

# 3EP European Entrepreneurship Educators Project: Evaluation



# CONTENTS

Introduction to 3EP	4
Objectives of 3EP	5
Evaluation Approach	7
Impact	9
Professional experience of delegates	11
Background organisational information	13
Expectations and expressed learning outcomes	14
Intention and desirability to teach entrepreneurship	15
Satisfaction survey: implementation of the Academy	16
Evening programme of activities	17
Direct learning results	19
Summary of 3EP participant views	20
Strategic panel member views	22

# INTRODUCTION TO 3EP

The European Entrepreneurship Educators Project (3EP) was funded through the European Union's Competitive and Innovation Framework (EU CIP) Programme; an initiative designed to support innovation activities, provide better access to finance and deliver business support services in the EU regions between 2009 and 2012.

The 3EP vision was to support the creation of a higher education sector across Europe capable of developing enterprising and entrepreneurial students, graduates and staff. 3EP was developed by four higher-education partners in Finland, Denmark, Croatia and the UK as a three year project with a view to developing and delivering entrepreneurship annual summer academies (EASA).

The four partners that form 3EP are the University of Turku in Finland, Aarhus University in Denmark, Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek, Croatia, and the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (now trading as National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE)) in the UK, which coordinates the programme. The four partners, whilst having extensive knowledge and experience of promoting graduate entrepreneurship, recognised the need to build a governance structure for the project that reflected the diversity of participating institutions and summer academy participants. This led the partners to establish a Strategic Panel, which was inclusive in nature, with colleagues from other EU countries (especially southern Europe), and from organisations representing entrepreneurs.

The role of the Strategic Panel was to oversee the development, management and evaluation of the project; to agree the content and methodology of the summer academies; to agree the format of the network's ongoing support structures; to evaluate all aspects and to ensure 3EP is sustainable after the EU funding ends.

## The partners

### **National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education (NCEE), United Kingdom**

The National Centre for Entrepreneurship in Education was formed in 2004 (as the National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship - the contracting entity for this project) as a key agent for change in four areas of enterprise and higher education. These were to:

- Lead long term cultural change in our universities
- Shape the institutional environment for enterprise and entrepreneurship, and embed good practice
- Increase the number of graduate businesses
- Inform regional and national policies that affect enterprise.

NCEE works closely with government departments, universities and businesses as well as national institutions and entrepreneurship experts internationally.

### **Aarhus Entrepreneurship Centre, Denmark**

The Aarhus Entrepreneurship Centre has significant experience in involving teachers in entrepreneurship at a full faculty university. Its network includes teachers from the humanities, the social science, the faculty of science and The Aarhus School of Business (ASB), health science and faculty of theology. The focus is on developing new entrepreneurial teaching methods, courses and material.

### **Business and Innovation Development (BID), University of Turku, Finland**

The Business and Innovation Development unit at the University of Turku in Finland is working in the field of entrepreneurship, technology, innovations support and SME education with emphasis on industrial relations and foresight. It hosts the secretariat of the European Council for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (ECSB) the Europe's leading association for small business and entrepreneurship educators and researchers.

### **Josip Juraj Strossmayer University, Osijek, Croatia**

The Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek, Croatia, has built a portfolio of programmes aimed at providing both academic and practical support for the entrepreneurial recovery of Eastern Croatia, which had been greatly devastated by war, in the late 1990s.

# OBJECTIVES OF 3EP

The specific and objectives of 3EP, as determined in the bid documentation produced by the partners, were to:

- Create a pedagogically driven programme that addresses key needs in curriculum change.
- Create institutional change (NCEE model) through curriculum change/institutional audit.
- Create 3EP graduates (Fellows) motivated to undertake 'action for change' (commitments).
- Support 3EP Fellows to deliver change at all levels, supported by trans-national mentors.
- Create a legacy of a European network of 3EP Fellows, trans-national mentors; online materials and, critically, provide a sustainable model of EASA delivery that can be cascaded to individual countries or regions.

3EP provided a programme of learning that effectively supported enterprise educators across Europe. Key programme components included:

- 147 participating educators, who together reached over 14,000 students, within 50 different institutions, across 11 different countries.
- A strong partnership has been developed that is being built upon for future projects and programmes.
- A wide range of programme resources are available from an active network of at least 75 3EP Fellows.

*3EP was an excellent international forum to interact with Entrepreneurship Educators and to exchange practical experience and best practice from several European states.*



*The mentoring program facilitates the development of implementing the new ideas developed from the exchange. I have already implemented learnings from 3EP and continue to share ideas with 'new' international colleagues!*

Jane Chang, Senior Lecturer, Westminster Business School, University of Westminster, UK (Finland 2010 Delegate) - 3EP Fellow.



# EVALUATION APPROACH

3EP involved a series of four intensive, residential summer schools hosted by each of the project's partners in turn.

The first of these summer schools, or European Annual Summer Academies (EASAs), took place in August 2010 at the University of Turku in Finland. A second EASA was successfully organised at the Aarhus Entrepreneurship Centre, Denmark, in August 2011, and two further EASAs were organised in 2012, the first by NCEE in Liverpool in March of that year, and the second by the Josip Juraj Strossmayer University in Osijek in Croatia in August. The Liverpool EASA occurred in tandem with the Global Entrepreneurship Congress (GEC), which took place in Europe for the first time that month.

The overall structure of the four partners' activities was the same, with an intensive, week-long residential Summer Academy supplemented by personal development projects in the delegates' own institutions, mentoring support, and access to continuing support through the 3EP Virtual Learning Platform.

Delegates who successfully completed the programme, by attending an EASA and committing themselves to a personal development project at their home institution, are additionally awarded the status of 3EP Fellow, which brings with it continued access to the unique programme resources on the Virtual Learning Portal, and an early view of all new 3EP materials and developments as they occur.

The 3EP's Summer Academies were designed to support the key elements of the Oslo Agenda (see right), including supporting institutional change and developing pedagogies, and giving educators the opportunity to work both with colleagues from other institutions and local entrepreneurs to explore their own teaching and approaches to entrepreneurship in education.

## The Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education

The aim of the "Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education" is to step up progress in promoting entrepreneurial mindsets in society, systematically and with effective actions. The Agenda is a rich menu of proposals, from which stakeholders can pick actions at the appropriate level, and adapt them to the local situation.

The Agenda is an outcome of the Conference on "Entrepreneurship Education in Europe: Fostering Entrepreneurial Mindsets through Education and Learning" – an initiative of the European Commission jointly organised with the Norwegian government - held in Oslo on 26-27 October 2006, which followed the Communication from Commission on the same topic.

The Agenda, which details specific actions, is framed around a number of core areas, as follows:

- A. Framework for policy development,
- B. Support to educational establishments,
- C. Support to teachers and educators,
- D. Entrepreneurship activities in schools and in higher education,
- E. Building links and opening education to the outside world; and
- F. Communication activities.

Each of the four EASAs covered six thematic areas over the six days of the Academy:

- Entrepreneurial Educational Challenges: Role as educator and institutional catalyst
- Teaching the Entrepreneurship Mind-set
- Teaching Entrepreneurial Behaviours, Attitudes and Skills
- Opportunity Recognition and New Venture Development
- Developing Entrepreneurship Education Strategies
- Style of Learning.

EASAs were supported variously by 3EP entrepreneurs-in-residence and entrepreneurship students, and the programme included at least 50 separate pedagogies that were presented to, and tested with, delegates, including ice-breakers, teaching networking, team and group work techniques, kinaesthetic exercises, practical tasks and activities, plenary discussion, use of imagery and pictures, learning logs, personal reflection, virtual learning, social media, elevator pitch, KaosPilot techniques, drama, communities of practice and many others.

## Evaluation team

The 3EP programme was evaluated by a team from the University of Turku's Business and Innovation Development (BID) unit. Evaluators included Kirsi Peura, the Turku 3EP project manager, and Kirsi Ahlman (project planning officer) and Katariina Nordell (project researcher).

*Attending 3EP enabled me to broaden my international network and learn about the differences and similarities in approach to enterprise education across the European Union in order to benchmark best practice.*

Dr Clare Schofield, Research fellow, Manchester Metropolitan University Business School, Manchester, UK (Finland 2010 Delegate) - 3EP Fellow.



Each Summer Academy was evaluated in turn using survey templates, and each evaluation led to the creation of an individual evaluation report. These reports have been used, along with additional consultation with Strategic panel members, as the basis for this summary report, which looks at the strengths and successes of the programme overall.

## Evaluation objectives and method

The Turku team used three categories of enterprise and entrepreneurship defined by Hytti and O'Gorman (2004) as a framework for their evaluation of the 3EP programme. These were:

- Learning to understand entrepreneurship – to increase understanding of what entrepreneurship is about;
- Learning to become entrepreneurial – to equip participants with an entrepreneurial approach to the “world of work” (non-business focus); and
- Learning to become an entrepreneur – to prepare individuals to act as entrepreneurs and as managers of new business (business focus).

The evaluation gathered both quantitative and qualitative data from each EASA which were supplemented by observational data to assess the feasibility and application of the 3EP model.

Each evaluation involved the following elements:

- A pre-summer school survey of delegates.
- Daily evaluation of delegates' actual experiences.
- A satisfaction survey of EASA delegates.
- Evaluating the success of the residential summer school delivery, including a follow-up survey of implemented project work.
- Outcome and output study.

# IMPACT

## Summary

A total of 147 delegates attended the four summer schools (Turku 2010, Aarhus 2011, Liverpool 2012 and Osijek 2012), and gave the programme an overall satisfaction rating of 3.96 out of a possible 5 (see table below). Delegates were from 88 different institutions in 19 European countries.

The majority of delegates were lecturers from the university sector, and collectively had a total of 14,000 students within their immediate 'reach,' emphasising the considerable learning impact that delegates could have when they returned to their home institutions.

Business and Management was the most commonly represented discipline, and delegates had tended to have had over seven years teaching experience, of which over four will have been related to enterprise or entrepreneurship. Learning objectives changed between the summer schools, but an interest in learning new teaching methods and tools ran across all four sets of delegates. There was a high level of interest in teaching enterprise and entrepreneurship amongst participants, but a somewhat lower expectation that this would prove feasible in practice.

Delegates were satisfied with most aspects of the summer schools in terms of their content and administration, giving them an overall rating of nearly four out of five, and found the evening programme exciting, if perhaps a little taxing. Delegates particularly welcomed the networking opportunities the summer schools brought.

In terms of meeting learning needs, participants felt they had gained the new skills and knowledge that they required, which would help them improve their entrepreneurship education activities in both existing and potentially new programmes and modules.

		Finland Turku, 2010	Denmark Aarhus, 2011	UK Liverpool, 2012	Croatia Osijek, 2012
Number of delegates		37	38	25	47
Response rates (%)	Pre-course	40	97	84	98
	Satisfaction	82	82	N/A	N/A
Profiles %	Female	59	41	64	N/A
	Male	41	59	36	N/A
	Home nation delegates	19	53	76	47
Professional experience (%)	University lecturers	46	35	N/A	79
	Researchers	8	18	N/A	4
	Careers development	N/A	7	N/A	2
	Graduate start-up	N/A	6	N/A	0
	Business start-up	N/A	13	N/A	7
	Incubator	N/A	6	N/A	2
	Staff development	N/A	6	N/A	4
	Other	N/A	9	N/A	2
Average years' work experience	General	7.4	7.8	7.5	9.4
	Enterprise related	7.3	4.3	4.9	4.7
Institutional backgrounds	Students reached by delegates	896	1540	3065	8500
Satisfaction	Overall rating (out of 5)	3.7	4.0	3.8	4.3

NOTE: gender break downs were not provided for Osijek. Professional experience data were inconsistent for Turku and Liverpool, making direct comparison difficult. Evaluation reports for Liverpool and Osijek did not give a response rate for the satisfaction surveys. Under 'professional experience' for Turku, 'University lecturers' includes professors and assistant professors.

## Geographic spread of delegates

The map, right, provides a clear representation of the geographic reach of the 3EP programme - it shows the 19 countries represented by 3EP delegates, with variations between each of the EASAs.

In Turku, a considerable majority of delegates (70%) came from Northern Europe, including the UK (30%), Ireland, Sweden and Estonia. The other three EASAs saw the highest (and in the cases of Aarhus and Liverpool, the majority) attendance from the host nation.

In the case of Aarhus, 53% of delegates were from Denmark, with 10% each from Finland and Sweden. Ten countries were represented in total, including the UK, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Norway, Cyprus and Albania, although the numbers from these other countries were small.

The majority (76%) of delegates at the Liverpool EASA were from the UK, which might be related to the fact the summer school was timed to coincide with the Global Entrepreneurship Congress, which was also taking place in the city then. Other countries represented included Spain, Denmark, Germany and Finland, all with about 5% of the delegates.

Eleven countries were represented at the Osijek EASA, and the greatest single number of delegates (47%) came from Croatia. 15% of the delegates came from Finland, and the UK, Denmark and Estonia all provided more than 6%. Other countries represented included Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ireland, Spain and Montenegro.



# PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF DELEGATES

## Turku, 2010

Thirty seven delegates attended the Turku EASA, of whom 17 were male and 20 female. In total, 28 different institutions were represented, of which nearly all (97%) were universities or universities of applied science. The remaining 3% were other education institutions. The largest single group of delegates (35%) were university lecturers and subject area teachers, followed by unit and programme directors (16%) and professors or assistant professors (11%).

The majority (53%) of respondents to the survey had not taught any credit-bearing courses or modules during 2009-10, but seven delegates reported that they had, citing various examples of entrepreneurship as part of business planning, as new venture development and as an element of innovation.

Most of the survey respondents (67%) provided extracurricular support for enterprise and entrepreneurship that did not form part of any academic qualification during the 2009-10 academic year, including entrepreneurship societies, exchange students, seminar programmes and careers services events.

Of those who responded to the pre-summer school survey, 53% taught embedded modules with enterprise and entrepreneurship during 2009-10, and discussed various initiatives such as pedagogic intervention, entrepreneurship as an element of technical innovation policy, EU funding and pilot initiatives involving teacher training colleges in Aalborg.

## Aarhus, 2011

The most common profession amongst the 37 delegates who responded to the Aarhus pre-summer school survey was university lecturer (35%) followed by researchers (18%) and delegates working with business start-ups (13%). Other respondents gave their professional backgrounds as variously careers development, graduate start-up, incubators and staff development. Project assistants, project consultants, engineers, business development officers, managers and entrepreneurs collectively accounted for the remaining 9% of responses.

The majority of the 37 survey respondents at Aarhus had taught credit-bearing courses or modules during 2010-11 in enterprise and entrepreneurship education that led to academic qualifications. These included entrepreneurship and innovation, new venture growth, quality and leadership and programmes in entrepreneurship for secondary teachers.

46% of the 37 respondents had provided extra-curricular support for enterprise and entrepreneurship during 2010-2011, including enterprise road shows, entrepreneurial days, networking, seminars, business growth events and incubation activities.

Again, 46% of respondents had taught embedded modules with enterprise and entrepreneurship during 2010/2011 in subjects that ranged from health sciences to furniture design, team building and a young enterprise start-up programme.

*Participating the European Entrepreneurship Educators Summer school was truly a superb experience. Well structured intensive week accompanied with the preliminary tasks and post event follow-ups and mentoring worked very well. The program provided extensive toolset and strong theoretical base for enhancing entrepreneurial education and inspiring new entrepreneurs in my local society.*

Toni Perämäki, Board member of the Turku Boost Entrepreneurial Society, Turku School of Economics, University of Turku, Finland (Finland 2010 Delegate).

## Liverpool, 2012

Eighteen delegates completed the professional experience section of the pre-summer school survey for the Liverpool EASA in 2012, or 72% of the delegates. The Liverpool evaluation allowed delegates to register both their primary role and other duties as well, meaning that the 18 responses in practice generated 44 separate roles, or an average of 2.4 roles for each delegate at their place of work.

Nearly 60% of respondents had taught credit-bearing courses or modules in enterprise or entrepreneurship education during the 2011-12 academic year that led to academic qualifications, including undergraduate programmes in entrepreneurship and creativity, biotechnology, employment skills and a cross-disciplinary module.

76% of the respondents had provided extra-curricular support for enterprise and entrepreneurship during 2011-2012, with activities including boot camps, workshops, competitions and networking.

Of the respondents, 43% had taught embedded modules with enterprise and entrepreneurship during the 2011-2012 academic year, with subjects covering small business management, business agility and creativity, journalism, technology and innovation, and management and accounts.

*I found the European Enterprise Educator programme to be very stimulating. It was very well organised throughout the whole week's programme and I have really benefitted from it, in terms of entrepreneurial learning and teaching approaches. The organisers and learning facilitators are extremely helpful in furthering understanding in enterprise education. The whole week was intensive and packed with fun activities which make the learning process not only enjoyable but memorable as well. It was also very nice to get to know many other enterprise educators across Europe and to share our experiences.*



PingPing Meckel, Senior Lecturer - Enterprise and Small Business Management, Liverpool John Moores University, UK (UK 2012)

## Osijek, 2012

The best represented discipline at the Osijek EASA was Business and Management (49% of respondents) followed by 'Cross-disciplinary' (13%), which included Business and Management and Education, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, and medicine and Health. Other disciplines included Education (11%), Engineering and Technology (7%) and Social Sciences (6%).

36% of the 45 respondents who answered this question had taught credit-bearing courses / modules during 2010-2011 (before entering 3EP) in enterprise and entrepreneurship education that lead to academic qualifications, including courses for secondary teachers, student incubator activities, innovation, quality and leadership and business planning.

Well over half the respondents (58%) had provided extracurricular support for enterprise and entrepreneurship during 2010-2011, with activities ranging from road shows and competitions to networking and innovation camps.

One third (33%) of respondents had taught embedded modules with enterprise and entrepreneurship during 2010-2011, including creativity, team building, health sciences and enterprise start up programmes.

# BACKGROUND ORGANISATION INFORMATION

## Impact

14000 - the minimum number of students across Europe who have been taught by 3EP participants.

## Turku, 2010

The total number of students enrolled in delegates' institutions at the Turku EASA during 2009-10 was, on average, 10318 (median, 2000).

The number of students the delegates had reach to during one academic year varied from 1-10 students to over 100 students, and the evaluation team calculated that the total number of students that could be reached by the delegates at the Turku EASA was a minimum of 896. However, the evaluators felt that, as many of the values that should have been provided by respondents were missing, the reach of 3EP Network Educators is likely to be much higher in practice.

## Aarhus, 2011

The total number of student enrolments in 2010/2011 in delegates' institutions was an of average 5129 (median, 3000), and the number that individual delegates reached regularly as educators varied from less than 20 to over 100. The evaluation team calculated that the total number of students reached by the delegates would be a minimum of 1540, and as only 52% of respondents provided values for this question, the actual number is likely to be much higher.

## Liverpool, 2012

There were an average of 5129 students enrolled in delegates' institutions during 2011-12 (median, 3000), and the number of students that delegates reached regularly as educators varied from less than 20 to over 100.

The evaluation team calculated that delegates reached a total of 3065 students, with the caveat again that, as only 76% of respondents answered this question, the actual figure is likely to be much higher.

## Osijek, 2012

The total number of student enrolments in 2011-2012 in Osijek EASA delegates' institutions was an average of 5115 (median = 1900). The number of students the delegates reached regularly as an educator varied from at least 21 students to over 100. From this, the evaluation team calculated that the total number of students reached by the delegates was a minimum of 8500, with the caveat that, as only 68% of respondents answered this question, the actual figure is likely to be much higher.

*3EP was an excellent programme which I would recommend to those wishing to increase both the effectiveness and capacity of their enterprise provision. It challenged me to think in new ways about enterprise education and allowed me to develop my pedagogical practice by sharing best practice with European Educators and testing and reflecting on new techniques.*



Carol Langston, Enterprise and Innovation Manager  
CREATE, Highland Centre for Enterprise and Innovation, Inverness  
College UHI, Scotland (Finland 2010 Delegate) - 3EP Fellow.

# EXPECTATIONS AND EXPRESSED LEARNING OBJECTIVES

Delegates were asked to identify their learning objectives in three areas:

1. In the current and on-going courses and modules that they teach,
2. In their profession as an educator in general (i.e. professional development), and
3. In the own home institution as a change agent.

Likert scales of 1 – 5 were used to gauge delegates' preferences, with 1 indicating the least important development area, and 5 the most important.

In terms of existing courses and modules, delegates across the four summer schools identified New ways to motivate and engage with students, New methods and tools in existing courses, New teaching materials and New entrepreneurship content as particular learning objectives. Delegates at Turku also identified New theories (philosophies) and frameworks as an important need. At Turku, Aarhus and Liverpool, delegates identified New exchange opportunities for students as the least important learning objective (at Osijek, to Create totally new courses or modules was the least important objective).

When discussing professional development, all delegates agreed that New educational and pedagogical skills was the most important objective, and many also felt that New operational skills in putting ideas into practice would be useful. Least important objectives varied from one summer school to the next, with no consistent theme emerging. New joint projects was the least important at Turku, something with which Aarhus delegates agreed, although they also identified a mentorship with a more experienced educator as being less relevant. Delegates at Liverpool felt that New individual strategies in one's profession and New openings for professional development were less relevant, whereas at Osijek it was New frameworks and New educator exchange opportunities.

Generally speaking, delegates felt that New concepts for institutional and strategic development and the need for a New direction towards the entrepreneurial university/ institution were the most important objectives, although delegates at both Turku and Osijek felt the former of these was less relevant. Delegates at Aarhus and Liverpool felt that Enhancing empowerment to promote the institution's strategy was also important, although, again, those at Turku and Osijek rated it somewhat lower.

*3EP provided a great opportunity to network with like-minded individuals across Europe and share Enterprise Education best practice.*

Dr Claire Hookham Williams, University Teacher of Entrepreneurship, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK (Finland 2010 Delegate) - 3EP Fellow.



# INTENTION AND DESIRABILITY TO TEACH ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The evaluation team was keen to assess both the extent to which 3EP delegates wanted to teach entrepreneurship, and the extent to which they thought it would be feasible for them to do this once they returned to their home institutions.

In their evaluation reports for the four EASAs (Turku, Aarhus, Liverpool and Osijek), the evaluators were therefore careful to draw a distinction between the desirability of teaching entrepreneurship, and the feasibility of achieving this in practice. They measured both outcomes using Likert scale statements, this time using a scale of 1 to 10.

## **Intention and Desirability to Teach Entrepreneurship: Turku, 2010**

With the Turku pre-summer school survey, all respondents showed a high level of desire to teach entrepreneurship, with none expressing a contrary opinion, something the evaluators felt possibly reflected the fact that the delegates had already shown themselves to have high levels of motivation and interest in entrepreneurship education by enrolling on the 3EP EASA in the first place.

However, when asked about the practicality of teaching entrepreneurship when they returned to their institutions, the results were more evenly spread, with 26% of respondents indicating they felt the feasibility was low (which the evaluation team defined as scores of between 1 and 4 on their Likert scales). Respondents indicated they felt it was more practical for their colleagues to teach entrepreneurship than it was for themselves.

Interestingly, respondents felt the probability of their teaching entrepreneurship or integrating entrepreneurship into their existing teaching was quite high, with none stating they felt it was improbable.

## **Intention and Desirability to Teach Entrepreneurship: Aarhus, 2011**

A broadly similar pattern emerged from the respondents to the pre-summer school survey at Aarhus in 2011. 84% of respondents agreed that it was highly probable that I will teach more enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in my teaching (values between 7 and 10). Nearly all the respondents (92%) also felt it desirable to teach enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in my teaching (values between 7 and 10), but only 44% of respondents felt it practical for me to teach enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in my teaching. Unlike Turku, however, only 16% felt it was practical for my colleagues to teach enterprise.

## **Intention and Desirability to Teach Entrepreneurship: Liverpool, 2012**

The results from the Liverpool EASA were altogether more positive, with 87% of respondents reporting that it was highly probable that I will teach more enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in my teaching (values between 7 and 10). In fact, 90% of the delegates found it desirable to teach enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in my teaching (values between 7 and 10). Compared to earlier 3EP Academies, respondents also found the practicality of teaching entrepreneurship much higher, with 57% agreeing that it was practical for me to teach enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in my teaching.

## **Intention and Desirability to Teach Entrepreneurship: Osijek, 2012**

Most respondents at the Osijek EASA (92%) thought it to be highly desirable to teach enterprise and entrepreneurship or to integrate them in their teaching (values between 7 and 10), and 86% felt it practical to teach enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in their teaching as well. Further to this, 83% of respondents estimated that it was probable to teach more enterprise and entrepreneurship or integrate it in their teaching. However, only 22% of respondents thought it was practical for my colleagues to teach enterprise.

The existence of different attitudes towards desirability to teach entrepreneurship may be, in part, a result of the different structures in each country for engaging with entrepreneurial content.

# SATISFACTION SURVEY: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACADEMY

## Satisfaction Survey Results: Turku, 2010

Overall, the delegates at Turku felt that the practical aspects of the summer school were organised to a high standard. More than half of the respondents felt that each of the four areas the survey examined, which were pre-information, pre-work, facilities and catering, were organised in a way that was 'most helpful' or 'helpful.' Delegates were also pleased in general with the summer school's working methods, and activities, participant engagement and guest speakers all received a high score (each over 75%).

There was, however, just a suggestion that delegates felt hand-outs and course materials could be further improved.

## Satisfaction Survey Results: Aarhus, 2011

Delegates at Aarhus the following year were also pleased with the way that 3EP managed the practical issues of the EASA, which they thought were organised well. Of the four categories surveyed, a large majority were pleased with them all, and particularly so with the facilities provided (97% rated them highly).

Over 50% of respondents were happy with the working methods used by the EASA's organisers, particularly the engagement with participants, with the visit to a local alternative business school (KaosPilot), and with the involvement of students

*A beautifully organized conference in Liverpool that provided a rich learning experience for all who attended. The sessions were informative, inspiring, affirming and even entertaining! It was an amazing and emotional feeling to be surrounded by so many educators. The passion in the conversations regarding students and how to be better at what we do was overwhelming. I am excited and encouraged by what I learned and ready to share it with students.*



Dorothee Zerwas, Research Assistant,  
University of Koblenz-Landau, Germany (UK 2012 Delegate) - 3EP

## Satisfaction Survey Results: Liverpool, 2012

A substantial majority (over 70%) of respondents at Liverpool's EASA were satisfied with all four areas surveyed (pre-information, pre-work, facilities and catering), with facilities proving especially popular (over 90%).

Over 50% of the delegates rated most of the working methods with the grade of 4 or 5, which means that they found them helpful or very helpful. Only about one third of the participants found the Global Entrepreneurship Congress (GEC) helpful or very helpful with around 40% of the participants rated it as moderately helpful.

## Satisfaction Survey Results: Osijek, 2012

Respondents to the Osijek survey were satisfied with all four categories being evaluated, and most found its content matched their level of experience well (90%), and was stimulating and interesting (97%). 77% also felt the 3EP EASA met their learning needs.

## Overall rating

As part of the satisfaction survey, delegates were asked to give the Summer Academy an overall rating, again based on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating the lowest level of satisfaction, and 5 the highest.

## Overall rating: Turku, 2010

Respondents to the Turku survey gave the Summer Academy a comparatively high rating of 3.7, and the majority felt it had contributed to their learning.

## Overall rating: Aarhus, 2011

Respondents at Aarhus also gave the EASA a high overall satisfaction rating of 3.99, a 0.29 improvement on Turku the previous year.

## Overall rating: Liverpool, 2012

At 3.83, the overall level of satisfaction amongst the Liverpool respondents was slightly lower than that for Aarhus, but still 0.13 better than Turku.

## Overall rating: Osijek, 2012

Respondents gave the Osijek EASA an overall rating of 4.33, the highest rating received by any of the four summer schools, and 0.34 higher than the Aarhus rating.

# THE EVENING PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES

All four EASAs had demanding evening programmes of activities and events, which were compulsory elements of the summer schools. In each case, the programme began with a welcome reception on Sunday evening, and concluded with a Gala dinner on Thursday evening.

## **Evening programme: Turku, 2010**

Thursday night's Gala dinner was the most popular element of the evening programme at Turku's EASA, with people feeling it both contributed to the programme and was enjoyable. Tuesday's activity, an 'Amazing Race', was also popular, as was the Sunday evening reception. The 'Pitch' event organised for Monday evening was perhaps the least popular activity, with two people out of the 37 participants rating it poorly. Overall 76% of respondents felt the evening activities contributed to their learning experience.

## **Evening programme: Aarhus, 2011**

The results from the Aarhus EASA were almost identical to those from Turku, with Thursday evening's Gala Dinner receiving the highest rating, followed by the 'Amazing Race' on Tuesday, and the reception on Sunday evening. The one-minute Pitch event organised for Monday evening was the least popular event, and received a satisfactory rating from under 50% of respondents.

The comments provided by respondents indicated they had enjoyed the networking and social opportunities the evening programme brought, but found it rather tiring after a long day.

## **Evening programme: Liverpool, 2012**

As with Turku and Aarhus, respondents to the Liverpool survey found Thursday night's Gala Dinner the most enjoyable element of the evening programme, an event that every delegate attended. The least enjoyable element was a Business Mastermind event organised for Wednesday evening, which only half the delegates attended. However, given that this event took place at the same time as the Global Entrepreneurship Conference, some delegates had already opted to participate in other events happening across the city.

## **Evening programme: Osijek, 2012**

Every night of the Osijek evening programme was rated highly, particularly so Tuesday night's 'Amazing Race' competition, which received a 100% satisfaction score. If any event was a little less popular, it was the Monday evening One Minute Pitch, which was in keeping with the results from the other EASAs.

*3EP has enabled me to make a major experiential step-change in my entrepreneurship teaching and learning approach, and has definitely enhanced my achievement of learning outcomes of my courses. It was also an excellent opportunity to network and share good practice (and correct bad practice), and challenge some theoretical fallacies currently being propounded in this field, and was delivered by a competent and experienced team.*



Dr Jonathan M. Scott, Senior Lecturer, Teesside University, UK (Finland 2010 Delegate) - 3EP Fellow.

UK Academy: 11-16 March 2012

**3EP** European  
Entrepreneurship  
Educators  
Programme



3EP UK Academy - 11 to 16th March 2012, Liverpool.

# DIRECT LEARNING RESULTS

Without attempting to measure exactly the knowledge gained or skills acquired at the EASAs, the evaluation team did gather the general impressions of direct learning benefits from delegates, which although inevitably subjective, do give some indication of learning impact. The evaluation also investigated the intention of delegates to put their learning into practice.

Direct learning was assessed using Likert scales across three outcomes: providing knowledge and skills to develop individual courses and modules; equipping delegates with tools to achieve personal development; and providing the motivation and confidence to seek institutional development.

## **Direct Learning Results: Turku, 2010**

Respondents at Turku indicated clearly they felt they had gained new knowledge and skills, something they felt would particularly help them implement new practices to run existing courses (74% satisfaction), implement new resources to run existing courses (66%) and implement new entrepreneurship content (70%). Improvement is needed in creating new courses or modules (57%).

## **Direct Learning Results: Aarhus, 2011**

Respondents at Aarhus broadly agreed that they had gained new skills and knowledge, although the results were not as strong as those from Turku. There was strong agreement that they had gained the ability to implement new methods and tools (81%), although only 36% felt they had gained the knowledge and skills to create completely new courses, and only 32% felt they had improved their ability to create new exchange opportunities for their students.

When comparing the direct learning results with the expressed learning needs (pre-summer school survey), it is possible to see that respondents' learning objectives were mostly met, and some expectations or objectives were even exceeded, including: knowledge and skills to implement new resources to run existing courses; a mentorship with a more experienced educator; new openings for professional opportunities; new joint projects; new networks and partnerships; and introducing new concepts for institutional and strategic development.

## **Direct Learning Results: Liverpool, 2012**

65% felt they had gained the ability to create new ways to motivate and engage with their students, and 65% to implement new practices to run existing courses/modules. 44% felt they were more able to implement new entrepreneurial related content, 26% had the knowledge and skills to create new exchange opportunities for their students, and 22% felt they had gained the knowledge and skills to create completely new courses.

Respondents found that the greatest professional benefit had been the possibility to build or join new professional networks and partnerships (70%), and new educator exchange opportunities in other HEIs (61%). However, they disagreed with the proposition that they had found new ways to connect with businesses and entrepreneurs (39% disagreed, only 18% agreed), or to create a mentorship with a more experienced educator (35% agreement).

## **Direct Learning Results: Osijek, 2012**

The responses from Osijek were some of the strongest of all four EASAs, with 90% agreeing they had gained the knowledge and skills to implement new practices to run existing courses, 90% to implement new entrepreneurship related content, and 93% to create new ways to motivate and engage with their students.

After the summer school in Osijek, the participants found their greatest professional benefits to be able to establish new professional networks and partnerships (90%), new individual strategies to their profession (77%) and new frameworks (83%).

In terms of institutional change, respondents felt they had gained the confidence and motivation to introduce new ideas for structural development in their organisation (67%), to introduce new resources for their organisation (77%) and to introduce new concepts for institutional and strategic development (66%).

In summary, it appears that the last of the EASA's was the most successful reflecting the learning throughout the programme and partners' on going commitment to improvement.

# SUMMARY OF 3EP PARTICIPANT VIEWS

## **Pre-course**

Although many delegates were pleased with the pre-course reading, some felt there was too much of it, and others had difficulty accessing material through the Virtual Learning Portal, prompting suggestions that the instructions should be reviewed, and pre-course material should be e-mailed as well. Some delegates would prefer printed hand-outs, and this could be considered for any future delivery.

## **Content**

### **Relevant and interesting**

Overall participants found the course content both relevant and interesting, and appreciated the many methods used during the week (over 60 in total), which included acting, business simulation, elevator-pitches, Lego, role play and visits. However, a small number of delegates did not understand the reasons why some of the exercises, such as drama, were used, and the rationale for the activities should perhaps be explained more clearly in the future.

Again, relatively small numbers of delegates (ranging from 10% to 30%) reported that the content was too basic for their experience levels, and others would like to see more theoretical content, but most favoured the way each training day had a clear set of learning goals that were supported by the activities.

### **Learning pace**

Delegates had mixed feelings about the intensity of the summer schools, and although generally speaking they found the pace aided their learning, some (approximately 10%) did find the course too intensive, and suggested that the evening programme might be reduced, perhaps with a second night off (currently only Wednesday evening is free). Some delegates suggested more of the evening programme might be dedicated to informal networking activities.

## **Visits**

Delegates enjoyed the visits where they occurred (such as the trip to the KaosPilot alternative business school at Aarhus), and found them a valuable way of tying theory and practice together. A small number of the delegates at Liverpool found the proximity of the GEC a distraction. It may be useful, for future programmes of this type to bear in mind similar activity or provision.

## **Pedagogies**

The wide range of pedagogies employed during the week was seen as a strength by most delegates. Over 60 different pedagogies were employed during the programme activities and a key resource developed is the 3EP Compendium of Pedagogies.

## **Personal challenges**

Delegates enjoyed the personal challenges set during their week with 3EP, and, as with the visits, found them a useful way to connect theory and practice. If anything, delegates felt the personal challenges should be integrated into the week even more deeply, and time should be allocated for them.

## **Group working**

Approximately 80% of participants were satisfied with the group working involved in the programme, which they found added to the dynamic, and gave a useful networking opportunity.

## Impact

### Reflection

De-briefings and opportunities for reflection enhanced the impact of the learning for many delegates, who would if anything like to see more time dedicated to this. Two respondents felt too much time had been allocated for reflection.

The personal challenges, which delegates saw as a form of 'homework', were an effective way of creating impact.

### Engagement

Delegates would like to be more practically involved in the programme, both as facilitators (i.e. sharing their personal experiences of enterprise and entrepreneurship), but also in terms of contributing to the creation of the course content. It could be useful for future summer schools to allocate more time to delegate-led activities.

### Motivation

Generally speaking, delegates felt they were motivated and enthusiastic, and this was reflected in the positive atmosphere experienced at all four EASAs. There was some concern (from two delegates) that in practice, the number of delegates expecting to complete their personal challenges and apply to become 3EP Fellows was low, and that greater motivation was needed around this. Generally, satisfaction with activities were high, and only a small minority (under 10%) felt uncomfortable with the activities and methods employed.

### Networking

Networking opportunities emerged as a clear strength of the 3EP summer school programme. There was a feeling that the days and evenings could be too intensive for some people. For instance, Turku data collected by the evaluation team indicate that some individuals felt the days were too intensive with the evening programme. Setting aside more time for informal networking and sharing experiences could be an advantage for future programmes of this type.

### 3EP

Overall, 3EP received positive feedback from the delegates, who were complimentary about the quality of facilitation, highlighting co-teaching and the input of students as particularly refreshing, the latter because it gave educators an opportunity to reflect on the importance of understanding students' learning needs. Delegates also appreciated the input from the EC representative.

Delegates also felt the 3EP 'brand' was being created, and recognised their connection to colleagues and participants from the other EASAs.

# STRATEGIC PANEL MEMBER VIEWS

## Strategic Panel - membership

The development and strategic direction of 3EP was overseen by a group of academic advisers and experts drawn from a number of European institutions. This 'Strategic Panel' consisted of the following members:

- Dr Thomas Cooney, Academic Director of the Institute for Minority Entrepreneurship, and a Research Fellow at the Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT).
- Professor Friederike Welter, Jönköping International Business School.
- Professor Jerzy Cieslik, Director of the Center for Entrepreneurship at the Kozminski University.
- Professor Alain Fayolle, EM Lyon Business School.
- Professor Paul Hannon, NCEE.
- Antonio Aracil, University of Valencia.

The views expressed in this section of the report are based on interviews conducted with four Strategic Panel members in February 2013. Panel members consulted were those who had less direct involvement in the development of the programme bid documentation, which encouraged an objective assessment of 3EP.

## Benefits to participants

It is clear to panel members that the participants have gained significantly from their participation in the programme. This has been evidenced through discussions between panel members and participants at the academies and elsewhere.

Whilst all panel members felt that the programme prepared participants for enterprise and entrepreneurship practice, one indicated (based on feedback he had received) that some participants would have welcomed more examples of tools and techniques they could immediately use in their home countries.

## Sustainability of programme outputs

One of the key questions, for one panel member, was how to sustain and continue the learning, development and momentum generated by participants successfully completing the programme. The solution, in part, seems to be to encourage those in host institutions to take charge of the content and materials produced as part of the programme and promote it to others who may benefit from it.

A solution to the issue of continuation and sustainability, put forward by more than one panel member, would be for an organisation with an international reach (such as NCEE) to continue to promote and share the materials and results of the programme. One panel member indicated that NCEE is increasingly seen as leaders of entrepreneurship education in the UK and internationally.

Another panel member stated that organisations such as NCEE, with their substantial knowledge and experience, could help to satisfy the increasing demands for good quality entrepreneurship education programmes in Europe.

The Summer School approach to the 3EP programme has been particularly successful, and some panel members discussed the possibilities of continuing this – through the networks and links already made with NCEE. Panel members indicated that there are huge and complex needs in entrepreneurship in education. Such complexity requires that there are more and complementary offers that can add value to educators, researchers and institutions across Europe. For example the European Foundation for Entrepreneurship Research (EFER) provides material and programmes that also support entrepreneurship research and teaching. Nevertheless, one panel member indicated that such competition often favoured US-based approaches to entrepreneurship and enterprise, which are not as relevant for European-based participants.

## Reaching out to Eastern Europe

Because panel members indicated that entrepreneurship programmes were generally dominated by US-based styles and approaches to the subject, this could deter some from undertaking or participating in such provision. One panel member felt strongly that because 3EP was rooted (in terms of approaches, styles and examples) in entrepreneurship from a European perspective, this enabled much greater participation from colleagues based in Eastern European institutions. 3EP also took account of (contrary to other entrepreneurship programmes) variations and differences in cultures, attitudes, and education systems that exist across Europe. In short, commented one panel member:

**“3EP presented a programme that embraced the diversity of background and experience of its European participants”.**

## Linking with the International Entrepreneurship Educators Conference

One option put forward for continuing the Summer School element of the 3EP programme would be to combine it in some way with the annual International Entrepreneurship Educators Conference (IEEC) - a partnership initiative between NCEE and EEUK (Enterprise Educators UK) conference in September. The typical provision of the IEEC conference could be towards the end of the working week, with the Summer School programme operating in the three days preceding this – enabling the conference to become a structural part of the Summer School programme.

## General views on impact and the future

Panel members views on the impact of the programme were extremely positive. The programme achieved what it set out to achieve as defined in its bid documentation and achieved the spirit of 3EP to develop something of real value to entrepreneurship educators in Europe.

Positive reference was made to the flexibility provided by the provision offered and the delivery of content. This included the variety of facilitation approaches used to creatively introduce entrepreneurship concepts and principles - such as material on perpetuation and causation, and the use of drama as a tool for delivery.

There was the general acknowledgement that to change the landscape of entrepreneurship education would take considerable time – and to measure the programme by this metric would be unfair. Nevertheless working with and educating 147 participants from 88 institutions across 19 countries demonstrates the programme has positively assisted in shaping entrepreneurship education in the institutions who supported 3EP.

## Logistics of meeting

Because of pressures of work, and the difficulties of organising the logistical aspects of meeting, opportunities to meet face-to-face with other panel members was limited during the programme. Constantly changing work commitments were an issue that prevented regular face-to-face and virtual meetings between strategic panel members. However, panel members did provide individual comment on programme materials, and other structural elements of the programme, in order to support its progress and implementation.

*... the one thing I liked about the programme was that it was introducing not only the kind of newer concepts around entrepreneurship such as perpetuation and causation stuff but it was also introducing the notion of using drama as part of the delivery ... it was fairly cutting-edge now from what I read of the programmes and from the feedback I was getting from the people at the top who were involved in delivery.*

3EP Strategic Panel Member.

