



**LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMUNITY SATISFACTION SURVEY
SOUTH GIPPSLAND SHIRE COUNCIL**

2017 RESEARCH REPORT

**COORDINATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, LAND, WATER AND
PLANNING ON BEHALF OF VICTORIAN COUNCILS**

- [Background and objectives](#)
- [Survey methodology and sampling](#)
- [Further information](#)
- [Key findings & recommendations](#)
- [Summary of findings](#)
- [Detailed findings](#)
 - [Key core measure: Overall performance](#)
 - [Key core measure: Customer service](#)
 - [Key core measure: Council direction indicators](#)
 - [Individual service areas](#)
 - [Detailed demographics](#)
- [Appendix A: Detailed survey tabulations](#)
- [Appendix B: Further project information](#)

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

Welcome to the report of results and recommendations for the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey for South Gippsland Shire Council.

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. Participating councils have various 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 South Gippsland Shire Council 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 South Gippsland Shire Council.

Survey sample matched to the demographic profile of South Gippsland Shire Council as determined by the most recent ABS population estimates 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 within South Gippsland Shire Council, particularly younger people.

A total of n=400 completed interviews were achieved in South Gippsland Shire Council. Survey fieldwork was conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March, 2017.

The 2017 results are compared with previous years, as detailed below:

- 2016, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March.
- 2015, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March.
- 2014, n=401 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 31st January – 11th March.
- 2013, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 24th March.
- 2012, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 18th May – 30th June.

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 the South Gippsland Shire 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.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLING


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. Therefore in the example below:

- The state-wide result is significantly higher than the overall result for the council.
- The result among 50-64 year olds is significantly lower than for the overall result for the council.

Further, results shown in blue and red indicate significantly higher or lower results than in 2016. Therefore in the example below:

- The result among 35-49 year olds in the council is significantly higher than the result achieved among this group in 2016.
- The result among 18-34 year olds in the council is significantly lower than the result achieved among this group in 2016.

Overall Performance – Index Scores (example extract only)



FURTHER INFORMATION

Further information about the report and explanations about the State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey can be found in [Appendix B](#), including:


- [Background and objectives](#)
- [Margins of error](#)
- [Analysis and reporting](#)
- [Glossary of terms](#)

Contacts

For further queries about the conduct and reporting of the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey, please contact JWS Research on (03) 8685 8555.



KEY FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS



OVERALL COUNCIL PERFORMANCE

Results shown are index scores out of 100.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

The **overall performance index score of 46** for South Gippsland Shire Council represents a **one point decline** on the 2016 result. Overall performance ratings are now at their **lowest level to date**.

- South Gippsland Shire Council's overall performance is rated statistically **significantly lower** (at the 95% confidence interval) **than the average rating for councils State-wide and in the Large Rural group** (index scores of 59 and 54 respectively).
- **Residents aged 50 to 64 years** (index score of 40) are **significantly less favourable** in their view of Council's overall performance than residents overall.
- In addition, **residents aged 35 to 49 years** (index score of 45, seven index points lower than 2016) and **men** (index scored of 44, five index points lower than 2016) *declined significantly* in their impressions of Council's overall performance in the past year.

More residents rate South Gippsland Shire Council's overall performance as 'very poor' (9%) than 'very good' (2%). Fewer than one in five (17%) rate Council's overall performance as 'good', while a further 49% sit mid-scale providing an 'average' rating. Another 19% rate Council's overall performance as 'poor'.

OVERVIEW OF CORE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Review of the core performance measures (as shown on page 18) shows that South Gippsland Shire Council's **performance was largely stable or exhibited a slight decline** compared to Council's own results in 2016, with two exceptions. Council's ratings in the areas of **sealed local roads** and **overall council direction** *increased significantly* in the past year.

- Council's performance ratings on all core measures, with the exception of overall council direction, are *significantly lower* than average ratings for councils in the Large Rural group and State-wide.

As a result of slight ratings declines (only one or two point declines in index ratings) in some areas, Council's ratings are typically close to or at their lowest levels to date. Specifically, ratings for **overall performance, customer service** and **consultation and engagement** are at their lowest point since 2012.

- **Overall council direction** and **sealed local roads** comprise the exception and ratings are at their highest point. While this is a positive result, in the case of sealed local roads, South Gippsland Shire Council remains rated *significantly less favourably* than the Large Rural council group average, meaning that further room for improvement exists.

Customer service (index score of 61) is South Gippsland Shire Council's best performing area.

More than half (57%) of South Gippsland Shire Council residents have had recent contact with Council.

- This level of contacting Council has been relatively consistent over time.

As mentioned previously, **South Gippsland Shire Council's customer service index of 61 is Council's best performing area.**

- Notwithstanding this, customer service ratings **declined slightly by four index points** in the past year (from an index score of 65 in 2016). Council's highest customer service ratings were achieved in 2013 (index score of 68).
- Men (index score of 57) may be driving this decline in ratings; customer service ratings among men declined by 12 index points (*considered significant*) in the past year.
- South Gippsland Shire Council's customer service index is *significantly lower than* the State-wide and Large Rural councils group averages (index scores of 69 and 66 respectively).

Almost one in five residents (18%) rate Council's customer service as 'very good', with a further 38% rating customer service as 'good'.

While there are differences in ratings between demographic and geographic groups, these are not statistically significantly different from Council's average index score. No group changed significantly in their perceptions of customer service in the past year, and there is no particular cohort that Council should focus its attention on. Rather, Council should aim to improve customer service across all groups.

AREAS IN NEED OF ATTENTION

Despite experiencing a significant ratings increase (six index points higher than 2016), the area that stands out as being most in need of Council attention is the condition of **sealed local roads**. With a performance index score of 36, Council is seen to be **performing poorly** in this service area. This is *significantly lower* than the State-wide and Large Rural group averages (performance index scores of 53 and 43 respectively).

- One in four residents (24%) rate Council performance in this service area as 'very poor'. Another 29% rate it as 'poor'.
- Feedback from residents on what they consider Council most needs to do to improve its performance in the next 12 months supports this finding, with **sealed road maintenance** mentioned by 25% of residents.

FOCUS AREAS FOR COMING 12 MONTHS

For the coming 12 months, South Gippsland Shire Council should pay particular attention to the areas where performance ratings are lower than what Council has previously achieved, to ensure that perceptions do not further decline. Key priorities include:

- **Customer service**
- **Making community decisions**
- **Lobbying.**

Consideration should also be given to *all* South Gippsland Shire Council residents, but especially men and residents aged 50 to 64 years, who appear to be most driving negative opinion in 2017.

It is noted that (relative to other services areas), Council is **performing well in the area of customer service**. However, historically, we have seen higher performance ratings for Council on this measure, and so efforts should be made to ensure this does not deteriorate further.

- It is also important not to ignore, and to learn from, what is working amongst other groups, especially residents aged 65+ years, and use these lessons to build performance experience and perceptions in other areas.

FURTHER AREAS OF EXPLORATION

An approach we recommend is to further mine the survey data to better understand the profile of these over and under-performing demographic groups. This can be achieved via additional consultation and data interrogation, self-mining the SPSS data provided, or via the dashboard portal available to the council.

Please note that 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 of the key gender and age groups, especially any target groups identified as requiring attention.

A personal briefing by senior JWS Research representatives is also available to assist in providing both explanation and interpretation of the results. Please contact JWS Research on 03 8685 8555.

SNAPSHOT OF KEY FINDINGS

Higher results in 2017

(Significantly higher result than 2016)

- Sealed local roads
- Overall council direction

Lower results in 2017

(Significantly lower result than 2016)

- None applicable

Most favourably disposed towards Council

- Aged 65+ years

Least favourably disposed towards Council


- Aged 50-64 years
- Men



SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

2017 SUMMARY OF CORE MEASURES

INDEX SCORE RESULTS



2017 SUMMARY OF CORE MEASURES


DETAILED ANALYSIS

Performance Measures	South Gippsland 2017	South Gippsland 2016	Large Rural 2017	State-wide 2017	Highest score	Lowest score
OVERALL PERFORMANCE	46	47	54	59	Aged 18-34 years	Aged 50-64 years
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION (Community consultation and engagement)	47	47	52	55	Coastal - Promontory	Men
ADVOCACY (Lobbying on behalf of the community)	46	47	51	54	Women	Men
MAKING COMMUNITY DECISIONS (Decisions made in the interest of the community)	45	47	51	54	Aged 65+ years	Aged 50-64 years
SEALED LOCAL ROADS (Condition of sealed local roads)	36	30	43	53	Aged 65+ years	Aged 18-34 years, Men, Aged 50-64 years
CUSTOMER SERVICE	61	65	66	69	Women, Aged 65+ years	Men
OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION	51	43	52	53	Aged 65+ years	Aged 50-64 years

2017 SUMMARY OF KEY COMMUNITY SATISFACTION


PERCENTAGE RESULTS

Key Measures Summary Results



2017 PERFORMANCE SUMMARY

INDEX SCORES OVER TIME



Q2. How has Council performed on [RESPONSIBILITY AREA] over the last 12 months?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

Note: Please see page 5 for explanation of significant differences

INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS PERFORMANCE


DETAILED PERCENTAGES

Individual Service Areas Performance




INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS SUMMARY

COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE VS STATE-WIDE AVERAGE



INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS SUMMARY

COUNCIL'S PERFORMANCE VS GROUP AVERAGE



2017 BEST THINGS ABOUT COUNCIL DETAILED PERCENTAGES


2017 SERVICES TO IMPROVE DETAILED PERCENTAGES



2017 Best Aspects



2017 Areas for Improvement



Q16. Please tell me what is the ONE BEST thing about South Gippsland Shire Council? It could be about any of the issues or services we have covered in this survey or it could be about something else altogether?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 25 Councils asked group: 8

Q17. What does South Gippsland Shire Council MOST need to do to improve its performance?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 41 Councils asked group: 11

POSITIVES AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

SUMMARY






DETAILED FINDINGS



**KEY CORE MEASURE
OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

INDEX SCORES



Q3. ON BALANCE, for the last twelve months, how do you feel about the performance of South Gippsland Shire Council, not just on one or two issues, BUT OVERALL across all responsibility areas? Has it been very good, good, average, poor or very poor?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

DETAILED PERCENTAGES

2017 Overall Performance



Q3. ON BALANCE, for the last twelve months, how do you feel about the performance of South Gippsland Shire Council, not just on one or two issues, BUT OVERALL across all responsibility areas? Has it been very good, good, average, poor or very poor?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19



**KEY CORE MEASURE
CUSTOMER SERVICE**

CONTACT LAST 12 MONTHS

SUMMARY

Overall contact with South Gippsland Shire Council

- 57%, up 4 points on 2016

Most contact with South Gippsland Shire Council

- Aged 35-49 years

Least contact with South Gippsland Shire Council

- Aged 18-34 years

Customer service rating

- Index score of 61, down 4 points on 2016

Most satisfied with customer service


- Women
- Aged 65+ years

Least satisfied with customer service

- Men

2017 CONTACT WITH COUNCIL

2017 Contact with Council




Q5. Over the last 12 months, have you or any member of your household had any contact with South Gippsland Shire Council? This may have been in person, in writing, by telephone conversation, by text message, by email or via their website or social media such as Facebook or Twitter?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 49 Councils asked group: 16

Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

2017 CONTACT WITH COUNCIL

2017 Contact with Council
Have had contact



Q5. Over the last 12 months, have you or any member of your household had any contact with South Gippsland Shire Council? This may have been in person, in writing, by telephone conversation, by text message, by email or via their website or social media such as Facebook or Twitter?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 49 Councils asked group: 16

2017 CONTACT CUSTOMER SERVICE INDEX SCORES



2017 Customer Service Rating

		2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
State-wide	69↑	69	70	72	71	71
Large Rural	66↑	67	67	n/a	n/a	n/a
Women	65	62	64	64	69	64
65+	65	67	67	64	68	65
Coastal - Promontory	64	64	65	55	62	n/a
Strzelecki	61	64	67	66	73	n/a
South Gippsland	61	65	65	63	68	65
18-34	60	67	66	63	67	59
Tarwin Valley	60	67	64	64	66	n/a
50-64	59	68	59	63	67	64
35-49	59	61	68	62	70	70
Men	57	69	67	62	67	65

Q5c. Thinking of the most recent contact, how would you rate South Gippsland Shire Council for customer service? Please keep in mind we do not mean the actual outcome but rather the actual service that was received.

Base: All respondents who have had contact with Council in the last 12 months.


Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

2017 CONTACT CUSTOMER SERVICE

DETAILED PERCENTAGES

2017 Customer Service Rating



Q5c. Thinking of the most recent contact, how would you rate South Gippsland Shire Council for customer service? Please keep in mind we do not mean the actual outcome but rather the actual service that was received.

Base: All respondents who have had contact with Council in the last 12 months.

Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

A satellite-style map of the United States is shown, with a glowing, interconnected network of lines and nodes overlaid on the landmass, suggesting a data or infrastructure network. The map is centered on the continental United States, with the Atlantic Ocean to the east and the Pacific Ocean to the west. The network is most prominent in the eastern half of the country, with a bright glow in the Northeast region.

KEY CORE MEASURE COUNCIL DIRECTION INDICATORS

COUNCIL DIRECTION SUMMARY

Council Direction from Q6

- 61% stayed about the same, up 4 points on 2016
- 18% improved, up 7 points on 2016
- 15% deteriorated, down 10 points on 2016

Most satisfied with Council Direction from Q6

- Aged 65+ years

Least satisfied with Council Direction from Q6

- Aged 50-64 years

2017 OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION LAST 12 MONTHS

INDEX SCORES



2017 Overall Direction

		2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
65+	57	43	39	43	43	43
Coastal - Promontory	54	42	37	42	40	n/a
Women	53	40	42	42	42	44
State-wide	53	51	53	53	53	52
Tarwin Valley	53	41	44	43	39	n/a
Large Rural	52	48	51	n/a	n/a	n/a
South Gippsland	51	43	44	42	42	43
18-34	51	46	56	52	48	44
Men	50	46	46	43	41	42
Strzelecki	49	45	47	41	45	n/a
35-49	49	47	43	36	40	43
50-64	47	36	39	39	37	43

Q6. Over the last 12 months, what is your view of the direction of South Gippsland Shire Council's overall performance?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

2017 OVERALL COUNCIL DIRECTION LAST 12 MONTHS

DETAILED PERCENTAGES

2017 Overall Direction





INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AREAS

2017 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PERFORMANCE INDEX SCORES



2017 Consultation and Engagement Performance

		2016	2015	2014	2013	2012
State-wide	55↑	54	56	57	57	57
Coastal - Promontory	53	47	44	50	52	n/a
Large Rural	52↑	52	54	n/a	n/a	n/a
Women	51	48	48	52	54	55
65+	50	47	49	51	51	52
South Gippsland	47	47	49	51	54	53
35-49	47	52	49	50	51	55
18-34	47	42	53	54	60	53
Tarwin Valley	46	45	51	53	50	n/a
Strzelecki	46	50	48	50	58	n/a
50-64	44	46	42	51	53	51
Men	43	46	49	51	53	51

Q2. How has Council performed on 'community consultation and engagement' over the last 12 months?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19


Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

2017 COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

PERFORMANCE DETAILED PERCENTAGES



2017 Consultation and Engagement Performance




Q2. How has Council performed on 'community consultation and engagement' over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

2017 LOBBYING ON BEHALF OF THE COMMUNITY

PERFORMANCE INDEX SCORES

2017 Lobbying Performance



Q2. How has Council performed on 'lobbying on behalf of the community' over the last 12 months?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

2017 LOBBYING ON BEHALF OF THE COMMUNITY

PERFORMANCE DETAILED PERCENTAGES

2017 Lobbying Performance




Q2. How has Council performed on 'lobbying on behalf of the community' over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

2017 DECISIONS MADE IN THE INTEREST OF THE COMMUNITY

PERFORMANCE INDEX SCORES



2017 Community Decisions Made Performance



Q2. How has Council performed on 'decisions made in the interest of the community' over the last 12 months?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19


Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

2017 DECISIONS MADE IN THE INTEREST OF THE COMMUNITY

PERFORMANCE DETAILED PERCENTAGES



2017 Community Decisions Made Performance




Q2. How has Council performed on 'decisions made in the interest of the community' over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19

2017 THE CONDITION OF SEALED LOCAL ROADS IN YOUR AREA

PERFORMANCE INDEX SCORES



2017 Sealed Local Roads Performance



Q2. How has Council performed on 'the condition of sealed local roads in your area' over the last 12 months?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19


Note: Please see page 5 for explanation about significant differences

2017 THE CONDITION OF SEALED LOCAL ROADS IN YOUR AREA

PERFORMANCE DETAILED PERCENTAGES



2017 Sealed Local Roads Performance




Q2. How has Council performed on 'the condition of sealed local roads in your area' over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked state-wide: 68 Councils asked group: 19




DETAILED DEMOGRAPHICS

2017 GENDER AND AGE PROFILE

Gender



Age



Please note that for the reason of simplifying reporting, interlocking age and gender reporting has not been included in this report. Interlocking age and gender analysis is still available in the dashboard and data tables provided alongside this report.

A satellite-style map of the United States is shown, with a glowing, interconnected network of lines overlaid on the landmass, suggesting a data network or survey routes. The map is set against a dark blue background.

APPENDIX A:

DETAILED SURVEY TABULATIONS

AVAILABLE IN SUPPLIED EXCEL FILE



**APPENDIX B:
FURTHER PROJECT INFORMATION**

APPENDIX B:

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

The survey was revised in 2012. As a result:

- 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 South Gippsland Shire Council 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 2012-2017 have been made throughout this report as appropriate.**

APPENDIX B:

MARGINS OF ERROR

The sample size for the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey for South Gippsland Shire Council was n=400. 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 n=400 interviews is +/-4.9% 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 45.1% - 54.9%.

Maximum margins of error are listed in the table below, based on a population of 22,000 people aged 18 years or over for South Gippsland Shire Council, according to ABS estimates.

Demographic	Actual survey sample size	Weighted base	Maximum margin of error at 95% confidence interval
South Gippsland Shire Council	400	400	+/-4.9
Men	177	196	+/-7.4
Women	223	204	+/-6.5
Strzelecki	147	150	+/-8.1
Coastal - Promontory	80	72	+/-11.0
Tarwin Valley	173	179	+/-7.4
18-34 years	34	77	+/-17.0
35-49 years	73	91	+/-11.5
50-64 years	130	103	+/-8.6
65+ years	163	129	+/-7.7

APPENDIX B:

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

All participating councils are listed in the state-wide report published on the DELWP website. In 2017, 68 of the 79 Councils throughout Victoria participated in this survey. For consistency of analysis and reporting across all projects, Local Government Victoria has aligned its presentation of data to use standard council groupings. Accordingly, the council reports for the community satisfaction survey provide analysis using these standard council groupings. Please note that councils participating across 2012-2017 vary slightly.

Council Groups

South Gippsland Shire Council is classified as a Large Rural council according to the following classification list:

- Metropolitan, Interface, Regional Centres, Large Rural & Small Rural

Councils participating in the Large Rural group are: Bass Coast, Baw Baw, Campaspe, Colac Otway, Corangamite, East Gippsland, Glenelg, Golden Plains, Macedon Ranges, Mitchell, Moira, Moorabool, Mount Alexander, Moyne, South Gippsland, Southern Grampians, Surf Coast, Swan Hill and Wellington.

Wherever appropriate, results for South Gippsland Shire Council for this 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey have been compared against other participating councils in the Large Rural group and on a state-wide basis. Please note that council groupings changed for 2015, and as such comparisons to council group results before that time can not be made within the reported charts.

APPENDIX B: ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

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 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

APPENDIX B:

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

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

APPENDIX B:

INDEX SCORE IMPLICATIONS

Index scores are indicative of an overall rating on a particular service area. In this context, index scores indicate:

- a) how well council is seen to be performing in a particular service area; or
- b) the level of importance placed on a particular service area.

For ease of interpretation, index score ratings can be categorised as follows:

INDEX SCORE	Performance implication	Importance implication
75 – 100	Council is performing very well in this service area	This service area is seen to be extremely important
60 – 75	Council is performing well in this service area, but there is room for improvement	This service area is seen to be very important
50 – 60	Council is performing satisfactorily in this service area but needs to improve	This service area is seen to be fairly important
40 – 50	Council is performing poorly in this service area	This service area is seen to be somewhat important
0 – 40	Council is performing very poorly in this service area	This service area is seen to be not that important

APPENDIX B:

INDEX SCORE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE CALCULATION

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

$$Z \text{ Score} = (\$1 - \$2) / \text{Sqrt} ((\$3^2 / \$5) + (\$4^2 / \$6))$$

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.

APPENDIX B:

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

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 2017 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)
- Decisions made in the interest of the community (Making community decisions)
- Condition of sealed local roads (Sealed local roads)
- 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 participating councils in the council group and against all participating councils state-wide. Alternatively, some questions in the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey were optional. Councils also had the ability to ask tailored questions specific only to their council.

APPENDIX B: ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Reporting

Every council that participated in the 2017 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey receives a customised report. In addition, the state government is supplied with a 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 Community Satisfaction Report is available at <https://www.localgovernment.vic.gov.au/our-programs/council-community-satisfaction-survey>.

APPENDIX B:

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

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

CSS: 2017 Victorian Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey.

Council group: One of five classified groups, comprising: metropolitan, interface, regional centres, large rural and small rural.

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.

Statewide 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.



**THERE ARE OVER
6 MILLION PEOPLE
IN VICTORIA...**

**FIND OUT
WHAT THEY'RE
THINKING.**

Contact Us:
03 8685 8555

John Scales
Managing Director

Mark Zuker
Managing Director

