



Motivational interviewing amongst United Kingdom educational psychologists: opportunities for practice development

February - March 2018

Craig Allen
Cathy Atkinson
George Thomas

cathy.atkinson@manchester.ac.uk

Contents list

Contents list	2
Introductory information	3
Motivational Interviewing – Practice protocols and outcome measures.....	5
Appendix 1 – A checklist of the main elements that need to be in place to support the effective delivery of school-based MI (adapted from Snape & Atkinson, 2018).....	13
Appendix 2 – Part 1 (MI spirit): Self, peer or supervisor protocol for evaluating the spirit of MI (Atkinson & Woods, 2018).....	14
Appendix 2 – Part 2 (MI processes): Self, peer or supervisor protocol for evaluating the processes of MI (Atkinson & Woods, 2018).....	16
Appendix 2 – Part 3 (MI skills): Protocol for reviewing the use of OARS in school-based practice (Atkinson & Woods, 2018).....	20
Appendix 3 – MI Child Outcome Rating Scale (MICORS)	21
Appendix 4 – Child-friendly Goal Attainment Scaling (CGAS).....	23
Appendix 5 – Semi-structured interview schedule for Skype/telephone interviews	24
Appendix 7 - Semi-structured interview schedule and discussion record: Follow-up interviews for Skype/telephone interviews	26

Introductory information

Dear colleagues,

Thank you so much for agreeing to take part in this opportunity to review and develop motivational interviewing (MI) practice within educational psychology services.

This work is funded by the University of Manchester School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED) impact fund. Its aim is to find out more about how research into school-based MI informs, and might continue to inform the work of practitioner educational psychologist.

The aims are essentially two-fold:

1. To look at how research into school-based MI, particularly research carried out at the University of Manchester, has informed the work of UK educational psychologists (EPs) and promoted outcomes for service-users.
2. To look at how University of Manchester research might support the further development of MI practice amongst UK EPs, through developing practitioner competency and evaluating impact for service-users.

To help with these aims, we have put together a pack of information, which we hope will be helpful. This pack contains the following:

1. An overview of the documentation, which we hope will help you prepare for the Skype/telephone interview;
2. Appendix 1 - A checklist around the initial contracting/ planning of school-based MI (Snape & Atkinson, 2018);
3. Appendix 2 - A protocol around assessing the three central tenets in MI theory (spirit; processes; skills) (Atkinson & Woods, 2018);
4. Appendix 3 - A MI-specific child outcome measure that has been created for the purposes of this project (Thomas and Atkinson, 2018a).
5. Appendix 4 - A child-friendly version of Goal Attainment Scaling (Kiresuk and Sherman (1968); Thomas & Atkinson, 2018b)
6. Appendix 5 - A semi-structured interview schedule for the Skype/telephone interview;
7. Appendix 6 - Discussion record for the Skype/telephone interview;
8. Appendix 7 - follow-up interview schedule/ discussion record (i.e., for summer 2018).

If you could share the information with your service colleague(s) and read through it before the Skype/telephone interview, it would be extremely helpful. Please don't worry too much if you don't have time to go through it all, but it might be a useful reference point.

Please note that this project is essentially an impact case study, rather than a research project. However, it may be that during the course of the work, we realise that the findings may be of interest to the wider EP profession. If this is the case, we would like to publish the findings relevant professional journals or publications. We have been informed by the University of Manchester that as the project constitutes practice review, that we don't need formal ethical approval. However, we would ensure that at all time, everyone is fully informed and that the following principles are adhered to:

- Anonymity – that all names and service details are removed from any published information.
- Confidentiality – that we will not publicise or circulate names of other authorities taking part in the study.
- Debriefing – that everyone taking part is fully debriefed, and is made aware of outcomes of the study
- Right to withdraw/withdraw data – that prior to data anonymisation and aggregation, anyone has the right to withdraw from the study, or to withdraw specific data.

In the event that findings are prepared for publication, we would offer everyone involved a right to veto over this information.

If there are any queries or questions, please feel free to contact any member of the project team. If you have any concerns, please contact Cathy Atkinson at cathy.atkinson@manchester.ac.uk, or on 0161 275 3511.

Thank you once again for looking at this with us. We are very much looking forward to working with you.

Best wishes

Cathy Atkinson (on behalf of the project team)

Motivational Interviewing – Practice protocols and outcome measures

Context

There are a number of checklists/ protocols and outcome measures that have been developed to help practitioners evaluate and develop their understanding and use of Motivational Interviewing (MI) in practice, and monitor client outcomes.

To aid the MI practice development work within your service, we have collated one practice checklist, one practice protocol and two outcome measures for your reference.

Practice checklist and protocol

Below is an overview of one checklist and one protocol pertaining to MI practice: the practice checklist, by Snape and Atkinson (2018), pertains to the contracting/ planning of school-based MI (SBMI) interventions when working with students; the practice protocol, by Atkinson and Woods (2018), pertains to the development of practitioner proficiency in terms of MI spirit, processes and skills.

- ***Appendix 1 – Snape and Atkinson (2018)***

- ***Overview:*** Snape and Atkinson undertook research to explore three disaffected students' views about the effectiveness of a school-based MI intervention that comprised five weekly sessions delivered by an educational psychologist (EP).

Intervention outcomes for the students were mixed and upon thematically analysing post-intervention EP interviews, Snape and Atkinson created a checklist summarising facilitators and barriers to the effective delivery of school-based MI interventions (see Appendix 1).

In terms of implications for MI practitioners, Snape and Atkinson intended that their checklist would support the initial contracting/ planning of school-based MI interventions before starting to work with students.

- ***How to use:*** The checklist can be used as a 'tick or cross' exercise during the initial contracting/ planning of school-based MI interventions (e.g., when consulting with school-based problem-holder, such as the SENDCo; during supervision).

- ***Appendix 2 – Atkinson and Woods (2018)***

- Overview: Atkinson and Woods undertook research to explore the integrity school-based MI interventions relative to MI theory. A three-part protocol was proposed so as to enable practitioners to plan, develop and reflect on school-based MI interventions according to three central tenets of MI theory – spirit, processes and skills (see Appendix 2).

In terms of implications for MI practitioners working in educational settings, Atkinson and Woods intended that their protocol would:

- increase the integrity of school-based MI interventions relative to MI theory;
 - enable practitioners to plan, develop and reflect on school-based MI interventions, either individually or by working with peers/ supervisors;
 - provide a means of benchmarking individual practitioner competency in school-based MI interventions.
- How to use: Details in how to use each part of the protocol are provided in turn.
 - Part-1 (MI spirit): The person completing the protocol uses the grid to indicate where they believe practice falls in relation to each statement using the following points on a likert scale:
 - 5 = strongly agree;
 - 4 = agree;
 - 3 = neither agree nor disagree;
 - 2 = disagree;
 - 1 = strongly disagree.
 - Part-2 (MI processes): The person completing the protocol uses the grid as a 'tick or cross' exercise to indicate whether they believe practice was demonstrated or not.
 - Part-3 (MI skills): Miller and Rollnick (2012) created an acronym for the core MI skills of open questions, affirming, reflecting and summarising (OARS). The person completing the protocol uses the grid to tally each time a skill is demonstrated. It may be useful for you to know, in relation to developing your own practice that notional proficiency ratios/ percentages for questions and reflections are as follows (see Moyers, Manuel & Ernst, 2014; Moyers & Martin, 2010):
 - Reflection to question ratio: 1:1 = beginner/ 2:1 = competent;

- Open question: closed question percentage: 50% = beginner/ 70% = competent;
- Complex reflection: simple reflection percentage¹: 40% = beginner/ 50% = competent;

Affirmations and summaries are tallied as 'MI-adherent behaviours' and can be contrasted with 'non MI-adherent behaviours' such as confronting and persuading, although Moyers et al. (2014) and Moyers and Martin (2010) do not provide notional proficiency ratios/ percentages for these.

A worked example of each of these schedules is available. We did not want to completely bombard you with information at this stage, but if these would be useful, please do not hesitate to contact Cathy Atkinson at cathy.atkinson@manchester.ac.uk.

Outcome measures

Below is an overview of two outcome measures: the first, by Thomas and Atkinson (2018a), is an MI-specific outcome measure designed to be completed at the end of each session within a school-based MI intervention; the second, by Thomas and Atkinson (2018b), is an adapted and child-friendly version of Kiresuk and Sherman's (1968) Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS).

- **Appendix 3 – Thomas and Atkinson (2018a)**
 - Overview: Duncan et al. (2003) created the Session Rating Scale (SRS) as a measure of client outcomes following a therapeutic session. The SRS contained four specific items, each of which had two opposing statements either side of a 10cm line and clients were asked to put a cross on each of the four lines at the end of each session. The four specific items pertained to: the therapeutic relationship (e.g., "I did not feel heard, understood and respected" vs. "I felt heard, understood and respected"); the client's goals and personal topics; the EP's approach or method; and, the session overall.

Duncan et al. then adapted the SRS for use with children and young people, and called it the Youth Outcome Rating Scale (YORS). In addition to slightly reworded versions of the four specific items from the SRS and the introduction of sad/ happy emoticons either side of the 10cm line, Duncan et al. introduced four general items with a single overarching statement; the items pertained to: 'me' (e.g., "How am I doing?"); 'family'; 'school'; and, 'everything'.

One of the main criticisms of the SRS and the YORS is that their use of lines as

¹ Complex reflections add emphasis or meaning to what the client has said, whereas simple reflections convey understanding without adding meaning or emphasis.

opposed to numerical scales makes it difficult to evidence subtle changes in client outcomes. Another criticism of the SRS and the YORS is that whilst the four specific items are informed by therapeutic common factors, they do not pertain to one therapeutic approach or method (e.g., MI).

Hence, Thomas and Atkinson designed the MI Child Outcome Rating Scale (MICORS) to include the four general items from the YORS and one further general item (i.e., “I look forward to the next session with my EP”), as well as seven MI-specific items pertaining to ‘Part-1 (MI spirit)’ of Atkinson and Woods’ (2018) protocol, as recommended by Atkinson and Snape (2018). Thomas and Atkinson also introduced the use of a 10-point numerical scale with sad/ happy emoticons at either side (see Appendix 3). Overall, the MICORS represents a child-friendly alternative to the well-established Client Evaluation of MI (CEMI) Scale (Madson, Mohn, Schumacher & Landry, 2015).

- *How to use:* At the end of each session within a school-based MI intervention, the practitioner provides the child/ young person with a copy of the MICORS and asks them to circle the number that applies to each overarching statement. The practitioner may also provide the child/ young person with completed MICORS from previous sessions to support their answers.

- **Appendix 4 – Thomas and Atkinson (2018b)**

- *Overview:* Kiresuk and Sherman (1968) developed Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) 50-years ago as a means of quantifying clients’ achievement of self-selected goals following therapeutic intervention. Before therapeutic intervention begins, EPs support their client to articulate a number of goals that they would like to work towards, most commonly three.

Traditionally, GAS uses a 5-point scale from -2 to +2 for each goal, whereby each of the five points contains a descriptor in relation to each goal: ‘0’ is used to describe the client’s baseline; ‘+1’ is used to describe progress; ‘+2’ is used to describe significant progress; ‘-1’ is used to describe regression; and, ‘-2’ is used to describe significant regression. Therefore, at the end of therapeutic intervention, each goal can be scored using the 5-point scales, whereby positive scores indicate progress, negative scored indicate regression and neutral scores indicate stagnation. A total GAS score can also be calculated.

One of the main criticisms of GAS is that many clients find it difficult and somewhat problem-focussed to contemplate regression within the context of seeking therapeutic intervention. Another criticism of GAS is that certain clients, especially children, are confused by the use of negative scale points. Furthermore, the use of descriptors for each scale point prevents the use of

midpoints.

Hence, Thomas and Atkinson (2018b) designed the Child-friendly Goal Attainment Scaling (CGAS) which retains the use of a 5-point scale across three goals, but which uses numbers 0 to 4, whereby '0' is used to describe the child's baseline, '2' is used to describe progress and '4' is used to describe significant progress. The CGAS also includes the use of a visual metaphor of a butterfly going through increasing stages of metamorphosis. This therefore avoids difficult/ problem-focussed contemplation of regression and confusion around the use of negative scale points, and introduces the use of midpoints (i.e., '1' and '3'; see Appendix 4).

- How to use: Before the school-based MI intervention begins, the practitioner provides the child/ young person with a copy of the CGAS and supports them to articulate three goals that they would like to work towards, whereby it is important for the practitioner to contain the goals so that they could potentially be achieved throughout the duration of the school-based MI intervention.

The practitioner then supports the child/ young person to first describe their baseline (i.e., '0') and then describe significant progress (i.e., '4') before finally describing progress (i.e., '2') in relation to each goal, whereby this staged process ensures that significant progress (i.e., '4') is a challenging yet achievable goal.

At the end of the school-based MI intervention, each goal can be scored using the 5-point scales, whereby positive scores indicate progress and neutral scores indicate stagnation. A total GAS score out of 12 can also be calculated.

Preparing for your Skype/telephone interview

Prior to your Skype/telephone interview, it may be helpful to meet with other colleagues in your service who use MI in practice or are keen to develop their MI practice and undertake the following preparatory work. If there is not an opportunity to do this before the Skype/telephone interview, please do not worry, as there will be ample time to explain the resources afterwards.

If there is an opportunity to meet or chat with colleagues, useful preparation activities might include:

1. Use Appendix 1 to reflect on:

- a. the facilitators and barriers that you experience/ have experienced when contracting/ planning school-based MI interventions;
 - b. the ways that these facilitators and barriers affect/ have affected your delivery of school-based MI interventions.
2. Use Appendix 2 to reflect on:
- a. the extent to which your current MI practice adheres to the three central tenets of MI theory (i.e., spirit, processes and skills) and whether you can spot any areas you would like to develop;
 - b. the ways in which the protocol could be used by your service to plan, develop and reflect on school-based MI interventions (e.g., by working with peers/ supervisors);
 - c. whether your service would find value in using the protocol to develop individual practitioner competency in school-based MI interventions, either through self-assessment or peer review.
3. Use Appendix 3 to reflect on:
- a. the ways in which the MICORS could be used to gather outcomes data at the end of each session within a school-based MI intervention;
 - b. the ways in which these data could be analysed/ presented/ utilised.
4. Use Appendix 4 to reflect on:
- a. the ways in which the CGAS could be used to gather outcomes data at the end of a school-based MI intervention;
 - b. the ways in which these data could be analysed/ presented/ utilised.

We hope that these activities will enable you and your service to get the most from MI practice development work.

Interview schedule for your Skype/ phone interview

A semi-structured interview schedule has been created to inform discussion during either your Skype/telephone interview (see Appendix 5). The interviewer will take notes using a formatted document (see Appendix 6). If you are concerned about anything you say to the interviewer either during the interview, or afterwards, or about how this might be recorded, please refer to the ethical guidance in the introductory information.

References

- Atkinson, C., & Snape, L. (2018). Mechanisms for change within school based MI: a review of the literature. In E. McNamara (Ed.), *Motivational Interviewing – Children and Young People III: Education and Community Settings* (pp. 76-91). Ainsdale: Positive Behaviour Management.
- Atkinson, C., & Woods, K. (2018). Integrity in the delivery of school-based MI: protocols for practitioners. In E. McNamara (Ed.), *Motivational Interviewing – Children and Young People III: Education and Community Settings* (pp. 76-91). Ainsdale: Positive Behaviour Management.
- Cryer, S., & Atkinson, C. (2015). Exploring the use of Motivational Interviewing with a disengaged primary-aged child. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 31(1), 56–72. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02667363.2014.988326>
- Duncan, B. L., Miller, S. D., Sparks, J. A., Claud, D. A., Reynolds, L. R., Brown, J., & Johnson, L. D. (2003). The Session Rating Scale: preliminary psychometric properties of a “working” alliance measure. *Journal of Brief Therapy*, 3(1), 3-12.
- Kiresuk, T. J., & Sherman, R. E. (1968). Goal attainment scaling: a general method for evaluating comprehensive community mental health programs. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 4(6), 443-453.
- Madson, M. B., Mohn, R. S., Schumacher, J. A., & Landry, A. S. (2015). Measuring client experiences of motivational interviewing during a lifestyle intervention. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 48(2), 140-151.
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2012). *Motivational Interviewing (3rd Ed.): Helping People Change*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Moyers, T. B., Manuel, J. K., & Ernst, D. (2014). Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity Coding Manual 4.1 (MITI 4.1). *University of New Mexico*.
- Moyers, T. B., & Martin, T. (2010). Revised global scales: Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity 3.1.1 (MITI 3.1.1). *University of New Mexico*.
- Snape, L., & Atkinson, C. (2018). Educational psychologists’ use of motivational interviewing with disaffected students: Facilitators and barriers to implementation. In *Motivational Interviewing with Children and Young People III: Education and Community settings*. Ainsdale: Positive Behaviour Management.
- Strait, G. G., McQuillin, S., Smith, B., & Englund, J. A. (2012). Using motivational interviewing with children and adolescents: a cognitive and neurodevelopmental perspective. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, 5(4), 290–304. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1754730X.2012.736789>

Thomas, G., & Atkinson, C. (2018a). *Motivational Interviewing Child Outcome Rating Scale (MICORS)*. Unpublished document: University of Manchester.

Thomas, G., & Atkinson, C. (2018b). *Child-friendly Goal Attainment Scaling (CGAS)*. Unpublished document: University of Manchester.

Appendix 1 – A checklist of the main elements that need to be in place to support the effective delivery of school-based MI (adapted from Snape & Atkinson, 2018)

A suitable room to deliver the SBMI intervention e.g. quiet, private, free from distractions, etc.

Carefully considered timing of sessions e.g. try to avoid student missing the same lesson/subject every week.

Staff involvement in SBMI sessions. Preferably a staff member would attend all sessions and be available to carry out follow-up work throughout the week and after the sessions have ended.

Adequate preparation time. This time is needed to liaise with school staff, plan and deliver sessions and prepare resources.

Students will have average or above average verbal abilities in order to meet the language demands of the programme².

Time should be built into SBMI sessions to develop rapport with the student.

There should not be significant systemic factors thought to be impacting on the student's behaviour and motivation for school e.g. difficult relationships with teachers.

² Literature suggests that MI may be most appropriate with students aged 12 or above with average or above average verbal abilities (Strait, McQuillin, Smith, & Englund, 2012). Work with younger students or those with language or social communication difficulties might require additional structuring, modelling or use of practical and visual strategies and resources (Cryer & Atkinson, 2015).

Appendix 2 – Part 1 (MI spirit): Self, peer or supervisor protocol for evaluating the spirit of MI (Atkinson & Woods, 2018)

Component	Evaluation	5	4	3	2	1	Evidence to support evaluation
Compassion	I have demonstrated feelings of warmth and caring for the young person						
	I have demonstrated an active commitment to meeting the student’s needs						
Partnerships	I have recognised that the student is the expert in knowing what is best for themselves						
	I have shown that the work I do with the student represents a partnership						
Acceptance/ Autonomy	I have recognised that it is up to the student to make decisions about change						
	I have attempted to seek out the student’s						

	strengths I have been respectful of the student's needs						
Evocation	I have listened carefully for 'change talk'						
	I have tried to elicit reasons for change from the student						
	I have understood that attempts at direct persuasion make be counterproductive						

Appendix 2 – Part 2 (MI processes): Self, peer or supervisor protocol for evaluating the processes of MI (Atkinson & Woods, 2018)

Engaging	Check	Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student understands my role and is clear about the reasons why we are working together 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have explained boundaries of confidentiality to the student 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have spent time learning about the student’s achievements, strengths and preferences 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am able to empathise with the student’s predicament 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have created time and space for the student to explain their perspective 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have listened carefully to the student's perspective and try to reflect back how they are feeling 		
<p>Focussing</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have spoken to the student about what areas (if any) are most important to them in terms of potentially making a change 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have helped the student to identify the priority/priorities for discussion 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student and I have a reasonable idea of the goals we are working towards 		
<p>Evoking</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have accepted ambivalence about change as normal 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have noticed talk for change (change talk) and against change (sustain talk) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have tried to draw from the student their ideas about how and why to change 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have asked carefully worded questions to try and elicit change talk 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have asked the student questions about important and confidence (the “Why?” and “How?” of change 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have used reflections and summaries to feed change talk back to the student 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have asked key questions about action towards change 		
Planning		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have been cautious not to jump ahead with the planning process and continue to be accepting of ambivalence 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have affirmed and reflected stronger change talk 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have asked the student about their readiness for change 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have asked open questions to try and help the student to make their plan more concrete and specific 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have helped the student to think about possible change options to allow them different choices 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have reflected and reinforced the student's commitment to change 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have encouraged the student to share decisions about changes with others and to keep a record of success 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have helped the student to think about any slips as learning opportunities 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have helped the student think about any possible barriers to change and ways of seeking support should these arise 		

Appendix 2 – Part 3 (MI skills): Protocol for reviewing the use of OARS in school-based practice (Atkinson & Woods, 2018)

Skill		Tally	Total	Comments
Questioning	Open questions			
	Closed questions			
Reflections	Simple reflections			
	Complex reflections			
Affirmations				
Summaries				
Non-MI adherent behaviour (e.g. confronting and persuading)				

Appendix 3 – MI Child Outcome Rating Scale (MICORS)

Child/ young person:	School/ setting:
D. o. B.:	EP:
Age:	Date:
Gender:	Session no.:

GENERAL QUESTIONS

Me

“How am I doing?”



Family

“How are things in my family?”



Friends

“How are things with my friends?”



School

“How am I doing at school?”



Everything

“How is everything going?”



Next session

“I look forward to the next session with my EP”



MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING QUESTIONS

Caring

“My EP cares about me”



Working together

“My EP respects my views and we work together as a team”



Accepting

“My EP knows that it is my choice to make changes”



Strengths

“My EP has found out about my strengths and the things I’m good at”



Needs

“My EP has found out about my needs and the things I’d like help with”



Waiting

“My EP has waited until I am ready to think about making changes”



My ideas

“My EP has helped me think of my own ideas about making changes”



Appendix 4 – Child-friendly Goal Attainment Scaling (CGAS)

Child/ young person:	Gender:	Consultee:
D. o. B.:	School/ setting:	Date CGAS written:
Age:	Therapist:	Date CGAS reviewed:



Goal-1:

0 – Where I'm at now	1	2 - What would show progress	3	4 – What would be excellent

Goal-2:

0 – Where I'm at now	1	2 - What would show progress	3	4 – What would be excellent

Goal-3:

0 – Where I'm at now	1	2 - What would show progress	3	4 – What would be excellent

Appendix 5 – Semi-structured interview schedule for Skype/telephone interviews

Setting the scene

- [Introduce self and reiterate reason for Skype/telephone interview].
- [Refer back to ethics/ data-gathering/ publication email sent by Cathy Atkinson].
- [Clarify timescales for interview].
- [Ask interviewees whether they have any questions before the interview begins].

Introductions

- *Could you tell me your names and your roles within the EPS?*
- *Could you provide me with a brief overview of your EPS (e.g., staffing structure; position within LA; model of service delivery; school/ community context; etc.)?*

MI context within EPS

- *Could you tell me a bit about how you use of MI in practice? Namely:*
 - *Who you use MI with.*
 - *Individuals?*
 - *Groups?*
 - *How you use MI.*
 - *Consultation?*
 - *Assessment?*
 - *Intervention?*
 - *Training?*
 - *Your rationale for using MI.*
 - *Specific pupil/ student needs?*
 - *Specific pupil/ student age ranges?*
 - *Specific pupil/ student traits (e.g., average or above language skills)?*
- *Could you tell me a bit about the ways in which you gather/ evidence pupil/ student outcomes following MI?*
- *What factors act as facilitators to your use of MI in practice?*
 - *EPS factors?*
 - *School factors?*
 - *Personal factors?*
- *What factors act as barriers to your use of MI in practice?*
 - *EPS factors?*
 - *School factors?*
 - *Personal factors?*
- *Could you tell me a little bit about how you developed competence in MI?*
 - *Training during doctorate/ masters?*
 - *External/ in-house CPD?*

- *Peer/ professional supervision?*
- *Are there any MI resources/ materials that inform your practice?*
- *Is there anything from the MI literature that informs your practice?*

MI development opportunities within EPS

- *With reference to your discussions around Appendix 1 – Snape and Atkinson’s (2017) checklist for the initial contracting/ planning of school-based MI interventions:*
 - *What were your thoughts about how this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS?*
- *With reference to your discussions around Appendix 2 – Atkinson and Woods’ (2018) protocol for assessing the three central tenets of MI theory (spirit; processes; skills):*
 - *What were your thoughts about how this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS?*
- *With reference to your discussions around Appendix 3 – Thomas and Atkinson’s (2018) MI Child Outcome Rating Scale (MICORS):*
 - *What were your thoughts about how this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS?*
- *With reference to your discussions around Appendix 4 – Thomas and Atkinson’s (2018) Child-friendly Goal Attainment Scaling (CGAS):*
 - *What were your thoughts about how this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS?*

Action-planning between now and follow-up

- *Could we now look to action-plan a couple of MI development opportunities within your EPS between now and follow-up?*
- [Refer to notes taken during ‘MI development opportunities within EPS’ discussion].
- [Agree a number of actions pertaining to MI development opportunities within EPS].
- [Agree notional follow-up date in summer 2018].

Round-up

- *Are there any other points that you’d like to discuss in relation to MI?*

Appendix 7 - Semi-structured interview schedule and discussion record:
Follow-up interviews for Skype/telephone interviews

Date:

Location:

Interviewer:

Interviewees:

.....
.....

- *In terms of developing MI practice within the EPS since we last spoke/ met:*

What has gone well?

What has gone less well?

- *In terms of the actions that we agreed around Appendix 1 (checklist for initial contracting/ planning of school-based MI interventions):*

How has MI practice within the EPS changed?

*What has been the impact of these changes to practice (e.g., pupil/ student outcomes)?
Is there any evidence of this that you could discuss/ show me?*

Has this led you to think of further ways that MI practice within the EPS could be developed?

- *In terms of the actions that we agreed around Appendix 2 (protocol for assessing the three central tenets of MI [spirit; processes; skills]):*

How has MI practice within the EPS changed?

*What has been the impact of these changes to practice (e.g., pupil/ student outcomes)?
Is there any evidence of this that you could discuss/ show me?*

Has this led you to think of further ways that MI practice within the EPS could be developed?

- *In terms of the actions that we agreed around Appendix 3 (MI Child Outcome Rating Scale):*

How has MI practice within the EPS changed?

*What has been the impact of these changes to practice (e.g., pupil/ student outcomes)?
Is there any evidence of this that you could discuss/ show me?*

Has this led you to think of further ways that MI practice within the EPS could be developed?

- *In terms of the actions that we agreed around Appendix 4 (Child-friendly Goal Attainment Scaling):*

How has MI practice within the EPS changed?

*What has been the impact of these changes to practice (e.g., pupil/ student outcomes)?
Is there any evidence of this that you could discuss/ show me?*

Has this led you to think of further ways that MI practice within the EPS could be developed?

- *Any additional comments regarding the development of MI practice within your EPS?*

Date:

Location:

Interviewer:

Interviewees:

.....

.....

EP roles (interviewees)/ description of EPS

--

MI context within EPS (1)

<i>Who MI is used with</i>	
<i>How MI is used</i>	
<i>Rationale for MI use</i>	

MI context within EPS (2)

<i>Gathering/ evidencing of pupil/ student outcomes following MI</i>	
--	--

MI context within EPS (3)

<i>Facilitators</i>	
---------------------	--

<i>of MI use</i>	
<i>Barriers to MI use</i>	

<i>MI context within EPS (4)</i>	
<i>How interviewees developed competence in MI</i>	
<i>MI resources/ materials informing practice</i>	
<i>MI literature informing practice</i>	

Appendix 1: Checklist for initial contracting/ planning of school-based MI interventions

How this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS:

<i>Action-planning</i>			
<i>Action/ activity</i>	<i>By who?</i>	<i>By when?</i>	<i>Support needed</i>

Appendix 2: Protocol for assessing the three central tenets of MI (spirit; processes; skills)

How this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS:

<i>Action-planning</i>			
<i>Action/ activity</i>	<i>By who?</i>	<i>By when?</i>	<i>Support needed</i>

Appendix 3: MI Child Outcome Rating Scale

How this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS:

<i>Action-planning</i>			
<i>Action/ activity</i>	<i>By who?</i>	<i>By when?</i>	<i>Support needed</i>

Appendix 4: Child-friendly Goal Attainment Scaling

How this resource could be used to develop MI practice within the EPS:

<i>Action-planning</i>			
<i>Action/ activity</i>	<i>By who?</i>	<i>By when?</i>	<i>Support needed</i>

NOTIONAL REVIEW DATE: