

BUILDING AND MAINTAINING A REGIONAL INTER-UNIVERSITY ECOSYSTEM FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP: ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION CONSORTIUM

Jacqueline J. Schmidt, John Carroll University
Kay F. Molkentin, Hiram College

ABSTRACT

This paper is about a collaborative effort of eleven colleges and universities in North East Ohio to create a regional ecosystem for undergraduate entrepreneurship education and support entrepreneurship in the area. The Entrepreneurship Education Consortium (EEC) has been operational since 2007 and won the USASBE award for innovative pedagogy in 2010. The paper reviews the development of entrepreneurship ecosystems in universities, discusses the uniqueness of the EEC ecosystem and its programs, and shares results and lessons learned in developing inter- University partnerships.

DEVELOPMENT OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP ECOSYSTEMS

From a “new enterprise” course for returning veterans offered in 1947, to over 5,000 entrepreneurship courses offered by two-year and four-year institutions by 2008, entrepreneurship education is one of the fastest growing disciplines. With over 20 million early stage entrepreneurs age 18 to 25 in the U.S. it is understandable why more and more institutions are building programs at the undergraduate, graduate and even the doctorate levels (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2010). Much of this growth has occurred since 1990 (Kauffman report, 2001; Katz, 2003; Kuratko, 2005).

Prior to 2000 these programs developed largely in schools of business (Kuratko, 2005; Katz, 2003). However, a study in 2000 by Bhide revealed only 25% of future entrepreneurs came from schools of business and engineering where most of these programs were housed. In an attempt to reach these non-business students and faculty the paradigm of entrepreneurship education began to change (Green, Katz, Johannisson, 2004).

The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation was a major thought leader in this effort encouraging institutions to envision new, interdisciplinary programs that transcended traditional academic silos; stretching across disciplines and schools within institutions; connecting the university community, outside as well as inside. The Kaufmann report advocated that universities must actively see these entrepreneurial ecosystems as an organizing concept in building their programs and understanding what they are doing (Kauffman, 2005). With this changing paradigm in which entrepreneurship education was delivered, many schools, some added by the Kauffman Foundation, formed centers to create an ecosystem for entrepreneurship on their campuses (Torrance, 2013). By 2005 there were over 100 such centers (Kuratko, 2005).

A good explanation of the variety of approaches to building ecosystems can be found in Entrepreneurship Programs and the Modern University (Morris, Kuratko and Cornwall, 2013). Some examples of university wide campus approaches are: supporting cross campus business plan and idea competitions; developing co-curricular activities to support entrepreneurship such as Texas Christian University's CEO club; or establishing learning communities as the University of Maryland's Hinman CEO's. Still other approaches have been to connect programs with other campus groups such as legal clinics, technical transfer units, or professional schools. Several universities have developed hatches/incubators to help developing entrepreneurs such as the one at Belmont University. Other approaches have expanded their campus ecosystem off campus through student run ventures (Millikin University) or successful study abroad programs (Baylor University). Still other universities have worked to build an ecosystem with specific groups outside of the University such as Jumpstart or the University of Syracuse's connection with the inner city.

Another approach to developing an ecosystem has been to develop partnerships between universities. As Morris, Kuratko, and Cornwall write, this can be difficult "as each institution has its own agenda and stakeholders. Schools must be able to move beyond a competitive mindset or a 'not invented here' orientation . . . and recognize how transformative partnerships can be" (2013, p. 224).

One type of these relationships are those in which universities partner for the good of a third party such as the Entrepreneurship Bootcamp for Veterans coordinated by Syracuse University which includes seven schools fairly similar size institutions drawn from various parts of the United States. Another type of partnership is to share resources between campuses. For example, the University of Wisconsin organized a system wide summit on entrepreneurship that brought together faculty from 12 of the 14 four and two year schools in the system (Torrance, 2013). Another such example is the Texas University Network for Innovation and Entrepreneurship (TUNIE) created in 2009 composed of Texas universities and health science institutions with academic programs to provide outreach, support technology and commercialization, promote collaboration, and increase awareness of entrepreneurship (Texas University Network for Innovation and Entrepreneurship LinkedIn, 2013). A similar approach is the Michigan Initiative for Innovation and Entrepreneurship founded in 2008, which is comprised of 15 public universities within that state. The purpose of this consortium is to gather capital and distribute grants to promote the development of new enterprises (ASU University Design Consortium, 2009).

ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION CONSORTIUM

This paper is about one such inter university transformative partnership, Entrepreneurship Education Consortium (EEC), and the ecosystem it has created. The EEC is a regional organization developed by the collaborative effort of private and public, large and small colleges and universities in Northeast Ohio. The mission of the EEC is to provide practical "experiential" and theoretical education to undergraduate students; preparing them to form either new enterprises or to work for existing businesses or start-up ventures and hopefully to reduce the "brain drain" by remaining in Northeast Ohio (Finkle, Soper, Fox, Reece & Messing, 2009).

The EEC differs from the inter university partnerships described earlier in that unlike TUNIE, the Wisconsin University and Michigan systems, it goes beyond sharing resources and expanding awareness to building and running programs together. Furthermore, it differs from the Syracuse initiative Boot camp in that the schools vary in terms of size, resources and mission and s are in the same area which may make competition for resources, funding, and students more of a problem. See Table 1 for a comparison of schools and characteristics (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2010).

Table 1
Characteristics of Entrepreneurship Education Consortium Schools

Institution * denotes original member school	Type	Undergrad Enrollment	College/School of Business	ENTR Degrees Offered	ENTR Center	Other
Ashland University*	Private; DRU; Prof+A&S/SGC	2,250	Y	Major	Y	
Baldwin Wallace University*	Private; Master's L; Bal/SGC	2,924	Y	Major, Minor	Y	Blackstone LaunchPad
Case Western University*	Private; Bal/HGC; RU/VH	4,016	Y	Minor	N	Blackstone LaunchPad
Cleveland State University*	Public; Bal/HGC; RU/H	11,722	Y	None	Y	SBDC
Hiram College (2010)	Private; A&S+Prof/NGC; Bac/A&S	1,296	N	Minor	Y	
John Carroll University*	Private; A&S+Prof/SGC; Master's L	2,949	Y	Minor	Y	Hatchery; EA
Kent State University*	Public; Prof+A&S/HGC; RU/H	22,000	Y	Major, Minor, Certificate	Y	Blackstone LaunchPad
Lake Erie College (2010)	Private; Prof+A&S/SGC; Master's S	1,200	Y	Major, Minor	Y	
Lorain County Community College (2013)	Public; Assoc; Assoc/Pub-U-SC	12,798	N	Associate, Certificate	N	Blackstone LaunchPad; GLIDE
University of Akron*	Public; Prof+A&S/HGC; RU/H	22,619	Y	Minor	Y	
University of Mt. Union (2013)	Private; Prof+A&S/NGC; Bac/Diverse	2,212	N	Minor	N	Stark Entrepreneurship Alliance

INCEPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

In 2006 several directors and faculty of entrepreneurship programs in Northeast Ohio (NEO) met to discuss and share information about their new developing programs and to explore collaborative opportunities to enhance entrepreneurship education at the undergraduate level. After several meetings to brainstorm opportunities the group concluded that much more could be accomplished by pooling resources and expertise. To borrow from the popular entrepreneurial phrase to “think outside of the box,” these individuals saw added value in “acting outside of their institutions.”

After conferring with and receiving the “blessing” of their respective deans and presidents, the Entrepreneurship Education Consortium was formed in 2007 as a self-funded non-profit 501(c)(3) entity. Table 2 shows the EEC’s founding Board of Directors. The founding directors chose to form as a separate entity in order to ensure autonomy, equal representation and collaboration.

Table 2
Entrepreneurship Education Consortium Founding Board of Directors (2007)

Phil Bessler	Baldwin Wallace University
Stephen Cook	The University of Akron
Scott Fine	Case Western Reserve University
Todd A. Finkle, Ph.D.	The University of Akron
Dan Fox	Ashland University
Mark Hauserman	John Carroll University
Lee McMannis	Kent State University
Julie Messing	Kent State University
Jack Reece	Cleveland State University
John C. Soper, Ph.D.	John Carroll University
Robert Stimpert	Ashland University

The seven founding schools - Ashland University, Baldwin Wallace University, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland State University, John Carroll University, Kent State University, and The University of Akron- each contributed \$6,000 as start-up funding for the new organization. The organization also solicited funding from a local foundation, The Burton D. Morgan Foundation, which focuses on entrepreneurship education in the NEO region.

Concurrently, The Burton D. Morgan Foundation had partnered with The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation to provide funding to private liberal arts colleges as part of the North East Ohio Collegiate Entrepreneurship Program (NEOCEP)/Kauffman Campus Initiative (KCI). This foundation partnership awarded funding to five area colleges to build or expand entrepreneurship programs across their campuses. With more schools in the region developing entrepreneurship programs, the EEC extended membership invitations to two of the five NEOCEP/KCI schools to expand its membership and as a funding strategy. In 2010, Hiram College and Lake Erie College joined the EEC. In 2013, the University of Mount Union and Lorain County Community College joined the EEC, bringing the membership to eleven NEO schools. Table 3 shows the EEC’s current Board of Directors. New members pay a one-time \$10,000 fee. All member schools are expected to contribute in-kind funding in the form of release of time for faculty and administrators for EEC activities, travel support, and the use of facilities for hosting events and meetings.

Table 3
Entrepreneurship Education Consortium 2013-14 Board of Directors
 (* denotes founding director)

Read F. Wakefield	Ashland University
Phillip S. Bessler*	Baldwin Wallace University
Robert Sopko	Case Western Reserve University
Mark Dobeck, Ph.D.	Cleveland State University
Kay F. Molkentin	Hiram College
Mark K. Hauserman*	John Carroll University
Jeff Eakin	Lake Erie College
Julie Messing*	Kent State University
Lee S. Kolezun	Lorain County Community College
Matt Stinson	University of Mount Union
Robert Chalfant	The University of Akron

After the initial one time membership fee paid by each school, funding support for EIW and *ideaLabs* has come mainly from The Burton D. Morgan Foundation with additional gifts coming from individuals and the in-kind support of the member schools.

The emphasis of the EEC continues to be the development of entrepreneurship programming for undergraduate students of all disciplines in Northeast Ohio (NEO). The core focus of this programming is on teaching the entrepreneurial process through doing. Subsequent objectives include: build collaborative team experiences through programming and competitions; build and expand a network of young people interested in entrepreneurship in NEO; inform students of entrepreneurial opportunities and resources in NEO; increase the awareness of all schools and community stakeholders of the importance of entrepreneurship; increase the regional and national visibility and success of the EEC and Northeast Ohio; and create an innovative and collaborative education model to teach entrepreneurship that can be transferred to other regions (Finkle, 2009).

The two main programs of the EEC are – *Entrepreneurship Immersion Week (EIW)* and *ideaLabs*.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP IMMERSION WEEK

The first program launched by the EEC in 2007 was *EIW*, an intensive one-week, academic immersion experience for undergraduates from all disciplines to immerse themselves in the skills needed to help them develop new business concepts and apply these skills in a team-based business concept competition. Held on the campus of a hosting member's institution during the first week of August, *EIW* rotates annually among the member institutions. Each EEC recruits students from across their campus, with first priority given to rising juniors and seniors. The reason for the grade limitation is two-fold: 1) we want the students to return to their respective universities to continue work on their ideas, as well as recruit students for next year; and 2) to lessen the chance of any student transferring to another member school.

A team of five students from each school participates in a series of academic sessions focusing on the feasibility analysis process. Topics include: idea generation, opportunity recognition, market feasibility analysis, legal and intellectual property issues, start-up financials,

funding a start-up venture, networking and professional development, leadership and team building, ethics, etc. At the start of the week, students participate in several “ice-breaker” and team building exercises. Additionally, each team works throughout the week to develop a new product or service venture that has not been vetted by the group prior to arriving at *EIW* or that has been previously presented in a competition. The *EIW* curriculum has been designed to lead the students through the feasibility analysis process to help them prepare to present their idea to a panel of judges at the end of the week in a culminating competition.

The academic sessions are taught by both academics and practitioners (e.g. financiers, attorneys, entrepreneurs). In a more casual format *EIW* and *ideaLabs* alumni who have launched or are in the process of launching their idea, along with other young entrepreneurs and representatives from area accelerators/incubators are invited to share their experiences and resources with the students during the lunch sessions.

All of the EEC directors and several “special member” faculty also reside on campus during the week to help all the students through the idea generation, development and feasibility process. Although the students are working as their school team, the EEC directors and faculty have no school attachment for the week. From the beginning it is stressed to the students that the *EIW* faculty are available to share their knowledge, expertise and time with all students, regardless of school affiliation. This is a unique concept, which students at first find difficult to believe, but by the middle of the week have no problem reaching out to any and all of the faculty for help and guidance.

IDEALABS

ideaLabs is a regional competition encouraging undergraduate students from all disciplines to develop a new venture idea, apply the feasibility analysis process and present it to a panel of independent judges to determine a regional champion from among the EEC member schools. The event was first held in 2008 under the name Launch Town, when the EEC partnered with an informal group of entrepreneurs, angels and academics to host the competition (Schmidt, Molkenin, Messing, Bessler, 2014). Due to differences in pedagogical focus, the two groups dissolved its partnership after one year and the EEC switched to an undergraduate only model with a focus on the idea development process, rather than on business creation. In preparation for *ideaLabs* each EEC member school, working with the same competition guidelines, holds its own campus competition to determine a student or team (of up to five students) to represent them at *ideaLabs*. The members of the judging panel are entrepreneurs, angel investors and business leaders involved in Northeast Ohio’s growing entrepreneurial ecosystem. All judges receive instruction on the use of the judging rubric that has been carefully designed to first and foremost evaluate the students’ comprehension and execution of the feasibility analysis process.

RESULTS

The primary objective of the EEC is to provide undergraduate students from all disciplines with educational programming focused on the entrepreneurial process. Since its launch in 2007, a total of 285 students have participated in *EIW*, with the diversity of students

improving over the seven years: arts and sciences students 24% to 46%, females 30% to 41%; and minorities 20% to 31%. During the period of 2009 to 2013, over 660 students have participated in *ideaLabs* at the campus level to the regional competition, with participation by non-business majors increasing every year, from 24% in 2009 to 49% in 2013 (Schmidt, 2014).

A pre- and post-survey is administered to all *EIW* participants. In the beginning, the EEC used a lengthy survey that aimed to provide an overall assessment of all elements of weeklong program (e.g. length/content of sessions, food, amount of free time), self-assessment of attitudes and knowledge gained, and demographic information. The annual results from this survey were used by the EEC directors to evaluate presentations, presenters and the overall format of the program.

In 2010, a more streamlined self-assessment survey (SAS) was developed and administered pre- and post. The survey uses a 7-point Likert Scale to examine knowledge gained in the following areas: business plans; opportunity recognition; market feasibility and market plans; operating plans; financial planning; ethics; legal issues; staff and management building; and presentations skills. The survey also queries students as to their confidence level, desire to start a business and plans to stay in northeast Ohio. Survey results are summarized and used for continuous improvement of the program. Demographic information is now collected when the students register for the program. Table 4 shows SAS results from 2009 to 2013.

Table 4:
Results from *EIW* Pre- and Post- Student Self-Assessment Survey
Knowledge Base increased on a 7-point Likert scale (NS - not surveyed)

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Business Plans	NS	+1.48	+1.31	+1.36	+1.82
Opportunity Recognition	+2.03	+1.92	+1.96	+2.01	+1.63
Marketing Plan	+1.473	+1.01	+1.15	+1.49	+1.31
Operation Plan	NS	+1.52	+1.72	+1.63	+1.49
Financial Plan	+1.83	+1.37	+1.51	+1.52	+2.14
Ethics	+0.76	+0.93	+0.99	+0.48	+0.44
Legal	+1.21	+1.70	+1.84	+1.21	+1.47
Staff/Management	+0.72	+1.04	+1.60	+1.18	+1.13
Presentation	NS	+1.64	+1.61	+1.41	+2.03
Grand Mean	+1.47	+1.40	+1.52	+1.26	+1.50
% wanting to start a business	63%	74%	89%	67%	76%
% Planning to stay in NEO	NS	NS	36%	29%	33%

While the focus of both *EIW* and *ideaLabs* is on teaching the entrepreneurial process and not solely to create business, there have been a number of ventures launched with several promising ones in the development pipeline. Launched ventures include: Fresh Fork Market, 1st Place *EIW* 2007; DecisionDesk (formerly Citizen Groove), 1st Place LaunchTown 2008; NextToNothingBooks.com (originally Affinity Algorithms), 2nd Place *ideaLabs* 2011; 7th Symphony, *EIW* 2011 participant; Bradley's Chocolate Covered Strawberries, *ideaLabs* 2012 participant; and Bundle Media, *EIW* 2013 participants. In development ventures include: Pothole Patch LLC, 1st Place *ideaLabs* 2012; CustoME Color, 1st Place *EIW* 2011;

www.widdle.it and www.kudoala.com, *EIW* 2013 participant; www.carbonorigins.com, *EIW* 2012 participant; ReJoyn Zipper Solution, *EIW* 2013 participants; Mango, *EIW* 2013 participants; FeMailbox, 1st Place *EIW* 2013; AvaKare, 2nd Place *EIW* 2013; and KnotProfit, *ideaLabs* 2014. Additionally, several of these start-ups have gone on to participate in area accelerators/incubators such as Bizdom, MAGNET, Technology Accelerator Alliance and Flashstarts, and several have received external funding from the Great Lakes Innovation and Development Enterprise Fund.

In addition to these student results, the EEC has developed the creation of an inter-university ecosystem and a culture of collaboration. The member schools share information on programs, best practices, and speakers not only for *EIW* but also for curriculum development. For example, twice when EEC schools have conducted internal programs to develop their own non-business faculty, directors have invited other directors and faculty from the EEC member schools to attend the programs for ideas. Directors have even shared faculty bios and resumes when a member was looking for adjunct or new positions. In fact, two faculty members have moved between EEC schools to accept new positions. Finally, the members serve as an informal sounding board for problems such as dealing with the administration or program management.

WHY THIS WORKS

In their analysis Morris, Kuratko and Cornwall (2013) assert that in effective inter university partnerships it is essential that “each has a stake in the initiative (or “skin in the game”) (p. 224). This was also one of the primary concerns of the founders of the EEC (Finkle, 2009). The EEC has done this by rotating the two signature programs between the schools. In this manner all schools have involvement with and responsibility for the programs. Furthermore, no school or institution is viewed as the dominant player in planning or implementation.

A second factor identified was that the effort “fits well with the mission and resources of each school” (Morris, 2013, p. 224). On the surface this could have been an obstacle for the EEC. A quick look at the member schools (Table 1) clearly shows differences in university missions and in resources (even in regard to entrepreneurship). However, in forming the EEC these schools all adopted the mission of developing students. The founders established a new organization with a specific mission rather than work with the variety of institution missions. Further, as mentioned earlier, the signature programs do not focus on fully developed business plans, although as indicated above many of them will become that, but on idea development-central to the educational mission of all of the schools. Perhaps this focus makes it easier for participating faculty/administrators to interject much in the same way that they work with students in developing research projects or papers collaboratively and as a facilitator rather than as a coach in a competitive contest.

Additionally, “collaboration is personal not institutional” and entails mutual adaptation, ongoing engagement and adjustment, a willingness to listen, and a commitment to ensuring both party’s objectives are being met” (Morris, 2013, p. 224). The EEC builds this collaboration in several ways.

First, EEC members meet monthly to discuss programming, funding, and share resources. This frequent interaction allows directors/professors to know each other and develop personal

relationships. An example of this interaction is the schedules for *ideaLabs* and *EIW* that are developed, reviewed and approved at the monthly meetings of the board. The board also makes site visits to the hosting school to be “a second set of eyes” and provide suggestions, as many have hosted previously.

Second, the EEC makes this collaboration a part of their programs. A good example of this collaborative attitude occurs during Immersion Week. As mentioned earlier, during *EIW* faculty/ directors make a commitment to support all teams in idea development. Faculty are expected to informally visit different school teams during the week and offer advice and network resources to them on their idea. Formally, there are two sessions in the program where faculty members from all schools provide advice and suggestions to the teams. The first occurs mid-week when all teams present their pitch on potential ideas to all faculty and the second is on Thursday night when combined faculty hear and give advice on presentations to the teams. Additionally, when a school has been unable to fill its team or support a team at all, for whatever reason, the team is filled or a “blended team” is formed with members from other schools. In the case of a “blended team”, faculty from several schools work directly with that team, as if it were their own school’s team. Students develop connections with each other and faculty/directors from other schools and many stay in touch after the program as they continue to work on launching their idea.

The result is the creation of a culture of collaboration in that focus is on developing ideas. While entrepreneurs are competitive, they must also develop an openness to explore and look for support and resources. This program models that skill and connection moving students beyond the attitude that “if I tell you my idea, I will have to kill you” to realizing that in order to develop an idea one needs to discuss and evaluate it.

CONCERNS

One issue that the EEC has struggled with, and still does, is how far can this network go and still maintain this culture? The original founders believed that the EEC should only include four year schools (Finkle, 2009). Yet the current leaders have expanded membership to include a community college. Leadership still maintains the regional aspect to the system rather than expanding to the state so that the culture can be sustained through direct interaction of the monthly meetings and program exchanges.

The culture of collaboration has remained even though only three of the original founders are on the current board. In an effort to preserve this connection, the current board has worked to document and create a history in several ways. A data base of participants has been established so that students can connect with each other. Another way has been to develop honor and highlight heroes and their beliefs through emeritus or honorary member status. Telling their stories serves to reinforce the underlying values of the organization. Additionally, articles such as this also reinforce organizational norms and behaviors.

Fundraising has been another issue around which the EEC has had difficulty. Institutional issues arise as everyone is funding for their own schools as well as attempting to fund raise for this program. From the perspective of their home institutions this presents a conflict of interest.

Additionally, many of the schools are receiving support from the same sources that would be interested in the EEC's programs.

LESSONS LEARNED

In the process of starting and expanding this regional inter-university collaborative, the EEC has worked through a number of key issues and learned important lessons worth sharing.

Stay Focused

The original founders encouraged the organization to stay focused on the objectives to avoid distractions, such as expanding too quickly or for the wrong reasons (Finkle, 2009). The EEC has done this, but has also been open to making changes when needed such as the inclusion of a community college.

Maintain Diversity

Maintain the diversity in students and schools. Of the 11 schools: 7 are private and 4 are public; 6 are liberal arts and 8 have a business school; and 6 have student populations under 3000, 3 with populations between 4,000 to 13,000, and 2 have student populations over 20,000 (Schmidt, 2014). The heterogeneity in the consortium's composition stimulates approaches to programming and resolving issues as it encourages the discussion of different perspectives and needs.

Autonomy and Ownership

Keep the organization autonomous and make sure that everyone "has skin in the game" by rotating the programs (*EIW* and *idea Labs*) among the schools; recognizing that each member of the group needs to be ready to contribute both cash and sweat equity when needed (Finkle, 2009).

Mix Matters

The "mix" of the directors does matter. That is not to say that everyone needs to be like-minded. As a matter of fact, we have found that having individuals with different views has been most beneficial. Everyone needs to be there because they want to be; not because they were assigned by their dean or president. It works best when everyone is there for the same reason – the students.

Maintain Focus on Collaboration and Students

On one level, all schools are competitors (for student enrollees, for outside support, and for media attention), but on another level, the EEC can cooperate to produce significant regional outcomes. Examples of collaboration are: during *EIW* the directors of all schools work equally with all of the teams to help them develop their ideas; when schools have been unable to support

a full team, a team has been completed or formed with members from several schools (Schmidt, 2014).

Communicate

The EEC board meets monthly, and more frequently in the two months leading up to its major events, *EIW* and the *ideaLabs* (Schmidt, 2014).

Hire Help

Hire competent outside help when necessary and if funding allows, i.e., legal, auditing, insurance, program evaluation, web development, and fundraising (Finkle, 2009). EEC has continued to follow this approach, which has reduced uneven pressure on certain directors of institutions thus eliminating an unequal balance in responsibility.

CONCLUSION

Uniquely, the EEC has formed a powerful regional network of faculty, students and staff to share undergraduate course ideas and materials. It recognizes that creativity in all fields is enhanced by understanding and employing sound business principles. It embraces both cooperation and competition. Its membership includes both private and public institutions. It taps into a legion of regional entrepreneurs, businesses, and supportive enterprises for curricular and extra-curricular programs. Last, while its focus is on educating undergraduate students in entrepreneurial studies, it seeks to have a long term impact on new business creation, job enhancement, and regional wealth.

REFERENCES

- Bhide, A. (2000). *The origin and Evolution of New Businesses*, Oxford University Press, New York, N.Y.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. (2010) Retrieved January 15, 2014 from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>.
- Finkle, T., Soper, J., Fox, D. Reece, J., and Messing J. (2009). Constructing an innovative model of entrepreneurship education through regional collaboration. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 12, 43-66.
- Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*. (2013). Retrieved February 2, 2014, from <http://www.gemconsortium.org/Data>.
- Greene, P., Katz J., and Johannisson B. (2004). From the guest co-editors. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3(8)0, 10-17.
- Katz, J. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education 1876-1999. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 283-300.
- Kuratko, D. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 29,(5), 577-598.
- Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership (2001). *The growth and advancement of entrepreneurship in higher education: an environmental scan*. Winter 2001.
- Kauffman, (2013). *Entrepreneurship Education Comes of Age on Campus*
http://www.kauffman.org/~media/kauffman_org/research%20reports%20and%20covers/2013/08/eshipedc-omesofage_report.pdf.
- The Michigan Initiative for Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. (2009) Retrieved February 2, 2014, from <http://universitydesign.asu.edu/db/the-michigan-initiative-for-innovation-and-entrepreneurship>.
- Morris, M., Kuratko, D., and Cornwall, J. (2013). *Entrepreneurship Programs and the Modern University*. Edward Elgard Press: Massachusetts.
- Schmidt, J.J, Molkenstin, K.F, Messing, J., and Bessler, P. (2014). "Entrepreneurship Educational Consortium: A Regional Approach," *Annals of Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*: Mike Morris (Ed). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Texas University Network for Innovation and Entrepreneurship LinkedIn*. (2014). Retrieved February 9, 2014, from <http://www.linkedin.com/groups?gid=2080296&mostPopular=&trk=tyah&trkInfo=tas%3ATexas%20University%20Network%20for%20Innovation%20%2Cidx%3A1-1-1>.
- Torrance, Kauffman Foundation Entrepreneurial campuses: (2013). *Action, Impact, and lessons learned from Kauffman Initiative August 2013*. Retrieved February 9, 2014, from http://www.kauffman.org/~media/kauffman_org/research%20reports%20and%20covers/2013/08/entrepreneurialcampusesessay.pdf.