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Summary

For some time there has been considerable and growing interest in Entrepreneurship Education. From at least the early 1980s, though earlier in the United States, Governments around the world have seen Entrepreneurship Education as an aid to creating a) An Enterprise Culture; b) A more Enterprising workforce; c) New Ventures.

There is no common agreement, however, over what constitutes Entrepreneurship Education or how it is taught. For some, it is concerned with raising awareness of entrepreneurship - with teaching students about entrepreneurs and, in particular, their roles and functions in the economy and society (Carter and Jones-Evans, 2000; Glancey and McQuaid, 2000; Swedberg, 2000). For others it is more than this. For them it is about developing in their students the attributes of the successful entrepreneur (Kirby, 2003b) and/or equipping them with the knowledge and skills to start and grow a business (Bygrave, 1994; Timmons and Spinelli, 2004). This is education for enterprise. In contrast, others (perhaps a small minority) are more concerned with education through enterprise – with using the new venture creation process to help students acquire a range of both business understanding and skills or competences.

In this paper it will be proposed that incubators (including pre-incubators and science parks) can be seen as enterprise teaching laboratories in which all three aspects of enterprise education can be undertaken. Attention will be focused, though, on the role of the incubator in educating “for” and “through” enterprise. Although it has been argued elsewhere that business schools have a role to play in entrepreneurship education (Kirby, 2003a), it is contested here that by transferring learning from the classroom to the incubator (i.e. seeing the incubator as a “teaching laboratory”), it is possible to both satisfy and develop the requisite activist and pragmatist approaches to learning (Honey and Mumford, 1986) that are so characteristic of the entrepreneur. A case study of the approach adopted in the University of Surrey is provided.

1. Introduction

For some time, considerable attention has been paid, by academia, to the role of higher education in the creation of graduate entrepreneurs (Hills 1986, Scott and Twomey, 1988). With the publication of Birch's (1979) findings on the role of new small businesses in the creation of employment opportunities in the USA, and the advent of Governments in America and Great Britain focussed on reducing the level of state intervention and increasing individual responsibility, Governments around the world became interested in the creation of cultures that would promote enterprise and create new ventures. Subsequently, national education systems in a variety of countries have been charged, in varying degrees, with bringing this about. Nowhere has this been demonstrated more clearly than in the UK. In
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1997, the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997, 201) recommended universities to:

“….. consider the scope for encouraging entrepreneurship through innovative approaches to programme design…..”

and by 2000 business and entrepreneurial development had been listed as one of four strategic goals for British universities (Universities UK, 2000).

Despite such external influences, there has been considerable debate within the academic community over whether universities in general and business schools in particular can or should contribute. To some, entrepreneurs are born not bred, while to others:

“….. to teach individuals to become not only more enterprising but businessmen as well…..is an undertaking that in both time and scope is beyond the capabilities of an academic business school…..”  (Johannisson, 1991,79).

As demonstrated elsewhere (Kirby, 2003a) business schools can educate students not just about entrepreneurship but for it, and create in them the aptitudes and capabilities of the entrepreneurial person. However, “developing entrepreneurs in the classroom is about developing the enterprising environments and approaches to learning” (op. cit. 371 ) and it requires “a very significant transformation in not only what is taught but how it is taught”, (op.cit. 371). In this context it is interesting to note, therefore, that according to Albert and Gaynor (2003, 20)

“incubators are becoming the entrepreneurial schools of tomorrow”.

The purpose of this paper is to explore how this might occur.

2. Incubators and the Incubation Process

While there is no formal or legal definition of the term “Incubator”, Smilor and Gill (1986, 1) provide a useful early definition, namely:-

“….an incubator is an apparatus for the maintenance of controlled conditions for cultivation. To incubate fledgling companies implies an ability or desire to maintain some kind of prescribed and controlled conditions favourable to the development of new firms. The incubator seeks to give form and substance – that is structure and credibility – to start-up or emerging ventures”.
In its generic form, therefore, the term “business incubator” can be used to describe a wide range of organisations that help entrepreneurs develop their ideas from inception through to commercialisation and the launching of a new venture (European Commission Enterprise Directorate General, 2002). However, it is generally accepted that, as the US National Business Incubation Association recognises (NBIA, 2001), incubators “provide hands on management assistance, access to financing and orchestrated exposure to critical business or technical support services. They also offer entrepreneurial firms shared office services, access to equipment, flexible leases and expandable space – all under one roof.”

An important feature of the definition is the provision of physical space and in all probability this was the *raison d’etre* for the first generation “incubators” of the 1980s, which were intended, primarily, to offer affordable space and shared facilities to fledgling businesses. However, the modern incubator places more emphasis on the process of incubation, which means that (a) incubators can be virtual, utilising the benefits of modern communications technology, and (b) equal, if not more, emphasis is placed on training, mentoring and the creation of a learning environment.

As with incubators, there is no uniformly accepted definition of a Science Park though the International Board of the International Association of Science Parks (www.iaspworld.org/information/definitions.php) suggests that a Science Park is “an organisation managed by specialised professionals, whose main aim is to increase the wealth of its communities by promoting the culture of innovation and the competitiveness of its associated businesses and knowledge-based institutions. To enable these goals to be met a Science Park stimulates and manages the flow of knowledge and technology amongst universities, R & D institutions, companies and markets; it facilitates the creation and growth of innovation-based companies through incubation and spin-off processes; and provides other value-added services together with high-quality space and facilities.”

Thus the process of incubation and, incubators, are very much part of the Science Park concept, which tends to be on a larger scale than the single incubator and which, according to the IASP, is synonymous with such terms as Research Park, Technology Park or Technopole¹, etc. Although authors such as Currie (1985) and Eul (1985) have attempted to distinguish between such terms, the work of MacDonald (1987) suggests that the terms can be used interchangeably and that a Science Park is a property-based initiative close to a place
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of learning which provides high quality units in a pleasant environment. Through their proximity to “places of learning” there is an assumption that technological innovation stems from scientific research and that parks “can provide the catalytic incubator environment for the transformation of ‘pure’ research into production” (Westhead, 1997, 46).

Though no two science parks are alike (Grayson 1993), they might be conceived as the end of a continuum of incubation support tailored to meet the emerging needs of the New Technology-Based Firm (NTBF) as it evolves. In a perfectly rational, linear evolution model, this continuum might be perceived as starting with the embryonic or early stage business concept in a pre-incubator or hatchery (a workstation within a room) where the concept is proven, a prototype developed, the entrepreneurial team established and the embryonic business brought to a stage where it is investment or and market ready. From there the fledgling business passes into the incubator (a room or rooms within a building) where, with training and mentoring that is both appropriate and timely, the business becomes established before passing on to the Science Park (a building on an estate) where it retains all of the benefits of clustering (Cooper and Folta, 2000) including the opportunity to network with similar type businesses and, importantly, a “prestigious address”.

In summary, therefore, the incubation process, whether it be through pre-incubators, incubators or science parks, is intended to support the formation and development of new technology based firms, producing higher survival and growth rates for those firms that locate in them. However, attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of such programmes have been fraught with difficulty. Not only are they set in different socio-economic and politico-cultural contexts, but, as Martin (1997) and others have recognised, they have different objectives. Under such circumstances, the evidence with respect to impact is somewhat inconclusive, particularly with respect to Science Parks. Irrespective of the findings, though, there seems to be general agreement that the quality of the management is important, as is the link with Higher Education. To be successful, Science Parks and Incubators need to be seen less as property-based initiatives (Westhead and Storey, 1994) and, according to Lofsten and Lindelopf, 2003), their managers and university industrial liaison officers need to become more proactive, setting up systems that encourage the involvement of universities. This is the Surrey model

3. The Surrey Case

Located approximately 30 miles south of London, at Guildford, the University of Surrey has a long tradition for promoting innovation and new ventures. In 1986 it opened its highly successful £70 million Science Park (The Surrey Research Park)2 which houses its incubator
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(the Surrey Technology Centre), the home of the SEEDA Enterprise Hub for Surrey. Since its inception the Park has contributed significantly to the economic development of the region and to technology transfer, as well as fostering innovation. Tenant companies employ over 2,500 staff and many feed technology into local companies with which they have partnering arrangements. More than this, approximately two-thirds of the firms have links with the University and a number of the University’s own spin-out firms have located there.

Over the years, the University has developed a successful track record of commercialising its research. Not only is the Research Park itself a successful venture in its own right, but numerous other ventures have been developed, including the internationally recognised Surrey Satellite Technology Ltd, the world’s leading provider of small satellite applications. In the academic year 2000-2001 alone, it created six businesses and signed 14 licence deals, providing £120,000 of revenue and the potential for future royalties. In addition, the University has been party to a number of successful bids to Government to fund its activities in this area. To complement its own £1 million venture capital fund, for example, it has received further funding (in partnership with Brunel University, the Universities of Reading and Sussex and Royal Holloway College, University of London) to create a two-tier fund providing members of the University who wish to commercialise their intellectual property with up to £30,000 for proof of concept, market studies, etc., and up to £250,000 for growing a promising venture. Further funding is being made available through the business angel and venture capital networks currently being established both regionally and nationally.

Additionally, a successful bid has resulted in the creation of a pre-incubator (SETsquared Centre) on the Research Park to facilitate the commercialisation of research from both within and outside the University. The Centre (like its partners at the Universities of Bath, Bristol and Southampton) is intended for nascent entrepreneurs with a sound business idea that shows high-growth potential and links into the knowledge (technology) base of the four universities. It offers managed workspace, including reception facilities, a telephone answering service, diary management plus meeting rooms. However, it is more than just a
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building providing accommodation and services. Rather, it can be viewed as Albert and Gaynor (2003, 20) have suggested, as an “entrepreneurial school of tomorrow”.

The intention of the Centre is to help create and launch new ventures based on ideas that appear to have considerable market potential. To do this, the members, whether from within the University or outside, are provided with the help and support needed to formulate a business plan, build the entrepreneurial team, identify customers and the route to market and bring the venture to a stage where it is investment ready. This is done through both one-on-one mentoring and a programme of training, workshops, clinics and “events”. In the process, the Centre members learn how to launch a business. The key to the process is a regular 3-monthly review that charts the member’s development and advises on what needs to be done and what skills need to be acquired. This is undertaken by a panel of experienced practitioners (including entrepreneurs), who offer advice and guidance with respect to future plans and progress, including guidance on exit strategies. To focus attention on the “learning needs” of the individual, the Centre member is required to complete a questionnaire (Appendix 1) in consultation with the panel. In effect, this is a negotiated learning agreement or contract (Stephenson and Laycock, 1993) and becomes the action or learning plan for the next period. It outlines what the member needs to do or learn and how he/she is going to do it.

Clearly, by so doing the Centre is educating its members for entrepreneurship through a programme of action learning that deals with real-world problems and adopts many of the entrepreneurship education principles advocated elsewhere (Kirby, 2003 a). Unlike in more traditional educational contexts, there is no formal curriculum. Rather, learning is tailored to the needs of the individuals who take ownership/responsibility for their own learning on a need to know, pragmatic basis. In the process, tutors (mentors) become facilitators of learning rather than transmitters of information (lecturers), asking questions and challenging the entrepreneur on his/her journey of discovery (Doyle and O’Neill, 2001).

Not only has the University put in place the complete incubation process, from pre-incubator through incubator to Science Park, but, like most other UK universities, it has responded to the National Committee’s 1997 exhortation to “…consider the scope for encouraging entrepreneurship through innovative approaches to programme design…”. Thus a range of new educational programmes has been developed intended to raise
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7 Apart from Entrepreneurship modules on its undergraduate and Masters programmes in the Management School, the University has a level 1 (30 credit) business start-up module that can be taken on-line and has introduced a highly popular full undergraduate degree (BSc in Entrepreneurship, IT, technology and Business) through the School of Engineering. Additionally, non-accredited extra curricular courses are offered to students of any discipline through the Federal University Student Entrepreneurs Programme (FUSE), run in conjunction with the Students’ Union, which includes a Summer School for those wishing to start their own businesses on graduation (appendix 2). This complements short courses and boot camps intended for academics and the employees of technology companies who wish to commercialise their research and/or start their own business. Finally, it has developed 3 “user-friendly” CD-roms intended to enable users to work at their own pace in order to develop the plans to Start, Grow and Market their businesses.
awareness of the opportunities for new venture creation. Some of these initiatives, such as FUSE, are intended to educate participants for entrepreneurship (see Appendix 2) and, although classroom-based, are linked directly to the pre-incubator. Others are intended either to educate participants about entrepreneurship or through it. For example,

— students on the MBA Entrepreneurship module are taught about Entrepreneurship largely in the classroom but are given the opportunity of working with entrepreneurs in the pre-incubator as mentors and/or on the development of their business plans. Some have actually gone on to become part of the entrepreneurial team.

— Students on the BSc in Entrepreneurship, IT, Technology and Business are given the opportunity to learn about entrepreneurship by working in one of the businesses in the pre-incubator, incubator or research park

— Students on non-entrepreneurship programmes are able to learn more about their disciplines through entrepreneurship, by conducting projects for businesses in the pre-incubator, incubator and science park. These have included the preparation of national and international marketing plans as well as technology projects.

By so doing, the University is not only attempting to develop closer links with its pre-incubator, incubator and science park through the creation of a completely integrated incubation process, but it is seeing them as research and teaching laboratories for its staff and students that help increase the numbers and survival chances of New Technology Based Firms being spun out of the University. However, by treating them in this way, the staff of the University are also able to provide their students with real-life work placements and projects. These reinforce their students’ classroom learning not just of the entrepreneurial/incubation process, but about management and technology in general, at the same time helping develop them as more enterprising individuals (Kirby and Mullen, 1990).

4. Conclusion

As yet, there is no common agreement over what constitutes Entrepreneurship Education or how it is and should be taught. For some, it is concerned with raising awareness of entrepreneurship - with teaching students about entrepreneurs and, in particular, their roles and functions in the economy and society (Carter and Jones-Evans, 2000; Glancey and McQuaid, 2000; Swedberg, 2000). For others it is more than this. For them it is about developing in their students the attributes of the successful entrepreneur (Kirby, 2003a; Rae, 1997) and/or equipping them with the knowledge and skills to start and grow a business (Bygrave, 1994; Timmons and Spinelli, 2004). This is education for enterprise. In contrast, others (perhaps a small minority) are more concerned with education through enterprise –
with using the new venture creation process to help students acquire a range of both business understanding and skills or competences.

In this paper an attempt has been made to demonstrate that incubators (including pre-incubators and science parks) can be seen as enterprise teaching laboratories in which all three aspects of enterprise education can be undertaken. By transferring learning from the classroom to the incubator (i.e. seeing the incubator as a “teaching laboratory”), it is possible to complete Kolb’s (1984) Learning cycle and move from classroom “observations and reflections” through the “formation of abstract concepts and generalizations” to the incubator where it is possible to “test implications of concepts in new situations” and gain “concrete experience”. At the same time, it is possible to shift the emphasis away from passive to active learning, thereby enabling participants not just to gain experience of what Honey and Mumford (1986) have termed the “Reflector” and “Theorist” styles of learning, but the “Activist” and “Pragmatist”. Also. This is important. Traditionally classroom – based teaching has favoured the former rather than the latter, which may help to explain, at least in part, why successful entrepreneurs have not succeeded in the formal education system. Thus, by taking the learning out of the classroom in this way and emphasizing the pragmatist and activist learning styles, not only are the learners being encouraged to acquire some of the entrepreneurial attributes, values and behaviour patterns of the entrepreneur (Kirby, 2003b), but a fairer, more balanced education system is being created that recognizes and caters for the preferred learning styles of all participants.
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Appendix 1

Centre Members’ first formal meeting record

This questionnaire is to help both you and us review your progress so that we can help you move your idea or enterprise forward. Please complete it by filling in electronically and ensure that it is with the centre manager at least one week before your next review panel, together with any supporting documentation, including updated business plan if relevant and any documentation that you feel will help the review. We look forward to seeing you.

DATE …………………………. REVIEW DATE (1)…………………………
NAME OF MEMBER ……………… REVIEW DATE (2)…………………………
NAME OF COMPANY…………………. REVIEW DATE (3)…………………………

Progress to Date:

How far have you got with your idea? (mark with an X in the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept:</th>
<th>Proved</th>
<th>Almost proved</th>
<th>Still working on it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototype:</td>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>Almost developed</td>
<td>Still working on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP:</td>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>Applied for</td>
<td>Under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business Plan:

How far have you got with your business plan?

Completed * | In progress* | Not started |

* Remember to include a copy for your review panel with this questionnaire.

Mission Statement:
How far have you got with:

- Deciding on the legal form of your business? (Mark with an X)
  - Incorporation
  - Memorandum and Articles of Association
  - Shareholders Agreements
  - Director and Company Secretary appointments
  - Registration for VAT, PAYE and Corporation Tax

Are there any specific legal areas that you wish to discuss with the review panel?

How far have you got with:

- Producing a fully costed marketing plan?
  - reviewing the market
  - setting your marketing objectives
  - formulating a marketing strategy
  - developing an action plan

Are there any specific areas of marketing that you wish to discuss with the review panel?

How far have you got with:

- Writing a fully costed operation plan?
  - production process
  - Suppliers
  - Distribution
  - quality control procedures

other (please specify)
• Producing a fully costed capital plan?
  Premises
  web site
  Equipment
  other (please specify)

• Developing a fully costed human resources plan?
  people
  roles
  skills and training needs
  recruitment process
  remuneration
  other (please specify)

• Producing a set of financial statements?
  profit and loss account
  cash flow forecast
  balance sheet
  break-even analysis
  sensitivity analysis
  other (please specify)
- Identifying the funding needs of your business?
  amount and purpose
  type
  timing
  deal offered/repayment
  other (please specify)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding: How far have you got with funding?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank Loan:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venture Capital:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Angel Funding:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMART Award:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vendor finance:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Partner finance:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application being prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application being prepared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)
### Your Personal Development:

I need to develop my *understanding* of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patenting and IP protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the small firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources and employment Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team building and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding and securing finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launching and growing the business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business harvesting and exit strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I need to develop my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative thinking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and project management skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and presentation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation and persuasion skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-working skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (please specify)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Milestones and Objectives:**

Review of how your business has progressed against agreed objectives (e.g. last review).
What are your plans for the next four months:

(You need to indicate what you are going to do and when and how you are going to do it - for example: "Develop my networking skills - attend a SETsquared seminar in March").

Help Required:

How has SETsquared helped you so far (or since the last review)?

What assistance will you need over the next four months to help you achieve your objectives?
Appendix 2

FUSE: Federal University Student Entrepreneurs.

FUSE is an extra-curricular programme for students of any discipline, studying in the Federal University of Surrey, who wish to explore the possibility of starting their own business. It is run under the Federal Innovation Fund of the University of Surrey at Guildford and Roehampton, in association with the Students Unions of both Institutions.

It comprises 4 two-hour classroom-based evening “classes”. For those who have a business idea, an outline business plan and the intention to start their own business, there is a one-week “summer school”. Details of the components are as follows:-

Evening “classes”:

Session 1: Taster Session. This is intended to introduce participants to the idea of starting a business, what is involved and the support that will be available through FUSE. A Business Start-up video is used to stimulate and focus discussion and participants are asked to consider (a) the attitudes of the key players – the entrepreneur, the bank-manager, the employer and the father. (b) the support available to help those who want to start a business and (c) the attributes of the entrepreneur. This is then used to address the aims of FUSE and what will be provided.

A self-assessment questionnaire is used to ascertain the entrepreneurial tendencies of the participants, and it is pointed out that participants will either be helped to develop the requisite skills and attributes or to acquire them by “building the entrepreneurial team”.

Student role models are used whenever possible.

Session 2: Idea Generation/Opportunity Recognition. Some students will have an idea for a business others will not. This session focuses on (a) idea generation/opportunity recognition and (b) idea modification/adaptation. Once students have been introduced to the creative process and the various techniques used to generate and modify ideas, they are given the opportunity to work in groups in order to generate ideas for the modification of common household products.

A useful starting point for this session is to ask them whether they regard themselves as creative, then to go on to consider the case of the serial inventor, Dan Bricklin. This gets them to think about their own creativity and whether creativity is a result of nurture or nature. Usually they conclude that it is nature, which then suggests that creativity can be developed both in organisations and in people. It is possible, then, to think about how this is done (the techniques that can be used).

Session 3: Idea Verification. Commercial verification of the idea is undertaken through the business plan. This session introduces the participants to the business plan – its role and structure – and to the process of business planning.

Participants are required to complete a pro-forma business plan that becomes the “application form” for participation in the summer school. The purpose of this is to demonstrate commitment, to ensure the participant has an idea that seems as if it is likely to be feasible,
commercially, and to focus on what is required if the participant does intend to launch the business (i.e. the plan becomes the starting point for the “summer school”).

**Session 4: Idea Funding.** This introduces the main forms of funding – loans, equity finance and grants – and considers what financiers are looking for when deciding on whether to fund the business.

Participants are given the opportunity, in groups, to make an elevator pitch for the funding of an actual or hypothetical business to a panel of adjudicators, who provide feedback on the presentation and the reasons for their decision.

**Session 5: Networking Opportunity.** This is an informal meeting of the participants, together with tutors, representatives of the students union, entrepreneurs, mentors and representatives of the start-up support network in order to get to know more about (a) each other (b) the programme and subsequent activities (c) networking. It is held in the University’s pre-incubator (The SETsquared Centre).

**The Summer School**

This is a week-long programme followed by (a) a month where the participant works on his/her own project and (b) a one-day review session whereby participants receive feedback from their peers and an expert panel on their idea and what they need to do to bring it to fruition.

During the week-long programme there are no formal lectures as such, though participants are brought together, periodically, for common training purposes. Instead, participants are allocated a mentor who collaborates with them on determining what they need to know in order to bring their idea to fruition. As part of this process the participants agree with their mentors (a) how they acquire the necessary knowledge/information to strengthen their business plan and (b) a programme of work for the following month. This forms their “learning contract/agreement”.

During the subsequent month they work on this contract/agreement, in consultation with their mentor, in order to produce a more robust business plan which they are required to present to the expert panel at the review session. The panel provides them with oral and written feedback on whether the idea should be taken forward and, if so, how.

As part of the process, they are required to keep records of meetings, expenditure and contacts.

Those participants who appear to have a sound idea with growth potential are offered a place in the University’s pre-incubator (the SETsquared Centre), where they receive ongoing support to bring their idea to the stage where it is investment or market ready. Those businesses that are not eligible for a place in the pre-incubator (i.e. those that are either not technology/knowledge-based or are not perceived to have high growth potential) are routed through alternative support channels in the community (such as the local Business Link offices).