Intellectual Entrepreneurship as a Platform for Transforming Higher Education

Gary D. Beckman and Richard A. Cherwitz

Abstract

The thesis of this article is that "Intellectual Entrepreneurship (IE)" provides an intellectually authentic philosophical foundation capable of sustaining cross-campus entrepreneurship education. Drawing upon initiatives begun at The University of Texas at Austin, we document how IE educates "citizen-scholars." Specifically, IE leverages the knowledge assets contained within the university's walls, empowering faculty and students to become agents of change—both on campus and in their communities. Anchored to the rich humanist traditions of the university, IE harnesses the core philosophy of western education to transform the master-apprentice-entitlement paradigm into one of discovery, ownership, accountability, collaboration and action.

Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart wrote a short concurrence in favor of the 1964 majority in *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, the landmark case pertaining to the definition of obscenity. Appearing in that supporting opinion was the phrase "…I know it when I see it…." When considering the definition of another term, *entrepreneurship*, Stewart's words may be apropos when paraphrased: "There is a certain quality that true entrepreneurs exude—that is, somehow we will know it when we see it." Interestingly, the less than satisfying quality of Stewart's criteria for ascertaining what counts as obscenity seems analogous to a recent development in higher education, namely the movement to bring entrepreneurial thinking to the arts and sciences without clear consensus or an academically legitimate definition of entrepreneurship robust enough to transcend disciplinary lines.

The growing interest in transforming the academy to meet the realities of a modern world while simultaneously preserving and celebrating the noble traditions that have comprised the education of prior generations is both palpable and tangible. Though this is a laudable and long overdue venture, the mechanisms for accomplishing this transformation are varied and reflect institutional micro-cultures. Cross-disciplinary entrepreneurship education is emerging as a leading method to respond to these needs; it provides an opportunity to reposition the academy as a vital part of American life by embedding change within a rich liberal arts tradition. For all the criticisms and challenges American higher education has confronted over the past century, transforming the university is occurring at an almost break-neck pace; entrepreneurship is an emerging theme with empowerment as its goal (Hulsey, Rosenberg, and Kim 2006).

Institutional change, however, is a sustained proposition; it requires more than good ideas and innovative programs. There are a myriad of topics to be considered before these endeavors can be implemented and successfully mainstreamed within the academic culture. Campus-wide efforts to transform academe via entrepreneurship share certain commonalities: garnering faculty support, visionary leadership and innovative curriculum development certainly lead the list. However, many universities have found that defining entrepreneurship is a vital part of their campus-wide initiatives; they have discovered that defining the term in a manner unique to their intended goals and institutional culture is critical to implementation and sustainability.

A recent study surveyed representative entrepreneurship efforts in the Arts, asking decision makers to conceive, describe or define entrepreneurship in the context of their existing programs (Beckman 2007). Below are selected responses:

> *"Entrepreneurship is a notion of thinking metaphorically...not thinking literally about the skill-set that one has grown, but the ways these things [skill-sets] can be potentially transferred to other kinds of activities; the way one can satisfy the same impulses, the same potential in different ways. Being flexible, being adaptable, being able to see and flow into opportunities all speak to the way that I feel about entrepreneurship."*

> *"Looking at new pieces and trying new ways to put them together, reframing things that are already there, combining things one isn't accustomed to combining. In some sense, it's less invention, or creation, as it is acute environmental scanning."*

> *"...entrepreneurship is concerned with empowering individuals to see new possibilities and to effect change."*

> *"Entrepreneurship with a small 'e,' is how to operate small business; entrepreneurship, with a big 'E,' is how to live your life.*

> *"...a process of channeling innovation and creativity into ventures that produce value in our communities. Value can be economic, social or intellectual."*

> *"Adventuring - broadly defined. For me, first and foremost, it defines a quality of action as opposed to a specific mode of 'work production'."*

There are three distinct aspects of these definitions. First, respondents did not define entrepreneurship by a popular perception of the term—that is, as a method of financial gain or new venture creation. Second, there is a move to define entrepreneurship without using the grammatical construction "entrepreneurship is…"—which broadens the potential and locus of entrepreneurship beyond the academic geography of business schools. Finally, these conceptions, descriptions and definitions reflect a need for a philosophical foundation to inform and guide educational reform—one capable of

giving entrepreneurship the kind of intellectual legitimacy and status needed to implement and sustain change in the academy.

These idiosyncratic definitions of entrepreneurship also underscore a fundamental tension with the term. A conscious acknowledgement of the problems with defining entrepreneurship in material/financial terms has spawned these emerging grammatical shifts, broader conceptions of what entrepreneurship could mean for higher education and a need for an overarching philosophy of practice. Respondents intuitively recognized that entrepreneurship is charged within the academy and can create a dangerous binary that pits the realities of institutional legitimacy in a new century against sacred disciplinary traditions. Hence, these descriptions demonstrate the early stages of imbedded philosophical ideals.

It is understandable that the academy is uneasy with entrepreneurship defined exclusively as the creation of material wealth. The humanist ideals that are the bedrock of higher learning, some might surmise, simply cannot be sacrificed for the expediencies of a term perceived by many as antithetical to the liberal arts tradition. There is a fundamental disconnect that these educators, perhaps intuitively, understand: Our relationship with the traditions and purpose of a humanist education appears at odds with the career environment most students inhabit after graduation.

Unique definitions and conceptions of entrepreneurship can address this disconnect. Yet defining entrepreneurship by faculty committee—common in the development of campus-wide entrepreneurship programs—reflects a moment in time; it is for many an act of compromise between personalities rather than consensus among educational communities. Attempting to supplement philosophical ideals into a single term is a worthy goal and, in some cases, will yield the desired results. In other cases, these efforts will fail due to the lack of a rigorous intellectual and philosophical grounding upon which campus-wide entrepreneurship education can be built.

The premise of this essay is that what will distinguish successful cross-campus entrepreneurship initiatives in the long run will be based partially on how a supporting philosophical structure can serve as an ethos for these initiatives. Sustaining efforts that bring entrepreneurial thinking to the arts and sciences, we contend, require a solution intrinsic to and issuing from academe's best humanist traditions—one that can inspire students and faculty to reach and exceed their goals for the benefit of themselves and society at large. We believe that defining entrepreneurship operationally (program by program from one institution to the next) and in the absence of a rigorous philosophical foundation doom cross-campus programs to failure precisely because they will not be authentic. One can define entrepreneurship by committee and channel resources to that end, but, in an environment that seeks institutional relevance in a new millennium, such an approach may cause us to squander an opportunity for leveraging the power of our educational traditions to empower students.

The question we must ask is: Where are the philosophers, rhetoricians, astronomers,

psychologists, mathematicians, theologians, writers and artists in the development of these campus-wide entrepreneurship programs and the articulation of the philosophical moorings underpinning this work? As we traverse the campus, these thinkers are invisible—sequestered in Galileo-esque ivory towers awaiting clemency from disciplinary isolation. To be sure, the norms of the academic culture and the demands of tenure elicit such behavior. Yet as educators we are responsible for our own intellectual segregation; sadly, too many choose safety in small numbers in lieu of engagement. As we continue to produce articles and books for the few, those outside the academy are abandoned and seldom reap the benefits of this work. For institutions that seek relevance and change through entrepreneurship, a broad intellectual and philosophical platform must be created. This platform must be inclusive, thoughtful and diverse; it must reflect the humanist origins of universities; contain an academic ethos and empower those who are touched by this vision. Above all else, the foundation for university-wide efforts to import entrepreneurial thinking into education must demonstrate that the greatest asset of any campus is the ability to deconstruct impediments that segregate knowledge and prevent knowledge from being put to work. Without such a foundation for campus-wide entrepreneurship initiatives, we may be left—as Justice Potter Stewart opined—with an unsatisfying retort: "We will know it [entrepreneurship] when we see it."

What is Intellectual Entrepreneurship?

It is our contention that "Intellectual Entrepreneurship (IE)" provides an intellectually authentic philosophical foundation capable of sustaining cross-campus entrepreneurship education. Based in classical rhetoric, IE aims to educate and nurture "citizen-scholars" throughout the university (Cherwitz and Darwin 2005). IE leverages the knowledge assets contained within the university's walls, empowering faculty and students to become agents of change—both internally and externally (Cherwitz and Hartelius 2007). By recognizing that the rich humanist traditions upon which the university is based transcend time, IE harnesses the core philosophy of western education to transform the master-apprentice-entitlement paradigm into one of discovery, ownership, accountability, collaboration and action (Cherwitz and Hartelius 2007). Reexamining and re-embracing our humanist traditions, we claim, can inform current efforts to bring entrepreneurial thinking to the many corners of the academy; these traditions can guide the creation of institutional change and, most importantly, help envision an academically engaged and socially relevant university.

Overview: The Core Pillars of IE

Discovery is a privilege shared by the university community. Faculty and students are charged (and gifted) with realizing the "new" in their study-objects. As knowledge increases, discovering innovative ways to apply and make relevant new findings licenses faculty and students to create change on a micro and macro level. IE charges individuals to "contemplate who they are," owning their education and applying their visions to systems of culture and society by using new discoveries to advance individual and community imperatives (Cherwitz and Sullivan 2002).

IE challenges learning communities to become accountable for their discoveries. Both faculty and students *earn* their degrees—a privilege often taken for granted. The motive for pursuing a degree is individually based, no doubt, but envisioning the impact of education beyond the individual strikes to the core purpose of education in a social context. Even Aristotle understood the need to put knowledge to work and the necessity of integrating rather than segregating theory, practice and production (Roberts 1954). In a recent study (Steffensmeier 2005), Aristotle's argument is amplified further as it relates to community engagement. IE implores degree holders to devise new applications of an advanced degree beyond salaried employment. Students and faculty recognize opportunities by surveying environments suitable for positive change that will benefit because of their degree—not despite their degree. This sense of empowerment helps to create the change agents who *realize* the potential of their degree and recognize the value and reward of personal accountability.

Creativity, change and innovation do not occur in a vacuum. Collaboration, therefore, is crucial to the IE ethos. The benefits of collaborative efforts exceed the potential for overcoming obstacles, however. Incubators or synergy groups initiated at the inception of any effort can become the creative engine that drives an innovative cross-campus effort (Cherwitz and Sullivan 2002). By working and creating in groups, the promise of interdisciplinarity is fulfilled beyond its academic justification as a method of scholarly inquiry.

New ideas, produced by methodical intellectual discovery and an accountable mindset, have little impact unless they are acted upon. Perhaps the most important part of the IE ethos is bringing a discovered idea—one which is owned by an individual or group—to a community that will benefit from this innovation. Action goes hand-in-hand with becoming accountable for one's intellectual gifts. Of course the vacuum metaphor mentioned above has some relevance in this context, though accountability through action could also be viewed as a moral imperative. That is, by empowering an individual to put ideas to work, one participates in a society where acting for the common good becomes the norm, not the exception. As Demosthenes knew, speech (scholarship) without action is empty and idle.

Examples of IE at The University of Texas at Austin

Integrating the IE philosophy across the university can occur within larger projects such as cross-campus initiatives or individual classes. However, IE is not another sanitized, programmatic effort initiated by committee and presented to "stakeholders" who have little input in the effort; rather, IE is a vision and philosophy that returns us to an authentic education. It does so by merging the original humanist ideals upon which higher education was founded with the IE ethos, thus creating the "citizen scholars" of a new era. These "citizen-scholars" reject the "apprenticeship-certification-entitlement" model of education under which universities have languished and instead seek personal relevance and impact through their education. It is a sense of meaningful contribution that is sought by a citizen-scholar—attained only by embracing rigorous intellectual training while simultaneously leveraging knowledge for a greater good.

At The University of Texas at Austin, IE—inspired initiatives and classes dot the campus landscape. Though not part of a "top-down" institutionalized program, these efforts flourish as a grassroots movement and are changing the lives of students and faculty alike. They do so, we argue, not because of administrative mandate or centralized structures but because of their incorporation of the IE philosophy and vision of education. In the College of Fine Arts, for example, an innovative class, *Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, builds upon IE principles and demonstrates how this philosophy can empower students to graduate from the university not simply as successful arts practitioners but as arts leaders using their education to meet both personal and community goals (Cherwitz and Beckman 2006).

Unlike many programs and courses in arts entrepreneurship across the country, *Entrepreneurship in the Arts* rejects teaching business topics to the exclusion of the individual, human agent. Rather, the class seeks to license arts students to conceive an entrepreneurial career or venture in the Arts through their innate artistic talent and individual temperament. Further, by eschewing the popularized perception of entrepreneurship solely as a means of amassing material wealth, students are liberated from negotiating the nineteenth-century aesthetic stance of Art—a stance prevalent in arts higher education. Students are exposed to new *conceptions* of entrepreneurship that blunt certain negative aspects of the arts training they've experienced for half of their young lives as the discourse in entrepreneurial theory in the past two decades has shifted somewhat and now includes an interdisciplinary voice (Palich and Bagby 1995; Shaver and Scott 1991; Ward 2004). In many cases, these new concepts focus on an individual's behavior and decision-making patterns. These ideas are placed in the context of arts culture and the arts marketplace. By creating a collaborative and level playing field in the classroom, students are free and engaged intellectual explorers in a supportive peer and instructor environment. Collaboration in this class is key to success.

In the *Entrepreneurship in the Arts* course, students are challenged to draw upon the wholeness of their education to formulate a unique and personalized conception of entrepreneurship. This is not simply interdisciplinary awareness but integrative thinking—an inherent part of the IE philosophy. When students are both challenged and given the opportunity to solve problems outside of disciplinary boundaries, they become aware of the interconnectedness of their education and how their possession of knowledge can serve them for a lifetime in the economic and cultural environment they will inhabit as arts practitioners.

The capstone project for *Entrepreneurship in the Arts* is a series of presentations (and a feasibility plan written in narrative) that outlines a self-selected arts venture, project or career. Students are encouraged to experiment and envision these projects beyond what "might" work. Though some "real-world" guidance is offered, this freedom to choose a project that is personally relevant encourages a strong sense of agency. Instead of students laboring through an arbitrary class requirement, they engage a process of educational and personal discovery that instills a significant sense of ownership for their ventures.

Without a perceived "safe space" in the classroom to experiment, discuss and envision their ventures, students will self-sequester and seldom engage an integrative process of education. The IE philosophy encourages a collaborative approach to discovery and action. In the *Entrepreneurship in the Arts* course, student collaboration occurs through two major projects; each strives to get beyond a simple team-building exercise by creating a community environment among students. In one project, students act as arts consultants. Drafts of the final feasibility study are not only submitted to the instructor for preliminary grading but also they are shared with every student. The goal of this exercise is for students (acting as community members) to evaluate each project and provide additional guidance, resources or thoughts that could improve the venture. This capitalizes on the unique abilities and experiences of each student.

Additionally, at the beginning of the semester, each student is assigned a specific research area. Students become in-class "experts" on an aspect of arts culture—arts policy, economic impact, grantsmanship, nonprofit culture, arts management, and such. As students research and develop their projects, they are encouraged to ask for assistance from classroom peers whose research areas may help in making their capstone projects as complete and successful as possible. Creating community in this way replicates aspects of networking, yet it goes much further. What transpires in the classroom is not simply community-building or developing a sense of safe, creative space for students, but model citizenship using the IE ethos: Students discover their education through collaboration with peers, embrace personal accountability and apply their intellectual prowess to assist fellow students for a common goal. Additionally, classroom citizenship takes place externally as informal sub-groups and partnerships develop. Such self-initiated social action is the norm, not the exception.

In an era of increasing pressure for assessment, it is notable that students in this course engage in intellectual, professional, personal and social development processes; they don't simply strive for high grades. Students are empowered in this course through an interdisciplinary methodology that draws upon many aspects of the liberal arts tradition. This is a significant outcome of an IE-based curriculum—the intrinsic potential for empowerment it possesses permeates classroom activities and weaves itself into the fabric of student interaction.

Interpreting the Texas Past is another example of IE at The University of Texas at Austin. Begun in 1999, *Interpreting the Texas Past* assembles graduate students from multiple disciplines and introduces them to the Texas historical community. Typically, students descend upon a historical site, analyze its presentation and create projects that will enhance the venue's meaning and impact (Cherwitz and Sievers 2004). Success is not measured by these projects being funded at a later date (though some have) but by explicitly demonstrating to Texas' historical community that, utilizing the methodology of oral history, students can have a significant and positive effect on the preservation and meaning of local history.

This initiative reflects the IE ethos simply and elegantly: A diverse group of graduate students, who collaborate and recognize that their education can impact the

community, use their scholarly tools to transform lives and demonstrate the relevance and social power of the liberal arts. Perhaps most promising about this program is that it can serve as an incubator for the entrepreneurial process and demonstrate that outcomes for graduate education in the humanities are not exclusively academic.

The success of *Interpreting the Texas Past* lies in its groundbreaking approach: connecting with society, putting research to work and making education more responsive and accountable. As universities and communities struggle to better connect and collaborate, programs like *Interpreting the Texas Past* are blueprints for a new type of academic: the intellectual entrepreneur. These citizen-scholars are part of a growing body of intellectuals whose research simultaneously contributes to academic disciplines and to society.

A third example of how the IE philosophy has been incorporated into the delivery of education at The University of Texas at Austin is the nationally-acclaimed *Pre-Graduate School Internship*. The *Pre-Graduate School Internship* is offered for academic credit; participants work closely with a faculty "supervisor" and/or graduate student "mentor" to create an internship experience aimed at exploring, entrepreneurially and from the ground up, their chosen field of study. Interns learn about the unique aspects of graduate study that make it distinct from their undergraduate experience (e.g., conducting research, writing for scholarly audiences, participating in seminars, serving as teaching and research assistants, publishing articles in professional journals, becoming members of scholarly organizations and learned societies, and preparing for an academic or professional career). Examples of internship activities include attending graduate classes, shadowing graduate student teaching and research assistants, attending seminars and departmental colloquia, interviewing faculty, collaborating with mentors on research projects, traveling to meetings of academic and professional organizations, working in research labs and discussing graduate study and career development with faculty, professionals and graduate students. Additionally, all students keep a personal journal and attend workshops/meetings where they reflect on their experiences and exchange insights on what they're learning about themselves, the culture of graduate school and academe, and ways to obtain admissions and funding. At the end of the internship, students write a report about their experiences and share it with their faculty supervisor, graduate student mentor, and IE interns.

The *Pre-Graduate School Internship* seeks to give undergraduates greater agency in and ownership of their education—especially underrepresented minorities and first-generation students. It does this by enabling students to become intellectual entrepreneurs, discovering their passions and professional aspirations and discerning how advanced education can bring these commitments to fruition; this includes acquiring an understanding of how graduate education equips them to make meaningful contributions to their communities. The internship—best thought of as an "entrepreneurial incubator"—brings students into the graduate school pipeline who otherwise would not have contemplated continuing their education and helps them select an appropriate field of study. The internship also demystifies the process of gaining admission into and succeeding in graduate school.

Employing the IE philosophy, the *Pre-Graduate School Internship* not only has been successful in bringing a new population into the graduate school pipeline but has been effective in making sure that students' passions and professional aspirations are consciously reflected in their decision about whether to seek an advanced degree and, if so, in which field. Like *Interpreting the Texas Past and Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, the key to the success of the *Pre-Graduate School Internship* is that it takes an intellectually legitimate entrepreneurial approach to education. In the final section of this article, we explain how this intellectual legitimacy owes to the fact that the IE grounds the contemporary quest to bring entrepreneurial thinking to the arts and sciences in a traditional and authentic conception of the academic enterprise.

When contemplating the design of cross-campus initiatives, Justice Stewart's words might well be on the mind of those who implement these efforts. For example, in twenty years time, program designers might reflect and ask if the project was successful. Justice Stewart's words provide both guidance and warning. We may be able to design a cross-campus entrepreneurship program today but, without an overarching philosophy with which to guide the implementation, curricular design and sustainability of these projects, stagnation may occur sooner than expected. These initiatives must be able to respond to changes in leadership at all levels, uncertain funding streams, changes in popular culture, student preparation in secondary schools and a host of other possibilities. IE's foundation in the liberal arts ideal described in the previous section, we believe, provides a philosophy that can adapt to both sudden and longer term changes by capitalizing on the entrepreneurial mantra—creativity, innovation and opportunity recognition—via a return to the humanist roots of higher education. The power of IE in this context is its adaptive, malleable and integrative character; it can co-exist and enhance these efforts despite the whims of cultural upheavals.

A citizen-scholar recognizes that a robust intellectual foundation can serve a lifetime, enhancing one's work far beyond what presently is known. IE then, can become a guiding principle—an internalized conception of discovery, accountability and an external collaborative act—that students and faculty might not only share in the classroom but also bring to society and scholarship. This is the philosophical essence of the citizen-scholar.

IE, however, is not simply a philosophy of education. Creating citizens accountable to the new challenges faced by a dynamic and flat world demands that our best and brightest thinkers develop a structured, yet malleable *conception* of education. Conceiving higher education as an empowering tool of change for students transforms institutions into towers of enlightenment, not battlements of the status quo—a pursuit that always has been part of the humanist project. IE's adaptive, individually-focused approach, as well as its roots in a rigorous intellectual tradition, renders it a concrete method of empowering citizens for a new age. If we are recalcitrant in replacing the present apprenticeship-certification-entitlement model of education (buttressed recently by the current discussion of assessment) the next generation (and, ultimately, we as educators) will participate in the reification of the very model of higher education campus-wide entrepreneurship efforts seek to change. Certainly, programmatic models

altruistically designed to change this paradigm are first steps; however, one must ask whether these programs are authentic.

Seeking the Authentic

As educators charge themselves to help students become engaged citizens through campus-wide entrepreneurship, program developers inevitably confront the authenticity of what they design. The IE ethos rejects the create-programs-by-committee-through-compromise mindset and embraces a larger ideal of collaboration, consensus and ownership by stakeholders. A committee world-view is not an authentic vision of the potential of cross-campus entrepreneurship initiatives unless a legitimate philosophy can fortify and inform the mechanisms of student empowerment and responsible citizenship. It is, then, a matter of re-discovering the root purpose of a humanist education that holds so much promise for cross-campus entrepreneurship efforts. When students are authentically guided and nurtured through their college years, they discover and become accountable for their education while seeking to act collaboratively within communities as entrepreneurial citizens. IE, as a critical part of any university-wide initiative, provides a philosophical foundation that can blunt "committee culture programming" by reflecting the authenticity of the humanist ideal upon which our centuries-long traditions of higher education are based.

When speaking about the authentic in this context, we are not advocating a neo-conservative view of education past. Instead, it is the re-discovery of how a humanist education can prepare citizens to participate and contribute to society. As Gary Tomlinson has written, the search for authentic meaning

> "…is the meaning we come to believe in the course of our historical interpretations its creators invested in it—yields fresh ideas by side-stepping the snare of objectivism. It highlights our own role in *constructing* authentic meanings and frees us from the presupposition that a single, true meaning is waiting to be found (Tomlinson 1988).

Tomlinson's insight offers a realistic interpretation of the authentic and highlights how IE and the humanist tradition *authentically* interact. That is, as educators observe the humanist traditions of higher education, it is not a singular, historical authenticity that emerges but a view of the *authentic spirit* and *intent* of humanist education. This has significant implications for cross-campus initiatives. Specifically, by dispelling a singular "authentic meaning" of the liberal arts ideal, IE can leverage and embrace the uncertainty of the authentic by understanding the spirit and intent of higher education and applying it uniquely. In fact, this view of the authentic has already been negotiated in other disciplines. For example, Fredrick Gedicks and Roger Hendrix have written (in the context of copyright law) that "the authentic is also embedded in a tradition which frames its potential meanings and defines its significance" (Gedicks and Hendrix 2005). In this sense, IE emerges as a seamless, integrated and intrinsic philosophy that is authentic to the purpose of creating citizens who advance and better society.

Tomlinson expresses clearly the meaning of the authentic. John Campbell links Tomlinson's ideas to higher education by drawing upon our most genuine academic traditions:

> "Intellectual entrepreneurship seeks to reclaim for the contemporary world the oldest strain in our common intellectual tradition: the need for thought and reflection in the midst of the world of action. As the experiment of the original Greek teachers of practical affairs demonstrated, and as Plato demonstrated through his reflections on these very themes, some of the deepest problems of thought emerge from the affairs of practical life. When one brings together the demands for action and the equally unrelenting demands for reflection characteristic of the new electronic and global marketplace, the term "intellectual entrepreneur" describes a new form of union between the academy and the world and between the academy and its own deepest traditions. (Cherwitz and Sullivan 2002)

Campbell demonstrates how IE's relevance to the larger world is wedded to its academic mission. That is, higher education is crucial in the development of society and should be considered integrated, not segregated. The IE ethos, as Campbell suggests, should permeate and infuse the academy with the promise of solving social problems by capitalizing on humanist traditions. Perhaps most important is Campbell's recognition that IE possesses relevance in a world that has seen dramatic change. IE exists as a dynamic and authentic philosophy that can engage academe, equipping students and educators with the tools and mindset needed to discover the social good both now and in the future—something that historically has been a hallmark of humanist thinking and liberal arts education.

The desire to return to the authentic in higher education has, in part, been a negotiation of context between the German university model of education and the responsibility of the university to society and the individual. Jose Ortega y Gasset (1833-1955), the famed Spanish essayist and philosopher wrote:

> "…the historic importance of restoring to the university its cardinal function of 'enlightenment,' the task of imparting the full culture of the time and revealing to mankind, with clarity and truthfulness, that gigantic world of today in which the life of the individual must be articulated, if it is to be authentic. (Gasset 1944)

Gasset's articulation of the authentic focuses on the university's mission of individual enlightenment as a mechanism of personal empowerment. Conceived in this manner, cross-campus entrepreneurship efforts that impart higher education's authentic task place students in the context of the present—the "full culture of the time." As higher education responds to a changing world and seeks to remain relevant, it need not radicalize a solution. Instead, by re-envisioning our humanist tradition in this "time," cross-campus initiatives can draw upon IE as the authentic ethos that informs through tradition, not destructs through hyper-intellectualism or commercialization. Thus, IE can guide the manner in which all educational endeavors (teaching, learning, research, service) are not

only conducted but conceived—realizing the transformation of the apprentice-certification-entitlement model to an empowered and fully realized "citizen-scholar."

The University of Texas at Austin's *Entrepreneurship in the Arts, Interpreting the Texas Past* and *Pre-Graduate School Internship* employ the core values of IE, enabling students to have greater agency in and ownership of their education. The success of these efforts lies not in a single aspect of design, nor simply in the adoption of IE principles. Rather, it is the recognition—perhaps intuitively for some—that these initiatives, because of their grounding in the IE philosophy, are authentic to the mission of higher education. This re-awakening of the academy's purpose is embraced by participants as they find unique applications of their education to better society. It is this realization—coupled with significant intellectual effort and freedom to find a new potential of the study-object—that empowers students and faculty alike.

Conclusion

As cross-campus entrepreneurship initiatives continue to emerge across the nation, integrating a robust and adaptive philosophical structure into these efforts will be critical to their long-term success—to their ability to be institutionally mainstreamed and sustained by changing the academic culture. IE, we have argued, constitutes one such platform; it is an authentic agent of the humanist ideal and spirit, thus providing a philosophical structure inherent to the *act* of higher education. In a sense, IE may not be an entirely new idea but a dynamic re-discovery of an authentic education that we own by virtue of *our* education. From our perspective, entrepreneurship—broadly conceived—is an intrinsic human right to change the status-quo and IE is a philosophy and pedagogy to exercise this act by educating citizen-scholars—agents of change who own, are accountable for and put their knowledge to work for the betterment of themselves and society. As we collaborate in the development of campus-wide efforts to bring entrepreneurial thinking to the arts and sciences, paraphrasing Justice Stewart's words should serve as our touchstone: Will we know entrepreneurship when we see it twenty years hence or can we envision entrepreneurship authentically now?

Acknowledgement:

References

Beckman, G. D. 2007. Adventuring arts entrepreneurship curricula in higher education: An examination of present efforts, obstacles and best practices. *Journal of ArtsManagement, Law and Society* 37 (2).

Cherwitz, R. 2005. A new social compact demands real change. *Change* (November/December): 48-50.

Cherwitz, R 2005. Diversifying graduate education: The promise of intellectual entrepreneurship. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education* 4 (1): 19-33.

Cherwitz, R., and G. Beckman. 2006. Re-envisioning the arts Ph.D.: Intellectual entrepreneurship and the intellectual arts leader. *Arts Education Policy Review* 107 (4): 13-20.

Cherwitz, R., and T. Darwin. 2005. Crisis as opportunity: An entrepreneurial approach to higher education productivity. In *Enhancing productivity in higher education*, eds. J. Miller and J. Groccia. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, 58-68.

Cherwitz, R., and J. Hartelius. 2007. Making a "great 'engaged' university" requires rhetoric. In *Making a great 'engaged' university requires rhetoric*, ed. J. Burke. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 265-288.

Cherwitz, R., and J. Sievers. 2004. Historians as intellectual entrepreneurs: Citizen-scholars build bridge between university and community. *American Studies Association Newsletter* (March): 23-24.

Cherwitz, R., and C. Sullivan. 2002. Intellectual entrepreneurship: Vision for graduate education. *Change* (November/December): 22-27.

Gasset, O. 1944. *Mission of the university.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gedicks, F., and R. Hendrix. 2005. Religious experience in the age of digital reproduction. *St. John's Law Review Association*, http://www.lexisnexis.com (accessed August 13 2007).

Hildebrand, D. 2005. Academics are intellectual entrepreneurs. *Peer Review* (Spring): 30-31.

Hulsey, L., L. Rosenberg, and Benita Kim. 2006. *Seeding entrepreneurship across campus: Early implementation experiences of the Kauffman Campuses Initiative.* Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

Hurtado, A L. 2007. Intellectual entrepreneurship: Improving education and increasing diversity. *Change* (January/February): 48-50.

Palich, L.E., and D. R. Bagby. 1995. Using cognitive theory to explain entrepreneurial risk-taking: Challenging conventional wisdom. *Journal of Business Venturing* 10: 425-38.

Roberts, W. Rhys, ed. 1954. *Rhetoric.* New York: Modern Library.

Shaver, K., and L. Scott. 1991. Person, process, choice: The psychology of new venture creation. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice* 16 (2): 23-45.

Steffensmeier, T. 2005. Rhetorical invention and becoming local. PhD diss., The University of Texas at Austin.

Tomlinson, G. 1988. Authentic meaning in music. In *Authenticity and early music*, ed. Nicholas Kenyon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 115-36.

Ward, T. B. 2004. Cognition, creativity and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing* 19: 173-88.

Author Information

Dr. Richard Cherwitz is a professor in the Department of Communication Studies and in the Department of Rhetoric and Writing at The University of Texas at Austin. He is the founder and director of the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium in the Office of the Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement.

Gary D. Beckman is a visiting professor at the University of South Carolina's School of Music, and Research Associate for the School's Carolina Institute for Leadership and Engagement in Music. He recently completed the first nationwide study of arts entrepreneurship efforts in higher education, funded by the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. Beckman is also the founder and editor of the Arts Entrepreneurship Educator's Network (http://www.ae2n.net).

Richard A. Cherwitz, Ph.D.
Professor and Director, Intellectual Entrepreneurship (IE)
Department of Communication Studies
The University of Texas
1 University Station A1105
Austin, Texas 78712
E-mail: spaj737@uts.cc.utexas.edu
Telephone: 512-471-1939
Fax: 512-471-3504
https://webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/

Gary D. Beckman, Ph.D.
Visiting Assistant Professor
Carolina Institute for Leadership and Engagement in Music
School of Music
University of South Carolina
813 Assembly Street
Columbia, SC 29208
E-mail: gbeckman@mozart.sc.edu
Telephone: 803-576-5755