

GOSPORT WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION EVALUATION

Target Group: Chief Executives, Chairs, Liaison Officers Timing: After publication of the report

Thank you for taking the time to complete this form. Your views will be used to inform the Evaluation Process

Please tick the box that reflects your view in each statement and add any comments at the end

SECTION A - PRE VISIT

1. The information requested by CHI prior to the site visit was difficult to collate	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. The information was easy to produce in the format requested	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. Most of the information requested by CHI was not used in the final report	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. CHI did not request all the information which would have helped the investigation team prior to the site visit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. The interval between receiving the request for information to supply to CH1 and the deadline was sufficient	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

SECTION B - TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. 1 was informed of the final terms of reference at an early stage	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. 1 felt that the final terms of reference would lead to a satisfactory investigation	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. The recommendations in the final report related appropriately to the terms of reference	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

SECTION C - START-UP MEETING

1. I felt that the aims and objectives of the start-up meeting were made clear	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. The arrangements for the start-up meeting did not go well	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. During the start-up meeting, the correct issues were covered	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. The right people from the Trust were present	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. 1 thought the CHI staff were well prepared for the meeting	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6. The Trust felt that the attitude of the CHI team was unhelpful	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

SECTION D - SITE VISIT

1. Arrangements for the week on site worked well	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. Trust staff were given inadequate information prior to interview	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. The investigation team interviewed the appropriate staff	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. The work of the Trust was not unduly disrupted during the week of the visit	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. The investigation team did not meet staff and representatives from appropriate external organisations	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6. The debriefing meeting at the end of the week worked well	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

7. Were the objectives of the debriefing meeting clear?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. Following the site visit, the Trust was aware of the next steps	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

<u>9.</u>

Arrangements for checking the draft report for factual accuracy worked well <u>SECTION E - MEDIA INVOLVEMENT</u>

1. CHI's handling of the media during the process was satisfactory	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. The Trust's media officer received sufficient information	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. Arrangements for the publication of the report worked well	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

SECTION F - AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE REPORT

1. The structure, layout and content of the report are clear	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. The report reflects fairly the information produced by the Trust	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. The report was not balanced and fair	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. The recommendations helped the development of the action plan	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. The report contained no surprises	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

SECTION G - GENERAL

1. 1 was aware of CHI's principles during the investigation process	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
·					

2. 1 was kept fully informed of progress during the report drafting process	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. In general, CHI staff were sympathetic, helpful and pleasant to work with	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. Did the investigation process help you to address the problems that led to the investigation?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

<u>SECTION H</u>

Please write your comments in the spaces provided.

1. What, if anything, have you learnt from this experience?

2. What suggestions do you have to improve the overall process?
3. How have you used the report?

4.	Any other comments

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. If you are happy to tell us what your role is, and who you are please print below.