

## MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING CODING, FEEDBACK AND COACHING FORM

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Session: \_\_\_\_\_

Length of time coded: \_\_\_\_\_ minutes

**BEHAVIOR COUNTS:**


**KEY:**

<b>Qo</b>	Open Question
<b>Qc</b>	Closed Question
<b>A</b>	Affirmation
<b>R</b>	Reflection
<b>S</b>	Summary
<b>ECT</b>	Eliciting Change Talk
<b>T</b>	Teaching
<b>C</b>	Confrontation

**TOTALS:**

<b>Longest Q String</b>	
<b># Asked 3 Questions in a row</b>	
<b># Open Questions</b>	
<b># Closed Questions</b>	
<b># Affirmations</b>	
<b># Reflections</b>	
<b># Summarization</b>	
<b># Elicit Change Talk</b>	
<b># Teach/Advise/Comment</b>	
<b># Confrontational Interactions</b>	
<b># TOTAL INTERACTIONS</b>	

**GLOBAL MEASURES:**

Global Measures are intended to capture the rater’s overall impression of how well the officer meets the intent of each scale. Global scores should reflect the holistic evaluation of the interviewer during the observed interview. Critique staff should circle the appropriate number in the table for each global measure based upon the observed interview. During the feedback session, allow the officer to self-evaluate and provide their perceived proficiency number in the space provided. Discuss any discrepancies during the feedback session.

<b>Acceptance (Unconditional positive regard/respect):</b> The officer is able to work with the offender as an individual and not based upon the offender's criminal behavior.						
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Officer is perceived as <i>intentionally</i> judgmental, harsh, disrespectful, labeling or condescending. Many confrontational interactions noted.	Officer is perceived as <i>inadvertently</i> judgmental, harsh, disrespectful, labeling or condescending. Several confrontational interactions noted.	Officer demonstrates little acceptance and respect for the offender. Officer confuses acceptance with approval of offender's behavior. Officer utilizes few or one-word affirmations, many closed questions, or many teaching comments. Some confrontational interactions noted.	Officer communicates sporadic acceptance and respect for the offender. Acceptance is generally person-focused and not confused with acceptance / approval of the offender's behavior. Officer limits teaching comments and uses mixed affirmations. Few confrontational interactions noted.	Officer communicates acceptance and respect for the offender. Acceptance is generally person-focused and not confused with acceptance / approval of the offender's behavior. Use of closed questions and teaching comments are limited. Officer uses specific affirmations. No confrontational interactions noted.	Officer clearly communicates acceptance and respect for the offender. Acceptance is clearly person-focused and not confused with acceptance / approval of the offender's behavior. Teaching comments are limited to <5% of the interview. Use of closed questions is limited. Officer uses several specific affirmations. No confrontational interactions noted.	Officer clearly communicates acceptance and respect for the offender. Acceptance is clearly person-focused and not confused with acceptance / approval of the offender's behavior. Teaching comments limited to <5% of the interview. Officer uses many specific affirmations and few closed questions. No confrontational interactions noted.

Officer's Self-evaluation of Acceptance: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---

<b>Empathy (<i>Understanding/Trying to Understand the Offender's Perspective</i>):</b> Through the use of reflective listening the officer shows an active interest in trying to more fully understand the offender's perspective of his/her criminogenic issues.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Officer's failure to show interest in the offender's perspective appears <i>intentionally</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer's failure to show interest in the offender's perspective appears <i>inadvertently</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer has no apparent interest in offender's view. Gives little to no attention to the offender's perspective: asking only information-seeking questions often with an ulterior motive, proving for factual information without attempting to understand the offender's perspective	Officer makes sporadic efforts to explore the offender's perspective, achieving an inaccurate understanding or detracting from the offender's true meaning: offering reflections that misinterpret what the offender has said, displaying shallow attempts to understand the offender.	Officer actively tries to understand the offender's perspective with modest success; offering a few accurate reflections that may miss the offender's point, making an attempt to grasp the offender's meaning throughout with mild success.	Officer shows evidence of accurate understanding of the offender's worldview through active and repeated efforts to understand and communicate the offender's point of view, mostly focused on explicit content; conveying interest in the offender's perspective or situation, offering accurate reflections of what the offender has said.	Officer shows evidence of deep understanding of not only what the offender has explicitly said; showing great interest in the offender's perspective or situation, attempting to put themselves in the offender's choice, encouraging the offender to elaborate beyond just following the offender's story, using many accurate complex reflections.

Officer's Self-evaluation of Empathy: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Genuineness (Transparent):</b> The officer is perceived as open, responsive, and honest.						
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
<p>Officer is not responding honestly and openly to the offender and may appear unresponsive or phony.</p> <p>Officer's responses have a very flat, closed, or technical-business quality, or may appear to be rote or mechanical.</p> <p>Officer's lack of genuineness is <i>intentionally</i> harmful to the offender.</p>	<p>Officer is not responding honestly and openly to the offender and may appear unresponsive or phony.</p> <p>Officer's responses are slightly flat, closed, or may appear to be rote or mechanical.</p> <p>Officer's lack of genuineness is <i>inadvertently</i> harmful to the offender.</p>	<p>Officer is not responding honestly and openly to the offender.</p> <p>Response to offender is general in nature and not catered to the offender's situation.</p>	<p>Officer is perceived as generally open &amp; honest.</p> <p>Officer is trying to demonstrate the quality of transparency.</p> <p>Responses to offender appear to address the offender's personal value, but are lacking individuality.</p>	<p>Officer is perceived as slightly open, responsive &amp; honest.</p> <p>Officer sporadically demonstrates the quality of transparency.</p> <p>Response to the offender is somewhat individual &amp; personal.</p>	<p>Officer is generally perceived as open, responsive &amp; honest.</p> <p>Officer sporadically demonstrates the quality of transparency.</p> <p>Response to offender is somewhat individual &amp; personal.</p>	<p>Officer is clearly perceived as open, responsive and honest.</p> <p>Officer clearly demonstrates a quality of congruent transparency, saying what they feel in the moment.</p> <p>Response to offender is individual &amp; personal.</p>

Officer's Self-evaluation of Genuineness: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**MI Spirit Measures:**

MI Spirit Measures are intended to capture the rater’s overall impression of how well the officer manifests the fundamental spirit of motivational interviewing through the use of a directive, client-centered style of facilitating, coaching, and negotiating which evokes change from the offender. MI Spirit scores should reflect the holistic evaluation of the interviewer during the observed interview. Critique staff should circle the appropriate number in the table for each MI Spirit measure based upon the observed interview. The officer’s cumulative MI Spirit score is tabulated by averaging the raw scores from each of the following areas. During the feedback session, allow the officer to self-evaluate and provide their perceived proficiency number in the space provided. Discuss any discrepancies during the feedback & coaching session.

<b>Collaboration (<i>Cooperating with the offender for change</i>):</b>						
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Officer's insistence on maintaining the expert role appears <i>intentionally</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer's insistence on maintaining the expert role appears <i>inadvertently</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer actively assumes the expert role for the majority of the interaction so that collaboration is absent; explicitly takes the expert role, minimized offender's ideas, dominates conversation, argues with offender's alternative approaches, is passive or disconnected.	Officer discourages collaboration or responds to opportunities superficially: difficulties surrendering expert role, superficial requests for offender input, distracted or impatient with the offender.	Officer incorporates offender goals, ideas & values in a lukewarm or erratic fashion, missing opportunities to deepen offender contribution: does not structure the interaction to offender input,, follows offender superficially, some instances of disagreeing with the offender, sacrifices some mutual problem solving in favor of supplying expertise.	Officer fosters power sharing so that the offender's ideas impact the session: some structuring to insure offender input, engages offender in problem solving, does not insist on resolution until the offender is ready.	Officer actively fosters power sharing so that the offender's ideas substantially influence the nature of the session: asking for offender ideas, identifying the offender as the expert, incorporating offender suggestions, tailors advice giving depending on offender input.

Officer’s Self-evaluation of Collaboration: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Evocation (<i>Eliciting offender's motivation for change</i>):</b>						
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Officer's insistence on informing and educating to argue the offender into change appears <i>intentionally</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer's insistence on informing and educating to argue the offender into change appears <i>inadvertently</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer actively provides reasons for or education about change exploring client knowledge, efforts, or motivation: ignoring or misunderstanding offender statements about target behavior change, providing education despite offender's indication of knowledge, using lists of questions not tailored to unique offender responses, dismissing offender contributions, not showing curiosity about offender circumstances, attempting to talk offender into changing.	Officer relies on information giving at the expense of exploring offender motivations and ideas: not incorporating offender contributions into discussions about change, responding vaguely to offender change talk, showing only superficial interest offender views or circumstances.	Officer shows no particular interest in or awareness of offender's own reasons or plans for change, providing information without tailoring it to the offender's circumstances: missing opportunities to investigate offender motivation and past successes, regarding offender views neutrally, responding to offender change talk occasionally.	Officer accept offender's own reasons for change and ideas about how change should happen and do not attempt to educate or direct if the offender resists: permitting offender's ideas to provide direction for the interview, acknowledging offender reasons for change at face value without eliciting or elaborating, consistently responding to change talk with reflections, elaborating questions or interest.	Officer works to evoke offender's own reasons for change and ideas about how change should happen: showing curiosity about the offender's ideas and experiences, helping offender's talk themselves into changing, strategically and consistently reinforcing and eliciting change talk, not missing opportunities to explore change more deeply.

Officer's Self-evaluation of Evocation: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Autonomy Supportive (Emphasizing the offender's ability to choose):</b>						
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Officer's insistence that the offender does not have a choice appears <i>intentionally</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer's insistence that the offender does not have a choice appears <i>inadvertently</i> damaging to the offender.	Officer actively detracts from or denies offender's perception of choice or control: stating the offender does not have a choice, implying that external consequences remove choice, exploring choices pessimistically or sarcastically, being rigid about change options.	Officer discourages offender's perception of choice or responds to it superficially: not elaborating on the topic of choice when raised by the offender, minimizing or superficially responding to offender choice, dismissing the topic of choice after acknowledging it, not being genuine in discussions of offender choice, ignoring the topic when the offender brings it up.	Officer is neutral to offender autonomy and choice: not denying options or choice but making little effort to actively instill it, not bringing up the topic of choice.	Officer is accepting and supportive of offender autonomy: exploring offender options genuinely, agreeing when offenders say they can't be forced to change.	Officer adds significantly to the feeling and meaning of offender's expressions of autonomy in such a way as to <i>markedly expand the offender's experience of personal control and choice</i> : proactively eliciting comments that lead to greater perceived choice, exploring options genuinely and non-passively, non-sarcastically and explicitly acknowledging the offender's option not to change, providing multiple opportunities to discuss options and control, giving credence to offender ideas about change.

Officer's Self-evaluation of Autonomy Support: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**MI "Spirit" Average Calculation:**

Collaboration Score: \_\_\_\_\_ +  
Evocation Score: \_\_\_\_\_ +  
Autonomy Score: \_\_\_\_\_ +  
Cumulative MI Spirit: \_\_\_\_\_ divide by 21 = **MI Spirit Average** = \_\_\_\_\_%

**Observed Areas of Strength:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Observed Areas Needing Improvement:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Collaborative plan of action to address areas needing improvement:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed this \_\_\_\_\_ day, \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Team Supervisor**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Probation and Parole Officer**