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**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**

Welcome to the report of results and recommendations for the 2014 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.

Each year Local Government Victoria (LGV) coordinates and auspices this State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey throughout Victorian local government areas. This coordinated approach allows for far more cost effective surveying than would be possible if councils commissioned surveys individually.

Participation in the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey is optional and participating councils have a range of choices as to the content of the questionnaire and the sample size to be surveyed, depending on their individual strategic, financial and other considerations.

The main objectives of the survey are to assess the performance of Victorian councils across a range of measures and to seek insight into ways to provide improved or more effective service delivery. The survey also provides councils with a means to fulfil some of their statutory reporting requirements as well as acting as a feedback mechanism to LGV.

**SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLING**

This survey was conducted by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18+ years in participating councils.

Survey sample was purchased from an accredited supplier of publicly available phone records, including up to 10% mobile phone numbers to cater to the diversity of residents in the council, particularly younger people.

A total of n=27,906 completed interviews were achieved across all participating councils. Survey fieldwork was conducted in the period of 31 January – 11 March 2014.

The 2013 results against which 2014 results are compared involved a total of n=29,501 completed interviews across all participating councils conducted in the period of 1 February – 24 March, 2013.

The 2012 results against which results are compared involved a total of n=29,384 completed interviews across all participating councils conducted in the period of 4 May – 30 June 2012.

Minimum quotas of gender within age groups were applied during the fieldwork phase. Post survey weighting was then conducted to ensure accurate representation of the age and gender profile of each council area.

Any variation of +/-1% between individual results and NET scores in this report or the detailed survey tabulations is due to rounding. In reporting, ‘-‘ denotes not mentioned and ‘0%’ denotes mentioned by less than 1% of respondents. “NET” scores refer to two or more response categories being combined into one category for simplicity of reporting.

Within tables and index score charts throughout this report, statistically significant differences at the 95% confidence level are represented by upward directing blue and downward directing red arrows. Significance when noted indicates a significantly higher or lower result for the analysis group in comparison to the ‘Total’ result for the council for that survey question for that year.

Further, results shown in red indicate a significantly lower result than in 2013, while results shown in blue indicate a significantly higher result than in 2013.

**FURTHER INFORMATION**

Further information about the report and explanations about the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey can be found in Appendix A, including:

* Background and objectives
* Margins of error
* Analysis and reporting
* Glossary of terms

**CONTACTS**

For further queries about the conduct and reporting of the 2014 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey, please contact JWS Research on (03) 8685 8555.

**KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Across Victorian councils, there have been significant increases on the **core measures** of overall performance, customer service and advocacy. Consultation and overall council direction ratings remain unchanged from 2013.

The average **overall performance** rating has increased by 1 point in 2014, to a score of 61. This overall performance increase has been driven by significant increases from last year’s 2013 results among Inner Metropolitan councils, Outer Metropolitan councils, Small Rural Shires, women, and 65+ year olds.

* In 2014, Inner Metropolitan councils, Outer Metropolitan councils, women, 18-34 year olds and 65+ year olds award significantly higher than average 2014 overall performance ratings across the state.

On the flipside, men, 35-49 year olds, 50-64 year olds, Regional Centres, Small Rural Shires and Large Rural Shires all rate overall performance significantly lower than average.

The proportion of residents making **contact with their local council** has increased significantly in 2014, by one percentage point up to 61%.

* Phone contact is still the most common method of making contact with council, with 39% of Victorians reporting they have contacted their council via this method in 2014.

**Customer service** ratings have also increased significantly across the state, up 1 point to 72. Customer service is usually the highest rated core measure for most councils, and it tends to rate highly against other service areas as well.

* Inner Metropolitan councils, women and 65+ year olds are significantly more satisfied with their customer service experiences, while Small Rural Shires, Large Rural Shires, 18-64 year olds and men award significantly lower ratings.
* Customer service is rated highest for in person contact (77) – ratings for customer service received in person and by telephone have increased significantly from 2013 (each by 3 points). Written contact is scored lowest for customer service, at 69.
* Victorians often mention customer service unprompted as one of the **best things** about their local council.

**Overall council direction** ratings remain unchanged at 53, although this result does mask some significant increases from 2013 among women (up 1 point), and in Small Rural Shires (up 2 points).

* 63% of Victorians see no change in their council’s direction, while 20% believe it has improved and 13% believe it has decreased.

Positively, 73% of Victorians in councils that asked about **future direction** believe their council is generally headed in the right direction (21% definitely so).

* The proportion of Victorians who believe their council is headed in the right direction has been steadily increasing since 2012, up from two thirds (67%) in 2012 to almost three quarters (73%) in 2014.

That said, 91% of Victorians think there is **room for improvement** in their local council, including 41% who believe there is *a lot* of room for improvement, although this is down 5 points on 2012.

**Community consultation** ratings are also largely unchanged. Overall, the community consultation score of 57 is equal to 2013, and the only significant movement in this score was a 1 point increase in consultation ratings in Inner Metropolitan councils.

By contrast, **advocacy** ratings have increased significantly, by 1 point to 56. Significant increases were registered across a range of demographic and council groupings, including:

* Inner Metropolitan councils
* Small Rural Shires
* Large Rural Shires
* Women
* 35-49 year olds
* 50-64 year olds

In terms of **individual service areas,** there have been statistically significant increases in performance across 12 services:

* Art centres and libraries (+2)
* Waste management (+2)
* Disadvantaged support services (+2)
* The appearance of public areas (+1)
* Recreational facilities (+1)
* Emergency and disaster management (+1)
* Elderly support services (+1)
* Community and cultural activities (+1)
* Family support services (+1)
* The enforcement of local laws (+1)
* Informing the community (+1)
* Maintenance of unsealed roads (+1)

The only decrease in performance on any service area at a state-wide level in 2014 is in **planning and building permits** – down 2 points to a score of 53; the second-lowest rated service area behind unsealed road maintenance.

* Many demographic and council groupings recorded significantly decreased performance ratings for planning and building permits: Outer Metropolitan councils and Regional Centres dropped 4 points each on this measure, 35-49 year olds rated 3 points lower than in 2013, and 1 point decreases were registered by both women and men.

Unsealed road maintenance, despite a 1 point increase in performance ratings in 2014, remained the lowest rated of any service area, with a score of 45. Unsealed roads are a perennial challenge for regional and semi-regional councils; Large Rural Shires in particular rate it significantly lower than average (score of 43), and it remains the service area with the largest gap between residents’ rated importance and councils’ perceived performance (importance – performance = -33).

* Sealed road maintenance issues are also mentioned unprompted as a key **area for improvement** by 12% of Victorians.

Across the state, Councils are consistently perceived as performing better on art centres and libraries and community and cultural activities than residents’ rated importance of these services. By contrast, in addition to unsealed road maintenance (-33), the biggest gaps between rated importance and perceived performance are on:

* Making decisions in the interest of the community (-22)
* Sealed road maintenance (-22)
* Planning for population growth (-21)
* Roadside slashing and weed control (-20)

Positively, emergency and disaster management and waste management are often among residents’ top five most important services, and these are also services that feature regularly in councils’ top five best performing services.

* Emergency and disaster management is particularly important for regional and rural councils, and Large Rural Shires and Regional Centres in particular are rated significantly higher than average for performance on this measure.

On the whole, 18-34 year olds and 65+ year olds tend to rate their councils higher, while 50-64 year olds are less positively disposed towards council. Inner Metropolitan councils tend to attract some of the highest performance ratings, while Outer Metropolitan councils and especially Large Rural Shires councils often rate significantly lower.

On the question of whether residents would prefer rate rises to pay for extra services or would prefer to see services cut to maintain current rate levels, 36% would prefer rate rises while 47% would prefer service cuts; a virtually unchanged split to 2013.

* Those who would prefer service cuts do so more intensely than those who would prefer rate rises: 23% would definitely prefer service cuts, more than twice those who would definitely prefer rate rises (11%).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, council groups whose residents rate their council’s performance higher than average across the board are more willing to consider rate rises: for example, 43% of Inner Metropolitan respondents would prefer rate rises (compared to 42% who would prefer service cuts), but just 28% of Large Rural Shires respondents would prefer rate rises (53% service cuts).

Finally, when it comes to receiving **communications** from council, a newsletter in the mail is still the preferred method of communication.

* This is the case for both under 50s and over 50s, but while the gap between mailed newsletters and emailed newsletters is narrowing among under 50s (36% prefer mail, 24% prefer email), among over 50s there is still a very large gap between mail and email preference (43% prefer mail, 18% prefer email).

**Please note:** The category descriptions for the coded open ended responses are generic summaries only. We recommend further analysis of the detailed cross tabulations and the actual verbatim responses, with a view to understanding the responses in more detail and by their demographic profile, especially for any over or under performing target groups identified for individual councils.This can be achieved via additional consultation and data interrogation, or self-mining the SPSS data provided or via the dashboard portal available to Councils.

**Higher results in 2014**

* Art centres and libraries (+2)
* Waste management (+2)
* Disadvantaged support services (+2)

**Lower results in 2014**

* Planning and building permits (-2)

**Most favourably disposed towards Council**

* 18-34 year olds
* Inner Melbourne Metro

**Least favourably disposed towards Council**

* 50-64 year olds
* Large Rural Shires

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**2014 Summary of Core Measures Index Score Results**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall 2012 | Overall 2013 | Overall 2014 |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | 60 | 60 | **61** |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | 57 | 57 | **57** |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | 55 | 55 | **56** |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | 71 | 71 | **72** |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | 52 | 53 | **53** |

**2014 Summary of Core Measures Detailed Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Overall  2014 | vs. Overall  2013 | Highest score amongst | Lowest score amongst |
| **OVERALL PERFORMANCE** | **61** | 1 points higher | Inner Melbourne Metro | Large Rural Shires |
| **COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**  (Community consultation and engagement) | **57** | Equal | 18-34 year olds | 50-64 year olds |
| **ADVOCACY**  (Lobbying on behalf of the community) | **56** | 1 points higher | 18-34 year olds | 50-64 year olds |
| **CUSTOMER SERVICE** | **72** | 1 points higher | Inner Melbourne Metro | Large Rural Shires |
| **OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION** | **53** | Equal | Outer Melbourne Metro | 50-64 year olds |

**2014 Summary of Key Community Satisfaction Percentage Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| Overall Performance | 11 | 40 | 35 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| Community Consultation | 8 | 32 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| Advocacy | 6 | 27 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 19 |
| Customer Service | 32 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 1 |

**Individual Service Areas Summary Key Results**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Highest results in 2014** | * Art centres and libraries (75) * Waste management (73) * The appearance of public areas (72) |
| **Lowest results in 2014** | * Unsealed road maintenance (45) * Planning and building permits (53) * Planning for population growth (54) |
| **Most favourably disposed towards Council** | * 18-34 year olds * 65+ year olds * Inner Melbourne Metro |
| **Least favourably disposed towards Council** | * 50-64 year olds * Large Rural Shires * Outer Melbourne Metro |

**2014 Percentage Personal and Household Use and Experience of Council Services**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Personal use | Total household use |
| Waste management | 84 | 87 |
| Parking facilities | 83 | 85 |
| Appearance of public areas | 75 | 77 |
| Maintenance of sealed roads | 73 | 75 |
| Condition of local streets & footpaths | 72 | 73 |
| Recreational facilities | 66 | 71 |
| Art centres & libraries | 60 | 68 |
| Maintenance of unsealed roads | 60 | 62 |
| Informing the community | 54 | 58 |
| Traffic management | 52 | 54 |
| Community & cultural activities | 44 | 48 |
| Environmental sustainability | 27 | 30 |
| Making decisions in the interest of the community | 24 | 27 |
| Business & community development & tourism | 23 | 25 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 22 | 24 |
| Consultation & engagement | 19 | 22 |
| Town planning policy | 18 | 20 |
| Planning and building permits | 16 | 19 |
| Tourism development | 18 | 18 |
| Business & community development | 16 | 18 |
| Family support services | 12 | 17 |
| Elderly support services | 11 | 16 |
| Planning for population growth | 13 | 15 |
| Emergency & disaster management | 12 | 13 |
| Lobbying on behalf of the community | 10 | 12 |
| Disadvantaged support services | 7 | 9 |

**Individual Service Area Summary Importance vs Performance**

Service areas where importance exceeds performance by 10 points or more, suggesting further investigation is necessary:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Service | Importance | Performance | Net differential |
| Maintenance of unsealed roads | 78 | 45 | -33 |
| Making decisions in the interest of the community | 79 | 57 | -22 |
| Maintenance of sealed roads | 77 | 55 | -22 |
| Planning for population growth | 75 | 54 | -21 |
| Slashing & weed control | 75 | 55 | -20 |
| Condition of local streets & footpaths | 77 | 58 | -19 |
| Planning and building permits | 71 | 53 | -18 |
| Consultation & engagement | 74 | 57 | -17 |
| Town planning policy | 72 | 55 | -17 |
| Lobbying on behalf of the community | 70 | 56 | -14 |
| Informing the community | 75 | 62 | -13 |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 57 | -13 |
| Traffic management | 70 | 60 | -10 |

**2014 Importance Summary**

The following service areas have seen a decrease in rated importance in 2014 as compared to 2013:

* Unsealed roads, down 3 points from 81 in 2013 to 78 in 2014
* Traffic management, down 2 point from 72 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Local streets and footpaths, down 1 point from 78 in 2013 to 77 in 2014
* Appearance of public areas, down 1 point from 74 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* Family support services, down 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Disadvantaged support services, down 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Town planning policy, down 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Parking facilities, down 1 point from 71 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Enforcement of local laws, down 1 point from 71 in 2013 to 70 in 2014

The following service areas have seen an increase in rated importance in 2014 as compared to 2013:

* Consultation and engagement, up 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 74 in 2014
* Environmental sustainability, up 1 point from 72 in 2013 to 73 in 2014

**2014 Performance Summary**

The following service areas have seen an increase in rated performance in 2014 as compared to 2013:

* Art centres and libraries, up 2 points from 73 in 2013 to 75 in 2014
* Waste management, up 2 points from 71 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* Disadvantaged support services, up 2 points from 62 in 2013 to 64 in 2014
* Appearance of public areas, up 1 point from 71 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Recreational facilities, up 1 point from 70 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Emergency and disaster management, up 1 point from 70 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Elderly support services, up 1 point from 69 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Community and cultural services, up 1 point from 69 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Family support services, up 1 point from 67 in 2013 to 68 in 2014
* Enforcement of local laws, up 1 point from 65 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* Informing the community, up 1 point from 61 in 2013 to 62 in 2014
* Lobbying on behalf of the community, up 1 point from 55 in 2013 to 56 in 2014
* Unsealed road maintenance, up 1 point from 44 in 2013 to 45 in 2014

The following service areas have seen a decrease in rated performance in 2014 as compared to 2013:

* Planning and building permits, down 2 points from 55 in 2013 to 53 in 2014

**Top Five Most Important Service Areas (Highest to Lowest, i.e. #1 – Most Important)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Elderly support services 3. Waste management 4. Community decisions 5. Unsealed roads |
| Inner Metro | 1. Waste management 2. Community decisions 3. Elderly support services 4. Local streets & footpaths 5. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Outer Metro | 1. Elderly support services 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Local streets & footpaths 4. Waste management 5. Unsealed roads |
| Regional Centres | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Community decisions 3. Waste management 4. Elderly support services 5. Sealed roads |
| Small Rural Shires | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Community decisions 3. Sealed roads 4. Unsealed roads 5. Elderly support services |
| Large Rural Shires | 1. Emergency & disaster mngt 2. Community decisions 3. Sealed roads 4. Elderly support services 5. Unsealed roads |

**Bottom Five Most Important Service Areas (Lowest to Highest, i.e. #1 – Least Important)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Community & cultural 2. Tourism development 3. Art centres & libraries 4. Bus/community dev./tourism 5. Business & community dev. |
| Inner Metro | 1. Bus/community dev./tourism 2. Community & cultural 3. Slashing & weed control 4. Business & community dev. 5. Lobbying |
| Outer Metro | 1. Tourism development 2. Community & cultural 3. Bus/community dev./tourism 4. Art centres & libraries 5. Lobbying |
| Regional Centres | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Tourism development 4. Lobbying 5. Planning and building permits |
| Small Rural Shires | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Traffic management 4. Parking facilities 5. Tourism development |
| Large Rural Shires | 1. Community & cultural 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Parking facilities 4. Traffic management 5. Tourism development |

**Top Five Highest Performing Service Areas (Highest to Lowest, i.e. #1 – Highest Performing)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Waste management 3. Appearance of public areas 4. Recreational facilities 5. Emergency & disaster mngt |
| Inner Metro | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Waste management 3. Recreational facilities 4. Appearance of public areas 5. Community & cultural |
| Outer Metro | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Waste management 3. Emergency & disaster mngt 4. Recreational facilities 5. Family support services |
| Regional Centres | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Appearance of public areas 4. Waste management 5. Recreational facilities |
| Small Rural Shires | 1. Appearance of public areas 2. Art centres & libraries 3. Elderly support services 4. Waste management 5. Community & cultural |
| Large Rural Shires | 1. Art centres & libraries 2. Emergency & disaster mngt 3. Appearance of public areas 4. Waste management 5. Elderly support services |

**Bottom Five Lowest Performing Service Areas (Lowest to Highest, i.e. #1 – Lowest Performing)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Planning and building permits 3. Population growth 4. Sealed road maintenance 5. Slashing & weed control |
| Inner Metro | 1. Planning and building permits 2. Population growth 3. Tourism development 4. Town planning policy 5. Parking facilities |
| Outer Metro | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Planning and building permits 3. Town planning policy 4. Lobbying 5. Traffic management |
| Regional Centres | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Parking facilities 3. Sealed roads 4. Planning and building permits 5. Town planning policy |
| Small Rural Shires | 1. Unsealed roads 2. Sealed roads 3. Slashing & weed control 4. Planning and building permits 5. Town planning policy |
| Large Rural Shires | 1. Sealed roads 2. Unsealed roads 3. Slashing & weed control 4. Population growth 5. Local streets & footpaths |

**Importance and Performance Index Scores**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Service** | **Importance** | **Performance** |
| Consultation & engagement | 74 | 57 |
| Lobbying on behalf of the community | 70 | 56 |
| Informing the community | 75 | 62 |
| Condition of local streets & footpaths | 77 | 58 |
| Traffic management | 70 | 60 |
| Parking facilities | 70 | 57 |
| Enforcement of local laws | 70 | 66 |
| Family support services | 72 | 68 |
| Elderly support services | 79 | 70 |
| Disadvantaged support services | 72 | 64 |
| Recreational facilities | 72 | 71 |
| Appearance of public areas | 73 | 72 |
| Art centres & libraries | 66 | 75 |
| Community & cultural activities | 62 | 70 |
| Waste management | 79 | 73 |
| Business & community development & tourism | 67 | 62 |
| Town planning policy | 72 | 55 |
| Planning and building permits | 71 | 53 |
| Environmental sustainability | 73 | 64 |
| Emergency & disaster management | 80 | 71 |
| Planning for population growth | 75 | 54 |
| Slashing & weed control | 75 | 55 |
| Maintenance of unsealed roads | 78 | 45 |
| Making decisions in the interest of the community | 79 | 57 |
| Maintenance of sealed roads | 77 | 55 |
| Business & community development | 69 | 62 |
| Tourism development | 65 | 64 |

**Positives and Areas for Improvement Summary**

Best things:

* Parks and gardens
* Recreational and sporting facilities
* Customer service
* Councillors

Areas for improvement:

* Sealed road maintenance
* Communication
* Community consultation

Each response category was volunteered by roughly one in ten respondents. Road maintenance is a common concern across councils, particularly those outside the Melbourne metropolitan area.

**Communications Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall preferred forms of communication** | * Newsletter sent via mail (39) |
| **Preferred forms of communication among over 50s** | * Newsletter sent via mail (43) |
| **Preferred forms of communication among under 50s** | * Newsletter sent via mail (36) |
| **Greatest change since 2013** | * Newsletter sent via email (up 2 points) |

Although there has been a steady increase in the popularity of an emailed newsletter since 2012, residents on the whole still prefer to receive a council newsletter via post. This is especially the case for residents aged over 50.

**DETAILED FINDINGS**

**KEY CORE MEASURE: OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

**Overall Performance Index Scores**

The overall score for overall performance is 61. This has increased by a statistically significant 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 61:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 68
* 18-34, score of 65
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 63
* Women, score of 62
* 65+, score of 62

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 61:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 60
* Men, score of 60
* Regional Centres, score of 59
* 35-49, score of 59
* Large Rural Shires, score of 57
* 50-64, score of 57

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 2 points from 66 in 2013 to 68 in 2014
* Outer Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 62 in 2013 to 63 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 61 in 2013 to 62 in 2014
* 65+, up 1 point from 61 in 2013 to 62 in 2014
* Small Rural Shires, up 1 point from 59 in 2013 to 60 in 2014

**Overall Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 40 | 35 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 40 | 35 | 10 | 4 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 40 | 36 | 9 | 4 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 15 | 49 | 28 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 10 | 43 | 35 | 8 | 3 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 10 | 37 | 36 | 10 | 6 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 7 | 35 | 39 | 12 | 5 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 12 | 38 | 34 | 10 | 5 | 1 |
| Men | 10 | 40 | 34 | 10 | 5 | 1 |
| Women | 11 | 41 | 35 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 11 | 50 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 39 | 37 | 10 | 5 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 35 | 38 | 12 | 6 | 1 |
| 65+ | 13 | 37 | 35 | 9 | 4 | 2 |

**KEY CORE MEASURE: CUSTOMER SERVICE**

**Contact Last 12 Months Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Overall contact with Council** | * 61%, up 1 point on 2013 |
| **Most contact with Council** | * Aged 35-49 years |
| **Least Contact with Council** | * Rural Cities and Regional Centres |
| **Customer Service rating** | * Index score of 72, up 1 point on 2013 |
| **Most satisfied with Customer Service** | * Inner Melbourne Metro |
| **Least satisfied with Customer Service** | * Large Rural Shires |

**2014 Contact with Council Last 12 Months**

61% of Victorians have had contact with their council; this is a significant increase of 1% since 2013.

39% of Victorians have not had contact with their council.

**2014 Contact with Council Last 12 Months Including Method of Contact**

39% of Victorians who had contact with Council in the last 12 months made contact via telephone; this is a significant increase of 2% since 2013.

30% made contact in person, 16% in writing, 15% by email, 12% via Council websites, 2% by social media and 1% by text message.

**2014 Contact with Council Last 12 Months Including Method of Contact**

44% of Victorians who had contact with Council in the last 12 months report their most recent method of contact to be via telephone.

28% had their most recent contact in person, 11% in writing, 10% by email, 5% via Council websites, 2% by social media and 0% by text message.

**2014 Contact Customer Service Index Scores**

The overall score for customer service is 72. This has increased by a statistically significant 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 74
* 65+, score of 74
* Women, score of 73
* The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 72:
* Small Rural Shires, score of 71
* 18-34, score of 71
* 35-49, score of 71
* Men, score of 70
* 50-64, score of 70
* Large Rural Shires, score of 68

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Women, up 1 point from 72 in 2013 to 73 in 2014

**2014 Contact Customer Service Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 32 | 38 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 31 | 38 | 17 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 31 | 37 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 35 | 38 | 15 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 34 | 39 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 35 | 38 | 14 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 27 | 39 | 17 | 10 | 6 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 33 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| Men | 29 | 40 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 2 |
| Women | 36 | 36 | 16 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 28 | 41 | 16 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 38 | 16 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 32 | 36 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 1 |
| 65+ | 38 | 35 | 14 | 7 | 5 | 1 |

**2014 Contact Customer Service By Method of Last Contact Index Scores**

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* By telephone, up 3 points from 72 in 2013 to 75 in 2014
* In person, up 3 points from 74 in 2013 to 77 in 2014

**2014 Contact Customer Service By Method of Last Contact Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| By Telephone | 37 | 38 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| In Person | 43 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| In Writing | 27 | 36 | 21 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| By Email | 31 | 35 | 19 | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| Via Website | 29 | 45 | 14 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| By Social Media | 25 | 55 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 1 |

**KEY CORE MEASURE: COUNCIL DIRECTION INDICATORS**

**Council Direction Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Council Direction** | * 63% stayed about the same, equal points on 2013 * 20% improved, up 1 point on 2013 * 13% deteriorated, equal points on 2013 |
| **Most satisfied with Council Direction** | * Outer Melbourne Metro * 18-34 year olds |
| **Least satisfied with Council Direction** | * 50-64 year olds |
| **Room for improvement** | * 41% a lot of room for improvement * 50% a little room for improvement * 6% not much/no room for improvement |
| **Right vs wrong direction** | * 73% right direction (21% definitely, 52% probably) * 17% wrong direction (8% definitely, 9% probably) |
| **Rates vs services trade-off** | * 36% prefer rate rises (11% definitely) * 47% prefer service cuts (23% definitely) |

**2014 Overall Direction Last 12 Months Index Scores**

The overall score for overall council direction is 53. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 53:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 57
* 18-34, score of 57
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 55
* Women, score of 55
* Small Rural Shires, score of 54
* 65+, score of 54

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 53:

* Men, score of 52
* Large Rural Shires, score of 51
* 35-49, score of 51
* 50-64, score of 50

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 2 points from 52 in 2013 to 54 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 54 in 2013 to 55 in 2014

**2014 Overall Council Direction Last 12 Months Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Improved | Stayed the same | Deteriorated | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 63 | 13 | 5 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 64 | 15 | 4 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 17 | 69 | 8 | 6 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 22 | 62 | 10 | 6 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 23 | 56 | 18 | 4 |
| Large Rural Shires | 17 | 63 | 16 | 3 |
| Small Rural Shires | 21 | 61 | 14 | 4 |
| Men | 19 | 62 | 15 | 4 |
| Women | 20 | 63 | 12 | 5 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 65 | 8 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 17 | 64 | 14 | 5 |
| 50-64 | 18 | 62 | 17 | 4 |
| 65+ | 22 | 59 | 14 | 5 |

**2014 Room for Improvement Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A lot | A little | Not much | Not at all | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 41 | 50 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 46 | 46 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 47 | 45 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 36 | 53 | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 46 | 47 | 5 | - | 3 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 47 | 48 | 3 | \* | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 45 | 48 | 4 | \* | 2 |
| Small Rural Shires | 33 | 54 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Men | 40 | 52 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Women | 42 | 49 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 37 | 57 | 5 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 44 | 50 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 47 | 46 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 38 | 49 | 7 | 1 | 5 |

**2014 Right/Wrong Direction Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Definitely right direction | Probably right direction | Probably wrong direction | Definitely wrong direction | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 21 | 52 | 9 | 8 | 10 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 50 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 49 | 11 | 12 | 10 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 21 | 56 | 6 | 7 | 11 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 18 | 52 | 9 | 9 | 12 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 19 | 50 | 11 | 10 | 10 |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 55 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Small Rural Shires | 25 | 49 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| Men | 22 | 50 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| Women | 21 | 54 | 8 | 7 | 10 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 59 | 6 | 5 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 21 | 49 | 11 | 10 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 19 | 51 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 65+ | 24 | 50 | 7 | 8 | 11 |

**2014 Rates/Service Trade Off Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Definitely prefer rate rise | Probably prefer rate rise | Probably prefer service cuts | Definitely prefer service cuts | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 17 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 18 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 29 | 22 | 22 | 16 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 14 | 29 | 22 | 20 | 15 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 10 | 23 | 26 | 23 | 18 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 12 | 27 | 23 | 22 | 16 |
| Large Rural Shires | 8 | 20 | 26 | 27 | 19 |
| Small Rural Shires | 12 | 25 | 23 | 25 | 16 |
| Men | 13 | 25 | 23 | 24 | 16 |
| Women | 10 | 26 | 25 | 22 | 18 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 27 | 30 | 19 | 12 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 26 | 22 | 24 | 18 |
| 50-64 | 11 | 25 | 22 | 24 | 17 |
| 65+ | 11 | 24 | 21 | 25 | 19 |

**POSITIVES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

**2014 Best Things about Council Detailed Percentages (Top Issues or Services)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parks and gardens | 10 |
| Recreational/Sporting facilities | 9 |
| Customer service | 9 |
| Councillors | 9 |
| Community facilities | 7 |
| Public areas | 6 |
| Waste management | 6 |
| Community support services | 5 |
| Road/Street maintenance | 5 |
| Community activities and public events | 5 |
| Nothing | 10 |

**2014 Council Needs to Improve Detailed Percentages (Top Issues or Services)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sealed road maintenance | 12 |
| Communication | 9 |
| Community consultation | 8 |
| Traffic management | 5 |
| Inappropriate development | 4 |
| Financial management | 4 |
| Parking availability | 4 |
| Median strips/Nature strips | 4 |
| Waste management | 4 |
| Footpaths/Walking tracks | 4 |
| Nothing | 12 |

**COMMUNICATIONS**

**2014 Best Forms of Communication Percentages**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 39 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 21 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 17 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local newspaper | 14 |
| A text message | 3 |
| The council website | 2 |
| Other | 2 |
| Can't say | 1 |

**2014 Best Forms of Communication – Under 50s Percentages**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 36 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 24 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 16 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local newspaper | 14 |
| A text message | 5 |
| The council website | 2 |
| Other | 3 |
| Can't say | 0 |

**2014 Best Forms of Communication – Over 50s Percentages**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A council newsletter sent via mail | 43 |
| A council newsletter sent via email | 18 |
| Advertising in a local newspaper | 18 |
| A council newsletter as an insert in a local newspaper | 15 |
| A text message | 1 |
| The council website | 1 |
| Other | 2 |
| Can't say | 1 |

**INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS**

**2014 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for community consultation and engagement is 74. This has increased by a statistically significant 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 74:

* 50-64, score of 77
* Women, score of 76
* 35-49, score of 76
* Large Rural Shires, score of 75
* Small Rural Shires, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 74:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 72
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 71
* Men, score of 71
* 35-49, score of 68

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* 35-49, up 2 points from 74 in 2013 to 76 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 75 in 2013 to 76 in 2014

**2014 Community Consultation and Engagement Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 28 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 24 | 41 | 29 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 25 | 42 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 30 | 40 | 24 | 4 | \* | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 31 | 41 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 31 | 42 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 25 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 32 | 42 | 22 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 36 | 33 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 31 | 41 | 24 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 36 | 42 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 26 | 46 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 3 |

**2014 Community Consultation and Engagement Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for community consultation and engagement is 57. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 57:

* 18-34, score of 60
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 59
* Small Rural Shires, score of 58
* Women, score of 58
* 65+, score of 58

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 57:

* Regional Centres, score of 56
* Men, score of 56
* 35-49, score of 56
* Large Rural Shires, score of 55
* 50-64, score of 54

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 58 in 2013 to 59 in 2014

**2014 Community Consultation and Engagement Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 32 | 32 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| 2013 Overall | 8 | 32 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 9 |
| 2012 Overall | 8 | 33 | 33 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 9 | 33 | 32 | 12 | 3 | 11 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 7 | 32 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 13 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 8 | 32 | 33 | 14 | 6 | 7 |
| Large Rural Shires | 7 | 31 | 34 | 16 | 6 | 7 |
| Small Rural Shires | 10 | 33 | 30 | 12 | 6 | 9 |
| Men | 8 | 32 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 9 |
| Women | 9 | 32 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 10 |
| 18-34 | 8 | 37 | 34 | 10 | 3 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 7 | 32 | 33 | 14 | 5 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 29 | 33 | 16 | 6 | 9 |
| 65+ | 11 | 30 | 29 | 13 | 5 | 12 |

**2014 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for lobbying on behalf of the community is 70. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Women, score of 73
* Small Rural Shires, score of 72
* 50-64, score of 72
* Large Rural Shires, score of 71

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* 65+, score of 69
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 68
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 67
* Men, score of 67
* 18-34, score of 67

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Men, up 1 point from 66 in 2013 to 67 in 2014

**2014 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 23 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 19 | 39 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 20 | 40 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 23 | 40 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 26 | 40 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural Shires | 24 | 44 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 19 | 38 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 26 | 42 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 39 | 30 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 26 | 39 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 27 | 40 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 19 | 44 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 5 |

**2014 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for community consultation and engagement is 56. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 56:

* 18-34, score of 59
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 57
* Small Rural Shires, score of 57
* Women, score of 57
* 65+, score of 57

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 56:

* Men, score of 55
* Large Rural Shires, score of 54
* 35-49, score of 54
* 50-64, score of 53

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 56 in 2013 to 57 in 2014
* Small Rural Shires, up 1 point from 56 in 2013 to 57 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 56 in 2013 to 57 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 1 point from 53 in 2013 to 54 in 2014
* 35-49, up 1 point from 53 in 2013 to 54 in 2014
* 50-64, up 1 point from 52 in 2013 to 53 in 2014

**2014 Lobbying on Behalf of the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 6 | 27 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 19 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 26 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 18 |
| 2012 Overall | 6 | 27 | 33 | 12 | 4 | 17 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 5 | 25 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 27 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 4 | 27 | 33 | 10 | 4 | 23 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 7 | 30 | 33 | 13 | 5 | 13 |
| Large Rural Shires | 5 | 27 | 34 | 14 | 5 | 16 |
| Small Rural Shires | 8 | 28 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 18 |
| Men | 5 | 27 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 19 |
| Women | 6 | 27 | 33 | 11 | 3 | 20 |
| 18-34 | 5 | 33 | 34 | 8 | 2 | 16 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 25 | 34 | 13 | 5 | 18 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 23 | 33 | 15 | 5 | 19 |
| 65+ | 8 | 26 | 29 | 11 | 4 | 24 |

**2014 Informing the Community Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for informing the community is 75. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* Women, score of 78
* Large Rural Shires, score of 76

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* 18-34, score of 73
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 72
* Men, score of 71

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 2 points from 76 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Informing the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 30 | 43 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 30 | 44 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 31 | 44 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 26 | 43 | 26 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 28 | 44 | 24 | 4 | \* | \* |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 34 | 40 | 22 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 33 | 44 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 32 | 43 | 21 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Men | 24 | 43 | 26 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 36 | 43 | 18 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 27 | 42 | 26 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 32 | 41 | 23 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 34 | 42 | 20 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 28 | 48 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

**2014 Informing the Community Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for informing the community is 62. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 65
* 65+, score of 65
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 64
* Women, score of 63
* 18-34, score of 63

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 60
* 50-64, score of 60

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 4 points from 61 in 2013 to 65 in 2014
* 65+, up 2 points from 63 in 2013 to 65 in 2014
* 35-49, up 2 points from 60 in 2013 to 62 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 62 in 2013 to 64 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 62 in 2013 to 63 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 61 in 2013 to 62 in 2014

**2014 Informing the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 40 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 12 | 38 | 32 | 11 | 3 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 12 | 38 | 31 | 13 | 4 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 15 | 39 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 3 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 12 | 39 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 3 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 12 | 38 | 33 | 11 | 4 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 11 | 39 | 30 | 13 | 5 | 2 |
| Small Rural Shires | 15 | 42 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| Men | 12 | 40 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 3 |
| Women | 14 | 39 | 31 | 11 | 3 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 42 | 32 | 10 | 2 | 3 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 40 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 37 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 2 |
| 65+ | 17 | 39 | 28 | 10 | 3 | 3 |

**2014 Local Streets and Footpaths Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the condition of local streets and footpaths is 77. This is down a significant 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 77:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 79
* Women, score of 79
* 35-49, score of 78
* 50-64, score of 78

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 77:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 76
* Small Rural Shires, score of 75
* Men, score of 74
* 18-34, score 74

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Women, down 2 points from 81 in 2013 to 79 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, down 2 points from 78 in 2013 to 76 in 2014
* 65+, down 1 point from 78 in 2013 to 77 in 2014
* Men, down 1 point from 75 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Local Streets and Footpaths Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 44 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 35 | 44 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 32 | 46 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 30 | 49 | 18 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 38 | 44 | 14 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 34 | 45 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 35 | 42 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 31 | 41 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Men | 28 | 46 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 38 | 42 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 30 | 41 | 23 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 37 | 42 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 36 | 43 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 30 | 49 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

**2014 Local Streets and Footpaths Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the condition of local streets and footpaths is 58. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 58:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 64
* 18-34, score of 62
* Men, score of 59

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 58:

* 35-49, score of 57
* 65+, score of 57
* Women, score of 56
* 50-64, score of 54
* Large Rural Shires, score of 53

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 2 points from 56 in 2013 to 58 in 2014

**2014 Local Streets and Footpaths Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 7 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 14 | 33 | 28 | 15 | 8 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 13 | 34 | 28 | 15 | 9 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 18 | 39 | 26 | 13 | 4 | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 16 | 35 | 26 | 15 | 7 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 14 | 32 | 30 | 15 | 7 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 9 | 30 | 30 | 17 | 10 | 3 |
| Small Rural Shires | 12 | 35 | 27 | 14 | 7 | 5 |
| Men | 14 | 36 | 27 | 14 | 7 | 2 |
| Women | 12 | 32 | 30 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 37 | 25 | 13 | 6 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 34 | 28 | 16 | 7 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 10 | 32 | 29 | 17 | 9 | 3 |
| 65+ | 12 | 32 | 30 | 15 | 8 | 3 |

**2014 Traffic Management Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for traffic management is 70. This is down a significant 2 points since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 75
* Women, score of 73
* 65+, score of 73
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 72
* Regional Centres, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 67
* Men, score of 67
* Small Rural Shires, score 64

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* 50-64, down 3 points from 74 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Women, down 2 points from 75 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, down 2 points from 74 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* 35-49, down 2 points from 71 in 2013 to 69 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, down 2 points from 69 in 2013 to 67 in 2014
* Men, down 2 points from 69 in 2013 to 67 in 2014

**2014 Traffic Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 26 | 42 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 29 | 42 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 26 | 43 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 31 | 43 | 22 | 4 | \* | \* |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 26 | 43 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 18 | 41 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 15 | 40 | 34 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 18 | 42 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 28 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 21 | 41 | 30 | 7 | 1 | - |
| 35-49 | 22 | 41 | 29 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 26 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 24 | 48 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

**2014 Traffic Management Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for traffic management is 60. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 60:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 68
* 18-34, score of 63
* Large Rural Shires, score of 61
* Women, score of 61

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 60:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 59
* 50-64, score of 58
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 56

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 4 points from 64 in 2013 to 68 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 60 in 2013 to 61 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 59 in 2013 to 60 in 2014

**2014 Traffic Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 10 | 40 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 39 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 38 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 10 | 39 | 31 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 9 | 38 | 28 | 15 | 8 | 3 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 12 | 39 | 31 | 12 | 4 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 10 | 42 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 4 |
| Small Rural Shires | 14 | 51 | 23 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| Men | 10 | 41 | 29 | 13 | 5 | 3 |
| Women | 11 | 40 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 4 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 44 | 28 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 41 | 28 | 13 | 6 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 37 | 33 | 13 | 6 | 3 |
| 65+ | 10 | 39 | 30 | 12 | 4 | 5 |

**2014 Parking Facilities Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for parking facilities is 70. This is down a significant 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Regional Centres, score of 75
* Women, score of 74
* 65+, score of 74
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 73

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* 18-34, score of 68
* Small Rural Shires, score 67
* Men, score of 67
* Large Rural Shires, score of 66

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Large Rural Shires, down 3 points from 69 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* 50-64, down 2 points from 73 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, down 2 points from 72 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Women, down 1 point from 75 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Parking Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 24 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 23 | 42 | 28 | 6 | \* | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 25 | 43 | 27 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 32 | 40 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 19 | 38 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 21 | 38 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 19 | 39 | 31 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 29 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 37 | 31 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 22 | 38 | 32 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 25 | 39 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 27 | 46 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

**2014 Parking Facilities Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for parking facilities is 57. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 57:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 62
* Large Rural Shires, score of 60
* 18-34, score of 60
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 59
* Men, score of 58
* 35-49, score of 58

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 57:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 56
* 50-64, score of 55
* Regional Centres, score of 52

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Women, up 1 point from 56 in 2013 to 57 in 2014

**2014 Parking Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 10 | 35 | 32 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 9 | 36 | 33 | 14 | 6 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 9 | 35 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 9 | 34 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 3 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 11 | 37 | 30 | 13 | 6 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 8 | 28 | 34 | 20 | 8 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 11 | 38 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 3 |
| Small Rural Shires | 12 | 42 | 28 | 11 | 5 | 2 |
| Men | 10 | 36 | 32 | 15 | 5 | 2 |
| Women | 10 | 34 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 37 | 31 | 14 | 4 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 36 | 33 | 14 | 5 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 8 | 33 | 34 | 16 | 7 | 2 |
| 65+ | 9 | 33 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 3 |

**2014 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for enforcement of local laws is 70. This is down a significant 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 75
* Women, score of 74
* 65+, score of 73
* Regional Centres, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Small Rural Shires, score 68
* 35-49, score of 68
* Men, score of 66

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* 18-34, down 2 points from 72 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* 35-49, down 2 points from 70 in 2013 to 68 in 2014
* Men, down 2 points from 68 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* Women, down 1 point from 75 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Enforcement of Local Laws Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 24 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 40 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 41 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 23 | 42 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 33 | 39 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 26 | 41 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 39 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 22 | 36 | 31 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 20 | 37 | 32 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 29 | 42 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 25 | 38 | 28 | 7 | 2 | \* |
| 35-49 | 23 | 35 | 32 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 25 | 38 | 29 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 24 | 46 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

**2014 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for enforcement of local laws is 66. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 66:

* 18-34, score of 69
* Regional Centres, score of 67
* Small Rural Shires, score of 67
* Women, score of 67

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 66:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 65
* Men, score of 65
* 65+, score of 64
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 63
* 50-64, score of 63

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 2 points from 65 in 2013 to 67 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 66 in 2013 to 67 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 65 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* 35-49, up 1 point from 65 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 64 in 2013 to 65 in 2014

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 2 points from 65 in 2013 to 63 in 2014

**2014 Enforcement of Local Laws Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 14 | 41 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| 2013 Overall | 13 | 40 | 25 | 7 | 3 | 12 |
| 2012 Overall | 13 | 40 | 26 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 14 | 39 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 13 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 13 | 38 | 24 | 10 | 4 | 11 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 16 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| Large Rural Shires | 13 | 42 | 25 | 7 | 2 | 10 |
| Small Rural Shires | 15 | 43 | 22 | 6 | 3 | 11 |
| Men | 13 | 41 | 25 | 8 | 3 | 10 |
| Women | 15 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
| 18-34 | 18 | 46 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 7 |
| 35-49 | 13 | 43 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 11 |
| 50-64 | 12 | 37 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 12 |
| 65+ | 12 | 37 | 27 | 7 | 3 | 14 |

**2014 Family Support Services Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for family support services is 72. This is down a significant 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Women, score of 77
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 74
* Regional Centres, score of 74
* 18-34, score of 74
* Large Rural Shires, score of 73
* 35-49, score of 73

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score 71
* Men, score of 68

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 3 points from 77 in 2013 to 74 in 2014
* Women, down 1 point from 78 in 2013 to 77 in 2014

**2014 Family Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 26 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 44 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 44 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 24 | 43 | 25 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 29 | 42 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 30 | 40 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 26 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural Shires | 24 | 44 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Men | 19 | 41 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 33 | 44 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 30 | 42 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 28 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 25 | 40 | 25 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 21 | 46 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 5 |

**2014 Family Support Services Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for family support services is 68. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 68:

* 65+, score of 72
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 69
* Regional Centres, score of 69
* Small Rural Shires, score of 69
* Women, score of 69
* 18-34, score of 69

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 68:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 67
* 35-49, score of 67
* 50-64, score of 66

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 2 points from 67 in 2013 to 69 in 2014
* 50-64, up 2 points from 64 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* 65+, up 1 point from 71 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 68 in 2013 to 69 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 68 in 2013 to 69 in 2014
* 18-34, up 1 point from 68 in 2013 to 69 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 67 in 2013 to 68 in 2014
* 35-49, up 1 point from 67 in 2013 to 68 in 2014

**2014 Family Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 12 | 33 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 33 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 29 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 34 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 26 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 11 | 30 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 36 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 12 | 31 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 31 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 14 | 38 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 22 |
| Large Rural Shires | 12 | 36 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 25 |
| Small Rural Shires | 14 | 33 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 29 |
| Men | 11 | 33 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 30 |
| Women | 14 | 33 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 28 |
| 18-34 | 14 | 39 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 20 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 35 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 25 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 29 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 35 |
| 65+ | 15 | 30 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 38 |

**2014 Elderly Support Services Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for elderly support services is 79. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 79:

* Women, score of 83
* Small Rural Shires, score of 80
* 50-64, score of 80

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 79:

* 35-49, score 78
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 77
* 18-34, score of 77
* Men, score of 68

Importance ratings have not increased or decreased significantly among any groups since 2013.

**2014 Elderly Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 35 | 46 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 36 | 45 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 37 | 46 | 14 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 31 | 48 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 40 | 41 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 37 | 46 | 14 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 35 | 45 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 38 | 44 | 14 | 2 | \* | 2 |
| Men | 27 | 48 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 43 | 44 | 11 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 33 | 46 | 18 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 35-49 | 34 | 46 | 17 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 40 | 43 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 35 | 48 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

**2014 Elderly Support Services Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for elderly support services is 70. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* 65+, score of 74
* Small Rural Shires, score of 73
* Women, score of 71

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 69
* 18-34, score of 69
* 50-64, score of 69
* 35-49, score of 68
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 67

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Regional Centres, up 3 points from 67 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* 50-64, up 2 points from 67 in 2013 to 69 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 70 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 1 point from 69 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 69 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 68 in 2013 to 69 in 2014
* 35-49, up 1 point from 67 in 2013 to 68 in 2014

**2014 Elderly Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 16 | 34 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 27 |
| 2013 Overall | 15 | 33 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 28 |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 34 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 25 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 12 | 30 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 37 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 12 | 29 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 35 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 17 | 37 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 20 |
| Large Rural Shires | 17 | 37 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 22 |
| Small Rural Shires | 23 | 36 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| Men | 15 | 36 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 27 |
| Women | 18 | 33 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 26 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 36 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 28 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 31 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 34 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 34 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 26 |
| 65+ | 25 | 35 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 18 |

**2014 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for disadvantaged support services is 72. This is down a significant 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Women, score of 77
* 18-34, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Men, score of 68

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 4 points from 78 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Disadvantaged Support Services Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 44 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 27 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 26 | 44 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 29 | 42 | 22 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 26 | 45 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 24 | 44 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 19 | 42 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 31 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 28 | 43 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 43 | 28 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 26 | 43 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 22 | 47 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 5 |

**2014 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for disadvantaged support services is 64. This is a significant increase of 2 points from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 64:

* 65+, score of 67
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 65
* Men, score of 65
* 18-34, score of 65

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 64:

* Women, score of 63
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 62
* 35-49, score of 62
* 50-64, score of 61

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 4 points from 62 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* 65+, up 3 points from 64 in 2013 to 67 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 2 points from 63 in 2013 to 65 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 2 points from 62 in 2013 to 64 in 2014
* Women, up 2 points from 61 in 2013 to 63 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 64 in 2013 to 65 in 2014

**2014 Disadvantaged Support Services Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 28 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 35 |
| 2013 Overall | 7 | 27 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 36 |
| 2012 Overall | 8 | 28 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 34 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 8 | 25 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 41 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 7 | 23 | 23 | 6 | 1 | 39 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 11 | 32 | 23 | 6 | 1 | 26 |
| Large Rural Shires | 8 | 31 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 32 |
| Small Rural Shires | 11 | 31 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 33 |
| Men | 9 | 29 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 35 |
| Women | 8 | 27 | 22 | 6 | 1 | 35 |
| 18-34 | 10 | 33 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 26 |
| 35-49 | 7 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 39 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 25 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 38 |
| 65+ | 11 | 27 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 38 |

**2014 Recreational Facilities Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for recreational facilities is 72. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Women, score of 74
* 35-49, score of 74
* Regional Centres, score of 73

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 71
* 65+, score of 71
* Men, score of 70
* 18-34, score of 70

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Large Rural Shires, down 2 points from 74 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* 35-49, down 1 point from 75 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Recreational Facilities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 47 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 23 | 47 | 26 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 22 | 49 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 21 | 47 | 27 | 4 | \* | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 26 | 43 | 27 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 24 | 47 | 25 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 47 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 22 | 46 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 20 | 45 | 29 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 25 | 48 | 23 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 42 | 30 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 28 | 45 | 23 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 23 | 48 | 25 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 19 | 51 | 24 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

**2014 Recreational Facilities Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for recreational facilities is 71. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 71:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 75
* 65+, score of 74
* Regional Centres, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 71:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 70
* Men, score of 70
* 35-49, score of 69
* 50-64, score of 69
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 68
* Large Rural Shires, score of 68

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 2 points from 73 in 2013 to 75 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 2 points from 66 in 2013 to 68 in 2014
* 65+, up 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 74 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 70 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* 18-34, up 1 point from 70 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* 35-49, up 1 point from 68 in 2013 to 69 in 2014

**2014 Recreational Facilities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 23 | 44 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 22 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| 2012 Overall | 21 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 27 | 47 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 20 | 43 | 23 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 24 | 45 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 19 | 44 | 23 | 8 | 3 | 3 |
| Small Rural Shires | 24 | 42 | 21 | 6 | 3 | 4 |
| Men | 22 | 45 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Women | 24 | 43 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 23 | 45 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 22 | 44 | 22 | 8 | 3 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 20 | 44 | 22 | 7 | 3 | 4 |
| 65+ | 26 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 6 |

**2014 Appearance of Public Areas Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the appearance of public areas is 73. This is down a significant 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 73:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 75
* Regional Centres, score of 75
* Women, score of 75
* 35-49, score of 75
* 50-64, score of 75
* Small Rural Shires, score of 74
* 65+, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 73:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 72
* Men, score of 71
* 18-34, score of 70

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Women, down 1 point from 76 in 2013 to 75 in 2014
* 65+, down 1 point from 75 in 2013 to 74 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, down 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Men, down 1 point from 72 in 2013 to 71 in 2014

**2014 Appearance of Public Areas Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 48 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 26 | 48 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 49 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 22 | 48 | 27 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 29 | 45 | 23 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 27 | 47 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 48 | 25 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Small Rural Shires | 25 | 48 | 25 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Men | 21 | 47 | 28 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 28 | 48 | 22 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 22 | 41 | 32 | 4 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 28 | 47 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 26 | 48 | 23 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 22 | 54 | 21 | 2 | \* | 1 |

**2014 Appearance of Public Areas Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the appearance of public areas is 72. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 76
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 73
* Regional Centres, score of 73
* 18-34, score of 73
* 65+, score of 73

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 71
* 50-64, score of 71
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 66

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 3 points from 73 in 2013 to 76 in 2014
* 35-49, up 2 points from 70 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 2 points from 69 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* 50-64, up 2 points from 69 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 72 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* 18-34, up 1 point from 72 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* 65+, up 1 point from 72 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 71 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 71 in 2013 to 72 in 2014

**2014 Appearance of Public Areas Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 46 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 24 | 46 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 23 | 48 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 26 | 46 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 18 | 43 | 25 | 9 | 3 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 28 | 45 | 20 | 4 | 2 | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 22 | 48 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 32 | 47 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 25 | 47 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 26 | 45 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 27 | 47 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 25 | 47 | 19 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 23 | 46 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 27 | 45 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 1 |

**2014 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for art centres and libraries is 66. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 66:

* Women, score of 70
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 68
* 65+, score of 68

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 66:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 63
* 18-34, score of 63
* Men, score of 62

Importance ratings have not increased or decreased significantly among any groups since 2013.

**2014 Art Centres and Libraries Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 17 | 40 | 33 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 16 | 42 | 33 | 7 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 17 | 42 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 18 | 45 | 30 | 5 | 1 | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 20 | 40 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 16 | 40 | 33 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 15 | 36 | 36 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 15 | 38 | 35 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 13 | 36 | 37 | 11 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 20 | 45 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 35 | 37 | 10 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 17 | 40 | 33 | 8 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 17 | 41 | 31 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 17 | 46 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 2 |

**2014 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the appearance of public areas is 75. This is a significant increase of 2 points from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* 65+, score of 78
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 77
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 77
* Women, score of 77
* Regional Centres, score of 76
* 35-49, score of 76

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* Men, score of 74
* 18-34, score of 74
* Large Rural Shires, score of 73
* 50-64, score of 73

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 6 points from 59 in 2013 to 75 in 2014
* Women, up 3 points from 74 in 2013 to 77 in 2014
* 35-49, up 3 points from 73 in 2013 to 76 in 2014
* 65+, up 2 points from 76 in 2013 to 78 in 2014
* Men, up 2 points from 72 in 2013 to 74 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 2 points from 71 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 76 in 2013 to 77 in 2014
* 18-34, up 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Art Centres and Libraries Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 27 | 44 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 44 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 44 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 28 | 46 | 16 | 2 | \* | 7 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 29 | 45 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 30 | 43 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 44 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| Small Rural Shires | 24 | 44 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| Men | 24 | 43 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| Women | 29 | 45 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 18-34 | 25 | 45 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 35-49 | 27 | 46 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 50-64 | 23 | 44 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| 65+ | 32 | 42 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 9 |

**2014 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for community and cultural activities is 62. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Women, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 61
* Men, score of 58

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, down 4 points from 64 in 2013 to 60 in 2014
* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 2 points from 64 in 2013 to 62 in 2014
* 65+, down 2 points from 63 in 2013 to 61 in 2014
* Men, down 1 point from 59 in 2013 to 58 in 2014

**2014 Community and Cultural Activities Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 37 | 39 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 10 | 35 | 43 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 13 | 36 | 39 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 12 | 39 | 39 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 12 | 36 | 40 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 9 | 37 | 41 | 9 | 3 | - |
| Men | 9 | 33 | 43 | 13 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 14 | 40 | 39 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 35 | 43 | 9 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 12 | 36 | 41 | 9 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 11 | 37 | 40 | 10 | 2 | \* |
| 65+ | 9 | 39 | 39 | 9 | 2 | 2 |

**2014 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for community and cultural activities is 70. This is a significant increase of 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 72
* 65+, score of 72
* Regional Centres, score of 71
* Women, score of 71
* 35-49, score of 71

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 70:

* 18-34, score of 69
* 50-64, score of 69
* Large Rural Shires, score of 68
* Men, score of 68
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 67

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 3 points from 68 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 2 points from 70 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* 35-49, up 2 points from 69 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 70 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* 18-34, up 1 point from 68 in 2013 to 69 in 2014

**2014 Community and Cultural Activities Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 18 | 44 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 2013 Overall | 17 | 44 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 44 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 21 | 43 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 15 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 9 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 21 | 46 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| Large Rural Shires | 15 | 45 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| Small Rural Shires | 19 | 47 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| Men | 16 | 43 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| Women | 21 | 44 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| 18-34 | 19 | 42 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| 35-49 | 19 | 46 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 7 |
| 50-64 | 16 | 44 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| 65+ | 20 | 43 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 12 |

**2014 Waste Management Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for waste management is 79. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 79:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 81
* Regional Centres, score of 80
* Women, score of 80
* 50-64, score of 80
* 65+, score of 80

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 79:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 77
* Small Rural Shires, score of 77
* Men, score of 77
* 18-34, score of 77

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 2 points from 81 in 2013 to 79 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, down 1 point from 82 in 2013 to 81 in 2014
* Women, down 1 point from 81 in 2013 to 80 in 2014
* 50-64, down 1 point from 81 in 2013 to 80 in 2014
* 35-49, down 1 point from 80 in 2013 to 79 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, down 1 point from 78 in 2013 to 77 in 2014

**2014 Waste Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 35 | 47 | 16 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 36 | 47 | 15 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 32 | 49 | 16 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 38 | 49 | 12 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 36 | 45 | 17 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 38 | 44 | 16 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 31 | 47 | 19 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 32 | 47 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 31 | 48 | 18 | 2 | \* | \* |
| Women | 38 | 46 | 14 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 33 | 43 | 21 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 35 | 46 | 17 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 50-64 | 38 | 45 | 14 | 1 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 33 | 54 | 12 | 1 | \* | 1 |

**2014 Waste Management Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for waste management is 73. This is a significant increase of 2 points from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 73:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 76
* 65+, score of 75
* 18-34, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 73:

* Women, score of 72
* 35-49, score of 71
* 50-64, score of 71
* Large Rural Shires, score of 70

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Regional Centres, up 3 points from 69 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 2 points from 74 in 2013 to 76 in 2014
* Small Rural Shires, up 2 points from 71 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* Women, up 2 points from 70 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* 35-49, up 2 points from 69 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* 50-64, up 2 points from 69 in 2013 to 71 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 2 points from 68 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* 65+, up 1 point from 74 in 2013 to 75 in 2014
* 18-34, up 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 74 in 2014
* Men, up 1 point from 72 in 2013 to 73 in 2014

**2014 Waste Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 26 | 47 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 24 | 47 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 48 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 31 | 49 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 26 | 46 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 26 | 46 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 47 | 18 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Small Rural Shires | 27 | 47 | 16 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Men | 27 | 48 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Women | 26 | 47 | 17 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 26 | 49 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 24 | 47 | 17 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 23 | 47 | 18 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| 65+ | 31 | 46 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 2 |

**2014 Business and Community Development and Tourism Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for business and community development and tourism is 67. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 67:

* Regional Centres, score of 73
* Large Rural Shires, score of 71
* Women, score of 70

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 67:

* Men, score of 65
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 58

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, up 4 points from 62 in 2013 to 66 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 69 in 2013 to 70 in 2014

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, down 2 points from 70 in 2013 to 68 in 2014

**2014 Business and Community Development and Tourism Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 38 | 31 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 20 | 39 | 31 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 18 | 39 | 31 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 10 | 32 | 40 | 14 | 2 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 18 | 37 | 33 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 27 | 42 | 26 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 24 | 41 | 29 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 22 | 39 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Men | 18 | 36 | 33 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 23 | 40 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 20 | 35 | 35 | 9 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 21 | 37 | 32 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 22 | 38 | 29 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 18 | 42 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 3 |

**2014 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for business and community development and tourism is 62. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Regional Centres, score of 64
* 18-34, score of 64
* Women, score of 63
* 65+, score of 63

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Men, score of 60
* 35-49, score of 60
* Large Rural Shires, score of 59
* 50-64, score of 59

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 1 point from 61 in 2013 to 62 in 2014

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Regional Centres, down 2 points from 66 in 2013 to 64 in 2014
* Men, down 1 point from 61 in 2013 to 60 in 2014

**2014 Business and Community Development and Tourism Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 2013 Overall | 10 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 3 | 13 |
| 2012 Overall | 10 | 35 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 8 | 31 | 29 | 7 | 1 | 23 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 9 | 35 | 30 | 9 | 2 | 16 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 14 | 38 | 29 | 8 | 3 | 7 |
| Large Rural Shires | 11 | 34 | 30 | 12 | 5 | 8 |
| Small Rural Shires | 13 | 35 | 29 | 9 | 3 | 9 |
| Men | 10 | 33 | 30 | 10 | 4 | 13 |
| Women | 12 | 36 | 29 | 9 | 2 | 12 |
| 18-34 | 13 | 40 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 9 | 34 | 30 | 11 | 3 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 31 | 32 | 11 | 4 | 12 |
| 65+ | 12 | 32 | 28 | 8 | 2 | 17 |

**2014 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for Council’s general town planning policy is 72. This is down a significant 1 point from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* 50-64, score of 76
* Regional Centres, score of 74
* Women, score of 74
* 65+, score of 74

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 72:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 70
* Men, score of 70
* 18-34, score of 66

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 3 points from 73 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Men, down 1 point from 71 in 2013 to 70 in 2014

**2014 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 42 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 2012 Overall | 25 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 24 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 23 | 38 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 26 | 42 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Large Rural Shires | 27 | 39 | 26 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Small Rural Shires | 24 | 41 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| Men | 23 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 2 | 4 |
| Women | 27 | 41 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 18-34 | 17 | 36 | 35 | 6 | 2 | 5 |
| 35-49 | 27 | 40 | 25 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 50-64 | 32 | 41 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 65+ | 24 | 46 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 7 |

**2014 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for Council’s general town planning policy is 55. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 55:

* 18-34, score of 60
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 56
* Women, score of 56

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 55:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 54
* Men, score of 54
* 35-49, score of 53
* 50-64, score of 51

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 2 points from 54 in 2013 to 56 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 55 in 2013 to 56 in 2014

**2014 Council’s General Town Planning Policy Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 6 | 28 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 17 |
| 2013 Overall | 5 | 29 | 32 | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 5 | 29 | 32 | 14 | 6 | 15 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 5 | 28 | 30 | 12 | 4 | 20 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 6 | 29 | 28 | 11 | 5 | 21 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 6 | 29 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 15 |
| Large Rural Shires | 5 | 29 | 33 | 12 | 6 | 15 |
| Small Rural Shires | 7 | 27 | 31 | 13 | 7 | 16 |
| Men | 6 | 29 | 31 | 13 | 7 | 14 |
| Women | 5 | 28 | 31 | 11 | 4 | 21 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 34 | 28 | 8 | 4 | 19 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 27 | 32 | 13 | 6 | 17 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 25 | 32 | 15 | 7 | 16 |
| 65+ | 6 | 27 | 30 | 13 | 5 | 18 |

**2014 Planning and Building Permits Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for planning and building permits is 71. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 71:

* Women, score of 74
* 65+, score of 74
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 73
* 50-64, score of 73

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 71:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 69
* Men, score of 69
* 18-34, score of 66

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Women, up 1 point from 73 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Planning and Building Permits Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 25 | 40 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 25 | 41 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 29 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 24 | 44 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 25 | 40 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 42 | 26 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| Small Rural Shires | 22 | 38 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Men | 21 | 40 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 28 | 42 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 19 | 36 | 34 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 26 | 42 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 29 | 41 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| 65+ | 26 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 6 |

**2014 Planning and Building Permits Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for planning and building permits is 53. This is down a significant 2 points from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 53:

* 18-34, score of 58
* Women, score of 54

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 53:

* 35-49, score of 51
* 50-64, score of 50

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Regional Centres, down 4 points from 58 in 2013 to 54 in 2014
* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 4 points from 57 in 2013 to 53 in 2014
* 35-49, down 3 points from 54 in 2013 to 51 in 2014
* Women, down 1 point from 55 in 2013 to 54 in 2014
* Men, down 1 point from 54 in 2013 to 53 in 2014

**2014 Planning and Building Permits Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 5 | 25 | 26 | 12 | 7 | 25 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 26 | 27 | 12 | 6 | 23 |
| 2012 Overall | 5 | 26 | 27 | 12 | 7 | 23 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 5 | 24 | 26 | 14 | 6 | 24 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 5 | 24 | 25 | 11 | 7 | 27 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 5 | 26 | 27 | 11 | 6 | 24 |
| Large Rural Shires | 4 | 27 | 26 | 12 | 7 | 23 |
| Small Rural Shires | 6 | 25 | 26 | 11 | 7 | 25 |
| Men | 5 | 26 | 27 | 13 | 8 | 21 |
| Women | 5 | 25 | 25 | 12 | 6 | 28 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 32 | 27 | 10 | 4 | 21 |
| 35-49 | 4 | 24 | 28 | 13 | 8 | 23 |
| 50-64 | 5 | 22 | 27 | 15 | 8 | 23 |
| 65+ | 6 | 21 | 24 | 12 | 6 | 31 |

**2014 Environmental Sustainability Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for environmental sustainability is 73. This is a significant increase of 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 73:

* Women, score of 77
* Small Rural Shires, score of 76
* 18-34, score of 75

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 73:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 71
* 65+, score of 70
* Men, score of 68

Importance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 5 points from 71 in 2013 to 76 in 2014
* Women, up 1 point from 76 in 2013 to 77 in 2014

**2014 Environmental Sustainability Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 29 | 40 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 27 | 42 | 24 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 26 | 41 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 30 | 40 | 23 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 29 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 26 | 42 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 28 | 39 | 24 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 38 | 35 | 20 | 5 | 2 | \* |
| Men | 23 | 38 | 28 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 34 | 42 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 33 | 40 | 22 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 29 | 38 | 27 | 5 | 2 | \* |
| 50-64 | 31 | 38 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 22 | 44 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 3 |

**2014 Environmental Sustainability Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for environmental sustainability is 64. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 64:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 65
* 18-34, score of 65
* 65+, score of 65

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 64:

* 50-64, score of 62

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Small Rural Shires, up 2 points from 62 in 2013 to 64 in 2014

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* 18-34, down 1 point from 66 in 2013 to 65 in 2014

**2014 Environmental Sustainability Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 39 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 40 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| 2012 Overall | 11 | 39 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 12 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 11 | 38 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 15 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 11 | 38 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 11 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 10 | 41 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 11 |
| Large Rural Shires | 10 | 42 | 29 | 7 | 2 | 10 |
| Small Rural Shires | 10 | 40 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 14 |
| Men | 11 | 39 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
| Women | 10 | 39 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 13 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 41 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 10 | 41 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 13 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 37 | 31 | 8 | 2 | 13 |
| 65+ | 11 | 38 | 28 | 6 | 2 | 15 |

**2014 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for emergency and disaster management is 80. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 80:

* Women, score of 85
* Large Rural Shires, score of 83
* 18-34, score of 82

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 80:

* Men, score of 76
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 75

Importance ratings have not increased or decreased significantly among any groups since 2013.

**2014 Emergency and Disaster Management Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 45 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 46 | 34 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 43 | 38 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 38 | 32 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 46 | 32 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 46 | 35 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 49 | 34 | 11 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 45 | 37 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 37 | 37 | 18 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Women | 54 | 32 | 11 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 49 | 32 | 14 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 35-49 | 45 | 31 | 16 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 47 | 32 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 41 | 41 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 3 |

**2014 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for emergency and disaster management is 71. This is a significant increase of 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 71:

* 18-34, score of 75
* Regional Centres, score of 74
* Women, score of 73
* Large Rural Shires, score of 72

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 71:

* Men, score of 70
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 69
* 50-64, score of 68

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* 18-34, up 3 points from 72 in 2013 to 75 in 2014
* Women, up 3 points from 70 in 2013 to 73 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 3 points from 69 in 2013 to 72 in 2014
* Outer Melbourne Metro, up 3 points from 67 in 2013 to 70 in 2014
* Regional Centres, up 2 points from 72 in 2013 to 74 in 2014

**2014 Emergency and Disaster Management Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 38 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 18 |
| 2013 Overall | 19 | 37 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 19 | 38 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 16 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 13 | 31 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 33 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 17 | 37 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 22 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 22 | 42 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 15 |
| Large Rural Shires | 23 | 40 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 12 |
| Small Rural Shires | 22 | 36 | 19 | 6 | 2 | 14 |
| Men | 19 | 37 | 19 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| Women | 21 | 38 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 18 |
| 18-34 | 26 | 42 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 12 |
| 35-49 | 17 | 38 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 21 |
| 50-64 | 17 | 35 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 18 |
| 65+ | 21 | 36 | 16 | 4 | 2 | 22 |

**2014 Planning for Population Growth Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for planning for population growth in the area is 75. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* 35-49, score of 78
* 50-64, score of 78
* Women, score of 77

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* Men, score of 73
* 18-34, score of 70

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down points from 77 in 2013 to 75 in 2014

**2014 Planning for Population Growth Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 38 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| 2013 Overall | 34 | 38 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 34 | 39 | 19 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 32 | 37 | 22 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 35 | 36 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 35 | 40 | 20 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 33 | 39 | 20 | 5 | 1 | 2 |
| Men | 30 | 38 | 23 | 6 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 37 | 39 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 18-34 | 27 | 35 | 28 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 39 | 38 | 18 | 4 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 39 | 39 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 31 | 43 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 3 |

**2014 Planning for Population Growth Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for planning for population growth in the area is 54. This is equal to 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 54:

* Regional Centres, score of 62
* 18-34, score of 59
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 57

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 54:

* 35-49, score of 52
* Large Rural Shires, score of 51
* 50-64, score of 51

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, up 3 points from 51 in 2013 to 54 in 2014
* Regional Centres, up 2 points from 60 in 2013 to 62 in 2014

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Large Rural Shires, down 2 points from 53 in 2013 to 51 in 2014

**2014 Planning for Population Growth Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 7 | 28 | 30 | 15 | 6 | 15 |
| 2013 Overall | 7 | 26 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 17 |
| 2012 Overall | 6 | 25 | 31 | 16 | 7 | 14 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 5 | 25 | 31 | 14 | 4 | 21 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 9 | 27 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 16 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 13 | 34 | 29 | 9 | 4 | 11 |
| Large Rural Shires | 6 | 27 | 29 | 18 | 8 | 12 |
| Men | 7 | 27 | 30 | 16 | 6 | 14 |
| Women | 7 | 28 | 30 | 14 | 6 | 16 |
| 18-34 | 7 | 35 | 29 | 12 | 4 | 13 |
| 35-49 | 6 | 25 | 31 | 17 | 7 | 15 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 24 | 31 | 17 | 8 | 15 |
| 65+ | 8 | 25 | 28 | 14 | 5 | 19 |

**2014 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for roadside slashing and weed control is 75. This is a significant increase of 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 78
* Women, score of 78
* 50-64, score of 78
* Large Rural Shires, score of 77

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 75:

* Regional Centres, score of 72
* Men, score of 71
* 18-34, score of 68
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 63

Importance ratings have not increased or decreased significantly among any groups since 2013.

**2014 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 32 | 40 | 23 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 30 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 2012 Overall | 24 | 42 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 11 | 44 | 34 | 9 | 2 | \* |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 24 | 46 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 38 | 37 | 21 | 3 | \* | \* |
| Small Rural Shires | 37 | 41 | 17 | 4 | \* | \* |
| Men | 26 | 40 | 27 | 6 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 37 | 39 | 20 | 3 | \* | \* |
| 18-34 | 24 | 33 | 32 | 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 34 | 40 | 22 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 38 | 38 | 20 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 65+ | 31 | 47 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

**2014 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for roadside slashing and weed control is 55. This is down 1 point from 2013 although not significantly.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 55:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 68
* 18-34, score of 63
* Regional Centres, score of 59

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 55:

* 35-49, score of 53
* 65+, score of 53
* Small Rural Shires, score of 52
* 50-64, score of 51
* Large Rural Shires, score of 50

Performance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, down 7 points from 64 in 2013 to 57 in 2014
* Regional Centres, down 5 points from 64 in 2013 to 59 in 2014
* 35-49, down 3 points from 56 in 2013 to 53 in 2014
* Men, down 2 points from 57 in 2013 to 55 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, down 2 points from 52 in 2013 to 50 in 2014

**2014 Roadside Slashing and Weed Control Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 11 | 32 | 28 | 17 | 10 | 3 |
| 2013 Overall | 11 | 35 | 28 | 16 | 8 | 2 |
| 2012 Overall | 14 | 38 | 28 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 20 | 45 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 14 | 35 | 24 | 15 | 10 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 13 | 35 | 27 | 14 | 6 | 4 |
| Large Rural Shires | 9 | 28 | 29 | 21 | 12 | 2 |
| Small Rural Shires | 9 | 30 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 3 |
| Men | 12 | 33 | 27 | 17 | 10 | 2 |
| Women | 11 | 31 | 28 | 16 | 10 | 3 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 43 | 24 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 31 | 25 | 19 | 11 | 2 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 28 | 30 | 21 | 11 | 2 |
| 65+ | 10 | 27 | 31 | 17 | 10 | 5 |

**2014 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for maintenance of unsealed roads is 78. This is down a significant 3 points from 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 78:

* Women, score of 81
* Small Rural Shires, score of 80
* 35-49, score of 80
* 50-64, score of 80

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 78:

* Men, score of 76
* Regional Centres, score of 73

Importance ratings have decreased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* Large Rural Shires, down 3 points from 81 in 2013 to 78 in 2014
* 18-34, down 3 points from 80 in 2013 to 77 in 2014
* 65+, down 3 points from 80 in 2013 to 77 in 2014
* Men, down 3 points from 79 in 2013 to 76 in 2014
* Women, down 2 points from 83 in 2013 to 81 in 2014
* 35-49, down 2 points from 82 in 2013 to 80 in 2014
* 50-64, down 2 points from 82 in 2013 to 80 in 2014

**2014 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 39 | 38 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 44 | 39 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 41 | 39 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 43 | 36 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 29 | 36 | 26 | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| Large Rural Shires | 39 | 39 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 42 | 39 | 16 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| Men | 34 | 40 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Women | 45 | 37 | 15 | 2 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 40 | 35 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 44 | 35 | 17 | 3 | \* | 1 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 39 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 65+ | 33 | 44 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 |

**2014 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for maintenance of unsealed roads is 45. This is a significant increase of 1 point since 2013.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 45:

* Regional Centres, score of 51
* 65+, score of 48

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 45:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 43
* 50-64, score of 42

Performance ratings have increased significantly among the following groups since 2013:

* 35-49, up 3 points from 42 in 2013 to 45 in 2014
* Women, up 2 points from 43 in 2013 to 45 in 2014
* Large Rural Shires, up 2 points from 41 in 2013 to 43 in 2014
* 50-64, up 2 points from 40 in 2013 to 42 in 2014

**2014 Maintenance of Unsealed Roads Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 5 | 22 | 30 | 22 | 14 | 7 |
| 2013 Overall | 6 | 20 | 29 | 24 | 16 | 4 |
| 2012 Overall | 7 | 22 | 29 | 21 | 15 | 7 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 6 | 21 | 27 | 20 | 13 | 13 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 6 | 26 | 31 | 18 | 9 | 11 |
| Large Rural Shires | 4 | 21 | 29 | 23 | 16 | 6 |
| Small Rural Shires | 6 | 23 | 31 | 22 | 14 | 5 |
| Men | 6 | 23 | 29 | 21 | 15 | 6 |
| Women | 5 | 22 | 30 | 22 | 13 | 8 |
| 18-34 | 5 | 26 | 29 | 21 | 15 | 4 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 22 | 29 | 24 | 14 | 6 |
| 50-64 | 4 | 19 | 30 | 24 | 16 | 7 |
| 65+ | 6 | 22 | 31 | 19 | 12 | 11 |

**2014 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for decisions made in the interest of the community is 79. This is a new service area in 2014.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 79:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 81
* Small Rural Shires, score of 81
* Women, score of 81
* 50-64, score of 81

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 79:

* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 77
* Men, score of 77

**2014 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 37 | 43 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 35 | 44 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 34 | 43 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 38 | 46 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 41 | 40 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Small Rural Shires | 39 | 43 | 14 | 1 | \* | 2 |
| Men | 33 | 43 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Women | 41 | 43 | 13 | 1 | \* | 1 |
| 18-34 | 35 | 44 | 19 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 35-49 | 39 | 41 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 42 | 41 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 65+ | 34 | 47 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

**2014 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for decisions made in the interest of the community is 57.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 57:

* 18-34, score of 60
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 59
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 58
* 65+, score of 58

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 57:

* Men, score of 56
* 35-49, score of 55
* Large Rural Shires, score of 53
* 50-64, score of 53

**2014 Decisions Made in the Interest of the Community Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 7 | 33 | 34 | 12 | 5 | 10 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 6 | 34 | 33 | 10 | 4 | 14 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 6 | 33 | 34 | 11 | 4 | 12 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 7 | 34 | 39 | 12 | 4 | 4 |
| Large Rural Shires | 5 | 30 | 35 | 16 | 6 | 7 |
| Small Rural Shires | 9 | 34 | 31 | 13 | 6 | 8 |
| Men | 7 | 33 | 32 | 13 | 6 | 10 |
| Women | 7 | 33 | 36 | 12 | 4 | 10 |
| 18-34 | 6 | 39 | 34 | 9 | 3 | 9 |
| 35-49 | 5 | 32 | 35 | 13 | 5 | 10 |
| 50-64 | 6 | 28 | 35 | 16 | 6 | 9 |
| 65+ | 9 | 31 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 11 |

**2014 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the condition of sealed local roads is 77. This is a new service area in 2014.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 77:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 81
* Large Rural Shires, score of 80
* Women, score of 79
* 35-49, score of 79
* 50-64, score of 81

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 77:

* Men, score of 75
* 18-34, score of 73
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 72

**2014 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 33 | 45 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 24 | 47 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 34 | 45 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 34 | 45 | 19 | 1 | - | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 40 | 43 | 14 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| Small Rural Shires | 40 | 44 | 14 | 1 | \* | \* |
| Men | 29 | 46 | 20 | 3 | 1 | \* |
| Women | 37 | 44 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 28 | 42 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 37 | 43 | 17 | 2 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 38 | 44 | 16 | 2 | \* | \* |
| 65+ | 31 | 52 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

**2014 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for the condition of sealed local roads is 55.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 55:

* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 69
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 61
* 18-34, score of 59
* 65+, score of 56

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 55:

* 50-64, score of 52
* Small Rural Shires, score of 51
* Large Rural Shires, score of 43

**2014 Condition of Sealed Local Roads Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 12 | 33 | 27 | 17 | 10 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 22 | 46 | 21 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 16 | 38 | 25 | 13 | 7 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 9 | 30 | 36 | 17 | 7 | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 6 | 22 | 29 | 25 | 18 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 8 | 29 | 31 | 19 | 11 | 1 |
| Men | 13 | 34 | 26 | 17 | 10 | 1 |
| Women | 12 | 33 | 28 | 16 | 9 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 16 | 35 | 25 | 14 | 9 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 12 | 33 | 25 | 19 | 10 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 9 | 31 | 29 | 19 | 11 | 1 |
| 65+ | 12 | 33 | 29 | 15 | 8 | 2 |

**2014 Business and Community Development Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the business and community development is 69. This is a new service area in 2014.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 69:

* Large Rural Shires, score of 71
* Small Rural Shires, score of 71
* Women, score of 71
* 35-49, score of 71

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 69:

* Men, score of 67
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 66

**2014 Business and Community Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 20 | 45 | 27 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 15 | 42 | 34 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 21 | 44 | 26 | 7 | 2 | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 21 | 46 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 22 | 46 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Men | 18 | 43 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Women | 21 | 46 | 27 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 22 | 42 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 20 | 48 | 26 | 4 | 1 | \* |
| 50-64 | 20 | 44 | 27 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| 65+ | 18 | 45 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 3 |

**2014 Business and Community Development Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for business and community development is 62.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* 18-34, score of 65
* Women, score of 63

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Men, score of 60
* 35-49, score of 60
* 50-64, score of 59

**2014 Business and Community Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 8 | 35 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 17 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 6 | 33 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 23 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 9 | 33 | 30 | 7 | 3 | 18 |
| Large Rural Shires | 7 | 38 | 31 | 10 | 2 | 11 |
| Small Rural Shires | 10 | 35 | 28 | 8 | 2 | 15 |
| Men | 8 | 32 | 31 | 9 | 3 | 17 |
| Women | 7 | 38 | 29 | 8 | 1 | 17 |
| 18-34 | 9 | 45 | 26 | 8 | 1 | 11 |
| 35-49 | 7 | 34 | 34 | 9 | 2 | 14 |
| 50-64 | 7 | 30 | 33 | 10 | 2 | 19 |
| 65+ | 8 | 31 | 28 | 7 | 2 | 24 |

**2014 Tourism Development Importance Index Scores**

The overall importance score for the tourism development is 65. This is a new service area in 2014.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall importance score than the 2014 average of 665:

* Small Rural Shires, score of 68
* Large Rural Shires, score of 67
* Women, score of 67

The following groups award a significantly lower overall importance score than the 2014 average of 69:

* Men, score of 63
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 49

**2014 Tourism Development Importance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely important | Very important | Fairly important | Not that important | Not at all important | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 18 | 37 | 31 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 5 | 26 | 35 | 28 | 5 | 1 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 15 | 41 | 36 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Large Rural Shires | 20 | 41 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 24 | 35 | 30 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| Men | 17 | 34 | 34 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| Women | 19 | 41 | 29 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 15 | 38 | 31 | 13 | 2 | - |
| 35-49 | 19 | 35 | 33 | 10 | 2 | \* |
| 50-64 | 20 | 36 | 32 | 9 | 3 | \* |
| 65+ | 18 | 39 | 30 | 8 | 2 | 3 |

**2014 Tourism Development Performance Index Scores**

The overall performance score for tourism development is 64.

The following groups award a significantly higher overall performance score than the 2014 average of 64:

* Regional Centres, score of 72
* Small Rural Shires, score of 66
* Women, score of 66
* 65+, score of 66

The following groups award a significantly lower overall performance score than the 2014 average of 62:

* Men, score of 62
* 35-49, score of 62
* Outer Melbourne Metro, score of 60
* Inner Melbourne Metro, score of 54

**2014 Tourism Development Performance Detailed Percentages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | Can't say |
| 2014 Overall | 13 | 36 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 13 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 3 | 18 | 34 | 12 | 1 | 31 |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 10 | 31 | 30 | 10 | 3 | 16 |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 22 | 43 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 7 |
| Large Rural Shires | 14 | 41 | 26 | 9 | 2 | 7 |
| Small Rural Shires | 15 | 39 | 25 | 7 | 2 | 11 |
| Men | 12 | 35 | 29 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| Women | 14 | 37 | 26 | 8 | 2 | 14 |
| 18-34 | 12 | 38 | 29 | 9 | 2 | 10 |
| 35-49 | 11 | 35 | 29 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| 50-64 | 13 | 36 | 27 | 9 | 2 | 14 |
| 65+ | 15 | 34 | 25 | 8 | 2 | 17 |

**DETAILED DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Gender Split**

Men: 51% of sample

Women: 49% of sample

**Age Split**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| 18-24 | 11 |
| 25-34 | 15 |
| 35-49 | 25 |
| 50-64 | 22 |
| 65+ | 26 |

**Household Structure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Married or living with partner with children 16 or under at home | 27 |
| Married or living with partner with children but none 16 or under at home | 24 |
| Married or living with partner, no children | 19 |
| Single person living alone | 15 |
| Single person living with friends or housemates | 7 |
| Single living with children 16 or under | 3 |
| Single with children but none 16 or under living at home | 3 |
| Do not wish to answer | 2 |

**Years Lived in Area**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-5 years | 5-10 years | 10+ years | Can’t say |
| 2014 Overall | 14 | 14 | 71 | \* |
| 2013 Overall | 14 | 14 | 72 |  |
| 2012 Overall | 15 | 16 | 68 | \* |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 15 | 16 | 69 | \* |
| Outer Melbourne Metro | 16 | 16 | 68 | \* |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 13 | 14 | 73 | \* |
| Large Rural Shires | 12 | 13 | 76 | \* |
| Small Rural Shires | 13 | 11 | 75 | - |
| Men | 14 | 14 | 72 | \* |
| Women | 14 | 15 | 71 | \* |
| 18-34 | 23 | 17 | 60 | \* |
| 35-49 | 17 | 21 | 62 | \* |
| 50-64 | 8 | 9 | 83 | \* |
| 65+ | 6 | 8 | 85 | \* |

**Home Ownership**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Own | Rent | Can’t say |
| 2014 Overall | 83 | 16 | 1 |
| 2013 Overall | 83 | 16 | 1 |
| 2012 Overall | 81 | 18 | 1 |
| Inner Melbourne Metro | 64 | 36 |  |
| Rural Cities and Regional Centres | 87 | 12 | 1 |
| Small Rural Shires | 90 | 9 | 1 |
| Men | 83 | 17 | 1 |
| Women | 83 | 16 | 1 |
| 18-34 | 66 | 33 | 1 |
| 35-49 | 86 | 13 | 1 |
| 50-64 | 93 | 6 | 1 |
| 65+ | 93 | 7 | 1 |

**Languages Spoken at Home**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| English | 61 |
| Total Other | 38 |
| Chinese | 5 |
| Vietnamese | 5 |
| Greek | 3 |
| Italian | 3 |
| Hindi | 2 |
| Croatian | 1 |
| French | 1 |
| German | 1 |

**Countries of Birth**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | % |
| Australia | 63 |
| Total Other | 35 |
| United Kingdom | 4 |
| China | 3 |
| India | 3 |
| New Zealand | 2 |
| Germany | 1 |

**APPENDIX A: FURTHER PROJECT INFORMATION**

**BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES**

Please note that as a result of feedback from extensive consultations with councils, in 2012 there were necessary and significant changes to the methodology and content of the survey, including:

* The survey is now conducted as a representative random probability survey of residents aged 18 years or over in local councils, whereas previously it was conducted as a ‘head of household’ survey.
* As part of the change to a representative resident survey, results are now weighted post survey to the known population distribution of Overall according to the most recently available Australian Bureau of Statistics population estimates, whereas the results were previously not weighted.
* The service responsibility area performance measures have changed significantly and the rating scale used to assess performance has also changed.

As such, the results of the 2012 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey should be considered as a benchmark. Please note that comparisons should not be made with the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey results from 2011 and prior due to the methodological and sampling changes. **Comparisons in the period 2012-2014 have been made throughout this report as appropriate.**

**MARGINS OF ERROR**

The sample size for the 2014 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey for Overall was n=26800. Unless otherwise noted, this is the total sample base for all reported charts and tables.

The maximum margin of error on a sample of approximately 26800 interviews is +/-0.6% at the 95% confidence level for results around 50%. Margins of error will be larger for any sub-samples.

As an example, a result of 50% can be read confidently as falling midway in the range 49.4% - 50.6%.

Maximum margins of error are listed in the table below, based on a population of 3,699,000 people aged 18 years or over, according to ABS estimates.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Demographic | Actual survey sample size | Weighted base | Maximum margin of error at 95% confidence interval |
| Overall | 27906 | 26800 | +/-0.6 |
| Men | 12272 | 13206 | +/-0.9 |
| Women | 15634 | 13594 | +/-0.8 |
| 18-34 years | 3013 | 7008 | +/-1.8 |
| 35-49 years | 5325 | 6831 | +/-1.3 |
| 50-64 years | 9071 | 5982 | +/-1.0 |
| 65+ years | 10497 | 6980 | +/-1.0 |

**ANALYSIS AND REPORTING**

In 2014, 67 of the 79 Victorian councils participated in this survey. Please note that the Councils that participated in 2012 and 2013 vary slightly to those participating in 2014.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Inner Metropolitan** | **Outer Metropolitan** | **Regional Centres** | **Large Rural Shires** | **Small Rural Shires** |
| Banyule | Brimbank | Ballarat | Bass Coast | Benalla |
| Bayside | Cardinia | Greater Bendigo | Baw Baw | Buloke |
| Boroondara | Casey | Greater Geelong | Campaspe | Central Goldfields |
| Glen Eira | Frankston | Greater Shepparton | Colac Otway | Gannawarra |
| Kingston | Greater Dandenong | Horsham | Corangamite | Golden Plains |
| Maroondah | Knox | Latrobe | East Gippsland | Hepburn |
| Melbourne | Manningham | Mildura | Glenelg | Hindmarsh |
| Monash | Melton | Wangaratta | Macedon Ranges | Indigo |
| Moonee Valley | Mornington Peninsula | Warrnambool | Mitchell | Loddon |
| Moreland | Whittlesea |  | Moira | Mansfield |
| Port Phillip | Yarra Ranges |  | Moorabool | Mount Alexander |
| Stonnington |  |  | Moyne | Murrindindi |
| Whitehorse |  |  | South Gippsland | Pyrenees |
|  |  |  | Southern Grampians | Queenscliffe |
|  |  |  | Surf Coast | Strathbogie |
|  |  |  | Swan Hill | West Wimmera |
|  |  |  | Wellington | Yarriambiack |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-participating councils: Alpine, Ararat, Darebin, Hobsons Bay, Hume, Maribyrnong, Nillumbik, Northern Grampians, Towong, Wodonga, Wyndham, Yarra | | | | |

**Council Groups**

In this 2014 Community Satisfaction Survey, councils have been able to self-classify according to the following classification list:

* Inner metropolitan councils
* Outer metropolitan councils
* Rural cities and regional centres
* Large rural shires
* Small rural shires

**Index Scores**

Many questions ask respondents to rate council performance on a five-point scale, for example, from ‘very good’ to ‘very poor’, with ‘can’t say’ also a possible response category. To facilitate ease of reporting and comparison of results over time, starting from the 2012 benchmark survey and measured against the state-wide result and the council group, an ‘index score’ has been calculated for such measures.

The index score is calculated and represented as a score out of 100 (on a 0 to 100 scale), with ‘can’t say’ responses excluded from the analysis. The ‘% RESULT’ for each scale category is multiplied by the ‘INDEX FACTOR’. This produces an ‘INDEX VALUE’ for each category, which are then summed to produce the ‘INDEX SCORE’, equating to ‘60’ in the following example.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scale Categories | % Result | Index Factor | Index Value |
| Very good | 9% | 100 | 9 |
| Good | 40% | 75 | 30 |
| Average | 37% | 50 | 19 |
| Poor | 9% | 25 | 2 |
| Very poor | 4% | 0 | 0 |
| Can’t say | 1% | -- | INDEX SCORE 60 |

Similarly, an index score has been calculated for the core question ‘Performance direction in the last 12 months’, based on the following scale for each performance measure category, with ‘Can’t say’ responses excluded from the calculation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scale Categories | % Result | Index Factor | Index Value |
| Improved | 36% | 100 | 36 |
| Stayed the same | 40% | 50 | 20 |
| Deteriorated | 23% | 0 | 0 |
| Can’t say | 1% | -- | INDEX SCORE 56 |

**Index Scores Significant Difference Calculation**

The test applied to the indexes was an Independent Mean Test, as follows:

Z Score = ($1 - $2) / Sqrt (($3\*2 / $5) + ($4\*2 / $6))

Where:

* + $1 = Index Score 1
  + $2 = Index Score 2
  + $3 = unweighted sample count 1
  + $4 = unweighted sample count 1
  + $5 = standard deviation 1
  + $6 = standard deviation 2

All figures can be sourced from the detailed cross tabulations.

The test was applied at the 95% confidence interval, so if the Z Score was greater than +/- 1.954 the scores are significantly different.

**Core, Optional and Tailored Questions**

Over and above necessary geographic and demographic questions required to ensure sample representativeness, a base set of questions for the 2014 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey was designated as ‘core’ and therefore compulsory inclusions for all participating Councils. These core questions comprised:

* Overall performance last 12 months (Overall performance)
* Lobbying on behalf of community (Advocacy)
* Community consultation and engagement (Consultation)
* Contact in last 12 months (Contact)
* Rating of contact (Customer service)
* Overall council direction last 12 months (Council direction)

Reporting of results for these core questions can always be compared against other councils in the council group and against all participating councils state-wide.

Alternatively, some questions in the 2014 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey were optional. Optional questions are noted for those results by a footnote of the number of councils who have asked the question.

Councils also had the ability to ask tailored questions specific only to their council.

**Reporting**

Every Council that participated in the 2014 State-wide Local Government Services Survey has received a customised report. In addition, the State Government is supplied with this state-wide summary report of the aggregate results of ‘core’ and ‘optional’ questions asked across all council areas surveyed.

Tailored questions commissioned by individual councils are reported only to the commissioning council and not otherwise shared unless by express written approval of the commissioning council.

The overall State-wide Local Government Services Report is available at [www.localgovernment.vic.gov.au](http://www.localgovernment.vic.gov.au/).

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

**Core questions**: Compulsory inclusion questions for all councils participating in the CSS.

**CSS**: 2014 Victorian Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.

**Council group**: One of five self-classified groups, comprising: inner metropolitan councils, outer metropolitan councils, rural cities and regional centres, large rural shires and small rural shires.

**Council group average**: The average result for all participating councils in the council group.

**Highest / lowest**: The result described is the highest or lowest result across a particular demographic sub-group e.g. men, for the specific question being reported. Reference to the result for a demographic sub-group being the highest or lowest does not imply that it is significantly higher or lower, unless this is specifically mentioned.

**Index score**: A score calculated and represented as a score out of 100 (on a 0 to 100 scale). This score is sometimes reported as a figure in brackets next to the category being described, e.g. men 50+ (60).

**Optional questions**: Questions which councils had an option to include or not.

**Percentages**: Also referred to as ‘detailed results’, meaning the proportion of responses, expressed as a percentage.

**Sample**: The number of completed interviews, e.g. for a council or within a demographic sub-group.

**Significantly higher / lower**: The result described is significantly higher or lower than the comparison result based on a statistical significance test at the 95% confidence limit. If the result referenced is statistically higher or lower then this will be specifically mentioned, however not all significantly higher or lower results are referenced in summary reporting.

**State-wide average**: The average result for all participating councils in the state.

**Tailored questions**: Individual questions tailored by and only reported to the commissioning council.

**Weighting**: Weighting factors are applied to the sample for each council based on available age and gender proportions from ABS census information to ensure reported results are proportionate to the actual population of the council, rather than the achieved survey sample.