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# Key Findings

It is clear from the research that local governments in Western Australia recognise the value of employing people with disability. This can contribute to creating a work environment that better reflects the diversity of the communities they serve. However, the research also shows there is a way to go in improving the environment and employment outcomes for people with disability in local governments. The key findings were:

* a total of 98 local governments participated in the survey and they represented 70 per cent of the sector
* almost half or 47per cent of respondents indicated they had been involved in a recruitment process that resulted in the employment of a person with disability
* collectively, survey respondents (to the best of their knowledge) employ 118 full-time, 54 part-time and 170 casual persons with disability
* of those surveyed, 60 per cent hold employee data on disability in their records
* the majority of respondents believe the employment of people with disability would bring benefits such as diversity, retention of existing employees who acquire disability and more user-friendly workplaces for everyone
* survey respondents believed the most common barriers in employing persons with disability were:
  + people with disability have little or no interest in applying for advertised vacancies
  + a lack of knowledge of support available
  + the costs of modifications in the workplace
  + a lack of confidence in relating to people with disability in the workplace.
* more than half or 61 per cent of survey respondents do not have a relationship with a disability service provider
* more than 50 per cent of survey respondents selected knowing what financial and other supports were available and the link between Disability Access and Inclusion Plans (DAIPs) and workforce plans as their top professional development needs, relating to the employment of people with disability.

# Introduction

DAIPs are a requirement of every local government. A DAIP ensures people with disability can access all information, services and facilities provided by local governments and be included in the community.

In 2013, a seventh outcome was added to all DAIPs:

**Outcome 7: People with disability have the same opportunities as other people to obtain and maintain employment with a public authority.**

Local Government Managers Australia (LGMA) in partnership with the Disability Services Commission has undertaken a research project to better understand disability employment in the local government sector.

The research objectives for the project are to establish:

* a baseline estimate of current employment levels of people with disability in local government
* an overview of general experience in the recruitment and management of people with disability
* an understanding of local government perceptions regarding:
  + the benefits of employing people with disability
  + barriers to employing people with disability
* current engagement levels with Disability Employment Service (DES) providers
* an understanding of the professional development needs to enable the local government sector to be engaged and fully informed on the employment of people with disability.

The findings and recommendations of the research project are intended to:

* provide useful information for local and state governments and other relevant stakeholders
* enable dialogue among stakeholders regarding employing people with disability in the local government sector
* guide stakeholders to develop practical measures to increase the employment of people with disability in the local government sector.

# Methodology

All local governments in Western Australia were invited to participate in an online survey. See Annex 1 for the survey questions.

# Western Australian Regions and Survey Respondents

This report categorises local government areas into regions. Table 1 shows the number and proportion of local governments in each region, plus the proportion of the West Australian population represented. Note Cocos (Keeling) Islands and Christmas Island, which are Australian territories, are term “Special Districts”.

Table 1: West Australian regions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number of local governments** | **% of local governments** | **% of population** |
| Gascoyne | 4 | 3 | 0.4 |
| Goldfields-Esperance | 9 | 6 | 3 |
| Great Southern | 11 | 8 | 2 |
| Kimberley | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| Metro Perth | 29 | 21 | 73 |
| Mid-West | 17 | 12 | 2 |
| Peel | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Pilbara | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| South West | 12 | 9 | 7 |
| Special Districts | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Wheatbelt | 43 | 31 | 3 |
| **Total** | **140** | **100** | **100** |

Table 2 shows the number and proportion of survey respondents by region. The total response rate represents 70 per cent of the sector. In terms of respondents, all regions are represented but to varying levels. The best responding region was the South West with a rate of 83 per cent, compared with only a 20 per cent response rate from the Peel region.

Table 2: West Australian regions – survey respondents

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Number of local governments** | **Survey respondents** | **% of region** | **% of survey** |
| Gascoyne | 4 | 2 | 50 | 2 |
| Goldfields-Esperance | 9 | 4 | 44 | 4 |
| Great Southern | 11 | 8 | 73 | 8 |
| Kimberley | 4 | 3 | 75 | 3 |
| Metro Perth | 29 | 20 | 69 | 20 |
| Mid-West | 17 | 11 | 65 | 11 |
| Peel | 5 | 1 | 20 | 1 |
| Pilbara | 4 | 2 | 50 | 2 |
| South West | 12 | 10 | 83 | 10 |
| Special Districts | 2 | 1 | 50 | 1 |
| Wheatbelt | 43 | 34 | 79 | 35 |
| Not stated |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| **Total** | **140** | **98** | **70** | **100** |

Figure 1: Number of survey respondents compared to the total number in the region

# esearch Findings – Survey

Information was gathered to determine indicative workforce statistics on employees with disability, existence of formal records, understanding of benefits, perception of barriers, extent of relationships with DES providers and professional development needs in the local government sector. These are outlined in the following sections.

Respondents comprised people in different job positions including Chief and Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Community Development Manager/Officer, Human Resources Manager/Officer, Corporate Services Manager/Officer, and Finance and Administration Manager/Officer.

## Recruitment of a person with disability, workforce statistics and records

Less than half (47 per cent) of survey respondents indicated they had been directly involved in a recruitment process that had resulted in the employment of a person with disability.

Table 3: Respondents involved in a recruitment process that has resulted in the employment of a person with disability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer options** | **Response count** | **Response %** |
| Yes | 46 | 47 |
| No | 51 | 52 |
| Not clear | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 98 | 100 |

The survey then asked for the number of persons with disability currently employed within the local authorities, to the best of their knowledge. The results demonstrate that casual employment is the most common arrangement (see Table 4).

The overall employment of people with disability in the local government sector reported in the survey (approximately 2 per cent of the total workforce on a headcount basis) matches the total percentage reported by local governments in the 2014 Equal Employment Opportunity annual returns (visit [http://data.gov.au](http://data.gov.au/dataset/public-sector-commission-wa-equal-employment-opportunity-survey-2014/resource/a5c92f6b-f51b-4062-b59d-2a6573c980b5) > Datasets> Public Sector Commission WA > Equal Employment Opportunity Survey). This is close to the estimated proportion in the WA working age population needing assistance with core activities (of mobility, communication and/or self-care) of 1.9 per cent. ([Australian Bureau of Statistics website](http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/lookup/2011.0.55.001Main%20Features1162011), 2011 Census of Population and Housing, retrieved 27 July 2015).

This is a small proportion of the total estimated working age population with a disability (approximately 20 per cent). The total is growing, strongly correlated with the ageing population.

Table 4: Currently employed persons with disability (best knowledge)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Answer options** | **Response total** |
| Full time | 118 |
| Part time | 54 |
| Casual | 170 |
| Total | 342 |

Only 60 per cent of those surveyed actually hold employee data on disability in their records. This is likely to have an impact on overall employment statistics. There were also a number of comments regarding the possibility of non-disclosure by some employees.

Table 5: Employee data on disability held in records

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer options** | **Response total** | **Response %** |
| Yes | 59 | 60 |
| No | 28 | 29 |
| Not clear | 11 | 11 |
| Total | 98 | 100 |

## Local government perspectives on the benefits of employing persons with disability

The majority of respondents, as shown in Table 6, believe the employment of people with disability would bring benefits such as diversity, retention of existing employees who acquire disability and more user friendly worplaces for everyone.

Table 6: Benefits considered to apply to the employment of people with disability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer options | Response count | Response % |
| Reflection of diversity in the community | 68 | 75 |
| Retention of existing employees who acquire disability | 60 | 66 |
| More user-friendly workplace for everyone | 58 | 64 |
| Access to a wider talent pool | 54 | 59 |
| Strengthened workplace morale | 42 | 46 |
| Reduced sick leave and early medical retirements | 14 | 15 |
| Other (please specify) | 9 | 10 |
| Answered question | 91 |  |
| Skipped question | 7 |  |

## Barriers to the employment of people with disability

A majority of respondents believed that people with disability appeared uninterested in applying for advertised positions. The issue of support was another key barrier identified, especially by more remote local governments.

Table 7: Barriers considered to apply to the employment of people with disability

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer options | Response count | Response % |
| People with disability do not seem to be interested in applying for advertised vacancies | 48 | 55 |
| Lack of knowledge of support available | 37 | 43 |
| Costs of modifications | 34 | 39 |
| Lack of confidence in relating to people with disability in the workplace | 25 | 29 |
| Other (please specify) | 22 | 25 |
| Workplace culture is not supportive | 5 | 6 |
| Answered question | 87 |  |
| Skipped question | 11 |  |

## Relationship with a DES provider

The majority of respondents (61 per cent) do not have a relationship with a DES provider.

Table 8: Relationship with a DES provider

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer options | Response count | Response % |
| Yes | 33 | 34 |
| No | 60 | 61 |
| Not clear | 5 | 5 |
| Total | 98 | 100 |

## Professional development needs

The survey then asked about the professional development needs of the local government sector.

As can be seen in Table 9, the majority of respondents identified one or more professional develoment needs. Over 50 per cent selected knowing what financial and other supports are available and the link between DAIPs and workforce plans.

Table 9: Professional development needs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Answer options | Response count | Response % |
| Knowing what financial and other support is available | 58 | 67 |
| Link between DAIPs and workforce plans | 44 | 51 |
| Developing strategies and an action plan for Outcome 7 in the DAIP | 36 | 41 |
| Workplace auditing for disability friendliness | 36 | 41 |
| Confidence to relate to people with disability in the workplace | 26 | 30 |
| Other (please specify) | 2 | 2 |
| Answered question | 79 |  |
| Skipped question | 19 |  |

Table 10 provides a detailed breakdown of identified professional development needs by local government region. This enables the Commission, LGMA and other relevant stakeholders to design targeted initiaitves that respond directly to each region’s needs. It also provides a baseline from which to measure, at a more detailed level, the local government sector’s progress against the identified professional development needs.

Table 10: Professional development needs by region

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question 10 - By region (% of category)** | Higher need | Medium need | | | Lower need |  |  |  | | |  | |  | |  |  |  |  |
| **Answer options** | **Gascoyne** | | **Goldfields-Esperance** | **Great Southern** | | **Kimberley** | **Metro Perth** | **Mid West** | **Peel** | **Pilbara** | | **South West** | | **Special Districts** | | | **Wheatbelt** | **Not Clear** |
| **Number of respondents** | **2** | | **4** | **8** | | **3** | **20** | **11** | **1** | **2** | | **10** | | **1** | | | **34** | **2** |
| Developing strategies and an action plan for Outcome 7 in the DAIP | 50% | | 25% | 38% | | 100% | 30% | 27% | 0% | 50% | | 30% | | 0% | | | 44% | 0% |
| Confidence to relate to people with disability in the workplace | 50% | | 25% | 25% | | 33% | 20% | 27% | 0% | 50% | | 40% | | 0% | | | 26% | 0% |
| Link between DAIPs and workforce plans | 0% | | 25% | 63% | | 67% | 35% | 45% | 0% | 100% | | 30% | | 100% | | | 50% | 50% |
| Workplace auditing for disability friendliness | 50% | | 25% | 13% | | 67% | 40% | 45% | 0% | 100% | | 60% | | 100% | | | 26% | 0% |
| Knowing what financial and other support is available | 100% | | 50% | 50% | | 67% | 65% | 45% | 0% | 100% | | 70% | | 100% | | | 53% | 100% |

# Conclusion

**Annex 1: Survey questions**

Q1. Name of local government

Q2. Position

Q3. To the best of your knowledge, have you been directly involved in a recruitment process that has resulted in the employment of a person with disability? Note that disability may be physical, sensory, psychiatric, neurological, cognitive, intellectual or a combination of these.

Yes □ No □

Q4. To the best of your knowledge, how many persons with disability are currently employed at your organisation?:

\_\_\_ Full-time

\_\_\_ Part-time

\_\_\_ Casual

Q5. What percentage of your workforce does this represent?

Q6. Do you hold employee data on disability in your records?

Q7. In your opinion, which of the following benefits do/could apply to the employment of people with disability in your organisation? (Please tick all that apply)

□ Access to a wider talent pool

□ Reduced sick leave and early medical retirements

□ Retention of existing employees who acquire disability

□ Strengthened workplace morale

□ Reflection of diversity in the community

□ More user-friendly workplace for everyone

□ Other (please specify)

Q8. In your opinion, which of the following barriers do/could apply to the employment of people with disability in your organisation? (Please tick all that apply)

□ Costs of modifications

□ Lack of confidence in relating to people with disability in the workplace

□ Lack of knowledge of support available

□ People with disability do not seem to be interested in applying for advertised vacancies

□ Workplace culture is not supportive

□ Other (please specify)

Q9. Do you have a relationship with a Disability Employment Service (DES) provider?

Yes □ No □

Q10. Do you or other relevant staff in your organisation have professional development needs in the following areas? (Please tick all that apply)

□ Developing strategies and an action plan for Outcome 7 (people with disability have the same opportunities as other people to obtain and maintain employment with a public authority) in the Disability Access and Inclusion Plan (DAIP)

□ Confidence to relate to people with disability in the workplace

□ Link between DAIPs and workforce plans

□ Workplace auditing for disability friendliness

□ Knowing what financial and other support is available

□ Other (please state)

Q11. What specific areas of training and development would Elected Members benefit from?

□ Arts and cultural planning

□ Understanding arts and culture in the community

□ Creative community engagement

□ Other (please state)

Q12. Is there anything else you would like to add that would help us to understand the current state of employment of people with disability in West Australian local government?

Annex 2: Full listing of local authorities and sur

respondents

| **Local government by region** | **In survey?** | **Type** | **Population** | **Area (m2)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gascoyne** |  |  |  |  |
| Carnarvon, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 5,785 | 4,656,220 |
| Exmouth, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 2,393 | 648,807 |
| Shark Bay, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 855 | 2,414,020 |
| Upper Gascoyne, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 250 | 5,788,340 |
| **Goldfields-Esperance** |  |  |  |  |
| Coolgardie, Shire of | Yes | Urban regional | 4,000 | 3,035,390 |
| Dundas, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 1,143 | 9,258,720 |
| Esperance, Shire of | Yes | Rural agriculture | 13,477 | 4,503,880 |
| Kalgoorlie-Boulder, City of |  | Urban regional | 31,109 | 9,515,150 |
| Laverton, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 1,226 | 17,989,200 |
| Leonora, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 2,512 | 3,189,320 |
| Menzies, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 385 | 12,457,700 |
| Ngaanyatjarraku, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 1,436 | 16,037,800 |
| Ravensthorpe, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 2,126 | 982,900 |
| **Great Southern** |  |  |  |  |
| Albany, City of | Yes | Urban regional | 33,651 | 430,994 |
| Broomehill-Tambellup, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,140 | 260,913 |
| Cranbrook, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,081 | 327,747 |
| Denmark, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 5,194 | 185,990 |
| Gnowangerup, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,271 | 426,557 |
| Jerramungup, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 1,053 | 650,748 |
| Katanning, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 4,184 | 151,829 |
| Kent, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 510 | 563,011 |
| Kojonup, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,982 | 293,114 |
| Plantagenet, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 4,882 | 487,647 |
| Woodanilling, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 416 | 112,835 |
| **Kimberley** |  |  |  |  |
| Broome, Shire of | Yes | Urban regional | 14,998 | 5,463,180 |
| Derby-West Kimberley, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 8,434 | 11,984,200 |
| Halls Creek, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 3,562 | 13,306,100 |
| Wyndham-East Kimberley, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 7,800 | 11,202,300 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Metropolitan Perth** |  |  |  |  |
| Armadale, City of | Yes | Urban fringe | 62,297 | 55,992 |
| Bassendean, Town of | Yes | Urban development | 14,405 | 1,034 |
| Bayswater, City of | Yes | Urban development | 61,264 | 3,277 |
| Belmont, City of |  | Urban development | 35,207 | 3,969 |
| Cambridge, Town of | Yes | Urban development | 24,965 | 2,199 |
| Canning, City of | Yes | Urban development | 85,515 | 6,490 |
| Claremont, Town of |  | Urban development | 9,279 | 496 |
| Cockburn, City of | Yes | Urban development | 89,685 | 16,794 |
| Cottesloe, Town of |  | Urban development | 7,605 | 386 |
| East Fremantle, Town of | Yes | Urban development | 6,932 | 314 |
| Fremantle, City of | Yes | Urban development | 26,583 | 1,901 |
| Gosnells, City of | Yes | Urban development | 106,584 | 12,720 |
| Joondalup, City of | Yes | Urban development | 152,403 | 9,893 |
| Kalamunda, Shire of |  | Urban fringe | 53,568 | 32,420 |
| Kwinana, City of | Yes | Urban development | 29,227 | 12,001 |
| Melville, City of |  | Urban development | 95,702 | 5,282 |
| Mosman Park, Town of | Yes | Urban development | 8,599 | 435 |
| Mundaring, Shire of | Yes | Urban fringe | 36,530 | 64,325 |
| Nedlands, City of | Yes | Urban development | 20,533 | 1,995 |
| Peppermint Grove, Shire of | Yes | Urban development | 1,527 | 107 |
| Perth, City of |  | Urban development | 16,715 | 1,202 |
| Rockingham, City of | Yes | Urban development | 104,105 | 25,689 |
| South Perth, City of | Yes | Urban development | 40,739 | 1,981 |
| Stirling, City of | Yes | Urban development | 195,699 | 10,473 |
| Subiaco, City of | Yes | Urban development | 17,575 | 698 |
| Swan, City of |  | Urban fringe | 108,462 | 104,322 |
| Victoria Park, Town of | Yes | Urban development | 32,433 | 1,793 |
| Vincent, City of |  | Urban development | 31,550 | 1,138 |
| Wanneroo, City of |  | Urban fringe | 152,076 | 68,506 |
| **Mid-West** |  |  |  |  |
| Carnamah, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 547 | 287,295 |
| Chapman Valley, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 1,173 | 398,258 |
| Coorow, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,065 | 418,883 |
| Cue, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 272 | 1,358,490 |
| Greater Geraldton, City of | Yes | Urban regional | 37,162 | 988,911 |
| Irwin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 3,567 | 237,196 |
| Meekatharra, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 1,377 | 10,012,100 |
| Mingenew, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 479 | 193,486 |
| Morawa, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 891 | 351,255 |
| Mount Magnet, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 643 | 1,387,290 |
| Murchison, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 115 | 4,503,020 |
| Northampton, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 3,191 | 1,261,770 |
| Perenjori, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 905 | 830,045 |
| Sandstone, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 105 | 3,266,650 |
| Three Springs, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 614 | 265,291 |
| Wiluna, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 1,159 | 18,129,400 |
| Yalgoo, Shire of |  | Rural remote | 402 | 2,793,640 |
| **Peel** |  |  |  |  |
| Boddington, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 2,228 | 189,937 |
| Mandurah, City of |  | Urban fringe | 69,903 | 17,423 |
| Murray, Shire of |  | Rural significant | 14,150 | 171,005 |
| Serpentine-Jarrahdale, Shire of |  | Rural significant | 17,745 | 90,407 |
| Waroona, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 3,582 | 83,185 |
| **Pilbara** |  |  |  |  |
| Ashburton, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 10,001 | 10,095,900 |
| East Pilbara, Shire of | Yes | Rural remote | 11,950 | 37,124,400 |
| Karratha, City of |  | Urban regional | 22,899 | 1,523,580 |
| Port Hedland, Town of |  | Urban regional | 15,046 | 1,843,110 |
| **South West** |  |  |  |  |
| Augusta-Margaret River, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 11,760 | 212,242 |
| Boyup Brook, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,589 | 282,650 |
| Bridgetown-Greenbushes, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 4,318 | 133,938 |
| Bunbury, City of |  | Urban regional | 31,348 | 6,524 |
| Busselton, City of | Yes | Urban regional | 30,331 | 145,401 |
| Capel, Shire of | Yes | Rural significant | 14,637 | 55,781 |
| Collie, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 9,126 | 171,002 |
| Dardanup, Shire of | Yes | Rural significant | 12,404 | 52,592 |
| Donnybrook-Balingup, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 5,322 | 155,997 |
| Harvey, Shire of | Yes | Urban regional | 23,238 | 172,788 |
| Manjimup, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 9,182 | 702,575 |
| Nannup, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,263 | 305,371 |
| **Special Districts** |  |  |  |  |
| Christmas Island, Shire of |  | Special district | 2,072 | 136,700 |
| Cocos Keeling Islands, Shire of | Yes | Special district | 550 | 14,200 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Wheatbelt** |  |  |  |  |
| Beverley, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,567 | 237,052 |
| Brookton, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 932 | 160,115 |
| Bruce Rock, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 975 | 272,471 |
| Chittering, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 4,427 | 121,990 |
| Corrigin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,063 | 268,060 |
| Cuballing, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 871 | 119,495 |
| Cunderdin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,311 | 186,245 |
| Dalwallinu, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,266 | 722,722 |
| Dandaragan, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 3,185 | 671,149 |
| Dowerin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 675 | 186,308 |
| Dumbleyung, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 603 | 254,128 |
| Gingin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 4,687 | 320,844 |
| Goomalling, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 986 | 183,543 |
| Kellerberrin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,180 | 191,558 |
| Kondinin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,046 | 742,209 |
| Koorda, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 434 | 283,235 |
| Kulin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 826 | 471,686 |
| Lake Grace, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,359 | 1,188,580 |
| Merredin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 3,282 | 329,439 |
| Moora, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 2,476 | 376,298 |
| Mt Marshall, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 486 | 1,018,590 |
| Mukinbudin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 489 | 343,499 |
| Narembeen, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 813 | 383,325 |
| Narrogin, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 875 | 161,835 |
| Narrogin, Town of |  | Urban regional | 4,220 | 1,313 |
| Northam, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 10,557 | 143,122 |
| Nungarin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 231 | 116,301 |
| Pingelly, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,164 | 129,405 |
| Quairading, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,044 | 201,693 |
| Tammin, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 405 | 110,169 |
| Toodyay, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 4,387 | 169,165 |
| Trayning, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 347 | 165,094 |
| Victoria Plains, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 897 | 255,094 |
| Wagin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,847 | 194,573 |
| Wandering, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 438 | 189,962 |
| West Arthur, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 868 | 283,265 |
| Westonia, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 276 | 331,401 |
| Wickepin, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 749 | 203,984 |
| Williams, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 913 | 230,448 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Wongan-Ballidu, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 1,434 | 336,507 |
| Wyalkatchem, Shire of |  | Rural agricultural | 523 | 159,435 |
| Yilgarn, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 1,637 | 3,037,630 |
| York, Shire of | Yes | Rural agricultural | 3,395 | 213,159 |