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Key Findings

SATISFACTION
Satisfaction with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal is high, with 82% of users giving a high satisfaction score for the online portal overall.

Positive aspects of the portal include:
• Instant or timely results/information/reports (26%)
• Ease of use/navigation (25%).

USAGE
Three in five (61%) of the users surveyed report accessing the portal at least several times a month, with 15% classed as very frequent users and 46% as frequent users. The remaining 39% that access the portal no more than several times a year are classed as infrequent users.

Generally, frequent users tend to rate performance metrics higher than infrequent users.

Ease of Access
Eight in ten (83%) portal users agree that it was easy for them to access the portal. This sentiment increases with frequency of access to the portal.

Ease of Use
Ease of use is rated highly among portal users (78% agree). In particular, users working for the Queensland Government agree the portal is easy for them to use compared to those from other organisations.

QUERY RESOLUTION
Outcome
Approximately half (51%) of portal users report always getting the information or outcome they desire directly from the portal. An additional third say getting the desired outcome occurs often.

Follow-up
At least one-quarter of users have contacted the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships (DATSIP) to seek assistance to use the portal and/or to request additional information following a search request in the past 12 months.

Just over half (53%) of all enquiries were resolved on the same day and an additional third (33%) within 1 to 2 business days.

STAFF PERFORMANCE
Users are highly satisfied with how staff handle their portal enquiries. Top aspects of staff performance include:
• Staff knowledge and competency (95%)
• Staff attentiveness (93%).

PORTAL IMPROVEMENTS
While overall satisfaction with the online portal is high, suggestions for improvement indicate most users have high expectations of the portal in the future, with some users comparing the online portal to what they perceive to be similar tools in the market. Some suggestions from portal users include:

• Visual tools to help identify different types of sites
• Search results provided in a direct GIS format (or GIS compatible format)
• Improvement of submission process and upload times (e.g. shape files).

Users are less inclined to cite the mapping of search, downloadable information, provision of detailed information and ease of results interpretation as areas of the portal they regard as working well. This is likely due to the fact that many of these functions are either restricted completely or partially within the portal as a result of Queensland legislation.

To maintain high satisfaction scores, it is imperative DATSIP continue to innovate and upgrade the portal in line with users’ expectations, where possible.
Research Background and Objectives

**BACKGROUND**

The Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships (DATSIP) provide information from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Database and Register to land users seeking to comply with their cultural heritage duty of care. The Cultural Heritage Online Portal enables all land users, who have registered for special access, to undertake cultural heritage search requests. These search requests provide land users with information about Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander areas and objects of traditional, customary and archaeological significance to assist land users in meeting their duty of care under the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003 and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Act 2003.

Enhance Research was commissioned by DATSIP to undertake an online survey designed to measure users’ experience and satisfaction with the online portal and assess the service quality provided by DATSIP associated with the portal. This report is a final quantitative evaluation of the findings.

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

The key objective of the survey was to evaluate the Cultural Heritage Online Portal, specifically the percentage of customers satisfied with services provided by DATSIP through the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage online portal.
Methodology and Interpretation

METHODOLOGY

Online surveys were sent to a list of 397 portal users provided by DATSIP between Wednesday 19 April and Wednesday 3 May, 2017.

The online surveys were programmed and managed in-house by Enhance Research. A total of 106 completed surveys was achieved with a response rate of 27%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation of User</th>
<th>n=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisations</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPORT INTERPRETATION

Please note the following when reading this report:
- Where question response percentages do not sum to 100%, this is due either to rounding or a question allowing multiple responses
- Caution is needed in interpreting data with small base sizes of around n=30 or less
- The base note included on each page throughout the report represents the number of respondents who answered the particular question

Statistical significance testing has been undertaken based on the following firmographics:
- Organisation type (i.e. Queensland Government vs other organisations)
- Frequency of access

For the purposes of this report only statistically significant differences of interest are shown, with figures in green or with ▲ being significantly higher than those in red or ▼. 
OVERALL SATISFACTION

Portal users are very positive about their overall experience with the portal (82%). In particular, users from the Queensland Government and/or more frequent users of the portal report higher levels of overall satisfaction.

**Organisation type:**
- **Queensland Government Department** (n=51)
  - Very dissatisfied: 4%
  - Dissatisfied: 10%
  - Neutral: 55%
  - Satisfied: 31%
  - Very satisfied: 86%
  - Satisfaction score: 4.1

- **Other Organisation** (n=55)
  - Very dissatisfied: 13%
  - Dissatisfied: 9%
  - Neutral: 49%
  - Satisfied: 29%
  - Very satisfied: 78%
  - Satisfaction score: 3.9

**Access to portal:**
- **Very Frequently** (n=16*)
  - Very dissatisfied: 13%
  - Dissatisfied: 6%
  - Neutral: 50%
  - Satisfied: 31%
  - Very satisfied: 81%
  - Satisfaction score: 4.0

- **Frequently** (n=49)
  - Very dissatisfied: 6%
  - Dissatisfied: 4%
  - Neutral: 47%
  - Satisfied: 43%
  - Very satisfied: 90%
  - Satisfaction score: 4.3

- **Infrequently** (n=41)
  - Very dissatisfied: 10%
  - Dissatisfied: 17%
  - Neutral: 59%
  - Satisfied: 15%
  - Very satisfied: 73%
  - Satisfaction score: 3.8

*Base: All respondents (n=106)
Q3. Overall, how satisfied are you with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.*
POSITIVE ASPECTS OF THE PORTAL

“It is brilliant that it is online and the results are instant, rather than the potential 20 business days it used to be.”

“Instant results. The new portal is light years ahead of the previous register. It enables consultants to quickly get spatial data...”

“It’s easy to navigate, produces quick report or search results and detail.”

“It’s been really easy to use. I have only been in the department for one year. So often the systems that we use take months to understand and I am constantly needing to ask seniors or supervisors for assistance. I didn't have that issue with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal and found that it works well and is easy to master.”

Among users, one-quarter cite the provision of timely results and information, and ease of use/navigation as top performing aspects of the online portal.

One in five feel that the search function or parameters, and the results produced from the portal have worked well for them over the past 12 months.

Users are less inclined to cite the mapping of search, downloadable information, provision of detailed information and ease of results interpretation as areas of the portal they regard as working well. This is likely due to the fact that many of these functions are either restricted completely or partially within the portal as a result of Queensland legislation.
PORTAL USAGE

More than half of the Cultural Heritage Online Portal users surveyed report accessing the portal at least several times a month, with 15% classed as very frequent users and 46% as frequent users. The remaining 39% that access the portal no more than several times a year are classed as infrequent users.

Frequency of access to the portal is highly similar across the Queensland Government and other organisations.
Eight in ten (83%) portal users agree that it was easy for them to access the portal. This sentiment increases with frequency of access to the portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department (n=51)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation (n=55)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (n=16*)</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (n=49)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (n=41)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1a. To what extent do you agree with the following statements...It was easy to access the Cultural Heritage Online Portal? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
EASE OF USE

The majority agree that the online portal is easy to use (78%). In particular, users working for the Queensland Government agree the portal is easy for them to use compared to those from other organisations.

Organisation type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to portal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents (n=106)

Q1b. To what extent do you agree with the following statements...It was easy to use the Cultural Heritage Online Portal.? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
QUERY
RESOLUTION
CONTACT WITH DATSIP

In total, at least one-quarter of users have contacted the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships to seek assistance to use the portal and/or to request additional information following a search request in the past 12 months.

Contact with DATSIP is more frequent for users who work for organisations outside the Queensland Government. Highly frequent users of the portal (who access the service at least multiple times a week) are more likely to request additional information following a search request than less frequent users of the portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department</td>
<td>12% (▼)</td>
<td>16% (▼)</td>
<td>Very Frequently: 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation</td>
<td>35% (▲)</td>
<td>44% (▲)</td>
<td>Frequently: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrequently: 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sought assistance to use the Cultural Heritage Online Portal
- Requested additional information following a search request

Base: All respondents (n=106)
TIMELINESS OF RESOLUTION

In the last 12 months, just over half (53%) of all enquiries were resolved on the same day and an additional third (33%) within 1 to 2 business days. This timeframe is highly similar across organisation types and users’ frequency of access to the portal (not charted).

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q5. Thinking about your most recent contact with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Partnerships, how long did it take for your enquiry to be resolved?
Approximately half (51%) of portal users report *always* getting the information or outcome they desire. An additional third say getting the desired outcome occurs *often*.

While still high, infrequent users of the portal report getting the desired outcome less often than more frequent users.
STAFF PERFORMANCE
Among portal users who have contacted DATSIP in the past year, there is very strong agreement (95%) that the staff they dealt with were knowledgeable and competent.

### STAFF KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department (n=11*)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation (n=29*)</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (n=12*)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (n=15*)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (n=13*)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q6a. Again, thinking of your most recent contact with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, how much do you agree with the following... Staff were knowledgeable and competent? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
Generally, the majority (88%) of portal users who made contact with DATSIP staff agree they were kept informed of everything they had to do to get the information they needed. This sentiment is slightly lower however, among infrequent users of the portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department (n=11*)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation (n=29*)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (n=12*)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (n=15*)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (n=13*)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The vast majority (93%) of portal users agree that the staff they spoke to listened attentively to their query.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department (n=11*)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation (n=29*)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal:</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (n=12*)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (n=15*)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (n=13*)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q6c. Again, thinking of your most recent contact with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, how much do you agree with the following... Staff listened attentively to my query? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
ABILITY TO ANSWER QUERIES

While still high (with an overall agreement score of 85%), users’ perceive the ability of staff to answer their queries slightly lower compared to other performance metrics.

Agreement with this aspect increases with frequency of access to the portal.

![Graph showing agreement scores for ability to answer queries]

**Organisation type:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation type</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Government Department</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisation</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access to portal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to portal</th>
<th>Total % Agreed (4-5 rating)</th>
<th>Agreement Score (mean score out of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents who had contact with the department (n=40)
Q6d. Again, thinking of your most recent contact with the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, how much do you agree with the following... Staff were able to answer my query? *Low base size (n<30). Interpret with caution.
PORTAL IMPROVEMENTS
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

While users are generally satisfied with the Cultural Heritage Online Portal, suggestions for improvement indicate most users have high expectations of the portal in the future, with some users comparing the online portal to what they perceive to be similar tools in the market.

Some suggestions for improvement indicate a possible lack of awareness among portal users when it comes to state legislative restrictions governing the type and/or amount of content the department can provide through the online portal. As a result, users’ suggestions have been grouped into the following categories; (1) currently available, (2) actionable and (3) non-actionable (i.e. restricted by legislation).
SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (CURRENTLY AVAILABLE)

Some users suggest the option to search the portal based on map selections, and the report database by report title or author despite the fact that these functions already exist.

- Greater search parameters – This includes the ability to conduct searches based on polygon drawings/map or area selections, to search reports databases by title and/or author and allowing the search of segment parcel details.

“Be able to do a search base on a polygon one could draw instead of a specific lot and plan to cover more than one property or an area in question.”

“Searchable reports database. There is currently no way to search report titles and/or authors. NSW, Vic and WA have this feature. SA, ACT, Tas and NT will provide you with a summary when you do a register search over an area. We don’t have this capacity in Qld.”

“I would like to be able to search road areas, at present we can only search a lot/plan parcel although you can specify a buffer area around the parcel to capture the road.”
Moving forward, portal users would like to see:

1. **Removal of steps to search the register** – There are currently two search buttons users are required to click through to submit a search, “search the database” and “complete search request”, and this generates some confusion.

   “Remove the second step to search the register - once you are in the online portal you click on "Search the database....." but then have to click on a new menu item that says ‘complete search request’. Took me a few minutes to work out the first time in that I had to click that to actually complete a search since that’s what I thought the first option was asking.”

2. **Visual tools to help identify different types of sites** – For example, different symbols to represent middens/ artefact scatters as opposed to showing the same symbol.

   “At the moment all records are represented by the same symbol whilst they are detailed in the report as different types of items e.g. middens and artefact scatters. A mapping tool that can zoom to a precise location and can produce a map that accurately represents the values and can be inserted into formal government reports.”

3. **Search results provided in a direct GIS format (or at least a CSV format)** like other states as the current PDF/.doc outputs are incompatible with modern GIS analysis.

   “If the site information could be downloaded into a format that’s usable with ArcGIS or MapInfo.”

   “The ability to download the Cultural Heritage Database search results directly to a GIS format. Or if that's not possible, a CSV format.”

   “Search results provided in CSV format like every other State and Territory in Australia provides. The current PDF and .doc format outputs are useless for modern GIS analysis. We currently waste hours on large projects getting the data into a format that can be used GIS. We know there are no technology restrictions for getting this done as the portal is based off the Victorian ACHRIS portal which provides that option.”

4. **Improve submission process and upload times** (e.g. shape files).

   “Uploading site data is time consuming and the system often crashes.”

   “Needs improvement in uploading shape files to the portal. I always have issues uploading shape files for cultural heritage searches, even though the data is in the format requested.”

   “...the uploading of a MIF digital data file never seems to work for me!!”
The following suggestions for improvement indicate a possible lack of awareness among portal users when it comes to state legislative restrictions governing the type and/or amount of content the department can provide through the online portal. Under current legislation, these suggestions are unable to be implemented. While the provision of more detailed site content cannot be made accessible through the portal directly, users are referred to the relevant Aboriginal party(s) who have permission to grant requests for such additional information.

Updating GPS data is currently unfeasible given the number of heritage sites linked to the portal. However, future initiatives that plan to integrate user collaboration and assist in the input of new sites may also enable the update of more accurate location data.

1. **Provision of more detailed (and up to date) information** – This includes the type of heritage, size of site (e.g. isolated or scattered area), site name not just ID, original recorder, permit record/report, site status and map linkage to site description (to help determine risks posed by project works).

   • **Accurate location data** – GPS coordinates displayed in the current portal are seen as being too “old” from when GPS was less accurate (users want updated, more accurate GPS locations provided below the map).

2. **Access to non-restricted site cards and reports** by accredited heritage advisors through the portal as done in other states.

   “More detailed descriptions of recorded sites located during searches to assist in determining risks posed by project works.”

   “From a construction point of view, I would like to have more detail about the results, in that if we are working in an area, is the item a tree scar, a painting, an artefact, an area? Is it a single item, or is it a scatter that spreads across an area? If it is an area, how large is it? I understand that we need to engage the Traditional Owners of the area, and that some of the information is sacred/private, so cannot be included, but it would be nice.”

   “More data provided in the search results including: site name (not just site ID), original recorder, report/permit record, site status.”

   “…the Aboriginal Party contact details information be updated more regularly/proactively reviewed every few months to ensure it is still correct.”

   “I have a case where the data relating to the Aboriginal Party contact details were incorrect due to a recent registered claim. So regular timely updates may be the answer.”

   “…I note that although there are GPS coordinates that these are often very old, likely taken when GPS’s were less accurate, therefore it is difficult to use the coordinate to differentiate between sites.”

   “Access to non-restricted site cards and reports by accredited heritage advisors through the portal. This is done in all states and territories including Victoria where the software for the portal was acquired from. Heritage advisors in Victoria (vetted by Department) have access to non-sensitive records (restrictions are in place for burials and highly sensitive ceremonial/sacred sites). The current system of requesting access from Aboriginal Parties for all sites does not work. Either get rid of this requirement (with the exception of burials and sacred sites), or put a request feature in the Portal in which the Aboriginal Parties are obligated to respond to in a certain time. Heritage sites are at risk from being impacted without access to this information.”
RESPONDENT PROFILE
DEMOGRAPHICS

Gender

- Women: 47%
- Men: 53%

Age

- 18 - 24 years: 3%
- 25 - 39 years: 32%
- 40 - 54 years: 45%
- 55+ years: 18%
- Prefer not to say: 2%

Base: All respondents (n=106)