Campaigners play key role in defeating North West London closure plan

Campaigners in North West London who have battled long and hard since 2012 to defend Charing Cross and Ealing Hospitals were quite rightly celebrating in the aftermath of the decision by Matt Hancock to scrap the widely hated Shaping a Healthier Future (SaHF) project (see inside pages 4-5).

Without their tenacity – and constant reference to hard evidence and a detailed critique of the plan as it evolved from a hospital merger plan to a wholesale downsizing of services covering 8 London boroughs from nine acute hospitals to just five – NHS chiefs might have succeeded in forcing through their deeply flawed plan.

Campaigners’ pressure helped ensure continued resistance from Ealing council and a Labour group in Hammersmith & Fulham that fought and won leadership of what had been a flagship Tory council on a platform of fighting to save local hospital services.

Hammersmith council then took the lead in establishing the Commission led by Michael Mansfield QC which called in December 2015 for the SaHF scheme to be scrapped, and in joining with Ealing council to stand firm in rejection of the Sustainability & Transformation Plan in 2016 which also tried to push through the closures of Charing Cross and Ealing hospitals.

The delay to the plan ensured that the real, soaring costs of implementing it were revealed, and the deeply flawed assumptions of reduced demand on acute and A&E services were exposed, resulting the hospital trusts resisting SaHF’s proposed massive cuts in bed numbers.

In other words the campaigners created conditions for the plan to effectively collapse through its own weaknesses: in similar fashion we can now see plans for controversial cuts in bed numbers in various STPs in 2016 being surreptitiously dropped as unworkable.

Had there been no resistance, these schemes might have been pushed through – with disastrous consequences.

The Lowdown will continue to chart the evolution of STPs: see our analysis of Nottinghamshire pages 8-9.

Failed private Sussex provider still owes £11m

Coperforma, the privately-run patient transport provider still owes £11m to the NHS and its other suppliers years after its contract was withdrawn as a result of a catalogue of problems.

It was one of the most controversial failures in recent times. In 2016 Coperforma were awarded a contract in Sussex for non-emergency transport - a four-year deal worth £83.5 million with seven CCGs, replacing the NHS’s South-East Coast ambulance service.

The contract was withdrawn after a matter of weeks due to shocking failures in the service. Within days problems with the contract hit headlines in the local and national press. Crews were failing to pick up patients, leading to missed appointments and patients languishing for hours in hospitals awaiting transport home.

Patients included those needing kidney dialysis and cancer patients attending chemotherapy sessions. The GMB union representing the ambulance crews said it was an “absolute shambles”.

Finally, in October 2016, Coperforma were forced to give up the contract. But even now according to a report in the Health Service Journal local NHS commissioners are still trying to recover £7.6m.

Emergency care is running above plan - A&E attendances by 9%, and emergency admissions by 16%
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Could this really be the end of hospital waiting?

By Paul Evans

Visiting your local hospital could be a far rarer event as NHS England plan healthcare much closer to home. However, turning this vision into reality hangs on NHS leaders overcoming a big crisis in staffing.

Traditionally the next step on from your GP is the local hospital, whether it is to help diagnose or to start treatment. But NHS England has concluded that many of these trips are unnecessary and cut up an already overwhelmed hospital service.

NHS leaders are working on plans to treat more of us in community settings. Instead of going to your local hospital for tests, treatment or check-ups you will be sent to a community-based facility, part of a Primary Care Network which will house multi-disciplinary teams of health professionals.

Jargon aside, this means GPs, community nurses, therapists and technicians all working together from large, scoup-up health centres connected with other core services like social care. At least that’s the vision, but can it be delivered?

Challenge

The size of the challenge is significant. It means a huge investment in extra buildings, community staff and technology. The government has pledged an extra £4.5bn for community staff and technology. The health secretary promised 5000 more district nurses and 5000 more health visitors.

The health secretary promised 5000 more by 2020. After missing their recruitment target for two years more young GPs are finally joining, but most areas are still understaffed, particularly as older GPs are retiring at twice the rate that they were in 2010.

All this explains why many of us are finding it hard to get a GP appointment. One in five patients now has to wait at least 15 days to see a GP in England. NHS figures have revealed. Meanwhile our need for healthcare has grown, the number of GP patients has risen by 16% in the last 7 years.

Capacity gap

There is a yawning capacity gap, which has widened throughout the recent years of austerity. The problem for NHS leaders is that community services are already struggling, but the gap must be bridged if they are to have any hope of redirecting thousands of hospital patients towards community services.

Health visitors have seen their numbers fall by nearly 10% in the last five years. Many are dealing with perilously high caseloads to manage. A recent study found that some health visitors are responsible for up to 830 children - when the recognised safe limit is 250.

Staff are running the risk of being too busy to manage domestic violence or child abuse or to have too little time to catch the signs of a mental health or physical decline.

The same pressures are evident for district nurses, who also know that their patients are getting a worse service.

“When you have a big list of patients to see in the day, if you want to get through that list, you really need to rush… you end up going and doing whatever you’re there to do, but if you’re sometimes, to notice that that person is actually not herself today, or something’s wrong. The workload is the main enemy for the patient and the nurse.”

Shocking district nurse numbers have fallen by 46% since 2010. In 2018, a backlash against their efforts to reduce the number of outpatient appointments by 30 million a year, a goal they explain in their Term Plan hangs on it and without it the vision of community-based healthcare lacks credibility.

The targets in the Long Term Plan don’t feel particularly realistic at the moment because of the absence of any clarity about investment and how.

The government avoided this crucial question when it published the Long Term Plan in January. Commentators noticed the hole in the plan immediately. A workforce plan would follow later the government reassured us. But getting the right level of staffing is fundamental. One of the reasons for the delay is the extra cost that it will entail. The issue is now caught up in the wider Autumn spending review.

All government departments are voting for extra cash and the NHS is seen to have already done relatively well by avoiding outright cuts that have hit many other public services.

However, the reality is that the £20.5bn already announced is not enough to fuel improvement, economists agree on this.

So why leave the job half done? The NHS is meeting the investment to support a new plan, the whole situation can become between a trust and its subsidiary.

The trust says it is carrying out a full programme of consultation with staff. In contrast, in early April Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust announced its plans and given it the go ahead.

KFM used

There are two ways money can be saved: through the VAT system and by a private company working for the NHS which is covered by different tax rules and can claim back any VAT it is charged from the Government; and, by changing the pay and conditions of staff - the companies will not be obliged to employ new staff on NHS pay and conditions but will instead be able to offer very much worse terms of employment.

A recent article in the HSL, on King’s College Hospital Trust and its subsidiary KFM, however, reveals just how complicated and even absurd the whole situation can become between a trust and its subsidiary.

The trust’s decision is casting around into question of whether the new plan is a valid response to reduce a deficit. In 2017/2018 King’s College Hospital Trust had one of the largest deficits reported of £132 million and in 2018/2019 it is expected to rise to £146 million. In 2016 it set up the wholly-owned subsidiary company KFM and transferred around 1460 employees.

Details from King’s College Hospital Trust accounts for 2017/2018 reveal that it recorded nearly £10 million in income from KFM. The income was from the sale of equipment to KFM, via a loan from King’s College Hospital Trust itself.

KFM only has contracts with the trust and charges the trust £30 million a year for these services. KFM also charges the trust for use of the equipment that it has just bought off the trust.

Furthermore, KFM is financially dependent on King’s College Hospital Trust having agreed its plans and given it the go ahead to set up a wholly-owned subsidiary, including all its estates, facilities and clinical engineering services.

The formation of these subsidiary companies is widely viewed as a back-door form of privatisation, which could lead to a worsening of employee rights and the creation of a two-tier workforce.

In 2018, a backlash against their formation led to NHS Improvement issuing new guidance. Plans for the subsidiaries now have to be scrutinised and approved by NHSI; Bradford Hospital Trust says that the NHSI has approved plans and given it the go ahead.

Bradford Hospital Trust is seeking to offload much of its non-clinical work to a wholly-owned subsidiary, including the trusts’ estates, facilities and clinical engineering services. Judith Cummins, Bradford South MP, has condemned the decision by the trust as a ‘worse employment rights and make it’ much easier to privatisate the running of essential services. Ms Cummins has written to Matt Hancock, Secretary of State for Health and Social Care, and the CEO of NHSI in an effort to reverse the trust’s decision.

The trust says it is carrying out a full programme of consultation with staff. In contrast, in early April Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust announced its plans and given it the go ahead.
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Lessons must be learned from axed North West London project

John Lister

At the end of March Health Secretary Matt Hancock finally axed the long-drawn-out and shambolic project to reconfigure hospital services in North West London. The failed plans were the result of a process which had been abandoned and revived as a model to others to follow is no longer supported by the Department of Health and Social Care, by NHS Improvement, or NHS England. But it’s not only ministers who are now distancing themselves from this failed project. Since Hancock’s statement many key players, including senior figures from NHS England’s shadowy London Regional office, some of whom have since reinvented themselves as management consultants, will have been praying the embarrassing details are simply forgotten or buried. There is a lot for them to keep under wraps.

Soaring cost

While the headline cost of the whole scheme reported from £119m to over £1 blion, project costs for the hugely expensive “Shaping a Healthier Future” (SaHF) scheme tittered away more than the cost of a substantial-sized new hospital, but delivered nothing but a stack of flawed and incomplete documents.

These included one of the largest-ever preliminary documents in the NHS (2,700 largely unread pages of the giant volumes of the “Lancet Acute Stroke Case” published online in 2013, a download totalling 86 megabytes).

By the end of 2017, when SaHF stopped publishing information on the costs of management consultants, local experts had already totted up official figures revealing a staggering total of £722,985,181 squandered in five years on management consultants. However consultancy fees were only a minor component of spending on the SaHF project over the whole 7 years of the project: advisors to the Commission led by Michael Mansfield QC which investigated the plans in 2015 used actual figures from NHS reports, coupled with informed estimates, to estimate that the total costs by 2017/18 would be a massive £2.5bn.

SaHF project leaders claimed they “did not recognise” the figures – but have never published any alternative figures to show how much has been spent. In June 2016 they revealed that a small army of 130 people, including 75 “interim executives” were employed on the project, and that more than a hundred of these would be still be present by March 2017.

Despite these lavish resources, and multiple contracts for management consultants to complete a final business case, the project which began in 2012 and not for another 7 years later. So poor was the plan that it had its application for capital funding rejected twice by NHS England and NHS Improvement citing the very problem highlighted by campaigners – a lack of detail on how care was going to be reprovided.

Nor did the services of consultants include Maceray, Ernst & Young and PwC who helped prevent the adoption of deeply flawed proposals. The Closure of A&E services at Central Middlesex and Hammersmith hospitals in the autumn of 2014, triggered a disaster – but entirely predictable – plague in A&E performance standards.

It later emerged that (as critics of the plan had warned) the project leaders had made significant errors in calculating the numbers of beds required. Only now, almost five years later and after extra beds have been opened has performance in London North West Hulls begun to move back towards the level it was at before the closures (see graph below).

The SaHF project never won any public acceptance in the boroughs it most affected: in fact it was instrumental in the Conservatives losing control of one of their flagship London boroughs, when a Labour campaign won Hammersmith & Fulham council, pledged to fight to save Charing Cross and Ealing Hospitals.

The determination of this council to halt plans to downgrade and close local services, coupled with sustained and vigorous activity by local campaigners working together in both Hammersmith & Fulham and Ealing played a major role in delaying the process and allowing reason to prevail.

Even local trust bosses began to distance themselves from planned cuts in bed numbers. Indeed the plan as the plan was set aside to become chief executives or management consultants rolling out similar nonsense elsewhere – and also need to be called to account.

Who those cannot learn from the errors of the past are doomed to repeat them, and any attempts to use the SaHF fiasco as a learning exercise requires a rigorous external inquiry into how so much time and money was wasted by so many. Hopefully this will deter any NHS managers who may have looked to NW London as a model from following down the same dead end.

Some of those who contributed so little to become chief executives or management consultants rolling out similar nonsense elsewhere – also need to be called to account.

Those who cannot learn from the errors of the past are doomed to repeat them, and any attempts to use the SaHF fiasco as a learning exercise requires a rigorous external inquiry into how so much time and money was wasted by so many. Hopefully this will deter any NHS managers who may have looked to NW London as a model from following down the same dead end.
Dangers of nurses lack affects a one in four hospital wards

By Sylvia Davidson

One in four wards in acute hospitals across England are dangerously understaffed, according to a study by researchers at the University of Southampton and Bangor University.

The study, entitled Implementation, Impact and Costs of Policies for Safe Staffing in Acute NHS Trusts, questioned 91 Bristol-based managers, directors and analysed national workforce data and four case studies at NHS trusts.

Hospital trusts were found to be experiencing major difficulties recruiting and retaining registered nurses; the average registered nurse vacancy rate was 10% across the country, but up to 20% in some trusts.

On top of this, the study found that despite Government workforce data showing that the number of nursing staff has increased since 2013, an increase in patient admissions means that there has been no net improvement in registered nurse staffing levels.

Nursing support staff (e.g., healthcare assistants), however, have increased at three times the rate of RNs since 2013, and the researchers note that this is a "dilution of skill levels in NHS acute care."

Francis Report "forgotten?"

The researchers note that the lessons from the Francis enquiry reported in 2013 into the scandal of patient deaths at the Mid Staffordshire Hospital Trust - to put patients first and never let it happen again - have not yet been fully put in place.

The University of Southampton study is one of a series of studies, reviews and reports that have been published in recent years that all highlight the growing workforce issues in the NHS. There are now around 100,000 vacancies in the NHS, with many of these positions being filled by agency workers and bank staff at great expense to the NHS.

A report by the think-tanks, The King’s Fund, The Nuffield Trust and The Health Foundation published in March 2019, predicts that based on the current trajectory there will be 250,000 vacancies within a decade if no determined action is taken to change things, including an extra £900 million per year by 2030/31 into the budget of Health Education England.

Despite the evident crisis in the workforce, the ten-year plan for the NHS, published by the Department of Health and Social Care in January 2019, did not include a workforce plan.

An interim workforce plan was expected to be published in April 2019, however this plan will not set out how the new staff role will be funded, this will take place in the autumn spending review.

Speaking to HSJ at the end of March, Julian Hartley, the national executive lead on the workforce plan, said that the plan would not say "things about priorities and investments" but "would instead set out a direction of travel for workforce policy."
John Lister

Nottinghamshire is one of the eight “first wave” Integrated Care Systems being established by NHS England, and discussed at length in the NHS Long Term Plan (LTP) published in January. It was also one that experimented with a short-term contract to enlist the services of US health insurance company Cigna’s Centre (headed by former high-flying NHS boss Samantha Jones) to help design new services, though there is now no sign of any continued US involvement.

Nottinghamshire’sICS appears to be functioning on a very different basis from the obsessive secrecy and efforts to ensure centralised control that have marked other proposals.

Partly as a result of pressure from Nottingham’s Labour-led City Council, under pressure from local campaigners, which walked away from the process last December, complaining of “lack of democratic oversight,” the Leadership Board of the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Integrated Care System (ICS) has agreed to hold its meetings in public, doing so for the first time in April.

It has also begun publishing its board papers and minutes of meetings. The Leadership Board also agreed that rather than dividing Nottingham and Nottinghamshire into two “Integrated Care Systems” (ICSs) --- with a separate one for the City of Nottingham, one for Southern Nottinghamshire and another for mid Nottinghamshire --- it will go ahead with the notion of “integration” in any meaningful sense of the word is debatable.

However responding to these developments, the City Council agreed in April that it would rejoin the ICS as a full member – provided that the ICS agreed to bring the NHS (including mental health) under its control. The March meeting of the ICS Board (minutes published in April) urged anyone drafting documents “to take all opportunity figures (in bubbles) – £m– are gross, high level and indicative.

In other words they have little value.

Indeed the document continues to say that most of the rest of the document appears to be proposing nothing but service improvements, and are inconsistent with the notional target of reducing spending.

Pinch of salt

However anyone seeking any serious analysis from the documents will be left with a generous pinch of salt. The March meeting of the ICS Board (minutes published in April) urged anyone drafting documents “to save another £15m. Mental health is expected to save £5m – despite all the fine words in the Long Term Plan about improving access and improving maximum waiting times for mental health care. Across the ICS there are vague proposals to save £18m ‘from back office’ services – which run the risk of dumping admin work onto clinical staff – and £10m from ‘procurement’.

None of these proposed savings come with any detailed explanation, and there is no one to account to the whole page highlighted in a red box which states: ‘Note: All opportunities figures (in bubbles) – £m– are gross, high level and indicative’.

In other words they have little value.

Theadoptions also involve a 2.7% (562 FTE) overall reduction in acute activity (a eccentric and jargonised use of language. We are left to assume what the figures mean).

"The plan is understandably barely mentioned at all, given that it was based on assumptions that have already proved false, including:

- Reduce “mortality emergency” and admissions overall in the next two years by 10%/p10
- 20-40% reduction in non-elective admissions
- 15.1% reduction in A&E attendances
- 30.5% reduction in Non elective acute bed days
- 25% reduction in admissions to nursing and respite homes
- 9.8% reduction in secondary care referrals

The ICS’s authors expected these very substantial (and largely imaginary) reductions in acute activity (a reduction of 30% in south Nottinghamshire and 19.5% in north Nottinghamshire, p10) would make it possible to reduce numbers of acute hospital beds by 2026 (p28).

Specifically the ICS is expected to be “sold” with its estate reduced by 20%, with further estate sales at Kings Mill (p44).

Instead the plan was to provide care in (undeclared) “alternative settings that are more appropriate for our citizens”.

“Care will be revided to short term residential/ community beds, short term assessment beds, standard residential beds and also supported at home living.” (p60) STP planned for cuts in staff

According to an 11-page appendix to the STP (which now appears to be no longer available online) the plan also involved a 57% reduction in staff in the STP projected to occur in the ICS in over five years, centred on acute services, with a proposed reduction of 667 staff in urgent care and 681 in planned care, despite an expected 9.3% increase in demand over the same period.

In fact NHS figures show that emergency admissions, total admissions and A&E attendances have each gone up over the past two years at both Nottingham University Hospitals and at Sherwood Forest Hospitals trust. Moreover the new Operating Plan (page 90) now expects future numbers of both emergency and elective admissions to increase even faster, by 5.6% and 3.8% respectively in 2019/20, and A&E increases to increase by 3.3%.

The staffing plans have also been quietly abandoned: between May 2016 and January 2018, both acute trusts increased their staff numbers – NUH by 15%, SFH by 7.7%; only the mental health trust (Nottinghamshire Healthcare Trust) slightly reduced its numbers of staff.

The ICS Operating Plan, which went to trust boards (and largely imaginary) reductions in acute activity (a reduction of 30% in south Nottinghamshire and 19.5% in north Nottinghamshire, p10) would make it possible to reduce numbers of acute hospital beds by 2026 (p28).

Specifically the ICS is expected to be “sold” with its estate reduced by 20%, with further estate sales at Kings Mill (p44). The scale of the problem of inappropriate out of area placements is enormous, with 20,488 bed days in 12 months to October 2018, and 20,496 bed days in November 2018.

The document continues in similar vein, with plans for reducing beds in both mental health and acute beds.

19% vacancy rate

But the problems faced by the trusts are glossed over. Nottingham University Hospitals for example is listed as one having 17% vacancies. Nottinghamshire Healthcare Trust. “The scale of the problem of inappropriate out of area placements is enormous, with 20,488 bed days in 12 months to October 2018, and 20,496 bed days in November 2018.

The document continues in similar vein, with plans for reducing beds in both mental health and acute beds.

The STP rubber stamped by NHS England at the end of that year. That plan is barely mentioned at all: it was based on assumptions that have already proved false, discussing “Options to develop additional acute capacity”, which states:

“in addition to the acute beds redesign, work is also being undertaken to develop potential options for the provision of additional acute capacity in case insufficient alternative alternatives can be identified to mitigate the current forecast gap in capacity versus expected demand of around 20% in 2019/20.”

Missing details

There is a striking lack of either estimated costs for some positive proposals to expand social care and reducing long lengths of stay in hospital. So questions remain over plans to develop a “Home First Strategy” to provide “adequate capacity and capability within the domestic care market,” or the prospects if increasing “large care packages >27hrs/ week & £300pw”.

Nor is there any estimate of costs or staffing implications in establishing “emergency ambulatory care”, or reducing long lengths of stay in hospital “to ensure we have few than 192 patients in hospital with a length of stay more than 20 days”, p41.

The plan proposes “to improve the acuity capacity of community beds” but also increase utilisation of community beds and “target the most complex patients”.

On mental health, where spending cuts are planned, the less than ambitious proposals include increasing provision of services for Children and Young People – to reach just over a third of the numbers needing support; mental health services are supposed to support the 190 requirements of increasing access to 34% of estimated 2004 CYP prevalence” (p49).

The document shows that recruiting and adequately training sufficient mental health staff is referred to, but not the cost. Instead the ICS freely promises to “build towards” 1,700 new staff by 2020/21. (p50)

There are contradictory proposals to regularise use of private beds with the trust purchasing 16 spot purchased beds into a sub-contract in order to achieve better value and ensure care is closer to home.” (p49).

The document states that the main focus of that year: it was already proved false.

The document states that the main focus is understandable barely mentioned at all, given that it was based on assumptions that have already proved false, including:

- Reduce “mortality emergency” and admissions overall in the next two years by 10%/p10
- 20-40% reduction in non-elective admissions
- 15.1% reduction in A&E attendances
- 30.5% reduction in Non elective acute bed days
- 25% reduction in admissions to nursing and respite homes
- 9.8% reduction in secondary care referrals

The ICS’s authors expected these very substantial (and largely imaginary) reductions in acute activity (a reduction of 30% in south Nottinghamshire and 19.5% in north Nottinghamshire, p10) would make it possible to reduce numbers of acute hospital beds by 2026 (p28).

Specifically the ICS is expected to be “sold” with its estate reduced by 20%, with further estate sales at Kings Mill (p44).

Instead the plan was to provide care in (undefined) “alternative settings that are more appropriate for our citizens”.

“Care will be revided to short term residual/ community beds, short term assessment beds, standard residential beds and also supported at home living.” (p60)
Why are NHS mental health services still in crisis?

One in four people will experience a mental health problem each year, but most go untreated. Extra funding and new approaches have repeatedly been promised by ministers and by NHS England, but a recent Parliamentary assessment revealed that the service is still letting huge numbers of mental health patients down, why is this?

Rising number of patients

A recent study looking at young people found a six-fold increase over the last two decades, in the proportion of mental health patients down, why is this?

Summary:

Staffing levels are not rising with demand - scope and standards of care falling

Funding has been insufficient, and money has not reached patients

Our society is not addressing the root causes of ill health, over relying on drug solutions

Targets to treat mental health patients with same priority have been missed

Planners of care don’t adequately involve people with a lived experience of mental health

NHS mental health beds have been cut and services outsourced

Staff numbers have not kept up with demand

In 2013 there was 1 mental health doctor for every 186 patients accessing services. In 2018 this has fallen to 1 for every 233 patients.

The number of nurses per patient has also dropped. In 2013 there was 1 mental health nurse for every 29 of patients accessing services, by 2018 that had fallen to 1 for every 39 patients.

10% of specialist mental health posts are unfilled. A survey by UNISON of staff working in mental health found that staff shortages were:

- a major factor preventing individuals from accessing services early (74 per cent)
- a reason for the increased frequency of violent incidents experienced in the past year (87 per cent)
- a reason for staff having to work unpaid overtime (57 per cent).

Last year it was reported that two thousand mental health staff a month are leaving their posts in the NHS in England, according to figures from the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC).

Funding is insufficient

An analysis of the most recent budget (2018) by economists at the Health Foundation noted that, ‘Extra investment in mental health services will see funding grow broadly in line with the total health budget but this will mean simply maintaining the status quo, which sees just 4 in 10 people who need it receive mental health support. To see some improvement, with provision increasing to 7 in 10, service would need an extra £1.5bn on top of what the chancellor has announced.

An overwhelming majority (81%) of trust leaders said they are not able to meet current demand for community CAMHS and more than half (58%) said the same for adult community mental health services; more than half (56%) could not meet demand for crisis resolution teams.

Commissioners don’t involve people with a lived experience of mental health

A report by the charity Rethink found that only 1% of clinical commissioning groups co-produce their mental health services with users and carers, they concluded “Decisions about complex care need to involve the people using them.” CCGs are failing to adopt co-production despite the fact that it was set out as the standard approach in the mental health strategy produced by NHS England.

Mental health is still given less priority than physical health

There is less stigma attached to mental health services, but they only received 13 per cent of the NHS budget despite the fact that mental ill health accounts for 23 per cent of the disease burden.

For three years in a row, 40 per cent of mental health trusts received a cut in their funding (2013-2016) according to research by the Kings Fund. In the last year (2017-18) 21 per cent still suffered a fall in income.

Overall, since 2012/13, funding for mental health trusts has increased by just 5.6 per cent compared to an increase of 16.8 per cent for acute hospitals.

This is despite the government have stated its commitment towards achieving parity between mental and physical health back in 2011, and has led to accusations that mental health funding is not reaching patients and according to a Nuffield Trust analysis is being diverted to cover outstanding debts.

Closure of mental health beds and other services

The number of beds for mental health patients in England has slumped by nearly 3,000 (-13%) since 2013. Official figures show that the number of beds for those with some of the most serious conditions – including psychosis, serious depression leading to suicidal feelings and eating disorders – has fallen from 26,448 in 2009 to 18,082 in 2018.

91% of trusts blamed council cuts as a reason for more demand for mental health services.

“Cuts to services funded by local authorities also mean that preventative approaches and early intervention services are less available. Mental health leaders pointed to rising demand during winter, but it is clear that these pressures on services are a year-round phenomenon.” - (NHS Providers survey of trusts).

Neglecting the root causes and over relying on drug solutions

As a society we are not adequately addressing the root cause of mental health - economic uncertainty, problems with housing, social isolation, relationship breakdown and chronic disease.

More people are sleeping rough and one in five of us have mental health issues connected to housing, changes to benefits have increased suicides, a million children are living with parent who is addicted to alcohol and two fifths of people in care homes suffer depression.

The most recent figures from NHS digital (2014) shows 9.3% of the population reporting a common mental health issue.
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Summary:

Staffing levels are not rising with demand - scope and standards of care falling

Funding has been insufficient, and money has not reached patients

Our society is not addressing the root causes of ill health, over relying on drug solutions

Targets to treat mental health patients with same priority have been missed

Planners of care don’t adequately involve people with a lived experience of mental health

NHS mental health beds have been cut and services outsourced
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Commissioners don’t involve people with a lived experience of mental health

A report by the charity Rethink found that only 1% of clinical commissioning groups co-produce their mental health services with users and carers, they concluded “Decisions about complex care need to involve the people using them.” CCGs are failing to adopt co-production despite the fact that it was set out as the standard approach in the mental health strategy produced by NHS England.
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Overall, since 2012/13, funding for mental health trusts has increased by just 5.6 per cent compared to an increase of 16.8 per cent for acute hospitals.

This is despite the government have stated its commitment towards achieving parity between mental and physical health back in 2011, and has led to accusations that mental health funding is not reaching patients and according to a Nuffield Trust analysis is being diverted to cover outstanding debts.

Closure of mental health beds and other services

The number of beds for mental health patients in England has slumped by nearly 3,000 (-13%) since 2013. Official figures show that the number of beds for those with some of the most serious conditions – including psychosis, serious depression leading to suicidal feelings and eating disorders – has fallen from 26,448 in 2009 to 18,082 in 2018.

91% of trusts blamed council cuts as a reason for more demand for mental health services.

“Cuts to services funded by local authorities also mean that preventative approaches and early intervention services are less available. Mental health leaders pointed to rising demand during winter, but it is clear that these pressures on services are a year-round phenomenon.” - (NHS Providers survey of trusts).
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More people are sleeping rough and one in five of us have mental health issues connected to housing, changes to benefits have increased suicides, a million children are living with parent who is addicted to alcohol and two fifths of people in care homes suffer depression.

The most recent figures from NHS digital (2014) shows 9.3% of the population reporting a common mental health issue.
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Who we are – and why we are launching The Lowdown

The Lowdown launched earlier in February 2019 with our first pilot issue and a searchable website. We aim to develop in the next few months into a weekly source of evidence-based journalism and research on the NHS – something that isn’t currently available to NHS supporters.

We are seeking your support to help establish it as an important new resource that will help to create enduring protection for the NHS and its staff. Our mission is to inform, explain, analyse and investigate issues and ensure that the founding principles of the NHS are upheld, in policy and practice.

Information is power, and we aim to provide people with the information tools they need to negotiate, communicate, campaign and lobby in defence of the NHS.

We will summarise news from across the media and health journals, provide critical analysis, and where necessary highlight news that might otherwise be missed, and make complex proposals understandable through a range of briefings. We will bring stories and insights you won’t find anywhere else.

And we are keen to follow up YOUR stories and ideas. We welcome your input and feedback to help shape what we do.

Paul Evans of the NHS Support Federation and Dr John Lister (London Health Emergency, Keep Our NHS Public and Health Campaigns Together) have almost 60 years combined experience between them as researchers and campaigners.

They are now leading this work to recruit and train new experts, and create a professionally-run news and investigation unit to inform NHS supporters and workers.

This package is therefore something quite new, and a genuine step-up in the resources that are currently available.

As we go we will build an online archive of briefings and articles, and use the experiences and comments of NHS staff and users to support and guide our work. In time we believe this will become a resource that will establish credibility with academics and journalists and which they will use to support inform and improve their own work.

The project aims to be self-sustaining, enabling it also to recruit and train new journalists, and undertake investigations and research that other organisations aren’t able to take on.

By donating and backing the mission of the project, our supporters will help develop this new resource, ensuring it is freely available to campaigners and activists, get first sight of each issue, and be able to choose more personalised content.

Help us make this information available to all

We really want to run this publication without clumsy paywalls that would exclude many activists – but if we are to develop new expertise we do need to recruit staff, and so we need the resources to pay them.

We are therefore planning to fund the publication through donations from supporting organisations and individuals – and we are very grateful for those individuals and organisations who have already given or promised generous donations to enable us to start the project going.

Our business plan for the longer term includes promotion of The Lowdown on social media and through partner organisations, and to develop a longer-term network of supporters who pay smaller amounts each month or each year to sustain the publication as a resource.

But we still need funding up front to get under way and recruit additional journalists, so right now we are asking those who can to as much as you can afford to help us ensure we can launch it strongly and develop a wider base of support to keep it going.

We would suggest £5 per month/£50 per year for individuals, and at least £10 per month/£100 per year for organisations.

Supporters will be able to choose how, and how often to receive information, and are welcome to share it.

On the website we will gratefully acknowledge all of the founding donations that enable us to get this project off the ground.

Please send your donation by BACS (54006610 / 60-83-01) or by cheque made out to NHS Support Federation, and post to us at Community Base, 113 Queens Road, Brighton, BN1 3XG

If you would like us to send a speaker to your meeting to discuss the project, or have any other queries or suggestions for stories we should be covering, contact us at contactus@lowdownnhs.info

In our first year we will:

● establish a weekly one-stop summary of key health and social care news and policy
● produce articles highlighting the strengths of the NHS as a model and its achievements
● maintain a consistent, evidence-based critique of all forms of privatisation
● publish analysis of health policies and strategies, including the forthcoming 10-year NHS plan
● write explainer articles and produce infographics to promote wider understanding
● create a website that will give free access to the main content for all those wanting the facts
● pursue special investigations into key issues of concern, including those flagged up by supporters
● connect our content with campaigns and action, both locally and nationally

THE
lowdown