Academic Health Science Networks - stakeholder research 2016
Overview
Survey details

This online survey was administered to stakeholders of the Academic Health Science Networks and covers the same areas as the first wave in 2015.

As with last year, stakeholders were initially pre-identified and provided with the opportunity to comment on any of the following:

- The AHSN which they are identified as having worked with/are associated with;
- Any other AHSN; and
- The entire AHSN network at a national level.

In addition, individuals who were not pre-identified as stakeholders were also given the chance to comment on AHSNs of their choosing via open links disseminated by NHS England, other stakeholders, and through AHSNs’ own communication channels.

This report contains responses specifically given in relation to Oxford AHSN. This is based on 93 responses. In the report, the data is compared against the 2015 results for this AHSN, and also the total figure for all AHSNs for each specific question.

The survey ran between 17th August and 19th September 2016.
Who took part?

**Stakeholder type**

- Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) (n=17): 17%
- Higher Education Institute (n=9): 9%
- Local Economic Partnership (LEP) (n=2): 2%
- Local government (n=3): 2%
- Patients group (n=7): 2%
- Private company (n=16): 24%
- Health or social care provider (n=38): 19% 41%
- Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) (n=1): 1%
- Other (n=16): 17% 28%

**Working relationship**

- We see ourselves as a member/partner of the AHSN: 23% (9%)
- We have worked with the AHSN in the last 12 months: 35% (58%)
- Neither of the above: 51% (55%)

Note: All AHSN figures in brackets

**Answering on behalf of their organisation or as an individual**

- The organisation: 22% (33%)
- As an individual: 78% (67%)

Note: All AHSN figures in brackets

**Sample source**

- Non pre-identified stakeholders (Open Link): 46% (31%)
- Pre-identified stakeholder (Targeted list): 54% (65%)

Note: All AHSN figures in brackets

S1. Which of the following best describes your organisation?
S2. Which, if any, of the following applies to your organisation...
S3. Is this response on behalf of your entire organisation or you as an individual?
Understanding the results

A sample of stakeholders were surveyed, rather than the entire population of stakeholders. The percentage results are subject to sampling tolerances – which vary depending on the size of the sample and the percentage concerned.

Confidence levels say how ‘sure’ we are about the results. That is, at 95% confidence level we have 95% probability that the results didn’t happen by chance but are similar to what is real for the population. If the survey was rerun 100 times the results in 95 of those surveys would fall very closely to the first run.

For example, for a question where 50% of the stakeholders in a sample of 100 respond with a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that this result would not vary more than one percentage point, plus or minus, from the result that would have been obtained from a census of the entire population of stakeholders (using the sample procedure).

However, caution should be taken where the sample is smaller than 100. When comparing an individual AHSN’s results to the national average, a difference must be of at least a certain size to be statistically significant. The table below illustrates the percentage difference needed based on example size sizes and percentage, in order to be at the 95% confidence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of sample</th>
<th>Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels (at the 95% confidence level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>6% points 9% points 10% points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>7% points 11% points 12% points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>8% points 13% points 14% points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also please note that sometimes the adding together of two percentages will not equal the net calculation because of rounding.
Summary
Executive summary (1)

• Nearly two thirds of stakeholders (61%) recommend working with the Oxford AHSN (slide 42). This is significantly lower (-15 percentage points (pp)) than 2015, but only 1 in 10 say they would not recommend working with the AHSN.

• In 2015, 6 in 10 stakeholders (57%) agreed that the AHSN helped them achieve their objectives in the previous year (slide 41). In the current period, 43% say the same. This is lower than the average for all AHSNs (62%).

• 32% have a ‘good’ understanding of its role (slide 10). A further 33% say that they have a fair understanding while 34% indicate that they either have little or no understanding of the AHSN’s role. The number who say that they have a good understanding is 20pp lower than that recorded in 2015.

• Just under a fifth (17%) state that they have a good understanding of the Oxford AHSN’s plans and priorities with another 42% having a fair understanding (slide 14). When compared to 2015, the number of those with a good understanding is 7pp lower while the number with a fair understanding is 8pp lower.
• The proportion of stakeholders who say that they have a good working relationship with the AHSN has changed from 76% in 2015 to 50% in the current period (slide 16).

• 55% agree that the Oxford AHSN has a clear and visible leadership (slide 19). This is lower than in 2015 (75%).

• 46% agree that the AHSN’s priorities are aligned to local priorities (slide 23).

• 60% value the Oxford AHSN’s work in ‘facilitating collaboration.’ Furthermore, 59% find its work in the ‘identification, adoption and spread of innovation’ valuable. Both of these figures are 10pp lower than 2015 figures (slide 30).

• Over half (53%) consider the ‘quality of support’ provided by the Oxford AHSN as ‘good’ which is lower than the average of all AHSNs (69%) (slide 35).
Understanding the role of the AHSN
Q. To what extent do you feel you understand the role of the AHSN?

- 52% in 2015 (n=58)
- 32% in 2016 (n=93)

2016 Average:
- 46% A good understanding
- 37% A fair understanding
- 14% A little understanding
- 4% None at all

2015:
- 40% A good understanding
- 33% A fair understanding
- 29% A little understanding
- 9% None at all

2016:
- 33% A good understanding
- 32% A fair understanding
- 29% A little understanding
- 5% None at all
Q. And thinking about the past 12 months, to what extent has the role of the AHSN become more or less clear?

Net: More clear = % much more clear + % more clear
Net: Less clear = % much less clear + % less clear

2016 Average
- Net: More clear: 61%
- No change: 30%
- Net: Less clear: 9%

2015 (n=58)
- Net: More clear: 72%
- No change: 21%
- Net: Less clear: 7%

2016 (n=93)
- Net: More clear: 58%
- No change: 31%
- Net: Less clear: 11%
Q. Which AHSN initiatives or programmes are you aware of?

- Mental Health EIP
- Leading Together
- The Hill events
Understanding of AHSN plans and priorities
Q. To what extent, if at all, do you understand the AHSN's plans and priorities?

- A good understanding
- A fair understanding
- A little understanding
- None at all

2015 (n=58)
- 24% (A good understanding)
- 50% (A fair understanding)
- 22% (A little understanding)
- 3% (None at all)

2016 (n=92)
- 17% (A good understanding)
- 42% (A fair understanding)
- 27% (A little understanding)
- 13% (None at all)

2016 Average
- 26% (A good understanding)
- 42% (A fair understanding)
- 25% (A little understanding)
- 7% (None at all)
Stakeholder relationship with the AHSN
Q. Overall, how would you rate your working relationship with your AHSN?

2015 (n=58)  
- Very good: 38%  
- Quite good: 30%  
- Neither good nor poor: 16%  
- Quite poor: 7%  
- Very poor: 2%

2016 (n=92)  
- Very good: 20%  
- Quite good: 30%  
- Neither good nor poor: 23%  
- Quite poor: 5%  
- Very poor: 8%

2016 Average  
- Very good: 41%  
- Quite good: 32%  
- Neither good nor poor: 15%  
- Quite poor: 5%  
- Very poor: 2%
Q. Thinking back over the past 12 months, would you say your working relationship with the AHSN has got better, worse, or is about the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (n=58)</th>
<th>2016 (n=90)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot better</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little better</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little worse</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot worse</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Average:
- A lot better: 28%
- A little better: 41%
- About the same: 25%
- A little worse: 4%
- A lot worse: 2%
Stakeholder perceptions
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

*The AHSN has clear and visible leadership*

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (n=56)</th>
<th>2016 (n=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net agree</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Average: 68%

2015 (n=56): 75%, 13%, 13%, 11%

2016 (n=83): 75%, 13%, 16%, 11%
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

I have confidence in the AHSN to deliver its plans and priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net agree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Net disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Average</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

*AHSN staff are knowledgeable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (n=56)</th>
<th>2016 (n=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net agree</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither disagree nor agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

*AHSN staff are helpful*

![Survey Results Chart]

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

2016 Average

- Net agree: 82%
- Net disagree: 9%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 4%
- Don’t know: 5%

2015 (n=56)

- Net agree: 79%
- Net disagree: 12%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 4%
- Don’t know: 2%

2016 (n=83)

- Net agree: 65%
- Net disagree: 14%
- Neither disagree nor agree: 19%
- Don’t know: 12%
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following?

*AHSN priorities are aligned to local priorities*

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree

Net disagree = % strongly disagree + % tend to disagree

2016 Average

Net agree = 63%
Net disagree = 18%
Neither disagree nor agree = 8%
Don’t know = 11%

2015 (n=56)

Net agree = 46%
Net disagree = 18%
Neither disagree nor agree = 16%
Don’t know = 11%

2016 (n=83)

Net agree = 23%
Net disagree = 20%
Neither disagree nor agree = 18%
Don’t know = 11%
Q. To what extent do you agree or disagree that in the last 12 months?

The AHSN has engaged with you effectively when developing its plans and priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All: 54%
Oxford: 44%

The AHSN has listened to your views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All: 63%
Oxford: 45%

You have felt involved in the AHSN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Tend to Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Tend to Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All: 61%
Oxford: 49%

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree
Attitudes towards AHSN staff
Q. If you have any comments about the AHSN’s staff, leadership and priorities, please type in below

Common words used to describe Oxford AHSN are “excellent” and “busy”...

“Excellent and committed partnership focus in Oxford Projects”
Local Government

“Staff are under resourced and 'busy' most of the time. Leadership is very 'busy' and not visible or accessible.”
Patients Group

“Extremely helpful and very focused on understanding local customer needs and priorities.”
Private Company

“Excellent at high level”
Higher Education Institute
Q. If you have any comments about the AHSN’s staff, leadership and priorities, please type in below [*continued from previous page*]

Themes identified within the answers provided by specific stakeholder groups include:

**Theme #1: Engagement**

- **Patients Groups**
  
  “Invisible. Unaccountable to patients, governors, volunteers, NEDs etc.”

- **Voluntary and Community Sector**
  
  “People are busy. It took a month to get an appointment. Principles are not aligned to budget for public engagement”

- **Health or Social Care Provider**
  
  “The liaison with local trusts has been haphazard in my opinion”

- **Other**
  
  “The Leading Together programmes which I attended was on the whole well run and informative. We were the first cohort and as such, the leaders of the programme took on board that some adjustment to the structure would be in place.

**Theme #2: Strong leadership**

- **Private Companies**
  
  “Oxford is a leading UK AHSN - I'm looking forward to seeing what can be achieved with sustainable support.”

- **Health or Social Care Provider**
  
  “Oxford has an extremely strong, articulate and visionary leadership team with demonstrable influence and oversight for a better health environment and the AHSN’s pivotal position in delivering this.”
Value associated with the level of support provided
Q. The AHSN aims to work with organisations on the following themes. For each theme, how valuable or not has been the support from the AHSN in the last 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2016 (n=78)</th>
<th>2015 (n=54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement (providing support for innovation and new ways of working)*</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioning support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net valuable = % very valuable + % quite valuable

* In 2015 phrased as “Quality improvement”
Q. The AHSN aims to work with organisations on the following themes. For each theme, how valuable or not has been the support from the AHSN in the last 12 months? [continued from previous page]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>2015 (n=54)</th>
<th>2016 (n=78)</th>
<th>Net valuable</th>
<th>Net not valuable</th>
<th>Not received support</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification, adoption and spread of innovation</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating collaboration</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing leadership to the local health economy</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net valuable = % very valuable + % quite valuable
Preferred methods of communication between AHSN and stakeholders
Q. Which, if any, of the following are or would be your preferred ways for the AHSN to communicate with you?

- Email newsletter: 80% (2015), 71% (2016)
- Workshops, consultations or events: 80% (2015), 64% (2016)
- Presentations to peer networks: 56% (2015), 41% (2016)
- One to one meetings: 61% (2015), 35% (2016)
- Social media: 24% (2015), 19% (2016)
- Printed newsletters: 14% (2015), 4% (2016)
- Telephone: 24% (2015), 10% (2016)
Impressions of AHSN performance & effectiveness
Q. Overall, how would you rate the AHSN’s...

**Accessibility**

- **2016 (n=78)**
  - Very good: 19%
  - Quite good: 24%
  - Neither good nor poor: 27%
  - Quite poor: 6%
  - Very poor: 4%
  - Don’t know: 19%

- **2015 (n=54)**
  - Very good: 31%
  - Quite good: 33%
  - Neither good nor poor: 13%
  - Quite poor: 13%
  - Very poor: 6%
  - Don’t know: 4%

**Responsiveness**

- **2016 (n=78)**
  - Very good: 23%
  - Quite good: 31%
  - Neither good nor poor: 15%
  - Quite poor: 6%
  - Very poor: 4%
  - Don’t know: 21%

- **2015 (n=54)**
  - Very good: 20%
  - Quite good: 46%
  - Neither good nor poor: 13%
  - Quite poor: 13%
  - Very poor: 2%
  - Don’t know: 6%

**Quality of advice**

- **2016 (n=78)**
  - Very good: 22%
  - Quite good: 32%
  - Neither good nor poor: 19%
  - Quite poor: 4%
  - Very poor: 22%

- **2015 (n=54)**
  - Very good: 30%
  - Quite good: 31%
  - Neither good nor poor: 19%
  - Quite poor: 7%
  - Very poor: 2%
  - Don’t know: 11%

**Position indicator:**

- % of those who rate the AHSN as very / quite good for...
  - All: 70%
  - Oxford: 44%
  - All: 70%
  - Oxford: 54%
  - All: 70%
  - Oxford: 54%
Q. Overall, how would you rate the AHSN’s...
[continued from previous page]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=78)</th>
<th>2015 (n=54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Knowledge of the local landscape</strong></th>
<th>2016 (n=78)</th>
<th>2015 (n=54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Promoting change in the local health economy</strong></th>
<th>2016 (n=78)</th>
<th>2015 (n=54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position indicator: % of those who rate the AHSN as good for...

- **Quality of support**: All: 69%, Oxford: 53%
- **Knowledge of the local landscape**: All: 74%, Oxford: 58%
- **Promoting change in the local health economy**: All: 64%, Oxford: 51%

Net good = % very good + % quite good
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? *Focusing on the needs of patients and local populations*

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses between 2015 and 2016.](chart.png)

**2016 Average**
- Net effective: 64%
- Net ineffective: 17%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 7%
- Not sure: 11%

**2015 (n=54)**
- Net effective: 46%
- Net ineffective: 24%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 19%
- Not sure: 11%

**2016 (n=75)**
- Net effective: 47%
- Net ineffective: 21%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 11%
- Not sure: 23%

Net effective = % very effective + % quite effective
Net ineffective = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? **Building a culture of partnership and collaboration**

Net effective = % very effective + % quite effective

Net ineffective = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective

2016 Average
- Net effective: 71%
- Net ineffective: 10%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 9%
- Not sure: 10%

2015 (n=54)
- Net effective: 61%
- Net ineffective: 19%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 15%
- Not sure: 17%

2016 (n=75)
- Net effective: 56%
- Net ineffective: 12%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 15%
- Not sure: 18%
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? *Speeding up adoption of innovation into practice*

- **Net effective** = % very effective + % quite effective
- **Net ineffective** = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Effective</th>
<th>Neither Effective nor Ineffective</th>
<th>Net Ineffective</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 (n=54)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=75)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Average</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net effective = % very effective + % quite effective
Net ineffective = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective
Q. How effective or ineffective is the AHSN in doing each of the following? *Creating wealth*

Net effective = % very effective + % quite effective
Net ineffective = % quite ineffective + % very ineffective

2016 Average:
- Net effective: 33%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 19%
- Net ineffective: 10%
- Not sure: 38%

2015 (n=54):
- Net effective: 52%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 19%
- Net ineffective: 13%
- Not sure: 17%

2016 (n=75):
- Net effective: 25%
- Neither effective nor ineffective: 24%
- Net ineffective: 15%
- Not sure: 36%
Q. Thinking about the last 12 months to what extent would you agree or disagree that the AHSN has helped you / your organisation achieve your objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (n=54)</th>
<th>2016 (n=75)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to agree</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tend to disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net agree = % strongly agree + % tend to agree

2016 Average

- Strongly agree: 28%
- Tend to agree: 34%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 18%
- Tend to disagree: 8%
- Strongly disagree: 8%
- Don’t know: 4%

2015 (n=54)

- Strongly agree: 13%
- Tend to agree: 15%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 16%
- Tend to disagree: 11%
- Strongly disagree: 7%
- Don’t know: 17%

YouGov
Q. Has the AHSN achieved more or less than you expected in the last 12 months?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who felt the AHSN achieved more or less than expected in 2015 and 2016.](chart.png)

- **2015 (n=53):**
  - Much more: 11%
  - Somewhat more: 23%
  - About what was expected: 25%
  - Somewhat less: 21%
  - Much less: 15%
  - Not sure: 6%

- **2016 (n=75):**
  - Much more: 5%
  - Somewhat more: 17%
  - About what was expected: 29%
  - Somewhat less: 12%
  - Much less: 8%
  - Not sure: 28%

2016 Average:
- Much more: 13%
- Somewhat more: 26%
- About what was expected: 31%
- Somewhat less: 9%
- Much less: 6%
- Not sure: 16%

Net more than expected = % much more + % somewhat more
Q. Would you recommend involvement in /working with the AHSN to others?
Q. To help your organisation meets its objectives over the next 5 years, what are the most valuable areas of support AHSNs could offer?

Theme(s) identified within the answers provided by specific stakeholder groups include:

Health and Social Care Provider
- “Identifying and supporting the adoption of innovation”
- “Developing industry links for the dissemination of innovations”

Patient Groups
- “Supporting innovation”

Private Companies
- “Investment in Innovation”
- “Adoption of innovation into the patient pathway”

Theme #1: Identifying and implementing innovation
- “Identifying and supporting the adoption of innovation”
- “Developing industry links for the dissemination of innovations”

Theme #2: Patient focus
- “Improving patient safety”
- “Developing a model of patient leadership (particularly in young people)”
- “Outcome-based healthcare”
- “Improving patient experience”
Q. What improvements could the AHSNs make over the next 12 months?

Theme(s) identified within the answers provided by specific stakeholder groups include:

**Theme #1: Focus more upon the wider area**
- **Health or Social Care Provider**
  - “Not be Oxford centric”
  - “Revise the Oxford AHSN name and marketing what it does across the locality other than Oxford”

**Theme #2: Public and Patient Involvement (PPI)**
- **Higher Education Institute**
  - “PPI and listening to AHP professionals”
- **Patients Groups**
  - “More Communication”
  - “Promoting patient and professional collaboration”
  - “Best measure of AHSN effectiveness are health outcomes for innovation. Best test of this is PPI. Best way of doing this is REAL coproduction.”
AHSN specific questions
What work should the Oxford AHSN prioritise over the next 18 months? (optional)

**Theme #1: Collaboration and Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health or Social Care Provider</th>
<th>Patients Groups</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“More collaborative working at national and local level”</td>
<td>“Firming relationships with CCGs”</td>
<td>“Across sector collaboration”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Collaboration with local trusts”</td>
<td>“Engaging with younger people to set priorities which mean something to them. Proactively encouraging access to and use of technology in healthcare.”</td>
<td>“Support with collaborative working in the region to meet the objectives of NHS England five year forward view.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should the Oxford AHSN do to facilitate collaborative working across partner organisations in the Oxford AHSN region? (optional)

**Theme #1: Bring People Together**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Companies</th>
<th>Patients Groups</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Advertise Networking events and seminars widely.”</td>
<td>“Get them to meet each other.”</td>
<td>“Bringing people together, brokering”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Continue to host events to allow networking opportunities”</td>
<td>“Be pro-active about letting people across the Thames Valley know what the AHSN can offer”</td>
<td>“Continue to do roadshows and get out and about to combat the oxford centric thoughts some people have”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme #2: Combat Oxford-centrism**