NB: 2010/2011 indexed mean res			rod with 2012 in		nov aro shown a	e trande anly
Indexed score = indexed mean S = Similar (+/- 1-2) H = Higher L = Lower	East Ward	South Ward	West Ward	Macedon Ranges	Large Rural Councils	All Councils (State)
Arrows show the <u>trend</u> direction of MRSC ratings between 2010 and 2011						
1 Overall Performance						
Very Good/Good %	46	47	38	43	40	49
Average %	40	41	46	43	41	36
Poor/Very Poor %	13	12	15	13	18	11
Index Score	58	57	59	58	56 ↓	60 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓				62 → 60	S	L
2 Advocacy	T				ı	1
Very Good/Good %	29	20	30	26	31	33
Average %	28	46	31	35	34	33
Poor/Very Poor %	16	20	22	20	20	16
Importance	70	71	70	70	71	70
2012 Index Score	54	50	52	52	53 个	55 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓				62 → 60	S	L
3A Community Consultation			<u> </u>		т	T
Very Good/Good %	37	41	26	34	37	41
Average %	43	32	46	40	34	33
Poor/Very Poor %	16	23	23	21	22	18
Importance	74	72	75	74	74	73
2012 Index Score	56	52	54	54	54 E	57 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓				59 → 56	S	L
2012: 3A & 3B avge = MR 56 avge						
3B Informing The Communi					T	T
Very Good/Good %	40	45	50	45	45	50
Average %	45	34	30	36	32	31
Poor/Very Poor %	13	20	19	17	21	17
Importance	75	75	77	76	76	75
2012 Index Score	58	58	61	59	57 ↓	60 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓				59 → 56	S	L
4 Customer Service						
Very Good/Good %	69	67	63	66	64	68
Average %	13	18	24	19	19	17
	16				15	
Poor/Very Poor % 2012 Index Score	70	13 68	12 68	14 69	68 V	13 71 ↑
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓	70	00	00	69 → 67	S	/ T T
zoro - zorr trend. V				03 7 07	J	L
5 Council Direction NEW						
Improved %	12	18	10	13	14	18
Stayed the Same %	70	66	74	70	64	64
Deteriorated %	15	15	15	15	18	15
2012 Index Score	49	52	48	49	48 ↓	52 ↑
2012 111000 00010		<u> </u>	10		10 +	02
	ı	l .	1	1	1	1

ndexed score = indexed mean S = Similar (+/- 1-2)	East Ward	South	West	Macedon	Large	All
H = Higher L = Lower		Ward	Ward	Ranges	Rural	Councils
Arrows show the <u>trend</u> direction of MRSC ratings between 2010 and					Councils	(State)
2011 6A Local Roads & Footpath	•					
Very Good/Good %	32	39	43	39	38	47
Average %	41	29	28	32	30	28
Poor/Very Poor %	26	27	29	27	30	24
Importance	78	77	78	78	78	77
2012 Index Score	49	54	53	52	51 ↓	57 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓			•	46 → 44	L	L
2012: 6A, 6B & 6C avge = MR 49 avg	e; LRS 49 avge; S	State 54 avge		•		•
B Maintenance of Unseale						
Very Good/Good %	21	25	29	26	21	29
Average %	30	36	36	35	31	29
Poor/Very Poor %	46	33	32	37	44	36
Importance	82	81	80	81	81	80
2012 Index Score	38	47	47	44	40 ↓	46 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓				46 → 44	L	L
6C Roadside Slashing/Weed	Control NEV	/	_	_	1	
Very Good/Good %	36	37	43	39	45	52
Average %	33	30	32	32	30	28
Poor/Very Poor %	30	30	23	28	22	17
Importance	78	75	75	76	72	71
2012 Index Score	50	49	56	52	57 个	61 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓	46 → 44 L L					
7 Parking (was: and traffic m	nat)					
Very Good/Good %	60	41	46	49	44	43
Average %	30	39	38	36	33	33
Poor/Very Poor %	7	17	15	14	21	21
Importance	58	61	68	63	69	71
2012 Index Score	66	59	57	60	56 ↓	56 ↓
2010/2011 trend: -		- 00		60 → 60	Н	S
	I					
8 Enforcing Local Laws						
Very Good/Good %	56	50	54	53	53	53
Average %	25	27	24	25	27	26
	9	10	7	9	10	10
Poor/Verv Poor %			70	68	69	70
Poor/Very Poor % Importance	67	66	10			
Poor/Very Poor % Importance 2012 Index Score	67 65	64	67	65	65 E	65 E

NB: 2010/2011 Indexed mean results CANNOT be directly compared with 2012 indexed means; they are shown as trends only indexed means; they are shown as the shown and they shown as the sh	Macedon Nanges Shire						
S = Similar (++-1-2)	NB: 2010/2011 indexed mean results CANNOT be directly compared with 2012 indexed means; they are shown as trends only						
## H = Higher L = Liower Ward Ward Ranges Rural Councils (State) ## Arows show the trend direction of MRSC radings between 2010 and 2011 ## A Family Support Services* (INEW was: Health and Human Services) * very high* teant say* response ## Very Good/Good % 36 36 45 39 47 45 ## Average % 29 30 27 28 23 22 ## Poort/Very Poor % 4 9 6 6 6 7 7 7 ## Importance 69 711 74 72 73 73 73 ## 2010 - 2011 Index Score 69 69 71 74 72 73 73 73 ## 2010 - 2011 Index Score 69 71 74 72 73 73 73 ## 2010 - 2011 Index Score 69 69 71 74 75 70 → 72		East Ward				_	
Arrows show the tiged direction of MRSC alrains between 2010 and 2011 3A Family Support Services* (NEW was: Health and Human Services)* very high "can't say" response* Very Good/Good % 36 36 45 39 47 45 Average % 29 30 27 28 23 22 Poor/Very Poor % 4 9 6 6 7 7 7 Importance 69 71 74 72 73 73 73 2012 Index Score 63 62 65 63 66 ↑ 67 ↑ 2 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 70 → 72			Ward	Ward	Ranges	Rural	
## Services NEW was: Health and Human Services very high "can't say" response	Arrows show the trend direction of					Councils	(State)
Section Sec							
Very Good/Good % 36 36 45 39 47 45 Average % 29 30 27 28 23 22 Poor/Very Poor % 4 9 6 6 7 7 Importance 69 71 74 72 73 73 2012 Index Score 63 62 65 63 66 6↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑							
Average % 29 30 27 28 23 22				uman Service		n't say" response)
Poor/Very Poor %	Very Good/Good %	36	36	45	39	47	45
Importance 69		29	30		28		22
2012 Index Score 63 62 65 63 66↑ 67↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ S 9B Elderly Support (NEW was: Health and Human Services) Very Good/Good % 33 47 50 43 53 49 Average % 28 24 28 27 21 20 Poor/Very Poor % 7 6 7 5 7 7 Importance 83 77 79 79 80 80 80 2012 Index Score 60 66 70 66 69 ↑ 69 ↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑	Poor/Very Poor %	4		6	6	7	7
## Selderly Support (NEW was: Health and Human Services) Very Good/Good % 33	Importance	69	71	74	72	73	73
Selderly Support (NEW was: Health and Human Services) Very Good/Good % 33 47 50 43 53 53 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	2012 Index Score	63	62	65	63	66 个	67 ↑
Very Good/Good % 33	2010 - 2011 trend: 个				70 → 72	L	S
Very Good/Good % 33	9B Elderly Support (NEW w	as: Health an	d Human Sen	vices)			
Average % 28 24 28 27 21 20 Poor/Very Poor % 7 6 7 5 7 7 Importance 83 77 79 79 80 80 80 2012 Index Score 60 66 70 66 69 ↑ 69 ↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 70 → 72 L S Solution So					43	53	49
Poor/Very Poor % 7 6 7 5 7 7 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 2 2 2	•		24	28	27		20
Importance 83 77 79 79 80 80							
2012 Index Score	•						
2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 70 → 72	•						
2012: 9A, 9B & 9C avge = MR 63 avge; LRS 65 avge; State 66 avge						1	
Services Very Good/Good % 26		e: I DS 65 avge: 1	State 66 avge		70 7 72	_	Ü
Very Good/Good % 26 36 35 33 38 36 Average % 23 26 19 22 25 23 Poor/Very Poor % 12 10 10 11 9 8 Importance 70 68 75 71 71 73 2012 Index Score 56 61 62 60 62 ↑ 63 ↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 71 66 65 60 65 ↑ 63 ↑ Very Good/Good % 57 71 66 65 60 65 Average % 26 24 21 23 24 22 Poor/Very Poor % 14 5 10 9 13 9 Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ↓ 70 ↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: - 77 76 65 72 67				ıman Services	2)		
Average % 23 26 19 22 25 23						38	36
Poor/Very Poor % 12 10 10 11 9 8	•						
Importance 70 68 75 71 71 73							
2012 Index Score	·		_				
10 Recreation Facilities Yery Good/Good % 57 71 66 65 60 65 Average % 26 24 21 23 24 22 Poor/Very Poor % 14 5 10 9 13 9 Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ↓ 70 ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑							
Very Good/Good % 57 71 66 65 60 65 Average % 26 24 21 23 24 22 Poor/Very Poor % 14 5 10 9 13 9 Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67		96	01	02		02 T	1
Very Good/Good % 57 71 66 65 60 65 Average % 26 24 21 23 24 22 Poor/Very Poor % 14 5 10 9 13 9 Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ♥ 70 ♠ 2010 - 2011 trend: - 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ♦ 71 ♦ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW 8 57 69 68 Average % <td colspan="7">2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 70 → 72 L S</td>	2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 70 → 72 L S						
Very Good/Good % 57 71 66 65 60 65 Average % 26 24 21 23 24 22 Poor/Very Poor % 14 5 10 9 13 9 Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ↓ 70 ↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: - 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57	40 Propostion Excilities						
Average % 26 24 21 23 24 22 Poor/Very Poor % 14 5 10 9 13 9 Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ↓ 70 ↑ 69 67 ↓ 71 69 67 ↓ 71 70 ↑ 69 67 ↓ 71 71 → 71 <t< td=""><td></td><td><i>F</i>7</td><td>74</td><td>66</td><td>C.F.</td><td></td><td>65</td></t<>		<i>F</i> 7	74	66	C.F.		65
Poor/Very Poor % 14 5 10 9 13 9 Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ↓ 70 ↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: - - 71 → 71 H S 11 Appearance of Public Areas Very Good/Good % 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	-						
Importance 71 74 72 72 72 72 72 2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ↓ 70 ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑							
2012 Index Score 64 72 71 69 67 ↓ 70 ↑ 2010 - 2011 trend: - 71 → 71 H S 11 Appearance of Public Areas Very Good/Good % 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW 8 S S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW 8 S S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW 8 S S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW 8 S S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW 8 S S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW 8 S							
2010 - 2011 trend: - 71 → 71 H S 11 Appearance of Public Areas Very Good/Good % 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 \rdot 71 \rdot 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66							
11 Appearance of Public Areas Very Good/Good % 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66		64	72	/1			
Very Good/Good % 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	2010 - 2011 trend: -				71 → 71	Н	S
Very Good/Good % 77 76 65 72 67 71 Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66							
Average % 19 19 25 21 24 21 Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66							
Poor/Very Poor % 4 5 9 6 8 8 Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	-						1
Importance 72 75 73 73 72 73 2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	_						
2012 Index Score 73 75 70 72 70 ↓ 71 ↓ 2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66							
2010 - 2011 trend: ↑ 67 → 68 S 12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	-	72	75		73		
12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	2012 Index Score	73	75	70		70 ↓	71 ↓
Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	2010 - 2011 trend: ↑				67 → 68	S	S
Very Good/Good % 57 51 63 57 69 68 Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66							
Average % 25 31 18 24 19 19 Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	12A Art Centres / Libraries NEW						
Poor/Very Poor % 9 8 10 9 6 7 Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	Very Good/Good %	57	51	63	57	69	68
Importance 67 62 70 67 63 66	Average %	25	31	18	24	19	19
	Poor/Very Poor %	9	8	10	9	6	7
2012 Index Score 66 65 70 67 73 ↑ 73 ↑	Importance	67	62	70	67	63	66
	2012 Index Score	66	65	70	67	73 个	73 个

		euon Ka	•		_	
NB: 2010/2011 indexed mean res						
S = Similar (+/- 1-2) H = Higher L = Lower	East Ward	South Ward	West Ward	Macedon Ranges	Large Rural Councils	All Councils (State)
Arrows show the <u>trend</u> direction of MRSC ratings between 2010 and 2011					Councils	(State)
12B Community & Cultural	Activities NE	W				
Very Good/Good %	38	54	61	51	55	59
Average %	41	29	29	33	28	26
Poor/Very Poor %	5	7	5	6	8	6
Importance	61	57	63	60	59	62
2012 Index Score	61	67	70	66	66 E	68 ↑
13 Waste Management	T		1		ı	
Very Good/Good %	81	75	72	75	66	72
Average %	13	14	17	15	20	17
Poor/Very Poor %	6	10	9	8	11	8
Importance	74	77	77	76	76	78
2012 Index Score	75	73	73	74	69 ↓	72 ↓
2010 - 2011 trend: ↑				64 → 66	L	L
14 Business & Community I		and Tourism	(was: Econ	omic Developn	nent)	•
Very Good/Good %	49	39	56	48	48	45
Average %	30	43	23	31	31	31
Poor/Very Poor %	7	10	13	10	15	12
Importance	66	63	72	67	70	66
2012 Index Score	64	60	65	63	61 ↓	62 ↓
2010 - 2011 trend: 个				<i>58</i> → <i>59</i>	S	S
15A Town Planning Policy			1		T	1
Very Good/Good %	25	24	29	27	30	34
Average %	42	31	35	36	32	32
Poor/Very Poor %	22	39	21	27	26	20
Importance	73	77	78	76	72	72
2012 Index Score	50	44	51	49	50 个	54 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓				52 → 49	L	L
15B Planning/Building Perm	1			1 ''		
Very Good/Good %	30	25	21	25	31	31
Average %	31	26	28	28	27	27
Poor/Very Poor %	21	36	33	30	23	19
Importance	70	74	76	73	70	71
2012 Index Score	51	45	43	46	51 个	54 个
2010 - 2011 trend: ↓				52 → 49	L	L
		·				

NB: 2010/2011 indexed mean results CANNOT be directly compared with 2012 indexed means; they are shown as trends only Indexed score = indexed mean West **East Ward** South Macedon Large ΑII S = Similar (+/- 1-2) Ward Ward Ranges Rural Councils $H = Higher \ L = Lower$ (State) Councils Arrows show the trend direction of MRSC ratings between 2010 and 2011 15C Planning Population Growth (NEW was: Town Planning Policy and Approvals) Very Good/Good % 30 29 31 30 31 31 Average % 35 33 31 33 31 31 Poor/Very Poor % 22 33 28 28 28 23 Importance 78 79 81 79 76 75 52 47 **50** 52 个 2012 Index Score 51 50 E 2010 - 2011 trend: ↓ 52 → 49 16 Emergency & Disaster Management NEW Very Good/Good % 61 60 63 57 58 57 Average % 21 16 22 20 21 20 Poor/Very Poor % 6 9 7 11 8 7 Importance 82 82 82 81 80 83 69 ↓ 2012 Index Score 70 70 69 70 70 E What's Good About Council Nothing % 15% Customer Service % 9% Councillors approachable % 9% **What Needs Most Improvement** Roads 18% Planning 15% Consultation 13% **Indexed Means Results** Overall 60 58 56 Advocacy 52 53 56 Community Engagement 54 54 57 **Customer Service** 69 68 71 Overall Direction 48 52 49 2012 Highest IM – Waste 74 Lowest IM - Unsealed 44 Roads

Macedon Ranges Shire Council: Comparison with All Councils and Large Rural Shires Group						
State: All C	Councils	Large Rural Shires				
MR: Below State Average	All core performance	MR: Slightly higher than Overall,				
	measures		Customer Service			
MR: Significantly Below State	Advocacy, Consultation,	MR: Equal to Consultation				
Average	Direction					
		MR: Slightly below	Advocacy, Direction			
Pay particular attention to		Consultation, Advocacy, Direction				
(MR under	performing State and Group):	Consultation, Advocacy, Direction				

Largest Differences Between 'Importance To Community' and 'Council Performance'						
Indexed means	Importance	Performance	Difference			
Maintenance of unsealed roads	81	44	-37			
Planning for population growth	79	50	-29			
General town planning policy	76	49	-27			
Planning & Building permits	73	46	-27			
Condition of local streets and footpaths	78	52	-26			
Roadside slashing/weed control	76	52	-24			
Community consultation	74	54	-20			
Lobbying on behalf of community	70	52	-18			
Informing the community	76	59	-17			
Elderly support services	79	66	-13			