

**A pilot action on Entrepreneurship
Education: High Level Reflection Panel –
First Cluster Meeting**

London, United Kingdom, 16-17th March 2009

A Pilot Action on Entrepreneurship Education: High Level Reflection Panel – First Cluster Meeting

London, UK, 16-17th March 2009

ECOTEC

▶ 31-32 Park Row
Leeds
LS1 5JD
United Kingdom

T +44 (0)113 290 4100
F +44 (0)113 290 4119
www.ecotec.com

Contents

PAGE

1.0	Overview of the pilot action on Entrepreneurship Education	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Background to the High-Level Reflection Panels.....	1
1.2.1	Purpose of the HLRPs.....	1
1.3	Objectives of the pilot action	2
1.4	Key Questions	3
1.4.1	The Key Questions: Content	3
1.4.2	The Key Questions: Process.....	3
1.5	The meaning of 'Entrepreneurship Education' in the context of the HLRP series	4
2.0	Ministry and Stakeholder Representation	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	Attendance.....	5
3.0	The London Panel Proceedings – Day 1	8
3.1	Introduction and welcome by the UK Authorities and the European Commission.....	8
3.2	Group Session 1: The Positioning of Entrepreneurship Education (EE) in Governance.....	10
3.3	Plenary Session 1: A UK Perspective on Collaboration in Action: National Enterprise Academy (NEA) – David Purdy, DCSF	15
3.4	Group Session 2: Practical Examples of Collaboration in Action by Country....	15
4.0	The London Panel Proceedings – Day 2	18
4.1	Plenary Session 2: Entrepreneurship in Mainstream Education (Pre-18)	18
4.2	Plenary Session 3: Entrepreneurship in Higher Education (Post -18): National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE) – presentation by Tim Evans, NGCE	19
4.3	Group Session 2: Entrepreneurship Education – Stages and Progressions: Getting the Balance Right (facilitated by Ron Botham and Professor Prue Huddleston)	21
4.4	Final Plenary Session: Review of the Event and Next Steps; European Commission and UK Authorities	22

5.0	Conclusions and Implications for Subsequent Panels	23
5.1	Key Conclusions	23
5.1.1	Developing national policy	23
5.1.2	Embedding Entrepreneurship in national curricula	23
5.1.3	The role of business	24
5.1.4	The need for continuing dialogue	24
5.2	Looking to the future of the HLRP process	24
	 Annex One: London High Level Reflection Panel AGENDA.....	A26
	 Annex Two: Delegate List	A29
	 Annex Three: Delegate aspirations for the High Level Reflection Panel.....	A34
	 Annex Four: Post HLRP perspectives from Delegates	A37
	 Annex Five: Useful links	A41

1.0 Overview of the pilot action on Entrepreneurship Education

1.1 Introduction

This paper will summarise the proceedings of the first EU High Level Reflection Panel (HLRP) on Entrepreneurship Education which took place on 16-17th March 2009 at the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) Conference Centre, London.

The London HLRP was jointly hosted by two UK Government Departments with primary responsibility for Entrepreneurship Education – Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF).

This report will aim to lay out the proceedings of the two day HLRP in the general form of the structure of the conference agenda (the Conference Agenda is attached as Appendix One).

1.2 Background to the High-Level Reflection Panels

The London HLRP represents the first in a series of four such Panels on Entrepreneurship Education taking place between March and November 2009. Each of these will bring together national level policy makers (from both education and enterprise departments) and stakeholder representatives from a regional cluster of seven or eight EU (and EEA countries)¹. The series is being held as part of the European Commission's pilot action on the Entrepreneurship Education Implementation under the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP) 2008 Work Programme. The Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry (DG ENTR), in co-operation with the Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC), have had the role of designing, implementing and evaluating the pilot action with assistance provided by ECOTEC Research and Consulting². The UK was selected to host the first regional cluster meeting on the basis of its good practice examples in the promotion of Entrepreneurship Education.

1.2.1 Purpose of the HLRPs

The purpose of the London HLRP fits into the broader aim of the overall pilot action series which is to enable dialogue and collaboration between participating Member States to investigate how the EU (and EEA countries) can build on existing good practice in the field of Entrepreneurship Education. It is hoped that the mutual learning will further progress in the area across Member States through giving rise to increased co-operation between different departments of the national administrations and the resultant emergence of forward-looking strategies.

¹ The European Commission is considering a fifth cluster consisting of Albania, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Israel, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey.

² In accordance with the Framework Service Contract EAC/03/06.1.

It is intended that the pilot action has the primary focus on Entrepreneurship Education within primary and secondary schools, but not excluding that undertaken within higher and further education (the responsibility for which in the UK sits with the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills – DIUS – who were consulted as part of the organisation of the London HLRP but not directly involved in its delivery). The cluster meeting approach has been adopted in order to maximise the degree of interaction between Member State delegates and therefore the productivity of the overall pilot series in terms of the contribution toward a shared action plan to underpin future progress. In essence, there are, then, two key needs:

- to develop greater co-operation between government administrations concerned with Entrepreneurship Education; and
- to develop more systematic approaches to the development and delivery of policy and practice in Entrepreneurship Education.

1.3 Objectives of the pilot action

The goals of the pilot action are to:

- stimulate increased and more structured inter-departmental co-operation for Entrepreneurship Education within Member States;
- devise a mechanism for structured dialogue at EU level;
- enable more Member States to devise national action plans for Entrepreneurship Education, based on good practices in other countries and on ideas from the Oslo Agenda, involving all key actors; and
- test the feasibility of a wider and more systematic European policy approach or program in this area, increasing cooperation between different stakeholders in the area of Entrepreneurship Education.

Further issues to be addressed are:

- Which learning outcomes are best delivered at school level and which in higher education, and who is to define the learning objectives?
- What are the respective roles that should be played by ministries responsible for enterprise and for education?
- How can various governance levels (EU, national, regional, local) best contribute to the development and implementation of the required policies?
- What roles should be played by private and third sector stakeholders?
- What are the barriers at school and higher education levels to:
 - effective policy formulation?
 - implementation: i.e. what inhibits policy getting down to grass roots level?
- How can obstacles be overcome?

Through consideration of these issues, the HLRPs seek to deliver on the following:

- Assessment of the extent to which structured co-operation is in place between administrations in charge of education and of enterprise, and key stakeholders, for the development of Entrepreneurship Education, in each of the participating countries.
- Identification of the factors through which such co-operation was successfully achieved, and how it led to a coherent action plan or strategy.
- Developed understanding of the differences in process, and in the key actors who need to take the lead, when planning Entrepreneurship Education strategies for education at school and at university level.
- A common understanding or agreement on the role that needs to be played by different actors (public and private) in moving forward the Entrepreneurship Education agenda.
- Initiatives that might be launched at national level, in order to implement the preceding point.
- Better definition of the role of EU policy, and of the European Commission, in assisting Member States in designing and implementing coherent strategies, with commonly agreed objectives.

1.4 Key Questions

The purpose of the HLRPs is primarily to act as a kick-start to both cooperation and the development of policy and practice in the field of Entrepreneurship Education. The pilot action has therefore evolved with a dual focus on **content**; in terms of the strategies and activities designed to deliver effective Entrepreneurship Education, as well as **process** which concerns the development of a multi-dimensional dialogue. This dialogue is intended to be structured in a way which enables exchange at an intra-ministry level and also between ministries and stakeholders.

In light of this focus on content and process, four **key questions** emerged that formed the basis of the dialogue at the London HLRP and which are also expected to inform the agenda of the cluster meetings:

1.4.1 The Key Questions: Content

- How can effective cooperation amongst ministries and between ministries and other stakeholders be built to deliver better MS strategies in Entrepreneurship Education?
- What should be the key components of coherent and effective MS strategies to introduce a more systematic approach to the teaching and learning of entrepreneurship within education systems?

1.4.2 The Key Questions: Process

- What should be the key principles and mechanisms to support sustainable structured dialogue at EU level?
- What should be the prioritised elements and main focus of a wider and more systematic approach?

1.5 The meaning of 'Entrepreneurship Education' in the context of the HLRP series

The research and publications surrounding the field of Entrepreneurship Education expose a number of different interpretations as being applied to the term. For clarity's sake, a distinction should be made between business education or economic studies and Entrepreneurship Education at the outset of this report. Business economics and associated subjects, with a general focus on preparing students for business employment, often involve a methodological process of exposing students to the language, processes and culture of the business world. This form of education is often 'tagged on' or added to the traditional curriculum.

However, the term 'Entrepreneurship Education', and that commonly espoused for the purpose of the pilot action HLRP series, encompasses a broader process of learning across a set of 'life' competencies such as personal development, problem solving, creativity, independence and team working. Although there is an inevitable overlap between these two interpretations and their practical implementation, there is a distinction in the overall objectives and outputs. Whilst traditional business education might tend to have a focus on creating business entrepreneurs, Entrepreneurship Education can be understood more accurately as a transformative approach to teaching methods, incorporated into all aspects of the curriculum and with the objective of creating enterprising individuals. A shift toward this latter understanding as the predominant interpretation of the term could be seen as taking place amongst the delegates during the course of the London HLRP.

2.0 Ministry and Stakeholder Representation

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will briefly summarise the attendance of the London HLRP in terms of the representation of the hosts, delegates, the EU Stakeholders and other consultant contributors.

2.2 Attendance

Those attending the cluster meeting in the capacity as hosts were two representatives each from the Department of Children, Schools and Families, along with the Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform. Representatives of the following bodies and authorities were also in attendance at the conference. A full delegate and attendance list is attached to the report at Annex 2.

Table 2.1 London HLRP Attendance

Role	Organisation	Country of Representation
Hosts	Department for Children, Schools and Families	UK
	Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform	UK
Delegates	Flemish Education Ministry, Belgium	Belgium (Flemish speaking)
	Ministère de l'enseignement obligatoire- Communauté Française de Belgique.	Belgium (French speaking)
	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports*	Czech Republic

Role	Organisation	Country of Representation
	Ministère des Finances - Direction Générale des Entreprises	France
	Ministry of Education, Science and Culture	Iceland
	Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment	Ireland
	National Council for Curriculum and Assessment	Ireland
	Ministere de l'education nationale et de la Formation professionnelle	Luxembourg
	Ministere des Classes Moyennes, du Tourisme et du Logement	Luxembourg
	Ministry of Economic Affairs	Netherlands
	Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications*	Sweden
Stakeholders	JADE, European Confederation of Junior Enterprises	Belgium
	EUROCHAMBRES – Education and Training	Belgium

Role	Organisation	Country of Representation
	CBI – Business Europe	UK
	European Trade Union Committee for Education	Denmark
EU	DG Enterprise and Industry DG Education and Culture	European Commission
Guest Contributors	University of Warwick University of Glasgow British Chamber of Commerce National Council for Curriculum and Assessment	UK UK UK Ireland
Consultants	ECOTEC Research and Consulting ECORYS Group - Event Management	UK Belgium

* Representatives from the Czech Republic and Sweden were invited to attend the London Panel as observers, recognising their roles as hosts for future Panel meetings.

3.0 The London Panel Proceedings – Day 1

3.1 Introduction and welcome by the UK Authorities and the European Commission

Ron Downing of BERR extended a warm welcome and thanked the conference delegates for attending. At the outset a distinction was made between the terms 'entrepreneurship' and 'enterprise' and an explanation was laid out surrounding the UK tendency for the term 'entrepreneurship' as relating to business start up with 'enterprise' more readily applied to the wider skill set associated with innovative behaviour across a broader context. This linguistic nuance has led to the UK's adoption of the term 'enterprise education', where the label 'Entrepreneurship Education' may be applied to the same phenomenon and process within the rest of Europe. There was clarification that it was the broader (latter) definition that had been adopted by the European Commission and Member States as the meaning of Entrepreneurship Education in the context of the HLRP.

Mr Downing emphasised that, despite the global economic circumstances, entrepreneurship is still important to the UK, and whilst acknowledging that the work undertaken by BERR on entrepreneurship promotion and education has been reasonable in its amount, the knowledge base underpinning the issue is recognised as remaining limited. It was outlined that the key means by which this process could be accelerated was through communication between government and stakeholders. It was also acknowledged that there was value in discussing examples of bad as well as good practice, in order that the lessons learned from such case studies could be maximised.

Ann Carter-Grey introduced her role within BERR and the Enterprise Directorate. Mrs Carter-Grey outlined that recent years have seen the growth of a more entrepreneurial culture as key to the development of our economy, and it was this that underpins the broad strategy of enterprise promotion. This strategy was highlighted as promoting specific enterprises among certain groups, such as women and ethnic minority groups, with a more recent recognition that enterprise should be presented as an opportunity for older people returning to employment after having been made unemployed for example. In terms of BERR's activity in the field, it was outlined that primarily, the enterprise culture work undertaken has been focussed at young people, with a focus on young people under 30 until two years ago (working along side other departments such as DCSF).

As part of this introduction from BERR, a number of publications were referred to, namely the 'Development of an Enterprise Culture' (2008) and 'Enterprise; Unlocking UK's talent (March 2008)', the latter of which laid out the importance of enterprise culture and the centrality of links to Entrepreneurship Education. It was outlined that these documents reflected an appreciation that what young people learn at school, college, or university can be fundamental to them developing more enterprising skills and using them either in going onto being employed or setting up their own business. Enterprise culture was laid out as being part of a broad setting, linking to areas such as

innovation and wider community benefits, such as social inclusion where entrepreneurship becomes a route out of disadvantage for someone with special needs or limited life opportunities. Mrs Carter-Grey expressed that as the UK cannot profess to be experts in the field of Entrepreneurship Education, the HLRP was welcomed as it would inform the UK's thinking through learning from partners. She stated that whilst there has been much progress to date, there is an increasing focus on further education and universities to develop the enterprising young people of the future.

David Taylor then gave an introduction on behalf of DCSF in which he talked about Entrepreneurship Education as forming an important dimension of education and training policy as well as a central agenda and priority for the UK. He said that there was importance in sustaining enterprise education efforts in the current economic circumstances as the seeds sown now will likely flourish when we emerge from recession. Mr Taylor outlined that the UK is involved in a long term set of reforms to education in England particularly in the 14-19 age group. Two of his responsibilities, exercised within that set of reforms, were to draw in more employers and businesses to support education and to reform the curriculum and qualifications that young people pursue to introduce more applied and practical learning options. Mr Taylor offered a definition of Entrepreneurship Education as being defined as "*enterprise capability supported by financial capability and economic and business understanding*" which he interpreted as relating to the capability of young people to handle uncertainty, to invent new ways of doing things and make well informed judgements about risk and reward. Mr Taylor expressed that DCSF looked forward to sharing experiences about successful approaches and concluded that the overall aim as far as DCSF was concerned is that all schools and colleges have a range of entrepreneurship learning opportunities.

The role of DG Enterprise and Industry was outlined by **Maive Rute**, the Director responsible for SME policy and competitiveness, who identified Entrepreneurship Education as a priority for the DG, whilst echoing Mr Taylor's emphasis that there was a need to make a wide range of opportunities available for young people in the area as well as adults. In summarising the EC's work in the area thus far, Mrs Rute described its key role as being promotional, for example in its support of the growth of 'mini (or mock) companies' amongst students. The example was given of some Nordic Countries (such as Sweden and Norway) which have seen up to 17% of students involved in such 'mini-companies', later go on to start up their own business.

A primary element of DG ENTR's work in the area was identified as being its collaboration with DG EAC working on establishing a common definition or framework for this work. A key achievement in this respect was outlined as being the agreement to have Entrepreneurship as a key competency for young people. Mrs Rute described the stance of the Directorate as regarding entrepreneurship as a necessary life skill and something that should be gained from the education system.

Mrs Rute emphasised that programmes of Entrepreneurship Education needed to be broad enough to encompass the development of skills in communication, thinking creatively, problem solving, networking – all of which are deemed important within a knowledge based economy. In speaking about the requirement for the growth of an enterprising culture across Europe, Mrs Rute

pointed to signs that this was taking place with there being an increased social cachet attached to being in a start-up company.

Elizabeth Bittner represented DG EAC on behalf of its newly appointed Director, and outlined that the DG was highly committed to the entrepreneurship agenda having worked with DG ENTR for several years in furthering the agenda in the field. The dedication of 2009 as the European Year of Creativity and Innovation was highlighted as representing an effective platform to promote and stimulate policy debate further and to highlight practical approaches in Entrepreneurship Education. Mrs Bittner reflected that entrepreneurship was a key competence for all which transcends merely initiating start up companies – instead it was referred to as a "*broad phenomenon of applied creativity, of problem solving, of innovation....and is relevant for the professional and personal development of individuals*". The process of sharing insight, good practice and mutual learning was communicated as informing new solutions to take the issue forward. The introductory session was concluded through Mrs Bittner's assertion that constructive cooperation on the issue of Entrepreneurship Education would certainly have benefits for Member States and for stakeholder groups within them.

3.2 Group Session 1: The Positioning of Entrepreneurship Education (EE) in Governance

This session was designed for country representatives to share their experience of Entrepreneurship Education. Two groups were facilitated with the discussions framed around the following questions posed to delegates:

- Where does Entrepreneurship Education sit in your country?
- What are the key challenges you have faced in this process?
- What are the key successes you have encountered in Entrepreneurship Education?

In discussion, the following key points emerged from the groups:

- **Embedding Entrepreneurship Education in national curricula**
 - ▶ From the discussions it emerged that entrepreneurship is embedded in the educational curricula of Iceland, Ireland and the United Kingdom. Furthermore, in Belgium, the Netherlands and France the activity is more of a voluntary activity. Luxembourg is currently somewhere in between voluntary take-up of entrepreneurship and that of an activity actively promoted through national strategies, although it is clearly moving in the latter direction.
- **Encouraging entrepreneurship within the educational system**
 - ▶ Discussion centred on the difficulties experienced surrounding appropriate ways of encouraging the growth of entrepreneurial spirit within the education system. In French speaking Belgium, there tended to be talk of 'enterprise spirit' in kindergartens and schools up to the age of 12 and an emphasis on how enterprise culture as a 'way of being', could be

encouraged through the development of cross-cutting skills, such as a sense of responsibility, team spirit, independence, perseverance, optimism and initiative. The view was shared that teachers at primary and secondary level there had been found mostly reticent to introduce Entrepreneurship Education, which was regarded an obstacle to this concept being taken on by schools. In this sense it was regarded as necessary to develop tools to help teachers and ensure that they are 'on-side' - in the absence of which it was doubted that any concrete results could be achieved in Entrepreneurship Education. The French speaking Belgian school system has done so on a voluntary basis with the Government creating an economic stimulation agency which aims to promote a spirit of entrepreneurship among young people and in schools. This agency is active in drawing up lists of the tools available to schools and encouraging them to take up the available training in the area. The role of not-for-profit organisations subsidised by the private sector (ASBLs)³ and supported by the public sector was referred to in helping to support entrepreneurial activities within schools. A need was outlined to communicate to teachers, that such activities have potential to embed, rather than trample on values such as solidarity.

- ▶ Luxembourg has also fostered co-operation with the economic world through the use of ASBLs (similar to the approach in Belgium referred to above). Through its membership of the Junior Achievement Network, a newly created ASBL fosters mini-companies with training programmes planned to be undertaken from September 2009. Whilst some aspects of what might be regarded as Entrepreneurship Education is already part of the curriculum in Luxembourg, others are voluntary, and it is by no means universal (especially in Lycees where such activities are more likely to be voluntary than within institutions offering a more technical education).
- ▶ It was outlined that Luxembourg has attempted to introduce 'enterprise spirit' at primary school level and expressed that at the age of 11, children would be shown how to set up a mini-enterprise, and then at higher education level, students on masters level programmes have the right to actually create enterprises. In this way, there was a growing appreciation in Luxembourg that Entrepreneurship Education should be a thread running though all of school level curricula and that this would be aided through the creation of an institution to create a link between the world of schools and enterprise (beyond the national group already existing in Luxembourg which brings together civil servants as this does not include collaboration with entrepreneurs).

³ Association Sans But Lucratif (ASBL) is a non-for-profit organisation which invests any profits back into it's objectives. Membership is afforded to legal entities, companies as well as individuals. In the UK, the nearest form of this would either be a Non Departmental Public Body (NDPB) or a charity limited by guarantee, which whilst separate to government may receive government funding (an example was offered as being 'Enterprise Insight' which runs the 'Make Your Mark' enterprise promotion campaign in the UK which was a limited company but which has now moved to becoming a charity.

- ▶ Further reference was made to the attempt of running the thread of Entrepreneurship Education through the education system, with visits for children to 'working environments' as playful ways of introducing entrepreneurship at the beginning of the scale and the introduction of Masters qualifications on the 'Science of Entrepreneurship and Innovation' at the University of Luxembourg.
- ▶ In the Netherlands, the continuous attention for education & entrepreneurship at national level, politically as well as socially, has made it a priority to promote embedding entrepreneurship in education in a sustainable way. The focus is not only on the student but also on the teacher and the educational institute. The primary role of government is that of awareness raiser and information provider to students and teachers, with a secondary role as advisor to educational institutes for the development of entrepreneurship initiatives, activities and projects within the educational institutes. Government ministries in the Netherlands are now currently working on a national entrepreneurship certificate to promote a structural uptake of entrepreneurship education in the curriculum.
- ▶ Although activity in Entrepreneurship Education in the Netherlands is still at a formative stage, a long term vision has been established by government and national stakeholders, and a process embarked upon of 'seducing' schools – initially via a 12 million Euros funding package, essentially imitating work undertaken by the Kauffman Foundation, calling for proposals from Universities –and followed by a further 8 million Euros for smaller projects from schools. Further funding from central government is now being made available to build networks.
- ▶ Ireland has a centrally determined curriculum which is followed by every school and is traditionally based on discreet subjects. In this way, once the State decides that a new subject is to be taken on in schools, this is rolled out across the country. As an advisory agency the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment is urging that as well as attracting its own subject focus, enterprise should be taught across the curricula through the development of key competencies (such as working with others and information processing) which are more widely applicable as general life skills.
- ▶ In England most teaching activity within schools is determined by the law through specific legislation. Entrepreneurship Education is available from the age of 11 up to 18, offering a range of teaching to be determined by the school itself. The approach adopted (by the DCSF) is that this should be embedded within the curriculum – rather than being taught as a separate subject. Most activity undertaken thus far has had the focus on secondary education, where as the aim is to extend activities down into primary schools and then upwards into higher education through encompassing enterprise into lots of subjects, rather than naming a subject 'Enterprise Education' and examining in this.

- **Integration with business and industry**

- ▶ In France, entrepreneurship has been developing over the last few years with more than 325,000 new enterprises created in 2008 - 50% more than was the case in 2002. A recent change in French regulation relating to the status of entrepreneurs means that any individual can now set up a company. Since the declaration bringing about this change in January 2009, 80,000 people have registered to be a self-employed entrepreneur in just 2 months. This has been taken to indicate a change in mindsets with relation to enterprise over recent years (see www.autoentrepreneurs.com).
- ▶ In addition, there has been some activity in France since February 2007, on a programme which has fostered entrepreneurship in the top management and engineering schools to encourage joint working to build entrepreneurship around innovation. One of the main challenges in France was identified as the need to not just create companies but to ensure that new businesses have strong added value. A means of achieving this was suggested as being national policies which have the focus of bringing together different skills in education with a range of tools to aid the development of relevant enterprise skills. A network has been announced by the French government which brings together various incubators and 'technopoles' with an objective to focus on entrepreneurship through the sharing of common skills. Reference was also made to the need for measures to be implemented in France to help start-ups be more durable and to support 'intrapreneurship' (expansion of SME's). Open days for school pupils to visit start up companies and seminars run in areas such as marketing, engineering and design for postgraduates on placements were both highlighted as measures which had been adopted to assist this process.
- ▶ In the Netherlands, 33% of the population sees starting their own enterprise as a good way of earning an income (compared to 61% in the United States). Less graduates choose to become entrepreneurs and this is also reflected in the lower percentage of young entrepreneurs - in the Netherlands this is 5%, in the United States and Australia this is 11% and 13% respectively.

- **Integrating Entrepreneurship in Education with Lifelong Learning**

- ▶ In the Czech Republic support for Entrepreneurship Education has been reflected in every part of the Lifelong Learning Strategy. There was an appreciation that 'we are not fighting with the teachers – we need to find strategies to support them'. In the Czech Republic it was outlined that entrepreneurship is regarded as a 'cross sectional subject' for children of a young age which grows to be a 'vertical subject' as education levels progress.
- ▶ One challenge was expressed as being the need to break the link that people place between entrepreneurship and business. This was acknowledged as a hard task given that the preconceptions of teachers and civil servants would have to be challenged as part of the process. Business start-ups were regarded as only one consideration in the notion of what Entrepreneurship Education might include.

- ▶ With respect to Entrepreneurship Education in England, 'work related learning' was highlighted as being a statutory obligation for all schools for 14-16 year olds. Reference was made to the use of an organisation along the same model as the ASBL approach (outlined above) – in the UK this has had the focus of improving teaching and learning surrounding enterprise, providing training for teachers and good practice materials, with Government funds now offering financial support to this organisation for the promotion of these activities.
- **The stakeholders' perspectives**
 - ▶ Teachers representatives outlined that Enterprise can be learnt from a young age and should be regarded as an important skill related to problem solving and task delivery and taking responsibility. Entrepreneurship Education should be promoted as '*cooperation, not competition*'. It was stated that '*if you want the teachers of Europe to teach 'them' and 'us', Europe against the rest of the world, then we (teachers) are not in. If you want us to be entrepreneurs seeing that we have a lot of problems in the world as needing solving then we would love to teach our children – we are in*'.
 - ▶ JADE, the European Federation of Junior Enterprise, viewed that for students in higher education, the issue of Entrepreneurship Education was concerned with '*students helping students*'. The model of student non-profit making junior enterprises is 15 years old and has been effective as it replicates the MIT learning pyramid, with discussion, practice and teaching as key elements of the approach. Key characteristics of the model are the involvement of SME employees, 'learning by doing' and the passing on of knowledge to the next generation of students. This is recognised as good practice which has allowed 20,000 students a year to have this entrepreneurship experience. A challenge was identified as the difficulties for students to gain recognition for these activities, with greater government (particularly national) and company recognition deemed as being required for further growth of Junior Enterprise. The flagship example of Junior Enterprise take up is in France where there has been long term government support and where they are responsible for 7 million Euros annual turnover.
 - ▶ A key point was made that 'as a student we learn subjects in different ways – but never asked to bridge between different things until we enter into practice'. An example was highlighted of the inadequacy found amongst engineering graduates who whilst possessing technical skills might have no understanding of business start up or management. The link between HEI's and governments was regarded as key, as well as a requirement for recognition within the education system (such as with credits) for work based practical learning.

3.3 **Plenary Session 1: A UK Perspective on Collaboration in Action: National Enterprise Academy (NEA) – David Purdy, DCSF**

David Purdy's presentation concerned his involvement with the National Enterprise Academy in the UK. The idea for the Academy emerged from observed gaps in educational provision, whereby core principles common to good entrepreneurs, seemingly not promoted in education, could be shared with young people to release entrepreneurial talent.

The process has involved proposing a Skills Academy such as that which already exists in different specialist areas under DIUS (Department of Innovation, Universities and Skills). Steps of the process of developing the academies have involved a pilot, considering qualification recognition through qualification bodies and the selection of regional hubs (in the North West and South East of England) through which the model can be applied and grown at a regional level.

The overall vision is to offer an alternative setting and form of education which grows entrepreneurship skills and qualities in the 16-19 age group but also through a focus on raising awareness and understanding of enterprise issues amongst families and teachers. Provision is also proposed to be widened to the under 16's through taster workshops, and start-up support to over 19s. The funding model was expressed as comprising the capital and revenue costs of £32 million provided by the UK government, the business community and other public sources (such as regional funding).

Mr Purdy outlined that support for the NEA has been found from the Treasury, BERR and DIUS due to the respective contributions to enterprise, business growth and further education and innovation.

3.4 **Group Session 2: Practical Examples of Collaboration in Action by Country**

Two groups were facilitated to gather practical examples as to what practical examples of Entrepreneurship Education were being pursued across the Member States.

Key points made in discussion were as follows:

- **Learning by doing – creating 'mock' companies**
 - ▶ In the Czech Republic, the initiative of establishing 'student companies' is supported by the Ministry of Education through teacher training and the creation of mock regulatory environments. This initiative has seen more than 300 active companies and 500 inactive companies across the 80+ schools involved.
 - ▶ Such companies are also active in Luxembourg, referred to as training companies, offered through NGOs and which have been regarded as very successful in terms of the learning experience for students. A governmental funding programme has been launched to enable schools to take part (through the provision of IT equipment for mock-office creation example)

in a voluntary fashion and it is hoped that whilst only a dozen or so schools having shown an interest so far, the programme can be extended.

- ▶ In the UK, the example of the mini-company normally takes place outside of central government funded schemes with individual schools choosing to bring in an external outside provider (such as 'Young Enterprise' in the UK which is part of the Junior Achievement Global network). The model is that it is up to the individual schools to choose if the nature of provision suits them. The main drawback is that this activity cannot be delivered for every individual in a school and can only work with a small group of young people in every school.
- **Innovative approaches supporting entrepreneurship**
 - ▶ In France, there was an example of the use of cartoons as a mode of promoting entrepreneurship for young people. In addition, there was reference to computer games as offering a wealth of entrepreneurial and educational content some of which are attracting funding from the Kauffman Foundation⁴ in the USA. In this way, the question was raised as to whether government and public authorities can tap into new media as a way of promoting enterprise amongst young people.
 - ▶ An example of good practice from the Netherlands was when, in 2004, Groningen University together with ID Media developed an educational internet game for students in preparatory intermediate vocational schools and intermediate vocational schools. The goal of the "starting entrepreneur game" (KvK Startersspel) is to inform students in a playful manner about the steps to take to start your own business as well as to direct them to the proper organisations that have a role in business creation, such as the chamber of commerce. The game was first tested in 2005 by 5 schools and can now be used by all schools in the Netherlands (currently around 80 schools are registered). Last year 5,000 people have visited the site where they can play the demo-version of the game:
<http://www.kvkstartersspel.nl/demo/#>
- **European Enterprise Awards**
 - ▶ Reference was made to the European Enterprise Awards annual competition which is in its third year. An interesting nomination received relates to a secondary school in Germany

⁴ The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation was established in the mid-1960s by the late entrepreneur and philanthropist Ewing Marion Kauffman. Based in Kansas City, Missouri, the Kauffman Foundation is among the thirty largest foundations in the United States with an asset base of approximately \$2 billion. Its vision is to foster "a society of economically independent individuals who are engaged citizens, contributing to the improvement of their communities." In service of this vision, the Foundation focuses its grant making and operations on two areas: advancing entrepreneurship and improving the education of children and youth. It carries out its mission through four programmatic areas: Entrepreneurship, Advancing Innovation, Education, and Research and Policy. www.kauffman.org

which has turned itself into an 'entrepreneurial school'. Enterprise has been incorporated in a cross-curricular approach with an enterprise focus coming through in the teaching of standard subjects.

- **Introducing risk taking**

- ▶ In Denmark, the issue of risk taking has been central to successful projects with an innovative example relating to a collective of 'alternative' people who organised street performance and who yielded a high number of individuals who went on to set up businesses. This raised the issue of whether mainstreaming provision in Entrepreneurship Education whilst adding to the net increment of enterprise in ordinary people, may be additionally focussed more widely at those of varied and alternative sub-cultures and interests.
- ▶ The point was made that sometimes *"we lack risk taking within the education system and forget that education is an investment in future - sometimes this investment has a time frame of 20 years. If we start making learning environments where creation and innovation are allowed – we need to know that the outcome will be in 20-30 years!"*

- **Coordinating action between stakeholders**

- ▶ The key difficulty relates to the lack of real coordination between many different organisations. A coordinating body is regarded as necessary for assisting and monitoring collaboration and for making the existing activity more productive.
- ▶ The importance of connections was noted also in terms of the importance of looking at and identifying different examples of practice, through an emphasis applied to the collaboration between departments and stakeholders and the structures for implementing good practice.

- **Accessing adequate funding**

- ▶ Through the discussion it was identified that the success factors of programmes and Entrepreneurship Education initiatives involved a motivated team to lever central government funds. Whilst local initiative is important, for national and international progress, national funding and strategies/initiatives (such as 'Enterprise Weeks') are necessary and excellent platforms for sharing good practice more widely.
- ▶ Funding regimes supporting Entrepreneurship Education need to be stable, long term and founded upon a solid policy framework.

4.0 The London Panel Proceedings – Day 2

4.1 Plenary Session 2: Entrepreneurship in Mainstream Education (Pre-18)

Chris Stacey of DCSF gave a presentation which summarised the main aims of the UK in terms of enterprise education within mainstream education as opposed to the flagship examples discussed elsewhere.

In 2002, the Howard Davies review of Enterprise and the Economy in Education in the UK recommended a renewed emphasis on enterprise in schools. The renewed focus was based on a definition of enterprise education which was composed of financial literacy, enterprise capabilities, and economic and business understanding. With this review as its basis, a pathfinder phase of 700 pilot projects to the value of £15 million 2003-2005 was set up to support new ways of working in enterprise education. Guidance based on this practical experience was then introduced to secondary schools through a series of conferences. A nominal, non-ringfenced amount of £55 million/year, has been allocated by central government to secondary schools (an average of £17,000 per secondary school) which is designed to offer a degree of recognition to schools which are to undertake a wider programme of events than they had previously.

The UK requirement for work-related learning and primarily work experience in schools forms part of the Framework for Work Related Learning, fitting into a wider economic well-being agenda. Promoting the economic well-being of young people is being communicated by the DCSF is part of the core business of schools, the progress of which they are asked to report to Government on. A key feature of the UK education system is that 90% of secondary schools are based around a particular specialism, such as Business and Enterprise which comprise 9% of secondary schools. The approach of raising standards of achievement by teaching these specialisms right across the curriculum reflected a key feature of the HLRP discussions which had highlighted the benefits of incorporating enterprise learning across all subject disciplines.

An element of good practice in the UK was that of the Enterprise Network which is comprised of 70-80 Local Enterprise Learning Partnerships across England each with a secondary, primary, special school and further educational institute represented along with a local business representative. This model has been useful in identifying enterprise education opportunities within local areas through the provision of professional development and resources for teachers and school leaders

Whilst too early to report to the Treasury on the long term benefits of the provision of enterprise education within 90% of UK schools, Mr Stacey indicated that Central government research was intended to identify what activity was going on in schools and to what extent. Overall the aim of the DCSF was expressed as the need to create a continuous enterprise journey to extend what

happens in secondary schools to primary schools and higher education with a focus on the empowerment of young people as opposed to them being 'taught'.

Professor Prue Huddleston of the University of Warwick shared three up to date examples of good practice:

- The first example was the inclusion of a one day enterprise workshop run for a day in a suburban school in Birmingham. This was run as a cross-disciplinary activity with the support of teachers from right across subject disciplines. The gift-card making enterprise was based on the 'plan, do and review' model which included market research, designing, costing, production and promotion
- The second example was in a central Birmingham school where an enterprise activity had involved the allocation of £10 to each pupil along with the task of turning the amount into a surplus. The start up capital had to be returned and the costs met, with the pupils free to use the remaining surplus as they wished. The activity saw business planning, marketing, finance as well as health and safety skills developed.
- The last example was of enterprise activity as extra-curricula and offered outside of normal school time where a model from the US was implemented within a Stockwell (London) school where pupils ran a business enterprise outside of school time. The resultant 'Valentines Disco' enterprise helped to grow the skills of market research, careful planning, risk assessment, promotion, health and safety, first aid and accounting and review.

These examples of enterprise education had offered a fun and interactive model for developing and implementing business concept, generic skills as well as principles to support social and community enterprises in young people. She communicated the opinion that teachers utilise a wealth of enterprise skills in their teaching and that teachers are well placed to facilitate pupils in their development of their own skill set. The opportunity of learning from failure was a feature of all examples along with an emphasis that the lessons learnt were transferable to life experience more widely

4.2 Plenary Session 3: Entrepreneurship in Higher Education (Post -18): National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NGCE) – presentation by Tim Evans, NGCE

Tim Evans introduced the background to NGCE. Gordon Brown launched in the NGCE in September 2005 as a new initiative in the educational world. Core funding came from BERR and DIUS. NGCE is an independent company with a board of directors. It is not located within a university so not associated with any particular institution – and also not based in London: it wanted to be out in the 'rest of England'. It was and is important to be seen to be independent and as an honest broker between the departments. NGCE sees itself as a catalyst to bring main stakeholders together to inform policy working at regional and national level as well as individual institutions.

The aim is to embed Entrepreneurship across higher education. To fulfil this there are four key areas of activity: research (we need a strong evidence base to inform the work we do); education (we have to increase capability and capacity within HEIs to teach Entrepreneurship) the direct Interface with students; and Policy (affecting policy – how things operate at different levels).

In 2005, the aims of NGCE were shaped by three key priorities: the importance of entrepreneurship in the Higher Education system; the potential impact for UK competitiveness; and the need to improve entrepreneurship capacity.

Challenges remain to be addressed: how do we act as a catalyst to bring stakeholders together in a multi-disciplinary environment? How do we approach governance and leadership of our institutions? How do we support embedding across institutions? How do we support graduate entrepreneurs?

One way forward is the establishment of a series of networks in, for example, advanced manufacturing, nuclear, science and technology, and mathematics. NGCE has 12 companies, 12 universities and 4 public agencies contributing £30 million cash: the aim of the networks is to enhance research and collaboration, R&D in more depth between HEIs and businesses. NGCE is, then, trying to create an environment to support SMEs.

Another focus is on organisational change of universities. The aim to provide high quality Entrepreneurship Education across disciplines, and the key thing that we are doing in this regard is the development of an entrepreneurial University leadership programme in partnership with Oxford University.

NGCE is also benchmarking entrepreneurial universities – what does it mean to be one? What are the comparisons that we can make? NGCE is shaping this with partners in the USA, Asia and Europe. NGCE has also developed a Fellowship programme – 39 so far have been engaged with students sent to the USA for 6 months – and now looking to re-orientate toward the UK Europe and Asia.

In summary, the NGCE view is that there is a need for a framework for Entrepreneurship Education which has a clear set of outputs which embeds across the different stages of education. There needs to be a national policy framework supported by all government departments – without that we will have confusion and separation of activity.

There is a continuing debate to be had over the role of business in Entrepreneurship Education in terms of shaping the curriculum and the way that business is engaged. With university enterprise networks we were clear that there has to be clear benefits for the businesses being involved. This must go beyond Corporate Social Responsibility agendas.

4.3 **Group Session 2: Entrepreneurship Education – Stages and Progressions: Getting the Balance Right (facilitated by Ron Botham and Professor Prue Huddleston)**

Two group sessions were facilitated. In discussion the following key points were made:

- **Raising awareness of entrepreneurship**
 - ▶ There is a difference between making young people aware of Entrepreneurship (at school or in continuing education and training) and qualifying them to start a company. These two aspects of entrepreneurship are different issues. If the debate is about raising standards and qualification then it is necessary to have tools to check the equivalence of qualifications – the task is not to identify common denominators in qualifications, but all MS do have a problem with companies that lose business and the task is to seek quality not quantity: the desire is not to create many companies that go bankrupt – but to build successful ones

- **The European qualification framework**
 - ▶ The European qualification framework has 8 stages – dealing with knowledge skills and competencies. However, generic skills and competencies are also importance for very young children – the general skills that are needed for a future world.

 - ▶ If Entrepreneurship is to permeate throughout the education system, cross-curriculum, are qualifications a necessary factor? The key is to ensure the skills and competencies are taught and embedded, not for a separate (or parallel) system of formalising qualifications.

 - ▶ The EC has a defined agenda which all agreed upon – the target is to make Europe a more entrepreneurial and more creative community, with creativity closely linked to entrepreneurship and innovation as core competencies. . There was an agreement on key competencies and so the critical area is about implementing these across the various stages of learning as a life long process.

- **Developing Entrepreneurship as a competency**
 - ▶ What is needed is to incorporate within the education framework a new approach which would mean that receiving information, developing competencies, and skills in entrepreneurship is all a part of what you need to live in society. Not everybody is going to become an entrepreneur but those that do not will be good consumers: entrepreneurship must be part of what you should know in order to live in society, the skills that you need to have in order to take risks without necessarily being an entrepreneur in the business sense.

- **Growing entrepreneurship leadership in our HEIs**
 - ▶ We need more high value entrepreneurs – each and every entrepreneur is not the same in terms of value added for our society– we need more technological fast growing companies and to achieve this we need to find them through the university system. When we come to higher education system, we should aim at getting more people who are willing and capable of starting up their own company with an ambition to be fast growing. Skills to be an

entrepreneur transcend all areas. The challenge is to transform the leaders of the HEIs from an autonomous teaching environment to one which is able to nurture these key entrepreneurial skills.

4.4 Final Plenary Session: Review of the Event and Next Steps; European Commission and UK Authorities

In conclusion to the event, it was stated that Entrepreneurship Education is clearly a complex areas: it is about skills and competencies, as well as concerning the potential in some areas for these to lead towards qualification and formal recognition – particularly important from a business perspective. The debate is concerned fundamentally with developing enterprising people – the more we can all do to develop individuals across the education system, the more we can drive toward the growth of businesses in the future.

All countries attending the HLRP are clearly at different stages in terms of culture and development of the Entrepreneurship Education agenda and the event has been as much about learning from each other and building networks. The London event was regarded as a small but important step in the evolution of this agenda and the process towards greater embedding of Entrepreneurship Education across the EU will accelerate from here. The event was seen to be an important step leading towards a more coherent approach on European level.

Critical for this continued evolution is the need to keep this dialogue at European level going but also enabling networking between MS to take place as relationships develop. Many expressed an interest in studying in detail other countries' good practices and plans, among those presented during this Reflection Panel. For instance, the DREAM programme in Belgium, where a student works one full day with a real entrepreneur, was seen as an easily transferrable model.

At the EU level, the Commission stated that they will continue working on the policy framework in general and we will see soon a communication on promoting diversity in enterprise, going in the direction of social enterprise. In this area, the Commission is now preparing policy work on the societal purposes of enterprise. Other activities from here onwards include:

- DG EAC preparing a communication on business and HEI cooperation.
- European SME week in May – raising the profile of Entrepreneurship but also about the tools and available support mechanisms.
- Promoting reforms and good ideas – keeping the Entrepreneurship Education agenda in the Charter Conference agenda – the annual process of bringing MS together on good practice in different fields.
- Continue working with MS through the Lisbon process – going out to the MS each year and looking back at what has been promised in national reform plans , reflecting back and giving them benchmarking from other parts of the EU.
- Continue the European Enterprise Awards.

5.0 Conclusions and Implications for Subsequent Panels

5.1 Key Conclusions

From the wide ranging debate and discussion which took place at the London HLRP, the following key points may be highlighted. These provide a strong platform for future activity and for the eventual concluding evaluation of the HLRP process:

5.1.1 Developing national policy

- A critical aspect of the debate is to ensure that policy/strategy and activity flowing from this ensures that the thread of Entrepreneurship Education runs throughout the education system, from primary through tertiary and encompassing vocational and adult education.
- For example, in the Czech Republic, entrepreneurship is regarded as a 'cross sectional subject' for children of a young age which grows to be a 'vertical subject' as education levels progress. Children can not be too young to learn entrepreneurship and instead it should be regarded as a lifelong learning issue.
- In developing the notion of entrepreneurship, it is important to develop and maintain a clear message that it is not only about enterprise and business, but allowing our children to develop skills for life – or core competencies - whether or not they choose to become 'business entrepreneurs'.
- At a national level, a common obstacle that was recognised to developing and then embedding policy and strategies relates to the lack of real coordination between many different organisations. Some form of central coordinating body was regarded as necessary for assisting and monitoring collaboration and for making the existing activity more productive.

5.1.2 Embedding Entrepreneurship in national curricula

- A critical audience for this message are teachers themselves and their representative bodies. One delegate stated that 'we are not fighting with the teachers – we need to find strategies to support them'. However, tensions were apparent between those who develop the policy and those who have to deliver at the 'chalk face'. This is most clearly revealed in terms of the debate concerning entrepreneurship as a 'cross cutting theme' across the whole of the curricula, or whether it may emerge (in some instances) as a separate subject area. In the case of the former, to what extent is this already embedded and how can this be developed further were

key questions to be answered. In the case of the latter, if 'enterprise' or 'entrepreneurship' emerges as a distinct subject area, what is lost from the curriculum to accommodate this?

- If Entrepreneurship is to permeate throughout the education system, cross-curriculum, there are future debates to be had concerning the role of qualifications, as opposed to key competencies. This means embedding cultural change across the education system and beyond into wider society.
- In reality, the skills to be an entrepreneur transcend all subject areas. The challenge is to transform schools and HEIs into places where environments enable the nurturing of these key entrepreneurial skills.
- If teachers are seen to be central in delivery terms for much of what is being debated here, then attitudes need to be changed and teacher training is required, with the role of the teacher to be placed in the middle of the process of the cultural change that is being talked about. The merits of this bottom-up approach were noted by delegates.

5.1.3 The role of business

- There is a continuing debate to be had over the role of business in Entrepreneurship Education in terms of shaping the curriculum and the way that business is engaged. This engagement may or may not be an aspect of Corporate Social Responsibility agendas, however, it is critical that business recognise the agenda is concerned with lifelong learning and core competencies and not simply to develop business leaders or entrepreneurial employees. Business must recognise that the development of enterprising people serves the whole of society – business included.

5.1.4 The need for continuing dialogue

- The HLRP provided a key opportunity for developing relationships and dialogue between ministries and between Member States. There were a number of commitments made at the Panel to keep this dialogue going at the MS level.
- It was also considered that the intervention of the EC in this area was of great importance both in facilitating this series of HLRPs but also in driving forward the agenda (Oslo, Small Business Act etc.) at the EU level beyond these events.

5.2 Looking to the future of the HLRP process

With the London Panel having given the first thought to the broad topics on offer, subsequent Panels will be able to add their own understanding of the issues into the growing base of knowledge about Entrepreneurship Education, as well as focusing on different threads as they

emerge as important from the facilitated debate. In particular, subsequent meetings will have the opportunity to:

- Reflect in more depth on how co-operation between government administrations and with other stakeholders is affected by the general structure of governance, by the structure of education and training systems, and by more general economic and labour market environments, with essential common features to be formulated that can be valid regardless of such differences. Comparisons and contrasts can then be drawn which may help countries to understand their own situations in more depth and to take appropriate action.
- Look in ever increasing depth at the important 'content' issues of whether Entrepreneurship Education should be integrated horizontally into other subjects or treated as a subject in its own right; how access to Entrepreneurship Education should be structured; and how bridges can be built between educational levels in order to open up pathways and enable progression to take place.

In this way the process will contribute not only to a deeper understanding of the best ways to ensure effective governance of Entrepreneurship Education but also to identifying the shared priorities of Member States.

From the Commission's perspective, priority was considered to be given to the consideration of:

- How to further facilitate intra-country departmental co-operation?
- How to further facilitate networking between countries; probably initially between 'shadow' departments (where these are easily identifiable)?
- How to further embed and refine the definition presented of Entrepreneurship Education in order to provide focus for MS?
- How to capture and evaluate good practice and enable effective sharing of this across MS?
- To what extent is the current economic crisis impacting upon entrepreneurship and, thereby, upon its role within education?

Annex One: London High Level Reflection Panel AGENDA

EU HIGH LEVEL REFLECTION PANEL ON ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

BERR, LONDON: 16th & 17th MARCH 2009

DAY ONE - AFTERNOON

Schedule	Agenda
14.00 – 14.40	Welcome by the UK Authorities: Ann Carter-Gray, BERR David Taylor, DCSF Introduction to the Event: European Commission Chair: Ron Downing, BERR
14.45 – 15.45	GROUP SESSION 1: The Positioning of Entrepreneurship Education (EE) in Governance (Facilitated by Peter Lloyd and Mike Blakemore, ECOTEC) Where does EE sit in your country; Key challenges you have faced; Key successes. (Short inputs from each Country representative, plus EU Stakeholder observations)
15.45 – 16.00	Refreshments Break
16.00 – 16.40	PLENARY 1: A UK Perspective on Collaboration in Action: National Enterprise Academy (NEA) David Purdy – NEA Chair: Chris Stacey, DCSF
16.45 – 17.45	GROUP SESSION 2: Practical Examples of Collaboration in Action by Country (Facilitated by Peter Lloyd and Mike Blakemore) Practical examples of successful collaborative actions on EE; Open discussion involving stakeholders.

DAY ONE - EVENING

Schedule	Agenda
19.30 – 20.00	Presentation by Young Chamber
20.00 – 21.30	Dinner
21.30 – 22.15	After Dinner Speech: David Frost: British Chambers of Commerce

DAY TWO – MORNING

Schedule	Agenda
09.00 – 09.25	<p>PLENARY 2: Entrepreneurship in Mainstream Education (Pre-18)</p> <p>Chris Stacey and Prue Huddleston</p> <p>Chair: Ron Downing</p>
09.25 – 09.50	<p>PLENARY 3: Entrepreneurship in Higher Education (Post -18): National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship (NCGE)</p> <p>Tim Evans – NCGE</p> <p>Chair: Ron Downing</p>
09.50 – 10.10	<p>PLENARY 4: Questions and Open Debate on the Issues Raised</p> <p>Chair: Ron Downing</p>
10.10 – 10.30	Refreshments
10.30 – 11.30	<p>GROUP SESSION 2: Entrepreneurship Education – Stages and Progressions: Getting the Balance Right (Facilitated by Ron Botham and Prue Huddleston)</p> <p>Free Facilitated Discussion</p>
11.30 – 12.00	<p>PLENARY: Review of the Event and Next Steps; European Commission and UK Authorities</p> <p>Chair: Chris Stacey</p>

Annex Two: Delegate List

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
HOSTS			
Chris STACEY, Mr	United Kingdom	Department for Children, Schools and Families	Chris.stacey@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk
Ron DOWNING, Mr	United Kingdom	Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform	Ron.downing@berr.gsi.gov.uk
David TAYLOR, Mr	United Kingdom	Department for Children, Schools and Families	David.taylor@dcsf.gsi.gov.uk
Ann CARTER-GRAY, Mrs	United Kingdom	Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform	Ann.carter-gray@berr.gsi.gov.uk
DELEGATES			
Rita CABUS, Mrs	Belgium	Flemish Education Ministry	Rita.cabus@ond.vlaanderen.be
André DELEUZE, Mr	Belgium	Ministère de l'enseignement obligatoire- Communauté Française de Belgique	Andre.deleuze@cfwb.be
Jakub STAREK, Mr	Czech Republic	Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports	Jakub.starek@msmt.cz
Armelle BILLON, Mrs	France	Ministère des Finances - Direction Générale des Entreprises	Armelle.billon@finances.gouv.fr
Rosa GUNNARSDOTTIR, Dr	Iceland	Ministry of Education, Science and Culture	Rosa.gunnarsdottir@mrn.stjr.is

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
Michael PENDER, Mr	Ireland	Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment	Michael_pender@entemp.ie
John HALBERT, Mr	Ireland	National Council for Curriculum and Assessment	John.halbert@ncca.ie
Elisabeth REISEN, Mrs	Luxemburg	Ministère de l'éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle	Elisabeth.reisen@men.lu
Bernadette FRIEDERICI, Mrs	Luxemburg	Ministère des Classes Moyennes, du Tourisme et du Logement	Bernadette.friederici@cmt.etat.lu
Rinke ZONNEVELD, Mr	The Netherlands	Ministry of Economic Affairs	r.zonneveld@minez.nl
Soledad AGUILAR, Mrs	Sweden	Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications	Soledad.aguilard@enterprise.ministry.se
STAKEHOLDERS			
Florent BAREL, Mr	Belgium	JADE	Florent.barel@jadenet.org
Margarete RUDZKI, Mrs	Belgium	EUROCHAMBRES – Education and Training	rudzki@eurochambres.eu
Matthew SHELDON, Mr	United Kingdom	CBI – Business Europe	Matthew.sheldon@cbi.org.uk
Birgitte BIRKVAD, Mrs	Denmark	European Trade Union Committee for Education	bbirkvad@dlf.org

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
EU COMMISSION			
Maive RUTE, Mrs	European Commission	EU – DG Enterprise	Maive.rute@ec.europa.eu
Marko CURAVIC, Mr	European Commission	EU – DG Enterprise	Marko.curavic@ec.europa.eu
Simone BALDASSARRI, Mr	European Commission	EU – DG Enterprise	Simone.baldassarri@ec.europa.eu
Elisabeth BITTNER, Mrs	European Commission	EU – DG Education and Culture	Elisabeth.bittner@ec.europa.eu
CONSULTANTS			
Peter LLOYD, Prof	United Kingdom	ECOTEC Research and Consulting	Peter.lloyd@ecotec.com
David GLUCK, Mr	United Kingdom	ECOTEC Research and Consulting	David.gluck@ecotec.com
Mike BLAKEMORE, Prof	United Kingdom	ECOTEC Research & Consulting	Mike.blakemore@ecotec.com
Michel LEPROPRE, Mr	Belgium	ECORYS Group - Event Management	Michel.lepropre@ecotec.com
GUEST CONTRIBUTORS			
Prue HUDDLESTON, Prof	United Kingdom	University of Warwick	p.j.huddleston@warwick.ac.uk
Ron BOTHAM, Mr	United Kingdom	University of Glasgow – Faculty of Law, Business and Social	h.ingleman@lbss.gla.ac.uk

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
		Sciences	
David PURDY, Mr	United Kingdom	Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform	David.purdy@berr.gsi.gov.uk
David FROST, Mr	United Kingdom	British Chambers of Commerce	m.hope@britishchambers.org.uk
Tim EVANS, Mr	United Kingdom	NCGE	Tim.evans@ncge.org.uk

Annex Three: Delegate aspirations for the High Level Reflection Panel

At the initial 'ice-breaking' session, delegates were asked to communicate their learning aspirations for the Panel. These are summarised below:

'I came looking for: Wishes, Objectives, Shares, Questions, etc...'

- 1 Sharing Examples internationally of entrepreneurship / enterprise education, good practice and innovation.
- 2 Practical action by countries to make progress with entrepreneurship / enterprise education.
- 3 Looking for confirmation of application of policy in other countries.
- 4 Lively discussions on issues concerning the education of future 'problem solvers' - of environmental problems, personal/ity problems, economical problems.
- 5 To gain a cleaner understanding of best practice models across other (non-EU) member states.
- 6 To explore means by which partnership work between or across member states and at an EU-level can help to promote entrepreneurship education.
- 7 Awareness raising of the junior enterprise concept.
- 8 Diverse support for junior entrepreneurs and joint projects.
- 9 How to follow up implemented national strategies for entrepreneurship?
- 10 How to divide the roles between the Ministries?
- 11 Identify bad 'counter productive' practices in schools... Or first step... Listen... to look for better understanding between 'two worlds'.
- 12 A structure that follows up from reflection panels that creates more joined up formal structures at national and EU level.

- 13 How to implement entrepreneurship education into the school system without making it compulsory.
- 14 Possibilities for exchange of entrepreneurship students and teachers.
- 15 How cooperation between ministries and business organisations can be strengthened?
- 16 How to bring on board teachers and schools in a more efficient way.
- 17 Sharing policy experiences of good and bad practices.
- 18 Create a synergy between the developed politics in favour of SMEs and the school programmes.
- 19 Share the good practices and avoid too much dispersion of those good practices.
- 20 Looking news strategies to younger and teachers
- 21 Wishing to share with other members all positives elements that we have.
- 22 Wishing to know the strategy 'spirit of enterprise' in other countries including good and bad practices.
- 23 Wishing to know if in the other countries there is links which are created to promote the spirit of enterprise at school.
- 24 To see 'good practice example' of high reflection panel for successful meeting in Prague (a kind of spy mission)
- 25 To see entrepreneurship education as life-long issue.
- 26 Get a clean picture of where the participating countries (in the cluster) are with entrepreneurship education, state of dissemination, sophistication/adaptation of concepts and level of cooperation between departments.
- 27 Measure the readiness and willingness to cooperate with other countries and EU.

Annex Four: Post HLRP perspectives from Delegates

1. Event Organisation (10 points = excellent, 0 points = unacceptable)

4 feedback forms only were received from delegates attending the HLRP. The following summarises the comments made:

SERVICE	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Contents of HLRP	8	Meeting was not as high level as expected and hoped for. Especially among the member states most countries were not represented at decision making level. Due to this fact and the fact that the open discussions were not really focused and problem oriented the outcome of the HLRP meeting was primarily a further exchange of good practices.
Venue	9	BERR has such excellent conference facilities.
Travel arrangements	-	No comments made.
Hotel accommodation	8	Good location, charming hotel.
Catering	9	Quality of the catering at BERR was excellent. Quality of the dinner was acceptable.
Interpretation	10	Excellent
Technical/audiovisual equipment	10	Excellent
Documentation	8	The added value of the documentation was limited.
Event organization	8.5	No complaints. Maybe a clearer division of the role of ECOTEC vs the EC and hosts in facilitating the discussions would have helped.
Assistance during event	8.5	Excellent

2. Event structure

Please provide your reflections on the individual sessions run during the HLRP, providing an overall 'score' and additional comments for improvement:

DAY 1		
SESSION 1	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Welcome and Introduction	8	Too much time for lunch, too little for icebreaker and introduction.
SESSION 2	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Group session 1: The positioning of Entrepreneurship Education in Governance	7	Good first round of discussion (or rather exchange of views and experiences), but not really focused on outcome.
SESSION 3	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Plenary: UK perspective on collaboration in action: National Enterprise Academy	7	Too much process, too little content. Interesting example of national action.
SESSION 4	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Group session 2: Practical examples of collaboration in action by country	8	Unclear what the focus was compared with the first round.

DAY 2		
SESSION 1	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Plenary: Entrepreneurship in Mainstream Education	7	Passionate people who believe in what they do, but not easily transferable to all situations.
SESSION 2	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Plenary: Entrepreneurship in Higher Education: National Council for Graduate Entrepreneurship	7	Very good and clear presentation. Challenges recognizable. Too little time for discussion.

DAY 2

SESSION 3	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Group session: Stages and progressions – getting the balance right	8	Did we get the balance right?
SESSION 4	RATING 0-10	COMMENTS
Plenary: Review of the Event and Next Steps	5	Not more than an exchange of politeness. More depth required from authorities concerning next steps and the future possibilities for EE.

3. Next steps

a. Please provide ONE firm example of a collaborative action you intend to take forward from the HLRP:

ACTION	WITH WHOM?	BY WHEN?
Take up contact about the experiences with the Kaufmann scholarship	NCGE	Asap
Enterprise day	Students	Asap
Bi-lateral exchange with other MS at Departmental level	MS ministries	2009

b. Please provide details of ONE key learning point you took away from the HLRP and how you might act upon this:

KEY LEARNING POINT	POTENTIAL ACTION
There is a lot to be learned from each other. Most probably more extensive bilateral contacts are a better way of exchanging experiences. We must focus on primary school	Further contact with the British departments and organizations. Enterprise Days

Annex Five: Useful links

Through the two days of the London HLRP, many useful websites were referred to by delegates which may provide valuable source material for future reference. These are noted (in no particular order) below:

- http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/entrepreneurship/support_measures/training_education/doc/mini_companies_en.pdf
- <http://www.efer.eu/web/index.htm>
- <http://www.kbs-frb.be/call>
- www.kbs-frb.be/index.aspx?Langtype=1033
- <http://www.ichec-pme.be/capten>
- www.forfas.ie/publications/featurespublications
- www.entrepreneurship-isemi.com/56114/Entrepreneurship-in-Ireland-2008
- <http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/entrepreneur/article3867146.ece>
- <http://www.ncge.com/home.php>
- www.makeyourmark.org.uk
- <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/14-19/>
- www.autoentrepreneurs.com
- www.kauffman.org
- www.peterjonesfoundation.org
- <http://www.nationalskillsacademy.co.uk>
- www.erasmus-entrepreneurs.eu/