

## Attachment One

Government		
Secretary – Department of Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SXS supervision is a shared responsibility</li> </ul>	<p>Road safety is a joint accountability of state and local government under the <i>Road Management Act 2004</i> (RMA).</p> <p>Under the RMA and the <i>Transport Integration Act 2010</i>, state and local government must provide for the safe use of roads, ensuring these meet the needs and priorities of our communities. This includes taking reasonable precautions in response to foreseeable road safety risks.</p>
Secretary - Department of Education and Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road safety is a joint accountability of state and local government</li> </ul>	<p>The Department of Education and Training believes that the expertise of municipal councils, as one of the responsible road authorities, is critical in both determining if and when a crossing should be established near a school and whether such a crossing should be operated by a school crossing supervisor. The department is also of the view that the local municipal council, again as one of the responsible road authorities, is best placed to maintain responsibility for staffing a school crossing.</p>
Councils		
Council 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service critical</li> <li>Concerned about cost shift</li> <li>Would welcome additional financial support</li> </ul>	<p>The service is however considered a critical one to ensure the safety of families in our townships, particularly where we have a significant number of major highway and heavy vehicle transportation routes through townships that have school crossings located on them</p>
Council 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SXS supervision is a shared responsibility</li> <li>Have conduct a review and are implementing recommendations</li> <li>Review considered the widening gap between the real costs and State Government contributions</li> </ul>	<p>At the City, our belief is that getting children to and from school safely is everyone's responsibility.</p> <p>Have conducted a review and implanting things such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing the number of supervised school crossings, with the investment and implementation of higher order crossings, enabling whole of community use, over a 5-year period.</li> <li>Reducing risk to School Crossing Supervisor staff in their roles, and to Council, through a revised assessment criteria policy position to remove supervised school crossings on arterial roads with speeds 50km/hr+.</li> </ul>
Council 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conducting a review given concerns about the funding gap and are considering the appropriateness of LG continuing to fund and provide the program</li> <li>Supportive of a sector wide approach</li> </ul>	<p>Recognising that multiple Councils share similar concerns over the provision of school crossing supervision, we are supportive of a sector wide approach, including engagement through the Municipal Association of Victoria, to help address the issues and concerns being raised.</p>

Council 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducting a review given concerns about the funding gap and are considering the appropriateness of LG continuing to fund and provide the program</li> <li>• fifteen supervised school crossings throughout the municipality.</li> <li>• The actual cost of providing supervision at the crossings in 2020/2021 was \$255,875 this amount was offset by the subsidy of \$90,615 making the net cost to Council \$165,258. Therefore, the average cost to Council per crossing, after the subsidy is applied is \$11,017</li> <li>• Ageing workforce – little interest shown through recruitment opportunities</li> <li>• Staff often disengaged from the organisation due to the nature of the work</li> <li>• Difficulty finding backfill to cover leave periods – generally undertaken by community rangers/Local Laws Staff at additional cost to the organisation</li> </ul>	<p>I note Mayor James' request for feedback – seeking the views of other Councils regarding the sustainability and appropriateness of local government funding school crossing supervision services. I can confirm that council is also considering its position in relation to this matter.</p> <p>Council at its 16 February meeting determined to provide City of Monash with current School Crossing information and to confirm its interest in Monash taking a lead in any advocacy project regarding the appropriate funding of the School Crossing Supervision Program</p>
Council 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would welcome additional financial support</li> </ul>	<p>We wish Monash well with progressing its resolution, but do not wish to create any uncertainty amongst our highly valued crossing supervisor team, nor for any of our school communities regarding our Council's view on this service.</p>
Council 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about cost shift</li> <li>• SXS supervision is a State responsibility on arterial roads</li> <li>• Dept of Education &amp; Training appears reluctant to take responsibility for the program</li> <li>• Supportive of a sector wide approach</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to the Monash initiative, Council supports any constructive review of the program and congratulates Monash in taking the lead</p>
Council 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is comfortable continuing to manage the School Crossing program on behalf of the community</li> <li>• Would welcome additional financial support.</li> </ul>	<p>... Increased funding is necessary to ensure the service can continue at a satisfactory level and ratepayers are not unfairly impacted as a result of the service.</p> <p>Specifically, Council would like to see funding increased to include the provision of administration and management support for the school crossing program, as well as funding for associated training and equipment to support the service.</p>
Council 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committed to the SXS service</li> <li>• Significant cost to the City – open to participate in advocacy regarding funding</li> </ul>	<p>The provision of the school crossing program is run at a significant cost to the City annually, and therefore we are open to participating in advocacy working groups with other Councils, MAV and School Crossings Victoria regarding the level of funding provided by the state government.</p>

Council 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hidden costs (operating costs, infrastructure, HR, payroll, uniforms and equipment) should be considered to the total contribution from DoT</li> <li>Number of school crossing sites continue to be covered that do not meet warrant for funding</li> </ul>	Whilst Council believes that this service is important to our community, as highlighted in the correspondence from City of Monash Mayor Stuart James there should be further consideration of further funding to Victorian Councils.
Council 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not hold formal position</li> <li>Officer participation via School Crossing Victoria to provide advocacy for DoT to revise funding</li> </ul>	We would be pleased to learn more about any future decisions of the City of Monash in relation to its position and any advocacy that may be undertaken.
Council 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are immensely proud of our staff and the service they provide to the community, and anticipate it will continue into the future.</li> <li>we note that the funding formula frequently leaves Councils "footing the bill" when new schools begin operating, and as new development quickly changes the local demographics</li> </ul>	In 2020, Council participated in a detailed joint service review with several neighbouring Councils. This service review highlighted that for all four participating Councils, the subsidy funding received by each Council did not live up to the 2016 state Labor government commitment to 50/50 funding split between State and Local governments. Across the four Councils, only 37% of the service costs were met by State government subsidy payments, with a range between 32% -47%. We agree that this represents an inappropriate shift in cost of the service to municipal ratepayers.
Council 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recognises the crossing supervisors play a critical role, however is not a core function of local government. Support of the review for funding</li> <li>applaud Monash for offering to take the lead</li> </ul>	Council's Community Safety team are currently covering 11 school crossing shifts per week whilst Council fill vacancies. On average, the Community Safety team undertake 1x school crossing shift per week due to staff unavailability. This disrupts the core services that are provided by Community Safety team.
Council 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>two supervised crossings however support Monash leadership for the cost shift</li> </ul>	Whilst Council has not formalised a position in respect of the advocacy, we would be supportive of action, at a sector level, to draw attention to the matter and assessment of costs and responsibilities
Council 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shares the view with regard for a sector wide approach.</li> <li>MAV to advocate on behalf of Victorian Councils to seek full funding of school crossing function.</li> </ul>	
Council 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports increased government financial contribution</li> <li>Funding model should be reviewed by State government</li> </ul>	Council shares your concerns regarding the prioritisation of resources and ongoing cost pressures in delivering services to our community in a rate capping environment.
Council 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Values the important service of school crossing supervision</li> <li>Faced challenges with recruitment in adequate staffing</li> <li>Happy to contribute to advocacy relating to sustainable funding of the service.</li> </ul>	We are interested in exploring sustainable models of service delivery and plan to undertake a project in 2022 to explore potential alternative delivery models. As this project progresses, we would be happy to provide an update to you.
Council 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it should not be the responsibility of local government to fund this service</li> </ul>	
Council 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Councils advocacy position with respect to the proportionate support and funding to LG to deliver the service</li> </ul>	It is acknowledged though that substantial investment by the Shire is made to subsidise the school crossing supervisor program to ensure the program is run efficiently and effectively.

Council 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council will consider its future role in school crossing supervision in due course.</li> </ul>	
Council 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council endorses your opinion that State Government should fully fund the current school crossing supervision program.</li> </ul>	
Council 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council supports your advocacy on this matter and understand that more money is definitely needed to continue this service.</li> </ul>	<p>... our communities believes that it is the councils responsibility to continue to fund, supply and maintain this service, as we have done it for such a long time now.</p> <p>... the loss of the service would have a negative affect for us all.</p>
Council 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council is broadly supportive of Monash's position regarding school crossing funding, and ideally would be a function performed by the Education Department.</li> </ul>	Council will continue to perform these functions for the community at this stage, but would like to be kept abreast of any response to Monash's advocacy.
Council 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council strongly supports the City of Monash in its advocacy to the State Government in relation to the funding of school crossing supervision services. The Council notes that funding from the Government provides less than one third of the cost of this service.</li> </ul>	Council Officers have identified a full review of School Crossing service provision in the 2023-24 Annual Budget. This review will include an analysis of whether the current level of subsidisation of this service is viable and whether such subsidisation is reflective of community expectations.
Schools		
School 1	School Crossings are a community service and Local Council should continue to fund this important service	
School 2	The matter to remain that of safety and wellbeing of children and not that of money.	If the view of the Council is to propose a new operating and funding model beyond 2022, then ensure a panel that includes Monash school representatives, where all can contribute their views and not have to read council resolutions through letters and email.
School 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school values school crossing supervisor support</li> <li>• The role should be given high priority in any Monash City Council Funding</li> <li>• Seen as a local community safety service and should be governed and funded by Council</li> </ul>	