Explanatory Comment

Overall Council Performance

Councils Overall Performance Over the Last Nine Years

- Across Victoria in 1998, 69% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. In 2006 this increased to 79% - an improvement of 10%.

- For metropolitan councils in 1998, 76% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. In 2006 this increased to 82% - an improvement of 6%.

- For country councils in 1998, only 65% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. In 2006 this increased to 77% - an improvement of 12%.

- For country councils in 1998, 36% of respondents rated councils as “needing improvement”. In 2006 this decreased to 23% - an improvement of 13%.

- For metropolitan councils in 1998, 25% of respondents rated councils as “needing improvement”. In 2006 this decreased to 18% - an improvement of 7%.

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 78% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate”. In 2006 this increased to 79% - a slight improvement of 1%.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 84% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. In 2006 this declined to 82%, a fall of 2%. In 2005, 54% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good”. In 2006 this declined to 50% - a decline of 4%. There was an improvement of 2% in those respondents that rated councils as “adequate”, however, there was a slight rise of 1% in those that rated councils as “needs improvement”.

- For country councils in 2005, 76% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. In 2006 this rose slightly to 77%, an improvement of 1%. In 2005, 44% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good”. In 2006 this increased slightly to 45% an improvement of 1%. The percentage of respondents that reported councils’ performance as “adequate” remained stable at 32% in 2005 and 2006. There was a slight improvement of 1% in the percentage of respondents that rated councils as “needs improvement” declining from 24% in 2005 to 23% in 2006.

Services most impacting on their satisfaction were – (in order of priority)

- Town Planning
- Economic Development
- Local Roads and Footpaths
- Appearance of Public Areas

Metropolitan residents were more satisfied than Country residents

- For Overall Council Performance in 2006, 82% of Metropolitan respondents rated excellent and good and adequate compared with 77% of Country respondents. However, residents’ satisfaction with Metropolitan councils has declined by 2% between 2005 and 2006 whereas residents satisfaction with Country councils improved slightly by 1%.
Council Advocacy

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 79% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate” this declined slightly to 78% in 2006.
- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 80% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate” this declined slightly to 79% in 2006.
- For country councils in 2005, 80% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate” this declined to 78% in 2006.

Community Engagement

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 68% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.
- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 70% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate” this declined slightly to 69% in 2006.
- For country councils in 2005, 67% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.

Customer Contact

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 82% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate”. This result declined to 80% in 2006.
- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 81% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate”. This improved slightly to 82% in 2006.
- For country councils in 2005, 82% of respondents rated councils as “excellent, good and adequate”. This result declined to 80% in 2006.

Local Roads and Footpaths

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 57% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 56% in 2006.
- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 65% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.
- For country councils in 2005, 50% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result improved slightly to 51% in 2006.
Health and Human Services

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 88% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 86% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 85% in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 88% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result improved slightly to 89% in 2006.

Recreational Facilities

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 81% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 80% in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 84% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 83% in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 78% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result improved slightly to 79% in 2006.

Appearance of Public Areas

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 79% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 77% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 76% in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 81% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.

Traffic Management and Parking

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 67% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 65% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined to 63% in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 69% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result improved slightly to 70% in 2006.
Waste Management

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 82% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 81% in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 86% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined to 84% in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 80% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.

Enforcement of By Laws

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 80% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined to 77% in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 78% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined to 76% in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 81% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined to 78% in 2006.

Economic Development

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 72% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 71% in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 79% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined to 76% in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 70% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 69% in 2006.

Town Planning Policy and Approval

Comparison with last year’s results

- Across Victoria in 2005, 68% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined slightly to 67% in 2006.

- For metropolitan councils in 2005, 68% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result was maintained in 2006.

- For country councils in 2005, 68% of respondents rated councils as “excellent and good and adequate”. This result declined to 66% in 2006.
FIGURE 2a: OVERALL PERFORMANCE 1998 - 2006
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TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP 1: Inner Metropolitan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP 2: Outer Metropolitan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP 3: Regional Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP 4: Large Shires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROUP 5: Small Shires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FIGURE 2b:  OVERALL PERFORMANCE 1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 2c: OVERALL PERFORMANCE 1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement
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- Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 4: ADVOCACY 1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 5: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate
vs Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 6: CUSTOMER CONTACT
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate
vs Needs Improvement
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- Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 7: RELATIVE PROPORTION OF THE IMPACT THAT EACH SERVICE AREA HAS ON RESIDENT SATISFACTION OVERALL
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FIGURE 8: LOCAL ROADS AND FOOTPATHS
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate
vs Needs Improvement

- Excellent / Good / Adequate

- Needs Improvement
FIGURE 9: HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 10: RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate
vs Needs Improvement

- Excellent / Good / Adequate

- Needs Improvement
FIGURE 11: APPEARANCE OF PUBLIC AREAS
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement
FIGURE 12: TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND PARKING
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 13: WASTE MANAGEMENT
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement

- Excellent / Good / Adequate

- Needs Improvement
FIGURE 14: ENFORCEMENT OF BY LAWS 1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate vs Needs Improvement
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FIGURE 15: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate
vs Needs Improvement

- Excellent / Good / Adequate
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FIGURE 16: TOWN PLANNING POLICY & APPROVAL
1998 – 2006
Excellent / Good / Adequate
vs Needs Improvement

- Excellent / Good / Adequate

- Needs Improvement