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Good Practice Equity-Driven Outcomes-Based Assessment Framework

Good Practice Criteria

Examples of Equity-Driven High Achievement Performance Indicators that can also be used in Predictive Analytics [with Caution]

Reflective Student Portfolio Instructions

Session Outcomes

- Explain the importance of collaboratively gathering authentic student voice via direct outcomes-based assessment evidence
- Utilize student voice data to inform the selection, use, and interpretation of equity-driven performance indicators and predictive analytics
- Critique a case study within a framework of Good Practice Criterion One
- Posit critical guiding questions to inform collaborative dialogue such that your campus can strengthen evidence-based, equity-driven, decision-making practices that promote high achievement for all students

Please email mbrescia@sdsu.edu for these materials
For This Case Study:

Good Practice in an Outcomes-Based Framework:
Criterion Number One
drawn from . . .

1. While the institution may serve many purposes, its primary priority is to demonstrate that it is a learning organization committed to human flourishing for all and to continuously investigating how it can improve high-quality student learning and development for all of the students it serves.
   a. The institution embodies evidence that it is a learning organization, engaged in continuous collaborative and reflective inquiry and dialogue and finding ways to improve its inquiry and dialogue processes, as well as committed to the professional development of all of its people.
   b. There is notable differentiation in the processes used to collect and report for compliance purposes and in the use of that same data as well as OBPR data to inform decisions for improvement.
   c. Evidence of intentional cultivation of human flourishing for every being that is associated with the organization is apparent.
   d. Every meaningful piece of data is scrutinized and investigated for its system connections (e.g., connections across department/division lines).
   e. Authentic generative questions are posited to investigate where improvements can be made or to explore what other questions need to be asked.
   f. There is a passion to discover how to improve and a playful curiosity in discovering how to improve it.
   g. Evidence of a meta-assessment of the organization’s own inquiry process or that it is continually researching how well it embodies a learning organization is present.
   h. The organization posits lines of institutional research inquiry and refines processes to better understand how well it is creating what was intended.
THEORETICAL CONTEXT SETTING: NEURODIVERSITY

Learning and Development are inextricably intertwined

Student Learning Imperative, 1996

Performance Metrics such as graduation rates, persistence rates, time to degree, matriculation into graduate school, and job placement

- Easily Identified Learning through test scores and standardized exams

Application of skills such as:
- Attention Regulation,
- Emotion Regulation,
- Active Listening,
- Empathetic Listening,
- Growth Mindset,
- Resilience,
- Prosocial Behavior,
- Implicit Bias Regulation,
- Implicit Stereotype Threat,
- Empathy,
- Openness,
- Reflective Learning,
- Conscientiousness,
- Effortful Control,
- Academic Self-Efficacy, and
- Deliberate Problem Solving

Iceberg Analogy of Dispositional Learning
Adapted from Bresciani Ludvik (2017)
Learning and Development as **Neurocognitive Skills**
(Bresciani Ludvik, 2018; Zelazo, Blair, and Willoughby, 2016)

**Neurocognitive Skills Or Learning and Development Outcomes**

- Fluid Intelligence/Executive Functions
- Crystalized Intelligence

**Map of Fluid Intelligence/Executive Functions to Specific Learning and Development Outcomes**

- Temperament and Personality
  - Effortful Control
  - Conscientiousness
  - Openness
  - Grit

- Neurocognitive Skills (Executive Functions/Fluid Intelligence) Learning and Development Outcomes
  - Positive Goal-Directed Behavior
    - Growth Mindset
    - Sense of Belonging

- Deliberate Problem Solving
- Planning
- Emotional Regulation
- Self Control
- Reflective Learning
- Persistence
- Academic Self Efficacy
- Positive Future Self
- Prosocial Goals and Values/Compassion

Bresciani Ludvik (2018; 2019)
Zelazo, Blair, and Willoughby (2016)
National Academies of Sciences (2017; 2018)
Educational Theoretical Characterization
(Bresciani Ludvik, 2017)

Whole Brain/Self Learning to Cultivate Neurocognitive Skills (includes Emotional Awareness)

Self-Reflection connects Neurocognitive Skills (including emotions) and Behavior

Neural Processes

Positive Goal-Directed Behavior

Environmental influences (context and culture) and empowered individual choice influence the ongoing development or change of Neural Processes

Learning and development theories are designed to influence Neurocognitive Skills with the hope that behavior positively changes

Assessment Measures focus on Neurocognitive Skills and Observed Behavior

How Do We Know...

First Person Direct Self-Report Reflection [Understand Context and Culture]

Pre- and Post-Questionnaires

Behavioral Tasks

Experience Samplings

Device Generated Data

Assessed activity/assignment where behavior can be observed either within the designed “intervention” or outside of

Reflective Practice - Describe in detail where emotion regulation was experienced – within or outside the designed “intervention” and 360 observations

Not Applicable Here

(Bresciani Ludvik, In Press)
Emphasizing Equity  
(Bresciani Ludvik et al., In Review)

• Neurodiversity teaches us that not all students learn and develop in the same ways; it as an absolute truth!
• Pre-post-equity institutional indicators (aka Learning Dispositions) help us identify who needs more or less alternative methodologies
• When in doubt, ask the students what they would love to share with you or observe them “doing” what they love – there are clues for us in all of that

Participant Critique and Application

• Based on the science of learning and development, how do you see your institution applying Criterion 1 to provide evidence that your “primary priority is to collaboratively demonstrate that your institution is a learning organization committed to human flourishing for all and to continuously investigating how it can improve high-quality student learning and development for all of the students it serves”?
• Where are your opportunities to gather authentic student voice to inform your data analytics and performance indicators?
**Context of Case Study**

- The University was most vulnerable to commuter students
- Pilot program unveiled commuter challenges
- This led to the creation of several interventions

**Commuter Life Evolution and Interventions**

- Overarching Learning Community
- Peer Academic Mentoring
- Co-Enrollment in Three-Unit GE Course
- One-Unit Supplemental Discussion
- One-Unit Seminar
- GENS 100A
**Fall 2018 Redesign of One-Unit Seminar**

- Flipped the Classroom
- Collaborated with faculty and staff experts across the campus to redesign this experience
- Put forward many of the people who cared
- Put forward a variety of faces and lived experiences with whom to connect
- Enhanced the Learning Community for the Course Instructors (PELSA Graduate Students) and provided them with weekly support

---

**Fall 2018 Redesign Data Collection Strategies**

First-Person Direct Self-Report Reflections
- Journal Entries
- Focus Groups
- Survey of Students’ Perspective on the Seminar

Other Data
- Instructor Observations
- Survey of Instructors’ Perspective on the Seminar
- Program Coordinator notes from meetings with students (indirect student voice)
- Pre- and Post-Assessment Inventories (e.g., sense of belonging, psychological well-being, metacognitive awareness, anxiety, leadership)
Comparison Groups to Check for High Achievement for All

Within Group and Across Group Comparative Analysis of Pre- and Post-Equity Indicators

Groupings:

1. **GENS 100 A – Commuter Life (n=87)**
2. GENS 100 B – Commuter and Residential Life with additional interventions (n=61)
3. ARP 296 – Leadership Minor (n=20)
4. Residential Life (No University Seminar) (n=129)

Pre/Post Equity Measure Findings

(\(p = 0.05\); analysis by Potter & Kahn in collaboration with Bresciani Ludvik, Timm, and Monzon)

1. **GENS 100A Commuter Life:**
   - Sense of Well-Being (ONS)

2. GENS 100B Commuter and Residential Life:
   - Sense of Belonging
   - Leadership
   - Autonomy (Ryff’s PWB)

3. ARP 296 Intro To Leadership:
   - Metacognitive Awareness
   - Sense of Belonging
   - Leadership
   - Autonomy (Ryff’s PWB)

1. **GENS 100A Commuter Life:**
   - Purpose in Life (Ryff’s PWB)
   - Environmental Mastery (Ryff’s PWB)

2. ARP 296 Intro. to Leadership:
   - Environmental Mastery (Ryff’s PWB)

3. Campus Residents:
   - Personal Growth (Ryff’s PWB)

Green: 0.20 – 0.44 Effect Size
Black: 0.45 - 0.79 Effect Size
Post Equity Measure Findings

\( p = 0.05; \) analysis by Potter & Kahn in collaboration with Bresciani Ludvik, Timm, and Monzon

- When controlling for Pre-Test Score

Except for Leadership

Equitable Outcomes on Pre/Post Were Reached

Controlling for Pre-Test Score and Sub-divided by First Gen, URM, Gender, and Pell = Pell recipients

\( p = 0.05; \) analysis by Potter & Kahn in collaboration with Bresciani Ludvik, Timm, and Monzon

1. Leadership:
   - ARP 296 – Intro to Leadership
   - GENS 100B

2. Autonomy (Ryff’s PWB)
   - ARP 296 – Intro to Leadership
   - GENS 100B

3. Personal Growth (Ryff’s PWB)
   - GENS 100A
   - GENS 100B

4. Positive Relationships (Ryff’s PWB)
   - GENS 100B

1. Leadership
   - Campus Residents
   - GENS 100A

2. Autonomy (Ryff’s PWB)
   - Campus Residents

3. Personal Growth (Ryff’s PWB)
   - Campus Residents

4. Positive Relationships (Ryff’s PWB)
   - ARP 296 – Intro to Leadership
   - Campus Residents
Relationship of Measures to First-Semester GPA

(p = 0.05; analysis by Potter & Kahn in collaboration with Bresciani Ludvik, Timm, and Monzon)

• Spearman Correlation between GPA and Equity Measures were significant for:
  ➢ Metacognitive Awareness
  ➢ Environmental Mastery – Ryff’s Psychological Well-Being
  ➢ Personal Growth – Ryff’s Psychological Well-Being
  ➢ Purpose in Life – Ryff’s Psychological Well-Being (p=0.01)

Relationship of Measures to First-Semester GPA

(p = 0.05; analysis by Potter & Kahn in collaboration with Bresciani Ludvik, Timm, and Monzon)

• Leadership, Environmental Mastery (Ryff’s PSW), and Metacognitive Awareness are significant predictors of GPA controlling for other academic preparedness variables
• Only demographic variable that significantly predicted GPA was gender (females higher)
• Residential students continue to have a higher GPA than commuting students
• ARPE 296 students had a higher GPA than those not enrolled in ARPE 296
Participant Critique and Application

- What portions of the design of this one-unit course and its assessment would work well for you to adopt and adapt at your institution?
- Where are your opportunities to gather authentic student voice to inform your data analytics and performance indicators that are also based on the science of learning?

These Findings Have Informed . . .

- **Fall 2018**: Collection of post-post-data (ABAA design) in hopes of conducting a longitudinal study
- **Fall 2019**:
  - Continued refinement of one-unit USEM course
  - Expanded Course Instructor training/support
  - Inclusion of shared reflection using weekly academic planner
  - Expansion to other colleges to join an expanded pilot
  - Inclusion of additional pre- and post-questionnaires
- **Fall 2020**: Course proposal for three-unit USEM with GE Area E designation (supported by large majority of GENS100A/B students)
These Findings Have Revealed a Need for... 

• Continued and expanded dialogue and collaboration across campus, such as:
  ➢ General: Does the broader campus value these neurocognitive skills (aka learning dispositions) and equity indicators?
  ➢ Specific: Why is GEN5100 student anxiety increasing at the end of fall? Proximity to final exams? Absence of continued support in spring?
• Strategic implementation of pre- and post-seminar surveys:
  ➢ Leverage In-College Shape and final seminar session to increase sample
  ➢ Leverage survey technology to optimize transparency and randomization
• Increased infrastructure for data collection, processing, and analysis
• Effective project management software for coordination/collaboration, confidential data sharing, and note keeping (e.g., Asana, Trello, etc.)
• Development of systematic solution for tracking meaningful engagement in various intervention opportunities
• FTE-based and other resources to sustain/expand this “First-Year Experience”

Questions and Comments

Mbrescia@sdsu.edu
Outcomes-Based Assessment Plan and Report for Program Review Purposes
Checklist

This is taken from Bresciani Ludvik, M. J. (2018). Outcomes-based program review: Closing achievement gaps in and outside the classroom with alignment to predictive analytics and performance metrics (2nd ed.). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

This checklist is designed to accompany the Assessment Plan and Report for Program Review Purposes within the book. All questions should be answered as either (a) yes – present in the proposed plan or (b) no – not present in the proposed plan. If no, an explanation needs to be provided for why that component is missing. The intention of this checklist is to simply guide institutions in selecting which components to include in their OBPR process.

Furthermore, if applicable and if it is helpful to the reviewer and the one being reviewed, the reviewer can rate the quality of the component as 5 = excellent, 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = average, 1 = below average, 0 = not present.

Overall/General
1. Is the plan and/or report written to conform to APA formatting guidelines (6th edition)?
2. Is the plan and/or report void of spelling errors?
3. Does the plan and/or report use proper grammar?
4. Was the plan and/or report submitted by the posted due date?
5. If the plan and/or report includes appendices, are they properly and accurately referred to within the plan?
6. Does the plan and/or report include a properly formatted APA list of references, if applicable?

Program Name
1. Does the plan and/or report provide the program/project/service area name?
2. Does the program name provide an indication of the scope of the OBPR project?
3. Does the plan and/or report list the primary contact information of the person who can answer questions about the plan and/or report?

Program Mission or Purpose
1. Does the plan and/or report provide the program/project/service area mission or purpose statement?
2. Does the plan and/or report provide an explanation of how this program mission or purpose aligns with the mission of the department, college, division, or university wherein it is organized?
3. Does the plan and/or report provide an explanation how the program aligns with institutional values and priorities?

High Achievement for All Students (HAAS) Statement

Bresciani Ludvik

Appendix J-1
1. Does the plan and/or report indicate how this program has been designed to advance HAAS?
2. Do the plan and/or report list performance indicators that will demonstrate the closing of achievement gaps and the demonstration of high achievement expectations for all students?
3. Are there related HAAS goals for each performance indicator?
4. Are their related outcomes for each HAAS goal and corresponding performance indicator?
5. Is there indication of how the identity characteristics (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability) and intersection of identity characteristics of students, faculty, and staff will be aggregated for each outcome, as appropriate?

**Descriptive Overview**

1. Does the plan and/or report describe the program that is being assessed in a general manner that would be understood by people outside of the program?
2. Does the plan and/or report introduce any learning, development, and engagement theories that undergird the program goals and outcomes?
3. Does the plan and/or report describe a brief history of the program?
4. Does the plan and/or report introduce other relevant literature, such as professional standards or accreditation requirements indicating why the program exists and what it is intended to accomplish?
5. Does the plan and/or report include a vision statement, market research, and/or community needs’ assessment about why the program came into being or explain the importance of the program’s existence?
6. Does the plan and/or report indicate how the program mission, purpose, goals, and outcomes were derived?
7. Where literature is not obtainable or accessible, does the plan and/or report list assumptions about the program?

**Program Goals**

1. Does the plan and/or report provide goals that are broad, general statements of what the program expects participants to be able to do or to know?
2. Does the plan and/or report align each program goal to department, college, division, and university goals or strategic initiatives?
3. Does the plan and/or report align each program goal to each HAAS goal and/or performance indicator?
4. Does the plan and/or report describe the alignment of program goals to the program mission?
5. Does the plan and/or report assist in your understanding of how meeting program goals may mean meeting higher-level organization goals and strategic planning initiatives, such as HAAS?

**Outcomes**

1. Does the plan and/or report include outcomes that are detailed and specific statements derived from the goals?
2. Do the outcomes describe what programs expect the end result of their efforts to be?
3. Can you identify participant learning and development outcomes?
4. Can you identify other program outcomes that address student services, program processes, enrollment management, research, development, alumni outreach, and other practices (if applicable)?
5. Is each outcome aligned with a program goal?
6. Is each outcome aligned with a relevant HAAS goal and/or performance indicator?

**Planning for Delivery of Outcomes/Outcomes-Alignment Matrix**
1. Is there an easy-to-read outcome delivery map or curriculum alignment matrix included?
2. Is it clear that there is an opportunity provided to participants of the program that enables each participant to achieve each listed outcome?

**Evaluation Methods and Tools**
1. Does the plan and/or report describe a detailed inquiry methodology?
2. Does the plan and/or report describe the assessment tools and methods (e.g., observation with a criteria checklist, survey with specific questions identified, essay with a rubric, role-playing with a criteria checklist) that will be used to evaluate EACH outcome?
3. Does the plan and/or report identify the sample or population that will be evaluated for each outcome? (This can go here or in the Implementation of Assessment Process section.)
4. Does the plan and/or report provide a description of how the sample size was selected? (This can go here or in the Implementation of Assessment Process section.)
5. Does the plan describe the sample by race, ethnicity, gender identity, socio-economic status, and other relevant identifiers? (This can go here or in the Implementation of Assessment Process section.)
6. Does the plan and/or report identify one or more evaluation methods or tools for each outcome?
7. Does the plan and/or report include the criteria that will be used with the tool for each outcome to determine whether the outcome has been met?
8. Does the plan and/or report provide a rationale for the measurements used to assess each outcome (e.g., why certain outcomes were measured quantitatively, while others were measured qualitatively, or using mixed-methods)?
9. Does the plan and/or report provide definitions of variables?
10. Does the plan and/or report provide a description of how the analyses will be conducted or were conducted? (This can go here or in the Implementation of Assessment Process section.)
11. Does the plan and/or report provide any other relevant discussion of methodological questions important to the context of the program being assessed, such as questions raised by previous or current accreditation, state, or federal standards?
12. Does the plan and/or report indicate (if applicable) the limitations of the evaluation methods or tools? (This can go here or in the Limitations and Assumptions section.)

13. Does the plan and/or report include the actual assessment and evaluation tools in the appendices?

**Level of Achievement Expected**
1. Does the plan and/or report indicate a particular expected level of achievement for each outcome?
2. Does the plan and/or report indicate the level of expected achievement for all program participants?
3. Does the plan and/or report indicate the expected level of achievement for each performance indicator?
4. Does the plan and/or report indicate who determined that expected level of achievement (either for the outcome or for the performance indicator)?
5. Does the plan and/or report indicate how the expected level of achievement was determined (either for the outcome or for the performance indicator)?

**Limitations and Assumptions**
1. Does the plan and/or report include a list of limitations?
2. Does the plan and/or report include a list of assumptions?
3. Does the plan and/or report detail how race, gender, ethnicity, and other identity characteristics may have been categorized together along with the assumptions and limitations that were made as a result?

**Implementation of Assessment Process**
1. Does this section describe the plan for the implementation of the assessment process? (In the case of the report, does it indicate what was completed?)
2. Does the implementation plan identify the individuals responsible for conducting each step of the evaluation process? (In the case of the report, does it indicate what was completed?)
3. Does it provide a timeline for implementation and include the points in time when each outcome will be evaluated? (In the case of the report, does it indicate what was completed?)
4. Does the plan identify the individuals who will be participating in interpreting the data and making recommendations? (In the case of the report, does it indicate who participated and how?)
5. Does the plan and/or report provide a timeline for implementing the decisions and recommendations?
6. Does the plan describe how the assessment results will be communicated to stakeholders, including who will see the results, when will they see the results, and who will be involved in making decisions about the program based upon the assessment results? (In the case of the report, does it indicate what was completed?)
7. Does the plan describe who will be connecting the outcomes to the program goals and other performance indicators, including HAAS indicators and goals? (In the case of the report, does it indicate what was completed?)

Bresciani Ludvik

Appendix J-4
8. Does the plan include a list of resources (e.g., time, professional development, specific assessment or benchmarking tools that must be purchased, consultants, data entry professionals or analysts that must be hired, etc.) and corresponding budget, if applicable, that need to be provided in order to assure a quality OBPR process? (In the case of the report, does it indicate what resources were used and how much was spent?)
9. Does the plan describe how results will be communicated to all of the stakeholders? (In the case of the report, does it indicate how this was completed?)

Results
1. Are the results summarized for EACH outcome that was evaluated?
2. Are the results summarized for EACH HAAS goal and other performance indicators or benchmarks that were used in the evaluation?
3. In the summary of the results, is there a brief narrative that indicates whether the results met the expected level, particularly relating to the various ways that participant results (e.g., faculty, staff, and students) were disaggregated by characteristic identity and intersection of identities?
4. Are detailed results, if applicable, contained as tables, charts, or narrative in the appendix?
5. Is there a narrative about the process to verify/validate/authenticate the results for each outcome that was evaluated?
6. Is there a brief narrative that illustrates whether results were discussed with students, alumni, other program faculty and/or administrators, or external reviewers?
7. Are the results generated from this OBPR linked to any other program, college, or institutional performance indicators?
   ○ And if so, is there a brief narrative describing the linkage?
   ○ Is there a narrative for the rationale of linking the results to those performance indicators?
8. Have the limitations and assumptions and the data analysis section of the plan been updated based on the process and the data analysis that was conducted?
9. Has everything else in the plan that may have changed during actual assessment, such as tool dissemination, data collection, and analysis, been updated?”

Reflection, Interpretation, Decisions, and Recommendations
1. Are the decisions and recommendations summarized for EACH outcome?
2. Are the decisions and recommendations summarized for EACH HAAS and other performance indicators or benchmarks that were used in the evaluation?
3. Is the process described for how to determine whether the results were satisfactory for ALL participants? In other words, be sure to describe the process used to inform how the level of acceptable performance was determined and why it was determined as such, particularly for disaggregated results.
4. If applicable, is the benchmark data that informed your decision of whether your results were “good enough” included?
5. Is there a reminder of what the expectations are for a certain level of learning as well as why that level was expected?
6. Are the decisions and recommendations that may contribute to the improvement of higher-level goals and strategic initiatives, including HAAS, identified as such?
7. Are the people identified who participated in the reflection, interpretation, and discussion of the evidence that led to the recommendations and decisions?
8. Is there a summary of suggestions that arose for improving the assessment process, tools, criteria, outcomes, and goals?
9. Is there an indication of when each outcome will be evaluated again in the future (if the outcome is to be retained)?
10. Are those responsible for implementing the recommended changes identified?
11. If applicable, are the additional resources required to implement the required changes listed? If so, is there a description of what those are or might be?
12. Have you indicated whether a member of the organization at a higher organizational level needs to improve the new resources requested? If so, have you indicated who that is and how the results and recommendations will be communicated to that individual?
13. If making a recommendation for a change that resides outside of the program leadership’s locus of control, have the individuals and the process for forwarding the recommendation and the action required/requested been indicated?
14. Are there recommendations for use of or change of use of institutional performance indicators?
15. Are there recommendations for use of or change of use of institutional predictive analytics?

**Action Plan, Memorandum of Understanding, and/or Documentation of Higher-Level Organizational Feedback**

1. Is there an action plan to indicate how results will be used?
2. Are the specific tasks that need to be completed included?
3. Is the primary responsible party for task completion listed?
4. Does the action plan include the time frame for implementing the decisions, and who will be responsible for that implementation?
5. Does the action plan refer to an assessment plan or performance indicators for how the action plan will be determined successful? Or will the assessment of this action plan be included in the next OBPR cycle?
6. How have the decisions that inform this action plan been disseminated throughout the organization?
7. Have the appropriate people approved the action plan?
8. Have you included the plan and/or budget for the new resources, policy changes, or other information that is required to improve the program learning outcomes that were assessed?
9. Have you noted any changes that will be made to the program goals, outcomes, evaluative criteria, planning processes, and budgeting processes as a result of higher-level organizational feedback, if feedback was already obtained?

**External Review Report (If Applicable)**

1. Have the members of the external review committee been named and their roles and responsibilities listed?
2. Is there a narrative included describing how they were selected and approved by the appropriate authorizing agent?
3. Are the charge that was given to the external review committee as well as the timeframe for completion indicated in the report?
4. Are the guiding questions that the external review members were given clearly articulated in the report?
5. Is the comparative analysis or benchmarking report included, if applicable or required?
6. Is there evidence that the recommendations made by the external reviewers were considered by program leaders and high-level organizational leaders prior to the action plan being determined?

Program Viability (If Applicable)
1. Has a decision been rendered to continue with action plan improvements or phase out the program been made?
2. Has capacity data (e.g., inputs, market research, community needs data, etc.) been considered prior to the program viability decision being made?
3. Has evidence of human flourishing been considered prior to the program viability decision being made?
4. Is there evidence that the OBPR process, which may or may not include an external reviewer report, has been used to make this decision?

Be Sure to Include Any Additional Appendices Generated From Completing Your OBPR Report
1. Have you included any detailed level results, assessment instruments, rubrics, and/or meetings minutes that identify where accepted level of learning and development were identified and how?
2. Have you included any program syllabi, faculty CVs, enrollment data, admission yield data, outreach data, budget data, market analysis, needs assessment, or any other pertinent data used in interpreting OBPR results?
3. Have you included information that illustrates how the summary of the learning from engaging in the OBPR process has been made public/transparent?
4. Have you included anything else that may be pertinent to understanding the context of this plan and/or report?