

Section 2:

TOOLS FOR DEVELOPING THE LCAP

S2 - pg 1	<i>Tool 2-1 Who are our stakeholders?</i> https://docs.google.com/document/d/1e00wc_wjQs7EjKnkTVe7aKIdCkhjgTCw-Pa6l3AzX8/edit?usp=sharing
S2 - pg 2	<i>Tool 2-2 Planning for Stakeholder Engagement</i> https://docs.google.com/document/d/1x3uqhcCxdUPiuKogScvdpCzIvtKJTKW2iGw5EG3G6Yo/edit?usp=sharing
S2 - pg 4	<i>Tool 2-3 Action Review Tool</i> https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-F3Q3RGEQqBZWRzWnFvS21QdmM/view?usp=sharing
S2 - pg 5	<i>Tool 2-4 Stakeholder Engagement Prioritization Process for Looking at the Data to Inform LCAP</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=1holjxo2IE3KCSVMhcGblnDXbjz4dvblGQBNCeVujUHY
S2 - pg 7	<i>Tool 2-5 Summary of Indicator Performance</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B-F3Q3RGEQqBU1pINTZHN0oxNUE
S2 - pg 8	<i>Tool 2-6 Stakeholder Engagement Input Chart (San Diego County Office of Education)</i> https://docs.google.com/document/d/1SdYQdDhnH3HkKe394kpn8BWSAaaaa9cz6rv8yWZl1Jo/edit?usp=sharing
S2 - pg 9	<i>Tool 2-7 Completed Example of Stakeholder Engagement section</i> https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-F3Q3RGEQqBbVpNZmhLWFUxbTA/view?usp=sharing
S2 - pg 11	<i>Tool 2-8 Blank of Stakeholder Engagement section</i> https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-F3Q3RGEQqBSGVQWmh4RHY3eig/view?usp=sharing
S2 - pg 12	<i>Tool 2-9 Stakeholder Messages</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B-F3Q3RGEQqBZ0dKOUdpUEUzeFk
S2 - pg 13	<i>Tool 2-10 Reducing and Selecting Ideas</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B-F3Q3RGEQqBS1BiOG5vMUtwVUE
S2 - pg 14	<i>Tool 2-11 Stakeholder Engagement Example</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B-F3Q3RGEQqBMkRpQ2xnZDRCZUk
S2 - pg 15	<i>Tool 2-12 Reducing and Selecting Ideas</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B4Trdt8VPoDtMWVfn3NYMWJYd0k
S2 - pg 16	<i>Tool 2-13 Stakeholder Messages</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B4Trdt8VPoDtQTRhSWIPR0tNVUk
S2 - pg 17	<i>Tool 2-14 Communication Plan</i> https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B4Trdt8VPoDtY1h3dWpaWVh6Sm8

Who are our stakeholders?

Name of Group (required)	District Level	Site Level
Parents		x
Teachers	x	x
Administrators	x	x
Students		x
DELAC	x	
ELAC		x
PAC	x	x
Union Leadership	x	
Name of Group (optional)	District Level	Site Level

Developed by the Monterey County Office of Education

Tool 2-2

Stakeholder Engagement Tool - Planning for Stakeholder Engagement

Planning Phase: Who Should Be Involved? How are we going to involve them? Why are we involving them?

Who should be involved? (Provide list of stakeholders)	How are we going to involve them? (Time/Location)	Why are we involving them? (Rationale)

Process Phase: What method will be used? Who will facilitate? How will we collect their input? How will we share this input?

Stakeholder Group	What is the best method to communicate with the stakeholders? (Face-to-face, Focused Interview, Survey, Other)	Who will facilitate?	How do we plan to collect their input? (charts, surveys, tally marks, wordle, other)	How will we share the stakeholder input to the LCAP committee? Other stakeholders? (summaries, charts, other)

Consultation Phase: What data will we share? What is the analysis of progress? How will we confirm their understanding?

What suggestions are we using? (No changes to suggestions)	What suggestions needed to be changed? (Modifications to suggestions)	What suggestions were not used? (Not used and why)	What are our next steps? Where do we go next to share this information?

Promise Phase: What is the status of their suggestions? What will we do with this information? How will we share this information?

What data will we share? (State Indicators, Local Indicators, Progress on expenditures, Progress on implementation of actions)	What is the analysis of this data? (brief narrative of charts, Excel spreadsheet of expenditures, completion of actions)	How will we confirm their understanding?

Developed by the Monterey County Office of Education

Tool 2-3 ✓ Implementation Complete		▲ Implementation on Track	▼ Implementation Not on Track	✘ Unable to Implement	Budgeted Expenditures
LCAP Goal	Action #	Actions/Services	On Track	Accomplishments/Challenges	What changes in actions, services, and expenditures need to be made
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Actions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Expenditures <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes 	<p>Accomplishments</p> <p>Challenges</p>	<p>Budgeted</p> <p>Expended</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✘ Actions ✓ Expenditures ✓ Outcomes 	<p>Accomplishments</p> <p>Challenges</p>	<p>Budgeted</p> <p>Expended</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Actions <input type="checkbox"/> Expenditures <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes 	<p>Accomplishments</p> <p>Challenges</p>	<p>Budgeted</p> <p>Expended</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Actions <input type="checkbox"/> Expenditures <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes 	<p>Accomplishments</p> <p>Challenges</p>	<p>Budgeted</p> <p>Expended</p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Actions <input type="checkbox"/> Expenditures <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes 	<p>Accomplishments</p> <p>Challenges</p>	<p>Budgeted</p> <p>Expended</p>

Tool 2-4

Stakeholder Engagement Tool - Prioritization Process for Looking at the Data to Inform LCAP

Step 1: Look at each California School Dashboard Indicator for the district (see District Data for Each Indicator Tool)

State Indicators	Local Indicators
Achievement-ELA	Basic Services
Achievement-Math	State Standards Implementation
Suspension Rate	Parent Engagement
English Learners	Local Climate
Graduation Rate	
College/Career Readiness	

Step 2: Drill down into school and student group data

Review the performance categories for each. List by color and indicator

Blue	Exceeds State Target
Green	State Target
Yellow	Below State Target
Orange	Very Below State Target
Red	Significantly Below State Target

Name of Indicator:

Blue/Green Performances	Yellow Performances	Red/Orange Performances

Step 3: Identify the root causes for results

Consider the narrative as to WHY each school/group has generated the results
 Check on alignment of LCAP actions to root causes and determine effectiveness

Step 4: Engage stakeholders to prioritize areas of need for specific gaps

Red Performance Indicator	Student Group	Prioritization Need 1=high, 2=med, 3=low-
Orange Performance Indicator	Student Group	Prioritization Need 1=high, 2=med, 3=low-

Developed by the Monterey County Office of Education






Step 5: Identify a meaningful number of goals to accomplish the stakeholder priorities

Consider the number of goals for which stakeholders will be able to reference quickly in order to support implementation.

Step 6: Using model practices, create high-leverage actions to address the prioritized needs, while at the same time supporting the autonomy of schools on how to address those actions

Model Practices are a component of the California School Dashboard. Practices are research-supported, evidence-based, and aligned to the State Priorities and will be made available on the online platform.

Summary of Indicator Performance

Performance Level	Student Subgroups	Schools
		
		
		
		
		

Stakeholder Engagement Input Chart

Goal:

--

State Priorities

Date Related to Goal	Proposed Actions/Services to Meet Goal
Results and Updates	Guiding Questions

Developed by San Diego County Office of Education

Tool 2-7:

Stakeholder Engagement

LCAP
Year

2017-18 2018-19 2019-20

INVOLVEMENT PROCESS FOR LCAP AND ANNUAL UPDATE

How, when, and with whom did the LEA consult as part of the planning process for this LCAP/Annual Review and Analysis?

During the 201-1* school year, the XYZ District met with stakeholders throughout the school year. Each school site SSC, ELAC, and PTA group was provided opportunities to engage in the LCAP process. District level meetings were held with DELAC and PAC groups, with included parents, teachers, and administrators. Site administrators' monthly meetings focused on both results of LCAP actions and future recommendations. High school student leadership groups (ASB, Clubs, Athletes) were surveyed regarding their views of LCAP goals, actions and services. Information was shared at monthly board meetings with district trustees.*

Meetings were held with the following groups:

District Curriculum Council 1/20/16

All School Sites 2/16/16

Public Hearing 6/3/16

Board Approval 6/30/16

Union Leadership 3/15/16

Site Administrator Meetings 9/10/15, 10/12/15, 11/1/15, 12/3/15, 1/25/16, 2/17/16, 3/1/16, 4/10/16, 5/5/16

DELAC 4/19/16

PAC 4/19/16

High School Students Survey 3/1-20/16

How did these consultations impact the LCAP for the upcoming year?

Stakeholders felt that having a specific goal for English Learners and other struggling students was important to focus on their needs. Previous actions to support these students were included in Goal 2. By including an additional goal, all elements of the organization were clearly aware of the support needed for specific student groups.

In addition, all stakeholders agreed to continue the 5 districts goals. In addition, due to the contributions of the stakeholders an additional goal of focus on students who need additional resources and support, such as English Learners and students with disabilities would be added in order to address these groups of students needing additional assistance. The following recommendations were made for each goal and will be added the actions/services under each appropriate goal:

Goal 1

More intervention classes available beginning at the elementary level so that students are prepared for high school

Provide parent workshops regarding post-secondary options

Goal 2

Provide better pay for substitute teachers

Provide academic coaches for each site in order to support classroom instruction

Goal 3

(additional suggestions here)

Goal 4

(additional suggestions here)

Goal 5

(additional suggestions here)

New Goal 6 Provide resources for students, particularly English Learners and students with disabilities, who need additional support

Tool 2-8

Stakeholder Engagement

2017–18 2018–19 2019–20

INVOLVEMENT PROCESS FOR LCAP AND ANNUAL UPDATE

How, when, and with whom did the LEA consult as part of the planning process for this LCAP/Annual Review and Analysis?

IMPACT ON LCAP AND ANNUAL UPDATE

How did these consultations impact the LCAP for the upcoming year?

Stakeholder Messages

Dashboard

- What areas of strength and needs for further growth are highlighted?
- How can the information provided by the *Dashboard* be used to support growth of all students in the school/district community?
- What does the *Dashboard* NOT tell us?
- There are a large number of changes. What changes need to be communicated to parents and community?

Root Causes

- We have begun our analysis and we would like to share our results and get your feedback. We have found....to be a great need based upon the underlying causes of... because of...

Prioritization

- We need to get your input on prioritization of potential solutions to address these needs. What do you believe would make a significant difference and why?

Focus

- There are several changes to the LCAP process this year-the template has undergone some changes, we have a new accountability model. Our state is looking at outcomes for the whole child.
- We are going to begin with looking at...We want your thoughts/ideas on where best to begin. We need to be focused and intentional. We can't do everything. Just as when you remodel a house and are still living in it, you can't do it all at once. You need to keep the water and heat on. In education, this is our base program. We will keep providing for all of our students. But we need to change...because this is our greatest area of need and this is where we are going to start. We will create a better program, just like you would when remodeling your home.

Team Tools (Side B)**Reducing and Selecting Ideas****Multi-Vote**

Used to reduce a long list of ideas (11 and up) to a manageable number (5-10).

1. Agree on the criteria (1-3 guidelines) against which ideas are tested.
2. Identify each idea on the list with a letter of the alphabet.
3. Decide on how many ideas you want members to vote on. This is usually 20-25% of the list. For example pick 4 or 5 for a list of 20. Members silently choose and list them in alphabetical order.
4. Record member choices:
 - **Dot Method:** Give the participants sticky dots. Members place dots on selected ideas. Only one dot per idea. **NO double dotting.** All dots must be used.
 - **Hash Mark Method:** Alternatively hash marks can be placed next to selected ideas by the recorder as members identify votes in alphabetical order. No double hashing.
5. Look at the voting results. Mark the 5-10 ideas with the most votes to take to Rank Ordering. If a person feels strongly about their left behind idea, include it in next round.
6. If you still have a lot of ideas that get only a few votes (say 15-20) you can do another round of MV to reduce the initial set of ideas to 10 or less.

Rank Order

Used to reduce a list of 10 or less, to the vital few ideas for further discussion.

1. Assign a letter to each idea
7. Agree on the criteria (1-3 guidelines) against which ideas are tested.
2. Lay out your rank order table.
 - The rows are the letters assigned to each of the ideas.
 - The columns are the initials of the team members. The far right column is the "total" column.
3. Using the criteria, members individually and silently rank all ideas with "1" being the first choice, "2" the second choice, etc. All ideas must be ranked, no double or omitted ranking.
4. Members take turns calling out their rankings to recorder in alpha order, without interruption.
5. The rankings are summed across rows for a total per item on a Rank Order chart.
6. The team reviews results, selects and marks the few ideas which should receive further consideration, looking at the total, as well as individual votes.
7. If considerable disagreement among members exists, a second ranking may be carried out.

Structured Discussion

Used to discuss the vital few ideas to arrive at a consensus decision which all members can live with.

1. Agree on the criteria (1-3 guidelines) against which ideas are tested. Members decide their position (what) and rationale (why). Large sticky notes can also be used. The recorder notes (or posts) positions and key points on the flipchart. This is not a debate so each person presents their views without rebuttal or debate.
2. When everyone has had a chance to present their views, the notes are reviewed and questions or added thoughts are aired. Open discussion and debate is held. Agreements are summarized, and a consensus is reached.
3. If consensus cannot be reached another structured discussion round is held by repeating steps 2-4. Structured discussion is also useful to gather positions and rationale on key issues or options.

Stakeholder Engagement

LCAP Year

2017-18
 2018-19
 2019-20

INVOLVEMENT PROCESS FOR LCAP AND ANNUAL UPDATE

How, when, and with whom did the LEA consult as part of the planning process for this LCAP/Annual Review and Analysis?

Introduction

It is the intent of the County Office of Education to gather input from all stakeholder groups including parents, teachers, administration, bargaining units, local school district personnel, representatives of DELAC, foster youth advocates and liaisons, community-based agencies, law enforcement, county government agencies and other partners in the effort to serve COE students. A County Office LCAP Writing Group was formed and met throughout the year to provide input and guidance on the development of the 2016-17 LCAP and the Annual Update to the 2015-16 LCAP. The committee used the input received from all stakeholders to write this year's LCAP.

How Data was Collected?

An online survey was created to begin the process of gathering data from all stakeholders. The County Office survey included a link to COUNTY OFFICE standardized performance reports to help guide the data collection. A link to the survey and performance reports was available on the COUNTY OFFICE home website page. In addition, it was also distributed through social media sites Facebook and Twitter. In order to capture the largest number of stakeholders possible, a paper copy of the survey in both English and Spanish was distributed to school sites. School sites were encouraged to have parents complete the paper survey whenever attending an event or meeting on campus to ensure parent/guardian input was solicited. The County Board of Education (CBE) was provided monthly reports on the development of the LCAP beginning in April, 2016.

With Whom did the COE Consult and When?

Parents

- PTO Meetings at all COE school sites beginning February through April 2016.
- Parent input cards provided at all school meetings including but not limited to, individual parent conferences, IEP meetings, family nights, open houses, school visitations and new student orientations. September of 2015 through June 2016
- English Learner Advisory Board Meeting - 10/28/15
- Foster Youth Meeting - 5/26/16

Community- Based Agencies and Other Partners

- Foster Youth Liaison Meetings - 9/24/15, 1/21/16, 3/24/16, 5/26/16
- Community Corrections Partnership Meetings - 7/22/15, 11/14/15, 4/26/16
- County Workforce Development Board Meetings - 9/2/15, 10/7/15, 12/2/15, 1/6/16, 3/2/16, 4/6/16, 5/4/16, 6/1/16
- Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council Meetings - 7/21/15, 9/15/15, 11/17/16, 3/15/16, 5/17/16
- Meetings with County Probation Agency- 8/4/15, 10/14/15, 2/10/16, 4/13/16, 6/9/16
- Direct Email from Deputy Superintendent to all community partners requesting they complete the online survey - 3/23/16, 3/24/16
- Meeting with community leader focus group – 1/10/16

- Meetings with representative of the Public Defender's Office and CRLA - 3/28/16, 4/7/16, 4/27/16, 5/26/16, 6/1/16

COE Staff:

- An email campaign to encourage all COE staff to participate in the development of the LCAP - November 2015 through January 2016
- Staff meetings at all school sites - July 2015 through June 2016
- Online Survey – Made available from February 2016 through June 2016
- Consultation meetings with bargaining Unit Leadership Unions - July 2015 through June 2016
- Representation on County Office LCAP Committee – Spring 2016 as detailed above
- Student Services Branch Meetings – Monthly - July 2015 through June 2016
- Special Education Principal Meetings - Monthly - July 2015 through June 2016

COE Students:

- Principals provided all COE students with dedicated class time to provide verbal and written comments during the school day in the month of April
- Online Survey – Every student was provided with time and a computer to complete the online survey
- Input Cards were made available to all COE students in the Main Office providing an ongoing opportunity to provide written suggestions
- Personal Interviews – School Principals held interviews throughout the school year and recorded suggestions for serving students better from the students themselves.

Data Results - Survey Responses by Stakeholder category:

- # Parents – 90
- # Teachers – 123
- # Classified – 135
- # Administration – 45
- # Students – 104
- # Community Members
- # Partners – 29
- **Total Survey Responses - 646 (up by 11.9% from 577 last year)**

Timeline for Stakeholder Engagement:

- Data Collection as detailed above : July 2015 -May 2016
- LCAP updates and Draft Reports to County Board of Education Monthly beginning in February of 2016
- Public Hearing June 20, 2016
- Superintendent written responses to stakeholders June 2016

IMPACT ON LCAP AND ANNUAL UPDATE

How did these consultations impact the LCAP for the upcoming year?

The LCAP committee gathered and analyzed the data from all the stakeholders detailed above. The responses were classified according to the primary state priority to which it related. The aggregated data was then used to prioritize the COE areas of focus that were then used to drive the development of LCAP goals, actions and services. The LCAP committee also used data collected that was responsive to the current year goals to adjust and refine these goals, actions and services to best meet the needs of the students the COE serves including Special Education, English learners, foster youth, and low income students. Additionally there was a great deal of feedback dealing with school climate and culture that was not measurable, but which, nevertheless was pervasive enough to drive some of the actions and services in this area of practice.

More specifically 241 stakeholders identified **course access** as a top priority and in response the LCAP includes efforts to ensure students have access to not only the courses they need for graduation, but to expanded offerings and increased opportunities in career and technical education courses. Course access is therefore prominently featured in Goals 1, 4, & 5.

In addition 330 stakeholders stated in surveys and on input cards that County Office schools should prioritize basic services as described State Priority #1. Basic needs includes teacher assignments and standards-aligned instructional materials and as such the plan includes activities and metrics reflecting this need. Basic needs action/services are embedded in each of the COE LCAP's goals #1-5.

A further 165 stakeholders identified pupil achievement as a priority for County Office. This input supports the experience of County Office administrators and reinforces the activities and metrics serving as the basis for Goal #1.

Because of the challenging populations served by County Office, pupil engagement continues to be a priority for County Office. This was supported in 168 responses from stakeholders and serves as the foundation for Goal #2 in the 2016-17 LCAP.

Stakeholder engagement related to the process for the Annual Review of the 2015-16 school year was incorporated as identified needs for revisions and adjustments. In addition, goals and aligned actions and services included in the 2016-17 LCAP were adjusted and amended accordingly. Representative areas are incorporated into the section "Annual Update" below and are not repeated here in the interest of efficiency.

The Annual Update was positively impacted through stakeholder engagement insofar as progress reports were regular and ongoing throughout the school year as described above. Stakeholder input based on regular reviews of the data was integral to identifying areas where progress was deemed sufficient. In addition, a public hearing was held in which COE staff provided a detailed account of progress to the County Board of Education. This account specifically called out areas of strength and weakness. Areas of weakness were the target of direct discussion including a public discussion of how and why they LCAP was being revised in light of areas of slow progress. As an example, the COE goal of improving attendance was not quite met and as a result, new strategies were identified and have been included in the ensuing year's LCAP and the budget adjusted to reflect the resources necessary to support these new actions and services. In this way, the spirit of ongoing improvement has been honored and COE efforts to provide a transparent analysis of its efforts to better serve students have resulted in the intended revisions necessary to demonstrate such ongoing improvement.

Developed by CCSESA

Team Tools (Side B)

Reducing and Selecting Ideas

Multi-Vote

Used to reduce a long list of ideas (11 and up) to a manageable number (5-10).

1. Agree on the criteria (1-3 guidelines) against which ideas are tested.
2. Identify each idea on the list with a letter of the alphabet.
3. Decide on how many ideas you want members to vote on. This is usually 20-25% of the list. For example pick 4 or 5 for a list of 20. Members silently choose and list them in alphabetical order.
4. Record member choices:
 - **Dot Method:** Give the participants sticky dots. Members place dots on selected ideas. Only one dot per idea. **NO double dotting.** All dots must be used.
 - **Hash Mark Method:** Alternatively hash marks can be placed next to selected ideas by the recorder as members identify votes in alphabetical order. No double hashing.
5. Look at the voting results. Mark the 5-10 ideas with the most votes to take to Rank Ordering. If a person feels strongly about their left behind idea, include it in next round.
6. If you still have a lot of ideas that get only a few votes (say 15-20) you can do another round of MV to reduce the initial set of ideas to 10 or less.

Rank Order

Used to reduce a list of 10 or less, to the vital few ideas for further discussion.

1. Assign a letter to each idea
7. Agree on the criteria (1-3 guidelines) against which ideas are tested.
2. Lay out your rank order table.
 - The rows are the letters assigned to each of the ideas.
 - The columns are the initials of the team members. The far right column is the "total" column.
3. Using the criteria, members individually and silently rank all ideas with "1" being the first choice, "2" the second choice, etc. All ideas must be ranked, no double or omitted ranking.
4. Members take turns calling out their rankings to recorder in alpha order, without interruption.
5. The rankings are summed across rows for a total per item on a Rank Order chart.
6. The team reviews results, selects and marks the few ideas which should receive further consideration, looking at the total, as well as individual votes.
7. If considerable disagreement among members exists, a second ranking may be carried out.

Structured Discussion

Used to discuss the vital few ideas to arrive at a consensus decision which all members can live with.

1. Agree on the criteria (1-3 guidelines) against which ideas are tested. Members decide their position (what) and rationale (why). Large sticky notes can also be used. The recorder notes (or posts) positions and key points on the flipchart. This is not a debate so each person presents their views without rebuttal or debate.
2. When everyone has had a chance to present their views, the notes are reviewed and questions or added thoughts are aired. Open discussion and debate is held. Agreements are summarized, and a consensus is reached.
3. If consensus cannot be reached another structured discussion round is held by repeating steps 2-4. Structured discussion is also useful to gather positions and rationale on key issues or options.

Adapted From Seven Step Meeting Process and Tools, Executive Learning Inc. Team Training Materials

Stakeholder Messages

Dashboard

- What areas of strength and needs for further growth are highlighted?
- How can the information provided by the *Dashboard* be used to support growth of all students in the school/district community?
- What does the *Dashboard* NOT tell us?
- There are a large number of changes. What changes need to be communicated to parents and community?

Root Causes

- We have begun our analysis and we would like to share our results and get your feedback. We have found....to be a great need based upon the underlying causes of... because of...

Prioritization

- We need to get your input on prioritization of potential solutions to address these needs. What do you believe would make a significant difference and why?

Focus

- There are several changes to the LCAP process this year-the template has undergone some changes, we have a new accountability model. Our state is looking at outcomes for the whole child.
- We are going to begin with looking at...We want your thoughts/ideas on where best to begin. We need to be focused and intentional. We can't do everything. Just as when you remodel a house and are still living in it, you can't do it all at once. You need to keep the water and heat on. In education, this is our base program. We will keep providing for all of our students. But we need to change...because this is our greatest area of need and this is where we are going to start. We will create a better program, just like you would when remodeling your home.

Worksheet A1: Communication Plan

Information to be shared:

Audience and Message	Format for Communicating, Date	Coordinator of Communication

