**21CCLC Evaluation and Sustainability Committee Notes**

**February 5, 2019**

1. Roll Call
	1. Beth Cristoffer
	2. Rhonda Nelson
	3. Brittney Backes
	4. Jessie Stoffel
	5. Ron Cravey
	6. Amy Whittington
	7. Loras Osterhaus
	8. Yolanda Shields
	9. Amy Minteer
2. Community Partners
	1. The Committee discussed the definition of “partnership” for 21CCLC programs. Partnerships must be reciprocal and sustainable. Ron directed the Committee to count everything (collaboration, advice, etc.) for in-kind support. The Committee wondered if schools should be included as partners. Jessie also brought up the full and partial levels of partnerships that Vic mentioned in the fall. This distinction will be further clarified on a future call when Vic is available. Rhonda asked for a general correspondence to send to potential partners. Are there any activities that partners are restricted from doing? Vic created a one-page sheet with examples of things that partners could do.
3. Google Templates
	1. Jessie presented the data collection templates to make it easier to do state evaluation and APR. These templates would just be used internally by evaluators and directors—there would be no need to turn them in.
	2. When discussing the APR template, it was noted that the teacher survey has not been updated to reflect the combination of HW completion and class participation in APR. The committee should look at updating this survey since it has not been updated in many years. The survey should be simplified (how many students are in the program, how many of them have made improvements in homework completion, how many have made improvements in classroom participation). Student behavior also needs to be included. Rhonda mentioned that it is helpful to identify specific students in data collection because it helps directors provide targeted support to those students who need it. Vic will need to approve of the final survey to ensure that it follows federal standards. The Committee suggested that it would be helpful if the new survey were ready by April or May when they disseminate to the teachers. Local sites can add additional questions if they would like.
	3. Ron suggested that the Committee needs to reevaluate the state evaluation form. Committee members feel like the questions on the APR, state evaluation, and local evaluations are duplicated and redundant. Britney will check with Michelle and Vic to see how much input the Committee is allowed to give on the state evaluation survey. Jessie also suggested providing all of these templates and forms to new grantees, so they know what data they should be collecting throughout the year. In the IAA’s newsletter, there should be a link to the Department of Education’s website with the different evaluation resources to serve as a reminder for sites.
4. Impact Meeting
	1. At the Committee’s meeting in April, they will decide if a committee meeting at Impact is needed.
5. Items for Next meeting – April 2nd, 2019
	1. Meeting at Impact
	2. Request changes for teacher survey
	3. Discuss changes for statewide evaluation survey
	4. Document best practices for Teacher Survey dissemination