InnoSocial

Mainstreaming Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship in Higher Education

2022-1-PL01-KA220-HED-000089820

Toolkit

Design and Delivery of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship education

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project "Mainstreaming Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship in Higher Education / InnoSocial" (ref. no: 2022-1-PL01-KA220-HED-000089820) is co-funded by the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union. The InnoSocial project is coordinated by the University of Social Sciences (Poland) and involves four other partner organizations: University of Pavia (Italy), Vilniaus kolegija/Higher Education Institution (Lithuania), InCREA Foundation (Poland) and Tetra Solutions Ltd. (Bulgaria).

The InnoSocial Toolkit was developed by the project team members representing all partner organisations. It aims to provide guidance to university faculty in terms of design and delivery of education and training in the field of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship.

Authors:
Rima Baciulyte, Vilniaus kolegija/Higher Education Institution (Lithuania)
Valentina Beretta, University of Pavia (Italy)
Danguole Ignatoniene Vilniaus kolegija/Higher Education Institution (Lithuania)
Krzysztof Kandefer, University of Social Sciences (Poland)
Evgenia Nikulina, Tetra Solutions Ltd. (Bulgaria)
Rafał Wojszko, InCREA Foundation (Poland)
Borislava Zaharieva-Tomova, Tetra Solutions Ltd. (Bulgaria)
Agnieszka Zając, InCREA Foundation (Poland)

Editors:
Evgenia Nikulina, Tetra Solutions Ltd.
Borislava Zaharieva-Tomova, Tetra Solutions Ltd.

Reviewers:
Maria Chiara Demartini, University of Pavia (Italy)
Edyta Dobosz-Maciuk
Ireneusz Żuchowski

Contacts:
www.innosocial.eu

This publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Contents

Foreword

The InnoSocial project

The InnoSocial project is a 30-month Erasmus+ initiative (1 November 2022 – 30 April 2025) that aims to facilitate mainstreaming of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship (II&SE) education and training in universities' curricula, thus promoting wider integration of the social dimension in the knowledge triangle practices implemented by higher education institutions (HEIs).

The specific project objectives are:
- To provide a comprehensive foundation for design and delivery of education in II&SE
- To contribute to a teaching and learning base in the field of II&SE
- To improve capacity of HEIs' academic staff to design and deliver education in II&SE
- To raise awareness of the role of HEIs in promoting II&SE among key stakeholders.

The main project results include:
- Toolkit for design & delivery of II&SE education: Guidelines for embedding II&SE education in HEIs' curricula;
- Course in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship (3 ECTS / 75-hour), integrated in the education offer of the partner universities;
- Collection of "lesson learnt" and "success stories" related to mainstreaming of II&SE education in HEIs' curricula, based on the pilot implementation of the InnoSocial course.

The InnoSocial Toolkit for design & delivery of II&SE education

The aim of the Toolkit is to provide an evidence base and methodological framework for design and delivery of education in II&SE – a precondition for mainstreaming teaching and learning in this field in HEIs' curricula. It also serves as a basis for developing teaching and learning resources in the field of II&SE – a Course in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship[1], the second major result of the InnoSocial project.

The development of the InnoSocial Toolkit was based on desk research, including literature review and analysis of study programmes/ courses in the field of II&SE, as well as on consultations with stakeholders carried our either as panel discussions or individual interviews. These activities were aimed at:
- Identifying and analysing good practices of embedding II&SE in HEIs' curricula;
- Defining the scope of knowledge and skills that should be targeted through II&SE education in HEIs;
- Collecting and documenting instructional design approaches conducive for developing innovation and entrepreneurial skills;
- Mapping possible ways of engaging stakeholders (such as public bodies, non-profit organizations, non-formal community groups, grassroots innovators, etc.) in II&SE education and training.

Analysis of study programmes and courses in the field of II&SE

25 programmes and courses originating from 8 countries (Bulgaria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, and United Kingdom) were analysed. Two of the analysed programmes were international. The subject to analysis were curricula or syllabi of the study programmes and courses in the field of II&SE delivered by: universities; VET and adult

[1] The InnoSocial Course Syllabus

education providers; business incubators, entrepreneurship centres, etc. both within and outside higher education institutions; NGOs, foundations, associations involved in II&SE; other stakeholder organizations. The analysis included 7 Master level programmes/courses, 4 Bachelor level programmes/courses, 1 school/VET level programme, 1 specialization programme, 1 incubation programme, and 11 non-formal education programmes/courses. 8 are full degree programmes, and 2 are stand-alone courses within degree programmes. Furthermore, there was one case of embedding relevant topics in different modules of degree programme courses. The workload of the analysed programmes and courses varies from several hours (short non-formal courses) to 2-4 years (Bachelor/ Master programmes). The mode of delivery is diverse: face to face, blended, online. The list of all analysed programmes is provided in Annex 2.

Most of the analysed programmes and courses are closely linked with the subject of social innovation and/or social entrepreneurship, covering topics such as "Social Capital and Local Socioeconomic Systems", "Realization of Creative Potential: from Social Idea to Product", "Social Innovation Relay", "Human Innovation", "Support for the Development of Micro-Innovation in the Area of Social Inclusion", "Social Innovation", "Social Entrepreneurship and Forms of Social Entrepreneurship", among others. However, the topic of Inclusive Innovation was not covered in the explored programmes and courses, except for the module on "Inclusive and Grassroots Innovation", developed within the Erasmus+ funded project AHEAD "African Higher Education Leadership in Advancing Inclusive Innovation for Development".

Stakeholder discussion panels and interviews

The stakeholder consultation meetings were conducted in Bulgaria, Italy, Lithuania, and Poland from June 15 to July 14, 2023. The meetings were either face-to-face or online, carried out in the form of group discussion panels or individual interviews. A total of 72 stakeholders took part in the meetings, including university faculty, management and administrative staff, PhD students, representatives of business, NGOs, public bodies, vocational and secondary schools, grassroots innovators and social entrepreneurs. The majority of the participants in the meetings (>75%) reported having expertise and experience in the field of II&SE.

The stakeholders were asked to discuss the following questions:

- How could II&SE be embedded in higher education? (e.g. as a mandatory or elective course, as part of existing courses; as a non-formal training in business incubators, innovation hubs, etc.) Which option do you find more feasible and appropriate in your context? (i.e in the context of partner countries' HEIs)?
- What are the most important elements of content and the most appropriate instructional approaches for teaching Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship?
- How could different stakeholder groups participate in design and delivery of education and training in the field of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship? What could be a stakeholder engagement strategy?
- How to measure impact of II&SE education at different levels (e.g. individual level, institutional level, and level of economy and society)?

Based on the literature review, the analysis of the curricula, and the findings of the stakeholder consultations meetings, the InnoSocial consortium partners compiled this Toolkit to help university faculty and other stakeholders to integrate inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship in the higher education programmes and courses.

The InnoSocial Toolkit target audience and benefits

The InnoSocial Toolkit provides the necessary background knowledge for HEIs' faculty to devise a framework for designing, implementing and measuring the impact of education and training in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship.

Therefore, the main target audiences that can benefit from the Toolkit are:
- University faculty, management and administrative staff and senior students;
- Representatives of industry and business, not-profits and non-formal community groups, public bodies and policy makers, grassroots innovators, social entrepreneurs, external experts in the field of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship.

The Toolkit allows its readers to:
- Understand the options for mainstreaming II&SE education in HEIs' curricula, particularly to explore the possibilities and requirements for the implementation of the following scenarios: incorporating II&SE in the HEIs' education offer as a stand-alone course; embedding knowledge and skills relevant for II&SE in existing courses; and delivering non-formal training in II&SE at HEIs' business incubators, start-up hubs, entrepreneurship centres or similar structures.
- Define the scope of II&SE education that should be mainstreamed in HEI curricula, in particular knowledge and skills that should be addressed, and ways (teaching methods) through which these knowledge and skills can be developed.
- Map stakeholders' interests for cooperation with HEIs in design and delivery of II&SE education.

The InnoSocial Toolkit structure

The Toolkit consists of six chapters dedicated to the following topics:
- Introduction to the concepts of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship
- Options for delivering II&SE education at universities
- Stakeholder-led II&SE initiatives and cooperation of HEIs with external stakeholders
- Knowledge areas and skills developed through II&SE education at universities
- Teaching and learning approaches and methods used in II&SE education and training
- Approaches and methods for assessing the impact of II&SE education at universities

It also has two annexes:
- Definitions of Inclusive Innovation
- List of the analysed programmes and courses in the field of II&SE

Short introduction to the concepts of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship

Objective

This chapter provides an overview of the concepts of social innovation, inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship and explains the relationship between these concepts.

Introduction

Over the past few decades, there has been a noticeable shift in the attention of researchers from mainstream market innovation to a more social and inclusive form of innovation. This transformation can be attributed to several factors that have shaped the way societies perceive and approach innovation.

Initially, the focus of innovation was predominantly on market-driven research and development, where the main goal was to create products or services that catered to the needs and desires of the mainstream consumer base. This approach was often profit-driven, seeking to maximize financial gains for businesses and stakeholders. However, as the world grappled with increasingly complex social, economic, and environmental challenges, it became apparent that traditional innovation alone was insufficient to address these pressing issues.

The rise of social and inclusive innovation represents a paradigm shift in the way researchers and innovators view their responsibilities. Instead of solely pursuing profit and catering to the affluent, there is now a growing recognition of the need to create solutions that address the needs of marginalized and underserved populations. This shift has been further fuelled by the growing awareness of global challenges, such as climate change, poverty, migration, healthcare disparities, and technological divides. Governments, organizations, and individuals have come together to prioritize innovation that can lead to positive social impact, fostering collaboration across sectors to address these pressing issues.

Innovation has a potential to drive positive change, not just for economic gain but also for the betterment of society as a whole. By embracing this new approach, we can foster a more equitable and sustainable future that benefits everyone, leaving no one behind.

Social innovation

Social innovation refers to the process of developing novel solutions and initiatives that address societal challenges and create positive social change. It involves the application of innovative ideas, strategies, and practices to improve the well-being of communities, promote social inclusion, and tackle pressing issues like poverty, inequality, environmental degradation, healthcare disparities, and more.

The attribute “Social” in “Social Innovation” may refer to (Phills et. al., 2008):

- The intention or motivation of the innovator to produce social change;
- Social needs or problems addressed by the innovation (for example, environmental preservation, improved health, and better education);
- Social value created by the innovation, as opposed to financial or economic value (for example, creation of benefits for society, in particular for disadvantaged and disenfranchised groups of population).

Social innovation manifests in various forms, each addressing specific social challenges. One of the main types is "*service innovation*," which involves creating new approaches or reimagining

existing services to enhance accessibility and effectiveness. This may include improving healthcare delivery methods, educational programs, or social welfare services. Another type is "*technological innovation*," where advancements in technology are leveraged to develop solutions that address social issues, such as the use of mobile applications for financial inclusion or renewable energy technologies to combat environmental problems. "*Policy innovation*" focuses on developing new regulations, policies, or frameworks that encourage social progress, while "*community-based innovation*" empowers local communities to develop grassroots initiatives to address their unique challenges collaboratively.

Inclusive innovation

Inclusive innovation is a type of social innovation targeted at excluded, underserved or underrepresented population (youth, women, elderly people, persons with disabilities, migrants, refugees, low-income groups) and aimed to improve the quality of their life at an affordable price. In particular, it aims to expand their access to education, health care, employment, environmentally-friendly services, and affordable technology, among other. Inclusive innovation implies addressing social needs of these population groups through innovation and involving them in the innovation process. In other words, inclusive innovation is innovation for and/or by excluded groups (Goel, 2011).

There are several levels of involvement of these groups in inclusive innovation reflecting the depth and strength of inclusion of the targeted society members in the innovation process (Heeks et al., 2013):

- *Level of intention*: motivation to address the needs and wants of excluded groups;
- *Level of consumption*: adoption, use and absorption of innovation by excluded groups;
- *Level of impact*: achievement of positive economic, social and/or environmental impact on excluded groups through wide dissemination and diffusion of innovation;
- *Level of process*: participation of representatives of excluded groups in different stages of the innovation process - invention, design, development, prototyping, production, marketing and distribution of innovation;
- *Levels of structure* and *post-structure*, where the whole innovation system and the discourse are inclusive.

The main characteristics of inclusive innovation are (UNCTAD, 2014):

- *Social character*, i.e. innovation addressing social development needs and goals;
- *Affordability*, i.e. innovation of good quality at reasonable price;
- *Accessibility*, i.e. innovation relying on effective distribution strategies that remove barriers hampering access of excluded groups to the new service or product;
- *Impact potential*: i.e. innovation that has positive impact on lives and well-being of excluded groups;
- *Participation*: i.e. innovation encouraging involvement of excluded groups in the process of creating and delivering new services or products;
- *Relevance*: i.e. innovation that is strongly connected to the targeted population.

Social entrepreneurship

Inclusive innovation can provide a business opportunity for social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship (or social economy) is an area of civic activity that brings about both economic and public benefits. There are different definitions of social entrepreneurship. The most famous one belongs to the Nobel Prize winner Muhammad Yunus, the founder of Grameen Bank and the pioneer of microfinancing. He explained social entrepreneurship as a “not-for-profit” and “not-for-loss” business dedicated to solving social issues (Yunus, 2011). The concept of social entrepreneurship consists of two words: “entrepreneurship” and “social”.

"Entrepreneurship" reflects the business orientation of social enterprises: they operate in the market and compete with traditional companies. "Social" demonstrates the specific nature of these enterprises. Their main objective is not to accumulate profit - to make the owners rich - but to pursue a social mission and to care for values important to the community.

Social enterprise is characterized as an economic entity, which is (ibid):

- *Cause-driven*, i.e. its main objective is to overcome social or environmental problems, often through social innovation;
- *Financially and economically sustainable*, i.e. it generates enough profit to cover its investment and operational costs;
- *Non-dividend*, i.e. it does not bring personal gains to investors and shareholders; its profit is re-invested to achieve its social goals;
- *Environmentally conscious*, i.e. it is mindful of the effects of its activities on the environment and takes measures to minimize the negative impact;
- *Fair to employees*, i.e. it pays market salary to its workforce and provides employees with better-than-standard working conditions.

Social enterprises usually operate in the following fields (European Commission):

- *Training and integration* of people from disadvantaged or excluded groups, incl. people with special needs and unemployed;
- *Social services*, incl. health, well-being and medical care, education and training, childcare, services for elderly people, or aid to disadvantaged groups;
- *Local development of disadvantaged areas*, incl. development of remote rural area, rehabilitation schemes in urban areas, development aid and cooperation with third countries;
- *Other services*, such as recycling, protection of the environment, preservation of cultural heritage, sports, science, research and innovation, and consumer protection.

Social entrepreneurship plays a vital role in tackling social and environmental challenges while promoting inclusive growth and social inclusion. Moreover, it contributes to job creation at local level, as well as to democratic participation and improvement of social service delivery.

Conclusion

Social and inclusive innovation is coming out of the "shadow" of mainstream innovation. It provides a strong competitive advantage to (social) enterprises and is becoming a full-fledged mechanism for driving their strategic and business goals. For social enterprises, combining social objectives with economic activities allows them to be a viable entity providing employment for their members, as well as providing an opportunity to influence the social world around us.

Reflective questions

Can you think of any examples of inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship in your local or national context? What social problem does it address? How does it involve the representatives of excluded, underserved or underrepresented groups? What impact does it have on these groups and on the society at large?

References

1. Goel, V. K. (2011). Instruments to Promote Inclusive Innovation: An Agenda for Inclusion and Growth, Inclusive Innovation Workshop Bangkok, March 4, 2011, World Bank.

2. European Commission. Social enterprises. URL: https://single-market-economy.ec.europa.eu/sectors/proximity-and-social-economy/social-economy-eu/social-enterprises_en. Accessed on May 27, 2023.
3. Heeks, R. et al. (2013). Inclusive innovation: Definition, Conceptualization and Future Research Priorities. Centre for Development Informatics, Institute for Development Policy and Management, SEED, Manchester. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/334613068_Inclusive_Innovation_Definition_Conceptualisation_and_Future_Research_Priorities. Accessed on April 23, 2023.
4. Phills, J. A., Deiglmeier, K., & Miller, D. T. (2008). Rediscovering Social Innovation. Standford Social Innovation Review. URL: https://ssir.org/articles/entry/rediscovering_social_innovation#. Accessed on July 31, 2023.
5. UNCTAD (2014). Innovation policy tools for inclusive development. Geneva. URL: https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ciid25_en.pdf. Accessed on April 29, 2023.
6. Yunus, M. (2011) Building Social Business: The New Kind of Capitalism that Serves Humanity's Most Pressing Needs. New York: Public Affairs.

Options for delivering II&SE education at universities

Objective

This chapter aims to discuss curricular and extracurricular options of embedding inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship in higher education. In particular, it explains possibilities of integrating II&SE in existing study programmes, offering it as a stand-alone course within different programmes, or providing it within entrepreneurship centres or similar units. This chapter also explains the requirements to the design and approval of a study programme to be delivered within formal HE curricula.

Introduction

Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship education can be broadly divided into two types: curricular and extra-curricular. Curricular type means that Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship is either taught as a stand-alone study programme, a stand-alone course/module - compulsory or elective - offered within different study programme, or is fully embedded in other disciplines through the use of pedagogical approaches conducive to developing entrepreneurial competences and mind set. Extra-curricular type means that II&SE education is provided within training programmes that are not part of higher education curricula. Such provision can be made, for example, at university entrepreneurship centres or business incubators. In the context of the InnoSocial project, this chapter focuses on developing a stand-alone course in II&SE[2]. Thus, it provides an overview of the requirements to study programmes after the general description of options for integrating II&SE in higher education.

Curricular type of embedment of II&SE education in higher education

Stand-alone study programmes

Universities can deliver II&SE education as a separate study programme at Bachelor or Master level. In this case, the programme objectives, the intended learning outcomes, the structure and the content of the curriculum should be related to the concepts of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship. The main advantage of a stand-alone programme in II&SE is that it

[2] Based on this Toolkit, the InnoSocial consortium developed a 3-ECTS (75 hours) Course in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship.

considers the given concepts in a greater level of details, covering all issues important for systemic understanding of social economy, social entrepreneurship and the role of innovation in finding and implementing solutions to pressing social problems.
The analysis of the study programmes implemented by the project consortium identified several examples of Master programmes in the field of Social Entrepreneurship, such as "Executive Master in Third Sector and Social Enterprise" (Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Italy) and "Master in Social Entrepreneurship" (New Bulgarian University, Bulgaria). The overview is provided in the grey box below.

Executive Master in Third Sector and Social Enterprise (60 ECTS)
ALTIS (Alta Scuola Impresa e Società) Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan, Italy

Intended learning outcomes:
- Plan and improve management in a social organization/ enterprise
- Design new ideas using a sustainable approach
- Design and establish a social enterprise
- Engage in collaboration with public/ private actors
- Interiorize data as a foundation for decision-making

Selected modules included in the curriculum:
- Third Sector reform, strategy and management
- Design for innovation
- Digital transformation of the third sector
- Data management and impact measurement
- Strategic financing for the third sector
- Communication for the Third Sector and Pitch Lab
- Social Business Model Canvas
- Accounting and business planning for social enterprises

Master in Social Entrepreneurship (60 ECTS)
New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria

Intended learning outcomes:
- Establish and manage a social enterprise
- Provide consulting services to public bodies involved in social policy making
- Develop and implement measures for tackling social problems, such as unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, and social inclusion of disadvantaged groups
- Project management, accounting, human resource management, and PR

Selected modules included in the curriculum:
- Civil society and solidarity, social work and social activities
- Social economy and social entrepreneurship
- Social enterprise: legal regulations and forms
- Project Management in Social Entrepreneurship
- Social Entrepreneurship in the European Union

Stand-alone courses/ modules within different study programmes
Traditionally, entrepreneurship education has been taught exclusively at Business Schools, within management and business administration programmes. However, the promotion of entrepreneurship in Europe as a driver of economic development and growth has put the focus on embedding entrepreneurship education within various study programmes, in order to reach those schools where students are more likely to start a business. There are examples of a business-school led provision of entrepreneurship courses, either mandatory or elective, within the curricula of other programmes (e.g. engineering, education or arts). This provision could be

either "centralized" / "standardized", when one and the same course is offered to students of different fields of study, or "contextualized", when the course takes into account the unique characteristics of the given field of study or sector of economy (Carey and Matlay, 2011). The focus on the context is important for teaching social entrepreneurship, because it allows for recognizing different organizational structures, understanding different value structures (e.g. triple bottom-line) and human recourse implications (e.g. involving and managing volunteers) (Carey and Hill, 2017). Thus, teaching II&SE in higher education in the form of a stand-alone course or module should follow a contextualized rather than common-for-all approach.

The analysis of II&SE study programmes and courses implemented by the consortium found several examples of stand-alone courses in the field of Social Entrepreneurship delivered within Bachelor or Master degree programmes. One example is the Social Entrepreneurship course offered by the Institute for Economics and Econometrics at the University of Regensburg. Its short overview is presented in the grey box below.

Social Entrepreneurship (6 ECTS)
The University of Regensburg, Germany

Intended learning outcomes:
- Design and establish a social enterprise
- Evaluate impact of a social enterprise

Selected modules included in the curriculum:
- Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: recent rise of social enterprises
- Developing and testing a start-up idea
- Planning, launching and scaling a social enterprise
- Psychological biases as an obstacle to social change
- Impact evaluation methods
- Non-monetary incentives and HRM in social enterprises

Embedded within disciplines across the university
Embedded II&SE education means that it is fully integrated within courses focused on other subjects. For example, at the University of National and World Economy (Bulgaria), the issues related to inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship are embedded in disciplines such as: Innovation; Economics of Innovation; Foundations of Entrepreneurship; Economic Policies; Economics of Development; Public Administration; Business Operations; Marketing; Human Resource Management; Corporate social responsibility, among others.

According to Pittaway & Edwards (2012), the main idea of embedded entrepreneurship education is to provide students, in particular within non-business fields of study, experience of (social) entrepreneurship directly within their discipline, and by doing so to ensure that what they learn about is relevant to their field of interest. Carey and Matlay (2007) argue that (social) entrepreneurship education is implicit in the pedagogical approach. They give example of creative disciplines, in which (social) entrepreneurship education can be embedded through self-directed project-based work, assessment methods based on presenting and justifying ideas, and inviting lecturers who are creative self-employed practitioners or entrepreneurial role-models. If the argument of embedded (or implicit) II&SE education is followed through, then any discipline could alter the delivery and assessment style to foster innovation and entrepreneurship skills and attitudes. The following chapters of this Toolkit describe entrepreneurship competences and teaching/learning approaches conducive to developing these competences.

Extracurricular type of embedment of II&SE education in higher education

Extracurricular II&SE education means it is provided not as part of the study programmes, but as additional education and training opportunity offered within university ecosystem. For example, business incubation centres are common structures at universities ''helping support start-ups from their student body while being able to capitalise on intellectual property spawned through the academy" (Carey & Domboka, 2019, p. 10). Incubators or enterprise centres offer support that enable students to start and run a business as part of their training. Students work under supervision of a business coach or a mentor and can develop and test their ideas using the university's infrastructure. The grey box below provides an example of a Start-Up Hub at the University of National and World Economy in Sofia, Bulgaria.

Start-Up Hub
University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria

The Start-up Hub at the University of National and World Economy (UNWE) operates as a sub-division of the Inter-University Center for Career Development. It provides students with a structured support needed to transform infant ideas into working business models.

The Strat-Up Hub organizes and carries out activities such as:

- *Open lectures* delivered by external stakeholders on various topics, for example, "Entrepreneurship with limited resources" or "Entrepreneurial skills";
- *Mentoring cafés*, where students get support of external mentors – successful entrepreneurs and experts in finance, marketing, and sales – in developing a solid plan for their start-up. Mentors usually come from local companies and organizations such as the Fund of Fund (the institution that manages funds under different national operational programmes co-financed by the European Structural and Investment Funds) and the Bulgarian Association of Start-Ups, among others.
- *Start-Up Competition*, an annual event at which students pitch their start-up ideas to a jury and winners get funding to launch their start-up. Usually, the competition is preceded by a series of mentoring cafés that help students develop their ideas to the level required by the competition.
- *Role play sessions*, aimed to test a start-up in the environment simulating a real market. This game allows the start-up idea-holders to understand the process of a start-up launch and see how the market could react on it.

Another example of an extra-curricular activity focused on social entrepreneurship is the Enactus programme. Enactus is a "global network of leaders committed to using business as a catalyst for positive and social environmental impact" (Enactus, 2023: website). It has 33 independent country offices, including eight offices in Europe (in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, the UK, and Ukraine). Their core programme is targeted at students and lasts one academic year. Students form teams in their universities, analyse local community needs, define the one that they will tackle, develop creative business solutions, and launch a project or business to meet this need. Students are provided training in "leadership, teamwork, project management, and business principles" (ibid) and are supported by an Enactus-trained faculty advisor, Enactus staff, and a business advisory board. The programme finishes with a National Competition and Enactus World Cup.

The following Chapter on Stakeholder involvement in II&SE education provides additional examples of university-based business incubators and how their programmes/courses support the innovation and entrepreneurial propensity of students.

Additional ideas for embedding II&SE in higher education

The stakeholders involved in the discussion panels and interviews emphasized that in addition to curricular and extracurricular way of embedding inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship in higher education, universities could adopt other strategies:

- *Policy and Advocacy*: Engage with policymakers and advocate for policies that support social entrepreneurship and inclusive innovation. Encourage students and faculty to participate in relevant conferences, seminars, and policy dialogues to contribute to the development of an ecosystem enabling initiatives with social impact.
- *Collaborative Research*: Encourage faculty and students to conduct research on inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship. Support interdisciplinary research projects that aim to develop innovative solutions for social challenges. Foster collaboration between academia, industry, and community stakeholders to ensure research has social impact.
- *Partnerships and Networks*: Foster partnerships with social enterprises, nonprofits, and governmental organizations to create opportunities for students to collaborate on projects, do internships, and take part in research initiatives. Engage with local communities to address their specific needs and develop sustainable solutions.
- *Funding and Awards*: Establish funding opportunities and awards (e.g. in cooperation with venture capital funds) specifically for social entrepreneurship and inclusive innovation initiatives. Encourage students and faculty to apply for grants to develop and implement their social impact projects, providing financial support to turn ideas into reality.
- *Alumni Engagement*: Create platforms for alumni who are involved in social entrepreneurship and inclusive innovation to share their experiences, mentor current students, and provide networking opportunities. Alumni networks can offer valuable support, guidance, and potential collaborations for students interested in these fields.
- *Measurement and Evaluation*: Develop mechanisms to assess and measure the social impact created by student-led initiatives and social enterprises. Incorporate impact measurement frameworks into the curriculum to ensure a focus on outcomes and sustainability.

By incorporating these strategies, higher education institutions can play a pivotal role in cultivating the next generation of socially conscious innovators and entrepreneurs who will drive positive change in society.

Requirements to the development of study programmes

The process of curriculum design includes the preparation of documentation containing a description of the programme. Such documentation should enable a comprehensive evaluation of the programme, in particular:

- Checking whether the programme meets the minimal requirements set out in relevant regulations at national and intuitional level;
- Assessing the possibilities and conditions for the implementation of the programme, including checking whether the department that submits the draft programme complies with the requirements set out in relevant regulations.

Evaluation of the educational programme on the basis of the submitted documentation leads to:

- Making decisions for adopting the curriculum by the faculty council and the university senate;
- Issuance of a decision entitling the responsible faculty to implement the programme by the Ministry of Education (or other responsible authority, where and if required).

The documentation related to the study programme should include the following main parts:

- General description of the programme
- Description of the intended learning outcomes
- Description of the structure of the programme: study plan; learning modules and practical training included in programme;

- Description of the conditions for implementing the programme
- Description of educational approaches and methods used in the programme
- Description of the internal education quality assurance system

The descriptions should provide information about the duration of the programme (in semesters) and its workload (in ECTS credit points and learning hours). It should also specify the percentage of ECTS credit points that can be obtained by completing elective modules. The description of the methods for assessment of the intended learning outcomes is usually provided at the level of individual education modules. At the level of a study programme, it may only apply to some specific learning outcomes, especially social competences, the achievement of which is a result of the completion of the study program as a whole.

This documentation is important for the faculty council and the university senate as the bodies making decisions regarding the implementation of the programme, and for the prospective students deciding which study programme to choose. This documentation is also helpful for developing informational and promotional materials for applicants, students, academic and administrative staff and other stakeholders. Publishing up-to-date, impartial and objective information about the programmes offered by a university is one of the criteria in education quality assurance systems in the European Higher Education Area. Any attempts of a university to limit access to information concerning intended learning outcomes, assessment methods, study plans, content of education and teaching/learning approaches, for example for protecting intellectual property, are therefore unjustified.

Conclusion

This chapter provides an overview of different possibilities for integrating Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship in higher education. In particular, it considers design and delivery of a stand-alone study programme, a stand-alone course within business and non-business education programmes, and a fully embedded II&SE education achieved by utilizing teaching and learning approaches conducive to the development of innovation- and entrepreneurship-related skills. The chapter also provides short overview of an extra-curricular approach of delivering II&SE education, which implies partnership with university-led business incubators, enterprise centres or similar units. How a university proceeds depends on its specific context; however, it is important to ensure that II&SE education is contextualized and allows all interested students to get access to it.

The presented way of documenting the work on a study programme design should be treated as a proposal that can be subject to modifications and adaptations. In no case, this should be considered as an attempt to introduce standards in the field of creating documentation related to study programmes. The decisions on these issues should be made at university level (it does not seem appropriate to delegate this task to individual units conducting studies) and be aligned with the requirements or guidelines of authorized institutions (for example, in Poland, the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, General Council for Science and Higher Education, and the Polish Accreditation Committee).

Reflection questions

- Does your university offer any study programmes, courses or extra-curricular training in the field of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship?
- If yes, how could II&SE education offer be further improved (e.g. to reach out to more students)?

- If not, what approach to embedding II&SE education is most appropriate for your institutional context? What institutional frameworks exist that could help or hinder implementing this approach?
- What are the national and institutional requirements to the development of study programmes and study modules (courses) that should be complied with, if a stand-alone course in II&SE is to be developed and integrated in the curricula?

List of references

1. Akt prawny (2023) URL: https://sejm.gov.pl/. Accessed on 15.03.2023.
2. Carey, C. and Matlay, H. (2007) Entrepreneurs as educators. The case of the creative industries in the UK. Industry and Higher Education, Vol. 52 No. 8/9, pp. 694–709.
3. Carey, C. and Matlay, H. (2011) Emergent issues in enterprise education: The educator's perspective Industry and Higher Education Vol: 25 No 6 pp 441-450.
4. Carey, C. and Hill, I. (2017) Part II: The practice and Business Model of Social Enterprises Mission, Structure, and Management of Social Entrepreneurial organizations. BEST: Business Education for Sustainability Teaching Corporate Social Responsibility and Social Entrepreneurship for Sustainable Local and Regional Development.
5. Carey, C. and Domboka, T. (2019) Resource Pack on Entrepreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship Education. AHEAD: African Higher Education Leadership in Advancing Inclusive Innovation for Development. URL: https://ahead-project.net/documents/18/WP2_4_Resource_Pack_on_EE_final.pdf. Accessed on 30.05.2023.
6. Enactus. (2023) Enactus who we are and what we do? URL: http://enactus.org/who-we-are/our-story/. Accessed on 13.06.2023.
7. Portal Gov.pl (2023) Kształcenie - Ministerstwo Edukacji i Nauki. URL: www.gov.pl. Accessed on 15.03.2023.
8. Portal Gov.pl (2023) Konstytucja dla Nauki - Ministerstwo Edukacji i Nauki. URL: www.gov.pl. Accessed on 15.03.2023.
9. Pittaway, L. and Edwards, C. (2012) Assessment: examining practice in entrepreneurship education. Education and Training, Vol. 54 No. 8/9, 2012, pp. 778-800.

Stakeholder-led II&SE initiatives and cooperation of HEIs with external stakeholders

Objective

This chapter presents examples of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship programmes implemented by different stakeholders that can be adapted to higher education curricula. It promotes stakeholder co-creation in the process of design and delivery of II&SE education at higher education institutions by:

- presenting an innovative approach to building a multi-elemental education in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship;
- showing examples of how to identify and adapt elements of programmes led by different stakeholders to the academic environment;
- presenting the value of applying different methods, techniques and approaches to II&SE education at universities;
- listing ideas of cooperation between a university and other stakeholder in the field of II&SE.

Introduction

The development of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship education at universities requires the involvement of more than just academic resources. Solutions that can be

implemented as part of teaching can be drawn from programmes already implemented by other stakeholders. Various types of companies, NGOs, aid and charity organisations or local authorities have launched innovative programmes to support people. Certain elements of such programmes can be adapted and used in teaching II&SE at universities.

Higher education, if it wants to keep up with the ever-changing labour market, must adjust programmes and adapt market elements to teaching. It includes not only theoretical knowledge but, above all, practical elements drawn from the experience of labour market actors, such as:

- Local companies, entrepreneurs, including social entrepreneurs;
- NGOs, foundations, associations;
- Local authorities;
- Funding agencies;
- Other II&SE providers.

Their experience can be used in teaching in the field of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship. Innovative methods and multi-element curricula that go beyond lectures and classroom activities are highly effective in improving the knowledge, practical skills and attitudes of students. Therefore, it is important to provide examples of how different stakeholder groups can contribute to the learning process at higher education institutions. Combining theory and practice outside of academic walls, testing solutions developed during classes in real market scenarios is crucial in the field of II&SE.

Stakeholder involvement in II&SE education

Higher education institutions wishing to implement new multi-element programmes to improve the competence of their students in the field of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship can draw on the rich experience of other institutions already conducting their own autonomous activities in this area, often in cooperation with the academic community. Below are examples of such programmes already implemented at different levels of education or by different labour market actors. They are recommendable and easily transferable to higher education by selecting certain parts and adapting them to the context on a "pick>choose>adjust" basis. They can also provide an inspiration for design and delivery of HEIs' own curricula in II&SE involving external stakeholders and drawing on their good practices.

1. Education at primary, secondary and vocational school level

Educational programmes involving local entrepreneurs to improve students' knowledge and competence in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship have been implemented at early levels of education. The experiences described below should serve as an example of how different stakeholders can be involved in learning processes regardless of the level of education.

The "Open a company" programme is organised by the Junior Achievement Foundation as part of Global Entrepreneurship Week. It is held simultaneously in 160 countries around the world, with the aim of creating a social environment that actively supports the entrepreneurial attitudes and initiatives of young people and providing tripartite benefits. The project consists of classroom activities in a school or in a company showing the practical aspects of running a business. Students then may explore future career opportunities. Local entrepreneurs talk about the specifics of their own business, share their experiences and show what to do to succeed after education. The project is cyclical and each year has its own specific objectives and topics (e.g. human resources or marketing issues). Students, teachers and local entrepreneurs participate and interact in the project. Application is free of charge; each teaching institution receives a detailed programme and, on the basis of this, invites a local employer to join. Together they create a curriculum, which is then run in classroom.

The 2021 edition of the "Open Company" was attended by 1 018 companies and 32 874 students; 1 273 educational meetings were held. The program allows its participants - students and teachers - to prepare for life in a market economy and enable young people to acquire knowledge and practical skills to facilitate the realization of their career plans. For companies, this is a great opportunity to promote itself and establish new contacts in the local environment. Schools get the opportunity to enrich its educational offer with interesting activities to prepare students for their future educational path.

Another good example of activities targeted at schools is the Social Innovation Relay programme conducted by Junior Achievement Foundation with support of Nationale Nederlanden. The programme is an international competition among students for the best innovative business idea that addresses a social need in education, health, social inclusion, improving quality of life and sustainable development. Participants are divided into teams and registered on the Social Innovation Relay platform. The teams develop social innovations based on the content included on the platform. Teams work out a solution that has a chance to exist in the real world. They draw on real problems in their local environments. They conduct market research, come up with business solutions that could be brought to market in the form of a social enterprise. The content on the platform and the project activities are in line with the social entrepreneurship curriculum in terms of:

- learning the basic concepts of entrepreneurship;
- learning about the principles of enterprise in a market economy, organisational and legal forms, innovative business models and the procedure for registering a business;
- recognising ethical and unethical actions in economic life and corporate social responsibility;
- designing activities for setting up one's own business or undertaking other ventures of a socio-economic nature;
- analysing the environment of the enterprise, including the market in which it operates;
- using the economic knowledge acquired to develop an entrepreneurial mind-set as one of the basic conditions for active participation in socio-economic life;
- an interest in running their own business and a motivation for continuous self-development and investment in themselves;
- taking advantage of market opportunities, taking initiative, being inventive and being able to overcome internal and external barriers;
- development of pro-activity, responsibility for oneself and others;
- appreciation of entrepreneurial attitudes in everyday life, readiness to actively participate in the socio-economic life of the country and to share responsibility for its development;
- appreciation of the role of entrepreneurs in building a competitive economy in a responsible manner, and appreciation of economic freedom and private ownership as pillars of the market economy.

All participants in the Social Innovation Relay programme gain knowledge about social innovation and social entrepreneurship through engaging materials, such as profiles of social entrepreneurs, quizzes, practical exercises, and sessions with social entrepreneurs. They also research the needs of their customers and target group and, based on the results, develop an idea for a social innovation that will contribute to solving a social problem in their local environment. They also practice how to implement this innovation in a social enterprise format under the guidance of mentors, identify the necessary activities, implementation costs, distribution channels, necessary resources, and plan promotional activities. At the end, team present their idea in front of a panel of judges - employees of the project partner. The winning teams receive prizes, but the biggest impact of the programme is the launch of a winning business idea.

2. Autonomous university projects

Universities are not far behind when it comes to programmes implemented for students in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship. Despite the lack of funding for social projects, the academic sector often uses external funding sources, such as public funds. Funding agencies disposing of national budgetary resources, EU funds like the European Social Fund or other international programmes can be another group of stakeholders opening up opportunities for educational initiatives.

An example of a project that received external funding is the "Mazovia Youth University". It was implemented and piloted at the University of Warsaw. The main objective of the project was to improve the competences of students in the following areas: financial literacy, entrepreneurship, critical thinking and learning skills. The programme was implemented during a series of training sessions in Warsaw, at the Faculty of Economics of the University of Warsaw. The project lasted 35 months, during which 30 training courses (consisting of three 10-hour modules) were conducted, each in a group of 8 to 12 people:

- Module I - financial literacy (10 didactic hours)
- Module II - entrepreneurship (10 didactic hours)
- Module III - critical thinking and ability to learn (10 didactic hours)

Each training course was scheduled to last 30 didactic hours, divided into five 6-hour blocks, although a different timetable could be agreed, depending on the preferences of schools and the availability of students. At the end of the course, each student received a personal certificate. At least 80% of the students who took part in the project improved their competences recognised as future-proof in the labour market.

3. Programmes implemented by local authorities

Another group of stakeholders are local authorities. Many of them have developed programmes to support Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship. Such an example is the City of Gdynia, which has established a special unit responsible for activities in the field of II&SE. Social Innovation Lab (SIL) is an autonomous budgetary unit of Gdynia City Hall responsible for developing and supporting innovative social solutions for citizens. SIL is also an embodiment of the idea grown from thinking that in order to develop sustainably and achieve durable results, a city needs new ideas not just in technological and economic areas but also in all social activities targeted at the inhabitants. SIL's objective is developing, supporting and promoting innovative social solutions, so as to improve the living standards for all inhabitants of Gdynia – regardless of their age, address and social background.

Social Innovation Laboratory in Gdynia and the Stocznia Foundation from Warsaw run the project "Human Innovation. Support for the development of micro-innovation in the area of social inclusion". The aim of the project is to incubate innovative ideas in the field of social inclusion so that they have the greatest possible potential for dissemination. The main task is to recruit, in an open nationwide call, nationally innovative ideas for services, products, solutions, and then to support their authors in refining, developing and testing their ideas with the help of the grants awarded. The next stage involves dissemination of 10 most successful solutions, including activities supporting absorption of innovation by the targeted population.

The "Idea Incubator" has been operating for three years at the Social Innovation Laboratory in Gdynia and the "Dreamers and Craftsmen" at the House of Social Innovation in Warsaw. The basic model of support offered by these units is the so-called incubation cycles, i.e. the processes comprising recruitment, support and development of innovative ideas and their testing, followed by evaluation, refinement of the final version of the solution and dissemination of the best of them. Within the framework of previous calls, approximately 100 innovation ideas received support in refining the concept and preparing a prototype of an innovative solution

(e.g. in the form of training, individual consultations and mentoring). In supporting the ideas, the mentors together with the innovators considered whether these were in fact the best answers to the problem at hand and under what conditions the solutions were likely to grow and work most effectively. After an incubation period of several months, 52 innovations were selected and given a grant (approximately PLN 40,000 or 9,000 EUR) to test their solutions in practice. 10 of these social innovations will be disseminated, taking steps to integrate them into practice.

4. Activities carried out by other stakeholders

Many projects and programmes for Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship, elements of which can be used for teaching in this area, have been implemented by other stakeholders, such as NGOs or institutions working on social innovation and inclusion. An excellent example of cooperation between a university and an external organisation is the Academic Business Incubators (AIP). Academic Business incubators are units set up at academic centres across Poland. The idea behind the AIP is to create ideal conditions for the development of business ideas. AIP is a combination of the knowledge represented by the scientific staff and students of the university and the practical knowledge of the functioning of companies in Poland.

The mission of the AIP is to create conditions for the development and commercialization of innovation. The purpose of the incubators is to provide comprehensive practical knowledge to students who have a great deal of theoretical knowledge which they find difficult to transfer into practice. The AIP programme allows students to test their ideas in the market under preferential conditions and without having to register a business or company. Operating in the incubator is a way for students to gain experience in business, exchange ideas and make business contacts.

Academic business incubators are one of the projects that support young entrepreneurs in their efforts to develop their interests and achieve financial independence. The business incubator is one of the new ways of developing entrepreneurship and helping companies to overcome crises along the way. The idea of incubation refers to the development phases that every newly created company goes through. As part of the Academic Business Incubators, the student running the business, known as the beneficiary, receives:

- AIP's legal personality;
- accounting management of the company;
- comprehensive legal assistance;
- access to office premises;
- the possibility of obtaining funds for the functioning of the company;
- a range of training courses to improve the efficiency of business management;
- a team of experts;
- assistance in company branding.

Functioning, as part of the Academic Business Incubators, allows for other types of assistance, including:

- the right to use the mark of the Academic Business Incubator;
- assistance in promotion and advertising, with the help of marketing agencies;
- organisation of business meetings and assistance in finding business partners;
- organisation of conferences, fairs to promote companies in the AIP.

The financial operations of a student company are done through the AIP sub-account. The participant has an option to pay out funds under a work contract or a contract order.

The AIP project is aimed not only at students, but all people under the age of thirty. The services of the Academic Business Incubator, apart from students and graduates, can be used by anyone

who has an idea of their first business. Generally, it can be said that AIP are designed to help young people start up and develop their business. The AIP business owner can concentrate as much as possible on making his or her company dynamic, growing and financially profitable. The AIP beneficiary does not have to worry about the technical issues involved in running his or her business and does not focus on the barriers that exist in the market. So far, the Academic Business Incubators have achieved the following results:

- a network of 48 Incubators at universities located all over Poland;
- the largest AIP network in Europe;
- more than 250 grants for opening beneficiary's own business;
- so far the incubators have launched more than 10,000 companies; and
- counselled more than 17,000 people interested in starting their own business.

Stakeholder engagement strategies in II&SE

The participants in the InnoSocial discussion panels and interviews emphasized that a strategy for engaging stakeholders in inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship education should rest on understanding the notion of "ecosystem". An ecosystem in the field of innovation and entrepreneurship is defined as a "community of interacting actors that all affect each other through their activities" (Jacobides et al., 2018, p. 2257, cited in Diaz Gonzalez & Dentchev, 2021). The interactions of these actors (stakeholders) in different activities allows for mobilization of resources, knowledge and capabilities that could improve II&SE education and training initiatives, and support aspiring innovators and social entrepreneurs.

Universities play a pivotal role in the innovation and (social) entrepreneurship ecosystem, because HEIs have mechanisms for promoting ecosystem participation and support, such as:

- *Consulting with stakeholders* (employers) about skills and competences needed to engage in innovation and (social) entrepreneurship and using their opinion as an input for curriculum design;
- *Inviting guest lecturers* (social entrepreneurs) who could share their experience, for example, in starting and running business, overcoming challenges that appear along the way, or managing particular business processes;
- *Running joint university-business initiatives*, such as mentorship programmes and master classes provided by representatives of business to students (e.g. mentorship for starting a social business); engaging students in solving real challenges that partner companies face (e.g. developing business strategies for partner social enterprises); arranging study visits to partner companies; and implementing joint projects that bring about positive social or environmental impact;
- *Establishing university-led centers for social entrepreneurship* that could provide targeted support to social entrepreneurs, for example, in scaling their activities or raising funds to support their cause;
- *Partnering with local public bodies and NGOs* that could provide insights into real social challenges of local community members, in particular people with fewer opportunities and special needs, that universities could address through research and innovation.

Conclusion

There are a number of programmes implemented by different stakeholders that support Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship. Some of these operate at the crossroad between academic activities and the institutional activities of various organisations, such as local companies, (social) entrepreneurs, NGOs, foundations, local authorities, funding agencies and other II&SE providers presented in this chapter. Many programmes boast excellent results and could be beneficial for HEIs. Universities could involve representatives of external organisations, leading such programmes, in curriculum development (e.g. give advice about the

structure of the course, pedagogies employed, activities planned, etc.), and/or delivery of classes (e.g. giving lectures, mentoring innovation projects, being jury members in start-up competitions, etc.). Their experiences may be very useful in creating new educational pathways in Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship.

Reflection questions

- Do you usually involve stakeholders in design and delivery of study programmes? Which methods of involvement do you use?
- Are you aware of any programmes or initiatives in the field of II&SE that are offered by your partner HEIs or other organisations?
- Is it possible to adapt some elements of programmes or initiatives in the field of II&SE offered by other organisations to your context?
- Which local, regional, national or international organizations can you collaborate with in the field of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship?

List of references

1. Diaz Gonzalez, A. and Dentchev, N. A. (2021). Ecosystems in support of social entrepreneurs: a literature review. *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 329-360. https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-08-2020-0064
2. Fundacja Młodzieżowej Przedsiębiorczości. Otwarta firmaŚwiatowy Tydzień Przedsiębiorczości. URL: https://otwarta-firma.junior.org.pl/. Accessed on April 10, 2023.
3. Fundacja Młodzieżowej Przedsiębiorczości. Program: Social Innovation Relay URL: https://sir.junior.org.pl/. Accessed on April 10, 2023.
4. Gdynia. Laboratorium Innowacji Społecznych. URL: https://lis.gdynia.pl/projekty/ and
5. https://lis.gdynia.pl/english/. Accessed April 15, 2023.
6. Inkubator pomysłów. URL: https://inkubatorpomyslow.org.pl/. Accessed on April 17, 2023.
7. Mazowiecki Uniwersytet Młodzieżowy. URL: https://www.wne.uw.edu.pl/mum. Accessed on April 13, 2023.
8. AIP. URL: https://aip.link/. Accessed on May 15, 2023.

Knowledge areas and skills developed through II&SE education at universities

Objective

This chapter provides an overview of the knowledge areas and skills that should be developed through II&SE education at universities predicated on an analysis of literature sources and existing study programmes/ courses in the given field. The chapter also includes a good practice presenting an online Bachelor's Program in Responsible Entrepreneurship and Management offered by the Tomorrow University whose structure could provide ideas for planning a course in II&SE in HEIs.

Introduction

In recent years, higher education institutions have increasingly been engaged in promoting education for social entrepreneurship and social innovation. Inclusive innovation, a concept initially coined as a driver of development in third counties, is rarely included in higher education programmes. In order to mainstream Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship education in HEI curricula, it is important to define the scope of these two concepts, as well as to understand the structure and content of existing training offers in this field. For this purpose, the InnoSocial consortium carried out a thorough literature review and

analysis of study programmes/ courses in the field of II&SE. The main objective of the analysis was to get insights into the topics/ themes/ subject areas that could constitute a course in II&SE and a skill set that should be developed through such a course.

Content of II&SE study programmes or courses

Brock and Steiner (2019) developed a methodology for identifying the most important topics that a course or programme in Social Entrepreneurship should cover based on the content analysis of definitions of this concept. They analysed twelve definitions of the most cited researchers, such as Dees et al. (2001), Bornstein (2004), Austin et al. (2006) among others. Based on this analysis, they identified common elements that appear in all definitions and therefore should be part of a course of study in Social Entrepreneurship. These elements include:

- Social need or problem: Social Entrepreneurship education should ensure that the teaching staff can prepare socially responsible entrepreneurs whose mission will be related to tacking a social problem;
- Opportunity recognition: Social Entrepreneurship education should allow students to learn to recognize, assess and exploit opportunities, thus transforming ideas into purposeful organizations;
- Innovation: Social Entrepreneurship education should foster innovation because innovation differentiates a social enterprise from a non-profit organization. Hence students of Social Entrepreneurship should understand the innovation process and be able to come up with innovative solutions to social problems.
- Scalability: Social Entrepreneurship education should teach students that a social enterprise should bring about social change, which is possible if the enterprise can be scaled up through wide dissemination and branching. Teaching scale should allow students to differentiate a social enterprise from a small community-based organization.
- Resource acquisition: Social Entrepreneurship education should teach students to acquire and leverage resources to create social value. This involves teaching students how to create partnerships, raise funds, and secure physical and human resources.
- Sustainable business models: Social Entrepreneurship education should ensure that students can describe how their social enterprise will create and deliver value in the long-term.

Applying the same approach to the concept of Inclusive Innovation, we analysed nine definitions (provided in Annex 1) of Inclusive Innovation, which in several cases are intertwined with the concepts of inclusive growth and inclusive innovation policies. The definitions selected for analysis originate either from scientific papers published by recognised researchers in this field (e.g. Heeks, 2013; Johnson & Andersen, 2012) or from reports of international organizations (such as OECD and UNDP). The analysis led to identifying the following list of common elements that should be included in a course in this field:

- Social development: education for Inclusive Innovation should ensure that students engage in innovation with the aim of improving quality of life of disadvantaged groups and providing access to good quality products and services at affordable price. Teachers should cultivate the positive attitude to innovation addressing social or environmental needs, as well as the particular needs of disadvantaged groups.
- Social inclusion: education for Inclusive Innovation should promote inclusion of disadvantaged groups (the poor, people with disabilities, women, elderly people, migrants and refugees, ethnic minorities and other marginalized groups) in research, entrepreneurial and innovation activities.
- Industrial and territorial inclusion: students of courses in Inclusive Innovation should be aware of different levels of inclusion - social (the previous bullet point), industrial (e.g.

micro-entrepreneurs and SMEs) and territories (e.g. lagging behind or less innovative regions).

- Accessibility and dispersion of innovation: education for Inclusive Innovation should emphasize the importance of dissemination and distribution of innovation to the disadvantaged group, i.e. ensuring the innovation will reach disadvantaged individual, organizations and/or territories.

The analysis of the concepts of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship shows that they go well together and can be combined in one course. A Social Enterprise inspired by an inclusive innovation can tackle a social or environmental need of disadvantaged groups or territories. II&SE education, therefore, shall promote a close-knit cooperation of students with external stakeholders (in particular, social enterprises, NGOs, non-formal community groups, and grassroots innovators).

The analysis of existing study programmes in the field of II&SE, complemented by the findings of the stakeholder discussion panels and interviews, provides further ideas related to the content of a course in II&SE.

Content elements relevant to a course in II&SE

Based on the analysis of 25 programmes/courses in the field of II&SE, and consultations with 72 stakeholders in all countries of the consortium, the following content elements were identified as relevant for II&SE education at universities:

- *Understanding inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship*
  - Innovation and social innovation; how social innovation differs from mainstream innovation; social innovation as a driver of social development
  - Inclusive innovation: its specific features and target groups; types of inclusive innovation and related concepts (e.g. bottom-of-the-pyramid or pro-poor innovation, frugal innovation);
  - Social entrepreneurship: what its main objectives are; how it differs from conventional entrepreneurship; how social and inclusive innovation is connected to social entrepreneurship; targeting and involving groups at the risk of exclusion in innovation and social entrepreneurship;
  - Importance of II&SE and motivation of an aspiring entrepreneur to invest in II&SE;
  - Case studies of inclusive innovations and social enterprises in emerging and developed markets.
- *Understanding societal challenges and designing inclusive innovations to address them*
  - Sustainable development goals and societal challenges;
  - Identifying and analysing a social/environmental problem or need (e.g. related to education, health, social inclusion, improving quality of life, etc.);
  - Design thinking as an approach for developing innovative solutions to problems (understanding the process and techniques used on each stage of the process);
  - Applying design thinking to solve the identified social/environmental problem or need; cooperating with stakeholders in the process.
- *Understanding and designing a social enterprise*
  - Spotting social business opportunities: transforming an inclusive innovation idea (developed in the previous block) into social business
  - Investigating business models suitable for inclusive innovation & social entrepreneurship and creating a business model for a social enterprise (applying Social Business Model Canvas)
  - Developing a Business Plan for a social enterprise
- *Establishing a social enterprise*

- Legal forms of social enterprises: laws and legals acts governing SEs' establishment and operation at EU and national level
- Selecting an organizational form for a social enterprise
- Designing a funding strategy (fundraising, donor funds, EU-funded programmes that could support a social start-up)

- *Ensuring sustainability of a social enterprise and measuring social impact*
  - Business sustainability and integration of social and environmental issues in the strategic plan
  - Measuring social impact of a social enterprise

The results of the study programmes analysis and consultations with stakeholders revealed two options for structuring a course in the field of II&SE:

- Version 1: a theoretical block followed by a practical block (project)
- Version 2: each unit of content comprising theoretical background and practical tasks

Competencies to be developed through the InnoSocial course

The InnoSocial Course[3] (the second project result) aims to tackle social and societal challenges by supporting the development of competencies that students need in order to engage in innovation and start a business pursuing social goals. In recent years, competence-based education, focusing on the attainment of not only knowledge, but also skills and attitudes, has gained attention from universities and colleges worldwide. One of the main reasons for its popularity is an improved chance of employability for students. By developing relevant skills and competencies, students get better prepared to meet the demands of the job market and demonstrate their abilities to prospective employers. This approach goes beyond theoretical knowledge and emphasizes its practical application, problem-solving, teamwork, and other critical skills sought by employers in various industries.

A number of research works and studies discuss the skill set targeted through Social Entrepreneurship education. For example, Murray et al. (2018) explores the key competencies required for individuals engaging in social innovation initiatives. They highlight the importance of skills such as empathy, systems thinking, collaboration, and creative problem-solving. Santos et al. (2020) investigates the skills and competencies needed for social entrepreneurs. Their study presents a comprehensive analysis of multiple case studies and identifies as relevant several key competencies such as adaptability, resilience, strategic thinking, and impact measurement.

The analysis of the existing study programmes/ courses in the field of II&SE revealed that the following skills are needed to start up own social venture or work in a social business:

- Systematic thinking
- Critical thinking
- Ability to learn
- Entrepreneurial mind-set
- Interest in running own business
- Motivation for continuous personal development
- Taking advantage of market opportunities
- Taking initiative
- Being inventive and being able to overcome internal and external barriers
- Pro-activity
- Responsibility for oneself and others

[3] The InnoSocial Course Syllabus

There are also studies dedicated to the analysis and development of tools for evaluation of innovation and (social) entrepreneurial skills (Espiritu et al. 2012; García-González, 2021). According to the results of a comprehensive study conducted within the Horizon 2020 project "Multi-disciplinary Innovation for Social Change" (COST Action CA18236), the European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (EntreComp) provides a solid foundation for understanding, developing and evaluating competences that should be targeted by education for social innovation and social entrepreneurship.

EntreComp was launched in 2016 by EU's Joint Research Centre on behalf of the Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion to support active citizenship, innovation, employability and learning through entrepreneurial thinking and action. It is a common reference framework that identifies 15 entrepreneurship competences (knowledge, skills and attitudes) in 3 key areas (Ideas & Opportunities, Resources, and Into Action) describing what people need to be entrepreneurial and to create financial, cultural or social value for others. The 15 entrepreneurship competences are broken down into thematic threads that explain the meaning of each competence in practical terms. There are a total of 60 threads that are further defined through 442 learning outcomes – what a learner knows, understands and can do, mapped across 8 different levels of progression, from foundation to intermediate, advanced and expert levels. Table 2 provides an overview of the EntreComp Framework for Advanced Level.

EntreComp builds upon a broad definition of entrepreneurship that hinges on the creation of cultural, social or economic value. It thus embraces different types of entrepreneurship, including social entrepreneurship. It is designed to be adapted and applied to support the development and understanding of entrepreneurial competence in any setting - formal education, non-formal learning and inclusion activities. Therefore, the Framework was used as a reference document for the development of the InnoSocial course competence matrix.

IDEAS AND OPORTUNIETIES	1. Spotting opportunities	Learners can seize and shape opportunities to respond to challenges and create value for others.	RESOURCES	1.Self-awareness & self-efficacy	Learners can compensate for their weaknesses by teaming up with others and by further developing their strengths.	INTO ACTION	1. Taking the initiative	Learners can look for opportunities to take the initiative to add or create value
	2. Creativity	Learners can transform ideas into solutions that create value for others.		2. Motivation & perseverance	Learners can stay focused on their passion and keep creating value despite setbacks.		2. Planning & management	Learners can refine priorities and plans to adjust to changing circumstances.
	3. Vision	Learners can use their vision to guide strategic decision-making.		3. Mobilising resources	Learners can define strategies to mobilise the resources they need to generate value for others		3. Coping with ambiguity, uncertainty& risk	Learners can weigh up risks and make decisions despite uncertainty and ambiguity.
	4. Valuing ideas	Learners can develop strategies to make the most of the value generated by ideas.		4. Financial& economic literacy	Learners can make a plan for the financial sustainability of a value-creating activity		4. Working with others	Learners can build a team and networks based on the needs of their value-creating activity
	5. Ethical & sustainable thinking	Learners act to make sure that their ethical and sustainability goals are met.		5. Mobilizing others	Learners can inspire others and get them on board for value-creating activities		5. Learning through experience	Learners can improve their abilities to create value by building on their previous experiences and interactions with others

Good practice: Bachelor's Program in Responsible Entrepreneurship and Management
Tomorrow University

Objective: the programme aims to equip learners with the tools and the mind set of entrepreneurs, capable of solving the most pressing challenges of our time by developing impactful solutions and ventures.

Four phases of learning for competence development:
The programme takes learners through four distinct phases based on their readiness to progress:

- *Orientation phase*: 6 introductory modules of 5 ECTS each, aimed to help learners understand the scope of their field of study and start identifying their own mission statement.
- *Calibration phase*: 3 semesters within which learners complete 18 Calibration challenges, aimed to help learners deep-dive into their main subject and research areas and gain practical experience in their field of study.
- *Elevation phase*: in this phase, learners develop solutions for 21st century challenges, related to one of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals. The solutions are designed in cooperation with Tomorrow University's external partners (mentors).
- *Activation phase*: after having acquired subject-matter expertise in the calibration and elevation phase, learners are taken back to their personal mission statement and apply their knowledge and skills to design and establish their own start-up in the Entrepreneurship Lab or work on an innovation project in cooperation with a company in the Corporate Lab.

Challenge-based learning:
In each phase, learners solve a practice-based challenge, taken from real-world, under the guidance of Subject Matter Experts. Here is an example of a challenge:

- *Identify your purpose*, using the tips and "how-to" guidelines provided by the mentors.
- *Create your personal mission statement*, aligned with your purpose, using the tools provided by your mentors
- *Analyse mission statements of 3 to 5 companies* and get inspired by the companies whose values you align with.
- *Engage in challenge discussion*: discuss the mission statements with peers and mentors to evaluate them; get ready to reflect on your mission statement
- *Share your personal mission statement*: refine and extend your personal mission statement based on the comments from your peers and mentor, what you have learned from the company mission statements, and the input from the challenge discussion.

Effectiveness of the programme
The programme is based entirely on experiential approach to learning. Within this programme, learners start working on their own entrepreneurial venture from day one of their studies and practice all the tools, techniques, and methodologies covered to succeed in entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial spheres.

Conclusion
The overview of the concepts of Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship, the analysis of existing study programmes/ courses in the field of II&SE, as well as the findings of the stakeholder discussion panels and interviews provided a good evidence base for designing the InnoSocial course. The results of the desk research and stakeholder consultations also highlighted the need of exploring in depth the topic of Inclusive Innovation, which represents an added value of the Course. More specifically, the focus in the field of Inclusive Innovation should be on creating innovative inclusive products, services, processes targeted at groups at the risk of

exclusion (the poor, migrants and refugees, women, elderly people, people with special needs, people living in remote areas) and distinguished by characteristics such as being social, affordable, accessible, impactful, participatory, and relevant to the target groups. The reference to the European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework – EntreComp for defining and assessing the competences and intended learning outcomes of education and training in the field of II&SE supports the development of entrepreneurship competence at European level.

Reflection questions

1. How does the developed material encourage students to develop a sense of social responsibility and empathy towards societal challenges?
2. Are there opportunities for students to collaborate with local communities or organizations to address real-world problems through their social entrepreneurship projects?
3. Reflecting on the course structure and content, are there any areas that require further development or clarification?
4. How can you modify or enhance the material to ensure that students gain a comprehensive understanding of II&SE principles and their practical application?
5. How can you incorporate real-life case studies or examples of successful social entrepreneurship ventures into the course material?
6. How do these examples help students connect theory with practice and inspire them to explore their own entrepreneurial ideas?

List of references

1. Austin, J., Stephenson, H. and Wei-Skillen, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, Different, or Both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1): 1-22.
2. Bornstein, D. (2004). *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Dees, J.G., Emerson J. and Economy, P. (2001). *Enterprising Nonprofits: A Toolkit for Social Entrepreneurs*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
4. European Commission. (2016) EntreComp: The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework. URL: https://eige.europa.eu/resources/lfna27939enn.pdf. Accessed on March 25, 2023.
5. Garcıa-Gonzalez, A. & Ramırez-Montoya, M. S. (2021) Social entrepreneurship education: change maker training at the university. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, Vol. 11: 5, pp. 1236-1251. URL: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/HESWBL-01-2021-0009/full/pdf?title=social-entrepreneurship-education-changemaker-training-at-the-university. Accessed on March 21, 2023.
6. George, G., McGahan, A. M. and Prabhu, J. (2012) Innovation for inclusive growth: towards a theoretical framework and research agenda. Journal of Management Studies, 49(4), pp. 661-683. URL: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35456307.pdf. Accessed on May 31, 2023.
7. Glennie, A., Ollard, J., Stanley, I. and Klingler-Vidra, R. (2020) Strategies for supporting inclusive innovation: insights from South-East Asia. UNDP. URL: https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/FINAL_PUBLICATION_UNDP-RBAP-Strategies-for-Supporting-Inclusive-Innovation-2020_2.pdf. Accessed on May 31, 2023.
8. Heeks, R., Amalia, M., Kintu, R. and Shah, N. (2013) Inclusive Innovation: Definition, Conceptualisation and Future Research Priorities. Working Paper Series. Paper No. 53. Manchester: Centre for Development Informatics, Institute for Development Policy and Management, SEED. URL: http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/subjects/idpm/research/publications/wp/di/. Accessed on June 1, 2023.
9. Johnson, B. & Andersen, A. D. (2012) *Learning, Innovation and Inclusive Development*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press. (cited in Heeks et al., 2013)

10. OECD (2021) *Inclusive Innovation Policy Toolkit*. URL: https://rri-tools.eu/-/the-oecd-s-inclusive-innovation-policy-toolkit. Accessed on May 30, 2023.
11. Vazquez-Parra, J. C., Garcıa-Gonzalez, A. & Ramırez-Montoya, M. S. (2020). Social entrepreneurship competency: an approach by discipline and gender. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 13: 5, pp. 1357-1373. URL: https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JARHE-09-2020-0317/full/pdf Accessed on March 20, 2023.

Teaching and learning approaches and methods used in II&SE education and training

Objective

This chapter contributes to the understanding, evaluation and subsequent selection of learning and teaching methodologies that most suit the aim of developing and scaffolding II&SE-related skills. Several methodologies, already used in II&SE curricula and whose pedagogical effectiveness has been analysed by researchers, are presented. This way, readers of this document can understand which methodologies are more in line with the objective of their II&SE courses, as well as identify the factors that are to be considered for a successful implementation of the methodology. This material should be seen as a portfolio of possible methodological options to be picked up according to particular variables, for example specific skills to be developed in the courses, available teaching resources and partnerships, etc.

Introduction

A literature review of scientific papers dedicated to teaching and learning methodologies used within Social Entrepreneurship courses has been conducted by Hattabou et al. (2021). It represents an overview of the most wide-spread and effective methodologies applied by higher education institutions to deliver and foster II&SE. First, all mentioned methodologies are listed to provide a summary of the existing alternatives that could be chosen; second, the ones recognized as more effective are analysed in detail, offering instructions on how to correctly perform them. Where available, a set of practical examples already applied in II&SE courses is provided. In addition, methodologies classified as relatively less effective are also presented in brief, so to ensure that this guide comprises a holistic set of teaching and learning methodologies scaffolding social entrepreneurship skills.

On the one hand, so called classical teaching methodologies have been applied so far to II&SE delivery in HEIs. The majority of them - except role-plays and case studies - focuses on raising awareness of what II&SE is ("teaching *about* II&SE") and which future career paths it opens for students (Alourhzal & Hattabou, 2021). Mainly characterized by teacher-centred approaches, they comprise – inter alia: frontal lectures addressing II&SE-related topics; readings; workbook exercises; case-based class discussions; discussions with experts; guest speakers from social businesses; individual coaching; and role plays. On the other hand, most-effective methodologies are those aiming at teaching students how to become social entrepreneurs ("teaching *for* and *through* II&SE)", and which include students' active involvement in real-life social entrepreneurship issues.

While teacher-centered methods can be easily tailored to the selected course content and primarily fulfil the need of transmitting knowledge, incorporating group social entrepreneurship projects into course curricula is the most effective mechanism for helping students build identity through active engagement (Chang, Benamraoui, & Rieple, 2014) (Smith

& Woodworth, 2012). Consequently, service and experiential learning projects stand out as major and most impactful learning methodologies: they can indeed support new entrepreneurs in developing an understanding of features such as financial risk and the importance of resource mobilization to generate real income (HEEG, 2011) (Pittaway, Rodriguez-Falcon, & Aiyegbayo, 2011).

Case study discussion

The power of case study methodologies largely consists in teaching managerial skills that cover conceptual skills (such as decision-making skills), functional skills (such as financial acumen skills), leadership skills (such as communication skills), interpersonal skills (such as teamwork skills) and integration capabilities (Jennings, 1996). According to Both et al. (2000), two case teaching methods exist, each with different features: case as skill development and case as conceptual development. The first aligns with the purposes of this material and has as objectives to solve puzzle, make recommendation or decision, and resolve a conflict. Students are prepared through this approach to gain the skills relevant in the strategic consultancy industry. The second is more abstract and aims at scaffolding students' critical-thinking skills by applying, criticizing and developing "theory against a background of complexity and ambiguity provided by the case" (Booth et al., 2000, p.65)

During the case-study "students assume the role of managers who make decisions based on incomplete and imperfect information as it would typically be the case in the real world. Thus, students are also held accountable for the quality of their decisions. The real protagonists of the business cases may also be invited into the classroom (or via Webcam/video-conferencing) to add a lively component to the discussion" (Rebeiz, 2011, p. 592).

The case-study method requires establishing two communication flows: students-students and teacher-students (Rebeiz, 2011). In the former, students are required to read the case study individually - a minimum 2-hour preparation is outlined as necessary - and then discuss them in small groups before the lecture, coming up with solutions. In the latter, the lecturer stimulates and guides the discussion.

Typical factors that enable this methodology to successfully scaffold skill development are diversity in groups, previous preparation of students, and quality of the chosen case study. In particular, the latter depends on authenticity, relevance, timeliness, and familiarity; a compelling narrative; and some kind of affective hook which will capture the students' imagination (Jennings, 1997; O'Cinneide, 1997; Towl, 1969). By contrast, critical aspects to be taken into account are classroom/group size - the bigger it is, the less likely students will express opinions. Furthermore, in large groups, the students' diversity in terms of cognitive abilities is bigger, which can pose difficulties to teaching staff when managing the discussion or assisting under-prepared students (Rebeiz, 2011; Booth, Bowie, Jordan & Rippin, 2000).

Role plays

"In role-play participants assume a specific role, enter a simulated scenario and behave as they expect they should in the circumstances" (Armstrong, 2003, p.6). While in case studies students act like managers (Rebeiz, 2011), role-plays offer a variety of roles students can pick up, e.g., local community residents, social entrepreneurs, profit-oriented shareholders, representative of social organizations (see Myyryläinen & Pajari 2022 for further examples). Grounding on this variety, students are indirectly forced to take into account different – at times contrasting – interests and perspectives on an issue (Armstrong, 2003) which enhances the development of empathetic understanding (Errington, 1997). To this regard, Errington (1997) argues role-plays deliver most enriching results when students play roles that are distant to their actual

ideological positions. In the context of II&SE this could be the case when students who are highly socially committed are required to act as profit-oriented shareholders that would rather not fund socially valuable projects within the company.

As case-study discussion, role-plays classify as a simulated learning by doing methodology (Armstrong, 2003) by the means of which students can demonstrate the acquired knowledge or gain new skills (Errington, 1997). Thanks also to the flexibility, role-plays can be adapted to the desired learning outcomes: both extremely complex scenarios and simple contexts can be simulated depending on the lecturers' resources and skills (Armstrong, 2003). Moreover, students can learn about themselves and develop feelings in the role they play without being continuously asked to express and logically justify their statements as in essays (Armstrong, 2003).

Moving to the design of role-plays, Errington (1997) defines four approaches: skill-, issue-, problem and speculative-based. Skill-based role-plays are particularly effective whenever tasks and performance criteria are clear and specific. Students are here required to acquire specific skills and present them to others, as this could be the case for developing and presenting a social entrepreneurial business model to the class in the role of a start-upper pitching to investors. In the issue-based variant, different beliefs and perspectives around an issue are confronted to then acquire a position. An issue could represent the proposal of expanding the current business model of a clean-energy company to build new plants aimed at selling energy to shareholders at fixed prices; students could here be shareholders wanting to invest in the projects, shareholders against the expansion, residents of the area in which the plant would be built, the CEO of the company (example taken from Myyryläinen & Pajari, 2022). Critical thinking skills are developed in this variant.

Next, problem-based role-plays foster the development of decision-making, inventive and team-work skills because students are confronted with a challenge they must tackle. Relative to II&SE, the challenge could be a drastic cut in the funds dedicated to a pool of highly interrelated social ventures that rely on each other's activities (e.g., foundations recruiting volunteers and organizations delivering assistance services to elderly people). Lastly, speculative-based role-play encourages students to speculate on the present, past and future events to find patterns and foresee future strategic actions. Hence, systematic thinking skills can be sustained. To this end, the role-play can be designed in a way students are asked to anticipate future social entrepreneurial trends either based on ad-hoc produced or actual evidence.

It is worth mentioning the opportunity of engaging students in online role-plays to scaffold their II&SE related soft skills does exist. Online role-play software has already been explored by some researchers specifically in the field of social entrepreneurship, as for instance the S-Cube project launched by O'Byrne et al. (2011).

Al in all, role-play has been assessed as particularly effective by Armstrong (2003) within a course on sustainable tourism for developing vocational skills, the comprehension of the business environment, oral business communication skills, interpersonal skills and teamwork. Though, for that specific case role-play delivered poor results when it came to stimulate students to acquire new knowledge referred to other fields as they enjoyed having an overview of other fields of study but were not willing to go deeper.

Armstrong (2003) recommends first assessing to what extent students are already familiar with role-playing in order to design it either in a simple or multi-layer way. As for the duration, the latter should be planned through trials and errors, and it should give students the possibility to deep dive in their roles. In addition, a "recency effect" is to be taken into account, which implies

students might at first find the whole role-play overwhelming. Albeit this is likely to disappear in the course of the role-play, as experienced by Armstrong.

Guest speakers from social enterprises

Guest speakers from the industry can provide business students with valuable practical knowledge and real-world examples. Their insight facilitates the integration of theory and practice within course content (Athavale, Davis & Myring, 2008; Bridges, 1999). Moreover, as suggested by Nakao et al. (2020), important elements of Social Entrepreneurship identified in literature (bricolage, effectuation, resource mobilization, reconfiguration of resources, and catalysing social change) can be embedded in guest speaker series.

However, several shortcomings prevent this learning methodology from delivering its full educational potential. For example, according to Karns (2005), students often find visits enjoyable, but not necessarily challenging, which results in lower impact of the guest-lecturing method on learning. Morrison, Sweeney and Heffernan (2003) found that students with visual and sequential styles usually dislike guest speakers. Taylor et al. (2004) concluded that students have low desire for guest speakers due to their failure "to grasp the significance of the guest speakers' comments to the course" (ibid, p. 47), leading to low level of active listening and participation during meetings.

To render such methodology more effective and an actual learning opportunity, Dalakas (2016) elaborated a new approach. It consists in requiring students to hand in graded assignments on guest speakers. The specific steps applied by the professor include the following:

- While scheduling the visit, speakers are asked to submit brief information regarding their specific areas and duties, including any relevant websites students should visit to get insight.
- Students are required to prepare a draft about the speaker's organization and industry.
- Students then prepare questions that are due two-three days before the speaker's visit. The questions should be based on knowledge gathered in their draft and should contain the rationale that links it to course material.
- Students usually submit three questions for every speaker. Each question is graded by the lecturer separately, with the lowest of the three scores being dropped. Grading grounds on:
    - depth of background knowledge on company/industry,
    - successful connection to class concepts/material,
    - importance of question (quality of rationale for asking specific questions).
- All questions are submitted to the professor first. Once received, they are organized in a unique file, eliminating similar ones, and subsequently submitted to the speaker before the visit. By doing so, the speaker is familiar with the key topics that will be covered.
- During the actual visit, after a brief introduction by the professor and a short introductory opening by the speaker (5-10 minutes), the students begin asking their questions, including their rationale for asking the question, leading to an energetic and interactive experience for both the students and the speakers.

Students are provided a guide on how to write good questions by the lecturer, which underlines different levels of questions' complexity, starting with very simple and proceeding to deeper and context-conscious ones. Although the abovementioned approach has been elaborated for marketing courses, it could be easily adapted to II&SE, considering the common business nature of the two disciplines.

Experiential learning

"Experiential learning is a powerful form of learning because it involves direct experience of the phenomenon being studied rather than simply reading or thinking about it (Kickul, Griffiths &

Bacq, 2010; Kolb, 1984; Tracey & Phillips, 2007)" (Chang, Benamraoui & Rieple, 2014, p. 4). It can relate to two kinds of experiential learning environments: simulated and real-life. Notably, this paragraph focuses on the latter because case studies (as a form of simulated environment) have already been explored in the previous section. Here the emphasis is placed on real-life learning contexts, which target "the development of an individual's practical skills and attributes, as well as both tacit and explicit knowledge (Gibb, 1987, 1993, 2000, 2002) within real situations, in which the learner is an active participant (Revans, 1982)" (Chang, Benamraoui & Rieple, 2014, p. 5).

Real-life experiential learning methodologies include "internships (Severance & Starr, 2011), field placements (Elrod & Simon, 2008; Mobley, 2007), apprenticeships, in addition short term "live'" projects working with "real'" people in real roles." (Chang, Benamraoui & Rieple, 2014, p. 4). On the one hand, apprenticeships and internships provide deep students' exposure and cover a wider array of social entrepreneurship related topics. Though, they are less attractive for students who do not want to engage for extended periods of time. On the other hand, live projects are characterized by a narrower scope and exposure, but are richer than normal class-room lectures.

The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor's survey (GEM, 2008) of 38 countries proved that experiential learning was a successful tactic of forming entrepreneurs, reinforced by studies in Singapore (Tan & Ng, 2006), Finland (Heinonen & Poikkijoki, 2006), Norway (Lewis, 2005), and the UK (Rae, 2003). In light of this evidence, experiential learning classifies as a potentially significant element of a social entrepreneurship curriculum (Tracey & Phillips, 2007), where learning comes about as the result of the accumulation of transforming experiences (Kolb, 1984; Politis, 2005; Rae, 2003; Sarasvathy, 2001).

To provide a concrete example, Chang et al. (2014) introduced an income-generating project in the undergraduate module "Developing a Small Business" at a UK business school and noticed positive effects on students' skill development. A brief explanation of the project was followed by practical assignments. Students were divided in groups and required to choose among four social enterprises; then, for the selected ones, raising funds through different events and projects represented the main task of the project. The scarce budget and limited time, together with the need of working with different groups of people provided a stimulating environment (Pittaway & Cope, 2007). Interesting design elements, helping understand students' thoughts and skill development were weekly reflective logs students were required to fill in, as well as regular monitoring through a university online page. Moreover, Just Giving Pages for online fund raising, created by each group, allowed the teaching staff to further monitor updates and assess activities carried out by each team. Regular contact and feedback came from the social enterprises and the teaching staff. It is also worth mentioning that students were weekly delivered SE related contents, which were then immediately put in practice.

Overall, Chang et al. (2014) observed students were able to appreciate social entrepreneurship ideological principles; understand the needs of beneficiaries; mobilize scarce resources; work with diverse stakeholders and comprehend the important social and economic measures to be applied when assessing the performance of social enterprises. Such results are in line with findings of other researchers, according to which the use of real fund raising pushes students towards random events and therefore builds a stimulating and dynamic environment that fosters students to be flexible and experiment (Pittaway & Cope, 2007) in order to come up and develop new business ideas (Gibb, 2002).

Service learning

Several definitions have been coined regarding the service-learning methodology – hereinafter SL. Following the definitions of, for example Bringle and Hatcher (1996) and Zlotkowski (1998), SL formats are defined by Halberstadt et al. (2019, p. 3) as "those kinds of modules or seminars designed to teach students about topics stipulated in the curricula while using community service settings. Compared to traditional teaching formats, SL approaches build synergies between subject-specific and generic skill development (Seifert, Zentner, & Nagy, 2012) as well as taking societal responsibility (Dewey, 1996)". Students are engaged in activities that address human and community needs by integrating academic material, service activities that benefit the community, and critical reflection that allows students to connect academic material to broader issues (Jacoby, 1996).

SL has recently gained increasing importance in research and higher education (Hatcher & Erasmus, 2008; Ni & Tian, 2017; O'Grady, 2014). As Butin (2006, p. 473) stresses, "the service-learning movement has become – indeed – a major presence within higher education". Dolgon (2014) and Jacoby (2015) highlighted the interdependencies existing between SE and SL: SE can benefit from SL's focus on campus-community reciprocity, while service-learning can take advantage of social entrepreneurship's emphasis on impact assessment and sustainability. Furthermore, Halberstadt et al. (2019) investigated the suitability of SL for SE education and came to positive results, which confirm this type of learning methodology deserves attention when designing SE curricula.

The group of competencies discussed below, identified by Halberstadt et al. (2019) as pivotal for social entrepreneurs, are positively scaffolded by SL:

- Social entrepreneurial opportunity recognition competence, defined by the authors as the capability of identifying social entrepreneurial potential and converting it into concrete ideas and realizing them;
- Social entrepreneurial management competence, the capability for implementation and management of the social business/project;
- Entrepreneurial self-efficacy, the ability to believe in one's own entrepreneurial competence, considered one of the strongest individual-level predictors of engagement in entrepreneurship (Halberstadt, Krau, Gundolf, & Timm, 2019).

In general, SL approaches (compared to traditional formats) do have a positive impact on students' competences (Halberstadt, Krau, Gundolf, & Timm, 2019). Remarkably, the conducted study indicates that (in the selected courses) the major effect was detected on communication and interaction skills. "This can be traced back to the group work performed by students as well as the real-world experience and various interaction scenarios that students experience during SL formats. This finding is in line with other studies showing that SL scaffolds personal skills (Halberstadt, Krau, Gundolf & Timm, 2019, p. 17). The authors argue communication and interaction skills are essential in opportunity research capabilities and in SE management competences. Thus, SL benefits SE skill development.

Integration perspectives

Moving from the assumption students have different beliefs and attitudes both in general, as well as relative to II&SE, Sinha & Thomas (2014) suggest designing the delivery of II&SE courses through a 6-step approach that progressively guides students from basic to a social entrepreneurial education. The model developed by the authors encompasses different stages, each associated with specific learning methodologies.

First, the basics of managing education should be delivered to students – with focus on specific areas, such as long-term profitability, efficiency, sustainability and economics of resource allocation – through classical frontal lectures. Then, students are made aware of possible social opportunities and initiatives to create a sustainable solution by helping others. This outcome can be obtained by the means of workshops, seminars and further insights can be stimulated through classroom debates, individual assignments or role-plays. In stage 3, students discover the social values and perceptions underpinning social business institutions thanks to community outreach and site visits, in which they can start meeting relevant stakeholders in the sector. Next, series of lectures with social entrepreneurs and public policy experts sharing their insights would enhance students' comprehension of what social impact means. Stage 5 involves one-to-one mentoring sessions aimed at helping students come up with and develop market oriented innovative solutions after the previous phases provided them with a deeper immersion in the strategic challenges of II&SE. Lastly, consulting projects and internships can serve as enablers to push students towards the search for solutions to concrete social problems.

Sinha & Thomas (2014) designed the model in the assumption that abundant financial resources and a social entrepreneurship centre are present at HEIs: as this might not be the case for all HEIs, the model is here presented as a source of inspiration to combine different methodologies with the aim of fulfilling multiple and interconnected learning outcomes and scaffolding several II&SE in a holistic perspective.

Findings of the analysis of study programme and consultation with stakeholders

In line with the literature review results, the analysis of study programmes/ courses and the findings of the stakeholder consultation meetings showcase the benefits of combining the following teaching-learning approaches and methods in a course dedicated to inclusive innovation and social entrepreneurship:

- Preference for learning-by-doing over traditional lecturing, yet using lectures to provide foundational knowledge of the theory underpinning practical activities related to innovation and entrepreneurship;
- Use of case studies and study visits to social enterprises;
- Involvement of grassroots innovators and social entrepreneurs (including alumni) as guest lecturers;
- Facilitating experiential learning through engaging in innovation development and social enterprise design activity, including idea pitching (e.g. presenting projects – inclusive innovation ideas and social business ideas to jury).

Conclusion

Both classical classroom-based methodologies – e.g., frontal lectures, role-plays, meetings with guest speakers – and real-life experiential learning methodologies – e.g., service learning, internships, and live projects – have been applied in II&SE curricula. However, research has highlighted the second group of methodologies is the most effective to convey and scaffold II&SE related skills as it pushes students to manage multiple factors at a time, confront with actual stakeholder needs and understand underlying challenges of II&SE in a real scenario. Teachers should decide which methodology to apply based on a series of factors, such as the partnerships available with actual social enterprises, policymakers and institutions; the financial resources, the length of the course and the desired learning outcomes. An approach integrating different methodologies is also recommended by some researchers to holistically enhance social entrepreneurial skills.

Reflection questions

1. What kinds of social challenges are personally important to students?

2. Which are the intended learning outcomes of my course? Which specific II&SE related skills should students develop by the end of the course?
3. How many hours per week does the course/module comprehend and how much time is available for live projects?
4. How many ECTS are related to the course/module which might justify more demanding learning methodologies as role-plays or live projects?
5. Which resources are at my disposal (e.g., partnership with external actors, copyrighted case-studies, and access to role-play software)?
6. How big is the class and which is students' attendance rate?

References

1. Alourhzal, H., & Hattabou, A. (2021). Social Entrepreneurship Education: A systematic review of curricula contents and teaching methods. African Scientific Journal, Vol : 3, Number 7, 1-22.
2. Armstrong, E. K. (2003) Applications of Role-Playing in Tourism Management Teaching: An Evaluation of a Learning Method, Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, Vol.2, n.1.
3. Athavale, M., Davis, R., & Myring, M. (2008). The integrated business curriculum: An examination of perceptions and practices. Journal of Education for Business, Vol. 83, 295-301.
4. Bingle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 67 No. 2, 221-239.
5. Booth, C., Bowie, S., Jordan, J., & Rippin, A. (2000). The Use of the Case Method in Large and Diverse Undergraduate Business. International Journal of Management Education, 62-75.
6. Bridges, S. (1999). Oral case exams in marketing: Enhancing and evaluating communication and problem-solving skills. Marketing Education Review, 9, 25-31.
7. Butin, D. (2006). The limits of service-learning in higher education. The Review of Higher Education, Vol. 29, No 4, 473-498.
8. Chang, J., Benamraoui, A., & Rieple, A. (2014). Learning-by-doing as an approach toteaching social entrepreneurship. Innovations in Education and Teaching International,51(5), 459-471.
9. Change, J., Benamraoui, A., & Rieple, A. (2014). Learning-by-doing as an approach to teaching social entrepreneurship. Innovations in Education and Teaching International 51(5), 1-45.
10. Dalakas, V. (2016). Turning Guest Speakers' Visits into Active Learning Opportunities. Atlantic Marketing Journal, Vol. 5 (2), 93-100.
11. Dewey, J. (1996). Democracy and Education. New York: Free Press.
12. Dolgon, C. (2014). Social enterprise and social justice in civic engagement. Email message to HE-SL Listserv.
13. Elrod, L., & Simon, M. (2008). Service Learning. In B. Dietz, & L. Ritchey, Scaffolding for Successful Student Learning: Effective Practices in Using Instructional Strategies (pp. 84-110). Washington, DC: American Sociology Association.
14. Errington, E. (1997) Role-play. Canberra: Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Inc.
15. GEM. (2008). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2008 Global Report. Retrieved from GEMconsortium.org: ttp://www.GEMconsortiumorg/docs/264/gem-2008-global-report
16. GIbb, A. (1987). Enterprise culture and its meaning and implications for education and training. Journal of European Industrial Training, Vol. 11, 1-36.
17. Gibb, A. (1993). The enterprise culture and education: understanding enterprise education and its links with small business, entrepreneurship and wider educational goals . International Small Business Journal, 3-32.

18. Gibb, A. (2000). Corporate restructuring and entrepreneurship: what can large organizations learn from small? Enterprise and Innovation". Management Studies, Vol. 1, 19-35.
19. Gibb, A. (2002). In pursuit of new enterprise and entrepreneurship paradigm for learning: creative destruction, new values, new ways of doing things and new combinations of knowledge. International Journal of Management Reviews, Vol. 4, 233-269.
20. Halberstadt, J., Krau, S., Gundolf, K., & Timm, J. (2019). Skills and knowledge management in. Journal of Knowledge Management, 1-25.
21. Hatcher, J., & Erasmus, M. (2008). Service-learning in the United States and South Africa: A comparative analysis informed by John Dewey and Julius Nyerere. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 49-61.
22. HEEG. (2011). An exploration of the use of student-run, real businesses in the South EastRegion, the UK and internationally for all or part of the award of a university degree . Surrey HEEG project final report.
23. Heinonen, J., & Poikkijoki, S. (2006). An entrepreneurial-directed approach to entrepreneurship education: mission impossible? Journal of Management Development, Vol. 25, 80-94.
24. Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-learning in today's higher education: An overview. In B. Jacoby, Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
25. Jacoby, B. (2015). Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
26. Jennings, D. (1996). Strategic management and the case method. Journal of Management Development, 15(9), 4-12.
27. Jennings, D. (1997). Researching and writing strategic management cases: A systems view. Management Decision 35 (2), 100-105.
28. Karns, G. (2005). An update of marketing student perceptions of learning activities: Structure, preferences, and effectiveness. Journal of Marketing Education, Vol. 25, 163-171.
29. Kickul, J., Griffiths, M., & Bacq, B. (2010). The boundary-less classroom: Extending social innovation and impact learning to the field. Journal of Small Business andEnterprise Development, Vol. 17, 652-663.
30. Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential Learning. Prentice-Hall, NJ: Englewood Cliffs.
31. Lewis, K. (2005). The best of intentions: future plans of Young Enterprise Scheme participants. Education and Training, Vol. 47, 470-483.
32. Mobley, C. (2007). Breaking ground engaging undergraduates in social change through service learning. Teaching Sociology, Vol. 35, 125-137.
33. Morrison, M., Sweeney, A., & Heffernan, T. (2003). Learning styles of on campus and off-campus marketing students: The challenge for marketing educators. Journal of Marketing Education, Vol. 25, 208-2017.
34. Myyryläinen, H. and Pajari, A. (2023) Toolkit for reflexivity exercises for social entrepreneurship education. LAB University of Applied Sciences Publications, Vol. 65.
35. Nakao, K., & Nashide, Y. (2020). The development of social entrepreneurship education in Japan. Entrepreneurship Education volume 3, , 95-117.
36. Ni, H., & Tian, J. (2017). Sendra L. Enos: service-learning and social entrepreneurship in higher education. Higher Education, 561-563.
37. O'Byrne, D., Dell'Aquila, E., Lean, J., Moizer, J., Walsh, P. and Friedrich, R. (2014) European Social Enterprises and Opportunities for Soft Skill Development Using Online Role Play, University of Plymouth Press.
38. O'Grady, C. (2014). Integrating Service Learning and Multicultural Education in Colleges and Universities. Abingdon: Routledge.
39. O'Cinneide, B. (1997). The role and effectivenessof case studies; student performance in casestudy vs 'theory' examinations. Journal ofEuropean Industrial Training, 21 (1), 3-13.

40. Pittaway, L., & Cope, J. (2007). Simulating entrepreneurial learning: Assessing the utilityof experiential learning designs. Management Learning, Vol. 38, 211-233.
41. Pittaway, L., Rodriguez-Falcon, E., & Aiyegbayo , O. (2011). The role ofentrepreneurship clubs and societies in entrepreneurial learning". International Small Business Journal, Vol 29, 37-57.
42. Politis, D. (2005). The process of entrepreneurial learning: a conceptual framework. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Vol. 29,, 399-424.
43. Rae, D. (2003). Opportunity centred learning: an innovation in enterprise education? Education and Training, Vol. 45, 542-549.
44. Rebeiz, K. (2011). An Insider Perspective on Implementing the Harvard Case Study Method in Business Teaching. US-China Education Review, 591-601.
45. Revans, R. (1982). The Origins and Growth of Action Learning,. London: Chartwell-Bratt.
46. Sarasvathy, S. (2001). Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift fromeconomic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. The Academy of ManagementReview, Vol. 26, 243-263.
47. Seifert, A., Zentner, S., & Nagy, F. (2012). Praxishandbuch Service-Learning. Lernen Durch Engagement an Schulen. Weinheim: Beltz.
48. Severance, T., & Starr, P. (2011). Beyond the classroom internships and students with special needs. Teaching Sociology, Vol. 39, 200-207.
49. Sinha, K.P. and Thomas, S. (2014) Teaching social entrepreneurship development through the juxtaposition of heart and head, Indian Journal of Economics & Business, Vol. 13, No. 3, 331-339
50. Smith, I., & Woodworth, W. (2012). Developing Social Entrepreneurs and SocialInnovators: A Social Identity and Self-Efficacy Approach. . Academy of ManagementLearning & Education, 11(3), 390-407.
51. Tan, S., & Ng, C. (2006). A problem-based learning approach to entrepreneurship education. Education and Training, 416-428.
52. Taylor, S., Humphreys, M., Singley, R., & Hunter, G. (2004). Business Student preferences: Exploring the relative importance of web management incourse design. Journal of Marketing Education, Vol. 26, 42-49.
53. Towl, A. (1969). To study administration by cases. Boston, MA: Harvard Graduate SchoolPress.
54. Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. (2007). The distinctive challenge of educating social entrepreneurs: a postscript and rejoinder to the special issue on entrepreneurship education. Academy of Management Learning Education, 264-271.
55. Zlotkowski , E. (1998). Successful Service-Learning Programs. New Models of Excellence in Higher Education. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Approaches and methods for assessing the impact of II&SE education at universities

Objective

This chapter provides an overview of the impact of II&SE education at individual, institutional, economic and social levels. It also discusses the impact measurement methods and tools at each of these levels. The chapter includes a good practice presenting the process of entrepreneurship impact assessment, developed by the European Commission (2015) that could be applied to II&SE education in HEIs.

Introduction

Inclusive Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship Education can make impact on a variety of stakeholders, including learners, teachers, universities that deliver it, businesses and communities among others. Measuring impact enables teams involved in delivering II&SE education to demonstrate its effectiveness and make future improvements. It offers insights into the accomplishments of students and highlights the opportunities for further development. It allows higher education institutions to identify strength and weaknesses in design and delivery of II&SE education programmes and courses, thus improving its quality and outcomes.

Entrepreneurship education may aim to accomplish a variety of goals, such as increasing awareness of what entrepreneurship is, improving learners' ability to approach the "world of work" in entrepreneurial way, and educating learners' on how to run and manage their own business (Hytti & Kuopusjärvi, 2004). Social entrepreneurship education may aim at increasing awareness of social problems and educating learners on how to solve them through social enterprise and social innovation (Brock & Steiner, 2009). Education in inclusive innovation should be aimed to involve community members in solving these social problems through innovation. The goals pursuing impact on economy and society may include raising start-up rates, increasing employability of learners and their productivity at future workplace, and enhancing social inclusion. The assessment of the impact of II&SE education, therefore, should show how these goals and objectives were achieved and what effect they had not only on learners receiving this education, but also on other stakeholders, on the economy and the society at large.

Impact of II&SE education

The impact of II&SE education at individual level focuses on learners' entrepreneurship skills, attitudes, behaviour and intention to start a business. There are plenty of studies that prove positive impact of entrepreneurship education on learners' business knowledge and financial literacy (Tucker, 2011), persistence and self-organization, team-working, problem-solving, decision-making and leadership skills (Volery & Mueller, 2013), as well as the ability to identify opportunities and develop innovative business ideas (Athayde, 2012). Entrepreneurship education is also associated with enhancing learners' sense of self-efficacy (i.e. the belief in the ability of the individual to complete tasks) and locus of control (i.e. the ability of the individual to control events affecting them) (Caird, 2023). Furthermore, entrepreneurship education increases perception of learners about entrepreneurship as a viable career option (Johansen, 2007; Volery & Mueller, 2013).

In addition, employing entrepreneurship education strategy makes impact on university teachers, in particular their capacity to use teaching approaches and methods conducive to the development of the above-mentioned skills and attitudes. These include:

- Participatory methods, such as group work, project-based learning, and role play;

- Learning by doing methods, such as problem-based learning and simulation;
- Methods involving learning outside of the classroom, such as field trips and study tours;
- Methods involving participation of external stakeholders in the education process, such inviting guest lecturers to classes;
- Methods helping learners to unlock their creative and innovative potential, such as using different creative thinking techniques.

The usage of these teaching methods, on the one hand, fosters the development of entrepreneurial competence in learners. And on the other hand, it boosts the teachers' sense of self-efficacy, i.e. the belief about their capability to make students achieve the desired learning outcomes (Zaidatol & Bagheri, 2011). Furthermore, the assessment of changes in teachers can help to measure the impact of II&SE education at institutional (university) level, because the capacity of teachers to arrange an effective educational process is a prerequisite for acceptance and promotion of innovation and entrepreneurship education (EC, 2015).

At the level of economy, the impact of II&SE education consists in increasing start-up rates, creating successful (social) ventures and enhancing graduates' employability. Research evidence shows that alumni of entrepreneurship education programmes are more likely to launch their own business at younger age and are more successful in running business than entrepreneurs who has not come through dedicated training (EC, 2015, p. 67). Entrepreneurship education also has positive impact on employability of alumni. In particular, those who finished an entrepreneurship programme are found to be better prepared to find a job, get better positions and higher salary (ibid, p. 69). Teaching (inclusive) innovation as part of university course or programme also contributes to start-up success and to employability of graduates. Innovation has been found to maximize the growth potential of start-ups (Fiorentino et al., 2021), provide a significant competitive advantage to start-ups and allow them to meet customer needs in a unique and more efficient way (Sevilla-Bernardo et all, 2022). Innovation skills are viewed as "antecedents of employability" and as a prerequisite for gainful employment (Singh et al., 2017).

In terms of social impact, II&SE education may enhance students' protective factors against social exclusion. Entrepreneurship education enhances self-confidence, self-esteem and self-efficacy of learners, particularly those coming from under-represented or disadvantaged groups. By developing entrepreneurial competences vulnerable learners get a better chance of employment, self-employment or creating their own business. This improves their labour market participation and provides an opportunity for them to earn more, to improve the standard of living, to become more active members of the society, which enhances social inclusion (OECD, 2018). Inclusive innovation per se is a driver of social development, because it implies the inclusion of disadvantaged groups in the mainstream development (Heeks et al, 2013). Thus, preparing learners to develop inclusive innovation could potentially result in creating more goods and services for disadvantaged groups, which will improve the quality of their life. This may also create a positive impact on the society.

Measuring impact of II&SE education

Methods and tools for measuring impact of II&SE education should be adjusted to the goals of the course/ programme, the objectives of the measurement and the target groups. The most frequently used method for impact measurement is survey/ questionnaire, because it can easily be adapted to the goals and objectives pursued. Online surveys provide additional advantages, such as the ease of reaching out to the target group (e.g. link shared by email), time and place flexibility (possibility to complete the questionnaire at any time and place convenient to the respondents), and cost-effectiveness (e.g. saved costs of printing paper-based questionnaires). Questionnaires are also useful, because they allow for gathering both quantitative and qualitative results. Quantitative results, usually collected through closed questions, are

particularly important for comparing pre- and post-programme results and evaluating the level of improvement. Qualitative results, usually collected through open-ended questions, are valuable for gaining insights into the perceptions of learners and other stakeholders about the quality of the programme (Cohen et al., 2010). Questionnaires should be based on a proven methodology, appropriate for the measurement objectives. For example, if the objective is to measure the impact of II&SE programme or course on the knowledge, skills and attitudes of learners, the questionnaire could be based on Bloom's or Biggs's taxonomy of learning outcomes. When the objective is to measure the level or intensity of a certain characteristic (e.g. intention to start a business), the Likert scale could be used.

Other methods used for impact measurement include (EC, 2015):

- Interviews with learners, teachers and other stakeholders (the interviewees should be asked questions allowing them to reflect on the subject of assessment/ measurement);
- Observation of learners (incidental observation of how they perform at regular classes and planned observation of how they manage to implement an assignment given specifically for the purpose of assessment/ measurement);
- Analysis of learners' portfolios (evidence of learning), diaries or journals (reflection on learning experience);
- Applying "thinking aloud protocol" (asking learners to verbalize everything that goes through their mind while implementing a task; this method is used to understand learners' reasoning behind the decisions they make in the process of task implementation).

It is also possible to combine different methods of impact measurement depending on the objectives. For example, a quantitative questionnaire can be combined with an interview (qualitative method). Or ongoing observation of learners can be combined with a pre- and post-training survey. These methods are mainly used for assessing and measuring impact at individual and institutional level.

Measuring impact on economy and society is a challenging task, because it is hardly possible to attribute the observed and measured effects to a single programme or course. The methods used for measuring economic impact include surveys aimed at identifying the percentage of alumni who founded a company, the number of jobs created by the alumni's companies, the level of innovativeness of these companies, among others indicators. Then, the results of this measurement should be compared with the relevant national statistics data. The data on start-up establishment and employment rates could also be used to make inferences about the social impact related to reduced unemployment and improved income levels. Indirectly, the impact of II&SE education on the society could be assessed through the analysis of social innovations and social enterprises established by the alumni. The criteria for such assessment could include the extent to which the innovation or enterprise enhances access to services (including education, social services, etc.) for disadvantaged groups, promotes fundamental rights (including equity and equality) and/or improves public health and safety. The methods of social impact measurement could be based on cost-benefit analysis, however it is difficult to achieve because most social impacts are difficult to monetarize (EC, 2015; Centre for European Policy Studies, 2010).

Good practice: Guidelines for impact measurement

European Commission (2015) provides guidelines for measuring impact of entrepreneurship education structured in the following 14 steps:

1. Decide on the definition of key terms (what is meant by entrepreneurship education impact)
2. Decide on the goals of the measurement (what is the focus of measurement, what tools are going to be used, when the assessment is going to take place, which stakeholders are going

to be involved)
3. Align the goals of the measurement with the goals of the education programme
4. Align the measurement tools with the key definitions and goals of the measurement
5. Adjust the tools to the target group (e.g. to age and educational background) and test the tools before launching the measurement
6. Collect quantitative data for clearer attribution and scaling of the impact
7. Carefully select the sample (e.g. bigger size of the sample to ensure statistically meaningful results; avoiding self-selection bias)
8. Include a control group, where possible (involving individuals that did not participate in the programme)
9. Rely on renowned statistical tools and techniques
10. Ensure a high response rate (e.g. designing questionnaires in a more appealing way: shorter, with few open questions)
11. Recognize the benefits and limitations of self-assessment (benefits: perception of improved knowledge and skills may indicate readiness to start to a business; limitation: perceptions do not mean that actual change in behaviour will occur)
12. Include a pre- and post- survey (important for measuring behavioural impact)
13. Adjust the number of measurements to the programme's duration (for short programmes: measurement before and after; for long programmes: before, right after, several months after and several years after)
14. Prove causality (i.e. that the programme led to specific results / effects)

This process was developed based on the analysis of 66 examples of impact measurement, identified as a result of literature review and interviews with 114 experts from 43 countries (28 EU member states and 15 other countries). It is recommended for application at different education levels, including higher education.

This good practice can be transferred to different contexts and be applied for the assessment of social entrepreneurship impact, because it defines the logic behind the impact measurement and allows for developing specific measurement approaches and tools in accordance with the objectives of the programmes and the profile of learners.

Examples of impact indicators

Below is a list of indicators that HEIs could use for measuring impact of II&SE education:

- Number (No) of students who enrolled in an II&SE course and successfully completed it
- No of students who established a social business or implemented an II&SE project in two years following the completion of the II&SE course
- No of graduates employed in social and/or innovative companies
- No of faculty members involved in II&SE research projects and II&SE courses
- No of scientific publications in the field of II&SE made by faculty members
- No of conferences, forums, stakeholder roundtables, etc. dedicated to II&SE issues that the University conducted
- No of research or educational projects in the field of II&SE carried out by the University
- No of people informed about and involved in these projects

Conclusion

The impacts of II&SE education are diverse. These include:
- improved innovation and entrepreneurship competences of learners and enhanced instructional design skills of teachers at individual level;
- enhanced culture of innovation and (social) entrepreneurship in HEIs at institutional level;

- improved employability and increased start-up activity of graduates at the level of economy; and
- potentially reduced unemployment rates, improved standard of living of graduates, and increased number of inclusive innovations and social enterprises, addressing different social needs, at the level of society.

The most common method of impact measurement is surveys/ questionnaires; other methods include interviews, observations, assessment of portfolios, diaries and journals of learners. When impact is measured at economic or social level, these methods should be complemented with the analysis of relevant statistical data and/or cost-benefit analysis. The methods and tools for measuring impact of II&SE education should always be aligned with the objectives of the study programme/ course, the objectives of the impact measurement, and with the specific characteristics of the target groups.

Reflection questions:

1. What approaches, methods and tools for assessing and measuring impact of education, in particular in the field of entrepreneurship, does your institution use? How effective are these approaches, methods and tools?
2. What are the challenges in evaluating the impact of II&SE education in your local / national context? How can these be overcome?
3. Which of the measurement methods discussed in this chapter could be applicable to your context?

List of references:

1. Athayde, R. (2012) Impact: 50 years of young enterprise. (Technical Report) Young Enterprise. Kingston University London.
2. Brock, D. and Steiner, S. (2009) Social Entrepreneurship Education: Is it Achieving the Desired Aims? SSRN Electronic Journal. Feb. 2009. DOI:10.2139/ssrn.1344419
3. Caird, S. (2023) GET2 test. URL: http://www.get2test.net/. Accessed on May 15, 2023.
4. Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2010) Research methods in Education. 6th edition. London: Routledge.
5. Centre for European Policy Studies. (2010) Study on Social Impact Assessment as a tool for mainstreaming social inclusion and social protection concerns in public policy in EU Member States. Executive summary. URL: https://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=6315&langId=en. Accessed on May 25, 2023.
6. European Commission. (2015) Entrepreneurship Education: A Road to Success: A compilation of evidence on the impact of entrepreneurship education strategies and measures Growth. URL: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c6590fd6-3e54-4989-bbe0-21d9785dff54. Accessed on April 10, 2023.
7. Fiorentino, R., Longobardi, S. and Scaletti, A. (2021) The early growth of start-ups: innovation matters. Evidence from Italy. European Journal of Innovation Management, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 1525-1546. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-02-2020-0057
8. Hytti, U. and Kuopusjärvi, P. (2004) Evaluating and Measuring Entrepreneurship and Enterprise Education: Methods, Tools and Practices. Entreva project (FIN/02/C/P/RF-82501). Small Business Institute, Business Research and Development Centre: Turku School of Economics and Business Administration.
9. Johansen, V. (2007) Experiences from participation in JA-YE Company Programmes. What experiences did participants in Company Programmes have during their time as company founders - and what happened next? Lillehammer: Eastern Norway Research Institute.
10. OECD. (2018) Strengthening social inclusion through inclusive entrepreneurship. Policy note. SME Ministerial Conference, 22-23 February 2018, Mexico City.

11. Sevilla-Bernardo, J., Sanchez-Robles, B. and Herrador-Alcaide, T. (2022) Success Factors of Startups in Research Literature within the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem. Adm. Sci. 2022, 12(3), 102; https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12030102
12. Singh, R., Chawla, G., Agarwal, S. & Desai, A. (2017). Employability and innovation: Development of a scale. International Journal of Innovation Science. 9. 20-37. DOI: 10.1108/IJIS-10-2016-0041.
13. Tucker, J. (2011) Making an impact. Assessing Junior Achievement of Canada's value creation. The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.
14. Volery, T and Mueller, S. (2013) The impact of entrepreneurship education on human capital at upper-secondary level. Journal of Small Business Management 51 (3), pp. 429-0. DOI: 10.1111/jsbm.12020
15. Zaidatol, L. Ph. and Bagheri, A. (2011) Teachers' and Students' Entrepreneurial Self-efficacy: Implication for Effective Teaching Practices. Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences. 29: 1071-1080. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.340.

Annex 1. Definitions of Inclusive Innovation

Author	Definition
Heeks et al., 2013	"Inclusive Innovation is the means by which new goods and services are developed for and/or by those who have been excluded from the development mainstream; particularly the billions living on lowest incomes".
Foster and Heeks, 2013	"Inclusive Innovation explicitly conceives development in terms of active inclusion of those who are excluded from the mainstream of development. Differing in its foundational view of development, inclusive innovation therefore refers to the inclusion within some aspect of innovation of groups who are currently marginalised".
Johnson and Andersen, 2012	"In the context of Inclusive Innovation, the narrow understanding of inclusion is "reducing income inequality and bringing the poor out of poverty through raising their income"; the broad definition is "giving rights, voice, capabilities and incentives for the excluded to become active participants in processes of development and innovation".
George et al., 2012	"Inclusive growth can be viewed as a desired outcome of innovative initiatives that target individuals in disenfranchised sectors of society as well as, at the same time, a characteristic of the processes by which such innovative initiatives occur".
Cozzens and Sutz (2012:12)	"Innovation needs to be 'inclusive' in at least two ways: inclusive in terms of the process by which it is achieved and inclusive in terms of the problems and the solutions it is related to".
Glennie et al., 2020 (UNDP)	Inclusive Innovation - "a type of innovation that fosters inclusion and reinforces the SDGs", "a means of addressing societal challenges and fostering more inclusive ecosystems". "Inclusive innovation describes the pursuit of innovation that has social aims, and local context, at its heart. One can think of it as either – and both – a more inclusive approach to innovation or a more innovative approach to driving social inclusion".
Klingler-Vidra et al., 2022	"Innovation offers potential: to cure diseases, to better connect people, and to make the way we live and work more efficient and enjoyable. At the same time, innovation can fuel inequality, decimate livelihoods, and harm mental health. Inclusive innovation – innovation motivated by environmental and social aims – is able to uplift the benefits of innovation while reducing its harms".
Digital Promise (Inclusive Innovation Center)	"Inclusive Innovation is an equity-centered R&D model that seeks to affect change by supporting communities and schools in co-designing solutions that embody novel and differentiated approaches. Inclusive Innovation starts by intentionally creating and catalyzing opportunities for communities—including students, parents, families, organizers—to be at the education R&D table with district leaders, educators, researchers, and developers".
OECD, 2021	"Inclusive innovation policies are defined as innovation policies that aim to remove barriers to the participation of under-represented individuals, social groups, firms, sectors and regions in innovation, research and entrepreneurship activities. Their goal is that all segments of society have opportunities to successfully participate in and benefit from innovation".

1. Heeks, R., Amalia, M., Kintu, R. and Shah, N. (2013) *Inclusive Innovation: Definition, Conceptualisation and Future Research Priorities*. Working Paper Series. Paper No. 53. Manchester: Centre for Development Informatics, Institute for Development Policy and

Management, SEED. URL: http://www.seed.manchester.ac.uk/subjects/idpm/research/publications/wp/di/. Accessed on June 1, 2023.
2. Foster, C. & Heeks, R. B. (2013) Conceptualising inclusive innovation: modifying systems of innovation frameworks to understand diffusion of new technology to low-income consumers. *European Journal of Development Research*, 25(3), pp. 333-355. URL: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/ejdr.2013.7. Accessed on June 1, 2023.
3. Johnson, B. & Andersen, A. D. (2012) Learning, Innovation and Inclusive Development. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press. (cited in Heeks et al., 2013)
4. George, G., McGahan, A. M. and Prabhu, J. (2012) Innovation for inclusive growth: towards a theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(4), pp. 661-683. URL: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35456307.pdf. Accessed on May 31, 2023.
5. Glennie, A., Ollard, J., Stanley, I. and Klingler-Vidra, R. (2020) *Strategies for supporting inclusive innovation: insights from South-East Asia*. UNDP. URL: https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/FINAL_PUBLICATION_UNDP-RBAP-Strategies-for-Supporting-Inclusive-Innovation-2020_2.pdf. Accessed on May 31, 2023.
6. Klingler-Vidra, R., Glennie, A., & Lawrence, C.S. (2022). *Inclusive Innovation* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003125877, Accessed on May 31, 2023.
7. Digital Promise. Inclusive Innovation Process. URL: https://digitalpromise.org/inclusive-innovation/inclusive-innovation-process/. Accessed on April 1, 2023.
8. OECD (2021) Inclusive Innovation Policy Toolkit. URL: https://rri-tools.eu/-/the-oecd-s-inclusive-innovation-policy-toolkit. Accessed on May 30, 2023.

Annex 2. List of the analysed programmes and courses in the field of II&SE

No	Programme title	Programme provider	Country	Level	Position	Workload	Modality
1	Management	Collegium Humanum	Poland	Bachelor	Full degree	4650 h 180 ECTS	F-2-F
2	Management	University of Social Science	Poland	Bachelor	Full degree	4650 h 180 ECTS	Blended
3	Management	Vistula University	Poland	Bachelor	Full degree	4525 h 181 ECTS	Online
4	Management	Wyższa Szkoła Bankowa in Warsaw	Poland	Master	Full degree	1561 h 120 ECTS	Blended
5	Management	Wyższa Szkoła Zarządzania – Szkoła Wyższa	Poland	Master	Full degree	1654 h 126 ECTS	Blended
6	Executive master in third sector and social enterprise	ALTIS (Alta Scuola Impresa e Società) Catholic University of the Sacred Heart - Milan	Italy	Master	Full degree	1500 h 60 ECTS	Blended
7	Business Sustainability	Catholic University of the Sacred Heart	Italy	Master	Topics included in other courses	8 ECTS	F-2-F
8	Social Capital and Local socioeconomic systems	University of Milan Bicocca	Italy	Master	Stand-alone course	48 h 6 ECTS	Blended
9	Social Entrepreneurship	University of Regensburg	Germany	Bachelor	Stand-alone course	6 ECTS	F-2-F
10	Realization of creative potential: from social idea to product	Vilniaus dailės akademija (Vilnius Art Academy)	Lithuania	Non-formal	Non-formal	16 h	Blended
11	Social design and business	Vilnius Art Academy	Lithuania	Non-formal	Non-formal	16 h	Blended
12	Social business training course for future innovators "Entrepreneurial wind"	Vilnius university	Lithuania	Non-formal	Non-formal	16 h	F-2-F
13	Entrepreneurship and	Loughborough University	United Kingdom	Master	Full degree	60 ECTS	F-2-F

No	Programme title	Programme provider	Country	Level	Position	Workload	Modality
	Innovation	London					
14	Social business and social innovation	Klaipeda State University of Applied Sciences, SMK University of Applied Sciences, Vilnius University Šiauliai Academy, Šiauliai State University of Applied Sciences	Lithuania	Non-formal	Non-formal	24 h	Blended
15	Social Entrepreneurship	School of Management and Labor Relations	Canada	Non-formal	Non-formal	15 weeks	F-2-F
16	Open a company	Junior Achievement Foundation	International	School, VET, adult	Non-formal	n/a	Blended
17	Mazovia Youth University	Warsaw University	Poland	Non-formal	Non-formal	30 h	Online
18	Social Innovation Relay	Junior Achievement Foundation / Nationale Nederlanden	Poland	Non-formal	Non-formal	1 semester	Online
19	Human innovation. Support for the development of micro-innovation in the area of social inclusion	Social Innovation Laboratory in Gdynia and the Stocznia Foundation from Warsaw	Poland	Incubation of ideas	Non-formal	n/a	Blended
20	Academic Business Incubators	Foundation Academic Business Incubators	Poland	Non-formal	Non-formal	n/a	F-2-F
21	Social entrepreneurship	New Bulgarian University	Bulgaria	Master	Full degree	60 ECTS	F-2-F
22	Social innovation	Centre for Social innovation (ZSI GmbH)	Germany	Non-formal	Non-formal	n/a	Blended

No	Programme title	Programme provider	Country	Level	Position	Workload	Modality
23	Social entrepreneurship and forms of social entrepreneurship	Balkan Institute for Labour and Social Policy	Bulgaria	Non-formal	Non-formal	6 h	Online / Blended
24	Inclusive and grassroots innovation	Innovation Hubs in 10 African HEIs (AHEAD project, 585919-EPP-1-2017-1-RO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP)	International	Non-formal	Non-formal	30 h	F-2-F / Online
25	Social Entrepreneurship	Copenhagen Business School (offered at Coursera platform)	Denmark	Specialization	Non-formal	60 h	Online

www.innosocial.eu

This document may be copied, reproduced or modified according to the above rules. In addition, an acknowledgement of the authors of the document and all applicable portions of the copyright notice must be clearly referenced.

All rights reserved. © Copyright 2023 InnoSocial