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**Introduction**

This is the fifth 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 people 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 11 cohorts of students on courses completed between April 2015 and April 2016 at various venues in central southern England.

This year 91% 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 (comments from 1/3 of the people who returned a survey).

91% 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**

175 students were emailed a link to an online survey and 43 replies were received, about 1/4 of the total students, which is a slightly lower response rate than usual. A few respondents did not reply to every question.

The questionnaire (shown in full in Appendix 2) contained some questions asking how much the student 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 the same as last year’s.

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), “2013-14” (11 cohorts in the financial year from April 2013 to April 2014) and “2014-15” (18 cohorts in the financial year from April 2014 to April 2015).

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

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

The graph shows the reduced size of the survey this year. This means that the detailed results are more likely to be due to chance and so may be less significant than usual.

The categories for “Police” and “Council / Government” were only added last year so in earlier years these workers would probably have placed themselves in the “Other” category.

This year, workers from the voluntary sector and “other” workplaces were more likely to reply to the survey than the average student, NHS workers replied at the average rate and although all 3 police replied, workers from prisons and the probation service were less likely to, so this report will represent workers from outside the NHS and forensic settings better and those from forensic workplaces less well. This varies from survey to survey but is more pronounced this year, probably only because of the small sample size.

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 43) who chose each option.

For most of the questions, the replies were overwhelmingly positive – about 88% of responses either agreed or strongly agreed with the questions. This is a slight increase after a dip last year (Previous values, starting with 2011, were: 90%, 85%, 94% and 86%) 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 98% agreeing or strongly agreeing they were knowledgeable (Previous values 91%, 92%, 98%, 93%). Just one person was neutral and nobody disagreed or strongly disagreed.

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 gone up again and is ahead of the others. Satisfaction with the expert by experience (XBX), facilitated days and video and audio clips has recovered from the dip last year but not to the peaks of 2013-14. Satisfaction with online material and with venues has gone down further and is not following the general upward trend for this year.

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

Satisfaction with the online material has gone down again this year and it has the lowest rating, though 74% still agreed or strongly agreed that it was easy to use and nobody strongly disagreed.

The VLE (Virtual Learning Environment – the website presenting the online material) was upgraded on 2/11/15 and there was some disruption when the change was made, which may have contributed to the lower satisfaction this year.

4 students disagreed with the question and 7 were neutral. 4 of these people were in one cohort, which ran in the month before the upgrade and in reply to question 6 on the least helpful aspects of the course, the 3 relevant comments from this cohort were mostly about technical problems. This year more of the comments were about things not working or being difficult to access, though there were still a few about repetitive content.

3 students mentioned the online material as one of the most helpful things but their comments were not specific.

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

Satisfaction increased after last year’s dip. 91% agreed or strongly agreed. The videos still seem to be the most popular aspect of the online material and 4 students mentioned them as the most helpful aspects of the course.

1 Student disagreed and 3 were neutral. None of them explained why but 2 others mentioned that the videos, in particular, were repetitious.

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

Satisfaction has recovered from last year’s dip, to 93%.

2 disagreed and 1 was neutral. Only the neutral respondent made any comments and they much preferred the online material and thought one facilitated day would have been enough.

Nobody mentioned the facilitated days among the least helpful aspects of the course but 2 specifically said they were the most helpful aspects.

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

Three “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. Over 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. 98% agreed or strongly agreed (only one person did not). 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 has stayed high at 96% (previous values 92%, 96%, 98%, 96%) but the only person who was neutral about this question happened to be in one of her cohorts.

Nobody has ever strongly disagreed with this question. This year 1 was neutral. She made no comments to explain but that was actually the highest rating she gave any of the satisfaction questions.

This year most of the comments relevant to the expert-by-profession trainer were about the trainer team as a whole. Only 2 mentioned them as one of the least helpful things about the course. One felt that other students were allowed to take over the discussions, distracting from the course material (similar comments were made last year). The other felt *the course leader initially appeared aggressive in manner* but did not specify which. 5 people mentioned the trainer team among the most helpful things*.* They liked the *balance* between the two trainers and said theywere *fantastic.*

*“The trainers were excellent - they communicated complicated concepts very clearly, facilitated discussions which were very relevant to my practice, and gave examples which really helped to illustrate positive ways of working…..”*

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

7 “expert-by-experience” trainers (members of STARS, see Appendix 1) are covered by this report. Each took 1 or 2 cohorts. All have a lived experience of having a personality disorder and have completed therapy.

Satisfaction was higher, after the dip last year. 93% agreed or strongly agreed. 72% strongly agreed - more than for any other question. 1 disagreed and 2 were neutral.

The one who disagreed was the same one who was neutral about the expert by profession and made no comments to explain why. There were 2 comments, both from the neutral students, mentioning the expert by experience as one of the least helpful things. One of them was the one who had commented that the other students were being allowed to take over the discussions. The other did not go into detail. One other student mentioned in reply to question 8 that they would have liked to hear more from their expert by experience.

There were 14 comments mentioning the expert by experience as one of the most helpful things about the course (33% of the replies to this question - a lower proportion than last year but still more than any other topic). Some praised the trainer team as a whole and all the comments listed for the expert by profession were applied to the expert by experience too. Others specifically liked *hearing from* the expert by experience, their *experience* and *group discussions* with them.

*“….input from some one who has personality disorder was extremely use full”*

*“The ex service user who was fantastic….”*

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

Nearly half (5) of the cohorts were presented at Didcot Civic Hall. There were also 2 each at High Wycombe and Portsmouth, one at Reading and one at Bicester.

The venue has previously been one of the aspects with which people are less satisfied, and this year the ratings have gone down further, to 77% agreeing or strongly agreeing.

2 strongly disagreed, 3 disagreed and 5 were neutral. The venue tends to be taken for granted unless something is wrong so there were no comments praising venues and 4 criticising them.

High Wycombe was rated poorly. Only 50% of the 10 students replying to the survey agreed or strongly agreed that it was satisfactory. The 2 who strongly disagreed, 2 of the 3 who disagreed and 1 of the neutral students had been there. One of the students who strongly disagreed commented that the room was small, there were not enough toilets and the room was so bright it was hard to see the screen. The only other comment was from one of the neutral students who had found parking difficult there.

The other student who disagreed was at Reading, but made no comments about it. Only 2 students from Reading replied to the survey so we do not have enough data to evaluate it.

3 of the students who were neutral were at the Buckland Community Centre in Portsmouth. One commented that the room was small, noisy and hot.

Didcot continues to be the best liked of the venues which have been used enough times to give significant data, with 95% agreeing or strongly agreeing that it was satisfactory, slightly better than last year. The 1 person who was neutral about Didcot did not explain why.

Distance travelled to the venue has been a problem before but the venues were more widely distributed this year and the issue was not mentioned.

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

91% agreed or strongly agreed, which is up again on last year (previous values, starting with 2012-13: 83%, 98%, 84%). Just over half strongly agreed.

2 students disagreed and 2 were neutral. Their reasons for dissatisfaction varied – all rated the expert by profession better than other aspects but one preferred the facilitated days, another the online material and one liked everything except the venue! Despite their relative dissatisfaction, 3 of the 4 identified some change in their work or attitude.

3 students commented that the course was all helpful.  *“couldn't pinpoint one thing it was all informative and useful…”*

**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 43 survey respondents, 39 replied to this question. The percentage of all survey respondents identifying some kind of change to their work has increased again to 88% (previous values 80%, 77%, 77%, 82%).

The comments fitted well into the same themes as before. Again, most changes identified involved knowing more about personality disorder generally, responding to clients better or understanding them. Expressed as a percentage of the 39 replies, they were -

* 97% identified some kind of improvement as a result of the course (that is, 88% of all the people who returned a survey)
* 38% knew more about personality disorders (about the same as last year)
* 36% felt they were responding better to clients (about the same)
* 33% felt they understood clients better (down from 47%)
* 15% felt they were more self-aware or coping better with their jobs or using supervision (up from 5%)
* 5% were using what they had learnt to help or train colleagues (down from 17%)
* Nobody said it had had little or no effect on them (down from 9%) or said they had had no opportunity yet to use what they had learned.

*“ I feel I have a better understanding of personality disorder, can more easily 'put myself in their place' and therefore my work is already showing to be more successful”*

*“I was beginning to feel that I was working with attention seekers and my patients was being tested more and more. I now take the time with my volunteers to review sessions and situations that have taken place. We support each other with what has happened and feedback how to deal with things in a better way.”*

*“I am becoming better at keeping boundaries in place even when individuals are in distress. I also feel I am working in a more reflective 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. Of the 43 survey respondents, 39 replied to this question. The percentage of all survey respondents identifying an attitude change increased to 74% (previous values, starting from 2012-13: 66%, 77%, 68%).

91% identified some change of work (question 3) and / or attitude (question 4), that is all the students who replied to these questions. (Previous values: 84%, 91%, 87%)

The range of themes mentioned is similar to last year, though the proportion of people mentioning each one varies from year to year. The two top themes last year, knowing more and coping better, are still in the top 3 this year, but the proportion feeling that they are responding better to clients has gone back up again.

* 33% mentioned knowing more (up from 28%)
* 28% felt they were responding better to clients (back up from 10%)
* 26% felt they were more self-aware or coping better with their jobs (down a little from 28%)
* 15% felt they understood clients better (about the same)
* 13% were more hopeful / enthusiastic / positive (up from 8%)
* 8% felt they were more patient / respectful / compassionate / open (the same)

* 15% mentioned finding the work challenging or frustrating, some in an enjoyable way, others less so (about the same)
* 10% said or implied they had had a good attitude already (down again from 19%)
* 5% said the course had had little or no effect on their attitude (down a lot from 17%)
* There was only 1 vague reply saying that their feelings had changed but not specifying how (about the same proportion as last year)

*“Always enjoyed this are of work, training helps make sense of my work”*

*“It can be challenging working with those with personality disorder and make you feel uncertain if you have used the best approach for the individual. I feel more informed about how to better work with them.”*

*“I did find that I had a problem but I am much more able to relate/work with people with a personality disorder since the course”*

**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 43 respondents, 38 replied to this question. 88% of people surveyed identified something helpful (down from 91%), that is all the people who replied to this question. Many mentioned several helpful things.

The graph shows the percentage of the 43 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 33% (down from last year. Previous values: 21%, 27%, 38%, 47%).

Comments about other people – trainers and fellow students – have always been among the most popular, though mentions of both the trainers have gone down this year. Other popular aspects of the course are the group discussions and various parts of the content.

*“the balance of expert by profession and experience ; theory and experience with contextual examples. The fact that it was multi agency with different perspectives. the fact that it was long enough to explore material in depth”*

*“…. individual responses to service users as well as a team approach, online materials to do between sessions”*

*“Looking at the different types of PD learning about splitting and different behaviours and triggers of PD”*

*“All aspect of the training is helpful”*

**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 43 respondents, 31 replied to this question but 9 of them just said that it had all been helpful, so only 51% identified anything unhelpful (down from last year - previous values: 49%, 59%, 42%, 64%).

The graph shows the percentage of the 43 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.

Fewer people identified an unhelpful aspect this year, and many fewer than had identified helpful ones. 49% either left the reply blank or stated that they hadn't found any of the course unhelpful. Nobody said it was all bad.

The themes are the same as in previous years. Online material was mentioned by 23% (up from 13% last year), mainly in connection with access and technical problems, exacerbated by the VLE upgrade process, but 2 people also described it as repetitive and one as wordy. Three other issues were each mentioned by 10%: The venue, which has been discussed elsewhere, “too simple / repetitive” which was the most common theme last year and involved both repeating online work in class and repeating the same videos. Comments on “discussion / exercises” varied - not focused enough, hard to hear and awkward when not everyone had done the online work.

*“The online training was ok but was quite complicated to find it on the website.”*

*“the second day we seemed to just go through what we had already done on the online training.”*

*“Some of the group discussions were difficult as the room was small and noisy, also very hot. I struggled to hear allot of what people were saying. Also when we broke off into groups the time aloud was very short….”*

*“That it could not go into more depth in the milited time available - I feel as though I've only scratched the surface!! …..”*

**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 expected to take more training, though they were slightly less likely to than last year. The distribution is very similar to previous years’.

**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 last year, to round off the survey in a containing way, letting the students express everything they wanted to, and thanking them for their contribution.

15 of the students replied to this question. There was a mixture of expansion on answers to earlier questions, helpful comments about possible improvements, their own plans and wishes for the future 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.

6 of them expressed some sort of thanks or praise for the course and 7 mentioned possible improvements, things they were not happy with or things they wanted more of.

*“No it was excellent. Would like a follow up day as a group.”*

*“…. facilities could have been better.”*

*“Great course for refreshing or those new to work with PD. Many more areas could be covered in further short courses e.g. self harm, emotional regulation and how to work on this, eating/drug/alcohol issues with PD.”*

*“I think this training is invaluable for people working with individuals with PD. It can be a hard and sometimes discouraging area of work, and I found the training gave me hope that change in people is definitely possible.”*

*“I enjoyed the course very much and it has helped me be a better support worker/social worker just by having the extra bit of understanding.”*

**Questions arising from the survey**

**What matters to students about the venue?**

Satisfaction with the venue fell again this year, although our main venue at Didcot still gets good feedback. When choosing a new venue it can be most cost-effective to use a room supplied free by the local NHS, but they do not always turn out to be suitable. This section looks back at the 29 comments made by students about venues in all 410 surveys since we started running the KUF awareness courses, to get a better idea of what matters to the students.

The problem mentioned most often is the distance to travel (7 people). This has been recognised as an issue for some time and was not mentioned this year. The only issue with getting to the venue mentioned this year was using public transport in the rush hour.

Room size mattered to 4 people (3 of whom felt it was too small), usually in connection with noise or temperature issues. They were all at different venues, but High Wycombe and Portsmouth were both described as small this year.

Within the room, the most-mentioned issue was noise (6 people). It made it hard to hear, particularly when in small groups, and was usually an issue with the acoustics or crowding. Temperature was mentioned by 5 people, mostly too hot. Wi-fi problems concerned 3 people, restricting the ability to watch videos, but were not an issue this year. Lighting can be hard to adjust to allow students to see the screen clearly – one disliked excluding natural light, another found the screen hard to see anyway and a third just mentioned the OHP without saying why.

Other facilities mentioned were drinks – one would have liked nice chilled drinking water and another mentioned a faulty drinks machine- and one student felt there were too few toilets at High Wycombe this year.

This analysis and the comments will be made available to our administrator so that she can see whether they suggest any extra questions she could usefully ask when booking a new venue.

**What affects the response rate to the survey?**

This year the proportion of students returning a survey was down to about 1 in 4 from the usual 1 in 3, so a short analysis was undertaken for internal use, based on actual response rates to all the KUF surveys and on internet searches for best practice. There were several actions arising from this which will be tried out to see if they help.

* Aim to send out the first survey requests 1-2 months after the end of each course (after access to the website has ended and the attendance data have been returned to our administrator but certainly no more than 4 months after the end, when the response rate drops off badly).
* Send the reminder about 8-10 days after the request on a different day of the week and time.
* Ask trainers to promote the survey more on the last day.
* Investigate personalising the email requests more or possibly sending a personal email before the survey request.

**Actions**

**This report allows us to evaluate the results of actions from previous reports.**

* **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:** There was no evidence of unrealistic expectations this year (all the comments classified as “too simple / repetitive” were about repetition of material). 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 2 in the Portsmouth area, 2 at High Wycombe and 1 each at Bicester and Reading. Travel was not an issue this year but some of the venues were not much liked. Other venues are being tried out in 2016-17, 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. 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:** This is an ongoing process which has not yet been completed after the late issue of the last report but 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 last year had a bigger effect than expected. It is better to keep the questions unchanged if possible, to allow easy comparison of replies from different years. The questionnaire was unchanged this year and no changes are being made for next year.
* **Continue surveying the students and repeat this assessment at the end of the financial year (April 2016)** **Survey the students more promptly and complete the next report sooner:** Done in this report, on schedule. Surveys continue for the next one.
* **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 2015-16**

* **Train 14 cohorts of 17 students (238 in total)**: Actual figures are 11 cohorts with a total of 239 students starting training within the financial year. Tvi delivered 2 more cohorts in Surrey but these are not counted towards this target or included in this report.
* **Increase the uptake of places from the Offender PD (OPD) Pathway / criminal justice**: The proportion of students from a forensic workplace was 32% this year, up from 21% last year, though the actual number trained was down a little because fewer students were trained.

**Plans for the future**

TVi’s target student numbers for 2016-17 are 238 again (nominally 14 cohorts of 17 students), continuing to encourage more students from forensic workplaces.

Recommendations arising from this report:

* Consider additional checks before booking a venue, based on the concerns raised above.
* Aim to survey the students 1-2 months after the end of their course, remind them 8-10 days later, promote the survey more and personalise the requests.
* Continue the other ongoing processes mentioned above.

**Conclusions**

Overall the students seem to be pleased with the course and satisfaction went up again this year (91% agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied overall). People found the expert-by-experience trainer particularly helpful (mentioned by a third 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. 91% 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 2015-16 7 STARS, 2 clinicians and a prison officer were active.

By April 2016, over 1500 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?