

APPENDIX B



**GOSPORT WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION
EVALUATION**

Target Group: Trust Staff

Collated Results

34 Responses Received out of 53

SECTION A

1. I received adequate information from CHI before my interview	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 16	<input type="checkbox"/> 8	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. I felt unprepared for my interview with the Investigations Team	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> 3

3. I received a copy of the investigation terms of reference before the interview	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

4. I was put at ease before and during my interview	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 22	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

5. The Investigation Team members conducting my interview were well briefed	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 21	<input type="checkbox"/> 9	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

6. I felt able to give full and	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

frank answers during my interview			Disagree		
	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 22	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

7. I was given the opportunity to raise my own issues and concerns	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 22	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. At the conclusion of the interview, I knew what the next steps would be	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 25	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 2

9. Arrangements for the CHI site visit did not work well	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 18	<input type="checkbox"/> 3

10. My comments on the factual accuracy of my interview were taken on board. (If relevant to you)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 12	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

11. The final report contained no surprises	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 19	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 1

SECTION B

Please write your comments in the spaces provided.

1. What suggestions do you have to improve the interview process?

- Interviewer "put words in my mouth"

- Questions at one point appeared to be steered towards possible negligence of Clinical Assistant

- Would have liked more practical information before interview - e.g. number of interviewers, range of skills in CHI team, whether it was possible to have a record of what was said etc.

- (5) Felt team pursued pre-determined, narrow-minded line of questioning. Did not open up questioning in response to information staff member interviewed was providing

- Gave answers and information only by force of determination - was not encouraged

- Trust put enormous effort into making visit go well

- Interviewers made me feel relaxed with their questioning approach

- Advance knowledge on specifics of questioning would have been helpful rather than cramming on everything that might be covered

- Left to stand in corridor (uncomfortably) while interview team collected their thoughts. Could have made more attempt to make interviewees feel at ease

- Appropriate handling by interviewers, thoughtful questioning and attentive to comments

- To be better prepared

- Thoughtful and sympathetic

- Clarity about purpose of investigation (audit of current practice or investigation of past practice) felt team unsure of its role and/or found it difficult to adhere to ToR

- Lack of knowledge among interviewers in respect of past and present management arrangements

- One of the interviewers should have been from a pharmacy background

- More info prior to interview. Instead, had to talk to colleagues already interviewed to gain greater understanding of what would be involved and required. Would have felt ill-prepared had he/she not spoken to others first.

2. Any other comments

- Factual inaccuracies in report (p4 - 2.1; p36 - 7.7; p 27 - 6.3; p23 - 5.17; p58)

-
- Despite assurances that investigation was not intended to be retrospective, perception was that much of the questioning was pertinent to the past rather than building on changes in the present
-
- Felt conclusions were a superficial analysis of happenings
-
- Not sure that investigating and finding a cause for the events in 1998 was part of CHI's Terms of Reference. Interview questions/conversation also went outside ToR
-
- Despite attending interview at short notice, felt the forum was suitable for airing views and sharing problems and concerns had there been any
-
- Felt interview was threatening due to questioning style of one of the interviewers
-
- Felt answers not always believed
-
- Felt distressed after the interview
-
- Feels that the wider "NHS systems" have failed the staff by failing to establish any balance between relatives complaints and distress and what actually happened
-
- Felt CHI's conclusions to be reasonable and recommendations should lead to safer practice, but would question the appropriateness of a CHI investigation in this case
-
- Interviewers very professional and appeared interested
-
- Criticisms of doctor in report will adversely affect running of local practice at which he/she is based
-
- Ex. General Manager complaining that he and many others at Trust did not receive promised copy of report so could not comment appropriately
-
- Found whole process terribly nerve-racking but felt was put at ease by interviewers
-
- Need to increase awareness of whistleblowing policy again as was launched 4 years ago
-
- Felt difference between transfers to GP beds on Sultan Ward and consultant transfers to other wards was not fully understood by interviewers
-
- Told at interview that opportunity would be given to check statement for factual accuracy - never happened
-
- Appalled by 'spin' put on press release and the executive summary which seemed to blame the process failure on one part-time member of staff
-

- Trust dissolved before report published so not given opportunity to comment on report - therefore number of factual inaccuracies that influence some of the recommendations made. Due to this, the report is weakened in its authority within the Trust

-
- Report mixed fact with opinion - again weakening status and authority of CHI and the report

****Other Issues pulled from questionnaire information****

- Confusion over interview request ([Code A] - says she refused first interview request (as stakeholder) but then received phone call requesting interview as Trust Staff member (she is involved from both sides, which was her reasoning for refusing interviews in the first place). Surprised to be asked again having once refused, but eventually gave interview over the phone
- [Code A] thought he was to receive a report before publish date, but didn't
- Anon - did not receive a copy of the draft report as promised at interview stage. Would have been helpful as there were minor inaccuracies that could have been rectified

****Recommendations Made****

- Where directors have moved on/retired, they receive draft copy to comment on
- Fact and opinion kept clearly separate
- Where CHI frames a recommendation as an opinion, this is made clear

*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*