# 706

Wartemberg G K<sup>1</sup>, Anastasiadis E<sup>2</sup>, West S<sup>2</sup>, Sutherland S<sup>2</sup>, Briggs K<sup>2</sup>, Hammadeh M<sup>2</sup>

1. Queen Elizabeth hospital, 2. Queen Elizabeth hospital, London

# DOES THE CREATION OF A PATIENT SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE IMPROVE QUALITY OF CARE RECEIVED IN LOCAL CONTINENCE CLINICS? AN AUDIT OF PATIENT SATISFACTION IN A DISTRICT GENERAL HOSPITAL

## Hypothesis / aims of study

The National Continence Audit in 2010 recommends that patient satisfaction surveys should be part of continence services. In order to audit our practice, we created a questionnaire to evaluate patient satisfaction with our continence clinics.

## Study design, materials and methods

The questionnaire was based on 8 closed-ended questions that asked patients to rank their satisfaction on a 5-point Likert scale. The following areas were evaluated: 1) waiting time 2)treatment by the nurse 3) treatment by the doctor and 4) the administrative staff 5) the explanation of their condition 6) explanation of investigations 7) follow-up appointment 8) overall outcome with the visit. A space for comments was provided at the end of each question. The questionnaire was piloted on 4 patients and the first survey was conducted in 2010. Findings from the 2010 survey were presented at a local meeting, and a sign was displayed for patients to read: "the waiting time may be up to 30 minutes". One to one feedback was provided to the members of the team. After implementing changes, we repeated the survey in October 2012 to January 2013.

#### Results

53 patients completed the survey in 2010 and 93 in 2012/3. The repeat survey showed improvements in almost all areas: 91 patients (97.8%) were satisfied or very satisfied with time waited compared to 87% in 2010. In 2010, a patient commented that they 'waited an hour for urodynamics appointment', whereas on repeat survey, comments such as 'fairly quick' were made. 99% were very satisfied with their treatment by the nurses (86% in 2010); 96% were very satisfied with doctors (71% in 2010). 'Spoke to colleague not to me' was a comment directed at the treatment by one of the doctors in 2010. However in 2012/3, positive statements such as 'made me feel relaxed' were documented. 99% were satisfied/ very satisfied with the explanation of investigations (95% in 2010).

However, satisfaction with administration staff was slightly reduced to 96% (100% in 2010) with a complaint documented on the questionnaire stating 'no one at reception but someone else booked me in'.

#### Interpretation of results

There was a significant increase in the perception of the treatment by doctors, nursing staff and the time waited. Unfortunately the satisfaction with the administrative staff decreased with one patient siting that there was no one available to book them. Compared to 2010, there were less negative comments in the repeat survey.

## Concluding message

Overall, there was a marked improvement in how patients perceived their treatment in the continence clinics. We have shown how simple measures, such as creating a questionnaire and administering changes, can increase patient satisfaction and the service provided.

# **Disclosures**

Funding: None Clinical Trial: No Subjects: HUMAN Ethics not Req'd: It is an audit of service. Helsinki: Yes Informed Consent: Yes