

MI before. As we have noticed before, Danish participants sometimes have difficulties in completely understanding Swedish and vice versa, which can cause misunderstandings. We observed this and tried to address these difficulties but perhaps we did not fully meet the needs of our Danish group. We had no such language barriers with the Norwegian group. Christina sometimes translated Swedish words to Norwegian, which was helpful even for the Danes.

Three days for a TNT is not much. Some participants wanted more specific information about research and material of evidence to present in their own workshops and some also expressed some initial uncertainty on how to set up presentations in their groups. On the whole the feedback forms from the participants were overwhelmingly positive. Many of them explicitly wrote that they felt much more competent after the training and that they were inspired to carry on as trainers with a new feeling of optimism. They are now invited to be part of the MINT and many of them expressed great interest to take part in discussions and sharing experiences with others. We feel that they will all add good quality to both the international and the Nordic MINT!

As trainers we discussed before the training that in fact the three of us are different personalities and that to some degree we may emphasize and have different favourite interests in MI. Most rewarding for us is that we carried out this TNT with 100% support for each other and that we were able to convey MI spirit in our training to the participants. **MB**

40 Trainers, 132 Trainings and 2100 Trainees

Development of the Cal-METRO Project

Melinda Hohman & Igor Koutsenok

Juvenile corrections has taken on a more punitive orientation in the past two decades (Caeti, Hemmens, Cullen, & Burton, 2003), but as the pendulum has swung in the other direction, towards rehabilitation—and towards evidence-based practice—it is no surprise that there has been a surge of interest in motivational interviewing (MI) (Feldstein & Ginsburg, 2006). The purpose of this article is to describe the history and development of a large-scale training project in MI for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation / Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Utilizing 40 trainers, this project intends to offer one 3-day training and one 2-day follow-up training in MI to approximately 2,100 DJJ employees between 2008-2010. Including training for trainers of DJJ staff in the third year of the project, this amounts to 132 trainings at 8 sites.

The impetus for this project was a series of lawsuits that led to the Farrell Consent Decree of 2004. This decree ordered a complete overhaul of the DJJ system to make it rehabilitative and therapeutic, particularly within institutional settings. In consultation with national experts, remedial plans were established in health care, mental health, safety, and education, and for sexual offenders and youth with disabilities. These plans, for example, called for the establishment of crisis response teams, small psychiatric and drug treatment units; increased staffing that included psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers; smaller living units; and a focus on non-violent ways to handle conflict resolution, de-escalation techniques, and training for all staff in the use of “motivational enhancement strategies” to engage youths in treatment programming (CDCR/DJJ, 2006, p. 3).

As part of the implementation process, DJJ youth who are less serious offenders are being returned to their home counties for supervision or incarceration by county juvenile probation, and several DJJ facilities will be closed. Currently there are about 2,400 youth (ages 14-25) in institutions or camps and

2,500 on parole (personal communication, Amy Siedlitz, November, 2007). Training of staff has been implemented in many areas such as anger management, crisis intervention, and risk assessment. Thus, trainers who will be conducting the trainings in MI understand that this project has come out of a court order to a system that is undergoing many changes at once.

DJJ awarded a \$1,958,791 contract to the Center for Criminality and Addiction Research, Training, and Application (CCARTA) of the Department of Psychiatry at University of California at San Diego for the training of all DJJ staff in MI over a 3-year period, as indicated above. Igor Koutsenok, the Director of CCARTA, assembled a local team of MINT trainers and those who had been involved in training or supervision of MI in UCSD research projects. This “curriculum committee” met over several months to develop an initial curriculum, utilizing their own curriculum along with content from the National Institute of Corrections MI curriculum (see <http://nicic.org/Downloads/PDF/Library/019791.pdf>). Melinda Hohman, a MINT member from San Diego State University, posted on the MINT listserv a description of the project, which has been named Cal-METRO (California Motivational Enhancement Toward Rehabilitative Outcomes), and asked for trainers to respond. Over 40 trainers from across the

Cal-METRO ; continued

US responded, and they were invited to attend a 2-day meeting in San Diego in November, 2007.

At this meeting, the Training Director of DJJ presented information about the consent decree, changes taking place in the DJJ system, and other aspects of the context of the training. MINT members Joel Ginsburg, Sarah Feldstein, Liz Barnett, and Scott Reiner presented material regarding issues in training and using MI in corrections and the use of MI with adolescents. The initial curriculum was then rolled out and a lively discussion ensued with various opinions of what should or should not be included. The trainers worked in small groups to make suggestions for changes and reported out to the larger group. One main suggestion that was utilized was to develop a "Menu of Options" (MOO) of exercises that trainers could select from. This developed from the need to have a standard curriculum (for fidelity) that could also provide some flexibility for the trainers.

Trainers were concerned about not having a co-trainer for their classes of 30-35 trainees, but due to the enormity of the project hiring co-trainers was not financially feasible. However, those who work in the DJJ training department will attend the first training and then be assigned to help with the rest of the trainings. Furthermore, some trainers elected to split their fees with other trainers, so as to have a co-trainer. Other trainers, who were locals, also indicated that they would like to observe/volunteer to help out, and to get a sense of the work. Trainers from out-of-state volunteered, via the Cal-METRO list-serv, to be available by phone or email to other trainers when they are conducting their workshops.

Suggestions from the San Diego meeting were incorporated into the final curriculum and MOO. Trainers including Ray Gingerich, Dee Dee Stout, Ann Carden, Kathy Tomlin, Diego Rogers, Frances Cox, Colleen Marshall, Pam Smithstan, Ali Hall, Brian Burke, Liz Barnett, and John Martin submitted slides and exercises, and some provided feedback on the revised curriculum. We also added exercises that had been posted by other MINT members on the list-serv. Using the facilities at her university (Oregon Health Sciences University), Susan Butterworth made a video that is specific to MI in juvenile corrections, similar to the PO1 and PO2 video put out by NIC (see <http://www.nicic.org/library/O22005>), utilizing a Latino youth actor. Ray Gingerich volunteered to consult on this project.

In December 2007, local trainers Jim Carter, Melinda Hohman, and Igor Koutsenok met with DJJ administrators and managers in four 1-day meetings

held in the Los Angeles area and in Sacramento. Participants were from varied roles and disciplines, such as school principals, facility doctors, psychologists, directors of parole services, directors of security, and facility superintendents and managers. In this meeting the trainers provided an overview of MI and the Cal-METRO project, and held discussions regarding their thoughts, concerns, and ways they could support the project. Reactions to the project were varied, as could be expected of those involved in a system undergoing a large-scale change: some support, some skepticism, some resistance. Overall, most were glad that DJJ was returning to a rehabilitative model, remembering when it had been this way in the past and that they had been proud of their work. Some were still angry about the consent decree, however, feeling as though they were being told their work was "no good" and believing that they already used many of the elements of MI. A concern was raised by some participants that while many of the MI trainers have a background in corrections work, none were familiar with the DJJ system in particular or had seen the correctional facilities to get a sense of the difficulty of their work. (Trainers have since, on a voluntary basis, taken tours of the DJJ facilities.) Other participants in the meetings grasped the difficulty in learning MI and indicated that they planned to attend the trainings and perhaps become coaches for their staff in the use of MI.

As for the process evaluation of the project, a check-off sheet was created for trainers to give feedback regarding which exercises they used from the MOO along with open-ended questions regarding their experience with the training, the curriculum, and the training site. The outcome evaluation

will include pre- and post-testing of knowledge and skills using a DJJ-oriented MIKAT and Officer Responses Questionnaire (MINT member Scott Walters was an informal consultant on this aspect). DJJ staff who are being trained in a risk assessment battery are required to be videotaped every 120 days. We will have access to these tapes and will have the tapes coded. We will conduct a small study, where half of the participants will receive mailed feedback and the other half will receive telephone coaching. There is also a possibility to develop the trainers from the training department as coaches in order to provide on-site coaching to another group. It is impossible to measure impact on the DJJ system from this project due to all the other interventions that are being implemented concurrently.

Overall, the development of the Cal-METRO project has been an enormous collaborative process. True to the spirit of MI, many people have offered their expertise and time to launch this project. We are now onto the next step. Further information on Cal-METRO can be obtained on the CCARTA website, <http://www.ccarta.com>



References

- Caeti, T., Hemmens, C., Cullen, F. T., & Burton, V. S. (2003). Management of juvenile correctional facilities. *The Prison Journal*, 83, 383-405.
- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation / Division of Juvenile Justice (2006). Safety and Welfare Remedial Plan. Accessed on 1/3/2008 at http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Divisions_Boards/DJJ/SafetyWelfarePlan.pdf.
- Feldstein, S. W. & Ginsburg, J. I. D. (2006). Motivational Interviewing with dually diagnosed adolescents in juvenile justice settings. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*, 6, 218-233.