

Does MI Training Enhance Wraparound?

The results of Study One made us start to think it was time for an enhancement to the wraparound model. Motivational Interviewing was one of the ways in which it could be re-energized. We truly believe that Wraparound is an excellent approach to working with people that have multiple complex issues and behaviors. We wanted to see if adding Motivational Interviewing training could provide a way of better engaging, motivating and building the self-efficacy of those youth/families who are not engaging in or completing wraparound. Motivational Interviewing is designed to increase intrinsic purpose and incentive to change and follow through on change plans (Miller and Rollnick, 2013).

- Motivational Interviewing is an interactional approach that is non-judgmental and non-confrontive. The approach attempts to increase the person's awareness of the need to change and follow through by focusing on the results of a better future (Miller & Rollnick, 2009). The principles, assumptions, and strategies are a good match to wraparound's goal to support families to achieve their own vision.
- Motivational Interviewing recognizes that people who need to make changes to achieve their long-range vision are often ambivalent about making the needed changes (Miller & Rollnick, 2009). There may be many reasons for this – including a lack of confidence that they can achieve their vision, that the changes may not lead to the vision, and that there may be negative impacts to making the changes.
- While the process is non-judgmental and non-confrontive, it is not a neutral discussion. The dialogue helps the family clarify for themselves why the change is needed. At this point, the wraparound staff becomes a support for the change, not the person advocating for the change. This recognizes that true change and growth must come from the youth (or family) and cannot be effectively imposed by an outside entity. The goal of Motivational Interviewing is to help the family make the decision to change and then support the change (Miller & Rollnick, 2013).

Wraparound and Motivational Interviewing have similar goals and are a good match. Wraparound works when it focuses on the needs families identify as most important. Thinking about how Motivational Interviewing works and can lead to lasting change can suggest effective strategies for working with youth/families not committed or motivated to change. Resistance and ambivalence to change are natural responses, so MI helps the youth/family view the discrepancy the resistance and ambivalence cause and help them address this ambivalence.

The second study was to look at the effect of training in Motivational Interviewing on current wraparound staff. The first question was to determine if training in Motivational Interviewing would change the way staff interact with youth/families in a way that better meets the spirit and fidelity of Motivational Interviewing.

Method

Participants – The participants were 17 wraparound facilitators who had been providing wraparound for four to 13 months. All staff had received a four-day wraparound training and weekly (or more often) individual and group coaching. The staff were working toward wraparound certification in which key sessions of wraparound were recorded by video to facilitate certification scoring and coaching. The participants then received a two-day training in Motivational Interviewing provided by a MINT trainer.

Intervention – The staff first received wraparound training. Coaching was ongoing throughout the study. Following the first round of videos all wraparound staff in each agency completed a two-day Motivational Interviewing done by a MINT trainer. Two to four months following this training a second round of videos was taken to assess the impact of the MI training. Feedback on the Global scores was provided to the staff after all videos were recorded to avoid any confounding of coaching to the impact of the MI training.

Outcomes – The outcomes were wraparound fidelity as measured by the VVDB certification tools and MI integrity as measured by the Global scores of the MITI 4.2.1. The fidelity scores were how well the required activities of wraparound (wraparound fidelity) and how well the three global scores from the MITI were met (MI spirit fidelity). The wraparound fidelity scores have been described (Rast, 2010). The three Global ratings of the Motivational Interviewing Treatment Index (MITI 4.2.1, Moyers, Manuel, and Ernst, 2014) describe how well the spirit of MI has been met and include: cultivating change talk, partnership, and empathy. Each Global is scored on a five-point Likert scale in which 5 is exceptionally well met, and 4 is the acceptable level of fidelity. Each rating has specified anchors.

Coding Procedures and Raters – The videos were scored for wraparound fidelity and for the global ratings of MI from the MITI 4.2.1. The MITI is a behavioral coding system that provides an answer to the question, “How well or poorly is a staff using Motivational Interviewing?” The MITI is intended to be used to measure treatment integrity for clinical trials and to provide structured, formal feedback about ways to improve the practice of Motivational Interviewing. The videos were scored by the local coach/supervisor and by a MITI trained evaluator to provide inter-rater reliability and feedback to the coach who was learning to use the fidelity measure. The scores reported are from the evaluator. Twenty percent of the videos were scored by a second MITI trained evaluator to ensure reliability of the evaluator’s scores.

Results

The study was designed to look at the outcomes of MI training and the first step was to look at the training transfer of the training itself. In this case there was little transfer, so the evaluation focused on the impact of the training on staff behavior. Videos of staff interactions with youth/families during the initial engagement session and the session to prepare the family for the first team meeting were recorded following the initial training and following the MI training. Videos of the before condition that did not meet minimum wraparound fidelity (75%) were excluded from the sample and after coaching a second

video was recorded. All 17 wraparound facilitators met minimum fidelity standards prior to MI training (there were some staff within the program that did not meet this standard and their videos were not included in either sample).

The global ratings for MI Spirit are scored on a 5 point Likert scale in which a 5 is generally exceptional practice, a 4 shows active and repeated efforts to meet the global category, 3 is focus on the global with limited success implementing it, a 2 shows sporadic effort and a 1 shows little or no attention to the global component. The mean scores on the three globals prior to MI training fell between level 2 and 3 showing very inconsistent use of the three overarching components of the MI process.

The scores for cultivating change talk ranged from a 1 to a 3 with a mean of 2.35. The goal of cultivating change talk is to use interactions to encourage the youth/family's own language in favor of change and confidence to make that change. This is important because the youth/family's desire and commitment to make change has been shown as a primary determinant of entering into and following through on change efforts. The mean score of 2.48 shows that staff were sporadically attending to change language and frequently missing opportunities to encourage change talk.

		Cultivating Change Talk	Partnership	Empathy
Initial Engagement	Before MI Training	2.29	2.00	2.76
	After MI Training	2.35	2.28	2.74
Preparing for Team Meeting	Before MI Training	2.36	2.43	2.57
	After MI Training	2.61	2.56	2.62
Overall Fidelity Score	Before MI Training	58.1%	55.4%	66.7%
	After MI Training	62.0%	60.5%	67.0%

The second global rating is for partnership which is intended to measure the extent in which staff convey an understanding that expertise and wisdom about change reside mostly with the youth/family and actively encouraging power sharing in the interaction and planning process. This is important because if youth/families do not own the process they will be much less engaged and motivated. The mean score of 2.42 shows that staff were superficially responding to opportunities to collaborate on the process with the youth/family.

The third global is empathy which measures the extent to which staff understand or make an effort to grasp the youth/family's perspective and experience. The slightly higher score in this global 2.62 is a positive sign for wraparound but still falls below the level of actively trying to understand this perspective and shows the modest success of this process.

Overall the baseline demonstrates the need for MI training and provides a wide range for improvement. Unfortunately, the overall level for improvement was not significant and may well have been a normal developmental rise for newer staff. The bottom row of the table shows the overall level of fidelity on these scores before and after the training. The minimum targeted level of fidelity on these scores is 80%.



Discussion

This study documents the experience of many more coaches and staff who report that MI training alone does not seem to have much impact on staff performance. The findings from this study suggest that training alone is not enough to infuse MI practices into the wraparound process. The small levels of change following MI training suggest that simply sending staff to MI training will not get the benefit that Motivational Interviewing offers in engaging and motivating youth/families who are not ready or committed to change. Future efforts to improve the infusion of MI spirit into the wraparound practice by staff are needed.

Discussions with coaches and supervisors and focus groups with staff suggest some of the possible challenges to infusing MI into wraparound practice.

- Some of the consistent findings of these discussions are that wraparound is a complex process and adding MI to the process makes it more complex.
- Requirements on wraparound staff from funders and current fidelity monitoring systems are not consistent with the spirit of MI
- Understanding how to use the two processes together is difficult without specific training and coaching in a more integrated model
- There are aspects of the two processes that are in conflict.

The next step is to see if integrated training and coaching may result in better use of MI concepts and then to look at the outcomes of this integrated practice if it can be obtained.

Jim Rast, Ph.D.

Paper prepared for FMIH Conference

March 2020