Minnesota Department of Education

Implementing Measures for Assessing School Safety and Students' Engagement and Connection at School

February 2010
Report To the Legislature

As required by 2009 Regular Session Laws, Chapter 96--H.F. No. 2, Article 2 – Education Excellence, Section 61

COMMISSIONER:

Alice Seagren

Implementing Measures for Assessing School Safety and Students' Engagement and Connection at School

February 2010 Report To the Legislature

As required by 2009 Regular Session Laws, Chapter 96--H.F. No. 2, Article 2 – Education Excellence, Section 61

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:

Carol Thomas

Minnesota Department of Education

T: (651) 582-8453

E-MAIL: carol.thomas@state.mn.us

1500 Highway 36 West

Roseville, MN 55113-4266

TTY: (800) 627-3529 OR (651) 582-8201

Upon request, this report can be made available in alternative formats.

ESTIMATED COST OF PREPARING THIS REPORT

This report provides information which is maintained and published as Minnesota Rules by the Office of Revisor of Statutes as a part of its normal business functions. Therefore, the cost information reported below does not include the cost of gathering the data but rather is limited to the estimated cost of actually analyzing the data, determining recommendations and preparing this report document.

Special funding was not appropriated for the costs of preparing this report.

The estimated cost incurred by the Minnesota Department of Education in preparing this report is $1,500.

IMPLEMENTING MEASURES FOR ASSESSING SCHOOL SAFETY AND STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT AND CONNECTION AT SCHOOL
A Report to the Minnesota Legislature
February 10, 2010

Background

In the 2009 Minnesota legislative session, the Minnesota Legislature charged the Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to convene a group to identify highly reliable student engagement and connection variables and to determine how to report "safety" in compliance with federal law (2009 Regular Session Laws, Chapter 96--H.F. No. 2, Article 2 – Education Excellence, Section 61). Information from this process, including the format to collect data, is to be reported to the Legislature by February 15, 2013, and applied to school report cards beginning July 1, 2014.

To begin this process, the Safe and Healthy Learners Unit of MDE held two work group meetings with interested stakeholders on the development of a plan and timeline for completion of the required process. The work group identified the elements for identifying the student engagement and connection variables: the participants, key tasks, a timeline for implementation and guiding principles that should inform the work of identifying student engagement indicators.

As a first step in this process, an MDE cross-agency team met to identify members for the working sessions and to identify resources and research on student engagement. The cross-agency team represented the Safe and Healthy Learners Unit, Research and Assessment, School Improvement, Consolidated Federal Programs, School Choice, Special Education and Dropout Prevention as well as representatives from the Minnesota School Safety Center. Researchers from the University of Minnesota provided additional information. MDE staff conducted a review of other state education departments' student engagement report cards (see Appendix) and developed a summary overview of the research in the area of student engagement.

Working Sessions
Working sessions were held on November 9, 2009, and January 14, 2010, at the Department of Education. MDE staff identified and invited 43 interested stakeholders to the meetings. The stakeholders included parents, classroom teachers, recognized and qualified experts on student engagement, equity specialists and cultural liaisons, school administrators, student support staff and community education agency partners. Staff from traditional districts—urban, suburban, rural and tribal—as well as alternative learning centers and charter schools were represented. Twenty-five workgroup members attended the November 9 meeting and 18 members attended the January meeting.

Results
With input from the two working sessions, the Department of Education developed a three-year timeline for completion of this process that included identification of key constituency groups to be involved in the process:

Youth, both high-school and post-high-school aged,
Communities of color, American Indian communities and immigrant communities,
Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender parents and youth,
School administrators from all levels,

Classroom teachers from all levels, English Language learner and special education teachers,
Student assistance staff, including cultural liaisons and school resource officers,
Parents and representatives from parent groups,
Researchers from education, school psychology and youth engagement,
Business leaders,
Community agencies that serve youth and families,
Out of school time and early childhood education program staff.

The work group recommended the following working groups of participants:

- An advisory group of 20 people to inform the department's work,
- Focus group participants to provide input to the advisory group and MDE staff,
- Individuals to provide input through surveys,
- Working group of MDE staff and research experts to guide indicator development.

Working session members also recommended that MDE apply for a U.S. Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities School Climate Grant. If awarded, the members suggested that the work plan of the student engagement indicators group would become the activities of the grant. An outline for a three-year work plan was developed (see Appendix).

Guiding Principles

The work group identified key principles to guide the work of creating the climate report card.

- The process and language used in the student engagement indicators should be respectful of values and belief systems held by cultural groups. A cultural lens and a culturally competent approach should be applied to the process.
- The student engagement definition should be student - and asset (strength) - focused, with an emphasis on protective (positive) factors.
- Engagement is an integral part of student learning—indicators and action should be connected and not siloed.
- Research, cultural experience and community experience should inform the definition of student engagement.
- Practicality of measurement should inform the indicators. Appropriate data protections should be considered and developed as final indicators are selected.
- The process of coming to consensus on the definition of student engagement and the indicators selected should involve the input of students and parents. The approach should be meaningfully multi-disciplinary and incorporate cultural needs and perspectives. The process should also be considerate of those groups and communities who are often missing in this work and strive to be inclusive of all voices where possible.
- Indicators should be age-appropriate. Indicators should be practical and universally applicable. Indicators should allow for the purposeful examination of over-representation of trends in specific groups.
- The level of involvement and size of the advisory group for this work, as well as the scope of surveys and focus groups, should be considerate of resource constraints and conscious of validating individual interests in specific roles.

Work group members were asked to recommend members for the advisory group and surveyed regarding their interest and willingness to serve. Sixteen people indicated that they would like to continue and other recommended people to solicit for advisory group membership.

Following are the milestones for each year of the three-year work plan:

Year One (2010-2011) create formal advisory group, conduct focus groups and apply for federal funding

Identify and solicit members to participate
The work group, in its two meetings, identified organizations or representation for the overall advisory group, and made recommendations for organizations and/or representative groups who would provide input through focus groups/listening circle, or through surveys. State staff will solicit representatives from the recommended organizations and representative groups to assist in the process. A subgroup of implementers, researchers and state staff will develop processes for gathering input through focus groups and surveys (see Task 4 for implementation).

Apply for USDE School Climate Grant
State staff will review the task list developed by the Student Engagement Indicators Work group (SEIG) to ensure the list accurately reflects the direction of the Work group and that it will be sufficient to complete the creation of indicators. Staff will match the tasks with current and potential resources.

State staff will apply for the U.S. Department of Education School Climate Grant using the student engagement indicators work as the outline for the application. A subgroup of initial SEIG members will be asked to advise in the development of the school climate measurement application (advisory group), and state staff will prepare and submit the application based on input and review from subgroup. The tentative deadline for the application is early May.

Year Two (2010-2012) define student engagement and select indicators

Define student engagement and gather input on indicators
The SEIG subgroup of implementers and researchers will provide draft examples of student engagement definitions to the large group, drawn from scientific evidence, practice evidence, and existing resources. State staff will use current research framework regarding the four domains of child development—academic, behavioral, affective and cognitive—to inform this discussion. The advisory group will refine definition(s) and with those definitions, prepare questions for listening circles and surveys.

The focus groups and surveys will be used to solicit input into definitions from diverse groups of parents, students, school staff, community and other providers. The SEIG working subgroup and state staff will analyze the information gathered from the focus groups and survey and report to the advisory group. The advisory group will review the definition(s) and analysis and develop a shared definition using sticky board methods.

Identify potential student engagement indicators
Using the student engagement definition, the advisory group will define specific potential indicators, working with scientific evidence, practice evidence, and existing resources. If appropriate, state staff will collaborate with the Minnesota Student Survey (MSS) Interagency Team to include the student

engagement indicators in the 2013 MSS administration. The advisory group will select a limited number of indicators to use in testing.

Year Three (2012-2013) test and finalize indictors; implementation

Test and finalize indicators
State staff and the advisory group will engage a mix of districts (rural/suburban/urban, large/small, multiple buildings/fewer buildings, and culturally diverse), to test the process of gathering and reporting indicators. The test districts, in conjunction with state staff and the advisory group, will involve key stakeholders (parents, teachers, and administrators, students) to explain and explore the ways the indicators can be used in a school district and in a school building.

After the testing process has been completed, the advisory group, along with state staff, will finalize the indicators. The Minnesota Department of Education will submit a report to the Legislature by February 15, 2013.

Summary
The Student Engagement Indicator Work Group recommended the following plan for identifying highly reliable variables of student engagement and connection and determining how to report "safety" in compliance with federal requirements:

- Solicit members from the broadest segments of Minnesota community, including administrators, researchers, classroom teachers, student support staff, community agencies, parents and youth.
- Seek their input to create a definition of student engagement and develop indicators.
- Test the indicators, and apply them to the Minnesota Student Survey.
- Report the finalized indicators to the Legislature, and a data reporting format.

The work group developed guiding principles to direct the creation of the indicators and identified specific participants for the three-year process. Minnesota Department of Education staff will support the creation of the indicators as resources allow.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Working Group Members

Appendix 2: Agendas—November 9 and January 14

Appendix 3: Meeting notes

Appendix 4: Guiding principles

Appendix 5: Work plan

Appendix 6: 2009 Regular Session Laws, Chap. 96--H.F. No. 2, Art. 2 – Education Excellence, Sect. 61

Appendix 7: Participation plan

Appendix 1

Implementing Measures for Assessing School Safety and Students' Engagement and Connection at School: Work Group Members

First Name	Last Name	Title	Organization
Jim	Angermeyer	Director of Research and Evaluation	Bloomington Public Schools
Meghan	Barp	Program Manager	Greater Twin Cities United Way
Mary	Cecconi	Executive Director	Parents United for Public Schools
Sandra	Christenson	Birkman Professor of Educational Leadership	U of M, School Psychology Program
Emanuel	Dolo	Research Director	MN Minority Education Partnership
Jill	Eulberg	Program Specialist	MN School Safety Center
Abdulahi	Farrah	Somali Outreach Worker	Richfield Public Schools
Marquita	Fox	Diversity Specialist	Hopkins West Jr High
Jennifer	Godinez	Associate Director	MN Minority Education Partnership
Marjorie	Grevious	Community Impact Manager	Greater Twin Cities United Way
Angie	Judd	High School Specialist	MN Department of Education
Al	Judson	Principal	Park Rapids High School
Deb	Landvik	Parent Involvement/ESEA	MN Department of Education
Cammy	Lehr	Education Specialist	MN Department of Education
Janell	Mellgen	Teacher	Seven Hills Charter School
Char	Myklebust	Director of Professional Learning	District 287
Jenni	Norlin-Weaver	Director of Teaching & Learning	Edina Public Schools
Peggy	Poitra	Assistant Education Director	Mdewakanton Sioux Community
Alex	Poppy	School Social Worker	Brooklyn Center Public Schools
Mike	Rabideaux	Superintendent	Fond Du Lac Ojibwe Schools
Michael	Resnick	Professor, Konopka Chair	Department of Pediatrics, U of MN
Willametta	Saydee-Tarr	Liberian Outreach Worker	Robbinsdale Public Schools
Regina	Seabrook	Teacher	Woodbury High School
Cindy	Skalsky	SDFS	Fergus Falls Public Schools
Paul	Snyder	Program Coordinator	Konopka Institute, U of MN
Maria	Steigauf	Teacher	Saint Paul Public Schools
Sandra	Suarez	Educational Director	El Colegio
Koua	Vang	Director	Long Tieng Academy
Nancy	VanHorne	Lead Social Worker in SpED	Prior-Lake Savage Schools
Cathy	Wagner	Information Technology	MN Department of Education
Barb	Ziemke	Parent/Parent Advocate	PACER Center
Cindy	Zwicky	Instructional Facilitator	Minneapolis Public Schools
Staff			
Carol	Thomas	Supervisor-Safe and Healthy Learners	MN Department of Education
Ali	Anfinson	Results Measurement Specialist	MN Department of Education
Nancy	Riestenberg	Prevention Specialist	MN Department of Education
Heather	Britt	Facilitator	

Appendix 2

Student Engagement Indicators Work Group

November 9, 2009

Agenda

8:30 a.m. Registration, Coffee

9:00 a.m. **Welcome – Who's here?**

Introductions: Large Group

Introductions: Small Group

Legislation and Timeline – When is the 'homework' due?

Reflections on Student Engagement – Why are we here?

Large Group: What does student engagement mean to you?

Overview of student engagement and school connectedness.

Small Group: Why is student engagement information important?

How will it be used?

What are potential unintended consequences of its availability?

12:00 p.m. **Lunch**

12:30 p.m. **Next Steps – What are we forgetting?**

Large Group: Who is missing from this conversation?

What other resources do we need to continue this process?

Small Group: What questions do we need to ask through this process?

What are the barriers we might run into?

2:00 p.m. **Adjourn**

Student Engagement Indicators Work Group

Thursday, January 14, 2010

Our task today is to develop the **PLAN/PROCESS** the state should use in identifying student engagement indicators that will appear on school report cards in 2014.

Today's Agenda

9:30 a.m.	Registration, Coffee
10:00 a.m.	Introductions
10:20 a.m.	**Who** should be a part of the process to identify student engagement indicators?
	How should they be involved in this process?
11:15a.m.	**What are the key tasks** that have to be accomplished as part of the climate indicators plan?
	What are the steps necessary to accomplish each task? *(see draft work plan)*
	What's the timeline for this work?

(Working Lunch)

1:00 p.m.	**What are the guiding principles** that need to inform this work? *(Please review flip chart notes)*
1:30 p.m.	**What are potential consequences** of the student engagement indicators on school report cards being public? *(see State Report Cards: a review)*
2:00 p.m.	Adjourn

Appendix 3

Student Engagement Indicators Work Group Meeting – November 9, 2009

Summary Notes

Twenty-one participants attended the first working meeting representing educators, funders, researchers, parents and community workers. A full list of attendees is available from the department.

Welcome/Purpose: Heather Britt, working group facilitator, welcomed the participants and invited them to introduce themselves and provide some background information. Following introductions, Minnesota Department of Education staff, Nancy Riestenberg and Ali Anfinson, joined with Heather in walking through the legislation related to student engagement indicators, the purpose of the two working group sessions and a quick overview of other states' efforts in similar areas.

Legislation Overview: Legislation approved in the last session calls for the Department of Education to identify highly reliable variables of student engagement and connection and to determine how to report safety to comply with federal regulations. The legislation requires consultation from interested stakeholders including "parents," "classroom teachers currently teaching" and "qualified experts on student engagement and connection." The department must submit a preliminary report to the education committees of both legislative houses by February 15, 2010. A report detailing the content and analysis and the format for data reporting must be submitted to the committees by February 15, 2013. This work will apply to the school reports beginning July 1, 2014.

Work Group Tasks: (November 9, 2009, and January 14, 2010). The department invited the work group participants to these two sessions to assist staff in designing the process to be used to comply with the legislative requirements described above. The work group will provide:

- Advice on key constituent groups to be involved in the indicator project and appropriate venues for securing their input,
- Recommendations to the department on representatives for an ongoing work group to guide the project implementation and decision-making phases,
- Information to the department on resources and research related to student engagement indicator development.

Meeting Tasks (November 9, 2009): During the November meeting, the participants provided recommendations to the department on individuals and organizations missing from the work group. They drafted principles to guide the project, individual definitions of student engagement and recommendations on how to finalize a definition.

Next Steps:

- MDE staff will provide meetings materials to those participants who were not able to attend the first work group meeting.
- MDE will summarize participant input and provide that information to the work group members prior to the next meeting.

Next Meeting: Thursday, January 14 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Minnesota Department of Education

Student Engagement Indicators Workgroup Meeting Notes

January 14, 2010

Eighteen participants attended the second working meeting representing educators, funders, researchers, parents and community workers. A full list of attendees is available from the department. Heather Britt facilitated the meeting.

Update on a funding opportunity. The federal Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities will be releasing a grant in February that may be a potential source of funding for the student engagement indicator process.

Who should be a part of the process and how should they be involved:

Advisory group—that will direct and advise the school indicators process.
Focus groups—to have a qualitative conversation with different groups of people.
Survey—to collect information from folks that are both qualitative and quantitative.

The Working Group responded to a worksheet of possible participants and their role in providing input to the student engagement indicators process. They indicated if they themselves wanted further participation, either as an advisor, in a focus group or by responding to a survey.

Keep the advisory small—20 members. There was discussion regarding the role of youth in the advisory group. Ensure that all groups are diverse. There needs to be a plan for the advisory and the process if there are funds or if there are no funds.

Clarification: the advisory group determines:

What the indicators should be on the 2014 report card,
What is the definition of student engagement,
What are the indicators to measure student engagement?

Who are the must-haves?

- School nurses and school social workers,
- Out-of-school time and community agencies,
- Like school family liaisons,
- Parents that are aligned with an advocacy group, so they can represent a broader perspective beyond their child.

On the grid, what groups are missing?

Alternative learning center staff/students; school nurses; higher education; English Language learners teachers; behavioral specialists. Early childhood, because we now know that kids come in not engaged.

Focus Groups

Young people, cultural communities and parents; classroom teachers in a focus group; lump of student support service staff either as focus group or survey. Have individual focus group of administration,

parents and students at the same school. Maybe also group school people as people of color. Take one or two people from the focus groups to the advisory group as people are triggered by other ideas.

Survey—who?
Develop an on line survey. Use data from the Minnesota Student Survey and existing evidence and research.

Big tasks that are missing
Define: What is an engaged student? How do we measure that?
The work of the focus groups and surveys is to define student engagement; the advisory group is to figure out how to measure.

Reactions to the work plan
The indicators are for all students. We are testing to evaluate if that is a valid way to test the data. Clarify the use of this data: school shooting prevention, dropout prevention, other –there is not one answer.

Guiding principles
Inform student engagement and promising practices reported to us by communities of color.
Honor the role of the advisory members and their various positions. Consider ways to be inclusive and consider who is missing. The principles help people understand what the advisory group stands for philosophically.

What are the consequences of engaging in this project?
We hope that this work will galvanize action and offer opportunities for collaboration across schools. People may start discussing student engagement.

Be careful of what response mechanisms are put in place. Options: remedy the practices, punish the school or do nothing. Make a philosophical statement—that this be used to remedy the situation.

The risk and rewards of using data are already available; MDE needs to teach people to use the data, to understand the data. Culturally competency is not seen now as a benchmark. If it became one, that could be positive.

Final reactions were shared and the group adjourned.

#######

Appendix 4

Student Engagement Indicators Process

Guiding Principles

The process and language used in the Student Engagement Indicators should be respectful of values and belief systems held by cultural groups. A cultural lens and a culturally competent approach should be applied to the process.

The student engagement definition should be student and asset (strength) focused, with an emphasis on protective (positive) factors.

Engagement is an integral part of student learning—indicators and action should be connected and not siloed.

Research, cultural experience and community experience should inform the definition of student engagement.

Practicality of measurement should inform the indicators. Appropriate data protections should be considered and developed as final indicators are selected.

The process of coming to consensus on the definition of student engagement and the indicators selected should involve the input of students and parents. The approach should be meaningfully multi-disciplinary and incorporate cultural needs and perspectives. The process should also be considerate of those groups and communities who are often missing in this work and strive to be inclusive of all voices where possible.

Indicators should be age-appropriate. Indicators should be practical and universally applicable. Indicators should allow for the purposeful examination of over-representation of trends in specific groups.

The level of involvement and size of the advisory group for this work, as well as the scope of surveys and focus groups, should be considerate of resource constraints and conscious of validating individual interests in specific roles.

1/12/10

Appendix 5

Student Engagement Indicators Workplan

	Year One (2010-2011)	***Year Two (2011-2012)***	***Year Three (2012-2013)***
Tasks/Activities	**Task 1:** Identify members to participate *Step 1: SEIG Identify organizations or representation for the overall advisory group, organizations and/or representative groups for input through focus groups/ listening circles, and identify organizations and/or representative groups who input is best gather through surveys.* *Step 2: State staff solicits representatives from organizations and representative groups to assist in the process.* *Step 3: Subgroup of implementers, researchers and state staff develop process for gathering input through focus groups and surveys (see Task 4 for implementation).* **Task 2:** Refine/clarify task list *Step 1: State staff reviews task list to ensure accuracy, adequacy and to match with resources.* **Task 3:** Apply for USDE School Climate Grant *Step 1: Identify a subgroup of Initial SEIG Workgroup Members to advise in the development of the application.* *Step 2: State staff prepare application based on input from subgroup.* *Step 3: Subgroup reviews and comments on near final draft of application. State staff implement changes as appropriate.* *Step 4: Submission of grant application.*	**Task 4:** Define student engagement and gather input on indicators *Step 1: Subgroup of implementers and researchers provide draft examples of definitions to the large group. Draw from scientific evidence, practice evidence, and existing resources. Use current research framework (4 domains) to inform this discussion.* *Step 2: Large group refines definition(s) and prepares for listening circles.* *Step 3: Broad input into definitions from diverse groups of parents, students, school staff, community, and other providers (e.g., focus groups, surveys).* *Step 4: Subgroup and state staff analysis of focus group information.* *Step 5: Large group review of definition(s) and analysis. Large group arrives at shared definition using sticky board methods.* **Task 5**: Identify potential indicators *Step 1: Collaborate with the Minnesota Student Survey Interagency Team for inclusion in the 2013 MSS administration.* *Step 2: Advisory group, working with scientific evidence, practice evidence, and existing resources, defines specific potential indicators.* **Task 6:** Select indicators *Step 1: Advisory group selects a limited number of indicators to use in testing.*	**Task 7:** Test indicators *Step 1: State staff and advisory group engage a mix of districts, to include rural/urban, large/small, multiple buildings/fewer buildings, culturally diverse, in gathering of and reporting of indicators.* *Step 2: Test districts, in conjunction with state staff and advisory group, will involve key stakeholders (parents, teachers, administrators, students) in understanding the usability of the indicators.* **Task 8**: Finalize indicators *Step 1: Advisory group, along with state staff, will finalize indicators.* **Task 9**: Final report and implementation *Step 1: State staff will complete final report.* *Step 2: State staff will work with other key MDE staff to implement Student Engagement Indicators on the 2014 school report cards.*

2009 Regular Session Laws, Chapter 96--H.F. No. 2, Article 2 – Education Excellence, Section 61

IMPLEMENTING MEASURES FOR ASSESSING SCHOOL SAFETY AND STUDENTS' ENGAGEMENT AND CONNECTION AT SCHOOL

(a) To implement the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.35, subdivision 3, paragraph (d), the commissioner of education, in consultation with interested stakeholders, including parents and teachers among other stakeholders, must convene a group of recognized and qualified experts on student engagement and connection and classroom teachers currently teaching in Minnesota schools to:

(1) identify highly reliable variables of student engagement and connection that may include student attendance, home support for learning, and student participation in out-of-school activities, among other variables; and

(2) determine how to report "safety" in order to comply with federal law.

(b) The commissioner must submit a written report and all the group's working papers to the education committees of the house of representatives and senate by February 15, 2010, presenting the group's responses to paragraph (a), clauses (1) and (2). The commissioner must submit a second, related report to the education committees of the legislature by February 15, 2013, indicating the content and analysis of and the format for reporting any data collected under Minnesota Statutes, section 120B.35, subdivision 3, paragraph (d). The group convened under this section expires December 31, 2013.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This section is effective the day following final enactment and applies to school report cards beginning July 1, 2014.

Appendix 7

Student Engagement Indicators – Proposed Participant Grid

Participants	Advisory Groups	Focus Groups	Surveys
Post-high-school-aged youth	x	x	x
High-school-aged youth	x	x	x
African American Community	x	x	
American Indian Community	x	x	
Hmong /Asian Community	x	x	
Immigrant Community	x	x	
Latino Community	x	x	
Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Community	x	x	
Administrators-higher education	x	Combined group, one group of color	
Administrators-secondary	x		x
Administrators-elementary	x		x
Alternative learning program administrators	x		
Classroom teachers-secondary	x	x	x
Classroom teachers-elementary	x	x	x
English language learners teachers	x	x	
Special education teachers	x	x	
Cultural liaisons/equity specialists	x	Combined group of student support staff	
School social workers/guidance counselors	x		
Counselor/psychologist/behavior specialist	x		
School resource officers	x		
Parents			
Parent groups	x	x	x
Parents of color groups	x	x	
Education research community	x		x
Youth engagement research community	x		x
School psychology research community	x		x
Out-of-school time learning	x		x
Early childhood education staff	x	x	
Community agencies	x		x
Culturally specific psychologist	x		x
Business leaders	x		