Summary of results 2015

This summary gives a brief overview of the main findings from the Your Experience in Mind Survey, 2015. We would like to thank everyone who took part in the survey and all the local Minds (LMs).

The survey aimed to find out how far local Mind (LM) services achieve the following:
- promote recovery in people with mental health problems
- offer a person-centred experience
- are culturally appropriate and accessible for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups
- offer opportunities for people to get involved in the design and delivery of mental health services
- provide a different experience from other services people receive (e.g. primary care, secondary care, social care etc.)

1449 total responses
344 (24%) Freepost envelope
839 (58%) Collection box
266 (18%) Online

25 survey champions across 20 LM

1449 total responses
344 (24%) Freepost envelope
839 (58%) Collection box
266 (18%) Online

72 = average number of response per site
Use of Services and Support

The most common types of service used were information and advice (40%), group activities (38%) and a drop-in centres (37%). 318 respondents described another form of support or service, including benefits and employment support, one-to-one support, peer support and volunteering with the local Mind.

Types of Mind services used by respondents

Recovery-focused practice

We asked people how often they experienced good recovery-focused support from their LM. Between 61% and 85% said they were always or mostly treated in a recovery-focused way for each question.

Experiences of LM staff were largely positive. The word cloud to the left shows some of the most common words used to describe the staff. The bigger the word, the more often people said it.

“She is so supportive and always ready to go to any length to assist in anything she can. She is like Mother Theresa.” (Manchester)
A small number of people complained about Mind staff. This was mainly about LMs being understaffed and therefore not being able to see staff, about poor communication, or occasionally about a specific member of staff being rude to them.

**Satisfaction with the local Mind**

Respondents were asked to state whether they would recommend their local Mind to a friend or family member if they needed support for mental health issues. Responses were positive, with 85% saying that they probably or definitely would recommend their local Mind to friends or family, and only 4% saying that they probably or definitely would not.

**‘Friends and family test’**

To what extent do local Minds provide a different experience from other services people receive?

We asked the question, “What do you consider to be particularly valuable about your local Mind in comparison to other services? E.g. GP, Jobcentre, other support groups. This resulted in eight themes, described below.

**Staff attitudes**: Many respondents felt that the staff at their LM had a less judgemental attitude towards their mental health issues than staff in other organisations.

**Staff understanding of mental health**: Several respondents spoke about how the staff’s knowledge of mental health issues and the wider problems surrounding these was a huge benefit which other services could not provide.

**A personalised approach**: Around 10% of respondents felt that their local Mind treated them as an individual. Several commented on structural differences between Mind and other services which allowed Mind staff to spend much more time with an individual than say a GP could.

**Environment and atmosphere**: Around 10% of respondents commented on some aspect of the environment or atmosphere that they experienced at their local Mind. The most common of these were that the atmosphere at the local Mind was safe, relaxed and friendly.
Quality and range of services: Around a fifth of respondents commented on the specific services that Mind offered. Some people commented that their LM offered services not offered by other organisations, while others felt that the quality and range of services was much better than that on offer at other organisations.

Accessibility: Local Minds were considered more accessible for several reasons. Firstly, their LM was able to offer immediate support, which meant bypassing the often lengthy waiting times at other services. Secondly, LMs offered a free or affordable service and lastly, some people were grateful that they did not need a referral to their LM.

Opportunities to socialise: Several respondents spoke about how being able to socialise contributed towards their recovery. Some also spoke about how this social element of their local Mind acted as a distraction, or sometimes as a motivation to leave the house.

Shared lived experience of mental health difficulties: Several people mentioned how this aspect of their LM helped their recovery. This shared lived experience meant that people felt more able to talk to others about their difficulties and often reminded respondents that they were ‘not alone’.

Suggestions for improvement

Run more activities
The majority of respondents commented on the activities that were on offer at their local Mind. Whilst there was an acknowledgement that local Minds offered unique activities that other organisations did not, respondents also gave several suggestions for further activities that they would enjoy at their local Mind. Some respondents also commented that they would like their local Mind to run more of the same activities that were already on offer.

“Organise walking groups, gardening project, exercise groups.”  
(Carrick)

“Open more in the evenings.”  
(West Leicestershire)

Improve the accessibility of the local Mind
Several respondents also commented on the accessibility of their local Mind. Whilst there was an acknowledgement that local Minds were often more accessible than other organisations due to their decreased waiting times, decreased costs and flexible nature, respondents felt that local Minds sometimes could do more to improve their accessibility. This was mainly in relation to the location of local Minds and the opening hours.

“Promote / advertise services. I was only aware of Mind as a mental health charity, not the services which can be accessed.”  
(Norwich and Central Norfolk)

Attract more funding
Finally, several respondents understood the impact of funding cuts on their local Mind services, and were keen to emphasise how important it was that these services continued to be funded.

“I’m sure with more money they would use it wisely and always to the advantaged of distressed clients.”  
(Havering)

Improve publicity
Some respondents also suggested that their local Mind could do more to advertise the services that were on offer, both to provide information to pre-existing service users and also to attract new members.