

CI-STEM Second Annual Survey Highlights

Patrik Lundh, Carrie Allen, Andrea Beesley,
Jared Boyce, Bowyee Gong



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

Survey Goals

- To measure three things in California afterschool sites:
 1. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)
 2. STEAM programming
 3. Whether and how CQI is used to improve STEAM programming
- Does **not** evaluate any individual, any site, or the California Department of Education Expanded Learning Division (EXLD)

Survey Administration

- Launched February 14, 2023; closed April 21, 2023
- Used a new, decentralized recruitment approach in 2023 to reach more respondents
 - Broad-spectrum outreach (vs. grant managers as initial point of contact)
 - In-person outreach (ex: 2023 CAN Site Coordinator Symposium)
 - Snowball method (asking all respondents to circulate the survey)

Survey respondents by role by year	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
2022	46	32	184	42	355
2023	83	109	355	111	339
% change	80%	241%	93%	164%	-5%

Survey Results Disclaimer

While the total number of respondents in 2023 increased compared to 2022, the total number of shared sites decreased—that is, more respondents were the sole respondent from their site. This makes cross-role comparisons challenging, as differences across roles may be due to differences in sites (rather than differences in roles).

We aim to use qualitative and site visit data to confirm cross-role survey comparisons as part of our triangulation process.

This presentation reports on some, but not all, of the questions asked in the survey. Full survey results for the 2023 survey are posted on our project website: <https://cistemresearch.org/>

CQI Knowledge & Practice

A group of diverse people, including men and women of various ethnicities, are gathered around a table in a meeting. They are looking at a laptop and a tablet, with one man pointing at the screen. The scene is overlaid with a semi-transparent blue filter. The text 'CQI Knowledge & Practice' is centered in white.

Familiarity with Continuous Quality Improvement

As in 2022, Grant Managers and Program Directors, followed by Site Coordinators, reported the most knowledge of CQI.

Please tell us how familiar you are with...	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
The term “continuous quality improvement”	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.0	2.7
Expectations for CQI from EXLD and the CA DOE	3.3	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.4
CQI Plan at my program/site	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.1	2.6
My program’s/site’s CQI goals	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.0	2.8
My program’s/site’s annual CQI report	3.2	3.2	3.0	2.8	2.4
<i>N</i>	89	109	355	111	339

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

CQI Training

Many respondents across all roles reported never receiving any CQI training in their current position or being uncertain whether they received such training.

I received training about continuous quality improvement since I started working in this position.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	34%	30%	15%	14%	10%
Yes	60%	59%	73%	52%	47%
Not sure/don't know	6%	11%	12%	34%	43%
<i>N</i>	83	109	355	111	339

External Sources of CQI Information and Learning

Only Grant Managers and Program Directors report significant external sources of CQI information and learning. There is no consistent external source of CQI information across respondents.

From whom do you learn or receive information about continuous quality improvement?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
California Department of Ed./ Expanded Learning Division	60%	51%	15%	14%	7%
California Afterschool Network	52%	48%	16%	15%	4%
My County Office of Education	43%	37%	13%	14%	5%
My region or system of support	39%	30%	11%	10%	1%
<i>N</i>	83	109	355	111	339

Contributions to CQI Plans

As in 2022, the majority of Grant Managers, Program Directors, and Site Coordinators contributed to their program's/site's CQI Plan. Most ASES Specialists and Frontline Staff did not.

I wrote or contributed to... my program's/site's CQI plan.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
	62%	65%	64%	43%	30%
<i>N</i>	82	108	350	107	313

I involved the following people in developing my program's/site's CQI plan:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Site Coordinators	90%	87%			
Frontline Staff	75%	84%			
<i>N</i>	51	70			

Perceptions of Site CQI Work Underway

As in 2022, nearly half of Frontline Staff reported not knowing if their site was currently working through a CQI cycle. Significant numbers of other roles also reported uncertainty.

My program/site is currently working through a CQI cycle.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	2%	6%	3%	4%	2%
Yes	77%	83%	79%	68%	49%
Not sure/don't know	20%	11%	18%	29%	49%
<i>N</i>	83	109	355	111	339

Perceptions of Site CQI Data Use (1/2)

As in 2022, most but not all Grant Managers, Program Directors, and Site Coordinators reported that they collect data as part of the CQI process. Around half of Frontline Staff reported uncertainty.

My program/site collects data as part of our continuous quality improvement process.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	4%	8%	5%	3%	3%
Yes	84%	82%	73%	68%	44%
Not sure/don't know	12%	10%	22%	30%	53%
<i>N</i>	83	109	355	111	339

Perceptions of Site CQI Data Use (2/2)

Even though most respondents report collecting data as part of the CQI process, they do not report strong agreement with easy access to those data.

Prompt	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Information about our CQI work is regularly shared with me.	3.0	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6
I have easy access to data about our CQI work.	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.5
Other people at my program/site have easy access to data about our CQI work.	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.7
<i>N</i>	83	109	355	110	339

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

Knowledge of Site CQI Work

As in 2022, respondents at best modestly agreed to knowing everything they needed to know about their program's/site's CQI work, yet also did not agree that anyone else knew more about it.

Prompt	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
I know everything I need to know about my program's/site's continuous quality improvement (CQI) work.	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.5
Other people at my program/site know more about our CQI work than I do.	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.8
<i>N</i>	83	109	355	110	339

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

Perceived Impact of CQI

All respondent groups Somewhat Agreed to positive impacts of CQI on their work, yet somewhat less so than in 2022 (averages 0.2–0.6 lower varying by item and respondent group).

Prompt	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	
Through the quality improvement process, I've learned things I didn't know before.	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.1	
I've made changes to my practice based on our quality improvement process.	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	
As a result of our program's participation in the quality improvement process, the quality of programming improved at my sites.	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.1	
	<i>N</i>	83	109	355	110	339

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

CQI Summary

- As in 2022 and as confirmed by site visits, CQI knowledge and practices exist most frequently with grantee-level staff (Grant Managers and Program Directors) and with Site Coordinators.
- To varying degrees, all respondent groups report significant lack of involvement in CQI planning, knowledge of CQI work, and/or receiving CQI training and information.

STEAM Programming



STEAM Programming Content Areas

Site Coordinators and ASES Specialists report a wide variety of STEAM content areas incorporated into their sites' programming.

What content areas are addressed by STEAM programming at your site?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Mathematics			64%	62%	
Life science			39%	44%	
Earth science			44%	39%	
Physical science (chemistry, physics)			37%	36%	
Engineering			51%	42%	
Computer science			38%	38%	
Visual arts			60%	62%	
Dance			43%	39%	
Music			48%	36%	
		<i>N</i>	353	110	

STEAM Programming Planning

Site Coordinators and Frontline Staff do the most planning of STEAM activities.

In your program, who plans STEAM activities?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Site Coordinator	74%	72%	64%	49%	60%
Frontline Staff	50%	62%	62%	43%	60%
Program Director	46%	46%	23%	31%	28%
Community partners	21%	19%	12%	10%	7%
<i>N</i>	82	109	351	106	338

STEAM Programming Curriculum Materials

Respondents most frequently reported finding STEAM curriculum materials from internet searches, followed by program staff.

We find or receive curriculum materials and/or resources for STEAM programming from:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Internet searches	33%	48%	40%	34%	29%
My program/site grant manager	25%	27%	38%	27%	28%
My site coordinator	21%	27%	32%	33%	56%
Co-workers	18%	28%	26%	26%	25%
An external vendor/provider who conducts our STEAM program	31%	22%	21%	19%	7%
County Office of Education	31%	30%	12%	16%	7%
Site teachers	24%	12%	17%	18%	17%
<i>N</i>	80	109	348	106	333

Participation in STEAM Activities

Site Coordinators and ASES Specialists report two-thirds of students participate in STEAM activities, yet most staff report all youth participate in STEAM activities.

What percentage of children who regularly attend your program participate in STEAM activities?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	
% students			64%	64%		
	<i>N</i>		350	105		
How are youth selected to participate in STEAM activities?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	
All youth participate	58%	60%	59%	58%	45%	
Youth decide whether and how to participate	34%	31%	40%	31%	25%	
Afterschool staff choose youth who participate	11%	19%	13%	21%	14%	
	<i>N</i>	80	108	347	106	333

STEAM Programming Evaluation

The most common ways respondents evaluate youth experiences in STEAM are through student work, reflection questions, and student surveys. “Other” responses are most frequently “N/A,” “don’t know,” or observational in nature (ex: “smiling faces of kids”)

How do you evaluate youth experiences with STEAM activities?	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Student work	59%	66%	70%	60%	53%
Reflection questions	50%	57%	53%	44%	40%
Student surveys	48%	40%	38%	31%	20%
Culminating events	41%	44%	31%	22%	17%
Exit tickets	10%	16%	9%	9%	11%
Other	6%	4%	4%	7%	7%
We do not evaluate youth experiences with STEAM activities	14%	16%	14%	6%	25%
<i>N</i>	80	108	347	106	333

STEAM Community of Practice/Hub Membership

Few respondents report that their programs or sites participate in a STEAM Community of Practice (CoP) or Hub. Many respondents report not knowing, including most site staff.

Our program is in a STEAM Community of Practice or Hub.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Yes, we are.	16%	22%	12%	19%	11%
No, and we never have been.	20%	16%	9%	9%	3%
No, but we used to be.	5%	13%	2%	1%	1%
No, but our program is interested in knowing more about it.	25%	18%	12%	9%	6%
Not sure/don't know.	34%	32%	64%	63%	79%
<i>N</i>	80	108	348	106	331

STEAM CoP/Hub Services

Of the respondents who reported being in a STEAM CoP/Hub, they reported the STEAM CoP/Hub provided several services and supports to their programs/sites.

The STEAM CoP/Hub has provided my program/site with:	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
Professional development	85%	79%	72%	55%	54%
Opportunities to collaborate with other programs/sites	85%	79%	58%	55%	35%
High-quality STEAM learning activities	77%	71%	61%	60%	65%
Instructional resources	77%	46%	30%	30%	35%
<i>N</i>	13	24	43	20	37

STEAM CoP/Hub Impacts

Of the respondents who reported being in a STEAM CoP/Hub, they overall report significant positive impacts from their STEAM CoP/Hub.

Prompt	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
The STEAM CoP/Hub helps build our capacity to provide high-quality learning at our site.	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.5
The support I receive from the STEAM CoP/Hub is beneficial to our program.	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.4
The STEAM tools and strategies we use in my program come from the STEAM CoP/Hub.	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.4
The STEAM CoP/Hub connects my program to regional partners (businesses, museums, colleges).	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.2
<i>N</i>	13	24	43	20	37

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

CQI & STEAM



CQI & STEAM: Occurrence

As in 2022, most respondents reported not conducting CQI cycles on STEAM programming or not being sure whether they had done so.

We have conducted continuous quality improvement cycles specifically focused on our STEAM programming.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	65%	56%	37%	25%	9%
Yes	6%	18%	30%	22%	26%
Not sure/don't know	29%	27%	34%	54%	65%
<i>N</i>	80	108	347	106	332

CQI & STEAM: Impact

As in 2022, most respondents reported either not changing their STEAM programming due to CQI work or not knowing whether the programming had changed.

We have changed our STEAM programming as a result of our continuous quality improvement cycles (even if the cycles weren't specifically focused on STEAM).	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS
No	41%	39%	29%	15%	9%
Yes	20%	31%	35%	32%	20%
Not sure/don't know	39%	31%	36%	53%	71%
<i>N</i>	80	108	347	106	330

CQI & STEAM: Data

Unlike 2022, all respondent groups had reported a lack of collecting data on the quality of their STEAM programming or uncertainty about such data collection. (In 2022, most Grant Managers reported “yes.”)

We collect data about the quality of our STEAM programming.	GM	PD	SC	ASES	FS	
No	41%	44%	33%	20%	9%	
Yes	31%	33%	37%	30%	21%	
Not sure/don't know	28%	23%	30%	50%	70%	
	<i>N</i>	80	108	347	106	330