

Service	LGPRF Metric	Ararat 17/18	Ararat 16/17	State Avg	State Best	State Worst	Rural Avg	Rural Best	Rural Worst	2018/19 Data	Commentary	
Food Safety	FS1	Average number of days it has taken for council to action food complaints	1.08	0	1.76	1	4.67	1.36	1	3.5	1.14	Council places a strong emphasis on food safety and public health, with reports of food complaints and related requests promptly responded to. This result remains within the range expected by Council, and above the 2017/18 state average.
	FS2	Percentage of registered class 1 and 2 food premises that receive an annual food safety assessment.	92.98%	0.00%	94.61%	144.15%	38.78%	87.40%	109.41%	38.78%	80.70%	Council has prioritised this as an area of improvement for the next financial year. An internal audit report has been undertaken and resulting actions are currently being implemented around the management of food safety assessments.
	FS3	Direct cost of the food safety service per food premises	\$291.09	\$0.00	\$489.47	\$148.59	\$2,112.59	\$562.63	\$148.59	\$2,112.59	\$184.40	In line with Council's commitment to deliver an effective and cost efficient food safety service, this reduction in cost reflects a change in Council's approach to staffing.
	FS4	Percentage of critical and major non-compliance outcome notifications about a food premises that are followed up by council	100.00%	86.96%	93.80%	101.13%	21.43%	92.01%	100.00%	33.33%	95.00%	There were 20 critical or major non-compliance outcome notifications issued in 2018/19 with 19 of these being followed up. Council places high importance on ensuring critical and major non-compliance issues are responded to. This performance is consistent with the statewide average.
Governance	G1	Percentage of council resolutions made at an ordinary or special meeting of council closed to the public	17.86%	19.41%	9.29%	0.00%	25.66%	10.57%	0.00%	18.23%	21.89%	This variance is largely due to a decrease in the number of Council Meeting resolutions presented during 2018/19 (252 in 2017/18 against 169 in 2018/19). The total number of decisions made in closed meetings has reduced in this year, but not as a percentage of total decisions made. 47% of these decisions had the confidentiality of the decision and/or report lifted following the Council meeting. Items included in the majority of confidential decisions were sale of land, commercial in-confidence procurement or Councillor leave items. Council continues to aim toward improving processes in relation to transparent governance and decision making by dealing with more Council reports in open meetings. Council have also reviewed it's meeting agenda to streamline the content and information presented, allowing for greater clarity and efficiency.
	G2	Community satisfaction rating out of 100 with the consultation and engagement efforts of the council.	41	49	56.26	74	41	53.74	62	41	49	Council has worked to improve community consultation and processes around engagement have been reflected by an increase in this community satisfaction survey outcome. While the improvement is encouraging, Council is continuing its commitment to listening to, and addressing, community concerns.
	G3	Percentage of attendance at ordinary and special council meetings by councillors	95.49%	95.71%	93.23%	100.00%	84.21%	93.52%	100.00%	84.82%	95.53%	Councillor attendance at Council meetings remains consistently high, reflecting Councillor's commitment to active participation in decision making.
	G4	Direct cost of delivering council's governance service per councillor	\$35,270.00	\$32,418.00	\$47,506.00	\$30,009.00	\$142,309.	\$43,262.00	\$31,683.00	\$142,309.00	\$40,167.86	This variance increase is due to one off costs associated with recruitment of a new CEO.
	G5	Community satisfaction rating out 100 with how council has performed in making decisions in the interests of the community	33	50	54.75	73	33	52	61	33	46	Council has placed a strong focus on consulting the community in regard to decisions made in their best interests. While the improvement is encouraging, Council is committed to continuously improving in this area.
Libraries	LB1	Number of library collection item loans per library collection item	3.39	3.67	4.65	11.5	1.04	2.52	4.56	1.04	3.28	Council's library collection is well utilised by community members accessing both printed and digital materials at our Ararat and Lake Bolac branches and via our home library service.
	LB2	Percentage of the library collection that has been purchased in the last 5 years	63.38%	69.09%	64.73%	91.37%	35.83%	55.29%	79.93%	35.83%	54.43%	This result remains within expected range. The purchasing of book stock is managed under a service agreement with City of Ballarat, who ensures a modern and relevant library collection. Council believes this percentage of new stock reflects an appropriate level of service that meets community expectations and demand. Councils continued commitment to increase our digital items including e-audio, e-magazines and e-books has seen an increase in resources to meet demand in this area.
	LB3	Direct cost to council of the library service per visit	\$7.26	\$7.35	\$6.82	\$2.33	\$16.25	\$7.44	\$2.33	\$16.25	\$6.92	Despite a slight reduction in library visitation for 2018/19, Council has managed a reduction in the direct cost of the library service by decreasing administration and labour costs.
	LB4	Percentage of the municipal population that are members of the library and have borrowed a library collection item.	12.78%	14.59%	15.82%	39.98%	7.21%	16.20%	39.98%	7.21%	13.59%	The community continues to have high engagement levels with the library service. Active library membership is marginally higher than 2017/18.

Service	LGPRF Metric	Ararat 17/18	Ararat 16/17	State Avg	State Best	State Worst	Rural Avg	Rural Best	Rural Worst	2018/19 Data	Commentary	
MCH	MC1	Percentage of infants enrolled in the MCH service who receive the first MCH home visit	100.00%	94.69%	100.09%	134.29%	88.74%	103.10%	134.29%	93.33%	103.50%	Indicators show a high participation rate of first MCH home visits to Ararat Rural City residents, 118 home visits were conducted. This percentage is over 100% due to the timing difference that can occur between birth notices being received and the home visit being completed across reporting periods.
	MC2	Percentage of infants enrolled in the MCH service	100.92%	100.88%	100.32%	109.18%	88.74%	99.83%	106.25%	92.86%	100.87%	Council achieved 100% infant enrolments in the maternal child health service, continuing the high level of results and client engagement as per the last three years. (This number is slightly more than 100% due to the small number of families that moved into the area after their baby was born.)
	MC3	Cost to council of the MCH service per hour of service delivered.	\$76.98	\$71.17	\$79.43	\$58.31	\$124.18	\$82.07	\$58.31	\$124.18	\$76.32	Council continues to deliver the maternal child health service within the expected budget and requirements. Costs remain consistent to ensure a high level of MCH service is received.
	MC4	Percentage of children enrolled who participate in the MCH service	79.62%	81.74%	78.41%	100.00%	65.14%	82.35%	100.00%	65.14%	79.56%	Participation levels remain consistent, with Council continuing to review engagement practices within the MCH service to increase participation rates.
	MC5	Percentage of Aboriginal children enrolled who participate in the MCH service	83.33%	72.73%	77.67%	100.00%	50.00%	84.92%	100.00%	50.00%	84.62%	Council has 13 aboriginal children enrolled in the Maternal & Child Health Service with 2 children having not attended in the last 12 months. Such low numbers creates sensitivity when reporting in percentages however attendance is steady with last years performance.
Animal Management	AM1	Average number of days it has taken for council to action animal management requests.	1	1	2.19	1	24	1.61	1	5.53	1	Council places a strong emphasis on responsible pet ownership and community safety, ensuring all requests for animal management received are actioned on the same day.
	AM2	Percentage of all collected cats and dogs (feral and registered) which have been reclaimed	35.35%	38.85%	50.34%	92.17%	11.59%	49.31%	88.10%	11.59%	83.17%	This significant improvement for Council has been the result of the introduction of a Council program to actively work with adoption agencies, significantly increasing the number of animals being reclaimed and adopted.
	AM3	Direct cost to council of the animal management service per domestic animal (i.e. cats and dogs) that has been registered	\$90.02	\$83.11	\$59.95	\$25.23	\$126.82	\$65.68	\$28.15	\$114.99	\$104.66	This variance is due to a lower number of animals reported as registered from 2017/18 (2950) compared to 2018/19 (2435). A review of the registered pets database in 2018/19 found in previous years, inactive pets have been incorrectly reported as registered. The decrease in the figure is a result of this review, this figure will be more accurately reported into the future. The total direct cost of the animal management service decreased by 4% from 2017/18. Further savings in animal management costs are expected in 2019/20.
	AM4	Number of successful animal management prosecutions									0	There were no animal management prosecutions initiated during 2018-19. Council has adopted a new Domestic Animal Management Plan in 2018-19 and will continue to focus on education.
Aquatic Facilities	AF2	Number of inspections by an authorised officer carried out per Council aquatic facility	1	1	1.61	8.44	0.29	1.13	4	0.33	0	There were no authorised officer inspections carried out at Council aquatic facilities during the 2018/19 financial year. The contract is managed with water quality assessed 4 times daily and records of results maintained. This area requires improvement and inspections have been scheduled for 2019/20.
	AF3	Number of WorkSafe reportable aquatic facility safety incidents	0	0	1.53	0	18	0	0	0	0	There were no WorkSafe notifiable incidents occurred during the reporting period. Aquatic facility staff undertake regular training and have systems of work in place to minimise the likelihood of an incident occurring.
	AF4	Direct cost to council (less any income received) of providing indoor aquatic facilities per visit	\$5.53	\$6.98	\$2.79	-\$1.72	\$11.39	\$7.05	\$5.53	\$9.46	\$5.45	This rate remains steady with participation at the indoor aquatics centre still popular.
	AF5	Direct cost to council (less any income received) of providing outdoor aquatic facilities per visit	\$13.03	\$12.14	\$11.66	\$1.10	\$28.22	\$12.04	\$5.65	\$22.74	\$9.39	This decrease in subsidy reflects an increase in visitation at the outdoor pools, along with a decrease in operational costs.
	AF6	Number of visits to aquatic facilities per head of municipal population	8.81	7.98	5.1	14.3	0.26	3.58	8.81	0.48	8.67	This number remains steady, with an increase in visitation at outdoor pools offset by slightly decreased visitation to Council's indoor facilities.
	Planning	SP1	Median number of days taken between receipt of a planning application and a decision on the application.	67	81	69.69	17	147	51.21	17	105	57

Service	LGPRF Metric	Ararat 17/18	Ararat 16/17	State Avg	State Best	State Worst	Rural Avg	Rural Best	Rural Worst	2018/19 Data	Commentary	
	SP2	Percentage of VicSmart planning application decisions made within 10 days and regular planning application decisions made within 60 days	58.33%	55.29%	69.63%	100.00%	31.23%	73.81%	100.00%	46.97%	60%	A continued focus on resourcing and process improvement has resulted in an increase in the number of applications decided within the 60 day statutory timeframe, and 10 day VicSmart timeframe. Council has made it a priority to continue to increase this percentage by finding further efficiency within the process.
	SP3	Direct cost to council of the statutory planning service per planning application received	\$1,859.10	\$2,227.40	\$2,459.07	\$532.05	\$7,570.04	\$2,466.62	\$532.05	\$7,570.04	\$2,976.70	The increase in direct cost of the planning service per application is due to contractors being engaged to reduce the backlog of planning applications that were not being assessed within the legislated timelines.
	SP4	Percentage of council planning application decisions subject to review by VCAT that were not set aside	0.00%	50.00%	61.19%	100.00%	0.00%	65.67%	100.00%	0.00%	100%	Council have had no VCAT decisions in relation to planning applications.
Roads	R1	Number of sealed local road requests received by council per 100 kilometres of sealed local road	11.84	10.91	45.89	1.2	442.86	39.44	1.2	442.86	10.73	Council have seen slightly less sealed road requests compared to 2017/18. The condition of roads remain a concern by the community and has been recognised in Council's 2019/20 budget which includes increased spend on capital works and road renewal.
	R2	Percentage of sealed local roads that are below the renewal intervention level set by council and therefore do not require renewal	99.63%	99.85%	95.71%	100.00%	77.68%	95.33%	100.00%	77.68%	99.41%	This result is consistent with previous years. Council maintains a strong focus on asset renewal, including local sealed roads.
	R3	Direct cost to council of sealed local road reconstruction per square metre reconstructed	\$72.50	\$51.56	\$84.34	\$18.66	\$294.94	\$43.82	\$21.57	\$97.51	\$72.42	Cost of sealed local road resealing is consistent with prior year's costs, however Council is continually reviewing their process around road reconstruction in order to provide highest quality at the most effective rate.
	R4	Direct cost to council of sealed local road resealing per square metre resealed	\$4.35	\$5.26	\$13.53	\$3.28	\$55.26	\$4.98	\$3.28	\$9.86	\$3.51	Council has delivered its sealing program in a cost-effective manner and has been able to reduce the unit cost of sealing works this financial year.
	R5	Community satisfaction rating out of 100 with how council has performed on the condition of sealed local roads	43	51	55.13	77	32	48.74	65	38	50	This result reflects an improvement in the community satisfaction of Council's local roads compared to recent years. It is envisaged that the ongoing investment in road renewal outlined in Council's budget 2019/20 will continue to improve community satisfaction in the longer term.
Waste	WC1	Number of kerbside bin collection requests received by council per 1,000 kerbside bin collection households	68.48	65.49	99.66	10.63	303.28	58.17	10.63	144.41	58.08%	Council continues to work closely with it's waste and recycling contractors to monitor services and continuously improve practices and systems where practicable. This has seen a 14.81% decrease in bin requests per household compared to the 2017/18 financial year.
	WC2	Number of kerbside collection bins missed per 10,000 scheduled kerbside collection bin lifts	5.75	5.62	5.05	0.1	18.51	3.12	0.68	9.31	4.13	Council endeavours to deliver an effective, cost efficient bin collection service for the community with this improved result remaining below last year's state average.
	WC3	Direct cost to council of the kerbside garbage bin collection service per kerbside garbage collection bin	\$141.68	\$133.71	\$102.52	\$44.94	\$237.33	\$104.82	\$53.97	\$168.37	\$139.19	Council is committed to lowering the cost of it's bin collection service, and is currently assessing it's options in relation to it's kerbside waste collection contractors, as well as looking for opportunities for efficiencies that may exist in the way the service is delivered.
	WC4	Direct cost to council of the kerbside recyclables collection service per kerbside recyclables collection bin	\$55.42	\$38.31	\$42.45	\$9.64	\$129.72	\$65.40	\$36.84	\$129.72	\$77.00	The cost of the kerbside recyclable bin collections has increased significantly due to changes within the recycling industry, specifically an increased cost of processing.
	WC5	Percentage of garbage, recyclables and green organics collected from kerbside bins that is diverted from landfill	24.86%	23.66%	44.69%	71.43%	21.89%	39.78%	69.75%	21.89%	25.95%	This result is consistent with the previous four years. Council is working with contractors, neighbouring Councils and regional waste group to establish opportunities for reducing the amount of waste going to landfill.
Financial - Efficiency	E1	Amount of rates charged on average for each residential property	\$1,823.40	\$1,769.60	\$1,625.06	\$654.00	\$2,687.64	\$1,426.28	\$654.00	\$2,032.97	\$1,778	The 2018 revaluation reflected a significant increase in property values for the farming sector (Average 24.5%). There were also changes to the rating differential applied to industrial and commercial properties. The result was a decrease in total rate contribution from residential properties.
	E2	Amount of council expenditure for each property	\$4,252.86	\$4,029.29	\$3,173.85	\$2,103.20	\$6,454.00	\$3,703.08	\$2,513.03	\$6,454.00	\$4,312	
	E3	Number of staff resignations and terminations divided by the average number of staff employed for the year	13.82%	7.20%	13.20%	3.98%	34.93%	14.00%	3.98%	34.93%	10.37%	This remains within the expected reporting range within this framework. Council would expect to see this rate increase in future years with 16% staff turnover indicated as an average for high performing organisations.
Financial - Liquidity	L1	Value of current assets at the end of the year (i.e. assets that can easily be converted to cash within 12 months) divided by the value of current liabilities at the end of year.	473.39%	4.22	3.18	8.33	1.25	3.62	8.33	1.39	432.22%	The favourable result in 2018 was assisted by current liabilities being \$1.031 million less than as at 30 June 2017. The budget for 2020 includes a \$2.8 million reduction in cash & cash equivalents to help fund a \$2.4 million increase in capital works.

Service	LGPRF Metric	Ararat 17/18	Ararat 16/17	State Avg	State Best	State Worst	Rural Avg	Rural Best	Rural Worst	2018/19 Data	Commentary	
	L2	Amount of cash at the end of the year which is free of restrictions divided by the value of current liabilities at the end of year	273.62%	2.73	1.01	3.94	-1.42	1.28	3.94	-0.52	201.71%	The variance in 2019 was expected as Council used unrestricted cash to complete major works at the Ararat Town Hall.
Financial - Asset Ren	O1	Expenditure on renewing existing assets or replacing existing assets to their original capability divided by the amount of depreciation on all assets	54.79%	51.29%	78.86%	155.87%	29.84%	77.48%	155.87%	29.84%	91%	During 2018/19 Council completed the \$8.5 million redevelopment of the Ararat Town Hall. Savings achieved in operations and maintenance in 2019 have been reinvested in asset renewal in future years.
	O2	Value of interest bearing loans and borrowings at the end of the year divided by rates raised for the year	12.35%	0.12	0.18	0	0.54	0.12	0	0.54	11.91%	The result for 2019 includes a new loan of \$1 million and 2022 includes a repayment of another loan of \$2 million
	O3	Interest bearing loan and borrowing repayments for the year divided by rates raised for the year	0.75%	0.01	0.03	0	0.21	0.02	0	0.07	0.78%	The forecast result for 2022 includes a repayment of a \$2 million loan.
	O4	Value of non-current liabilities at the end of year divided by total revenue excluding government grants	12.42%	0	0.21	0.01	0.7	0.18	0.01	0.55	11.96%	The result for 2019 includes a new loan of \$1 million and 2022 includes a repayment of another loan of \$2 million
Financial - Operating	OP1	Surplus or deficit for the year excluding non-recurrent government grants received for capital purposes divided by total revenue excluding non-recurrent government grants received for capital purposes	-5.69%	0	0.05	-0.51	0.24	-0.01	-0.51	0.22	-0.66%	Council received a \$1.5 million non-recurrent grant for Natural Disaster Relief in 2018/19. There is no allowance for non-recurrent capital grants from 2021 to 2023.
	S1	Rates raised for the year divided by total revenue excluding non-recurrent government grants received for capital purposes	59.04%	0	0.6	0.34	0.73	0.55	0.34	0.65	56.78%	
Financial - Stability	S2	Rates compared to property values	0.71%	0.68%	0.71%	0.62%	0.61%	0.61%	0.61%	0.61%	0.62%	This indicator measures the amount of income recieved from rates as a percentage of the total value of properties within the municipality. In 2018 the revaluation of all properties resulted in an increase in overall value of 16.5%. The increase in total rate revenue was 0%. This is reflected in the 9% variance in this indicator from the previous year.
Sustainable Capacity	C1	Expenses per head of municipal population	\$2,539.45	\$2,558.97	\$1,934.86	\$858.46	\$4,502.19	\$2,572.80	\$1,423.25	\$4,502.19	\$2,559.14	
	C2	Infrastructure per head of municipal population	\$17,745.12	\$14,089.09	\$14,192.44	\$35,120.28	\$4,310.49	\$20,703.09	\$56,295.06	\$9,277.93	\$17,820.01	There was a significant shift in the value of infrastructure assets as a result of a revaluation in 2018.
	C3	Population density per length of road	4.86	4.66	108.55	663.04	1.16	13.1	68.23	1.16	4.87	
	C4	Own-source revenue per head of municipal population	\$1,610.25	\$1,657.50	\$1,458.66	\$3,199.44	\$763.66	\$1,726.12	\$3,199.44	\$1,132.16	\$1,620.86	
	C5	Recurrent grants per head of municipal population	\$745.46	\$963.89	\$449.59	\$2,229.12	\$80.08	\$722.78	\$2,229.12	\$267.98	\$702.16	
	C6	Relative Socio-Economic Disadvantage	1	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	The ABS statistics updated in 2018 reflected a shift for the Ararat Rural City Local Government Area from decile 2 to decile 1. This reflects an increase in reported disadvantage compared to the rest of the state. Our Socio Economic Index For Ages (SEIFA) score which measures disadvantage has increased from 942 to 951 in the Census data collection period between 2011 & 2016.