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Utilization of Patient Satisfaction Data at Geisinger

Performance improvement
Provider evaluation and compensation
Manager/executive goals and compensation
Health care delivery and outcomes research
Measurement of Patient Experience at Geisinger

Geisinger contracts with Press Ganey Associates to assess patient feedback using the following survey tools:

- **Medical Practice** (ambulatory care)
- Inpatient Hospital
- Children’s Hospital
- Emergency Departments
- Ambulatory Surgery
- Behavioral Medicine
- Urgent Care Services
- Dental Medicine and Oral Surgery
Press Ganey
Medical Practice Report

Access to care
Visit
Nurse/assistant
Care provider (physician/midlevel provider)
Personal issues
Overall assessment
Press Ganey
Medical Practice Report

Care provider (physician/midlevel provider):
- Friendliness/courtesy
- Quality of explanations
- Concern for questions
- Inclusion in decisions
- Information about medications
- Follow-up instructions
- Use of clear language
- Time spent
- Confidence in provider
- Likelihood to recommend
The Value of Specialty-Specific Patient Satisfaction Data

Performance improvement:
- Facilitates focused efforts in areas of opportunity

Provider evaluation:
- Enhances the credibility of the data
- Levels the playing field
- Recognizes the real differences in patient populations and practices
Two Physicians’ Press Ganey “Care Provider” Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physician</th>
<th>Provider Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Physicians’ Press Ganey “Care Provider” Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physician</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Provider Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Medical Oncology</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Two Physicians’ Press Ganey “Care Provider” Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physician</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Provider Score</th>
<th>Percentile Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Medical Oncology</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Specialty Scores at Major Percentiles
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Specialty Groups</th>
<th>Percentile 05</th>
<th>Percentile 25</th>
<th>Percentile 50</th>
<th>Percentile 75</th>
<th>Percentile 95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Practice</td>
<td>87.40</td>
<td>91.13</td>
<td>92.61</td>
<td>93.71</td>
<td>94.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>85.66</td>
<td>91.21</td>
<td>92.76</td>
<td>94.19</td>
<td>95.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetrics/Gynecology</td>
<td>88.12</td>
<td>91.62</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td>94.49</td>
<td>96.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedics</td>
<td>83.95</td>
<td>89.21</td>
<td>91.32</td>
<td>92.84</td>
<td>94.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>86.52</td>
<td>91.32</td>
<td>93.17</td>
<td>94.63</td>
<td>95.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery, General</td>
<td>88.13</td>
<td>91.47</td>
<td>93.04</td>
<td>94.18</td>
<td>95.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>86.68</td>
<td>90.33</td>
<td>91.96</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td>95.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular Disease</td>
<td>88.82</td>
<td>91.97</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>94.43</td>
<td>95.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastroenterology</td>
<td>86.55</td>
<td>90.36</td>
<td>91.71</td>
<td>92.90</td>
<td>94.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otolaryngology</td>
<td>85.15</td>
<td>89.58</td>
<td>91.44</td>
<td>92.96</td>
<td>94.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary Disease</td>
<td>89.36</td>
<td>92.20</td>
<td>93.31</td>
<td>94.54</td>
<td>95.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
<td>86.53</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>92.20</td>
<td>93.67</td>
<td>94.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>85.95</td>
<td>90.52</td>
<td>92.13</td>
<td>93.89</td>
<td>95.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endocrinology</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td>91.57</td>
<td>92.81</td>
<td>93.99</td>
<td>95.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheumatology</td>
<td>88.32</td>
<td>91.72</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>94.72</td>
<td>96.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urology</td>
<td>87.99</td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td>91.80</td>
<td>93.15</td>
<td>94.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncology, Medical</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>93.39</td>
<td>94.43</td>
<td>95.16</td>
<td>96.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiology (Interventional)</td>
<td>89.18</td>
<td>91.39</td>
<td>93.37</td>
<td>94.39</td>
<td>95.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrology</td>
<td>89.14</td>
<td>91.91</td>
<td>93.30</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>96.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery, Cardiovascular</td>
<td>91.75</td>
<td>92.91</td>
<td>93.87</td>
<td>94.42</td>
<td>95.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of Specialty Scores
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Distribution of Specialty Scores
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95th Percentile by Specialty

- Onc
- Peds
- Ob/Gyn
- Ortho
- Gastro
- Otlaryn

PG Score

93.5 - 96.5
Care Provider Section Scores

Highest patient-rated specialties:
- Medical oncology
- Pediatrics
- Ob/Gyn

Lowest patient-rated specialties:
- Orthopedics
- Gastroenterology
- Otolaryngology

Source: © 2011 Press Ganey Associates
Comparison of Physician Specialty Scores 
Clinician & Group CAHPS

“…a comparison of top box scores across specialty categories for the Adult Primary care Survey with the 6-point response scale shows a high degree of similarity for both the composite and doctor rating question”

AHRQ: Preliminary Data for the CAHPS Clinician & Group Survey
CAHPS Clinician and Group Survey Preliminary Data (www.cahps/ahrq/gov)

- Doctor Composite Score
  - All Specialties (N=128,030)
  - Family Practice (N=15,972)
  - Int Med (N=99,603)
  - Other Primary Care: GP, Ob/Gyn, Peds, Geriatrics (N=6,995)
  - Other Specialty: Card, ED, Nephro, Psych, Rheum (N=4,353)
Factors Affecting
the Patient’s Experience

Nature of the patient-provider relationship
   – Continuity, acute, episodic, and/or consultative

Outcome
   – Cure versus chronic disease
   – Symptom relief versus ongoing pain or disability
   – Desired life event
   – Certainty versus uncertainty

Culture and aura of the specialty
Using Specialty-Specific Data to Improve the Patient Experience

Enhanced credibility of the data gets better buy-in from leaders and providers

– Eliminates one barrier to data acceptance:
  “Our patients are always in pain, so of course they rate us lower.”
– Generates motivating discrepancy between “us” and “ideal:”
  “I wonder what they do in that 95th percentile endocrinology practice?”
Improving the patient experience should lead to improved health outcomes that will vary by specialty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endocrinology</td>
<td>Motivational Interviewing</td>
<td>Reduced HgA1C, HTN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalists</td>
<td>Know caregiver Teachback discharge instructions</td>
<td>Reduced readmissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care Providers</td>
<td>Elicit low back pain concerns</td>
<td>Reduced imaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different specialty, different culture, different patient expectations, different training.

Ob/Gyn
Endocrinology
General Internal Medicine
Nephrology
Hospitalists
Primary Care
Effective communication skills vary by specialty

EXAMPLE:
- Family Practice: Elicit Patient Perspective on patient illness and treatment
- Cardiology: “You tell me, you’re the expert.”
Specialty-Specific Training

Allows focus on all team members of particular specialties:

EXAMPLES:
- Children’s Hospital
- Endocrinology
- Hospitalists
- Ob/Gyn
Summary

There are real and significant differences in the patient’s experience that vary among different medical and surgical specialties.

To accurately assess a practitioner’s performance, it is important to use same-specialty data rather than “all specialists” data.
Summary

In fact, the orthopedists are right. They are special, but so is everyone else.
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