The **Maker Movement**, a largely grassroots effort to establish **makerspaces** where participants can use a variety of design and fabrication tools, has become a focus of interest for educational institutions throughout the U.S. and California in recent years.

In 2016 the **California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO)** was interested in growing a statewide network of makerspaces linked to California Community Colleges, as a key partner in developing a workforce for the innovation economy. At the CCCCO’s request, the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) was commissioned to develop a report to inform these efforts. This report includes a literature review, background research, and interviews with stakeholders, all of which are used to develop a playbook of considerations and recommendations for establishing a network of makerspaces.

The CCCCO’s **Doing What MATTERS for Jobs and the Economy** framework envisioned a network of at least 10 makerspaces to support the efforts of California’s community colleges to help students prepare for this environment. CCST’s report provided background information and parameters for this proposed network.

CCST’s report helped identify key network characteristics, including a proposed organizational structure, parameters of varying makerspace models which could be included in the network, suggested budgets, a timeline, and practical considerations for evaluation and long-term strategies.

### SUMMARY

**The Maker Movement**, a largely grassroots effort to establish **makerspaces** where participants can use a variety of design and fabrication tools, has become a focus of interest for educational institutions throughout the U.S. and California in recent years.

In 2016 the **California Community College Chancellor’s Office (CCCCO)** was interested in growing a statewide network of makerspaces linked to California Community Colleges, as a key partner in developing a workforce for the innovation economy. At the CCCCO’s request, the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) was commissioned to develop a report to inform these efforts. This report includes a literature review, background research, and interviews with stakeholders, all of which are used to develop a playbook of considerations and recommendations for establishing a network of makerspaces.

**BACKGROUND**

There is an inherent challenge in bringing together traditional academic institutions with Maker culture. Traditional academic environments rely on measurable outcomes, working to achieve the “correct” result, and testing to demonstrate the value of an educational experience.

In contrast, makerspaces emphasize intrinsic motivation, student-led learning, multiple acceptable products/results, and the process of creating. With this complementary structure, makerspaces are well suited to link colleges with the regional economy and help students be competitive in California’s entrepreneurial environment.

The CCCCO’s **Doing What MATTERS for Jobs and the Economy** framework envisioned a network of at least 10 makerspaces to support the efforts of California’s community colleges to help students prepare for this environment. CCST’s report provided background information and parameters for this proposed network.

CCST’s report helped identify key network characteristics, including a proposed organizational structure, parameters of varying makerspace models which could be included in the network, suggested budgets, a timeline, and practical considerations for evaluation and long-term strategies.
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**Figure:** Venn diagram showing identified operational models for makerspace management (From Figure 2.2, Barrett et al.)