



A Pilot Action on Entrepreneurship Education: High Level Reflection Panel

Fifth Cluster Meeting

Zagreb, 18-19 March 2010

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Background	4
2. Introduction	5
3. Objectives	5
The Zagreb Proceedings (18 March)	6
4. Welcome and Introductory Remarks	6
• Republic of Croatia	6
• European Commission	6
• European Training Foundation	7
5. Plenary 1	7
• Entrepreneurship education - progress in the host country (Croatia)	7
6. Plenary 2	8
• Overview of the previous four Panels	8
7. Plenary 3	8
• Round Table on Entrepreneurship education: where do we stand?	8
	9
8. Plenary 4: Working Groups and Report Back	
<i>Progress through Partnership</i>	
• Cross-stakeholder cooperation	9
• Economy ministries generating leverage	11
• Private sector engagement	12
• System building	12
<i>Scope and approaches to entrepreneurship education</i>	
• The entrepreneurship key competence	13
• Ensuring teacher readiness for entrepreneurship education	13
• Borrowing on good practice	14
• Lessons Learnt	15

	The Zagreb Panel Proceedings (19 March)	16
9.	Plenary Sessions 5 & 6	16
	Good practice in entrepreneurship education	16
	• Good practice from FYR Macedonia	16
	• Good practice from Tunisia	16
	• Good practice from Germany	16
	• Good practice in multi-country cooperation	17
10.	Plenary 7	17
	Working Groups and Report Back	
	• Continuation of the strategy building effort	17
	• Improving access to and exchange of good practice	22
	• Follow-up of High Level Reflection Panel	23
11	Plenary 8	23
	• Conclusions and next steps	23
	• Closing remarks	24
12	Key conclusions and implications	25
	• Partnership, strategy and system building	25
	• The entrepreneurship key competence	25
	• Initial and in-service teacher training	26
	• Good practice vs. next practice	27
	• Dissemination	27

Annexes

1. Background

- 1.1 Concerned about its standing in the global economy policy makers in the European Union set an objective of developing a more entrepreneurial culture in the 27 member countries¹ in the bid to enhance competitiveness and jobs. Education and training has emerged as key pillar in the competitiveness drive with particular attention now turning to the potential that national education systems can bring to the entrepreneurship policy objectives. To this end, the European Commission established guidelines to support EU member countries in bringing forward the entrepreneurship education agenda.² The response by the national education systems to the policy guidelines has been mixed.³
- 1.2 The European Commission has identified two primary building blocks for more developed entrepreneurship education. Firstly, it recommends that the range of government partners, particularly education and economy ministries, will need to cooperate and co-work policy developments to bring forward the entrepreneurship education agenda. Secondly, the design and delivery of entrepreneurship education across all parts of the learning system will need to be addressed in a more systematic way if the political objectives established by the European Council in 2006 and reinforced by the EU's development perspectives for the next decade (see Barroso, 2009).
- 1.3 EU policy developments on entrepreneurship education have been closely watched by the countries in the EU pre-accession and Southern neighbourhood regions which hold similar concerns as to competitiveness and employment. Both regions cooperate with the European Union as part of their policy alignment strategies with the Small Business Act for Europe⁴ (pre-accession region) and the Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Enterprise (Southern Neighbourhood Region).⁵ Both instruments give particular attention to entrepreneurship education and against which the countries have engaged in a strategic monitoring exercise involving indicators designed to track each country's performance on the EU policy recommendations for entrepreneurship education.
- 1.4 In 2009, the European Commission launched a four-part series of High Level Reflection Panels involving EU member countries⁶ to determine how entrepreneurship education could be improved. In 2010, this 'reflection process' was extended to the EU pre-accession countries and a selection of countries from the EU's Southern Neighbourhood region.

1 See Presidency Conclusions of the Brussels European Council (23-24 March 2006) and the more recent perspectives of the European Commission in Barroso, J.M. (2009). Political guidelines for the next Commission. European Commission. 3 September 2009

2 European Commission (2006). Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe. October 2006.

3 European Commission (2007). Assessment of compliance with the entrepreneurship education objective in the context of the 2006 Spring Council conclusions, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry. 27 November 2007.

4 Small Business Act for Europe. European Commission. Brussels, 25.6.2008 COM(2008) 394 final

5 European Commission (2004). Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Enterprise. Directorate general for Enterprise and Industry.

6 Iceland and Norway as members of the European Economic Area also participated in the reflection process. Greece, Cyprus and Slovakia did not participate in the Panels.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 The Fifth Entrepreneurship Education High Level Reflection Panel was held in Zagreb, 18-19 March. Hosted by the Croatian government (the Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship and the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports), the panel was jointly organized by the European Commission (DG Enterprise and Industry and DG Education and Culture) and the European Training Foundation. The panel comprised all EU pre-accession countries and a selection of countries from the EU Southern Neighbourhood region (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99), Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey) and three countries from the EU Southern Neighbourhood region (Egypt, Israel and Tunisia).
- 2.2 National delegations comprised senior government staff, policy makers as well as representatives of employers and enterprise associations. See Annex 1.
- 2.3 The structure of the proceedings reflected the previous four panels: a) an overview of EU policy on entrepreneurship education, b) plenary discussion, c) break-out thematic working groups and d) show-casing of good practice. The agenda is attached at Annex 2.
- 2.4 This paper provides an overview of the proceedings of the Fifth Entrepreneurship Education High Level Reflection Panel. In following the chronology of the two-day agenda, it captures the key issues and concerns raised by the delegations from the eleven participating countries. A final section of the paper draws on the more salient issues raised by the panelists over the two-day programme and concludes with a number of next-step recommendations for entrepreneurship education in the EU partner countries.
- 2.5 The paper should be read in conjunction with the conclusions of each of the preceding four panels⁷ including the synthesis report and follow-up recommendations that are based on the deliberations of the four panels⁸

3. Objectives

The objectives of the Zagreb panel were:

- to map policies supporting entrepreneurship education in the participating countries, as well as to exchange good practice;
- to identify ways to improve cooperation between stakeholders at national level with a view to more systematic strategies in entrepreneurship education.

7 Reports on each of the previous four panels (London, Stockholm, Prague and Rome) are available on the European Commission's website: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/promoting-entrepreneurship/education-training-entrepreneurship/reflection-panels/index_en.htm

8 European Commission (2010). Towards greater cooperation and coherence in entrepreneurship education. Report and evaluation of the Pilot Action High Level Reflection Panels on Entrepreneurship Education. Directorates General Enterprise and Industry and Education and Culture.

The Zagreb Panel Proceedings (18 March)

4. Welcome and introductory remarks

Republic of Croatia

- 4.1. The panel was opened by Radovan Fuchs, Minister of Science, Education and Sports of Croatia. Dr. Fuchs welcomed the delegations from the eleven countries represented on the Panel including the representatives of the European Commission and the European Training Foundation who he thanked for organising the final high-level reflection panel. He stressed the importance particularly that Croatia and fellow EU pre-accession countries should contribute to the European debate on entrepreneurship education. He underlined how entrepreneurship education was now recognised in Croatia as critical for the younger generation's success in the labour market. This required a systematic approach to ensure that education system could respond to fast-changing demands of the economy. In that regard, Dr. Fuchs stressed the importance of cooperation between the education and the world of enterprise that was represented at the panel discussions.
- 4.2. Tajana Sapic-Kesic, State Secretary, Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship, representing Minister Popijać, welcomed all delegates. She emphasised the priority that her ministry had attached to the promotion of entrepreneurship at all levels of education. She explained how the ministry actively supported high-profile projects in entrepreneurship education from early education through to training for small enterprises, and where all developments involved the close cooperation of the education authorities and Croatian Chamber of Economy. Ms Sapic-Kesic particularly emphasised the importance of the education system in promoting entrepreneurship as a key competence. She informed the Panel that Croatia had been independently assessed as the lead performer in the EU pre-accession region on the entrepreneurship education dimensions of the European Small Business Act. Finally, Ms Sapic-Kesic pointed out the importance of cooperation on entrepreneurship education amongst the EU pre-accession countries and informed the meeting of the Ministry's initiative in establishing the South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning.

European Commission

- 4.3 Marko Curavić of the European Commission's Directorate for Enterprise and Industry outlined the objectives of the Panel. He highlighted the importance of small and medium-sized for the European economy and which accounted for 80% of new jobs. He said that Europe's education systems had an increasingly important contribution to make to the wider competitiveness drive and lifelong entrepreneurship education was an important factor in that effort. Mr. Curavić said that while entrepreneurship education would be an important leverage in promoting enterprise start-ups, he emphasised that the entrepreneurship education additionally had a wider societal value in promoting more creativity, innovation and a more entrepreneurial workforce.
- 4.4 Representing the Directorate General for Education and Culture, Mr Peter Baur reminded delegates of increasing expectations being made on national education by the economy with EU Member States. This was now more pronounced with the onset of the more recent global economic crisis. Laying particular emphasis on employability, Mr. Baur argued that the greater demands on education included vocational skills that needed to be

reinforced with broader key competences, and where entrepreneurship was increasingly identified as important.

European Training Foundation

- 4.5 In her opening remarks, Madlen Serban, Director of the European Training Foundation, outlined how entrepreneurship education was now very much in the EU policy agenda set against a wider concern for better interfaces between education and the economy. She, too, emphasised that the objective of entrepreneurship education went beyond business creation and how the entrepreneurship key competence was essential for promoting a wider, more entrepreneurial workforce. Dr. Serban underlined that the entrepreneurship education developments needs to be set against a wider objective of bridging the divide between education and the economy and where ETF was already working with all countries represented on the Panel (Torino Process). She concluded by underlining the opportunity of the fifth Panel delegation in identifying common concerns for more strategic developments in entrepreneurship education and exchange of good practice amongst the eleven countries represented on the Panel.

5. Plenary 1

■ Entrepreneurship education - progress in the host country (Croatia)

- 5.1 Dijana Vican, State Secretary, Ministry of Science, Education and Sports provided an overview of the national education system underlining its three primary goals: promoting independent thinking of children, employability and entrepreneurship. She the described key lines of entrepreneurship promotion in the schooling system, designed to progressively develop awareness and understanding of young people of the world of enterprise as well as general entrepreneurship competences:
- pre-school education were introduced to entrepreneurship through activities within a dedicated 'entrepreneurial week' where teachers and parents were also targeted through a range of awareness-raising activities;
 - primary education had access to entrepreneurship education through curricular an extra-curricular activities, with student cooperatives providing the core entrepreneurship activity;
 - secondary education allowed for the introduction of principles of economics as well as student 'practice firms'. The Panel also had the opportunity to hear at first hand from secondary students who underlined the entrepreneurial learning value of the 'practice firm' (currently included in the curriculum of 48 schools) while providing an in-depth overview of the firm creation, including access to start-up financing, business registration, management, taxation responsibilities and wider development process.
- 5.2 Dr. Vican informed the panel that the Croatian authorities were presently preparing a proposal for a national curriculum. This includes the promotion of entrepreneurship as a cross-curricular theme. A teacher training programme was foreseen after the national curriculum proposal was approved.

6. Plenary 2

■ *Overview of the previous four Panels*

- 6.1 Marko Curavić (European Commission) provided an overview of the issues emanating from the previous four Panels. He identified two core areas which required attention if developments in entrepreneurship education were to move forward:
- more concerted cooperation between education and economy policy makers, including non-governmental stakeholders, in particular the world of businesses;
 - national strategies for promoting entrepreneurship across the education system.
- 6.2 On strategy building across EU member countries, he referred to a 'progression model' in some countries, typified by high-profile initiatives involving individual schools and teacher training actions and where local authorities and enterprise support organisations were key to the entrepreneurship developments. Such initiatives in turn were generating a more strategic development line in entrepreneurship education. This invariably was being followed through into more developed implementation arrangements. Where strategies were in place, these addressed a number of core issues such as inter-ministerial cooperation, promotion of the entrepreneurship key competence, teacher training, and linkages in entrepreneurship promotion across the various levels of the education system. Building on good practice was an additional feature of member state developments in entrepreneurship education.
- 6.3 Closing his review of the previous four panels, Mr Curavić outlined potential areas where the European Union could foresee support. These included:
- a more developed exchange between experts on core thematic areas including training for teachers and school managers;
 - development of teaching and learning materials;
 - a web-based knowledge-sharing platform for policy makers and practitioners.
- 6.4 Given the need and potential for more concerted developments in entrepreneurship education, Mr. Curavić also indicated that the establishment of a European Centre for Entrepreneurship Education was a recommendation from the previous Panels.

7. Plenary 3

■ *Round table on entrepreneurship education: where do we stand?*

- 7.1 A round table exchange allowed for an overview of entrepreneurship education developments in the countries with particular reference to policy and institutional developments and stakeholder support frameworks. Overall, most countries had already taken strategic steps to move beyond the project-driven model of entrepreneurship education with varying degrees of engagement by key stakeholders for more strategic developments. A particular feature across most countries has been the adherence of the countries to the entrepreneurship education policy recommendations of a) The Small Business Act for Europe (EU pre-accession countries) and b) The Euro-Mediterranean Enterprise Charter (EU Southern Neighbourhood Region). Both instruments advocate cross-stakeholder cooperation and partnership building for improved entrepreneurship

education. A summary of the key policy and institutional arrangements for entrepreneurship education developments in the countries represented on the Fifth Panel is provided at Table 1.

- 7.2 The round table also identified a number of common challenges facing the countries in their bid to develop entrepreneurship education more strategically. Generally, while awareness and understanding of the importance of entrepreneurship promotion in national education systems had been gaining ground in all countries, it was evident that between the panel delegations, a common language on entrepreneurship and its manifold aspects was required. Nonetheless, panellists agreed that forward developments in the areas needed to be maintained. Early policy momentum needed to be underpinned by a more concerted engagement of key stakeholders. Further, policy initiatives needed to be backed up with financial commitment to ensure effective implementation. All countries were keen to learn from others' good practice where efficiencies in home developments could be made assuming improved access to good practice (policy and delivery). Table 2 provides a summary of the common challenges raised by the Panel.

8. Working Groups & Report Back (Plenary 4)

- 8.1 Parallel Working Groups allowed for more in-depth discussions and exchange between the delegations. A first series of working groups concentrated broadly on stakeholder cooperation, the scope and approaches to entrepreneurship, including the practicalities of integrating entrepreneurship into the teaching and learning process as well as lessons learnt. This section summarises key issues from the working groups.

■ *Progress through Partnership*

Cross-stakeholder cooperation

- 8.2. A central theme to working group exchanges was the importance of cross-stakeholder partnership in the effort to establish a sequence of entrepreneurship learning across the education system with more developed leadership and ownership of development by the education authorities necessary. While, EU policy recommendations had been instrumental in forging better interfaces between education and economy policy makers in some countries (e.g. Montenegro, Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99), FYR Macedonia), other countries had already demonstrated home-driven, cross-stakeholder policy initiatives to promote entrepreneurship at different levels of the learning system (e.g. Tunisia).

Country	Strategy and Stakeholder Cooperation
Albania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and economy ministries engaged in dialogue for more developed approach to entrepreneurship education. • National strategy building activity imminent.
Bosnia and Herzegovina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National economy and education authorities in dialogue with view to national strategy development. • Complex institutional and governance arrangements required separate strategic responses.
Egypt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A national entrepreneurship strategy is under development involving education and industry ministries. • A policy initiative addressing 'across campus' entrepreneurship in higher education is under preparation.
Israel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close involvement of civic society with national education system ensures a well developed non-formal system of entrepreneurship in cooperation. • National small business support network (MATI) provides training for business start-ups with specific support for particular groups (e.g. special needs, women). • Education and industry cooperation to be addressed more fully after Panel conclusions.
Kosovo (UNSCR 1244)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National entrepreneurial learning strategy in place. • Education and economy ministry cooperating in policy developments. • Chamber of Commerce actively engaged in policy and curriculum developments.
FYR Macedonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key development has been the a formal agreement signed between the education and economy ministries to bring forward entrepreneurship education developments. • A national centre for promoting entrepreneurship education supported by the Austrian government provided an essential institutional and policy support mechanism.
Montenegro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Entrepreneurial Learning Strategy in place. • Education and economy ministry cooperating in policy developments. • Chambers and employers federation actively engaged in policy and curriculum developments
Serbia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National strategy for entrepreneurial learning drafted and awaiting joint approval of education and economy ministries. • Wider stakeholder engagement into entrepreneurial learning (Chamber, NGOs, youth ministry).
Tunisia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation in place to promote entrepreneurship across all levels of education. • Particular attention in national policy to entrepreneurship key competence. • Good practice sharing in entrepreneurship in third-level education had direct policy implications.
Turkey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifelong entrepreneurship education is a central feature of a national lifelong learning strategy. • Entrepreneurship is taught as an elective subject in primary, secondary and vocational education.

*Table 1.
Summary of key issues on strategy and stakeholder cooperation by country*

Common Challenges	
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions of entrepreneurship education needed to be harmonised.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies required implementation plans backed up with financial resources.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-ministerial cooperation where it exists is often fragile and personalised which undermines potential for sustainable development of entrepreneurship education at national level.
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The education community and wider public need to be more aware of new policy phenomena e.g. entrepreneurship as a key competence.
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easier identification and access to good practice would help with national developments.

*Table 2.
Key challenges for development of entrepreneurship education identified by the Panel*

Economy ministries generating leverage

8.3 Secondly, the evidence shared into the workshops underlined a trend towards a ‘push model’ of entrepreneurship promotion in education, with economy and industry ministries clearly taking a pro-active approach to education reforms. For example, the national economy ministry of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the national SME agency in Montenegro have each been instrumental in opening a dialogue on lifelong entrepreneurship education. In both instances this had been followed up with financial support from the European Union. Likewise, in Serbia the economy ministry has initiated a policy discussion with a range of national partners on ‘why’ and ‘how’ entrepreneurship education should be taken forward. While, partnership and strategy building for entrepreneurship education is still evolving in Serbia, the broad-based partnership involving education, economy and youth ministries, with full engagement of employers and civic interest groups, provided a good example of comprehensive and inclusive policy development in entrepreneurship education.

Private sector engagement

- 8.4 Thirdly, a factor to develop from the working groups was the variance in the extent to which the private sector was an integral part of the system building of entrepreneurship education. In some instances, employers' organisations were considered as a primary driver of reform and providing leverage on the public authorities to better engage on common policy interests. The Chamber of Economy of Croatia, for example, had taken its own initiatives in promoting entrepreneurship education in primary and secondary education which had been instrumental in cultivating better understanding and awareness of the importance of more developed policy attention by both the education and economy ministries. Nonetheless, some delegations (e.g. Albania, Tunisia, Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99)) felt that enterprise needed to be more engaged into the policy and practice of entrepreneurship education and this required facilitation and incentives from the public sector. The Egyptian delegation underlined that national strategy development was being considered in that country and any developments would be on the basis of a public-private partnership.

System building

- 8.5 Ensuring that different parts of the national entrepreneurship education effort are connected to enable an entrepreneurial learning sequence from early education through to university level, including interfaces with non-formal entrepreneurship promotion, requires a system solution where all promotional bodies are connected up.
- 8.6 While, there was recognition of the need for a holistic, one-system approach to entrepreneurship education, feedback from the delegations generally pointed to fragmented institutional arrangements. In Egypt, for example, where there were already first steps to develop entrepreneurship in third-level education, a more strategic discussion on entrepreneurship promotion in earlier parts of the system and linkages between the two has still to be addressed. Where, different education ministries were responsible for various parts of the learning system, as is the case in Egypt and other Southern Mediterranean countries (third-level education is the responsibility of ministries for higher education) closer coordination and cooperation between ministries responsible for different parts of the learning system will be important.
- 8.7 Likewise, particularly where entrepreneurship education was well developed by non-formal providers, opportunities existed in borrowing on know-how for more mainstream developments. Israel provided a good example of close coordination and engagement, particularly of non-governmental organisations, into entrepreneurship education developments with specific efforts involving the employment services and small business support agency in providing entrepreneurship training to ensure labour market integration of immigrants.
- 8.8 How the general education system connected up with entrepreneurship education and training promoted by labour ministries (e.g. self-employment training) and the efforts of SME agencies in terms of business start-ups was an area which would require more attention in the bid to establish a more joined up and seamless entrepreneurship education system. Delegates from Albania, Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99) and Tunisia underlined that the culture of institutions and in some

instances, institutional rivalry, were barriers to developing common understanding and cooperation. In this regard, examples of good institutional linkages could encourage better institutional coherence and cooperation in the wider entrepreneurship education effort.

- 8.9 Finally, a system building approach to entrepreneurship education needs to ensure that it becomes and is recognised as an integral feature of the wider learning framework. In this regard, an initiative by Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99) to have entrepreneurship competences integrated into its national qualifications' framework, make good sense.

■ *Scope and approaches to entrepreneurship education*

- 8.10 The reports from each of the three working groups underlined various degrees of concentration on entrepreneurship education developments with entrepreneurship as a key competence, while recognised as the priority area for development, still very much not fully understood in policy or operational terms while teacher training was identified at the keystone for all developments.

The entrepreneurship key competence

- 8.11 The working group comprising Albania, Tunisia and Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99) underlined the challenges that remained in getting to an appreciation of the potential of the education system in promoting the entrepreneurship key competence. Most delegates considered that entrepreneurship, more specifically, certain aspects of the entrepreneurial character, are genetically defined. The 'nature-nurture' concerns generated discussion as to what real contribution could be made by formal education and the potential that 'born or bred' pre-conceptions could have for policy development, resource allocation and teaching and learning process.
- 8.12 The uncertainty surrounding the entrepreneurship key competence, however, had clearly not deterred some countries from already directly including the key competence into education legislation (e.g. Tunisia) and national education policies (e.g. Montenegro, Kosovo UNSCR 1244/99, FYR Macedonia) with preparations underway in other countries to ensure that the key competence is an integral feature of education policy (e.g. Albania, Croatia, Serbia). While policy makers are evidently ready to commit themselves to the key competence policy principle, the litmus test, however, is how the policies are implemented which raises two issues. Firstly, some delegations expressed concern that commitment to implementation of entrepreneurship education policy in general is often weaker than the initial commitment to formulate and approve the strategy (Montenegro). Secondly and more specifically on the entrepreneurship key competence, the mechanics for reform of curriculum and teacher training implications, including learning outcomes of the entrepreneurship key competence, are still very much uncharted areas and without access to good practice, there can be reluctance to move forward (Turkey, Egypt, Croatia).

Ensuring teacher readiness for entrepreneurship education

- 8.13 Where delegates were in full consensus was that for entrepreneurship education to have real impact, a paradigm change was needed in the wider teaching process and broader school environment. However, until the curriculum implications of the key competence had been unravelled, teacher competencies and implications for teacher training remained unclear. The FYR Macedonian delegation underlined that this would require a significant investment in time and money in the teaching profession, addressing both initial and in-service teacher training.
- 8.14 Efficiencies could be created by countries co-working curriculum and teacher training developments. The South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning, a regional body established by the governments of the eight countries preparing for EU accession, briefed the Panel on its plans to establish regional task forces of teachers and curriculum specialists (all EU pre-accession countries represented). The objective of the expert groups is to specifically explore curriculum and teacher training implications of the entrepreneurship key competence, including the need for school-based organisational reforms with a view to establishing a European model for the entrepreneurial school.
- 8.15 Nonetheless, some countries had already taken their own initiative to determine how the curriculum and teacher developments implications of the entrepreneurship key competence. Montenegro, for example, had piloted reforms in one local authority involving all primary and secondary schools, teachers, local enterprises, parent associations and civic interest groups. Meanwhile, on broader teacher capacity for the entrepreneurship education agenda, the response of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the teacher development challenge has been to establish capacity within a core group of teaching professionals with a cascade of know-how down through the teaching network. The Israeli education system's cooperation with the NGOs operational in entrepreneurship education highlighted how a significant effort was being made by the non-formal education sector to enhance the skills of teacher in entrepreneurship education (approx. 700 teachers trained annually). Finally, the Panel learnt of more innovative entrepreneurship teacher approaches e.g. the University of Tunis (Tunisia) had developed an e-learning framework for teachers ensuring wider access to training for Tunisia's teaching corps.
- 8.16 Finally, a representative of Eurochambres (European business representation) advised delegates that engaging the teaching profession into entrepreneurship education developments required political sensitivity and efforts to ensure ownership of all developments by teachers were essential.

Borrowing on good practice

- 8.17 A recurrent theme from the workshop was, in the bid to move forward with entrepreneurship education, to draw on tried-and-tested experience of others. Particular interest was expressed in good practice from within the European Union. However, the Tunisian delegation warned that 'good practice' in the education industry was now a 'business' recommending that any developments in good practice sharing on entrepreneurship education needed a quality control mechanism.

Lessons learnt

8.18 Discussions from the three parallel working groups identified a number of lessons learnt by the delegations as a whole in their efforts to promote entrepreneurship education. These are summarised in Table 3.

Five Lessons Learnt	
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Political will is essential before starting out on systemic entrepreneurship education developments.
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• While policy reform pressure may come from outside the education system, a leadership response and ownership by the education authorities was essential.
3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Structured partnership between education and economy ministries, and government and the private sector are important to sustainable developments in entrepreneurship education.
4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The teaching profession was a central constituency to all reforms. Dialogue, engagement and investment in teacher readiness for the entrepreneurship education challenge are a <i>sine qua non</i> for all developments.
5.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Curriculum and teacher training requirements for the entrepreneurship key competence requires more systematic investigation.

*Table 3.
The top five lessons learnt in developing the entrepreneurship education agenda.*

The Zagreb Panel Proceedings (19 March)

Plenary Sessions 5 & 6

■ *Good practice in entrepreneurship education*

- 9.1 The second and final day of the Panel focused particularly selected good practice from the pre-accession and Southern Mediterranean region, including European and a multi-country initiative in entrepreneurship education. This was followed by more developed discussion and exchange on future developments in entrepreneurship education with conclusions and next step recommendations closing the Panel's proceedings.
- 9.2 An overview of each of the good practice case studies is provided below with a more detailed description of the key issues from each presentation available boxed later in the text.

Good practice from FYR Macedonia

- 9.3 The presentation by the FYR Macedonian delegation highlighted how the entrepreneurship education agenda had evolved in as part of the wider education reforms and broader efforts to establish a market economy. The case study demonstrated how the national authorities had stepped up their commitment to the entrepreneurship agenda with a formal cooperation protocol signed by the education and economy ministries backed by and efforts to mainstream entrepreneurship education within the national curriculum.

Good practice from Tunisia

- 9.4 A second presentation by the Tunisian delegation highlighted the importance afforded to entrepreneurship education by the national authorities set against the twin objectives to enhance employability of university graduates and to ensure a more developed contribution of third-level education to national competitiveness. The presentation also demonstrates how the 'across campus' promotion of entrepreneurship education is operationalised and particularly how the 'key competence' is addressed in higher education.

Good practice from Germany

- 9.5 This presentation from one of Germany's autonomous regions, demonstrated how the economy ministry in partnership with its fellow education ministry and other regional stakeholders, has been instrumental in promoting a policy and an innovative support framework for entrepreneurship education which including a pioneering seed capital fund for school-based enterprise start-ups.

Good practice in multi-country cooperation

- 9.6 This final good practice presentation highlighted how the governments of the eight countries with perspectives of joining the European Union, represented by education and economy ministries, have signed up to partnership, cooperation and co-developments in entrepreneurship education under an umbrella institution – the South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (SEECCEL). The regional initiative is unique in that it represents the only multi-country cooperation initiative in entrepreneurship education specifically addressing entrepreneurship as a key competence.

10. Working Groups & Report Back (Plenary 7)

- 10.1 A second break out session comprising three parallel workshops focused on next developments in entrepreneurship education. Discussions centred round the need to further the entrepreneurship education strategy drive, the potential for a more systematic identification and international information management framework for good practice in entrepreneurship education and possible follow up lines to the High Level Reflection Process.

Continuation of the strategy building effort

- 10.2 All working groups were clear that only by way of clearly defined national strategies could the entrepreneurship education be brought forward with the delegation from Bosnia and Herzegovina underlining that strategies development needed to reflect national institutional and governance arrangements. Further, there was concern that what to date appeared to be ‘organic ‘ strategy development processes needed to be supplanted by more concerted, holistic and clearly articulated strategic commitments by national governments in partnership with the private sector and which gave equal weighting to all levels of the learning system. The risk, as underlined by the Tunisian delegation, is that if there is a focus on select areas of education, fragmentation could be institutionalised in the policy evolution process.

Good Practice 1

Entrepreneurship education in FYR Macedonia as a case study

Key issues highlighted in the presentation to the Panel include:

- a policy partnership involving a signed cooperation protocol between the education and economy ministries to develop entrepreneurship across all levels of education and with a particular emphasis on promoting entrepreneurship as a key competence;
- entrepreneurship education as an integral feature of national curriculum (secondary education), involving both key competence (communication skills, problem solving, risk assessment, leadership skills etc.) and more developed entrepreneurship skills (financial literacy, business planning, sales techniques, market research etc.) backed up teacher training activities;
- experiential learning techniques involving school-based virtual companies;
- entrepreneurship as core feature of national careers guidance and counselling;
- the establishment of a National Centre for Entrepreneurship Education and Innovation tasked with supported lifelong entrepreneurship education developments;
- perspectives to widen our entrepreneurship key competence developments to all levels of education, reinforcement of national partnership arrangements and policy framework, development of post-secondary entrepreneurship education including synergy building between formal and non-formal entrepreneurship education providers.

Good Practice 2

Entrepreneurship in higher education – national policy and institutional case study

Key issues highlighted in the presentation to the Panel include:

Policy Developments

- Sfax University's 'entrepreneurship centre' whose mission is to promote an entrepreneurship culture across the university had generated a policy response with all Tunisian universities required by national decree (2008) to establish similar entrepreneurship support centre;
- all universities required by national decree (2008) to provide entrepreneurship education to all third-level students;
- Ministry of Higher Education and university establishment have established a new contractual relationship for enhancing third-level education, which includes the promotion of entrepreneurship education.

Institutional Developments

- the establishment of a dedicated entrepreneurship centre at Sfax University tasked with ensuring a concerted development of entrepreneurship promotion across the campus;
- training of academic staff central to the centre's activities with training provided by national and international authorities on entrepreneurship education;
- elaboration of across-campus entrepreneurship curriculum and development of a new masters level programme in entrepreneurship, including pedagogic and assessment instruments;
- introduction of impact indicators and student tracking systems to determine value and implications of the university's entrepreneurship education drive.

Good Practice 3

Partnership and strategy for entrepreneurship education in (Baden-Wurttemberg)

Key issues highlighted in the presentation to the Panel include:

- Cross-stakeholder partnership for entrepreneurship education includes regional education and economy ministries, Chamber of Commerce, Chamber of Crafts, business and entrepreneurship education support institutions as well as linkages to the federal economy ministry;
- a four-level entrepreneurship education strategy which focuses on:
 - a) targeted support for more entrepreneurial students;
 - b) student-led enterprise creation;
 - c) experiential entrepreneurial learning and role modelling;
 - d) development of formal qualifications in entrepreneurship education.
- a seed capital fund by an accredited regional bank where students can submit requests for financial support set against viable business plans;
- a telephone hotline for students with queries on school-based enterprises addressing issues such as company registration, taxation, patenting, finance etc.
- a systematic student tracking framework to determine impact which doubles up as an alumni support framework.

Good Practice 4

Multi-country cooperation in entrepreneurship education: EU pre-accession region

Key issues highlighted in the presentation to the Panel include:

- SEECEL as first international body established with remit to coordinate and support multi-country entrepreneurship education developments;
- political interest and support from all eight countries followed a regional feasibility study which underlined value and efficiencies to be gained through strategic multi-country cooperation in entrepreneurship education;
- feasibility study and SEECEL start-up investment provided by Croatian government with technical support of Croatian Chamber of economy; follow-up financial support from the European Union;
- SEECEL Governing Board demonstrates concerted effort to address the education-economy nexus with representatives of both education and economy ministries from all eight pre-accession countries;
- multi-country task groups, comprising economy and education experts from all eight pre-accession countries, focus on curriculum and teacher training implications for entrepreneurship as a key competence as well as regional cooperation in entrepreneurship in higher education.

- 10.3 Secondly, a number of delegations underlined that the strategy building effort, and the partnership arrangements that paralleled it, were in many cases still not sufficiently robust to guarantee follow-through in implementation terms. Committing financial resources to meet the requirements of a national entrepreneurship education development drive was highlighted as a common area of concern for all delegations and where greater efforts to engage financial support would be required.
- 10.4 Thirdly, the delegations recognised that efforts to establish a better equilibrium of stakeholder commitment to national strategy building and implementation could be improved. Where there is political hesitancy from key partners in committing to a multi-stakeholder strategic process, strategy building and its follow-up implementation would be at risk as highlighted by Serbia. In the same vein, the FYR Macedonian delegation emphasised the importance of education authorities taking more ownership and leadership of the entrepreneurship education reform process.
- 10.5 On a more positive note, Albania, Tunisia and Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99) proposed that knowledge sharing between countries particularly on strategy definition and action planning would allow for continued improvements in strategy. In this regard, they recommended the creation of an international peer review system of national strategies for entrepreneurship education. Further, FYR Macedonia delegation underlined that credibility to the strategy building and delivery process could be helped by an impact measurement facility attached to each national strategy.
- 10.6 Finally, there was a clear consensus from the Panel that, given the evolving nature of developments in entrepreneurship education, strategy building should be preceded by (or at least paralleled with) high-level awareness raising campaigns to ensure that all parts of society understand the importance of support for lifelong entrepreneurship education. The Croat delegation emphasised that this was particularly important given a poor public perception of enterprise and entrepreneurship generated by international high-profile cases of corruption in the business world.

Improving access to and exchange of good practice

- 10.7 Following discussions from the first day's proceedings, access to good practice remained a recurrent theme for the panellists.
- 10.8 Firstly, the presentations of the good practice had generated discussion within the working groups with Serbia and FYR Macedonia expressing interest in immediate follow-up with the Baden-Wurttemberg authorities to learn further on their entrepreneurship education model; They underlined the dynamic and potential that the reflection panel had in knowledge dissemination and promotion of cooperation.

- 10.9 Secondly, delegates were unanimous that in their efforts to establish credible and cost-effective arrangements for entrepreneurship education, access to good practice for all levels of education was important. The Tunisian delegation, however, reiterated its concern about the 'race for good practice'. With the Albanian and Kosovar (UNSCR 1244) delegations, it called for good practice criteria to be established by the entrepreneurship education community at international level to include a quality assurance mechanism that would allow entrepreneurship education specialists (policy makers and practitioners) to confidently borrow on tried-and-tested experience and know-how.
- 10.10 Thirdly, the Panel had generated interest in more knowledge sharing in entrepreneurship education both within the regions participating as well as cross-regionally. The delegations from Croatia, Egypt, Israel and Turkey put forward proposals for international cooperation projects and competitions on thematic areas (e.g. teacher training for entrepreneurship development).

Follow-up of High Level Reflection Panel

- 10.11 The workshops closed with identification of a number of areas that could be considered as follow-up to the High Level Reflection Process. A number of options and proposals were put forward including
- the immediate sharing of the results of the Zagreb reflection panel at national level (Montenegro);
 - the establishment of a national reflection panel (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia);
 - thematic roundtables (Bosnia and Herzegovina);
 - regional exchanges (policy and practice) through expert organisations such as SEECEL (Croatia, Tunisia).

11. Plenary 8

Conclusions and next steps

- 11.1 Drawing conclusions from the Panel's proceedings, Marko Curavić of the European Commission reiterated the policy interest of the European Union in bringing forward entrepreneurship education developments both within the 27 EU member countries and through cooperation arrangements between the European Union and the two partner regions represented on the Fifth Panel.
- 11.2 He underlined how many of the challenges and concerns raised by the Fifth Panel mirrored those already aired in the previous four Panels. He thanked all delegations for their commitment and contribution to the exchange of experience, ideas and aspirations for improved entrepreneurship education in their countries. He recommended that all delegations to continue to pursue the ethos and objectives of the High Level Reflection Panel, both nationally and regionally, by way of focused events addressing core development themes raised by the Fifth Panel.

Closing remarks

- 11.3 Mr. Curavić thanked the Croat authorities for hosting the Panel and the European Training Foundation for making a Fifth Panel both a possibility and a success.
- 11.4 On behalf of State Secretary for Education Dijana Vican, Ivana Puljiz thanked the European Commission, the European Training Foundation and the participant delegations for their joining the Croatia for the Fifth Reflection Panel. She underlined that entrepreneurship education was an evolving area of policy interest and where opportunities for international exchange and access to good practice, as the case with the Fifth Panel, were crucial to those intent on taking a more strategic line in entrepreneurship education. She confirmed Croatia's commitment for continued exchange and cooperation with the European Union, the pre-accession region and Southern Mediterranean countries for further developments in entrepreneurship education.
- 11.5 Madlen Serban of the European Training Foundation thanked the Croatian authorities and congratulated all panellists for their openness and readiness to cooperate in the Fifth Panel exchanges and thanked the delegations their high quality contribution to the discussions.

12. Key conclusions and implications

- 12.1 This section of the report draws a number of overall conclusions to the discussions held by the Zagreb High Level Reflection Panel, including follow-up recommendations. It goes on to explore some of the implications of the key issues that may assist partner countries that participated in the panel with their post-panel reflections and possible follow-up lines. Given the similarities in the findings and conclusions of the Fifth Panel with those of the preceding four Panels, the conclusions and additional analysis provided in this closing section of the report may also provide signals as to possible follow-up to the wider 'reflection process' in the European Union, including possible areas for support by the European Union or bi-lateral support frameworks.

Information and improved public awareness

- 12.2 On a number of occasions during the Fifth Panel proceedings, participants underlined how manifold aspects of entrepreneurship education were misunderstood in their respective countries. Terminology, what entrepreneurship involved in pedagogic terms as well as target groups were still issues for the wider public to understand. More specifically, the wider concept of the EU definition which went beyond preparing people for business start-ups to include entrepreneurship as a key competence for economic, social and civic life needed attention. Participants called for the development and promotion of public awareness-raising activities for entrepreneurship education as an essential basis for sustained policy commitment to the area.

Partnership, strategy and system building

- 12.3 A clear message from the Fifth Panel is that entrepreneurship education does not have a clearly defined policy home. This requires different parts of government, particularly education and economy ministries, to act in partnership, systematically co-engaging to ensure better coherence and synergy in strategy building, policy making and policy monitoring. Further, set against an understanding that all parts of the national learning system have a contribution to the entrepreneurship education agenda (lifelong approach), the partnership should include other ministries e.g. ministries responsible for youth policies. Particularly important is that ministries for higher education (Southern Mediterranean region) and national rectors' conferences are fully integrated into the policy dialogue and partnership building process.
- 12.4 Secondly, the sequence of entrepreneurship promotion in formal education ideally needs to connect up with the wider effort for entrepreneurship education and training in each country. This includes the contribution made by non-governmental organisations as well as business support organisations. Essentially, a coherent system for lifelong entrepreneurial learning involving state, private sector and civic interest groups requires a 'joining up of the dots'. The efforts of Serbia in developing a comprehensive and inclusive partnership model, including strategy building, are very much in this direction. This approach provides one of the pre-conditions for building a lifelong entrepreneurial learning system.
- 12.5 Thirdly, a risk with all policy partnership arrangements is there can often be a lack of equilibrium in commitment across the range of stakeholders, particularly government partners. This is where leadership is important. A second pre-condition for system-building therefore is that top levels of each ministry involved will need to ensure that a ministerial agenda does not undermine a broader, cross-ministry or government agreed strategy. This includes each ministry following through with budgetary support where this is appropriate.
- 12.6 Finally, and again on leadership, given that the national education authorities (general and higher education), including the higher education establishment (e.g. rectors' conference) have central role in the national strategy and system-building processes, their leadership and ownership of reform and development processes is a third pre-condition for developing a national entrepreneurship education framework. This includes ensuring that entrepreneurship education developments are integrated within wider education development lines including curriculum reform, teacher training and development of national qualifications as in the case of Kosovo (UNSCR 1244/99).

The entrepreneurship key competence

- 12.7 Where the Fifth Panel went further than their counterparts in the preceding Panels was in addressing the entrepreneurship key competence. Given the crucial role of the key competence in promoting the cognitive and behavioural traits of young people as a bedrock for an entrepreneurial culture, the Fifth Panel discussions demonstrate that there is a good understanding of the concept of entrepreneurship as a key competence. However, missing is how the key competence can be effectively addressed in the teaching and learning process.
- 12.8 More specifically, the Panel underlined that a number of essential issues remain to be addressed and until they are could discourage the countries from taking any substantive steps forward. These include definition of the learning outcomes of the key competence promotion, particularly in primary and secondary education, curriculum

provisions and assessment arrangements still to be defined. Until, the key competence had been demystified, the likelihood that each country places emphasis on entrepreneurship as a separate subject, usually enshrined within business studies curriculum or economics, remains high.

- 12.9 While SEECEL is leading a ‘practitioner participatory’ action (teachers, curriculum specialists) in this direction, its mandate only covers the countries of the pre-accession region. To ensure that the countries of the EU Southern Neighbourhood region can similarly move forward on this area, a regional support initiative for entrepreneurship education could be considered, as proposed by the Tunisian delegation.
- 12.10 Notwithstanding, region-specific initiatives, there is clearly a need for developed empirical enquiry and support for the entrepreneurship education key competence area within the European Union and beyond. Given joint policy interests between the European Union and the partner country regions through the Small Business Act (pre-accession countries) and Euro-Mediterranean Charter for Enterprise (Southern Mediterranean countries), an action research collective could be considered with the task of coming forward with commonly agreed policy solutions, including clearly defined curriculum and teaching protocols and tools which could subsequently be adapted down into each country.

Initial and in-service teacher training

- 12.11 As with the preceding four Panels, the Zagreb discussions underlined the importance of engaging and supporting the most critical of constituencies to all developments in the entrepreneurship education drive – the teachers. An inherent risk here is that without proper consultation and engagement with teacher unions and representation organisations, policy efforts could quickly founder.
- 12.12 A second factor is that with many of the countries represented on Fifth Panel already undergoing significant reforms to the schooling system for some time (pre-accession countries particularly), the introduction of the entrepreneurship education agenda could add to the growing reform fatigue. This is a possible risk to getting ‘buy in’ from the teaching profession.
- 12.13 A well-resourced, information and consultation campaign targeting teachers in each country could be considered. This would need to be backed up with incentives and exposure to success models of teachers and schools that take on the challenges of the entrepreneurship education agenda. The case shared in the Fifth Panel workshop of schools from a strategic pilot municipality in Montenegro, is one example and where the teachers became the most prominent advocates for entrepreneurship education.

- 12.14 Incentives should concentrate on personal and professional value for teachers. Innovative teacher training measures perhaps linked to the key competence proposals above could be considered e.g. multi-country teacher training networks (initial and in-service training). In any event it will be important that all measures ensure a sense of ownership of any entrepreneurship-driven teacher development policies and initiatives.

Good practice vs. next practice

- 12.15 Access to good practice, as with the previous Panels, was a recurrent theme across the two-day Fifth Panel meeting. Delegates considered good practice as an opportunity against which their own developments could be enhanced. However, the Zagreb Panel went further than earlier panels in underlining the risks of blind borrowing from the good practice market and advocating the development of an international, accredited, quality assured good practice intelligence framework based on a peer review system. This recommendation in part reflects disillusion of pre-accession and Southern Mediterranean partners with entrepreneurship education 'good practitioners' engaged from developed economy aid machine and who themselves are 'clutching straws in a wind'.
- 12.16 In this regard, the SEECCEL response has been less one of good practice but of 'next practice' i.e. moving forward on areas of work still undeveloped e.g. defining learning outcomes for the entrepreneurship key competence and against which curriculum and teacher training can be framed. Political and financial support of 'next practitioners' will be critical to the strategic development of entrepreneurship education.

Dissemination

- 12.17 The report from the Fifth Panel should be disseminated as largely as possible across the stakeholder institutions of the countries which participated in the Fifth Panel. Additionally, the report should be disseminated in the countries of the EU Southern Mediterranean Neighbourhood region that did not participate in the Fifth Panel.

Annex 2

List of participants

ALBANIA

Mr Halit Shamata

Deputy Minister
Ministry of Education and Science
Rruga e Durrësit, No. 23
AL-1001 Tirana
ALBANIA
Tel.: +355 42 230747
Fax: +355 4 2232002
E-mail: hshamata@mash.gov.al gmuzaka@mash.gov.al

BOSNIA HERZEGOVINA

Ms Lejla Kadusic

Advisor for European Integration
Sector for Education - Department for EU Integration and International
Cooperation
Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Trg Bosne i Hercegovine 3
71000 Sarajevo
BOSNIA HERZEGOVINA
Tel.: +387 33 492515
Fax: +387 33 492627
E-mail: lejla.kadusic@mcp.gov.ba

Mr Dragan Milovic

Assistant Minister
Sector For Economic Development and Entrepreneurship
Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations
Musala 8
71000 Sarajevo
BOSNIA HERZEGOVINA
Tel.: +387 30 552540
Fax: +387 30 552541
E-mail: dragan.milovic@mvteo.gov.ba omegakiseljak@gmail.com

CROATIA

Ms Anny Brusic

Director of SME Association
SME Association
Croatian Employers Association
p.Hatza 12,
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 4897572
Fax: +385 1 4897556
E-mail: anny.brusic@hup.hr

Mr Radovan Fuchs

Minister of Science, Education and Sports
Donje Svetice 38
10000 Zagreb
Tel.: +385 1 4569000
CROATIA

Ms Natalija Gjeri

Expert assistant
Department for quality of Education Assurance
National Centre for External Evaluation of Education
Trg Marka Marulica, 18
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 14501832
Fax: +385 1 4501888
E-mail: natalija.gjeri@ncvvo.hr

Ms Dragica Karaic

Head of Department
Department for EU Programmes and projects
Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship
Vukovarska 78
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 6106 812
Fax: +385 1 6106333
E-mail: dragica.karaic@mingorp.hr

Ms Olga Lui

Consultant for Education Issues
Department for Education
Croatian Chamber of Trades and Crafts Ilica 49/11
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 4806609
Fax: +385 1 4806624
E-mail: olga.lui@hok.hr, obrazovanje@hok.hr

Ms Vesna Marovic

Advisor
Subsidiary Split
Education and Teacher Training Agency
21000 Split
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 21 340980
Fax.: +385 21 314246
E-mail: vesna.marovic@azoo.hr

Ms Zeljka Mrksa

Head of Eu Projects Implementation Section
Directorate for SMEs
Ministry of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship
Ulica grada Vukovara 78
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 6106351
Fax: +385 1 6106333
E-mail: zeljka.mrksa@mingorp.hr mzeljka@hotmail.com

Ms Ivana Puljiz

Directorate for International Cooperation and European Integration
Director
Ministry of Science, Education and Sports
Donje Svetice 38
HR-10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 4594451
Fax: +385 14594312
E-mail: ivana.puljiz@mzos.hr

Ms Tajana Sapic Kesic

State secretary, Entrepreneurship
Minister of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship
Ulica grada Vukovara 78
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 6106111

Mr Mirko Smoljic

Advisor to the minister
Office of the minister
Ministry of Science, Education and Sport
Donje Svetice, 38
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 14560027
Fax: +385 1 4569085
E-mail: m.smoljic@mzos.hr

Ms Vesna Stefica

Deputy Director
Human Resource Development Centre
Croatian Chamber of Economy
Rooseveltova trg 2
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 4561514
Fax: +385 1 4828380
E-mail: vstefica@hgk.hr

Mr Vitomir Tafra

National E4E- Coordination
Selska 119
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 3010618
Fax: +385 13014943
E-mail: vitomirt@zrinski.org

Ms Dora Ulaga

Professional consultant
Agency for Vocational Education
Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 16274657
Fax: +385 1 6274606
E-mail: dora.ulaga@aso.hr

Ms Dijana Vican

State Secretary
Ministry of Science, Education and Sports
Donje Svetice 38
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 14569028
Fax: +385 14594312
E-mail: dijana.vican@mzos.hr

EGYPT**Mr Amr Gohar**

President of the Middle East Council for
Small Business and Entrepreneurship
Ministry of Industry and Trade
Corniche El Nile,
El salam Tower
Cairo
EGYPT
Tel.: +20 2 24886098
Fax: +20 2 252 84095
E-mail: agohar@ntcegypt.com, mireille.makram@call-ecco.com

Dr. Mohsen Elmahdy Said

Advisor to the Minister for International Cooperation
Ministry of Higher Education
101 Kasr El Eini street, EG Downtown
Cairo
EGYPT
Tel.: +20 2 33458611
Fax: +20 2 33458611
E-mail: saidme@eun.eg

FYR OF MACEDONIA

Mr Mile Boskov

President
Confederation of Employers Republic of Macedonia
Vasil Gorgov 11
1000 Skopje
FYR of Macedonia
Tel.: +389 2 5511868
E-mail: mb@cerm.com.mk

Ms Elizabeta Jovanovska-Radanovik

Advisor
National VET Centre
50 Divizija b.b.
1000 Skopje
FYR of Macedonia
Tel.: +389 2 3135484
Fax: +389 2 111085
E-mail: ejov@yahoo.com

GERMANY

Ms Petra Weininger

Ministry of Economy
Wirtschaftsministerium Baden-Wurttemberg
Theodor-Heuss-Str.4
70174 Stuttgart
GERMANY
Tel.: +49 711 1232765
Fax: +49 711 1232556
E-mail: petra.weininger@wm.bwl.de

ISRAEL

Ms Zvia Dori

Head of the Department
Finance & Internal Trade Administration
Ministry of Industry, Trade and Labor
5 Bank of Israel Street
91036 Jerusalem
ISRAEL
Tel.: +972 2 6662584
Fax: +972 2 6662935
E-mail: zvia.dori@moital.gov.il

Mr Michael Oren

Vice President
Ta'asiyeda Industry for advance education
Manufactures Association of Israel
29 Hamered st. Tel Aviv
68125 Tel Aviv
ISRAEL
Tel.: +972 3 5173336
Fax: +972 3 5198760
E-mail: michael@think.org.il

Ms Magdalena Gross

Chief Supervisor
Science and Technology Department
Ministry of Education
Hashlosa St. 2
67060 Tel-Aviv
ISRAEL
Tel.: +972 3 6896157
Fax: +972 3 6896199
E-mail: magdagr@education.gov.il

KOSOVO UN 1244

Mr Safet Fazliu

Advisor to Minister
Ministers Cabinet
Ministry of Economy and Finance
Nena Tereze Street, nn New Government Building
10000 Prishtina
Tel.: +381 38 20034558
Fax: +381 38 21311
E-mail: sfazliu@mfe-ks.org safet.fazliu@gmail.com

MONTENEGRO

Ms Zora Bogicevic

Senior Advisor for Secondary and Higher Vocational Education
Ministry for Education and Science

Vaka Durovic b.b

81000 Podgorica

MONTENEGRO

Tel.: +382 20 410147

E-mail: zora.bogicevic@gov.me mima.mitrovic@gov.me

SERBIA

Mr Radovan Zivkovic

Advisor

Department for Secondary education

Ministry of Education

Nemanjina 22

11000 Belgrade

SERBIA

Tel.: +381 11 2684735

Fax: +381 11 3616384

E-mail: radovan.zivkovic@mp.gov.rs

TUNISIA

Prof. Mohamed Rached Boussema

General Director of Higher Education Reforms

Direction Générale de la rénovation Universitaire

Ministry of Higher Education and scientific research

Avenue Ouled Haffouz

1030 Tunisi

TUNISIA

Tel.: +216 71835080

Fax: +216-71833320

E-mail: Rached.Boussema@enit.rnu.tn mrboussema@gnet.tn

Mr Mohamed Haddad

Principal Inspector of Economy

Ministère de l'éducation - Tunisie

Regional Direction of Education

6000 Gabès

TUNISIA

Tel.: +216 75290219

Fax: +216 75 290112

E-mail: med.haddad@edunet.tn

Ms Lamia Ghazouani

Ministry of Industry and Trade
Immeuble Beya, 40 Rue 8011 Montplaisir
1073 Tunis
TUNISIA
Tel.: +216 71 909401
Fax: +216 71 902742
E-mail: Lamia.Ghazouani@mit.gov.tn

Dr. Lassaad Mezghani

Professor
Faculty of Economics and Management
University of Sfax
B.P. 1088
Sfax
TUNISIA
Tel.: +216 74 450577
E-mail: mezghani@tunet.tn

TURKEY**Mr Salih Celik**

Deputy Undersecretary
Ministry of National Education
Ataturk Bulvari N° 98 D Blok 1. Kat Bakanliklar
06648 Ankara
TURKEY
Tel.: +90 312 4186979
Fax: +90 312 4253315
E-mail: scelik@meb.gov.tr

Mr Salih Tuna Sahin

Vice President
KOSGEB
Abdül HakHamit Cad no: 866 Altmisevler
06470 Ankara
TURKEY
Tel.: +90 312 5952947
Fax: +90 312 3690340
E-mail: tuna.sahin@kosgeb.gov.tr

EUROPEAN COMMISSION**Mr Peter Baur**

Deputy Head of Unit
European Commission
DG Education and Culture
Place Madou
1049 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel.: +32 2 2944208
E-mail: peter.baur@ec.europa.eu

Mr Simone Baldassarri

Policy Officer
European Commission
DG Enterprise and Industry
Avenue d'Auderghem 45
B-1040 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel.: +32 2 2953311
Fax: +32 2 2990309
E-mail: simone.baldassarri@ec.europa.eu

Mr Marko Curavić

Head of Unit
European Commission
EC DG Enterprise and Industry
Avenue d'Auderghem 45
1049 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel.: +32 2 2987425
Fax: +32 2 2966278
E-mail: marko.Curavić@ec.europa.eu

Ms Vedrana Ligutic

Task Manager
EU Delegation to the Republic of Croatia
Trg zrtava fasizma 6
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 4896515
Fax: +385 1 4896555
E-mail: vedrana.ligutic@ec.europa.eu

Ms Carmen Raluca Ipate

Policy Officer
European Commission
DG Enterprise and Industry (BREY 8/15)
1040 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel.: +32 2 2956542
E-mail: Carmen-Raluca.Ipate@ec.europa.eu

REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Ms Efka Heder

Director
South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning
Selska Cesta 217/IV
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 3040260 / 3040264
Fax: +385 1 3040261
E-mail: Efka.Heder@seecel.hr

Ms Sandra Roncevic

Office and Event manager
South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning
Selska Cesta 217/IV
10000 Zagreb
CROATIA
Tel.: +385 1 3040260
Fax: +385 1 3040261
E-mail: sandra.roncevic@seecel.hr
E-mail: nenad.vakanjac@seecel.hr nvakanjac@inet.hr

EUROCHAMBERS

Ms Margarete Rudzki

Advisor European Affairs
B-1000 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel.: +32 22820881
Fax: +32 22300038
E-mail: rudzki@eurochambers.eu

JOURNALIST

Mr Nick Holdsworth

ETF Journalist
Tel.: +44 1454852018
Fax: +44 7748686571
E-mail: holdsworth.nick@gmail.com

EUROPEAN TRAINING FOUNDATION

VIALE SETTIMIO SEVERO, 65
10133 TURIN
TEL: +39 011 6302222
FAX: +39 011 6302200

Ms Madlen Serban

Director
Tel.: +39 011 6302201
E-mail: mse@etf.europa.eu

Mr Anthony Gribben

Team Leader - Entrepreneurial Learning
Tel.: +39 011 6302310
E-mail: aag@etf.europa.eu

Mr Aziz Jaouani

Operations Department
Tel.: +39 011 6302229
E-mail: Abdelaziz.Jaouani@etf.europa.eu

Mr Vaclav Klenha

Country Manager Croatia and Serbia

Tel.: +39 011 6302225

E-mail: vkl@etf.europa.eu

Mr Markus Losi

Operations Department

Tel.: +39 011 6302451

E-mail: Markus.Losi@etf.europa.eu

Ms Rosita Van Meel

Operations Department

Tel.: +39 011 6302313

E-mail: Rosita.Van-Meel@etf.europa.eu

Annex 2

HIGH LEVEL REFLECTION PANEL ON ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION
Zagreb, 18-19 March 2010

Agenda

HIGH LEVEL REFLECTION PANEL ON ENTREPRENEURSHIP EDUCATION

Zagreb, 18-19 March 2010

18.03.10	DAY ONE – AFTERNOON
12.00 – 12.30	<p>Welcome: Croatian authorities, European Commission and European Training Foundation <i>Radovan Fuchs, Minister of Science, Education and Sports, Croatia</i> <i>Đuro Popijać, Minister of Economy, Labour and Entrepreneurship, Croatia</i></p> <p>Introduction to the event: aim and purpose of the meeting <i>Marko Curavić, Head of Unit, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry, European Commission</i></p> <p>Developments on entrepreneurship education in the European Union <i>Peter Baur, Deputy Head of Unit, Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission</i></p> <p>What do we want to get from this meeting? <i>Madlen Serban, Director, European Training Foundation</i></p>
12.30 – 13.00	Roundtable introduction of participants
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch
13.00 – 13.30	<p>Press Conference <i>Croat authorities, European Commission, European Training Foundation</i></p>
14.00 – 14.30	<p>Plenary Session 1: Entrepreneurship education in Croatia – progress in the host country <i>Dijana Vican, State Secretary, Ministry of Science, Education and Sport, Croatia</i></p> <p><i>Questions and clarifications (10 mins)</i></p>
14.30 – 14.45	<p>Plenary Session 2: Overview of the previous four clusters <i>Marko Curavić, Head of Unit, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry, European Commission</i></p>
14.45 – 15.45	<p>Plenary Session 3: Round table – entrepreneurship education, where do we stand? <i>Chair Peter Baur, Deputy Head of Unit, Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission</i></p> <p><i>Moderator 1: Efka Heder, South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning</i> <i>Moderator 2: Rosita Van Meel, European Training Foundation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where does entrepreneurship education sit in your country? • What is the current institutional framework for entrepreneurship education? • Key challenges in your country.
15.45– 16.00	Refreshment break

16.00 – 17.30	<p>Introduction to the Parallel Working Groups <i>Rosita van Meel, European Training Foundation</i></p> <p>Group 1: <i>Chair: Marko Curavić, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry, European Commission</i> <i>Rapporteur: Aziz Jaouani, European Training Foundation</i></p> <p>Group 2: <i>Chair: Madlen Serban, Director, European Training Foundation</i> <i>Rapporteur: Peter Baur, Deputy Head of Unit, Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission</i></p> <p>Group 3: <i>Chair: Efka Heder, South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning (SEECCEL)</i> <i>Rapporteur: Anthony Gribben, European Training Foundation</i></p> <p>Session 1: Practical examples of collaboration in action by country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of cooperation in entrepreneurship education; • Is there an ideal way to incorporate entrepreneurship education into teaching? Best practices? • Are there specificities for entrepreneurship education when teaching different age groups? • Entrepreneurship education: subject-oriented or cross-curricula topic? • Lessons learnt so far
17.30 – 18.00	<p>Plenary Session 4: <i>Chair: Marko Curavić, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry, European Commission</i></p> <p>Report back by the rapporteurs from the 3 Working Groups</p> <p><i>Moderator 1: Efka Heder, South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning</i> <i>Moderator 2: Rosita Van Meel, European Training Foundation</i></p> <p>Summary of key issues from the working groups</p>
18.03.10	DAY ONE – EVENING
19.30 – 20.00	Pre-dinner drinks
20.00 – 20.30	<p>Creating an entrepreneurial generation: how enterprise contributes to entrepreneurship education in Croatia <i>Mr. Nadan Vidošević, President, Croatian Chamber of Economy</i></p>
20.30	Dinner

19.03.2010	DAY TWO – MORNING
09.00 – 09.10	<p>Introducing the day ahead <i>Efka Heder, South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning</i> <i>Rosita Van Meel, European Training Foundation</i></p>
09.10 – 09.50	<p>Plenary Session 5: Developments in entrepreneurship – best practice <i>Chair: Madlen Serban, European Training Foundation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurship education in secondary education in FYR of Macedonia <i>Elizabeta Jovanovska, Advisor, Vocational Education and Training Centre</i> • Entrepreneurship in higher education – national policy and institutional case-study <i>Lassaad Mezghani, University of Sfax, Tunisia.</i> <p><i>Questions and clarifications (10 mins)</i></p>
09.50 – 10.30	<p>Plenary Session 6: European and multi-country perspectives for entrepreneurship education <i>Chair: Madlen Serban, European Training Foundation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Partnership and strategy for entrepreneurship education: the case of Baden-Württemberg (D)</i> <i>Petra Weininger, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Baden-Württemberg</i> • <i>Multi-country cooperation in entrepreneurship education in the EU pre-accession region</i> <i>Efka Heder, Director, South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning</i> <p><i>Questions and clarifications (10 mins)</i></p>
10.30 – 10.45	Refreshment break
10.45 – 12.15	<p>Introduction to the Parallel Working Groups</p> <p>Group 1: <i>Chair: Peter Baur, Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission</i> <i>Rapporteur: Anthony Gribben, European Training Foundation</i></p> <p>Group 2: <i>Chair: Madlen Serban, European Training Foundation</i> <i>Rapporteur: Sannie Fisker Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission</i></p> <p>Group 3: <i>Chair: Efka Heder, South East European Centre for Entrepreneurial Learning</i> <i>Rapporteur: Marko Curavić, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry, European Commission</i></p> <p>Session 2: Future developments in education entrepreneurship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the ideal strategy to promote entrepreneurship education? • How to establish good communication channels with employers and business? • How to align entrepreneurship in the educational system to the Lisbon Agenda and Small Business Act • How to implement the “Oslo Agenda for Entrepreneurship Education in Europe”? • How do you plan to strengthen entrepreneurship education in your country in the next two years? • How to create a European framework for exchanging good practices and ideas for improving policy? • How to follow up to these Reflection Panels?

12.15 – 12.40	<p>Plenary Session 7: <i>Chair: Marko Curavić, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry, European Commission</i></p> <p>Report back by the rapporteurs from the 3 Working Groups</p> <p><i>Moderator 1: Ms Sannie Fisker, Directorate General for Education and Culture, European Commission</i> <i>Moderator 2: Rosita Van Meel, European Training Foundation</i></p> <p>Summary of issues from the working groups</p>
12.40 – 12.45	<p>Plenary Session 8:</p> <p>Conclusions and next steps <i>Chair: Marko Curavić, Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry, European Commission</i></p>
12.45 – 13.00	<p>Closing statement <i>Dijana Vican, State Secretary, Ministry of Science, Education and Sport,</i></p>
13.00- 14.30	<p>Lunch</p>