

## **EAM International 2017 Professional Development Workshop Submission**

### **TITLE PAGE**

**Title:** *Building Social Entrepreneurship Course Outlines for the Global Student*

**Primary Submission Domain:** Management Education & Development (MED)

**Potential Co-Sponsor Domain:** Entrepreneurship (ENT)

**Organizer:** Jeffrey J. McNally, University of New Brunswick (UNB)

**Co-Chairs:** Thomas Mengel, UNB; Maha Tantawy (Student), UNB;  
Dianne H.B. Welsh, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Panos Piperopolous, University of Leeds

### **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this workshop is to build upon recent research in the area of syllabus design, namely for social entrepreneurship education (SEE) courses. This will be accomplished by discussing the recent research in syllabus development for SEE courses and building a template for an effective, modern SEE outline. Research on a global set of SEE outlines, conducted by the organizers, will also be presented in the context of building effective syllabi using andragogical principles.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurship Education; Social Entrepreneurship; Social Innovation; Social Business; Social Entrepreneurship Education; Andragogy; Student-Centered Learning; Syllabus; Course Outline.

## **BUILDING SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP COURSE OUTLINES FOR THE GLOBAL STUDENT**

Social entrepreneurship (SE) is passionately and increasingly being practiced around the globe (AshokaU, 2014). However, while entrepreneurship is an established area of scholarly focus since the late 17<sup>th</sup> century (Landstrom, 2007), SE has only recently entered the academic arena and still is a field under development (Mueller et al., 2014). As such, definitions of SE are plenty and far apart, (Mueller et al., 2014). This can cause a lack of consistency amongst those who teach SE at the university level.

Often SE is understood as entrepreneurship with social impact or with focus on a social mission resulting in a dual- and, more recently, a triple bottom line approach (Slaper & Hall, 2011). This may be because the majority of research on SE is undertaken by scholars in business and published in management journals (AshokaU, 2014). Other approaches – while casting a wider net – often originate outside of traditional business schools or in the field of SE practice (Dacin, Dacin & Matear, 2010). As a result, social entrepreneurship education (SEE) is aiming at educating change agents from various disciplinary backgrounds and for different fields of practice.

Further, some specific perspectives and valid arguments add to the variety of approaches and to the confusion of scholars and practitioners who are working on passionately moving the field to the stage of academic maturity and well established and understood practice. For example, the social business (SB) movement, based on Mohammad Yunus' definition of social business as a business with social impact but without any consideration for profit generation (Kickul, Terjesen, Bacq, & Griffiths, 2012) and Wesley's adamant attempts to clearly differentiate SE from social innovation (SI) (Weber, 2012), adds some potential for clarity which has not yet been widely accepted let alone been implemented (Mueller et al., 2014).

In this professional development workshop (PDW) proposal, we first contextualize social entrepreneurship education by reviewing how the literature has addressed important terms, concepts, and issues. Second, we present and discuss relevant frameworks that have proven to be of benefit for the analysis of educational approaches. Third, some of these frameworks will be used to analyze social entrepreneurship syllabi at Canadian universities that have been collected by the panelists; Fornaciari and Lund Dean's (2015) recent presentation of an andragogical approach to syllabus development will be at the heart of our analysis. Fourth, resulting practices and issues will be compared and discussed and some first recommendations will be offered.

## **WORKSHOP OVERVIEW**

### **Background**

The primary focus of this PDW proposal is on developing SEE course outlines using the most up-to-date, andragogical principles. The recent SEE literature extensively discusses various pedagogical approaches and perspectives. Only a few explicitly acknowledge the fact that most

SE learners are adult learners by choosing the term andragogy (or learner) over pedagogy (or student). Given that demand from “students” is one of the key drivers of the growth for SEE, a learner-centered approach and andragogy seem appropriate. In the following we present what earlier reviews of SE course material (Welsh & Krueger, 2009; Brock & Steiner, 2009; AshokaU 2011) have found in terms of pedagogical approaches and discuss more recent contributions that have enriched the pedagogical and andragogical discourse regarding SEE.

Brock and Steiner (2009) mention service learning as a pedagogical approach well utilized in SEE (75%). They also found that the ratio between classroom and practice based learning is about half and half. These results are confirmed by the findings of Welsh and Krueger (2009). The latter also emphasize “the wide range of approaches faculty are taking to teach social entrepreneurship... [due to the] diversity of instructor backgrounds...[and identify a] need to develop a set of common best practices and determine what content and methods are most productive” (p. 36f).

Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) have introduced a three-step creation process for SEE oriented towards practice-based learning. First, in “problem representation” learners try to understand the problem and work on developing ideas for solutions. Second, in “solution planning” they evaluate the ideas generated earlier and translate them into concrete plans. Third, in “solution execution” they are implementing their preferred option based on their recommendations resulting from the earlier phases. Similarly, Pache and Chowdhury (2012) claimed that teaching “about” SE and SI – with a focus on knowledge – needs to be balanced with teaching “for” SE and SI by adding a focus on practical skill development.

Probably, the most influential contribution to the discourse about pedagogical – or andragogical – frameworks has recently been made by Fornaciari and Lund Dean (2014); their discussion of “The 21st century syllabus” certainly is at the core of our methodological approach (see further down). Based on respective student development literature about the Generation Y they “explore how and why the role of a course syllabus has changed, particularly in the management education realm, using the andragogy literature to frame the discussion” (Fornaciari & Lund Dean, 2014, p. 701). They particularly employ “four analytic frames from the current syllabus development literature—syllabus as contract, as power, as communication or signaling device, and as collaboration” (ibid.) – to guide their discussion.

The traditional syllabus provides “an operational roadmap” orienting students about the what, when, who and how technicalities of the course. However, syllabi often do not well reflect the needs of current students in terms of adult learners and, as Fornaciari and Lund Dean claim, “our students are not using our syllabi with any regularity toward its intended purpose” (p. 703f.). Instead the authors suggest that andragogical principles guide the development of syllabi. Adult learners need to know why they are learning and they prefer intrinsic motivators. Further, they prefer experiential and problem-based learning that is immediately relevant to them. Finally, adult learners should own their learning and be involved in any decision-making about their learning. As a result of applying these principles, syllabi can become “much more than unidirectional instruments and can assist in constructing both intellectual and psychosocial meaning with students” (Fornaciari & Lund Dean, 2014, p. 703). The authors hold that most syllabi to date are used with a focus on instructor control and as contractual or power instruments. They further suggest that utilizing syllabi as communication or collaboration device

is more promising in regard to a learner-centered, andragogical approach.

In a follow-up paper Lund Dean and Fornaciari (2014) provided the following set of tips and recommendations that “requires both a philosophical shift and an actual implementation in practice” (p. 730):

- Consider Moving Toward Inclusive Syllabus Language and Policies, Signaling Mutual Respect....
- Consider Streamlining Syllabi to Recognize Reading Habits of Today’s Students....
- Consider the Schedule Portion of the Syllabus as Most Important for Students....
- Consider Syllabus Design and Layout for Accessibility and Engagement....
- Consider Students’ electronic-based worldview for readability....
- Consider Designing the Syllabus as a Resource and Go-To Document” ....
- Consider Our Own Ambiguity Preferences to Balance Structure With Student Input.... (p. 725ff)

In this proposal we outline ways that we plan to examine a small portion of the overall population of SEE courses to start to examine whether instructors have begun to make this philosophical shift. Specifically, using the above tips as a checklist, we examine the extent to which existing SEE courses in English-speaking Canadian universities have been designed with pedagogical (or andragogical) underpinnings. We believe this is important not only as a “pulse check” on existing, but also to provide a baseline understanding of pedagogy/andragogy in SEE courses for the purpose of benchmarking future improvements.

### **Research to Date: Canada**

The results of our study mirror AshokaU’s (2011) findings and suggest that “despite increased interest, rigorous, relevant and innovative social entrepreneurship curricula and teaching resources remain scarce” (p. 15) and androgogical principles of syllabus design are not yet well addressed. Drawing on frameworks developed by Fornaciari and Lund Dean (2014), our study has shown that SE syllabi do not yet well address the need of today’s learners and the required “philosophical shift and actual implementation in practice” (Lund Dean & Fornaciari, 2014, p. 730) is still outstanding.

The language of reviewed syllabi is rather exclusive (instructor and control oriented) and does not well support the also existing intention of instructors to invite learners to take control of their own learning. In addition, many of today’s learners may not well connect to existing syllabi because the documents do not readily “recognize [the} reading habits of today’s students” (Lund Dean & Fornaciari, 2014, p. 726) and still offer too much information that may not be perceived as relevant by students. Learners will likely focus on what they consider to be of key importance and what in fact is highlighted in most syllabi that were analyzed: the course schedule (ibid., p. 727); other elements might simply not be read. This is not surprising given that only half of the syllabi investigated appear to be designed and laid out for “accessibility and engagement” of today’s learners (ibid.) and even less “consider students’ electronic-based worldview for readability” or design the syllabus as “resource and go-to-document” (ibid., p. 729).

As part of a related research project, the panelists collected approximately 80% of the existing SEE course outlines in publicly funded Canadian universities. We applied Lund Dean and

Fornaciari's framework to them and found that many of the outlines we not designed with andragogical principles in mind. We will discuss this research as part of the PDW to provide a Canadian context to our outline building exercises.

### Target Audience

This workshop will be of interest to those who teach (or plan to teach) social entrepreneurship and those who study (or plan to study) the outcomes of social entrepreneurship educational interventions at the university/college level. As such, the workshop will be open to all who are interested in attending, from curious graduate students to experienced scholars.

## WORKSHOP FORMAT

### PDW Organizer:

**Jeffrey J. McNally, Ph.D.** is an assistant professor of human resource management in the Faculty of Business Administration at the University of New Brunswick (UNB). He has a Ph.D. in business administration from McMaster University and a master's degree in industrial/organizational psychology from Western University. He is currently engaged in a longitudinal, global study of the outcomes of entrepreneurship education. The project, entitled "The Entrepreneurship Education Evaluation Project", received a large SSHRC Insight Grant in 2013 (<http://www.eeeresearch.com>). Jeff has published in some of the management field's highest- ranking journals and, in 2013, received the FBA's *Annual Research Award* for excellence in research. In 2015, Jeff received the FBA's *Excellence in Teaching Award*, and in 2016, he received the faculty's *Excellence in Research Award*.

### Structure:

<b><u>Section 1: Introduction</u></b>	<b>(:30)</b>
1. Introduction of panelists and session goals	(:05)
2. Background and key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Brief summary of SEE research issues from panelists, including what outcomes are currently studied</li> <li>b) What is SE? Definitions discussed.</li> <li>c) Discussion of SEE syllabus research.</li> <li>d) Identification of any other key issues related to developing a modern, inclusive SEE syllabus.</li> </ul>	(:25)
<b><u>Section 2: Breakout Groups</u></b>	<b>(:60)</b>
Panelists will join participants at tables and discuss current, andragogical approaches to creating SEE course outlines and to design a brief course outline.	(:30) (:30)
Groups will prepare a short presentation of the issues raised at their tables for both (a) and (b).	

<b><u>Section 3: Discussion / Wrap-Up</u></b>	<b>(:30)</b>
Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panelists will engage the participants and in an analysis and integration of the individual breakout group discussions.</li> <li>• It is our hope that both panelists and participants leave with examples of course outlines that they can use in their own SEE classrooms.</li> </ul>	<b>(:25)</b>
Conclusion	<b>(:05)</b>

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R., (Eds. 2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York, NY: Longman.
- AshokaU. (2011). *Curriculum and Teaching Resource Guide*. Arlington, VA: AshokaU.
- AshokaU. (2014). *Trends in Social Innovation Education*. Arlington, VA: AshokaU.
- Brock, D. D., & Steiner, S. (2009). *Social Entrepreneurship Education: Is it achieving the desired aims?* Retrieved from Social Sciences Research Network website:  
[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1344419](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1344419)  
 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1344419>
- Chia, R. (1996). Teaching paradigm shifting in management education: University business schools and the entrepreneurial imagination. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(4), 409–428.
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M., & Matear, M. 2010. Do we need a theory of social entrepreneurship? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24, 37-57.
- Dees, G. J. (Producer). (1998, October 31, 1998). *The Meaning of "Social Entrepreneurship"*. Retrieved from  
<http://csistg.gsb.stanford.edu/sites/csi.gsb.stanford.edu/files/TheMeaningofsocialEntrepreneurship.pdf>
- Entrepreneurship Education Evaluation Project (n.d.). Retrieved August 06, 2015, from  
<http://www.eeeresearch.com/>
- Fornaciari, C. J., & Lund Dean, K (2014). The 21st-Century Syllabus: From Pedagogy to Andragogy. *Journal of Management Education*, 38(5), 701-723. doi: 10.1177/1052562913504763
- Howorth, C., Smith, S. M., & Parkinson, C. (2012). Social Learning and Social Entrepreneurship Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 371-389.
- Kickul, J., Terjesen, S., Bacq, S., & Griffiths, M. (2012). Social Business Education: An Interview With Nobel Laureate Muhammad Yunus. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. 11(3). 453-462.
- Kickul, J., Janssen-Selvadurai, C., & Griffiths, M. D. (2012). A Blended Value Framework for Educating the Next Cadre of Social Entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 479-493.
- Kwong, C. C. Y., Thompson, P., & Cheung, C. W. M. (2012). The Effectiveness of Social Business Plan Competitions in Developing Social and Civic Awareness and Participation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 323-348.
- Krueger, N. F., & Wuebker, R. J. (2014). In Search of the "Entrepreneurial Mindset": Insights from Neuroscience. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*, 2014(1), 15052-15052. doi: 10.5465/AMBPP.2014.15052symposium
- Lawrence, T., Phillips, N., & Tracy, P. (2012). From the Guest Editors: Educating Social Entrepreneurs and Social Innovators. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 319-323.
- Landstrom, H. (2007). *Pioneers in Entrepreneurship and Small Business Research*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Lund Dean, K., & Fornaciari, C. J. (2014). The 21st-Century Syllabus: Tips for Putting Andragogy Into Practice. *Journal of Management Education*, 38(5), 724-732. doi:10.1177/1052562913504764
- Mueller, S., D'Intino, R. S., Walske, J., Ehrenhard, M. L., Newbert, S. L., Robinson, J. A., & Senjem, J. C. (2014). What's Holding Back Social Entrepreneurship? Removing the Impediments to Theoretical Advancement. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1-12. doi:

10.1080/19420676.2014.954259

- Nicholls, A. (2011). Social Entrepreneurship Teaching and Research: Orphan, Cuckoo, or Walrus? In D. D. Brock & M. Kim (Eds.), *Social Entrepreneurship Education Resource Handbook* (pp. 6-9). Arlington, VA: Ashoka U.
- Pache, A.-C., & Chowdhury, I. (2012). Social Entrepreneurs as Institutionally Embedded Entrepreneurs: Toward a New Model of Social Entrepreneurship Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 494-510.
- Slaper, T. F., & Hall, T. J. (2011). The Triple Bottom Line: What is it and how does it work? *Indiana Business Review*, 86(1), 4-8. Retrieved from <http://www.ibrc.indiana.edu/ibr/2011/spring/article2.html>
- Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. (2007). The Distinctive Challenge of Educating Social Entrepreneurs: A Postscript and Rejoinder to the Special Issue on Entrepreneurship Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(2), 264-274.
- Vidal, N., Smith, R., & Spetic, W. (2015). Designing and Teaching Business & Society Courses From a Threshold Concept Approach. *Journal of Management Education*, 39(4), 497-530. doi: 10.1177/1052562915574595
- Weber, M. J. (2012). Social Innovation and Social Enterprise in the Classroom: Frances Westley on Bringing Clarity and Rigor to Program Design. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3), 409-418.
- Welsh, D. H. B., & Krueger, N. F. (2009). Defining Social Entrepreneurship. *BizEd*, 8(4), 36-37.
- Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Worsham, E. L. (2012). Reflections and Insights on Teaching Social Entrepreneurship: An Interview With Greg Dees. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(3). 442-452.