



14

Education Policy Perspective on Entrepreneurship

John E. Reilly

Introduction

It is probably a mistake to quote scripture in an academic publication because an exegesis will be expected. However, Bill Gates in his Harvard Commencement speech in 2007, in which he was urging the faculty and graduates to recognise their responsibility to tackle global problems, quoted a letter from his mother in which she said “From those to whom much is given, much is expected”. J.F. Kennedy, in an address to the Massachusetts legislature, January 9, 1961, expressed it slightly differently “For of those to whom much is given, much is required”. In both cases, the concept is clear but neither acknowledged or were expected to cite their source expressed at greater length and perhaps more elegantly “For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more” (Luke 12:48 King James translation).

Bill Gates was addressing a gathering at Harvard but his admonition was intended to apply more universally to the academic world. Universities may justifiably fear that international and national bodies too have this scriptural admonition in mind when they proclaim their manifold requirements for what universities are to achieve in the twenty-first century amounting to a transformation of the economic, social and political landscape. The intensity and diversity of the demands on universities for ‘in-depth reform’ to address

J. E. Reilly (✉)
University of Kent, Canterbury, UK
e-mail: J.E.Reilly@kent.ac.uk

the current perceived needs of governments and society puts them in an enviable central role but it may also challenge more universal university values.

This chapter reflects on one aspect of the extensive external agenda for Higher Education, namely, the rise in the volume of exhortation on the need for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial education in universities as a key component in the solution to the perceived needs of the age. This may possibly be interpreted as an indication of frustration that in spite of increased investment and greater participation in Higher Education, the impact is not achieving the hoped-for results. It examines a selection of international and national reports and statements which assert the importance and need for entrepreneurial education. It notes that for the large part universities have been followers rather than leaders and that there is significant ambiguity in the statements about what is expected from universities. Are they to become more entrepreneurial institutions; are all students in all three cycles to learn to be entrepreneurial; should there be an increase in programmes devoted to entrepreneurship; and in each case, what would the transformation/reform mean in practice?

In Europe, the European Commission has led the campaign for greater emphasis on entrepreneurship and has sponsored a number of dedicated initiatives recognising that the European response to entrepreneurial education has been muted and possibly of poor quality. While the Commission has been active in promoting the topic, it could be argued that the case for entrepreneurial education has become an article of faith rather than a policy based on evidence. It has not produced evidence-based research to demonstrate the impact of entrepreneurial education and how this relates to the need for graduates with well-grounded subject-specific knowledge, understanding and ability as well as generic competences. In particular, it has not exploited the growth in Erasmus+ work placements/traineeships to focus on the entrepreneurial competences which placements should engender.

In the wider Europe represented in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)—Bologna Process—the assertion of the importance of entrepreneurial education as a source for change and a motor for achieving the goals of the EHEA has been slower to gather momentum, but in the most recent communiqués it could be said that the entrepreneurial throttle has been opened and now, if not quite in pole position, entrepreneurial education is among the leaders on the grid. It remains to be seen whether and how this will result in radical change in curriculum and how EHEA universities will respond to the challenges. In the final section, the UK is presented as a possible case study of a country which may be argued to have embraced the entrepreneurial agenda.

Expectations from Higher Education

In October 1998, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) convened a World Conference on “Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century”. Its extravagant objective was to “lay down the fundamental principles for the in-depth reform of higher education systems throughout the world”. The report and the “Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development in Higher Education” (UNESCO 1998) is emblematic of the way in which governments and international organisations seek to articulate a role for Higher Education which might be interpreted as being “all things to all people”.

The summary of the Declaration illustrates the comprehensive multifaceted roles which Higher Education is expected to play:

The core missions of higher education systems (to educate, to train, to undertake research and, in particular, to contribute to the sustainable development and improvement of society as a whole) should be preserved, reinforced and further expanded, namely to educate highly qualified graduates and responsible citizens and to provide opportunities (*espaces ouverts*) for higher learning and for learning throughout life. Moreover, higher education has acquired an unprecedented role in present-day society, as a vital component of cultural, social, economic and political development and as a pillar of endogenous capacity-building, the consolidation of human rights, sustainable development, democracy and peace, in a context of justice. It is the duty of higher education to ensure that the values and ideals of a culture of peace prevail. (ibid.: 1)

These core and far-reaching objectives are demanding, possibly utopian, but they do not represent the full extent of the expectations which Higher Education is expected to fulfil. In addition, higher education institutions (HEIs) are to be “critical and forward-looking ... through the ongoing analysis of emerging social, economic, cultural and political trends, providing a focus for forecasting, warning and prevention”. They must be relevant “in terms of the fit between what society expects of institutions and what they do. Institutions...should base their long-term orientations on societal aims and needs, including the respect of cultures and environment protection”.

HEIs must also be responsible for the development of “*entrepreneurial skills and initiatives (which) should become major concerns*” (my italics). “Special attention should be paid to higher education’s role of service to society, especially activities aimed at eliminating poverty, intolerance, violence, illiteracy, hunger, environmental degradation and disease, and to activities aiming at the development of peace, through an interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary

approach”. They must be ‘student centred’, ensure equal opportunities, widen participation, exploit the full potential of information and communication technologies, develop an international dimension and be committed to a pervasive quality culture’.

The 1998 UNESCO Declaration and Framework for action provide evidence of the pivotal role that government rhetoric and exhortation is claiming for HEIs. It has been followed up by successive meetings. In May 2015, the Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action “for the implementation of sustainable development goals for – ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all” was adopted (UNESCO 2015). The four targets for the sustainable development goal 4, includes 4.4: “By 2030 substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills including technical and vocational skills for employment, decent jobs and *entrepreneurship*” (ibid.: 20, my italics).

The UNESCO documents define a role or roles, which, if the Declaration is taken at face value, place a heavy responsibility and burden on institutions, their staff and their leaders. The question must be posed whether this all-embracing mission is either appropriate or achievable and whether teachers actually engage with the extended agenda. This question will be in the background of the exploration of ‘entrepreneurism and entrepreneurship’ in education, the demand for which has become progressively louder and more persistent from international organisations—UNESCO, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the European Union (EU) and national governments through the Bologna Process and the EHEA.

The election of President Trump in the US might be perceived to represent the apotheosis of entrepreneurship. An entrepreneur has become the Head of State of the most powerful country in the world and his cabinet and immediate advisers are in large part successful entrepreneurs. Time will reveal whether entrepreneurial success translates or transfers seamlessly into success in government in all its facets.

Other chapters in this volume address aspects of the history of entrepreneurship as an academic subject in more detail than we do here. Suffice to say that Schumpeter’s *Theory of Economic Development* (1934) (Schumpeter 1934) is credited by many writers as the precursor of formal teaching of entrepreneurship, with the first graduate course offered by Harvard in 1948. Karen Wilson (2008) points out that while entrepreneurship courses are pervasive in universities in the US, “In Europe entrepreneurship only substantially began to enter the curriculum in the last ten years”, that is, in the latter part of the 1990s and increasingly as the new century progressed. This coincides with the launch of the Bologna Process and the increasing engagement of the EU with Higher Education policy and delivery, which is discussed in more detail in the next section.

In Search of a Mission for Higher Education

The development, popularity and burgeoning of new subject areas in Higher Education is closely associated with growth in the number of institutions and greater participation in Higher Education, both of which have contributed to a more competitive Higher Education environment and continuous open and public scrutiny of the purpose of and outcomes from high public investment in Higher Education. As students, their families and governments pay close attention to educational returns, institutions are anxious to demonstrate their distinctive qualities and identity, in their approach to learning and teaching and in their subject focus, manufacturing a constant flow of new degree titles and repackaging of existing ones in inter- and multidisciplinary programmes. In response to imaginative initiatives from the European Commission, national growth in new programmes has been complemented by a growth in joint international degrees, mainly at the second and third cycles. The Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA) website (EACEA 2017) provides an excellent illustration of the variety of Erasmus Mundus joint programmes in all subject areas.

In their day-to-day work, individual academics may not think a great deal about the role of the university since they tend to be absorbed by their subject, their immediate teaching responsibilities, their research and how these contribute to the development of their professional career. However, they cannot ignore the growing societal pressures on Higher Education and have to respond by adapting curriculum content and methods of learning and teaching. Because they have to compete for students and are subject to student evaluation, they have to consider the general attractiveness of course titles and content and the longer-term impact on the future employment of their students.

Although the individual university teacher may not be occupied with a vision of the university mission, it is probable that, as a collective, the wider university community may continue to espouse Newman's *Idea of the University* (1852) (Newman 1852) and the paramount importance of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake or Humboldt's emphasis on research and remain convinced that these are the real and true objects of university education. However, in a world more and more dominated by populist politics and media headlines, these perspectives no longer hold general sway and as Sacha Garben (2012) asserts "the relevance of education is increasingly phrased in economic terms favouring the skills-oriented approach focusing on employability of graduates and encouraging universities liaising with the business community".

This view provides the thrust behind the assertion in EU, OECD, UNESCO and Bologna/EHEA documents that Higher Education is a 'public good'. Public good may be cloaked in honeyed rhetoric but in essence it is related to the economic return from a more highly educated population with an escalating obligation on HEIs to 'produce' graduates with relevant skills and competences for the labour market. Universities are urged to ensure that they are student centred, concentrating on the student as learner, ensuring a transparent articulation of outcomes expressed in terms of knowledge, understanding and ability. The European Commission-funded Tuning projects have taken this approach to a global level in a wide range of subjects integrating and making explicit generic and subject-specific competences as key components of the outcomes approach (Tuning Academy 2017).

Although the initial 'outcomes' policy was based on first-cycle programmes, the outcomes approach now permeates second and third cycles. The European *Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training* (European Commission 2011) indicate explicitly that alongside research training and a research output, development of transferrable competences must be a central component of doctoral training. "It is essential to ensure that enough researchers have the skills demanded by the knowledge based economy. Examples include communication, teamwork, entrepreneurship, project management, IPR, ethics, standardisation" (ibid.). Note that for doctoral candidates, 'entrepreneurship' is perceived to be a critical competence and this is a generic competence applying to all subjects.

Phrases such as 'value' and 'value added' in relation to the objectives of Higher Education have been replaced by economic return, employability, innovation and creativity and explicit references to the need for entrepreneurial training have become more prominent and insistent. The Recommendation of the European Parliament and Council on key competences for lifelong learning (EC COM 2006) identified "Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship" as one of the eight key competences for all citizens (ibid.).

Accompanying other policy objectives for a general growth in participation in Higher Education has been the social cohesion agenda to widen this participation. This theme has become more dominant both within the EU and the Bologna Process. While it is argued in terms of equity and benefits to the individual, it is difficult to avoid being cynical when, in practice, large-scale expansion in many countries is seen to benefit what might be broadly defined as the middle classes.

All of this is pertinent to any consideration of entrepreneurship in education because it reveals the manifold pressures and far-reaching agenda with which universities now have to operate and which were expressed in elaborate

detail in the UNESCO Declaration and Framework of 1998. They are expected to be agents for social change, for economic development, regional, national and international, for research with increasing emphasis on impact-focused research, for development of the widest range of skills and competences in graduates in all cycles and all subjects, for employability, for engendering civic values and developing *entrepreneurism*. Universities themselves are expected to be entrepreneurial and the EU and OECD have together developed a self-assessment tool for institutions to evaluate the extent to which they are effectively entrepreneurial—*A Guiding Framework for Entrepreneurial Universities* or as it is known on the EU website *HE Innovate* (OECD and European Commission 2012). A prominent indicator in the self-assessment is the extent to which the institution has incorporated “entrepreneurship development in teaching and learning” in all departments.

Interpretations of the Entrepreneurial Prescription

Although the European Commission—OECD—guide has transparent indicators, it is not always clear from the Delphic shorthand used in many official documents whether the admonitions to Higher Education in relation to entrepreneurship are designed to ensure that universities engender an entrepreneurial spirit in all their graduates, provide modules which all graduates take, offer more degrees in entrepreneurship, and/or create cohorts of entrepreneurs. To the extent that the Trump administration is seen to be ‘entrepreneurial’, its success or otherwise may give impetus or the reverse to any or all of these.

A recurring theme in European and Bologna documents, is a commitment to lifelong learning. This, too, may be related to the growing emphasis on entrepreneurial skills with employers valuing the ability to learn: learning to learn is a competence which all graduates need to acquire. A recent special issue of *The Economist* devoted to lifelong learning, includes a feature on “How to Survive in the Age of Automation” proposing that the real challenge for most workers will not be entrepreneurship but coping with and adjusting to the dominant changes produced by new technology and automation (The Economist 2017).

Assertions of this kind may paradoxically give some pause to the increasing emphasis on the vocational expectations for Higher Education and may provide a counterpoint to the entrepreneurial lobby. Recognising that Higher Education first-cycle degrees are a starting point and that, “In many occupations it has

become essential to acquire new skills as established ones become obsolete”, the author argues that “To remain competitive and to give low – and high skilled – workers alike the best chance of success, economies need to offer training and career focused education throughout people’s working lives” (The Economist 2017, 6). The author suggests that this poses new challenges for universities in the way in which they market and package their education. In shorthand, although this is not stated explicitly, universities need to become even more entrepreneurial because, in their current form, “academic institutions also struggle to deliver really fast moving content” (ibid.). However, universities will be further challenged in their widening participation (social inclusion) agenda as “The emerging system of life-long learning will do little to reduce inequality unless it can be made more accessible and affordable” but it is easier “To imagine a future in which the emerging infrastructure of life-long learning reinforces existing advantages, far from alleviating the impact of technological upheaval that would risk exacerbating inequality in the social and economic tensions it brings in its wake” (ibid.). It may be that the proponents of the saving quality of entrepreneurship will wish to claim that this is precisely the situation in which the development of entrepreneurial attributes will help individuals to meet the new challenges.

OECD has played a significant role in developing understanding of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship in Higher Education. Its publication *Entrepreneurship and Higher Education* (Potter 2008) argues that “A transformation in the activities of HEIs is required if they are to play their full part in stimulating economic growth and competitiveness in the modern knowledge economy. Greater weight needs to be accorded to activities that support entrepreneurship and innovation in particular through entrepreneurship, education and knowledge transfer to enterprises” (ibid.: 11).

It also stresses the distinction to be made “between entrepreneurial education and training which could apply to all forms of education and entrepreneurship education and training, which is specifically concerned with new venture creation and innovation” (ibid.). The second use of the term applies specifically to degrees which have the title Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurship and are focused solely on aspects of that subject. Both objectives indicate the need for a changing role and attitude in universities but they also point out an important, and often not well articulated, difference between entrepreneurial education and entrepreneurship education. The former, it is maintained, should be embedded in all subjects.

This is stressed in a report from the Kauffman Panel on Entrepreneurship Curriculum in Higher Education which asserts that “Entrepreneurship should be both a legitimate subject in American undergraduate education

and a pervasive approach to learning and the management of universities” (Kauffman Panel 2008, 4). It also proclaims that “Entrepreneurship must find its place among and within the disciplines to become genuinely mainstream” (ibid.). In other words, all subject areas should include the entrepreneurial dimension. Many of the European Commission documents on this subject do not distinguish between the two approaches to entrepreneurial education and it has to be assumed that they, in practice, embrace both.

Arising out of a European Commission conference on Entrepreneurship Education in Europe in Oslo in October 2006, the agenda for entrepreneurship education known as the Oslo Agenda was established. It provided a catalogue of initiatives which it was hoped might be used both in the EU and in the neighbouring countries. Initiative D10 proposes that “Higher education establishments should integrate entrepreneurship across different subjects of their study programmes, as it may add value to all degree courses (e.g. technical and scientific studies, but also humanities and creative studies). All faculties/disciplines should develop opportunities for students at every level to experience entrepreneurship” (European Commission 2006).

In 2008, the Commission published a survey of Entrepreneurship in Higher Education in Europe (NIRAS Consultants, FORA and ECON Pöyry 2008). This study suggests that, at that time, the scope of entrepreneurial education was of concern. It “estimated that more than half of Europe’s students at the Higher Education level do not even have access to entrepreneurial education” (ibid.: 3). The report indicates three main obstacles to entrepreneurship education (ibid.: 200):

- Dependence on a single person or few people
- Sufficient academic time to engage in entrepreneurship
- Inadequate level of educated competence

In addition, it is a field “that has to fight for its reputation, the lack of academic credibility surrounding entrepreneurship can also make it difficult for entrepreneurship education to be accepted in faculties and especially non-business faculties” (ibid.: 203).

Complementing its own work, in the field of entrepreneurship education, the European Commission co-funds work by other organisations. The Knowledge Economy Network published *Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators: Entrepreneurial Education & Training in CEI Countries for the 21st Century* (2014) (not to be confused with a Commission publication *Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators* also published in 2014) supported by the European Commission and the Central European Initiative (CEI) Cooperation fund. In a separate document, *Entrepreneurial Education*

✂ *Training in CEI Countries for the 21st Century* (Knowledge Economy Network 2014), the Network published a set of recommendations. The recommendations propose the modernisation and reform of education and training and state that: “Unless curricula and teaching and learning methods are modernised, particularly at post-secondary education institutions – even if entrepreneurship study is introduced – it will remain **an alien component** inconsistent with the rest of the learning process” (ibid.). This is an echo of the 2008 Commission survey referred to earlier. Other recommendations reinforce the thesis in the Kauffman report and the Oslo Agenda that entrepreneurship should be embedded in the education process.

EU Engagement with Entrepreneurship Education: A Historical Overview

The EU engagement with entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial education can be traced to the 2000 Lisbon Strategy and its ambitious objective to make Europe “The most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion” (Lisbon European Council 2000). While in 2017 this objective had a hollow ring, it has nevertheless been the basis for a range of documents increasingly declaring the importance of entrepreneurship education for delivering economic growth and realising the Lisbon objectives. The insistence on the role of universities in developing entrepreneurial competences has been reinforced by the EU’s 2020 Strategy (EC COM 2010) and the Innovation Union which calls on member states “To ensure a sufficient supply of science, maths and engineering graduates and to focus school curricula on creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship” (EC SEC 2010).

The 2009 Strategic Framework for European cooperation in Education and Training (‘ET 2020’) strategic objective 4 is: “Enhancing creativity and innovation including entrepreneurship at all levels of education and training”. The Communication from the Commission on the Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan published in 2013 broadens the scope of ‘Higher Education for Entrepreneurship’ stating that “The role of Higher Education in Entrepreneurship goes far beyond the delivery of knowledge to participating in Ecosystems, partnerships and industrial alliances”. “Universities should become more entrepreneurial. The first ‘Pillar’ of the ‘Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan’ (EC COM 2013) is Entrepreneurial education and training to support growth and business creation”. The Plan insists that “Investing in entrepreneurship education is one of the highest return investments Europe can make”.

The Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan is forthright in criticism of the current state of entrepreneurial education in Europe—“Generally **would-be entrepreneurs in Europe find themselves in a tough environment**: education does not offer the right foundation for an entrepreneurial career”. The plan commits the Commission to a number of actions including the dissemination and promotion of the entrepreneurial university guidance framework to the EU HEIs and seeks to engage member states calling on them to “Ensure that the key competence entrepreneurship is embedded into curricula across primary, secondary, vocational, higher and adult education before the end of 2015”.

The Action Plan needs to be viewed in the context of a final report published in the following year from the EU Thematic Working Group on Entrepreneurship Education (2014). It echoes and reinforces earlier reports in its review of the current situation in Europe. Among the findings of the report are:

- Entrepreneurial curricula and teaching methods are rarely embedded throughout all age groups. Where there is entrepreneurship education, this is more commonly found at higher levels and related primarily to business skills.
- Entrepreneurial learning outcomes remain an undeveloped area across the EU characterised by a piecemeal and fragmented approach and lacking a lifelong learning perspective.
- Assessment of entrepreneurial learning is very underdeveloped and does not link to entrepreneurial learning outcomes and generally follows traditional methods.
- Educators and education leaders in Europe are not sufficiently trained in entrepreneurship education which negatively impacts on the potential for entrepreneurship to become embedded in education systems (EU Thematic Working Group 2014, 4).

As a solution to the problems, the report proposes an entrepreneurship ‘ecosystem’ with ambitious goals. Above all, it indicates the complexity of the topic and the interplay of a wide range of stakeholders, new curricula, new learning and teaching methods, a focus on learning outcomes and assessment of entrepreneurial competences, and support for educators and leaders ‘to deliver curricular, institutional and cultural change’. HEIs are encouraged to use HE Innovate, the self-assessment tool for HEIs ‘to develop and improve entrepreneurial and innovative institutions’ (EU Thematic Working Group 2014, 15).

To follow-up the Rethinking Education and the Entrepreneurship Action Plan, the Commission published the Entrepreneurship Competence Framework in 2016. In addition, giving a detailed map of competences, it groups them by level related to the European Qualifications Framework.

Through the flagship Erasmus+ programme, which is designed to contribute to the objectives of the Europe 2020 Strategy, the Commission encourages and provides tangible support for projects on entrepreneurship education. In addition to the incentive to undertake projects in the field of entrepreneurial education under Strategic Partnerships and Knowledge Alliances, the Action 1 Learning Mobility has as one of its headline outcomes “increased sense of initiative and entrepreneurship”.

Erasmus+ supports traineeships/work placements which provide another context for learners to develop entrepreneurial skills through short and/or extended periods in enterprises. The Strategic Partnerships action encourages “Transnational initiatives fostering entrepreneurial mind sets and skills to encourage active citizenship and entrepreneurship (including social entrepreneurship)”. Knowledge Alliances are designed *inter alia* to introduce “Entrepreneurship education in any discipline to provide students, researchers, staff and educators with the knowledge skills and motivation to engage in entrepreneurial activities in a variety of settings, as well as “Opening up new learning opportunities through the practical application of entrepreneurial skills which can involve and/or lead to the commercialisation of new services, products and prototypes”.

The Erasmus+ programme which is a global leader in the promotion of student mobility has been instrumental in stimulating large numbers of international traineeships/work placements. However, it is not evident to what extent institutions have sought to embed the placements in the development of entrepreneurial competences. Indeed, the training agreement, designed by the EACEA to be used by all institutions, is in a form which in practice does not ensure that defined competences, generic and subject-specific, are clearly articulated as effective learning outcomes which are then adequately assessed. Although credits may be awarded for work placements, the assessment of the achievements in the actual placement and the learning outcomes may require much more work and it is rare to see the competence ‘entrepreneurism’ even mentioned as an intended outcome.

On the whole, academic staff, in most disciplines, are not trained for work-based learning and do not interact with the employers. Over 60% of placements are found by students themselves and are not evaluated or in any way quality assured. Although by a process of osmosis students inevitably gain tremendously from their work placements, it is probable that if there was a

more structured, integrated and fully assessed approach, both the academic staff and employers would gain considerably more. It is an area which demands much closer scrutiny and at an EU level, the sort of guidance provided by the UK Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) referred to later in the chapter. A helpful starting point might be the UK Higher Education Academy publication—“Towards a competency framework for student work-based learning” (Jones and Warnock 2014).

This might be complemented by another UK publication—by ASET, the work-based and placement learning association, “Good practice guide for work-based and placement learning in Higher Education” (ASET 2013). While this is tailored for the UK context, it does have a range of good practice and a framework which is widely applicable.

Entrepreneurism in the Bologna Process and the European Higher Education Area

The development of the Bologna Process and the EHEA have become for the most part aligned with the policy objectives of the EU in the field of Higher Education but formal Bologna communiques have lagged behind the EU in their references to and emphasis on entrepreneurship education. Vignette 14.1 provides a brief historical review of EU and EHEA policy statements.

This brief review of some of the many EU and EHEA policy statements relating to Higher Education indicates the growing emphasis on entrepreneurship education and the increasing volume of the call to develop entrepreneurial competences for all graduates—first, second and third cycles. It is difficult to avoid being somewhat cynical about this. While the tone and phrasing of Bologna communications is measured and calm, there is a sense that Ministers and their advisers are desperate to find a solution to their current economic and consequent political and social woes and in doing so are losing sight of both the limits to what HEIs may be able to achieve without increased resources and more fundamentally the imperative to ensure a higher level of achievement in core subject and generic competences, without which entrepreneurship education will be hollow and have an ‘emperor’s clothes’ quality.

University Responses

Reports cited earlier indicate that although universities may have begun to embrace the insistent messages from governments, many have not. This

Vignette 14.1 Historical Review of EU and EHEA Policy Statements

The **Sorbonne Declaration**, which provided the initial impetus for the Bologna Process, refers to a Europe of Knowledge but focuses on harmonising degree structures, mobility and recognition of qualifications, with the aim of improving employability as the route to the achievement of the Europe of Knowledge.

The **Bologna Declaration June 1999**, which formally ushered in the Bologna Process, built on and reiterated many of the proposals in the Sorbonne Declaration. It listed six explicit objectives to be achieved over the next ten years.

Prague, two years later, added lifelong learning “as necessary to face the challenges of competitiveness and the use of new technologies and to improve social cohesion, equal opportunities and the quality of life”.

In **Berlin**, the Ministers responded to the European Councils in Lisbon and Barcelona and the objectives of the dynamic knowledge-based economy ‘through enhanced cooperation among European HEIs’ and by stressing that the EHEA and the European Research Area were ‘two pillars of the knowledge-based society’.

The **Bergen Communiqué 2005** is notable for its focus on doctoral education and the need to develop transferrable skills, ‘the developed transferrable skills thus meeting the needs of the wider employment market’.

The **London Communiqué 2007** provides a statement of what Ministers see as the role and purposes of Higher Education which include ‘preparing students for life as active citizens in a democratic society, preparing students for their future careers and enabling their personal development, creating and maintaining a broad advanced knowledge base and stimulating research and innovation’. It also warns that there will be a “need to adapt our higher education systems, to ensure that the EHEA remains competitive and can respond effectively to the challenges of globalisation”.

In their review of progress in implementing the Bologna objectives, the Ministers ‘underlined the importance of improving graduate employability’. For the first time, the priorities for the next follow-up meeting included employability and ‘how to improve employability in relation to each of the three cycles as well as in the context of lifelong learning’.

The **Leuven Communiqué 2009** develops the ‘employability’ theme, which in the aftermath of the economic upheaval had become a political imperative. It is remarkable that in contrast with the repetition and emphasis in EU education documents, there is no mention of entrepreneurship. Perhaps it could be seen as implicit in the reference to the need for ‘higher-level skills and transversal competences and for institutions to ‘be more responsive to employers’ needs’. The Communiqué also encourages work placements embedded in study programmes as well as ‘on-the-job learning’ both of which might be viewed as inculcating entrepreneurial competences but again the word is not used.

The **Bucharest Communiqué 2012**, the first under the formal banner of the EHEA, under the heading ‘Enhancing employability to serve Europe’s needs’ states: “Today’s graduates need to combine transversal, multidisciplinary and innovation skills and competences with up-to-date subject-specific knowledge so as to be able to contribute to the wider needs of society and the labour market”.

(continued)

Vignette 14.1 (continued)

The Ministers aim to enhance employability 'by improving cooperation between employers, students and HEIs especially in the development of study programmes to help increase the innovation, entrepreneurial and research potential of graduates'. This is the first mention in the Bologna communiques of entrepreneurial competences. In the context of promoting Doctoral employability and other EHEA priorities, the communique refers to the European Commission 'Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training' (see p.4 above) which state that 'Business should be more involved in curricular development and Doctoral training so that skills better match industry's needs'. The priorities for the next phase of the EHEA process include 'work to enhance employability, life-long learning, problem solving and entrepreneurial skills through enhanced cooperation with employers, especially in the development of educational programmes'. So in 2012, entrepreneurship has reached the top of the EHEA agenda.

The **Yerevan Communiqué May 2015** is even more categorical in its commitment to 'Promote a stronger link between teaching, learning and research at all study levels and provide incentives for institutions, teachers and students to intensify activities, to develop creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship'. It has an equal commitment to 'Fostering the employability of graduates throughout their working lives'. Here, too, 'Fostering the entrepreneurship and innovation skills of students' is a key objective. It can be seen that the EU and Bologna agenda are now in harmony in their evangelism for 'entrepreneurship' in Higher Education.

should not be surprising, the need for increased and different types of resource to enhance the recruitment, training and development of academic staff and restructuring of institutions in their relationships with employers and business generally are lacking. As often happens—there is a gap between rhetoric and delivery. The economic crisis has meant that in many countries there has been a reduction in funding for Higher Education. Simultaneously, institutions are faced with a multiplicity of demands for change and engagement and a highly competitive environment, both national and international. The international and national agendas show signs of interacting in perhaps the most challenging ways for institutions. On the one hand, internationalisation is urged as a key goal for institutions and an aspect of their entrepreneurial commitment, while on the other, the resurgence of nationalism and associated protectionism is pulling in the opposite direction. At the same time, universities are asked to take on a social role in widening participation which poses further challenges for resources and learning and teaching methods and facilities. The UK (Vignette 14.2) may be considered to have embraced the entrepreneurial agenda more than some other countries in the EU. (Alas, it will no longer be possible to use this phrase in two years' time).

Closer engagement with employers in curriculum development is a perennial exhortation from governments but this, too, seems to have limited suc-

Vignette 14.2 Entrepreneurial Agenda in UK Higher Education

UK has a highly competitive environment, is much influenced by ranking tables (national and international), is subject to regular nationally organised research assessment reviews and rankings and is engaged in a new 'Teaching Excellence Framework' assessment exercise (*Note—this exercise formally applies only in England*). Over a number of years, Ministers have admonished institutions to respond to change and, in the most recent proposed legislation, intend to open the Higher Education market (in England) to new providers, partly on the argument that "The role of incumbents in the current system (also) risks limiting innovation" (Department for Education 2017).

The White Paper which provided the basis for the new legislation is entitled "Success as a knowledge economy: Teaching excellence, social mobility and student choice", (Department for Business Innovation and Skills 2016). In the Executive Summary, paragraph 5, the role of Higher Education is encapsulated by the assertion that "There is more to be done for our university system to fulfil its potential as an engine of social mobility, a driver of economic growth and cornerstone of our cultural landscape".

It comments on student dissatisfaction with the provision provided, employers' concerns at skills shortages and other shortcomings. For the government, these stem from "insufficient competition and a lack of informed choice". Their solution, which is inherently entrepreneurial, is 'more competition' since "Competition between providers in any market incentivises them to raise their game, offering consumers a greater choice of more innovative and better quality products and services at lower cost. Higher education is no exception".

A National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE) has been established to foster entrepreneurship in UK Higher Education. It aims to 'Support Higher Education to build its entrepreneurial future' and asserts that it 'has been integral in the development of the entrepreneurial university concept through the flagship Entrepreneurial University Leaders' programme'.

The UK QAA has responded to the call for more and improved learning and teaching in entrepreneurship through the publication of a guide for UK Higher Education providers (September 2012)—'Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education: Guidance for UK higher education providers' (QAA 2012). The guide is essentially for first-cycle education but is helpful for second-cycle programmes. It refers to the guidance for third cycle (doctoral) published by Vitae: The Enterprise Lens on the Researcher Development Framework (2010) which provides "an overview of the key knowledge, behaviours and attributes typically developed by researchers that can be acquired through, or used in, enterprise activities", reinforcing the message that entrepreneurial competences should be developed in all levels of Higher Education. (Vitae 2010).

The QAA Guidance states that "The call for a greater emphasis on enterprise and entrepreneurship education is compelling. Driven by a need for flexibility and adaptability, the labour market requires graduates with enhanced skills who can think on their feet and be innovative in a global economic environment. There is an acknowledged need, as well as a *political imperative* (my bold and italics), for an infrastructure that supports and enhances enterprise development across the curriculum". This assertion is reminiscent of the views expressed in the

(continued)

Vignette 14.2 (continued)

OECD and EU documents reviewed earlier. The guide distinguishes between enterprise education, entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial effectiveness stressing that “Enterprise and entrepreneurship are transdisciplinary with a strong connection to issues of employability, innovation, knowledge transfer, and commercialisation and intellectual property”. The document provides a thoughtful review and guidance for institutions and educators, distinguishing between ‘learning ‘for’ and learning ‘about’ and providing insights into intended outcomes under the headings—‘Entrepreneurship behaviours, attributes and skills and ‘developing entrepreneurial effectiveness’, all concerned with understanding and doing rather than knowledge acquisition. This is particularly evident in the section on assessment. The guidance is excellent at a general level and is intended to be applicable in all subjects but there may be a need for it to be translated into more directed guidance for curriculum embedding in specific subjects ranging from molecular biology to the study of literature.

cess. Business schools again have been at the forefront and in some areas of science and engineering, there are good success stories but engagement with business and enterprise simply does not permeate the humanities and social sciences. Indeed, the attitudes of both learners and teachers may be an impediment in this field. Since c.46% of all EU students are in the humanities and social sciences, if it is true that embedded entrepreneurial education is essential for economic growth, then more case studies of effective employer collaboration in all cycles in the humanities and social sciences would be helpful.

The Erasmus+ programme provides a vehicle through student work placements for the development of relations with employers and the development of entrepreneurial competences but as suggested earlier, although the number of students participating continues to grow there are serious policy, monitoring and curriculum integration issues which suggest that the full potential of the placements is not being realised. This is certainly an area for significant further development with a more explicit reference to entrepreneurial competences as an intended outcome from placements.

Future Research and Policy Implications

This brief survey seeks to indicate that the primary interest for entrepreneurship education continues to come from outside the Higher Education sector in Europe and that the sector is, in large part, in a reactive rather than a leading mode. This is not to say that there are not faculties/schools/departments in universities which are leading in the field but these tend to be associated with business schools. Governments appreciate that increasing participation in ter-

tiary education is essential for economic growth but they and the business community manifest their concern that their investment is not producing the results which they require in terms of economic growth and hence focus on entrepreneurship education as a vehicle to realise their economic aspirations.

The entrepreneurship theme is an illustration of how universities are subject to cumulative pressure to become more vocational and to concentrate on graduate employability as the primary indicator of the quality of the general education which they provide. Within the EU, the exhortations of Ministers and Bologna communiques seem to have had limited impact on Higher Education and there does not seem to be the same level of demand from students for education in entrepreneurship, which makes it difficult to assess whether more embedded entrepreneurial education would produce the dramatic stimulus to economic growth which proponents contend. This is clearly a matter for more research and monitoring to provide reliable evidence. A number of questions for further research and possible implications are discussed later.

Is the entrepreneurial university essential to generate graduates who are entrepreneurial? Current literature on 'internationalisation' suggests that to be successful, it must engage the whole institution and all its activities. Does the same apply to entrepreneurial education or is it possible that success depends much more on the individual department. If, as the proponents argue, more pervasive entrepreneurial learning is the key to success for the individual and society, then this question needs to be addressed. It will have implications for the governance and management of the university and its relations with wider society.

Can the entrepreneurial university be reconciled with the Newman Idea of a University or the Humboldt philosophy or is utilitarianism in Higher Education the only game in town? While it is well understood that universities have an extensive mission to learning and research, the philosophical context in which this takes place is of fundamental importance. If, as seems to be increasingly the case, the objectives, curriculum and desired impact of the learning and research are dictated and closely regulated by external bodies, then can universities be effectively autonomous or do they become simply governmental agencies. In what ways can academic staff be independent and exercise genuine academic freedom if they are simply expected to deliver predetermined outcomes. Is there still a place for the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake? How can the plethora of external policy assertions relating to what is learnt, taught and researched be tempered by a respect for real academic freedom? Or is it the case that universities are by nature such conservative institutions that change has to be instigated from outside. This research would need to examine whether entrepreneurship has superseded other values in education and how it relates to

cultural values, sustainability and lifelong learning. A key question is whether the values of entrepreneurship are compatible with social cohesion?

The chapter has focused on formal, structured learning, but it is frequently asserted that entrepreneurship is acquired through experience. If, in the future, this is complemented by more formal learning (in entrepreneurship) in each cycle at a university, will there be a need and a demand for more structured formal lifelong learning (in entrepreneurship) through HEIs? How will this be provided and validated? This bears on the development of much closer relations between the employment world, alumni and the continuing development and experience of the academic staff.

Conclusion

The chapter has sought to demonstrate that the insistence on the urgency for more pervasive entrepreneurial education in Europe is endorsed by all the international institutions and, through the EHEA, the governments of 48 countries. It has indicated that universities are not leading this movement and indeed judging from comments in European Commission documents may not be as responsive to the goading in the proclamations as might have been anticipated. It is not clear whether this is because of reluctance or a lack of resource or both. Nor does it seem that European students and their families are echoing the call for more entrepreneurial formation. If they were then change would follow swiftly. This may indicate a serious disjunction between the rhetoric of international bodies and governments and the perceptions of citizens and the reality of the learning and teaching contexts in universities. Alternatively, it could simply be a time-lag syndrome and tomorrow we will wake up to a new entrepreneurial era as universities implement new curricula and graduates with entrepreneurial knowledge, understanding, and (possibly) ability, engage in the labour market. If this is the case, then it will prove or disprove the extravagant claims for transformation of the economy.

In practice, neither is likely since there is no panacea for achieving the change which is so earnestly desired. Entrepreneurial education will develop and be more widely experienced but it will also take its place in the glossary of international educational phrases with: 'sustainable development', 'knowledge economy', 'employability', 'competiveness', 'the digital economy and digital skills and competences', 'transferable skills' and 'innovation and creativity'—all of which have vogue periods and are each a manifestation of the search for keys to meeting the needs of society as well as the expectations of political leaders. In their different ways, it could be argued that each of these phrases

represents an aspect of entrepreneurship but that illustrates the challenge of articulating a common shared understanding of entrepreneurial education.

References

- ASET. 2013. ASET Good Practice Guide for Work Based and Placement Learning in Higher Education. <https://bit.ly/1Bu2B7x>. Accessed 2 Mar 2017.
- Department for Business Innovation and Skills. 2016. Success as a Knowledge Economy: Teaching Excellence, Social Mobility and Student Choice. <https://bit.ly/2iY6r5o>. Accessed 18 Feb 2017.
- Department for Education. 2017. Higher Education and Research Bill: Introduction to the Higher Education Market Entry Reforms. <https://bit.ly/2ITJvjN>. Accessed 1 Mar 2017.
- EACEA. 2017. Erasmus Mundus Programme. <https://bit.ly/2v8oNeg>. Accessed 22 Feb 2017.
- EC COM. 2006. COM (2018): The Recommendation of the European Parliament and Council on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. European Commission. <https://bit.ly/2nhClgP>. Accessed 25 Feb 2017.
- . 2010. COM (2010) 2020 Final, Europe 2020: A Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth. European Commission. <https://bit.ly/2IXpXvc>. Accessed 19 Feb 2017.
- . 2013. COM (2012): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan: Reigniting the Entrepreneurial Spirit in Europe. European Commission. <https://bit.ly/2H12GYk>. Accessed 2 Mar 2017.
- EC SEC. 2010. Europe 2020 Flagship Initiative Innovation Union. European Commission. <https://bit.ly/2qxRP17>. Accessed 15 Feb 2017.
- EU Thematic Working Group. 2014. Thematic Working Group on Entrepreneurship Education Final Report November 2014. <https://bit.ly/2qxog0C>. Accessed 28 Mar 2017.
- European Commission. 2006. Conference on Entrepreneurship Education in Europe in Oslo in October 2006, the Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education Known as the Oslo Agenda. <https://bit.ly/2H0JE4D>. Accessed 28 Feb 2017.
- . 2011. Principles for Innovative Doctoral Training. <https://bit.ly/2H1WRxS>. Accessed 17 Feb 2017.
- Garben, Sacha. 2012. *The Future of Higher Education in Europe: The Case for a Stronger Base in EU Law*, LEQS Paper No. 50/2012. London School of Economics. <https://bit.ly/2H0MtGW>. Accessed 2 Mar 2017.

- GHK Consulting Ltd. 2014. Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators. European Commission. <https://bit.ly/2ELxZ7H>. Accessed 2 Mar 2017.
- Jones, Hilary M., and Lorna Warnock. 2014. *Towards a Competency Framework for Student Work-Based Learning*. The Higher Education Academy. <https://bit.ly/2qB0UpZ>. Accessed 22 Feb 2017.
- Kauffman Panel. 2008. Entrepreneurship Curriculum in Higher Education. <https://bit.ly/2qAtEA3>. Accessed 24 Feb 2017.
- Knowledge Economy Network. 2014. Entrepreneurial Education & Training in CEI Countries for the 21st Century. <https://bit.ly/2EN1iXL>. Accessed 21 Feb 2017.
- Lisbon European Council. 2000. 23 and 24 March Presidency Conclusions. <https://bit.ly/2a8XQZW>. Accessed 26 Feb 2017.
- Newman, John Henry. 1852. *Idea of the University*.
- NIRAS Consultants, FORA, and ECON Pöyry. 2008. Survey of Entrepreneurship in Higher Education in Europe. European Commission. <https://bit.ly/2qyfo4>. Accessed 1 Mar 2017.
- OECD, and European Commission. 2012. A Guiding Framework for Entrepreneurial Universities. <https://bit.ly/2oQ5KAN>. Accessed 11 Feb 2017.
- Potter, Jonathan. 2008. Entrepreneurship and Higher Education. OECD. <https://bit.ly/2qziiM1>. Accessed 17 Feb 2017.
- QAA. 2012. Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Education: Guidance for UK Higher Education Providers. <https://bit.ly/2oQ5KAN>. Accessed 1 Mar 2017.
- Schumpeter, Joseph Alois. 1934. *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- The Economist*. 2017. How to Survive in the Age of Automation. <https://bit.ly/2qzNCu1>. Accessed 8 Mar 2017.
- Tuning Academy. 2017. <http://tuningacademy.org>. Accessed 7 Mar 2017.
- UNESCO. 1998. Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development in Higher Education: Final Report. <https://bit.ly/2JNLJ5I>. Accessed 9 Feb 2017.
- . 2015. Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4. <https://bit.ly/2dcTapT>. Accessed 3 Mar 2017.
- Vitae. 2010. Vitae Researcher Development Statement (RDS). <https://bit.ly/2qywXrn>. Accessed 24 Feb 2017.
- Wilson, Karen. 2008. Entrepreneurship Education in Europe. European Foundation for Entrepreneurship Research. <https://bit.ly/2ITeGfh>. Accessed 1 Mar 2017.