

Binder

CE's, Chairs, Liaison Staff
Stakeholder attending meetings
Team Members
Trust Staff
Section 1
Collated - Trust Staff
Section 1

HdrFtr

View000

GOSPORT WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION
EVALUATION

Target Group: Chief Executives, Chairs, Liaison Officers
Collated Results
4 responses received

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
3 1
2.
The information was easy to produce in the format requested
Strongly
Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
2 1 1
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
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
2 2
5.
The interval between receiving the request for information to supply to CHI and the deadline was sufficient
Strongly Agree Agree Neither
Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
2 1 1

SECTION B - TERMS OF REFERENCE

1.
I was informed of the final terms of reference at an early stage
Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree
Strongly
Disagree
1 2 1

2.

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

3.

The recommendations in the final report related appropriately to the terms of reference Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree
 Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

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
 4

2.

The arrangements for the start-up meeting did not go well Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 4

3.

During the start-up meeting, the correct issues were covered Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

4.

The right people from the Trust were present Strongly Agree
 Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

5.

I thought the CHI staff were well prepared for the meeting Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 2 1 1

6.

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

1 3

SECTION D - SITE VISIT

1.
 Arrangements for the week on site worked well Strongly Agree
 Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 1 3

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

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

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
 3 1

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

6.
 The debriefing meeting at the end of the week worked well Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

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

4

8.

Following the site visit, the Trust was aware of the next steps
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 2 1 1

9.

Arrangements for checking the draft report for factual accuracy worked well

SECTION E - MEDIA INVOLVEMENT

1.

CHI's handling of the media during the process was satisfactory
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

2.

The Trust's media officer received sufficient information Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

3.

Arrangements for the publication of the report worked well Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

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
 1 3

2.

The report reflects fairly the information produced by the Trust
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

3.

The report was not balanced and fair Strongly Agree Agree Neither
 Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 1 3

4.

The recommendations helped the development of the action plan Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 3

5.

The report contained no surprises Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree
 nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 4

SECTION G - GENERAL

1.

I was aware of CHI's principles during the investigation process
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 4

2.

I was kept fully informed of progress during the report drafting process
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

3.

In general, CHI staff were sympathetic, helpful and pleasant to work
 with Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 3 1

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
 3 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.

Disagree
5 8 1

4.

The information provided beforehand did not give me a clear picture of the investigation process Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree
1 9 3

5.

The investigation team member I met with explained the investigation process clearly enough for me to understand Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree
12 2

6.

The investigation team I met with was helpful, understanding and listened to my experiences and views about the hospital Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree
10 3 1

7.

I felt it was worthwhile attending the interview Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree
10 3 1

8.

My interview covered the issues that I had expected it to Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree
6 7 1

9.

The meeting place was
(a) easy to find Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
6 7 1

(b)

easy to get to Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
6 6 2

(c)

a comfortable environment Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly

Disagree
7 5 2

(d)

a 'good' place to meet Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor
Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
3 7 3 1

10.

I did not feel the investigation manager was very helpful and
understanding about my experiences Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree
nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1 8 5

11.

It was not clear from the information provided beforehand what the
purpose of my interview was Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor
Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1 1 7 5

12.

I felt at ease discussing my experiences and views about the hospital
Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
Strongly
Disagree
8 6

13.

I do not understand how this information will be used during the
investigation Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1 11 2

14.

Additional support was provided for me as requested (interpreter,
signer, etc) Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree Strongly
Disagree
Not applicable 14

15.

I understood I would get feedback from the investigation Strongly Agree
Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
2 10 1 1

16. I received a copy of the report 14 Yes No

17. What suggestions do you have for changing the way we organise these meetings?

- Venue could be further away from hospital which can hold bad memories
- Large interview - e.g. 3:1 can cause intimidation. 1:1 or even 2:1 better
- Most gave no response and a few said the interview structure and experience was fine.

18. If you received a copy of the report, do you learn anything from it?

- Despite bad publicity aimed at GWMH, report showed it is a good hospital with caring and dedicated staff providing a high quality of care
- That future patients will feel safer and more secure now
- That the situation at GWMH has changed for the better
- That its independence showed through its lack of local empathy
- Improvements at GWMH have largely come about due to stakeholders coming forward with information
- Felt assured that individual complaints related only to a small section of the hospital
- Reinforced expectations and knowledge of local situation

19. Do you have any other comments?

- Still dispute hospital's treatment of relative. Lack of trust remains
- Positive and helpful outcome - professional, unfailingly courteous team from CHI

- Could produce short document containing key points and findings to distribute at time of publication as report too long and hard-going for many. Perhaps only distribute full report on request
- Feel that there is nowhere else to turn as CHI cannot investigate the death's themselves. Know that certain staff have been investigated but that is as far as it goes
- Stakeholders should meet prior to CHI visit to discuss and see if there are any general patterns in occurrences
- Hospital given too much notice of investigation - too prepared!
- Community care needs more supervision and better training - reduce care staff turnover
- Investigation helps improve for future but fails in addressing questions of the past
- Members of the public from the other side (i.e. praise for Trust & good experiences of hospital) tend not to be involved or see the point of being involved - therefore no. of complaints could be seen out of context
- Generally good report but not damning enough
- Report balanced and fair, well-presented and well laid out

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

View000

Gosport War Memorial Hospital Investigation
EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE INVESTIGATION

PROGRAMME BOARD

Target audience: Investigation Programme Board
Collated Results
1 Response Received

SECTION A

Please tick the appropriate box

1.
The terms of reference were relevant and clear Strongly Agree
Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1
2.
The report structure, layout and content are good Strongly Agree
Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1
3.
The report is clearly written and easy to understand Strongly Agree
Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1
4.
The recommendations in the report were not clear enough to help the
Trust develop the action plan Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree
nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1
5.
The report clearly reveals the methodology used to investigate the terms
of reference Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1
- 6.

The report demonstrates that the methodology used to investigate is
robust Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
Disagree 1

7.
In my view the patient experience is strongly represented in the report
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
Disagree 1

SECTION B

Please write you comments in the space provided.

8. In what way has the report met or failed to meet your expectations?

We weren't able to say clearly why patients had died

9. How well do you think the patients' perspective has been included?

10. What impact do you think the report has had on the Commission's image?

Important that this group of vulnerable people are seen to be important to CHI

11. What do you think CHI has learned from this investigation?

Importance of clinical reports

Importance of getting to story and asking the relevant questions

12. What suggestions do you have to make any improvements to the investigation process?

Final handling of press could have been better

13. Any other comments?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

2

GOSPORT WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION - EVALUATION

Target Group: Investigation Team Member

Collated Results
5 Responses Received

1. During the whole investigation, the team functioned well as a team
Strongly Agree
- 5 Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
2. The briefing before the visit prepared us well for the actual visit
itself Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
Strongly
Disagree

1 3 1

8.

In my view there was a lack of cohesion in the investigation team

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree

Strongly

Disagree

3 2

9.

In general, the methodology and approach for the investigation was appropriate

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree

Strongly

Disagree

4 1

10.

The actual visit was a strong reflection of what I thought it would be like

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree

Strongly

Disagree

1 2 2

11.

On the whole, during the investigation we were well received by the Trust staff

Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree

Strongly

Disagree

2 3

12. Do you wish to make any comments to explain any answers that you have given

to questions 7 - 11 above?

- (11) Staff appeared anxious and some were visibly distressed, but as welcoming as could be expected under the circumstances

- Impossible to predict what being an Investigator would feel like. Could empathise with feeling of 'lost sleep' that interviewees experienced

- (9) Responsible for assessing quality of care - made difficult as not able to engage in conversation with patients re. their care. Therefore assessments based purely on observations and staff interviews

13.

The report does not adequately reflect the actual investigation itself
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree

2 3

14.

Some important information gathered during the investigation was not
 included in the report Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree
 Disagree Strongly
 Disagree

3 2

15.

The team agreed on the key aspects of the report Strongly Agree
 Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree

2 3

16.

The report made it difficult for the Trust to develop an action plan
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree

1 3 1

17.

My overall experience of being involved in this investigation was
 positive Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree

4 1

18. Do you wish to make any comments to explain any answers that you have
 given

to questions 13 - 17 above?

- Lay team member impressed by Julie's considerable efforts to make all
 tem members feel equal
- (16) Possible that tenor of press release might generate negative local
 reaction in turn impeding local progress
- (17) Nature of investigation subject obviously distressing, but overall
 experience positive in terms of bringing professional expertise to team
 and evaluating where system had broken down and how improvements could be
 made to prevent any recurrences in Gosport or the NHS in general

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

- The need to develop skills for absorbing vast amounts of info/data pre- and during visit, as quickly as possible
- Opportunity to develop further interviewing skills
- The need to analyse and feed back information to the team members as succinctly as possible
- Reinforces virtue of humility
- Scale of project and exhaustive amount of work involved
- Problems Trust's can get into by ignoring warning signs

20. What suggestions do you have for changing the way in which the investigation is conducted?

- Earlier access to patient records, particularly of those involved in complaints, making it easier to see more clearly the differences between the Trusts' actions at the time of the incidents and actions taken now
- Useful if Trust executives had access to Police reports long before they did
- During visit, investigation team had info from police and expert witnesses that the Trust did not. This does not assist in promoting openness and honesty
- More time needed, but understand that no matter how much time is allocated, it might never feel like enough

21. Any other comments

- Likes the questionnaire structure
- Thanks for opportunity to participate

questionnaire. Thank you for taking the time to complete this

GOSPORT WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION
EVALUATION

Target Group: Trust Staff
Collated Results
34 Responses Received

SECTION A

1.
I received adequate information from CHI before my interview Strongly
Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
5 16 8 4
2.
I felt unprepared for my interview with the Investigations Team
Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
Strongly
Disagree
9 9 12 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
10 20 1 2 1
4.
I was put at ease before and during my interview Strongly Agree
Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
5 22 3 2 1
5.
The Investigation Team members conducting my interview were well briefed
Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
Strongly
Disagree
1 21 9 2 1

6.

I felt able to give full and frank answers during my interview

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Agree nor	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly					
Disagree					
6	22	3	2	1	

7.

I was given the opportunity to raise my own issues and concerns

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Agree nor	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly					
Disagree					
4	22	5	3		

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					
1	25	3	3	2	

9.

Arrangements for the CHI site visit did not work well

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Agree nor	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly					
Disagree					
1	11	18	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					
1	12	10		1	

11.

The final report contained no surprises

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither	Agree nor	Disagree	Disagree
Strongly					
Disagree					
2	19	4	5	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 (Sam Page) - 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
- Dr P.A. Beasley 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

GOSPORT WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL INVESTIGATION
 EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAKEHOLDERS

Target audience: Stakeholders (contact by phone/letter)

Collated Results
 11 Responses Received

SECTION A

Please tick the appropriate box

1.

I had a clear understanding of what the investigation was about
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 3 5 1

2.

Arrangements for contacting the investigation team were clear Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
 Disagree
 1 3 4 1

3.

I had problems arranging to speak to the investigations manager
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 3 3 2

4.

My concerns were treated sensitively by the investigations team manager
 Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
 Strongly
 Disagree
 1 4 3

5.

The written information I had from CHI was clear and helpful Strongly
 Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly

Disagree
1 5 2 1

6.

I now have a better understanding of CHI's role Strongly Agree
Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
1 7 1 1

7.

A copy of the report was sent to me Strongly Agree Agree Neither
Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
9 1

8.

The report is easy to read and understand Strongly Agree Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
2 5

9.

The report structure, layout and content could be improved Strongly
Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree Strongly
Disagree
2 5 1

10.

The report paints a full picture of the patient/relatives perspective
Strongly Agree Agree Neither Agree nor Disagree Disagree
Strongly
Disagree
1 2 2 2

SECTION B

Please write you comments in the space provided.

1. Is the report of any value to you?

Please explain:

Value would have been enhanced had CHI presented the report to locals more proactively and publicly

Extremely - it is a final public acknowledgement that concerns were genuine and publicly admits to existence of problems at GWMH

Confirms what was already known

Bad value as it promotes a negative image of a hospital that provides excellent care. Staff need support and sympathy, not blame.

2. What do you think about the ways in which the patients' experience were incorporated in the reports:

It was helpful, but the 'good' was not shown equal to the 'bad'

All concerns were noted

Concerns not accountable in report. Entered at late stage and told that CHI didn't need any more info as they couldn't look at individual cases. Could not express concerns effectively over telephone

Hard to express the experiences of dead patients

Direct observation and requesting views of relatives were satisfactory approached under the difficult circumstances

3. Did you learn anything from the report?

Nothing new

That situation was as serious as feared and still many failings that need to be addressed

Able to see summary of police concerns not seen before

That pressurised hospital environments lead to bad practice

Proves lack of communication between all involved

That staff need to explain relative's conditions and reasons for actions taken in their care

4. What suggestions do you have to improve the process for patients/relatives/stakeholders to contact CHI?

Work of CHI should be more widely publicised and known

Leaflets/flyers, written reports in local and national papers, TV (Especially for deaf - 'See.Hear')

All Trust workers should be informed of CHI's role in the NHS

Anyone who complains or compliments a Trust should be advised about CHI. Public need to know about CHI so that they can see someone is trying to improve NHS care independently

CHI should utilise media to shout about themselves

It should be made clearer to relatives what exactly CHI does. What they can expect/not expect from a CHI investigation

5. Any other comments?

Police contact with SI John James - commonly known that many relatives were unhappy with the investigation and he was subsequently removed but CHI only appeared to have contact with him. CHI should have reassessed the police input following James' removal from the case

Disappointed that report stops short of accepting that excessive drug prescriptions caused patient deaths, despite the fact that the evidence and the CHI report were all damning

Part of CHI's remit should be to refer individuals back to police or GMC

Report should not signal the end. CHI should do unannounced visits to check uptake of new policies and procedures

A committee of people from all sections (incl. lay) could form a best-value group where all items could be discussed and reported

General lack of communication among staff and between hospitals needs to be resolved and between staff and relatives as well

Pleased with treatment and experience

Possibly too much information in report - useful to CHI and health experts but too much for a lay person

6. Any other comments

questionnaire. Thank you for taking the time to complete this