**PROFICIENCY TEST IN MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING ACCORDING TO MITI 4.2.1**

# Recording id: {id} Name: {name}

# Date: {qa\_completed\_date} Target Change: {target}

# Global Ratings

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical Components | |
| Cultivating Change Talk  This rating reflects your use of MI skills to highlight and strengthen the patient’s own reasons for making a change. | 1 2 3 4 5  {m4\_cultivating\_change\_talk} |
| Softening Sustain Talk  This rating reflects your use of MI skills to validate the patient’s barriers to change and guide them to consider possible reasons for change. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Relational Components | |
| Partnership  This rating reflects your use of skills designed to build a collaborative working relationship with your patient, consistent with the Spirit of MI. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Empathy  This rating reflects your use of skills designed to express warmth and understanding of your patient within their unique circumstances, consistent with the Spirit of MI. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Behaviour Counts |  | Total |
| Giving information |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Persuade |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Persuade with Permission |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Questions |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Simple Reflection |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Complex Reflection |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Affirm |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Seeking Collaboration |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Emphasizing Autonomy |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Confront |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Summary of indices of coded skills demonstrated in the interview

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indices of proficiency |  | Level | |
|  |  | Fair | Good |
| Simple + Complex Reflections  Questions | = | (≥1.0) | (≥2.0) |
| This is the ratio of your reflections to your questions. Within MI, we aim for reflections to exceed questions, ideally with 3 or 4 (or more) reflections for every question. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Complex Reflections  Simple + Complex Reflections | = | (≥0.40) | (≥.50) |
| This is the ratio of your complex reflections to your total number of reflections. Generally speaking, having a higher percentage of complex reflections suggests a better quality of MI interaction. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total MI Adherent  = Seeking Collaboration + Affirm + Emphazising Autonomy | = | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interactions within the encounter that were consistent with MI |  |  |  |
| Total MI Non Adherent  = Confront + Persuade | = | --- | --- |
| This is the total number of utterances or interaction within the encounter that were inconsistent with MI |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Relational Component: Empathy + Partnership  2 | = | (≥3.5) | (≥4.0) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Technical Component: Cultivate Change talk + Softening Sustain talk  2 | = | (≥3.0) | (≥4.0) |
|  |  |  |  |

Guidelines on the meaning of Empathy and Partnership

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Value | Proficient in relational skills | Things to consider in future use of MI |
|  | 1 – 2.5 | Low | Risk of not being able to help the clients |
|  | 2.5 – 3.5 | Fair | Continued training is recommended |
|  | 3.5 – 5 | Good | Likely helpful for clients |

Guidelines on the meaning of technical variables

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Value | Proficient in technical skills | Things to consider in future use of MI |
|  | 1 – 2.5 | Low | Risk of not being able to help the clients |
|  | 3.0 | Fair | Continued training is recommended |
|  | 3.5 – 5 | Good | Likely helpful for clients |

### Clinician strengths:

### Important areas for improvement:

### How was the coding performed?

The interview between the practitioner and the client (or actor) is reliably assessed according to a manual developed and validated for assessing how well MI is performed. The assessment is made by professional coders at MIC Lab whose reliability is regularly checked.