

567

West S¹, Vedanayagam M², Sutherland S¹, Briggs K¹, Hammadeh M¹

1. South London Hospital Trusts, 2. South London Hospital Trusts

PATIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY IN UROLOGY CONTINENCE CLINICS

Hypothesis / aims of study

In 2010 the Royal College of Physicians and the National Continence Audit UK issued guidelines stating that evaluation of patient satisfaction should form a part of all Continence services.

The aim of this audit was to evaluate patient satisfaction with all aspects of continence services provided using a newly developed questionnaire, and highlight areas of patient care that require improvement.

Study design, materials and methods

A survey of patient satisfaction questionnaires was conducted over a one month period in our urology continence clinics. A single page questionnaire was developed containing eight closed ended five points Likert- scale type questions. The questions explored patient satisfaction with all aspects of the services starting from administration level to consultant and continence nurse specialists care in terms of how they were treated, communication and explanation of results of investigations. The questionnaire was piloted in 4 patients and was found practical and easy to complete. The results were analysed using SPSS (SPSS Inc. Chicago Illinois).

Results

51 patients completed and returned questionnaires following their clinic visits. The data was anonymous and did not contain any demographic information. Overall fifty patients (98%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided. Only one patient was unsatisfied but did not comment on the reasons. Three patients gave neutral responses regarding the service, and areas of dissatisfaction were mainly around long waiting time to be seen, and inadequate communication and explanation of results.

Interpretation of results

Areas of patient care that required improvement in our clinic were identified as long waiting times and clarity of communication to patients including results explanation.

Concluding message

This audit highlighted the importance of providing better information to patients about their condition and clarifying that waiting times in urodynamics clinics may be varied due to the nature of the test.

Disclosures

Funding: No grant **Clinical Trial:** No **Subjects:** HUMAN **Ethics not Req'd:** It was an audit approved by the trust **Helsinki:** No **Helsinki not Req'd:** It was an audit of patient satisfaction carried out by means of a questionnaire. **Informed Consent:** Yes