

## 2023 CI STEM Formatted Survey Results

We launched our CQI and STEAM survey on February 14, 2023 and closed the survey on April 21, 2023. Our recruitment process included broad statewide outreach to grant managers of afterschool programming grants, site coordinators attending the annual in-person California Afterschool Network Site Coordinator Symposium, past respondents from the prior year's survey, and snowball recruiting where respondents encourage others in their sites to take the survey.

We surveyed five respondent types, defined as follows:

- **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”

Respondents self-identified their roles as part of the survey. The survey team resolved role conflicts as part of the data cleaning process. (Ex: If multiple people identified themselves as grant managers for the same site, we used the CA DOE records to assign a unique grant manager to that site.)

Our usable survey response sample comprised 83 grant managers, 109 program directors, 355 site coordinators, 111 ASES specialists, and 339 frontline staff.

Note that some questions below have fewer responses than our full sample. This is because some respondents chose not to respond to all items, and some survey items were gated by skip logic (e.g., question 6a was only given to respondents who answered “yes” to question 5). We note skip logic requirements for each question.

Q2b: How many years have you worked in afterschool programs in California (in your current program or elsewhere)?

*Headline: Most Grant Managers and Program Directors have worked in afterschool programs longer than Site Coordinators, who in turn have worked in afterschool programs longer than ASES Specialists or Frontline Staff.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
Less than 1 year	Mean	10.8%	11.9%	5.1%	18.0%	32.4%	99.60	<0.01	4
	SE	3.4%	3.1%	1.2%	3.6%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
1 to 2 years	Mean	13.3%	11.0%	15.5%	18.9%	29.2%	30.10	<0.01	4
	SE	3.7%	3.0%	1.9%	3.7%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
3 to 5 years	Mean	10.8%	11.9%	27.9%	24.3%	23.3%	21.55	<0.01	4
	SE	3.4%	3.1%	2.4%	4.1%	2.3%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
6 to 10 years	Mean	22.9%	15.6%	25.1%	18.0%	8.8%	35.35	<0.01	4
	SE	4.6%	3.5%	2.3%	3.6%	1.5%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Over ten years	Mean	42.2%	49.5%	26.5%	20.7%	6.2%	124.44	<0.01	4
	SE	5.4%	4.8%	2.3%	3.8%	1.3%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

*Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”*

Q2c: How many years have you worked specifically at your current program/site?

*Headline: Most Site Coordinators, ASES Specialists, and Frontline Staff have been in their current sites for three or fewer years.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
Less than 1 year	Mean	15.7%	28.4%	23.1%	34.2%	45.4%	52.70	<0.01	4
	SE	4.0%	4.3%	2.2%	4.5%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
1 to 2 years	Mean	19.3%	13.8%	28.2%	27.0%	29.2%	14.44	<0.01	4
	SE	4.3%	3.3%	2.4%	4.2%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
3 to 5 years	Mean	26.5%	17.4%	21.7%	16.2%	17.1%	5.83	0.21	4
	SE	4.8%	3.6%	2.2%	3.5%	2.0%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
6 to 10 years	Mean	18.1%	18.3%	13.8%	9.0%	5.0%	27.09	<0.01	4
	SE	4.2%	3.7%	1.8%	2.7%	1.2%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Over ten years	Mean	20.5%	22.0%	13.2%	13.5%	3.2%	47.26	<0.01	4
	SE	4.4%	4.0%	1.8%	3.2%	1.0%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

*Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”*

Q3. Please tell us how familiar you are with the following:

*Headline: Most respondents reported being at least Moderately Familiar with continuous quality improvement expectations and plans. Frontline Staff were significantly less familiar than other respondent groups.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
The term “continuous quality improvement”	Mean	3.66	3.61	3.38	3.01	2.67	54.18	<0.01	4; 992
	SE	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.09	0.05			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Expectations for continuous quality improvement from Expanded Learning Division (EXLD) at the California Department of Education	Mean	3.34	3.30	2.99	2.80	2.35	39.54	<0.01	4; 992
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.05			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
The continuous quality improvement plan in my program/at my site	Mean	3.28	3.42	3.27	3.05	2.61	32.98	<0.01	4; 992
	SE	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.09	0.05			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My program’s/my site’s continuous quality improvement goals	Mean	3.30	3.39	3.30	3.05	2.79	19.02	0.01	4; 992
	SE	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.09	0.05			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My program’s/ my site’s annual continuous quality improvement report	Mean	3.20	3.23	2.97	2.75	2.44	23.39	<0.01	4; 992
	SE	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.10	0.06			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

Note: 1 = Not at all familiar, 2 = Slightly familiar, 3 = Moderately familiar, 4 = Extremely familiar.

Q4. Please tell us which documents you are familiar with:  
 (Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q3 to be “Slightly familiar” or higher)

*Headline: Most Grant Managers and Program Directors reported being familiar with key CQI resource documents. Most Frontline Staff reported not being familiar with CQI documentation and resources, including the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
The Quality Standards for Expanded Learning in California	Mean	89.0%	87.0%	76.3%	60.7%	43.1%	135.43	<0.01	4
	SE	3.5%	3.2%	2.3%	4.7%	2.8%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	313			
Completing a Quality Improvement Plan	Mean	67.1%	70.4%	65.4%	41.1%	26.2%	139.22	<0.01	4
	SE	5.2%	4.4%	2.5%	4.8%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	313			
Guidance for a Quality Improvement Process	Mean	54.9%	56.5%	42.0%	37.4%	21.1%	68.28	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.6%	4.7%	2.3%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	313			
Crosswalk Between the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning and Program Quality Assessment Tools	Mean	51.2%	57.4%	24.6%	18.7%	11.2%	116.88	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.3%	3.8%	1.8%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	313			
My program’s/site’s previous continuous quality improvement plans	Mean	63.4%	72.2%	60.0%	47.7%	42.5%	41.41	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.3%	2.6%	4.8%	2.8%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	313			
Other quality improvement resource: (see below)	Mean	9.8%	4.6%	1.1%	0.9%	0.3%	25.20	<0.01	4
	SE	3.3%	2.0%	0.6%	0.9%	0.3%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	313			
I am not familiar with any of these documents	Mean	3.7%	5.6%	7.7%	21.5%	31.6%	94.29	<0.01	4
	SE	2.1%	2.2%	1.4%	4.0%	2.6%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	313			

*Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”*

Other responses:

- ASES
- Observation Tools / Action Plan
- California Self Assessment Tool
- NYSAN, LIAS
- Site Manager meetings discussing what we can do to improve our after school programs.
- We are a PQA District and have been since 2012
- Doctoral course on program improvement
- Youth Development Guide 2.0, LIAS Principles
- YPQA
- Formula for Impact BGCA

Q5. I wrote or contributed to (wrote sections, offered ideas) my program/site continuous quality improvement plan:  
*Headlines: Two-thirds of Grant Managers, Program Directors, and Site Coordinators were involved in writing their programs/sites' continuous quality improvement plans while most ASES Specialists and Frontline Staff were not.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
Yes	Mean	62.2%	64.8%	63.7%	43.0%	29.8%	95.65	<0.01	4
	SE	5.4%	4.6%	2.6%	4.8%	2.6%			
	<i>n</i>	82	108	350	107	312			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Q6a. When developing the continuous quality improvement plan for your organization, which documents did you refer to?

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q5 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Most CQI plan contributors used the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning in developing their CQI plans. Other documents, websites, etc. were not consistently used.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
The Quality Standards for Expanded Learning in California	Mean	90.2%	92.9%	78.9%	73.9%	54.8%	41.45	<0.01	4
	SE	4.2%	3.1%	2.7%	6.5%	5.2%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
Completing a Quality Improvement Plan	Mean	54.9%	55.7%	60.1%	56.5%	34.4%	17.99	<0.01	4
	SE	7.0%	5.9%	3.3%	7.3%	4.9%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
Guidance for a Quality Improvement Process	Mean	49.0%	57.1%	40.8%	34.8%	20.4%	26.84	<0.01	4
	SE	7.0%	5.9%	3.3%	7.0%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
Crosswalk Between the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning and Program Quality Assessment Tools	Mean	51.0%	54.3%	19.7%	19.6%	3.2%	80.87	<0.01	4
	SE	7.0%	6.0%	2.7%	5.8%	1.8%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
California Afterschool Network (CAN) website	Mean	49.0%	45.7%	24.2%	32.6%	8.6%	43.72	<0.01	4
	SE	7.0%	6.0%	2.9%	6.9%	2.9%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
California Department of Education (CDE) website	Mean	66.7%	50.0%	16.6%	13.0%	9.7%	86.63	<0.01	4
	SE	6.6%	6.0%	2.5%	5.0%	3.1%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
County Office of Education (COE) website	Mean	23.5%	15.7%	10.8%	15.2%	7.5%	8.62	0.07	4
	SE	5.9%	4.3%	2.1%	5.3%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
My program’s/site’s previous continuous quality improvement plans	Mean	62.7%	75.7%	56.1%	47.8%	49.5%	15.08	<0.01	4
	SE	6.8%	5.1%	3.3%	7.4%	5.2%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
Research literature	Mean	17.6%	17.1%	4.5%	6.5%	7.5%	15.50	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.5%	1.4%	3.6%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
Other quality improvement resource: (see below)	Mean	9.8%	8.6%	3.1%	8.7%	3.2%	7.15	0.13	4
	SE	4.2%	3.3%	1.2%	4.2%	1.8%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			
I did not use any of these documents	Mean	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	8.7%	17.2%	21.43	<0.01	2
	SE			1.0%	4.2%	3.9%			
	<i>n</i>	51	70	223	46	93			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other responses:

- Association with Lead by Learning. We meet on a regular bases regarding steps to reaching our yearly goals for the Quality Standards we are focused on.
- Stakeholder Feedback Via google survey
- Site Coordinator Network (of CAN) Members
- Redwood Afterschool Network
- Student, Parent, and Teacher surveys
- Pilot CAN CQI workbook
- QSAT

- Site surveys
- Boys & Girls Clubs of America
- LIAS, NYSAN
- Information shared from my Program Manager
- PQA
- Evaluation Report Summary (Outside Evaluator)- Data collected from school sites
- Information given during Region 2 Director's meetings
- I ask my supervisor.
- LACOE-Expanded Learning Trainings
- Don't remember the name of the data
- Parents and student input
- Parent, Teacher, Student Surveys
- My area Liaison Lupe Valdez SCOE



Q6b. I involved the following people in developing my program's/site's continuous quality improvement plan:  
 (Skip logic requires the answer to Q5 to be "Yes" and the respondent to be either GM or PD)

*Headline: Grant Managers and Program Directors reported including Site Coordinators and Frontline Staff in CQI planning more than those groups themselves reported being involved in the CQI planning process.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Site coordinators	Mean	90.2%	87.1%				0.27	0.60	1
	SE	4.2%	4.0%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						
Frontline staff (program coaches, program supervisors, program workers, traveling program staff)	Mean	74.5%	84.3%				1.75	0.19	1
	SE	6.1%	4.3%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						
Site principal	Mean	76.5%	75.7%				0.01	0.92	1
	SE	5.9%	5.1%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						
Site teachers	Mean	43.1%	45.7%				0.08	0.78	1
	SE	6.9%	6.0%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						
District Staff	Mean	68.6%	58.6%				1.29	0.26	1
	SE	6.5%	5.9%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						
Parents, students, and/or families	Mean	66.7%	65.7%				0.01	0.91	1
	SE	6.6%	5.7%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						
Other personnel: (see below)	Mean	11.8%	11.4%				0	0.95	1
	SE	4.5%	3.8%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						
No one else	Mean	0.0%	0.0%						
	SE	0.0%	0.0%						
	<i>n</i>	51	70						

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."

Other personnel responses:

- community stakeholders
- Assistant Superintendent
- Varies from site to site, district to district
- Tutors
- External Evaluator
- Afterschool staff
- managers and directors from partner agencies
- Board members
- CDE STEAM Grant COE Regents
- Tribal Education Office's
- Superintendent / Board of Education

Q7. My program/site is currently working through a continuous quality improvement cycle (assess, plan, improve).

*Headline: While most respondents reported their programs/sites were working through a CQI improvement cycle, a sizeable minority reported being unsure.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	2.4%	6.4%	2.8%	3.6%	2.4%	4.08	0.40	4
	SE	1.7%	2.3%	0.9%	1.8%	0.8%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Yes	Mean	77.1%	82.6%	79.4%	67.6%	49.0%	90.81	<0.01	4
	SE	4.6%	3.6%	2.1%	4.4%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	20.5%	11.0%	17.7%	28.8%	48.7%	105.72	<0.01	4
	SE	4.4%	3.0%	2.0%	4.3%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.

Q8. My program/site is currently in the (check one):

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q7 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Most respondents at programs/sites currently conducting CQI improvement cycles reported knowing which phase they were working through.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
Assess phase	Mean	26.6%	27.8%	15.6%	12.0%	12.0%	15.14	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.7%	2.2%	3.8%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Plan phase	Mean	17.2%	20.0%	19.1%	21.3%	10.8%	7.34	0.12	4
	SE	4.7%	4.2%	2.3%	4.7%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Improve phase	Mean	50.0%	46.7%	52.5%	44.0%	42.2%	5.19	0.27	4
	SE	6.3%	5.3%	3.0%	5.7%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	6.3%	5.6%	12.8%	22.7%	34.9%	53.54	<0.01	4
	SE	3.0%	2.4%	2.0%	4.8%	3.7%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			

*Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”*

Q9. Our continuous quality improvement cycle is focused on the following Quality Standards for Expanded Learning: (Skip logic requires the answer to Q7 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: By far, the most common standards chosen for CQI improvement cycles were Safe & Supportive Environment, Active & Engaged Learning, and Youth Voice & Leadership.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Safe and supportive environment	Mean	60.9%	66.7%	66.7%	74.7%	72.3%	4.71	0.32	4
	SE	6.1%	5.0%	2.8%	5.0%	3.5%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Active and engaged learning	Mean	68.8%	63.3%	65.6%	64.0%	74.1%	5.04	0.28	4
	SE	5.8%	5.1%	2.8%	5.5%	3.4%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Skill building	Mean	34.4%	43.3%	45.0%	60.0%	66.3%	31.54	<0.01	4
	SE	5.9%	5.2%	3.0%	5.7%	3.7%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Youth voice and leadership	Mean	50.0%	61.1%	63.8%	66.7%	66.3%	5.91	0.21	4
	SE	6.3%	5.1%	2.9%	5.4%	3.7%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Healthy choices and behaviors	Mean	37.5%	37.8%	42.9%	50.7%	51.8%	7.94	0.09	4
	SE	6.1%	5.1%	2.9%	5.8%	3.9%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Diversity, access and equity	Mean	29.7%	31.1%	35.8%	45.3%	53.6%	21.47	<0.01	4
	SE	5.7%	4.9%	2.9%	5.7%	3.9%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Quality staff	Mean	45.3%	60.0%	51.1%	46.7%	56.6%	5.76	0.22	4
	SE	6.2%	5.2%	3.0%	5.8%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Clear vision, mission and purpose	Mean	28.1%	32.2%	38.7%	42.7%	42.2%	6.01	0.20	4
	SE	5.6%	4.9%	2.9%	5.7%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Collaborative partnerships	Mean	35.9%	34.4%	34.8%	34.7%	39.2%	1.05	0.90	4
	SE	6.0%	5.0%	2.8%	5.5%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Program management	Mean	29.7%	28.9%	28.0%	26.7%	42.8%	12.10	0.02	4
	SE	5.7%	4.8%	2.7%	5.1%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Sustainability	Mean	23.4%	21.1%	15.2%	21.3%	32.5%	18.02	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.3%	2.1%	4.7%	3.6%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Other: (see below)	Mean	7.8%	3.3%	1.8%	0.0%	1.2%	7.10	0.07	3
	SE	3.4%	1.9%	0.8%		0.8%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	4.7%	4.4%	1.1%	1.3%	5.4%	9.52	0.05	4
	SE	2.6%	2.2%	0.6%	1.3%	1.8%			
	<i>n</i>	64	90	282	75	166			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other responses:

- RECRUITING QUALITY STAFF AND PD
- Mental health support
- Continuous quality improvement
- physical activity
- specific per site
- I oversee multiple school districts and they all have a different standard they are focusing on,
- Overseeing 155 sites, all these standards are covered.

- Community Involvement (Engagement)
- Continuous Quality Improvement
- It varies site by site
- Emotional Support
- Different for each specific school site
- Continuous quality improvement
- Native Languages

Q10. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about who is involved with the continuous quality improvement at your program/site:

*Headline: Overwhelmingly, all respondent groups Somewhat Agreed or stronger to whether all respondent groups were involved in the CQI process.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
I am involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.35	3.51	3.52	3.26	2.94	25.43	<0.01	4; 990
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.05			
	n	83	109	354	110	339			
Our grant manager is involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.42	3.21	3.24	3.25	3.09	3.50	0.11	4; 988
	SE	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.05			
	n	83	109	353	110	338			
Our site coordinators are involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.70	3.55	3.57	3.56	3.43	3.34	0.12	4; 989
	SE	0.06	0.08	0.03	0.06	0.04			
	n	82	109	355	109	339			
Our frontline staff are involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.22	3.29	3.29	3.28	3.16	1.44	0.40	4; 989
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.05			
	n	82	109	355	109	339			
The site principal is involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.02	2.96	2.88	3.04	2.98	1.06	0.56	4; 989
	SE	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05			
	n	82	109	355	110	338			
Site teachers are involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	2.48	2.56	2.59	2.81	2.82	5.12	0.06	4; 989
	SE	0.10	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05			
	n	82	109	355	110	338			
Students are involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	2.96	3.00	3.16	3.24	3.08	2.34	0.21	4; 989
	SE	0.09	0.09	0.04	0.06	0.04			
	n	82	109	354	110	339			
Parents are involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	2.90	2.79	2.73	2.85	2.81	0.98	0.60	4; 987
	SE	0.08	0.09	0.04	0.08	0.04			
	n	82	109	354	110	337			
In my opinion, the right people are involved in the continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.10	3.13	3.24	3.26	3.20	1.03	0.58	4; 988
	SE	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	82	109	354	110	338			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.

Q11. My program/site collects data as part of our continuous quality improvement process.

*Headline: Most Grant Managers, Program Directors, Site Coordinators, and ASES Specialists reported that they collected data as part of the CQI process. Around half of Frontline Staff were unsure if their site collected data for the CQI process.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	3.6%	8.3%	4.8%	2.7%	2.9%	6.05	0.20	4
	SE	2.0%	2.6%	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Yes	Mean	84.3%	81.7%	73.0%	67.6%	44.0%	103.11	<0.01	4
	SE	4.0%	3.7%	2.4%	4.4%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	12.0%	10.1%	22.3%	29.7%	53.1%	128.21	<0.01	4
	SE	3.6%	2.9%	2.2%	4.3%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.

Q12a. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about who collects data for your continuous quality improvement at your program/site:

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q11 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: All respondent groups at least Somewhat Agreed that all respondent groups collected data for their CQI work.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
I collect data for our continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.49	3.46	3.42	3.09	3.01	9.95	0.02	4; 637
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.10	0.07			
	n	70	89	259	75	149			
Our grant manager collects data for our continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.46	3.16	3.28	3.32	3.23	1.67	0.34	4; 636
	SE	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.06			
	n	70	89	258	75	149			
Our site coordinators collect data for our continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.59	3.45	3.50	3.46	3.53	0.60	0.85	4; 636
	SE	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.05			
	n	70	89	259	74	149			
Our frontline staff collect data for our continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.09	3.06	3.06	3.08	3.22	1.11	0.54	4; 636
	SE	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.11	0.06			
	n	70	89	258	75	149			
The site principal collects data for our continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	2.57	2.47	2.60	2.68	2.88	3.57	0.11	4; 633
	SE	0.10	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.07			
	n	70	89	257	74	148			
Site teachers collect data for our continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	2.37	2.31	2.37	2.51	2.73	4.46	0.08	4; 635
	SE	0.11	0.09	0.06	0.12	0.08			
	n	70	89	258	75	148			
In my opinion, the right people collect data for our continuous quality improvement process.	Mean	3.21	2.98	3.28	3.35	3.39	4.80	0.07	4; 635
	SE	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.05			
	n	70	89	258	75	148			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.



Q12b. We collect data for our continuous quality improvement processes from the following:  
 (Skip logic requires the answer to Q11 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: All respondent groups reported that their program/site collected CQI data from Site Coordinators, Frontline Staff, and Students.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Our site coordinators	Mean	92.9%	92.1%	86.1%	88.0%	79.2%	11.79	0.02	4
	SE	3.1%	2.9%	2.1%	3.8%	3.3%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Our frontline staff	Mean	80.0%	82.0%	76.1%	69.3%	74.5%	4.43	0.35	4
	SE	4.8%	4.1%	2.7%	5.3%	3.6%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Students	Mean	77.1%	79.8%	82.6%	78.7%	69.1%	9.92	0.04	4
	SE	5.0%	4.3%	2.4%	4.7%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Parents	Mean	60.0%	77.5%	67.2%	68.0%	47.0%	27.50	<0.01	4
	SE	5.9%	4.4%	2.9%	5.4%	4.1%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Our site (such as students' grades from site's school)	Mean	44.3%	51.7%	38.2%	34.7%	30.9%	11.56	0.02	4
	SE	5.9%	5.3%	3.0%	5.5%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Other: (see below)	Mean	5.7%	9.0%	3.9%	1.3%	1.3%	10.30	0.04	4
	SE	2.8%	3.0%	1.2%	1.3%	0.9%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other responses:

- School Teachers, School Administration, School Staff, School Community Partners
- day school staff
- I ready and benchmark assessments
- Admin
- teaches and administrators
- Teachers
- District office
- school administration and faculty
- Program Director
- Surveys
- Teachers
- Specialty partners
- Teachers, School Site Administrators
- Teachers
- community members and partners
- Surveys
- Teachers & administrators
- school administrators
- Site Supervisors
- Different at each school site
- Teaches and admin on campus too
- We have a data coordinator
- Online surveys
- Pricipal
- We have no idea here she collects from, as she does not use the above

Q13. We use the following program assessment tool(s) to collect data for our continuous quality improvement process:  
*Headline: A sizable minority of respondents reported using the California After School Program Quality Self-Assessment Tool in collecting CQI data. There was no other single tool with a similar level of use.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
California After School Program Quality Self-Assessment Tool (CAN-QSA)	Mean	50.0%	53.9%	41.3%	40.0%	24.8%	25.27	<0.01	4
	SE	6.0%	5.3%	3.1%	5.7%	3.5%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
New York State Afterschool Network Program Quality Self-Assessment Tool (NYSAN-QSA)	Mean	1.4%	1.1%	0.8%	1.3%	0.0%	0.35	0.95	3
	SE	1.4%	1.1%	0.5%	1.3%				
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
California High School After School Program Quality Self-Assessment Rubric (CAN-QSAR)	Mean	14.3%	7.9%	6.6%	4.0%	5.4%	6.53	0.16	4
	SE	4.2%	2.9%	1.5%	2.3%	1.8%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Program Quality Assessment (PQA)	Mean	17.1%	10.1%	16.2%	16.0%	8.1%	7.95	0.09	4
	SE	4.5%	3.2%	2.3%	4.2%	2.2%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Assessment of Program Practices Tool (APT)	Mean	4.3%	0.0%	4.2%	8.0%	2.7%	3.09	0.38	3
	SE	2.4%		1.3%	3.1%	1.3%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Out-Of-School Time Program Observation Tool (OST)	Mean	8.6%	9.0%	2.3%	2.7%	1.3%	13.39	<0.01	4
	SE	3.3%	3.0%	0.9%	1.9%	0.9%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Promising Practices Rating System (PPRS)	Mean	4.3%	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%	2.0%	2.11	0.55	3
	SE	2.4%	1.1%	0.8%		1.2%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
Other tool: (see below)	Mean	22.9%	24.7%	13.5%	10.7%	3.4%	31.05	<0.01	4
	SE	5.0%	4.6%	2.1%	3.6%	1.5%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
We do not use any specific tool.	Mean	7.1%	10.1%	5.8%	5.3%	7.4%	2.15	0.71	4
	SE	3.1%	3.2%	1.5%	2.6%	2.1%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
I'm not sure what we use.	Mean	10.0%	12.4%	30.1%	38.7%	59.1%	85.14	<0.01	4
	SE	3.6%	3.5%	2.9%	5.6%	4.0%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			
We are looking for a self-assessment tool and would like some guidance.	Mean	4.3%	7.9%	2.7%	2.7%	0.7%	9.52	0.05	4
	SE	2.4%	2.9%	1.0%	1.9%	0.7%			
	<i>n</i>	70	89	259	75	149			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."

Other tool responses:

- QCASP
- ERC
- CQI
- Many meetings with all involved parties, note taking, Lead by Learning planning forms.
- Student surveys
- Agency Continuous Quality Improvement Survey
- Survey Monkey
- stake holder surveys, core program assessment, employee surveys
- We use school assessment data and surveys, but would like a specific data collection tool for Expanded Learning
- Created own tool based on CAN tool

- Whatever SDCOE makes us use
- Survey's
- School Age Environment Rating Scale
- District created surveys
- surveys
- PSOT
- student, parents, and staff surveys
- Google Forms
- observation tool created by Claremont university external assessor
- Boys & Girls Club NYOI
- Online surveys via QR code
- Cqi
- parent and student surveys
- observation tool/ action plan tool
- parent surveys, comment post-its, student surveys
- we developed our own tool
- Panorama Education
- NYOI
- NYOI surveys, member of the month interviews, annual awards interviews
- Internally generated surveys
- Surveys
- Surveys built around quality standards, informal observation
- Google Forms and Staff Observation
- Google surveys
- National Youth Outcomes Initiative, Program Surveys
- Site Observation
- Google Forms, Qualtrics, internal tools
- In house program observation forms
- Internal created tool using the CQI standards and quality crosswalk
- Surveys
- End of year surveys for parents and students
- PQA
- Panorama surveys, iReady
- Pre/Post Surveys - All Stakeholders; Focus Groups (In-Person) - All Stakeholders
- Parent/student/Staff surveys
- youth and voice leadership
- Survey's
- surveys
- Google survey
- Outside data collecting company
- We have performance matter online system and EZ reports system that allows to track data in our dashboard for our district
- TransACT
- Agency Assessment
- self-created survey (small charter school)
- PSOT
- surveys, observations
- Our own surveys
- YPQA
- CQI
- student surveys, student participation
- Claremont College Observations

- QAP-Quality Action Plan, Culture and Climate surveys, STEAM Observation tools
- Google, survey monkey, another program used by the district
- Agency Observation form
- Google survey
- surveys
- Google survey that combines the above tools and rubrics
- We created a tool based on several of these tools that was more clear and accessible to our frontline staff.
- Organization developed surveys and assessments
- CDE Quality Program Improvement Plan
- on site- observations/ interviews/ surveys
- survey the students and parents
- District Created formative tool
- Qualitative data with student engagement
- In-house developed survey
- erc/cqi
- teacher survey, parent survey, student survey, (2) classroom connection forms
- Surveys

Q14. Why did your program/site choose this self-assessment tool?

*Headline: The most common reasons cited for tool selection were ease of use and/or interpretation (7 responses) and the tool's specific alignment to the EXLD Quality Standards (7 responses).*

Responses included:

- We will use the QCASP to guide our planning and observation process. We are plan the observation process and reflection with this our team. We have modified some of the summer questions to fit in the school year. It is lengthy but it supports and fits with our program well.
- PAST PRACTICES
- Only known resource to use for this process
- Partners
- N/A
- They are the tools I am familiar with
- The program was easy to follow and access.
- The TA support provided if needed to train staff - Ease of use and clarity of the functions
- I am not sure.
- It is user friendly.
- Just Because it's an after-school program and most of the time it's when we collect our data.
- For continuous monitoring
- Easy to access.
- Chosen for us by SDCOE (consortium)
- Based on the specific needs of our site and community.
- Familiarity, have received training from CAN
- It has strong components
- I believe because it's our go-to.
- We feel it is important to see what the environment projects
- This was provided to us from out Redwood Afterschool Network
- Easy to use, familiarity
- It was already in place when I was hired. We are a CA based company also.
- The program assessments that we are using were selected because they are helpful tools that can be used to conduct a program assessment.
- Woodcraft Rangers has developed internal assessment tools.
- Recommended by CDE
- It aligns with the CQI.
- I am unsure, its what was given to us to do. We were trained on how to use it to collect information.
- The organization chose Claremont Observations
- Easy to follow
- Organization wide protocol
- this program provides and supports intentional opportunities
- This Tool is available and easily accessible and aligned to our quality standards.
- It is the tool that the site has been using to measure growth.
- It was the highest recommended/ best practice offered by LACOE.
- To help align with the CQI process
- Developing our own tool fits our needs better, also it feeds into our database for us to easily create a report for reporting purposes.
- Ease of survey issuance and data collection, as well as it being the most rigorous research based school survey tool
- To continuously improve our afterschool programs in elementary and middle schools throughout the school districts in San Leandro and San Lorenzo.
- YPQA
- It gives an overlay of all that we focus on and provides us with a guide as to what our sites need to work on.
- Was aligned best with the quality standards

- part of guidelines
- We are new to the Expanded Learning programs and this seemed like the best one.
- I was specifically training on how to write and use these tools by the people who created them.
- To narrow in on key areas we felt as a team needed to be focused on.
- We were involved in the writing of the foundational document so it was a natural fit that works well for us.
- We have used them in the past.
- It is accessible to all
- Affiliation with Boys & Girls Clubs of America (we are a Boys & Girls Club)
- One is a BGCA tool for assessment the other is one we developed for our use
- Ease of use and is the most appropriate as we are in California
- City mandated
- We have used it since the beginning, and it seems to help us breakdown our plan for the year into smaller bites.
- Recommended by regional
- we work with our partner organizations to determine appropriate tools
- To ensure that we are aligned with the guidelines for the state
- We use this document throughout the organization.
- We adopted the PQA and the YPQI model in 2012. We are transitioning to the SEL PQA for 2023-24SY.
- It's a district wide tool
- More thorough assessment value - Survey questions are specifically aligned with Quality Standards.
- to support intentional opportunities for students to play a meaningful role in program design that provides ongoing access to authentic leadership roles
- We have used this assessment in the past.
- used existing resource and what we knew
- We wanted to align to our district dashboard so we can compare data between students in and out of expanded learning and the impacts of each program
- It had the closest alignment to what we wanted to observe.
- Available to us.
- It is straight forward and easy to use
- we like developing our own tools to meet our unique needs, designed based on best practices in resources provided by CAN, CDE and TA providers including SSEL, ASAP Connect and CalSAC.
- We feel we are comfortable using this tool
- To improve our programs and staff. To best provide resources
- The tools above were the items that were presented to us in a training session.
- They have a great understanding of a high functioning expanded learning program and the tools are easy to use.
- depended on previous years outcomes. We want to compare our tool from before the pandemic.
- It is easy to use.
- We have used it historically.
- it is used by BGCA and have staff trained to follow.
- It is easy to follow and easy to understand for front-line staff
- It is what we originally used
- ExCEL designed the QAP - Quality Action Plan tool for our District/CBO after school partnership. STEAM Observation tool is designed to support STEAM implementation and design for our afterschool programs.
- All tools provided by the CDE Expanded Learning Day Programs are research-based and align with our practices for creating, monitoring, assessing and evaluation a quality extended learning day program.
- Easy to use
- We've used it in the past and is a quick and easy way to gather data from stakeholders and easy to get results.
- It most accurately aligns to our program requirements.
- user friendly. consistency. informative.
- This tool offers a link to an assessment understood by stakeholders.
- These tools were the most comprehensive tools available that had trainings provided. CAN provided several workshops and office hours to support program staff to better understand the concept of CQI.
- We use a lot of parent and student surveys as well as California quality assessment

- It is what our provider uses with all their sites
- Alignment with CA needs. User friendly.
- It was recommended by our regional lead and appeared to be the most useful.
- This is what our county office suggests we use.
- Easy to use with clear language
- Internal surveys
- We can navigate this form the best.
- Closely aligned to what we care about and want to measure
- Used a variety of different evaluation tools over the years
- District selected based on need for communication with governing board
- CAN-QSA- Age appropriate, wide range OST- age appropriate, program quality
- Our program partner uses this self-assessment tool.
- I did not know that the other tools existed. We used the CAN when it was developed but I thought it was a one time tool.
- These are most aligned with our program model.
- Recommended
- Familiarity
- Leadership decision
- The tool is easy to use.

Q15. You mentioned earlier that you were familiar with your program's/site's quality improvement plan. Please tell us who is carrying out the work of the continuous quality improvement plan.

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q3 to be "Slightly Familiar" or higher)

*Headline: All respondent groups at least Somewhat Agreed that all respondent groups were involved in carrying out their program's/site's quality improvement plan.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
I am involved with carrying out our quality improvement plan.	Mean	3.09	3.50	3.49	3.28	3.01	18.71	<0.01	4; 907
	SE	0.10	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.05			
	n	82	105	343	98	284			
Our grant manager is involved with carrying out our quality improvement plan.	Mean	3.23	3.04	3.02	3.23	3.07	2.05	0.26	4; 906
	SE	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.08	0.05			
	n	81	106	341	99	284			
Our site coordinator is involved with carrying out our quality improvement plan.	Mean	3.65	3.52	3.54	3.46	3.49	1.27	0.47	4; 908
	SE	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.07	0.04			
	n	81	106	344	98	284			
Our frontline staff are involved with carrying out our quality improvement plan.	Mean	3.32	3.38	3.25	3.29	3.30	0.66	0.80	4; 908
	SE	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.04			
	n	81	106	343	99	284			
Our site principal is involved with carrying out our quality improvement plan.	Mean	2.67	2.55	2.64	2.84	2.87	4.11	0.09	4; 907
	SE	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.05			
	n	81	106	343	99	283			
Site teachers are involved with carrying out our quality improvement plan.	Mean	2.35	2.27	2.42	2.63	2.82	12.04	0.01	4; 908
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.05			
	n	81	106	344	99	283			
In my opinion, the right people are involved with carrying out our quality improvement plan.	Mean	3.25	3.08	3.27	3.29	3.32	2.05	0.26	4; 907
	SE	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	81	106	344	98	283			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.



Q16. Do you share information about your program's/site's quality improvement work with other people?

*Headline: All respondent groups other than Frontline Staff reported sharing information about their program's/site's quality improvement work with other people.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
Yes	Mean	78.3%	76.1%	74.6%	56.8%	27.7%	200.89	<0.01	4
	SE	4.5%	4.1%	2.3%	4.7%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

*Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."*

Q17. With whom do you share information about your program's/site's quality improvement work?

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q16 to be "Yes")

*Headline: Most of the sharing of quality improvement work occurred within programs/sites (such as sharing information with Frontline Staff). Information about quality improvement was also shared with Site Principals and families.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
The Expanded Learning Division (EXLD)/California Dept of Education (CDE)	Mean	46.2%	38.6%	20.4%	22.2%	10.6%	36.70	<0.01	4
	SE	6.2%	5.3%	2.5%	5.2%	3.2%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
My program's/site's grant manager	Mean	72.3%	65.1%	62.6%	60.3%	30.9%	38.09	<0.01	4
	SE	5.6%	5.2%	3.0%	6.2%	4.8%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
My site coordinator	Mean	76.9%	86.7%	48.3%	76.2%	81.9%	72.12	<0.01	4
	SE	5.2%	3.7%	3.1%	5.4%	4.0%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Frontline staff at my program/site	Mean	61.5%	73.5%	72.1%	71.4%	67.0%	3.61	0.46	4
	SE	6.0%	4.8%	2.8%	5.7%	4.8%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Other program/site	Mean	21.5%	26.5%	30.2%	30.2%	24.5%	2.85	0.58	4
	SE	5.1%	4.8%	2.8%	5.8%	4.4%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Parents, guardians, families	Mean	50.8%	37.3%	37.0%	47.6%	26.6%	12.36	0.01	4
	SE	6.2%	5.3%	3.0%	6.3%	4.6%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Students	Mean	30.8%	30.1%	35.1%	44.4%	33.0%	3.92	0.42	4
	SE	5.7%	5.0%	2.9%	6.3%	4.8%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Site principal	Mean	69.2%	68.7%	57.7%	55.6%	33.0%	30.88	<0.01	4
	SE	5.7%	5.1%	3.0%	6.3%	4.8%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Site teachers	Mean	32.3%	33.7%	30.2%	25.4%	21.3%	4.70	0.32	4
	SE	5.8%	5.2%	2.8%	5.5%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Local schools	Mean	9.2%	12.0%	4.9%	15.9%	0.0%	9.90	0.02	3
	SE	3.6%	3.6%	1.3%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
School board of directors	Mean	46.2%	30.1%	13.6%	12.7%	6.4%	50.12	<0.01	4
	SE	6.2%	5.0%	2.1%	4.2%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			
Other organization or community member/group: (see below)	Mean	18.5%	13.3%	5.3%	4.8%	1.1%	22.91	<0.01	4
	SE	4.8%	3.7%	1.4%	2.7%	1.1%			
	<i>n</i>	65	83	265	63	94			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."

Other organization or community member/group responses:

- academic coach
- excel
- partners
- third party vendors
- Community Partners
- BGCKC
- District cabinet members, including my boss.
- county office of education

- Agencies we work with: Boys & Girls Clubs, YMCA, Peoples' Self-Help Housing
- District Leaders
- District Supervisors
- HCOE
- California Afterschool Network (CAN)
- Director of Operations of our organizations
- District Staff
- Trinity County Office of Education
- City of Sacramento
- Directors/program managers
- Community members who help financially with our programs
- Community School Directors, SCOWs
- Site Liaison
- Region 2 Directors, County Superintendents, other county program directors
- School Board of Trustees
- Organization board of directors and development team
- supervisor
- Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, Mendocino Youth Project (community partners)
- YMCA of Orange County
- CBO Directorss, Program Managers
- District staff
- The City of Fontana operates the Fontana Expanded Learning Program, we share this information with City Administration.
- Tribal Education Departments
- grant managers

Q18. I share information about my program's/site's quality improvement work through the following:  
(Skip logic requires the answer to Q16 to be "Yes" and the respondent to be either GM or PD)

*Headline: The most common way of sharing program/site quality improvement information was through meetings with program/site staff.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Meetings with people who work at my site/program	Mean	95.4%	95.2%				0.00	0.95	1
	SE	2.6%	2.4%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
Meetings with people who do not work at my site/program (families, teachers, school leaders, etc.)	Mean	56.9%	48.2%				1.12	0.29	1
	SE	6.1%	5.5%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
Emails	Mean	55.4%	53.0%				0.08	0.77	1
	SE	6.2%	5.5%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
Social media	Mean	20.0%	12.0%				1.74	0.19	1
	SE	5.0%	3.6%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
My site's/program's website	Mean	30.8%	13.3%				6.74	<0.01	1
	SE	5.7%	3.7%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
Newsletters	Mean	21.5%	25.3%				0.29	0.59	1
	SE	5.1%	4.8%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
School site council	Mean	23.1%	9.6%				5.00	0.03	1
	SE	5.2%	3.2%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
English Learner Advisory Council	Mean	21.5%	4.8%				9.77	<0.01	1
	SE	5.1%	2.4%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
My organization's annual report	Mean	29.2%	24.1%				0.49	0.48	1
	SE	5.6%	4.7%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
Another website or service: (see below)	Mean	4.6%	6.0%				0.14	0.71	1
	SE	2.6%	2.6%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						
Informal conversations with other people	Mean	16.9%	27.7%				2.45	0.12	1
	SE	4.7%	4.9%						
	<i>n</i>	65	83						

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."

Another website or service responses:

- California Expanded Learning School of Facilitation and Leadership group
- Board meeting
- county website
- Board of Trustees
- staff meetings
- Different at each school site
- www.sccsc.org

Q19a. Please tell us what you and others know about your program's/site's continuous quality improvement (CQI) work:

*Headline: No respondent group Strongly Agreed that they knew everything they needed to know about their program's/site's CQI work, but respondents did not report that others knew more than they did about the CQI work.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
I know everything I need to know about my program's/site's continuous quality improvement (CQI) work.	Mean	2.73	2.92	2.93	2.75	2.54	10.00	0.02	4; 991
	SE	0.10	0.09	0.04	0.08	0.05			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
Other people at my program/site know more about our CQI work than I do.	Mean	2.63	2.34	2.38	2.62	2.79	10.13	0.02	4; 990
	SE	0.11	0.10	0.05	0.09	0.05			
	n	83	109	354	110	339			
Information about our CQI work is regularly shared with me.	Mean	2.95	2.85	2.89	2.80	2.62	5.10	0.06	4; 991
	SE	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
I have easy access to data about our CQI work.	Mean	2.98	2.99	2.94	2.82	2.49	13.97	<0.01	4; 991
	SE	0.10	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
Other people at my program/site have easy access to data about our CQI work.	Mean	2.92	2.78	2.65	2.74	2.66	2.18	0.23	4; 991
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
I know who to go to for more information about our CQI work.	Mean	3.39	3.18	3.20	3.10	2.93	6.43	0.04	4; 990
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.05			
	n	83	109	354	110	339			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.

19b. From whom do you learn or receive information about continuous quality improvement?

*Headline: Most site staff (other than Site Coordinators) learned about CQI from Site Coordinators. Site Coordinators themselves most commonly learned about CQI from grant management staff. Grant Managers most commonly learned about CQI from EXLD.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
My program's/site's grant management staff	Mean	55.4%	53.2%	68.5%	52.3%	34.8%	80.54	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.5%	4.7%	2.6%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My site coordinators	Mean	57.8%	38.5%	35.5%	61.3%	72.0%	108.11	<0.01	4
	SE	5.4%	4.7%	2.5%	4.6%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My frontline staff	Mean	32.5%	13.8%	16.9%	23.4%	22.1%	13.94	<0.01	4
	SE	5.1%	3.3%	2.0%	4.0%	2.3%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Staff at other sites (grant managers, site coordinators, frontline staff)	Mean	21.7%	17.4%	24.8%	28.8%	14.2%	18.01	<0.01	4
	SE	4.5%	3.6%	2.3%	4.3%	1.9%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My school	Mean	16.9%	8.3%	15.2%	19.8%	13.0%	7.41	0.12	4
	SE	4.1%	2.6%	1.9%	3.8%	1.8%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My school district	Mean	19.3%	22.0%	20.8%	18.9%	15.6%	4.00	0.41	4
	SE	4.3%	4.0%	2.2%	3.7%	2.0%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My County Office of Education	Mean	43.4%	36.7%	13.2%	13.5%	5.3%	101.86	<0.01	4
	SE	5.4%	4.6%	1.8%	3.2%	1.2%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
My region or system of support (SSEL)	Mean	38.6%	30.3%	11.0%	9.9%	1.2%	123.73	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.4%	1.7%	2.8%	0.6%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
California Department of Education / Expanded Learning Division (EXLD)	Mean	60.2%	51.4%	14.9%	14.4%	6.2%	177.42	<0.01	4
	SE	5.4%	4.8%	1.9%	3.3%	1.3%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
California Afterschool Network (CAN)	Mean	51.8%	47.7%	16.3%	15.3%	3.8%	163.33	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.0%	3.4%	1.0%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
ASAPConnect	Mean	8.4%	12.8%	1.4%	1.8%	0.3%	44.49	<0.01	4
	SE	3.1%	3.2%	0.6%	1.3%	0.3%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Other organization or program: (see below)	Mean	4.8%	3.7%	4.5%	1.8%	0.6%	13.91	<0.01	4
	SE	2.4%	1.8%	1.1%	1.3%	0.4%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
None/don't know	Mean	6.0%	5.5%	5.1%	9.9%	17.7%	34.65	<0.01	4
	SE	2.6%	2.2%	1.2%	2.8%	2.1%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."

Other organization or program responses:

- BACR Management
- DCYF
- my program specialist
- AL
- SENIOR DIRECTOR, VARIOUS MANAGERS FROM THE OFFICE WHEN WE HAVE TRAININGS OR SUPERVISOR MEETINGS

- No one
- The Educational Resource Consultants (ERC) because they are contracted with our school district, as an outside evaluator.
- Claremont university
- Site Director
- ProYouth main office staff
- QAC
- My Regional Leaders and Business POD
- BGCA NYOI (National Youth Outcomes Initiative) Survey
- My Program Manager
- Supervisor/Directors/Administrators
- Regional Lead - Region II Colleagues
- SOS
- My Quality Assurance Coach
- Site Supervisor
- Sacramento Chinese Community Service Center
- LEARN
- Quality Assurance Coach

Q20. I received training about continuous quality improvement since I started working in this position.

*Headline: While most respondents reported receiving CQI training at some point, sizable minorities of all respondent groups reported not receiving such training or being unsure whether they received such training.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	33.7%	30.3%	15.2%	13.5%	10.0%	40.14	<0.01	4
	SE	5.2%	4.4%	1.9%	3.2%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Yes	Mean	60.2%	58.7%	72.4%	52.3%	47.2%	48.89	<0.01	4
	SE	5.4%	4.7%	2.4%	4.7%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	6.0%	11.0%	12.4%	34.2%	42.8%	124.70	<0.01	4
	SE	2.6%	3.0%	1.7%	4.5%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.



Q21. I have received training about continuous quality improvement within the last 12 months.  
 (Skip logic requires the answer to Q20 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Of those who ever received CQI training, most received it in the last 12 months.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	30.0%	31.3%	7.8%	12.1%	3.1%	49.01	<0.01	4
	SE	6.5%	5.8%	1.7%	4.3%	1.4%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Yes	Mean	70.0%	67.2%	89.9%	82.8%	88.8%	27.27	<0.01	4
	SE	6.5%	5.9%	1.9%	5.0%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	0.0%	1.6%	2.3%	5.2%	8.1%	9.06	0.03	3
	SE		1.6%	0.9%	2.9%	2.2%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.

Q22. The training about continuous quality improvement I received addressed:

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q20 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Of those who received CQI training, most reported that they were trained on the Quality Standards for Expanded Learning and CQI in general (rather than a specific skill).*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Quality Standards for Expanded Learning	Mean	90.0%	92.2%	87.2%	65.5%	77.5%	23.46	<0.01	4
	SE	4.2%	3.4%	2.1%	6.2%	3.3%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Continuous Quality Improvement or quality improvement	Mean	86.0%	84.4%	77.8%	53.4%	55.6%	43.59	<0.01	4
	SE	4.9%	4.5%	2.6%	6.5%	3.9%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Organizing a Continuous Quality Improvement Cycle (Assess phase, Plan phase, Improvement phase)	Mean	68.0%	59.4%	47.5%	32.8%	31.9%	31.77	<0.01	4
	SE	6.6%	6.1%	3.1%	6.2%	3.7%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Writing a quality improvement plan	Mean	44.0%	51.6%	51.4%	39.7%	38.1%	8.83	0.07	4
	SE	7.0%	6.2%	3.1%	6.4%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Collecting data for Continuous Quality Improvement	Mean	48.0%	50.0%	43.2%	32.8%	20.6%	31.70	<0.01	4
	SE	7.1%	6.3%	3.1%	6.2%	3.2%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Training people at my program/site on Continuous Quality Improvement	Mean	42.0%	45.3%	37.7%	32.8%	20.6%	20.36	<0.01	4
	SE	7.0%	6.2%	3.0%	6.2%	3.2%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Carrying out a Continuous Quality Improvement cycle	Mean	40.0%	51.6%	38.1%	24.1%	20.6%	27.51	<0.01	4
	SE	6.9%	6.2%	3.0%	5.6%	3.2%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Using data to determine if we are meeting our Continuous Quality Improvement goals	Mean	40.0%	26.6%	31.9%	24.1%	15.6%	18.98	<0.01	4
	SE	6.9%	5.5%	2.9%	5.6%	2.9%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Other Continuous Quality Improvement topic: (see below)	Mean	2.0%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.3%	0.33	0.85	2
	SE	2.0%		0.9%		0.9%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
None of the above.	Mean	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	3.4%	0.6%	2.53	0.28	2
	SE			0.5%	2.4%	0.6%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	2.0%	0.0%	1.2%	15.5%	10.6%	29.10	<0.01	3
	SE	2.0%		0.7%	4.8%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other Continuous Quality Improvement topic responses:

- PSOT
- Meetings discussions on how to improve on our program.
- CAN Trainers

Q23. I received the training on continuous quality improvement from:

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q23 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Most Grant Managers received their CQI training from CAN or from County Offices of Education. Most Site Coordinators were trained by Grant Managers, and most Frontline Staff were trained by Site Coordinators.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
CAN	Mean	52.0%	28.1%	18.3%	20.7%	6.9%	49.71	<0.01	4
	SE	7.1%	5.6%	2.4%	5.3%	2.0%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
ASAPConnect	Mean	14.0%	14.1%	2.7%	1.7%	2.5%	20.99	<0.01	4
	SE	4.9%	4.3%	1.0%	1.7%	1.2%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
CalSAC	Mean	14.0%	9.4%	14.4%	8.6%	12.5%	2.38	0.67	4
	SE	4.9%	3.6%	2.2%	3.7%	2.6%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
STEAM Hub/Community of Practice	Mean	12.0%	12.5%	11.7%	17.2%	11.9%	1.31	0.86	4
	SE	4.6%	4.1%	2.0%	5.0%	2.6%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
County Office of Education	Mean	60.0%	46.9%	17.9%	19.0%	13.1%	63.29	<0.01	4
	SE	6.9%	6.2%	2.4%	5.1%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Other community-based organization: (see below)	Mean	4.0%	4.7%	5.8%	1.7%	3.8%	2.58	0.63	4
	SE	2.8%	2.6%	1.5%	1.7%	1.5%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Other technical assistance provider: (see below)	Mean	8.0%	9.4%	1.6%	0.0%	1.3%	13.14	<0.01	3
	SE	3.8%	3.6%	0.8%		0.9%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
My program/site grant manager	Mean	22.0%	25.0%	66.5%	46.6%	36.9%	72.70	<0.01	4
	SE	5.9%	5.4%	2.9%	6.5%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
My site coordinator	Mean	6.0%	9.4%	24.1%	32.8%	60.0%	99.42	<0.01	4
	SE	3.4%	3.6%	2.7%	6.2%	3.9%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			
Other: (see below)	Mean	10.0%	6.3%	6.6%	6.9%	4.4%	2.19	0.70	4
	SE	4.2%	3.0%	1.6%	3.3%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	50	64	257	58	160			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other community-based organization responses:

- DCYF
- RFTS
- EduCare Foundation Site Coordinator Training series
- BGCSL
- Boys & Girls Clubs of America
- LEARN
- Grant manager
- CA Site Coordinator Network
- In house training
- Claremont College
- True Curriculum
- Sacramento Chinese Community Service Center
- training from the person that was in my position prior to me.

Other technical assistance responses:

- My Quality Assurance Coach at THINK Together
- Region 3 TA
- The ERC.
- Claremont
- I can't remember who
- Region One
- CDE ASES Video Tutorial as condition of receiving grant
- Regional Leads / CDE Support
- via regional 3 TA and related meetings, which are fantastic
- Region 4

Other responses:

- Learn PREP
- not sure
- LEARN
- staff development department at LEARN
- Region 5 manager
- I work at a county office and my training was done by CAN.
- Professional development at Organization
- LMS
- Training department
- Previous TOSA for ASES
- I don't know or remember
- Self review
- My Program Manager
- DPO (Director of Program and Operations)
- Director of PBVUSD extended learning department
- District director/ QAC
- Regional Lead
- Boost Conference, Region 2 conference
- supervisor
- TRUSD
- Not sure
- cqi website and bgca
- School District
- Regional Lead
- CTFF Liaisons
- School District
- EGUSD
- Not sure

Q24. I need more training about continuous quality improvement.

*Headline: Most respondent groups reported needing more training in CQI. Frontline Staff were uncertain about needing more CQI training.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	36.1%	33.0%	29.0%	25.2%	19.5%	16.39	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.5%	2.4%	4.1%	2.2%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Yes	Mean	50.6%	51.4%	54.6%	53.2%	40.7%	15.02	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.6%	4.7%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	13.3%	15.6%	16.3%	21.6%	39.8%	64.72	<0.01	4
	SE	3.7%	3.5%	2.0%	3.9%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	83	109	355	111	339			

*Note:* Results reported as % of respondents marking the response option.

Q25. What do you need more training about?  
 (Skip logic requires the answer to Q24 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Those who reported needing more CQI training wanted training on how to collect and use data for CQI and train other people in CQI.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Quality Standards for Expanded Learning	Mean	45.2%	41.1%	52.1%	59.3%	45.7%	5.51	0.24	4
	SE	7.7%	6.6%	3.6%	6.4%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)	Mean	54.8%	58.9%	50.5%	59.3%	50.0%	2.77	0.60	4
	SE	7.7%	6.6%	3.6%	6.4%	4.3%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Organizing a Continuous Quality Improvement Cycle (Assess phase, Plan phase, Improvement phase)	Mean	47.6%	57.1%	50.5%	59.3%	44.2%	5.17	0.27	4
	SE	7.7%	6.6%	3.6%	6.4%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Identifying standards to focus on in the Continuous Quality Improvement plan	Mean	35.7%	41.1%	45.9%	47.5%	41.3%	2.28	0.69	4
	SE	7.4%	6.6%	3.6%	6.5%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Writing a Continuous Quality Improvement plan	Mean	57.1%	55.4%	51.5%	42.4%	41.3%	6.80	0.15	4
	SE	7.6%	6.6%	3.6%	6.4%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Collecting data for Continuous Quality Improvement	Mean	66.7%	64.3%	46.9%	54.2%	40.6%	15.47	<0.01	4
	SE	7.3%	6.4%	3.6%	6.5%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Training people at my program/site on Continuous Quality Improvement	Mean	61.9%	67.9%	60.8%	49.2%	31.2%	38.24	<0.01	4
	SE	7.5%	6.2%	3.5%	6.5%	3.9%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Carrying out a Continuous Quality Improvement cycle	Mean	47.6%	57.1%	42.8%	44.1%	42.8%	4.12	0.39	4
	SE	7.7%	6.6%	3.6%	6.5%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Using data to determine if we are meeting our Continuous Quality Improvement goals	Mean	64.3%	60.7%	48.5%	50.8%	35.5%	17.13	<0.01	4
	SE	7.4%	6.5%	3.6%	6.5%	4.1%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
Other Continuous Quality Improvement topic: (see below)	Mean	7.1%	8.9%	4.6%	10.2%	3.6%	4.58	0.33	4
	SE	4.0%	3.8%	1.5%	3.9%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			
I'm not sure what specific topic I need more training on.	Mean	4.8%	7.1%	7.2%	11.9%	24.6%	25.45	<0.01	4
	SE	3.3%	3.4%	1.9%	4.2%	3.7%			
	<i>n</i>	42	56	194	59	138			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other Continuous Quality Improvement topic responses:

- Developing a CQI tool for sites
- More in depth
- Any continuing training would just help to expand my knowledge base.
- Use of a rubric to clarify current status of improvement cycles
- continuous training is always a good idea

Q26. Please tell us about the value and relevance of continuous quality improvement work for your job at your program/site.

*Headline: Most respondent groups at least Somewhat Agreed that quality improvement was a top priority for themselves and for their program/site. Most respondent groups further Somewhat Agreed that CQI had resulted in significant improvements.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	F	p	df
Quality improvement is a top priority for me in my work.	Mean	3.35	3.54	3.45	3.37	3.40	1.46	0.40	4; 991
	SE	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
Quality improvement is a top priority in my program/site.	Mean	3.40	3.51	3.45	3.37	3.38	1.17	0.51	4; 991
	SE	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
Those who provide me with information about quality improvement understand the context and particular needs of my program/site.	Mean	3.25	3.17	3.26	3.25	3.22	0.31	0.99	4; 991
	SE	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
My program/site has the authority to implement quality improvement in a way that makes sense for us.	Mean	3.41	3.49	3.32	3.34	3.27	2.28	0.22	4; 991
	SE	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
The continuous quality improvement process has resulted in significant improvements to my program/site.	Mean	3.04	3.22	3.18	3.18	3.19	0.91	0.65	4; 989
	SE	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	354	110	338			
The time we spend on continuous quality improvement is well-spent.	Mean	3.24	3.33	3.19	3.21	3.19	0.86	0.67	4; 991
	SE	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
I am satisfied with the <b>amount</b> of time my program/site spends on quality improvement.	Mean	2.88	2.96	3.00	3.10	3.11	2.03	0.26	4; 991
	SE	0.09	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.

Q27. Please tell us about the impact of continuous quality improvement on your work.

*Headline: Respondents overall reported that CQI helped them learn new things, change their personal practice, achieve program quality improvements, and engage more youth.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
Through the quality improvement process, I've learned things I didn't know before.	Mean	3.13	3.24	3.26	3.25	3.12	1.86	0.29	4; 991
	SE	0.09	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
I've made changes to my practice based on our quality improvement process.	Mean	3.18	3.30	3.32	3.23	3.14	2.91	0.15	4; 991
	SE	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
As a result of our program's participation in the quality improvement process, I gained relevant knowledge and/or developed valuable skills.	Mean	3.11	3.21	3.27	3.25	3.10	2.51	0.19	4; 991
	SE	0.09	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
As a result of our program's participation in the quality improvement process, the quality of programming improved at my sites.	Mean	3.14	3.31	3.26	3.19	3.12	2.34	0.21	4; 991
	SE	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
As a result of our participation in the quality improvement process, youth are more engaged in our program.	Mean	3.04	3.27	3.23	3.18	3.12	2.18	0.23	4; 991
	SE	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	109	355	110	339			
As a result of our participation in the quality improvement process, youth attendance has improved.	Mean	2.89	3.04	3.05	2.97	2.99	0.93	0.63	4; 989
	SE	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	107	355	110	339			
As a result of our program's participation in the quality improvement system, youth have developed skills.	Mean	2.99	3.24	3.23	3.18	3.17	1.92	0.28	4; 990
	SE	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04			
	n	83	108	355	110	339			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.



Q28. Our program is in a STEAM Community of Practice or Hub. (There are 16 formal regional STEAM Communities of Practice/STEAM Hubs across the state, based out of county offices of education.)

*Headline: Relatively few programs were part of a STEAM Community of Practice or Hub. Most site staff were not sure whether their sites were part of a STEAM Community of Practice or Hub.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No, and we never have been.	Mean	20.0%	15.7%	9.2%	8.5%	2.7%	35.28	<0.01	4
	SE	4.5%	3.5%	1.5%	2.7%	0.9%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	348	106	331			
Yes, we are.	Mean	16.3%	22.2%	12.4%	18.9%	11.2%	10.66	0.03	4
	SE	4.1%	4.0%	1.8%	3.8%	1.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	348	106	331			
No, but we used to be.	Mean	5.0%	13.0%	1.7%	0.9%	0.9%	32.68	<0.01	4
	SE	2.4%	3.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.5%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	348	106	331			
No, but our program is interested in knowing more about it.	Mean	25.0%	17.6%	12.4%	8.5%	6.3%	26.05	<0.01	4
	SE	4.8%	3.7%	1.8%	2.7%	1.3%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	348	106	331			
Not sure/don't know.	Mean	33.8%	31.5%	64.4%	63.2%	78.9%	111.19	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.5%	2.6%	4.7%	2.2%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	348	106	331			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.

Q29. Please tell us about the role of the STEAM Community of Practice/Hub.

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q28 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Those who were part of a STEAM CoP/Hub broadly agreed that the CoP/Hub helped build capacity, provide support and tools, and connect programs to regional partners.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
The STEAM Community of Practice/Hub helps build our capacity to provide high-quality learning at our site.	Mean	3.62	3.38	3.49	3.60	3.49	0.44	0.94	4; 132
	SE	0.14	0.16	0.10	0.13	0.11			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
The support I receive from the STEAM Community of Practice/Hub is beneficial to our program.	Mean	3.54	3.38	3.56	3.60	3.41	0.61	0.83	4; 132
	SE	0.14	0.15	0.08	0.15	0.13			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
I rely on the information I get from the STEAM Community of Practice/Hub in my job.	Mean	3.08	3.21	3.40	3.35	3.30	0.60	0.84	4; 132
	SE	0.29	0.13	0.10	0.18	0.12			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
The STEAM Community of Practice/Hub connects my program to regional partners (businesses, museums, colleges).	Mean	3.38	3.13	3.19	3.25	3.19	0.29	0.99	4; 132
	SE	0.18	0.15	0.12	0.14	0.13			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
The STEAM tools and strategies we use in my program come from the STEAM Community of Practice/Hub.	Mean	3.31	3.17	3.44	3.40	3.38	0.69	0.78	4; 132
	SE	0.21	0.16	0.08	0.15	0.12			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.

Q30. The STEAM Community of Practice/Hub has provided my program/site with:  
 (Skip logic requires the answer to Q28 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: The most common supports received by staff who were part of a STEAM CoP/Hub were professional development, opportunities to collaborate, and high-quality STEAM learning activities.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Professional development	Mean	84.6%	79.2%	72.1%	55.0%	54.1%	8.25	0.08	4
	SE	10.0%	8.3%	6.8%	11.1%	8.2%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Opportunities to collaborate with other programs/sites	Mean	84.6%	79.2%	58.1%	55.0%	35.1%	17.00	<0.01	4
	SE	10.0%	8.3%	7.5%	11.1%	7.8%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
High-quality STEAM learning activities	Mean	76.9%	70.8%	60.5%	60.0%	64.9%	1.84	0.77	4
	SE	11.7%	9.3%	7.5%	11.0%	7.8%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Instructional resources	Mean	76.9%	45.8%	30.2%	30.0%	35.1%	10.59	0.03	4
	SE	11.7%	10.2%	7.0%	10.2%	7.8%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Other: (see below)	Mean	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	5.0%	2.7%	0.31	0.85	2
	SE			2.3%	4.9%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
None of the above	Mean	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	0.96	0.33	1
	SE		5.6%			2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other responses:

- N/A

Q31. With which STEAM disciplines has the STEAM Community of Practice/Hub supported your program/site?  
(Skip logic requires the answer to Q28 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Those who were part of a STEAM CoP/Hub reported broad discipline support across all STEAM disciplines.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
Science	Mean	84.6%	75.0%	69.8%	55.0%	73.0%	3.91	0.42	4
	SE	10.0%	8.8%	7.0%	11.1%	7.3%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Technology	Mean	84.6%	54.2%	51.2%	50.0%	56.8%	5.61	0.23	4
	SE	10.0%	10.2%	7.6%	11.2%	8.1%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Engineering	Mean	76.9%	58.3%	58.1%	45.0%	51.4%	3.90	0.42	4
	SE	11.7%	10.1%	7.5%	11.1%	8.2%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Arts (visual arts, dance, theatre, music, media arts)	Mean	69.2%	58.3%	76.7%	45.0%	86.5%	13.35	<0.01	4
	SE	12.8%	10.1%	6.4%	11.1%	5.6%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Mathematics	Mean	46.2%	41.7%	37.2%	35.0%	56.8%	3.98	0.41	4
	SE	13.8%	10.1%	7.4%	10.7%	8.1%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Integrated STEAM approach	Mean	61.5%	50.0%	41.9%	35.0%	24.3%	7.72	0.10	4
	SE	13.5%	10.2%	7.5%	10.7%	7.1%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Other discipline: (see below)	Mean	7.7%	4.2%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.20	0.90	2
	SE	7.4%	4.1%		4.9%				
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other discipline responses:

- 5 E's lesson format. How to use open ended questions to promote exploration.
- Environmental Education & Literacy
- General

Q32. What Community of Practice/Hub activities have you participated in during the last year?  
 (Skip logic requires the answer to Q28 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Virtual and in-person training were the most common CoP/Hub activities among those who were part of a STEAM CoP/Hub.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Community of practice convenings	Mean	53.8%	50.0%	16.3%	5.0%	27.0%	19.29	<0.01	4
	SE	13.8%	10.2%	5.6%	4.9%	7.3%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
In-person training	Mean	69.2%	50.0%	44.2%	55.0%	73.0%	8.22	0.08	4
	SE	12.8%	10.2%	7.6%	11.1%	7.3%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Virtual training (videoconference convenings, etc.)	Mean	69.2%	66.7%	39.5%	65.0%	37.8%	10.62	0.03	4
	SE	12.8%	9.6%	7.5%	10.7%	8.0%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Online learning	Mean	46.2%	25.0%	27.9%	40.0%	37.8%	3.01	0.56	4
	SE	13.8%	8.8%	6.8%	11.0%	8.0%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
Other professional development: (see below)	Mean	7.7%	16.7%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	2.62	0.27	2
	SE	7.4%	7.6%	3.2%					
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			
None of the above	Mean	7.7%	4.2%	20.9%	5.0%	5.4%	7.40	0.12	4
	SE	7.4%	4.1%	6.2%	4.9%	3.7%			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	37			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other professional development responses:

- STEAM on-site training from Steam hub rep
- Remix Conference
- CAELI
- in regional meetings connected to UCR Extension 4H

Other activities:

- QUEST session orientation training
- I’ve sent my frontline staff to in person trainings to report back to our team

Q33. Based on the information you've received from the STEAM Community of Practice/Hub, how would you describe high-quality STEAM out-of-school time learning?

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q28 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Among those who are part of a STEAM CoP/Hub, the most common definitions for high-quality STEAM out-of-school time learning focused on student engagement or involvement (42 responses) and the amount of learning from the activity (15 responses).*

- The best
- It would look like students having access to google classrooms that are rich with the materials and supports for Steam. Also, Providing students with long term projects that they can work on sections of the program at home
- programming that is highly engaging, kids love, active and collaborative
- It is great because our students get to think outside the box
- STEAM activities that students are engaged in
- na
- N/A
- As a great resource for our program
- Relatable and growth. The youth is the future.
- Somewhat of the ground but not fully.
- To be honest there is no information from the STEAM Community of Practice and therefore their has been none of their implement but i am personally interested in the STEAM community as i am an educator and part of the STEAM program. I would describe high-quality STEAM out of school time learning as practicing and creating projects that involve science, technology, engineering, art and mathematics. There would also be opportunities of learning from experts in the STEAM program in school visits, field trips, and in our programs.
- Amazing, we have great support
- I would describe it as an opportunity for children to participate in learning-centered activities that are fun, organized, and recreational and that provide enrichment in a variety of subjects including math, science, technology, engineering, and art.
- The students take what they know and practice it outside of school and it helps develop their skills.
- Our training is not through them.
- The kids enjoy the science bus that come once a month and creat a steam project together to take home
- Higher quality, need more kits and easy to package activities
- Great learning opportunities to pass on to front line staff. Strategies on facilitating an engaging lesson for students. Subjects that grab students attention.
- The best description for high quality out-of-school learning would be a program that includes activities that specifically promote problem solving and exploration and utilizes the 5E's planning format. It should include the delivery of activities that result in student exploration and student feedback. Instructors should be well-versed in the development of these typed of activities and be able to ask open-ended questions throughout the activity to promote exploration and evaluation.
- Fun, engaging, resourceful, learning in disguise.
- Interaction between students and staff has increased student appreciation for learning. It engages their thought patterns and opens pathways of new interest for students
- quality education that focuses on the child's social, emotional, mental, physical, and cognitive development.
- Beneficial to all students but lacking at our site
- I would describe it as a necessity.
- Great
- high quality STEAM learning after school at my site is engaging, and enlightening for students
- I like how now it's easier to connect to the school day and there are a lot of resources out there. It is now finding the staff to confidently lead and providing the funding/time to teach them.
- A lot of good programs for the students. Including art, robotics and cool projects like 3d keychain printing with computers.
- 1 to 2 hours
- Thinking outside the box
- To be very helpful

- None
- the activities presented are aligned with the standards that the school staff follow. This makes it easy to incorporate their school work with our projects
- I enjoy doing STEAM with the students during our Expanded Learning hours. It gives students the opportunity to take on new skills
- Its great and kids have fun
- Focus on career interests and knowledge that are tied to STEM/STEAM, I believe more youth would participate in after school programming if it had a career based relationship with the activities and curriculum.
- The steam have been engaging and a good buy in for the population we serve.
- We have slowly incorporated STEAM activities into our program. We will continue to set goals each year to increase the capacity in which students participate in STEAM activities and instruction.
- It helps us engage better with students and there creativities.
- Engaging, hands-on, relative to real life experiences.
- Our issue is being able to go to any trainings to be able to learn anything in the first place so we can bring back ideas to our sites. Especially with all the new staff we have. In the past when even I was able to learn things from STEAM hub trainings I was able to get some good notes and share out with the team. They are open to try new things.
- This is a great opportunity for students to get to practice some science and math at home
- Very informative and needed for our program.
- The school sites all have access to STEAM activities and resources. All the school sites are incorporating some curriculum and hands on activities for kids.
- "use of critical thinking and
- analysis skills displayed by decision making"
- Activities that attract and are fun to students
- Very practical
- Very beneficial , always finding new ways to learn through steam outside of school
- this programs provides us to learn more to teach students in order to improve in math and other subjects.
- It is an integrated approach (math, science, art , literacy etc) that is hands on and interactive.
- The students feel more confident
- I would do my research and make sure I have the top quality for steam
- Students learn engendering skills and basic motor skills that will trigger a positive experience with STEAM.
- Students all have different interests and it provides them an opportunity to learn.
- N/A
- hands on learning
- Productive
- Engaging students in the inquiry process and providing ample time to practice the engineering cycle.
- Engaging with kids, being able to direct them to the right resource.
- Great time to connect with other organizations and gather good ideas
- It helps students work as a group
- Good
- Learning from other sites
- Hands-on, engaging, inquiry-based, etc.
- Very good
- An important part of making learning educational and fun, which is more inviting to our students!
- Teaching the students different crafts and activities that will help them astonish ways of art they didn't know how to before. The students are striving and willing to learn new materials each week. They also learn about becoming a team with other peers and brings the community more powerful and strong foundation united.
- Excellent
- beneficial
- Creating different styles of presentation to accommodate students' learning styles.
- Great opportunity & resources for providing high-quality STEAM instruction for youth.
- Hands-on, projected-based, challenges of high interested to students which give them opportunities to problem solve, communicate and collaborate.

- This is a main priority at my site. We value STEAM and implement this in almost 100 percent of our activities.
- Vital to providing experiencing through the lenses of equity for our students.
- engaging/ hands on/collaborative
- Exciting and new! So many of our students love our STEAM club and activities. I think since we are a rural school district, we do not always get access to some of the new technology or labs that are down the hill at bigger schools, and I think it is so important to introduce our students to everything STEAM has to offer.
- We use it in the everyday world whether it's at the store getting change or using your phone as technology
- the lesson is engaging and extends past what happens in the classroom
- very good
- It can be done outside of school time.
- Our students are doing science experiment, engineering etc
- I enjoyed the in person trainings rather than the online training.
- engaging and fun
- no
- Adequate but would benefit in site teachers training as well.
- It really good feed back
- High-Quality STEAM out-of-school time learning is hands-on, minds-on activities that ask students to be problem solvers and use creative thinking. Students are working on authentic problems that are local and/or relevant.
- putting steam approach to work, teaching kids with steam material, making projects and getting trained for each item
- more activities
- When students get involved and having fun with the STEAM activity
- A necessity. It is a continuous journey to implement and design after school programs with a STEAM through line. Many after school sites are participating in amazing lessons/activities but have not identified the practice under the STEAM acronym. High quality STEAM OST or afterschool is essential for both staff and students.
- STEAM in the Expanded Learning program is engaging and allows for creativity, critical thinking, and student voice.
- Very good
- I see it more engaging and fun for students and staff
- Hands on experience
- Encourage youth development of problem-solving and critical thinking skills, as well as skills in innovation.
- It is very interactive for students to learn while they are out of school. It provides various interactive lessons for students to practice their skills they receive during school time.
- This is an emerging practice. Although several years old, there does not appear to be a pathway to distribute information beyond the CoP practitioners.
- Hands-on activities that keep students engaged. Activities with open ended questions and critical thinking components.
- not sure
- Focused learning on STEAM activities that I can take directly to my site and implement/share with my staff
- Its a great opportunity for our students to be creative.
- hands-on demonstrations
- Hands - On PD for frontline staff personal using the curriculum.
- outstanding its a great program, especially for this specific schools site do to the community that it teaches to.
- Expanding the classroom beyond the bell. Student voice and choice.
- we focus more on the students since we get to work with smaller groups
- Resourceful
- With ways to develop our students with tools and resources provided for the program
- I have not received STEAM Community of Practice/HUB
- Non-existent and misuse of resources and funding from the TA provider who does not provide quality STEAM OST
- In high quality steam, learning is involved not just projects.
- enriching





Q34. Please tell us about the role of the STEAM Community of Practice/Hub:

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q28 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: There was consistent agreement among those who were part of a STEAM CoP/Hub that the CoP/Hub provided useful information on program quality and encouragement for improving program quality.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
We get useful information on program quality improvement from our STEAM Community of Practice/Hub.	Mean	3.46	3.25	3.26	3.45	3.33	0.47	0.92	4; 131
	SE	0.18	0.16	0.11	0.14	0.11			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	36			
The STEAM Community of Practice/Hub encourages us to focus on program quality improvement.	Mean	3.46	3.25	3.33	3.40	3.39	0.29	0.99	4; 131
	SE	0.18	0.15	0.11	0.13	0.10			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	36			

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.

Q35: What content areas are addressed by STEAM programming at your site?

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q1 to be Site Coordinator or After School Education & Safety (ASES) Specialist)

*Headline: The most common STEAM disciplines in site programming were math, visual arts, robotics, and some type of natural science (ex: life science, earth science, physical science).*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Mathematics	Mean			64.2%	61.8%		0.21	0.65	1
	SE			2.5%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Life science	Mean			39.2%	43.6%		0.70	0.40	1
	SE			2.6%	4.7%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Earth science	Mean			43.9%	39.1%		0.81	0.37	1
	SE			2.6%	4.7%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Physical science (chemistry, physics)	Mean			36.9%	36.4%		0.01	0.92	1
	SE			2.6%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Engineering	Mean			51.0%	41.8%		2.84	0.09	1
	SE			2.7%	4.7%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Computer science	Mean			37.5%	38.2%		0.02	0.89	1
	SE			2.6%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Family & consumer sciences (home economics, nutrition, cooking, personal finance, etc.)	Mean			40.8%	32.7%		2.37	0.12	1
	SE			2.6%	4.5%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Visual arts	Mean			59.7%	61.8%		0.16	0.69	1
	SE			2.6%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Dance	Mean			42.5%	39.1%		0.41	0.52	1
	SE			2.6%	4.7%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Theatre	Mean			24.8%	22.7%		0.20	0.66	1
	SE			2.3%	4.0%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Music	Mean			47.6%	35.5%		5.09	0.02	1
	SE			2.7%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Media arts	Mean			28.7%	26.4%		0.24	0.63	1
	SE			2.4%	4.2%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Robotics	Mean			40.8%	44.5%		0.47	0.49	1
	SE			2.6%	4.7%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
Other STEAM area or discipline: (see below)	Mean			5.4%	7.3%		0.54	0.46	1
	SE			1.2%	2.5%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				
None of the above	Mean			3.7%	3.6%		0.00	0.99	1
	SE			1.0%	1.8%				
	<i>n</i>			355	110				

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes”

Other STEAM area or discipline responses:

- Crafts
- Heritage Language
- MESA Club, Film Club, College Classes
- yoga
- Idk
- SEL
- CSI Crime solving
- Aerospace, 3D printing
- Arts & Crafts
- recreational activities and sport activities
- Arts & crafts
- hand on science experiments: hand on building of simple projects: 2 and 3 D art projects
- shperos
- ECO Wildlife
- 3D Printing
- 3D Printing
- Drones
- I try to do science projects in my own with my class.
- Inquiry Mindset, The Tech Challenge
- Lego
- Art

Q39: Please tell us more about STEAM in your program or site:

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q1 to be Site Coordinator or After School Education & Safety (ASES) Specialist)

*Headline: Site Coordinators and ASES Specialists only Somewhat Agreed that their programs/sites had the content, training, and funding to conduct STEAM activities.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
STEAM is the primary focus of our program.	Mean			2.82	2.92		1.15	0.65	1; 456
	SE			0.04	0.07				
	<i>n</i>			351	107				
STEAM content in my program is aligned to California state standards.	Mean			3.17	3.20		0.10	1.00	1; 457
	SE			0.04	0.07				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
STEAM content in my program is coordinated with in-school learning.	Mean			2.90	3.01		1.47	0.59	1; 457
	SE			0.05	0.07				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
I am confident in my knowledge of STEAM content.	Mean			2.96	2.98		0.04	1.00	1; 457
	SE			0.04	0.08				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
I am confident about teaching STEAM content to youth in our program.	Mean			3.01	2.98		0.09	1.00	1; 457
	SE			0.04	0.08				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
Staff come to our program with enough experience to deliver STEAM content.	Mean			2.67	2.86		3.86	0.39	1; 457
	SE			0.05	0.08				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
Staff have enough time to plan for STEAM activities.	Mean			2.85	3.04		3.53	0.40	1; 457
	SE			0.05	0.09				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
My site has enough space to conduct STEAM activities.	Mean			2.93	3.05		1.21	0.64	1; 457
	SE			0.05	0.08				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
My site has enough funding to conduct STEAM activities.	Mean			2.96	2.97		0.01	1.00	1; 457
	SE			0.05	0.09				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
My site has enough materials to conduct STEAM activities.	Mean			2.85	2.89		0.17	0.98	1; 457
	SE			0.05	0.09				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
Staff have enough time to participate in STEAM professional development.	Mean			2.68	2.85		2.71	0.46	1; 457
	SE			0.05	0.09				
	<i>n</i>			352	107				
STEAM content is engaging for our students.	Mean			3.28	3.36		0.94	0.70	1; 456
	SE			0.04	0.07				
	<i>n</i>			351	107				

Note: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.

Q40: What percentage of children who regularly attend your program participate in STEAM activities?  
 (Skip logic requires the answer to Q1 to be Site Coordinator or After School Education & Safety (ASES) Specialist)

*Headline: Site Coordinators and ASES Specialists reported that approximately two-thirds of their students participated in STEAM activities.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	F	p	df
Percentage of children	Mean			64.28	64.16		0	1.00	1; 453
	SE			1.51	2.71				
	n			350	105				

Note: Answered on a sliding scale from 0% – 100%.

Q41: How long is a typical STEAM unit or experience?

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q1 to be Site Coordinator or After School Education & Safety (ASES) Specialist)

*Headline: Site Coordinators and ASES Specialists reported a variety of STEAM activity lengths. Most STEAM activities were one week or less in length.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
One day	Mean			22.6%	17.1%		1.47	0.22	1
	SE			2.2%	3.7%				
	<i>n</i>			350	105				
A few days	Mean			27.7%	29.5%		0.13	0.72	1
	SE			2.4%	4.5%				
	<i>n</i>			350	105				
A week	Mean			10.6%	16.2%		2.29	0.13	1
	SE			1.6%	3.6%				
	<i>n</i>			350	105				
Multiple weeks or longer	Mean			30.9%	26.7%		0.69	0.41	1
	SE			2.5%	4.3%				
	<i>n</i>			350	105				
Other: (see below)	Mean			8.3%	10.5%		0.47	0.49	1
	SE			1.5%	3.0%				
	<i>n</i>			350	105				

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes”.

Other responses:

- At the various sites there is STEAM happening daily
- 0
- we haven't had steam.
- 1-2 days
- Couple of day per month
- Not Sure/Don't Know
- none
- Not sure
- Depends on the unit
- n/a
- two days
- Once a week at least.
- 3 days a week
- Few days a week for the whole school year
- It depends on the activity
- none
- 2xs a week
- Just Depends the on the curriculum that is being used with their enrichment plans
- N/A
- monlthy
- n/a
- Spread out over a month
- then rotate
- 8 week cycles
- 6-8 weeks
- From one day to a week
- once a day everyday of the week for about 50 min

- it depends on the age range and activity
- 4 weeks, 2 to 3 days out of the week
- na
- Depends
- Idk
- Not sure
- Not sure
- varies
- Not sure
- Not Sure
- 2hrs
- I don't know
- don't know
- Not sure
- an hour
- N/A



Q42 How often do STEAM activities or experiences occur? What kinds of activities are included in STEAM programming at your program or site?

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q1 to be Site Coordinator or After School Education & Safety (ASES) Specialist)

*Headline: Most Site Coordinators and ASES Specialists reported that STEAM activities occurred at least once per week.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Every day	Mean			16.8%	22.9%		1.91	0.17	1
	SE			2.0%	4.1%				
	<i>n</i>			351	105				
Every week	Mean			47.9%	42.9%		0.82	0.37	1
	SE			2.7%	4.8%				
	<i>n</i>			351	105				
A few times per month	Mean			15.7%	13.3%		0.35	0.55	1
	SE			1.9%	3.3%				
	<i>n</i>			351	105				
Monthly	Mean			8.0%	9.5%		0.25	0.62	1
	SE			1.4%	2.9%				
	<i>n</i>			351	105				
Less than monthly	Mean			3.7%	1.0%		2.60	0.11	1
	SE			1.0%	0.9%				
	<i>n</i>			351	105				
Other: (see below)	Mean			8.0%	10.5%		0.62	0.43	1
	SE			1.4%	3.0%				
	<i>n</i>			351	105				

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes”

Other responses:

- At the various sites there is STEAM happening daily
- 0
- we haven't had steam.
- Every other day
- multiple STEAM activities facilitated every week.
- 3 times a week
- A few times a week
- Not Sure/Don't Know
- none
- Not sure
- couple times per week
- 2 times per week
- twice weekly
- n/a
- We have one month dedicated to STEAM curriculum. Additionally, staff conduct STEAM related enrichment about once/twice a month.
- With day school every week
- Thursday & Friday
- none
- 2xs a week
- None
- n/a
- twice a week
- 3 days a week

- twice every week
- every couple of months
- 2 times a week
- I try to do one once a week
- it depends on the age range and activity
- na

Q43: What kinds of activities are included in STEAM programming at your program or site?

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q1 to be Site Coordinator or After School Education & Safety (ASES) Specialist)

*Headline: The most common types of STEAM activities were hands-on labs, designing, building, making, using computers (e.g., coding), cooking, and visual arts.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Hands-on labs	Mean			46.7%	44.3%		0.19	0.67	1
	SE			2.7%	4.8%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Robotics/drones	Mean			38.5%	39.6%		0.05	0.83	1
	SE			2.6%	4.8%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Rocketry	Mean			8.5%	10.4%		0.32	0.57	1
	SE			1.5%	3.0%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Gardening, botany	Mean			48.4%	47.2%		0.05	0.82	1
	SE			2.7%	4.8%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Designing, building, making	Mean			63.5%	51.9%		4.57	0.03	1
	SE			2.6%	4.9%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Field trips	Mean			29.9%	31.1%		0.06	0.81	1
	SE			2.4%	4.5%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Coding, programming, computer use	Mean			44.2%	50.0%		1.12	0.29	1
	SE			2.7%	4.9%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Environmental science/ecology	Mean			27.1%	24.5%		0.27	0.60	1
	SE			2.4%	4.2%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Cooking	Mean			51.9%	49.1%		0.25	0.61	1
	SE			2.7%	4.9%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Graphic design, illustration	Mean			25.1%	28.3%		0.44	0.51	1
	SE			2.3%	4.4%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Photography, filmmaking, videos	Mean			28.8%	33.0%		0.69	0.41	1
	SE			2.4%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Music, sound	Mean			47.6%	43.4%		0.57	0.45	1
	SE			2.7%	4.8%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Architecture, building, design work	Mean			27.1%	20.8%		1.76	0.18	1
	SE			2.4%	3.9%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Visual arts (painting, sculpting)	Mean			70.4%	65.1%		1.05	0.31	1
	SE			2.4%	4.6%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
Other activity: (see below)	Mean			2.8%	4.7%		0.82	0.36	1
	SE			0.9%	2.1%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				
None of the above	Mean			2.6%	2.8%		0.02	0.88	1
	SE			0.8%	1.6%				
	<i>n</i>			351	106				

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other activity responses:

- 3D Printing
- Story telling, lego engineering
- Not Sure/Don't Know
- yoga
- Dance, Sports, Math
- Mix Martial Arts
- Dance
- Lego Robotics
- Fitness
- Remote Control Cars - Acceleration, Speed, Engineering
- ARTS
- Science, Engineering, Forensics, Drama

Q44: In your program, who plans STEAM activities?

*Headline: All respondent groups agreed that Site Coordinators and Frontline Staff most frequently planned STEAM activities.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Program director	Mean	46.3%	45.9%	22.2%	31.1%	27.5%	33.49	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.2%	4.5%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	82	109	351	106	338			
Site coordinator	Mean	74.4%	71.6%	63.5%	49.1%	59.8%	18.33	<0.01	4
	SE	4.8%	4.3%	2.6%	4.9%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	82	109	351	106	338			
Frontline staff	Mean	50.0%	62.4%	62.1%	42.5%	59.8%	16.21	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.6%	2.6%	4.8%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	82	109	351	106	338			
Community partners	Mean	20.7%	19.3%	11.7%	10.4%	6.5%	20.98	<0.01	4
	SE	4.5%	3.8%	1.7%	3.0%	1.3%			
	<i>n</i>	82	109	351	106	338			
STEAM Community of Practice/Hub staff	Mean	13.4%	9.2%	6.8%	9.4%	5.3%	7.11	0.13	4
	SE	3.8%	2.8%	1.3%	2.8%	1.2%			
	<i>n</i>	82	109	351	106	338			
Site teachers	Mean	13.4%	12.8%	14.2%	14.2%	12.4%	0.57	0.97	4
	SE	3.8%	3.2%	1.9%	3.4%	1.8%			
	<i>n</i>	82	109	351	106	338			
Other: (see below)	Mean	12.2%	8.3%	10.3%	10.4%	5.9%	6.21	0.18	4
	SE	3.6%	2.6%	1.6%	3.0%	1.3%			
	<i>n</i>	82	109	351	106	338			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other responses:

- No one
- Youth Leaders
- we haven't had steam person come to our site.
- Students
- Youth Voices
- Hire a third party to make curriculum for the program.
- Curriculum writer
- N/A
- student leadership
- SOMEONE FROM STEAM COMES TO MY SITE AND CONDUCTS THE STEAM ACTIVITIES.
- Not Sure/Don't Know
- N/a
- Enrichment Staff
- No idea we have no way to use anything it's kept from us
- Windtree Group
- STEAM traveling coaches
- Training and Curriculum development team
- N/A
- coaches
- Hired person to create curriculum
- n/a
- Program Support Specialists
- Activity leaders

- Curriculum Team
- N/A
- Science Director
- Windtree
- We have not yet planned STEAM activities
- Community Business Organization
- Depending on activity and time provided. Usually we all try to brainstorm together
- Program Staff
- Students
- District Certified Specialists
- Curriculum Coordinator
- No one
- None
- Curriculum Coordinator
- Not sure
- Grants manager contracts with specialty STEM providers
- Idk
- ELOP Project Facilitator
- Program Leads & County Office Staff
- SERRF STEAM Coordinators
- extended learning specialist
- City corp staff and outside vendors
- Mizzen by Mott
- Staff Member that travels to different sites
- Site Supervisor
- administrator
- STEAM Support Specialist
- Enrichment development staff
- Curriculum Liaisons, Lead Tutors
- No one.
- Program Manager
- Me (Site Coordinator Assistant)
- PL
- Not sure
- STEAM Team
- Site supervisor
- Consultant for Expanded Learning
- Program Manager
- Rangers
- offsite partners - Vandenburg Space Force
- Curriculum
- na
- Grant Manager
- After School Program Coordinator, Family Resource Center

Q45a: What curriculum materials or resources do you use in your STEAM programming (kits, curriculum books, etc.)?

*Headline: We received 868 open-ended responses to this question. The most common responses were:*

- *Kits (377 responses), curriculum (167 responses), and/or books (197 responses) usually without detailed description (“kits online”)*
- *Online or internet resources of some kind (91 responses) usually without detailed description*
- *Mentions of content yet not specific activities, such as STEAM (93 responses), science (65 responses), and/or robotics (41 responses)*
- *The most common specific resources named were Legos (78 responses), Ozobots (15 responses), and Pinterest (14 responses)*

Q45b: We find or receive curriculum materials and/or resources for STEAM programming from:

*Headline: Respondents most commonly report getting their STEAM programming from internet searches, followed by County Offices of Education (for Grant Managers and Program Directors) and Grant Managers (for site staff).*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
CAN	Mean	22.5%	17.4%	8.0%	7.5%	3.0%	40.36	<0.01	4
	SE	4.7%	3.6%	1.5%	2.6%	0.9%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
ASAPConnect	Mean	3.8%	1.8%	0.6%	1.9%	1.5%	4.72	0.32	4
	SE	2.1%	1.3%	0.4%	1.3%	0.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
CalSAC	Mean	6.3%	7.3%	5.5%	6.6%	3.9%	2.71	0.61	4
	SE	2.7%	2.5%	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
County Office of Education	Mean	31.3%	30.3%	11.5%	16.0%	7.2%	51.87	<0.01	4
	SE	5.2%	4.4%	1.7%	3.6%	1.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
STEAM Community of Practice/Hub	Mean	18.8%	29.4%	10.6%	13.2%	9.0%	29.15	<0.01	4
	SE	4.4%	4.4%	1.7%	3.3%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Through my regional office	Mean	15.0%	11.0%	13.2%	11.3%	4.8%	18.07	<0.01	4
	SE	4.0%	3.0%	1.8%	3.1%	1.2%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
An external vendor/provider who conducts our STEAM program	Mean	31.3%	22.0%	21.3%	18.9%	7.2%	43.74	<0.01	4
	SE	5.2%	4.0%	2.2%	3.8%	1.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Site principal	Mean	17.5%	8.3%	8.3%	11.3%	9.0%	6.13	0.19	4
	SE	4.2%	2.6%	1.5%	3.1%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Site teachers	Mean	23.8%	11.9%	17.0%	17.9%	16.5%	4.65	0.33	4
	SE	4.8%	3.1%	2.0%	3.7%	2.0%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Internet searches	Mean	32.5%	46.8%	39.7%	34.0%	27.9%	17.49	<0.01	4
	SE	5.2%	4.8%	2.6%	4.6%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Co-workers	Mean	17.5%	28.4%	25.9%	25.5%	25.2%	3.40	0.49	4
	SE	4.2%	4.3%	2.3%	4.2%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Community-based organization: (see below)	Mean	17.5%	12.8%	8.9%	9.4%	0.6%	51.30	<0.01	4
	SE	4.2%	3.2%	1.5%	2.8%	0.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Other technical assistance provider: (see below)	Mean	8.8%	4.6%	1.4%	1.9%	0.6%	18.07	<0.01	4
	SE	3.2%	2.0%	0.6%	1.3%	0.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Attending an event or workshop: (see below)	Mean	20.0%	17.4%	7.8%	5.7%	5.1%	26.12	<0.01	4
	SE	4.5%	3.6%	1.4%	2.2%	1.2%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
My program/site grant manager	Mean	25.0%	26.6%	37.9%	27.4%	27.3%	12.76	0.01	4
	SE	4.8%	4.2%	2.6%	4.3%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
My site coordinator	Mean	21.3%	26.6%	32.2%	33.0%	55.9%	66.08	<0.01	4
	SE	4.6%	4.2%	2.5%	4.6%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			
Other: (see below)	Mean	10.0%	11.9%	11.5%	7.5%	8.7%	2.66	0.62	4
	SE	3.4%	3.1%	1.7%	2.6%	1.5%			
	<i>n</i>	80	109	348	106	333			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”



Community-based organization responses:

- Word of mouth from parents
- Children's initiative
- WindTree
- Versa Style Dance Company
- Noyo Center for Marine Science
- Cal Berkeley Student Volunteer Programs
- BCSD
- Berkeley School Fund
- Parker Anderson, Hip Hop Mindset, Art Trek
- Greenfield city science mobile unit
- Fathomworks
- Windtree
- Windtree
- Think Train
- Think Together
- Woodcraft rangers
- UCCE Cal Fresh, Fresno State Physics
- Boys & Girls Clubs of America (BGCA)
- Flockworks
- Partnership with Local high School Engineering pathway team
- BGCP
- vendor presentations and services
- Monterey Bay Aquarium, State Parks, local museums
- San Bernardinos Steam rep
- CSUSM
- The Tech
- YMCA of Orange County has a YMCA Club Curriculum which includes STEAM clubs and activities.
- Bay Area Discovery Museum
- Code Nation
- Delhaven Community Center
- Boys and girls club of Whittier/Pico Rivera
- Compton College
- SMUD
- Cal State San Marcos
- Tigerwoods Center
- Mid Klamath Watershed Council& Salmon River Outdoor School
- Kiwaiian
- TGR Learning Lab (Tiger Woods) , CyberPatriots, OC STEM
- Musuem visits
- RISE Education
- DIY Girls
- Windtree

Other technical assistance provider responses:

- Weekly staff meetings for Cyber Security (Cyber Patriots) program
- LACOE STEAM Learning
- Skill struck.
- Fused learning

- Ventura County Office of Education
- Organization Science Director
- Lennox Engineers
- UC Davis CStem
- PLTW
- Lawrence Hall of Science

Attending an event or workshop responses:

- mandatory trainings
- Lego Spike, Math Hoops, Tynker Coding
- BOOST conference
- Los Angeles Comic Con
- Piper!
- Region 2 workshops
- Thursday meetings with STEAM workshop provided by THINK Together. Cyndee Zandez
- various local partners, Lawrence Hall of Science
- Boost
- Region 3 offerings
- Region 2 Conferences
- Regional offered trainings
- SMUD
- Region 2 and Remix
- ELOP Fair
- Resource Fair
- Provided by woodcraft rangers
- BOOST
- CA STEAM SYMPOSIUM
- CA STEAM Symposium
- Remix workshops for ASES staff
- training with Learn
- Children's Initiative
- vendor presentations and services
- CUE
- Professional Development/Lead Teacher Meetings
- Region 2, Boost, Exploratorium
- Orange County STEAM HUB
- Home Depot Kids Workshop
- CA STEAM Symposium, CA Science Association of Science Educators
- The Exploratorium/Tinkering Studio Workshops
- CUE, ISTE
- California STEAM Symposium
- region 1 support team
- STEAM workshops

Other responses:

- Frontline Staff
- our own research towards the activities and such
- Line Staff

- None
- LEARN program
- not sure
- I'm not sure
- NA
- WHEN I CONDUCT STEAM RELATED ACTIVITIES I USUALLY GET THEM FROM THE INTERNET AND I DO A TRIAL AND ERROR BEFORE CONDUCTING THEM WITH STUDENTS.
- none
- Not Sure/Don't Know
- I do not know.
- Pinterest
- none
- We have a team that creates/enhances STEAM curriculum
- None
- IF i need items i buy them
- AIMS Center
- None
- community volunteers with professional experience
- STEAM coach
- Online research
- Not sure
- n/a
- Our ELA leadership staff write our own curriculum
- N/A
- Science Museums
- N/A
- Not Sure
- not sure
- Internet
- colleagues
- BCSD
- Nothing and No One
- None yet
- We have a STEAM coordinator and they have their own staff. Those staff are training are conduct the STEAM projects.
- me
- n/a
- Think Train
- We partner with local STEM providers.
- Idk
- ELOP
- Not sure
- Teachers Pay Teachers, Technology department
- Program Director
- Curriculum cordinator
- Myself
- Outside purchases with Program budget
- don't know
- Wintree

- I am not the one who plans the STEAM, so I am unsure where resources are gathered.
- Lemelson-MIT, Lawrence Hall of Science, Discovery, NASA, 4-H
- not sure
- Site Supervisor
- stores that our grants allow us to buy from
- Not sure/i dont know.
- Not completely sure
- Our district representatives
- Not sure
- BGCA Curriculum
- our program petty cash
- Not sure from where else I just know we get them.
- Staff
- purchasing
- Not sure
- curriculum
- steam coordinator
- websites
- ana
- Director of Innovation and Special Programs
- our learn higher ups
- personal knowledge
- After School Program Coordinator TOSA

Q46: How much of your curriculum materials or resources come from your STEAM Community of Practice/Hub?  
 (Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q28 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Most respondents who were participating in a STEAM CoP/Hub reported getting some curriculum materials and resources from the CoP/Hub.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>df</b>
Amount of curriculum materials or resources	Mean	3.08	2.83	3.00	3.65	3.42	2.74	0.17	4; 131
	SE	0.26	0.22	0.16	0.24	0.13			
	<i>n</i>	13	24	43	20	36			

*Note: 1 = None, 2 = A little, 3 = Some, 4 = A lot, 5 = Almost all.*

Q47: How are youth selected to participate in STEAM activities?

*Headline: Most respondents reported that all youth participated in STEAM activities.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b><math>\chi^2</math></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>	<b>df</b>
All youth participate	Mean	57.5%	60.2%	58.5%	57.5%	45.0%	16.16	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.7%	2.6%	4.8%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Afterschool staff choose youth who participate	Mean	11.3%	18.5%	12.7%	20.8%	14.4%	6.00	0.20	4
	SE	3.5%	3.7%	1.8%	3.9%	1.9%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Youth decide whether and how to participate	Mean	33.8%	31.5%	39.5%	31.1%	24.9%	16.76	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.5%	2.6%	4.5%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Parents decide whether their children participate	Mean	11.3%	7.4%	6.6%	9.4%	6.0%	3.35	0.50	4
	SE	3.5%	2.5%	1.3%	2.8%	1.3%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Teachers choose youth who participate	Mean	7.5%	4.6%	3.7%	1.9%	1.8%	7.60	0.11	4
	SE	2.9%	2.0%	1.0%	1.3%	0.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Don't know/not sure	Mean	15.0%	9.3%	6.1%	8.5%	29.1%	77.25	<0.01	4
	SE	4.0%	2.8%	1.3%	2.7%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			

*Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."*

Q48: How do you evaluate youth experiences with STEAM activities?

*Headline: Most respondents evaluated youth experiences with STEAM activities through student work.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Student work	Mean	58.8%	65.7%	69.5%	60.4%	53.2%	20.29	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.6%	2.5%	4.8%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Reflection questions	Mean	50.0%	57.4%	53.3%	44.3%	39.9%	17.20	<0.01	4
	SE	5.6%	4.8%	2.7%	4.8%	2.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Exit tickets	Mean	10.0%	15.7%	9.2%	9.4%	11.1%	3.66	0.45	4
	SE	3.4%	3.5%	1.6%	2.8%	1.7%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Culminating events	Mean	41.3%	44.4%	31.4%	21.7%	16.8%	46.67	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.5%	4.0%	2.0%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Student surveys	Mean	47.5%	39.8%	37.8%	31.1%	19.8%	41.12	<0.01	4
	SE	5.6%	4.7%	2.6%	4.5%	2.2%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
Other: (see below)	Mean	6.3%	3.7%	4.0%	6.6%	7.2%	4.35	0.36	4
	SE	2.7%	1.8%	1.1%	2.4%	1.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			
We do not evaluate youth experiences with STEAM activities	Mean	13.8%	15.7%	13.8%	5.7%	24.6%	28.15	<0.01	4
	SE	3.9%	3.5%	1.9%	2.2%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	333			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other responses:

- smiling faces of kids having fun with the activities
- conversations with students
- Na
- Youth voice
- we haven't had steam.
- Student project feedback and development for future projects.
- Open class discussion about activity
- Also part of the 5E's lesson plan
- I PERSONALLY EVALUATE BY STUDENTS ENAGEMENT THROUGH THE ACTIVITY, TO EITHER CONTINUE DOING SIMILAR ACTIVITIES OR MODIFY THEM TO HAVE STUDENTS ENGAGED.
- verbal feedback
- Not sure
- feedback from STEAM teachers
- Talk with students as activity is being done, asking open ended questions.
- N/A
- I'm not sure
- n/a
- Debrief
- not sure
- Don't know
- informal observation and conversation with students
- Students feed back
- Program Site Coordinator Survey
- If students ask their parents to stay. Student and parent feed-back in person daily

- Data review grades, attendance
- not sure
- Reflection questions are ask in person at the end of the activity.
- not sure
- Different at each school site
- I will regularly check in on the programs and see what it is they are doing and converse with students to see if they understand the work they are doing and if they are enjoying it.
- not sure
- Not quite sure
- Observation during activities
- Not sure
- Feedback or whole group activities
- Student Celebrations
- Program leaders typically reflect with students on how they liked or disliked the steam activity for the month
- parent surveys
- We ask verbally
- Not sure
- culminating activities



Q49: We have conducted continuous quality improvement cycles specifically focused on our STEAM programming.

*Headline: Few respondents' sites had conducted CQI cycles specifically focused on STEAM programming.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	65.0%	55.6%	36.6%	24.5%	9.0%	166.62	<0.01	4
	SE	5.3%	4.8%	2.6%	4.2%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	332			
Yes	Mean	6.3%	17.6%	29.7%	21.7%	25.6%	27.25	<0.01	4
	SE	2.7%	3.7%	2.5%	4.0%	2.4%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	332			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	28.8%	26.9%	33.7%	53.8%	65.4%	101.12	<0.01	4
	SE	5.1%	4.3%	2.5%	4.8%	2.6%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	332			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.

Q50: Our continuous quality improvement cycles focused on the following STEAM disciplines:  
 (Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q49 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Those who had conducted CQI cycles specifically focused on STEAM most often chose the science and technology content areas.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Science	Mean	80.0%	84.2%	70.9%	65.2%	81.2%	4.84	0.30	4
	SE	17.9%	8.4%	4.5%	9.9%	4.2%			
	<i>n</i>	5	19	103	23	85			
Technology	Mean	80.0%	73.7%	56.3%	65.2%	74.1%	7.75	0.10	4
	SE	17.9%	10.1%	4.9%	9.9%	4.8%			
	<i>n</i>	5	19	103	23	85			
Engineering	Mean	60.0%	73.7%	53.4%	47.8%	62.4%	4.55	0.34	4
	SE	21.9%	10.1%	4.9%	10.4%	5.3%			
	<i>n</i>	5	19	103	23	85			
Arts (visual arts, dance, theatre, music, media arts)	Mean	60.0%	78.9%	88.3%	82.6%	84.7%	3.40	0.49	4
	SE	21.9%	9.4%	3.2%	7.9%	3.9%			
	<i>n</i>	5	19	103	23	85			
Mathematics	Mean	40.0%	63.2%	49.5%	34.8%	49.4%	3.61	0.46	4
	SE	21.9%	11.1%	4.9%	9.9%	5.4%			
	<i>n</i>	5	19	103	23	85			
Integrated STEAM approach	Mean	40.0%	52.6%	26.2%	13.0%	20.0%	10.44	0.03	4
	SE	21.9%	11.5%	4.3%	7.0%	4.3%			
	<i>n</i>	5	19	103	23	85			
Other discipline: (see below)	Mean	0.0%	10.5%	1.9%	4.3%	2.4%	2.98	0.39	3
	SE		7.0%	1.4%	4.3%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	5	19	103	23	85			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other discipline responses:

- not sure
- gardening
- CTE
- This provided through our Afterschool Programing.

Q51: 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).

*Headline: Relatively few respondents reported CQI cycles that resulted in STEAM programming improvements.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	41.3%	38.9%	28.8%	15.1%	8.8%	83.24	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.7%	2.4%	3.5%	1.6%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	330			
Yes	Mean	20.0%	30.6%	35.2%	32.1%	20.3%	22.69	<0.01	4
	SE	4.5%	4.4%	2.6%	4.5%	2.2%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	330			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	38.8%	30.6%	36.0%	52.8%	70.9%	108.02	<0.01	4
	SE	5.4%	4.4%	2.6%	4.8%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	330			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.

Q52: We have changed our STEAM programming in the following ways because of our continuous quality improvement cycles

(Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q51 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Those who did report improvements to STEAM programming from CQI work most often said they had increased and/or changed the STEAM offerings.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Increased number of STEAM offerings at my program/site	Mean	75.0%	78.8%	68.0%	47.1%	65.7%	8.52	0.07	4
	SE	10.8%	7.1%	4.2%	8.6%	5.8%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			
Professional development provided to our staff about STEAM	Mean	62.5%	63.6%	32.8%	26.5%	31.3%	17.43	<0.01	4
	SE	12.1%	8.4%	4.3%	7.6%	5.7%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			
Better STEAM instruction	Mean	50.0%	45.5%	35.2%	55.9%	44.8%	5.75	0.22	4
	SE	12.5%	8.7%	4.3%	8.5%	6.1%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			
Changing offerings based on youth interest	Mean	56.3%	63.6%	64.8%	58.8%	61.2%	0.79	0.94	4
	SE	12.4%	8.4%	4.3%	8.4%	6.0%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			
Staffing our program/site with more STEAM expertise	Mean	25.0%	39.4%	21.3%	11.8%	25.4%	7.62	0.11	4
	SE	10.8%	8.5%	3.7%	5.5%	5.3%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			
More students participating in STEAM offerings	Mean	12.5%	45.5%	38.5%	32.4%	37.3%	6.28	0.18	4
	SE	8.3%	8.7%	4.4%	8.0%	5.9%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			
Increased number of culminating events in STEAM	Mean	12.5%	33.3%	18.0%	20.6%	14.9%	5.18	0.27	4
	SE	8.3%	8.2%	3.5%	6.9%	4.4%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			
Other: (see below)	Mean	0.0%	6.1%	3.3%	0.0%	3.0%	0.60	0.74	2
	SE		4.2%	1.6%		2.1%			
	<i>n</i>	16	33	122	34	67			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering “yes.”

Other responses:

- Community partnerships and programs developed with STEAM in mind.
- Peer to peer learning and teaching
- Teachers at our site have volunteered to run STEAM programs
- Offering professional development to staff to support their STEAM expertise

Q53: We collect data about the quality of our STEAM programming

*Headline: Most respondents reported not collecting data on the quality of their STEAM programming or being uncertain whether such data were collected.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	41.3%	43.5%	33.1%	19.8%	8.5%	100.41	<0.01	4
	SE	5.5%	4.8%	2.5%	3.9%	1.5%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	330			
Yes	Mean	31.3%	33.3%	37.2%	30.2%	21.2%	21.76	<0.01	4
	SE	5.2%	4.5%	2.6%	4.5%	2.3%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	330			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	27.5%	23.1%	29.7%	50.0%	70.3%	154.12	<0.01	4
	SE	5.0%	4.1%	2.5%	4.9%	2.5%			
	<i>n</i>	80	108	347	106	330			

*Note: Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.*

Q54: Please select the types of data you can access about your site's STEAM programming.

(Skip logic requires the answer to Q53 to be "Yes")

*Headline: Those who collected data on the quality of their STEAM programming most commonly reported collecting overall youth attendance data, youth STEAM activity participation data, student surveys or other feedback, and student interest data.*

Response		GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	df
Youth attendance overall	Mean	80.0%	83.3%	76.0%	62.5%	72.9%	4.48	0.35	4
	SE	8.0%	6.2%	3.8%	8.6%	5.3%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Youth participation in STEAM programming	Mean	80.0%	69.4%	64.3%	53.1%	70.0%	5.48	0.24	4
	SE	8.0%	7.7%	4.2%	8.8%	5.5%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Student surveys or other feedback	Mean	72.0%	69.4%	69.8%	59.4%	57.1%	4.40	0.35	4
	SE	9.0%	7.7%	4.0%	8.7%	5.9%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Student interest	Mean	72.0%	75.0%	79.1%	71.9%	82.9%	2.44	0.65	4
	SE	9.0%	7.2%	3.6%	7.9%	4.5%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Students demonstrating mastery of learning outcomes	Mean	36.0%	41.7%	34.9%	46.9%	42.9%	2.38	0.67	4
	SE	9.6%	8.2%	4.2%	8.8%	5.9%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Parent/guardian/family surveys or other feedback	Mean	56.0%	30.6%	27.1%	28.1%	30.0%	7.74	0.10	4
	SE	9.9%	7.7%	3.9%	7.9%	5.5%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Staff surveys or other feedback	Mean	20.0%	27.8%	31.8%	46.9%	35.7%	5.50	0.24	4
	SE	8.0%	7.5%	4.1%	8.8%	5.7%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
College and career connections (students being exposed to postsecondary options, or choosing STEM-related postsecondary options)	Mean	4.0%	5.6%	9.3%	3.1%	11.4%	3.56	0.47	4
	SE	3.9%	3.8%	2.6%	3.1%	3.8%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Evidence from a STEM assessment, resource, or tool:	Mean	4.0%	2.8%	3.9%	3.1%	1.4%	1.13	0.89	4
	SE	3.9%	2.7%	1.7%	3.1%	1.4%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			
Other: (see below)	Mean	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.00		0
	SE		2.7%						
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	70			

Note: Results reported as % respondents answering "yes."

Evidence from a STEM assessment, resource, or tool.

- YPQA

Other responses:

- Verbal feedback from students

Q55: Our data indicate that our STEAM programming has improved over time.

(Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q53 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: Of the respondents who collected data on the quality of their STEAM programming, most reported seeing improvements in their STEAM programming over time.*

<b>Response</b>		<b>GM</b>	<b>PD</b>	<b>SC</b>	<b>ASES</b>	<b>FS</b>	$\chi^2$	<i>p</i>	<b>df</b>
No	Mean	0.0%	2.8%	5.4%	3.1%	0.0%	0.68	0.71	2
	SE		2.7%	2.0%	3.1%				
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	69			
Yes	Mean	64.0%	72.2%	76.7%	75.0%	75.4%	1.82	0.77	4
	SE	9.6%	7.5%	3.7%	7.7%	5.2%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	69			
Not sure/don't know	Mean	36.0%	25.0%	17.8%	21.9%	24.6%	4.34	0.36	4
	SE	9.6%	7.2%	3.4%	7.3%	5.2%			
	<i>n</i>	25	36	129	32	69			

*Note:* Results reported as % respondents marking the response option.

Q56a How have your STEAM programming improved over time? Which data show improvement?

(Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q55 to be “Yes”)

*Headline: The respondents who saw improvement in their STEAM programming over time most commonly reported improvements in attendance (30 responses) and participation (30 responses).*

Responses included:

- We have more kids enjoying their time here engaging in steam activities, and telling their friends to apply because they would have fun too. Thus creating a need for more frontline staff and more better activities
- Surveys
- 3
- More students have had interest in joining Stem activities and they have engaged in more stem activities. Our attendance and also Students that participate in robotic teams and other stem related activities.
- NyOi surveys
- surveys
- With experience it has improved & training staff. Our participants have showed more involvement
- Increased Attendance
- Better trained staff, more student involvement and interest
- Kids enjoyed themselves
- The kids are more engaged
- The numbers always go up.
- Working with community partners to provide more engaging and a variety of activities for kids to participate in. Bringing in unique experiences to ensure kids have more lasting impressions and expose them to new opportunities. Offerings this year have been magicians school, 3d printing, drones, and a larger emphasis on gardening and outdoor experiences
- We have staff, parents, and students surveyed to let us know that they are enjoying the new activities we are providing such as Smart Mind Robotics.
- Students are engaged with the activates done by instructor, we have students in waiting list to enter the STEAM days
- Competition with other sites
- Engaged students, finding new resources, improved attendance
- Students engage more
- We have more structured and focused lesson plans that provide step by step guidance to both instructors and students alike. We have also gained greater access to a variety of STEAM programming-related supplies and materials that make participation more rewarding and engaging for students.
- Student/parent/staff/principal/teacher surveys and student attendance
- "We're providing a numerous of STEAM activities, and previously all of our STEAM activities were art related, now we're focusing more on skill building and robotics, physics and environmental.
- We've noticed that more students are interested in participating in such activities and they're the first ones to volunteer to take another STEAM class."
- Our students have become more engaged as we continue to incorporate activities in which they are more interested in. Student work is being done at a higher quality and the overall completion rate of the class has increased. The increase in work being turned in and the quality of the work has showed these improvements.
- 3
- Student survey, parent survey, Site coordinator participating in LACOE STEAM meetings.
- Surveys, participation, referrals to our sites for community partnerships
- Through leadership in sports and and the children involvement numbers.
- Students like to come to program and do STEAM activities. They started with basic putting sticks together to form a bridge, to creating blueprints, making reinforcements and bettering our bridges to hold x amount of weight.
- Student surveys Lesson plans include more STEAM interaction
- contracting specialized instructors
- Student attendance has increased due to students being interested in the STEAM Activities offered. Students ask for more extension on their STEAM Lessons.
- Kids participate more



- It has improved last curriculum for this year staff and students enjoyed it. It showed more participation.
- More class engagement, attendance and feedback from students
- Students went from 75% participation to 95% participation
- The students have completed certifications, created multiple cte pathway coursework, and shown higher and higher levels of interest.
- Kids are more involved and excited about building
- End of the year surveys give us feedback about what interests our students and increased attendance proves that the more STEAM options that are provided that more students show up
- The surveys
- Students show more interest in activities.
- Student participation has grown and the interest in STEM programming has evolved.
- A lot and more students want to participate
- Students have access to STEAM activities for enrichment at least twice a week.
- Students interest increased and using surveys
- From the start of the year we have had more participation, better attendance, better communication with school staff, and the grades of the students have gone up.
- staff review and share negative and positive outcomes and configure outlets to improve
- Student surveys
- yes
- Student attendance
- The number of students taking part in the program and the quality of products (3D prints).
- parent surveys, student surveys, overall happiness of students
- Student interest in participating in STEAM activities demonstrates to us that the STEAM programming that we are offering is improving over time. Students are receiving more programming during their core school day, combined with activities that they are participating in during the after school program.
- the kids engaging in critical thinking and hands on activities
- Higher attendance and more STEAM Offerings.
- Better instructors and better educational activities
- Students are getting more involved.
- Student participation and attendance gradually increases on STEAM days
- Our staff assesses our STEAM curriculum through reflections with our students and staff. We evaluate their interest, participation and overall skills learned. With this feedback, we have updated our curriculum every year to improve and match our students' interests. Through the student survey and reflection data we have collected from last year, our students want to experience unique STEAM experiences in their curriculum. They do not want to repeat previous curriculum, but expand their horizons in STEAM related activities.
- Increase in attendance and mastery in the activity
- We are getting more students to want to learn how to create and use science
- The attendance of students and participation in our STEAM activities has increased over time.
- Our STEAM programming has improved mainly in our Music area and we are able to see results based on student's participation.
- More hands-on projects and no repetition
- Number of course offerings
- Student engagement.
- A was
- Since I'm fairly new, after students participate in their STEAM related programming, I ask for feedback and have seen increased interest overtime.
- every month trainings helps us to improve
- We are currently launching additional STEAM programs and training we show a higher participation rate during our summer school when we use STEAM based offerings.
- Students communication with staff
- More student interest and participation
- We have collaborated for our STEAM projects and included every subject
- Greater attendance

- Attendance
- There is an improvement of youth participation in STEAM enrichment/modules that are offered. Youth have input in activities that interest them.
- Our STEAM programming is expanding.
- More student involvement and student learning
- Attendance increases
- student test scores and school recognition.
- More students attend
- We have had more student involvement over the past couple of weeks
- More diverse activity offerings for the studentd
- Student enrollment and interest
- Yes students want to come and learn new recipes and be a little more in a diverse cooking style
- Students have given good feedback regarding activity.
- We continue to offer more variety for students so all students interests can be met. We evaluate what works & change it
- student interest has improved in these fields and increased community partnerships
- Over time staff have learned to demonstrate and share information about how to engage and Instruct students to follow their curiosity and it is okay if success is not found during the first try.
- More projects completed
- Student and staff involvement
- Kid work together more
- Our STEAM programming has become more responsive to student interest, and that interest has led to greater youth voice and leadership.
- Student participation increase, adding specialized staff to the program, positive student and staff feedback
- Total attendance of STEAM programming, youth voice asking for more
- Overall, student engagement and enrollment has increased.
- More student involvement
- Student Interaction/Feedback
- Increased student engagement found through student participation, attendance, and feedback from surveys.
- My Steam program involved overtime by creating a foundation with the students. Open discussions of feedback from the students; letting me know what their interests are and materials that will grab their attention. Learning more how to develop a safe comfortable space for boys and girls for Cosmetology. Showing the students materials of different arts.
- More STEAM activities being available to students and more participation
- Our student surveys help us determine if the students are liking the curriculum they are being taught
- The post surveys compared to pre surveys showed higher interest in fun activities. Overall, students said it was a somewhat more interesting program to attend.
- We serve more students and the hours of service has increased.
- Larger student attendance
- More students involved and actively participating
- We offer more workshops for student engagement
- Youth participation and attendance
- More participation from students and their genuine interest in STEAM.
- Increased engagement with youth.
- More student participation and retention
- Student attendance, participation and surveys.
- Students enjoy STEAM classes where it is a lot more hands on.
- Student participation
- Overtime I got to know the students and their tactics
- And what makes them comfortable."
- Participation
- Survey results formal and informal. Staff feedback, student feedback. Observing the lessons at different sites
- We've done more STEAM programs and the kids have been enjoying them more and more

- The amount of students participating in STEAM related activities and offerings.
- Student surveys show an 85% increase in STEM enjoyment and interest
- Activities and lesson plans are more engaging and more club members are signing up to those clubs.
- Students seem more engaged and excited for activities
- More students are wanting to join elp due to us having steam rotations
- I think finding quality staff that is excited about offering a STEAM actiivty club is key. Staff that shows excitement about their activity, that comes through, and students recognize that and then in turn also become excited about that day's STEAM activity. Students are now talking more about the activities they are doing in our STEAM club and others are listening and starting to come!
- More student attendance.
- Student engagement, student knowledge,
- We have more steam curriculum now and more training. Students really enjoy learning steam and its reflected in our student surveys.
- More students are participating in our STEAM programs. Attendance data & surveys show the improvement.
- The attendance rate is high. Member's are always eager and ready to participate in any STEAM activity.
- I feel kids are ready and using it in the outside world I also believe it creates communication skills as well as SEL a lot
- Student & Staff involvement
- More student attendance overall, different student interests (topics), webinars with former students in STEAM now attending college.
- Surveys from students, teachers and parents."
- Student interest and participation.
- The survey and the content we show case
- We are very fortunate in having the opportunity of having Steam again due to students interests.
- We have seen students getting more involved in STEAM activities. We currently are reviewing how many students attend and what they would like to learn for next STEAM activity.
- students are able to state a take away from participating
- Variety and complexity of the activities.
- our STEAM program is has not yet recovered from the pandemic disconnect but in many ways it has improved. students have shown a big increase in STEM programs and also attendance across our sites has increased.
- Positive feedback from parents
- We have made changes to our overall program including hosting a STEAM focused winter camp. The response from both students, families, and school administrators have been very positive
- The STEAM programming continues to improve through student participation and feedback from the staff and parents.
- Stem interest has increased
- It has improved because more children are exited for STEAM and more form part of the projects
- support
- STUDENT ATTENDANCE AND SURVEYS
- Kids interest
- More students participating
- We offer more programming and have been getting more participation.
- Student/parent feedback
- Student, parent and teacher surveys indicate student interest and parents and teachers ask for more STEAM lessons each year. Also, student attendance in STEAM related classes that are offered.
- More students participate
- Students give feedback and we improve the program from there
- Activities are brought that the students are interested in attending. This is based on student/staff feedback, attendance in the programs
- Student surveys and input
- When we collect students work from the first semester to the next semester
- Parents have indicated they liked the programs for their children. Children were also enjoyed being part of the many programs. The classes are at full capacity.

- Our Stem Director has our surveys but we do conduct Pre/Post surveys which lets us know about our data and improvements.
- We always receive student feedback on what is working and what they would like to see or change. Parents constantly let us know that we are doing a great job and their kids are expanding, mentally and socially through our program.
- Increases numbers of students entering steam programs
- Engagement from the staff and students
- More student involvement.
- We have used our survey results to increase STEAM offerings and participation based on student interests
- The level of student engagement shows more improvement versus the beginning of steam projects/activities.
- it helps students find a new hobby or even a new interest that they can further pursue in college if they'd like
- Yes more students will show up and be more interested
- Student engagement
- our enrichment club has improved and have challenged each student from tk-8th grade
- Student interests and engagement.
- The amount of students asking for certain activities have increased.
- Data collected from evaluation and asking the children and staff about the interest and success of the STEAM activities. Data shows that art has been a huge interest to our students, and the students have commented on the curriculum being interesting and have been engaged in the recent curriculum.
- Student surveys as well as increased participation in STEAM activities show improvement.
- Our Feedback surveys from youth have showed improvement.
- Staff have become more comfortable in providing STEAM activities due to ease of lessons and professional development. More STEAM opportunities are being provided as a result. Staff, student and parent surveys.
- Reflecting on the past two years, our program has improved. We offer more STEAM based programs such as ecology, graphic design club, and Mogal program. We have had an increase of student participation since 2020-2022. We identify the amount of student involvement through our 5-star program.
- More learning opportunities for our younger students (TK-2nd)
- More materials and one on one hands on Coach leading the activity
- Students demonstrate learned skills in piano, dance, and art.
- Students are requesting more art classes in surveys.
- Data received has helped with meeting goals district wide for quality of improvement.
- surveys, participation
- Student engagement has improved %100.
- technology
- we have been able to implement more and more over time. hiring specific third parties to teach each enrichment.
- Students become more involved or say they cannot wait to do the activity again
- Engagement in the classroom, improvement in design thinking, increased in growth mindset
- the kids are more involved, and they ask to stay in the program longer to participate
- Student polls and surveys. Student attendance.
- Our data include student achievement in science and other subjects. Students on our programs outperform those that are not by 3%+ across subjects. We also have feedback surveys and formative feedback from district oversight.
- Increased interests
- We look over data surveys from last year and compare it to this year's data
- Students interest in STEAM has increased over the year
- Student ADA
- surveys
- We have gained student interest in areas of gardening/horticulture.
- ERC program Monitoring And Feedback,
- we are providing additional support to students that need help with academics due to low grades
- student reaction
- Student growth in certain activities. Mastering Legos and hands on experiments.
- students involvement and interests

- I would say our student attendance and feedback has been one of the biggest improvement signs.
- Student attendance and participation in the STEAM clubs.
- Attendance

Q56b What data indicate that your STEAM programming is not improving?

(Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q55 to be “No”)

*Headline: Of those who did not see improvement in STEAM programming over time, the most common metrics cited for indicating lack of improvement was student attendance, participation, and enrollment.*

Responses included:

- Information
- not many students are enrolling for stem activities
- student participation
- Have not offer for very long
- attendance
- There is a consistency
- We haven't been able to staff/supply our STEAM program since the pandemic shut down.
- Lack of student participation and staff support to have STEAM focus programs for after school activities.

Q56c What other data, information, etc. would you need to understand whether your STEAM programming is improving? (Skip logic requires at least one answer to Q55 to be “Not sure/don’t know”)

*Headline: Those who were not sure about whether their STEAM programming improved most commonly cited needing more or better data (15 responses).*

Responses included:

- more informative surveys
- Student engagement
- On hands training with ex. Science centers, teachers
- Time, I have been in this position for 7 months and have more to learn on how to read this program.
- na
- I would have to take a look at the information provided by research done on our STEAM programming.
- Asking returning participes if the program has improved compared to the previous year/s. Ask as well as the staff and all those involved
- more feedback from families
- More specific survey questions, looking at additional data such as student projects, student grades
- We would need to have more intentional data collection to determine improvements or assessments for our STEAM programming.
- Surveys
- Previous data?
- Getting statistics from PSS, data team
- Student surveys
- Im sure that what they provide is more than enough
- STEAM activity attendance
- testing
- This is my first year at this site, so there isn't a baseline to compare it to.
- Not sure since it is my first year, not sure what past data compared to new data shows
- we would need to implement more check ins where data was obtained in order to identify trends.
- NA
- Check for understanding by showcasing what students have done
- N/A
- Surveys form students
- More access to data
- Better tracking
- More data on student, teacher interest. Data how STEAM participation impacts the whole student and school.
- Students are more engaged
- targeted exit tickets, better evaluation of STEAM programs, more clarity on learning targets for students to build better assessments.
- student survey
- Not sure yet
- Independent surveying or CQI for STEAM
- In person evaluations, student feedback, Line staff feedback, additional feedback on our internal QAP (Quality Action Plan)
- Potentially more student data on whether they liked it, the quality of instruction, or any other feedback
- I am not to sure
- Students enjoy the programs and activities we do, but sometimes get bored quickly. Variety is key, and knowing what they do during the school day or what programs they are already familiar with would be helpful
- Student questionnaires
- Survey data
- N/A
- More time.
- more student surveys
- Running programming in a post-covid school environment is still an adjustment.

- I haven't seen past data
- I would need to gather data to see if it has improved.
- in school data