
IEEC | International
Entrepreneurship
Educators
Conference

IEEC2014 Call to Action
“The Challenge is Ours”



Prepared by Alison Price

(2014)

Enterprise Educators UK (EEUK) and National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE)

With thanks to Lisa McMullan (NCEE), EEUK Chair Shelia Quairney and IEEC Conference Director Kate Beresford together with Professor Andy Penaluna EEUK Board for document comment and insight.

With grateful thanks to the delegates of IEEC2014 and the lead provocateurs who led the discussions

September 2014

Please Note: The IEEC2014 Call for Action: the Challenge is ours is released as a discussion document and call to action from the discussions of IEEC2014 delegates. It does not necessarily reflect the views of the IEEC2014 sponsors, organisers, or 'provocateurs' but is published to stimulate discussion with key stakeholders in support of the enterprise and entrepreneurship agenda.

IEEC2014 Call for Action: the challenge is ours

Executive Summary: In September 2014, 253 IEEC Delegates, Keynotes, Exhibitors and Student Hosts gathered together to explore the IEEC2014 theme of “Education + Engagement = Impact”. Running across the conference theme were 6 provocations, presented for discussion and debate by IEEC delegates. Collectively these provocations created the challenge “we must be doing it wrong” and resulted in 6 calls for action to enterprise educators and institutional management that stated:

1. All students should have enterprise education within their learning journey
2. Recognition that enterprise/entrepreneurship education is needed *throughout* the learners’ educational experience and should not be left “until the end”
3. Through a variety of pedagogic practice, enterprise educators create impact and such entrepreneurial impact is worthwhile
4. The need for review and clarification as to what is being taught and how it is evolving in the face of economic challenges
5. Institutional support for the enterprise/entrepreneurship education agenda is needed urging greater
 1. Embedded enterprise education across the curriculum
 2. Greater cross discipline programmes
 3. The development of a mass of enterprise/entrepreneurship educators
6. A critical need for a common language, particularly around qualitative measures within our research and evaluation in order to ensure the depth of societal impact is recognised.

These wide-spread discussions had collectively explored:

- Institutional silos, subject boundaries and definitions
- Clarity between the terms and practice of enterprise, employability and entrepreneurship
- The changing environment of future employment practice

And called for:

- Embedded enterprise education for all learners
- Review and evaluation of what is being taught, through a common language of evaluative measures
- The development of more enterprise educators to support truly embedded enterprise education.

The conference concluded that the challenges of practice that the IEEC2014 delegates outlined were within the scope of the educator to resolve and could be addressed by working collectively. IEEC2014 demonstrates the potential of a true ‘community of practice’(Lave and Wenger 1998) and well networked educators, who by sharing their experiences have an opportunity to make strategic advances within a developing practice, and make a difference for their learners. IEEC2014 delegates have set themselves, and their colleagues, the challenges of

- professional development;
- subject clarity in light of a new economic and employability landscape;
- integrated institutional working; and
- agreeing effective evaluative measures which evidences the deep impact that is possible on the individual as well as through society.

These challenges will be returned to at our 10th annual conference IEEC2015 to be hosted by Anglia Ruskin University, 9th-11th Sept 2015.

Contents

Introduction:.....	4
Method:.....	4
IEEC 2014 Provocations.....	7
Summary: A Conference Reflection.....	12
Appendix 1: Lead Provocateurs and IEEC Provocations.....	15
Appendix.....	16
References:.....	16

Introduction:

At the suggestion of IEEC2014 Newcastle University hosts, the concept of conference provocations was raised as a way of challenging our thinking and exploring the views and experiences of IEEC2014 delegates. The IEEC conference committee felt that this approach would develop the conference theme of “Education + Engagement = Impact” and provide delegates with opportunities for deep reflection upon their institutional and personal practice.

This briefing paper outlines the IEEC2014 provocation process and indicates the breadth and range of the discussions, before presenting the summary position that delegates concluded with and presented to the full plenary session of IEEC2014 delegates.

Method:

This new IEEC format was proposed and delivered by Newcastle University hosts and IEEC delegates. The approach was designed to be delegate led and responsive to the issues and concerns of those attending IEEC2014. In order to reflect delegate concerns, the request for 50 word provocations was made within the conference call for papers. This resulted in submissions from across the spectrum of enterprise activity including research and teaching staff, City Council and Scottish Institute for Enterprise (SIE). This not only reflects the breadth of the challenge, but through the wide appeal of IEEC ensured that the provocations came from the delegates, to the delegates.

Whilst provocateur leaders were invited to challenge delegates, it was the debate and discussion amongst delegates over two breakout sessions that formed the resulting statements presented here. Provocateur leaders used a range of data gathering methods to draw together the view of their self-selected participants, and were asked to present their findings to the plenary as three dimensions of discussion and a ‘call for action’.

Many provocateur leaders started their debate and discussion before IEEC2014 within on-line “Linked-in” discussion groups and twitter debates. Delegates were therefore invited to engage with the debate within the IEEC registration process and were exposed to ‘provocative stimulus’ as a group in order to ignite some debate in advance, before the formal opportunity in Newcastle to draw from the IEEC evidence to develop their discussions.

Initial Stimulus

To explore concept of provocation, delegates were first asked to address four provocative statements as a plenary group and vote on their responses.

IEEC delegates were asked to gauge their support for the following:

1. the launch of “Entrepreneur Barbie” by Mattel in June 2014

and challenging the stated position purported by enterprise educators (Price 2014) whether IEEC 2014 delegates were confident that:

2. “What we do is great – we know it works”
3. It is better to ask forgiveness than to ask for permission
4. The activity balance within their working life as an enterprise/entrepreneurship educator

The details of these four “provocative statements” are provided below to demonstrate the range of debate and discussion that started the formal provocation process; however this ‘vote’ was designed as stimulus and to provide an example of pedagogy, rather than deployed as a scientific research method and therefore the general consensus is reported for information only.

To stimulate provocative thinking IEEC2014 delegates were asked to ‘vote’ immediately on each proposal and these are captured below.

Snap Decision 1: Mattel’s launch of “Entrepreneur Barbie”	
This is evidence of a clear ‘coming of age’ for the agenda as entrepreneurship is now recognised as an outcome for all and that it is never too early to share the entrepreneurial message.	
‘v’	
Whether a “power dressed” doll embodies the very worst of the stereotyping seen within entrepreneurship and teaches inappropriate lessons to our youth about entrepreneurial ambitions.	
IEEC2014 Snap Decision	The delegates of IEEC were generally supportive of “Entrepreneur Barbie” as a potential force for increased awareness amongst future learners.

Snap Decision 2: “What we do is great – we know it works”	
There is evidence of institutional practice maturing to create synergy and develop a supportive strategy, as well as a growing confidence in educators with their roles within this developing agenda.	
‘v’	
Institutions suffer from ‘agenda degradation’ as key staff get promoted/leave and their innovative practice/activities stop, without the depth of evaluation to know which projects and activities need to continue, or the longitudinal tracking to know what works for graduate entrepreneurs in the long term.	
IEEC2014 Snap Decision	There is a strong degree of confidence in the activities undertaken by IEEC delegates within their institutions.

Snap Decision 3: “Don’t ask for permission, beg for forgiveness” Rear Admiral Grace Hopper	
Enterprise educators working in all aspects of this agenda find that this maxim serves them well as the progress the institutional agenda.	
‘v’	
There is an institutional problem if staff are unclear if they are supporting objectives or breaking the rules, lacking an institutional entrepreneurial “frame” (Gunther McGrath, R and MacMillan, I 2000) to direct and guide activities.	
IEEC2014 Snap Decision	A strong majority of delegates follow this maxim to deliver their objectives.

Snap Decision 4: Busy with activity, or building infrastructure	
Enterprise educators have an expansive remit with a wide range of additional/out-of-hours activities to link the institutional agenda to the needs of learners, the community and industry.	
‘v’	
It is clear that the majority of activity within this agenda is short term funded and project driven which limits the infrastructure and capacity building that is necessary to create permanent institutional change.	
IEEC2014 Snap Decision	It was clear that whilst educators recognised the demands of a busy and challenging role, they were also keen to develop a stronger infrastructure or synergy to underpin their work.

Evidence for Shared Discussion:

The evidence and common experience for these discussions came from the three keynote speakers – Professors Luke Pittaway (Ohio University) and Roy Sandbach (North East LEP) and David Price OBE (Educational Arts) as well as the 35 parallel workshop sessions which explored 6 key themes:

- Student learners (in curriculum)
- Student, Graduate and Community Entrepreneurs
- External Partners
- Learners (extra curriculum)
- Working with colleagues who are not (yet) enterprise educators
- Doctoral and Postdoctoral researchers

Details of these inputs are made available by conference partners EEUK and NCEE at www.ieec.co.uk

IEEC 2014 Provocations

Under a provocative banner that asked delegates to challenge their thinking as to whether “*we must be doing it wrong*” six discussion groups emerged that explored the following thematic headings:

We must be doing it wrong because...

1. It is not needed
2. It has lost its sparkle
3. It is just good teaching
4. The myths of entrepreneurship get in the way
5. It doesn't work online
6. We don't research it correctly

With these provocations bringing together 9 lead provocateurs, each with a short argument piece (see appendix 1) to share with the delegates, the debate and discussion started in advance of the conference through on-line 'Linked-in' groups.

“It is not needed”
<p>Truly entrepreneurial students will find a way to start a business regardless and do not need standard support available at Universities. Students interested in entrepreneurship but not entrepreneurially confident should NOT be supported to start up a business straight out of university but be encouraged to seek work/life experience first.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Dominic Martinez University of Salford</i></p>
<p>Can you deliver an education fit for an entrepreneur? In Sheffield, our enterprise pipeline supports students from the age of four to university students- but why do we do it? Won't an entrepreneur just establish a business anyway? What is the value of the support that any of us provide?</p> <p><i>Liz Taylor, University of Sheffield and Mike Garnock-Jones Sheffield City Council</i></p>

The debate and discussion surrounding this explored the need, or otherwise, to give students support and encouragement to start their own business. The premise that entrepreneurial students will “do it anyway” was negated by the need to create an initial awareness in our students of this career option. The discussion as to ‘When should we start enterprise education? What do we teach?’ then echoed through this provocation. The resulting discussion resulted in the following views:

- Institutions need to give support all the way through the educational experience (particularly noting that “just at the end” was not an option)
- whilst awareness raising is a key element of the role of an enterprise education “the financials are really important” and need to form part of the developing enterprise/entrepreneurship experience for learners.

“It has lost its sparkle”

We’ve been thinking through 10 years of enterprise at Northumbria. Is enterprise education at the end of its life cycle and rather losing its sparkle? Is it, for most learners and teachers, now mainly about new approaches to employability? Do we need possibly to redefine the whole enterprise education project?

Roger Candy, Northumbria University

There's too much emphasis on entrepreneurship and ‘making it real’ in enterprise education. We know that ALL students studying any discipline will benefit from what we teach, but the focus on business start-up is off-putting to many students and teaching staff. We must acknowledge that and focus on wider benefits.

Fiona Godsman, SIE

Exploration of this provocation discussed some of the core elements of the work of an enterprise educator, including challenging current practice (what is taught and the core messages inherent within). The changing economy drove this discussion, with a keen recognition of the self-employment trends (rise of freelancers) and full consideration of the future working experience of our learners.

This resulted in one clear message from this group, driven by the economic shifts:

- we need to clarify what we are teaching

“It is just good teaching”

“Teaching” students for venture creation is about giving them questions and stories – and pointers where to get more information. Then leave them to get on with it. When they come back, give them more and better questions. Learning that sticks (=impact) happens when they seek and create new insight themselves.

Dr Inge Hill Birmingham City University

The debate as to whether enterprise and entrepreneurship education can be seen as just good teaching explored the range of ways in which this form of education seeks to engage with students, as well as business and social enterprise. This resulted in a call for institutional management to support the ambitions of enterprise educators by providing:

- Support to the enterprise/entrepreneurship education including
 1. Embedding across the curriculum
 2. Encouraging cross discipline programmes
 3. The development of a mass of enterprise/entrepreneurship educators

“The myths of entrepreneurship get in the way”

There is a widely held belief that entrepreneurial activity is the panacea to economic stagnation. This provocative piece challenges this notion by asking if we are also fanning the flames of entrepreneurial failure on the basis that it is the myths of entrepreneurship and not the reality that is driving the agenda.

Dr Simon Best Middlesex University

With the myths of entrepreneurship potentially diluting the work of IEEC delegates, this provocation resulted in discussions surrounding the changing economic climate and its impact on the future of work, as well reflecting upon the institutional responses which have traditionally seen this agenda placed within ‘silos’. It was clear that delegates recognised the importance of the variety of roles seen in institutions and made a call for professional training which would then allow students to be exposed to a ‘disruptive process’ in their education.

The call for action was that

- “all students should do enterprise (just in case)”
- the silos and boundaries that are seen within the enterprise, entrepreneurship and employability agenda need to be addressed; advising
 - don’t separate entrepreneurship from enterprise
 - do link enterprise with employability

“It doesn’t work online”

Imagine a lecture in which neither you, nor your learners were able to ask questions or respond to thoughts. I am conclusive that the best education does not follow a planned path, yet I am designing, developing and delivering a MOOC! Am I exposing myself as a ‘deviant educator’?

Katie Wray, Newcastle University

The dimensions of this debate explored the demands of teaching within enterprise and entrepreneurship education and agreed that:

- There are principles to engagement/education which cannot be achieved solely on-line
- The expertise of the educator is to respond and adapt to the learners and their needs and therefore the educator work role that requires educational experience, whether on-line or in the class-room. This resulted in the summary point “it depends” as a clear indicator of the expertise colleagues bring to their role in adapting to their learners.
- Enterprise Educators find that are too innovative for technology that is currently available!

“We don’t research it correctly”

In assessing the impact of education and engagement, why is there a focus on quantitative metrics when there are qualitative alternatives which offer meaningful and transferable evidence? Could universities effectively illustrate the impact of our engagements through qualitative approaches? If yes, which research tools should be adopted and why?

Susan Laing, Napier University

National and internal student surveys will stifle enterprise and entrepreneurship education, and will limit the development of innovative teaching by creating risk adverse learning environments.

Dr Steve Mansfield, Manchester Metropolitan University

This provocation was developed with the question “*does it have to be this way?*” and challenged delegates to consider the role of evidence and evaluation in our practice.

Collectively the following methods were identified as prevalent across current practice, providing an extensive list of the options within the current armoury of the enterprise educator:

Research Methods Summary	
Qualitative measures	Quantitate Measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews • Case study research • Reflection exercises • Happy sheets 😊 • Longitudinal interviews • Surveys post course • Ethnography • Narrative Accounts • Field Notes • Video / Audio reflections • Collaborative Writing • Stories • Alumni case studies • Tracking career destinations • Start up Profiles • Features in press • Website forum for comments • Post Boot camp questionnaire • Students assess themselves prior to event then after • Press coverage • Tracking student journey • Interviews on 3 occasions • YouTube testimonials / written • Quotes Student feedback – transcripts and PDP plans • Ethnographic approach • Evaluation forms from funders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of attendees / events / workshops / boot camps – bums on seats • Number of business start ups • Number of 1-2-1 advice sessions • Website metrics • Click through return rate • Emails opened • Jobs created • Numbers accessing the services • Metrics on placements • Reports from Smart Phone App • Ent society numbers • Sign up figures • How many students/ grads start trading • Economic value of ventures created- HE-BCI survey • Number entering competition • DLHE • Wellbeing scores • 3 year tracking • Self-efficacy survey

The breadth of options available to explore entrepreneurial outcomes evidences one of the clear problems that this group explored: the need for a common language or approach, particularly given the range of qualitative measures available. It is accepted that some of the external funding outputs has driven a common understanding within quantitative, but it was felt that without the qualitative narrative the depth of experience was lost. It was felt that commonly used qualitative measures could assist in the development of a narrative that recognised the societal impact as well and individual outcome.

The call made was for a reporting future where 85% quantitative measures were supported by 15% qualitative assessment of enterprise and entrepreneurship practice, asking:

- “Does it have to be this way?” seeking
 - Common Language around qualitative that creating a qualitative narrative around quantitative measures to assess quality of output/outcomes/societal impact

Summary: A Conference Reflection

Whilst evaluation of IEEC2014 delegate response shows that the provocations served their purpose in providing strong stimulus for purposeful networking during the conference, it is clear they created more than space to share practice. Several of the themes which resonated through discussion groups are apparent within much of the literature as well as the practice debate and are increasing explored within policy. These are:

- Embedded enterprise education for all learners
- Review and evaluation of what is being taught, through a common language of evaluative measures
- The development of more enterprise educators to support truly embedded enterprise education.

Whilst these debates have been resolved for some, it is clear that there is still much work to be done. It can be evident within the more entrepreneurial institutions (see Times Higher Entrepreneurial University of the Year NCEE) that there is clarity of practice emerging within their approaches. Much of the historic or 'silo' thinking surrounding employability, enterprise and entrepreneurship has developed into a clear student offer, where embedded curriculum change leads to a clear pathway of support for those exploring business start-up. However many have not.

Limited institutional staff development means that 'new-to-enterprise' staff and supporting agencies (careers; enterprise centres; business development) are all having to work through this agenda, without sufficient institutional clarity of purpose to guide them. It remains clear, as evidenced by the many the arguments regarding terminology and boundaries, that issues of definition continue to diffuse and confuse the progression of the enterprise and entrepreneurship education agenda.

It is also interesting to reflect upon these IEEC2014 call for actions as part of previous delegate responses. In 2010 delegates were asked to create 5 calls for action through their work during IEEC2010 Cardiff and these are presented below.

IEEC2010 Concordat Summary
The key findings of IEEC2010 can be summarised as the "IEEC2010 Concordat" declaring 5 key calls for action http://ieec.co.uk/previous-conferences/action-in-enterprise-education/ieec2010-concordat/
IEEC2010 calls for:
1. Integration and pathways to be developed so that schools, colleges and universities can provide a continuous and integrated approach that will help our learners to develop the lifelong skills needed to be enterprising and entrepreneurial.
2. Improved institutional support and leadership that helps to drive forward the entrepreneurial mission across institutions, at all levels.
3. Clarity of impact measures and associated funding priorities so that we can work to develop a more sustainable, transparent and appropriate, approach to developing these capacities.
4. Improved guidance on issues of quality and assessment , so that a more coherent yet flexible framework will enable educators to embed more enterprising approaches in their curriculum.
5. Recognition and reward nationally, regionally and institutionally to support those working within a fragile environment of short term funding by providing career progression and recognised development opportunities - for the ultimate benefit of regions, institutions as well as individuals (staff & students).

Each of these statements has clear relevance to the discussions at IEEC2014 but it is important to recognise that important progress has been made across the sector.

1. **Integration and Pathways:** Whilst the 2010 call has yet to be resolved in its entirety, there are clear signs that this approach is gaining momentum. Following on from a coherent Welsh Action Plan (YES 2010) and multi-layered Scottish response (Scotland CAN DO Action Framework 2013 & 2014) as well as the All-Party Group for Micro Businesses Report “*An Education System Fit for an Entrepreneur*” (2013) the recent Lord Young (June 2014) report “Enterprise for All” explores the relevance of enterprise at each level within the education system (England and Wales). <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/enterprise-for-all-the-relevance-of-enterprise-in-education>
2. **Institutional support and leadership:** with one of the provocation ‘call to action’ being directed to the institutional leadership it is clear that a disconnect is being experienced by staff. Statements of entrepreneurial mission are now common place, but the practice is clearly still developing and is yet to address complexities inherent within this agenda.
3. **Impact measures:** this is clearly a key issue for delegates and one that has resonated since well before the IEEC 2010 Concordat was released. This issue permeated throughout the conference discussions (including IEEP Alumni pre-meeting) and clearly remains a source of frustration for IEEC delegates. However this challenge is being met as delegates share their experience and build clarity through the IEEC “community of practice” and will be returned to within IEEC2015.
4. **Quality Guidance:** It is clear that QAA Enterprise and Entrepreneurship Guidance (Sept 2012) has made a significant impact on this 2010 delegate concern. The subsequent Scottish response (QAA Scotland 2014) has given this guidance document a national dimension that is clearly providing support to delegates. <http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/flexible-learning/enterprise-and-entrepreneurship>
5. **Recognition and Reward** has been supported at a national level through the EEUK and NCEE “National Enterprise Educator Awards (NEEA)” since 2009 but is yet to be uniformly adopted as part of the promotion/HR policies of most institutions.

To summarise, advances have been made since the IEEC2010 conference debate (Cardiff Concordat) with the biggest national movement being with the the issue of quality and assessment (4) – an initiative which was itself driven by the community and supported by QAA, to produce clear curriculum guidance in 2012. However the need for leadership (2) and clarity across impact measures (3) remain strong issues for educators and champions working to create entrepreneurial outcomes in others, within the class room and beyond.

These are now the further challenges for enterprise educators. However the scope to resolve these issues together is a clear; therefore “The Challenge is Ours”.

**These challenges will be returned to at our 10th annual conference
IEEC2015
to be hosted by Anglia Ruskin University, 9th-11th Sept 2015.**

Acknowledgements:

Conference joint hosts EEUK and NCEE wish to thank the #IEEC2014 Provocation Leaders who offered the provocation statements and facilitated their group discussions on-line and throughout the conference:

- Dominic Martinez, University of Salford
- Liz Taylor, University of Sheffield
- Roger Candy, Northumbria University
- Fiona Godsman, SIE
- Inge Hill, Birmingham City University
- Simon Best, Middlesex University
- Katie Wray, Newcastle University
- Susan Laing, Napier
- Steve Mansfield, Manchester Metropolitan University

And to the
IEEC 2014 delegates who explored these ideas both on-line and at Newcastle University.

Appendix 1: Lead Provocateurs and IEEC Provocations

It is not needed	Dominic Martinez University of Salford	Truly entrepreneurial students will find a way to start a business regardless and do not need standard support available at Universities. Students interested in entrepreneurship but not entrepreneurially confident should NOT be supported to start up a business straight out of university but be encouraged to seek work/life experience first.
	Liz Taylor Sheffield	Can you deliver an education fit for an entrepreneur? In Sheffield, our enterprise pipeline supports students from the age of four to university students- but why do we do it? Won't an entrepreneur just establish a business anyway? What is the value of the support that any of us provide?
It has lost its sparkle	Roger Candy	Is enterprise education at the end of its life cycle and rather losing its sparkle? Is it, for most learners and teachers, now mainly about new approaches to employability? Do we need possibly to redefine the whole enterprise education project?
	Fiona Godsman SIE	There's too much emphasis on entrepreneurship and 'making it real' in enterprise education. We know that ALL students studying any discipline will benefit from what we teach, but the focus on business start-up is off-putting to many students and teaching staff. We must acknowledge that and focus on wider benefits
It is just good teaching	Dr Inge Hill Birmingham City University	"Teaching" students for venture creation is about giving them questions and stories – and pointers where to get more information. Then leave them to get on with it. When they come back, give them more and better questions. Learning that sticks (=impact) happens when they seek and create new insight themselves.
The Myths of entrepreneurs	Dr Simon Best Middlesex University	There is a widely held belief that entrepreneurial activity is the panacea to economic stagnation. This provocative piece challenges this notion by asking if we are also fanning the flames of entrepreneurial failure on the basis that it is the myths of entrepreneurship and not the reality that is driving the agenda.
It doesn't work on-line	Katie Wray, Newcastle University	Imagine a lecture in which neither you, nor your learners were able to ask questions or respond to thoughts. I am conclusive that the best education does not follow a planned path, yet I am designing, developing and delivering a MOOC! Am I exposing myself as a 'deviant educator'?
We dont research it properly	Susan Laing, Napier University	In assessing the impact of education and engagement, why is there a focus on quantitative metrics when there are qualitative alternatives which offer meaningful and transferable evidence? Could universities effectively illustrate the impact of our engagements through qualitative approaches? If yes, which research tools should be adopted and why?
	Steve Mansfield, Man Met University	National and internal student surveys will stifle enterprise and entrepreneurship education, and will limit the development of innovative teaching by creating risk adverse learning environments

Appendix

Delegates voting on Entrepreneur Barbie had limited time to digest the wider information provided by Mattel on their packing (see table below) and on the associated website before being asked to vote.

Women entrepreneurs are LEADERS who start their own businesses
They use their intelligence and imaginations to create new ideas that can CHANGE THE WORLD
Today nearly 1 in 3 US businesses are owned by women
By 2018 women will create OVER HALF of the new small businesses in the US
You too can be an entrepreneur – Work Hard to SUCCEED, DREAM and to MAKE A DIFFERENCE! (Mattel
promotional information 2014)

Sources and References:

All-Party Parliamentary Group for Micro Businesses (2013) “An Education System fit for an Entrepreneur”
<http://www.enterprise.ac.uk/index.php/news/item/402-entrepreneurs-and-educators-agree-new-report-calls-for-better-integration-of-entrepreneur-skills-at-all-levels-of-education/news>

Batchelor, L (2013) A Guide for Enterprise Education
http://www.coast2capital.org.uk/images/C2C_Enterprise_Handbook_A4_v10_online.pdf

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1998) “Situated Learning – Legitimate Peripheral Participation”. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Penaluna, A Smith, K and Price, A (2010) Cardiff Concordat <http://ieec.co.uk/previous-conferences/action-in-enterprise-education/ieec2010-concordat/>

Price, A (2014) unpublished “Challenges of the Enterprise Educator” Speech to the Entrepreneurial University Leadership Programme London (June 2014)

QAA Guidance (2012) Enterprise and entrepreneurship guidance
<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/enterprise-entrepreneurship-guidance.pdf>

QAA Scotland (2014) Creating Entrepreneurial Campuses
<http://www.enhancementthemes.ac.uk/docs/report/creating-entrepreneurial-campuses.pdf?sfvrsn=14>

‘Scotland CAN DO: Becoming a World-leading Entrepreneurial and Innovative Nation’
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2013/11/7675> Policy issued Nov 2013

‘Scotland CAN DO Action Framework - Building on Our Vision to Become a World-leading Entrepreneurial and Innovative Nation’ - <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2014/04/3454> Action Framework issued April 2014

Welsh Action Plan (YES 2010) <http://www.learningobservatory.com/uploads/publications/828.pdf>

Yorke, M., Knight, P. (2003) The Undergraduate Curriculum and Employability ESECT HEA Series

Entrepreneurial University of Year Publications can be found: <http://ncee.org.uk/publications/>
EEUK Best Practice Days <http://www.enterprise.ac.uk/index.php/events>