

ROMNEY HOUSE SURGERY

Dr Gerald and partners

**PATIENT SURVEY
2012**

Summary and Key Findings

Contents

Summary and Key Findings (pages 1 and 2)

Appendix 1 - Blank questionnaire

Appendix 2 - Survey results

Appendix 3 - Comment listing

BACKGROUND

The Patient survey was conducted between Monday 30th January and Friday 10th February 2012, at the Long Street Surgery (LSS) and Tetbury Hospital Trust Surgery (THS), by volunteer representatives of the Patient Participation Group (PPG).

All patients attending the surgeries were asked to participate by completing an anonymous and confidential questionnaire. There were 537 responses at Long Street and 90 at Tetbury Hospital. This represents 7.8% of the total registered patient population.

The questionnaire contained some questions included in previous surveys for comparative purposes¹, and some that were devised by the PPG to reflect local issues and concerns. Patients were also given opportunity to make general comments on the surgery and its practices. The full results in both raw data and percentage format, the comparative data in mean percentage scores, and a full listing of the written comments given by patients are in the appendix.

Thank you to all of the staff at the surgery who supported us in our research and to the volunteer members of the PPG who helped to collect and compile the data.

KEY FINDINGS

Areas To Celebrate

Patient's **level of overall satisfaction** of their visit to the surgery was very high, with 95% recording a good or better level of satisfaction at LSS and 98% at THS. The responses compare favourably to results from previous surveys, with the mean percentage score² increasing from 66 in 2007, 71 in 2009 to 74 in 2012 for both surgeries combined. One patient commented "we have nothing but praise for this GP practice.....All staff must be praised and thanked for all they do". Another commented on this "Wonderful practice"

The responses to questions about the **appointment time spent with the doctor or nurse** were also very positive. When asked about the level of listening by the doctor, the quality of explanation by the nurse/doctor, the confidence in the clinician, the opportunity to express concerns and the level of respect shown by the nurse/doctor, 94% of all responses were good or better. Again the responses in these categories compared favourably with previous surveys, with the mean percentage scores matching or improving on the previous outcomes. When asked about the amount of **time allocated for each appointment**, 100% of patients at THS responded that it was good or better, with 93% giving the same response at LSS. Significantly this represented an increase in the mean % scores from 54 in 2007 and 60 in 2009, to 70 in 2012.

The survey showed a general high level of satisfaction with the manner in which patients were treated by the **reception staff**, with 94% of those who communicated with the reception staff rating their experience as good or better at LSS and 97% at THS. This did, however, represent a fall in the mean percentage scores from 64% in 2009 to 51% in 2012, and some patients did comment on poor reception skills. There was also a significant difference in the mean percentage for the **comfort of the waiting room** question, with the score increasing from 44 in 2009 to 51 in 2012 (although there were a large number of requests for a water or coffee/tea machine and a clock – "please, please may we have the clock back", and concern expressed about a lack of chairs with arms for infirm patients).

Areas for Consideration/Concern

The questionnaire allowed plenty of opportunity for patients to make comments about the surgery and there was a lot of detailed and constructive feedback. Many of the questions asked produced similar levels of response to those asked on previous surveys, but comments accompanying the tick box responses have helped to identify possible areas for change.

The **levels of satisfaction on opening hours, telephone access, seeing a practitioner within 48 hours and the timing of appointments** have all seen small decreases in their mean percentage scores. When asked whether they were aware that **appointments could be made on the internet** 77% at LSS and 67% at THS responded that they were unaware. Regarding **choice of practitioner**, 41% of patients at LSS and 24% at THS responded that the opportunity to see a doctor of their choice was only fair or poor. There were several concerns voiced about the difficulty of seeing a female doctor, and having to wait two or more weeks to see a doctor of their choice. One patient commented “..there was a 10 day wait to see my doctor of choice for this particular condition. My 2nd choice still had a wait of one week”

The problems with **car parking** were once again a feature of the survey. At LSS 62% of patients came by car. Of these 60% were unable to park in the surgery car park. The majority, 57% tried the car park but could not find a space and a further 32% did not bother to try. Many patients commented on parking problems, with one suggesting that “Car parking is dire, especially if you have to bring in disabled or poor mobility patients”. **Access to the surgery** was also highlighted as a problem for some patients. Although 89% found access to LSS to be good or better, young parents and more infirm patients saw it as a major issue. One commented that the outside door at the front of the surgery was “too heavy for elderly people or those with walking aids. Why is it closed?” Also, “Front door is a pain with a pushchair”. Information about **test results** also scored poorly, with 29% at LSS rating it as only poor or fair. Could this be linked to 50% of patients at LSS not seeing their usual doctor? One patient requested that test results to be phoned through as soon as they became available.

The main area of concern highlighted by the survey was the **length of waiting times**. At LSS 44% of patients had to wait longer than 16 minutes, and at THS the figure was even higher at 54%. The length of waiting time recorded may even have been understated, with a very high no response for this question (20%) and researchers feeding back that some respondents either left before their appointments because they were unable to wait any longer or rushed away after their appointment to retrieve their cars, or meet other commitments. One angry patient commented “The appointment system is a joke. Think it’s disgraceful, especially when the wait is over an hour” Several parents of young children objected to having to wait for long periods, and many respondents complained about not being kept informed of delays. One typical comment was “Would be sympathetic if knew on arrival – just let us know”

Practice Comment

The Surgery is delighted that so many patients have taken the time to contribute to the survey and welcome the key findings summarised in this document. It is gratifying to see that levels of satisfaction remain high and that patients value the time clinical staff spend with them and the standards of care they deliver. It is also pleasing that the friendly professionalism of the reception staff has been recognised, who, along with the administration team, always carry out their tasks diligently.

We recognise there are areas of concern that we are keen to address. As is common to most GP practices, waiting times are an issue. They are our priority and we are actively looking at ways to ease the inconvenience without losing the special relationship between doctor and patient. We look forward to working with the PPG now and in the future, improving the experience for all our visitors, serving the health needs of our community and putting patients first.

Summary

The survey produced a large amount of data, which is in the public domain and is available for further interrogation. This report is an outline of the key features based on the statistical evidence and the comments made by patients. It will be presented, along with an action plan produced by the practice, at a meeting open to all patients, on 25th April 2012, at 7pm, in the Dolphin Hall.

¹ Surveys were conducted at the surgery in 2004, 2007 and 2009 by Cfep UK Surveys using a sample of 334 patients.

² Mean percentage scores are expressed as a percentage of a maximum possible score. 'No responses' are not used in the calculations