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ABSTRACT

The impact of globalization to education has changed the landscape of teaching and learning, forever. This disruption was ushered in by the information technology, creative innovations and communications, which changed and redefined trade, industries and the way peoples live, think or adapt to these advancements. There too, emerged new and future generation of skills and competencies needed for global competitiveness (Higher Education to 2030, OECD, 2009). One is entrepreneurship, which also recognized as one key economic driver *(Schumpeter 1934; Wennekers and Thurik 1999; Baumol 2002; van Stel et al. 2005).*

Contextualized in the Philippine setting, this paper presents models of action development approaches namely: a) the bottom-up development approach *(Anderson, 2010; Filev, 2008; Ries & Trout, 1989; Blenker & Rind, 2010; Gatchalian, 2012),* which aims to bridge the teaching and learning gaps in entrepreneurship education; b) the triple helix approach to development as government, private organizations and stakeholders start to build an ecosystem with the aim of investing in the new change makers of young star-ups in various support and enabling programs to help grow, scale and accelerate their venture potentials *(Sison, 2012; Barcelon, 201; Valencia & Eustaquio & Masancay 2012)*; and c) the cross regional border collaboration *(Higher Education to 2030, OECD, 2009)*amongst academic and professional communities through consortia and similar programs of mutual cooperation and friendship in the ASEAN region.

These were culled from research, results of end-of-course evaluations of entrepreneurship courses from 2006-2011 and 2012-2013; roundtable and panel discussions; consultative meetings; interviews and discussions with co-teachers, school administrators, entrepreneurship graduates, enabling stakeholders in an ecosystem with technology incubation models as interventions for creative innovations; and initiatives for networking and collaboration. The models identified are envisioned to institutionalize, sustain and continuously improve the quality of entrepreneurship education and its development overtime.
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**Introduction**

The leaping advancements in technologies, sciences, communication and changing economies lead one after the other towards globalization. This created new challenges and puts pressure on all sectors at all fronts to lead the pace, be at pace or be outpaced. This also brought about 21st Century learning skills, competencies and required capabilities to be relevant to these changing landscape. It has also redefined education, curriculum, content, delivery, research, emerged new blends and course hybrids for a lifelong education and career *(Higher Education to 2030, OECD, 2009; Lopez, 2007; 2010, 2012).*

Education in general is about preparing the human resource, the single and most important capital that defines an intelligible and productive society. And if there is one goal for governments and societies aspires to achieve, it is to educate and develop its human resource capital for global competitiveness.

Hence, there is a heightened recognition for a need to articulate “an entrepreneurial economy” *(Audretsch & Thurik, 2000 cited in Stam, et al, 2006),* as well as, establish and develop entrepreneurship as a lifelong education in both formal and informal levels. It is an education that creates and develops an entrepreneurial culture, which has long been identified as a key driver of economic growth and development *(Schumpeter, 1934; Wennekers and Thurik, 1999; Baumol, 2002; van Stel, et al, 2005).*

The path towards acquiring entrepreneurial competencies is more of outcomes, experiential and action-based learning *(Boyles, 2012; Gatchalian et al, 2013).* The measures of its outcomes are: a) behavioral, attitudinal and transformational change; b) the skills and competencies of identifying opportunities; c) preparation of a business plan through series of incubation process as the students’ idea takes a new form and value that fuels an increased entrepreneurial intention; d) continuing towards scaling and accelerating the venture to commercialization leading to job and wealth creation; that are e) sustainable and enduring.

Lamentably, outcomes in higher education mostly end in c, as academic and development planners and experts agree, in the Philippine experience *(Serrano, 2007; Thinking Hats, 2012; Sison, Enterprise, 2012; Barcelon, AFI-TBI, 2012; Valencia & Eustaquio, IdeaSpace 2012).*

Likewise, a new breed of development educators, experts and visionaries embarked on action-development programs to address those needs. These are defined by the author following the concepts and framework of: a) the bottom-up development approach *(Anderson, 2010; Filev, 2008; Ries & Trout, 1989; Blenker & Rind, 2010; Gatchalian, 2012*), which aims to bridge the teaching and learning gaps in entrepreneurship education; b) the triple helix approach to development as government, private organizations and stakeholders start to build an ecosystem with the aim of investing in the new change makers of young aspiring entrepreneurs to help accelerate and sustain venture start-ups (*Sison, 2013; Barcelon, 2013; Valencia, Eustaquio, & Masancay, 2012);*and c) the cross regional border collaboration *(Higher Education to 2030; OECD, 2009; AEEC, 2012)*  of academic communities with shared and mutual interests in Southeast Asian region.

**Entrepreneurship in Higher Education, the Philippine Experience**

The entrepreneurship program is relatively new as a course offering in the tertiary level. Already, in the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has pushed the formal integration of entrepreneurship education pursuant to Republic Act No. 7722 as embodied in Memorandum Order No. 17 (CMO No. 17) Series of 2005 – “Minimum Circular Requirements For Bachelor of Science In Entrepreneurship (BS Entrepreneurship).” This document contains the academic and developmental thrusts of the Entrepreneurship Programs and Courses in the Tertiary Level.

As the Philippine education gears towards responding on the developments and advancements towards 21stcentury achievement skills, this CMO No. 17starting in 2012, has started its review, assessment and consultative meetings as it undergoes some updating.

***Issues, Concerns, Challenges***

This new generation course is not without its growing pains and challenges. A study conducted in 2010 titled, “An In-depth Analysis of the Entrepreneurship Education in the Philippines” has identified gaps, challenges and limitations in its administration, management, teaching content, model and its delivery including its physical facilities, infrastructures and more. Seminal initiatives and volunteer works were undertaken by the Entrepreneurship Educators Association (ENEDA) Philippines and its officers from 2007 to 2009 in the national capital region and in 2011 to 2013 on a nationwide and ASEAN regional level.

It started with roundtable discussions, consultative meetings, networking with and gathering of like-minded individuals and institutions, both from the private and government, to surface and pursue the concerns and issues on entrepreneurship in higher education to have some resolve in immediate sight. The goal then was to come up with action development plans and programs to address the issues and concerns besetting the academic community and to impact in a larger or national scale.

The following are the issues and concerns identified, which paved the way for the purposive action development approaches:

***a. Entrepreneurship education should be clearly defined as the building and developing the entrepreneurial character and discipline, values and behavior, mindset and culture. Its curriculum and program should, therefore, put premium to such behavioral and attitudinal change, first and foremost. Lamentably, it is confused with the business course****.*

Entrepreneurship is a course where students are taught the competencies and skills to be innovative, self-directed leaders, and change makers who can disrupt or challenge ways and do things some other or better ways. It is a course that teaches the perspective of an owner and an employer or a solution provider with service orientation. It is about patiently iterating ways in a “figure-it-out” and “work and learn” environment, which along the way builds resiliency, confidence and incredible optimism in the midst of uncertain future, numerous challenges, and failures, but with some end in sight, on exponential successes. The business courses are the tools of the trade and skills to make them better decision-makers. The business courses are the vehicles through which the entrepreneurial competencies can be taught and caught. *(Viloria, Diaz, Alonzo & Pascual; Juan, Ong &Angeles; Lupisan; Serrano; Gatchalian; First ENEDA NCR Roundtable Discussion, 2008; Fajardo, Lavador, Casiño, Koa, Aquino, ENEDA National Roundtable Discussion, 2011; Delphi Conference, 2012, Proceedings in the 11th ENEDA National Conference, 2013*

***b. A unique and distinct curriculum that should develop the abstract and theoretical alongside the practical and hands on; its course management should consider the developmental stage and maturation level of students who are no longer children, but still minors, and at the same time are not yet adults aspiring to become entrepreneurs.*** *(Roundtable Discussions, ENEDA NCR, 2008, 201, Gatchalian, 2010;)*

As an achievement motivation, learning by doing and figure it out program, the curriculum should teach the desired entrepreneurial competencies alongside the business courses that would enable students to learn from incubating, exploring and growing their venture ideas. While this requires a lot of self-initiated project, it is also heavy on teacher engagement in terms of facilitation and mentoring. This is a program where the teaching and learning modes recognize the general learning disposition and maturity of young college teens, considered as minors.

This should lead educators to understand and acknowledge that teaching entrepreneurship requires specific personal and communication skills. Personal skills like sensitivity to understand their specific developmental and maturation stage of these young, restless, most often-confused individuals who are no longer children, but still minors, and at the same time, yet adults, are aspiring to become entrepreneurs. These are the young teens, in their age of rebelliousness who have also a high sense of idealism in search of role models and mentors that can guide them at the beginning and later be self-directed as they are treated as co-entrepreneurs who can make their own decisions. The educator, who is likened to a parent, handholds the students at the beginning and wean them over time as they learn to be self-directed and independent-minded in the entrepreneurial journey through college,

***c. Differentiated curriculum, needs and requirements; pedagogical approaches unique to entrepreneurship; the need for committed, competent, skillful educators and practitioners; and teaching models that works***

Teaching entrepreneurship requires distinct pedagogical methods akin to differentiated curriculum *(Tomlinson, 2008, 2011)*, which further require teachers to possess certain professional teaching qualities. These are: a) facilitation and mentoring skills; b) specialized knowledge on some industry and its standards or networking capability to help students go about their ventures; c) the readiness to commit hours of long engagement from the birth of an idea and as far its launching and venture operation; d) computer skills with some level of technological adeptness are important to match (at least) the new generation of face time and touch screen students.

The CHED, also highly recommends a mix of entrepreneurs/industry practitioners and competent academician to balance the reality gaps and industry practices. But the fact remains that hiring entrepreneurship educators in higher education requires postgraduate degrees and many other academic requirements. Entrepreneurs and industry practitioners are also extremely busy in their own business concerns. Academic life, simply do not fit their schedules and their availability for long student engagement, scarce. On the other hand, academicians lack the knack, practicality and dynamics of the industry. The contrasting set up where teachers, who are not entrepreneurs, but teaching students to be one and entrepreneurs, who are not teachers, but teaching students to become like them, further adds up to the scarcity of competent and available educators.

Katz, *(2007*) offers some relief as he points out that it is possible to teach entrepreneurship not necessarily by entrepreneurs themselves, but by trainers or educators who were trained and taught how to teach a model that works!

Several top notch academic institutions, private foundations and organizations have started the development and the successful use of entrepreneurship teaching models and programs in the United States and across Europe like Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, Network for Teaching Entrepreneurship, Babson College –Boston, Entrepreneurship Programs, Cambridge, Entrepreneurship Programs, UK, to name some. The point here is, an effective entrepreneurship teaching program and model has to be as dynamic as the course itself. It has to break walls and barriers as it find its niche relevant and appropriate to its needs and that which works around its nature, culture or challenges in a “figure-it-out” environment.

In the Philippines, entrepreneurship teaching models and programs were pioneered in the informal education set-ups in late 60’s by the University of the Philippines Institute for Small Scale Industries (UP ISSI, RA 6041) through its Entrepreneurship Development Program (EDP); the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) for example, and its allied agencies have assistance programs mostly for existing and growing entrepreneurs which formally started in the early ’70 (DTI, PD 488, PD 721); as well as, foundations, like the Small Enterprises Research and Development Foundation (SERDEF, 1976); or those international non-profit developmental organizations like; ILO-UNCTAD, USAID, World Bank, GTZ or JICA. The teaching models and programs are for entrepreneurs, would be-entrepreneurs, and trainers, but not in formal higher education for college teens.

***d. Dearth of teaching materials and methods on the motivational teaching aspect***

Educators opined that there is a general lack of teaching guides and resource materials especially in the entrepreneurial and motivational aspects. And if there are, they are either very expensive and not affordable or mostly written by foreigners from different cultures. Mostly, the acquisition of teaching materials is left at the disposition and on the account of the faculty handling the course.

***e. An expensive course - where money spent for product and venture development that cannot be recoup, is viewed as a waste of money and senseless to pursue***

Entrepreneurship is also perceived as an expensive course. The product exploration and development costs and expenses, which students cannot generally recoup during their college years, is said to be a waste of money, to begin with. Mostly, the people making such comments or observations are risk averse, with obscure understanding of what entrepreneurship is and is not. They are not entrepreneurial, after all. It takes some character, discipline, disposition and vision. And for those who do not have it, entrepreneurship is certainly not their path.

***f. School administration and its traditional top-down approach to program and course management makes it wanting for: a dynamic and enabling environment; a support system that provides structure and infrastructure for venture exploration, development, operation and its acceleration to commercial level***

Studies, roundtable and panel discussions, results of consultative meetings and conference proceedings, all revealed that entrepreneurship as a course is generally treated in the traditional mold, which are still heavy on lectures and mostly classroom work due to the large number of students that teachers can handle *(7th ENEDA National Conferences, 2007; ENEDA NCR 1st Roundtable Discussion, 2008, Gatchalian, 2010).*

Entrepreneurship courses and the ventures the students created are supposed to be treated like a running case which should develop over time as the course progresses to various levels of development. However, the general lack of course integration can be attributed to the teachers teaching entrepreneurship with an orientation and perspective of general business management courses with little or no regard to the highly differentiated need of the students and their ventures. Teachers revealed though that the mixed courses of students and the large number per class make it extremely difficult for them to make adjustments and cater to the high engagement demands of students with ventures. Students and teachers alike also shared that there are inadequacies in terms of providing the technical and scientific expertise, knowledge, and facilities to further explore and test ventures.

There is also the issue of restrictive policies, stringent rules or unclear course management guidelines in terms of the kind and extent of learning interventions a faculty may apply. These are industry and market exposures, exchange, travels, conferences or other extra-curricular activities. These always entail costs, which are often beyond the means of students.

The top-down approach to education management and its process is one traditional or standard approach where policies, course directions, rules, strategies and disciplines, tutor selection and hiring with standard academic requirements and many other concerns are systematically done and imposed from the top to other levels down. Understandably, this top-down follow mode makes any organization orderly and operable within its resources and limitations.

On the other hand, the bottom-up approach to education management and its change process works well in the context entrepreneurship spirit where innovation, change and reform, self-direction and independence and where change process are done collectively and collaboratively on the situation or problems at hand *(Blenker & Christensen, 2010).* The dynamic nature of entrepreneurial culture is the exact opposite of the top-down approach such that conflicting perspectives are bound to happen.

Therefore, it is of interest to take into consideration the opposite approaches of top-down and bottom-up in order to find the balance in terms of filling the gaps and providing support that both approaches can offer.

In many cases and for other varied reasons, business plans and its launching as part of the entrepreneurship course requirement stops at college graduation; therefore, stuns the ventures to accelerate, which could have been potentially scalable and commercially viable *(7th, 2007; 10th, 2012; and11th, 2013 ENEDA National Conferences; Gatchalian, 2010, 2013; Serrano, 2007, 2012; Sison, 2012, 2013; Barcelon, 2012, 2013; Valencia & Eustaquio, 2012, 2013).*

The many challenges and limitations cited above certainly limits the effective implementation of the entrepreneurship program and discourage potential entrepreneurs to pursue its path.

But true to the dynamic nature of entrepreneurialism, stakeholders admittedly recognize these challenges. This paved the way for creative strategies as solutions to the limiting effects of the traditional top to bottom dynamics of organizations; obscure understanding of what entrepreneurship is and is not; or the lack of appreciation of an entrepreneurial culture; and the inadequate support system for faculty development and resources in various levels of entrepreneurship development in higher education and even after graduation.

A renewed drive and a strong sense of entrepreneurial spirit brought together college students turned entrepreneurs (alumni); faculty and student organizations along with the new and emerging breed of successful industries and capitalists and their social development foundations, as well; leaders and individuals with high sense of altruism and national pride to form and organize models of action development programs. Hence, new rays of hope beams.

**Action-development approaches and models to stand and sustain entrepreneurship in higher education with far greater impact to socio-economic development**

***The Bottom-Up Approach: a development model that engages the stakeholders in the teaching and learning entrepreneurship***

The engagement of stakeholders identified here are: students, educators and alumnae make up the core of the bottom-up approach. The concept is derived from the management of change *(Anderson, 2010; Filev, 2008; Ries & Trout, 1989)*. Bottom-up approach in this paper is seen as a pragmatic approach to support Entrepreneurship Program of Miriam College (MC), Philippines (*the alumni organization as the support system*), as a lifelong education system *(involving both the administration and organizational elements of education, as well as, its content and delivery strategies*) that is found to be wanting in resource and many other challenges *(Gatchalian, 2012).*

It is interesting to note that the entrepreneur in the context of this study, who is directly involved in the change process, is no other than the former students of the MC entrepreneurship program, who after years of minting, emerge as the key stakeholder. It is a newly organized non-profit association called the MC Entrepreneurship Alumni Association. It is a support system where the new teaching and learning model from the bottom-up takes on various roles in various situations (e.g. mentor, facilitator, angel investor, educator etc.) in the venture life cycle will take place.

It is also interesting to note that the “MC entrepreneur” here emerged as organic brought about by the transformation process of entrepreneurship education. It is the student turned into a homegrown entrepreneur. This is “intrinsic” to the program for having generated what it supposed to create--entrepreneurs. This is one approach about someone who used to be a student, turned entrepreneur, who is not a teacher or educator but is now an entrepreneur-teaching student to be one. Such is one radical contrast of the traditional top-down approach, as it turned the whole pedagogy upside down.

It is such a timely occasion that these entrepreneurs have found their place with new and varied roles as mentors in the entrepreneurship program, where they are sorely needed. The entrepreneurs see themselves banding together to work and create on “possibilities” with the aim to blend in an ambitious solution to change, find the balance to address the needs and gaps of the top-down and the terms of support or assistance programs the bottom-up can provide from mentoring to angel investing *(Gatchalian, Lopez, Ibanez, Serrano, 2012).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The Entrepreneurship Program**  | **The Student – Nascent Entrepreneur** | **The Graduate –Entrepreneur*****MC Entrepreneurship Alumni Association***  |
| ***Needs, Issues, Concerns in Teaching and Learning and Closing in the Gaps******S*** |
| Entrepreneurial competencies and skills (***10 PEC’s; self-directed; independent; creative; opportunity seeking; employer/ owner perspective; educated risk-taker and more)***Differentiated-action-project-outcomes-based learning***(Treated in a traditional/regular business course; Dearth of resources, structures and infrastructures; generally traditional mode of teaching)***Clear entrepreneurial culture and Strong support system(Generally bound by traditional top-down administration model; limits the entrepreneurial culture to flourish)Competent, committed and available educators/mentors/partners ***(Educators who are not entrepreneurs but teaching students to become one; Dearth of competent, available and committed mentors)***Effective teaching models and an enabling environment; pedagogies that are age appropriate and specific to maturation level and disposition ***(Not available; left at the discretion of the faculty in charge; large number of students with mixed course per class)*** Highly engaged faculty members (***from the bottom down of the organization; who recognize the gaps and challenges, now reaching out, across and up to the top level with the aim of closing in the gaps and becoming part of an ecosystem that will strengthen and support the program and the institution it serves as well as others)***  | Heavy on facilitation; meaningful and personalized mentoring engagementPrefers to be treated as co-entrepreneur; partners; co-worker; co-creatorFunds for initialization- pre-operation; investment start-up; Enabling environment; incentives and support program (from government for student start-ups) Creative thinking laboratory; incubation facilitiesIntegration of course and its progressionThe desired achievement and motivation level and entrepreneurial competencies prepare students to enter into various modes of productive pursuits | Graduates-turned entrepreneurial with an increased level of intention; to pursue later onGraduates with entrepreneurial character and qualities who are sought after by progressive companies; increased level of employability in an intra-preneurial environmentGraduates turned homegrown entrepreneurs; ***organic to the entrepreneurship program; with a high sense of service and development orientation – organized and form the MC Entrepreneurship Alumni Association;*** ***Institutionalizing the association as an enabling eco-system that builds and breeds new generation of entrepreneurs; part resource persons; lecturers, motivational speakers, mentors; angel investors; part of the alumni organization)***Networks and collaborates with individuals and organizations with shared interests and mission; forming an ecosystem that fill the gaps of the education system and supports the growth and development of a new breed of start-ups. |
|  |

***Figure 1 - Needs, concerns, issues and gaps filled in by organically grown graduates and highly engaged stakeholders formally institutionalizing an ecosystem through purposeful collaboration from bottom up and across systems***

***The Triple Helix Approach to Development and Sustainability***

The “triple-helix innovation” or “university-industry- government” *(Leydesdorf, 2006; Etzkowitz, 2007*) is one development approach that is not new especially in the advanced countries and major emerging economies where the creation of high growth firms, such as high-technology start-ups has been the primary goal of entrepreneurship precisely because these economies recognize the significant microeconomic effects these technology start-ups bring, which are considered as the “engine behind the formation and subsequent growth of new firms” *(Stam et al 2006).*

For a country like the Philippines, this poses an ambitious and serious challenge where the industry and economic landscape generally comprised of 99% micro, small and medium, where the majority are from wholesale and retail trade industries, followed by manufacturing and service-oriented industries (NCSO, 2009) and high technology start-ups, as insignificant.

Even the nature or kind of venture engagements are exact opposites, where research and technology-driven entrepreneurial set-ups with large job-creation opportunities in developed countries is in sharp contrast with the business start-ups in developing nations, which are mostly based on need as: self-employment, livelihood, micro home-based, with little or no direct employment opportunity for others, and the most recent trend, a creative business model on social entrepreneurships. This brings forth the state of the general education, which further defines the state of the human resource, its intellectual readiness and its propensity for scientific and technical innovation.

However, there is an emerging breed of industry--government and academic leaders unfazed by such constraints. They organized and institutionalized programs that would develop and promote high growth potentials of technology-driven firms. Essentially, these programs benefit higher education where students, as nascent entrepreneurs, graduates, and even existing entrepreneurs with creative and innovative ideas with high growth and scalable potentials are given the opportunity to incubate, accelerate, grow and flourish.

This is the new ecosystem that recognizes the need for education and industry reforms that harness the potentials of its citizens by providing them with an enabling environment that would develop “techno-preneurs” with the technical, scientific and entrepreneurial capacities to grow globally competitive ventures with high impact benefits to society.

They offer incubation and acceleration support system and services in various forms of: a) office spaces and common service facilities like training –conference-meeting - lounge room; internet access; b) technical services; c) support services like: legal and IP assistance; data services etc.; marketing/technology forecasting and matching support; d) virtual incubation; back office support; video conferencing; website support; f) professional mentoring support; and, g) seed/investment support and many others depending on the need of the venture.

In some avenues, academic institutions benefit from the support and services of the new ecosystem offer. Among them are: DOST/UP Enterprise Program; Ayala Foundation- AFI-TBI Program; MVP/Pacific Group of Companies, IdeaSpace; TRC-TBI; OpenTBI – UP DIliman - DOST-EPZA; CebuInIt; Kickstart; PhilDev; SeedAsia; National and Local Governent Units; TRC DTI/DOST/PTTC etc.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The Entrepreneurship Program**  | **The Student – Nascent Entrepreneur/Start-up Gazelles** | **Triple Helix Models*:*** ***Incubation Centers; Support system from: Accelerators & Investors*** |
| ***Needs, Issues, Concerns of Start-ups with High Growth Potentials and Closing in the Gaps*** |
| Entrepreneurial competencies and skills ***(10 PEC’s; self-directed; independent; creative; opportunity seeking; employer/ owner perspective; educated risk-taker and more)***Differentiated-action-project-outcomes-based learning***(Treated in a traditional/regular business course; Dearth of resources, structures and infrastructures; generally traditional mode of teaching)***Clear entrepreneurial culture and Strong support system(***Generally bound by traditional top-down administration model; limits the entrepreneurial culture to flourish***)Competent, committed and available educators/mentors/partners ***(Educators who are not entrepreneurs but teaching students to become one; Dearth of competent, available and committed mentors*** Effective teaching models and an enabling environment; pedagogies that are age appropriate and specific to maturation level and disposition ***(Not available; left at the discretion of the faculty in charge; large number of students with mixed course per class)*** Highly engaged faculty members (***from the bottom down of the organization; who recognize the gaps and challenges; now reaching out, across and up to the top level with the aim of closing in the gaps and becoming part of an ecosystem that will strengthen and support the program and the institution it serves, as well as, others)*** | Heavy on facilitation; meaningful and personalized mentoring engagementPrefers to be treated as co-entrepreneur; partners; co-worker; co-creatorFunds for initialization- pre-operation; investment start-up; Enabling environment; incentives and support program (from government for student start-ups) Creative thinking laboratory; incubation facilitiesIntegration of course and its progressionThe desired achievement and motivation level and entrepreneurial competencies prepare students to enter into various modes of productive pursuitsRequires higher level of technical specialization and proficiencies; mentoringRequires investments or partners for further testing and incubation of creative and innovative ideas with high growth potentials for commercialization  | Network of academic institutions, organizations, individuals from private and government sectors with shared interests and mission by: 1. Forming, organizing and investing in an ecosystem that fill the gaps of the education system and the industry environment;2. Providing support and services to a new breed of start-ups with scalability and high growth potentials; with high impact benefits and growth through various vehicles; towards a strong entrepreneurial cultureFresh development and trends through 1. Initiatives from association of educators ***(e.g. ENEDA and its volunteer members on specific action research; action development programs)***2. Focused programs and support to strengthen the curriculum, student/ teacher engagements for creative and innovative pursuits in higher education; pedagogy; faculty development and training ***(Program niching and specialization: Family Enterprises; Agriculture; Hospitality/Tourism; Techno-prenuership; Social entrepreneurship etc.; UPISSI; SERDEF; CHED; MC Alumni Association; ENEDA/YES[[1]](#footnote-1); school-based student organizations and the like)***3. Corporate advocacies on new approaches or models of mind-setting, experiential and outcomes-based teaching and learning: ***( IdeaSpace;AFI-TBI; Entrep Corner of Robinsons Land Corporation and Malls; Go Negosyo; DTI-DOST/PTTC, etc.)***4.Incubation set-ups, services and investment funding for Philippine-based science and technology lean start-ups from lab to market; in collaboration with educational institutions and agencies involved in techno-entrepreneurship, education and development in the Philippines: ***(IdeaSpace[[2]](#footnote-2); Techno Hub[[3]](#footnote-3)DOST-UP Enterprise Center[[4]](#footnote-4); Open TBI – UP DIliman - DOST-EPZA[[5]](#footnote-5); CebuInIt[[6]](#footnote-6); Kikstart [[7]](#footnote-7); PhilDev; [[8]](#footnote-8)SeedAsia[[9]](#footnote-9); National and Local Governent Units; TRC DTI/DOST/PTTC, etc).*** |
|  |

***Figure 2 - Needs, concerns, issues and gaps filled by a new breed of highly charged groups forming an ecosystem to support incubation and acceleration of potentially high growth ventures and technology start ups***

***Cross Regional Border Collaboration among ASEAN Neighbors***

The growing appreciation of the benefits of collaboration and networking and renewed interests on the commonalities in various academic concerns and issues in neighboring countries in South East Asia have awaken the academic communities to come together and discuss issues among themselves with the best interest of learning from each other. This was also prompted by trends in globalization and advances in technologies that make reaching out for neighboring countries much easier than before.

The recent founding of the ASEAN Entrepreneurship Education Consortium (AEEC) co-organized by the Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Malaysian Academy of SME and Entrepreneurship Development (MASMED) and KPT in Malaysian November 4-5, 2012 to coincide with the ASEAN Entrepreneurship Conference (AEC) is the first step in this cross-regional-border collaboration between academic institutions and strategic partners in these countries.

It aims to promote and improve entrepreneurship education in the ASEAN region. The mission of AEEC is to: a) build and develop networking and collaboration amongst ASEAN academic institutions towards outstanding entrepreneurship education in ASEAN region; b) advance the principles and practices of entrepreneurship within academic institutions; c) provide a framework for collaboration for member institutions to best entrepreneurship education for ASEAN; d) promoting and supporting academic leaders, faculty, and students to advance entrepreneurship education; e) disseminating and sharing information and knowledge on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education; f) jointly organizing the Annual ASEAN Entrepreneurship Conference among members to promote new ideas and share these with members of the consortium.

The conference and the newly formed consortium was attended by over 100 academic researchers/faculty/administrators in higher education; policy makers and practitioners in ASEAN countries namely: Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, and United Kingdom. The Philippines has the highest number of foreign delegation primarily headed by Miriam College and with the representation of the members of the Entrepreneurship Educators Association of the Philippines or ENEDA. The Philippine delegation is composed of 33 participants with 18 entrepreneurship students and 15 entrepreneurship and business faculty members.

Early this year, on February 8, 2013, ENEDA Philippines, forged, a memorandum of understanding, specifically on “Friendship and Cooperation, Promotion of Mutual Understanding, Academic, Cultural and Scientific Thought and Personnel Exchange with Universiti Teknologi MARA – Kelantan Malaysia.” Since then, program of exchange has been drafted for discussion in June 2013.

These recent developments and progress show the academic vibrancy crossing borders as stakeholders expect more advances in entrepreneurship education that will propel the entrepreneurial culture. The action development models are indications of the iterative nature of strong entrepreneurial spirit among the stakeholders, who fuel all these advancements. They make life after all, better and better.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Academic Institutions and the Entrepreneurship Program**  | **|Faculty Members | Students as Nascent Entrepreneurs** | **Cross Regional Border Collaboration and Mutual Cooperation Among ASEAN Neighbors: AEEC** |
| ***Academic Concerns for Mutual Cooperation, Friendship and Exchange***  |
| Development and management of programs that are relevant and responsive to the emerging trends and needs of the new generation of learning goals and achievementsSupport for an entrepreneurial culture in the academic environment and a proactive stance to change and development.School administration and management for collaborative and cooperative engagement to learn, enrich and grow.Effective teaching models and an enabling environment; effective pedagogies to learn from as institutions find commonalities in the context of ASEAN culture and its environment.Sharing of best practices to learn from.Embark on collaborative programs in the academic communities local and across regional borders in areas of research; faculty and student visits or exchanges; training, seminars, or conference for mutual benefit, enrichment and professional growth.  | Engage faculty members and students Aspiring for development from enriching experience and personal growthExpand network for reaching out and sharing; exchange; friendship; and Professional growth Avenues for future ventures | Consortia: A network of academic institutions, organizations, individuals from private and government sectors with shared interests as they all aim to promote and improve entrepreneurship education in the ASEAN region. This cross border collaboration and mutual cooperation may be expanded following the mission of AEEC to:a) Build and develop networking and collaboration amongst ASEAN academic institutions towards outstanding entrepreneurship education in ASEAN region; b) Advance the principles and practices of entrepreneurship within academic institutions; c) Provide a framework for collaboration for member institutions to best entrepreneurship education for ASEAN; d) Promoting and supporting academic leaders, faculty, and students to advance entrepreneurship education; e) Disseminating and sharing information and knowledge on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education; f) Jointly organizing the Annual ASEAN Entrepreneurship Conference among members to promote new ideas and share these with members of the consortium |
|  |

***Figure 3–Forming a Cross Border Ecosystem among ASEAN neighbors on academic development and growth through mutual cooperation, friendship, and exchange to share, learn, and enrich each other***
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