

CI-STEM Survey Summary



This material is based upon work supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation (#1906490). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

January 2023



CI-STEM One-page Summary

- CI-STEM is a 5-year study (2019-2024) of continuous quality improvement (CQI) and STEAM programming in California's publicly funded afterschool programs.
 - Collaboration between SRI Education and University of North Texas
 - Funded by the National Science Foundation (Award #1906490)
- The goal is to understand how CQI is implemented, both in general and how it is used to improve STEAM programming.
- Surveys are one of three data sources, the others being interviews and case studies.

Survey Goals

- To measure three things in California afterschool sites:
 1. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)
 2. STEAM programming
 3. Whether and how CQI is used to improve STEAM programming
- Does **not** evaluate any individual, any site, or EXLD itself
- Aims to help understand how CQI and STEAM are used in California afterschool programs so that sites can be better supported in how they support youth

Survey Administration

- Launched January 18, 2022, closed February 26, 2022
- Invited all grant managers
 - If agreed, sent survey link and instructions for submitting site coordinator contact information
 - Emailed site coordinators with site-specific links to use and share with frontline staff
- The final sample included ~200 sites with 46 Grant Managers, 33 Program Directors, 190 Site Coordinators, 45 ASES Specialists, and 379 Frontline Staff.

Survey Key Terms

- **Site:** a location running an afterschool program
- **Grant Manager:** person who manages a grant, sometimes across multiple programs/sites
- **Program Director:** person who directs a program, usually over multiple sites
- **Site Coordinator:** person who oversees a single site or multiple sites, including overseeing frontline staff
- **After School Education & Safety (ASES) Specialist:** person who oversees a single site or multiple sites funded by the ASES program
- **Frontline Staff:** person who leads activities and provides instruction to youth

Survey Results Disclaimer

We collected surveys from **~200 afterschool sites** out of **~4,500 afterschool sites** across California (~4.5%).

While our themes and findings should be interpreted as being true among survey respondents, they may or may not be readily generalize to afterschool programs across California.

This presentation reports on some, but not all, of the questions asked in the survey.

Survey Results Weighting

Frontline Staff results were weighted such that each site has the same statistical weight for its Frontline Staff respondents regardless of how many Frontline Staff responded to that site.

Experience in Afterschool Programming

Most Grant Managers, Program Directors, and Site Coordinators have been working in afterschool programs for 6+ years, more than either ASES Specialists or Frontline Staff.

How many years have you worked...	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
<1 year in afterschool programs	7%	12%	6%	22%	39%
1-5 years in afterschool prog.	23%	9%	42%	36%	50%
6+ years in afterschool prog.	71%	79%	52%	42%	11%
<i>N</i>	48	33	190	45	379

CQI Knowledge & Practice

A blue-tinted photograph of a group of people in a meeting. A man in a light blue shirt stands in the background, pointing towards a screen. In the foreground, several people are seated around a table. A woman with blonde hair is smiling, and a woman with long dark hair is looking at a tablet. A laptop is open on the table. The overall atmosphere is collaborative and professional.

Familiarity with Continuous Quality Improvement

Overwhelmingly, Grant Managers and Program Directors, followed by Site Coordinators, reported the most knowledge of CQI.

Please tell us how familiar you are with...	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
The term “continuous quality improvement”	3.7	3.5	3.2	3.0	2.7
Expectations for CQI from EXLD and the CA DOE	3.6	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.3
CQI Plan at my program/site	3.5	3.2	3.2	2.9	2.6
My program’s/site’s CQI goals	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.0	2.7
My program’s/site’s annual CQI report	3.5	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.4
<i>N</i>	46	33	190	45	~378

1: Not at all familiar 2: Slightly familiar 3: Moderately familiar 4: Extremely familiar

Familiarity with CQI Documents

Overwhelmingly, Grant Managers and Program Directors, followed by Site Coordinators, reported the most knowledge of CQI documents.

Please tell us which documents you are familiar with...	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
The Quality Standards for Expanded Learning in California	96%	81%	78%	69%	35%
Completing a Quality Improvement Plan	76%	72%	59%	55%	25%
Guidance for a Quality Improvement Process	76%	59%	38%	48%	21%
Crosswalk Between the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning and Program Quality Assessment Tools	74%	53%	31%	21%	12%
My program's/site's previous CQI plans	72%	71%	61%	50%	38%
<i>N</i>	46	32	184	42	354

Contributions to CQI Plans

The majority of Grant Managers, Program Directors, and Site Coordinators contributed to their program/site's CQI Plan. Most ASES Specialists and Frontline Staff did not.

I wrote or contributed to... my program's/site's CQI plan.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
	76%	79%	61%	41%	28%
<i>N</i>	46	32	184	42	355

I involved the following people in developing my program's/site's CQI plan:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Site Coordinators	94%	84%			
Frontline Staff	83%	88%			
<i>N</i>	35	25			

Perceptions of CQI Work Underway

Nearly half of Frontline Staff and nearly one quarter of Site Coordinators and ASES Specialists reported not knowing if their site was currently working through a continuous quality improvement cycle.

My program/site is currently working through a CQI cycle.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	9%	9%	6%	7%	3%
Yes	85%	79%	71%	69%	53%
Not sure/don't know	7%	12%	23%	24%	44%
<i>N</i>	46	33	190	45	379

Perceptions of CQI Data Use

Most Grant Managers, Program Directors, and Site Coordinators reported that they collect data as part of the CQI process. Around half of the ASES Specialists and Frontline Staff reported collecting data for the CQI process.

My program/site collects data as part of our continuous quality improvement process.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	11%	9%	7%	2%	3%
Yes	87%	82%	73%	51%	45%
Not sure/don't know	2%	9%	20%	47%	52%
<i>N</i>	46	33	188	45	377

Quality Standard Focus of CQI Cycle

Our CQI cycle is focused on the following Quality Standards for Expanded Learning:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Safe and supportive environment	64%	69%	74%	68%	80%
Active and engaged learning	72%	58%	59%	55%	74%
Skill building	41%	50%	44%	61%	66%
Youth voice and leadership	64%	46%	56%	74%	65%
Healthy choices and behaviors	36%	46%	41%	58%	54%
Diversity, access and equity	34%	39%	42%	39%	56%
Quality Staff	59%	58%	45%	52%	57%
Clear vision, mission and purpose	26%	27%	39%	48%	45%
Collaborative partnerships	36%	35%	33%	39%	44%
Program management	28%	35%	27%	23%	45%
Sustainability	26%	23%	22%	26%	27%
<i>N</i>	39	26	135	31	210

Quality Standard Focus of CQI Cycle (High/Med/Low)

Our CQI cycle is focused on the following Quality Standards for Expanded Learning:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Safe and supportive environment	64%	69%	74%	68%	80%
Active and engaged learning	72%	58%	59%	55%	74%
Skill building	41%	50%	44%	61%	66%
Youth voice and leadership	64%	46%	56%	74%	65%
Healthy choices and behaviors	36%	46%	41%	58%	54%
Diversity, access and equity	34%	39%	42%	39%	56%
Quality Staff	59%	58%	45%	52%	57%
Clear vision, mission and purpose	26%	27%	39%	48%	45%
Collaborative partnerships	36%	35%	33%	39%	44%
Program management	28%	35%	27%	23%	45%
Sustainability	26%	23%	22%	26%	27%
<i>N</i>	39	26	135	31	210

Knowledge of Site CQI Work

All respondent groups Somewhat Agreed to knowing everything they needed to know about their program's/site's CQI work, and did not agree that anyone else knew more about it than they did.

Prompt	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
I know everything I need to know about my program's/ site's continuous quality improvement (CQI) work.	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8
Other people at my program/site know more about our CQI work than I do.	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.9
<i>N</i>	~45	32	~165	~39	~273

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Somewhat Disagree 3: Somewhat Agree 4: Strongly Agree

“Don't Know/Not Applicable” coded as missing

CQI Training: Occurrence

Majorities of all non-Frontline Staff groups reported receiving training on CQI since they started in their positions. Almost half of Frontline Staff were not sure whether they received this training.

I received training about continuous quality improvement since I started working in this position.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	24%	24%	20%	31%	16%
Yes	69%	67%	65%	51%	41%
Not sure/don't know	7%	9%	16%	18%	44%
<i>N</i>	45	33	185	45	364

CQI Training: Need

Most respondents reported needing more training on CQI.

I need more training about continuous quality improvement.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	40%	21%	19%	20%	16%
Yes	47%	67%	65%	62%	53%
Not sure/don't know	13%	12%	16%	18%	31%
<i>N</i>	45	33	184	45	363

Value & Relevance of CQI

All respondent groups chose between Somewhat Agree and Strongly Agree on all items concerning the value and relevance of CQI to their jobs.

Prompt	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Quality improvement is a top priority in my program/site.	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7
The time we spend on continuous quality improvement is well-spent.	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5
I am satisfied with the amount of time my program/site spends on quality improvement.	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.3
<i>N</i>	~43	~31	~168	~42	~290

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Somewhat Disagree 3: Somewhat Agree 4: Strongly Agree

“Don’t Know/Not Applicable” coded as missing

Perceived Impact of CQI

All respondent groups, across all items, selected Somewhat Agree to Strongly Agree on all items concerning the impact of CQI on their work.

Prompt	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Through the quality improvement process, I've learned things I didn't know before.	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.4
I've made changes to my practice based on our quality improvement process.	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5
As a result of our program's participation in the quality improvement process, the quality of programming improved at my sites.	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5
<i>N</i>	~43	~29	~160	~39	~270

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Somewhat Disagree 3: Somewhat Agree 4: Strongly Agree

“Don’t Know/Not Applicable” coded as missing

CQI Summary

- Across all respondent groups, there is consistent agreement on the value and impact of CQI on their work.
- Most respondents reported needing more training on CQI in general and not clearly knowing everything they need to know about their site's CQI work.
- Overall, Frontline staff report less familiarity with CQI practices and data use.
- There is some disagreement and uncertainty around who is involved in CQI across different levels of the system. Grant managers and Program Directors may want to consider how to more extensively involve staff in CQI.

STEAM Programming

A photograph of a classroom scene with a blue overlay. A male teacher stands in the background, pointing towards a group of students. Several students are seated at a table, looking at a laptop and a tablet. The text 'STEAM Programming' is overlaid in white.

STEAM Offerings: Content Area

Site Coordinators, ASES Specialists, and Frontline Staff most commonly reported mathematics and visual arts as the STEAM content areas offered at their program or site.

What content areas are addressed by STEAM programming at your site?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Mathematics			69%	59%	61%
Visual Arts			68%	57%	50%
Engineering			52%	52%	36%
Life Science			38%	41%	33%
Physical Science			34%	41%	27%
Computer Science			27%	50%	25%
	<i>N</i>		180	44	352

STEAM Offerings: Engagement

Site Coordinators, ASES Specialists, and Frontline Staff agreed that approximately 60% of students at their sites participated in STEAM activities.

What percentage of children who regularly attend your program participate in STEAM activities?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
			62%	64%	57%
<i>N</i>			179	44	346

STEAM Offerings: Planning

Overwhelmingly, Site Coordinators and Frontline Staff planned STEAM activities.

In your program, who plans STEAM activities?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Program director	49%	66%	15%	23%	23%
Site coordinator	78%	69%	70%	61%	51%
Frontline staff	56%	75%	74%	59%	68%
Community partners	27%	13%	4%	7%	4%
Steam Community of Practice/Hub	20%	6%	3%	9%	5%
Other	9%	6%	7%	11%	8%
<i>N</i>	45	32	178	44	349

STEAM Offerings: Resources

The most commonly reported single source of curriculum materials and/or resources for STEAM programming was internet searches, followed by Site Coordinators.

We find or receive curriculum materials and/or resources for STEAM programming from:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Internet searches	44%	50%	44%	33%	32%
My site coordinator	30%	40%	30%	48%	45%
CAN	42%	30%	8%	17%	3%
CalSAC	35%	23%	5%	7%	4%
County Office of Education	61%	30%	14%	21%	5%
Steam Community of Practice/Hub	44%	37%	10%	21%	8%
<i>N</i>	43	30	176	42	340

STEAM Community of Practice or Hub: Membership

Only Grant Managers and Program Directors were confident in knowing if their sites were part of a STEAM Community of Practice/STEAM Hub, and one-quarter of them were not sure. Most sites surveyed were not part of a STEAM Community of Practice/STEAM Hub.

Our program is in a STEAM Community of Practice or Hub.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Yes, we are.	28%	25%	15%	36%	9%
No, and we never have been.	16%	28%	7%	0%	4%
No, but we used to be.	16%	9%	3%	5%	1%
No, but our program is interested in learning more about it.	14%	9%	15%	12%	4%
Not sure/don't know.	26%	28%	61%	48%	82%
<i>N</i>	43	32	178	42	348

STEAM Community of Practice or Hub: Value

All respondent groups that were part of a STEAM Community of Practice/Hub agreed that STEAM Communities of Practice/Hubs provided their program/site with professional development and high-quality STEAM learning activities.

The STEAM Community of Practice/Hub has provided my program/site with:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Professional development	92%	100%	60%	60%	58%
Opportunities to collaborate with other programs/sites	83%	88%	64%	33%	35%
High-quality STEAM learning activities	92%	100%	76%	60%	73%
Instructional resources	100%	75%	52%	27%	45%
<i>N</i>	12	8	25	15	37

CQI & STEAM

A photograph of a classroom scene with a blue overlay. A male teacher in a light blue shirt stands behind a group of students seated at a table. The students, including a boy with a laptop and a girl with a tablet, are engaged in a collaborative activity. The background shows a classroom with a grid chart and posters.

CQI & STEAM: Occurrence

Most respondents reported not conducting CQI cycles on STEAM programming or not being sure whether they had done so.

We have conducted continuous quality improvement cycles specifically focused on our STEAM programming.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	64%	53%	39%	14%	11%
Yes	21%	22%	21%	43%	26%
Not sure/don't know	16%	25%	40%	43%	63%
<i>N</i>	44	32	177	42	348

CQI & STEAM: Impact

Most respondents reported either not changing their STEAM programming due to CQI work or not knowing whether the programming had changed.

We have changed our STEAM programming as a result of our continuous quality improvement cycles (even if the cycles weren't specifically focused on STEAM).	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	48%	31%	37%	12%	12%
Yes	27%	44%	21%	32%	18%
Not sure/don't know	25%	25%	42%	56%	71%
<i>N</i>	44	32	177	42	348

CQI & STEAM: Data

A majority of Grant Managers reported collecting data on the quality of their STEAM programming, while other respondent groups did not.

We collect data about the quality of our STEAM programming.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	32%	47%	36%	22%	14%
Yes	57%	38%	31%	42%	22%
Not sure/don't know	11%	16%	33%	37%	65%
<i>N</i>	44	32	177	42	348

CQI & STEAM: Improvement

Of those who collected data on their STEAM programming, most reported seeing improvement in their STEAM programming over time.

Our data indicate that our STEAM programming has improved over time.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	12%	0%	2%	0%	1%
Yes	52%	67%	71%	89%	75%
Not sure/don't know	36%	33%	27%	11%	24%
<i>N</i>	25	12	55	18	80

CQI & STEAM: Improvement

Of those who collected data on their STEAM programming AND said they saw improvement over time, most reported seeing improvement in:

- Student attendance (ex: “higher attendance on STEAM days”)
- Student engagement/participation (ex: “students are more engaged and want to stay the full duration of the program,” “kids are having more fun”)
- Student interest (ex: “youth voice asking for more programming”)

Very few respondents commented on increased student learning (ex: “the work provided from the students,” “students have demonstrated learning by presenting benchmark projects”).



For more information, go to
<https://cistemresearch.org/>