Entrepreneurship education in the European Union: an overview of policies and practice

Results of thematic survey for the EU SME Envoys Network (2015)



Prepared by:

South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (SEECEL) Selska 217, 10000 Zagreb Croatia

Editors:

Dražen Pros, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts of the Republic of Croatia (Croatian SME Envoy)

Antonija Mršić, Head of Sector for International Cooperation and Innovation, Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts of the Republic of Croatia (Croatian SME Sherpa) **Stjepan Srhoj**, Programme Officer and Liaison, SEECEL

Authors:

Thomas Farnell, Entrepreneurial Learning Expert, SEECEL **Efka Heder**, Director, SEECEL **Maja Ljubić**, Assistant Director, SEECEL

Design and Layout:

Jelenko Hercog

Published in Zagreb, Croatia, 2016 Copies of this publication are available at the SEECEL website at www.seecel.hr



Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	5
1. Policy framework	8
2. Policy partnership	11
3. Curricula and qualifications frameworks	13
4. Entrepreneurship education ecosystem	18
5. Monitoring and evaluation	23
6. Other notable findings	25
7. Conclusions and recommendations	28
References	30
Annex I: About SEECEL	31
Annex II: Survey questionnaire	32

Executive Summary

Entrepreneurship education is identified as a priority in the Europe 2020 Strategy, in the EU's policy framework on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and in the EU's key strategies for education and training. A thematic survey of the EU's SME Envoy Network on entrepreneurship education was carried out in 2015 to collect data from EU Member States to take stock of current policies and practice n this area. The main progress and challenges identified through the survey results were the following:

- **1. Policy:** There is broad policy commitment to the entrepreneurship education agenda in virtually all EU Member States. However, in eight Member States entrepreneurship education is not reflected in education strategies. SME Envoys from nine Member States also consider that entrepreneurship education is currently not a priority of education policy.
- 2. **Policy partnership:** Strong policy partnerships between relevant ministries and other stakeholders to promote entrepreneurship education do exist in several Member States. However, although most Member States claim to have such partnerships in place, the vast majority of examples provided were only partially or indirectly relevant to entrepreneurship education.
- 3. Curricula and qualifications frameworks: Integrating entrepreneurship as a key competence into national curricula is widespread, but entrepreneurship education content is often incorporated into optional rather than compulsory subjects. Additionally, some SME Envoys have brought into question to what extent the national curriculum is implemented in the classroom, at least with regard to entrepreneurship education. Very few Member States have yet made any link to the entrepreneurship key competence within their national qualifications frameworks, with some notable exceptions.
- 4. Entrepreneurship education ecosystem: Several Member States complement their curricular approaches with policies to support entrepreneurial schools, teacher training and good practice exchange. However, many Member States that promote entrepreneurship in the curriculum have not yet developed such complementary measures, so there appears to be a need to raise awareness of such an "ecosystem approach".
- **5. Monitoring and evaluation:** Almost no Member States collect and publish data on how entrepreneurship education is implemented or evaluate its impact. However, some Member States have begun to plan this process, and one Member State stands out as having a highly-developed monitoring and evaluation process in place.

6. Other notable findings:

Non-formal entrepreneurship education for targeted groups (such as the unemployed, women, youth or disadvantaged groups) is not considered as a part of entrepreneurship education policy, with no links or coordination made between these policies. Only one Member State covers these policies together.



- Practical entrepreneurial experience is available to students in many Member States through training firms or cooperation with NGO's. However, more systematic approaches are needed to ensure that every school-leaver acquires such an experience.
- There are a number of other innovative good practices in Member States such as local and regional entrepreneurship education initiatives, as well as the establishment of (or cooperation with) specialised non-profit organisations for entrepreneurship education.

Based on these findings, the main recommendations of the report are the following:

- 1. Further strengthen the "key competence approach" to entrepreneurship education in national and school-level curricula in EU Member States (by considering whether to make it compulsory, instead of optional; and by ensuring that the learning outcomes are not only related to business development, but to the broader notion of "turning ideas into action").
- 2. Move beyond curriculum specification to an "ecosystem approach" that supports schools and teachers in developing entrepreneurship education and that fosters stakeholder involvement.
- 3. Ensure that entrepreneurship education ecosystems at the national level benefit from the full involvement of education *ministries*.

Two specific recommendations are addressed to the EU SME Envoy Network:

- Consider how to improve the Open Method of Coordination on entrepreneurship education between Member States through the platform of the SME Envoy Network.
- **2. Consider how to strengthen EU-level expert support for the development of entrepreneurship education,** including through the establishment (or multiplication) of structures such as observatories, stakeholder platforms and research hubs to collect and disseminate good practice, commission new research and develop frameworks for entrepreneurship education.



Introduction

Within the framework of the EU's SME Envoy Network, the Croatian SME Envoy Mr. Dražen Pros (Deputy Minister of Entrepreneurship and Crafts of the Republic of Croatia) was designated in 2014 as the network's *rapporteur* on entrepreneurship education in EU Member States and invited to take stock of current policies and practice in the field of entrepreneurship education. To this end, cooperation was established by Mr. Pros with the South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (based in Zagreb, Croatia) to design and administer a survey of each member SME Envoy Network on the topic in 2015 to prepare a report analysing the survey results.

EU policy framework for entrepreneurship education

The European Union's policy framework on small and medium enterprises (SMEs), through the overarching *Small Business Act for Europe* and the *Entrepreneurship 2020 Action Plan*, emphasises the importance of entrepreneurship education in building an entrepreneurial culture in the EU, which in turn will result in a more competitive economy, job creation and social cohesion.

Entrepreneurship education has also been emphasised in the EU's policy framework for education and training. In 2006, "a sense of initiative and entrepreneurship" became one of the eight key competences for lifelong learning defined by the European Parliament and Council as the set of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are fundamental for each individual in a knowledge-based society and that should be acquired at the end of compulsory education and through lifelong learning. Since then, entrepreneurship education has become a priority in the EU's Europe 2020 strategy and in the EU's key policy documents on education and training.¹

Despite a range of definitions of entrepreneurship education (Lackéus, 2015), this analysis considers the term from the "key competence" perspective: that it is not merely about teaching students about business, but is about building a broader set of knowledge, skills and attitudes for turning ideas into action, taking place both in formal and non-formal education in a lifelong learning perspective.

- 1 Among the most prominent policy documents with an explicit emphasis on entrepreneurship education are the following:
- Council Conclusions of 12 May 2009 on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020) [Official lournal C 119 of 28.5.2009].
- COM (2012) 669: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes
- Council conclusions on entrepreneurship in education and training (2015/C 17/02)
- European Parliament resolution of 8 September 2015 on promoting youth entrepreneurship through education and training (2015/2006(INI))



Aims and methodology of survey

The survey aimed to collect data from each Member State on existing policies and practice in the field of entrepreneurship education in order to:

- identify trends with regards to both the progress and challenges facing entrepreneurship education (in terms of policy, implementation and monitoring and evaluation)
- provide illustrative country examples, both as good practice and as cases where challenges have been identified by Member States
- provide recommendations for furthering the entrepreneurship education agenda, with specific reference to the potential role of the SME Envoy Network.

The survey questionnaire consisted of 13 questions that combined both multiple-choice and openended questions. The survey was administered both online and via e-mail to SME Envoys from all EU-28 countries between 20 July and 11 September 2015. Responses were received from 24 out of 28 Member States (missing countries: Cyprus, Italy, Latvia, Romania), which allows one to draw robust conclusions about trends at the EU-level.

The survey questionnaire was designed bearing in mind that reports with data on entrepreneurship education have been published by the European Commission in the last few years² and that a thematic report on entrepreneurship education is planned to be published by Eurydice in 2016. However, the added value of this survey (in addition to providing fresh data in a short period of time) is that it covers areas that were not covered in previous reports.³

- 2 Among others, see EACEA/Eurydice (2012a, 2012b) and European Commission (2010, 2014).
- The themes that were not covered in previous European Commission reports on entrepreneurship education including questions on policy partnership, policies targeted at schools and teachers, non-formal education policies, practical entrepreneurial experience and links to national qualifications frameworks, as well as the respondents' own assessment of the priority level of entrepreneurship education in their respective countries. Many of these themes will be covered, however, in the 2016 Eurydice survey publication.



Note on limitations of the survey

Regarding the interpretation of results, some caution was required during the analysis of the collected data and similar caution should be taken in interpreting the results. Firstly, while serving as an important source of information, the SME Network survey is a more informal data collection process than those carried out by Eurostat or Eurydice, for example, and responses should be taken as indicative rather than as the official position of each Member State. Secondly, the quality of the survey responses varied significantly, with some responses being incomplete and others showing inconsistencies with the evidence provided. As will be argued in the report, this challenge reflects two of the report's conclusions: that entrepreneurship education is still an area for which there is insufficient monitoring and data availability at the national level; and that it is a topic that requires closer inter-ministerial and multi-stakeholder coordination.

Due to the above limitations this report will:

- identify trends primarily based on analysis of qualitative data and will therefore avoid the use of graphs or data tables showing quantitative data
- focus on EU-level trends, rather than showing comparative results by country; country-level examples are used, however, to illustrate various policies and practices.

Despite the limitations highlighted above, the authors of this analysis would argue that the report provides a concise, accurate and critical overview of the entrepreneurship education landscape in the European Union. The report therefore provides a valuable tool for SME Envoys and other stakeholders to assess the current state of affairs, discuss these issues within the SME Envoy Network and define the next steps needed to push the entrepreneurship education agenda forward.



1. Policy framework

Background

Entrepreneurship education is cross-cutting: in addition to linking education and entrepreneurship in the narrow sense, it can touch upon a range of broader areas such as economic development, industry, employment, innovation or youth policy. A critical success factor for entrepreneurship education is therefore cross-ministerial coordination (European Commission, 2010), also referred to as horizontal policy management (Peters, 2006) or policy integration (Briassoulis, 2004).

To make a critical assessment of the extent to which entrepreneurship education features as a priority of national policy in EU Member States, and of the extent to which it is the subject of horizontal coordination between relevant ministries, the survey asked SME Envoys from all Member States:

- whether sectoral strategies cover entrepreneurship education and/or whether there is a separate strategy for entrepreneurship education;
- whether education strategies specifically include entrepreneurship education;
- and to what extent entrepreneurship education is considered as a priority of national education policy.

The special emphasis on the position of entrepreneurship education within education policy in this analysis is intentional, since planning system-level change in the education system requires the full cooperation and support of the central educational authorities.

Findings and conclusions

There is broad policy commitment to the entrepreneurship education agenda in EU-28 Member States

All but one of the 24 surveyed Member States have incorporated entrepreneurship education into one or more strategies (or other policy documents),⁴ or are in the process of doing so. The strategies into which entrepreneurship education is incorporated include strategies for education/lifelong learning, entrepreneurship, industry, economic development and employment. A total of six Member States have specific strategies for entrepreneurship education. This confirms trends identified in previous reports by Eurydice (EACEA/Eurydice, 2012) and the European Commission's Thematic Working Group

4 While the wording of the survey question referred to strategies, some of the countries' responses referred to documents such as policy statements and national curriculum frameworks, and these were accepted as falling under the "strategy" category as long as they explicitly mentioned entrepreneurship education.



for Entrepreneurship Education (European Commission, 2014). In addition to the question about the priority level of entrepreneurship education in national education policy, the majority of surveyed Member States (15 out of 24) consider entrepreneurship education to be a medium (11) or high priority (4) of national education policy.

However, there is a need to ensure more involvement and "buy-in" from education ministries

Despite a generally positive trend, a notable finding of the survey is that as many as eight Member States that do have a policy framework for entrepreneurship education nevertheless reported that entrepreneurship education is not included in their national education strategies. Additionally, while most Member States agree that entrepreneurship education is an education policy priority, nine Member States believe that it is not an education policy priority.

The challenge of not having sufficient engagement or involvement of central educational authorities is that the implementation of the policy is likely to run into difficulties. As emphasised by the Thematic Working Group for Entrepreneurship Education (European Commission, 2014), a genuine cross-cutting approach is needed: "Policy documents should create a joint vision across departments and across educational levels, promote cooperation between government and other stakeholders, provide visibility to entrepreneurship education, raise awareness and bind all actors involved." (p. 17).



Country examples: good practice and/or challenges

- **Estonia:** Estonia is one of the four Member States that assessed that entrepreneurship education is currently a high priority of national education policy. According to Estonia's responses to the survey questionnaire, the country's lifelong learning strategy (Eesti elukestva õppe strateegia 2020) includes a range of specific measures on entrepreneurship education: the development and delivery of teacher training on entrepreneurship education; involving extra-curricular partners into the entrepreneurial learning process; encouraging entrepreneurial projects between schools and the community; providing recognition for the best entrepreneurial schools and teachers; as well as the organisation of events to share and introduce best practices and experiences in entrepreneurship covering all levels of education. The strategy also foresees monitoring and reporting to measure the impact of the activities.
- **Sweden:** Sweden is an example of a country that has a separate strategy for entrepreneurship in education (*Strategi för entreprenörskap inom utbildningsområdet*, 2009), jointly developed by Ministry of Education and Ministry of Industry. Sweden's survey response confirms findings of a previous study (Chiu, 2012), showing that entrepreneurship is a cross-curricular competence in primary and secondary education, and features in teacher training and school support policies. However, despite such a strong framework, the assessment of the Swedish SME Envoy is that entrepreneurship education is currently not an education policy priority and that entrepreneurial skills are "more often mentioned while talking about competences that SMEs are looking for".
- **Slovakia:** Slovakia's lifelong learning strategy from 2011 (Stratégia celoživotného vzdelávania 2011) puts explicit emphasis on entrepreneurship as a key competence, including through "students leading training firms and solving real problems through simulated projects", as well as through the incorporation of entrepreneurship into the subject "Civics" in secondary education. Slovakia also has a specialised in-service teacher training for entrepreneurial learning among its list of nationally accredited teacher training programmes (the course "Development of entrepreneurial skills in primary and secondary schools"). Nevertheless, the Slovakian SME Envoy's assessment is that "the Slovak educational system has been for the past decade developed without regard to the needs of labour market and without any connection with entrepreneurs and business praxis" and that, although the inclusion of entrepreneurial learning in lifelong learning policies is welcome, it still "remains unnoticed in school curricula".



2. Policy partnership

Background

Establishing a multi-stakeholder policy partnership at the national level that specifically focuses on entrepreneurship education can be another critical success factor (European Commission, 2014, Gribben, 2013). On the one hand, such a partnership can ensure horizontal/trans-ministerial coordination of national authorities in charge of education, economic development and other relevant areas. On the other hand, such a partnership can (and should) allow for adequate inclusion of other stakeholders who will be affected by the policy in question and who should therefore inform the policy development process (European Commission, 2010), including school management, teacher representatives, experts, business associations, chambers of commerce, civil society organisations and others.

To make a critical assessment of what forms of entrepreneurship education partnership exist in Member States, the survey asked:

- whether a national body or partnership is in place in the country in order to provide advisory support, development, implementation and/or monitoring regarding entrepreneurship education;
- to what extent such a partnership includes horizontal coordination between institutions and stakeholders from relevant sectors (such as education, economic development, entrepreneurship or employment).

Findings and conclusions

Partnerships between ministries and stakeholders exist, but in most Member States the examples of such partnerships have no direct link to entrepreneurship education or are project-based

The majority of surveyed Member States claimed to have a national partnership related to entrepreneurship education in place (16) or that such a partnership was planned (3). However, upon closer analysis of the examples of partnership provided, only six of the 19 examples could be described as formal bodies with a specific focus on entrepreneurship education – examples include interministerial bodies, national working groups or regional organisations that gather stakeholders from several countries, each with a specific agenda to contribute to policy development, implementation or monitoring of entrepreneurship education.

Among the remaining examples were several project-based partnerships with a limited mandate and with a narrow scope relating to a specific aspect of entrepreneurship education (e.g. on setting up student companies at educational institutions). Other examples of partnerships included bodies with a much broader mandate (e.g. chambers of commerce, education research institutes), whose links with entrepreneurship education were only indirect or contingent.

Country examples: good practice and/or challenges

- **Denmark:** The Danish Foundation for Entrepreneurship Young Enterprise was established in 2009 by an inter-ministerial partnership between four ministries: Ministry of Higher Education and Science, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Business and Growth. To ensure implementation and monitoring of Denmark's strategy for entrepreneurship education, the Government set up a Partnership including the aforementioned ministries that meets annually with the Foundation and other relevant stakeholders to discuss progress in teaching entrepreneurship and which publishes an annual monitoring report.
- **Portugal:** Due to the importance given by the Portuguese Ministry of Education and Science to a curriculum of entrepreneurship education, Guidelines for Entrepreneurship Education are currently under development by a national working group (GTREE Grupo de Trabalho para o Referencial em Educação para o Empreendedorismo). The multi-stakeholder working group includes the Directorate General of Education (Ministry of Education and Science), the National Agency for the Qualification and Vocational Education, the General Direction of Schools, AIP (Portuguese Association for Industry), the Portuguese Institute of Sport and Youth (Secretary of State for Sport and Youth), the Ministry of Economy and the Portuguese Platform for Entrepreneurship Education (PEEP). The resulting Guidelines will not be prescriptive, but will serve as a support tool that can be used by schools and teaching staff.
- **Spain:** In Spain, a project led by the National Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CNIIE), which is under Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, has been launched to plan the implementation of entrepreneurship education in Spain (including through teacher training, good practice exchange). One of the project activities is to develop "joint work" of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport with other ministries, educational authorities of the Autonomous Communities and other economic and social stakeholders for the development of entrepreneurship education.
- Croatia: The South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning was jointly established by the Croatian Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts and the Croatian Chamber of Economy, with support from the European Union. SEECEL's governing board represents a partnership from eight countries of South East Europe and Turkey, gathering SBA coordinators and ministry of education representatives from each country, who jointly define how SEECEL can contribute to policy development and policy implementation in the field of entrepreneurial learning. The impact of SEECEL's work through this partnership is felt both at a national level in each member country, as well as through cooperation at the regional level.

3. Curricula and qualifications frameworks

Background

One of the eight key competences for lifelong learning defined by the European Union (European Parliament and Council, 2006) is a "sense of initiative and entrepreneurship". In addition to strategies and reform initiatives (discussed in Chapter 1), two other components of education policy play a crucial role in ensuring that this key competence is acquired through education:

- National curricula: national curricula define the goals, objectives and quality and/or content criteria of a national school system (OECD, 2004). They usually consist of a set of level-specific curricula or of a national curriculum framework (an overarching document usually defining the vision and expected outcomes of the education system, as a basis for developing specific curricula). National curricula can also include guidelines for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the curriculum (UNESCO IBE, 2013).
- National qualifications frameworks: national qualifications frameworks (or systems) are
 instruments that are increasingly used worldwide for developing and classifying national
 qualifications based on learning outcomes, with a set of criteria defined for each level of learning
 (Tuck, 2007), thus encouraging citizens' mobility and lifelong learning.

There is no doubt that the inclusion of entrepreneurship education into both national curricula and qualifications frameworks would result in the exposure of a much higher proportion of students to such educational content. It would also ensure system-level (rather than individual school-level) solutions for ensuring the acquisition of the entrepreneurship key competence.

In this survey, respondents were asked to describe whether the key competence of entrepreneurship is specifically referred to in their national qualifications framework. Regarding the national curriculum, although no specific question addressing this topic was included in the survey (since it is covered by existing Eurydice data), an analysis was made based on country references to their curricula (in responses to other questions) and based on additional desk research.

Findings and conclusions

Integrating entrepreneurship as a key competence into curricula is widespread, but the delivery of entrepreneurship education takes a wide variety of forms, often through optional subjects

Previous Eurydice data (EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a, 2012b) tell us that almost all EU Member States have incorporated entrepreneurship education into secondary curricula and that two-thirds of Member States have included it in primary-level curricula. The picture of how entrepreneurship education is implemented in Member States is complex and can only be briefly commented on in this report. The



key question, however, is to ascertain whether entrepreneurship is a compulsory or optional part of the curriculum. Previous Eurydice data already show us that not all Member States use cross-curricular approaches, with many integrating entrepreneurship into specific subjects that are not compulsory (EACEA 2012a, 2012b). The challenge noted by the European Commission (2014) is that the coverage of entrepreneurship may be limited in many countries. This poses a challenge to achieving the goal of all school leavers acquiring the key competence of entrepreneurship.

The survey provided illustrations of these trends through country examples. For example, entrepreneurship is integrated in secondary education into the subject "Civic Education" in Portugal and Slovakia; and into "Economics" and "Business" in Germany and Belgium. Some integrate entrepreneurship into a broader range of specific subjects (e.g. Poland, where it is integrated into subjects such as "Knowledge about Society", "Geography", "History and Society", "Information Technology", "Mathematics", etc.); whereas others define entrepreneurship more generally as a cross-curricular objective or competence (e.g. Hungary, Slovakia, Malta).

Despite curriculum specification, the extent to which the key competence approach to entrepreneurship is fully or successfully implemented has been questioned by some Member States

The added value of this survey for the debate about entrepreneurship education is that some Member States' SME Envoys provided critical reflections on the extent to which implementation has taken place, on the quality of implementation and on improvements that need to be made:

- As mentioned in Chapter 1, Slovakia is an example of a country that has explicitly integrated entrepreneurship as a key competence into steering documents and into the curriculum, but the SME Envoy assesses that it still "remains unnoticed in school curricula".
- Ireland is also a country that is listed among the countries in which entrepreneurship is integrated into the national curriculum (in EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a), yet a national Entrepreneurship Forum that was formed in 2013 identified that further efforts were needed to embed entrepreneurship at all levels of the education system and that there is a need for a specific entrepreneurship education strategy for Ireland.
- Slovenia has admitted similar challenges regarding the implementation of entrepreneurship education and the need for a more systematic approach (see country example box below).

These reflections emphasise the need for in-depth, critical reflections on policy implementation in each Member State, since relying on data from policy and curricular documents is likely to provide an incomplete picture of entrepreneurship education's position in a given Member State's education system. This reflects an overall concern voiced in the European Commission's high reflection panels on entrepreneurship education (European Commission, 2010), whose critical conclusion is that "much entrepreneurship education practice tends to be ad hoc, varies vastly in quantity and quality, is not treated systematically in the curriculum and has relied heavily on the enthusiasm and commitment of individual teachers and schools" (ibid, p. ii).



In several Member States, evidence on the implementation of entrepreneurship education appears to show an emphasis on extra-curricular, project-based and career-guidance approaches

A European Commission (2010) report stated that entrepreneurship education needs to progress "from being an extra-curricular 'add-on' to an integral part of the curriculum". Based on the results of the survey, several Member States adopt approaches that are not primarily teaching-based, or that are implemented on a project basis, rather than as an integral part of schools' activities. Examples from Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, presented in the country example box below, illustrate some of these approaches. Similar responses were also received by the United Kingdom and Luxembourg. In France, although the curriculum soon plans to incorporate entrepreneurship, the main initiative so far has been the national programme *Parcours avenir*, which includes meetings with entrepreneurs and learning about business, thereby taking place as school-based career guidance programme.

Country examples: good practice and/or challenges

- **Slovenia:** Slovenia's Elementary Education Act (covering primary and lower-secondary education) includes the objective of the "development of the entrepreneurship as a personality attitude towards effective action, innovation and creativity", and entrepreneurship is mentioned explicitly in relevant curricular documents as a cross-curricular key competence. Nevertheless, in its response to the survey, Slovenia adopted a critical stance, admitting that implementation "is often limited to its individual dimensions (critical thinking, creativity etc.), usually within the scope of project work and similar activities" and that "a comprehensive approach to include entrepreneurship into school education is (yet) to be developed". However, Slovenia is now participating in a range of projects related to entrepreneurship education, in order to "experiment, develop, analyse and evaluate different approaches, methods and programmes" with the aim of eventually making entrepreneurship a compulsory part of the school system.
- states (Länder). Data from other sources (EACEA/Eurydice, 2012a), show that entrepreneurship education is generally recognised in lower- and upper-secondary education curricula, but usually as a sub-topic in the subject "Economics" (which is optional). In lower-secondary it also features as a cross-curricular objective, although data on how the cross-curricular objective is implemented are not available (other than through mini-enterprises). The main initiative at the national level is *Unternehmergeist in Schulen* ("Entrepreneurship in Schools"), a voluntary cooperation of private and public institutions which has resulted in 30 entrepreneurship education projects. However, the German SME Envoy notes that this initiative is led by the Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Energy and that entrepreneurship education is not currently a priority of education policy, although it is a priority of other relevant strategies.
- **Netherlands:** The Netherlands has an entrepreneurship education action plan (*Actieprogramma Onderwijs en Ondernemen*) that focuses on all sectors of education, from the primary to university level. However, the approach taken in the plan is to support individual educational institutions through a grant programme (with approximately 56 million Euro allocated) to develop activities for entrepreneurship education. In order to additionally support this process, specialised centres work on promoting entrepreneurship education (Dutch Centres for Entrepreneurship).



• **Belgium:** The Flemish Region of Belgium had an entrepreneurship education action plan in 2011-2014 (Actieplan Ondernemend Onderwijs 2011-2014), with a new one under development. The Action Plan included a range of activities to provide entrepreneurship education at each level of education. However, the SME survey report states that "entrepreneurial spirit and entrepreneurship are not integrated into the curriculum, so student participation in entrepreneurial education is optional for almost all levels of education", primarily due to school autonomy. Also, the teaching and learning framework developed within the Action Plan has "not been translated in legal documents".

In the Walloon Region of Belgium, measures for entrepreneurship education are planned in the so-called Plan Marshall 4.0 and as part of a special entrepreneurship action plan (Générations entreprenantes 2015-2020). However, in this case the impetus appears to be coming primarily from entrepreneurship policy, not education policy. Although the SME Envoy emphasised that there remains openness on behalf of educational institutions to take part in such activities, the activities appear to be primarily project-based.

Very few Member States were able to demonstrate any link to entrepreneurship as a key competence within their national qualifications frameworks

The responses received to the survey question relating to national qualifications frameworks demonstrated that there is either confusion or lack of information in many Member States about the level of development of their qualifications frameworks. Some responses to the question made no reference to qualifications frameworks at all, but rather to curriculum frameworks. Among the nine Member States that did state that entrepreneurship is incorporated as a key competence into the country's national qualifications framework (or into the guidelines for developing the framework), only four examples were confirmed, based on additional desk research checks of available evidence. The four examples in question are presented in the box below and provide an insight into various ways in which qualifications frameworks can incorporate the entrepreneurship competence.



Country examples: good practice and/or challenges

- Malta: Malta answered "Yes" to the survey question of whether entrepreneurship is incorporated into their national qualifications framework. Based on additional desk research, the analysis noted that although Malta's national qualifications framework does not mention entrepreneurship specifically, it is one of the few Member States that includes the statement "acquires and applies key competences as a basis for lifelong learning" within its national qualifications framework level descriptors, thereby encompassing the entrepreneurship key competence.
- Austria: Austria's response noted that the inclusion of the entrepreneurship key competence into their national qualifications framework is "under development" and that currently the Austrian framework only incorporates elements that are closely connected to the entrepreneurship key competence in its description of levels. For example, at Level 3 it states that "he/she has the ability for economic thinking and critical consumer behaviour" and at Level 5 that "he/she has deepened business-related economic and legal knowledge to take on managerial responsibilities and/or to run a business".
- **Hungary:** Hungary answered "Yes" to the survey question on linking entrepreneurship education to the national qualifications framework. Additional desk research was carried out to verify how the framework in question made such a link, which confirmed that entrepreneurship is indeed specified, although it is only mentioned at Level 5 through the level descriptor: "able to make responsible decisions related to employment and entrepreneurship".
- Croatia: The Croatian questionnaire was a unique example of one that compiled responses by eight different national stakeholders. Interestingly, their responses to the question on the national qualifications framework differed. Some answered "Yes", since the National Qualifications Framework Act and the framework development guidelines include explicit reference to the key competences (including entrepreneurship) as core principles. Others answered "No" since none of the level descriptors included a specific reference to key competences or to other categories directly relevant to the entrepreneurship competence.

The diversity of these country examples shows that additional discussion is needed nationally and at the EU-level regarding how entrepreneurship education (and other key competences) could or should be reflected within national qualifications frameworks.



4. Entrepreneurship education ecosystem

Background

Integrating entrepreneurship education into policy, curricula and related qualifications frameworks provides a firm basis for ensuring that students acquire the key competence of entrepreneurship. However, it is unlikely to be sufficient: due to the novelty and complexity of entrepreneurship education, more support is needed to complement these measures and to make this goal a reality. This is one of the main messages of the European Commission's high-level reflection panels on entrepreneurship education (European Commission, 2010) and its Thematic Working Group for Entrepreneurship Education (European Commission, 2014). In these reports, the term "entrepreneurship education ecosystem" is used to describe a holistic approach that is likely to yield the best results. The approach (illustrated in Figure 1) involves looking not only at policy and the curriculum, but also at a range of other areas such as stakeholder cooperation, the institutional culture of schools and teacher/school management training, as well as monitoring and evaluation.



Figure 1: The entrepreneurship education ecosystem

Source: Thematic Working Group for Entrepreneurship Education final report (European Commission, 2014).

To assess the extent to which EU Member States are moving towards an "ecosystem approach" to entrepreneurship education, the survey asked whether their policies currently included support to schools, teacher training (both initial teacher training and continuous professional development) and good practice exchange. In addition, previous responses to questions relating to policy, partnerships, curricula and monitoring/evaluation were also considered.

Findings and conclusions

Several Member States complement their curricular approaches with measures to support entrepreneurial schools, teacher training and good practice exchange

Several Member States have undertaken or are planning specific training for teachers to deliver entrepreneurship education – some through the availability of continuous professional development for teachers, others through developing guidelines or manuals for teachers. However, it should be noted that almost none of the EU Member States systematically incorporate entrepreneurship into initial teacher training, which would be necessary in countries where teachers will be expected to cover entrepreneurship as a cross-curricular key competence in their classes.

The data collected also revealed numerous examples of targeted support to schools and/or universities to adopt an institutional culture that reflects entrepreneurial approaches and values. Such initiatives include grant schemes for schools to develop entrepreneurial projects, as well as highly innovative approaches such as the system of voluntary certification of entrepreneurial schools developed in Austria (see box below for details). Finally, several Member States have provided enlightening examples of how local and regional initiatives have been developed independently of national policies to support the entrepreneurship education agenda (see section "6. Other notable findings" for specific examples).

This progression towards an ecosystem approach to entrepreneurship education in several Member States is significant. Nevertheless, as will be covered in the following section of the report, only few Member States address all phases of the ecosystem cycle presented in Figure 1 (e.g. monitoring and evaluation remains underdeveloped).

However, many Member States that promote entrepreneurship in the curriculum have not developed such complementary measures, so there is a need to raise awareness of the ecosystem approach

Combining measures such as those described above with a strong policy agenda and a national curriculum that develops entrepreneurship competences at all levels of education is what creates the "ecosystem approach". Some Member States have already achieved such ecosystems, and other Member States are making significant efforts to build them (see country examples in the box below). The data collected, however, show that many Member States have not yet developed such holistic approaches. Many Member States that explicitly mention entrepreneurship as part of their national curriculum did not provide any evidence that they offer teacher training, and support for entrepreneurial schools, or that they engage in good practice exchange or monitoring of entrepreneurship education.



Country examples: good practice and/or challenges

• **Finland:** Finland is an example of a country with a long tradition of entrepreneurship education, and of a country which adopts many aspects of the "ecosystem approach". Finland has a specific entrepreneurship education strategy led by the Ministry of Education, which is well coordinated with other relevant ministries and stakeholders through a partnership named the Steering Group for Entrepreneurship Education. The national curriculum includes entrepreneurship as a cross-curricular theme in basic and upper-secondary level, including vocational education.

In terms of support to schools and teachers, the ministry developed Guidelines for Entrepreneurship Education in 2009 and in-service teacher training programmes exist (including through provision by the national "YES network", whose 17 local centres provide teacher support throughout the country, as well as supporting school-business cooperation). In addition, an Annual Enterprise Education Conference takes place to exchange good practice in this area and an innovative "Measurement Tool for EE" provides a toolbox for teachers' self-evaluation.

However, pre-service teacher training on entrepreneurship education still varies between institutions and (based on data from Chiu, 2012) appears to be optional at many teacher training institutions, despite entrepreneurship being a cross-curricular competence in schools. Monitoring and evaluation of entrepreneurship education was also reported by the SME Envoy as being "not regular".

• Austria: Austria's lifelong learning strategy (LLL:2020) places a strong emphasis on developing new curricula for all types of schools, with a focus on integrating the entrepreneurship key competence, as well as wider key competences. The National LLL:2020 Platform is the partnership in charge of monitoring the implementation of the strategy. Austria's national qualifications framework is in the process of incorporating entrepreneurial skills in its level descriptors.

From 2012 to 2014, a reference framework for entrepreneurship education was elaborated and entrepreneurship has now been established as a teaching principle across all subjects within the broader cross-curricular competence "Economic and Consumer Education". Entrepreneurship education is based on a so-called "TRIO model", consisting of three levels of competences: supporting entrepreneurial core education, strengthening entrepreneurial culture and fostering entrepreneurial civic education.

Austria has a range of in-service teacher training options relating to entrepreneurial learning. Pre-service teacher training in this field is still under development. Finally, Austria's commitment to entrepreneurial learning is evidenced through the existence of the EESI Impulse Centre (Entrepreneurship Education for Innovation at Schools), supported by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Education and Women, whose activities include the accreditation of so-called "Entrepreneurship Schools".



- Ireland: Ireland is an example of a country that has adopted an ecosystem approach to entrepreneurship education in tertiary education, but not (yet) in pre-tertiary education. At the tertiary level, Ireland has an number of structures to develop entrepreneurial higher education institutions through: specific policy documents (Higher Education Strategy to 2030 and the Enterprise Engagement Strategy); a university staff training programme (the Enterprise and Entrepreneurial Learning Level 9 Module); and specialised networks (the Campus Entrepreneurship Enterprise Network and the REAP National Network).
- **Portugal:** The Ministry of Education implemented a four-year project on entrepreneurship education from 2006 to 2009 (*Projecto Nacional de Educação para o Empreendedorismo*) to prepare the ground for the national implementation of entrepreneurship education. Today, entrepreneurship education is an integral part of the curriculum at all school levels in Portugal, as one of the core components of "Civic Education", which is defined as a crosscurricular competence. The curriculum guidelines for civic education define the aims of entrepreneurship education as "promoting the acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes that encourage and ensure the development of ideas, initiatives and projects, in order to create, innovate or make changes in the sphere of action of the individual depending upon the challenges set by society."

To further strengthen the national entrepreneurship education drive, a multi-stakeholder national working group (from the government, education sector and NGOs) is drafting guidelines for effectively implementing entrepreneurship education as a cross-curricular competence in schools. Teacher training is planned to follow this stage.

Finally, Portugal has a range of initiatives for promoting entrepreneurship education: the Platform for Entrepreneurship Education in Portugal is an NGO that works with other stakeholders on research, capacity building and public policy development, and has organised the first national conference on entrepreneurship education. Finally, the INOVA Ideas Contest is an example of multi-stakeholder coordination (connecting ministries, schools, local governments and NGOs) to promote entrepreneurship in schools.

- France: In 2013, France gave the entrepreneurship education agenda a new impetus within the national framework for promoting entrepreneurship in France (Assises de l'entreprenariat). According to reports on the implementation of the planned policies, the main activities up to 2014 were of an extra-curricular nature, including student mini-companies, visits to schools by businesses and through a grant programme (of around 20 million Euros) to support entrepreneurship education projects by schools. The experimental implementation of entrepreneurship as an integral part of the school curriculum of secondary education was planned for 2014 and its overall national implementation as a cross-curricular theme in secondary schools is planned from 2015.
- **Belgium:** As mentioned in the Chapter 3, the Flemish Region of Belgium had an entrepreneurship education action plan (*Actieplan Ondermend Onderwijs 2011-2014*), which included a partnership of three ministries in charge education, employment and economy,



agriculture, fisheries and rural policy. The plan placed a strong focus on teachers, providing training and placements in industry. However, the plan also explicitly mentions a challenge in this area:

"We realise that too much is asked of teacher training courses because various groups expect that in teacher training focus is greater on specific social themes. (...) It is not realistic to expect future teachers to already learn how to engage in pedagogical activities within the framework of Entrepreneurial Education during teacher training. Nevertheless, we may expect from teacher trainers that they try to make future teachers demonstrate more entrepreneurship themselves and acquire a positive image of entrepreneurship."

This honest assessment may point to challenges also faced by other Member States in this area and could be a productive area of further discussion.



5. Monitoring and evaluation

Background

Monitoring and evaluation include the systematic collection of data on specified indicators and the objective assessment of an ongoing or completed project, programme, or policy, including its design, implementation and results (OECD, 2002). In the case of entrepreneurship education, monitoring and evaluation could include valuable data on inputs/outputs (e.g. number of schools or students involved in entrepreneurship education) or on outcomes (e.g. impact of the acquisition of learning outcomes on subsequent career paths). The process of monitoring and evaluation can lead to an assessment of the extent to which intended objectives are fulfilled and can help define lessons learned for further improving a given policy (ibid.). In this survey, respondents were asked to list what kind of monitoring or evaluation activities are undertaken in their countries regarding entrepreneurship education.

Findings and conclusions

Almost no Member States collect data on how entrepreneurship education is implemented or evaluate its impact

Only one Member State (Denmark) provided evidence of having in place systematic and regular monitoring and evaluation of its policies in the field of entrepreneurship education. Most other countries reported that they do not publish any data on the implementation of entrepreneurship education in their country. Several Member States noted that although no official data are collected directly, secondary sources such as the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) provide data on the level of development of entrepreneurship education in their countries. Data that are available in some Member States often refer to specific entrepreneurship education projects, which collect data on the number of users/beneficiaries. Other Member States noted that data from schools is collected at the national or regional level and that such data include information on students in given courses – although no evidence was provided that such data are used (or could be used) to provide an insight into the implementation of entrepreneurship education.

While in most Member States the lack of systematic monitoring and evaluation may be because entrepreneurship education is not deeply ingrained in the education system, the survey results do suggest that some countries choose not to adopt such formalised processes. For example, Finland (a country with a long tradition of implementing entrepreneurship education) stated that monitoring data is collected and published, but "only occasionally (not regularly)." Sweden, another country with a strong framework for entrepreneurship education, produces an annual report on entrepreneurship (including on entrepreneurship education), but which is based on GEM data, not on data from the school system.

Country examples: good practice

- **Denmark:** The Danish Foundation for Entrepreneurship accumulates and disseminates knowledge about entrepreneurship education at all levels of the education system. Once a year, the Foundation maps the spread of entrepreneurship education at all levels of the education system. The quantitative data for the academic year 2015/2015 are the following:
 - 10.6 percent of all 700,000 pupils in primary school participated in entrepreneurship education and special activities;
 - 31.5 percent of all 270,000 pupils in upper-secondary education participated in entrepreneurship education and special activities;
 - 10.9 percent of all 258,000 students in higher education participated in entrepreneurship education.

In addition, the Danish Foundation for Entrepreneurship also carries out continuous measurements of the impact of entrepreneurship education, including as part of a large research project that investigates the immediate and longer-term effects of education by means of questionnaire surveys and quantitative analyses. The project covers all three levels of the education system and builds up a considerable database to be used in later research.

• Malta: Although noting that they do not currently monitor and evaluate data relating to entrepreneurship education (the process was described as being "under development"), it is significant that Malta is the only Member State to mention the role that learning assessment will have in providing data on entrepreneurship education. Namely, Malta is in the process of defining a national "Learning Outcomes Framework" for their national curriculum, in which entrepreneurship is emphasised as a key competence. The Learning Outcomes Framework will start being implemented from the school year 2016/7. The SME Envoy from Malta emphasised that this will allow subsequent access to data on students' progress in acquiring the learning outcomes of entrepreneurship education.



6. Other notable findings

Practical entrepreneurial experience for school students

In its *Entrepreneurship* 2020 Action Plan, the European Commission (2013) called upon Member States to provide young people with the opportunity to have at least one practical entrepreneurial experience before leaving compulsory education, such as running a training firm/mini-company, being responsible for an entrepreneurial project for a company or a social project.

Virtually all Member States provide some form of practical entrepreneurial experience within their school systems. This primarily occurs via training firms or through cooperation with external organisations or NGOs (primarily with the international non-profit organisation Junior Achievement) that work with schools to provide such experiences as extra-curricular or curricular activities. The challenge, however, is that although such structures provide highly valuable experiences, they are unlikely to achieve the goal of every student having at least one such experience. Additionally, some practical entrepreneurial experiences may not always be adequate or sufficient for developing the key competence of entrepreneurship. On this topic, a comment from the SME Envoy from Belgium (reporting on the activities in the Flemish Region) stated that:

"Student firms, for instance, will probably not fit all education levels and all courses of study; and when they are limited to only buying and selling some goods (as is sometimes the case) they might not have the intended effect".

Alternative approaches may be more beneficial to achieving the acquisition of the entrepreneurship key competence by all school leavers, such as the use of different teaching and learning methods in all subjects, as well as supporting schools to connect more closely to their local communities. In Poland, for example, the compulsory course "Knowledge about Society" includes involvement in social actions and citizen activities, with 20% of the contents of the course being in the form of student educational projects. In Greece, as a result of the "New School" reform, a new compulsory subject entitled "Project" was launched enabling students to implement projects in a classroom environment, with schools also encouraged to establish links with the community.

Non-formal entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurship promotion

General measures for promoting and supporting entrepreneurship typically take place outside the formal education system. They include, for example, non-formal entrepreneurship training for specific groups (e.g. the unemployed, youth, women and minorities) or training for SMEs. Member States were asked to what extent their entrepreneurship education policies include such measures or whether they are covered by other sectoral policies (employment policy, SME policy etc.).

The survey results show that in almost all Member States non-formal educational programmes related to entrepreneurship are have no link to policies relating to entrepreneurship education.



The former are usually implemented by SME agencies, employment agencies or NGOs, and there is no evidence of coordination regarding how this fits into the larger picture of entrepreneurship education. The only notable exception is France, which incorporates all such policies under a joint policy framework that aims to foster start-ups and SME development: the Assises de l'Entrepreneuriat launched in 2013. In addition to measures aimed at pre-tertiary and tertiary education, measures include mentorship programmes and incubators for youth, promotion and mentorship programmes for women entrepreneurs (programme: Entreprendre au Féminin), as well as a national programme Plan création quartier for the populations of disadvantaged urban areas.

Local and regional entrepreneurship education initiatives

Local and regional authorities can play a key role in supporting entrepreneurship education and creating "ecosystem approach"es at the local and regional level (European Commission, 2010). Although the survey did not explore this topic specifically, responses provided by certain Member States highlighted inspiring good practice in this area. Spain, in particular, provided an extensive list of initiatives from eight of Spain's Autonomous Communities, including the following:

- "EDUEmprende": a joint programme of the Galicia Ministry of Culture, Education and University Planning, together with the Galicia Ministry of Economy and Industry, to develop entrepreneurial attitudes in the pre-tertiary education system.
- "Catalunya, escuela de emprendedores" (Catalonia School of Entrepreneurs): launched in 2011 by the Government of Catalonia in order to develop entrepreneurial values at all stages of education (with a special emphasis on rural schools), the programme aims to develop the key competence of "turning ideas into action".
- "Emprender en la Escuela" (Entrepreneurship in the School): within the "Entrepreneurship Programme" of the Aragon Institute of Development, this initiative (in collaboration with the Department of Education, Culture and Sports of Aragon) delivers workshops in secondary education throughout Aragon and presents awards for the best business plans.

Another example comes from Poland, where the "Entrepreneurship Education Programme" in Wrocław (*Program Edukacja Przedsiębiorczości*) is a unique programme implemented by the local administration and consists of projects whose common aim is promoting an entrepreneurial culture and widening consumer awareness. Activities cover educational levels from pre-school to upper-secondary and include innovative teaching methods and direct cooperation with businesses.

Specialised organisations for entrepreneurship education

Finally, the survey also provided insights into the role that specialised non-profit organisations for entrepreneurship education (with an international, national or local focus) can play in national policy-making and/or in the delivery of entrepreneurship education. Some examples include:

• The EESI Impulse Centre in Austria leads a range of entrepreneurship education activities, including teacher training and the accreditation of "Entrepreneurship Schools".



- The Portugal Entrepreneurship Education Platform (PEEP) is a non-profit association whose mission is to help the development and implementation of entrepreneurship education and training through research projects, capacity building and policy development.
- Valnalón, from the Autonomous Community of Asturias in Spain, provides a range of innovative programmes in cooperation with the local government, including mini-companies, trainings in schools and support to young entrepreneurs.
- Junior Achievement is mentioned Europe-wide as playing a key role in provision of practical entrepreneurial experience (as an extra-curricular or school-based activity).
- SEECEL (the author of this study), works on policy development at the regional (South East Europe) and EU level, develops frameworks for implementing entrepreneurship education and coordinates regional initiatives for piloting such frameworks (including for teacher training).



7. Conclusions and recommendations

Further strengthen the "key competence approach" to entrepreneurship education in national and school-level curricula in EU Member States

Most Member States incorporate entrepreneurship into national policies and national curricula. But adopting a key competence approach to entrepreneurship education ultimately means ensuring that all those who complete formal education acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes defined under the EU competence entitled "a sense of initiative and entrepreneurship", and that they can further develop this competence through lifelong learning. This means thinking carefully about the structure of provision, especially by ensuring that the entrepreneurship competence is not only acquired by a proportion of students as an optional subject, but that it is made compulsory (either as a set of compulsory cross-curricular competences, or through content integrated into compulsory subjects).

In addition to considering organisational options for delivering entrepreneurship education, adopting a key-competence approach requires paying equal attention to course content and learning outcomes. In particular, curricular approaches should reflect the fact that the key competence of entrepreneurship (as defined by the EU) is not necessarily about business-launching, but has a wide-ranging and inclusive definition as the capability to "turn ideas into action", and is therefore a key component of employability. Therefore, practices such as limiting access to entrepreneurship-related content only through subjects such as "Economics" or "Business" could be reconsidered in this light. Additionally, the news that a European Entrepreneurship Competence Framework will be published by the European Commission in 2016 should provide valuable support to all Member States who aim to achieve this goal.

Move beyond curriculum specification to an "ecosystem approach" that supports schools and teachers to develop entrepreneurship education and that fosters stakeholder involvement

In several Member States, SME Envoys consider that entrepreneurship education is still not a reality in schools, despite having been integrated into national strategies and national curricula. Curriculum specification is therefore necessary, but it may not be sufficient for ensuring that entrepreneurship education "works" in the classroom. Some Member States, however, have gone several steps further and have set up (or are planning) additional measures to support entrepreneurship education including support to schools, teacher training, teaching guidelines, monitoring and good practice exchange. Adopting such a holistic approach is referred to by the European Commission's Thematic Working Group for Entrepreneurship Education as an "entrepreneurship education ecosystem" (European Commission, 2014), and such an approach is likely to lead to higher-quality entrepreneurship education and to better results.

Ensure that entrepreneurship education ecosystems at the national level have full support of education ministries

Planning system-level change in education requires the cooperation and support of central educational authorities. This survey, however, has shown that several Member States that do have a policy framework for entrepreneurship education nevertheless have not included



entrepreneurship education into education strategies. Additionally, several Member States believe that entrepreneurship education is not an education policy priority at all. The challenges experienced in this survey, with regards to the lack of relevant or accurate data on entrepreneurship education in many Member States, may themselves be an indicator of insufficient involvement of education ministries in entrepreneurship education. Taking steps to include education ministries in developing the entrepreneurship education agenda along with other relevant ministries and stakeholders (e.g. through a national partnership) could be fundamental to the success of policy implementation.

Consider how to improve the Open Method of Coordination on entrepreneurship education between Member States through the platform of the SME Envoy Network

While there are a wide variety of approaches to entrepreneurship education in the European Union, this analysis has also shown that there are similar trends (and perhaps joint challenges) shared by many Member States. While the monitoring of the Small Business Act for Europe (through "SBA Fact Sheets") currently allows for some limited benchmarking of country performance in entrepreneurship education (using the Open Method of Coordination), there are insufficient opportunities or platforms for countries to discuss and identify joint challenges and to exchange good practice in this area. Such policy learning and collaboration opportunities could help Member States to plan improvements in their entrepreneurship education policies.

The SME Envoy Network could provide such a platform. For example, a thematic working group within the Network could regularly track entrepreneurship education progress (through surveys such as this one), organise good practice exchange, launch thematic discussions at the EU or regional level and to disseminate updates and recommendations to relevant EU and national institutions. This could be considered in the light of the new European Parliament (2015) resolution on promoting youth entrepreneurship through education and training, which called on the European Commission "to include measures related to entrepreneurship education into the European Semester evaluation indicators, starting in 2016".

Consider how to strengthen EU-level expert support for entrepreneurship education

One of the conclusions of the European Commission's high-level reflection panels on entrepreneurship education (European Commission, 2010) is that there is a need for structures at the EU level to support Member States (and EU institutions) in entrepreneurship education policy development and implementation. Among their recommendations are the establishment of an observatory of policy and practice, stakeholder "platforms" and a research hub to collect relevant data and develop frameworks. They therefore recommended the establishment of a European Centre for Entrepreneurship Education as the main vehicle to implement such activities.

A range of initiatives and institutions have already been set up in this direction. The European Entrepreneurship Education NETwork (EE-HUB) is an initiative supported by the European Commission (DG GROW), gathering experts and organisations to work on identifying good practice and developing policy recommendations. SEECEL itself was set up with European Commission support and now works in South East Europe, the Danube Region and at the EU level on developing frameworks for the entrepreneurship key competence and has become recognised as a best practice example in Europe (See Annex I for more details). The strengthening (or multiplication) of such expertise hubs could provide relevant EU and national institutions with valuable support, advice and resources for policy development on entrepreneurship education.



References

Briassoulis, H (2004). "Policy integration for complex policy problems: what, why and how." *Greening of Policies: Interlinkages and Policy Integration*, Berlin: 3-4.

Chiu, R. (2012). Entrepreneurship education in the Nordic countries: Strategy implementation and good practices. Oslo: Nordic Innovation.

EACEA/Eurydice (2012a). Entrepreneurship Education at School in Europe National Strategies, Curricula and Learning Outcomes. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

EACEA/Eurydice (2012b). Developing Key Competences at School in Europe: Challenges and Opportunities for Policy. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

European Commission (2010). Towards Greater Cooperation and Coherence in Entrepreneurship Education. Report and Evaluation of the Pilot Action High Level Reflection Panels on Entrepreneurship Education initiated by DG Enterprise and Industry and DG Education and Culture. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry.

European Commission (2014). *Thematic Group for Entrepreneurship Education. Final Report.* Brussels: European Commission, Directorate General for Education and Culture.

Gribben, A.A. (2013). Entrepreneurial learning: keystone to an entrepreneurial culture. INFORM Policy Briefing. European Training Foundation. Issue 16. Turin. June 2013

Lackéus, M. (2015). Entrepreneurship in education – what, why, when, how. Entrepreneurship360 Background Paper. Paris: OECD. Available at:

http://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/BGP_Entrepreneurship-in-Education.pdf

OECD (2002). Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management. Paris: OECD/DAC

OECD (2004). OECD handbook for internationally comparative education statistics: Concepts, standards, definitions and classifications. Paris: OECD/DAC

Peters, G.B. (2006). Concepts and Theories of Horizontal Policy Management, in: Peters, G:B./Pierre, J. (eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy*. London: Sage. pp. 115-138

Tuck, R. (2007). An Introductory Guide to National Qualifications Frameworks: Conceptual and Practical Issues for Policy Makers. Geneva: International Labour Organisation

UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE) (2013). Glossary of Curriculum Terminology. Available at: http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/IBE_GlossaryCurriculumTerminology2013_eng.pdf



Annex I: About SEECEL

The South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (SEECEL) is an institution founded in 2009 to establish structured regional cooperation in the field of human capital development, in the context of the Small Business Act for Europe, with a particular focus on lifelong entrepreneurial learning. SEECEL's activities currently cover South East Europe and the Danube Region, and the EU level.

Working with national policy makers, teacher training authorities, universities, school management and teachers on developing entrepreneurial learning, SEECEL has become a valuable support structure and is recognised at the EU level as a best practice in promoting entrepreneurship education. SEECEL's activities include:

- Support to policy-making: At the EU level, SEECEL's work includes being one of the four lead partners of the European Entrepreneurship Education NETwork (EE-HUB) and being a member of expert working groups (ET2020 Thematic Working Group for Transversal Key Competencies and the Expert Group on Indicators on Entrepreneurial Learning and Competence). At the regional level, SEECEL provides support to governments developing entrepreneurial learning strategies and curricula. SEECEL has led (in cooperation with the European Training Foundation) the assessment of entrepreneurial learning policy and practice in the countries of South East Europe and Turkey, as part of the official monitoring of the EU's Small Business Act for Europe in the region.
- Policy implementation: SEECEL supports the efforts of its member countries to incorporate
 entrepreneurship as a key competence into their education systems. SEECEL develops instruments
 for teaching entrepreneurship as a cross-curricular competence at the levels of primary, secondary
 and tertiary education and works directly with teacher training agencies to develop training
 modules in this area.

SEECEL has been recognised by the European Commission as a best practice for good conceptual solutions in the field of entrepreneurial learning and for strategic regional cooperation. SEECEL's work is also featured in numerous European Commission reports.

Supported financially by the European Commission and by the governments of its current member countries,⁵ SEECEL has an international governing board composed of appointed representatives from each member country (with one member from the ministry of education and one from the ministry responsible for SMEs), from the European Commission, the European Training Foundation (ETF), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Regional Cooperation Council (RCC).

The eight SEECEL member states are Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey.



Annex II: Survey questionnaire

1. Policy

1.1.	National strategy: Is entrepreneurship education part of a national strategy (either as a specific strategy or part of a broader strategy)?
	Yes, as a specific strategy for entrepreneurship education
	Yes, as part of broader entrepreneurship strategy
	Yes, as part of a broader education strategy
	Yes, as part of a strategy in another area (economic development, employment, youth, etc.)
	□ No
	Under development
	(NB: Multiple answers possible)
	Please list the titles of the strategies in question with links to sources (English or original language). If your answer was "No", or please write "N/A" in the box.
1.2.	Policy partnership: Is there a national body or partnership in place in the country whose role includes advisory support, development, implementation and/or monitoring regarding policy on entrepreneurship education?
	Yes
	□ No
	Under development
	If such a partnership exists (or is planned), please describe its role and to what extent the partnership includes horizontal coordination between institutions and stakeholders from relevant sectors (education, economic development, entrepreneurship, employment, etc.). If not, please write "N/A" in the box.

1.3.	National qualifications framework: Is entrepreneurship incorporated as a key competence into the country's national qualifications framework (or into the guidelines for developing a national qualifications framework)?
	Yes
	□ No
	Under development
	Please expand and, if possible, provide links to relevant sources (including in original language) If your answer was "No", or please write "N/A" in the box.
2.	Implementation
2.1.	Educational institutions: Do existing entrepreneurship education policies in the country include measures for fostering an entrepreneurial culture within educational institutions (at all levels of formal education? (E.g. training on entrepreneurship education for school directors; targeted support for links between educational institutions and business and the wider community; etc.)
	Yes
	No
	Under development
	Not applicable (no entrepreneurship education policies in place)
	If yes, please explain and mention at which levels of formal education do such measures exist (primary, secondary, tertiary education, or all levels). If possible, provide links to relevant sources (including in original language) If your answer was "No", or please write "N/A" in the box.

	incorporation of the entrepreneurship competence into
	2.2.1 initial teacher training (pre-service teacher training)
	Yes
	□ No
	Under development
	Not applicable (no entrepreneurship education policies in place)
	2.2.2 continuous professional development of teachers (in-service teacher training)?
	Yes
	□ No
	Under development
	Not applicable (no entrepreneurship education policies in place)
	If so, please expand on which programmes exist, and comment on the extent to which such programmes are mainstreamed (or rather ad hoc) in the teacher training system. If not, please write "N/A" in the box.
2.3.	Practical entrepreneurial experience in schools: Does the teaching of entrepreneurship in education institutions (at any level of education) include an emphasis on ensuring a practical entrepreneurial experience for students? (E.g. student firms, project-based learning entrepreneurship challenges, etc.).
	Yes
	□ No
	Under development
	Not applicable (no entrepreneurship education policies in place)
	If so, please provide illustrative examples on the current methods or mechanisms used for providing such practical experiences of entrepreneurship. If not, please write "N/A" in the box.

2.2. Teacher training: Do existing entrepreneurship education policies in the country include the

2.4. Promoting and supporting entrepreneurship: Please describe to what extent do entrepreneurship education policy measures also cover more general measures for promoting and supporting entrepreneurship, which typically take place outside the formal education system (e.g. non-formal entrepreneurship education for groups such as the unemployed, youth, women, minorities, etc.; training for SMEs; etc.), or whether such measures are instead covered by other sectoral policies (employment policy, SME policy etc.). If these are integrated with entrepreneurship education, please provide some examples of such entrepreneurship promotion policies and their main target groups.

3•	Monitoring and evaluation; promotion and exchange of good practice
3.1.	Monitoring and reporting: Is data on implementation on entrepreneurship in formal and nonformal education in the country collected and analysed?
	Yes
	□ No
	Under development
	If so, please comment on how regularly data is collected/analysed, and whether the data and reports are publically available (if possible, provide links to relevant sources). If not, please write "N/A" in the box.
3.2.	Promoting entrepreneurship education and exchanging good practice:
	3.2.1. Is there a national platform for promoting entrepreneurship education and for exchanging good practice (e.g. a specialised network, an annual conference, an annual awards ceremony, etc.)?
	Yes
	□ No
	Under development
	Please expand and, if possible, provide links to relevant sources (including in original language) If your answer was "No", or please write "N/A" in the box.
	3.2.2. If possible, please describe an example of national good practice in the field of entrepreneurial learning that has learning potential for other EU Member States. If not, please write "N/A" in the box.



4. Final reflections on the priority status of entrepreneurship education and on the road ahead

4.1.	Policy priority level: Considering the current education strategies and policies in the country, to what extent does entrepreneurship education feature as a prominent priority area?
	Entrepreneurship education is among the high priorities of education policy
	Entrepreneurship education is among the medium-level priorities of education policy
	Entrepreneurship education is not currently a priority of education policy
	Entrepreneurship education is not currently a priority of education policy, but is a priority in other relevant strategies (entrepreneurship, youth, employment, etc.)
	If entrepreneurship education is a priority, please expand on how this priority level is defined in relevant policy documents. If entrepreneurship education is not currently among the priorities of education policy, are there any specific obstacles to overcome in order to change its priority level?

4.2. Current and future prospects for developing entrepreneurship education: Are there any current initiatives, plans or opportunities at the national level to further develop entrepreneurship education? (E.g. upcoming strategy development; curricular reform; new funding schemes, etc.) If not, please write "N/A" in the box.





Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts of the Republic of Croatia