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Abstract  

The MD Anderson Cancer Center Colorectal Survivorship Clinic conducted a baseline patient satisfaction survey to determine the initial level of satisfaction with the multidisciplinary care patients received at the clinic. The results of this baseline survey will be used to increase the effectiveness of the Colorectal Survivorship Clinic and will be compared to the results of a second survey after the survivorship program has been implemented in this clinic.

There were twenty-four responses to the baseline survey. The majority of respondents rated MD Anderson either very good or good in the degree to which the staff addressed their emotional needs (95.8%); the degree to which their care was well coordinated among their doctors and other caregivers (91.6%); and the overall rating of care given at their survivorship visit (95.7%).

Respondents were asked to indicate if they received information on 18 topics. Information was received by at least ten patients on only four of these topics: cancer education and recurrences, cancer screening, fatigue, and pain. All (100%) of the respondents were either very satisfied or satisfied with the information they received on all four of these topics.

Comparisons with prior studies could not be provided as the survey questions changed from the prior survey.

When respondents were asked what suggestions they had to make their clinic visit better, a majority of them had positive comments about their visit. There were four comments about their wonderful or professional interaction with the faculty and staff and four comments about excellent care or a good experience. There were also two suggestions about how to improve appointment scheduling.

The results of the survey were favorable since patients’ ratings in the first part of the survey were uniformly above 90% and the patients’ level of satisfaction was at least 85% with the information they received on the topics listed in the second part of the survey. Less than ten respondents received information on the majority of these topics (14/18 or 77.8%), which may be attributed to the relatively small number of respondents or that the respondents did not know the listed services were available. We suggest that advertising available services to the patients may result in more patient inquiries for information.