

MELBOURNE SEXUAL HEALTH CENTRE
CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY
2008


SUMMARY

The Melbourne Sexual Health Centre (MSHC) Client Satisfaction Survey 2008 was conducted from 05 – 11 November 2008 (inclusive). All practitioners in the main clinic were asked to offer the questionnaire to clients at the end of their service. Of the 628 individuals who received a service during that week, 269 elected to complete the questionnaire. This represented a response rate of 43%, compared to 36% in 2007, 37% in 2006 and 45% in 2005.

Clients were asked to rate their level of agreement with various statements about their visit to MSHC. Clients rated the professionalism and approachability of staff extremely high. This result is reflected in the comments provided by clients that what clients liked best about the centre was the staff.

Melbourne Sexual Health Centre scored a 97% overall satisfaction rating, and only one respondent was very dissatisfied with the service, but would use the Centre again if the need arose. Six were not sure of their level of satisfaction and five of the six indicated that they would attend the Centre again if required. It is most encouraging to note that the satisfaction level has remained consistent for a number of years (Figure 1).

Figure 1



SURVEY POPULATION

Respondents recorded their gender and age on the survey form and these two variables were used to confirm that the sample was representative of the General Clinic client population for 2008 and for the client population during the week of the survey. Comparing the sample population and general clinic populations for the year and week of the survey showed that the populations were all similar.

GENDER	Clinic Population (2008)	Clinic Population (survey week)	Sample Population
Male	11,505 (60%)	360 (57%)	155 (58%)
Female	7,540 (40%)	265 (42%)	112 (42%)
Transgender	52 (0.3%)	3 (0.5%)	2 (1%)
TOTAL	19,097	628	269

AGE	Clinic Population (2008)	Clinic Population (survey week)	Sample Population
Under 20	417 (2%)	13 (2%)	8 (3%)
20 – 29	8,590 (45%)	273 (44%)	121 (45%)
30 – 39	5,460 (29%)	186 (30%)	77 (29%)
40 – 49	2,866 (15%)	111 (18%)	44 (16%)
50 – 59	1,207 (6%)	33 (5%)	13 (5%)
Over 60	557 (3%)	12 (2%)	6 (2%)

Note: General Clinic Population Definition: One visit can include consultations with several services provided by MSHC. Individuals who have accessed the service more than once are only counted once. For the survey individuals are defined as the General Clinic Population.


USE OF MELBOURNE SEXUAL HEALTH CENTRE

Clients were asked some general questions about the use of MSHC website and services. The MSHC website was used by 52% of respondents in 2008, compared to 48% in 2007, 41% in 2006 and 27% in 2005 (Figure 2). The MSHC website was redeveloped and launched in November 2007 and usage has been steadily increasing.

Overall, in 2008, the majority of visits were more than once in the last year (41%) compared to 33% of first visits. In 2007, 2006 and 2005 visits were similar, except that in 2006 and 2005, the majority of visits were from first time visitors (35%) followed by more than once in the past year (31% and 29%).

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 -2007 Range %
Have you used the MSHC website?		
Yes	138 (52%)	27 - 48%
No	100 (38%)	36 - 56%
Did not know about the website	29 (11%)	12 - 17%
How often have you visited MSHC?		
First visit	88 (33%)	28 - 35%
More than once in the last year	109 (41%)	29 - 43%
More than once in the last five years	32 (12%)	14 - 17%
Monthly	34 (13%)	10 - 16%
Other	6 (2%)	4%

Figure 2:



Clients were asked for their reasons for attending MSHC and if they agreed to the importance of providing access to those with acute symptoms who need to be seen urgently rather than provide appointments.

Most clients attended for a check-up or tests (64%) followed by concerns about symptoms (33%). The numbers associated with the reasons for attendance have remained consistent for the last few years, except for a slight increase in the numbers returning for test results.

The 'Other' category covered the following:

- STD Certificate
- Condom breakage

The majority of clients (84%) remain in agreement that it is important for the Centre to maximize access to clients with acute symptoms or urgent needs by providing a system of 'walk-in' rather than providing appointments.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	Range % 2005 - 2007
Reason for attending MSHC		
Check-up/ tests	171 (64%)	53 - 69%
Concerned about symptoms	89 (33%)	34 - 36%
Test results	64 (24%)	12 - 18%
Treatment	42 (16%)	18 - 20%
Vaccinations	24 (9%)	6 - 7%
*SH information/advice	21 (8%)	6 - 13%
Other	3 (1%)	3 - 5%
Contact with partner with STI	12 (5%)	4 - 7%
Counselling	6 (2%)	1 - 5%
<i>Allowed multiple reasons</i>		
Agreement level of walk-in access rather than provide appointments		
Strongly agree	98 (37%)	39 - 42%
Agree	126 (47%)	41 - 43%
Not sure	25 (9%)	11%
Disagree	10 (4%)	2 - 3%
Strongly disagree	8 (3%)	3 - 4%
Missing	2	

* SH = sexual health

TELEPHONE CONTACT

Clients were asked to rate their experience of telephone contact with MSHC. The majority of responders who used the service (90%) found the person on the telephone helpful and 92% were able to find out the information they requested. Overall, positive responses were recorded relating to the helpfulness of the person they spoke to and being able to find out the information they wanted. Similar observations were recorded in previous years from 2005 to 2007.

Of 95 respondents who called in for results, 91% were satisfied with the process of accessing their results.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
Reason for telephone inquiry		
Service information	74 (41%)	33 – 40%
SH information	28 (16%)	21 - 32%
Results	76 (43%)	20 – 40%
No telephone contact	92 (34%)	33 – 35%
<i>Missing</i>	90	
The person on the telephone was helpful		
Strongly agree	56 (39%)	35 – 47%
Agree	74 (51%)	47 - 54%
Not sure	9 (6%)	2 - 7%
Disagree	2 (1%)	3 – 4%
Strongly disagree	4 (3%)	0 – 1%
<i>Missing/not applicable</i>	124	
I was able to find out the information I wanted		
Strongly agree	60 (41%)	37 - 47%
Agree	74 (51%)	50 – 55%
Not sure	6 (4%)	1 - 6%
Disagree	2 (1%)	1 - 3%
Strongly disagree	3 (2%)	0%
<i>Missing/not applicable</i>	124	
<i>"Not applicable" indicates no telephone contact with MSHC</i>		
<i>"Missing" indicates declined to answer the question</i>		

TELEPHONE RESULTS LINE

Clients were asked to rate the telephone results line service and 65% of respondents had not accessed results via telephone or did not answer the question compared to 66% in 2007, 71% in 2006 and 74% in 2005 (it may be assumed that those who did not answer these questions have not used the telephone results line).

Of those who indicated they had not received results via telephone, 35% were first time clients of MSHC compared to 33% in 2007, 42% in 2006 and 45% in 2005. The remaining 65% had visit patterns ranging from monthly (17%) to more than once in the past year (35%) and more than once in past 5 years (5%). Of those who had used the telephone results line, 90% had positive comments and responses.

A large number of people (67) did not answer the question about the preferred method of receiving test results. Of those who did answer it, the preferred method was the telephone (42%), followed closely by 39% who preferred to receive results in person. In 2006 receiving results by either telephone or in person was equally recorded whereas in 2007 and 2005, significantly more clients preferred to receive results by telephone.

When asked about receiving results by email and SMS, 49% had concerns about confidentiality. Of these, 32% were concerned about the possibility of others accessing their email or SMS messages. Other concerns raised were anxiety associated with receiving results by SMS or human error (sending to an incorrect number). Others prefer the option of being able to ask questions about their results using the telephone or in person. The levels of concern have remained similar since 2005.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
I was satisfied with the process of accessing my results from MSHC via the telephone results line		
Strongly Agree	44 (46%)	36 – 55%
Agree	42 (44%)	38 – 54%
Not sure	5 (5%)	4 – 5%
Disagree	2 (2%)	0 – 2%
Strongly Disagree	4 (2%)	0 – 3%
<i>Missing/not applicable</i>	174	
If available, which method would you rather receive your test results?		
In person at the clinic	79 (39%)	32 – 42%
By telephone	85 (42%)	41 – 54%
By email	31 (15%)	11 – 14%
By SMS	7 (4%)	3 – 8%
<i>Missing</i>	67	

I would have concerns about my confidentiality if an email or SMS system for accessing test results was introduced

Yes	101 (49%)	46 - 53%
No	75 (37%)	35 - 40%
Not sure	29 (14%)	6 - 15%
<i>Missing/not applicable</i>	64	

"Not applicable" indicates no telephone contact with MSHC

ARRIVING AT THE CENTRE

Clients were asked a series of questions relating to arriving at MSHC and the front-line services they received. Generally encouraging results were received for the welcome at reception (84%); 5% indicated that they did not feel welcomed by the reception staff, and 12% were not sure.

The majority of respondents (93%) used their real name for registration and 49% preferred to be called from the waiting room by their first name and date of birth followed by 37% preferring to be called by their first name only. One client suggested using a numbering system linked to arrival instead of calling out names.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
The reception staff made me feel welcome		
Strongly Agree	78 (30%)	33 – 39%
Agree	140 (54%)	47 - 58%
Not sure	31 (12%)	4 - 7%
Disagree	8 (3%)	4 – 5%
Strongly Disagree	4 (2%)	1 - 4%
<i>Missing</i>	8	
Did you use your real name when you registered?		
Yes	242 (93%)	90 - 92%
No	13 (5%)	6 - 7%
Prefer not to say	5 (2%)	2%
<i>Missing</i>	9	
In which way would you prefer to be called from the waiting room? By your:		
First name and date of birth	101 (49%)	N/A
First name only	75 (37%)	N/A
Clinic number	29 (14%)	N/A
Full name	6 (2%)	N/A
Surname only	1 (1%)	N/A
<i>Missing</i>	10	
<i>"Missing" indicates that the person declined to answer the question</i>		

The majority of respondents (76%) either read the information provided to them by staff or in the reception area or had a brief look at it. The most popular/read pamphlets are:

- General information about the visit
- Genital herpes
- HIV Antibody tests
- Genital warts
- Hepatitis A
- Hepatitis B
- Hepatitis C

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
I read the information pamphlets provided by reception staff or in reception		
Yes	128 (50%)	47 – 64%
No	62 (24%)	16 - 28%
I had a brief look	66 (26%)	18 - 31%
<i>Missing</i>	<i>13</i>	
Type of information read (Allowed multiple responses)		
During your visit	71 (26%)	16 - 42%
Genital herpes	45 (17%)	12 - 20%
HIV Antibody Test	37 (14%)	7 - 21%
Hepatitis A	21 (8%)	8 - 18%
Hepatitis B	28 (10%)	9 - 17%
Hepatitis C	29 (11%)	9 - 19%
Genital warts	32 (12%)	10 - 15%
MSHC Services	26 (10%)	6 - 23%
HPV	18 (7%)	4 - 13%
K.I.S.S. Guide to Safe Sex	8 (3%)	4 - 8%
Pap smear	22 (8%)	4 - 10%
Urethritis	11 (4%)	3 - 7%
Counselling Services	23 (9%)	2 - 8%
Health Records Act 2001	8 (3%)	1 - 5%
Don't remember	46 (17%)	7 - 16%
<i>"Missing" indicates that the person declined to answer the question</i>		

Of those respondents who read the information pamphlets, 93% agreed that they found them useful, compared to 88% in 2007 and 2006 and 92% in 2005. Of the respondents who viewed the multimedia screens, 61% found them useful, 31% were not sure and the remaining 7% found them not useful.

Compared to past years, very few comments were received about the lack of non-STI related reading material with one client suggesting reading material to include information about pro-choice issues and counselling, and another requesting more information on types of vaccinations

available. Another two clients suggested having tea, coffee and TV in the waiting area because of the long wait.

On the whole positive results were received in regard to waiting times to see the triage nurse and a practitioner for the main consultation, although lower than previous years. In 2008, 83% of respondents agreed to some degree that waiting time to see a triage nurse was reasonable compared to 92% in 2007. In addition, 75% agreed that the waiting time to see a practitioner was reasonable compared to 83% to 86% in earlier surveys.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
I found the information pamphlets useful		
Strongly Agree	42 (22%)	20 - 32%
Agree	137 (71%)	60 - 68%
Not sure	14 (7%)	8 - 11%
Disagree	0	0%
Strongly Disagree	1 (1%)	1%
<i>Missing</i>	75	
I found the multimedia screens useful		
Strongly Agree	34 (15%)	8%
Agree	104 (46%)	35 - 40%
Not sure	70 (31%)	43 - 46%
Disagree	11 (5%)	7 - 9%
Strongly Disagree	5 (2%)	1 - 2%
<i>Missing</i>	45	
The time I waited to see the triage nurse was reasonable		
Strongly Agree	55 (21%)	29 - 36%
Agree	161 (62%)	59 - 63%
Not sure	14 (5%)	3 - 4%
Disagree	17 (7%)	2 - 4%
Strongly Disagree	1 (1%)	0 - 1%
<i>Did not see the triage nurse</i>	12	
<i>Missing</i>	8	
The time I waited to see a practitioner was reasonable		
Strongly Agree	54 (21%)	26 - 31%
Agree	141 (54%)	55 - 58%
Not sure	29 (11%)	7 - 8%
Disagree	31 (12%)	6 - 7%
Strongly Disagree	5 (2%)	0 - 2%
<i>Missing</i>	9	
<i>"Missing" indicates that the person declined to answer the question</i>		

SERVICES RECEIVED AT THE CENTRE

Clients were asked a series of questions relating to the services they received at Melbourne Sexual Health Centre. The majority saw a doctor for the main consultation and most respondents received a genital examination, blood tests or urine tests.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
For my main consultation I saw a:		
Doctor	165 (64%)	63 - 67%
Nurse	65 (25%)	23 - 30%
Counsellor	1 (1%)	1%
Not sure	27 (11%)	3 - 10%
<i>Missing</i>	11	
What services did you receive at MSHC today? Allowed multiple responses		
Genital examination	150 (58%)	64 - 69%
Blood tests	152 (59%)	61 - 65%
Urine Tests	163 (63%)	55 - 67%
Information/ advice	101 (39%)	34 - 42%
Treatment	81 (31%)	27 - 30%
Specimen collection	92 (36%)	29 - 43%
Test results	71 (28%)	21 - 26%
Vaccination	38 (15%)	13 - 16%
Counseling	13 (5%)	4 - 12%
Other	4 (2%)	1 - 4%
<i>Missing</i>	11	
<i>"Missing" indicates that the person declined to answer the question</i>		

The following results have also remained consistent since 2005. Respondents agreed or strongly agreed to questions relating to:

- comfort level in discussing personal matters: 97%; 98% in 2007, 2006 and 2005
- understanding procedures which were carried out: 99%; 98% in 2007, 99% in 2006, and 100% in 2005
- the professionalism of the practitioners: 98% in 2008 and 2007 to almost 100% in both 2006 and 2005
- feeling more informed about sexual health post-visit: 95%; 91% in 2007 to 94% in both 2006 and 2005
- confidentiality of information: 94%; in 2007, 91% of respondents believed that medical information collected at MSHC will be kept confidential compared to 94% in 2006 and 98% in 2005
- opportunity to ask questions: 97%; 99% in 2007 and 2005, and 98% in 2006
- a personal sense of control over what happens during the visit: 96%; 88% in 2007 compared to 96% in both 2006 and 2005
- experience of using the pharmacy: positive feedback was recorded from 96%; 100% in both 2007 and 2005, compared to 96% of the users in 2006

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
The practitioner made me feel comfortable to discuss sexual health matters		
Strongly Agree	169 (65%)	55 - 69%
Agree	83 (32%)	29 - 43%
Not sure	4 (2%)	1%
Disagree	3 (1%)	0 - 1%
Strongly disagree	1 (1%)	0 - 1%
<i>Missing</i>	8	
I understood the procedures that were carried out today		
Strongly Agree	147 (57%)	50 - 65%
Agree	108 (42%)	35 - 48%
Not sure	5 (2%)	1 - 2%
Disagree	0	0
Strongly disagree	0	0
<i>Missing</i>	9	
I did have the opportunity to ask questions		
Strongly Agree	159 (61%)	57 - 67%
Agree	95 (36%)	32 - 42%
Not sure	2 (1%)	0 - 1%
Disagree	3 (1%)	0 - 1%
Strongly Disagree	2 (1%)	0 - 1%
<i>Missing</i>	8	
The practitioner treated me in a professional manner		
Strongly Agree	183 (71%)	62 - 76%
Agree	71 (27%)	24 - 36%
Not sure	3 (1%)	0 - 1%
Disagree	2 (1%)	0 - 1%
Strongly Disagree	0	0 - 1%
<i>Missing</i>	10	
I believe that medical information collected by MSHC will be kept confidential		
Strongly Agree	153 (58%)	53 - 65%
Agree	94 (36%)	33 - 38%
Not sure	14 (5%)	2 - 8%
Disagree	0	0 - 1%
Strongly Disagree	1 (1%)	0 - 1%
<i>Missing</i>	7	

VARIABLE	2007 No. (%)	2005 – 2007 Range %
I felt in control over what happened to me today		
Strongly Agree	144 (55%)	45 - 58%
Agree	107 (41%)	38 - 43%
Not sure	8 (3%)	3 - 5%
Disagree	3 (1%)	1 - 31%
Strongly Disagree	0	1%
<i>Missing</i>	7	
I feel more informed about my sexual health after visiting MSHC today		
Strongly Agree	125 (48%)	44 - 55%
Agree	124 (47%)	39 - 47%
Not sure	10 (4%)	4 - 7%
Disagree	3 (1%)	2 - 3%
Strongly disagree	0	0 - 1%
<i>Missing</i>	7	
Describe your experience of using the Pharmacy		
Very good	98 (65%)	64 - 67%
Good	47 (31%)	32 - 34%
Not sure	5 (3%)	0 - 2%
Poor	1 (1%)	0 - 1%
Very poor	1 (1%)	0
<i>I did not use the Pharmacy</i>	107 (41%)	41 - 52%
<i>Missing</i>	10	

INTRODUCING ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION AND CLIENT RECORDS

MSHC introduced computerized registration and questionnaires in 2008 to obtain part of clients' medical histories that includes names and contact details, general health, lifestyle and sexual behaviour. This information is obtained in a private and secure manner. Clients were asked how they felt about providing these details electronically before (2007) and after implementation (2008).

Prior to implementation, the majority of clients were in agreement about providing registration, general health, and sexual behaviour details (74%, 70%, and 61% respectively). Significantly more clients in 2008 were in agreement following usage of the system (90%, 88% and 84% respectively). Clients were asked to provide comments and these were largely around privacy and security concerns and apprehension with using computers. Some felt that it would make processes quicker and easier. In relation to providing sexual health behaviour details, some clients said that they preferred to discuss these details face-to-face while others suggested it would be easier especially for shy people. In 2008, a few clients commented that it was one of the best things that they liked about MSHC

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)
I am prepared to use a computer to provide my registration details		
Strongly Agree	117 (45%)	44 (24%)
Agree	117 (45%)	92 (50%)
Not sure	8 (3%)	35 (19%)
Disagree	8 (3%)	7 (4%)
Strongly disagree	2 (1%)	8 (4%)
Did not use	7 (3%)	
<i>Missing</i>	7	16
I would be prepared to use a computer to provide general details of my health		
Strongly Agree	93 (37%)	34 (18%)
Agree	128 (51%)	100 (52%)
Not sure	15 (6%)	39 (20%)
Disagree	5 (2%)	13 (7%)
Strongly disagree	3 (1%)	7 (4%)
Did not use	5 (2%)	
<i>Missing</i>	20	9
I would be prepared to use a computer to provide details of my lifestyle and sexual behaviour in a private and secure manner before my consultation		
Strongly Agree	87 (35%)	33 (17%)
Agree	121 (49%)	84 (44%)
Not sure	19 (8%)	45 (23%)
Disagree	7 (3%)	24 (12%)
Strongly disagree	6 (2%)	7 (4%)
Did not use	9 (4%)	
<i>Missing</i>	20	9

The clients were also asked for their views in 2008 and 2007 on the use of electronic medical records to record their histories by doctors and nurses during their consultation. Although the majority of clients (55% and 56%) indicated that using electronic records was not less personal than using a paper record, a fair proportion were unsure (18% and 16%), and 29% reported that it would be less personal. The comments received were mixed, where some clients felt clinicians would be distracted and there would be less eye contact, whereas others thought it would improve consultations and is part of the natural progression to computerization.

Similarly, the majority of clients would reveal their personal details about their medical history (64%), while a fair proportion were unsure (19%) and 17% recorded that they would be less inclined to reveal their personal details. The comments received were mainly concerns for confidentiality and security, whereas some felt the process would become more efficient and environmentally friendlier.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)	2007 No. (%)
If a doctor or nurse was using an electronic record during my consultation I would feel that the consultation was less personal than if a paper record was used		
Strongly Agree	17 (7%)	21 (11%)
Agree	55 (22%)	34 (18%)
Not sure	40 (16%)	35 (18%)
Disagree	101 (41%)	72 (38%)
Strongly disagree	34 (14%)	30 (16%)
<i>Missing</i>	22	10
If a doctor or nurse was using an electronic record during my consultation I would be less inclined to reveal personal details about my medical history		
Strongly Agree	10 (4%)	11 (6%)
Agree	33 (13%)	23 (12%)
Not sure	46 (19%)	37 (19%)
Disagree	111 (45%)	83 (44%)
Strongly disagree	46 (19%)	37 (19%)
<i>Missing</i>	23	11

SEXUAL HEALTH CONSULTATIONS

Melbourne Sexual Health Centre is constantly investigating innovative ways to improve the services provided including finding alternatives to distributing the service to the broader community of Victoria. Clients were asked for their views about using phone consultations or secure webcam consultations with a doctor if they lived a far distance from the Centre explaining that their samples for testing and treatment could be sent by post.

While the majority of clients said they were likely to use a phone consult (41%), 24% were not sure and 36% were unlikely to use one. The comments provided about using a phone consult varied with some clients preferring face to face consultations, others having concerns about getting things wrong without an examination and were worried about how blood tests would be performed and some thought it would be convenient.

Conversely, the majority of clients were not likely to make use of a secure webcam consultation with a doctor (48%), while 21% were not sure and 31% would make use of webcam consultation. The comments provided were related to security and being recorded with their face being visible, not owning a webcam and again preferring face to face consultations.

VARIABLE	2008 No. (%)
If available, would you make use of a phone consultation service with a doctor for the health issue you have attended the centre for today?	
Strongly Agree	28 (12%)
Agree	67 (29%)
Not sure	55 (24%)
Disagree	55 (24%)
Strongly disagree	27 (12%)
<i>Missing</i>	37
If available, would you make use of a consultation with a doctor via a secure webcam?	
Strongly Agree	26 (11%)
Agree	46 (20%)
Not sure	49 (21%)
Disagree	66 (28%)
Strongly disagree	46 (20%)
<i>Missing</i>	36

OVERALL SATISFACTION

Clients were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the service provided at MSHC. A consistently high positive rating of 97% satisfaction was recorded and has been recorded since 2004 (97 – 99%).

Six respondents said they were unsure of their satisfaction with the service. Of these, five said they would attend the service again, and one was not sure. This female client was unsure of her comfort level; was not sure of being given an opportunity to ask questions and of being more informed about her sexual health after her visit. The other five clients' who were unsure of their level of satisfaction could be associated with waiting and opening times; would prefer to have an appointment system or it was too far to travel. One female client reported that her nurse and doctor were judgmental, made her feel unwelcome and were rough during the examination. Her previous visit had been satisfactory.

One male client was very dissatisfied with the service and strongly disagreed with: "urgent access;" the phone service being helpful and informative; reception being welcoming; was not sure if the waiting time for triage nurse and clinician was reasonable; but said he would attend again.

There was only one male client who said he would not use the service again. He indicated that he was satisfied with the service, but found the telephone service unhelpful; was unsure about reception staff making him feel being welcome and what he liked least about the clinic was that it was not limited to homosexuals.

VARIABLE	2007 No. (%)	2005 – 2006 Range %
Overall, I am satisfied with the services at MSHC		
Very satisfied	179 (71%)	65 - 76%
Satisfied	63 (26%)	22 - 33%
Unsure	6 (2%)	1 - 2%
Dissatisfied	0	0 - 1%
Very dissatisfied	1 (1%)	1 - 2%
<i>Missing</i>	10	
If the need arose, I would attend MSHC again		
Yes	249 (99%)	97 - 98%
No	1 (1%)	0 - 1%
Not sure	1 (1%)	1 - 2%
<i>Missing</i>	17	

Clients were asked what they like best and least about MSHC. The results are summarized from clients who offered between one and three comments in categories below and compared with 2005 and 2007. Overall, the majority of respondents rated staff and feeling comfortable best, followed by efficiency and the service provided and then accessibility.

VARIABLE	2008	2005 - 2007 2005
A summary of what clients like <i>BEST</i> about the Centre (based on top 3)		
Staff and comfort	162	119 - 195
Efficiency and service	87	62 - 72
Easy access/free	73	35 - 51
Facilities and information	60	38 - 50
Confidentiality	36	21 - 29
Location	15	10 - 19

In 2007, once again waiting times was what clients liked least about the Centre followed by the opening hours and the facilities.

VARIABLE	2008	2005 - 2007 2005
A summary of what clients like <i>LEAST</i> about the Centre (based on top 3)		
Waiting times/no appointments	78	35 - 46
Facilities	33	13 - 28
Embarrassment/stigma of attending	13	6 - 19
Opening hours	8	8 - 10
Staff	7	9 - 13
Location	3	7 - 15

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

The aim of the client satisfaction survey is to measure their satisfaction with the services provided at MSHC and to identify areas for improvement. The results indicate overwhelmingly that clients remain satisfied with the staff and the way that the centre operates. Areas of dissatisfaction where staff at MSHC have the ability to affect are:

- waiting times
- waiting room facilities
- approach to clients

Waiting times


While the Centre recognises that some clients may experience lengthy waiting times, providing a Centre that operates to maximise access to clients with acute symptoms or urgent needs has greater benefits to public health, and in particular to transmission rates of sexually transmitted infections (STIs).

While waiting times continue to be an issue of dissatisfaction among clients, cross-tabulation of results showed that of 77 respondents who listed waiting times as what they liked least about MSHC, only 20 disagreed/ strongly disagreed that they waited a “reasonable time” to see a practitioner. Many who indicated that waiting was a problem also expressed some understanding and acceptance towards this issue. Additionally, 18 of these 77 respondents reported that one of the things they liked best about MSHC was that the service was either “fast” or efficient and the no appointment policy.

The average waiting time to see a triage nurse was 13 minutes and 90% of clients were seen in 14 minutes in 2008 (Figure 3). During the week of the survey, 90% of clients were seen by the triage nurse within seven minutes of arrival. On average in 2008, clients were seen by a practitioner within 42 minutes of arrival and 90% of clients were seen within 61 minutes. During the survey week, on average clients were seen by a clinician within 50 minutes, and 90% were seen within 41 minutes.

The average time spent in the clinic was 61 minutes and 90% of clients completed their visit within two hours. The Staff have continued to do their best to ensure that clients are not kept waiting longer than is reasonable. The waiting time statistics have been slowly increasing since 2006 and this is not surprising given that the total number of services provided in 2006 was 28,826 compared to 31,571 in 2008.

Figure 3



Waiting room facilities

Comments received about the waiting area included the décor, that the size needs to be larger, men and women together and seats facing other people were a source of embarrassment and suggestions of TV, tea and coffee were singular comments.

Staff and clients

All staff are once again to be highly commended for their continued professionalism, compassion and understanding towards clients. The general results of the survey continue to show that the majority of clients feel that the approach of staff is welcoming and positive, and directly relates to their comfort levels in using the service.

As expected, the survey did contain some negative comments about staff. While these comments are in the minority they serve as a reminder that clients do observe and are affected by our approach and provide us with an opportunity to reflect on ourselves.

MELBOURNE SEXUAL HEALTH CENTRE
ANNUAL REPORT & CLIENT SATISFACTION SURVEY
2008

