

## User satisfaction survey

<b>Name</b>	xxx
<b>Module (3)</b>	xxx
<b>Evidence Number</b>	3
<b>Evidence Title</b>	xxx user satisfaction survey 2018.

To ensure pathology at xxx trust continues to provide a dedicated and reliable service to our service users; a user satisfaction survey was produced to gain feedback from wards, outpatient departments and GP practices from within the trust. A copy of the user satisfaction survey is displayed below. This was approved by a senior biomedical scientist in Microbiology before the survey was finalised and posted out to the appropriate departments and practices. A copy of the 2018 user survey is attached.

I decided to use the following questions on the user survey for the following reasons:

**1. “There is access to the Microbiology and Pathology User Handbook”**

Microbiology have a handbook available to all service users detailing services available, sample requirements, clinical advice and TAT - it is important that the survey establishes whether service users are aware of the handbook and how to access it.

Additional questions asked ref user handbook (see user questionnaire for full details):

**2. “The handbook is easy to access”**

**3. “The handbook provides all the information you require (If not -please detail in the ‘comments’ section)”**

Other questions asked on the survey:

**4. “Microbiology results are made available to users within a clinically acceptable time frame”**

**5. “Enquiries to the laboratory are dealt with efficiently and courteously”**

**6. “The ICE system is easy to use”**

A group of questions was asked regarding reports (This was used to determine whether the additional comments that are reported alongside results are helpful to the service users):



**Additional similar Responses where received from:**

- UHNT wards (including out patient departments) – results below
- GP’s - – results below

In total, the number of xxx responses, including both xxx, equals 32. 66 surveys were posted, meaning from the wards, there was a 48% response. Only 5 GP surveys were received back out of a total of 43. Resulting in a 11% response rate. Overall, the total response from the entire trust was 33%.

Responses in terms of the additional comments, which the service user could circle, are shown in the table below:

<b>Chosen phrase</b>	<b>Total number</b>	<b>% out of responses received</b>
<b>Helpful</b>	24	64%
<b>Friendly</b>	12	32%
<b>Efficient</b>	21	56%
<b>Disorganised</b>	0	/
<b>Interactive</b>	2	5%
<b>Participative</b>	4	10%
<b>Considerate</b>	4	10%
<b>Reliable</b>	14	37%
<b>Unhelpful</b>	0	/
<b>Informative</b>	12	32%
<b>Useful</b>	15	40%

Additional comments which could be written in the suggestions box are shown below:

**xxx Day Unit:** Crossmatch should be populated and filed automatically after certain period of time. We relay our work on ice reports, very useful to us.

**Ward xxx:** Unsure if handbook is online on intranet.

**xxx:** Main issues are around functioning of IT/ICE systems. Clinical reports not relevant to my role. Each interaction with the path lab is usually dealt with immediately and the staff are knowledgeable.

**xxx Outpatients:** Was not aware of handbook.

**xxx Medical Centre:** It would be useful in the instance when we have entered the antibiotic started for ?uti ?lrti; if the bug in question had a reported sensitivity for that antibiotic.

**xxx Surgery:** Sometimes comments on reports unhelpful, for example, ‘bile acids’- if normal, comment states ‘ look for alternative diagnosis’, however could still be cholestasis of pregnancy if

an increase of ALT is noted as well as normal bile acids. Also the new CKD2 comment ? helpful  
Having said this, we are very happy with service in general, Thanks.

**xxx Practice:** I think the supply system since going to North Tees is terrible. Our time is wasted chasing up orders!! I think this needs to be reviewed.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, it is apparent that the majority of the service users within the trust are unaware of the Microbiology and Pathology handbook. A large proportion of the questions relating to the handbook were left unanswered due to the service user not being aware where to find the handbook or knowing that a handbook existed. Due to the GP response rate being very poor, it is difficult to identify trends. The ward response was considerably more beneficial; it can be determined from these responses that the handbook needs to be reviewed in terms of how easily it can be accessed. A communication to be sent trust wide may be necessary to inform service users how to access the handbook and what it can be used for. No negative comments were received in terms of the phrases which could be circled. 64% of service users believe pathology is helpful and 56% believe pathology is efficient. This may appear as a low percentage; however, it must be considered that only a small percentage of user survey responses were received back and that not all surveys were fully completed i.e. the suggestions box and the phrases selection was kept blank.

In terms of microbiology and xxx Centre comment, a new system of reporting a antibiotic sensitivity is now in place when a service user has mentioned that the patient is on a particular form of treatment, however, this sensitivity is only reported if it is suitable for the bacterium that has been isolated and/or that particular infection.

Overall, the majority of answers showed that the service users strongly agreed with the statements on the survey in regards to turn around time, dealing with enquiries and the overall effectiveness of the service we provide. This shows that pathology as a whole is continuing to provide an optimum service for the service users.

**Witness Signature:**

**Date:**

**Trainee Signature:**

**Date:**

**Training Officer Signature:**

**Date:**