

Intellectual Entrepreneurship

An Authentic Foundation for Higher Education Reform¹

Our relationship with the traditions and purpose of a humanistic education, it appears, are at odds with the career environment most students inhabit after graduation.

by Gary D. Beckman and Richard A. Cherwitz

Introduction

The growing interest in transforming the academy to meet the realities of a modern world while simultaneously preserving its traditions is both palpable and tangible. As the call to transform the university grows louder, a variety of mechanisms for doing so have emerged in response. At the forefront of these is entrepreneurship education,² which provides an opportunity to reposition the academy as a vital and responsive part of American life by embedding change *within* higher education's rich liberal arts tradition.

Entrepreneurship is an intrinsic human right to change the status quo.

Gary Beckman is a visiting professor in the School of Music at the University of South Carolina and Director of Research for the school's Carolina Institute for Leadership and Engagement in Music.

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 (see <https://webpace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/index.html>) in the Office of the Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement.

Institutional change is a sustained proposition; it requires more than good ideas and innovative programs. Efforts to transform academe via entrepreneurship share certain commonalities: garnering faculty support, providing visionary leadership, and developing innovative curricula certainly lead the list. However, many universities have also found that defining this term in a manner unique to their intended goals and institutional culture is critical to successful implementation and long-term sustainability, particularly given a general uneasiness with entrepreneurship defined exclusively in economic terms. The humanistic ideals that are the bedrock of higher learning, some might surmise, simply cannot be sacrificed for the expediences of something perceived by many as antithetical to the liberal arts tradition. Our relationship with the traditions and purpose

of a humanistic education, it appears, are at odds with the career environment most students inhabit after graduation.

Where are the philosophers, rhetoricians, astronomers, psychologists, mathematicians, theologians, writers, and artists in the development of these campuswide entrepreneurship programs and in the articulation of the philosophical moorings underpinning this work? As we traverse the campus, these thinkers are invisible—sequestered in 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 of us 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 our 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 humanistic origins of universities, contain an academic ethos, and empower those who are touched by this vision. Above all else, the foundation for these efforts must demonstrate that the greatest asset of any campus is the ability to deconstruct impediments that segregate knowledge and prevent it from being put to work.

The premise of this article is that what will distinguish successful cross-campus entrepreneurship initiatives in the long run will be based partially on how well a supporting philosophical structure can be developed to serve as an ethos for these initiatives. Sustaining efforts that bring entrepreneurial thinking to the arts and sciences, we contend, requires a solution intrinsic to and issuing from academe's best humanistic 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 will doom these cross-campus programs to failure precisely because they will not reflect higher education's core intellectual traditions.

What is Intellectual Entrepreneurship?

It is our contention that intellectual entrepreneurship provides an intellectually authentic philosophical foundation capable of sustaining cross-campus entrepreneurship education. Based in classical rhetoric, intellectual entrepreneurship aims to educate and nurture "citizen-scholars" throughout

the university (Cherwitz and Darwin 2005). Intellectual entrepreneurship 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 humanistic traditions upon which the university is based transcend time, intellectual entrepreneurship 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). We claim that reexamining and reembracing our humanistic traditions 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 (Cherwitz 2005).

Imagine if students could discover their lives' true passions and commitments and from the very beginning function as intellectual entrepreneurs—designing their educations to pursue those paths. The Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium at the University of Texas at Austin has this as its objective. Sponsored by and part of the portfolio of the vice president for diversity and community engagement, the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium brings together 12 colleges and schools at the university. The mission of the consortium is to educate citizen-scholars—individuals who creatively use their intellectual capital as a lever for social good. The Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium is neither a program nor a compartmentalized academic unit or institute; it is an intellectual platform and student-centered educational philosophy for instigating learning across disciplinary boundaries, promoting diversity in higher education, and generating collaborations between the academy and society. Consortium initiatives pertain to the undergraduate experience, graduate study, faculty research, and the connections between the university and community.

Intellectual entrepreneurship is premised on the belief that intellect is not limited to the academy, and entrepreneurship is not restricted to or synonymous with business.

Intellectual entrepreneurship is a philosophy and vision of education that views academics as "innovators" and

Intellectual Entrepreneurships : An Authentic Foundation for Higher Education Reform

“agents of change.” It focuses on creating cross-disciplinary and multi-institutional collaborations designed to produce intellectual advancements that can provide real solutions to society’s problems and needs. Intellectual entrepreneurship is academic engagement for the purpose of changing lives.

Intellectual entrepreneurship widens the mission of institutions of higher learning from “advancing the frontiers of knowledge” and “preparing tomorrow’s leaders” to also “serving as engines of economic and social development.” In the process, the role of faculty member and student evolves from that of “intellectual provocateur” into what might be called an “intellectual entrepreneur.” Intellectual entrepreneurship includes a readiness to seek out opportunities, undertake the responsibilities associated with each, and tolerate the uncertainty that comes with initiating genuine innovation.

Intellectual entrepreneurship is premised on the belief that intellect is not limited to the academy, and entrepreneurship is not restricted to or synonymous with business. Entrepreneurship is a process of cultural innovation. While the creation of material wealth is one expression of entrepreneurship, at a more profound level entrepreneurship is an attitude for engaging the world. Intellectual entrepreneurs, both inside and outside universities, take risks and seize opportunities, discover and create knowledge, and innovate, collaborate, and solve problems in any number of social realms: corporate, nonprofit, government, and education.

Intellectual entrepreneurs understand that genuine collaboration between universities and the public is tantamount to more than increased “access” to the academy’s intellectual assets. It is more than “knowledge transfer”—the exportation of neatly wrapped solutions rolling off the campus conveyor belt. Collaboration demands mutual humility and respect, joint ownership of learning, and co-creation of an unimagined potential for innovation—qualities that move universities well beyond the typical elitist sense of “service.” Knowledge, after all, involves the integration of theory, practice, and production.

Intellectual Entrepreneurship: Articulating the Ethos

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. Intellectual entrepreneurship charges individuals to “contemplate who they are,” owning their educations and applying their visions to systems of culture and society by using new discoveries to advance individual and community imperatives (Cherwitz and Sullivan 2002).

Intellectual entrepreneurship 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.³ Intellectual entrepreneurship implores degree holders to devise new applications for 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.

Innovation, creativity, and change do not occur in a vacuum. Collaboration, therefore, is crucial to the intellectual entrepreneurship ethos. Incubators or synergy groups formed at the inception of any effort can become the creative engine that drives an innovative cross-campus initiative (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.

Action goes hand-in-hand with becoming accountable for one’s intellectual gifts.

New ideas produced by methodical intellectual discovery and a mindset of accountability have little impact unless they are acted upon. Perhaps the most important part of the intellectual entrepreneurship ethos is bringing a discovered idea—one that is owned by an individual or group—to a community that will benefit from it. Action goes hand-in-hand with becoming accountable for one’s intellectual gifts. Of course the vacuum metaphor has some relevance in this context, although 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 Intellectual Entrepreneurship at the University of Texas at Austin

Integrating the intellectual entrepreneurship philosophy across the university can occur within larger projects, such as cross-campus initiatives, or within individual classes. However, intellectual entrepreneurship is not another sanitized, programmatic effort initiated by committee and presented to “stakeholders” who have little input in the effort; rather, intellectual entrepreneurship is a vision and philosophy that returns us to an authentic education. It does so by merging the original humanistic ideals upon which higher education was founded with the intellectual entrepreneurship 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, one attained only by embracing rigorous intellectual training while simultaneously leveraging knowledge for a greater good.

At the University of Texas at Austin, intellectual entrepreneurship-inspired initiatives and classes dot the campus landscape. These efforts are not part of a “top-down” institutionalized program, but rather flourish as a grassroots movement changing the lives of students and faculty alike. They flourish, we argue, not because of administrative mandate or centralized structures but because they incorporate the intellectual entrepreneurship philosophy and vision of education.

Intellectual entrepreneurship at the University of Texas at Austin began in the Office of Graduate Studies in 1997. Under the guidance of its founder and director, Dr. Richard Cherwitz, intellectual entrepreneurship initiatives enrolled more than 4,000 students in over 90 academic disciplines from every college and school on campus in classes, workshops, internships, and other activities. Since 2003, these intellectual entrepreneurship initiatives have evolved into the intercollegial Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium.

Current initiatives of the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Consortium include the Project in Interpreting the Texas

Past, the Pre-Graduate School Internship, the Intellectual Entrepreneurship/National Science Foundation Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IE/NSF IGERT) Partnership, the Texas Interdisciplinary Plan/Intellectual Entrepreneurship Pre-Grad Internship, the UT-Texas State Pre-Doctoral Mentorship Program, the Bryce Jordan Arts Entrepreneurship Incubator, the Intellectual Entrepreneurship/McNair Scholars Program, the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Oral History and Diversity Project, Academic Engagement, the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Undergraduate Mentorship Course, the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Dissertation List-Serve/Resources, and the Intellectual Entrepreneurship Job/Career Resources for graduate students.

Let us examine in closer detail three of these intellectual entrepreneurship initiatives. In the College of Fine Arts, an innovative class, Entrepreneurship in the Arts, builds upon intellectual entrepreneurship principles and demonstrates how this philosophy can empower students to graduate from the university not simply as successful arts practitioners but as arts leaders who use 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 19th-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 have experienced for half of their young lives.⁴ 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. This approach integrates intellectual entrepreneurship’s proposition that collaboration is key to a student’s classroom success; in professional, “real-world” environments this is especially powerful. Note that this is contrary to much of arts training where the myth of the isolated artist remains stubbornly pervasive if not implicitly nurtured.⁵

Intellectual Entrepreneurships : An Authentic Foundation for Higher Education Reform

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 intellectual entrepreneurship 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. Although 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 in a process of educational and personal discovery that instills a significant sense of ownership in their ventures.

Without a perceived “safe space” in the classroom to experiment, discuss, and envision their ventures, students will self-sequester and seldom engage in an integrative process of education. The intellectual entrepreneurship 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 each student’s capstone feasibility study are not only submitted to the instructor for preliminary grading, but are also shared with the class. 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, etc. As students research and develop their capstone projects, they are encouraged to ask for assistance from classroom peers whose research

areas may help in making their projects as complete and successful as possible. This not only leverages intellectual entrepreneurship’s premise of collaboration, but also goes further by helping students discover their education. Without drawing upon (or leveraging) all of their experiences, knowledge, education, and intuition, students cannot succeed at accomplishing this task. We must remember that in the context of arts training, learning about the cultural environment students are trained to inhabit is not a traditional part of the curriculum. Thus, students must develop and discover a competency critical to their professional success.

Creating community in this way replicates aspects of networking. Yet it goes much further. What transpires in the classroom is not only simply building community or developing a sense of safe, creative space for students, but also encouraging model citizenship using each aspect of the intellectual entrepreneurship ethos: Students *discover* their education through collaboration with peers, embrace personal *accountability*, and apply their intellectual prowess (*action*) to assist fellow students for a common goal (*collaboration*). Additionally, classroom citizenship takes place externally as informal subgroups 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 do not 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 intellectual entrepreneurship-based curriculum—the intrinsic potential for empowerment it possesses permeates classroom activities and weaves itself into the fabric of student interaction.⁶

Interpreting the Texas Past is another example of intellectual entrepreneurship 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 (although some have been) but by explicitly demonstrating to Texas’ historical community that, using 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 intellectual entrepreneurship 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 is that this program can serve as an incubator for the entrepreneurial process and demonstrate that outcomes for graduate education in the humanities are not exclusively academic.

A unique aspect of *Interpreting the Texas Past* is that it realizes the promise of interdisciplinarity for the benefit of communities. In this case, it leverages our budding historians and anthropologists (*discovery* and *collaboration*) through the intellectual entrepreneurship ethos—a rhetorical-based approach to education—to create (*action*) new meaning through a shared community resource (*accountability*). Intellectual entrepreneurship, in this case, is not simply about bringing different disciplines together. Instead, it serves as a framework where meaningful educational experiences can thrive and demonstrates how universities can use their intellectual assets to forge a new role in their communities.

Universities can use their intellectual assets to forge a new role in their communities.

The success of *Interpreting the Texas Past* lies in its groundbreaking approach: connecting with society, putting research to work, and demonstrating that education can become 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 intellectual entrepreneurship philosophy has been incorporated into the delivery of education at the University of Texas at Austin is the nationally acclaimed Pre-Graduate School Internship. Since it began in 2003, more than 400 students from over 50 academic disciplines have participated; nearly 50 percent of them are either first-generation students and/or members of underrepresented populations (Hurtado 2007). 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, 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 laboratories, 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 are learning about themselves, the culture of graduate school, and academe, as well as how to obtain admission 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 the intellectual entrepreneurship 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 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 intellectual entrepreneurship philosophy, the Pre-Graduate School Internship not only has been successful in bringing a new population into the graduate school pipeline, but also 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 intellectual entrepreneurship grounds the contemporary quest to bring entrepreneurial thinking to the arts and sciences in a traditional and authentic conception of the academic enterprise.

What is clear is that while we may be able to design a cross-campus entrepreneurship program today, without an overarching philosophy with which to guide the implementation, curricular design, and sustainability of such a program, 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, varied levels of student preparation in secondary schools, and a host of other possibilities. Intellectual entrepreneurship's foundation in the liberal arts ideal, 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 humanistic roots of higher education. The power of intellectual entrepreneurship in this context is its adaptive, malleable, and integrative character; it can co-exist and enhance these efforts despite the whims of cultural upheavals occurring within the academy.

A citizen-scholar recognizes that a robust intellectual foundation can serve a lifetime, enhancing one's work far beyond what presently is known. Intellectual entrepreneurship, then, can become a guiding principle—an internalized conception of discovery and 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.

Intellectual entrepreneurship, however, is not simply a philosophy of education. Creating citizens accountable to new challenges faced by a dynamic and flatter world demands that a structured yet malleable *conception* of education be envisioned by our best and brightest thinkers. 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 humanistic project. Intellectual entrepreneurship'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 discussion of assessment), the next generation (and ultimately we as educators) will participate in the reification of the very model of higher education that campuswide 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 campuswide entrepreneurship, program developers inevitably confront the authenticity of what they design. The intellectual entrepreneurship ethos rejects the "create programs by committee through compromise" mindset and embraces a larger ideal of collaboration, consensus, and ownership by stakeholders. A committee worldview 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 rediscovering the root purpose of a humanistic 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 and seek to act collaboratively within communities as entrepreneurial citizens. Intellectual entrepreneurship, as a critical part of any universitywide initiative, provides a philosophical foundation that can blunt "committee culture programming" by reflecting the authenticity of the humanistic 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 neoconservative view of education past, but rather the rediscovery of how a humanistic education can prepare citizens to participate in and contribute to society. As Gary Tomlinson (1988) writes, our negotiation of the "authentic":

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 out there to be found. (p. 117)

Tomlinson's insight offers a realistic interpretation of the authentic and highlights how intellectual entrepreneurship and the humanistic tradition *authentically* interact. That is, as educators observe the humanistic traditions of higher education, it is not a singular, historical authenticity that emerges but a view of the *authentic spirit* and *intent* of humanistic education. This has significant implications for cross-campus initiatives. Specifically, by dispelling a singular "authentic meaning" of the liberal arts ideal, intellectual entrepreneurship can leverage and embrace the uncertainty of the authentic by understanding the spirit and intent of higher education and applying it uniquely.⁷ In this sense, intellectual entrepreneurship 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. (the University of Texas at Austin n.d., unpaginated Web source)

Campbell demonstrates how intellectual entrepreneurship'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 intellectual entrepreneurship ethos, as Campbell suggests, should permeate and infuse the academy with the promise of solving social problems by capitalizing on humanistic traditions. Perhaps most important is Campbell's recognition that intellectual entrepreneurship possesses relevance in a world that has seen dramatic change. Intellectual entrepreneurship 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 humanistic 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 (1883–1955), the famed Spanish essayist and philosopher, writes:

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. (Ortega y Gasset 1944, p. 75)

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 reenvisioning our humanistic tradition in this "time," cross-campus initiatives can draw upon intellectual entrepreneurship as the authentic ethos that informs through tradition, not destructs through hyperintellectualism or commercialization. Thus, intellectual entrepreneurship can guide the manner in which all educational endeavors (teaching, learning, research, service) are not only conducted but also 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 intellectual entrepreneurship, 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 intellectual entrepreneurship principles. Rather, it is the recognition—perhaps intuitively for some—that these initiatives, because of their grounding in the intellectual entrepreneurship philosophy, are authentic to the mission of higher education. This reawakening 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 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. Intellectual entrepreneurship, we have argued, constitutes one such platform; it is an authentic agent of the humanistic ideal and spirit, thus providing a philosophical structure inherent to the *act* of higher education. In a sense, intellectual entrepreneurship may not be an entirely new idea, but rather a dynamic rediscovery 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 intellectual entrepreneurship 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 campuswide efforts to bring entrepreneurial thinking to the arts and sciences, we have the opportunity to envision entrepreneurship education in an authentic manner that is sustainable across campus, relevant to communities, and, most importantly, empowering to stakeholders. 🌱

References

- Aristotle. 1954. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. R. Roberts. New York: Modern Library.
- Beckman, G. D. 2007. “Adventuring” Arts Entrepreneurship Curricula in Higher Education: An Examination of Present Efforts, Obstacles, and Best Practices. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 37 (2): 87–112.
- Beckman, G. D., and R. A. Cherwitz. 2008. Intellectual Entrepreneurship as a Platform for Transforming Higher Education. *Metropolitan Universities* 19 (3): 88–101.
- . Forthcoming. Advancing the Authentic: Intellectual Entrepreneurship and the Role of the Business School in Fine Arts Entrepreneurship Curriculum Design. In *Handbook of University-wide Entrepreneurship Education*, eds. G. P. West III, E. J. Gatewood, and K. G. Shaver. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Cherwitz, R. A. 2005. A New Social Compact Demands Real Change: Connecting the University to the Community. *Change* 37 (6): 48–49.
- Cherwitz, R. A., and G. D. 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. A., and T. Darwin. 2005. Crisis as Opportunity: An Entrepreneurial Approach to Productivity in Higher Education. In *Enhancing Productivity in Higher Education*, eds. J. E. Miller and J. Groccia, 58–68. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Cherwitz, R. A., and E. J. Hartelius. 2007. Making a “Great ‘Engaged’ University” Requires Rhetoric. In *Fixing the Fragmented University: Decentralization with Direction*, ed. J. Burke, 265–88. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cherwitz, R. A., and J. Sievers. 2004. Historians as Intellectual Entrepreneurs: Citizen-Scholars Build Bridge Between University and Community. *American Studies Association Newsletter*, March, 23–26.
- Cherwitz, R. A., and C. A. Sullivan. 2002. Intellectual Entrepreneurship: A Vision for Graduate Education. *Change* 34 (6): 22–27.
- Gedicks, F. M., and R. Hendrix. 2005. Religious Experience in the Age of Digital Reproduction. *St. John’s Law Review* 79: 127–60.
- Hulse, L., L. Rosenberg, and B. Kim. 2006. *Seeding Entrepreneurship Across Campus: Early Implementation Experiences of the Kauffman Campuses Initiative*. Princeton: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Hurtado, A. L. 2007. Intellectual Entrepreneurship: Improving Education and Increasing Diversity. *Change* 39 (1): 48–50.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. 1944. *Mission of the University*. Trans. H. L. Nostrand. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Palich, L. E., and D. R. Bagby. 1995. Using Cognitive Theory to Explain Entrepreneurial Risk-Taking: Challenging Conventional Wisdom. *Journal of Business Venturing* 10 (6): 425–38.

- Shaver, K. G., and L. R. Scott. 1991. Person, Process, Choice: The Psychology of New Venture Creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* 16 (2): 23–45.
- Steffensmeier, T. R. 2005. Rhetorical Invention and Becoming Local. Ph.D. diss., The University of Texas at Austin.
- The University of Texas at Austin. n.d. What is Meant by Intellectual Entrepreneurship? Retrieved April 9, 2009, from the World Wide Web: webspace.utexas.edu/cherwitz/www/ie/what_is_ie.html.
- Tomlinson, G. 1988. The Historian, the Performer, and Authentic Meaning in Music. In *Authenticity and Early Music*, ed. N. Kenyon, 115–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ward, T. B. 2004. Cognition, Creativity, and Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing* 19 (2): 173–88.

Notes

1. Portions of this article are taken from previous publications by its authors. See Beckman and Cherwitz (2008, forthcoming).
2. For a recent study on cross-campus entrepreneurship initiatives, see Hulse, Rosenberg, and Kim (2006).
3. Aristotle (1954) understood the need to put knowledge to work and thus the necessity of integrating rather than segregating theory, practice, and production. For a recent study that amplifies his argument as it relates to community engagement, see Steffensmeier (2005).
4. The discourse in entrepreneurial theory has shifted somewhat in the past two decades and now includes an interdisciplinary voice. For a short survey, see Palich and Bagby (1995); Shaver and Scott (1991); and Ward (2004).
5. We can see this metaphorically (if not explicitly) in the plethora of practice rooms and studios that accommodate a single student. Certainly, some units are restricted in this regard, but one wonders if we simply had larger rehearsal and studio spaces whether more student collaboration (beyond the making of “Art”) would occur naturally. Theater, by its very nature, provides an excellent model where a single artist simply must collaborate to produce the desired product.
6. See Beckman (2007) for a survey of arts entrepreneurship programs in the United States.
7. This view of the authentic has already been negotiated in other disciplines. For example, Gedicks and Hendrix (2005, p. 140) have written (in the context of copyright law) that “The authentic work is also embedded in a tradition which frames its potential meanings and defines its significance.”