

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION RESOURCE HANDBOOK



SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION RESOURCE HANDBOOK
FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
ENGAGED IN TEACHING, RESEARCH AND
APPLIED LEARNING IN SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP
ASHOKA U AND DEBBI D. BROCK • 2011

WELCOME

WELCOME TO THE 2011 SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION RESOURCE HANDBOOK.

We are pleased to share this third version of the *Handbook* with our colleagues at colleges and universities around the world.

WHAT'S NEW IN THE 2011 EDITION?

As advocates for social entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurship education, we have gathered a comprehensive set of resources both for faculty and administrators new to the field of social entrepreneurship, and for veterans who blazed the trail for this academic field to take root. As you know, the field of social entrepreneurship education has grown exponentially since the first *Handbook* was published in 2004. This 2011 *Handbook* has some enhanced features to help you navigate recent developments in the field:

- “Highlighted Examples” delve into new or innovative models
- Ashoka U’s Elements of Excellence offer a road map for building a standout social entrepreneurship education program
- New structure and key categories help you navigate featured resources
- “Summary Grids” make comprehensive section listings easier to scan

HATS OFF TO SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATORS!


We are motivated and humbled by the commitment, passion and creativity of social entrepreneurship educators and administrators. We admire the educators who are teaching students the knowledge and skills they need to excel in social entrepreneurial careers. We are inspired by the administrators who are transforming their schools into innovation hubs that help students gain the applied learning experiences and networks they need to make a difference in the world.

Be the change
you wish to see
in the world.
~ GANDHI


We are thankful and grateful to you, for in your role as college and university educators you are helping students to “be the change” and you are transforming colleges and universities into hubs of social innovation, from which a new generation of social entrepreneurs and changemakers will emerge.

We welcome you to the 2011 *Social Entrepreneurship Education Resource Handbook* and hope it will be an effective tool for advancing social entrepreneurship with your students, on your campus, and in your local and global communities.

Warm Regards,



Debbi D. Brock
Assistant Professor of Entrepreneurship, Anderson University



Marina Kim
Director, Ashoka U

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication would not have been possible without the support of many individuals, organizations and networks. We would first like to thank all the contributors to the *Handbook* who helped us to provide a clear resource guide for those interested in learning about the various ways to engage in the teaching and practice of social entrepreneurship.

We would also like to thank Beeta Ansari on the Ashoka U team, who put in countless hours synthesizing the submissions for the *Handbook* and working tirelessly on rounds of revisions to assure accuracy and clarity.

We would also like to thank Michele Leaman from Ashoka U and our intern Tommy Tobin, who spent hours with edits and proofing of the final document.

We would also like to thank Debbi Brock for her role as the Founder of the *Social Entrepreneurship Teaching Resource Handbook* in 2004. Her visionary effort to piece together lists of resources to navigate the nascent field of social entrepreneurship has since grown to a publication that is cited as a key handbook for academics and practitioners around the world. Debbi's original *Handbook* has transformed into this *Social Entrepreneurship Education Resource Handbook*.

HOW TO USE THIS HANDBOOK

The *Handbook* is designed to provide an array of rich resources at your fingertips, which you can either read section by section, or pick up as a reference guide when you have specific questions. Originally designed for faculty members interested in teaching social entrepreneurship, this *Handbook* was revised this year to include uses and applications for administrators eager to advance social entrepreneurship at their colleges and universities, students interested in launching their own social ventures and plugging into relevant opportunities, and practitioners of social entrepreneurship with an interest in higher education programs.

TIPS FOR NAVIGATING THE HANDBOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The table of contents outlines key categories to make navigation simple.

SUMMARY LIST

Many categories provide a summary list of resources to expose you to the range of opportunities, while extended descriptions highlight some of the newer, innovative examples by category.

SECTIONS BY USER

Some categories, like conferences, are separated into three key sections – faculty, student, and practitioner – to make navigation easy by user type.

WHERE TO START

ADMINISTRATORS:

Use the sections on Programs, Majors and Minors to identify where your institution fits in the emerging field of social entrepreneurship. The Ashoka U Elements of Excellence orients you to emerging standards in the field.

PROFESSORS:

Use the sections on Teaching, Curriculum and Research for your classroom. Listing over 500 professors the Global Faculty Directory connects you to peers.

STUDENTS:

Use the section on Applied Learning and Apprenticeship for an overview of conferences and competitions that help you learn more, get connected and gain feedback on your new venture idea.

PRACTITIONERS:

Use the section on Community and Culture for an outline of support organizations and practitioner conferences that get you inspired and connected to networks and resources.

The information provided in this *Handbook* was obtained from program directors, faculty, college and university websites, and course syllabi. The *Handbook* will be updated on a bi-annual basis. To submit updates, additions, corrections or suggestions, please contact Ashoka U at info@ashokau.org



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. FOREWORD	4
II. INTRODUCTION	6
III. ASHOKA U ELEMENTS OF EXCELLENCE	11
IV. TEACHING AND CURRICULUM	13
A. Innovative Curriculum, Masters Programs and Experiential Learning	
B. Case Study and Teaching Material Repositories	
C. Social Entrepreneurship Programs, Majors, Minors, Certificates	
D. Case Study Examples	
E. Multimedia Teaching Resources	
V. RESEARCH	36
A. Books and Publications on Social Entrepreneurship	
B. Core Academic Readings in Social Entrepreneurship	
C. Journals in Social Entrepreneurship	
VI. APPLIED LEARNING AND APPRENTICESHIP	48
A. Internships, Jobs and Volunteer Opportunities	
B. Social Entrepreneurship Competitions	
VII. RESOURCES	56
A. Social Entrepreneurship Support Organizations	
VIII. ROLE MODELS	60
A. Social Entrepreneur in Residence	
IX. COMMUNITY AND CULTURE	61
A. Social Entrepreneurship Conferences and Events	
X. GLOBAL SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP FACULTY DIRECTORY	66
A. Europe: Marthe Nyssens, Université Catholique de Louvain	
B. Latin and South America: Roberto Gutiérrez, Universidad de los Andes	
C. North America: Robert S. D'Intino, Rowan University	
D. Asia: Marie Lisa Dacanay, Ateneo De Manila University	
E. Africa: Susan Steinman, University of Johannesburg	
F. Australia: Ian Jones, RMIT College of Business	



I. FOREWORD

The Field of Social Entrepreneurship Education:
From the Second Wave of Growth to a Third Wave of Innovation

By Marina Kim, Director, Ashoka U and Jane Leu, Ashoka U Fellow in Residence 2010

As world citizens, we face pressing social challenges of an unprecedented scope and scale. These challenges require the skills, passion and commitment of social entrepreneurs to solve. The magnitude and complexity of social challenges requires a more robust, diverse and talented cadre of social entrepreneurs and changemakers, prepared and positioned to solve these problems.

We believe colleges and universities have an essential role to play in growing the next generation of social entrepreneurs. In recent years, in response to student demand, colleges and universities have taken up social entrepreneurship as a field of academic study. Today, more than 148 institutions globally are teaching some aspect of social entrepreneurship on their campuses.

At Ashoka U, we enjoy a landscape view of the field of social entrepreneurship education, which was further expanded as we worked to update this *Handbook*. In the past several years we have observed that social entrepreneurship education is entering a Second Wave of development, with a Third Wave emerging quickly on the horizon.

From our perspective, the First Wave of development was characterized by activity and courses primarily at graduate schools of business, with early leadership from Harvard University, University of Geneva in Switzerland, Stanford University, and later schools of Government and Public Policy including New York University and Harvard University joined in along with pioneering centers at Oxford University, Duke University, and others.

TODAY'S SECOND WAVE, FROM ASHOKA U'S VANTAGE POINT, IS BEING SHAPED BY FOUR MAJOR TRENDS:

1) Shift from Business Schools to “Everyone a Changemaker”

We see a shift from business schools as the primary or sole driver of social entrepreneurship toward cross-campus, interdisciplinary, “embedded” programs that serve undergraduates, graduates, and executive education seekers. Several leading institutions have set a goal that every student will be exposed to the concepts of social entrepreneurship in the classroom before graduation.

2) Focus on Comprehensive, Rigorous Social Entrepreneurship Course of Study that Combines Classroom and Practice

Colleges and universities are paying increased attention to combining and to connecting social entrepreneurship theory with practice, and connecting the classroom to campus life and to a career. Institutions are thinking beyond the one semester class to create cohorts of social entrepreneurship students over a period of years. Colleges and universities are also developing a series of classes and experiences that build upon one another to produce a rigorous course of social entrepreneurship study. Colleges and universities are replacing applied learning experiences of internships and community consulting models with innovative models that offer more value to students, community partners and to the practitioners in the field. Finally, institutions are creating a comprehensive social entrepreneurship experience, integrating social entrepreneurship teaching, thinking, and practice into diverse campus elements, including residential life, student affairs and alumni relations.



3) Presidents and Senior Leaders Embrace Social Entrepreneurship

Senior leaders are seeing social entrepreneurship as a core value they want to embed into their institution's reputation, culture, education and programming. Presidents are seeking out and using social entrepreneurship as a core competitive advantage for new student recruitment, alumni engagement, and donor cultivation.

4) Diversity of Institutions

Diverse institutional types are embracing social entrepreneurship, including 2- and 4-year institutions, online universities, continuing and executive education programs and undergraduate and graduate schools across diverse disciplines, including engineering, design, law, social work, and education. In addition, social entrepreneurship education is moving outward from its popularity at elite colleges and universities to institutionalization at universities and colleges worldwide.

IS A THIRD WAVE OF INNOVATION NEXT?

As social entrepreneurship becomes more established as an academic field, the opportunity exists for a third wave of innovation. Institutions of higher education have the opportunity to build on existing social entrepreneurship programs to act as both engines and agents of systemic change.

As engines of change, colleges and universities can effectively develop human capital to implement pattern-changing ideas to address the world's most pressing challenges. The development of student competencies will depend on the creation of effective pedagogies and methodologies to ensure results. Furthermore, academia can produce rigorous, peer-reviewed research that identifies effective approaches in diverse contexts and deepens the field's understanding of the interplay between business, philanthropy, nonprofit management, social innovation, social enterprise, and social entrepreneurship. Finally, contributing to increased social impact, applied research can further the work of practitioners and develop new tools and innovations for the good of society.

As agents of change, colleges and universities have the opportunity to focus activities and resources towards defined social needs. In doing so, an institution can transform itself into one that rivals any socially entrepreneurial organization, with scale and impact beyond what is possible through small to mid-sized organizations. Many colleges and universities are already moving down this path, harnessing the considerable assets of their institution to create and scale systems-changing solutions.

The socially entrepreneurial university that produces change agents and acts as a change agent is where the next wave can take us.



II. INTRODUCTION

Social Entrepreneurship Teaching and Research: Orphan, Cuckoo, or Walrus?

Alex Nicholls, University of Oxford

SIT YOU DOWN, FATHER, REST YOU

Today, social entrepreneurship is no longer the academic cottage industry it once was ten years ago. The data in this volume amply demonstrates that, in the last few years, college and university teaching and research on social entrepreneurship has grown significantly across campuses globally and continues to grow. Current evidence suggests that students across the world are responding strongly to social entrepreneurship teaching and demanding more courses. At the same time, academic research on the field is growing, maturing, and improving in quality and impact

"The time has come,"
the walrus said, "to talk
of many things: of shoes
and ships and sealing-
wax of cabbages and
kings and why the sea is
boiling hot and whether
pigs have wings."

~CARROLL, 1871

As a consequence, this is a useful point to pause and take stock of where we are in terms of the development and progress of this field of study: to sit down and reflect a moment. The rise of social entrepreneurship scholarship is now empirically proven, but as the subject enters mainstream academic discourses and arenas of debate, this introduction poses two questions: What is the nature of the institutionalization of social entrepreneurship in academe and what are the implications of this? This paper aims to sketch out where we are today in social entrepreneurship research and teaching and how we got there. It also

attempts to set out some of the current implications of the development of the field and to imagine future opportunities and hurdles.

PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT: I AM HE, AS YOU ARE HE, AS YOU ARE ME, AND WE ARE ALL TOGETHER

With hindsight, it is now possible to map out the development of modern social entrepreneurship scholarship in three phases (pioneers, consolidators, new arrivals) across three dimensions (institutions, publications, conferences: see Table 1). The pioneers began working in the 1990s and focused on practical analysis linked to case studies, applied teaching and practitioner-facing events and publications, and close involvement in policy development. The consolidators followed a decade or so later and institutionalized the study and research of social entrepreneurship in new college and university centers and programs (particularly in business schools), edited collections and new journals, and specialist academic conferences. Finally, the new arrivals represented the mainstreaming of social entrepreneurship research and teaching into traditional disciplines and established academic structures (for example, in the UK, publicly funded research underwritten by the ESRC). This phase included special editions on social entrepreneurship in top-ranked journals and streams of papers on social entrepreneurship at well-established conferences.

This pattern of development demonstrates a gradual assimilation of social entrepreneurship into mainstream academic structures without revealing a clear institutionalization of meanings. The dominance of business schools in the early contextualization of the subject has been diluted and challenged by other disciplines' engagement suggesting a Janus-faced topic that can adapt to different perspectives easily. The absence of an agreed unified theory of social entrepreneurship (Osberg and Martin, 2007, and Santos, 2010) suggests that this subject remains flexible and fluid. Whilst Dacin et al (2010) proposed that social entrepreneurship might be distinguished from other topics within entrepreneurship by three factors – a distinctiveness in organizational processes, resource strategies and financial structure, and mission objectives - they remained skeptical of its viability as a stand-alone area of theory.



	INSTITUTIONS	PUBLICATIONS	CONFERENCES
PIONEERS (1990S)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Harvard Business School Social Enterprise Initiative (1993) ▪ Foundations / think tanks / policy development, REDF / Demos / IPPR (mid 1990s) ▪ Not-for-profit, co-operative studies scholars: EMES (1999) ▪ Stanford Center for Social Innovation (1999) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dees (1998) ▪ Dees, Emerson, and Economy (2001) ▪ Borzaga and Defourny (2001) ▪ Bornstein (2004) ▪ Stanford Social Innovation Review (2004-) ▪ Austin / SEKN (2004) ▪ Dacanay (2004) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Harvard Business School Social Enterprise Conference (2000-)
CONSOLIDATORS (2000s)	<p>Business Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CASE, Duke University (2002) ▪ Skoll Centre, University of Oxford (2003) <p>Schools of Government Public Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kennedy School, Harvard University (Bloom, c.2002) ▪ Wagner School, New York University (Light, c.2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social Enterprise Journal (2005-) ▪ Mair, Hockerts, and Robinson (2006, 2009, 2010) ▪ Nicholls (2006) ▪ Nyssens (2006) ▪ Perrini (2006) ▪ Light (2006) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social Enterprise Research Conference (SERC) (Open University and London Southbank University, 2004–2006: with University of Oxford, 2006-2008) ▪ Satter Conference on Social Entrepreneurship (NYU Stern, 2004-) ▪ International Social Entrepreneurship Research Conference (ISERC) (IESE – Barcelona, NYU Stern, & Copenhagen Business School. 2005-2007)
NEW ARRIVALS (2008+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Third Sector Research Centre: Social Enterprise Cluster (University of Birmingham and University of Southampton: 2008) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kerlin (2009) ▪ Zeigler (2009) ▪ Santos (2010) ▪ Journal of Social Entrepreneurship (2010-) ▪ Ridley-Duff and Bull (2010) ▪ Journal of Social Business (2011) <p>Special Editions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Journal of World Business 41.1 (2006) ▪ Emergence: Complexity and Organization 10.3 (2008) ▪ MIT Innovations (2007, 2009) ▪ Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 34.4 (2010) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ International Social Innovation Research Conference (ISIRC) (University of Oxford and London Southbank University, 2009-) ▪ Colloquium on Social Entrepreneurship (University of Oxford and Duke University, 2007, 2009, 2010-) <p>Converts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ARNOVA (USA) ▪ International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) (Europe) ▪ National Council of Voluntary Organizations (NCVO) (UK) ▪ Academy of Management



STRUCTURE AND CONTEXT: THE JOKER LAUGHS AT YOU?

The establishment of social entrepreneurship as an object of study for mainstream scholarship clearly reflects significant institutional and societal changes over the past decade driven by a powerful confluence of new initiatives around sustainable business, more effective government, and a more efficient third sector (Nicholls, 2006). In turn these changes reflect broader shifts in the global political economy that can be characterized today as Globalization 3.0.

The first wave of globalization followed an imperialist model of – largely European – conquest and trade during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Hobsbaum, 1987). The second wave developed during the twentieth century and was built upon two foundations: the post-war set of new, trans-national organizations, including the United Nations and the institutions of the Bretton Woods Agreement, and a rapid acceleration of (mostly) free trade between the North and South (Chang, 2002). This wave was further enhanced by the rise of digital technologies in the 1990s that extended and embedded existing patterns of global connectedness. Finally, the third wave of globalization has its origins in the Kyoto Protocol drafted in 1997 and represents a new agenda for global collaboration based around climate change, peace and terrorism, poverty alleviation, education, health, and other of the Millennium Development Goals.

Unlike the previous two waves, this third wave focuses on social and environmental objectives ahead of narrow economic or parochial national concerns. Globalization 3.0 has created a set of new institutional contexts that are very amenable to socially entrepreneurial models in terms of fresh policy agendas, disruptive business models, new markets, and a reformed civil society. As a result, new institutional logics built on socially entrepreneurial thinking have become commonplace today, for example: blended value creation (Emerson, 2003); impact investing as a new asset class (Fulton and Freireich, 2009); Bottom of the Pyramid market analysis (Prahalad, 2005); increased attention to social capital and community cohesion (Putnam, 2001); and identity economics (Akerlof and Kranton, 2000). The collapse of the global financial system in 2008 only served to accelerate these changes (Mulgan, 2009; Murray, 2009).

However, whilst the rise of social entrepreneurship has strong links with these macro-level trends, work by Kerlin (2009) and Defourny and Nyssens (2010) has highlighted the importance of individual cultural contexts in the interpretation and enactment of social entrepreneurship. Building on the regionally focused work of SEKN and EMES, these authors expanded the study of social entrepreneurship to include comparative, cross-national dimensions of analysis. This stream of work presents a useful bridge between social entrepreneurship and other important work in areas as varied as the study of ‘frugal’ innovation (Economist, 2010), Bottom Billion development models involving infrastructure projects and support for SMEs (Collier, 2007), and clean water, health, and education policy debates. The conclusion is that social entrepreneurship has both macro- and micro-level expressions and enactments that interrelate and interpenetrate in dynamic and various ways depending on context. The interplay of structure and agency here is less clear, however. Does social entrepreneurship represent a driver of institutional change or simply an expression of it?

CONCLUSIONS: I AM THE WALRUS OR THE WALRUS WAS PAUL?

An analysis of the development of social entrepreneurship to date suggests three possible future scenarios: first, social entrepreneurship scholarship may increasingly be institutionalized as an ‘orphan’ subject taken in and legitimized by an established, ‘parent’, discipline (Kuhn, 1962); second, social entrepreneurship may act as a ‘cuckoo’ subject assimilating itself to fit in many disciplines, whilst remaining ultimately distinct and resistance to isomorphic pressures (Nicholls, 2010); third, that social entrepreneurship may represent a ‘walrus’ subject that can mean everything (and nothing?) to all interested scholars, a fluid institutional space with porous borders and hazy meanings (Lennon, 1967).



It has been argued elsewhere that the institutionalization of the discourses and logics of social entrepreneurship to date represents a process of ‘reflexive isomorphism’ (Nicholls, 2010) within a Kuhnian (1962) paradigmatic setting. This is a process not without its own dangers since the establishment of an academic paradigm represents – of necessity – an act of monological exclusion and expression of singular power. It is encouraging to note that from a teaching and research perspective there is evidence of scholarly spaces for ambiguity and disagreement in current social entrepreneurship scholarship. For example, there are spaces where positivists (e.g. Short, et al) can debate with interpretivists (Steyaert and Dey, 2010) across different country perspectives and cultural contexts.

This brief survey suggests that social entrepreneurship will resist being adopted as an orphan subject, has the potential to work as a viral influence within and across established disciplines, but may, above all, remain a ‘walrus’ subject, whose complexity and diversity will be inspire and infuriate students and scholars in equal measure for years to come.

REFERENCES

- Akerlof, G., and Kranton, R. (2000), ‘Economics and Identity’, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115.3, pp. 715–753
- Austin, J. E., (2004), *Social Partnering in Latin America*, SEKN/Harvard Business School
- Bornstein, D. (2004), *How to Save the World*, Oxford University Press
- Borzaga, C., and Defourny, J. (2001), *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*, Routledge
- Carroll (1871), *Through the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Found There*, Macmillan
- Chang, H.-J. (2002), *Kicking Away The Ladder*, Anthem Press
- Collier, P. (2007), *The Bottom Billion*, Oxford University Press
- Dacanay, M.-L. (2004), *Creating a Space in the Market*, AIM
- Dacin, P., Dacin, T., and Matear, M. (2010), ‘Social Entrepreneurship: Why We Don’t Need a New Theory and How We Move Forward From Here’ *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24.3, pp. 37–57
- Defourny and Nyssens (2010), ‘Conceptions of Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and Divergences’, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, pp. 32–53
- Dees, J. G. (1998), ‘*The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship*’, available at: www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf
- Dees, J.G., Emerson, J., and Economy, P. (2001), *Enterprising Nonprofits: A Toolkit for Social Entrepreneurs*, John Wiley
- Economist (2010), ‘First Break All The Rules: The Charms of Frugal Innovation. A Special Report on Innovation in Emerging Markets’, *Economist*, April 15th
- Emerson, J. (2003), ‘The Blended Value Proposition: Integrating Social and Financial Results’, *California Management Review*, 45.4, pp. 35–51
- Fulton, K., and Freireich, J. (2009), *Investing for Social and Environmental Impact*, Monitor Institute
- Hobsbaum, E. (1987), *The Age of Empire: 1875–1914*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson



- Kerlin, J. (2009), *Social Enterprise: A Global Comparison*, Tufts University Press
- Kuhn, T. (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press
- Lennon, J. (1967), *I am the Walrus*, *Magical Mystery Tour*, EMI-Parlophone
- Light, P. (2006), *The Search for Social Entrepreneurship*, Brookings
- Mair, J., Hockerts, K., and Robinson, J. (2006), *Social Enterprise*, Palgrave MacMillan
- Mulgan, G. (2009), 'After Capitalism', *Prospect*, 157, pp. 23-32
- Murray, R. (2009), *Danger and Opportunity: Crisis and the New Social Economy*, NESTA/Young Foundation
- Nicholls, A. (ed) (2006), *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*, Oxford University Press
- Nicholls, A. (2010), 'The Legitimacy of Social Entrepreneurship: Reflexive Isomorphism in a Pre-Paradigmatic Field', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34.4, pp. 611-633
- Nyssens, M. (2006), *Social Enterprise*, Routledge
- Osberg, S., and Martin, R. (2007), 'Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition', *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, pp. 28-39
- Perrini, F. (2006), *The New Social Entrepreneurship: What Awaits Social Entrepreneurial Ventures?*, Edward Elgar
- Prahalad, (2005), *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid*, Wharton University Press
- Putnam, R. (2001), *Bowling Alone*, Simon and Schuster
- Ridley-Duff, R., and Bull, M. (2011), *Understanding Social Enterprise: Theory and Practice*, Sage
- Santos, F. (2010), 'A Positive Theory of Social Entrepreneurship', *INSEAD Working Paper 2009/23*
- Short, J., Moss, T., and Lumpkin, T. (2009), 'Research in Social Entrepreneurship: Past Contributions and Future Opportunities', *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3.2, pp.161 – 194
- Steyaert, C., and Dey, P. (2010), 'Nine Verbs to Keep the Social Entrepreneurship Research Agenda 'Dangerous'', *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, pp. 231 – 254
- Zeigler, R. (2009), *An Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship*, Edward Elgar



III. ASHOKA U'S ELEMENTS OF EXCELLENCE IN SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

VISION

Ashoka U envisions a world where colleges and universities everywhere serve as an enabling environment for social entrepreneurship and everyone has access to the learning opportunities, role models, resources and peers needed to actualize their full potential as social entrepreneurs and changemakers.

HISTORY

As the number and diversity of colleges and universities engaged in social entrepreneurship education increased, the field asked Ashoka for guidance in creating programs and environments that are both conducive to nurturing future leading social entrepreneurs and changemakers and to pushing the boundaries of the field. Ashoka U offers colleges and universities our Elements of Excellence as road map.

DEVELOPMENT

The Elements of Excellence are based on the combined experiences of over 2,500 Ashoka Fellows and leading social entrepreneur practitioners. We also drew upon the expertise of our Changemaker Campus partners, industry experts, and philanthropic leaders. We then asked each to help answer the question,

THE 6 ELEMENTS OF EXCELLENCE

1. Teaching and Curriculum
2. Research
3. Applied Learning and Apprenticeship
4. Resources
5. Role Models
6. Community and Culture

What makes an enabling environment for social entrepreneurs and changemakers?

As many colleges and universities seek new levels of rigor and effectiveness, we hope the Elements will encourage the creation of unique campus- or sector-specific innovations that catapult social entrepreneurship education forward and create awe-inspiring results.

The Six Elements of Excellence can serve as an institutional road map to assist with:

- A) the creation of a comprehensive and sustainable cross-campus program, and/or
- B) the embedding of social entrepreneurship into existing institutional infrastructure

MEASURES OF EXCELLENCE: THE ELEMENTS AT ACHIEVEMENT

Element 1: Teaching and Curriculum

- The institution offers a rigorous course of study in social entrepreneurship, constituting of four or more high quality courses that form a minor or certificate.
- A significant number of faculty and staff at the institution integrate concepts of social entrepreneurship into courses across the disciplines.
- A significant number of students show proficiency in changemaker competencies.

Element 2: Research

- The institution's researchers and faculty produce a steady output of positively received thought leadership that advances social entrepreneurship theory and practice and offers systems-changing solutions that deeply reshape the way social entrepreneurs innovate.
- Faculty, students and practitioners across campus actively collaborate to build a comprehensive, integrated multi-disciplinary social entrepreneurship research agenda.



Element 3: Applied Learning and Apprenticeship

- The institution provides a formal, well-structured apprenticeship program that integrates students into social entrepreneurship organizations to build skills and obtain deep experiences with and exposure to passionate changemakers.
- Each year, students participate in increasingly more challenging experiential learning opportunities designed to ensure students learn to advance a powerful idea into a high-impact reality.
- The institution has established relationships with social entrepreneurship organizations that recruit graduates for full-time positions.

Element 4: Resources

- A dedicated team effectively coordinates all social entrepreneurship leaders and activities; social entrepreneurship champions across campus are supported by respected full- or part-time staff with clearly defined responsibilities for connecting all Six Elements of social entrepreneurship programming.
- The institution has a robust, multi-year funding model that includes earned income, grants and endowment strategy, supports key faculty and staff roles, and funds student and faculty projects.

Element 5: Role Models

- The institution invests heavily in efforts to expose students to diverse real-life examples of social entrepreneurs at multiple points in a student's life-cycle; social entrepreneurship experts regularly interact with students at lecture series, public events and classroom visits.
- The institution nurtures 1-5 ongoing relationships with leading social entrepreneurs as role models/mentors for faculty, administrators, students, and staff.

Element 6: Community and Culture

- The institution provides students with immersive on-campus experiences in social entrepreneurship that effectively link the academic, social, practical, and residential elements of student life.
- A social entrepreneurship advisory council has regular meetings and includes diverse representatives.
- An executive leadership team ensures accountability for driving the social entrepreneurship program towards cross-campus integration and institutionalization, and ensures quality and sustainability across leadership changes.

