

**A Pilot Action on Entrepreneurship
Education: High Level Reflection Panel -
Second Cluster Meeting**

Stockholm, Sweden, 23rd-24th April 2009

**A Pilot Action on Entrepreneurship
Education: High Level Reflection
Panel - Second Cluster Meeting**
Stockholm, Sweden, 23rd-24th April 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	Building on the London HLRP	2
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	Desired Outcomes.....	3
1.6	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 Stockholm Panel Proceedings – Day 1	7
3.1	Introduction and Welcome	7
3.2	Plenary Session 1: The Swedish National Strategy for Entrepreneurship in the Education system	7
3.3	Plenary Session 2: The Positioning of Entrepreneurship Education across participating Member States	8
3.4	Group Session 1 and Plenary Session 3: Strategies to promote Entrepreneurship Education	12
3.5	Evening presentations.....	14
4.0	The Stockholm Panel Proceedings – Day 2	16
4.1	Introduction	16
4.2	Plenary Session 4; Education and entrepreneurship – the Teacher's perspective	16
4.3	Plenary Session 5; Presentation of Sweden's programme for entrepreneurship 2005-2008.....	18
4.4	Case Study Presentation; Junior Achievement in Lithuania.....	19
4.5	Challenges and Roles in Entrepreneurship Education.....	19

4.6	Group Session 2 and Plenary Session 6; Future scenarios for Entrepreneurship Education	20
4.7	Plenary Session 7: Next Steps - Summing up closing conclusions from the discussions:	22
5.0	Conclusions and Implications for Subsequent Panels	23
5.1	Introduction	23
5.2	Delegate Feedback.....	25
	Annex One: Stockholm High Level Reflection Panel AGENDA.....	1
	Annex Two: Delegate List	5
	Annex Three: Post HLRP perspectives from Delegates	10
	Annex Four: Useful Links	12

1.0 Overview of the pilot action on Entrepreneurship Education

1.1 Introduction

This conference paper lays out the proceedings of the second EU High Level Reflection Panel (HLRP) on Entrepreneurship Education which took place in Stockholm, Sweden and hosted jointly by the Swedish Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications and Ministry of Education and Research. This second panel meeting comprised a two day agenda over the 23rd and 24th April 2009 with proceedings of the first day of the meeting held at Nordregio, Skeppsholmen whilst on the second day the proceedings took place at the Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communication, 70 Mäster Samuelsgatan.

This report structure will follow the form of the agenda proceedings (the agenda is attached to this report at Appendix One).

1.2 Background to the High-Level Reflection Panels

The Stockholm HLRP represents the second in a series of four¹ High Level Reflection Panels taking place between March and November 2009. The aim is that each panel presents an opportunity to bring together national level policy making representatives along with stakeholder representatives within the education and enterprise field. With the panels arranged on a regional cluster basis, the aim has been for the each event to gather representatives from a relatively small group of seven or eight EU (and EEA countries) at a time.

The series of Panel meetings forms part of the European Commission's pilot action on the Entrepreneurship Education Implementation under the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP) 2008 Work Programme. The role of designing, implementing and evaluating the pilot action has been progressed through the co-operative action of the Directorate-General for Enterprise and Industry (DG ENTR), in cooperation with the Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC). ECOTEC Research and Consulting was commissioned to provide assistance in the process of coordinating the pilot action meetings².

¹ A fifth cluster meeting is being considered by the European Commission which is proposed to consist 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.

1.2.1 Building on the London HLRP

The first HLRP took place in London on 16-17th March 2009. The United Kingdom was selected as host for the first meeting of the regional cluster meeting on the basis of good practice examples in the promotion of Entrepreneurship Education. The Department of Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform and the Department for Children, Schools and Families jointly hosted the event. The first cluster meeting drew together representation from the UK, Ireland, France, Iceland, Luxembourg, Belgium and the Netherlands¹.

The second regional meeting in Stockholm was arranged to bring together a cluster of countries within the Baltic Sea region. These included Sweden, Lithuania, Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Norway, Denmark and Belgium. The second cluster meeting built on the experience of the London HLRP, in that it further developed the identified good practice, whilst refining the approach in response to the lessons learned from the first Panel meeting.

1.3 Objectives of the Pilot Action

The central aim of the overall pilot action series 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 proposed that through supporting mutual learning, and increased cooperation between different Departments/Ministries of the national administrations the Entrepreneurship Education agenda can be furthered. In particular, it is proposed that the process will support the emergence of forward-looking strategies with respect to the development of Entrepreneurship Education in the EU Member States.

The specific objectives 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 programme in this area.

The Stockholm HLRP fits into the broader Pilot action aims whilst sharing the following underlying purpose with the other Panel meetings:

¹ The London HLRP also had representation from the Czech Republic and Sweden given the roles of these countries in hosting subsequent regional cluster meetings.

- The development of 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.

1.4 Key Questions

The purpose of the HLRP series 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 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 and which also inform the agenda of the cluster meetings. The key questions underpinning the Pilot series were outlined in the London HLRP Report and are repeated here for the sake of completeness, as are common to the all of the regional 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 Desired Outcomes

Setting them out more specifically, the outcomes of the pilot action are envisaged to be as follows:

- Increased and more structured inter-departmental cooperation for Entrepreneurship Education;
- More Member States devising a national action plan for Entrepreneurship Education, based on good practices in other countries and on ideas from the Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe, involving all key actors;

- A proposal for a new European action aiming to increase cooperation between different stakeholders in the area of Entrepreneurship Education; and
- A mechanism for structured dialogue at EU level.

1.6 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. In the Stockholm HLRP, such clarification was usefully emphasised within Plenary Session 1 (section 3.2) as having underpinned the development of the Swedish National Strategy for Entrepreneurship Education, and therefore adopted at an early stage in the proceedings.

2.0 Ministry and Stakeholder Representation

2.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Attendance

The HLRP meeting was hosted by the Swedish Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications along with the Ministry of Education and Research. The following table lays out the attendance of the Panel in terms of Ministerial and stakeholder representation. A full delegate list is attached to this report at Annex 2.

Table 2.1 Stockholm HLRP Attendance

Role	Role	Country of Representation
Hosts	Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications	Sweden
	Ministry of Education and Research	Sweden
Delegates	Ministry of Education	Czech Republic
	Ministry of Education and Science	Lithuania
	Ministry of Education	Finland
	Ministry of Education	Latvia
	Ministry of Education and Research	Estonia
	Ministry of Education and Research	Norway
	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Norway
Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs	Denmark	

Role	Role	Country of Representation
Stakeholders	European Trade Union Committee for Education	Denmark
	Foretagarna (Swedish Federation of Business Owners)	Sweden
	Svenskt Näringsliv (Swedish Enterprise)	Sweden
	The National Agency for Education	Sweden
	Swedish Agenda for Economic and Regional Growth	Sweden
	Junior Achievement	Lithuania
	EUROCHAMBRE – Education and Training	Belgium
European Commission and Agencies	DG Enterprise	European Commission
	DG Education and Culture	European Commission
	European Training Foundation (ETF)	Belgium
Guest Contributors	NOVIA – University of Applied Sciences	Finland
	Young Enterprise	Sweden
	Framtids Frön ('Future Seed') ¹	Sweden
Consultants	ECOTEC Research and Consulting	United Kingdom

¹ A non-for-profit agency working to promote Entrepreneurship Education activity in Swedish schools.

3.0 The Stockholm Panel Proceedings – Day 1

3.1 Introduction and Welcome

The proceedings of the first day of the conference took place at NORDREGIO¹, the Nordic Centre for Spatial Development located on Stockholm's island of Skeppsholmen.

The Panel was opened by Inga Thoresson-Hallgren, a Director within the Ministry of Enterprise who welcomed the delegation. Her introduction referred to the increased importance of Entrepreneurship Education as an investment in the future, during times of economic uncertainty, and also in achieving the goals set down in the Lisbon Strategy².

Mr Christian Weinberger welcomed the delegates and contributors to the Panel on behalf of the European Commission's DG Enterprise. At the outset of the event, Mr Weinberger emphasized that the HLRP series was tethered into the context of the Oslo Agenda³ and recognised the role of the Panels in helping to develop the Entrepreneurship Agenda through supporting the emergence of Entrepreneurship Education frameworks within individual Member States.

3.2 Plenary Session 1: The Swedish National Strategy for Entrepreneurship in the Education system

In speaking of the Swedish experience of integrating entrepreneurship into the education system, Fritjof Karlsson of the Swedish Ministry of Education and Research introduced a preview of Sweden's 'Strategy for entrepreneurship in the field of education'. Mr Karlsson, in laying out the process of the Strategy's development covered the following areas:

- **Defining a focus for the Strategy**

It was outlined that a starting point for the document had been a consideration of what constitutes an entrepreneur. The skills identified as common to good entrepreneurs, such as innovative and independent thinking, work planning and responsibility, were also found to match the profile of a more general complement of 'life skills'. Given the potential breadth of the application of the term 'entrepreneurship', a refined definition was applied for the sake of the Strategy, this regarding entrepreneurship as 'the willingness or readiness to start a company'.

¹ Holmamiralens väg, 10 – 111 86 Stockholm.

² The Lisbon Strategy or Agenda was adopted by the European Council to cover a 10 year period from 2000. The Action Plan aims to increase the degree to which the E.U can compete as a knowledge-based economy and secure sustainable economic growth.

³ The Oslo Agenda (2007) for Entrepreneurship Education was an outcome of the 2006 Conference on 'Entrepreneurship Education in Europe: Fostering Entrepreneurial Mindsets through Education and Learning' and lays out initiatives to guide and develop Entrepreneurship in Europe.

- **Stakeholder Consultation**

Mr Karlsson highlighted that stakeholder consultation on the Strategy had raised the following main issues:

- ▶ there was a general view that the theme of entrepreneurship should be integrated across education at all levels;
- ▶ whilst teachers identified 30 or more key competencies to form part of Entrepreneurship Education, stakeholder consultation exposed differences in opinion as to whether this should be enshrined within the curriculum;
- ▶ there is a need for an increased knowledge base and research to support development in the area of Entrepreneurship Education; and
- ▶ the need for national agencies to undertake mutual sharing of data and learning in the field was identified along with a funding requirement for national agencies to support schools at a municipality level.

- **Strategy development**

The resultant Strategy was identified as a first step toward merging the worlds of schooling and entrepreneurship. As an initial project in an emerging area of work, the Strategy does not lay out indicators by which progress in Entrepreneurship Education in Sweden can be measured. Whilst this agenda has been primarily pursued by Sweden's Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communication, inter-Ministry co-operation was identified as having been important to the development of the Strategy as well as to future progress in the area.

3.3 **Plenary Session 2: The Positioning of Entrepreneurship Education across participating Member States**

ECOTEC Research and Consulting gave a brief presentation summarising the position of Entrepreneurship Education within the participating Member States. As an initial overview of the activity being undertaken in Member States, the summary drew out the main themes that emerged from the responses to questionnaires distributed to participating Member States in advance of the event. Whilst the number of responses received were not representative of the whole set of participating Member States, the summary served useful in terms of setting the scene for understanding the range of activity and progress across the participating countries.

The main areas covered were whether countries have any strategic documentation (such as a national level strategy or action plan) to underpin or foster Entrepreneurship Education at a national level, and the types of policy activity undertaken in the field at different governmental levels. In addition, a practical summary of the nature of Entrepreneurship Education activities taking place at different levels of education was presented (again on the basis of questionnaire feedback). The general positions are laid out below:

- In terms of whether countries have a **national level strategy or action plan** in place to foster Entrepreneurship Education, a variety of positions were seen in the responses. Finland,

Lithuania, Norway and Sweden reported having a national plan in place, whilst Denmark and Estonia were noted to be currently preparing such documents. Latvia outlined that no Strategy was being prepared at the current time. Generally, it could be seen that a relatively high degree of activity in Entrepreneurship Education had and was being achieved within this specific cluster of countries. A main current focus for four of the participating Member States was now on achieving implementation.

- With regard to the **types of policy activity** for Entrepreneurship Education normally carried out at different levels of governance, various examples of activity at the National , Regional and Sub-Regional levels were reported which are summarised in the following table:.

Table 3.1 Examples of Policy Activity to support Entrepreneurship Education

National Level
Development plans for education and research.
Policy guidelines (action plan) for Entrepreneurship Education.
Core curricula for basic education and upper secondary.
Provide standards/programme samples.
National Strategies.
Contracts and funding of universities.
Creation and funding of national organisations and projects promoting entrepreneurship.
Regional and Sub-Regional Level
Development programmes of regional councils.
The implementation of Entrepreneurship Education within local curricula.
Regional strategies and regional curriculum.
Funding of regional/individual projects.

- There was a variation between the **schooling levels** at which Entrepreneurship Education is most likely to be found. The table below lays out the **nature of activities** or coverage afforded to Entrepreneurship Education at different levels of education.

Table 3.2 Examples of Entrepreneurship Activity across different levels of Education

Primary
Young entrepreneurship projects
Mandatory block ('social science') – consisting of health, ethics, civic knowledge and economics.
Integrated into mainstream programmes
Development of teaching materials
National network (of interested teachers)
Junior achievement programme
Secondary
Business economics basic curriculum
Connections with work life: business experience
Entrepreneurship Education as a compulsory subject area
Materials related to Entrepreneurship Education widely distributed to students
Student company programmes
Post-Secondary (vocational)
Practical business-experience
Some compulsory Entrepreneurship Education (subject dependent)
Macro and micro-economics included in most courses
Tertiary
Innovation: training for teachers
Øresund Entrepreneurship Academy active in the East of Denmark and South of Sweden.
IDEA – International Danish Entrepreneurship Academy active in Danish Higher Education Institutes.
Networks in place (JADE).

Contributions were then elicited from the delegate countries as to the activity which had been undertaken across the participating Member States in the field of Entrepreneurship Education. The session was framed around representatives sharing specific contributions of national departments

to Entrepreneurship Education along with main challenges. The following table lays out the two main contributions and challenges as identified by Member State representatives.

Table 3.3 Contributions and Challenges as offered by MS representatives

Country	Main Contributions to EE* Agenda (by National Department)	Main Challenges Faced
Denmark	Ministry of Enterprise: Supports Oresund Education Academy, Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation.	Need for additional research. Needs to improve teacher competencies.
	Ministry of Education: Clarifying and implementing tools. Defining EE in the curriculum. Find ways to make it attractive to teachers – economic incentives (funding of programmes for student participation). Conferences.	Need to root in leaders of institutions and 'institutionalise' E.E provision.
Norway	Ministry of Trade: Supports Young Enterprise Trust	Research and documenting has proved important. Much to achieve in teacher education.
	Ministry of Education: Innovation in National Qualifications Framework. Bringing parties together.	Learning about experiences (between teachers and municipalities). Getting all municipalities and universities on board.
Estonia	Ministry of Education: Curriculum development and incorporation of EE competencies; optional subject in gymnasium.	One of 40 Strategies.
Latvia	Ministry of Education: Basic School mandatory Social Science block; Secondary Education level 3/4 of all pupils take a non-mandatory block of economics.	Resources are hard to find. Lack of communication between Ministries. Teaching occupation is stable - not risk based.
	Ministry of Economy; Project weeks	EE already in existing strategies - cross ministry.
Finland	Ministry of Education: EE incorporated within the national curriculum; Financing projects	HEI need to be more active and more strategic. Teacher education (already busy programme).
	Ministry of Enterprise and Employment: Boosting entrepreneurship; launching programme for business	

Country	Main Contributions to EE* Agenda (by National Department)	Main Challenges Faced
Lithuania	Ministry of Enterprise and Employment: Boosting entrepreneurship; launching programme for business.	End of funding programmes. The numbers of pupils and schools to engage with the new curriculum.
Czech Republic	Ministry of Education: Sets outcomes for school leavers. Schools and regions work out how; find way to have overview of activities e.g. coordinating body.	No strategy in place or being planned to underpin EE.
Sweden	Ministry of Education: Overall responsibility Ministry of Enterprise: Responsibility in collaborating with Ministry of Education. Funding responsibility to be determined.	How to go about implementing EE? How can EE be a common thread running through education?

* EE: Entrepreneurship Education

3.4 Group Session 1 and Plenary Session 3: Strategies to promote Entrepreneurship Education

In the Group Session 1, delegates and hosts were split into two break-out groups which had the focus of discussing the ideal strategy to promote Entrepreneurship Education, along with practical examples of successful collaborative action in the field.

The group discussion centred on examples of various cross-ministry involvement and interesting instances of collaboration between ministries. The main points arising from the group discussions can be summarised as follows:

- **Structure of Collaboration**

- ▶ Progress in Entrepreneurship Education was regarded as requiring inter-Ministry and departmental collaboration beyond those immediately and obviously implicated. For instance, progress in the field of entrepreneurship requires effective collaboration with those ministry's responsible for areas such as agriculture and labour;
- ▶ Once the need for intra-national collaboration has been identified as a requirement of furthering the Entrepreneurship Education at a national level, should there be an agreed approach as to how this should be organised? Is there a need for a Steering Group to co-ordinate this activity nationally?

- ▶ Much of the Entrepreneurship Education activity in Member States is being pursued on a relatively ad-hoc basis – there was a question as to the degree that structure should be injected in to this process and how this should best be achieved, if so. For instance, Norway had set up working groups which had successfully brought different partners together, whereas Denmark's government had made a decision to implement actions to further collaboration in this area. In areas where no formal Committee had been set up to support this process, there was evidence of pre-cursor activity such as discussion of Entrepreneurship Education strategy within education/ Lisbon Committees at a high level within government (such as in Latvia);
- ▶ In the case that it is felt that a certain Ministry should lead national developments in Entrepreneurship Education, there was a question as to where this responsibility should rest. In addition, there was debate around how partnership working should be organised within this process? In Sweden, stimulus for the Entrepreneurship agenda had come from the Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communication and subsequently endorsed and developed by the Ministry of Education. It was noted that responsibility for educational reform such as inscribing requirements within curricula inevitably rested with Ministries of Education. This was recognised as ultimately having a bearing as to those governmental departments/bodies with the ability to introduce, enforce and regulate any prescribed Entrepreneurship Education activity should this route be taken by Member States.

- **Extent and Process of Collaboration**

- ▶ Defining the key stakeholders in the process of furthering the Entrepreneurship Education agenda was identified as a primary task which was viewed as an important determinant of the nature and extent of the collaboration process;
- ▶ Within the process of developing the Entrepreneurship Education agenda at a national level, the importance of early-collaboration with teacher representatives was emphasised in order to promote clarity of understanding and to ensure 'buy-in' from those relied upon to deliver and implement any agreed agenda.
- ▶ Group discussions highlighted that Ministries would often take on a 'pushing' or 'pulling' role as part of a healthy tension that helped to support development in the Entrepreneurship Education agenda and/or action plans and strategies to support it.
- ▶ There was recognition that the appreciation of key competencies relating to Entrepreneurship Education needs to be held in mind throughout stakeholder discussions informing development of the agenda.
- ▶ There was a feeling amongst some participants that the EC should not be prescriptive as to how collaboration between stakeholders should be progressed and organised. Instead it was

widely regarded that its input should take the form of guidance as to how the right learning environment to support enterprise learning can be created.

- ▶ Economic (division of funding between Ministries) and political (action that will represent a legacy of a certain political party) influences were acknowledged as ultimately having a great deal of impact on the development of actions and agenda to support Entrepreneurship on a National level.

The importance of adopting a realistic appreciation as to the likely timescale for the development and production of a national level strategy emerged during the course of the Plenary Session 1 and Group Session 1 discussions. It was emphasised that in the case of Sweden's experience, there was a period of 18 months between the start of work on the Strategy and its launch. Furthermore, there was recognition that such a timeframe required extension in which to achieve concrete implementation of the Strategy. This consideration highlights the need for a sufficiently long-time frame within which to accommodate the inception, production, launch and implementation of a new policy approach or action plan at the national level.

3.5 Evening presentations

Pre-dinner presentations were given by representatives from Framtids Frön and 'Young Enterprise', two Swedish organisations active in promoting entrepreneurship at two different levels of education.

Framtids Frön or 'Future Seeds', summarised its work as involving the production and dissemination of learning material and teaching aids to encourage Entrepreneurship Education for 6-16 year olds. Representatives introduced the approach of this non-for profit enterprise, the work of which can be summarised as having the following scope and area of activity;

- Learning aids and materials piloted to ensure that they were appropriate within the traditional Swedish school culture;
- The original pilot project gave rise to the beginnings of formal activity, initially within 5 municipalities;
- The approach of the intervention was likened to a 'fruit basket' in terms of the different concepts and learning aids that could be adopted and used to enable teachers to teach entrepreneurship in the classroom. This flexible programme allowed interventions to be tailored to local circumstances and the culture of a particular school and its teachers;
- Whilst the programme has developed its own conceptual approaches, some mapping activity is being undertaken to highlight where enterprise learning activity is taking place across Europe;

- Activities such as product 'invention' activities, help pupils to achieve problem solving skills, team building, marketing and basic book keeping principles.
- Support from the school Principal as well as the culture of the school were identified as a key features ensuring the success of the programme;
- The development of the model has been based on the premise that entrepreneurship learning can be cross-thematic across the curriculum.

Young Enterprise made a short presentation to summarise its work as part of the worldwide network of Junior Achievement. In Sweden, Young Enterprise is an organisation working in upper secondary schools to assist students in setting up 'mini' companies which are based on the inception of a real good or service which can be marketed and sold in the real world. The organisation is funded by government and private enterprises (50:50) which has the broad aim of promoting entrepreneurial activity through giving every Swedish student the chance to participate in the programme. The success of the programme was highlighted by the statistics that 15,000 students last year had participated in the mini-company programme with this set to increase to 18,000 or more over the coming year. A notable characteristic of the programme was that with regard to equality and participation within the programme, there was a higher number of female than male company CEOs in the companies that had been set up thus far.

The appeal of the programme for the participants was linked to the ability and merit of their good or service to be judged on the basis of real markets and for profits to be reinvested into the development of their company. During the development phase, students can access advice from a Young Enterprise advisor as well as gaining from the support of the Junior Achievement network. Student representatives introduced their exemplar company 'Mobile Education' which had developed applications for cell phones with support of Young Enterprise.

4.0 The Stockholm Panel Proceedings – Day 2

4.1 Introduction

The second day proceedings took place at the Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communication in Stockholm. Fritjof Karlsson briefly introduced the second day of proceedings which had a more general focus on the form that future working toward Entrepreneurship Education would take.

4.2 Plenary Session 4; Education and entrepreneurship – the Teacher's perspective

Bettina Backström-Widjeskog of NOVIA - University of Applied Sciences gave a presentation from the perspective of a researcher on the findings of her Doctoral thesis which centred on the views of teachers in relation to Entrepreneurship Education. The Study 'You can if you want to – Teachers' thoughts on enterprise education'. The Group discussions had highlighted the need for further research in the area to inform future activity and therefore the delegates found it useful to hear of this Study which had focussed on the transfer of enterprise from an economic to an educational context in Finland, with a focus on the teachers' perspectives. The research was characterised by the following key features and findings:

- **Context**

- ▶ The Study was undertaken in Finland which was the first country to introduce Entrepreneurship Education into the national curriculum. This had taken the form of representing a cross-curricula theme for comprehensive and upper secondary schools in 1994, during a time of national recession and unemployment. The development of the agenda was therefore informed by political and economic objectives;
- ▶ The importance of definition was stressed as the perceptions and understanding among teachers of what Entrepreneurship Education represents and entails will affect how it is delivered within the classroom;
- ▶ The research highlighted the suitability of a pedagogical approach which sought to convince and encourage teachers of the value of and reasons for enterprise education, along with the provision of practical support for its implementation within the classroom.

- **Content**

- ▶ The research drew a distinction between individual, social and functional enterprise along with the associated skill, attitude and ability set, pedagogical approach and the learning environment appropriate to support development in each area;
- ▶ In framing the research around several different research perspectives (linguistic, economic, political, cultural, psychological and educational) the research identified the main factors that affected the interpretation as well as the delivery of Entrepreneurship Education within the classroom.
- ▶ The research noted that the interpretation of the **definition** Entrepreneurship Education reflected a combination of immanent, cooperative and technical understandings. There was found to be a shift toward an immanent perception during the course of research interviews whereby teachers came to interpret enterprise education as more to do with the learning associated with a culture of initiative and personal development.
- ▶ In terms of the **purpose** of Entrepreneurship Education as interpreted by teachers, there was similarly a shift away from understandings associated with business-development and vocationally-orientated qualifications and toward personal development.

- **Culture**

- ▶ Entrepreneurship Education tended to be interpreted by teacher's either as a means of encouraging autonomous thought and initiative in pupils, or on the other hand was seen as profit-based mentality and competition into schooling which was more broadly perceived as a negative force.
- ▶ It was found that the gender of teachers affected the conceptions and understanding of the definition as well as the purpose of Entrepreneurship Education, which should be taken into account in training and documentation to further Entrepreneurship Education.
- ▶ The relative success of Entrepreneurship Education in the north of Finland was attributed to the adoption of a humanistic as well as a certain pedagogical approach which sought to encourage learning rather than serving students or teaching 'enterprise'.

The main finding of the research was that increased knowledge and understanding of Entrepreneurship Education amongst teachers, supported through useful conceptual tools, has the capacity to increase the degree to which Entrepreneurship Education is internalised as part of the teacher's professional competency. This was seen to have a positive impact on the activities that framed Entrepreneurship Education within the classroom.

4.3 Plenary Session 5; Presentation of Sweden's programme for entrepreneurship 2005-2008

This session comprised a presentation from Björn Sandström of the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (Tillväxtverket) which was introduced as having the aim of working to achieve more enterprises, growing enterprises and sustainable, competitive business and industry throughout Sweden.

The presentation focused on Sweden's National Entrepreneurship Programme, a three year programme which has been developed as a response to the country's limited number of business start-ups. This trend was attributed to the predominance of large firms, a large public sector and a low interest amongst the population in starting their own business. The programme was underpinned by the evidence base provided by an Entrepreneurship survey which had been undertaken to gain insight into the attitudes to employment and entrepreneurship among young people (18-30 years). The Programme then focussed on increasing the proportion of young people who are self-employed (which the survey found to stand at just 4% of 18-30 year olds, with only 32% of young people stating that they prefer being self-employed over being employed). The following approaches have characterised the intervention:

- **Scope:** The intervention has been focussed on four main areas of action across different educational levels (primary & secondary education, universities & colleges) as well as activity focussed on bringing about adequate competence among business advisors, and a co-ordinated approach to entrepreneurship at country level (the Regional strategy for entrepreneurship as a tool for long-term regional development).
- **Priorities:** Priority areas of the programme have included teacher training, co-operation between schools and companies, Entrepreneurship Education for all age groups, young people without education and/or employment and role models & inspiration. Within Universities, the intervention had focussed on changing attitudes to self-employment as well as offering study and career training to students.
- **Role and coordination:** The Agency has provided funding of projects mainly run in schools and universities through a 50% grant. The role has also involved the provision of meetings and workshops for project managers as well as dissemination of results and good practice.
- **Results:** Outputs have been realised in the form of project support, new courses and training programmes, teacher training, new business start ups, the emergence of six regional strategies and distribution of enterprise literature. The work has seen the awareness of entrepreneurship increase.

Overall, it was stressed that the three-year national entrepreneurship program should be seen as the start of a long-term effort to increase the share of entrepreneurial individuals in society. Furthermore, the work of the Programme has been seen to expose a need for a national strategy and an action plan to underpin developments in Entrepreneurship Education.

4.4 Case Study Presentation; Junior Achievement in Lithuania

Eugenijus Savicius gave a brief summary of the progress achieved in Lithuania in terms of the widened application of Entrepreneurship Education and particularly with Junior Achievement. The growth that had been seen in this area in a relatively short space of time was attributed by Mr Savicius to the following key factors:

- the emphasis on collaboration with teachers at early stage;
- a focus on bringing people from business environments into schools and training them to deliver teaching effectively. Certificates had been issued to business people in recognition of their contribution;
- motivation of facilitators – which was identified as an important factor in ensuring effective delivery of Entrepreneurship Education given that its optional status within the Lithuanian education system;
- training of main curriculum teachers in Entrepreneurship Education methods and approaches; and
- student Companies through the Junior Achievement programme were identified as an active component within Lithuania's Entrepreneurship Education.

4.5 Challenges and Roles in Entrepreneurship Education

The challenges presented to the future development and delivery of Entrepreneurship Education were summarised in a presentation delivered by Andrew McCoshan of ECOTEC. This drew together the constraints and issues which had been articulated by Member States during the course of the HLRP, but particularly from the sharing of experiences across different countries within the Plenary Session 2. The main challenges were summarised as falling into the following areas:

- the reform agendas of individual Member States are already very full;
- there is difficulty in finding funding to support the Entrepreneurship Education development and activity;
- there is a lack of stability within the funds that are available;
- difficulties surrounding implementation related to the scale of the task, the space in the curriculum and the approach for ensuring that Entrepreneurship Education is a strand running through educational levels and curriculum;
- a lack of research base to inform future development and to justify role of Entrepreneurship Education;
- issues surrounding teacher buy-in;
- the need to improve teachers competencies in the field;
- a lack of space for additional priorities within teacher training programmes;
- the lack of tools and materials to support teachers in the implementation of Entrepreneurship Education;

- the need for leadership development; and
- leveraging stakeholder buy-in (such as municipalities and Higher Education Institutes).

In terms of the roles and responsibilities in progressing the Entrepreneurship Education agenda, it was summarised that responsibility of the **Ministries of Education** was related to a legal responsibility for the curriculum along with the development of National Qualification Framework. On the basis of examples from across Member States, it could be seen that the Ministries of Education had often played a role in bringing different parties together.

On the other hand, Ministries with responsibility for **Enterprise** had often played a role in policy development, providing an initial stimulus for the Entrepreneurship Education agenda.

Overall, it was seen that there were varying reasons for the involvement of different parties and actors in the development of Entrepreneurship Education. It emerged that strategies to further progress in the field needed to be sensitive and tailored to context. For instance, it was clear that whilst a certain approach was required to underpin cooperation in strategy development, the mechanisms for actually implementing Entrepreneurship Education required a wider set of stakeholders and partners. Furthermore, different mechanisms were noted as being required for compulsory and post-compulsory education.

4.6 **Group Session 2 and Plenary Session 6; Future scenarios for Entrepreneurship Education**

The second group session within the HLRP focussed on the application of Entrepreneurship Education as well as future steps to support its application on the part of national governments and at European level. The break-out groups were framed around a number of questions which included the following:

- How can dialogue be strengthened at the European level?
- How do you plan to strengthen Entrepreneurship Education in your country in the next two years?

On the basis of the group discussions, the rapporteurs summarised that the focus of the Member States was on the implementation of Entrepreneurship Education over the next two years, with this especially being the case in Sweden.

- ▶ In Lithuania, work was planned to progress the work that had been undertaken in defining indicators in the field, whilst progress was underpinned by a clear plan to increase finances to support Entrepreneurship Education by 65%.
- ▶ Denmark's priority was focussed on the production of a comprehensive strategy to underpin Entrepreneurship Education. Within Member States there was seen to have been shift toward more formal high level discussions surrounding Entrepreneurship Education as a

permanent theme within the delivery of national education (which was noted as being particularly the case in Denmark).

- ▶ Norway's activity in the area was expressed as being mainly focussed on the preparation of an action plan to guide development in the area of Entrepreneurship Education.
- ▶ For Latvia, there was to be a renewed focus of teacher training priorities which was identified as an opportunity for moving Entrepreneurship Education forward.
- ▶ In Estonia, the focus was to be on curriculum development with the priority of implementing the revised basic curriculum by 2011.
- ▶ For the foreseeable future, Finland's focus was outlined as being on the implementation of the two major educational strategies that have been developed over recent years.

In terms of what can be done to strengthen dialogue at European level, there was an appreciation that the development and application of evaluation methods could help to support the development of good practice and benchmarking within the Entrepreneurship Education. The role or potential role of the EU in furthering this agenda was highlighted in facilitating communication in the area, through instruments such as its websites was especially noted. In particular, it was considered that the EU could play a part in disseminating information to teachers across Europe and increasing awareness as to what Entrepreneurship involves. A need for a round table style meeting to discuss strategy and practice in Entrepreneurship was highlighted (to resemble the European Round Table of Industrialists in form).

The groups discussed the influence of political factors such as election cycles on the adoption and priorities placed on Entrepreneurship Education, which highlighted the requirement to consider the wider political context. There was also some general discussion as to how to align entrepreneurship in the educational system to the Lisbon agenda, as well as how to implement the Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe. A key point raised was whether Entrepreneurship Education could be considered as part of the review of Tertiary Education.

Furthermore, the discussions highlighted the need to strategies to be considered for promoting enterprising mindsets within Higher Education, with an interesting example presented of Finland's training of Doctoral students within Doctoral colleges and plans for all Professors to have spent some time in business.

During the course of discussions, it was highlighted by a number of participants that a barrier to influencing the development of Entrepreneurship Education within higher education was the relative autonomy which characterised institutions at this level. In this regard there was not the freedom for national authorities to implement a particular approach or strategy across all HEI's in the country. Where this was perceived or encountered as an issue, it was recognised that the coverage, scope and political strength of a resultant strategy document would likely be affected.

4.7 Plenary Session 7: Next Steps - Summing up closing conclusions from the discussions:

A summary and brief review of the event was provided by the Swedish Authorities and the EU participating Directorates. In terms of the 'wish-list' that had been presented to the EU as to the ideas for future support and development activities, DG Enterprise and DG Education representatives outlined that this was aligned with the objectives and intended outcomes of the HLRPs. It was considered that the trajectory of cooperative stakeholder working was being established through series of meetings which would help to support future development of the Entrepreneurship Agenda.

In this way, there was acknowledgement that the next HLRP to be held in Prague in June 2009 would build on both the London and Stockholm event in terms of creating a common understanding, source of support and programme of measures that would help to create successful interventions to overcome obstacles in the area of Entrepreneurship Education.

5.0 Conclusions and Implications for Subsequent Panels

5.1 Introduction

The Stockholm HLRP provided an invaluable opportunity to build on the basis of the discussion and reflection begun at the first HLRP in London, through providing a platform upon which Baltic countries could share experiences, learning and challenges in the area of Entrepreneurship Education. Whilst at this juncture, no fully developed and final conclusions can be reached¹, the main reflections of the Stockholm meeting provide interesting insights which can be aggregated into the following themes. The main learning points and conclusions will be briefly summarised under each theme.

Stage of progress – towards implementation

It was evident from the HLRP discussions that a relatively sophisticated level of activity and considerable progress had been made in the field of 'Entrepreneurship Education' within the core of countries participating in the Baltic cluster HLRP. This is demonstrated by the existence of national strategies in Finland, Lithuania, Norway and Sweden whilst there is progress in the development of such strategies in Denmark and Estonia. This specific cluster of countries is therefore typified by a certain stage of progress such that the main challenge now shared is that of strategy implementation.

Resources and funding

The HLRP exposed that competing priorities for resources and funding to support the development of Entrepreneurship Education. There was little strategic thinking as to the future of funding streams that could be accessed to support the agenda. The part-funding of initiatives such as that exemplified under the Sweden's National Entrepreneurship Programme was an approach which could be rolled out more widely across member states. This programme saw 50% funding to schools, colleges or organisations which was an effective means for ensuring buy-in (match-funding) from the initiative providers and partners. This model shows potential for development – but one which requires collaborative actions.

Roles and Responsibilities

There was discussion around whether certain Ministries or Departments at a national level should hold ultimate responsibility for developing and leading Action Plans to support Entrepreneurship

¹ A final set of recommendations and conclusions will be developed following the full set of pilot action HLRPs which will draw together the cumulative outcomes and reflection resulting from all of the meetings.

Education. It was widely acknowledged that only Departments of Education had the primary ability and position to bring about changes to the curriculum in each country and for this reason it was thought that Ministries with responsibility for education would often be in the position of leading the agenda with respect to the implementation and supporting framework / curriculum development. However, discussions highlighted that there was added value in adopting a collaborative approach and exposed no particular barriers necessarily preventing the shifting of responsibility between Ministries for different roles and stages within the development of Entrepreneurship Education. Much of the Entrepreneurship Education activity in Member States is being pursued on a relatively ad-hoc basis – there was a question as to the degree that structure should be injected in to this process and how this should best be achieved, if required.

Teacher Competencies

It was acknowledged that there was a key set of competencies that were to be developed as part of Entrepreneurship Education and that could be developed through facilitated learning. For this to be effectively implemented, the delegates were generally of the view that teacher competencies need be developed and sustained. Means by which this could be achieved were highlighted as, first, raising awareness of the definition and purpose of Entrepreneurship Education; secondly, the promotion of teacher training to support cross-curricula teaching of enterprise; and thirdly, the proliferation of organisational and material (teaching aids) to support teachers implementing Entrepreneurship Education in the classroom.

Curriculum content and support

There was a notable distinction in the views of delegates as to whether Entrepreneurship Education should be formally enshrined in curricula or not. Some delegates were of the view that such structure would act to stifle the freedom of teachers to implement enterprise learning activity to suit the culture of the students and learning environment. On the other hand, there was the view that specific learning outcomes and methodological approaches need be formalised in order to ensure internal consistency within Member States. The production of national guidance and frameworks for the implementation of entrepreneurship learning across different levels and on a cross-curricula basis were generally anticipated as being useful. However, the debate rested on what mechanism would ensure participation, clarity and compliance from teachers in the absence of curricula coverage of the key competencies and learning outcomes.

Future Action

Future development across Member States was generally focussed upon working on the development of an Entrepreneurship Education Agenda. For those Countries that had an agenda or supportive documentation in place, the focus for the foreseeable future was for the specified actions and frameworks to be implemented. Participants were generally of the view that engaging stakeholder involvement was to form an integral part of the future approach underpinning development in Entrepreneurship Education. There was some agreement about the importance of engaging with teachers and consulting with those who would actually deliver Entrepreneurship

Education. At an individual Member State basis, as well as for the EU as a whole, there was identified to be the need for discussions with the teaching community as to the role, appropriate curriculum coverage, required framework support and methodological approach for delivery. It was recommended that teacher engagement and collaboration becomes a central element of future action in the area of Entrepreneurship Education.

Research Base

There was a common appreciation within the HLRP that future research in Entrepreneurship Education was required to support the development of understanding and to inform future development. There is a potential role for the EU to coordinate, commission and disseminate such research on a European basis, which may encourage Member States to do the same on an individual country basis. The delegates were in agreement overall that the collation and dissemination of good practice at an EU level would be useful for Member States. Whilst the HLRP reporting will capture some of this, it is felt that a more formal and structured recording of good practice examples in Entrepreneurship Education from across Member States would be very usefully coordinated and/or commissioned.

Strategy and Action Plan Support

The Stockholm and London HLRP events made clear that each Member State is at a different stage in the development of a Strategy or Action Plan to guide Entrepreneurship Education. For those countries that had developed such plans, there is a need for further work to be done in defining key indicators and outputs to gauge progress. Overall, the pilot action was seen to encourage Member States within this trajectory of plan development, with the shared learning facilitated acting as a catalyst for individual Country's actions and agendas. Potential was clearly expressed for continuing and developing the networking of countries begun by the HLRP process, particularly where there was already trans-national working in place and operation.

Support of the EU

It was acknowledged that the EU is not in a position to dictate what the approach of individual Member States might be, especially with regard to curriculum development. However, on the basis of the HLRP discussions there is clearly an agreement that the EU has a valued role in facilitating shared communication and best practice across Member States.

5.2 Delegate Feedback

Feedback and input from the delegates was elicited through the use of a question and answer sheet which was distributed within the delegate pack on the first day of the Sweden HLRP. The questions related to the development of national level strategies, and the sharing of good practice in Entrepreneurship Education, with the responses gathered in at the end of the event. The questions posed are recounted here along with a synopsis of the responses:

Which are, in your opinion, the main elements of an ideal national strategy to promote Entrepreneurship Education?

The main features of a national strategy were identified by responses as requiring input and/or coverage across the following areas:

Vision/ objectives: Whilst many respondents noted the importance of underpinning a Strategy with a vision, the need to ground a national strategy document within a set of concrete objectives, indicators as well as relevant evaluation criteria was identified as important. This was related to the recognised need to measure successes effectively. It was also outlined that objectives should be framed around an agreed definition of entrepreneurship. It was recognised that systematic data collection should form the basis for evidence based policy making and inform the development of relevant objectives.

Stakeholder involvement: A need was identified for wide engagement and consultation as well as co-operation between Ministries and NGOs in the formation and implementation of national strategies. However, it was highlighted that a clear focus for a strategy development could be potentially jeopardised by too many working groups. Some feedback identified that stakeholders should be made co-responsible for the results and outcomes of a national strategy.

Education approach and focus: Some feedback identified that curriculum targets, teacher competencies and teaching methods should form a main focus of a national strategy. The importance of training and collaboration with teachers was deemed central to the development and implementation of a strategy. Some feedback outlined a view that Education Ministry's must be responsible for strategy implementation.

Ministerial Support: The importance of securing the commitment of Ministers, and cross-Ministry working to guarantee the implementation of strategies was highlighted as necessary. This was also emphasised as a pre-requisite for changing institutional culture.

Visibility: It was outlined that in order to have maximum impact, national strategies needed to be visible rather than further contributing to 'policy crowding' or being regarded as 'just another strategy'.

Good practice: It was highlighted that national strategies could have a role in detailing and promoting good practice whilst outlining measures through which support can be offered to schools willing to improve their performance in the area of Entrepreneurship Education.

Funding: Feedback outlined that national strategies needed to be linked to ready funding sources, with the possibility of linking funding to performance. It was outlined that strategy implementation could be enabled through all Ministries being familiar with the mechanisms of levered State funding from municipal departments as well as EU Structural Funds.

What is the most interesting example of good practice that you have heard of in these two days – one that could be usefully applied in your own country perhaps?

The following examples of good practice shared within the Stockholm HLRP were referred to in the delegate feedback:

- The commitment of the Danish and Norwegian ministries of Economy to Entrepreneurship Education.
- The Finland incorporation of doctoral study programmes with business corporations was recognised as good practice in offering students an experience of the business world.
- The Swedish model of strategy development was regarded as representing good practice.
- The research presented by Bettina Backstrom-Widjeskog around "Research and Entrepreneurship – the Teachers Perspective" in the Finnish education system was regarded as useful practice, demonstrating the value of considering pedagogical perspectives.
- The role and contribution of parent participation in the development and implementation of Entrepreneurship Education had been referred to in the course of the HLRP, and this was identified as good practice by delegates keen to feed this into their national Strategy.
- The reflections from delegates have been considered and reflected in the conclusions and recommendations of this report, and will be fed into the final summary report following the HLRP series.

Annex One: Stockholm High Level Reflection Panel AGENDA

EU HIGH LEVEL REFLECTION PANEL ON ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

Stockholm 23rd & 24th April 2009

DAY ONE – AFTERNOON

Schedule	Agenda
12.00-12.30	<p>Moderator: Inga Thoresson-Hallgren, Director, Ministry of Enterprise</p> <p>Welcome by the Swedish Authorities - Introduction to the Event: Aim and purpose of the meeting:</p> <p>Inga Thoresson-Hallgren, Ministry of Enterprise</p>
12.30-13.00	Lunch
13.30 – 14.00	<p>PLENARY SESSION 1: The Swedish national strategy for Entrepreneurship in the Education system: Fritjof Karlsson, Ministry of Education and Research</p>
14.00 - 15.00	<p>PLENARY SESSION 2: The Positioning of Entrepreneurship Education in national or regional policies and governance structures:</p> <p>Where does Entrepreneurship Education sit in your country? What is the current institutional framework for Entrepreneurship Education; Key challenges in your country.</p>
15.00 – 15.15	Refreshment break
15.15 – 16.30	<p>GROUP SESSION 1: Practical Examples of Collaboration in Action by Country (Moderators – Soledad Aguilar-Oddershede and Fritjof Karlsson. Rapporteurs – Christian Weinberger and Andrew McCoshan)</p> <p>What is the ideal strategy to promote Entrepreneurship Education? Practical examples of successful collaborative actions on Entrepreneurship Education; Lessons learnt so far;</p>
16.30-17.15	PLENARY SESSION 3: Sum-up of Group session 1
	Conclusions from each group – ECOTEC and rapporteurs

DAY ONE - EVENING

Schedule	Agenda
19.00 – 19.30	Pre-Dinner Drinks
19.30 – 20.00	Presentation by Young Enterprise and Framtids Frön ('Future Seed')
20.00 – 21.30	Dinner

DAY TWO – MORNING

Schedule	Agenda
09.00 – 09.15	Introducing the 2nd Day – Eva Durhan
09.15 – 09.45	PLENARY SESSION 4: Education and entrepreneurship – the Teacher's perspective: Bettina Backström-Widjeskog
09.45 – 10.15	PLENARY SESSION 5: Presentation of Sweden's programme for entrepreneurship 2005-2008: Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth Case Study Presentation of Entrepreneurship Education in Lithuania.
10.15– 10.30	Refreshments
10.30 – 11.45	GROUP SESSION 2: Future scenarios for Entrepreneurship Education (Moderators – Soledad Aguilar-Oddershede and Fritjof Karlsson. Rapporteurs – Christian Weinberger and Andrew McCoshan) How to align entrepreneurship in the educational system to the Lisbon agenda and Small Business Act? How to implement the “Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe”? How do you plan to strengthen Entrepreneurship Education in your country in the next two years?

Schedule	Agenda
11.45– 12.15	PLENARY SESSION 6: Sum-up of Group session 2 – ECOTEC and Rapporteurs
12.15– 12.45	PLENARY SESSION 7: SUMMING UP Closing conclusions from the discussions: Review of the Event – Swedish Authorities Next Steps - European Commission
12.45	LUNCH and CLOSE

Annex Two: Delegate List

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
HOSTS			
Inga THORESSON-HALLGREN, Mrs	Sweden	Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications	Inga.thoresson-hallgren@enterprise.ministry.se
Soledad AGUILAR-ODDERSHEDE, Mrs	Sweden	Ministry of Enterprise, Energy and Communications	Soledad.aguilar@enterprise.ministry.se
Fritjof KARLSSON, Mr	Sweden	Ministry of Education and Research	fritjof.karlsson@education.ministry.se
DELEGATES			
Michal KADERA, Mr	Czech Republic	Ministry of Education	Michal.kadera@cebre.cz
Arunas PLIKSNYS, Mr	Lithuania	Ministry of Education and Science	Arunas.pliksnys@smm.lt
Ulla MAKELAINEN, Ms	Finland	Ministry of Education	Ulla.makelainen@minedu.fi
Dmitrijs KULSS, Mr	Latvia	Ministry of Education	Dmitrijs.Kulss@izm.gov.lv
Einar VÄRÄ, Mr	Estonia	Ministry of Education and Research	Einar.vara@hm.ee
Una SJORBOTTEN, Mrs	Norway	Ministry of Education and Research	Una.sjorbotten@kd.dep.no
Bjorn EGGEN HERMANSEN, Mr	Norway	Ministry of Trade and Industry	bjh@nhd.dep.no

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
Kristoffer ASTRUP, Mr	Denmark	Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs	ka@ebst.dk
Anders POLD, Mr	Denmark	Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs	apo@ebst.dk
STAKEHOLDERS			
Birgitte BIRKVAD, Mrs	Denmark	European Trade Union Committee for Education	bbirkvad@dlf.org
Christina LINDERHOLM, Mrs	Sweden	Foretagarna (Swedish Federation of Business Owners)	christina.linderholm@foretagarna.se
Kristina SCHARP, Mrs	Sweden	Svenskt Näringsliv (Swedish Enterprise)	Kristina.Scharp@svensknaringsliv.se
Peter JOHANSSON, Mr	Sweden	The National Agency for Education	Peter.johansson@skolverket.se
Björn SANDBERG, Mr	Sweden	Swedish Agenda for Economic and Regional Growth	Bjorn.sandstrom@tillvaxtverket.se
Eugenijus SAVICIUS, Mr	Lithuania	Junior Achievement Lithuania	jalith@lja.lt
Margarete RUDZKI, Mrs	Belgium	EUROCHAMBRE – Education and Training	rudzki@eurochambres.eu
EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND AGENCIES			
Christian WEINBERGER, Mr	European Commission	EU - DG Enterprise	Christian.weinberger@ec.europa.eu

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
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
Peter BAUR, Mr	European Commission	EU – DG Education and Culture	Peter.baur@ec.europa.eu
Rosita VAN MEEL, Mrs	Belgium	European Training Foundation (ETF)	Rosita.Van-Meel@etf.europa.eu
GUEST CONTRIBUTORS			
Bettina BACKSTRÖM WIDJESKOG, Mrs	Finland	NOVIA – University of Applied Sciences	Bettina.backstrom-widjeskog@novia.fi
Magnus OLSSON, Mr	Sweden	Young Enterprise	Magnus.olsson@ungforetagsamhet.se
Louise LÖVGREN, Mrs	Sweden	Framtidsfrön ('Future Seed' – a non-profit agency promoting Entrepreneurship Education activity in Swedish Schools)	Louise.lovgren@framtidfron.se
CONSULTANTS			
Andrew McCOSHAN, Dr	United Kingdom	ECOTEC Research and Consulting	andrew.mccoshan@ecotec.com
David GLUCK, Mr	United Kingdom	ECOTEC Research and Consulting	David.gluck@ecotec.com
Jenny BETTS, Ms	United	ECOTEC Research	Jenny.betts@ecotec.com

Name	Country	Organisation	Contact
	Kingdom	and Consulting	
Michel LEPROPRE,	Belgium	ECORYS Group	Michel.lepropre@ecotec.com

Annex Three: Post HLRP perspectives from Delegates

Feedback forms were included in the delegate packs for the Reflection Panel and a high response rate achieved. The feedback can be summarised as follows:

Event Organisation – Excellent feedback was received with regard to the practical organisation of the HLRP event. Key areas in which suggestions/ points were made were as follows;

- It would be helpful if copies of the presentations were made available prior to their delivery
- A summary of conclusions from the previous cluster meeting would have been appreciated
- Internet connectivity problems (accommodation)
- The circulated delegate list should have include the professional position of the delegate as well as their employing organisation/ contact
- Background and practical details issued to delegates prior to the event should be incorporated into one document for ease

Event Structure – Excellent feedback was received. Key points to note are as follows;

- Session and Introduction – 'Excellent'
- Session 2; Swedish Strategy – 'Excellent'; more details relating to evaluation and funding would have been useful. More time for debate would have been useful.
- Session 3; Position of Entrepreneurship Education in national policy – 'Excellent'; participants should have been clearer and more concise with their contributions.
- Session 4; Practical Collaboration – 'Excellent'; more time for this would have been useful
- Session 5; Entrepreneurship Education in mainstream education – 'Excellent'
- Session 6; Sweden's Programme for Entrepreneurship – 'Excellent'
- Session 7; Future Scenarios' – 'Excellent'; perhaps too short? More coverage on expectations and requirements from the European Commission would be useful.
- Session 8; Review and Next Steps – 'Excellent'.

Annex Four: Useful Links

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

- Whilst not endorsed by the Stockholm meeting, there was reference to interesting work surrounding entrepreneurship and technology undertaken by US academic Scott Shane. The following link shows an example of some of his work:

<http://blog.guykawasaki.com/2008/01/top-ten-myths-o.html>

- Global competitiveness Report 2008-2009:

<http://www.weforum.org/en/initiatives/gcp/Global%20Competitiveness%20Report/index.htm>

- This study was referred to as offering a comparative approach to the innovative dimension of entrepreneurship education:

http://www.proinno-europe.eu/EIS2008/website/docs/EIS_2008_Final_report.pdf

- Pro Inno Europe – an initiative of Directorate General Enterprise and Industry which aims to be a focal point for innovation policy analysis, learning and development in Europe:

<http://www.proinno-europe.eu/>

- The Official Website for the Lisbon Strategy (or Lisbon 'Agenda'):

<http://lisbon.cor.europa.eu/>

- Additional websites/links referred to included:

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.wicheck-pme.be.capten>

www.forfas.ie/publications/featurespublications

www.entrepreneurship-isemi.com/56114/Entrepreneurship-in-Ireland-2008

<http://www.ncge.com/home.php>

www.makeyourmark.org.uk

<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/14-19/>

www.autoentrepreneurs.com

www.erasmus-entrepreneurs.eu/