Immunization Status of Patients in a Residency-Based Family Practice

Ronald A. Ferguson, MD, Robert H. Colvin, PhD, and Terry W. McCammon Carbondale and Chicago, Illinois

Immunization studies in the United States have revealed that about 35 percent of children are not adequately immunized.

This family practice residency desired to evaluate its immunization patterns, particularly since it was involved in the education of physicians. All of the charts of those patients from birth to 14 years of age were reviewed from July 1, 1974, when the residency accepted its first residents until April 1, 1977, when this evaluation was completed.

The results revealed two patterns. First, the older the patient the less likely that his/her immunizations were up to date. Secondly, the older the patient the more likely that there were no immunization records.

The evaluation resulted in the initiation of many improvements in patient and staff education which, it is hoped, will enable the desired goal of having the immunization up-todate percentages raised to 95 percent within two years.

Immunization patterns in the United States have been the subject of numerous articles in recent years. McDaniel et al¹ demonstrated that less than 40 percent of active patients of pediatricians had completed suggested immunizations by the age of two years. Simon² reported that about 5.3 million out of 13.2 million children between the ages of one and four years have not been immunized against polio, measles, rubella, pertussis, diphtheria, and tetanus. Center for Disease Control statistics³ indicate that among one to fouryear-old children in the United States, 39 percent remain unimmunized against measles, 40 percent against polio, and 27 percent against diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus (DPT). Because of continued attention regarding the lack of immunization in school-aged children by medical authorities, the press, and television, this family practice residency decided to evaluate its immunization patterns.

Methods

The immunization schedules used in this teaching practice since its inception in July 1974, until the completion of this evaluation, April 1, 1977, were very similar to those outlined by Van Reken⁴ (Tables 1 and 2). The charts of all children from birth through 14 years of age were extensively studied, and data were recorded regarding immunization status. A total of 325 patient charts were examined. Data were obtained from the inside chart cover which contained an immunization flow sheet; SOAP (Subjective Objective Assessment Plans) progress notes; history and physical examinations; and, finally, from the special im-

From the Departments of Family Practice and Basic Medical Education, Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, Carbondale, and Northwestern University School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois. Requests for reprints should be addressed to Dr. Ronald A. Ferguson, Apt. 1320, 340 W Diversey, Chicago, IL 60659.

munization data sheet which is an integral part of all the charts in the Family Practice Center. In this Family Practice Center, immunizations are recorded in each of the above categories.

Results

The results of the study are tabulated in Table 3 and shown graphically in Figures 1 through 6. In analyzing the results, it is important to understand that the data collected were not necessarily lon-

| Age | Type of Immunization | | | | |
|-------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2 months | DPT,* TOPV† | | | | |
| 4 months | DPT, TOPV DPT, TOPV TB Test MMR** DPT, TOPV DPT, TOPV | | | | |
| 6 months | | | | | |
| 10 months | | | | | |
| 1 year*† | | | | | |
| 11/2 years | | | | | |
| 4-6 years | | | | | |
| 14-16 years | Td,t and every | | | | |
| | 10 years thereafter | | | | |

*TImmunization for MMR changed from one year to 15 months when new recommendations were instituted **MMR—combined measles-mumps-rubella

vaccine ‡Td—combined tetanus and diphtheria toxoids (adult) for those greater than six years. gitudinal. That is, the children were placed in age groups based on their age at the time the records were examined, so the numbers in each age group do not represent repeated measures on the same patients.

It is evident that two distinct trends were present. First, the older the child, the less likely that his/her immunizations were up to date. Secondly, the older the child, the more likely there were no immunization records at all.

In the evaluation of DPT and TOPV (trivalent oral polio vaccine), it is clear that the first immunization series was reasonably successful (ie, 85 percent and 81 percent of patients in the 7 to 15month-old group were immunized). However, in the older children, immunization up-to-date percentages dropped significantly to the 50 percent level. The same trends clearly applied to the other immunization categories.

The data also revealed that 38 percent of Family Practice Center patients in the 10 to 14 years-ofage group had no immunization records.

Discussion

It is clear that the immunization up-to-date percentages were consistent with the national average, if not slightly worse. What is particularly surprising about this finding is that at the Family Practice Center, immunization has always been approached in a serious manner. A resident seminar has been conducted each year on the current immunization schedules and the need has been

| Table 2. Primary Immunization for Children Not Immunized in Infancy ⁵ | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 through 5 years of age | | | | | | | | |
| First Visit 1 month later 2 months later 4 months later 6-12 months later or preschool | DPT,TOPV, TB Test MMR DPT, TOPV DPT, TOPV DPT, TOPV | | | | | | | |
| 6 years of age and over | | | | | | | | |
| First Visit 1 month later 2 months later 6-12 months later Age: 14-16 years | Td, TOPV, TB Test MMR Td, TOPV Td, TOPV Td, and every 10 years thereafter | | | | | | | |

| Patients with Immunization Records, and Number and Percent of Patients for Whom the Center Has No Immunization Records | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | 3-4 Months | 5-6 Months | A 7-15 Months | ge 16-18 Months | 19 months- 9 Years | 10 years- 14 Years | | |
| DPT at 2 months | N % | 1 0 | 9 77 | 22 85 | 11 65 | 124 63 | 37 48 | | |
| DPT at 4 months | N % | 1 0 | 9 66 | 22 81 | 11 59 | 120 57 | 37 47 | | |
| DPT at 6 months | N % | | | 22 62 | 11 53 | 112 54 | 37 45 | | |
| TOPV at 2 months | N % | 1 0 | 9 77 | 22 85 | 11 65 | 114 62 | 37 55 | | |
| TOPV at 4 months | N % | 1 0 | 9 66 | 22 81 | 11 59 | 119 57 | 37 53 | | |
| TOPV at 6 months | N % | | | 21 54 | 11 53 | 116 55 | 37 50 | | |
| MMR at 12 months | N % | | | 22 19 | 11 47 | 121 55 | 37 53 | | |
| DPT/TOPV Booster at 18 months | N % | | | | 11 47 | 125 52 | 37 48 | | |
| DPT/TOPV Booster at 5 years | N % | | | | | 78 28 | 37 43 | | |
| Td Booster at 10-14 years | N % | | | | | | 37 38 | | |
| No Record | N % | 0 0 | 0 0 | 4 15 | 6 35 | 59 29 | 23 38 | | |

Table 3. Immunization Status: Number and Percent of Family Practice Center

stressed for continuous review of the charts to ensure that patients were up to date on immunizations. Residents have been advised to ask and record data about immunization status at episodic visits and at times of physical examinations. Immunization schedules have been posted in the nursing stations, and nurses have been asked to record immunization data when they talked to parents. Histories and physicals were reviewed by faculty, and specific comments made regarding immunization status. In addition, spot checks were made of episodic visits and comments on immunization again made by faculty. Clearly, these measures have been only effective enough to maintain the national average!

Anecdotally, the record review revealed two parental attitudes about immunization that were surprising. First, one set of parents absolutely refused to have the children immunized because "The needle will hurt the child." Secondly, another set of parents refused to have the children immunized because of religious beliefs: "If God wants our children to be diseased, it is His will." The Family Practice Center staff is working to



modify these attitudes and, if necessary, pastoral help will be included.

Evaluation of the data points out that the Family Practice Center staff needs to proceed on three fronts.

First, immunization records need to be obtained for patients whose charts lack them. When over 29 percent of a unit's child patients have no immunization records at all, this clearly becomes the first priority.

Secondly, the in-house efforts mentioned earlier probably are necessary, but clearly are not sufficient to do better than match the national average. Better internal systems need to be developed to insure that immunization data are gathered and updated.

Thirdly, parent/patient education and motivation need to be increased. Obviously, the national decline in incidence of disease as a result of immunization programs has reduced parental motivation to insure their children's protection.



Figure 2. Percent of Family Practice Center patients who have received second DPT and TOPV immunizations, and percent of patients for whom there are no records of these immunizations.

The Family Practice Center has set as its goal to have immunization up-to-date percentages of its patients raised to 95 percent within two years. Action steps in the three areas identified above will include the following:

Obtaining Records

All medical records will be updated through the Medical Records Department and the Family Practice Center Consumer Advisory Council. This Council consists of consumers and staff of the Family Practice Center who meet monthly to discuss mutual problems and issues. All patients will be requested to fill out an immunization record which will be mailed to them in a newsletter from the Consumer Advisory Council. Any replies not received will be followed up by telephone by the Medical Records Department. The newsletter from the Consumer Advisory Council will be sent at least twice yearly to all patients explaining the





importance of immunization, and those patients who have not given the required data to the Family Practice Center will be asked to do so.

In-House Efforts

The Center will continue to hold resident seminars, post schedules, and stress immunization in didactic interactions with residents, nurses, and staff. In addition, the following actions are being taken:

1. Immunization records are being reproduced on distinctly colored paper, and clipped to patients' folders in a prominent place at each visit.

2. Funding is being sought to computerize patient records in order to provide current summaries and descriptive statistics for review without the effort required to gather the data used in this study.



3. In addition to monitoring the progress of this project, the patient activator is designing a prepost research project to assess educational and motivational variables among patients regarding immunization. The patient activator is a member of the behavioral science faculty who emphasizes patient education.

Patient/Parent Education

Patient education will be restructured in several ways.

1. Patient education will be carried out at all office and home visits.

2. Prenatal classes are held regularly in the Family Practice Center. As part of the process, emphasis will be placed on the need for up-to-date immunizations when the child is born.

3. The need for immunizations will be stressed



to the hospitalized postpartum patient.

4. A video tape of immunization is being prepared for display in the waiting room of the Family Practice Center.

5. Posters and information on immunization practices will be placed in the hospital's Emergency Room, newborn nursery, and pediatric floor.

6. Greater attention will be given by the staff toward increasing parental motivation regarding immunization.

Monitoring of this project will probably indicate changes in emphasis over time. It is hoped that this study will isolate and identify some immunization practices that other family practice res-



idencies will find useful. Certainly the enthusiasm with which the staff has approached the project bodes well for its success.

References

1. McDaniel DB, Patton EW, Mather JA: Immunization activities of private-practice physicians: A record audit. Pediatrics 56:504, 1975

2. Simon JL: Immunizations: 1977. Continuing Educ 7:90, 1977

3. Center for Disease Control: Rubella, measles, polio immunization. Status Report Number 20. Atlanta, Georgia, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, 1973

 Van Reken DE: Current status of polio immunization with recent legal implications. J Fam Pract 3:603, 1976

5. Recommended schedule for active immunization of normal infants and children. In Report of the Committee on Infectious Diseases, (ed 17). Evanston, Illinois, American Academy of Pediatrics, 1974, pp 3,9