

# GOSPORT WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION EVALUATION

Target Group: Chief Executives, Chairs, Liaison Officers (of organisation being investigated)

#### Collated Results

4 responses received out of 5

### SECTION A - PRE VISIT

1.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The information	Agree		Agree		Disagree
requested by CHI			nor		
prior to the			Disagree		
site visit was					
difficult to					
collate					
		<b>3</b>		<b>u</b> 1	

2.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	
The information	Agree		Agree		Disagree
was easy to			nor		
produce in the			Disagree		
format requested					
		<b>2</b>	<b>u</b> 1	<b>u</b> 1	

3.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
Most of the	Agree		Agree		Disagree
information			nor		
requested by CHI			Disagree		
was not used in					
the final report					
				<b>4</b>	

4.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
CHI did not	Agree		Agree		Disagree
request all the			nor		
information			Disagree		
which would have					
helped the					
investigation					
team prior to					
the site visit					
			<b>□</b> 2	<b>□</b> 2	

5.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The interval	Agree		Agree		Disagree
between			nor		
receiving the			Disagree		
request for					

information to				
supply to CHI				
and the deadline				
was sufficient				
		<b>a</b> 2	<b>1</b>	<b>u</b> 1

## SECTION B - TERMS OF REFERENCE

1.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
I was informed	Agree		Agree		Disagree
of the final			nor		
terms of			Disagree		
reference at an					
early stage					
	<b>1</b>	<b>a</b> 2		<b>u</b> 1	

2.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
I felt that the	Agree		Agree		Disagree
final terms of			nor		
reference would			Disagree		
lead to a					
satisfactory					
investigation					
	<b>u</b> 1	<b>1</b>	<b>u</b> 1	<b>u</b> 1	

3.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The	Agree		Agree		Disagree
recommendations			nor		
in the final			Disagree		
report related					
appropriately to					
the terms of					
reference					
		<b>a</b> 3	<b>1</b>		

#### SECTION C - START-UP MEETING

1.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
I felt that the	Agree		Agree		Disagree
aims and			nor		
objectives of			Disagree		
the start-up					
meeting were					
made clear					
		<b>4</b>			

2.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The arrangements	Agree		Agree		Disagree
for the start-up			nor		

meeting did not		Disagree		
go well				
			□ 4	

3.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
During the	Agree		Agree		Disagree
start-up			nor		
meeting, the			Disagree		
correct issues					
were covered					
		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		

4.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The right people	Agree		Agree		Disagree
from the Trust			nor		
were present			Disagree		
		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		

5.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	
I thought the	Agree		Agree		Disagree
CHI staff were			nor		
well prepared			Disagree		
for the meeting					
		<b>2</b>	<b>u</b> 1	<b>u</b> 1	

6.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The Trust felt	Agree		Agree		Disagree
that the			nor		
attitude of the			Disagree		
CHI team was					
unhelpful					
			<b>u</b> 1	<b>3</b>	

#### SECTION D - SITE VISIT

1.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
Arrangements for	Agree		Agree		Disagree
the week on site			nor		
worked well			Disagree		
	<b>u</b> 1	<b>3</b>			

2.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
Trust staff were	Agree		Agree		Disagree
given inadequate			nor		
information			Disagree		
prior to					
interview					
				<b>4</b>	

3.	Strongly	Ag	ree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The	Agree			Agree		Disagree
investigation				nor		
team interviewed				Disagree		
the appropriate						
staff						
			4			

4.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The work of the	Agree		Agree		Disagree
Trust was not			nor		
unduly disrupted			Disagree		
during the week					
of the visit					
		<b>3</b>		<b>u</b> 1	

5.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The investigation	Agree		Agree		Disagree
team did not meet			nor		
staff and			Disagree		
representatives					
from appropriate					
external					
organisations					
				<b>a</b> 3	<b>1</b>

6. The debriefing meeting at the end of the week worked well	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
		<b>a</b> 3	<b>-</b> 1		

7. Were the objectives of the debriefing	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
meeting clear?					
		<b>4</b>			

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

	ln 2	□ 1	l n 1	
_		<b>J</b>	<b>-</b> -	

#### <u>9.</u>

# Arrangements for checking the draft report for factual accuracy worked well

#### SECTION E - MEDIA INVOLVEMENT

1.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
CHI's handling	Agree		Agree		Disagree
of the media			nor		
during the			Disagree		
process was					
satisfactory					
		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		

2.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The Trust's	Agree		Agree		Disagree
media officer			nor		
received			Disagree		
sufficient					
information					
		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		

3.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
Arrangements for	Agree		Agree		Disagree
the publication			nor		
of the report			Disagree		
worked well					
		<b>3</b>	<b>u</b> 1		

#### SECTION F - AFTER PUBLICATION OF THE REPORT

1.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The structure,	Agree		Agree		Disagree
layout and			nor		
content of the			Disagree		
report are clear					
	<b>u</b> 1	<b>3</b>			

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

Trust			
	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	

3.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The report was	Agree		Agree		Disagree
not balanced and			nor		
fair			Disagree		
			<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	

4.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The	Agree		Agree		Disagree
recommendations			nor		
helped the			Disagree		
development of					
the action plan					
		<b>3</b>			

5.	Strongly	Ag	ree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
The report	Agree			Agree		Disagree
contained no				nor		
surprises				Disagree		
			4			

#### SECTION G - GENERAL

1.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
I was aware of	Agree		Agree		Disagree
CHI's principles			nor		
during the			Disagree		
investigation					
process					
		<b>4</b>			

2.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
I was kept fully	Agree		Agree		Disagree
informed of			nor		
progress during			Disagree		
the report					
drafting process					
		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>		

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

with			
	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	

4.	Strongly	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly
Did the	Agree		Agree		Disagree
investigation			nor		
process help you			Disagree		
to address the					
problems that led					
to the					
investigation?					
		<b>3</b>	<b>u</b> 1		

#### SECTION H

Please write your comments in the spaces provided.

- 1. What, if anything, have you learnt from this experience?
- Reinforced Trust-wide commitment to providing highest quality services
- Everyone supported when under pressure team environment
- That paperwork for every action and decision is vital to ensure proof
- Need for independence in complaint handling and investigations
- Need to take action as soon as possible and to make info sources routinely available

•	Need	to	review	trends	and	patterns	

2.	What suggestions do you have to improve the overall process?
•	Organisation under investigation could be advised to assign dedicated support for duration of investigation
•	Cut time from investigation to report
•	An earlier copy of final report (e.g. 48hrs before) would be helpful
•	Try to keep to report/draft deadlines
•	CHI should bear in mind that Trust staff have F/T roles as well as a requirement to assist CHI. Deadlines for info were unreasonable and put unnecessary pressure on staff. More warning would be useful wherever possible
3.	How have you used the report?
•	Shared with staff/key stakeholders
•	Used in other areas of PCT to develop action plans
•	Produced summary of main points

•	Learning to aid action plan
•	Shared widely and many developments already in hand
4.	Any other comments
•	CHI very professional
•	JM great to work with
•	At time of investigation, PHCT were in process of dissolution and resources that were already diluted were put under even greater pressure as a result
•	Investigation process puts Trust's / staff in danger of becoming swamped
•	Concern over CHI's spending of public money. Felt it was extravagant - e.g. venue, expensive restaurants, lots of taxis. Made worse when found out that Trust were to foot the bill

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.