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**Introduction**

This is the fourth report on Personality Disorder Knowledge and Understanding Framework (KUF) Awareness level courses delivered by the Thames Valley Initiative (TVi). They are aimed at increasing awareness, understanding and effective practice for professionals who come into contact with those who either have a personality disorder or would meet diagnostic criteria. For more background information on TVi and the course, please see Appendix 1.

This report covers 18 cohorts of students on courses completed between April 2014 and April 2015 at various venues in central southern England.

This year 84% of students who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the course overall. People gave the best satisfaction ratings to the expert-by-profession trainer and mentioned the expert-by-experience trainer most often as one of the most helpful aspects of the course (47%).

87% of respondents were able to identify some change in the way they worked and/or their attitude to people with a personality disorder as a result of the course.

**Feedback from students**

304 students were emailed a link to an online survey and 102 replies were received, about 1/3 of the total students. A few respondents did not reply to every question

The questionnaire (see Appendix 2) contained some questions asking how much they agreed or disagreed with a statement rating their satisfaction with an aspect of the course. Other questions had a text box allowing a fuller reply. Where these replies are quoted below, they might be shortened, with removed text replaced by an ellipsis (….), but they have been copied directly, with no corrections to spelling or grammar. The questions are very similar to the previous year’s, but with Police and Council/Government added to the list of workplaces and some re-phrasing, which will be described below as we look at answers to the individual questions.

The data are compared with results from our previous reports – “2011” (26 cohorts in 15 months from Nov 2010 to Jan 2012), “2012-13” (21 cohorts in 15 months from Jan 2012 to April 2013) and “2013-14” (11 cohorts in the financial year from April 2013 to April 2014).

This section of the report will go through the replies to each question in turn.

1. **“Please indicate your workplace”**

Overall student numbers have increased back to planned levels after the funding difficulties of the previous year. This is reflected in the number of students replying to the survey, which tends to be about 1/3 of those who are sent a request.

This year’s survey added categories for Police and Government/Council workers (who were previously included in the “Other” category), to make the survey easier to compare with the workplace information which is collected before the course. In fact there were few police this year but the proportion of students from a forensic background of some sort (police, prison and probation) was about the same as in previous years.

This year NHS workers were very slightly less likely to reply to the survey whereas other, non-forensic workers were slightly more likely to, but the previous year it was probation and voluntary workers who were a bit more likely to reply and others who were less likely to. There is no overall trend for any particular workplace to be more likely to reply. The differences are so small that the replies we have received can be seen as representing students from all the workplaces fairly.

1. **Questions about satisfaction with various aspects of the course**

These multiple choice questions asked how much the students agreed with each question. This graph shows the number of respondents (out of 102) who chose each option.

For most of the questions, the replies were overwhelmingly positive – about 86% of responses either agreed or strongly agreed with the questions. This is a fall back to previous levels after a peak last year (2011: 90%, 2012-13: 85%, 2013-14: 94%) but the distribution of replies is very similar.

Best results were again for the experts by profession (“Did you find the expert-by-profession trainer knowledgeable in the subject matter?”), with 93% agreeing or strongly agreeing they were knowledgeable (2011: 91% , 2012-13: 92%, 2013-14: 98%) and nobody strongly disagreeing.

Trends over time can be examined in the graph above, by comparing the percentage of people who agree or strongly agree with each question. Satisfaction with the expert by profession (XBP) trainer has only fallen a little, satisfaction with the expert by experience (XBX), facilitated days and venues is just above the 2012-13 levels, and satisfaction with the online material and clips is a little lower. It is not obvious why ratings have fallen this year or why they went up last year. It might just be the natural random variations of a relatively small sample of data. It will be interesting to see what happens to the ratings next year.

**“Did you find the online material easy to use?”**

Satisfaction with the online material has gone down more than the other ratings this year and it has the lowest rating, though 79% still agreed or strongly agreed that it was easy to use.

Two people strongly disagreed. Their comments in replies to later questions give us some idea why: One mentioned having limited time and not being warned in advance how much time would be needed and also finding the videos condescending.

11 disagreed and 8 were neutral. The ones with worse satisfaction with ease of use tended to mention problems playing the audio / video (6), difficulty of access or complete lack of access at work (2 and 2) and were more likely than average to mention time pressure (5) and lack of user-friendliness (3). Dissatisfied people who had managed to get access were then more likely to mention finding the content repetitive (especially the videos) (9), other aspects of the video content (3) and wanting longer access after the end of the course (3). Last year there were also comments about difficulty in accessing the online material and finding it repetitive. Overall, 11 students mentioned the online material as one of the least helpful aspects of the course and a further 14 just mentioned the video clips.

9 students mentioned the online material as one of the most helpful things but most of the comments were not specific. A further 9 just mentioned the video clips as most helpful.

**“Were the video and audio clips helpful?”**

Satisfaction reduced to below previous years. 85% agreed or strongly agreed (2011: 90%, 2012-13: 88%, 2013-14: 94%) but the videos still seem to be the most popular aspect of the online material.

For the first time, a student strongly disagreed with this question. They mentioned the clips both as helpful (giving examples of situations and stimulating discussion) and unhelpful (access problems). The 2 who disagreed and 12 neutral only mentioned criticisms: access problems, condescending content and repetition.

Lack of access did not entirely stop people finding the clips helpful. Access was mentioned as a problem by 3 who found them unhelpful but also by 5 who agreed or strongly agreed that they were helpful.

9 people complained specifically about the videos (not just online content in general) being repeated, even though 5 of them had found the videos helpful. 3 criticised the content as being condescending, simplistic or not credible, but these are balanced by 11 “good” comments, mostly about content, for instance, “*video clips that helped to reinforce how to work with peope in a proactive way”*

**“Did you find the facilitated days helpful?”**

Satisfaction has gone back to just above the levels of 2012-13, at 84%

4 disagreed and 12 were neutral. They were more likely to complain about the venue, particularly not being able to hear or see things clearly, to want handouts summarising the course and to think that the course could have been shorter or have covered more content in the time available. 3 of them found the course disorganised or bewildering or that the discussions were not kept under control (these were not problems mentioned by anyone else).

In contrast, the more satisfied respondents were more likely to say good things about the trainers or the group discussions. 4 specifically mentioned the facilitated days as one of the most helpful things about the course.

**“Did you find the expert-by-profession trainer knowledgeable in the subject matter?”**

Four “expert by profession” trainers are covered by this report. Two work for TVi and all currently work or have worked with clients with a personality disorder. Half of the cohorts were presented by TVi's training coordinator.

Satisfaction has always been good with the experts by profession and it is still the highest rating. 93% agreed or strongly agreed. Our training coordinator has led enough cohorts to let her statistics be examined individually. The percentage of students agreeing or strongly agreeing that she is knowledgeable is even higher (2011: 92%, 2012-13: 96%, 2013-14: 98%, 2014-15: 96%).

Nobody has ever strongly disagreed with this question. This year 2 disagreed and 5 were neutral. The 2 who disagreed had also disagreed about the facilitated days. One said *“…group members were allowed to talk about personal aspects of their life and clients that were often not particularly relevant... for long periods of time... The facilitator (by profession) seemed to lack motivation to be there…*” Only one of the neutral respondents made relevant comments and they were the other person who had felt the discussions were uncontrolled. They also felt the trainers had not planned who was doing what.

Only 3 mentioned the expert-by-profession trainer as one of the least helpful things about the course: the 2 who had disagreed and also one other person who had wanted **more** input from them. 19 people mentioned them among the most helpful things, citing *knowledge, experience, passion, good communication, challenging comments and attitudes* and *refreshing style.*

Some of the comments were about both trainers as a team, saying the course was *well delivered* and describing them *as excellent, knowledgeable, experts with lots of experience, practical and realistic, good communicators* and able to give *different perspectives*. *“…facilitators extremely good and knowledgeable .They were very good at communicating with the group and getting some good discussions going”*

**“Did you find the expert-by-experience trainer helpful?”**

6 “expert-by-experience” trainers (members of STARS, see Appendix 1) are covered by this report. Each took 3 or 4 cohorts. All have a lived experience of having a personality disorder and have completed therapy.

Satisfaction was lower than last year but still above the levels for 2012-13. 87% agreed or strongly agreed. 59% strongly agreed - more than for any other question - but more people disagreed too, maintaining the trend observed in previous years of opinions of the expert by experience being more polarised. One strongly disagreed, 3 disagreed and 9 were neutral.

The one who strongly disagreed felt the expert by experience needed stronger boundaries and said “…*expansive comments on folk with suicidal ideation were offensive and that is only one example*…” The only relevant comment from one who disagreed was also about boundaries, feeling that the expert by experience was taking over the group more than was helpful, echoed by one neutral and two others who felt that their expert by experience was sharing too much. A couple of the neutral students criticised the trainer team as a whole and the one who had wanted more of the expert-by-profession trainer also wanted more of the expert by experience. In all there were 8 comments mentioning the expert by experience as one of the least helpful aspects of the course.

There were 48 comments mentioning the expert by experience as one of the most helpful things about the course (51% of the replies to this question, going up every year). Some praised the trainer team as a whole, others specifically liked the expert by experience’s *thoughts, knowledge, experience, perspective and feedback*, said they could *“explain in a way I understood”* and *“enhance insight “* and found them *helpful, interesting, informative, useful and inspirational*.

*“Having an ex-service user training was extremely helpful to apply theory to someone's lived experience, and to hear someone be so insightful about really personal and complex parts of themselves inspired hope in me and helped my learning a lot.”*

The distribution of replies to this question is fairly similar to those of the other satisfaction questions, though slightly more polarised, and the increasingly large number of comments on the experts by experience shows the impact they have on many of the students.

**“Were the facilities at the venue satisfactory?”**

Most of the cohorts were presented at Didcot Civic Hall (12). There were also 2 at Thame, 3 at various venues on the south coast and 1 on the Isle of Wight.

The venue has previously been one of the aspects with which people are less satisfied, but this year the ratings only reduced slightly so they are now about average. 86% agreed or strongly agreed this year. Didcot continues to be the best liked of the venues which have been used enough times to give significant data, with 92% agreeing or strongly agreeing that it was satisfactory.

One strongly disagreed, 5 disagreed and 8 were neutral. The venue tends to be taken for granted unless something is wrong so there were no comments praising venues and 10 criticising them.

Two venues were rated less well. Cohort 75 on the Isle of Wight had 9 replies to the survey of which only 44% agreed or strongly agreed. The only comment mentioned that it was small and noisy. We are restricted to the rooms supplied by the NHS there but are attempting to be more selective about which rooms we use at this venue. Cohort 86 at Tatchbury Mount on the south coast only had 2 replies to the survey and one of them disagreed. We were offered a free room there by the hospital which was supplying many of the students but it was so unsuitable that we moved to a different one after day 1. It has not been used again.

Didcot was rated well on the whole and 7 of the 12 cohorts had everyone agreeing or strongly agreeing that the venue was satisfactory and making no comments. The only person who strongly disagreed was in cohort 71 with someone else who disagreed; it was run in hot summer weather and the comments were about heat and noise. Cohort 85, in the winter, had one person disagreeing and another neutral; comments were about cold and noise. Didcot has several rooms and these cohorts might have been held in a larger room with big windows facing the road, making it noisier and harder to keep at a reasonable temperature; we seldom use this room now. One person from another cohort would have liked nicer drinks.

Distance travelled to the venue has been a problem before and attracted 3 comments this year. Someone from Slough felt Thame was too far to go, and people from High Wycombe and Amersham did not like travelling to Didcot. Next year (2015-16) there are cohorts in Reading and in High Wycombe which should reduce the problem again.

**“Were you satisfied with the course as a whole?”**

84% agreed or strongly agreed, which is back to 2012-13 levels (2011: not asked, 2012-13: 83%, 2013-14: 98%). The average over all the satisfaction questions is slightly higher, at 86%.

6 students disagreed and 10 were neutral. They were more likely to give a list of lots of things they had not liked about the course, particularly the venue, feeling disorganised and wanting handouts and struggling with the expert by experience’s contribution. They were more likely to have had problems with accessing the VLE or having time to do the ‘homework’ and to criticise the online content but they were also more likely to praise the online content and videos.

5 commented that the course was all helpful. *“I think a combination of all of it really helped…”*

**3. “Could you indicate how your practice in your workplace has been changed by this training?”**

This was a free text box in which the students could write anything. For analysis of these text replies, common themes mentioned by the students have been identified and the number of people mentioning each one counted.

Of the 102 survey respondents, 92 replied to this question. The percentage of all survey respondents identifying some kind of change to their work has increased to 82% (2011: 80%, 2012-13: 77%, 2013-14: 77%).

The comments fitted well into the same themes as before. Again, most changes identified involved understanding clients, responding to them better and knowing more about personality disorder generally. Expressed as a percentage of the 92 replies, they were -

* 91% identified some kind of improvement as a result of the course (that is, 82% of all the people who returned a survey)
* 47% felt they understood clients better (up from 42% last year)
* 37% knew more about personality disorders (up from 25%)
* 36% felt they were responding better to clients (about the same)
* 17% were using what they had learnt to help or train colleagues (down from 21%)
* 5% felt they were more self-aware or coping better with their jobs or using supervision (same)
* 9% said it had had little or no effect on them (up from 5%)
* 5% had existing ideas reinforced (down from 11%)
* 2% had had no opportunity yet to use what they had learnt

*“…better insight into how behaviours evolve has a big impact into my own beliefs … influences my attitudes and has made me more reflective about my own responses …”*

*“Increased levels of knowledge and tolerance of certain behaviours. I think this has made me more effective at defusing difficult situations”*

*“I have been able to provide a teaching session to staff on PD awareness and help us support challenging patients in a sympathetic way.”*

### 4. “How do you feel about working with people with a personality disorder? Has that changed since taking this training?”

This was a free text box in which the students could write anything. The wording was changed this year from “Have you noticed any changes in your attitude to people with a personality disorder since this training? If so, please tell us about them” to encourage fuller, less defensive answers.

Of the 102 survey respondents, 90 replied to this question. The question was new in 2012-13, when 66% of all people who replied to the survey identified an attitude change. Last year it increased to 77% but this year it has gone down again to 68%.

87% identified some change of work (question 3) and / or attitude (question 4). This is down a little from last year (2013-14: 91%) but still higher than the year before (2012-13: 84%).

The range of themes mentioned is similar to last year, with the addition of 12 mentions of how challenging the work is (sometimes seeing it as good and exciting and sometimes bad and frustrating). However, the proportion of people mentioning each theme has changed quite a lot. Some of this might be due to the changes in wording of the question. This year there was more emphasis on knowing more and coping better and less on understanding clients and being more patient or sympathetic to them.

* 29% mentioned knowing more (up a lot from 12%)
* 29% felt they were more self-aware or coping better with their jobs (also up a lot from 7%)
* 16% felt they understood clients better (down from 40%, the most popular comment last year)
* 10% felt they were responding better to clients (back down from 30% to 2012-13 levels)
* 8% felt they were more patient / respectful / compassionate / open (back down from 35% to 2012 levels)
* 8% were more hopeful / enthusiastic (up from 6%)
* 1% felt they were less condemning / rejecting (down from 19%)
* 19% said or implied they had had a good attitude already (up a lot from 4%)
* 17% said it had had little or no effect on them (back up from 13%, nearly to 2012-13 levels)
* There were 2 vague replies saying that their feelings had changed but not specifying how (up from none last year but this is still much better than 14% in 2012-13)

*“I feel I have a greater understanding of PD and this has made me more reflective when working with people.”*

*“Yes. Some early experiences had left me fearful and anxious about this kind of work. I now feel that I am better equipped to establish a more genuine relationship.”*

*“…I am hopeful when working with them and this has changed enormously since the training.”*

*“I enjoy the challenge of working with individuals with PD and this remains the case after the training.”*

The change in wording seems to have shifted the meaning of the question more than intended, from examining attitude (with more emphasis on the student’s behaviour to clients) to feelings (with more emphasis on how they feel about their job as a whole). This means that comparing the details of the replies to previous years’ does not necessarily reflect actual differences in the students’ attitudes. However, all the changes they mention are still desirable and the most important result from this question – the number of students able to identify a change – is still valid and comparable to previous years.

**5. “Could you indicate the most helpful aspects of this training?”**

This was a free text box in which the students could write anything. Of the 102 respondents, 95 replied to this question. 91% of people surveyed identified something helpful (up from 89%). Many mentioned several helpful things.

The graph shows the percentage of the 102 respondents who mentioned each theme in their reply. The themes are very similar to the previous years’, with the most popular theme still being the expert-by-experience trainer, at 47% (steadily increasing. 2011: 21%, 2012-13: 27%, 2013-14: 38%).

Comments about other people – trainers and fellow students – have always been among the most popular and mentions of both the trainers have gone up again. Other popular aspects of the course are various parts of the content and the videos.

*“The interactive work which was reinforced by the face to face sessions. Listening to the experiences of the service user. Learning baout schema theory.”*

*“Well delivered, covered a broad range of working environments and the video clips were very helpful.”*

*“Having two trainers bringing different perspectives. An experienced professional and an ex-service user.”*

*“The trainer had a very refreshing and interesting style… particualrly helpful to have a training with members of entirely difenret professions from my own (nursing) This offered different perpepctives not always appreciated”*

*“Understanding diagnostic criteria for PD. Understanding that I am not alone in experiencing difficulties and frustrations when working with this client group.”*

*“Nearly everything for me, great material”*

**6. “Could you indicate the least helpful aspects of this training?”**

This was a free text box in which the students could write anything. Of the 102 respondents, 65 replied to this question (that is 64% of the surveys, more than in previous years. 2011: 49%, 2012-13: 59%, 2013-14: 42%).

The graph shows the percentage of the 102 respondents who mentioned each theme in their reply. It is on the same scale as the previous graph, showing the most helpful aspects of the course, so that they are easy to compare.

More people identified an unhelpful aspect this year, though still many fewer than had identified helpful ones. 36% either left the reply blank or stated that they hadn't found any of the course unhelpful, though 4 of them then mentioned slight concerns elsewhere in the survey which have been counted here. Nobody said it was all bad.

The same themes as in previous years have been used, with the addition of “disorganised” (4 people). They felt the group discussions got a bit out of hand or would have liked more information beforehand on what to expect.

“Too simple / repetitive” is still the most common theme mentioned (up to 23%), often about watching the same videos again in group. The next most common is “video / audio” (up to 16%), mostly about watching them again or not being able to hear / play them and only occasionally the content. Many of the mentions of online material (13%) are about access too. Complaints about the venue (10%) are varied and were discussed above. “Too long” (9%) often relates to simple/repetitive, saying it could have been condensed but one said the face-to-face days were too far apart and, in contrast, another said it was intensive and tiring.

The least satisfied person to reply to this question summarised several of the common problems, as well as some less common ones. *“…unorganised... Completing some on line work was highlighted in the pre-course information, but there was no reference made to the amount of time this could take… if I had known this beforehand, I would not have committed myself to attending. I did not find the on-line training facility user friendly and the fact that there was no volume when referring to the on line case studies was unhelpful (although we did view some of the videos in our sessions, so had the gist of what they were about). I felt the tutors didn't compliment each other, not always knowing who was doing what and when… hand outs demonstrated weren't always available to be distributed and kept. There were two participants that constantly dominated the group … tutors were not taking control of the matter... rooms were very hot, and … windows were opened all you could hear was* [noises from outside]*… The acoustics of the room made it particularly difficult to hear… disappointed … perhaps an evaluation form should have been offered at the end of the course too, not months later in the form of this survey.”*

Examples from other people include - “*The online layout of material was hard to use. It also may have been more helpful to have different clips discussed in the face-to-face days as these became somewhat repetitive over the course.”*

*“this could be compressed in to a two day event, and the on line work was not easy to access”*

*“Although the service user gave very helpful personal experiences to learn from, at times I found it disruptive and the sessions became about that person, not our learning… The sessions appeared very long and tiring at times due to the indepth nature of the topic.”*

*“Some of the work presumed a zero knowledge of the topic. I was left on completion wishing that I could learn more.”*

*“None spring to mind at this point.. So all useful really”*

**7. “Having completed this training, how likely are you to continue training in this field?”**

At the end of each course, students are encouraged to develop their skills further with reminders of the information on further KUF courses available on the VLE and information on courses available through TVi.

Most students expect to take more training. The distribution is very similar to previous years’. This year the replies are slightly more polarised, with more people knowing that they are very likely or not likely to go on training and fewer vaguely “quite likely”.

Two mentioned in replies to other questions that they had already taken up further training.

**8. “Thank you very much for completing this survey to help us improve the way we deliver the course. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about it which has not already been covered?”**

This question was added this year, to round off the survey in a containing way, letting the students feel they had been able to express everything they wanted to, and thanking them for their contribution.

40 of the students replied to this question. There was a mixture of expansion on answers to earlier questions, helpful comments about possible improvements and praise and thanks for the course. Some replies included both praise and criticism. Any replies relating to particular good or bad things about the course have been dealt with in this report in the sections about what the students had found most helpful or unhelpful.

24 of them expressed some sort of thanks or praise for the course and 18 mentioned possible improvements, things they were not happy with or things they wanted more of.

*“I would recommend KUF training to all others working with personality disorder, particularly nursing staff, prison and probation staff who encounter it so often. I think it is so important to encourage optimism and positive attitudes, and hope that people with personality disorder can make changes successfully, which this course does excellently.”*

*“I was a little frustrated that there was not more practical tips ....”*

*“… recommended the training to my colleagues within my organisation as I have found it to be very helpful.. I would have liked to have been able to keep the information on the on line training for longer than the one month period following the last session”*

*“Having a service user describe and discuss her personality disorder was interesting, informative, and gave more insight and understanding. This should be explored more along with the treatment/therapies used to incorporate as part of the training.”*

*“It was an amazing experience!”*

**Actions**

**Could the course be shortened?**

During 2015, the KUF central organisation considered changes, including shortening the course to 2 days. Shortening the course, while still delivering the same content, was suggested by 7 students in this survey, though it had not been mentioned in previous years. They came from various cohorts and different workplaces and varied in satisfaction with the course as a whole from ‘disagree’ to ‘strongly agree’ so there is no obvious pattern to who they were.

The suggestion is supported by 23 people mentioning that the course was too simple or repetitive in some way, 5 of whom said that the facilitated days were too drawn out or had too much discussion. This might be improved by shortening the course but there were other students who liked the space to reflect (3) and enjoyed the discussions (10) and 3 more who found the course too complicated or technical for them.

13 of the people who found the course simple / repetitive did not like going over the same material (content or video clips) in both the VLE and the facilitated days. This would not necessarily be improved by shortening the course. Some of them said they would have liked more new material instead and, although nobody said that the course was too short, 15 expressed a wish for more content, often more practical “how to” training. Some said they were fairly knowledgeable already and were disappointed that this ‘awareness level’ training was aimed at people with no knowledge of PD.

*“…Group sessions could have furthered what we had learnt online, rather than mainly recapping.”*

*“The material could have been delivered over two days rather than three but I think that given we need to take into consideration different learning styles, this was probbaly about right.”*

*“…time to actually stop and think about practice and try it out was the greatest gift”*

Some repetition is necessary. People with different learning styles might benefit from having the same information presented in a different way, from discussing it for themselves and asking questions rather than just reading it passively. VLE access problems (mentioned 10 times) and time pressures (2) mean that trainers usually find a few students in each cohort who have not been able to complete all the online material, so they need to have the basic information explained and the videos played to them in the facilitated days too.

The decision on shortening the course is up to KUF central. However, a useful topic for TVi to discuss at the next trainers’ meeting might be ways of making the facilitated days slightly brisker without leaving behind the less experienced students, preventing the shyer students from contributing, or losing the reflective atmosphere we want to encourage.

**This report allows us to evaluate improvements that had been identified and made**.

* **Continue to manage expectations** **at the start of the course for those who do not know about it and stress the opportunities for asking questions, sharing, networking and reflection for those who are already very experienced in working with PD. Check the effects of this in future reports:** Unrealistic expectations are still an issue and this action is ongoing.
* **More widespread venues to reduce journey times for some students:** Most courses were at Didcot, which was well liked, but there were 3 in the Portsmouth area, 2 at Thame and 1 on the Isle of Wight. Travel was an issue again for 3 students. Other venues are being tried out in 2015-16, so this is ongoing.
* **Ideas fed back to the trainer team within TVi and discussed, so that the trainers have a clearer understanding of the students’ concerns and what they have appreciated:** This is an ongoing process and will be done again with a summary of this report.
* **Ideas fed back to “KUF central”:** This is also an ongoing process.
* **Review the survey questions, particularly “4. Have you noticed any change in your attitude to people with a personality disorder since taking this training?”**: The change to question 4 this year has had a bigger effect than expected. No changes are being made for the next year.
* **TVi needs to ensure continuity of funding to go on presenting enough cohorts**: Funding continues to be secured, but only on a year-to-year basis so the issue is ongoing.

**TVi’s aims for 2014-15 were**

* **Train a total of 300 students again**: Actual figures are 16 cohorts with a total of 303 students starting training within the financial year. This report also covers 2 cohorts that started in the previous year and ended in 2014-15 and so were counted towards the previous year’s target. Tvi delivered 3 more cohorts in Surrey; these are not counted towards this target or included in this report.
* **Continue surveying the students and repeat this assessment at the end of the financial year (April 2015):** Done in this report, but later than intended. Surveys continue for the next one.

**Plans for the future**

TVi’s target student numbers for 2015-16 are 300 again, ensuring as wide an area of coverage as possible and increasing the uptake of places from the Offender PD (OPD) Pathway / criminal justice.

Recommendations arising from this report:

* Feedback the results of this survey at a trainers’ meeting, particularly students’ comments about the facilitated days and the trainers, as a basis for trainers to share ideas on what they find works well. Include discussions on making the facilitated days slightly brisker without leaving behind the less experienced students or losing the reflective atmosphere we want to encourage.
* Continue the other ongoing processes mentioned above. The last two reports have been delayed for various reasons. Survey the students more promptly and complete the next report sooner.

**Conclusions**

Overall the students seem to be pleased with the course though satisfaction decreased this year (84% agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied overall). People found the expert-by-experience trainer particularly helpful (mentioned by nearly half of them) and they rated the expert by profession best (nearly two thirds strongly agreed they were knowledgeable).

People changed as a result of the course, too. 87% of the people who returned a survey were able to identify a change in the way they work, their attitude to people with personality disorder or both.

**Appendix 1**

Background information on the KUF courses and TVi

**KUF**

Knowledge and Understanding Framework (KUF) is a Department of Health (DH) initiative to increase awareness, understanding and effective practice for professionals who come into contact with those who either have a personality disorder or would meet diagnostic criteria. There are three courses, the KUF Raising Awareness being the basic level. It was developed by the Institute of Mental Health, Nottingham (IMH), the London-based Tavistock and Portman NHS Trust, Emergence and The Open University. ([http://www.personalitydisorderkuf.org.uk](http://www.personalitydisorderkuf.org.uk/)).

A key purpose of the KUF is to improve the quality of service user experience by developing practitioner attitudes, skills and behaviours. The course uses a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) and this online study is sandwiched between three days in the class room. Material presented is taken from standard KUF slides with discussions facilitated by a team made up of an expert by profession and an expert by experience. Each member of the team must have completed a six-day training course in the delivery of KUF, provided by the IMH.

**TVi**

Thames Valley Initiative (TVi) sits within Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust. It was initially funded by the Department of Health to support the development of personality disorder services, and provide training across the Thames Valley, in order to improve the experience of people with personality disorders and has since become self-funding. The team is made up of professionals and experts by experience, including a group of ex-service-users called STARS. For some years now they have been presenting various types of training, usually in teams combining clinicians and STARS, so from the beginning there was a pool of experienced trainers available to take on the KUF trainers’ course and a robust organisation to take responsibility for the training in the South Central area.

**TVi delivering KUF**

In 2010 TVi, in collaboration with the South Central Strategic Health Authority, put together a proposal to the DH to deliver the KUF Awareness Course. Non-recurring money was awarded to TVi to manage and deliver the KUF Awareness Course across the South Central region and continued funding has to be negotiated each year. We are now accountable to the Southern steering group, comprised of NHS England and NOMS (National Offender Management Services).

In May 2010 the first cohort of trainers were trained by trainers from the IMH. This included six STARS, three clinicians and two third-sector staff. A further cohort of trainers qualified in January 2011, bringing the total number of trainers up to nine STARS, ten clinicians, two third-sector staff and one prison officer. Individual trainers have since attended IMH train-the-trainers courses elsewhere in the country, to maintain an adequate pool of trainers as a few have moved on to other commitments. In 2014-15 6 STARS, 3 clinicians and a prison officer were active.

By April 2015, over 1300 students had attended a KUF Awareness course run by TVi.

**Appendix 2**

This is the questionnaire that the students were asked to complete online. The options for the multiple choice questions are shown in [square brackets].

**KUF Awareness Training survey 2014/5**

As a previous student of the Knowledge and Understanding Framework Awareness training about Personality Disorder, we would like to ask your help in evaluating the impact of this training and its mode of delivery.

1. Please indicate your workplace

[NHS Prison Probation Police Council/Government Voluntary sector Education Other]

2. Please rate these aspects of the course......

[Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree]

Did you find the on-line material easy to use?

Were the video and audio clips helpful?

Did you find the facilitated days helpful?

Did you find the expert-by-profession trainer knowledgeable in the subject matter?

Did you find the expert-by-experience (ex-service-user) trainer helpful?

Were the facilities at the venue satisfactory?

Were you satisfied with the course as a whole?

3. Could you indicate how your practice in your workplace has been changed by this training?

4. How do you feel about working with people with a personality disorder? Has that changed since taking this training?

5. Could you indicate the most helpful aspects of this training?

6. Could you indicate the least helpful aspects of this training?

7. Having completed this training, how likely is it that you will continue training in this field?

[Very likely Quite likely Not likely]

8. Thank you very much for completing this survey to help us improve the way we deliver the course. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about it which has not already been covered?