



2024 Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey

Golden Plains Shire Council

Coordinated by the Department of
Government Services on behalf of
Victorian councils



Contents

<u>Background and objectives</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Key findings and recommendations</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Detailed findings</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Overall performance</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Customer service</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>Council direction</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>Individual service areas</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>Community consultation and engagement</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>Lobbying on behalf of the community</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>Decisions made in the interest of the community</u>	<u>46</u>
<u>Condition of sealed local roads</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>Waste management</u>	<u>54</u>
<u>Maintenance of unsealed roads</u>	<u>56</u>
<u>Detailed demographics</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>Appendix A: Index scores, margins of error and significant differences</u>	<u>62</u>
<u>Appendix B: Further project information</u>	<u>66</u>



Background and objectives

The Victorian Community Satisfaction Survey (CSS) creates a vital interface between the council and their community.

Held annually, the CSS asks the opinions of local people about the place they live, work and play and provides confidence for councils in their efforts and abilities.

Now in its twenty-fifth year, this survey provides insight into the community's views on:

- councils' overall performance, with benchmarking against State-wide and council group results
- value for money in services and infrastructure
- community consultation and engagement
- decisions made in the interest of the community
- customer service, local infrastructure, facilities, services and
- overall council direction.

When coupled with previous data, the survey provides a reliable historical source of the community's views since 1998. A selection of results from the last ten years shows that councils in Victoria continue to provide services that meet the public's expectations.

Serving Victoria for 25 years


Each year the CSS data is used to develop this State-wide report which contains all of the aggregated results, analysis and data. Moreover, with 25 years of results, the CSS offers councils a long-term measure of how they are performing – essential for councils that work over the long term to provide valuable services and infrastructure to their communities.

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.



How to read index score charts in this report




Question asked and base size(s)

Q3. ON BALANCE, for the last twelve months, how do you feel about the performance of Golden Plains 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: 62 Councils asked group: 9
 Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



How to read stacked bar charts in this report



Q3. ON BALANCE, for the last twelve months, how do you feel about the performance of Golden Plains 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: 62 Councils asked group: 9

A large, stylized letter 'W' graphic that spans the right side of the page. The 'W' is filled with a dark blue color and contains a glowing, intricate network pattern of white and light blue lines, resembling a neural network or a complex data structure. The background of the 'W' is a lighter blue gradient.

Key findings and recommendations



Golden Plains Shire Council – at a glance

Overall council performance

Results shown are index scores out of 100.



Golden Plains
42



Large Rural 50



State-wide 54

Council performance compared to group average

Top performing areas		
	Waste management	▼ lower
	Lobbying	= on par
Lowest performing areas		
	Unsealed roads	▼ lower
	Sealed local roads	▼ lower
	Customer service	= on par



Summary of core measures

Index scores

Overall Performance

Value for money

Community Consultation


Making Community Decisions

Sealed Local Roads

Waste management

Customer Service


Overall Council Direction















Summary of core measures

Core measures summary results (%)





Summary of Golden Plains Shire Council performance

Services	Golden Plains 2024	Golden Plains 2023	Large Rural 2024	State-wide 2024	Highest score	Lowest score
 Overall performance	42	43	50	54	65+ years	South-East residents
 Value for money	36	37	43	48	65+ years	35-49 years
 Overall council direction	42	41	42	45	Central residents	50-64 years
 Customer service	63	62	65	67	Women	Men
 Waste management	60	61	65	67	North-West residents, Central residents	South-East residents
 Lobbying	46	46	47	50	65+ years	South-East residents
 Consultation & engagement	43	43	48	51	North-West residents	South-East residents
 Community decisions	43	43	46	50	65+ years, North-West residents	35-49 years, South-East residents
 Sealed local roads	27	34	38	45	65+ years	18-34 years
 Unsealed roads	26	27	34	36	65+ years	35-49 years



Focus areas for the next 12 months

Overview

Perceptions of Council's performance largely stayed the same across the board (with the exception of sealed local roads) in the past year, arresting significant declines experienced across most service areas in 2023. Nevertheless, perceptions of Council's overall performance and performance on most of its service areas (with the exception of waste management) are among the lowest levels recorded in 10 years.

Key focus

Council should first look to improving performance on the lowest performing service areas: sealed local roads and unsealed roads. Residents also consider these two service areas among the most important of Council services evaluated in this research – leading to the largest differential between importance and performance scores among all service areas and highlighting the urgency to address these poor perceptions.

Comparison to state and area grouping

Council performs in line with the Large Rural group average in the areas of lobbying and customer service. In all other service areas evaluated, Council performs significantly lower than the group average. Council performs significantly lower than the State-wide average on all service areas.

Shore up consultation and engagement efforts

Council should look to improve its performance in community consultation and engagement, and demonstrate that it is making decisions in the interest of the community – both of which are service areas that are relatively important to residents, moreso (though not significantly) among those living in the South-East areas. Given North-West residents' more positive ratings (but not significantly) of Council performance, it may be worth identifying approaches in that region that resonate and bolstering these in the South-East.

DETAILED FINDINGS



Overall performance



Overall performance


The overall performance index score of 42 for Golden Plains Shire Council represents a (not significant) one point decline on the 2023 result. Overall performance is however at its lowest level in 10 years.

Golden Plains Shire Council's overall performance is rated statistically significantly lower (at the 95% confidence interval) than the Large Rural group and State-wide group averages for councils (index scores of 50 and 54 respectively).

- Ratings among residents aged 65 years and above (index score of 48) is significantly higher than the Council average.

Only one in seven residents (14%) rate the value for money they receive from Council in infrastructure and services provided to their community as 'very good' or 'good'. Nearly four times more residents (50%) rate Council as 'very poor' or 'poor'. A further 33% rate Council as 'average' in the area of value for money.

- As with overall performance, residents aged 65 years and over have significantly higher than average perceptions of Council's value for money (index score of 44 compared to 36 on average).
- Central residents' ratings in the area of value for money significantly improved after experiencing a decline last year (index score of 38, up from 30).





Overall performance

2024 overall performance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	
State-wide	54▲	56	59	61	58	60	59	59	59	60
Large Rural	50▲	52	55	58	55	56	56	54	54	56
65+	48▲	51	55	55	51	54	53	52	51	59
North-West	46	49	54	52	49	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	44	42	49	49	45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Women	42	45	51	51	49	48	55	53	49	56
Golden Plains	42	43	51	51	49	49	52	49	49	54
Men	41	41	50	51	48	50	50	46	49	52
35-49	39	40	49	45	45	43	52	48	43	49
50-64	39	38	47	46	46	48	50	46	49	54
18-34	39	42	51	57	52	55	54	50	54	57
South-East	38	40	48	51	49	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Q3. ON BALANCE, for the last twelve months, how do you feel about the performance of Golden Plains 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: 62 Councils asked group: 18

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Overall performance

2024 overall performance (%)




Q3. ON BALANCE, for the last twelve months, how do you feel about the performance of Golden Plains 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: 62 Councils asked group: 18



Value for money in services and infrastructure

2024 value for money (index scores)



Q3b. How would you rate Golden Plains Shire Council at providing good value for money in infrastructure and services provided to your community?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 61 Councils asked group: 18

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Value for money in services and infrastructure

2024 value for money (%)



Q3b. How would you rate Golden Plains Shire Council at providing good value for money in infrastructure and services provided to your community?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 61 Councils asked group: 18



Top performing service areas

Waste management (index score of 60) is the area where Council performed best in 2024. Despite so, Council performs significantly lower than the State-wide group and Large Rural group averages in this service area (index scores of 67 and 65 respectively).

Geographic comparisons of waste management services reveal that:

- North-West or Central residents (both with an index score of 69) rate Council significantly higher than the average.
- South-East residents (index score of 49) rate Council significantly lower than the average, suggesting a need to improve waste management services in this area as a first priority.

A small proportion of residents (9%) volunteer waste management as one of the things Council performs best at.

Lobbying is Council's next highest rated service area (index score of 46), followed by consultation and engagement, and community decisions (both with an index score of 43). Council's performance in all three of these service areas is stable after experiencing significant declines last year, however, these remain among the lowest levels noted in the past 10 years.



Waste management (index score of 60) is the area where Council performed best in 2024.

Low performing service areas



Council rates lowest in the areas of unsealed roads and sealed local roads (index scores of 26 and 27 respectively), continuing a downward trend in performance in the past 10 years (seven years for unsealed roads).

On maintaining the conditions of sealed local roads, Council's performance decreased significantly this year (down seven index points on 2023).


- Geographically, significant decreases in the perceptions of residents living in the North-West (index score of 25, down from 34) or South-East (28, down from 35) areas are also noted.
- Moreover, two in five residents (41%) volunteer sealed roads maintenance as a service area most in need of improvement.

Notably, residents consider the maintenance of unsealed roads and sealed local roads as among the most important of Council's responsibilities evaluated (importance index scores of 87 and 90 respectively). There is over 60 index points difference between importance and performance index scores for these service areas, suggesting a need to improve the condition of roads in the area and manage resident expectations to arrest further declines in perception (ideally beginning with the North-West and South-East areas).



Individual service area performance

2024 individual service area performance (index scores)




Q2. How has Council performed on [RESPONSIBILITY AREA] over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18
 Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Individual service area performance

2024 individual service area performance (%)




Q2. How has Council performed on [RESPONSIBILITY AREA] over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18



Individual service area importance

2024 individual service area importance (index scores)




Q1. Firstly, how important should [RESPONSIBILITY AREA] be as a responsibility for Council?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 27 Councils asked group: 9
 Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Individual service area importance

2024 individual service area importance (%)




Q1. Firstly, how important should [RESPONSIBILITY AREA] be as a responsibility for Council?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 27 Councils asked group: 9



Individual service areas importance vs performance

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



Note: Net differentials are calculated based on the un-rounded importance and performance scores, then rounded to the nearest whole number, which may result in differences of +/-1% in the importance and performance scores and the net differential scores.




Best things about Council and areas for improvement

2024 best things about Council (%)
- Top mentions only -



2024 areas for improvement (%)
- Top mentions only -



Q16. Please tell me what is the ONE BEST thing about Golden Plains 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: 31 Councils asked group: 9

Q17. What does Golden Plains Shire Council MOST need to do to improve its performance?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 49 Councils asked group: 14

A verbatim listing of the responses to these questions can be found in the accompanying dashboard.



Customer service



Contact with council and customer service

Contact with council

Rate of contact with Council has been relatively stable over recent years with around seven in ten Council residents (68%) contacting Council in the last 12 months.

- Council's rate of contact is significantly higher than the Large Rural group and State-wide group averages (63% and 62% respectively).



Among those residents who have had contact with Council, 54% provide a positive customer service rating of 'very good' or 'good', including 28% of residents who rate Council's customer service as 'very good'.

Customer service

Council's customer service index of 63 is not significantly different from 2023 (62). Council has maintained a relatively consistent performance in this area over the past ten years.

- Customer service is rated in line with the Large Rural group average but significantly below the State-wide average for councils (index scores of 65 and 67 respectively).
- Notably, perceptions of customer service among residents in the South-East improved significantly from last year (index score of 66, up from 58).


Seven in ten residents (54%) provide a positive customer service rating of 'very good' or 'good'.

- Perceptions of customer service are equally positive compared to the average among residents in the different demographic and geographical groups.



Contact with council

2024 contact with council (%)
Have had contact




Q5. Over the last 12 months, have you or any member of your household had any contact with Golden Plains 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: 36 Councils asked group: 9



Contact with council

2024 contact with council (%)



Q5. Over the last 12 months, have you or any member of your household had any contact with Golden Plains 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: 36 Councils asked group: 9

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Customer service rating

2024 customer service rating (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	
Women	68	66	70	65	62	67	70	65	66	72
State-wide	67▲	67	68	70	70	71	70	69	69	70
South-East	66	58	61	63	66	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
35-49	65	61	60	57	64	62	65	57	61	67
Large Rural	65	65	67	68	68	69	67	66	67	67
18-34	63	63	68	66	64	62	60	66	62	66
Golden Plains	63	62	64	62	63	63	65	61	65	68
65+	62	62	67	68	66	69	70	64	69	69
50-64	61	62	63	55	57	61	67	55	68	70
North-West	61	68	73	60	60	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	60	61	58	62	58	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Men	58	58	59	58	64	60	60	55	63	64

Q5c. Thinking of the most recent contact, how would you rate Golden Plains 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: 62 Councils asked group: 18

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Customer service rating

2024 customer service rating (%)



Q5c. Thinking of the most recent contact, how would you rate Golden Plains 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: 62 Councils asked group: 18



Council direction

Council direction

Over the last 12 months, 65% of residents believe the direction of Council's overall performance stayed the same, up seven percentage points on 2023.


- Just 8% of residents believe the direction has improved (down two percentage points) in the last 12 months.
- More residents (24%, from 28% in 2023) believe Council direction has deteriorated, representing three times more people than those who believe it has improved.

With an index score of 42, Council performs in line with the Large Rural group average (also an index score of 42), but significantly below the State-wide group average for councils (index score of 45).

Central residents are significantly more positive about the direction of Council's overall performance compared to last year (index score of 46, up from 36).

No significant differences were found among residents from different geographic and demographic groups compared to the average.

- The most satisfied with council direction are Central residents or those aged 18 to 34 years.
- The least satisfied with council direction are residents aged 50 to 64 years or men.





Overall council direction last 12 months

2024 overall council direction (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Central	36	40	41	44	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18-34	49	52	45	50	58	53	45	47	38
State-wide	46	50	53	51	53	52	53	51	53
Women	43	47	47	44	45	50	46	41	45
35-49	37	43	43	44	38	47	43	34	40
Large Rural	44	47	51	50	51	52	52	48	51
Golden Plains	41	45	45	45	46	49	45	41	42
65+	40	44	48	42	48	50	49	44	44
North-West	40	51	45	46	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
South-East	44	44	46	44	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Men	39	44	42	46	47	48	43	41	39
50-64	37	42	42	44	41	47	43	42	45

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


Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Overall council direction last 12 months

2024 overall council direction (%)



Q6. Over the last 12 months, what is your view of the direction of Golden Plains Shire Council's overall performance?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18

A large, stylized letter 'W' graphic that serves as a background element. The 'W' is filled with a dark blue color and contains a glowing, intricate network pattern of white and light blue lines, resembling a fiber optic or neural network. The 'W' is positioned on the right side of the slide, extending from the top to the bottom.

Individual service areas



Community consultation and engagement importance



2024 consultation and engagement importance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	
35-49	81	85	76	84	80	84	77	n/a	81	83
Women	81	83	81	80	79	80	80	n/a	78	77
South-East	80	83	78	80	77	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	79	81	79	78	85	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
65+	78	79	77	80	76	79	77	n/a	73	78
Golden Plains	78	80	78	78	76	78	77	n/a	75	77
50-64	78	78	80	80	80	82	80	n/a	75	79
Large Rural	77	77	77	77	76	75	76	75	76	75
State-wide	76	76	76	75	74	74	74	74	74	74
Men	75	78	74	76	73	77	73	n/a	72	77
North-West	75	76	77	74	73	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18-34	74	79	79	67	68	68	72	n/a	69	67

Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Community consultation and engagement' be as a responsibility for Council?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 25 Councils asked group: 9


Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Community consultation and engagement importance



2024 consultation and engagement importance (%)



Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Community consultation and engagement' be as a responsibility for Council?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 25 Councils asked group: 9



Community consultation and engagement performance



2024 consultation and engagement performance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
State-wide	51▲	52	54	56	55	56	55	54	56
Large Rural	48▲	49	51	54	54	54	52	52	54
North-West	47	48	56	47	52	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
65+	46	47	51	51	49	49	51	49	48
Men	45	43	47	46	49	46	45	44	44
Central	45	47	47	45	44	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18-34	44	41	53	50	48	52	49	47	57
Golden Plains	43	43	49	47	49	47	50	48	47
35-49	42	43	49	43	50	44	53	49	40
Women	41	44	52	48	49	48	55	52	50
50-64	41	41	44	44	50	45	46	44	47
South-East	40	39	46	48	48	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18


Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Community consultation and engagement performance



2024 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: 62 Councils asked group: 18



Lobbying on behalf of the community importance



2024 lobbying importance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	
Women	74	70	75	74	71	74	73	n/a	n/a	n/a
50-64	73	71	69	74	71	72	69	n/a	n/a	n/a
35-49	72	72	73	69	75	74	75	n/a	n/a	n/a
South-East	71	71	72	71	71	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	71	70	73	68	75	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Golden Plains	70	69	72	70	69	70	70	n/a	n/a	n/a
Large Rural	69	69	71	71	69	67	68	69	70	70
State-wide	68	68	71	69	68	67	68	69	69	69
18-34	68	67	74	65	60	62	66	n/a	n/a	n/a
65+	68	67	71	72	68	70	69	n/a	n/a	n/a
North-West	68	66	72	69	64	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Men	66	68	70	65	67	65	67	n/a	n/a	n/a

Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Lobbying on behalf of the community' be as a responsibility for Council?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 21 Councils asked group: 7


Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Lobbying on behalf of the community importance



2024 lobbying importance (%)



Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Lobbying on behalf of the community' be as a responsibility for Council?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 21 Councils asked group: 7



Lobbying on behalf of the community performance



2024 lobbying performance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	
65+	51	50	54	51	47	51	50	49	48	53
State-wide	50▲	51	53	55	53	54	54	54	53	55
North-West	49	49	56	53	47	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	49	48	48	45	39	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Large Rural	47	49	51	54	53	52	52	51	50	53
Golden Plains	46	46	51	50	48	47	51	46	45	47
Men	46	45	52	49	49	50	48	45	43	47
Women	46	47	51	50	48	45	54	47	47	48
35-49	46	45	52	51	47	42	51	46	35	43
18-34	44	46	51	50	50	50	52	47	54	48
50-64	43	42	48	46	48	48	51	42	45	46
South-East	42	43	50	48	51	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 46 Councils asked group: 14


Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Lobbying on behalf of the community performance



2024 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: 46 Councils asked group: 14

Decisions made in the interest of the community importance



2024 community decisions made importance (index scores)



Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Decisions made in the interest of the community' be as a responsibility for Council?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 19 Councils asked group: 8

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.

Decisions made in the interest of the community importance



2024 community decisions made importance (%)



Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Decisions made in the interest of the community' be as a responsibility for Council?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 19 Councils asked group: 8

Decisions made in the interest of the community performance



2024 community decisions made performance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	
State-wide	50▲	51	54	56	53	55	54	54	55	
65+	48	47	53	52	47	47	52	51	43	45
North-West	48	49	54	49	50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Large Rural	46▲	48	51	54	52	52	52	51	50	52
Men	44	42	49	49	48	47	50	46	44	43
50-64	43	40	46	46	44	46	47	45	47	46
Central	43	41	47	45	38	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Golden Plains	43	43	50	49	47	47	51	48	44	45
Women	42	44	51	48	46	46	51	50	44	47
18-34	41	44	51	53	55	55	47	48	50	47
South-East	39	40	48	51	47	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
35-49	39	40	48	45	43	40	55	47	38	42

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: 62 Councils asked group: 18

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.

Decisions made in the interest of the community performance



2024 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: 62 Councils asked group: 18

The condition of sealed local roads in your area importance



2024 sealed local roads importance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	
18-34	94▲	85	84	74	78	83	84	n/a	n/a	n/a
North-West	91	89	87	82	84	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
35-49	90	87	84	85	85	86	83	n/a	n/a	n/a
Women	90	84	88	84	82	87	86	n/a	n/a	n/a
Golden Plains	90	86	84	82	83	85	84	n/a	n/a	n/a
South-East	90	85	83	82	81	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Men	89	88	80	80	84	83	81	n/a	n/a	n/a
50-64	89	89	85	85	86	86	85	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	89	85	82	83	90	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
65+	86▼	84	83	85	82	83	83	n/a	n/a	n/a
Large Rural	84▼	83	83	80	81	80	80	77	80	78
State-wide	83▼	82	81	79	79	79	80	78	78	76

Q1. Firstly, how important should 'The condition of sealed local roads in your area' be as a responsibility for Council?


Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 20 Councils asked group: 6

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.

The condition of sealed local roads in your area importance



2024 sealed local roads importance (%)



Q1. Firstly, how important should 'The condition of sealed local roads in your area' be as a responsibility for Council?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 20 Councils asked group: 6

The condition of sealed local roads in your area performance



2024 sealed local roads performance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
State-wide	48	53	57	54	56	53	53	54	55
Large Rural	40	45	50	47	47	45	43	44	45
65+	39	45	44	44	48	46	47	45	51
Central	29	35	40	29	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
South-East	35	40	44	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Men	32	39	44	38	43	45	39	45	46
Golden Plains	34	37	42	39	44	47	38	44	45
Women	35	35	41	39	44	49	38	44	44
North-West	34	35	42	39	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
35-49	32	36	39	41	42	49	37	44	40
50-64	30	36	40	38	43	45	34	44	43
18-34	31	32	47	31	42	49	36	45	48

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: 62 Councils asked group: 18

Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.

The condition of sealed local roads in your area performance



2024 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: 62 Councils asked group: 18



Waste management performance



2024 waste management performance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
North-West	72	68	62	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	67	62	60	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
State-wide	66	68	69	65	68	70	71	70	72
65+	68	63	63	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	51	62
Large Rural	65	65	66	62	64	67	68	66	68
18-34	58	62	59	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	49	53
Men	60	58	62	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	49	57
Golden Plains	61	60	57	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	46	55
Women	61	62	53	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	43	53
50-64	62	57	55	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	50	58
35-49	55	57	53	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	37	49
South-East	51	53	52	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a


Q2. How has Council performed on 'Waste management' over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18
 Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Waste management performance



2024 waste management performance (%)



Q2. How has Council performed on 'Waste management' over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18



Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area importance



2024 unsealed roads importance (index scores)

	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
Central	90	86	87	86	88	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Women	89	86	88	87	83	84	86	n/a	n/a
65+	87	82	82	84	84	81	84	n/a	n/a
18-34	87	88	89	79	74	81	78	n/a	n/a
Golden Plains	87	86	85	84	81	82	81	n/a	n/a
50-64	87	87	85	86	84	84	82	n/a	n/a
South-East	87	85	84	83	78	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
35-49	87	87	86	86	83	83	81	n/a	n/a
Men	85	86	83	81	80	80	77	n/a	n/a
North-West	85	87	86	84	84	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
State-wide	84▼	83	83	81	80	80	80	79	79
Large Rural	84▼	83	82	80	79	79	78	77	78

Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area' be as a responsibility for Council?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 13 Councils asked group: 6


Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area importance



2024 unsealed roads importance (%)



Q1. Firstly, how important should 'Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area' be as a responsibility for Council?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 13 Councils asked group: 6



Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area performance



2024 unsealed roads performance (index scores)

		2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015
State-wide	36▲	37	41	45	44	44	43	44	43	45
Large Rural	34▲	35	39	44	42	41	41	42	43	44
65+	33▲	32	41	39	37	44	42	n/a	n/a	n/a
North-West	29	30	35	39	38	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Men	28	28	36	38	35	35	40	n/a	n/a	n/a
50-64	27	25	29	34	35	35	38	n/a	n/a	n/a
Central	26	25	29	29	28	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Golden Plains	26	27	33	36	36	36	41	n/a	n/a	n/a
Women	23	27	31	35	37	38	42	n/a	n/a	n/a
South-East	23	27	35	38	36	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
18-34	23	24	29	40	32	34	42	n/a	n/a	n/a
35-49	20▼	28	34	32	39	34	42	n/a	n/a	n/a

Q2. How has Council performed on 'Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area' over the last 12 months?

Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 27 Councils asked group: 11


Note: Please see Appendix A for explanation of significant differences.



Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area performance



2024 unsealed roads performance (%)



Q2. How has Council performed on 'Maintenance of unsealed roads in your area' over the last 12 months?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 27 Councils asked group: 11




Detailed demographics




Gender and age profile

2024 gender


Golden Plains



Large Rural




State-wide




2024 age


Golden Plains



Large Rural



State-wide




■ 18-24 ■ 25-34 ■ 35-49 ■ 50-64 ■ 65+

■ 18-24 ■ 25-34 ■ 35-49 ■ 50-64 ■ 65+

■ 18-24 ■ 25-34 ■ 35-49 ■ 50-64 ■ 65+

S3. [Record gender] / S4. To which of the following age groups do you belong?
 Base: All respondents. Councils asked State-wide: 62 Councils asked group: 18

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. Councils interviewing residents on an annual basis included an "Other" option for gender, hence the State-wide and Large Rural gender results may not add to 100%



Appendix A: Index scores, margins of error and significant differences



Appendix A: Index Scores

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.

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
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

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

Please note that the horizontal (x) axis of the index score bar charts in this report is displayed on a scale from 20 to 100.



Appendix A: Margins of error

The sample size for the 2024 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey for Golden Plains 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 18,700 people aged 18 years or over for Golden Plains Shire Council, according to ABS estimates.

Demographic	Actual survey sample size	Weighted base	Maximum margin of error at 95% confidence interval
Golden Plains Shire Council	400	400	+/-4.9
Men	210	205	+/-6.7
Women	190	195	+/-7.1
North-West	138	129	+/-8.3
Central	89	88	+/-10.4
South-East	173	183	+/-7.4
18-34 years	39	94	+/-15.9
35-49 years	71	111	+/-11.7
50-64 years	118	79	+/-9.0
65+ years	172	115	+/-7.5



Appendix A: Index score significant difference calculation

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

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

Where:

- \$1 = Index Score 1
- \$2 = Index Score 2
- \$3 = unweighted sample count 1
- \$4 = unweighted sample count 2
- \$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: Further project information



Appendix B: Further information

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

- Background and objectives
- Analysis and reporting
- Glossary of terms

Detailed survey tabulations

Detailed survey tabulations are available in supplied Excel file.

Contacts

For further queries about the conduct and reporting of the 2024 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey, please contact JWS Research on

(03) 8685 8555 or via email:

admin@jwsresearch.com



Appendix B: Survey methodology and sampling

The 2024 results are compared with previous years, as detailed below:

- 2023, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 27th January – 19th March.
- 2022, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 27th January – 24th March.
- 2021, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 28th January – 18th March.
- 2020, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 30th January – 22nd March.
- 2019, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March.
- 2018, n=401 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March.
- 2017, n=400 completed interviews, conducted in the period of 1st February – 30th March.
- 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.

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 Golden Plains 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.

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

Survey sample matched to the demographic profile of Golden Plains 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 60% mobile phone numbers to cater to the diversity of residents within Golden Plains Shire Council, particularly younger people.

A total of n=400 completed interviews were achieved in Golden Plains Shire Council. Survey fieldwork was conducted across four quarters from 1st June 2023 – 18th March 2024.



Appendix B: Analysis and reporting

All participating councils are listed in the State-wide report published on the DGS website. In 2024, 62 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 2012-2024 vary slightly.

Council Groups

Golden Plains 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, 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 Golden Plains Shire Council for this 2024 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 cannot be made within the reported charts.



Appendix B: Core, optional and tailored questions

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 2024 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)
- Value for money in services and infrastructure (Value for money)
- Contact in last 12 months (Contact)
- Rating of contact (Customer service)
- Overall council direction last 12 months (Council direction)
- Community consultation and engagement (Consultation)
- Decisions made in the interest of the community (Making community decisions)
- Condition of sealed local roads (Sealed local roads)
- Waste management

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 2024 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 2024 State-wide Local Government Community Satisfaction Survey receives 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, which is available at:

<https://www.localgovernment.vic.gov.au/our-programs/council-community-satisfaction-survey>

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.



Appendix B: Glossary of terms

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

CSS: 2024 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.

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.

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

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



Contact us
03 8685 8555



Follow us
[@JWSResearch](#)

John Scales
Founder
jcales@jwsresearch.com

Mark Zuker
Managing Director
mzucker@jwsresearch.com

Katrina Cox
Director of Client Services
kcox@jwsresearch.com

