

Context, Infrastructure, and Alignment Matter: Statewide Systems Change in Round 4 of TAACCCT

This brief explores factors affecting the implementation of statewide systems change in the **Round 4 Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT)** grants, focusing on the experiences of statewide consortia. It first describes Round 4's emphasis on systems change and then discusses systems change to improve community colleges' ability to train workers in skills needed for in-demand jobs. The brief then presents findings on systems change efforts implemented by statewide consortia composed of multiple community colleges in one state. It concludes by summarizing the common elements affecting systems change efforts and suggesting areas to explore in future research.¹

For this brief and other TAACCCT Round 4 Evaluation findings visit: www.dol.gov/agencies/oasp/evaluation/completedstudies

TAACCCT Round 4 National Evaluation

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL)'s *Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT)* grants program was a \$1.9 billion investment aimed to help community colleges across the nation increase their capacity to provide education and training for unemployed workers and other adult learners to prepare them for in-demand jobs. DOL provided four rounds of grants, which operated between 2011 and 2018. In order to build evidence on its grant-funded programs and strategies, DOL funded a national evaluation of each round of grants to collect and assess data across all participating colleges. The Evaluation of Round 4 included the following components:

- An *implementation analysis* of the service delivery approaches developed and the systems changed through the grants.
- An *outcomes study* of nine Round 4 grantees and 34 programs using survey data and administrative records to better understand the characteristics of participants, their service receipt, and their training and employment outcomes.
- *Syntheses of third-party evaluation findings* to develop a national picture of the implementation of the capacity-building strategies and build evidence of the effectiveness of the strategies on participants' training and employment outcomes.
- A *study of employer perspectives on strong community college relationships* with selected Round 4 employer-partners, to better understand employers' perspectives on how to develop and maintain strong relationships with colleges.

This Brief adds to the findings from the synthesis of third party evaluations by describing how a subset of grantees used funds to implement system-wide changes to improve community colleges' ability to provide training services to target populations.

¹ More information on TAACCCT capacity-building strategies and participants' outcomes can be found in the *Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training: Round 4 Outcomes Study Final Report* (Judkins et al. 2020) and *Impact and Implementation Synthesis Report: Round 4 TAACCCT Third-Party Evaluation* (Scott et al. 2020).

TAACCCT GRANTS AND SYSTEMS CHANGE

The TAACCCT grant program provided funding to community colleges and other postsecondary institutions to increase their capacity to deliver education and training programs for unemployed workers and other adult learners to prepare for in-demand jobs.²

The fourth and final round of grants emphasized **systems change**. The grant announcement instructed applicants to “propose policy alignment across institutions to bring institutional changes to scale.”³ It also emphasized **collaboration** with the public workforce system and other stakeholders, such as employers, with a shared interest in training skilled workers for jobs in the grantees’ service areas. As detailed in other reports on Round 4 grantees’ efforts (Judkins et al., 2020; Scott et al., 2020), grantees used their funding to implement three broad categories of capacity-building strategies to support systems change:

- *Accelerated and enhanced learning strategies* to reduce adult learners’ time to complete training programs, such as **curriculum redesign** to create **career pathways** or **stackable credentials**, **technology-enabled learning**, **transfer credits**, and **credits for prior learning**.
- *Persistence and completion strategies* to support adult learners’ enrollment in, progress in, and completion of training programs, such as **academic advising**, **nonacademic advising**, **financial aid advising**, **career counseling**, and **nonacademic skills courses**.
- *Connections to employment strategies* to connect adult learners to the workforce, such as *work-based learning strategies* (**skills training** in physical or virtual environments, **internships**, and **apprenticeships**) and *employment services* (**job search or placement assistance** and **interviewing practice**).

Key Findings

- Consortia implemented statewide systems change in many of the capacity-building strategies pursued under the TAACCCT grants, including creation of career pathways, technology-enabled learning, transfer credits, credits for prior learning, partnerships with the public workforce system, and work-based learning.
- Across these strategies, factors that facilitated the implementation of statewide systems change included the state policy and governance context, existing infrastructure established under prior grants or initiatives, and alignment with and responsiveness to the needs of allied and key stakeholders.
- Promising areas for future research include the extent to which these changes will be sustained after the grants and on how these changes will inform implementation of relevant federal policies and efforts under relevant federal grant programs.

² The grant announcement required applicants to provide data and analysis on both current and projected employment opportunities for each targeted industry and specific occupation. This had to include data on current and expected job openings with at least two employers in the community in each targeted industry, and may have also included commitments from employers who expect to hire program participants.

³ <https://www.doleta.gov/grants/pdf/SGA-DFA-PY-13-10.pdf>

The Round 4 funding structure rewarded grantees that proposed systems change approaches that were regional and statewide, with tiered award levels based on the criteria listed in the Tiered Funding box (right).

This brief explores systems changes implemented by the 25 Round 4 grantees that were “statewide” consortia, defined as any consortium grantee with at least two colleges in any state. These are listed in the Appendix. Like all Round 4 grantees, these consortia were required to procure a third-party evaluator to assess their implementation of grant activities.

This brief also reports on systems change efforts by these consortia as documented in their third-party evaluation final reports.⁴ The research team analyzed the reports using qualitative data analysis software to identify key patterns and themes in the implementation of grantees’ systems change activities. Because third-party evaluation reports were due when the grant period ended, they may not have captured later developments related to sustaining the grant-initiated efforts. This brief therefore may underestimate lasting systems changes initiated under the TAACCCT grants.

Round 4 Tiered Funding Incentives

- **Larger grants for larger groups of institutions.** Consortia, wherein multiple community colleges applied for a joint grant, were eligible for higher funding amounts than single institutions; the more community colleges in the consortium, the higher the award amount.
- **Larger grants for specific capacity-building strategies supporting regional and statewide change.** Both single institutions and consortia could receive higher funding amounts for proposing programs that led to instruction on competencies and the awarding of credentials. Consortia could also receive higher funding amounts by proposing strategies to advance state career pathways systems or to improve statewide data collection, integration, and use.

SYSTEMS CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONTEXT

Attempting to effect systems change in community college settings—and attributing such change to any particular grant or initiative—is a complex endeavor for several reasons. First, states vary widely in the extent of their oversight and coordination of community colleges. Most states have a state board or other oversight entity, but just 11 states have statewide community college governance structures (McGuiness, 2014). In general, centralization and its associated governance and guidance processes facilitate broader adoption and implementation of lasting systems changes. Second, community colleges continuously refine their missions and approaches, particularly as related to occupational training (Bragg, 2011). The resulting ongoing systems change may be difficult to attribute to any specific initiative. Third, shifts in relevant federal policies in recent years provided incentives for community colleges to pursue (and explore collaborations on) systems change. The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), for example, designates community colleges as a partner to the public workforce system.

Round 4 consortia attempted to implement statewide systems change both in different contexts from one another and in statewide and national contexts that were evolving in their readiness for such change. It

⁴ As of August 2020, third-party evaluation reports are available on www.SkillsCommons.org. To locate final reports, select “Browse” → “Material Type” → “Final Program Report”

can therefore be difficult to disentangle which changes are related to of the Round 4 grant itself and which are related to other factors.

Broadly, the three factors shown in **Exhibit 1**—context, infrastructure, and alignment—appear to influence the implementation of systems change. Throughout the brief, the three icons shown in the exhibit will signify the influence of these factors.

FINDINGS ON STATEWIDE SYSTEMS CHANGE IMPLEMENTED BY ROUND 4 CONSORTIA

This section describes how grantees implemented statewide systems change as part of their grant-funded activities, the challenges they encountered in doing so, and the factors that facilitated execution of systems change.

The examples detailed below both illustrate what statewide systems change is possible to implement with funding, such as TAACCCT grants, and offer a roadmap to policymakers and practitioners to what can facilitate (and inhibit) implementation of such change.

Creation of Career Pathways through Curriculum Redesign

A key way consortia tried to implement systems change was through curriculum redesign to create career pathways. Most of the Round 4 consortia developed a career pathways conceptual framework⁵ as part of their project design (see Scott et al., 2020). For consortia, developing the framework represented a step towards statewide career pathways efforts (which, for some states, laid the groundwork for these efforts under WIOA). Findings suggest that two key factors affected grantees' career pathways framework development.





 **First, prioritizing alignment of their career pathways framework with the needs and priorities of local employers and policymakers appeared to enable consortia to be thoughtful about the framework's design.** In Minnesota, for example, *South Central College* created its consortium's career pathways stacked and latticed credentials in manufacturing in consultation with employers and state educational institutions, ensuring alignment among multiple stakeholders in a key growth industry. In California, efforts under the grant prepared *Chaffey College* and its consortium

Exhibit 1. Factors Affecting Statewide Systems Change

 CONTEXT
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1 State community college structure2 Evolution of community college missions3 State progress on implementation of relevant legislation
 INFRASTRUCTURE
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1 Infrastructure developed through prior rounds of TAACCCT funding, as well as other prior or concurrent relevant grants2 Infrastructure at the institutional level, such as staffing or training materials
 ALIGNMENT
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1 Alignment with existing efforts or initiatives2 Alignment with the needs of key stakeholders and end users (students, employers, workforce system)

⁵ Career pathways conceptual frameworks offer articulated education and training steps between occupations within an industry sector, combined with support services, to enable individuals to enter and exit the job market at various levels and to advance over time to higher skills, recognized credentials, and better jobs with higher pay.

members to participate in the state's Strong Workforce Program, which provides incentive funding to community colleges that meet specific metrics, including those related to career pathways.



Second, existing infrastructure, including prior rounds of TAACCCT funding, appeared to aid systemic changes related to career pathways frameworks. For example, in Iowa, *Hawkeye Community College's* consortium engaged employers to align information technology career pathways at three community colleges in Iowa with apprenticeship opportunities developed and piloted under the grant. To do so, grant staff built on a statewide employer engagement initiative, launched under a TAACCCT Round 2 grant that included all of the state's community colleges. This initiative created ongoing quarterly meetings, which are still active, between community colleges and their local employers to inform curriculum development and to facilitate internship and job placements (Jobs for the Future, 2019b).

Consortia could receive higher funding amounts under Round 4 by proposing specific capacity-building strategies. The only grant that proposed advancing state career pathways systems went to *Chippewa Valley Technical College* in Wisconsin. This consortium used the funding to staff Career Pathways Coordinator positions at all of the state's 16 technical colleges to both develop pathways at their institutions and support the alignment of career pathways policies among the other technical colleges. These efforts built on prior infrastructure to develop state career pathways systems. Wisconsin began building its career pathways infrastructure in 2007 through a Joyce Foundation grant for the Regional Industry Skills Education initiative, which was a partnership between the state's technical college system and the state workforce development system to advance career pathways development. The state technical college system subsequently received TAACCCT grants in Rounds 2, 3, and 4. Immediately before the Round 4 grant, the technical college system revamped its policies and funding approach to support career pathways through a joint initiative with the state department of workforce development.

Technology-Enabled Learning

Consortia also supported systems change through technology-enabled instruction such as online and hybrid learning and computerized simulation programs. In addition to numerous examples of specific equipment and physical infrastructure investments, consortia also developed consortium-wide or statewide vehicles for promoting the adoption and use of technology-enabled instruction strategies. Two patterns emerged in grantees' implementation around technology-enabled instruction.



First, uptake of these technologies required sufficient institutional infrastructure for implementing new platforms. Consortia reported challenges in the initial adoption of these technologies due to variable quality and stability of the platforms, challenges working with the contractors developing these platforms, and lack of interest or technology skills among targeted participants. Consortia were generally able to overcome these initial challenges, but those with prior experience implementing computerized simulation and online/hybrid learning—including under prior rounds of TAACCCT funding—were more easily able to use these technologies for the Round 4 grant. For example, in Wisconsin, *Chippewa Valley Technical College* developed new statewide courses that included computerized simulation learning scenarios for health care programs, which built on similar efforts under earlier statewide TAACCCT grants for advanced manufacturing and information technology.



Second, alignment with and engagement of end users, such as the community college system and students, facilitated adoption of these technologies.

For example, *Hawkeye Community College* created the Iowa Community College Simulation Network, which included community colleges across the state and outside the consortium; network members continued to meet regularly after the Round 4 grant to share resources on incorporating classroom simulation in health care training. In New Jersey, members of the consortium led by *Bergen Community College* adopted a hybrid in-person/online introduction to health professions course developed and piloted by one of the member colleges. In Hawaii, the *University of Hawaii at Manoa* used the Round 4 grant to pilot the use of videoconferencing software so training program participants in rural areas could participate remotely.

Transfer Credits

Transfer credits provide an opportunity for lasting systems change to support persistence and completion by making it simpler for participants to transition from one institution or training program to another. Examples of such efforts included articulation agreements between individual community colleges, between community colleges and four-year institutions (both public and private), and between community colleges and K-12 schools. Two factors appeared to affect grantees' implementation success around transfer and articulation agreements.



Context, and specifically the extent of centralization and standardization in community college systems, seemed to affect the speed with which these agreements could be finalized.

Key challenges cited by grantees in developing and implementing transfer and articulation agreements related to the difficulty of working across institutional requirements and contexts. For example, arranging for transfer credits required aligning programming across semester and trimester systems, converting clock-hours to credit-hours, and navigating multiple institutions' approval processes for these agreements. For consortia located in states that had existing efforts to standardize and centralize across their educational institutions, this process was considerably smoother. For example, in New Jersey, *Bergen Community College* developed transfer and articulation agreements between consortium members (e.g., between entry-level health care trainings and an associate's degree in allied health, and between a Licensed Practical Nurse training and a bachelor's degree in Nursing). In Maryland, *Montgomery College* developed new articulation agreements for cybertechnology training with both high schools and colleges. Both of those states have relatively centralized systems; by contrast, consortia in states with decentralized or less-coordinated systems struggled more to address these challenges.



Existing state-level infrastructure also appeared to aid the development of transfer and articulation agreements.

The transfer and articulation agreements developed under Round 4 by *Central Arizona College* in Arizona, *Massasoit Community College* in Massachusetts, and Wisconsin's *Chippewa Valley Technical College* benefited from existing state-level initiatives to promote such agreements. In Arizona, for example, transfer and articulation agreements developed under Round 4 benefited from existing efforts under AZ Transfer, a statewide collaboration among 21 community colleges, tribal colleges, and state universities to promote transfer of credits and degree completion for students in all public postsecondary institutions in Arizona. In Florida, credential programs developed by members of *Miami Dade College's* consortium articulated statewide to associate degrees specified under the state department of education's Statewide Career and Technical Education Articulation Agreements.

Credits for Prior Learning

Through implementation of prior learning assessment policies, consortia sought to facilitate awarding credit for prior learning. These policies capitalize on participants' prior work experience and education and accelerate time to completion of training. Two factors appeared to affect grantees' implementation success around this strategy.



The context for the community college system, and specifically the extent of standardization across and coordination between community colleges.

Some consortia struggled to initiate or sustain systems change around prior learning assessment due to the challenges of gaining agreement about application of the policies across and within participating colleges and multiple accrediting bodies. Consortia that were able to build and implement statewide efforts generally either included all community colleges in the state or tried actively to involve non-consortium colleges in policymaking. For example, *Mountwest Community & Technical College* in West Virginia, whose consortium included all community colleges in the state, designed processes to help community colleges award credit for prior learning to veterans through evaluation of military transcripts and application of appropriate credit for military experience on their college transcripts.

In Massachusetts, a consortium of all the state's community colleges, led by *Massasoit Community College*, created a website on prior learning assessments with information for prospective participants and an online "wizard" to help them build a prior learning portfolio and select relevant training programs in science, technology, engineering, and math fields. In Maryland, a statewide working group comprising two- and four-year institutions convened under *Montgomery College's* grant to develop a website detailing the opportunities for credit for prior learning in the cybersecurity industry across the state.



Alignment with state-level prior learning assessment policy efforts.

For example, in Kansas, *Washburn University of Topeka's* activities around prior learning assessments occurred in coordination with the state Board of Regents' work to crosswalk military occupational specialties and college programs of study, which facilitated statewide adoption of these crosswalks. In New Jersey, *Bergen Community College* shared the standards for health care prior learning assessment it developed as part of the Round 4 grant with the state's prior learning assessment network for use in and application to other training fields. By contrast, lack of alignment in prior learning assessment policies with state-level efforts hindered progress for some grantees. One consortium had hoped to create prior learning assessment policies in tandem with the state board of education's ongoing overhauling of its policies on awarding credit for prior learning. However, delays in finalizing those new policies at the state level meant that the consortium could not make progress on its prior learning assessment policies.

Partnerships with the Public Workforce System

Community colleges are a key partner to the public workforce system under WIOA; and in many states, efforts under the TAACCCT grant to build partnerships laid the groundwork for those relationships. The funding announcement for Round 4 emphasized strategic alignment with the public workforce system, emphasizing the importance of the community college and workforce development systems partnering for both planning under WIOA and working together on goals such as engaging local employers and providing customized job search assistance services and training funding to TAACCCT participants. Some consortia reported challenges with engaging the public workforce system due to lack of consortium staff

time for such engagement; lack of familiarity with the workforce system’s approach and core programs; lack of alignment between training enrollment timing and the availability of Individual Training Account funds; and in rural areas, distance between the colleges and their nearest American Job Center. Addressing these challenges, consortia with successful workforce system partnerships invested in three common elements to ensure lasting and productive partnerships.⁶



Co-location of workforce system staff to create the *infrastructure* to connect participants with employment services.

For example, all of New Mexico’s community colleges, as part of the consortium led by *Santa Fe Community College*, provided space for workforce system staff to be located on their campuses and they continued to have co-located staff on campus after the grant ended (Jobs for the Future, 2018). Having workforce system staff co-located—which aligns with WIOA’s focus on improving access to services⁷—made it easier for college staff to learn about the workforce system and to be able to provide participants with access to workforce system services, including funding for training. In addition to staff co-location, consortia in more rural areas also arranged to bridge the distance to the nearest American Job Center in other ways. For example, in Minnesota, *South Central College* hosted American Job Center staff for on-campus workshops on job training topics. In Kansas, *Washburn University of Topeka* established a contract between the consortium and the state department of commerce to operate a mobile workforce unit throughout the state in order to provide counseling and assistance in communities that no longer have American Job Centers, as well as in military bases. Such collaborations developed through the grant provided a way to address that WIOA’s emphasis on partnerships and systems coordination has been more challenging to operationalize in rural areas (Betesh, 2018).



Aligning data collection and performance measurement practices to enable consortia and workforce system partners to benefit.

One of the challenges of partnerships across complex systems is the differences in how those systems define eligibility and measure performance, but several consortia used their collaboration with the public workforce system to begin moving towards aligning those definitions and practices. For example, in North Dakota, rather than create its own employment performance measures scorecard, *Bismarck State College* contributed its data to the state workforce agency’s WIOA scorecard. This choice both enabled the consortium to have its data matched with wage records⁸ (which was not previously possible given restrictions on the release of individual-level wage data) and to provide a vehicle for collaboration with the public workforce system beyond the end of the TAACCCT grant.



Existing *infrastructure* to facilitate collaboration to improve cross-agency data collection, integration, and use between the community college and workforce development systems. In Kansas, *Washburn University of Topeka’s* consortium received additional funding under Round 4 to improve statewide data collection, integration, and use, representing a key investment in future understanding of the effectiveness of career pathways programs developed under TAACCCT. The consortium worked with the state Board of Regents to formalize an agreement for access

⁶ More examples and additional detail on the examples that follow appear in a summary brief looking across all rounds of the grants (Jobs for the Future, 2018).

⁷ For more information on this priority under WIOA, see *Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 14-15*, https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/corr_doc.cfm?DOCN=3363.

⁸ For more information on the importance of access to wage records for WIOA reporting, see *Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 14-18*, https://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL/TEGL_14-18_Acc.pdf.

to individual-level data on participants and their educational and workforce outcomes. The Board of Regents then developed standardized wage data reporting tables that could be used for WIOA reporting. Before this agreement, the colleges did not have permission to access individual-level employment data; the agreement enabled the consortium to understand its outcomes by leveraging the Board's data access and analysis capabilities. It is important to note that these efforts built on existing infrastructure, specifically work begun under a Workforce Data Quality Initiative grant and a State Longitudinal Data Systems grant.⁹

Work-Based Learning, Including Apprenticeship

Consortia used a variety of approaches to give participants work experience in their target industry, including internships, apprenticeships, cooperative education programs, and customized training opportunities designed for employer partners. A key challenge in arranging these opportunities was finding employers to host such placements, particularly given limited college staff time to devote to employer engagement (and specifically to address employers' reluctance to host work-based learning opportunities). Consortium staff reported that it was sometimes difficult to convince employers of the value of these arrangements. Some employers were leery of the time and paperwork involved in setting up the arrangements; some were concerned about the potential liability of hosting participants at their facility. Most consortia were able to overcome these challenges, but implementation was smoothest when consortia developed their opportunities in response to the identified needs of specific employers (Scott et al. 2018). To establish a lasting statewide strategy for work-based learning, findings suggest that it was beneficial to establish three points of alignment with the needs of employers willing to host placements.



First, alignment of instructional approaches with employer needs to create a source of demand for work-based learning opportunities. For example, *Mid-South Community College's* consortium in and around Memphis, Tennessee, developed a cooperative education program. To be selected, participants had to complete at least 50 percent of the curriculum and be recommended by an instructor, who worked in the transportation industry. The program placed participants in work sites chosen by that instructor, working there four days a week and attending class one day a week. Similarly, in West Virginia, *Mountwest Community & Technical College* developed a Patient Care Technician training program that included a 60-hour internship requirement. The internship requirement continues post-grant at the request of a local hospital.



Second, alignment between the structure of work-based learning opportunities and employer work cycles to facilitate placement. In Kentucky, *Hazard Community and Technical College* responded to workforce needs of employers in information technology by developing virtual internships that connected participants with employers that had short-term project work that could be done remotely.






Third, alignment with existing statewide initiatives and structures to enable consortia to leverage relationships with employers that were already interested in developing work-based learning opportunities. In Minnesota, *South Central College* created a statewide apprenticeship coalition of employers willing to offer Registered Apprenticeships in advanced manufacturing fields. The consortium also engaged employers to create statewide apprenticeship

⁹ For more information on grantees' data integration work, see Jobs for the Future (2019a).

standards and models, and it collaborated with a national industry association to develop a mentorship curriculum for employers offering apprenticeships. To support these efforts, the consortium leveraged a grant program created by the state legislature to compensate employers for participating in Registered Apprenticeships or other work-based learning. In Montana, *Missoula College–University of Montana* convened 11 employers to develop curricula and engaged 53 employers across the state to sponsor new Registered Apprenticeship opportunities. The consortium used grant funds to hire staff to coordinate with employers for the consortium’s apprenticeship program and housed these staff in the state department of labor, where they reported to the state’s director of apprenticeship.

CONCLUSION

Using Round 4 funds, consortia facilitated statewide systems changes to support capacity-building strategies including creation of career pathways, technology-enabled learning, transfer credits, credits for prior learning, partnerships with the public workforce system, and work-based learning/apprenticeship. Findings suggest that grantees’ implementation of these strategies benefited from the following common elements:

-  State policy and governance **context**, and the extent to which policy and governance allowed or supported consortia to coordinate at the state-level to initiate and advocate for statewide systems change. For example, credit for prior learning and transfer credits were easier to develop in states with centralized community college systems, and implementation of these approaches benefited from joining statewide efforts around these issues.
-  Building on existing **infrastructure**, including efforts begun under prior grants, often facilitated systems change. Consortia that successfully engage employers for work-based learning opportunities; develop career pathways frameworks; and improve data collection, integration, and use frequently built on efforts supported either by prior round TAACCCT grants or by concurrent grants from other state, philanthropic, or federal funding streams (such as the Workforce Data Quality Initiative). This meant they were at a later stage of addressing these issues. They had worked through contextual, partnering, and prototyping challenges in prior efforts, thus could use the Round 4 grant funding to support more mature efforts. Consistent with findings from other evaluations of statewide systems change efforts around workforce development (Almandsmith et al. 2011; Roberts and Price 2015; Dunham, Folsom, and Geckeler 2018), the consortia that built on prior efforts were better positioned to focus on institutionalizing innovative strategies rather than piloting them.
-  **Alignment** with and responsiveness to the needs of allied and key stakeholders—employers, state agencies, and the public workforce system—facilitated the adoption of new practices. For example, engagement of employers and workforce system partners prioritized collaborations that would enable those partners to mutually benefit. As has been noted in the broader literature on systems change (Murray, Caulier-Grice, and Mulgan 2010; Grant and Sacks 2019), understanding the needs of end users and other key stakeholders is a crucial step in ensuring both initial buy-in and lasting change. That step appears to be equally important for these grantees.

Questions for Additional Research

Based on these findings, future research on systems change around workforce development in community college settings might explore these questions:

1. *Will systems changes initiated through Round 4 grants be sustained? Why or why not?*
2. *How can future grant programs ensure that changes developed and implemented under the grant continue beyond the funding period?*
3. *How will systems changes initiated or strengthened under these grants inform states' implementation of relevant legislation such as WIOA?*
4. *How will the systems change infrastructure developed or strengthened under these grants inform efforts funded under subsequent grants awarded by the U.S. Department of Labor, such as America's Promise Job Training Grants; Apprenticeships: Closing the Skills Gap; State Apprenticeship Expansion; Scaling Apprenticeship Through Sector-Based Strategies; Workforce Opportunity for Rural Communities; and Veterans Accelerated Learning for Licensed Occupations?*
5. *Should future workforce development grant programs target their funding to grantees most likely to be able to effect statewide systems change, based on their state context and existing or prior efforts to effect such change? If so, how?*

Suggested citation: Betesh, Hannah, Smith, Adrienne, and Karen Gardiner. (2020). Context, Infrastructure, and Alignment Matter: Statewide Systems Change in Round 4 of TAACCCT. Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Chief Evaluation Office. Rockville, MD: Abt Associates.

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Chief Evaluation Office by Abt Associates under Contract Number DOL-ETA-14-F-00013. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to DOL, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement of same by the U.S. Government.

APPENDIX: ROUND 4 STATEWIDE CONSORTIA

Grantee (Lead College)	State
Multi-State Consortium	
Mid-South Community College	Arkansas, Tennessee
Single-State Consortium	
Bergen Community College	New Jersey
Bismarck State College	North Dakota
Board of Regents NSHE–Western Nevada College	Nevada
Central Arizona College	Arizona
Centralia College	Washington
Chaffey College	California
Chippewa Valley Technical College	Wisconsin
Hawkeye Community College	Iowa
Hazard Community and Technical College	Kentucky
Lorain County Community College	Ohio
Manchester Community College	Connecticut
Massasoit Community College	Massachusetts
Miami Dade College Kendall Campus	Florida
Missoula College–University of Montana	Montana
Montgomery College	Maryland
Mountwest Community & Technical College	West Virginia
North Idaho College	Idaho
Northampton Community College	Pennsylvania
Santa Fe Community College	New Mexico
South Central College	Minnesota
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville	Illinois
University of Alaska	Alaska
University of Hawaii at Manoa	Hawaii
Washburn University of Topeka	Kansas

REFERENCES

- Almandsmith, S., Walshok, M., Magill, K., Barker, L.T., et al. (2011). "Transforming Regional Economies: Challenges and Accomplishments Final Report of the Evaluation of Generation I Workforce Innovation Regional Economic Development (WIRED) Grants." Oakland, CA: Berkeley Policy Associates. https://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/ETAOP_2014-06-WIRED-Gen-I-Final-Report.pdf.
- Betesh, H. 2018. "American Job Center Service Delivery in Rural Areas." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research and Social Policy Research Associates. <https://www.mathematica.org/our-publications-and-findings/publications/an-institutional-analysis-of-american-job-centers-ajc-service-delivery-in-rural-areas>.
- Bragg, Debra D. 2001. "Opportunities and Challenges for the New Vocationalism in American Community Colleges." In *New Directions for Community Colleges* (Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series, No. 115), 5-15. [doi:10.1002/cc.26](https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.26).
- Dunham, K., L. Folsom, and C. Geckeler. 2018. "Creating Systems Change—Sustaining and Scaling Innovation: A Briefing Paper for the Accelerator Innovation Evaluation." Prepared for the California Workforce Development Board. Oakland, CA: Social Policy Research Associates.
- Grant, H. M., and A. Sacks. 2019. *Leading Systems Change: A Workbook for Community Practitioners and Funders*. San Mateo, CA: Open Impact and the With/In Collaborative.
- Jobs for the Future. 2018. "Powerhouse Partnerships: Community Colleges and Workforce Boards Working Together." https://taaccct.workforcegps.org/resources/2018/04/09/17/11/Powerhouse_Partnerships_Community_Colleges_and_Workforce_Boards_Working_Together.
- Jobs for the Future. 2019a. "How Three States Use Data to Improve Student Job Outcomes and Meet Employer Needs." https://taaccct.workforcegps.org/resources/2019/03/12/15/13/Resource_Data_to_Improve_Student_Job_Outcomes_and_Employer_Needs.
- Jobs for the Future. 2019b. "Statewide Employer Engagement in Iowa." https://taaccct.workforcegps.org/resources/2019/01/24/17/23/Resource_Employer_Engagement_Case_Study.
- Judkins, David, Karen Gardiner, Adrienne Smith, and Douglas Walton. 2020. *Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training: Round 4 Outcomes Study. Final Report*, Rockville, MD: Abt Associates.
- Murray, R., J. Caulier-Grice, and G. Mulgan. 2010. *The Open Book of Social Innovation*. London: National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts.
- Roberts, B., and D. Price. 2015. *Building Career Pathways for Adult Learners: An Evaluation of Progress in Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin After Eight Years of Shifting Gears*. Chicago, IL: The Joyce Foundation.
- Scott, Molly, Daniel Kuehn, Lauren Eyster, Amanda Briggs, Christin Durham, Natalie Spievack, and Alphonse Simon. 2020. *Round 4 TAACCCT Third-Party Evaluation: Implementation and Impact Synthesis Report*, Rockville, MD: Abt Associates.
- Scott, Molly, Lauren Eyster, Yipeng Su, David Blount, Alex Trutko, Adrienne Smith, and Karen Gardiner. (2018). *The Employer Perspectives Study: Insights on How to Build and Maintain Strong Employer-College Partnerships. Round 4 TAACCCT Evaluation*. Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Chief Evaluation Office. Rockville, MD; and Washington, DC: Authors.