


# Sydney/Sydney Eye Hospital

# South Eastern Sydney LHD

This profile presents selected results from the Outpatient Cancer Clinics Survey for patients seen during February and March 2015. Patients were identified for inclusion if they attended an outpatient cancer clinic at a participating NSW public hospital or the Chris O'Brien Lifehouse.

Across NSW, more than 3,500 patients attending outpatient cancer clinics responded to the survey - a response rate of 57.3%. There were 43 responses from Sydney/Sydney Eye Hospital - a response rate of 30.1%.

# Overall, how would you rate the care you received in the clinic?



# Summary results for patients who attended this hospital, by theme

Hospital result, relative to NSW:

Significantly higher

Significantly lower

No significant difference

Data suppressed (<30 responses)

#### Overall experience of care



- 1. Overall, care was rated as 'very good'
- 2. Would 'speak highly' of the clinic to friends and family
- 3. Overall, health professionals were rated as 'very good'
- 4. Care was 'very well organised'

#### Access and timeliness before the visit



- 1. Able to get an appointment time that suited them
- 2. Time waited for appointment was 'about right'
- 3. Travelled 'less than 30 minutes' to get to the clinic
- 4. Had no out-of-pocket expenses in relation to visit

### Access and timeliness during the visit



- 1. Appointment started 'within 30 minutes' of scheduled time
- 2. Told reason for wait (for appointment to start)
- 3. Told how long to wait (for appointment to start)

# Physical environment and comfort



- 1. 'No difficulties' entering and moving around the clinic
- 2. 'Definitely' easy to find way to the clinic
- 3. Waiting area was 'very comfortable'
- 4. 'No problem' finding parking near the clinic

#### Addressing patient concerns



- 1. 'Definitely' had enough time to discuss health issues with health professionals
- 2. 'Definitely' had confidence and trust in health professionals
- 3. Heath professional 'completely' discussed worries or fears
- 4. While in the clinic, received or saw information about how to comment or complain

### Respect and dignity



- 1. Cultural or religious beliefs were 'always' respected
- 2. 'Always' treated with respect and dignity
- 3. Health professionals were 'always' kind and caring
- 4. 'Definitely' given enough privacy when being examined or treated
- 5. 'Definitely' given enough privacy when discussing condition
- 6. Reception staff were 'definitely' polite and courteous

# Information to support patient



- 1. Health professional 'completely' explained purpose of new medication
- 2. Told who to contact if worried about condition or treatment after leaving the clinic
- 3. Health professionals 'always' explained things in an understandable way
- 4. 'Completely' informed about medication side effects to watch for
- 5. 'Completely' informed about any other treatment side effects to

# Shared decision-making



- 1. Had care plan in place for cancer treatment
- 2. Health professionals reviewed cancer care plan at most recent visit [for those who had a care plan]
- 3. 'Definitely' involved in decisions about care and treatment
- 4. 'Definitely' asked for ideas and preferences when developing cancer care plan

#### Coordination and continuity



- 1. Did not receive conflicting information from health professionals [in the past 12 months]
- 2. Health professionals were able to access patient's health records when needed [in the past 12 months]
- 3. Health professionals 'definitely' knew enough about patient's medical history
- 4. Health professionals worked together in a 'very good' way

# Hygiene and cleanliness



- 1. Clinic was 'very clean'
- 2. 'Always' saw health professionals wash their hands

# Complications




- 1. Did not go to an emergency department because of cancer or cancer complications in the past three months
- 2. Did not experience any complication related to care received at the clinic




#### Note: This hospital has too few respondents in active treatment for individual reporting


# Profile of patients attending this hospital



# Self-efficacy scores<sup>1</sup> among patients in active treatment for cancer at time of survey



# Symptom assessment scores<sup>2</sup> among patients in active treatment for cancer at time of survey



#### Notes

For more information about the NSW Patient Survey Program or the Outpatient Cancer Clinics Survey, please visit bhi.nsw.gov.au

- \* Significant differences are when 95% confidence intervals do not overlap.
- Communication and Attitudinal Self-Efficacy Scale (CASE-Cancer). Wolf MS et al, 2005. CASE-Cancer scores were generated by scoring the four response options and averaging at the domain level for hospital and NSW.
- 2. Edmonton Symptom Assessment System (ESAS). Bruera E, et al, 1991. ESAS scores are average values for each symptom.