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ABSTRACT
This article describes an ongoing effort to train MSW students to practice motivational interviewing (MI) competently in the context of a university–community field education partnership model. Students in field placement are trained using the Motivational Interviewing Training and Assessment System and participate in a field seminar to hone MI proficiency. Mixed-methods preliminary evaluation data were collected to understand the impact of the training. Results suggest the Motivational Interviewing Training and Assessment System is promising for preparing social work students to use this evidence-supported practice competently. Implications from this practical example are discussed in relation to integrating an evidence-based practice such as MI into the social work curriculum.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Accepted: October 2017

Calls continue for social work educational programs to better prepare students to engage in evidence-based practice (EBP), implement evidence-supported intervention models, and integrate an implementation science perspective into their practice (Bertram, Charnin, Kerns, & Long, 2015; Howard, Himle, Jenson, & Vaughn, 2009). Motivational interviewing (MI) is an evidence-supported approach with nearly 30 years of empirical support, including more than 200 clinical trials with diverse populations and in the context of multiple-service delivery systems (Miller & Rollnick, 2012). MI is defined as a collaborative, goal-oriented style of communication with particular attention to the language of change . . . designed to strengthen personal motivation for and commitment to a specific goal by eliciting and exploring the person’s own reasons for change within an atmosphere of acceptance and compassion. (Miller & Rollnick, 2012, p. 29)

MI also has been used as a supplement to other EBPs in the context of implementation science. Because EBPs are often implemented with weak fidelity across many disciplines (Fixsen et al., 2005), MI has been proposed as a promising and innovative supplement to bolster EBP fidelity and therefore improve client outcomes (Blom-Hoffman & Rose, 2007; Dishion & Stormshak, 2007; Frey et al., 2011; Gueldner & Merrell, 2011; Herman et al., 2012).

In addition to being evidence based, MI also has been identified as an excellent fit for social work practice based on the congruence between the approach and social work values (Hohman, Pierce, & Barnett, 2015). In particular, MI focuses on supporting client choice and autonomy—a core social work value—and emphasizes the importance of the relationship and communication between the practitioner and client, a general goal of all social work curricula (Kirst-Ashman & Hull, 2012).

Although there are various places in social work educational programs to embed training on EBP models, such as MI, questions remain on how best to prepare social work students with the knowledge and skills to use these practices competently. One natural mechanism to integrate and promote student learning on evidence-supported intervention models, the EBP process, and
implementation science, however, is through partnerships between universities and community organizations in the context of field education (Bertram et al., 2015; Bledsoe-Mansori et al., 2013; Manuel et al., 2009). The purpose of this article is to describe how MI, which is an effective, flexible EBP and an important strategy to improve implementation of other EBPs, was successfully integrated into a College of Social Work field curricula. The current example focuses on teaching students to use MI competently in an existing university-community field placement partnership.

We describe a practical example of a collaborative partnership between a College of Social Work and a local county sheriff’s department along with the process for students to learn to use MI. Next, we present results from a mixed-methods preliminary evaluation of this initiative, which demonstrates the promise of this approach for promoting MI skill development among social work students. Finally, implications for integrating an EBP such as MI into the social work curriculum are offered.

The university–community collaborative partnership

In August 2010, a collaborative partnership was formed between the University of South Carolina College of Social Work, the Richland County Sheriff’s Department, and one local public school district in an effort to prevent high school students from dropping out of school. At the time, the school district and the sheriff’s department already had an existing formal relationship. The sheriff’s department was and is currently responsible for placing two school resource officers (SROs) in each high school in the district each academic year. As part of this partnership, the College of Social Work places graduate students with the SROs in three local high schools to support students at risk for dropping out. This field placement is known as the Richland County Sheriff’s Department School-Based Field Practicum (Iachini & Lutz, 2013). A faculty member serves as a field liaison to these students, and a sergeant in the sheriff’s department who has an MSW degree serves as the field instructor. Training on MI was embedded in the context of this existing university–community collaborative partnership and field placement structure.

Incorporating MI into social work field education

Students selected for the School-Based Field Practicum have two requirements. First, they must participate in intensive training, known as the Motivational Interviewing Training and Assessment System (MITAS). Second, they must complete a one-credit-hour field seminar. Each of these core MI training components is described in more detail next.

MITAS

MITAS (Frey et al., 2017) includes training and assessment components delivered flexibly depending on participant needs. It was developed to increase the likelihood that MI is successfully transported from common fields of MI practice (i.e., substance use and health care) to other settings (education) that involve work with children, parents, and teachers. MITAS consists of workshops, structured feedback, and development of a community of practice.

Workshops

First, the training component of MITAS begins with multiple workshops that aim to enhance students’ MI knowledge and skill development for work with youth, parents, and teachers. Workshops are available in 1-, 6-, and 15-hour options. During the workshops, several didactic and interactive teaching methods are used, including lecture, discussion of key concepts, modeling (through video, audio, and live demonstration), and role play and real play. The workshop topics, which are derived from the four MI processes described by Miller and Rollnick (2012), include Introduction to MI; Skills and Values; Focusing and Evoking; Exchanging Information, Sustain Talk,
Discord, and Evoking Confidence; and Planning for Change. Many of the activities included in the workshops are variations of those recommended by the Motivational Interviewing Network of Trainers website (http://www.motivationalinterviewing.org/). However, all are tailored to be relevant to personnel working in school settings. The objectives and activities for each topic are briefly described next.

**Introduction to MI.** The objectives of this workshop include understanding and identifying change and sustain talk, identifying the MI processes (engaging, focusing, evoking, and planning), and understanding the components of the MI spirit (partnership acceptance, evocation, and compassion). To achieve these objectives, facilitators use lecture, video examples, and skill-focused structured practice activities designed to encourage comparing and contrasting MI with other clinical modalities.

**Skills and values.** The objectives of this topic include understanding and applying MI skills and understanding the importance of client values. The MI skills are represented by the acronym OARS (open-ended questions, affirmations, reflections, and summaries). Each skill is described and modeled in vivo and through video and audio examples. The majority of the time is spent on reflections, which are the heart of MI practice. Next, the importance of identifying, clarifying, and validating client values is discussed, demonstrated, and practiced. Finally, structured practice activities allow students to apply the OARS skills in the context of a values discovery activity. For example, participants might gather in triads with one playing the role of the interviewer, one the client, and one as an observer taking notes on the interviewers’ MI skills while performing the values discovery interview. The emphasis on reflective practice and the values discovery activity during this topic area is to provide a clear focus on the importance of the first of the four MI processes—engagement.

**Focusing and evoking.** The objectives of this topic include understanding the importance of identifying the target behaviors (or beliefs) that clients may be interested in changing. Proficient MI practice uses interview strategies (reflective practice and strategic questioning) to prioritize potential target behaviors and explore the importance of target behaviors. During the workshop, in vivo, video, and audio examples are used to demonstrate how each of the OARS skills are used as the focus of the interview moves from broad to narrow target behaviors or beliefs (e.g., becoming a better student to practicing a particular note-taking strategy). Next, a series of structured scenarios are completed in dyads and triads (i.e., role playing) so that trainers can provide performance feedback to students regarding the focusing process.

The objectives of this topic include understanding how importance and confidence plays a role in the evocation process, practice in the identification of change and sustain talk, and practice applying the OARS skills differentially to promote change talk and recognize, yet minimize, sustain talk. During the workshop, a lecture is used to describe the importance of evocation. Audio-recorded conversations that demonstrate the effective use of evocation strategies for a single target behavior are listened to and discussed. Evocation strategies are introduced and then practiced in structured role- and real-play activities and scenarios. These activities and scenarios are structured to demonstrate each of the OARS skills and are used to elicit the client’s own perspectives regarding the importance of the target behavior and the clients’ confidence in their belief that they can approach the change process. Next, a series of structured scenarios are completed in dyads and triads (i.e., role playing) so that trainers can provide performance feedback to students regarding the process of evocation.

**Exchanging information, sustain talk, discord, and evoking confidence.** The objectives of this topic include understanding how and when to exchange information, as well as applying the skills necessary for exchanging information in an MI-adherent fashion. The skills include asking permission and use of the elicit-provide-elicit framework. In addition, client use of sustain talk is explored. 
further and compared to discordance in the working relationship. Sustain talk and discord are often confused by novice MI practitioners, and the differences between the two are highlighted in this workshop. Finally, an emphasis on client confidence is presented in preparation for the planning process. Specific methods for the evocation of confidence are introduced, exemplified, and practiced (confidence ruler and exploring past successes). As in previous workshops, a series of structured scenarios are completed in dyads and triads (i.e., role playing) so that trainers can provide performance feedback to students regarding these processes.

**Planning for change.** The objectives of this topic include using OARS to reaffirm the client’s motivation (importance and confidence), recognize readiness for change, negotiate a plan, and consolidate commitment. This is completed with a lecture and structured activities.

**Structured feedback**

In addition to the workshops, the training component then includes up to three individualized coaching sessions in which participants receive performance feedback on their use of MI from an experienced practitioner. Prior to each performance feedback session, participants’ audio record a 20-minute conversation with a standardized client, which is an individual who role-plays a teacher, parent, or adolescent and uses a script to guide participants’ responses. During this interaction, students use MI in support of the client’s consideration of behavior change. An experienced MI practitioner evaluates the recording and then provides performance feedback in a 30-minute coaching session to build the student’s use of MI toward competence. The Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity coding system (Moyers, Manuel, & Ernst, 2014) is used to code the session, and then these data are used to inform and guide individualized coaching and feedback as well as document the student’s incremental movement toward MI competency.

**Community of practice**

The final training component of MITAS involves monthly consultation groups, or professional learning communities, in which students come together to discuss their use of MI with clients and, in particular, the successes and challenges of implementation, thus moving their own practice toward proficiency.

Overall, MITAS is structured to include innovative instructional features to support students’ learning and practice. First, our conceptualization of the progression of MI skill development is aligned with the practice activities we provide during the course of the training (see Figure 1). The MITAS workshop series provides didactic and narrowly focused skill practice to help support students’ growing knowledge and skill development. To develop students’ competency in the use of MI skills, we then introduce interactions with a standardized client, which is a safe, yet realistic, method to practice MI skills. Second, the performance feedback component of MITAS is carefully delivered in an MI-consistent manner, which allows students to further experience MI practice. Finally, MITAS promotes learning and collaboration with peers through the community of practice component. This allows students to continue to grow toward proficiency as they review and discuss the use of MI in applied settings.

**MITAS in the school-based field practicum**

For the past 3 years, social work graduate students placed in the Richland County Sheriff’s Department School-Based Field Practicum have been trained using MITAS. One tenure-track faculty member and one clinical faculty member, both experienced MI practitioners, conducted five 3-hour workshops for three students each year (N=9). Graduate students also participated in a group discussion about MI. As part of the training, each graduate student took part in two audio-recorded MI practice sessions with a standardized client who played the role of a high school student representing a member of the population the graduate social work students will work with in their field placement. The clinical faculty member then reviewed the audio recordings using the
Motivational Interviewing Treatment Integrity (Moyers, Manuel, & Ernst, 2014) coding system and met individually with each student to provide feedback. Training was provided prior to the first week of the semester, and practice sessions occurred within the first month of their entry into their school field placement setting.

Graduate students in the field placement also are required to enroll in a 1-credit-hour elective during the fall semester. The course is designed to be interactive, promote critical thinking, and help students integrate learning from their field experience. The course objectives were to (a) apply critical thinking to understand and assess nonacademic barriers students face to learning in schools; (b) discuss research, skills, and practices related to addressing nonacademic barriers to student learning and apply these concepts to field placement; (c) monitor and communicate the impact of school social work interventions to diverse stakeholder groups; (d) collaborate with SROs and other student support professionals, participate in teaming structures that support student learning, and self-reflect on the use of self in these collaborative experiences; and (e) identify and discuss value conflicts and ethical dilemmas that may arise during collaboration with law enforcement personnel and suggest responses that are consistent with the National Association of Social Workers’ Code of Ethics. As part of this course, MI learning and skill development are reinforced. Specifically, all graduate students are required to present a case and discuss their application of MI skills in the school setting. In addition, MI role plays and discussions occurred throughout the course. In the end, this seminar complements and extends the training as it allows for a small community of practice to develop among the students to further promote development of their MI practice.

**Mixed-methods preliminary evaluation**

Nine graduate students (six females and three males, each in their mid-20s) have participated in MITAS over the course of 3 years (2014–2016). All the participants held bachelor’s degrees and were enrolled in a graduate social work program. Five participants self-identified as African American, and four identified as White. All participants reported non-Hispanic ethnicities.

We were interested in understanding how participation in MITAS affected students’ MI self-efficacy and competency, as well as how students perceived the MITAS training. To do this, we measured perceived MI self-efficacy and competency at baseline and following participation in MITAS each year. The Motivational Interviewing Self-Efficacy Questionnaire, which was modified from the work of Young (2010), consists of 11 items assessing perceived self-efficacy at implementing MI on a 5-point scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree).

Two measures of MI competency were used: the Written Assessment of Simulated Encounters – School-Based Applications (Lee, Small, & Frey, 2013) and the Video Assessment of Simulated Encounters – School-Based Applications (Lee, Frey, & Small, 2013). All responses were scored by two raters to verify findings and account for any inconsistencies. One rater’s coding was confirmed and used for these analyses. Detailed descriptions of these measures can be found in Lee, Frey, and Small (2013) and Lee, Small, and Frey (2013).

Finally, an hour-long focus group was held at the end of each year in spring 2015 and spring 2016 to understand the students’ experiences using MI in their field placement with students repeating the
ninth grade and their experiences with the MITAS training and overall field placement. The focus group was conducted by a staff member who was not involved with the MI training or with the students’ field placement. An example focus group prompt was, “Tell me about your experiences using motivational interviewing (MI) with students.” Each focus group was audio recorded and transcribed.

Descriptive statistics and visualization tools were used to describe changes in the data from the Motivational Interviewing Self-Efficacy Questionnaire. Given the small sample size and nonexperimental nature of this work, and to provide case-level information while determining if the MI skill changes from baseline to postmeasurement were clinically and statistically reliable, the Reliability Change Index (RCI; Jacobson & Truax, 1991) was calculated for the Written Assessment of Simulated Encounters and Video Assessment of Simulated Encounters for each participant. A significant RCI statistic (≥1.96) indicates statistically significant reliable change occurred between baseline and postevaluation in an individual’s MI ability. If the RCI statistic is not significant, but an individual’s postevaluation scores have increased from below the competency score at baseline to above the competency score at posttest, then the change is clinically significant, meaning the increase in ability measured by the instrument is meaningful as a practitioner of MI. Given this analysis plan, we classified each case based on baseline to posttest evaluation changes scores as responders, partial responders, or nonresponders.

Qualitative data collected through the focus groups were analyzed by a research assistant not involved in the training process using provisional codes that included what participants enjoyed about MITAS as well as what they would like to see changed (Saldaña, 2009). A second coder (the first author) then performed second-cycle axial coding to identify themes within these two provisional codes and selective coding to identify those codes related to students’ learning and application of MI skills (Saldaña, 2009). Throughout the process of coding, the two coders conducted debriefings to discuss any differences in coding and arrive at the final themes.

**Results**

Overall, MI self-efficacy increased for all six participants who participated in 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 (This measure was not administered to the 2014–2015 cohort.). Large consistent gains were reported, moving from an average baseline score of 29.67 (SD=7.23) to an average posttest score of 49.67 (SD=2.94). The average total point change for the six participants was 20 (SD=6.00) points, representing a 36% increase (Table 1).

In terms of MI competency, total scores from the Written Assessment of Simulated Encounters-School Based Applications- at baseline ranged from 6 to 26 (out of 30 possible) with a mean value across cases of 11.11 (SD=7.52); at posttest scores ranged from 10 to 25 with a mean value across cases of 19.11 (SD=4.73). Baseline to posttest change in total scores ranged from 0 to 18. Calculation of the RCI statistic for each participant revealed two responders, demonstrating clinically reliable change (statistical significance RCI≥1.96), whereas three participants obtained clinically significant changes but not reliable change (moving from below the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Identification Number</th>
<th>Baseline Total (M)</th>
<th>Post Total (M)</th>
<th>Baseline to Post Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>28 (2.55)</td>
<td>51 (4.64)</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>21 (1.91)</td>
<td>47 (4.27)</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>39 (3.55)</td>
<td>52 (4.73)</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>26 (2.36)</td>
<td>45 (4.09)</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>26 (2.36)</td>
<td>52 (4.73)</td>
<td>+26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>38 (3.45)</td>
<td>51 (4.64)</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Total (SD)</td>
<td>29.67 (7.23)</td>
<td>49.67 (2.94)</td>
<td>+20 (6.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cutoff score of 16.02 to above, with RCI<1.96). Seven out of eight participants demonstrated positive growth at posttest (Table 2).

Total scores from the Video Assessment of Simulated Encounters-School Based Applications at baseline ranged from 8 to 35 (out of 48 possible) with a mean value across cases of 25 ($SD=8.49$); at posttest scores ranged from 26 to 36 with a mean value across cases of 32.44 ($SD=2.70$). Baseline to posttest change in total scores ranged from -1 to 24. Calculation of the RCI statistic for each participant revealed two responders, demonstrating clinically reliable change (statistical significance $RCI\geq1.96$), and four participants obtained clinically significant changes but not reliable change (moving from below the cutoff score of 30.64 to above, with RCI<1.96). Eight out of nine participants demonstrated positive growth at posttest.

In terms of participant experiences, participants reported enjoying the MI training and gaining feedback on their skills. One participant noted, “I loved learning motivational interviewing. For me, it was incredibly helpful. Not just for the kids in field, but I mean, I think in daily use. It can be super helpful.” Several participants noted they found the recorded role plays particularly helpful, as well as receiving feedback on the use of their MI skills in these role plays. Participants also shared several core MI concepts and skills they learned through this process. One participant said,

"the reflections, the open-ended questions, the affirmations. The very first kid that I met with … I could visibly see the effect it had. And so much so—I remember he came to my SRO’s office and was like ‘I liked working with her. I wanna come back.’"

The participants also discussed how they believed the program was helpful to the high school students they worked with in their field placement. One participant said,

I think they [the high school students] felt like they were treated more like adults with the fact that they could take ownership. So, I think that was very good working with high schoolers because they want to be adults, and so that … let them feel like it was their program. That it wasn’t just us talking at them. It was like a conversation [and] working along.

Participants also noted several areas to consider for strengthening the training in the future. One topic identified during the focus groups that could be emphasized more in training is how to use MI when gaining biopsychosocial assessment information and administering assessment measures. Participants also said that although they had access to ongoing support through the field instructor, the field liaison/seminar leader, and through the MI coach, there was some confusion about whom they should contact for support about an issue. Participants indicated further clarification of roles related to this intensive training process would be helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Identification Number</th>
<th>WASE-SBA</th>
<th>VASE-SBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Total Score</td>
<td>Baseline–Post Change</td>
<td>RCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Competency scores thresholds for the WASE and VASE assessments are 16.02 and 30.64, respectively. Non = Non-Responder. <sup>a</sup>RCI statistic<sub>=1.96</sub> reliable and significant change. <sup>b</sup>Clinically significant change from baseline to postevaluation.
Discussion

This article presents an example of how to integrate an EBP, such as MI, into social work field education and prepare graduate social work students to practice MI competently. Specifically, MITAS was successfully integrated into an existing university-community field practicum partnership with an accompanying field seminar. Although this training structure worked best for implementation in this university, it is important to note that MITAS could easily be incorporated into the social work core curriculum in other ways. For example, MITAS could be embedded in courses or through a combination of course work and field education. Or MITAS could be embedded as part of an MI course or as part of a broader interventions course. In addition, MITAS could be embedded as part of a field seminar model. In fact, we recommend a more integrated approach, which allows didactic instruction and role plays and real plays but also direct application and feedback in real-world clinical settings.

In addition, through the findings of our study, we have preliminary evidence that suggests the promise of MITAS for promoting student learning and skill development in MI. Overall, most students improved across all self-efficacy and MI competency measures. This is important as graduate students come to courses and field placement with a diverse set of clinical expertise and experiences. The findings of this effort suggest that graduate students, regardless of where they began, either learned new skills or maintained their existing skills. Individualized feedback provided as part of MITAS also is well suited to this reality regarding variability in graduate students’ clinical experiences, particularly as it allows one-on-one feedback and skill development. Results also demonstrate students were satisfied with the MITAS procedures. Obviously, however, this preliminary evaluation has significant methodological limitations. In particular, this evaluation is limited in terms of internal and external validity. Specifically, the absence of a counterfactual condition severely limits our ability to conclude the observed changes are not the result of common threats to internal validity, such as history, repeated testing, or confounding variables. With regard to external validity, much more research is needed to understand the impact of this training in more diverse settings and with participants with different characteristics.

Another finding of note through our implementation and preliminary evaluation is the importance of clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all involved in MITAS training. Two faculty members involved with this effort had complementary, yet different, expectations and expertise. One is a tenure-track faculty member with expectations prioritizing research, and the other is a clinical faculty member with expectations prioritizing teaching. Together, these two faculty members ensure the success of students learning this evidence-supported intervention. However, because two faculty members were involved, along with the field partners, roles and responsibilities of each individual can potentially overlap and sometimes cause confusion as reported by the students. Other faculty members in schools of social work interested in implementing MITAS should not only consider who will be on the team to implement MITAS training but also consider how to communicate the roles and responsibilities of each team member to students to enhance clarity and further support their learning this EBP.

Integrating training on MI through field education and university-community partnerships, such as in the example showcased here, can benefit social work students in several ways. First, understanding the importance of EBPs for teachers, parents, and adolescents makes students more competitive when entering the workforce. Practicing MI competently can be viewed as a value-added skill for an agency or organization and can differentiate graduates in important ways in the competitive job market. In addition, training students on EBPs, such as MI, also helps social work students tackle the complex grand challenges identified by the American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare (Flynn, 2017). Given that MI has been found applicable and effective for use in a range of settings and to address a range of social problems, incorporating MI training through field education provides students with real-world opportunities to use these skills to help alleviate these societal challenges.
Conclusion

MI is an important EBP for social work students to learn. This article showcases an innovative way to integrate training on EBPs into the social work curriculum through field education and a university-community partnership. Given the promise of this EBP integration, other faculty members and schools of social work should consider MITAS as one potential mechanism to prepare social work students to competently practice MI.
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