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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Methodology – Beginning in 2008, the Sentara Laboratory Services Client Satisfaction Survey adjusted its surveying tactics by reaching out to primary clinical decision-makers and providers via an online survey tool to enhance the survey process and more accurately measure client satisfaction. For the fifth time, the Sentara Laboratory Services Client Satisfaction survey was made available to respondents via the online survey interface provided by Survey Monkey/Zoomerang. An internet link was sent to all clients, physicians, nurse practitioners and physician assistants available in the Sentara Laboratory Services database via fax, email and as a logon ‘splash’ message for 4Medica users. The survey was sent to clients in the Hampton Roads, and did not include clients serviced by Sentara Albermarle. In addition, a link to the survey was posted on the Sentara Laboratory Services website at www.sentara.com/lab and respondents were given the option of submitting a survey via fax or post. During the survey open time of April 2016 to August 2016, respondents were sent reminders via fax and email to take the survey.

The survey was designed to measure the level of satisfaction that Sentara Laboratory clients have with regard to a wide variety of services including, clinical testing, online ordering and result retrieval, courier services, patient service centers, phlebotomy services, client services, marketing and sales, and billing. Respondents were asked to rate aspects of service on a classic five point Likert scale. Additionally, respondents were allowed to submit detailed comments and were asked open-ended questions in an effort to measure their perception, opinions and beliefs about Sentara Laboratory Services.

Beginning in 2014, respondents were asked to identify their role within a client practice. This question was asked to gauge satisfaction amongst a narrower segment of our client base. Benchmarks established in 2012 regarding the usage of EMRs, awareness of the Sentara SelfTest product and an overall ten point service rating show continued opportunities for service improvement. For the first time respondents were asked more in-depth questions about their experience with 4Medica online ordering.

Conclusions – Sentara Laboratory Services has undertaken several, long-term projects since the 2014 Client Satisfaction Survey and we are pleased to see improvements have been made in several areas since that survey. However there remain areas that have room for growth and improvement. Expansion into new markets, construction projects, and billing functions moving in house from an outside vendor, all had a significant impact on the 2016 Client Satisfaction Survey.

The overall service rating, improved compared to the 2014 (6.49) rating to 7.17 in 2016. Among the recommendations are the following:

- Continue efforts to improve customer service delivered by front line employees;
- Continue efforts to improve order entry accuracy and client communication;
- Continue expansion of internet-based ordering and result retrieval, and improve compatibility with a wider variety of EMR platforms;
- Continue efforts to improve Billing experience;
OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the Sentara Laboratory Services Client Satisfaction Survey is to measure and describe what the departments do well and highlight the areas of opportunities that exist, all in an effort to improve the quality of diagnostic testing services. Clients were surveyed during April 2016 through August 2016. Specific areas of interest for this Satisfaction Study which examined respondent satisfaction are as follows:

Clinical Testing
- Accuracy of results
- Turnaround time of routine and PAP test results
- Knowledge/helpfulness of Technical Staff
- Overall satisfaction with Clinical Testing

Online Ordering and Result Retrieval
- Awareness of and use of 4Medica or other online ordering platforms
- Use of electronic medical records (EMRs)
- Overall satisfaction with 4Medica online ordering

Anatomic and Clinical Pathology Services
- Awareness of locally based pathology groups affiliated with Sentara Laboratory Services
- Availability as resource

Courier Staff
- Knowledge/helpfulness of Courier
- Number of pickups per day
- Timeliness of delivery and pick-up
- Satisfaction with supply ordering & delivery
- Overall satisfaction with Courier services

Patient Service Centers
- Convenience of Patient Service Centers
- Overall satisfaction with PSC hours of operation
- Suggestions for new PSC locations

Phlebotomy Services for Nursing Home Clients
- Convenience of Phlebotomy schedule
- Standards and performance of phlebotomist
- Overall satisfaction with Phlebotomy services

Client Services
- Wait time for calls to be answered
- Knowledge/helpfulness of Client Services Staff
- Ability to obtain appropriate technical information
- Overall satisfaction with obtaining reports
- Overall satisfaction with Client Services
Marketing and Sales
- Frequency of contact with Sales/Marketing Representative
- Knowledge/helpfulness of Sales/Marketing Representative
- Ability of Sales/Marketing Representative to solve problems and answer questions
- Ability to reach Sales/Marketing Representative via phone/email
- Overall satisfaction with Marketing and Sales

Processing and Billing
- Convenience of billing system
- Accuracy of monthly bills
- Timeliness in resolving issues
- Sentara Laboratory pricing of testing services
- Overall satisfaction with Billing Services

Additionally, respondents were given the opportunity to add comments on many questions and were specifically asked to offer open-ended comments on:

- External laboratories other than Sentara used for diagnostic services
- Interest in meeting with Clinical staff
- Awareness of 4Medica online system
- Awareness of Sentara SelfTest direct access testing service
- Overall satisfaction with Sentara Laboratory Services
- Comments about how to improve diagnostic services
RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Continue efforts to improve customer service delivered by front line employees, with particular focus on Client Services
The Client Services and Phlebotomy Services displayed a decrease in scores related to professional standards. Although the declines in these departments were marginal, it may indicate that the attention to customer service is still needed. A thorough review of staffing levels, customer service training or the development of new service tools may be required to better equip team members so they may provide a higher level of customer service to a larger pool of clients. Additional development of training and resources may be needed so that Client Services staff may be able to handle more technical calls without relying on transferring clients to techs in the laboratory.

2) Continue efforts to improve order entry accuracy and client communication
Gains were made in 2016 with regards to turnaround time, but respondents continue to express opportunities for improvement with processing, and ordering of requested test. Beginning in January of 2017 Sentara Laboratory Services are reviewing Requisition order forms to aid in ordering of tests and to minimize test inaccuracies.

3) Continue expansion of internet-based ordering and result retrieval, and improve compatibility with a wider variety of EMR platforms.
Since 2006, the number of clients that use the Internet to retrieve results/order laboratory testing has increased dramatically. Users give the 4Medica system high marks. A number of processing, billing and result retrieval efficiencies result from adopting online methods of ordering and testing, thus making further implementation of the 4Medica system a worthy activity. As the use of EMRs continue to grow, enhanced compatibility between Sentara’s laboratory information system and a wider variety of EMR platforms would enhance the client experience. As well as direct order entry from 4Medica to Beaker/Epic.

4) Improve Billing experience
Efforts are already underway to improve efficiency and client experience with Billing, as a new project began in the fall 2016. Additional opportunities to improve the entire billing process - include client education, reducing write-offs and customer service training. Other issues may be identified and integrated into a comprehensive, short and long term improvement plan.
SAMPLE METHODOLOGY

For the fifth time, the SLS Client Satisfaction Survey data was collected electronically via an online interface. The 2016 survey tool was loaded into the Survey Monkey/Zoomerang internet based survey software. The internet link to the 2016 Client Satisfaction Survey hosted at Survey Monkey/Zoomerang, was sent via fax to 1,434 Sentara Laboratory Services clients, emailed to 225 client email addresses on file, posted on the Sentara website and linked within a login splash page for 4Medica users.

The Survey Monkey/Zoomerang survey software platform is reliable, providing respondents with anonymity and integrity of data. Additionally, the survey was built to allow for only one survey to be taken per IP address to help insure reliability of data. For clients that chose not to take the survey online, respondents were given the option of requesting a paper survey by mail/fax to be added to online survey data collected. All survey respondents were instructed to complete online or return completed surveys by August 2016.

A total of 61 surveys were completed online or returned via fax by the due date. This response rate reflects a significant decline in total number of responses when compared to the record of 671 responses obtained in 2012 and 228 responses in 2014. **Overall, the response rate is approximately 4%**.

Respondents were asked to report their satisfaction levels on a wide variety of services provided by Sentara Reference Laboratory. Most questions relied upon the five point Likert scale, with “1” being the lowest rating to “5” as the highest. A variety of statistical procedures were performed on the factors, including descriptive statistics (means and frequencies) and correlations. Respondents were also given the opportunity to describe in detail any service issues. Verbatim comments (when submitted) are included following each question.
OVERVIEW
Responses by Client Location

Respondents were asked to identify the location(s) of their practice(s). Keeping in mind that many clients have practices located throughout Hampton Roads, they were asked to check any and all locations where they practice. In the chart below, beside the name of the city is the percentage of responses coming from that location.

The location of respondents is diverse and representative of the entire Hampton Roads region. Over half (56%) of Sentara Laboratory Services clients reported having practices located in Hampton Roads’ largest markets of Norfolk (27.6%) and Virginia Beach (29.3%). Responses from other cities that comprise Hampton Roads are also of significance in addition to the growth of responses from the outlying, more rural areas our service area, indicate outreach efforts are effective and coincide with expansion of Sentara Healthcare.

In what city is your practice located?

![Pie chart showing percentage of responses by city in Hampton Roads region]
OVERVIEW
Percentage of Responses by Type of Practice

The majority of respondents (32.8%) identify as a “Specialty Practice” while a slightly smaller percentage identify as a “Primary Care Practice” (20.7%). However, most respondents felt their practice fell into the “Other” category. In future surveys, more options about the nature of their practice should be provided in the survey so that better, more detailed data can be collected.

Included among “Other” are the following specialties:

- Home Health
- Free clinic
- Academic institution
- Occupational Health
- Hospital lab
- Urgent Care
- Public Health
- Government institution
OVERVIEW
Percentage of Responses by Role within Practice

Following a suggestion from the 2012 Client Satisfaction Survey, respondents were asked to identify their role within their respective practice. Nearly half of respondents (51%) identified as clinical providers (MDs, NPs & PAs) or nurses, providing additional insight into these groups perception about the services provided by Sentara Laboratory Services.
**CLINICAL TESTING**

Respondents were asked to rate five factors related to clinical testing, including an overall rating, based on the five-point Likert (with 1 being a ‘poor’ and 5 being an ‘excellent’ ranking.) Each service ranking includes percentage rankings for each rating and the Likert means from the 2010, 2012, and 2014 surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate the following aspects of Clinical Testing?</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Very Good (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
<th>Likert Mean All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of testing and results</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time (TAT) on routine test results</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time (TAT) on PAP test results</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround time (TAT) on STAT test results</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/helpfulness of technical staff</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall performance of Clinical Testing</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents answering “N/A” were factored out of Likert mean calculations.
**Accuracy of Testing & Results**
Client satisfaction with the accuracy of testing and results declined slightly overall to 3.81 in 2016 compared to the 2014 survey mean of 3.85 and the 2012 survey mean of 3.88. Nearly two-thirds (60%) rate this aspect of service as “Very Good” or “Excellent” with another 25% of clients assigning accuracy of testing and results a Good” rating.

**TAT on Routine Test Results**
Client satisfaction with turnaround time (TAT) on routine test results has improved since 2014 and achieved its highest marks since 2010 with a Likert mean of 3.72. More than half (53%) rate this aspect of service as “Very Good” or “Excellent” with another 25% of clients assigning accuracy of testing and results a Good” rating.

**TAT on PAP Testing**
Despite continued efforts to improve processing and reporting, the rating for turnaround time (TAT) on PAP testing saw no change with an overall mean of 3.51 on the Likert scale in 2016. Nearly one third (32%) of all respondents rated this aspect of service as “Excellent,” while another 20% rated turnaround time as “Good.”

**TAT on STAT Test Results**
Satisfaction with the turnaround time (TAT) on STAT testing reversed the downward trend noted in 2012 and 2014, and increased to an overall mean of 3.84 for 2016 and shows significant improvement from the low average of 3.26 recorded in 2008.

**Knowledge/Helpfulness of Technical Staff**
Satisfaction with the knowledge/helpfulness of technical staff remained consistent and edged down slightly to a Likert mean of 3.64 in 2014, compared with a Likert mean of 3.68 in 2016. Half, (50%) of respondents rated this aspect of service as “Very Good” or “Excellent”.

**Overall Performance of Clinical Testing**
In 2016, the overall mean for Clinical Testing improved to 3.89 from the low of 3.59 recorded in 2014. In 2016, 57% of respondents rated overall performance of Clinical Testing at “Very Good” or “Excellent”, this marks a 6% increase from the 2014 survey.

Individual comments regarding Clinical Testing can be found on pages 14 – 16.
CLINICAL TESTING
Individual Respondent Comments

Comments for "Accuracy of testing and results"

1. We did have an issue with bad samples due to bad tubes recently.
2. They make processing mistakes 2 to 3 times a week.
3. We have times where more errors happen than others.
4. We’ve never had any issues.
5. We have had an issue with specimen results that were not accurate, related to sample size or processing.
6. Working together to resolve the issue.

Comments for "Turnaround time (TAT) on routine test results"

1. We will get the preliminary results faxed but then must search for the final results.
2. Seems to take an extra day longer than it should.
3. Some tests take too long to final, i.e. HBG electrophoresis.
4. Working to have our specimens processed at SLH vs SNGH as it is closer and has a lower inpatient volume.

Comments for "Turnaround time (TAT) on PAP test results"

NONE

Comments for "Turnaround time (TAT) on STAT test results"

1. Not used very often.
2. Working to have our specimens processed at SLH vs SNGH as it is closer and has a lower inpatient volume.
3. Calling in the afternoon for a critical BS that was drawn in the morning
4. Best they can

Comments for "Knowledge/helpfulness of technical staff"

1. Very few are professional and patient. Most of the time I feel like I'm being rushed off the phone. Teresa Tobin I have never felt this way, she is always polite and professional.
2. Management team is always great but most clinical/laboratory staff are typically rude and unhelpful.

3. Have had issues with correcting demographics on our pt, if we make the mistake its an act of congress to get it corrected but if Sentara makes the mistake its fixable. I understand there are legalities but we are willing to sign anything to make correction. Had issues with a son and father with same name. Test obviously wasn't the dads.

4. Client services could be more knowledgeable about tests/requirements.

5. Called several times how to order tests, got each time a different answer.

Comments for "Overall performance of Clinical Testing”

NONE
Clients were asked if their practice(s) employed online ordering/result retrieval system. Less than half (38.8%) indicated they use an online ordering/result retrieval system, a 14% decrease from the 2014 survey.
Client Awareness of the 4Medica Online Order Entry and Retrieval System

Efforts to educate and promote the 4Medica online ordering and result retrieval system continue to have an impact, as almost 88% of respondents are aware of the 4Medica system. That is an increase of 30% from 2014 to 2016.

Are you aware that Sentara Laboratory Services uses the 4Medica online ordering and result retrieval software?

Among all respondents, 71% of respondents use the 4Medica software platform, an increase from 2014. As a benchmarking exercise, 4Medica users were asked to rate their satisfaction with the system on the five point Likert scale. The overall Likert mean measuring 4Medica user satisfaction is 3.79.
Users of 4Medica Online Ordering

New for 2016, respondents were asked several questions regarding 4Medica and their level of satisfaction with the system. In first of the series of questions, respondents were asked if they are currently using 4Medica to order lab testing. More than a third of respondents are currently using 4Medica and 28.6% currently are not.
User Level of Satisfaction with 4Medica

Respondents were asked to rate their experience with 4Medica. This rating below is based on Likert scale, and received a score of 3.79 overall. A large majority of respondents gave a rating of “Excellent”, “Very Good”, and “Good.”
**Interest in 4Medica**

Respondents were asked of their interest in using 4Medica system in their practice. There was an overwhelming amount of respondents who are interested, with 47.1% and those who selected No, 52.9%. Many respondents who selected, "No" did so because they are currently using 4Medica.
Usage of Electronic Medical Records (EMRs)

In 2012, respondents were asked about their usage of electronic medical records (EMRs) for the first time. In 2012, only 31% of respondents were using an EMR system. In two years, EMR usage appears to have changed significantly as 58% of respondents indicated they use an EMR system.

Among those who use an EMR, EPIC, Practice Fusion, AllScripts and NextGen are the most commonly mentioned by respondents.
PATHOLOGY SERVICES
Client Awareness of Anatomic and Clinical Pathology Services

The locally based pathology teams affiliated with Sentara Laboratory Services (Pathology Services Medical Group (PSMG) or General Hospital Pathologists (GHP), enjoy high levels of awareness as this ranking improved by four percentage points over 2014 data to 79%.

Resource Availability of Anatomic and Clinical Pathology Services

Clients indicating that they regularly consult with the Anatomic and Clinical pathologists on staff were asked to rate the availability of pathologists. Once again, respondents are very satisfied with this aspect of service as reflected with a Likert mean of 5.36, a 2 point jump from 2014.

On the following page, you will find individual comments respondents made regarding Anatomic and Clinical Pathology Services.
PATHOLOGY SERVICES
Individual Respondent Comments

1. I think our docs really value Dr Fisher's opinion and look forward to his input.
2. The team of pathologists is great!
Respondents were asked to rate five factors related to courier services, including an overall rating, based on the five-point Likert (with 1 being a ‘poor’ and 5 being an ‘excellent’ ranking.) Each service ranking includes percentage rankings for each rating and the Likert means from the 2010, 2012, 2014 surveys, in addition to the 2016 survey. The overall Likert mean score of satisfaction in Courier Services declined slightly with a score of 3.82.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate the following aspects of Courier Services?</th>
<th>Year &amp; (Rating)</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Very Good (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
<th>Likert Mean All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/helpfulness of courier rep.</td>
<td>2010 1% 7% 27% 33% 32%</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 2% 4% 22% 20% 28%</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 3% 6% 19% 30% 29%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 2% 4% 18% 31% 31%</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courier pickups</td>
<td>2010 25% 24% 21% 16% 16%</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 9% 12% 20% 11% 19%</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 2% 6% 2%1 28% 25%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 0% 5% 25% 32% 18%</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of delivery &amp; specimen pickup</td>
<td>2010 3% 9% 25% 37% 26%</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 2% 5% 22% 19% 26%</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 3% 5% 22% 28% 27%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 0% 18% 18% 33% 24%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supply ordering and delivery</td>
<td>2010 1% 9% 28% 37% 25%</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 2% 9% 20% 20% 24%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 2% 9% 16% 28% 23%</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 4% 6% 31% 16% 27%</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with Courier Services</td>
<td>2010 2% 7% 26% 36% 30%</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 1% 3% 25% 18% 30%</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014 3% 4% 20% 30% 30%</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016 0% 6% 24% 27% 24%</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents answering N/A were factored out of Likert mean calculations.
Knowledge and Helpfulness of Courier Services
Courier Services consistently rates highly amongst providers in the area and this service factor and experienced an increase in 2016 with a Likert mean of 3.95. This is the highest score received since 2010.

Number of Courier Pickups
Respondents evaluating the number of specimen pickups Courier Services indicating a slight drop in the service they receive. Even with a slight drop from 2014 to 2016, this aspect of service still shows the most improvement with a Likert mean of 3.76.

Timeliness of Delivery and Pickups
In regards to the timeliness of specimen pickups, Courier Services saw no change as the Likert mean score for 2014 and 2016 were both 3.85. This continues to be an area that is consistently strong among respondents.

Satisfaction with Laboratory Supply Ordering and Delivery
Supply ordering and delivery experienced a slight drop compared to 2014, with a Likert mean of 3.63. This area continues to experience a decline and that may need to be addressed as the opportunity to improve exists.

Overall Satisfaction with Courier Services
Overall, survey respondents continue to be very satisfied with the service provided by Courier Services as overall satisfaction with Courier Services declined slightly to 3.82 (down from 3.92 in 2014), but remains high.

Individual comments regarding Courier Services can be found on pages 25 – 26.
Comments for "Knowledge/helpfulness of courier services representatives"

1. My regular guy (Bobby) always the same time every day. The fill-in person never on time always an issue.
2. Lester is awesome!
3. We have to call for pickup there has been problems in the past with this.
4. I feel quite certain that the courier does not go directly to the lab for processing effecting the results at times.

Comments for "Number of courier pickups at your practice"

1. Items are picked up from central location.
2. None right now. We send our patient to Sentara site.
3. 1 per day.
4. 2-5 a week.

Comments for "Timeliness of delivery and specimen pickup"

1. Judy worked with us and got our courier issues fixed.
2. It was good when we required a pick up.

Comments for "Satisfaction with lab supply ordering and delivery"

1. Not completely filling the urine containers (partial fills).
2. Phlebotomist had expired tubes and so a draw was delayed.

Comments for "Overall satisfaction with Courier Services"

NONE
PATIENT SERVICE CENTERS

Respondents were asked to rate three factors related to Sentara’s Patient Service Centers, including an overall rating, based on the five-point Likert (with 1 being a ‘poor’ and 5 being an ‘excellent’ ranking.) Each service ranking includes percentage rankings for each rating and the Likert means from the 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year &amp; (Rating)</th>
<th>Year 2010</th>
<th>Year 2012</th>
<th>Year 2014</th>
<th>Year 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor (1)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (2)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good (3)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good (4)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (5)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert Mean</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Convenience of and Operating Hours of Patient Service Centers
A majority of those responding rated the convenience (56%) and operating hours (58%) of Sentara’s Patient Service Centers between “Good” and “Excellent.” These ratings are consistent with past surveys and indicate Sentara’s Patient Service Centers are meeting patient and client needs.
**Hours of Operation**
Respondents were asked to evaluate their level of satisfaction with the hours of operation. This area demonstrated an increase in satisfaction, with a Likert score of 3.67, and increase from the 2014 survey.

**Professional Standard and Performance of PSC Staff and Phlebotomists**
In 2012, a baseline measure evaluating the professional standards and performance of Patient Service Center staff was established. The Likert mean measuring this aspect of service declined for the third time from 3.68 in 2014 to 3.66 in 2014.

Respondents were also asked if they would like to see additional Patient Service Centers established in the area. Of those that answered, 8% responded that additional draw sites would be beneficial, a significant change from 2014 (33%). However, respondents indicated the need of draw site locations in Elizabeth City, Portsmouth, and Franklin.

Individual comments regarding Patient Service Centers may be found on page 29.
Comments for "Convenience of Patient Service Center locations"

1. Not enough Saturdays and after hours

Comments for "Hours of operation at our Patient Service Centers"

1. Not enough Saturdays and after hours

Comments for "Professional standards and performance of Patient Service Center staff and phlebotomists"

1. Never had to go there myself

2. Most results when drawn at these centers do not integrate into our EHR and are not reported. We have to go into Epic to find results.
PHLEBOTOMY SERVICES for NURSING HOME CLIENTS

Nursing home respondents were asked to rate two factors related to phlebotomy services along with an overall rating on the Likert scale of 1-5 (with 1 being ‘poor’ and 5 being ‘excellent’). The table found below displays the breakdown of each factor in percentages. Each service ranking includes percentage rankings for each rating and the Likert means from the 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate Sentara Laboratory Services Phlebotomy Services?</th>
<th>Year &amp; (Rating)</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Very Good (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
<th>Likert Mean All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The numbers in each data field include the total response percentage for each option for years 2010 – 2014.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of phlebotomy schedule</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td><strong>3.58</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional standards and performance of phlebotomists</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td><strong>3.54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td><strong>3.65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents answering "N/A" were factored out of percentages and Likert averages.

**Convenience of Phlebotomy Schedule**

Respondents displayed a slight level of displeasure in the convenience of their phlebotomy schedule overall Likert mean to 3.58 in 2016 from 3.76 in 2014.
**Phlebotomy Service Standards**
Despite efforts to improve phlebotomist standards and performance since 2010, the Likert mean decreased from 3.85 in 2014 to 3.54 in 2016.

**Overall Satisfaction with Phlebotomy Services**
Overall satisfaction with Phlebotomy Services improved compared to past surveys shows a decline. Since 2014, the Likert mean decreased to 3.83 from 3.65 in 2016.

**Individual comments regarding Phlebotomy Services may be found on page 32.**
Phlebotomy Services
Individual Responses

Comments for "Convenience of Phlebotomy Services Schedule"

1. New phlebotomist need to ask for assistance when unable to stick a combative resident
2. History of poor communication of changes in times

Comments for “Professional Standards & Performance of Phlebotomists”

1. Experience has been much better since scheduling and dedicated phlebotomist was arranged.
2. SOH phlebotomists are wonderful
3. I would ask the phlebotomist to be sure there is adequate sample at the time of the draw
4. History of unprofessional and unacceptable behavior.

Comments for “Overall Satisfaction of Phlebotomy Services”

1. We have had challenges with the timely arrival and services of one phlebotomist.
2. Has improved
CLIENT SERVICES

Respondents were asked to rate four service factors related to Client Services, along with an overall rating on the Likert scale of 1-5 (with 1 being ‘poor’ and 5 being ‘excellent’). The table found below displays the breakdown of each factor in percentages. Each service ranking includes percentage rankings for each rating and the Likert means from the 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2016 surveys.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The numbers in each data field include the total response percentage for each option for years 2010 – 2014.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Very Good (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
<th>Likert Mean All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiting time for call to be answered</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge/helpfulness of staff</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to obtain technical information</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with obtaining reports</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Likert scores for the Client Services team showed an improvement in the overall satisfaction in 2016 survey but a few areas showed a slight decline. Of particular note is the significant decline with satisfaction of wait time for a call to be answered.

**Waiting time for call to be answered by Client Services staff**

Despite efforts to decrease phone waiting times instituted since the 2012 survey, this area saw the largest decline since 2012 Likert mean of 3.38 from a low of 3.54 found in 2014.

**Knowledge and Helpfulness of Client Services Staff**

Focus on ongoing customer service training remain necessary for Client Services staff as the Likert mean for 2016 declined to 3.31 from 3.47 in 2014.
Ability to Obtain Appropriate Technical Information
The ability of Client Services staff to obtain appropriate technical information is good, but data shows a slow decline in satisfaction since 2010. For 2016, this aspect of service showed a slight decline from 3.47 in 2014 to 3.35 in 2016.

Satisfaction with Obtaining Reports
Client satisfaction obtaining reports is the aspect that improved for Client Services in 2016. The Likert mean in 2016 improved to 3.39 from the 3.31 mean of 2014.

Overall Satisfaction with Client Services
Despite a decline in all areas of Client Services, the overall satisfaction with Client Services remains consistent with the 2014 and 2016 with a mean of 3.46. Client Services staffs are front line customer service staff and were responsible for an increased volume of client questions during the recent consolidation of Sentara Rockingham and Sentara Martha Jefferson.

Individual comments related to Client Services can be found on pages 34-36.
CLIENT SERVICES
Individual Comments

Comments for "Waiting time for your call to be answered by Client Services staff"

1. Spence is excellent in resolving issues

Comments for "Knowledge/helpfulness of Client Services staff"

1. Not very professional and sometime feel being rushed off the phone.
2. Leeann and Mary are great. The rest of the staff is fair at best
3. Need to be more knowledgeable of tests/requirements

Comments for "Ability of Client Services staff to obtain appropriate technical information"

1. I get passed around to get tech information
2. Many do not reach us - we have to go and find them. Especially if drawn at your sites.

Comments for "Satisfaction with obtaining your reports"

1. You have to call 2 or 3 times to get your fax request

Comments for "Overall satisfaction with Client Services"

1. We Love Teresa Tobin...she is great!
MARKETING

Respondents were asked to rate a number of service factors related to the Marketing department, along with an overall rating on the Likert scale of 1-5 (with 1 being ‘poor’ and 5 being ‘excellent’). The table found below displays the breakdown of each factor in percentages. Each service ranking includes percentage rankings for each rating and the Likert means from the 2013 and 2015 Marketing Department surveys in addition to the Client Satisfaction Surveys in 2012, 2014, and 2016.

Services ratings measured in 2015 enjoyed high mean scores, and this trend continued in 2016. Satisfaction with three levels of service and the overall rating improved since 2015. Finally, the only service aspect that declined since 2015 are the ‘knowledge/helpfulness’ to client offices conducted by the Marketing Department.

On the following page, you will find a chart including scoring for 2010 to 2016. Upon closer examination of the historical data, overall progress of marketing staff to improve client satisfaction is positive, despite some year to year variability. Marketing has taken great efforts to improve the overall visibility and availability of team members in recent years.
### MARKETING SURVEY DATA
#### 2009-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The numbers in each data field include the total response percentage for each option for years 2010 – 2014.</th>
<th>How would you rate the following service aspects of Marketing and Sales staff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year &amp; (Rating)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Poor (1)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of visits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge/Helpfulness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013*</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to solve problems/answer questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013*</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to reach rep via phone/email</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013*</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013*</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents answering "N/A" were factored out of Likert means and percentages.

* Data from 2013 Marketing and Sales Satisfaction survey

* Data for "Frequency of Visits" not available for 2013 & 2015
Satisfaction with Frequency of Visits from Marketing/Service Representatives
In past surveys, the frequency with which Sales/Service staff visit client offices has shown the need for improvement. However, in 2016, this service aspect showed a modest level of improvement since the 2014 survey, possibly indicating that efforts to raise visibility and increase visits to more clients had a positive effect.

Knowledge and Helpfulness of Sales/Service Representatives
After showing significant improvement between the 2012 and 2013 surveys, client satisfaction with marketing staff knowledge and helpfulness slightly declined from a Likert mean of 3.69 in 2015 to 3.64 in 2016.

Ability to Solve Problems & Answer Questions
Client perceptions regarding the ability of marketing staff to solve problems and answer questions remained consistent since the 2015 survey, from a Likert mean of 3.60 to a more 3.64. This rating was part of an overall downward trend for this aspect of service since 2010, but is showing improvements.

Ability to Reach Marketing/Service Representatives
The Likert mean for this aspect of service slightly improved from a high of 3.73 in 2015 to 3.74 in 2016. This area shows an a slight increase from year to year, this may indicate that that Marketing staff were able to maintain an adequate level of service while handling challenges from the Beaker LIS transition and switch to a new billing system.

Overall Satisfaction with Sales/Marketing Representatives
Overall satisfaction remains adequate, and improved from 2015 levels. The 2016 Likert mean for this aspect is 3.74, an increase from 3.69 measured in 2015, yet not higher than the 4.01 score in 2013. The data shows a trend is toward more positive perception of marketing staff efforts, as it has gradually improved over the last two years.
MARKETING
Visibility of Sales/Marketing Representatives

Past Client Satisfaction surveys have measured the visibility of Marketing Staff with a few different metrics. Since 2012, respondents were asked if they could recall the last time a Sales/Service Representative visited their office. The 2016 survey data shows an increase compared to 2014 and 2012.

Improved efforts to raise the visibility of Sales/Service staff since the last two years have proven to be effective, and should be continued.

In the past year, do you recall speaking to or personally meeting with a Sentara Laboratory Services Sales or Service representative?

Another measurement of marketing staff visibility is to ask respondents if they can recall the name of a sales or support staff person they have encountered.
MARKETING
Visibility of Sales/Marketing Representatives

Another measurement of marketing staff visibility is to ask respondents if they can recall the name of a sales or support staff person they have encountered. In 2016, 56% of respondents could identify by name, at least one sales/service person, an increase from 2014 (40%). Awareness of marketing staff continues to improve.

**Awareness of Marketing Staff by Name, 2012-16**

![Bar chart showing awareness of marketing staff by name from 2012 to 2016.](chart)

*Individual Comments related to Marketing staff may be found on pages 42-43.*
MARKETING
Individual Comments

Comments for "Frequency of visits with Marketing/Service Representatives"

1. It has been nice to have someone we can call to address our lab issues
2. Rarely see them.
3. We Love Teresa Tobin
4. We have not seen our Marketing Representative in years
5. Never met
6. Didn't know of their existence

Comments for "Knowledge/Helpfulness of Marketing/Service Representatives"

1. Always helpful and courteous
2. Very professional and personable
3. Our practice did not know that our testing panel are no longer available and the staff from the lab have been changing them.

Comments for "Ability of Marketing/Service Representatives to solve problems/answer questions"

1. Mrs. Tobin is excellent.
2. Judy always tries to help solve our issues. She tries hard to fix the problems that the people in the lab cause.
3. Teresa Tobin does a fantastic job getting back with us.
4. When we have problems I do feel that the marketing rep can solve them in a timely manner.
5. He has been a great partner in problem resolution. He aware of any concerns and works to address them

Comments for "Ability to reach your Marketing/Service Representatives via phone/email"

1. Never had any issues with Teresa Tobin
2. Judy usually calls back within minutes.
3. Very easy
4. She calls us back within minutes usually!
5. I had someone in the lab to email her to update our practice on the testing panels that were setup a while ago. I do not recall her following up with our office.
6. never know who to call for issues
7. Not always responsive to emails, but has improved.

Comments for "Overall satisfaction with Marketing and Service Representatives"

1. Teresa Tobin is great and I love working with her. Whenever I need something researched or even corrected, it is completed and if it is out of her scope she sends to the correct people and communicates with us.
2. Judy is a nice lady and easy to work with
BILLING

Respondents were asked to rate four factors related to billing services along with an overall rating on the Likert scale of 1-5 (with 1 being ‘poor’ and 5 being ‘excellent’.) In 2010, benchmarking data was established for the Billing department.

In 2016, all areas increased the Likert mean score, with the exception of “Accuracy of Monthly Bills”, which had a slight decline from 3.11 in 2014 to 3.05 in 2016. The overall satisfaction score increased to 3.32 in 2016, showing an increase in satisfaction. The 2014 survey showed a decline in all aspects measured (except for test pricing), however based on this feedback efforts were taken to improve our Billing processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year &amp; (Rating)</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Very Good (4)</th>
<th>Excellent (5)</th>
<th>Likert Mean All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of billing system</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of monthly bills</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness in resolving billing issues or problems</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing of testing</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents answering “N/A” were factored out of Likert means and percentages.

Individual comments related to the billing system may be found on page 45.
BILLING
Individual Comments

Comments for "Convenience of billing system"
   1. Do not handle billing directly
   2. Not my department

Comments for "Accuracy of monthly bills"
NONE

Comments for "Timeliness in resolving billing issues or problems"
   1. If Judy did not help us I am not sure it would ever get fixed

Comments for "Pricing of testing services"
NONE

Comments for "Overall satisfaction with Billing Services"
   1. Not involved with billing aspects
Survey respondents are asked a series of questions about their usage of other laboratories. The chart below displays the percentage of testing respondents reported being done externally (outside of their office) in an average month. The majority of respondents (34.04%) continue to report that approximately 80-100% of their testing done externally; a 1% increase when compared to 2014 data. Additionally, the percentage of clients indicating they send 81-100% of their testing to Sentara increased by 5% compared to 2014.
COMPETITIVE ISSUES
Percentage of external testing performed by Sentara Laboratory Services

As a follow up question, respondents are asked to estimate as a percentage, how much of their external testing is performed by Sentara Laboratory Services. More than half, 53% of respondents indicate that from 40-100% of their testing is sent to Sentara Laboratory Services. Due to limitations on the way the data from this question was reported, market share estimation is difficult to calculate.
Survey respondents were also asked about their usage of other laboratories. Of those using external laboratories other than Sentara, LabCorp and Quest are the primary alternatives. Bon Secours and CHKD were again reported by more respondents as a lab alternative. Please note the number of times chosen as an alternative is included under the name and that more than one answer was accepted per respondent.

If applicable, survey respondents were instructed to report the name of “Other” laboratories used by their office not listed on the survey. Below is a list of “other” laboratories used as reported by clients.

- Chesapeake General Hospital
- Shared Lab – Riverside
- Vidant
- Gyncore
- Infinity
- TPMG
- Oxford
COMPETITIVE ISSUES
Reasons Sentara is not Primary Laboratory

Survey respondents who indicated that Sentara Laboratory Services was not their primary laboratory were asked to indicate a reason(s). Below you will find a graph showing the frequency breakdown of the reasons as to why Sentara is not their primary laboratory. As compared with the 2012 and 2014 survives, lack of insurances accepted is no longer the main issue with clients. The number one issue that prevents Sentara Laboratory Services from being the primary lab is now insufficient turnaround time. Comments given for “other” reasons include in lack of testing, house phlebotomy, LabCorp, and Quest. Please note that more than one answer was accepted per respondent.
Among the respondents to this survey, those respondents “Very Likely” or “ Likely” to recommend Sentara Laboratory Services to a colleague increased 10% from 2014 to 2016, which indicates that clients are becoming more overall satisfied with the services provided.
For the second time, respondents were asked about their awareness of the Sentara SelfTest product – a direct access testing service where patients can order a variety of tests to monitor their health between physician visits.

Awareness of this product declined significantly since 2014 to with only 32% respondents aware of the service. Further education, communication and PR, resources are necessary.

**Awareness of Sentara SelfTest**

2012-16
OVERALL SERVICE RATING

A benchmarking rating was established in the 2012 Client Satisfaction Survey asking respondents to give Sentara Laboratory Services an overall rating on a ten point scale where zero (0) represents the worst possible rating and ten (10) as the best possible rating. In the chart below, the first columns show the overall ratings from 2012 (red), the 2014 rating (blue), and the last column shows the 2016 (purple).

Of the 61 that responded to this question, 25.5% assigned SLS a rating of 9 or 10. Another 12.8% gave a rating of 8. The mean score for 2016 is 7.19, a slight increase from the decline in 2014 (7.17), but not higher than the benchmark of 8.02 set in 2012.

On the following pages, you will find final comments from survey respondents.
**FINAL COMMENTS**

As part of this survey, respondents were given an opportunity to describe in as much detail as possible, “How the services of Sentara Laboratory could be improved?” The following are the verbatim responses to this question.

1. Customer Service Training for Client Services (Professionalism, being polite, do not rush your customers)

2. Specimen processing is soooo important and there seems to be a lack of knowledge of specimens and how they are handled in that dept. Billing had been a huge issue with our facility and clients..

3. Fix your processing problems. We mark the forms clearly and correctly and you miss test after test day after day. You have got a real problem.

4. It would be nice if we were contacted via e-mail or phone when our stats are completed. Sometimes we wait (or forget) on the results and they are already in the patients chart!

5. In some of the draw site the tech moves so slow. It's like they really do not want to be there that day. They have to realize that our time is valuable too. We are sometimes getting labs drawn on lunch break and we do not have all day. It would also be nice to let your providers know that there are lab changes especially, when it is a panel that was created by a specialist group for a specific test required. We need to know that everything that was in that panel that was created will still be done.

6. Need to work on consistently getting me reports, preferably by EHR - but anyway that we don't have to retrieve them

7. To remember we all are working for the same reason to keep out pt healthy and happy
Please answer all questions by shading the circle under each number with blue or black ink. Rate our services on a scale ranging from 1-5. A “5” response means you are very satisfied or that the service exceeded your expectations and a “1” response means you are not satisfied and the service did not meet your expectations. (1= Poor, 2= Fair, 3= Good, 4= Very Good, 5= Excellent)

**PLEASE RETURN SURVEY BY FRIDAY, APRIL 22 VIA FAX to 757/388-3270**

*All information will remain anonymous and be kept confidential.*

Please rate the following factors and indicate why for responses of “1” or “2.”

In what city is your practice located? (Check any that apply.)

- Norfolk
- Virginia Beach
- Chesapeake
- Suffolk
- Franklin
- Hampton
- Newport News
- Portsmouth
- Williamsburg
- Smithfield
- Gloucester
- York County, VA
- NE North Carolina
- Accomack County, VA
- Other (please name locality)

Please describe the nature of your practice:
- Primary Care
- Specialty practice
- Nursing home
- Other

Of the following choices, which best describes your role in your practice?
- Physician
- Nurse Practitioner
- Physical Assistant
- Nurse
- LPN
- Practice manager
- Administrative

**Clinical Testing**

1. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the accuracy of testing and results?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

2. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the turnaround time (TAT) on *routine* test results?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

3. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the turnaround time (TAT) on *PAP* test results?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

4. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the turnaround time (TAT) on *STAT* test results?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

5. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the knowledge and helpfulness of technical staff?

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

*Sentara Reference Laboratory Client Survey 2016*
6. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the services performed by Clinical Testing?

- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Fair
- 3 = Good
- 4 = Very Good
- 5 = Excellent
- NA = Not Applicable

Physician Connectivity

7. Does your office currently employ an online test ordering system?
   - Yes: ___________
   - No: ___________

8. Are you aware that Sentara Laboratory Services uses the 4Medica online test ordering/result retrieval system?
   - Yes: ___________
   - No: ___________

9. Does your office currently use the 4Medica online test ordering/result retrieval system?
   - Yes: ___________
   - No: ___________

10. If you use 4Medica online ordering and result retrieval software, please rate your overall satisfaction with its ease of use, reliability and support.
    - 1 = Poor
    - 2 = Fair
    - 3 = Good
    - 4 = Very Good
    - 5 = Excellent
    - NA = Not Applicable

11. Are you interested in using the 4Medica system in your practice?
    - Yes: ___________
    - No: ___________
    - If answering yes, please contact Pat Mullin, Sales Manager by phone at 757/388-2074 or via email at pjmu11@sentara.com to arrange for a demonstration.

Pathology Services

13. Are you aware that Sentara Laboratory Services offers its clients the services of locally based anatomic and clinical pathologists?
    - Yes: ___________
    - No: ___________

14. If you regularly consult with a Sentara anatomic/clinical pathologist, how would you rate their availability as a resource?
    - 1 = Poor
    - 2 = Fair
    - 3 = Good
    - 4 = Very Good
    - 5 = Excellent
    - NA = Not Applicable

Courier Services

15. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the knowledge/helpfulness of courier services?
    - 1 = Poor
    - 2 = Fair
    - 3 = Good
    - 4 = Very Good
    - 5 = Excellent
    - NA = Not Applicable

16. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the number of courier pickups at your practice?
    - 1 = Poor
    - 2 = Fair
    - 3 = Good
    - 4 = Very Good
    - 5 = Excellent
    - NA = Not Applicable

Sentara Reference Laboratory Client Survey 2016
17. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the timeliness of delivery and pick-up?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the satisfaction with lab supply ordering and delivery?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Please rate the level of service provided by Courier Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Patient Service Centers/Drawsites**

20. How would you rate the convenience of our Patient Service Center locations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How would you rate the hours of operation of our Patient Service Centers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How would you rate the professional standards and performance of Patient Service Center staff and phlebotomists?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Would you like to see additional Patient Service Centers?

○ Yes  ○ No

If yes, please indicate a geographic location/service area: ____________________________________________

**Phlebotomy Services for Nursing Home Clients** (If you do not receive phlebotomy services, please skip to Question 28)

24. How would you rate the convenience of your current phlebotomy schedule?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How would you rate the professional standards and performance of phlebotomists?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Please rate your overall satisfaction with phlebotomy services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Client Services

27. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the waiting time for your call to be answered by Client Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the knowledge/helpfulness of Client Services staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the ability to obtain appropriate technical information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your satisfaction with obtaining your reports?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with Client Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marketing/Service Representatives

32. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the frequency of visits with Marketing/Sales/Service Representatives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the knowledge/helpfulness of Marketing/Sales Representative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the ability of Marketing/Sales Representative to solve problems/answer questions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate your ability to reach your Marketing/Sales Representative via phone/email?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. In the past year, do you recall speaking to or personally meeting with a Sentara Laboratory Services Sales or Service representative?

- Yes
- No

37. Do you recall the last time a member of the sales/service staff visited your office? (Choose from any of the names found below.)

- Fat Mullin
- Judy Caldwell
- Stacy Thomas
- Stephanie Dukrs
- Kelly Stevenson
- Teresa Tobin
- Emmanuel Asencion
- Other: ____________
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38. Please rate your overall satisfaction with Marketing/Sales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Processing/Billing**

39. How would you rate the convenience of billing system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. How would you rate the accuracy of your monthly bills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. How would you rate the timelines in resolving billing issues or problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. In relation to other laboratories, how would you rate Sentara Laboratory Service’s prices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. On a scale of 1-4, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with Billing Services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General**

44. What percentage of your testing is done externally (in another laboratory besides your own) in a month?

| 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% |

| 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% |

45. What percentage of your external testing is done by the Sentara Reference Laboratory?

| 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% |

| 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% |

46. Please indicate the other lab(s) used by your office:

- LabCorp
- Chesapeake General Hospital
- Quest Diagnostics
- Children's Hospital of the King's Daughters
- Bon Secours
- Dominion Pathology
- Other (please list)

47. If Sentara Reference Laboratory is not your primary lab, indicate why - select any that apply:

- Convenience of Drawsites
- TAT not sufficient
- Lab service issues
- Phone service issues
- Courier service issues
- Lack of insurance accepted
- Reporting service issues
- Pricing
- Client Services
- Other

Sentara Reference Laboratory Client Survey 2016
Overall Impressions

48. How likely are you to recommend Sentara to a colleague or other practice?
   - Very Unlikely
   - Somewhat Unlikely
   - Likely
   - Very Likely
   - Don't know

49. Would you be interested in a visit from one of Sentara Reference Laboratory's clinical specialists?
   - Yes
   - No

   If answering 'yes', please list any laboratory specialties.

50. Are you aware that Sentara Laboratory Services offers Sentara SelfTest, a product where patients can order a variety of laboratory tests and monitor their health between regular physician visits?
   - Yes
   - No

51. Using any number from 0 to 10, where 0 is the worst service possible and 10 is the best service possible, overall, how would you rate Sentara Laboratory Services?
   - 0 (Worst possible)
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6
   - 7
   - 8
   - 9
   - 10 (Best possible)

52. How could the services of Santara Reference Laboratory be improved?


If you would like to receive lab alerts and other communications from Sentara laboratory Services, please enter your email address.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

PLEASE RETURN BEFORE FRIDAY, APRIL 22 VIA FAX TO 757/388-3270 OR VIA POST TO:

Pat Mulin, Sales Manager
Laboratory Administration
Sentara Norfolk General Hospital
600 Gresham Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23507