Prine Mister<sup>2</sup>

You have already responded to

The Norris miste. But the figures

fruen here are identiting.

CONFIDENTIAL

12/11.

12 November 1987

PRIME MINISTER

## NURSING IN LONDON STUDY

John Moore is intending to publish the Nursing in London Study at the end of the month and has minuted you about how he proposes to respond on key issues such as pay and accommodation. You asked us in particular to look at the issue of whether London weighting for nurses was adequate.

As the attached tables show, there are substantial shortages of nursing staff in some specialities and some health authorities. But, as you will also see, there are very wide variations. For example, there is a shortage of some 20% in accident and emergency nursing staff in Merton and Sutton district, but only 5% in Barnet.

There are several, complementary, things that need to be done to tackle these shortages. Improving pay is one and John Moore's minute mentions a number of other sensible improvements to accommodation, recruitment and being more flexible in meeting the needs of staff. One important change, not mentioned in John Moore's minute, is using nursing staff more efficiently. Personal experience suggests that there is considerable scope for this, for example in out patient departments where nurses may be used as little more than receptionists.

## Pay

One way of tackling the pay problem is a substantial increase in London weighting for nurses which at present stands at £930 a year compared, say, to £3,000 for central London bank staff. But this would be an expensive and wasteful solution, given the wide variation in vacancy

levels. The alternative is to give more discretion to local managers to pay higher rates of pay to meet particular shortages. This would have to be tightly controlled to prevent managers taking the soft option and would need to be kept within existing budgets. But there would be offsetting savings, for example from reducing dependence on agency staff. It would also be consistent with our policy more generallly of encouraging greater geographical variations in pay in response to market forces. This is the approach John Moore proposes in his minute. In fact he hopes that the Review Body can be presented with a new pay structure for nurses, similar to that already agreed Lervice, which would replace rigid pay scales by a pay spine. Managers in districts with a high level of vacancies would be able to move groups of nurses up to 20% up the pay spine. Conclusion The shortage of nursing staff in Greater London is a serious problem. John Moore appears to be going the right way about tackling it and we suggest you give him your strong support. You might add that you also attach importance to using nursing staff more efficiently. Perer Stredder John d'Sulline JOHN O'SULLIVAN PETER STREDDER

QUALIFIED MURSING AND NIDWIFERY STAFF

	1		l		1						eraity/						ì	
Mealth Authority	General &   Gene		Geriatrics !		: Mental		! Mental				Hospi		. Community Hidwifery		Nealth   Visitors		District   Dursing Staf	
				Illness			Bandicap		Mursing		Hiduifery							
									1004	100/	1 1004	1000	1 1004	1 1907	1004	188/	1 1984	1 1004
aner Landon HA's	1794	1766	1384	1786	1394	1790	1 1764	1760	1764	1786	1705	1780	1794	1 1700	1784	17789	2	1 1700
MICT LINKING IN 5													30.5				i	
liverside .	17.4	17.3	18.0	34.0	11.5	23.6	75.0	MIL	21.4	29.8	19.4	20.2	MEL	14.3	18.6	15.2	1 26.4	1 23.1
Paddington & H Lens'ton	3.2	13.4	7.3	29.7	11.4	14.7	23.1	23.1	-	-	12.8	18.0	-	-	4.2	9.6	1 -	1 -
	13.8	14.5	25.8	12.0	3.7	7.3	-	-	-	-	1 15.2	13.8	MEL	28.6	+7.6	148.4	1 14.3	111.
Bloomsburg		13.7	Hil :	37.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 -	! -
Islingten	-	-	3 -	-	14.9	24.3		-	-	-	1 5.3	6.9	MIL	HIL I	14.0	15.5	1 -	1 -
	11.5	17.2	-			-	-	-	MIL	58.8	9.8	32.7	17.6	14.3	24.1	1.6	1 13.0	1 +2.
Leuban	11.7	6.4	20.3	24.8	34.8	19.7	76.4	53.3	HIL	HEL	1 16.3	18.6	11.8	NIL I	2.4	13.6	1 14.4	1 7.
Tower Haalets	14.9	12.8	16.3	40.1	14.3	18.7	14.3	66.7	21.1	9.7	11.5	4.9	15.4	24.9	6.2	9.9	8.4	1 0.
Nest Lameth .	3_8	11.0	17.4	9.8	8.0	14.7	-	-	: +3.3	1+13.9	27.4	14.6	8.3	+5.9	2.1	3.1	1 14.4	1 13.
Cambernell	26.1	17.6	23.B	37.3	52.8	32.8	-	-	-	-	16.6	23.8	+3.0	1.0	+15.	19.3	1 -	! -
Lewishan & # Southwark	-	-	-	-	18.4	24.5	-	-	1 -	-	: 23.1	23.0	17.0	48.3	1.2	1 45.5	1 14.4	1 7.
Nandsworth	16.7	17.6	6.7	5.9	17.7	15.8	8.8	28.6	+58.0	MOL	9.2	9.4	13.3	+7.1	5.4	17.5	13.7	19.
luter Landon IM's				100														
Sarnet	5.4	16.8	23.9	18.9	11.4	12.5	-	-	1 45.4	2.0	9.1	9.8	MIL	5.3	0.4	2.0	23.4	24.
Harrow	12.3	13.3	1 19.7	24.5	1 8.4	: 21.9	HIL	58.8	20.2	1 8.5	17.7	23.4	FIN :	HIL.	3.9	: 3.9	1 11.2	8.
Arent	14.3	14.6	16.4	23.3	16.6	1 14.4	14.6	17.3	1 19.6	13.5	38.1	36.6	MIL	7.2	2.8	14.7	1 2.9	: 22.
Hourslan & Spelthorne	20.1	22.8	1 15.3	1 16.9	! -	! -	: -	-	! -	1 -	1 12.5	12.5	HIL	1.8	1.2	: 6.9	1 4.5	1 4.
Ealing	2.4	+1.2	1 18.2	14.5	4.9	8.8	14.7	14.7	I MIL I	36.4	5.2	B.6	I MIL	16.7	MEL	1 3.5	1 24.8	1 16.
Willingdom	13.1	: 19.9	1 16.5	29.2	1 13.1	10.5	: -	1 - 1	-	! -	1 13.4	9.8	1.5	12.5	18.7	: 40.3	1 12.3	I R
Barking, Havering		1	:	1	:	1	1	:	: .	:	1		1	1	1	1	1	1
& Brentwood	21.1	: 21.9	: -	1 -	1 8.2	10.6	10.8	24.3	1 -	! -	! -	: -	! -	: -	8.7	13.3	1 9.1	+0.
Enfield	8.6	2.5	1 5.1	15.2	23.1	23.6	1 6.D	3.9	-	: -	1 +0.5	7.8	-	1 -	MIL	19.9	-	-
Haringey	1 21.9	15.1	: 24.3	32.1	7.8	17.8	: 64.3	23.5	1 -	! -	1 1.4	4.9	: MEL	: MIL	14.8	6.7	1 +2.9	1 14.
tedbridge	16.2	1 18.5	29.1	44.9	: -	: -	! -	1 -	1 17.4	28.0	18.2	19.1	16.7	MIL	6.4	9.0	+3.4	1 3.
Halthan Forest	1 16.6	1 28.4	: 11.6	1 13.9	1 16.9	1 17.2	1 25.4	1 16.1	1 21.5	6.9	1 14.3	1 4.5	1 5.0	1 10.0	7.1	20.4	: 2.6	; 3.
Berley	-	-	! -	! -	: -	: -	-	: -	+28.7	1+28_0	1 21.5	21.0	MIL	: MIE	+7.4	1.7	4.3	1 0.
Greenvich	1 48.5	1 2.2	: +0.4	: 2.2	14.9	17.0	32.1	23.4	: 10.4	27.2	1 ta.3	28.2	1 +3.2	3.4	24.8	20.3	; +4.7	9
trouley	- 1	-	-	! -	-	-	B.0	13.1	-	-	: 11.4	4.5	MIL	MIL	1.6	3.1	14.8	10.
Czeydon	1 6.1	1 1.0	1 7.3	: 8.4	8.5	17.8	14.3	24.3	1 16.9	37.5	9.6	7.4	HIL	1.9	4.5	9.8	8.1	: 5
Lingston & Esher	11.2	16.3	1 5.5	14.7	12.1	5.4	38.7	1 16.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.9	4.2	1 8.0	7.
Richmond, Iwickenhau	:	1	1	:	1	1	1	ile.	:	1	1	1 700	1	:		1	1	
& Rochampton	15.9	15.3	6.3	1 16.7	24.9	19.3		17.9	1 21.0	1 44.4	1 16.2	27.3		1+12.8	3.7	3.2		25.
Herton & Sutton	8.8	1 19.9	1 11.5	14.9	: 10.4	8.2	48.6	2 6 E	-	: -	1	1	1 +16.4	i DIL	1.3	3.0	1 5.8	1 14.

Source: Marsing in Landon study

SEPTEMBER 1984 AND SEPTEMBER 1986

## QUALIFIED HURSING AND NEDWIFERY STAFF

Smalth Authority	Accident & Emergency				Intensive & Carel		\$ceal .		Community   Heatal   Handicap		Community     Hental   1   Illness   1		SCHU & Paediatric/ Hee Hatal Intensive Care	
	1984 1	1996	1984	1986	1984	1986	1964 :	1986	1994 1	1986	1984	1986	1994	1986
Taner London MA's		1	. 1		1. 1	1			. !	. !		1		
	: :	3	1		- 1	9					28.6	40!	19.1	23.9
Liverside :	6.5 1	9,5 1	18.4 I	15.6	15.5 1	100000000000000000000000000000000000000			- 1	40.8	NO !	22.2	21.4 :	19.6
Paddington & M Kens'ton	9.3 1	15.6 1	11.6	9.8	31.4	39.1	+3.4		20.4	4U.8 3	MIL I	22.2 1	20.6	14.7
Hamestead	: MIL !	8.7 1	19.1	16.7	22.0	26.5	19.5	8.1					44.0	74.4
&loessbury	: HILL !	12.6	19.4	24.4	2.8	7.4		T	- !	- :				
Islington	1 - 1	- }	- 1	-	- 1	-							21.1	36.4
City & Hackney	! MIL!	4.9	MIL	10-4	1 29.9		7.1	#IL	-	-	17	M11 1	20 0 1	10 0
Newhan	MIL	13.0	15.8	15.8	1.46.0		-		66.7	58.0	15.4	MIL S	10.4	17.5
Tower Manlets	1 13.0	5.7	24.7	39.4	21.2		2.1	6.3	-			439 £ !	14-3	4.7
West Lambeth	1 9.1	8.3	18.6	20.9	2.4	9.5	19.4	6.5	MIL	MTF			11.8	27.9
Cambernell	1 1.2	9.6	8.8	1 16.9	1 22.2	1 70.0	22.6	31.7	-		WALL !	16.7	11.9	41.7
Lewishan & M Southwark	1 48.8	13.4	7.3	7.8	1 9.5	7.8	19.1	MIL	-		16.8			
Mandsmorth	1 -	-	-	1 -	: -	-	: -	-	33.3	50.8	3.0	2.3		
denie mant en	i				1		1	1	1					
Outer Leaden Mi's	1				1		١.	1	5					
	1	1	1		1		ŀ						15.8	1 14 1
tarnet	1 +7.0	1 14.7	1 23.3	1 13.3	1 5.0	1 16.7	1 -	-	21.4	7/.6				20.3
Barrau	1 4.8	1 9.5	20.9	1 14.8	22.2		; -	: -	MIL	i BIL	1 12.5	15.4	1 21.9	1 28.
Breat -	1 9.6	1 4.9	: 27.7	1 17.6	17.6	1 5.5	: -	1 -	#IT	; MIL			21.7	1 68-1
Mounsion & Spelthorne	1 10.4	: 19.1	1 19.9	1 7.1	1 28.5	1 34.2	: -	! -	-	-	•	1		1
Ealing	1 421.7	12 +2.7	1 +6.3		1 4.8	: 10.7	1 -	! -	1 -	-				1 134
Hillingdon	HIL	1 +0.4	1 16.9	1+14.6	1 11.3	1 15.1	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	8.3	B.6	1 +20.5	2,34
Lacking, Rovering	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	p.			i .	
& Srentwood	1 -	1 -	1 -	1	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	-	-	!	1 -	-
Enfield	1 -	1 -	1 MIL	1 3.4	11 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	-	MIL	; 30.8		1
Haringer	1 23.1	1 7.4	: MIL	1 16.7	1 17.6	1 12.5	1 -	1 -	1 28.6	1 11.1	; MIL	9.1	-	i -
Redbridge	1 16.7	1 5.6	1 8.6	1 24.	3! -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	! -	I MET	HIL	1 15.0	29.
Nalthan Forest	2 6.7		1 9.7	1 7.1	0 : 9.2	1 22.8	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 4.6	1 2.3	16.3	1 4.
Series	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	1 -	3 MEL	MIL	i	1
Sreemich	1 421	61 10.4	1 7.7	1 7	6 : 4.3	: 10.8	1 -	1 -	1 +108	1450.6	! MIL	1+23.1	1 18.6	1 44.
president	1 -	! -	1 -	1 -	! -	1 -	1 -	1 -	: -	1 -	: -	1 -	1 -	•
	1 40	1 24	1 21	1 7.	1 1 45.7	1 45.7	1 -	1 -	1 12.5		1 -	1 -	14.7	1 25.
Creydon Lingston & Esher	8.4	1 15 6				1000	1 -	1 -	1 58.0	1 50.0	1 11.8	1 10.8	10.0	1 7
Sistered Trickentra	1 0,4	1 40 0	5	!	1	1	1	1	1 3		1			1
Richmond, Twickenham	1 49 1	28.1	1 7	5 ! 20	6   24.6	1 45.1	1 -	1 -	1 28.0	37.5	1 33.3	The state of	1 23.2	
& Rechampton		2 1 20.5			4   +11.		1 11.4	1 19.7	HIL !	. I MIL	; MET	i Mia	1 +36.	21156
Herten & Satton	1 25-6	1 54-3	4 40-1		- 1						1			1

Source: Mursing in London study