of ten questions (appendix 5). Prior to the interview the key contact person of each organisation/community group was provided with the scoping questions and invited to bring together those members of their organisation they deemed to be the most able to provide the information sought. Interviews involved between one and 21 participants at a time. With larger groups, two contractors attended the interview so that one could facilitate and one could document the interview. Participants were asked for their perspective when unable to provide specific quantitative data. The interviewer documented responses during the interview before entering this data into a Survey Monkey database.
Questions posed to organisations and community groups included their perspective on ECE participation, barriers and solutions. There was a wide variance in organisations’ abilities to contribute information about ECE participation. Some were actively involved in promoting ECE participation, whereas others did not have ECE participation on their organisation’s agenda.

Organisation interviews were completed in the early phases of this project, prior to the 23 June CERA land report announcement. This avoided any detrimental impact on the data.

Parents, families/whānau

A total of 96 parents were interviewed using a parent questionnaire (appendix 6). Eighty-nine (89) of these interviews took place at a local shopping mall. Two of the project team set up a display table at Northlands Mall. Over the course of two days in the mall, parents with preschoolers were invited to contribute to this data gathering.

Of the remaining seven (7) parents, five (5) were interviewed at Te Pua Waitanga ki Otautahi during a community gathering, and two (2) Pasifika parents were interviewed in their child’s early childhood setting.

Parents interviewed represent the perspective of families/whānau who currently live in Christchurch locations. A limitation to this report is that the scope of the project did not allow for interviewing parents/whānau who had moved from Christchurch after the 22 February earthquake. The parent/whānau perspective presented in this report, therefore, offers a partial perspective of families/whānau impacted by the earthquake.

Questions posed to parents captured their perspective on participation in early childhood, barriers to participation, and the personal impact of the earthquake. The project team documented parent contributions on the survey form. Data was then collated to explore both the quantitative and qualitative data.

The data from parents was collected in week 9 (11-15 July) of the project. Data collected was categorised separately for parents living in eastern suburbs and non-eastern suburbs, to enable comparisons to be made. The data clearly illustrates the patterns of movement both for residential and educational purposes as well as trends in participation. The data is presented in this report in comparison groupings to offer some insight as to the impact of the earthquake on both groups.

Parent home location and ethnicity

Figure 3 presents the numbers of parents from either eastern or non-eastern suburbs.
The ethnicity of parents interviewed is representational of the ethnic diversity of Christchurch (figure 4). Ethnicities included in the category ‘other’ include Chinese, Australian, European and Indian.

**Figure 4. Parent ethnicity (n=96)**

- **Māori**: Eastern suburbs 6, Non-eastern suburbs 31
- **Pakeha**: Eastern suburbs 14, Non-eastern suburbs 3
- **Pasifika**: Eastern suburbs 3, Non-eastern suburbs 1
- **Other**: Eastern suburbs 4, Non-eastern suburbs 7

**Christchurch early childhood education services**

Data was requested from a total of 142 early childhood settings and eight (8) playgroups. Individual services were asked for statistical information in relation to roll numbers, attendance, age, and ethnicity of children attending their service for the week of 16 – 20 May 2011 for open services and 14 – 18 February for closed services. Qualitative information about community wellbeing, financial impact and earthquake recovery was collected from all services. All data was collected through the use of surveys (appendices 2, 3 & 4).

The Ministry of Education provided data on roll status and capacity of individual services as collected in the July 2010 RS61 returns. This data provided the pre-22 February earthquake statistics to compare with post-22 February statistics collected through this scoping project.
The surveys for early childhood education services outlined the information required from services. The versions of the survey differed according to the circumstances of services, that is, ‘open’, ‘closed’, or ‘playgroup’. ‘Closed’ surveys were used for services that remained closed as at 23 May due to the impact of the 22 February earthquake. ‘Open’ surveys were used for open east Christchurch centres and the comparison centres. Playgroups received their own version.

Surveys were distributed to the 142 early childhood settings and eight (8) playgroups in the week beginning 30 May. One hundred and ten (110) of these services/playgroups located within the Christchurch East are referred to as the open east group in this report. Fourteen (14) closed services (closed group) located in the Christchurch east area and twenty (20) services located outside of Christchurch east (comparison group) made up the remaining thirty four (34 services. A full list of ECE services represented in this report is attached as appendices 9, 10, 11 and 12.

The Christchurch Ministry of Education office provided a database of ECE services and contact details for the Christchurch East comparison and closed groups. Surveys were distributed via email on 31 May, with a request date for return of 10 June. On 9 June a reminder email was sent, at which time the due date was extended to 15 June. A further major earthquake on 13 June required a further extension to the return date as services were interrupted by closure. An extension to the period of the scoping contract enabled the due date to be extended out to 30 June.

All data from surveys was entered into a Survey Monkey database.

**Surveys**

- **Open services**

  The ‘Open services’ survey was distributed via email to 102 early childhood services in the Christchurch east area. Following the 13 June earthquake, the contract team contacted individual services or the ECE umbrella organisation representing a number of services that had not returned their survey. In some cases, services were visited to complete the survey with the support of a project facilitator.

  In the week beginning 27 June the contract team contacted all services that had returned their survey prior to 13 June to invite these services to update the information they had initially provided.

  Four of the larger early childhood umbrella organisations assisted in the collection of survey data for services under their jurisdiction.

  A total of 89 surveys were returned, a response rate of 87.3%. Three (3) of the returned surveys were from specialist ECE services. Following consultation with the Ministry these three surveys were not included in the collation and analysis for this report. They were kept aside to be submitted directly to the Ministry. Four surveys were returned after the final cut off date for returns. This left a total of eighty-two (82), or (80.4%) of surveys from ECE services in Christchurch East.

- **Closed services**

  The ‘closed services’ survey was distributed via email to a total of 14 early childhood services that remained closed as at 23 May, due to the impact of 22 February earthquake. A total of 11 surveys were returned, a response rate of 78.5%.

- **Comparison services**

  The ‘open services’ survey was distributed to a total of 20 early childhood services located outside of the Christchurch east area. Prior to 13 June, no ‘comparison’ surveys had been returned. The contract team contacted individual services to reinforce the importance of their data. An additional two (2) services outside of Christchurch east not on the original comparison list voluntarily submitted a survey. Due to the low response rate from comparison services it was agreed with the Ministry to include the data from these additional surveys. A total of 15 surveys were returned, a response rate of 75%.
• **Playgroups**

The Christchurch Ministry of Education office collected surveys from eight (8) playgroups located in Christchurch east. The survey requested information paralleled with that requested from the Christchurch east early childhood services. The data was collated and analysed in the same way as other surveys, keeping it separate to allow inspection of trends or issues that may prove more relevant to playgroups.
Section 1 findings: Impact on ECE participation

This section focuses on data from centre and playgroup surveys and 2010 the Ministry RS61 returns associated with movement of children into, and out of, east-Christchurch early childhood centres and playgroups, using data associated with withdrawn and new enrolments by age and ethnicity. Data from the comparison centres is also discussed.

The impact on ECE participation: Population movement

‘24 families left after the Feb 22nd earthquake but 22 returned as [they] could not find affordable rental accommodation outside of the area and/or their landlords would not release them from their tenancy agreements.’

- Christchurch East Open centre

Impact of population movement on ECE participation

The population movement in and out of Christchurch, and resulting movement noted in Christchurch ECE services has affected overall participation in ECE. The population number and socio-economic distribution across Christchurch has changed.

The impact of 22 February quake on ECE enrolments

As a result of the event on 22 February ECE services in Christchurch closed for a minimum of two weeks. A large number remained closed for an extended period of time beyond two weeks. During this period many families/whānau left their damaged homes, particularly in Christchurch east. When ECE services reopened many experienced significant loss of enrolments.

The movement of families/whānau within Christchurch is visible in the statistics of overall loss and gains in enrolments. This data supports the anecdotal view that many families/whānau from the east had moved to the west side of town following 22 February 2011. As well as resulting from relocating, ECE movement is occurring where parents want easier access to their children. Parent interview data confirmed that the prime reason for movement between services was proximity to workplace or home.

- The net loss of enrolments for east-Christchurch ECE services is 17.5%.
- The net loss of enrolments for Christchurch east location playgroups is 34%.
- Comparison ECE centres have had a net gain of 21.2% new enrolments.

Lost enrolments vs. new enrolments

Data from 105 ECE services and playgroups about numbers of lost enrolments between 22 Feb and 23 May revealed that a total of 1097 children and their families/whānau left their ECE service. A further 1000 or more enrolments were lost through the closure of 14 east ECE services. Data about new enrolments identified 542 of the children and families/whānau represented in the ‘lost enrolment’ data re-enrolled in another Christchurch ECE service. Approximately 25.8% of children and families/whānau who stopped attending an ECE service (lost enrolments) following the quake continued to participate in ECE through re-enrolment in Christchurch ECE services.
In the following sections, enrolment data from ECE services helps to explain ECE participation loss and gains, and population movement in Christchurch.

**Movement out of and re-enrolment in Christchurch**

Information about the child’s destination when leaving a service was difficult to ascertain with certainty as a significant population movement occurred during the period immediately following 22 February when ECE services were closed. The following statistics were provided by surveyed ECE services.

**Lost enrolment data**

- 1049 children left 73 open Christchurch east ECE services and eight (8) east playgroups after 22 February. These were children identified as not returning to the service when the service reopened.
- Forty-eight (48) children left 11 comparison group ECE services.
- Fifty-nine (59) children were reported to be no longer attending ECE by east and comparison services. Two (2) interviewed parents reported their child no longer attended ECE. Organisations and community groups attributed the reason for children no longer attending ECE to parents preferring to keep their child close/at home as a result of the 22 February quake. There may be many more than 59 children no longer participating in ECE as the destination of 413 children who had left ECE services (east services 360; comparison group 4; and playgroups 49) was unknown.

**Destination data**

The data collected from ECE services and playgroups about the destination of families when they left an ECE service is summarised as follows:

- Three hundred and four (304) ECE children and their families/whānau were identified as having moved to other cities in New Zealand.
- Ninety (90) ECE children and their families/whānau have moved overseas.
- Approximately 19% (197 of 1049) of those children leaving an east open ECE service or playgroup after 22 February and before 20 May were identified with confidence as re-enrolling in another ECE.
- Nine (9) children leaving comparison ECE services were identified as re-enrolling in alternative ECE services.
- The destination of 409 children and their families/whānau leaving Christchurch east ECE services and playgroups was unknown. The destination of four (4) children and their families/whānau leaving comparison centres is unknown.

**New enrolment data**

It was more likely that ECE services knew where children had come from when enrolling in a service than where they went to when they left a service. The following is drawn from new enrolment data.

- Four hundred and ninety-seven (497) east-Christchurch new ECE enrolments were identified as transfers from other east-Christchurch ECE services. Services indicated that many of these new enrolments were from the 14 east ECE services closed after 22 February. The trend of movement within east Christchurch was supported by eight (8) interviewed parents, who said they had moved home within Christchurch east.
- Forty-five (45) new enrolments in eleven (11) comparison groups were identified as transferring from another ECE service.
- Two hundred and nine (209) ‘new to ECE’ enrolments were taken in 84 ECE services during the period 22 February–20 May (73 east services 175; and 11 comparison services 34). New enrolments cannot be recognised as part of the migrating group of ECE participants; these children came from services waiting lists or from the local community. At this point in time the data suggests that services in Christchurch east may have enrolled the available demographic of their location.
• ECE services were unsure of where 72 new enrolments had come from (67 east services, 5 comparison services).

**Emerging trends in Christchurch population movement**

• A small population movement into Christchurch was reported. Twenty-one (21) new enrolments to east services, and five (5) new enrolments in comparison centres, were identified as families/whānau new to Christchurch.

• Data suggests a recent trend of families/whānau returning to east Christchurch. Nine (9) interviewed parents said they had initially moved away from the eastern suburbs and had recently returned. East services reported that after 20 May, 18 children had returned to their service.

**Presenting the data: Population movement**

**Overall loss and gains in enrolments**

**Open east-Christchurch and comparison centres**

Open east-Christchurch and comparison centres were asked about the number of children that had both left their centres and enrolled in their centres since the 22 February 2011 earthquakes up to 20 May 2011. They were asked not to include children who had left and returned at that point in time. Seventy-three (73) open east-Christchurch centres and 11 comparison centres responded to these questions.

The open east-Christchurch centres report a total loss of 961 enrolments and total gain of 778 new enrolments to 20 May 2011 (see figure 5). The net loss of enrolments for these centres is 183 enrolments or 19.04%.

![Figure 5. Total loss Vs gain in enrolments in open east Christchurch centres (n = 73)](chart)

In contrast, the 11 comparison centres report 48 lost enrolments and 104 new enrolments, resulting in a net gain of 56 or 46.15% (figure 6).
The increase in enrolments in comparison centres compared to the decrease in east centres is supportive of the anecdotal view that many located in the east had moved to west. This is explored in the next section destination.

**Playgroups**

Playgroups were asked about the number of children that had both left their playgroup and enrolled in their playgroup since the 22 February 2011 earthquakes up to 20 May 2011 (refer figure 7). They were asked not to include children who had left and returned at that point in time. All eight (8) playgroups responded to these questions.

All eight (8) Christchurch east playgroups reported families/whānau had left, with a total loss of 88 enrolments. This figure had been offset with a total gain of 58 new enrolments to 20 May 2011. The net loss of enrolments for playgroups is 30 enrolments or 34%. All but one playgroup reported taking new enrolments. This playgroup reported that most of their families/whānau had returned to the playgroup.
Destination of ‘lost’ enrolments

Centres and playgroups were asked to identify where the children who have left their services had gone. Seventy-three (73) of the open east-Christchurch centre enrolments responded to this question, eleven (11) of the comparison centres and all eight (8) playgroups. Figures (8, 9 and 10) illustrate the responses from these centres. These responses are indicative only as this question was frequently answered in an unclear or imprecise way.

Destination of ‘lost’ enrolments – open east-Christchurch centres

Open east-Christchurch centres believed that 196 (20.39%) children who had left their centre had enrolled in other Christchurch ECE services, indicating a migration of families/whānau across Christchurch. Forty-six (46) (4.78%) were thought to no longer be participating in ECE. Two hundred and eighty-one (281) (29.24%) were thought to have shifted to another town or city in New Zealand, while 78 (8.11%) were thought to have left the country. Centres were unsure or unclear about where the remaining 360 (37.46%) had gone.

Centres were also asked how many of these children are likely to return. The open east-Christchurch centres suggested that, overall, perhaps as many as 60 children are likely to return to their centres.

Destination of ‘lost’ enrolments – comparison centres

The comparison centres believed that nine (9) (18.75%) of the children to have left their centre had enrolled in other ECE services, indicating that the migration of families/whānau within Christchurch is not exclusive to east Christchurch families/whānau. Twenty (20) (41.66%) were thought to have moved to another town or city within New Zealand, while 10 (20.83%) were thought to be now living overseas. Proportionately the percentage of children thought to no longer be participating in ECE was higher for the comparison centres (13, 27.08%) than the east-Christchurch open centres (4.78%). The comparison centres appear more certain about where children and families/whānau had moved to, with only four (4) (8.33%) centres unsure or unclear about where children had gone. These centres suggested that six (6) children are likely to return to their centres.

Figure 8. Destination of lost enrolments from open east Christchurch centres (n=73)
Destination of lost enrolments – playgroups

All eight (8) playgroups reported that families/whānau had left the playgroup following 22 February. Some had moved away from the city while others moved within other areas of Christchurch. Respondents discussed how families/whānau had been affected by damage to their homes and stopped attending playgroups as a result. Others have been unable to be contacted because phones are no longer connected.

The following figure (10) illustrates the responses from playgroups. Responses are indicative only as this question was frequently answered in an unclear or imprecise way. Playgroups were less likely to know where their families/whānau had gone.

New enrolments

Centres and playgroups were asked to identify where new enrolments to their services had come from. Seventy-two (72) of the east-Christchurch open centre enrolments responded to this question, eleven (11) of the comparison centres and eight (8) playgroups. Figures (11, 12 and 13) illustrate the responses from these centres. These responses are indicative only as this question was frequently answered in an unclear or imprecise way.
Four hundred and ninety-seven (497) (63.88%) of open east-Christchurch centre new enrolments came from other Christchurch ECE services. Centres indicated that many of these enrolments were from closed centres, or that parents had moved their children from another centre because they wanted them to be closer to home or the parent’s workplace.

One hundred and seventy-five (175) new enrolments (22.49%) were children new to ECE, either from the centre waiting lists or from the local community. Some movement into Christchurch is evident, with 21 of the new enrolments (2.69%) being from families/whānau new to the city. Together, these enrolments (new to city and new to ECE/from waitlist) total 196 children. It is important to recognise this group represents a ‘new’ group of participants in ECE in open east-Christchurch centres rather than part of the migrating group of participants. If this group is withdrawn from the overall ‘gain’ in enrolments, this gain is reduced to 582, making the net loss of enrolments in these centres 379 or 39.43%.

These centres reported 18 (2.31%) children had returned after the 20 May 2011 timeframe set in the survey. Centres were unsure or did not respond to where 67 (6.61%) of the new enrolments came from.

**New enrolments – comparison centres**

Forty-five (45) (43.26%) of the comparison centre new enrolments came from other Christchurch ECE services. As in the case of east-Christchurch open centres, comparison centres indicated that many of these enrolments were from closed centres, or that parents had moved their children from another centre because they wanted them to be closer to home or the parent’s workplace.

Comparison centres also reported 34 (32.69%) were children new to ECE, either from the centre waiting lists or from the local community. A small number of enrolments - two (2) (1.92%) - came from families/whānau moving into Christchurch. Together, these enrolments (new to city and new to ECE/from waitlist) total 36 children. Again, this group represents a ‘new’ group of participants in ECE in the comparison centres rather than part of the migrating group of participants. If this group is withdrawn from the overall ‘gain’ in enrolments, this gain is reduced to 66, reducing the net gain of enrolments in these centres 18 (27.27%).

Comparison centres were unsure or did not respond to where five (5) (4.80%) of the new enrolments came from.
New enrolments – playgroups

Playgroup respondents reported that 58 new enrolments to playgroups have predominantly come from local and neighbouring areas. The suburbs where families/whānau had come from were listed as Woolston, Waltham, Barrington, Beckenham, Burwood, Hoon Hay, Bexley, and St Albans. Some of the new enrolments were for families/whānau who had been displaced by other playgroups closing, while other new enrolments were for either siblings of current children or family and friends. The data from playgroups was unable to be graphed as responses were vague and generalised.

Parents/whānau relocation/ECE movement

The data represented in this section is drawn from the 96 parent interviews, 43 from Christchurch east locations, and 53 from non-Christchurch east locations. Immediately following the earthquake, many families/whānau living in both Christchurch’s eastern and non-eastern suburbs reported moving home. Parents were asked where they had moved. Figure 13 show that families/whānau moved home to different locations. For example, away from home location, away from home location and returned, within their home location, or hadn’t moved (no change). The data also took note of any parent expressing the intention to move.
A total of 23 (52%) families/whānau in the eastern suburb group reported that they had moved home, compared to five (5) (9.4%) from the non-eastern group. Overall, six (6) out of 86 (7%) families had moved away from their original location, and only one (1) expressed intention to move.

Nine (9) of the 23 (39%) eastern families that had moved home said they had initially moved away from their home but had since returned to Christchurch’s eastern suburbs, and that this move had taken place more recently (as at 13 July 2011). A further eight (8) of the 23 (34.7%) eastern families/whānau had moved home within the eastern area. It is interesting to note that of the 23 eastern suburb parents who had moved, 17 (74%) remained in the general Christchurch east area. Reasons for choice of location that parents moved to was not asked in the interviews.

Four (4) of the five (5) (80%) parents in the non-eastern group who had moved home, remained in their home suburb. This data, alongside the data from the eastern suburb group, may suggest that families/whānau choose to live in familiar environments where they have established connections.

**Post quake movement in ECE**

Parents were asked if their children were currently attending ECE, and if they had changed the ECE centre their child attends since 22 February. The data is represented in figures 14 and 15 for the eastern and non-eastern groups.
Movement between ECE services has occurred across Christchurch following the 22 February earthquake, although to a greater degree for Christchurch east families/whānau than non-eastern families/whānau. The most frequent reasons eastern parents gave for choosing their new ECE service was that they had chosen a centre within closer proximity to home, school or work. Some parents from the eastern suburbs described how they had temporarily moved home and their child/ren did not attend ECE until returning to their damaged home or a new home. When returning home, or moving to something more long term, children did not return to their original ECE centre. A few Christchurch east parents reported that they had ‘lost their place’ at their original centre due to a prolonged absence when temporarily moving from their home.

Reasons for the movement of children in ECE in non-eastern suburbs (19%) included moving to a cheaper option, moving to a new location, and to a different ECE service (centre-based to home-based).

28% of Christchurch east and 38% of non-Christchurch east respondents had children who had never attended ECE. Reasons for non-attendance in ECE are explored in the next section of this report, ‘participation’.

\[Figure 15. Post quake movement in ECE - non-eastern group (n=53)\]

![Post quake movement in ECE - non-eastern group (n=53)](image)

Perspectives from organisations and community groups

All organisations and community groups described movement and displacement of families/whānau as a result of the 22 February earthquake.

**Families identified as no longer attending ECE**

A common trend reported was that families/whānau preferred to keep children at home. In one case this was described as ‘not getting education, just at home’.

Early Start reported 33 children on their lists as non-participating in ECE.

In some instances, numbers of children no longer participating in ECE as a result of the earthquake were given. For example:

- Five where childcare was no longer required.
- One withdrew due to not being able to settle.
- One withdrew due to payment problems.
• Three withdrew because they were too anxious.

**Families with preschool children who have left the area**

In general, all organisations are aware of the movement of a significant number of families/whānau. For example:

• Te Kōhanga Reo Trust reports that 40% of families/whānau have left the Christchurch East area.
• Early Start reports that 33 of 79 of their families/whānau have left Christchurch.
• Kindercare reports that approximately 150–200 families/whānau from across Christchurch have left.

**Ethnicity of families and whether they are to return**

All organisations reported families of multi-ethnicities left the area. Many reported Māori and Pasifika as making up a large number of those leaving the area. These families/whānau/aiga were described as moving to other cities throughout New Zealand to be with extended families/whānau. Families of other ethnicities were more likely to be described as leaving for their home country.

Overall, there is limited information about the expectation of families returning. As one described: ‘Some families had fled intending never to return. Some who had fled had the financial support grant to do so but are now stranded and cannot afford to return.’

**Families planning to leave the area**

The data suggested that the movement of families/whānau was continuing as at the end of June 2011. Many organisations talked of knowing someone who is planning to leave, including ECE staff. There was a strong indication that decisions about leaving the area will be influenced by the impending land announcement, for example, ‘*Once we know we’re gone!*’ Organisations reported the expectation for those skilled or professional to be the next group who may well leave the area.
The impact on ECE participation: enrolment and attendance

‘We are educators. What we do sets up the main highways for all future learning. .... Post earthquake we have not only provided education for our tamariki, we have provided a sense of security, normality, a return to routines and patterns. We have also provided education, strategies, support for their whānau. We have been the whānau support and resources. We are an important part of Christchurch’s recovery.’

- Christchurch east open centre

Comparison of 2010 and 2011 ECE participation data identifies trends in the overall loss and gains in ECE enrolments by exploring changes in ethnicity and age. Noticeable changes in participation, analysed by comparing 2010 and 2011 ECE enrolment statistics, include:

- Seventy-five (75) open east-Christchurch services experienced an overall 17.54% decline in enrolments in 2011. Over-two enrolments declined by 13%, and under-two enrolments by 4.5%.

- Thirteen (13) comparison services experienced a 21.2% overall growth in enrolments in 2011. Enrolments of under two year olds increased by 18.2%, while, for over two year olds, the growth was less significant with an increase of 2.9%.

- At the time of closure (22 Feb), comparison data for six (6) closed services indicated that these services had experienced a decline in over two enrolments in 2011, with 4.69% less than 2010. Under two year old enrolments had remained steady.

The decline in over two year old enrolments in east-Christchurch services, alongside the small increase in the comparison services, may be explained by the depopulation of Christchurch described earlier, where a total of 394 children were noted to have left Christchurch for other parts of New Zealand or overseas. However, there is a risk that numbers of over two year olds may remain in Christchurch and not participate in ECE. Parent/whānau and organisation/community group data point to a new barrier to participation, that of parents choosing to keep children at home as a result of anxiety and apprehension following the earthquakes.

The significant increase in under-two-year-old enrolments in the comparison services may be attributed to the increase in families/whānau remaining in Christchurch but moving away from Christchurch east locations.

**Impact on participation by Ethnicity**

Māori enrolments in ECE across Christchurch experienced significant decline, indicating a large loss of Māori population in Christchurch. Pasifika enrolments declined in Christchurch east, indicating a loss of Pasifika population in one side of Christchurch. The small increase in Pākehā/NZ European enrolments in comparison services, alongside the large decline in east-Christchurch services, aligns with the overall picture of Christchurch east depopulation. An interesting trend in all Christchurch services is the increase in the number of ‘other’ ethnicity enrolments, suggesting a changing ethnographic in Christchurch.

- Seventy-five (75) open east-Christchurch services experienced a decline in the numbers of Māori (19.79% decline), Pasifika (26.94% decline), and Pākehā/NZ European (11.04% decline) enrolments since 2010. Enrolments of ‘other’ ethnicities experienced a growth (38.50% increase).

- Thirteen (13) comparison services experienced a decline in the numbers of Māori (26.61% decline) enrolments since 2010. Enrolments increased for Pākehā/NZ European (7.19% increase) and ‘other’ ethnicities (70.69% increase). Pasifika enrolments remained steady in these comparison services.

- At the time of closure (22 Feb), enrolments in six (6) closed services showed that there had been a decline in the number of Pākehā/NZ European (7.09%), while Māori and Pasifika enrolments...
remained relatively steady. Like the open east and comparison services, the closed services had experienced a growth in enrolments of ‘other ethnicities’ (55.56% increase).

- Te Kohanga Reo Trust reported that 40% of their families/whānau had left Christchurch east. Organisations and community groups were aware that large numbers of Pasifika and Māori were represented in the number of families/whānau who have left Christchurch.

2010 comparison data was not available for playgroups. Current enrolled numbers in playgroups are Māori (13), Pasifika (2), and Other (22) and Pākehā/NZ European (217).

**Impact on ECE Attendance**

- Playgroups recorded a 61.3% reduction in attendance for the week 16–20 May.
- Eleven (11) closed services provided attendance data for the week 15–19 February, with a mean average of 10.97% absence rate. East Christchurch services recorded a mean average of 11.36% absence, and comparison services recorded a mean average of 14.90% absence for the week of 16–20 May.

While it is not possible to make judgments about whether the rate of absence for closed services was regular, it could indicate a rise in absences in Christchurch ECE services since the February quake when compared to the east-Christchurch and comparison services data for the week of 16–20 May. Playgroup data may indicate that as at 20 May, parents continued to be hesitant about attending ECE.

It is interesting to note that the majority of parents interviewed with children participating in ECE retained the same attendance hours since 22 February, although many had transferred to different ECE services. The number reducing their hours was similar to the number increasing their hours of attendance, so that overall, participation hours largely remain the same. Parent data is representational of those who stayed in Christchurch.

**Presenting the data – impact on enrolment and attendance**

Data associated with the issue of participation of children in early childhood education centres and the Ministry-funded playgroups by ethnicity and age (under-two-years and over-two-years) is presented in this section of the report. It includes data from parents/whānau and umbrella organisations, non-governmental organisations and Work and Income personnel.

**Changes in participation from comparison of 2010 and 2011 ECE service data**

All open east-Christchurch centres, comparison centres and playgroups were asked to present enrolment data by age and ethnicity across the week of 16–20 May 2011. Closed centres were asked to present enrolment data by age and ethnicity across the week prior to the February earthquakes, being the week 14–18 February 2011.

The data collected from ECE centre responses to this aspect of the scoping project survey was compared to the Ministry’s 2010 RS61 data. In some cases, there was no 2010 data provided by the Ministry due to the centre not being open in 2010 or the centre not submitting 2010 RS61 returns. These centres are not included in the data presented in this section of the report. Likewise, some centres did not respond to this part of the survey and have also not been included in this section. With these factors in mind the sample sizes for both east-Christchurch open and comparison centres vary.

The data is complicated further by the fact that often centres did not provide a full breakdown of ethnicities of enrolments, particularly in the case of 2010 data. Therefore the ethnicity data reflects the known ethnicities of enrolments and not the total number of enrolments in these centres.
In addition to the age and ethnicity data, all centres and playgroups were asked to provide enrolment and attendance data. Open east-Christchurch centres, comparison and playgroups, provided this data across the week of 16–20 May 2011. Closed centres were asked to provide the same across the week of 14–18 February 2011.

**Participation in centres 2010 and 2011 by ethnicity and age - open east-Christchurch centres**

Enrolment data for the week 16–20 May 2011 was collected from 80 open Christchurch East centres. These centres reported having 3694 children in total enrolled at this time. Seven hundred and thirty (730) (19.8%) were under two years, and 2964 (80.2%) were over two years. Figure 16 shows the known ethnicity by age of these enrolled children across this week.

![Figure 16. Ethnicity by age of enrolments in open east-Christchurch centres 16 - 20 May 2011 (n = 82 centres)](image)

**Ethnicity**

Data used to compare participation from the week 16–20 May 2011 against 2010 data, in terms of ethnicity and age of enrolments, could only be used from 75 centres (3465 enrolments) in this section of the report.

Figure 17 illustrates the ethnicity of these enrolments in the 75 open east-Christchurch centres in that week against the Ministry’s 2010 RS61 ethnicity data. As noted previously this data reflects the recorded ethnicity data and does not reflect the total number of children enrolled in these centres. Figure 18 shows the breakdown of these 2010/2011 enrolments in open east-Christchurch centres, in terms of decline/growth and percentage decline/growth in enrolments by ethnicity, as well as overall percentage split across both years.
These figures show the open east-Christchurch centres have experienced a decline in the numbers of Māori, Pasifika and NZ European enrolments in centres since 2010. Pasifika make up the greatest proportional decline with a 26.94% (73 less enrolments in 2011) decline in enrolments in the 75 centres represented in this aspect of the study, taking the overall proportion of enrolments by Pasifika down 1.24%, from 6.95% in 2010 to 5.71% in 2011.

Māori have also experienced a decline in enrolments with 131 less enrolments in 2011 than 2010, representing a 19.79% decline. Māori now make up 15.32% of enrolments in these centres, down from 16.98% in 2010 (overall proportional decline 1.66%). NZ European/Pākehā enrolments in east-Christchurch centres have also reduced by 306 since 2010, representing an 11.07% decline (down .04% overall proportional decline).

‘Other’ ethnicities are the only group to have experienced growth in enrolments in the 75 open east-Christchurch centre cohort. Enrolments for this group have risen to 277 in 2011, from 200 in 2010. This represents a 38.5% increase in enrolments, taking the overall proportion of enrolments to 7.99% up from 5.13%.

Figure 17. 2010/2011 enrolments by ethnicity in open east-Christchurch centres (n = 75 centres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Decline/growth</th>
<th>Decline/growth %</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>-131</td>
<td>-19.79%</td>
<td>16.98%</td>
<td>15.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-26.94%</td>
<td>6.95%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>2765</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>-306</td>
<td>-11.07%</td>
<td>70.93%</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3898</td>
<td>3465</td>
<td>-433</td>
<td>-19.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age

Of the 3465 enrolments in these centres, 634 (18.29%) were aged under two years and 2827 (81.58%) were aged over two years. Figure 19 illustrates the total enrolments by age (under 2s/over 2s) of open east-Christchurch centres in 2010/2011.

![Figure 19. 2010/2011 total enrolments by age of open east-Christchurch centres (n = 75 centres)](image)

Figure 20 shows the breakdown of these 2010/2011 enrolments in open east-Christchurch centres, in terms of decline and percentage decline in enrolments by age, as well as overall percentage split across both years.

These figures indicate the open east-Christchurch centres have experienced a 17.54% (453) decline in enrolments in 2011, from three thousand nine hundred and fourteen (3914) enrolments in 2010 to three thousand four hundred and sixty-one (3461) enrolments in 2011. Over two year old enrolments have declined by 423 (13.02%) in 2011 (total enrolled 3250), compared to total enrolments in 2010 (2827). The overall proportion of enrolments of over two year olds is down 1.36%, from 83.04% in 2010 to 81.68% in 2011.

Under two year old enrolments have also declined (-30) in open east-Christchurch centres, however this is proportionately lower than for over two year olds in these centres. In 2010 there were 664 total enrolments for this age group; in 2011 this figure is 634, a decline of 4.52%. The overall proportion of enrolments of over two year olds is down 1.36%, from 83.04% in 2010 to 81.68% in 2011.

![Figure 20. 201/2011 enrolments by age in open east-Christchurch centres (n= 75 centres)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Decline</th>
<th>Decline %</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2s</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>2827</td>
<td>-423</td>
<td>-13.02%</td>
<td>83.04%</td>
<td>81.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Participation in centres 2010 and 2011 by ethnicity and age – comparison centres

Enrolment data for the week 16–20 May 2011 was collected from 14 comparison centres. These centres reported having 869 children in total enrolled. One hundred and eighty (180) (20.70%) were under two years and six hundred and eighty-nine (689) or 79.28% were over two years old. Figure 21 shows the known ethnicity by age of enrolled children across this week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 2s</th>
<th>Over 2s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 2s</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3914</td>
<td>3461</td>
<td>-453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-4.52% 16.96% 18.32% 17.54%

Data used to compare participation over time (2010–2011), in terms of ethnicity and age of enrolments, could only be used from 13 centres in this section of the report.

Ethnicity

Figure 22 illustrates the ethnicity of enrolments in 13 comparison centres in that week against the Ministry’s 2010 RS61 ethnicity data.
Figure 23 shows the breakdown of these 2010/2011 enrolments in comparison centres, in terms of decline/growth and percentage decline/growth in enrolments by ethnicity, as well as overall percentage split across both years.

As in the east-Christchurch open sample, Māori enrolments have also declined in the comparison group. Of the 13 centres in this group, there were 34 less Māori enrolments in 2011 (75) compared to 2010 (109). This represents a 31.19% decline in enrolments for this ethnic group and an overall proportional decline of 4.88% (13.81% in 2010 to 8.93% in 2011).

The comparison group data shows growth in enrolments for Pākehā/NZ European by 7.19%. This ethnic group had 43 more enrolments in 2011, from 598 in 2010 to 641 in 2011. Pākehā/NZ European make up 76.31% of enrolments overall, up from 75.79% in 2010, representing a slight overall growth in enrolments of 0.52%.

Pasifika enrolments in these centres remained steady with one (1) additional enrolment in 2011 to 25 (from 24 in 2010) a rise of 4.17%. Despite this small gain in enrolments the proportion of Pasifika enrolments declined slightly overall (-0.06%) in this sample group, from 3.04% (2010) to 2.98% (2011).

As in the case of the open east-Christchurch centres, the greatest proportionate growth occurred in the ‘other’ ethnicities group. This group experienced a 70.69% growth with 41 new enrolments, with a total enrolment of 99 in 2011, compared to 58 in 2010. Overall ‘other’ ethnicities now make up 11.79% of total enrolments in these 14 centres, up from 7.35% in 2010, a 4.44% overall growth in enrolments.
Figure 23. 2010/2011 enrolments by ethnicity in comparison centres (n= 13 centres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Growth/Decline %</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-26.61%</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
<td>75.79%</td>
<td>76.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>70.69%</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>11.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

Of the 840 children who were enrolled in the 13 comparison centres across this week in May, 175 (20.83%) were aged under two and 665 (79.16%) were aged over two. Figure 24 illustrates the total enrolments by age (under 2s/over 2s) of the comparison centres in 2010/2011.

Figure 25 shows the breakdown of these 2010/2011 enrolments in comparison centres, in terms of growth and percentage growth in enrolments by age, as well as overall percentage split across both years.

These figures indicate the comparison centres have experienced a 21.18% (46) overall growth in enrolments in 2011 from seven hundred and ninety-four (794) in 2010, to eight hundred and forty (840) in 2011. Enrolments of under two year olds have increased by 27 (18.24%) in 2011 (total enrolled 175), compared to total enrolments in 2010 (148). The overall proportion of enrolments of under-two-year-olds is up 1.3%, from 19.6% in 2010 to 20.8% in 2011.

Over-two-year-old enrolments have also increased in comparison centres; however, this is proportionately lower than for under-two-year-olds in these centres. In 2010 there were six hundred and forty-six (646) total enrolments for this age group; in 2011 this figure is six hundred and sixty-five (665), a growth of 2.94%
(under two growth 18.24%). The overall proportion of enrolments of over two year olds is down 2.19% from 81.36% in 2010, to 79.17% in 2011.

**Figure 25. 2010/2011 enrolments by age in comparison centres (n= 13 centres)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Growth %</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under2s</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.24%</td>
<td>19.58%</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2s</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>81.36%</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation in centres 2010 and 2011 by ethnicity and age – closed centres**

Closed centres were asked to provide data on enrolments by age and ethnicity for the week 14–8 February 2011 (the week prior to the 22 February earthquakes) due to most of these centres closing from 22 February. Although this group of centres is relatively small, the statistics from these centres during this week provides a snap-shot of participation in east-Christchurch centres prior to the 22 February earthquakes.

Nine (9) centres provided data that showed a total of 531 children were enrolled in these centres. One hundred and sixteen (116) (21.84%) of these enrolments were under two year olds, and 415 (78.15%) over two year olds. Figure 26 illustrates the ethnicity by age (under- two-years/over-two-years) of these enrolments.

Although enrolment data was collected from nine (9) closed centres, comparative 2010 enrolment data was only available for six (6) of these centres or 458 enrolments. Data for the remaining closed services was unavailable due to incomplete surveys and/or these services being newly established (in the past two years) and therefore the Ministry’s 2010 RS61 data had not been collected.
Ethnicity

Figure 27 illustrates the 2010/2011 ethnicities of enrolments for these six (6) centres.

Figure 27. 2010/2011 enrolments by ethnicity in closed centres (n = 6 centres)

![Graph showing enrolments by ethnicity in closed centres](image)

These figures show the overall number of enrolments of Māori had remained steady at 57 enrolments in 2010 and 2011. However, given decline and growth in other ethnicities, the overall proportion of Māori in these centres had increased slightly (0.45%), from 12% in 2010 to 12.45% in 2011.

These closed centres had experienced a decline in the numbers of Pākehā/NZ European enrolments in their centres since 2010. Twenty-eight (28) (7.09%) less Pākehā/NZ European were participating in these centres in 2010 (395) compared to 2011 (367).

Pasifika enrolments experienced a growth of 20%, however, this growth only equates to one (1) more enrolment, given the number of Pasifika was six (6) in 2011, compared to five (5) in 2010. The overall proportion of enrolments by Pasifika was up 0.26%, from 1.05% in 2010 to 1.31% in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Growth/Decline</th>
<th>Growth/Decline %</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>12.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasifika</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā/NZ European</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-7.09%</td>
<td>83.16%</td>
<td>80.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>6.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>475</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>68.47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures show the overall number of enrolments of Māori had remained steady at 57 enrolments in 2010 and 2011. However, given decline and growth in other ethnicities, the overall proportion of Māori in these centres had increased slightly (0.45%), from 12% in 2010 to 12.45% in 2011.

These closed centres had experienced a decline in the numbers of Pākehā/NZ European enrolments in their centres since 2010. Twenty-eight (28) (7.09%) less Pākehā/NZ European were participating in these centres in 2010 (395) compared to 2011 (367).

Pasifika enrolments experienced a growth of 20%, however, this growth only equates to one (1) more enrolment, given the number of Pasifika was six (6) in 2011, compared to five (5) in 2010. The overall proportion of enrolments by Pasifika was up 0.26%, from 1.05% in 2010 to 1.31% in 2011.
As in the open east-Christchurch and comparison centres, ‘other’ ethnicities had experienced growth in enrolments in the closed centres too. Enrolments for this group have risen to 28 in 2011 from 18 in 2010. This represents a 55.56% increase in enrolments, taking the overall proportion of enrolments up 2.32% to 6.11% in 2011 from 3.79% in 2010.

Age

Of the 458 children enrolled in the six (6) closed centres with 2010/2011 data across this week of 14-18 February 2011, 72 (15.7%) were aged under two and 386 (84.3%) were aged over two. Figure 29 illustrates the total enrolments by age (under 2s/over 2s) of the closed centres in 2010/2011.

Figure 29. 2010/2011 total enrolments of closed centres (n = 6 centres)

![Graph showing enrolments by age]

Figure 30 shows the breakdown of these 2010/2011 enrolments in closed centres, in terms of growth and percentage growth in enrolments by age, as well as overall percentage split across both years.

These figures indicate the closed centres had experienced a decline in over two year old enrolments in 2011. Three hundred and eighty-six (386) over two year olds were participating in these centres before they closed in 2011, 19 (4.69%) less than in 2010 when 405 were enrolled. The overall proportion of enrolments of over two year olds had declined slightly by 0.63% in these centres, from 84.91% in 2010 to 84.28% in 2011.

Under two-year-old enrolments remain steady at 72, with no overall change in enrolments from 2010 to 2011. The overall proportion of enrolments of under two year olds had experienced a slight increase (0.63%) due to decline of over two year old enrolments in this group of centres, taking the overall percentage to 15.72% in 2011 up from 15.09% in 2010.
Regular enrolments and attendance – open centres

Regular roll enrolment and regular attendance data for the week 16–20 May 2011 was collected from 79 open east-Christchurch centres. Figure 31 illustrates the regular enrolments against regular attendance and absences/absence percentages for these centres across that week.

Figure 31. Regular enrolments and regular attendance for open east-Christchurch centres week 16-20 May 2011 (n = 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Monday 16.5.11</th>
<th>Tuesday 17.5.11</th>
<th>Wednesday 18.5.11</th>
<th>Thursday 19.5.11</th>
<th>Friday 20.5.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular enrolments</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>2540</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>2356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Attendance</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences %</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>12.53%</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
<td>11.60%</td>
<td>13.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absences ranged between 10.45% and 13.15% per day across these five days, with the average being 11.81%. The average number of absences per day across the week was 288. Without comparative weekly data from these centres it is not possible to make judgments about whether this rate of absences is regular, however, it would seem important to explore the issue of regular attendance in open east-Christchurch centres further.

Regular enrolments and attendance – comparison centres

Regular roll enrolment and regular attendance data for the week 16–20 May 2011 was also collected from 14 comparison Christchurch centres. Figure 32 shows the regular enrolments against regular attendance and absences/absence percentages for these comparison centres across that week.
Figure 32. Regular enrolments and regular attendance for comparison centres week 16-20 May 2011 (n = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday 16.5.11</th>
<th>Tuesday 17.5.11</th>
<th>Wednesday 18.5.11</th>
<th>Thursday 19.5.11</th>
<th>Friday 20.5.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular enrolments</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular attendance</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences %</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>12.75%</td>
<td>13.29%</td>
<td>21.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of absence rates in comparison centres were slightly higher than open east-Christchurch centres. Absences ranged in the comparison centre between 12.75% and 21.03% per day across these five days, with an average of 15.35%. The average number of absences per day across the week was 91. Without comparative weekly data from these centres it is not possible to make judgments about whether this rate of absences is regular. It would seem important to explore the issue of regular attendance in ECE centres across Christchurch further.

Regular enrolments and attendance – closed centres

Regular roll enrolment and regular attendance data for the week 14–18 February 2011 was collected from 11 closed centres. Figure 33 shows the regular enrolments against regular attendance and absences/absence percentages for these closed centres across that week.

Figure 33. Regular enrolments and regular attendance for closed Christchurch east centres week 14-18 Feb 2011 (n = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday 14.2.11</th>
<th>Tuesday 15.2.11</th>
<th>Wednesday 16.2.11</th>
<th>Thursday 17.2.11</th>
<th>Friday 18.2.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular enrolments</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular attendance</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences %</td>
<td>11.37%</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of absence rates in closed centres ranged between 7.63% and 13.18% per day across these five days. The average percentage of absences was the lowest of the three groups of centres at 10.32%. The average number of absences per day across the week was 32. Without comparative weekly data from these centres it is not possible to make judgments about whether this rate of absences was regular; however, these figures, when compared to the other two groups of open ECE centres, could indicate a slight rise in absences in Christchurch ECE centres since the February earthquakes.
Participation in playgroups

Playgroups were asked to provide data on regular enrolments and regular attendance for the week 16–20 May 2011. Seven (7) of the eight (8) playgroups provided this data. One of the playgroups was closed and therefore registered zero (0) attendance for the one session scheduled that week. 253 children were enrolled in the seven (7) playgroups during the week, with 98 attending sessions and 155 children absent (refer to figure 34).

![Figure 34. Overall playgroup enrolment against attendance and absences 16 – 20 May, 2011 (n=7)](image)

The seven (7) playgroups recorded a reduction in attendance at the total of nine sessions held across the week, with an average attendance of 38.7% of regular enrolled numbers. The average provided here is affected by the fact that six (6) of the seven (7) playgroups held one session during the week 16-20 May and reported very low attendance, while the remaining playgroup held 3 sessions with very high attendance (i.e. only 2 absent).

Age/ Ethnicity

Of the total of 253 children enrolled in the seven (7) playgroups during the week 16–20 May 2011, 75 (29.5%) children were under two years of age, and 178 (70.5%) over two years. Figure 35 illustrates the ethnicity and age (under-two-years/over-two-years) of these enrolments.
NZ Pakeha represents the predominant group of playgroup participants. Māori and Pasifika families/wānau/aiga are represented in very low numbers, with other ethnicities slightly higher.

Parent/whānau perspectives on participation in ECE.

Sixty-four (64 or 67%) of ninety-six (96) parents interviewed reported that they had a child or children attending early childhood. These parents were asked if they had changed their child's hours of participation since 22 February.

Parent post quake changes to attendance hours

Figure 36 ‘Post quake change to attendance’ shows that the majority of parents reported that they had kept participation hours the same.

Equal numbers had reduced hours as those who had increased hours, which would suggest that participation hours in playgroups, overall, have not been significantly affected.
Impact on ECE capacity

‘Our rolls remained stable after September 2010 however, after Feb. 22nd, we were closed for five weeks and our rolls dropped by approximately 15%.’

- Christchurch east open centre

Christchurch east ECE capacity was reduced for an extended period of time immediately following the February earthquake with 14 ECE services either closed or on suspended licence. Four of these services remained closed as at the time of writing this report. A total of 458 children were enrolled in six (6) of these services at the time of closure. Seventy-two (72) of these were under two year olds, and 386 were over two years. The actual number of lost ECE license numbers due to closed/suspended ECE services in Christchurch east was greater than 458.

Spare capacity in ECE services across Christchurch has increased. In spite of the closure of 14 east ECE services, and the resulting re-enrolment of many children in alternative east ECE services, Christchurch east has more capacity than services in other parts of the city. The following statistics illustrate the difference in increased capacity between Christchurch east and comparison services.

- 51.21% increase from 2010 to 2011 in the number of Christchurch east services with spaces available. Available spaces are not necessarily full-time or full day spaces.
- 33.33% increase from 2010 to 2011 in the number of comparison group services with spaces available.

Increased capacity is also noticeable in waiting time statistics.

- 40% increase from 2010 to 2011 in centres with no waiting times for children wanting to start ECE in Christchurch east services.
- 20% increase from 2010 to 2011 in centres with no waiting times for children wanting to start ECE in the comparison group of services.

Overall, the waiting time for children under two years has significantly reduced in both Christchurch east and comparison services, indicating that there is less demand on under two placements in ECE at present. Over two year olds are experiencing a longer wait time to start ECE in comparison services than in Christchurch east. Even although spaces are available, they are not necessarily at suitable times/days.

Presenting the data – ECE capacity

This section of the report illustrates and discusses data associated with the capacity of ECE centres and playgroups to accept new children according to age (under two years and over two years).

ECE services were asked to indicate the number of spaces they had available for under two year olds and over two year olds. Centres responded to this question in several ways. Some only recorded full day spaces while others recorded available half-days, depending on how they interpreted the question, or according to the operation of their centre. Therefore, it is best to interpret the data reported below as indicative.

Available spaces

Open east-Christchurch centres

Eighty-two (82) (100%) open centres provided data on the number of spaces available in their centres for under two year olds and over two year olds in 2011. This indicates a 51.21 % increase in the number of
centres who have spaces available in this group of centres. In 2010, only 40 of these centres had indicated they had capacity to accept new enrolments; 37 centres had spaces for under two year olds; only three (3) centres had spaces available for over two year olds.

While many centres are licensed for both under two year olds and over twos, 43 of these centres are licensed for under two year olds and 65 for over twos.

Figure 43 illustrates the number of spaces available for each day of the week in open east-Christchurch centres. Figure 44 illustrates the total number of spaces available for each day of the week in these centres. These figures show a total of 3181.5 spaces available across the week, with 918 spaces available for under two year olds, and 2263.5 for over two year olds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Under 2s</th>
<th>Over 2s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>201.5</td>
<td>536.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>174.5</td>
<td>418.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>176.5</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>474.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total spaces | 918 | 2263.5 | 3181.5 |

Comparison centres

Twelve (12) (85.71%) of the 14 comparison centres provided data on the number of spaces available in their centres for under two year olds and over two year olds in 2011. In 2010, only eight (8) of these centres indicated spaces were available in their centres, therefore, there has been a 33.33% increase in the number of centres who indicated they had spaces available in their centres in 2011. In 2010, all of these spaces were for over two year olds, with no spaces available for under two year olds.

While many centres are licensed for both under two year olds and over twos, nine (9) of these centres were licensed for under two year olds, and 10 for over twos.

Figure 45 illustrates the number of spaces available for each day of the week in comparison centres. Figure 46 illustrates the total number of spaces available for each day of the week in these centres. These figures
show a total of 187 spaces available across the week, with 40 spaces available for under two year olds, and 147 for over twos.

![Figure 45. Number of spaces available in comparison centres (n = 12)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 2s</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2s</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spaces</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waiting times**

Centres were asked to indicate how long under two year olds and over two year olds wanting to start at their centre would have to wait. Comparative 2010 data was not available for all centres, therefore, only those where 2010 and 2011 data was available are included.

**Open east-Christchurch centres**

Data from 67 of the 82 centres who provided data on the waiting times in their centres, for under two year olds and over two year olds, is used in this section on the report. Figure 47 illustrates the total waiting times for these centres in 2010. This can be compared with figure 49, which illustrates the 2011 waiting times for open east-Christchurch centres.

Figure 48 shows the 2010 waiting times for open east-Christchurch centres, and figure 50 shows the total waiting times for these centres in 2011 by age and total.
In 2010, 42 centres indicated there was no waiting time for a child wanting to start in their centre for both under two year olds and over two year olds. In 2011 this number had increased to 70, a 40% increase in centres with no waiting times. It is interesting to note that the proportion of centres with no waiting times for over two year olds is now higher than those with no waiting times for under twos.

Waiting times for over two children were disbursed relatively evenly across the other categories in 2010; however, these are more orientated towards the no waiting time, or shorter waiting times in 2011.

In 2010, 49.06% of waiting times for under-two-year-olds were between no waiting time and 1 month or less; however, in 2011, 68.33% of waiting times fell into these categories for this age group.
Comparison centres

Data from 12 of the 14 centres who provided data on the waiting times in their centres, for under two year olds and over two year olds, was used in this section on the report. Figure 51 illustrates the total waiting times for these centres in 2010. This can be compared with figure 53, which illustrates the 2011 waiting times for comparison centres.

Figure 52 shows the 2010 waiting times for comparison centres, and figure 54 shows the total waiting times for these centres in 2011 by age and total.
In 2010, six (6) of the 12 centres in this group indicated there was no waiting time for a child wanting to start in their centre for both under-two-year-olds and over-two-year-olds. In 2011 this number had increased to eight (8), a 25% increase in centres with no waiting times. It is interesting to note that the proportion of centres with no waiting times for under-two-year-olds is now higher than those with no waiting times for over-twos, the opposite of the situation in open east-Christchurch centres.
Waiting times for under two children in comparison centres had a relatively even distribution across categories in 2010, waiting times for over twos were more mixed in distribution.

In 2011, over two year old waiting times are more evenly distributed, however, under two year old waiting times have shortened with 81.81% of waiting times for over two year olds falling into the ‘no waiting time’ and ‘less than one month’ categories compared to 47.37% of waiting times falling into these categories in 2010.

### Figure 53. 2011 waiting times for comparison centres (n = 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Under 2s</th>
<th>Over 2s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No waiting time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mth or less</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 mth and up to 3 mths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 mths and up to 6 mths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 mths and up to 12 mths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12 mths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 54. Total 2011 waiting times for comparison centres (n = 67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Under 2s</th>
<th>Over 2s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No waiting time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mth or less</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 mth and up to 3 mths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 mths and up to 6 mths</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 mths and up to 12 mths</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12 mths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Barriers and solutions to ECE participation

‘It’s costly to attend now than preschool was. Ideally I want [child] to be with children who go to the same school but not knowing where families will move to means this is not certain now.’
- Christchurch east parent

‘I don’t want him to slip through the system. I don’t want him to end up like his father. How am I going to find that money? What will I have to go without?’
- Christchurch east parent

Parents/whānau, organisations and community groups identified potential solutions to overcome the new complexity of barriers to ECE participation in Christchurch caused by the impact of 22 February.

**Parent/whānau perspective**

Parents readily identified barriers to participation, including reasons such as: child too young; choose not to; fees/costs; alternative care option chosen; and difficulty with ECE access/choice. The impact of earthquakes was evident in parent/whānau reasons for choosing not to use ECE. Concerns were voiced about leaving children, or the child being apprehensive about being separated from the parent. In some cases, loss of income/work has resulted in withdrawing the child from ECE. Parents/whānau suggested ECE participation could be made easier by:

- Making ECE attendance more affordable
- Improving community responsiveness in ECE settings
- Providing accessible information about ECE e.g. locations, enrolment procedures, value of ECE
- Improving the subsidy application process

The need to raise the public profile about the value of ECE for children is supported by the fact that 17% of parents interviewed rated the importance of ECE as average to very low. 83% of parents rated the importance of ECE as very high or high, identifying socialisation (first) and education (second) as the two most frequently rated benefits.

**Organisation/community group perspectives**

Organisations and community groups provided insight on barriers to ECE participation, both before and after 22 February. Barriers to participation identified as present prior to 22 February – cost; funding rules; Work and Income’s processes; access to ECE centres; transport/weather; ECE profile; personal circumstances – were compounded after 22 February, with new barriers identified including: family displacement; social/emotional wellbeing; parent access to child; living conditions; work-related changes; ECE locations; and uncertainty about the future.

**Presenting the data – barriers and solutions**

**Why some children go to ECE and some children don’t: Parent perspectives**

In total, 32 (33%) parents surveyed reported their child did not attend an early childhood education service. The fact that the majority of the data was gathered from parents accompanying preschool children during the day at a local shopping mall may have resulted in the likelihood that the children did not participate in early childhood education. However, 66% of those surveyed did participate. There was no discernible
difference in participation statistics between eastern and non-eastern suburb families/whānau as illustrated in figure 37.

The reasons given by the parents of non-ECE participating children for why they do not attend early childhood are summarised in figure 38. It is of interest that parents from both eastern and non-eastern suburbs described similar reasons for non-attendance, and that many of these reasons are not as a direct result of the earthquakes.

Figure 38 lists responses from eastern and non-eastern parents separately. It can be seen that eastern suburb parents provided a fuller list of earthquake related reasons, however, the non-eastern suburb parents also described how the earthquake has affected ECE attendance. This data suggests that there has been a negative impact on participation in ECE across all of Christchurch as a result of the earthquake.

Figure 38. Reasons why non-attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern suburbs</th>
<th>Non-eastern suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too young</td>
<td>Too young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose not to</td>
<td>Choose not to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees /cost</td>
<td>Fees /cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal perspective</strong></td>
<td><strong>ECE not for under three year olds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that child should stay at home with mum for first three years then look at home-based option</td>
<td>Can teach at home so don’t need to. May go when needing friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is better to be at home with mum for first three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Alternative option chosen** | **Enjoy having child with me**  
Wouldn’t want to leave a child at ECE – only if I was there too |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grandparent/extended family - if Grandparent not available then child would go to ECE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Access to ECE /choice** | Location – wanting somewhere close to home/work but not available  
Service choice not available (until three years)  
No vacancy at ECE of choice |
| **Service choice is not available since moving, no vacancy in new location and children don’t want to leave me anyway** | |
| **Lack of information about ECE** | Recently moved to city and didn’t know how to enrol, too hard and too much effort  
Parent not knowing services available |
| **Not really aware of ECE options/ locations** | |
| **Child in CYFs care with Grandmother – Grandparent doesn’t know what to look at, plus fees/costs** | |
| **Quake related reasons:** | Child’s anxiety, not keen for mum to leave  
It is important for child but just too worried at the moment  
Don’t like having child out of sight during risk of earthquake  
Child at preschool during quake and now panics so parent needs to stay with child  
Was going to enrol but earthquake interrupted things |
| **Too hard in current situation** | |
| **Don’t want to be away from them, it’s too scary.** | |
| **Too hard/too much effort** | |
| **Child apprehensive about attending – ‘they get sore tummies a lot’** | |
| **Change in teaching staff is affecting parents trust in the new team of teachers** | |
| **Jobs have gone – was working at 6am, can’t afford ECE** | |
| **Mother lost job and doesn’t feel safe leaving child in centre** | |
| **Oldest child in Grandparent care, younger child too young (6 weeks)** | |
| **Living conditions for first 6 weeks meant non-attendance – e.g. no heating** | |
| **Don’t want child at ECE in case anything happens, the father sneaks her to ECE now & again** | |
| **Changed mind about going back to work due to fear of** | |
Parent concerns about leaving children at ECE

The impact of the 22 February earthquake on parent and child is evident in the frequency of parents voicing concerns about being separated from their child/ren. The following parent quote is representative of many conversations had with parents.

‘I’ve had enough of earthquakes now though. E not too upset unless there’s a big one. He slept with me last night. I worry about what E is doing when I’m not with him. I’m doing Ok. Home alone is scary, I feel safer with others around who are going through the same thing. I’m unsure of being in the malls and more aware of dangerous situations. House hunting is stressful too.’

The earthquake impact was not the only reason described by parents for why they do not leave their child in ECE settings. The following two parent statements indicate that the ECE sector has some responsibility for non-participation in ECE.

‘We choose not to attend just now. We think there are too many children for the number of teachers in centres. When I (Mum) had worked in preschools previously there are too many babies for each teacher. I think that babies are neglected in preschools. They are put down and left to cry or entertain themselves.’

‘When we had tried preschool previously we did not feel supported in our parenting choices, for example, we wanted to have her not use a pacifier unless she was going to bed. We often arrived and found her with it in her mouth, and it was not sleep time. Didn’t feel they respected us.’

Parent perspectives on the importance of ECE

The profile of how ECE is valued by parents was explored by asking parents to rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, how important it is to have their child attend ECE, and to identify their reasons. Figure 39 illustrates that 50% of those interviewed rated ECE importance as very high, with a further 33% rating it as high. 17% rated ECE attendance as ‘moderate’ to ‘very low’ in importance. This suggests that there is a group of parents who could be targeted in future the Ministry’s ECE participation projects.
This data was checked to see whether there was a discernible difference in parents’ perspectives on the importance of ECE between eastern and non-eastern suburb groups of parents. Both sets of data revealed that 81% of parents surveyed from each group had rated ECE importance as very high or high. This finding suggests that the majority of families/whānau currently living in Eastern suburbs are likely to want to have their children attend ECE and, if their children are not currently attending ECE, the adverse effects of the 22 February quake may be impeding their ability to do so.

**Benefits of ECE**

Parents were asked to identify what they consider the benefits of ECE participation to be. Parents who had rated the value of ECE participation as ‘very low’ or ‘low’ had not contributed to this data. Figure 40, ‘Benefits of ECE’ represents what parents consider to be the benefits for their child in attending ECE.

Parents of children participating in ECE confidently articulated benefits for their children, with socialisation and education identified as the main ones. This insight suggests that recognising the benefits of ECE participation is an experiential outcome for parents, and raises a dilemma in terms of encouraging parents of non-ECE participating children to enrol.

**What would make attendance at ECE easier?**

Twenty-two (22) parents interviewed, who identified as having children who did not attend ECE, were asked to describe what would make it easier for them so their child could attend ECE. Gaining this information from parents, as consumers of ECE, adds impetus to pursuing the recovery strategies and recommendations put forward in this report.

**Funding**

- Payment (subsidy) for casual attendance.
- Funding for under twos at Playcentre.
- Lower income criteria for ECE subsidy, (*am in middle income bracket and don’t meet criteria for subsidy*).
• Subsidy (20 hrs ECE) for under three year olds.

**ECE Improvements**

• Communication from ECE centre – use internet/phone calls.
• Improved adult child ratios.
• Attention to parent expectations

**Location of ECE**

• Location - near schools, workplaces, homes.
• More choice of ECE in Woolston.
• Access to child in emergency, for example, child on same side of river to parent.
• Reassurance that child will be safe.

**Information**

• Information about holiday/after school programmes for preschool children and subsidy for attendance.
• Information about choices and locations.

**Organisations and community groups perspectives**

Organisations and community groups were asked for their perspective on participation in ECE, both before and after February 2011. Responses were diverse. ECE umbrella groups provided data specific to their organisation; community groups offered subjective viewpoints; while those organisations working directly with young families/whānau, were able to provide information about non-attendance as many of their clientele fell into this category.

The picture of ECE non-attendance prior to February 2011 was unclear, so this section focuses on the identified barriers and solutions to ECE participation offered by the organisations and community groups.

*Barriers and solutions to participation before Feb 2011*

Responses to the questions about what organisations and community groups believed were the barriers and solutions to ECE participation are collated in figure 41. The common themes of: cost, funding rules, Work and Income’s Childcare Subsidy process, visibility/access of ECE centres, transport/weather, ECE profile/social perceptions and personal circumstances are used to organise the data, with a range of comments alongside to illustrate the issues and suggestions.

The Ministry’s Aranui Pasifika project consultation report provided a perspective on barriers and solutions to Pasifika children’s participation in ECE gathered from Pasifika community groups located in Christchurch east. These mirrored many of the reasons given by the non-government organisations and community groups included in the scoping project. The reasons and solutions drawn from the Aranui Pasifika report mainly related to existing barriers and solutions to ECE participation rather than those that occurred as a result of 22 February. These are included in the following tables and identifiable by the reference APP.

*Figure 41. Pre 22 February barriers and solutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cost | Fees (most need ELP top up)  
No ECE $s for under three year olds  
Charges over top of 20 hrs ECE. e.g. paying for a swipe card  
Fees were seen as a major barrier to already struggling Pasifika families (APP) | Remove the 6hr cap in the 20hr subsidy provision – relax the rules around this to allow for 15 mins drop off, pick up  
Cap hourly rate/fees  
Increase subsidies and raise income threshold for eligibility  
Include 2-3 year olds in 20 hrs ECE policy – not including under 3 year olds provides a message to parents that ECE is not important for this age group |
|---|---|
| Funding rules | Nine hours not enough but that’s all they can afford, so they don’t bother. By the time they transport to and from, the time has been used  
Restructuring of kindergartens – cheaper to attend ½ days now facing full day costs  
6 hr a day cap | Introduce discretionary funding to enable ECE to withdraw additional fees/late fees etc in individual circumstances. Especially when families are working with support agencies |
| Work and Income’s Childcare Subsidy process | Transient families – time it takes to complete the process of application for subsidy, Work and Income – becomes too hard. Can take up to one month  
Too many forms and having to deal with so many different people  
Can’t complete forms at the ECE service | Make Work and Income process easier – ‘we don’t enrol in school like this so why in ECE?’  
ECE centres to be able to support parents with this process, to introduce a system of pre-approval for Work and Income subsidy before families begin to explore their ECE options (e.g. similar to mortgage pre-approvals)  
Ensure every ECE service has current knowledge of the Work and Income process and eligibility criteria |
| Visibility/access of ECE centres | ECE centres are not easy to find  
Parents need support to select an appropriate service. They don’t always understand the diversity of services  
Parental lack of routine or motivation  
Restrictions on signage where centres are off main road locations  
Location of ECE is problematic if the preferred local ECE has a waiting list. This demands travel | Leaflet drops  
Address resource consent signage restrictions with Council  
Locate ECE on school site so there is one drop off point for parents |
| **Transport/weather** | Difficulties e.g. using bus, walking longer distances  
Lack of motivation | Provide free bus fares for adults accompanying children to and from preschool  
Provide ECE vans to pick up and drop off  
Transport bus to pick up children - carpooling to ECE centres |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **ECE profile and social perceptions** | Mixed messages – on the one hand, parents hear how beneficial ECE can be, but on the other, hear that 80% trained teachers is sufficient. Where benefits of ECE are not valued, parents don’t prioritise $s for this  
Many young Pasifika parents do not value ECE. Many parents did not attend ECE in the Islands so therefore it is not considered important. (APP)  
Lack of information about late fees/absences results in loosing space and need to wait for available place  
Lack of awareness of the benefits of ECE to children (APP)  
Being ‘told off’ when late to pick up, resulting in payment of late fees, embarrassment can mean they don’t return  
Parents own negative experience of schooling  
Having to make lunches and have them as ‘full’ as other children’s lunches is an added pressure (APP)  
Perception of 2nd & 3rd NZ born Pasifika parents of A’oga Amata as inferior in quality to regular ECE services. i.e. Staff are not trained like Palagi centres (APP) | Improve customer relations between ECE centres and parents/whānau  
Phone manner of staff  
Understanding of different circumstances and lives  
Offer additional support to assist parents to gain clear knowledge and understanding about the uniqueness of the service so they can make an informed decision about what is best for individual/whānau needs  
Provide clear information about the service, costs, fees, and rules  
Strengthen collaboration between ECE settings and other organisations working with young families e.g. Early Start, PAFT, Waipuna, Before 5, Shirley Hub, Te Puawaitanga ki Otautahi Trust  
Develop an outreach model where community/whānau is brought together with ECE as a part of social services for families/whānau  
Educate Pasifika Ministers to update and upskill them to promote ECE benefits (APP)  
Promote educational awareness around ECE benefits with parents. Playgroups are a good starting point. (APA)  
Support the establishment of more playgroups (APP) |
| **Personal circumstances** | Family pressure not to send child to ECE e.g. abuse situations  
When families apply to Work and Income, they come to the | As above – a one stop shop  
Establish community hubs (a village approach) where parents can access a range of services and parenting resources |
attention of welfare agencies and then scampers again
Parental mental health e.g. disorganised
Child sickness – limits parent availability for work and adds financial burden e.g. no leave left and ECE late fees
Literacy level of parents where so many forms need to be completed before starting ECE
Parents prefer to stay at home, particularly for their baby’s first year (APP)

including playgroups, ECE service, Govt agencies and community groups. (APP)
Introduce a support system for families – a professional who can work with parents to make informed decisions supported with training, Professional development, mentoring programmes
Provide advisory agency – e.g. Plunket – a person who can sit alongside parents and give support and advice
ECE centres (teachers and environments) need to meet the cultural needs of parents/families/whānau
Improve health nurse services – access, availability
Work together to overcome suspicions of Government agencies

**Barriers and solutions to participation post Feb 2011**

The barriers and solutions to ECE participation post 22 February 2011 as described by organisations and community groups, were seen to be additional to the earlier responses (presented in figure 42). Interviewees stated that the first set of barriers and solutions remain relevant, however, they have been compounded by the effects of the 22 February earthquake. This is visible in the additional themes of family displacement, social/emotional wellbeing, access to childcare, work related changes, living conditions, ECE centre locations, and uncertainty about the future.

**Figure 42. Post 22 February 2011 barriers and solutions to ECE participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>One car or no car per working parent</td>
<td>ECE services may need to coordinate carpooling, provide support to parents to identify the best way to access service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus route changes - trips take a long time due to re-routing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distrust of bridges – will not cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harder travelling to ECE settings as well as school when located at a distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family displacement</strong></td>
<td>Families not sure how long they will be displaced so not enrolling in ECE or with Drs in the meantime</td>
<td>Offer casual attendance options where families can attend on days to suit and stay with their child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not staying in one place for long enough – there is constant movement as families ‘outstay’ their welcome with relatives</td>
<td>Use discretion around fee charges – i.e. EC put discretionary funding to use in these circumstance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities have changed with less community knowledge about location and type of ECE services available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing ECE centres - children’s friendships interrupted and less inclined to settle in new unfamiliar environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of available spaces in some ECE centres where families have relocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing NZ families have been evicted at short notice from ‘munted’ housing. Families now transient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-establish community support networks e.g. family rooms in centres where families can stay longer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators may need to spend more time with families and children who are transitioning to ensure they settle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/ emotional wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental anxiety – know ECE is not compulsory so keeping children at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children fearful of quake re-occurrence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult illness making it too hard to take children to and from ECE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for emergence of concerning behaviours (children) – how well are our ECEs equipped to handle this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE to provide reassurance to parents – explain emergency procedures; don’t leave it to the children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build relationships and connections between families by providing social groups such as coffee playgroups, music group, gym time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE to have information about local support agencies etc so they can link these with parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer parent/education session around how to handle anxiety – Nigel Latta as an example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer parents forums on quake related recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide PD for ECE teachers to equip them to support parents/children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-establish old style ECE home visits to help build trusting relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore ways of building partnerships and making connections with various support groups within communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate a family support worker attached to each ECE service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the Ministry’s Welfare Support team to support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing ECE service is located some distance from parents residence or work – parents concerned about how to get to their child in an emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school siblings unable to continue dropping off, or picking up, preschool child as they are now ‘school site sharing’ away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-enrol at closer ECE service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication between ECE and families to contribute toward parental confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome parents to stay with their child at ECE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living conditions</strong></td>
<td>from locality with change to school attendance hours</td>
<td>Teachers share their ‘what if’ strategies with their community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Portaloos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No water, heating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of warm clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every day living takes longer to do. Families have had to stay in the house where they experienced the quake, ‘basic functioning is affecting everything else’

Basic living needs. ECE is low on Pasifika families’ priority when they are struggling to have adequate housing and good health. (APP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Work related changes</strong></th>
<th>Loss of employment - can no longer afford ECE fees</th>
<th>Work and Income to work with ECE to reduce barriers to participation for families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace relocation - parents working from home so easier to keep child at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ECE centre relocations</strong></th>
<th>Increased distance to travel to relocated centre</th>
<th>Keep familiar teachers together with children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote ECE through static displays in local Govt and community agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Uncertainty about future</strong></th>
<th>Difficult making longer term decisions about ECE until land settlements have been made</th>
<th>Decisions need to be made around where new facilities will be – e.g. business hub, schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business sector needs to consider how communities feel, and where the family’s workplaces, schools, ECE centres, and parks are in relation to each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The post February 2011 solutions discussed by organisations and community groups provide valuable insights into practical strategies for supporting the recovery of ECE in Christchurch east. These insights are reflected in the recommendations of the report.

**Reducing ECE participation barriers**

Contributors to this scoping project frequently expressed a desire for a collaborative and coordinated approach to planning for future ECE provision and relocation of ECE services in Christchurch. Representation of ECE umbrella groups, community organisations, ECE centre governance and management, teachers/educators, and parents/whānau has potential to enrich the current collaboration between CERA and the Ministry.
Many scoping project contributors expressed a desire for those planning to establish new ECE services to consider the advantages of locating community agencies and/or schools and/or ECE services in venues/locations that could accommodate the needs of multiple groups (that is, community hubs). Non-government organisations and community groups (for example, PAFT, B4 School services, Early Start, Child Wellbeing, ECE umbrella groups, ECE community network groups, Plunket) could contribute to increasing ECE participation when located alongside ECE services. Groups may need to enter legal partnerships to plan for the provision of venues that accommodate the needs of all parties.

Services such as Early Start and PAFT working directly with young families would benefit from increased capacity so that more time can be spent supporting families/whānau to enrol and participate in ECE.

Access to ECE subsidies was identified as a significant barrier to ECE participation. Families/whānau under additional pressure and stress related to home relocation have limited/reduced resources to work through an already complex subsidy process when needing to re-enrol or enrol in ECE. The wait time for Work and Income approval was identified as a barrier to successful engagement in ECE. The wait timeframe for families/whānau accessing the ECE subsidy needs to be reduced. Contributors to this scoping project suggested that a system of Work and Income pre-approval for families needs to be developed so that families can complete the enrolment process at their early childhood setting. A further suggestion made was for Work and Income to provide training to equip all ECE staff to effectively support families/whānau with administrative requirements related to subsidies and 20 EC hours.

Current Christchurch City Council requirements for approving ECE service location limit the choice of suitable sites for establishing ECE services. Timeframes and administrative requirements are unnecessarily time-consuming. Christchurch City Council consent procedures could be streamlined for ECE services relocating/rebuilding as a result of the earthquake.

Section 1 summary: Participation

Participation rates in ECE in Christchurch have declined at the same time as ECE capacity has increased. Christchurch east ECE locations have been affected more than other parts of the city. Comparative ECE data indicates Māori and Pasifika children are represented in the lost enrolment data at higher levels than Pākehā/NZ European.

The expected future movement of families/whānau from east Christchurch has the potential to further impact negatively on participation rates. ECE services outside of Christchurch east may experience a lack of capacity in the near future as east families/whānau face relocation and seek new ECE services. Many of these affected families include those from lower socio-economic, Pasifika and Māori groups.

The impact on viability and sustainability of ECE provision in Christchurch east may decrease the range of choice for the families/whānau remaining. In all locations across Christchurch ECE provision will need to respond to changing community demographics. A coordinated approach between the Ministry, ECE sector and organisations working with families/whānau in the area would help to ensure ECE sector operational decisions are well informed and responsive to community demands for ECE participation.

Pre-existing barriers to ECE participation have increased in complexity by the affects of the earthquakes in Christchurch. Many proposed solutions offered by parents/whānau and organisations/community groups point to improvements ECE services themselves could address, while others require external consideration.

Continued focus and attention by the Ministry on providing ongoing communication is essential. The ECE sector expressed a need to be kept informed of Christchurch recovery planning and decision making, particularly in relation to public transport changes, population movement, and new property developments.
Access to information for families and community agencies about the benefits of ECE participation, how to enrol and where ECE services have capacity will support considered and informed choice about enrolling children in ECE.
Section 2 findings– Impact on the capability of ECE services

Participation in ECE services is supported where ECE services operate a financially secure service and provide quality programmes that are responsive to local communities. The Christchurch quakes posed a risk to both ECE staff and management capability as many personal and professional challenges were faced. This scoping project explored the impact of the earthquakes on staff, children and families/whānau wellbeing and on the financial situation of ECE services to identify potential impacts on ECE participation in the future. ECE service capability was further investigated by looking to the ways in which services were responding by implementing recovery strategies.

Impact on ECE services: wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Has there been an impact on the wellbeing of staff, children and families/whānau as a result of the earthquake?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Absolutely, in every way, but we soldier on. Bexley is a tough bunch of people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wellbeing of staff, children, and parents/whānau in all ECE services across Christchurch has been detrimentally affected as a result of the earthquakes. Descriptions of the emotional wellbeing of staff, parents/whānau, and children at the present time include:

- Tired and weary
- Low morale
- Fearful and anxious
- Concerned and uncertain about the future
- Unsettled and reluctant
- Heightened concern about safety
- Sense of vulnerability
- Nervous
- Emotional

Parents are particularly anxious about their child’s safety. Playgroups and ECE centres are responding to parent/whānau needs for increased communication and reassurance.

ECE staff have been confident in their ability to support children in their care, however, they expressed concern that any reduction to staff numbers may impede their ability to continue to provide high quality care. The threat of staff cuts is a very real concern for many ECE services, particularly in Christchurch east.

The catastrophic events of 22 February have demonstrated that the majority of ECE services are a valuable resource for communities in crisis. ECE centres and playgroups have been instrumental in community and ECE recovery. Services retained a sense of normality for children and families/whānau, provided a place for the social needs of communities, and offered additional support for staff and families/whānau.

Where external support has been provided to ECE services, this has been well received. External support has come from ECE umbrella organisations, local churches, PD providers, and other ECE services across New Zealand. The majority of standalone services, however, have needed to draw on their own resources to provide the support required by staff, families/whānau and children.
**Presenting the data - wellbeing**

The impact on staff, children and families’ wellbeing focussed on in this section show that the descriptions from centres outside of Christchurch east (the comparison group) mirrored that of the descriptions from Christchurch east settings and playgroups. There is no question that the emotional and social impact of the 22 February earthquake is citywide.

**Staff wellbeing**

Of the 102 Christchurch east respondents, 10 expressed that staff were ‘fine’ (e.g. ‘Generally staff, children and families have coped incredibly well.’), or didn’t mention staff wellbeing, however, their responses were tempered with acknowledgment of the increased stress that staff in their centres were experiencing. The majority of respondents from all groups, (Christchurch east, playgroups, and comparison), expressed concern over staff wellbeing, for example, ‘Our days are a vicious cycle of just living day by day.’

Only one of the comparison services reported that the impact on staff, children and families had been short lived. This service was located in a North-western suburb:

‘There was for a period a definite impact on staff but this was managed with time, care and support. Most families were able to resume ‘normal’ patterns of life fairly quickly with only a small number having jobs affected. The change in wellbeing for most families was minimal.’

In all groups, staff anxiety, sleep deprivation and stress were identified as major issues. Staff from across the city are dealing with their own personal circumstances, such as loss of or damaged homes, unsettled families, partner’s loss of work, and fears of another quake. The following summarises the responses from all ECE services included in this report as there was insufficient variation between the different groups.

Staff are very tired and weary. Disrupted sleep, additional travel and complex home pressures are adding to this, for example, damage to homes, land, now sewerage, relocated secondary school-aged children. For example: ‘Most of our staff live in the eastern suburbs and have been badly affected. My family has been struggling without water since the Feb earthquake and we have just had water on this Monday 20th June and it was a long battle without it.’ Several respondents noted an increase in staff illness.

In some cases, teachers have needed additional time ‘off the floor’ due to stress, or needing to take time off to deal with EQC, insurance, family needs etc; or they are required to work additional time ‘on-the-floor,’ which adds further stress. Teachers with young children of their own were noted as the most affected. Staff with children attending the ‘site sharing’ secondary schools were finding the adjustment difficult, as it required new arrangements for transport and supervision of their children.

ECE staff are dealing with the social impact of the earthquake, for example, death of family members, supporting centre parents as they are made redundant, relationship breakdown, and parents’ ability to care for children. For example: ‘The demand on their (teachers) role has increased as they try to help families resettle children.’ ‘Parents and caregivers look to teachers for support and guidance.’

Morale is low in many teams. There are ongoing concerns over possible redundancies and centre sustainability. Loss of staff is impacting on team morale. In some cases, staff left the city due to earthquakes (fear and stress), resulting in centres dealing with changes to staff relationships as new teachers are employed.

Teachers are feeling the additional responsibility of ‘keeping children safe’ in these uncertain times. Fear of, and anxiety about, the possibility of further quakes was frequently referred to in responses. Teachers are acutely aware of their responsibility for the safety of children in their care. ‘It plays on teachers minds.’

The new physical limitations/complications and damage to environments are taking a toll on staff, for example, portaloos for children and staff, extra supervision, time and effort. Settling and loss of children is an additional pressure. There are significant numbers of new children and families/whānau to settle. In addition, children have left the centre over night with no time or opportunity for goodbyes. ‘Staff have to be superhuman sometimes and put on a smile’.
In spite of the raft of concerns and issues described in relation to staff wellbeing, respondents provided an impression of teachers and caregivers as being professional and resilient. One comment summed this up:

‘Despite everything, they continue to do a wonderful job with children and whānau.’

Respondents frequently mentioned concerns about how they were going to get through the long cold winter when tiredness was so prevalent. The majority of early childhood teachers and caregivers do not have term breaks when batteries can be recharged.

What has been making a difference?
The level of support for staff from outside the setting has been valued by a number of settings. ECE settings attached to organisations reported appreciation of the care and support they had received. For example, Te Kohanga Reo stated that the ‘care and support we have received has been fantastic’. Some of the ECE centres attached to organisations have been provided a free counselling service for teachers, for example, Edukids centres, ABCs and CPIT. One playgroup described the support given to the playgroup community by the local church. ‘Our playgroup is very well supported by the church whose building we use. They have provided food, blankets etc. They’re offering a budgeting course in a few weeks.’

One centre described how continued participation in the Ministry’s funded professional development has helped with staff morale. ‘It has been good to have [provider] workshops to attend. We can focus on something else. Nice to lighten up a bit, not traumatic.’

One centre described how the provision of a ‘quake day’ off for staff had made a difference. The centre funded the release day. This centre also talked of reducing meetings and changing the time of meetings to accommodate staff needs to be at home with their families/whānau at the end of the day.

In some centres, support has needed to come from within teaching teams. This has contributed to individual teachers’ ability to cope with everyday pressures. As one centre described: ‘Teachers have become closer, wanting to socialise more outside the centre. [We have] discussions with each other that are real and genuine, especially those staff who will be losing their homes.’

Support from other ECE services across New Zealand has been valued. Financial and emotional support was described by one centre:

‘We have been fortunate to have the support of other centres outside Christchurch. This is absolutely wonderful. Having an outside centre support takes small pressures off financial resources – they donated money, resources and gift vouchers. We are so grateful and as a team we are going to follow these centres. Our long term goal is to visit these centres.’

Children
Respondents reported that most children were fine, with lingering reactions to ongoing earthquakes evident. ‘Children are coping well but often getting scared when aftershocks occur during preschool.’ Some children are displaying strong resilience, for example: ‘when the big aftershocks struck on June 13th one of the children said, “It’s OK. I have the power to stop it.”’

Some noted changes in children’s behaviour, for example, aggression, toileting requiring additional teacher effort and awareness, sleep patterns, or reaction to loud noises. Some children were described as displaying separation issues, for example, crying when their parent leaves. Often there was a relationship between children’s unsettled behaviour and parent reluctance to leave the child. For example: ‘There were a few children who took a while to settle back in but we did realise it was more the parents who found it hard to let go.’

Many respondents discussed children’s general unsettledness. The unsettledness of children over this time can be attributed to the many changes ECE children are experiencing in their relationships. Many have moved to different centres with unfamiliar peers and teachers. Children’s friendships have been disrupted abruptly as families/whānau moved away during the period of ECE centre closures. For many, there have
been new teachers in their environments and they have not had the opportunity to farewell their familiar teacher/s.

New patterns in children’s play were described: ‘I have noticed that children’s behaviours have changed but we are working with them through these interesting times.’ Earthquake related themes such as crashing buildings, role play, more physically active play, and increased noise levels were described.

What has been making a difference?

Respondents acknowledged that children were experiencing many quake related issues outside of their ECE setting, but while in the centre, teachers have been confident in their ability to support the children.

‘We spend a lot of time with the children making sure they are having a great day and not worrying about their house or mum crying, but giving them extra time to talk – and lots of cuddles.’

To this point, ECE settings have attributed their ability to carry on to the fact that they have been able to retain their full staffing capacity of fully qualified teachers, however, uncertainty about how long this can continue is causing concern.

Family and whānau

Survey respondents demonstrated empathy, understanding, and concern for their families/whānau. They described how they have been supporting parents and families/whānau in various ways, from handouts and readings, phone calls, talking to families, hugs, sharing the safety procedures, reassuring families/whānau that the centre is safe, giving time to listen and assisting with practical things like clothing, baking, or washing. In some cases, parents have been supported to access external agencies.

For example: ‘Families need our constant support, either financially, physically or collaboratively. We are very aware of families at risk and seek support and guidance from agencies.’

Parents are displaying a heightened awareness of safety, sense of vulnerability, and nervousness about leaving their child. Parents in playgroups, in particular, were described as preferring to keep their children close to them right now. Overall, parents are reported to be tired, frequently emotional, and have a need to talk more. Some parents have lost their jobs, which has added additional financial worries.

It was apparent that strong relationships within ECE communities have been instrumental in supporting family and community wellbeing. As one expressed, ‘on the positive side, there is a stronger sense of community and people have formed relationships with others that they previously would not have’. ‘The parents/families who have stayed in Christchurch were, and are, very supportive to each other and the centre.’

Parents have been spending more time in the centre. ‘Relationships are stronger and parents are spending more time in the centre with their children or with other parents.’ Within playgroups there was a general theme of these groups providing positive support for families/whānau and communities as they re-establish themselves.

For example: ‘The playgroup was a good place to air and talk about these things.’ ‘Most [families] are from within the area. Looking for social network especially after natural disaster. Community bonding’.

What has been making a difference?

The responses to the surveys clearly illustrate that ECE settings offer more than care and education for children. This event (Christchurch earthquakes) has demonstrated that ECE settings are a valuable resource for communities in crisis. ECE staff have a commitment to their ECE communities and ‘go the extra mile’ by placing family/whānau and children’s needs ahead of their own. The level of concern for families/whānau and communities was expressed by one centre that was closed for 10 weeks following 22 February:
‘Families had no power or water and more liquefaction over this time, this caused more stress. Usually the centre would be used to support these families but due to the extended closure they could not.’

Early childhood centres became a focal point for many families/whānau to meet, seek and give support. One survey respondent aptly described this:

‘Post earthquake, we have not only provided this education for our tamariki, we have provided a sense of security, normality, a return to routines and familiar patterns. We have also provided education, strategies, and support for their whānau. We have been the whānau support and resources. We are an important part of Christchurch’s healing and recovery.’
Impact on ECE services: Finance

‘Yes, our centre has had huge financial problems with so many families being relocated to other areas. When I first started at this centre we had 48 children, and it's just that one day that changed everything.’

- Christchurch east centre

Overall, around 60% of ECE services across Christchurch reported a financial impact as a result of the 22 February earthquake. Twelve of 34 services reporting no financial impact, belong to ECE umbrella organisations. However, all umbrella organisations talked of financial impacts during interviews.

ECE services across Christchurch are operating within a financial environment where fixed expenses remain either the same or increased, income has reduced through lower occupancy and, where services still making adjustments to budgets as a result of the 2010 funding changes for services staffed above 80% qualified.

East services described additional earthquake related financial demands and concerns, such as:

- Loss of income due to reduced roll numbers and attendance hours.
- Impact on funding from service closures beyond the Ministry’s emergency funding allowance end date in April 2011.
- Loss of parent fees where families have relocated.
- Additional quake-related operation expenses, for example, additional hygiene supplies, water, advertising costs.
- Additional staffing costs, for example, payment during closures, retaining staff over ratio when rolls dropped, additional recruitment costs, reliever costs.
- Loss of income and increased expenses due to relocation to temporary premises.
- Significantly increased insurance costs.

Financial resources are seriously depleted and viability is an issue for many of the east ECE services.

Presenting the data: Finance

ECE services in east-Christchurch and comparison groups were asked, ‘Have there been any significant financial impacts for your centre?’

The data gathered from 82 open centres in the eastern suburbs, and 15 comparison centres, indicated that there were many similarities in their perceptions of the financial impact from the earthquakes.

The open east-Christchurch centres gave 48 ‘yes’ responses to this question, 30 ‘no’, and four (4) respondents did not complete this section. The comparison group of centres gave nine (9) replies to ‘yes’, five (5) to ‘no’ and one (1) centre did not respond to the question. Figures have been represented in percentages to provide direct comparison (see figure 55).
Overall, around 60% of Christchurch ECE services report a financial impact as a result of the 22 February earthquake.

It should be noted that twelve (12) of the total thirty-four (34) ‘no’ responses were from centres attached to umbrella organisations. These centres, licensed under umbrella organisations, did not report any financial impact. It was understood that these organisations are offsetting their own costs with the flexibility to support staffing and child transfers within their own services. The financial stability of umbrella organisations will have been stretched as a result, with concern now as to how long they will be able to continue to financially support individual centres.

### Funding and income concerns

#### Ministry of Education funding

The combined impact of the loss of funding from earthquake related issues, in tandem with a reduction in funding for those centres staffing at higher than 80% registered teachers, was voiced by a significant number of respondents. The following statement expresses this clearly: ‘The combination of the earthquake AND Government Funding Cuts has been devastating.’

A significant financial impact identified across both groups has occurred as a result of a reduction in enrolments and attendance. This reduction led to decreased Ministry funding and income from parent fees. Respondents explain the reduced centre income, for example: ‘We have lost so many children, we are not getting very much in funding’; ‘We have less enrolments, therefore less funding’; ‘The new enrolments are less in number than those who have left therefore we have less money coming in from parent fees and funding.’

Occupancy numbers in ECE, particularly for children under two, have decreased. Enquiries from families/whānau with children under two years of age have reduced significantly. Along with this, children are attending fewer hours per day and fewer sessions per week, sometimes due to sickness, reduced ability of parents to pay, or a preference to stay at home, (for example, fear of earthquakes). A trend across both open and closed respondents is that families/whānau who had pre-enrolled in services have now withdrawn those enrolments. For example: ‘Occupancy has decreased. People are not working in the area now and there is not the same interest to have infants and toddlers in the centre.’

Interestingly, some respondents in Christchurch east described that they are seeing some increases in the roll numbers. For example: ‘We are beginning to increase our rolls again’; ‘Our rolls filled up to capacity’; ‘An increase in our roll’; ‘New children are less in number than those who left.’
Only one (1) respondent from the comparison group acknowledged that their roll is stable: ‘We have families that have not moved away from their homes to the same extent.’

Centres who had remained closed for several weeks, due to conditions imposed on them by the Civil Defence Emergency Regulations in the CBD, expressed frustrations around how the Ministry’s Emergency Funding only covered closure up to 28 March. Centres remaining closed after this date have been further disadvantaged by this loss of income. These centres also voiced concern that Emergency Funding stopped too soon compared to the compulsory education sector.

Several centres indicated disappointment that wash-up and advanced funding had been greatly reduced. They expect that the next round will also be well down on budgeted predictions.

**Parent fees**

Most respondents described how they showed compassion toward families who had been affected by the earthquakes by not charging fees when families/whānau had temporarily moved away, or during closures of the centres. Many families/whānau did not return, as one respondent describes:

‘...Losing fees from families who had left town for a break, but were coming back, we didn’t charge them fees to hold their places in this instance, they didn’t need the added pressure of running up bills. We preferred to support them so they could come back to our preschool.

This resulted in financial loss, as these centres have been unable to claim funding for children leaving the centre during the emergency closure period, even though parents provided appropriate notice of the intention to leave.

The ability to raise parent fees or to fundraise in some areas has lessened considerably, as respondents recognise that communities are still in ‘survival mode.’ For example: ‘As a service we need to look at increasing our fees due to budget cuts from 2010, however our community have also been seriously affected financially, and our families are predominately on low incomes. Management and the Board are therefore having to consider the ‘impact’ of fee increases and our ability to significantly fundraise has diminished.’

**Additional expenses**

Respondents from both open and comparison centres identified another financial impact as a result of this natural disaster. Fixed expenses are the same now as before, yet funding has been reduced because of lower attendance. Expenses such as the lease of buildings, salaries, insurance, and accounting services still need to be met. Some of these have increased since the earthquakes.

Many centres described additional costs during the emergency phase. Costs were associated with purchasing a constant supply of potable drinking water, and increased use of sanitising solution and wet wipes for hygiene purposes.

One centre expressed concerns around the set up costs for new profile books for children, who then leave shortly afterwards. This is adding up, along with the costs involving debt collection.

The costs associated with advertising vacancies for child spaces are also described as an additional expense to be budgeted for.

**Staffing costs**

Another major issue for centres is that of additional staffing related expenses. The varying lengths of time when centres were closed has led to a variety of financial repercussions for individual centres. Most centres continued to pay staff throughout those closure times. Since reopening, some centres have lost staff, with no notice, and have had to employ relievers in the interim. Costs associated with re-employment are costly for centres already experiencing financial hardship. One community centre from the comparison group mentioned: ‘When staff have left, (4 now) it is too expensive to advertise to replace them.’
Some centres have retained staffing levels, as they were pre-quake. In some instances this is manageable, but for others it is acknowledged that redundancies are possible. These centres are waiting for natural attrition (that is, not replacing staff who leave) so they do not have the additional costs associated with redundancy payments.

Several respondents stated that the cost of employing relievers above and beyond previously budgeted for expenses are proving to be costly. They mention situations such as employment of relievers to cover staff absences for sickness, stress, and arrangements for personal meetings with EQC and insurance personnel. Relievers are also being employed to cover ratio requirements, for example, when regular staff are required to meet with centre families/whānau, or to overcome the difficulties associated with portable toilets being situated outside and the extra supervision required in supporting children to attend to their toileting needs. One respondent describes their situation thus: ‘Not being able to use the toilets, due to this we have to hire a reliever so we can take children out of the building to use the Port-a-loos.’

One centre described closing the centre 15 minutes earlier each day as a move to reduce stress for teachers. This results in loss of income for those times slots, which would have previously been included in budgeting calculations.

**Temporary premises**

ECE services operating in relocated premises are dealing with an increased number of issues that have a direct detrimental financial impact. Centres located in temporary premises have reported issues with the reduction in numbers of children due to licence requirements of a smaller area. For example, one centre reduced from 34 to 28 children. Another reduced from 50 to 23. Reduction of child spaces leads to a reduction in funding and parent fees.

Some families/whānau have cut back their attendance hours in order to enable more families to access the service. One relocated centre noted that now they can only cater for four (4) under twos instead of their former licence allowance of eight (8) under twos. This is a significant reduction in budgeted amounts of funding and fees coming in. One community centre described the impact of their move to a temporary location: ‘[we] have to close early one day and close for a week during the holidays due to our building being used for church activities.’ The reduction to available attendance hours directly affects funding levels.

**Insurance issues**

Across the city, insurance stand down times, increases in premiums and excess amounts have been identified as yet another additional expense beyond budgeted allowances in centres. For example: ‘Insurance costs have increased and excess values have gone up by 100%+.’

Many centres report that they are still waiting for confirmation of claims, some of which are considerable. For example: ‘Loss of furniture, computers, damage to floors and underfloor heating’; ‘Waiting for find out if insurance claims will be accepted.’
Impact on ECE capacity: recovery

‘Onwards and upwards. Trying to get key people back on board and replacing them if they are no longer able to attend. Supporting each other, talking a lot.’
- Christchurch east playgroup

The recovery of ECE provision has been difficult due to the raft of uncertainties that services and communities are experiencing. Very few services are looking deeply to the future or making decisions about future operations. The extent of uncertainty is impeding their ability to focus on anything beyond day-to-day practice. East ECE services demonstrated an inability to make long-term decisions while the future of the population remains in question.

- The east-Christchurch group more frequently expressed concerns and uncertainty about provision of service, viability, and sustainability, than the comparison group.
- Recovery for the comparison group is less affected by an impending loss of communities and/or centre repairs or rebuilding, although comparison services with staff living in affected locations are concerned about staff wellness.
- The recovery strategies identified in data from playgroups, east Christchurch and comparison groups, indicates that ECE services are looking at strategies more or less in their immediate control. For example, changes in age groupings, communication with parents/whānau, seeking alternative sources of funding.
- Around 20% of ECE service respondents (east and comparison) indicated that they are considering plans to change license numbers, for example, decreasing the number of under-two year olds, or increasing the license number to cater for an increased demand.
- Three (3) of the 11 closed ECE services stated that they want to re-establish their service and voiced a commitment to their prior ECE community. These three services were independently owned, and owners displayed a strong community ethos.
- Playgroups expressed a commitment to continuing in their communities through providing a sense of normality, ensuring a safe place for families/whānau, and increased communication with families/whānau.
- In the wider community collaboration between non-governmental organisations, community groups and the Ministry of Education was expressed as a desired strategy in the recovery of ECE provision in Christchurch.

Presenting the data: recovery

This section focuses on the responses to questions about plans to change license numbers, factors influencing recovery strategies and plans to re-establish ECE services. The range of recovery strategies that early childhood services, organisations and community groups discuss provide insight to the current capacity of the sector to support the recovery of ECE in Christchurch.

Plans to change license numbers

ECE services in the open east-Christchurch and comparison groups were asked, ‘Has your service got any long term plans to increase, decrease or change your licence numbers?’
The data gathered from 82 open centres in the eastern suburbs, and 15 comparison centres, indicated that there were many similarities in their responses in relation to long-term plans for their licences (see figure 56). The open centres gave nineteen (19) ‘yes’ responses to this question, fifty (50) ‘no’, and thirteen (13) respondents did not complete this section. The comparison group of centres gave three (3) replies to ‘yes’, eleven (11) to ‘no’ and one (1) centre did not respond to the question. Figures have been represented in percentages to provide direct comparison.

![Figure 56. Plans to change license nos. (n=97)](image)

**YES responses**

Of those responding yes, some are finding a decrease in the numbers of children in under two environments, for example: *Seems to be a trend towards more over two’s than under twos.* They are therefore considering filling those spaces with children over two, for example: *We are looking at decreasing nursery numbers.*

Some centres in the east group have recently had increases in their licence numbers and will retain them for the meantime, for example: *We have recently relicensed our centre to take 100*. One centre, attached to an umbrella organisation, expressed a definite plan to consider increasing licence numbers: *[A] temporary licence [was] issued on June 29. We will look at this over the next few weeks and permanent increases are definitely feasible and possible.*

Centres who are in temporary premises are considering their options for the return to their original buildings or new premises. Some may increase while others are likely to remain the same.

*Possible increase, new building required.*

*Possible increase to under two centre.*

*Possible new building required.*

*Probably when we return to our original building.*

Centres from the east group show concern for, and awareness of, an impending need to change license numbers to meet community needs:

*Currently in the process of changing our licence to be open over school holidays to meet the needs of the community.* - East

*We are gathering info to determine community needs, this will drive or decision about increasing.* - East

One Playcentre in the east group is hoping to increase their licence to cater for:
‘...siblings and Mums and bubs wanting to join. Also, to cover referrals from ‘Babies Can Play’ program.’

A centre from the comparison group is considering options to change licence numbers but is wary that this could be a conflict with their philosophy. Another centre from the comparison group has been approached by members of the community, to consider providing yet another service.

**NO responses**

The majority of centres either answered no or did not respond to this question. It should be noted that fifteen (15 or 30%) of the ‘no’ responses received from east services were from centres within umbrella organisations. Organisations responsible for these centres did not report any plans for licence changes.

Some centres expressed they feel they are meeting the current needs of their community and will continue as they are:

‘We believe our numbers are reflective of the amount of families that need our service and we aren’t a large preschool anyway. We believe the families are out there we just have to let them know we are here and we provide low cost high quality education and care. All our staff are fully qualified and registered teachers which we believe children deserve to have and shouldn’t be discriminated against because of the age we teach. This is where the funding change has hugely affected us.’ - Comparison

‘We know we will grow and child numbers will increase. At this stage we are committed to our community and the service we promote, therefore a change in licence numbers has not yet been considered or discussed.’ - Christchurch east

‘We believe the families are out there, we just have to let them know we are here and that we provide low cost high quality education and care.’ – Comparison

Three of the east centres in the eastern suburbs expressed a desire, or expectation, for returning to the service they had before the earthquakes.

‘Would like to go back to 24 over two children if financially viable as we can already see changes in children’s behaviour, whether this is because of high numbers or home life we cannot really tell as yet – but it is there.’

‘[We] plan to continue to have a waiting list.’

‘To be honest, we do not want to think about it but there is a suggestion from MOE to change our licence number, by decreasing, but at the moment we are not taking it seriously because we know we can get our numbers back.’

Overall the responses are varied, with some centres looking deeper into the future and many others still in the ‘coping’ phase of their recovery. The higher number of ‘no-response’ to the question from east services may be an indication of a current inability to make long-term decisions while the future of the population in communities remains in question.

When considering license changes, the underlying concern for centres appears to be around affordability, balanced with the provision of a quality service while serving the true needs of their immediate communities.

**Short-term and long-term recovery strategies**

Surveys to all ECE services asked the question, ‘When thinking about your services operations, alongside the Christchurch redevelopment plans, what factors are influencing your recovery strategies; in the immediate future, and in the long term?’

Interviews with non-governmental organisations also asked this question. The question generated a large amount of data, which was sorted and categorised. Initial analysis indicated a wide variance in responses
from ECE centres and playgroups; their responses ranging from explaining strategies already implemented, to describing the ‘here and now’ of centre life, to expressing uncertainty of the future. Organisations offered a ‘bigger picture’ for recovery strategies in Christchurch ECE. The data from parents provided many very practical suggestions for how to improve access to early childhood education.

In the following section, data from each group is presented.

**Open and comparison groups**

The data was explored to look at the type of responses in the first instance. Each response was categorised according to the main point made in each centre’s response.

For the open and comparison centres, categories used are described below.

**Strategies described**: Where responses focused on the recovery strategies the centre was implementing or planning to implement. These responses may also include concerns and/or uncertainty: ‘Implemented a four weeks free strategy; ‘Altered the license to allow for more over twos; ‘Balancing staff child ratios & keeping a close eye on the budget; ‘Reviewing our staff employment conditions’.

**Listed concerns**: Where specific issues or concerns were identified. For example: ‘Most of the staff are fully qualified and we are disadvantaged by this now; ‘We just want more families; ‘The loss of our income is our biggest concern.’

**Expressed uncertainty**: Where respondents discussed issues in terms of uncertainty. For example: ‘Uncertain about our building and whether we can even return; ‘How many families will be here to serve?’ ‘We have found that a lot of our families are in the red zone but we’re still not sure what will happen; ‘We don’t know what’s going to happen tomorrow.’

**Organisation support**: Where centres indicated that they had the support of an organisation (ECE umbrella groups and tertiary providers) to address recovery, for example, ‘the fact we’re close to other ABCs means the operation is not being affected; Canterbury Westland Kindergarten Association responded for all Kidsfirst kindergartens, Te Kōhanga Reo Trust responded for all Kōhanga Reo.

**No concern**: Where respondents stated that everything was OK. For example: ‘As long as we stay full we will be OK; ‘Staffing is stable; ‘None’.

**No response**: Where respondents did not provide an answer.

Figure 57 and 58 visually represent the data for open and comparison centres respectively.

![Figure 57. Strategies - Open group responses (n=82)](image)
Short-term recovery

Around 30% in both groups reported on implementing recovery strategies in the short term. When adding in the ‘organisation support’ category, with the knowledge that the organisations had implemented short-term strategies, the figure raises to about 60% for both groups. This leaves around 40% of ECE centres. The difference between the percentage of responses for short-term and long-term strategies from both groups (average 16.6%) may suggest that ECE services are more focused on addressing their current needs. Further investigation of the data sheds light on this.

The limitation of the data is that it may not accurately represent what is actually happening in ECE settings, but it does give insight into what may be seen as the main thing on the minds of these centres. The fact that respondents did not acknowledge current practices (if implementing strategies) as recovery strategies, but rather discussed ongoing concerns and uncertainties is an indication that these centres are experiencing a certain sense of powerlessness that impedes their ability to focus on anything beyond day-to-day practice. One comment illustrates this point: ‘At the moment we are about survival. We can’t think that far ahead, we can’t look at the bigger picture.’

Long-term recovery

17% of the open east-Christchurch group and 14.3% of the comparison group identified strategies for the long term. For both groups the percentage is small, indicating that decisions for the future have not been made in the majority of ECE services. The ‘organisation support’ responses suggest that 28.3 of the open group and 14.3 of the comparison group, as centres belonging to an umbrella organisation or attached to tertiary providers, expect their ‘organisation’ to be strategising for the long term.

The data suggests that uncertainty about the long-term future of Christchurch ECE is in the minds of open east-Christchurch centres to a greater degree than the comparison group. It would appear that the impact of the earthquake has not posed the same degree of threat to the functioning of the group located outside of Christchurch east. The fact that 35% of the comparison group did not respond to the question, compared to 8.6% of the Christchurch east group, endorses this view.

Suggested recovery strategies

The following list of suggested recovery strategies is drawn from both the Christchurch east and comparison group data. When viewing this list it becomes apparent that centres are looking at strategies that are more or less in their control.

- Merge age groupings and reduce overall roll numbers.
• Collaborate with Ngai Tahu developments.
• Seek alternative funding streams e.g. community grants, fundraising.
• Develop community gardens.
• ECE centres to become community hubs.
• Focus on ‘green’ ‘sustainable communities.
• EAP for support.
• Communication and reassurance for parents.
• Employ more ‘in training’ teachers.
• Public relation strategies to retain ECE reputation.
• Focus on strengthening leadership in ECE centres.
• Revise strategic plans.
• Continual monitoring of roll numbers and staffing.
• Professional development for leaders around quake recovery to help communities.
• Reverse funding cuts to ECE.
• Provide flexibility of attendance for families/whānau as they undergo rebuilding and repair of homes.
• Access to free advertising.
• Discounted products, power and phone services for ECE as they rebuild.
• Change license to all year operation, i.e. No ‘school term’ breaks.
• Reduce the number of changes in centres (e.g. staff, curriculum, fees) – aim for stability for families/whānau.

**Concerns and uncertainty**

Overall key differences noted between the two groups are that:

• 38% of the open group expressed uncertainty compared with 21.4% of the comparison group.
• 45.8% of the open group identified concerns compared with 21.5% of the comparison group.
• 14% of the comparison group had no concern compared with 6.2% of the open group.

While these differences are small, they do provide an indication that the open group in Christchurch east is experiencing more concerns about their centres’ provision of services, viability and sustainability than those located outside Christchurch east.

The concerns and uncertainties identified by comparison centres included financial, staffing and community issues. A number of these centres are experiencing financial issues, mainly in relation to reduced roll numbers, coupled with the reduction in funding as a result of the changes in the qualified staffing cap.

Many comparison centres demonstrated that the earthquake had impacted on their communities, as they described issues such as the loss of community resources, interruption to bus routes, family/whānau movement, and staff wellness. They were not dealing with the same level of uncertainty in relation to impending loss of homes, or land, and centre repairs or rebuilding.

The concerns and uncertainties listed by the open east-Christchurch group have been collated into groupings of those related to ECE staffing, financial, communities, and quake-damage (refer figure 59).

Please note, financial implication and concerns were discussed more fully in the previous section of this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 59.</th>
<th>Descriptions of east group concerns and uncertainties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Financial** | • Maintaining roll numbers  
               • Loss of families/whānau and income  
               • Carrying debt from unpaid fees  
               • Used up contingency fund  
               • Loss of income due to 2010 qualified staffing changes  
               • Reduced occupancy  
               • Higher bills through the winter  
               • How to build up roll numbers?  
               • Inability to refill contingency funds  
               • Government funding cuts  
               • Loss of Council grant |
| **Staffing** | • Wellness  
               • Can’t afford relievers  
               • Redundancies  
               • Retaining 'good staff'  
               • Attracting staff when needed in devastated areas  
               • Affording fully qualified staff  
               • Maintaining ratios - staffing at sustainable levels  
               • Employment/working conditions  
               • Disadvantage of fully qualified staffing, not wanting to forego quality of service by employing unqualified staff. |
| **Community** | • Decisions on land/housing in immediate community  
               • Inability to cater for community needs  
               • Lack of community resources, e.g. library, Plunket  
               • Living conditions – impact on health  
               • Impact of land zoning – who will go?  
               • Health and safety in ECE environments  
               • Ensuring safety for children  
               • Building confidence re stability of ECE centre  
               • Ensuring range of ECE choice is available in communities  
               • Unsettled families and children  
               • Parent employment  
               • Decisions about CBD location |
| **Quake damage** | • Insurance outcomes |
Closed group

The data gathered from the group of 11 (of 14) closed centres about recovery strategies provided insight into the future plans for these ECE services. The data is collated and categorised by taking notice of these plans, that is, plans to re-establish or not.

Figure 60. Closed group responses

Three of the 11 ECE centres intend to re-establish their service in Christchurch. The three (3) respondents, independent owners, indicating the intention to re-establish voiced a sincere commitment to ECE provision in Christchurch, particularly to their prior communities. As one stated: ‘Our community was all of Christchurch as parents worked in the CBD – I won’t re-form that if I am not in the CBD.’

Six (6) services have yet to make a decision. These centres all belong to umbrella organisations. Indecision was based on uncertainty around financial sustainability. For example: ‘[Will we] get the numbers back to be able to sustain the business?’

One (1) service closed one part of their ECE centre (play sessions for babies) at the time of the earthquake, although the closure was not related to the quake. The centre has since re-organised programmes so that they can offer full time care for under twos in the preschool, for parents needing to return to work. They intend to reopen the baby play sessions once demand increases.

One (1) respondent categorically stated the centre will remain closed.

Future analysis of the data collected in this project would provide statistical information around the number of enrolment spaces lost through the closure of the 14 services in Christchurch east at this time.
**Playgroups**

Recovery strategies for playgroups focused on communication with families/whānau, provision of support for families, on-site safety, and securing premises for their future operation.

All playgroups mentioned that they planned to continue to create and maintain safe places for families/whānau to meet. The importance of parents meeting as a group for support, and having continuity and ongoing links with community, was of paramount importance for all playgroups.

Recovery strategies implemented by playgroups included:

- Providing a sense of normality for families, for example: ‘we wanted playgroup to seem like normal’.
- Ensuring that families/whānau know about evacuation procedures and encourage families to have their own emergency plans. For example: ‘We have done earthquake and fire drills at playgroup recently [with parents].’ ‘I have spoken with our group about evacuation procedures.’
- Supporting families/whānau with provision of resources such as clothing, water, free nappies, so that families can continue with daily life. For example: ‘We have stored up bottled water and given away free nappies’; ‘The local church has provided food, blankets etc. They’re offering a budgeting service in a few weeks’.
- Keeping in touch with families/whānau. This has been done in several ways, for example, Facebook, word of mouth, letterbox drops, school newsletters, group email contacts, talking a lot, and phone calls. For example: ‘We are giving the families of playgroup the information and support we can, hoping to keep our playgroup network strong and growing.’

Alternative venues have been sourced for two (2) playgroups needing to relocate.

Playgroups are seen as vital meeting places for parents. The Sumner playgroup, who’s building was red stickered, is one of the playgroups that has already secured new premises. Motivation for ensuring this playgroup’s continued operation is expressed by the respondent:

‘Now more than ever we need to ensure we keep the playgroup and other community run services available as we are a small community and have suffered with the loss of other services in the area (library and Plunket nurse facilities). The children need to have some routine and the parents and carers need a place to meet and talk through their issues so they do not feel isolated and alone. I feel the playgroup offers a place of community and support which is vital right now.’

**Organisations and community groups**

Most organisations and community groups working directly with families/whānau and young children described recovery strategies that they had implemented post 22 February during interviews. They were also able to provide creative and innovative ideas for strategising the overall recovery of ECE in Christchurch. The community groups and organisations with a primary focus on communities beyond young families were less able to contribute to recovery strategies for ECE.

The ideas gathered from organisations and community groups are collated and presented in figure 61 below.

*Figure 61. Organisation short-term and long-term recovery strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECE provision</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Long term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide supportive network for staff welfare</td>
<td>Strategise where new ECE are to be located, for example, close to work, schools and business parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an emergency funding scheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City renewal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community recovery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed actions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to support affected struggling stand-alone centres where there have been unexpected staff illness/absence due to stress</td>
<td>Streamline licensing requirements. The Ministry and local government need to come together around resource consents in order to make the process quicker and easier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthen maternity leave provision so that parents have time to get to know ECE and make informed choices</td>
<td>Recruitment drive to attract qualified staff, should supply be detrimentally impacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locate ECE, primary and secondary all on one site – one governance board with representation of each group. Include social agency hubs alongside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positioning and resource allocation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positioning and resource allocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for families/whānau to be involved in the rebuild of city services etc. Maybe through employment or providing individual or group voices throughout the consultation and rebuilding processes</td>
<td>Position ECE sector/services first and foremost when making new city decisions - ECE as integral part of the Christchurch community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make decisions about location of ECE and schools available to families/whānau when planning new housing areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locate new rest homes alongside ECE and schools – for positive benefits for both older and young alike. For example, community gardens where one generation can share expertise with the other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offer parent education support – e.g. coping strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commission research project to explore the long-term impact of trauma/resiliency on children (include the unborn) and families/whānau. This research could contribute toward curriculum that matters in ECE and school</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide support/training in supporting emotional health for ECE services to assist with supporting their communities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support for ECE organisations/centres and community groups to collaborate and work together. Plan for community ‘hubs’, locating these services alongside each other as one-stop shops for families/whānau with young children</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide earthquake counselling for families and ECE staff</strong></td>
<td>‘Don’t treat this experience as a one-off thing, as it’s not’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set up after school care and holiday programmes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bring back Public Health nurse service</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It became apparent during interviews with organisations and community groups that many shared a common concern and vision for families/whānau and young children, yet limited collaboration between organisations/agencies was evidenced. In some cases, collaboration between agencies was an earthquake recovery strategy introduced in communities, for example, the Pasifika Hub in Aranui. Where this occurred, organisations talked positively and viewed this type of collaboration as a way forward during the city’s renewal.
Section 2 summary: Capability of ECE services

The wellbeing of staff, children and families/whānau is an on-going issue that has potential to impact on ECE services’ ability to provide a responsive educative service for their community. Many ECE staff are reported to be overtired and exhausted while also concerned about the fluctuation of roll numbers and resulting impact on staffing. Continued instability of ECE roll numbers across Christchurch over the next few years is likely.

A significant number of children and families/whānau are transitioning between ECE services, both within and out of Christchurch. ECE staff are dealing with larger numbers of transitioning children and families than normal at a time when staff wellbeing is of concern.

As a result of family/whānau relocation in Christchurch, the ethnicities, ages and numbers of children enrolled in individual ECE services are likely to change. Initiatives to support educators to plan for and respond to these changing demographics are needed to ensure that the quality of children’s education and care is given priority at all times.

Successful transitions out of and into ECE services are important for supporting children’s wellbeing and engagement in learning. Assistance may be needed for ECE services, umbrella organisations and community groups to support families/whānau to overcome the barriers to participation following relocation.

Many ECE services in Christchurch have been financially impacted due to unforeseen reductions in roll numbers alongside quake-related additional expenses. The financial viability of affected ECE services is a concern.

ECE services in land/quake affected areas of the city need to begin planning for managing the relocation or repair of their service. Initiatives to support governance groups and management to plan and respond to the increased demands on their service should be implemented.
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