

Fidelity of design and training of opportunistic discussions about weight management in a mental health setting: a document analysis

Angela Rodrigues^{1,*}PhD (angela.rodrigues@northumbria.ac.uk), Emma Kemp¹, PhD, Maria Raisa Jessica Aquino², PhD, Rob Wilson³, PhD, Milica Vasiljevic⁴, PhD, Kate McBride⁵, Sally Faulkner⁵, Craig Robson⁶, Jill Harland⁶, Mish Loraine⁷, Catherine Haighton⁸, PhD.

Introduction

- The Making Every Contact Count (MECC) programme provides training and materials to support organisations to encourage health-promoting behaviour change by utilising the day-to-day interactions between public-facing workforce and individuals [1].
- A bespoke MECC training package has been developed to encourage opportunistic discussions about weight management in a mental health setting [2].



Ask
Take notice and engage

Assist
Provide motivational health information

Act
Signpost to a local service

Research aim

This study aimed to evaluate the fidelity of design of opportunistic discussions about weight management in a mental health setting and fidelity of the training package.

Results

- The implementation of MECC in the mental health setting had moderate fidelity to the MECC guidance, with a 77% adherence of provider documents to guidance.
- The training package showed high fidelity that the training package was being delivered as intended with 100% of BCT matched from training materials to training transcripts.
- Potential loss of fidelity through additional BCTs was present across provider documents and training transcripts.

TIDieR Checklist	Mental Health Setting MECC implementation
Name	Making Every Contact Count (MECC) implementation
Why	The MECC training programme aims to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Increase staff confidence in initiating opportunistic conversations with service users and delivering targeted messages to encourage behaviour change.Support service users in making positive changes to their physical and mental health through MECC conversations about healthy weight, physical activity, and healthy eating.
What	Materials: Training resources, including slides. Procedure: A training package including two training components: 1) a 'train the trainer' session to enable staff to gain the skills needed to deliver cascade MECC training to their colleagues; 2) a bespoke training which combined Core MECC training with the element of A Weight Off Your Mind (AWOYM). The training is designed by the public health and wellbeing lead. Train the trainer training is delivered by a wellbeing specialist/regional MECC trainer. Bespoke training is delivered by a health improvement specialist. Clinical staff are invited to take part in the training.
Who	Online training / Face-to-face within hospital settings
How	Northeast England mental health setting
Where	
When and how much	Post COVID-19, the training package relaunched in September 2022. The initial planned sessions occurred between September-December 2022, then recommenced in March 2023 and are currently ongoing. Train the trainer training sessions lasted 3 hours, and Core MECC + AWOYM were 90 minutes.
Tailoring	Both training sessions included examples of MECC scripts for AWOYM following the 3A's structure which focused on healthy weight management, physical activity and alcohol consumption.
Modifications	No modifications
How well	No intervention adherence or fidelity assessed

Strengths and limitations

- The study provides a thorough evaluation of the current MECC training program in a mental health setting.
- The fidelity analysis offers insights into how MECC training is delivered and the key BCTs targeted.
- The findings are limited to one mental health trust in a specific UK region, restricting their applicability to broader MECC implementation contexts.
- The absence of specific fidelity checks highlights a gap in assessing MECC implementation adherence to guidelines, suggesting a need for a fidelity assessment to enhance training evaluation and consistency.

Methods

- Analysis of documents (k=6) including implementation guide, logic model, and checklist and evaluation framework.
- Documents were coded using the TIDieR framework [3] and the Behaviour Change Technique (BCT) Taxonomy v1 [4]. Coding was compared against MECC guidance documents.
- Three documents and two recordings of training sessions were analysed for BCTs and compared for the fidelity of training assessment.

Discussion

- The implementation of MECC across the mental health setting and the training package appear to be delivered as intended therefore demonstrating good fidelity.
- Future research would benefit from assessing cascade training sessions to evaluate ongoing fidelity of training across the trust.

X: For MECC research updates, follow us on @MECCgroupNCL

References

- Nichol, B., et al. "Establishing an updated consensus on the conceptual and operational definitions of Making Every Contact Count (MECC) across experts within research and practice: an international Delphi Study?." *Public Health* 230 (2024): 29-37.
- Rodrigues, A. M., Kemp, E., Aquino, M. R. J., Wilson, R., Vasiljevic, M., McBride, K., ... & Haighton, C. (2023). Understanding the implementation of 'Making Every Contact Count'(MECC) delivered by healthcare professionals in a mental health hospital: protocol for a pragmatic formative process evaluation. *Health Psychology and Behavioral Medicine*, 11(1), 2174698.
- Hoffmann, T. C., Glasziou, P. P., Boutron, I., Milne, R., Perera, R., Moher, D., & Lamb, S. E. (2014). Better reporting of interventions: Template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ*, 348(mar07 3), g1687. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g1687>
- Michie S, Richardson MS, Johnston M, Abraham C, Francis J, Hardeman W, et al. The Behavior Change Technique Taxonomy (v1) of 93 Hierarchically Clustered Techniques: Building an International Consensus for the Reporting of Behavior Change Interventions. *Ann Behav Med*. 2013;46(1):81–95.



Northumbria University
NEWCASTLE

Affiliations:
1 Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Northumberland Building, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, UK
2 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 4AX, UK
3 Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE1 8ST, UK
4 Department of Psychology, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK
5 Cumbria, Northumberland, Tyne & Wear NHS Foundation Trust, St Nicholas Hospital, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE3 3XT, UK
6 Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, North Tyneside General Hospital, NE29 8NH, UK
7 Holy Jesus Hospital, City Road, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 2AS, UK
8 Department of Social Work, Education and Community Wellbeing, Northumbria University, Coach Lane Campus West, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE7 7XA, UK.

This project is funded by/ supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) North East and North Cumbria (NENC). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.