

	<b>Topic</b>	<b>WellComm</b>
	<b>Venue</b>	
	<b>Date</b>	<b>3/01/23</b>
	<b>Forms returned</b>	<b>9</b>

Pre and post training participants were asked to allocate confidence ratings to the following descriptors on a scale of 1 – 5 (where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest).

<b>A.</b>	Why we need universal screening
<b>B.</b>	Where to start screening with individual children
<b>C.</b>	Carrying out the screen
<b>D.</b>	How often to rescreen
<b>E.</b>	Using the Big Book of Ideas
<b>F.</b>	Putting children together in groups for intervention
<b>G.</b>	Knowing <b>which</b> children to refer on and <b>when</b> to refer them on
<b>H.</b>	Collecting and making effective use of the data
<b>I.</b>	What to do with children who aren't ready for WellComm

In order for our training to be effective, demonstrate value for money and ultimately benefit the children in a setting, we identify anticipated outcomes. The descriptors identified above cover the key points delivered in the training. We look at how confident (i.e. knowledgeable) participants feel before the training, whether their confidence increases and to what extent. In this way we can help settings to think about next steps.

### Summary/comment

The results are quite spectacular and very clearly show that every participant benefited from the session.

Most descriptors showed *some* confidence before the session took place. This is to be expected, given that Wellcomm is already being used in school. No participants felt that they knew about what to do with children who are just not ready for Wellcomm (descriptor I).

The post-training ratings are self-evident and should provide a sound basis from which to refresh the use and delivery of Wellcomm.

**What to do going forward**

- Share the feedback with staff
- Encourage them to support each other going forward
- Use the expertise of your therapist if there are residual queries
- Consider establishing a data champion
- Consider commissioning the Attention & Listening programme training (children who are not ready for Wellcomm)

**Here is your data summary**

<b>Ratings 1 + 2 = under-confident</b>	<b>3 = neutral (not scored in % gain calculation)</b>	<b>Ratings 4 + 5 = confident</b>
--	---	----------------------------------

100% = 9	Pre - training						Post- training						% gain
	1 + 2		3		4 + 5		1 + 2		3		4 + 5		
	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%	
<b>A</b>	5	55.5%	4	44%							9	100%	100%↑
<b>B</b>	7	78%	2	22%							9*	100%	100%↑
<b>C</b>	7	78%			2	22%					9	100%	78%↑
<b>D</b>	6	67%	3	33%							9	100%	78%↑
<b>E</b>	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%					9	100%	89%↑
<b>F</b>	5	55.5%	2	22%	2	22%					9	100%	78%↑
<b>G</b>	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%					9	100%	89%↑
<b>H</b>	7	78%	1	11%							9*	100%	89%↑
<b>I</b>	9	100%									9*	100%	100%↑

NB: scores of 4 & 5 are added together. Descriptors with \* in the post column indicated that 1 or 2 of the ratings were 4 (rather than 5)

**Individual staff comments – none**