

## Snowy Valleys Council – Community Sounding Board EVALUATION

Please circle the responses that best describe your experience in relation to the Community Sounding Board (CSB), and provide further comments if you wish:

1. Overall, I found the CSB process to be:				
Very poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very good
		1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1
0%	0%	6 = 30%	8 = 40%	6 = 30%
<i>Comments (optional):</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was the first time the communities of Tumba and Tumut were invited to contribute together</li> <li>The info at the beginning of the last session should have been discussed at session 1 – too many services looked at – really not a lot of time to drill down to fully understand</li> <li>The first session was disappointing but it improved</li> <li>Started off a bit slow</li> <li>This is first time SVC have used the CSB concept and the project of service level reviews is very complicated</li> <li>Very interesting and beneficial – but only if Council take it on board.</li> </ul>				
2. Overall, the CSB process:				
Did not meet my expectations	Was about what I expected	Exceeded my expectations		
1	½ 1 1 1 ½ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	½ 1 1 ½		
1 = 5%	16 = 80%	3 = 15%		
<i>Comments (optional):</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I had the impression we would be discussing the issues with upper level Councils staff included</li> <li>This was good and at times improved for the last day and summary and gave an opportunity for after thoughts.</li> <li>Didn't have any expectations</li> <li>Expectations are one thing; hopes are another – Hopes far exceeded expectations.</li> </ul>				
3. Overall, the time spent discussing each individual service (including the introduction, the round-table discussion, and my own notes) was:				
Insufficient	About right	More than enough		
1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 ½	1 1 1 ½		
2 = 9 ½ %	15 ½ = 74 %	3 ½ = 16 ½ %		
<i>Comments (optional):</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I was fortunate in having the right people to discuss and consider</li> <li>Many became distracted by issues that didn't relate to service levels               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considering the amount of material/topics that had to be discussed, it could not have been less.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				
4. The commitment of four Saturday sessions was				
Excessive and/or difficult to manage	Acceptable	Appropriate and manageable		
1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
2 = 9 ½ %	11 = 52 ½ %	8 = 38 %		
<i>Comments (optional):</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was suitable. However, there should be an understanding plan of individuals and planned in advance</li> </ul>				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable, but not at this time of year</li> <li>• Sorry to see numbers drop but I think this was due to the poor first session</li> <li>• Long travel time/distance to Batlow</li> <li>• The commitment was significant and I did find that it impacted on my current roles/responsibilities and family.</li> </ul>
<p>5. The thing I liked most / found the most interesting about the CSB process was:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I was able to voice my opinions and cast a vote</li> <li>• To be able to voice my opinion about our Aboriginal Country</li> <li>• Often facts and figures give you a greater understanding of the situation</li> <li>• Meeting and having conversations with people from other communities within the Snowy Valleys region</li> <li>• The structured service-by-service (except for first session)</li> <li>• General discussions – could have been more time for this</li> <li>• That the whole community from across the SVC region was invited to contribute</li> <li>• The depth of knowledge within the group of the region and council processes. The passion and care of the committee</li> <li>• Finding out about how our community functions in regards to Council</li> <li>• Service discussions including events, cemeteries and libraries</li> <li>• The general involvement</li> <li>• Differing thoughts of those present. Got a better understanding of the differences between the two former shires</li> <li>• Good community discussion and interaction</li> <li>• At least CSB has started</li> <li>• Learning about and understanding more about Council services. Now in a better position to comment on issues</li> <li>• Good contribution by many/most. Everyone was listened to – no tension</li> <li>• The ability and freedom of individuals to speak freely without criticism</li> <li>• The open discussion and point of different thoughts of the members present.</li> </ul>
<p>6. The thing I liked least / found the most difficult about the CSB process was:</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had to miss two meetings because of other commitments</li> <li>• Had to miss one session because it fell on the same date as our TKNIC AGM meeting</li> <li>• Time commitment</li> <li>• Unable to consider the budget without knowing the overall financial situation – income</li> <li>• I would have liked more opportunity to actually take the questions to the larger community before having to commit to paper more of my own thoughts than that of the community</li> <li>• The antagonistic behaviour of some volunteers to others (although it's good to see passionate involvement)</li> <li>• Issues that were not applicable to me including economic development and planning</li> <li>• The lack of understanding of how Council works eg SRV, various departments, budgets – frustration re inaccurate/false comments made re former Tumut Shire and reps still Council bashing. Ongoing division between former councils always mentioned.</li> <li>• Sometimes too repetitive. Tighter controls of debate required</li> <li>• I think there was or will be confusion between the differing services that each [former] council provides, and the comments made</li> <li>• Travel distance</li> <li>• The CSB concept is complicated but SVC must persevere and develop the process</li> <li>• A lot of paperwork and detail</li> <li>• Being asked about making recommendations without having all the necessary information</li> <li>• Not all the time was the big picture visited. Some only look at the small picture</li> <li>• Failure to address wasteful, unsustainable, expensive services we see day by day and continue with no one apparently accountable – dictates from faceless back-room people in Tumut.</li> </ul>
<p>7. The information provided about each individual service (including the emailed information, and on-screen and presented information on the day) was:</p>

Insufficient	About right	More than enough		
1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1		
3 = 16%	13 = 68%	3 = 16%		
<i>Comments (optional):</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than enough, but interesting</li> <li>• Insufficient, needed more information on finances</li> <li>• The information about each service was adequate. However, the items within those services needs to be known</li> <li>• Figures didn't always add up on slides</li> <li>• Insufficient, some of the information was illogical eg budgets that didn't add up, not enough info</li> <li>• About right, but I don't know how many people read all the info</li> <li>• Insufficient – I felt we needed more information on many of the topics. However, I realise that this would also require more time</li> <li>• Insufficient – costing of obviously wasteful services not available.</li> </ul>				
8. Having an independent person provide information about Council services was:				
Poor – would have preferred to hear from a Council person	Inconsequential – it didn't matter to me who provided the information	Good – as it provided an arms-length overview of each service		
	½ 1 1 1 1	½ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
0%	4 ½ = 25 %	13 ½ = 75 %		
<i>Comment (optional):</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So long as the person presenting understands the services and was open to alternative points of view, it didn't matter.</li> <li>• It prevented aggravation and reactive responses from the group – or at least helped to prevent</li> <li>• While it may have been beneficial to have a representative from Council to provide facts and details etc</li> <li>• Having presenters with knowledge of how Council operates was helpful and having previous council employees made a contribution</li> <li>• Inconsequential, but would have been good to have a council rep to respond to current questions</li> <li>• The consultants provide expert information</li> <li>• Good – it was essential</li> <li>• LG people are LG people, whether consultants or otherwise – in short, no real independence.</li> </ul>				
9. Overall, the two independent facilitators conducted the CSB workshops:				
Very poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very well
		1 1	1 1 ½ 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 ½ 1 1 1 1 1 1
0%	0%	2 = 11 %	6 ½ = 36 %	9 ½ = 53 %
<i>Comments (optional):</i>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having presenters with knowledge of how Council operates was helpful</li> <li>• It could have been better. For example, we had people from all walks of life yet there was no icebreaker giving people opportunity to introduce themselves</li> <li>• Well presented and discussion was controlled in an appropriate manner</li> <li>• The facilitators were part of the LG "club".</li> </ul>				
10. The venue (room and Batlow location) was:				
Not satisfactory	Adequate	Satisfactory		
1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
1 = 5%	7 = 35%	12 = 60%		
<i>Comments (optional):</i>				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good central location. However, no natural light (the curtains could have been opened to allow some sunlight. Freezing on week 2 – no light, no heating until asked, and then only one heater was turned on. The venue could have been adapted much better.</li> <li>• Reasonably sensible – possibly could move to Tumba or Rosewood</li> <li>• It was good</li> <li>• Venue/catering excellent and for the sake of access, Batlow is central</li> <li>• Long way to travel</li> <li>• Little bit hard to hear as perhaps we were a little too spread out</li> <li>• It would have been better to use the larger screen that is in the building (if possible). Air conditioner a bit noisy</li> <li>• Good that it was near geographical centre of Shire.</li> </ul>		
<p>11. If Snowy Valleys Council were to offer opportunities for community panels in the future, I would:</p>		
Not seek to be involved	Possibly seek to be involved	Definitely seek to be involved
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
0 %	8 = 40%	12 = 60%
<p><i>Comments (optional):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If I am invited</li> <li>• At times the forums were more about being critical of everything, not addressing the scope of service levels. Also many only addressed what they want in their own area – few spoke in terms of "the whole"</li> <li>• Possibly, depending on location</li> <li>• Must continue with the CSB and community engagement commitment</li> <li>• Good cross section of people – important that includes people with expertise in various issues/ responsibilities of Council. People with life experience and young people mature enough to deal with such a forum – fairly demanding</li> <li>• Definitely – forever seeking much-needed improvement.</li> </ul>		
<p>If there are any other comments you'd like to make, or feedback you'd like to provide, please do so here:</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the Council take any notice?</li> <li>• Don't let the demerge with our shires go ahead</li> <li>• Overall the SVC needs to change their attitude with the whole community. Better communication and reporting on SVC outcomes and issues. SVC must reduce employee costs and benefits. Issue raised and ignored re reporting to SVC on issues. Don't need a history lesson from the Mayor – what's your vision? Poor.</li> <li>• Congratulations and thanks to all involved. Please, no styrofoam cups at any Council or community event across the SVC region.</li> <li>• There is a need to keep this group together and be involved in the budget allocation to just see where the funds are actively used, eg where are the heritage advisory fees used? what items are used in parks, environmental, ranger?</li> <li>• In group conversations it was sometimes difficult to hear – maybe suggest people stand to project their voice (air conditioner very noisy)</li> <li>• Think the scope tried to cover too much in the timeframe. At times were off track re service levels and spend a lot of time listening to squeaky wheels. I would consider future sounding board opportunities but would hope they would discourage personal criticism and certainly not include identifying comments in the notes</li> <li>• Concerned that when we stated to maintain a service, could mean two different things between the two old shire areas!</li> <li>• Everyone seemed to be wanting to get the best for the whole LGA</li> <li>• Brindabella Road – YES YES. New sports centre – NO NO</li> <li>• Definite need to dive deeper to have wasteful services seen by people day to day recognised and addressed. Too many decisions are made by unaccountable staff members.</li> </ul>		

*Thank you for your feedback, and for your participation on the Community Sounding Board.*