Introduction

The UK-India Social Entrepreneurship in Education Network was launched on April 15th, 2016 with its first flagship conference held at the IIT Madras Research Park in Chennai. While it is too early to gauge the impact of the conference at the moment, it can be said without doubt that it has paved the way for greater collaborations and exchanges of ideas, values and skills. The Conference, which aims to promote collaboration and best practice in social entrepreneurship teaching between UK and Indian universities, was organized jointly by the Centre for Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship, IIT Madras and the Social Impact Lab, University of Southampton with the able guidance and support of the British Council India and IIT Madras. The two-day Conference witnessed several speakers and experts initiate relevant discussions on the many ways in which the Conference's objective could see fruition. The valuable insights provided by speakers and participants, over a span of eight masterclasses or sessions, have been recorded in this report.

Day 1

Opening Session

The Conference was declared open at 10 am on April 15th, 2016 in the august presence of five members representing the University of Southampton, IIT Madras and the British Council, India. Dr Jospeh Thomas, Vice President of IIT Madras' Development Office delivered the welcome address, in which he provided the background about the UKISEEN Conference. The network, it was learnt, is the result of two years of correspondence and exchange between

the three aforementioned institutions. Dr Thomas' address was followed by the Dr Pathik Pathak's commencement address. Dr Pathak, the Director of University of Southampton's Social Impact Lab, delved deeply on the vast promises of friendship, collaboration and knowledge that the network holds. While iterating on the network being peer-led, Dr Pathak urged the participants to coalesce into an informal network, that would be quintessential in making an impact in the world. The Chief Guest's address was delivered by Mr Richard Everitt, the Director of Education and Society at the British Council of India. While reminding the participants about the enormous potential that the social entrepreneurship education and industry has in India and the UK, Mr Everitt highlighted the three key focus areas for the two nations in collaboration, namely capacity building, policy environment and education. He, further, highlighted the scope for the network's expansion, thanks to governmental action such as the declaration of 2016 as the UK-India Year of Education, Innovation and Research; and Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's pet project Startup India. The keynote address was delivered by Prof L S Ganesh, who is with the Department of Management Studies, IIT Madras. Professor Ganesh elaborated on IIT Madras' institutional initiatives in fostering an atmosphere conducive for an education in social entrepreneurship. One of the six faculty members considered today as the pioneers of such an initiative, he had believed that the need for a world with peace and dignity would be fulfilled through social enterprise. Urging participants to take cognizance of survival being the paramount cause, he reflected on the sector's technology-supported solutions for obliterating inequity and inequality in the world. Prof. Ganesh ended his speech on an optimistic note with the following lines:

It's not enough if we can change the world. We must change the world. Let's do it!

The opening session culminated with the Vote of Thanks delivered by Mrs Jospehine Francis, Program Manager at University of Southampton's Social Impact Lab.

Session 1: Curriculum

Part 1

The first session of the day was a masterclass on Curriculum, led by Professor Pathik Pathak, Director of University Southampton's Social Impact Lab. The session aimed to provide a possible framework through which social entrepreneurship can be embedded in the university curriculum. Characterizing students and practitioners of social entrepreneurship as borderless leaders, Prof. Pathak cited the interdisciplinary nature of problems, employability and global interconnectedness as crucial sites for the discipline's relevance in today's world. While merely having a degree would not suffice, he acknowledged the need to imbue students with skills necessary for a career that provided fulfilment.

Professor Pathak followed up this key piece of advice with a set of skills, that he believed are essentials for those in the discipline. To name a few are agility, creativity, network fluency, problem solving and the ability to thrive in diversity. These skills could only be provided with a well-structured educational model. The ideal model, he believed, would be one that granted equal weightage to the formal curriculum as well as extra-curricular activities. In order to call oneself a complete graduate in social entrepreneurship, he

believed that one should have had exposure to fieldwork and interactions with social entrepreneurs. Drawing on his university's model called the Social Entrepreneurship Pathway, he made open the possibility for teachers of the discipline among the audience to adopt an evaluation pattern that provided 70% weightage to the core curriculum and 30% weightage to the extra-curricular, experiential component.

Prof. Pathak, further, highlighted the accomplishments of such a model in enthusing students in great numbers to take up an education in social entrepreneurship. The Social Entrepreneurship modules, with 150 takers and 3 winning projects, he said, had become so popular that it had a two-year waiting list of students. Moreover, the modules prefixed 'UOSOM' went on to be referred to as 'AWESOME' models by students.

Prof. Pathak concluded the session with a brief insight into the discipline's challenges and opportunities namely funding for extra-curricular programs, embedding extra-curricular programs in the curriculum, syncing with institutional enterprise strategies and working with social entrepreneurs. He urged students and graduates to go in to a workplace or an investment house with half an idea. In an effort to understand the leadership first, he believed that syncing with institutional ideas and moving on the path of co-creation are qualities that students would need to adopt.

Session 1: Part 2

The discussion on Curriculum was further carried on by Dr Roberto Daniele, Senior Lecturer at Oxford Brookes University, United Kingdom. Dr Daniele's presentation titled 'From Passion to Action' encapsulated the aim of the Conference. Quoting the University's founder, John Brookes, Dr Daniele

appreciated the need for an education, that like all formal education, would equip "graduate students to lead lives of consequence". He, further, incorporated the message in the light of social entrepreneurship, which he considered the best setup for those willing to make an impact.

Dr Daniele elaborated on Oxford Brookes' social entrepreneurship curriculum and drew on some of the key points that would be of interest to universities willing to offer programmes in the discipline. He called upon the participants to be clear about the aims of the programme- a crucial step in charting the course of the programme. The next step would be to understand the place and significance of the social entrepreneurship programme in the context of the university and ideate on possible avenues for funding and technical support. While the development of a community of change makers and disruptive, he urged must be the ultimate aim, linking in with the wider social entrepreneurship industry and movement would be crucial in such a pursuit. He reiterated Prof Pathak's call to integrate extra curricular components into the university programme and added that experiential activities would make the programme accessible to one and all. A merely theoretical, academically rigorous program, he stressed, would also ease the burden on teachers, who would be spared from evaluating and assessing theory papers. A programme in social entrepreneurship, he concluded, must not be confined to the university.

Dr Daniele's session, then, dwelled on the intricacies and challenges of the social entrepreneurship programme at Oxford Brookes.

Dr Daniele had come to learn that the arts faculty was averse to incorporating aspects from the business world into an academic program and, hence, advocated the removal of business jargon from the social entrepreneurship modules. What emerged out of such an endeavor was a module that

necessitated a passion, determination and drive to be a changemaker as the sole pre-requisite for admission into the programme. In order to incentivize students, the university, participants learnt, awarded scholarships and grants of three categories- the Try It Awards aimed at, as the name suggests, letting students explore and experiment with the idea of a social entrepreneurial academic or career path; the Do It Awards aimed at those willing to grow an entrepreneurial idea; and the Build It Awards to those with projects that have the potential to operate full-scale. As an extension of such an incentive was the conscious decision to not make the classroom just a lecture theatre but as a space that was not confined to just four walls. The students were taken out on the field to interact with social entrepreneurs, while also making available to them one-on-one counselling sessions from teachers as well as experts. Dr Daniele, then, charted out the achievements of such a programme, which include a good 88% students expressing their desire to continue on the social entrepreneurial path. Moreover, the 80 awards granted since 2012, have brought in 400 participants. However, Dr Daniele was quick to add that, despite such positive results, it would be too big an ask to ask students at an early stage in their education if they would be interested on following the path of a social entrepreneur.

Dr Daniele also shared with the participants some of the key takeaways from the programme. The first and foremost lesson to remember, he said, was to apprentice with the problem and acknowledge the need to spend a good amount of time analyzing the problem before jumping to solutions. Secondly, he emphasized on the need to co-create and be a "teampreneur" rather than a "hero entrepreneur". Lastly, he believed that embedding the academic programme in a wider social entrepreneurship environment would ensure

that there was an unabated flow of ideas, information and knowledge across the spectrum of stakeholders.

Session 1: Part 3

The last feature of the first session on Curriculum was a brief talk by Ms Aruna Raman, who straddles the world of academia as well as the world of business. While she works as a social entrepreneur in Bengaluru, she also serves as a Consultant at the University of Minnesota's inter-disciplinary entrepreneurship programme. Ms Aruna elaborated on the collaboration's flagship ACARA Challenge founded in 2009. The programme, she said, aimed at engaging university education with ongoing problems and focused on students from American and Indian universities, who are presented with a problem and are expected to bring forth unique approaches and solutions. The collaboration has also resulted in the establishment of an inter-disciplinary education fieldwork program, that lets students from American students, mostly visiting India for their first time, receive a texture idea of development. The program, organised along with two social entrepreneurial ventures SELCO and Environment Support Group, offers students workshops on community participatory design and helps them acknowledge and respect the expertise possessed by social entrepreneurs on the ground. Ms Aruna further said that the social entrepreneurs are entrusted with the choice to decide as to how and what they would like to share with the students.

Ms Aruna believed that according great importance to problem formulation would be justified even if it meant relegating the aspect of consumer analysis to the next spot. Through the framework of what she described as a "robust

questioning process", the students are expected to carefully understand the nitty-gritties of the problem before ideating on a business model cum solution.

While the programme's success was hugely noted, Ms Aruna, then, elaborated on the reasons why it could not be sustained in the Indian educational set-up. She believed that in order to continue the collaboration with Indian universities, she was being unfairly asked to negotiate several educational vicissitudes. Given that such a path would be a dream for many and something that can never be thought of for others, she believed that an education in social entrepreneurship was inaccessible for many in India. Moreover, the fact that students, upon the culmination of the ACARA Challenge, were asked to return to their respective university programmes led her to believe that collaborations with Indian universities would not be feasible. While she professed that she did not have an immediate solution for such a problem, she expressed her belief that integrating non-academic educators such as on-the-field social entrepreneurs would make the programme accessible to a wide audience. She concluded her talk with the important message that it was unfair for the innovation ecosystem to place a lot of pressure on merely the youth. Calling upon people of all ages to join the movement, she advocated a turnaround of the existing system.

Session 2: Technology

Dr. V.K Kalyanaraman, Retd. Professor started the speech by saying that Technology is the least complicated issue in Social Entrepreneurship but the kind of technology that is necessary for Social Entrepreneurship is not that simple. IIT Madras started working socially relevant technology problems.

This lead to alumni funded projects, the Central government also realized the need. Because of all these RuTaG was introduced: To fund work that looked into the technological need of the rural sector and marginalized urban sector. The problem faced by Social Entrepreneurs is that they find it difficult to pay the market rate for such technology. Research in academic institutions are also usually driven by publication necessities. The social problems do not show up in their radar.

Technology solutions must be inclusive in terms of affordability and should be interdisciplinary. Academic institutions need to create a platform where students and teachers can work together on social problems.

Professor Sujatha Srinivasan, department of mechanical engineering at IIT Madras shared some of the work that in done at IIT Madras. Her group is called R2D2 (Rehabilitation Research and device development group). Their main motivation is to help people who have locomotive disability with replacement devices like prosthesis, orthotics, wheelchairs etc. The team consists of 20 staff and students. She explained how assistive devices are either primitive and low cost or high tech and unaffordable. The mission of their group is to use appropriate technology to indigenously engineer functional and affordable assistive devices of high quality.

She explained various devices like the body movement wheelchair, which basically moves as a person move his/her body in a particular direction according to the movement of the body. This helps people who do not have the fine motor skills to operate a joystick like people with cerebral palsy.

She explained about Saathi walker which again helps people walk on their own, who would have otherwise not been able to walk without help.

She talked about the Standing wheel chair. When people spend a long time in a wheel chair they develop pressure sores or contractures, their muscles

freeze up or their joints lose the freedom to move. Hence standing is considered a form of therapy for someone who uses a wheel chair. This device helps the person to stand. The wheel chair can be mechanically operated. They can use their hands to lift themselves up and this has psychological benefits to the person as well. This is in the beginning stages of commercialization.

Lastly, she explained about 'add ons' that they have invented which can be attached to a regular wheel chair. This is essentially a large wheel attached to the front of the wheel chair which makes it more suitable to be used in different terrain. The device is made in such a way that it can be used with Indian attires like saari or dhoti.

She also spoke about TTK which has extended its CSR wing to work with IIT Madras. She says she can use their help to hire students to work on projects.

She ended by saying how affordability, user friendly, customization-accommodate different users with a design that caters to all and appropriate technology are what makes the technology a great one.

Professor Prabhakaran, faculty of electrical engineering (area of research-photonics) started his speech by explaining how in India, we do not think about disability the way other counties do. He explained the internet of things for the differently abled that they have created.

He gave a short introduction to CREATE: Centre for Rehabilitation Engineering and Assistive Technology at IITM. He also spoke about the minor in Assistive technology which is highly interdisciplinary. They held the first conference in 2005 called silent revolution on alternative and augmentative communication.

He explained about a device which was designed after a Theremin which helps people use computers by waving their hands.

They have also created a version of the fitbit, which sends signals to a smartphone. The smartphone then speaks for them. But only 4 sentences can be said as their movements are also limited.

Another main issue is to bring down costs by a factor of 3. For this the costs that come through sales and marketing, Intellectual Property cost etc needs to be cut down. If the product is sold at bill of materials, this brings down the cost.

He introduced other products like KAVI: Kommunicating Audio Visual Interface (Through Local Language), Mozhi (Syllable to word in Tamil) which are smart phone based technology. He also explained about Sarva Siksha Abhyan, which is a device that enables schools to print their own tactile books at an affordable price for partial vision and visually challenged children. This enables children to learn through books that have pictures in them, unlike the usual books which give to visually challenged children which do not have any pictures.

Questions:

Questions were raised about whether there were projects related to the environment that were going on and Dr. Kalyanaraman explained various projects under RuTaG like the production of charcoal with least possible emission of carbon monoxide.

When asked about their expectations from their peers in the social sector. Dr. Kalyanaraman said that there is the need to set up structures in institutions which will enable student to work on social problems but this does not seem to exist everywhere. But when students are actually involved in such projects they show high levels of interest and are highly motivated.

When asked about the affordability component. It was sad that it all depends on working out the right business model. When this is done affordability

comes automatically. Longer time horizons are necessary. The investor cannot expect fast returns. When it comes to passing on the cost in the case of environment. There is no one to bear it. This is the problem with projects relating to the environment.

When questioned what kind of projects they prioritise to work on, Prof. Sujatha Srinivasan said that though they try to steer the students towards working on a particular project, they are usually given the choice to work on whatever they need and that they usually seem to work on the projects better when it is something they have chosen and do it voluntarily.

Session 3: Incubation

Mr. Ravi from TATA Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) Mumbai explained about the MA program on Social Entrepreneurship which is run by the Centre for Social Entrepreneurship of TISS Mumbai. They have a have an incubation side to the centre which is handled by him.

He spoke about the policy of zero placements that they follow. The ecosystem on the other hand supports entrepreneurial behaviour. By the end of the final year of the program, the students are ready with their plan for a social venture. The core of the venture must be social value creation, to address social problems in an entrepreneurial and innovative way. The students in the end of the 2nd year are eligible for 3 years of incubation, but this selection itself is done in a stringent manner. They need to do a pilot of the project for 3 months in their 1st and 2nd years. These students are mentored during this time. PBS bank that partners with them for their CSR activities helps them support the students with a seed capital. As a policy, they also encourage students to go back to their home towns to start

enterprises and hence they are virtually incubated. Very stringent and structured reviewing and mentoring mechanisms are in place. A mentor – student program is in place and the students are visited regularly and mentored and advised. This gives the students a macro view of the project as they usually only has a micro level view of it when they are working in the field. Peer mentoring is where the 3rd year incubatees mentor 1st year students. PBS brings in experts from various fields like marketing who also act as mentors.

Family support of the Social Entrepreneur is highly critical but this is lacking in a lot of cases. They have started inviting parents to their conference which is called 'Celebrating Social Entrepreneurship'. Where they were introduced to the work that their children do and parents are now highly supportive and actively participate in their work.

They guide them through the whole process: Venture creating- planning- preparing pitch- pitching – proper incubation process like funding, networking and mentoring- end of the 3rd year they are ready to take off. Sustainability in terms of funds is hence given importance from the 2nd year onwards- their dependence on funding from TISS should go down, they should create methods for alternative funding,

Questions:

Q: How is the zero placement policy received by students?

Ans: We expect the students who take the course to have an entrepreneurial mindset. This sort of filters only the students with an entrepreneurial spirit into the course. The students are however fully aware of this policy before being placed.

Q: You do a lot of promotional activities and academic work. But SE required various other things like field study, funding etc. But it is in the application side that the synergies of the ecosystem takes place.

Ans: We have been involved in the setting up rural incubators. The incubatees can even be small or micro enterprises. We try to find a local partner like a local NGO get them onboard, then there is learning, transfer the ideas from them and then the incubation is set up. This is what is done outside the academic method.

The MA program is designed in such a way that about 45% of the credit comes from field work. It is based a lot on field work.

JAYA UMADHKAR from Rural technology and business incubator (RTBI) explained about the various activities that take place in IIT Madras. She gave an introduction of how incubation and a course on Social Entrepreneurship can be taught hand in hand and how incubation can play a role while the course is taught in the curriculum.

She explained 3 aspects:

1. The kind of network that is already present in IIT Madras and the kind of entrepreneurial ecosystem that exists.
2. How the course on social entrepreneurship came about.
3. The kind of work that IIT Madras does and more specifically RTBI.

1. IIT Madras has an environment that is conducive to innovation, leading to entrepreneurship. CfI(Centre for Innovation) enables this. There are clubs like aero club, robotics etc in CfI, where they are enabled to design and build a product. The difficulty sets in when they need to see

whether the product can be commercially viable and hence can become a business.

This is where the E- cell comes in. It is the student hub for all entrepreneurship related activities. There are activities like talks, panel discussions, workshops, leadership lecture series etc that take place. The students thus get to hear real life stories about start ups and get a sense of what entrepreneurship really means and what it is like to launch your own business.

CSIE is involved in delivering social entrepreneurship education to students.

Students usually lose hope in their ideas in their 3rd and 4th years. This is where Nirmaan- a pre incubation initiative comes in. They are given a small funding, space etc . If their ideas work well, they are hence able to go to incubation cells to seek incubation.

There are also other options given to final year students where they can choose to convert to an MS in entrepreneurship where they can pursue to work on their idea full time. If it doesn't work out, they can get their B tech degree and sit for placements.

There is also the option to take a semester off to work on their ideas and then come back to complete their course.

There are groups like iVil, RuTaG etc. which have been working on socially beneficial projects.

2. Business plan competitions usually drew enormous response. Some of them had a social side to it. Hence we understood that there is scope for social enterprise. But this was still a hobby for them and they could

not spend much time on it. So a course was developed so that it would help them spend time on it and get credits legitimately for this course.

Parts of the course:

1.Introduction to social enterprises in india.

2. Product design and business models: understand the kind of products needed for social enterprises

3. Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship (Laboratory based): develop an idea into a prototype

4. Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship (Field Study): develop a business model to solve a social problem.

Challenges that the course faced:

There was difficulty in finding dedicated resources to teach the courses. Also the professors who could were not satisfied with the kind of time that they could give to them.

To overcome this:

1. Looking for dedicated teachers

2. Database for students to work on in as projects.

3. Support students by advising them and giving them ideas through the whole process.

4. INCUBATION:

She explained about the entrepreneurial ecosystem in IIT , Madras where there is cutting edge research at the department level, there are organizations like CSIE, the Alumni Network, the IIT Madras Incubation cell, under which comes RTB (Rural Technology and Business Incubator), IITM Bio-Incubator and Medtech incubator . IITM Research park houses 98 Tech

start-ups and gives them space at subsidised rates, there are also other companies that have their Rand D work going on. This creates networking between major companies, small start-ups, professors and the students. They provide 3 to 5 years of incubation where they get

1. Office space

2. Branding as an IITM incubated company

3. Business support services

4. Mentorship

5. Networking

6. Seed funding

She explained in detail about the mentoring sessions where there are heads of big companies and experienced people who share their advice with the startups. She also explained that there were Angel investors are supportive of the ventures.

She gave examples of a few start ups that are incubated in IIT Madras like Planys Technologies Pvt Limited which designs and manufactures compact underwater vehicles for immersed structure inspection and environmental survey.

Swadha Energies Pvt Ltd. which designs control systems for Heating, Ventilation, Air- conditioning (HVACA) Industry that provides comfortable cooling at every zone of an office space with much less power consumption.

Kamal Kissan- Simple Solutions for Smart Farmers, which provides cost effective solutions to small farmers which helps cut down the labour costs to farmers up to 50% with smart mechanization intervention. This way they do not have to depend on expensive technologies from foreign counties.

Stellaps which specializes in end to end dairy farm services which focuses on clean milk production protocols, productivity improvement, cost optimization and real time data access. They also have a cloud based system for recording productivity, peak yield management, breeding, preventive healthcare, fodder and veterinary care powered by a powerful proactive analytics module.

Questions:

Question: What is the usual participation rate of women when it comes to social entrepreneurship? How do they compare to men in terms of their entrepreneurial abilities?

Answer: Roughly one in four incubated here are social entrepreneurs. There is no difference when it comes to their abilities and commitment. Though they face a lot of challenges they make enough time needed for the ventures. For example, Devi spends most of her time in the field, with farmers, who are her customer. She has to stay away from her home for this.

2. What is the added advantage that comes with being an incubatee under IIT Madras?

IIT Madras incubatees might have the name that can be trusted but if there is always the need to prove that the product is useful to the customer.

Day 2

Session 1: Skills

The second day of the Conference began with a session on Key Social

Enterprise Skills. Led by key resource persons Ms Josephine Francis and Ms Sioban Hone, the interactive session aimed at ideating on the important skills that a social entrepreneur must possess. The resource persons divided the 25 participants in session into groups of five each and instructed them to ideate on social enterprise skills. With a whiteboard bearing the question: "What are the key social enterprise skills?", one representative of the group was asked to write down the skill that the group had identified on a sticky note. He / She was, then, asked to come forward and say it out loud to the remaining participants, before posting the note on the whiteboard. The exercise was carried on for fifteen minutes until around thirty notes with distinct skills were found on the whiteboard bearing the first question. Some key skills identified were empathy, creativity, team spirit, risk management, innovation, communication, adaptability, integrity, intrinsic motivation, perseverance and networking, among others.

The second question posed to the groups was: "What sets apart social entrepreneurs from regular entrepreneurs?". With five minutes of time stipulated for preliminary ideation, groups were expected to repeat the task carried out earlier. Some of the notes stuck on the whiteboard carrying the second question bore the following responses, among others: impact solution, opportunity recognition, social mission, people-centric approach, creating an image of need and profit-purpose balance.

The third question posed to the groups was: "How does one embed these skills into a social entrepreneurial education to students?". Post ideation and brainstorming for five minutes, some groups suggested that students be introduced to ground level problems right at the beginning of the program so as to help them inculcate managerial skills and understand the prevalent issues. Another group advocated the need for an active participatory method

wherein the inclusion of stakeholders is complete. One suggestion that was unanimously acknowledged by the groups was the possibility of making rural service mandatory so as to sensitize the student and help him/her conceptualize the matter at hand, along with his/her theoretical knowledge.

The session ended with Ms Josephine and Ms Sioban appreciating the ideas brought forth by the groups and expressing hope that they be incorporated in the respective universities that the group members represented. Ms Sioban, at the end of the session, also spoke to one of the conference's presspersons and had the following to say about the network:

"I personally believe that the network belongs with the people. And since UKISEEN has provided us with such a fantastic starting point, it depends on us ultimately as to how we build strong networks hereafter in helping strengthening social entrepreneurship education."

Session 2: Design Thinking

The second day saw a session on Design Thinking being held in parallel with the session on Skills. Led by Professor Sumit Mitra from IIM-Kozhikode, the session aimed at giving participants an overview of design thinking and understanding its significance in the field of social enterprise.

Professor Sumit Mitra talked about the uniqueness of each design and urged the participants to take cognizance of the fact that real life problems could not merely solved with the skill sets, tools and techniques used to solve problems in mathematics and physics. He emphasized on the need for out-of-the-box thinking and said that cognitive processes emerged from the field of designing.

On the question of the nature of design thinking, Professor Mitra talked

about the unstructured situations in real life, that are based on processes that are unique. As a result, he expressed the need for a process of design aimed at transforming existing situations into preferred, desirable ones. Innovative solutions, he said, were premised on design thinking.

Following Professor Mitra's talk, a TED talk by Tim Brown was aired. In his talk, Tim Brown elaborated on the how of design thinking. He advocated the adoption of methods like observation, protocol, study and discussions with fellow designers. He, then, outlined the stages of design thinking namely inspiration, ideation and implementation. He also dealt with the importance of design thinking in a social enterprise.

Session 2 Part 1: Design & Innovation

Led by Soumitra Bhatt, the interactive session on design and innovation began with a brief talk by the speaker. While drilling the idea into the participants that design thinking was about actually doing it, Mr Bhatt spoke about designing systems that had people as components. The session was, then, opened to participants to pair up and share with each other the things that he/she had been procrastinating. A general framework for the sharing comprising three key questions listed below was presented to the participants:

- Why do you need to do what you have been procrastinating?
- Why don't you want to do it?
- What would make you enjoy doing it?

Post the interaction, participants were asked to sketch a basic version of their design ideas highlighting the key points that would help solve the problem at hand. The participants, then, shared their sketches with the audience one by

one.

Session 2 Part 2

The session led by Mr Soumitra Bhatt was followed by an interactive session led by Professor Pathik Pathak. During the session, participants were asked to share their research experiences and needs with each other. The participants were also asked to ideate on a suitable methodology to measure the output or outcome of the research. Participants were, lastly, asked to write down their research questions in groups of four each.

Session 3: Students' Perspectives

The following session, titled 'Students' Perspectives', witnessed social entrepreneurship and social science students share their experiences and insights on their disciplines. The speakers were judged on the basis of their sharing by Professor Agnes from Stella Mary's College, Chennai and Professor Mohan from Kongu Engineering College, Coimbatore.

The first team from Stella Mary's College comprising Mary and Rachael addressed the audience on the way colleges need to encourage students to take up entrepreneurship, specifically social entrepreneurship. The speakers shared with the audience their strong-held belief that any creative solution for a social issue amounts to social entrepreneurship. They believed that students must ideate on how their solutions would cater to the needs of the have-nots and, then, channelize the skills they possessed towards the implementation of their solutions, thus, empowering themselves as entrepreneurs.

The team from Southampton University comprised Jenna, Annie, Mauro, Andrews and Katie. The five speakers shared their personal experiences and

trysts with social entrepreneurship.

Jenna, who had initially believed that an education in business would equip her to do good, went on to understand that it was crucial to focus on the problem and not worry about the solution. She also learned that the path to such an undertaking, irrespective of the field and discipline it embodied, would produce the desired results. She ended her speech with a call to students to engage with stakeholders, as one cannot ever be fully aware of all the problems.

Annie shared with the audience details about a food supply model that she and her teammates had worked on. While expressing her elation over the success that the model had garnered, she said that teaming up with established enterprises would increase the scope of arriving at sustainable solutions to real world problems. She rested her proposition on the ground that including more people under the umbrella would lead to a better quality of service.

Mauro, an engineering graduate, had been unaware about the discipline and field of social entrepreneurship. Post his engagement with the field over the past few years, he had come to learn a few things, that he shared with the audience. He shared his observation that a social enterprise is a business undertaking that profits more than just its CEO. In conclusion, he termed the inclusion of a module on social entrepreneurship in the curriculum as imperative.

Andrews shared with the audience about his journey towards self-discovery through social entrepreneurship. His involvement with two projects namely Enactus, aimed at empowering youth in and outside school; and Right Light, aimed at providing solar lights in Tanzania for a year, he said, were the highlights of his journey so far. He characterized social entrepreneurship as

an incredible tool and attitude, that was to be fostered at a young age to students. In conclusion, he expressed his belief that social entrepreneurship provides students with the ability to view the world through a different lens.

Katie shared with the audience about the projects, such as Espark based in Ahmedabad, that she had been actively participating in. She called for a change in the curriculum and incited teachers and professors to motivate students to get involved in social entrepreneurial programmes at the national and international stages.

Syed Fazil Shariq from Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS)- Hyderabad outlined the curriculum design implemented at his university, which offered students extensive field work experience and a solid framework to approach social issues. He shared with the audience details of a smart school campus model, that his team had constructed for students in the third, fourth and fifth grades, at a cost of about six thousand rupees. He further raised a clarion call for social entrepreneurs to be "intrapreneurs" rather than isolated entrepreneurs.

Trypheena Duddley from IIT Madras shared with the audience her involvement with the field at school through a carnival, that aimed to raise funds for an orphanage. She claimed that that opportunity had helped her realize the importance of practical, application skills and the incentive to help people. She expressed her strong belief that the foundation for social entrepreneurial engagement needed to be laid at schools. She suggested that such an endeavor could be fulfilled by way of introducing students to incubators and providing students counselling on the possibilities that the field of social entrepreneurship held. She called on teachers and professors to "sow the seeds for a better tomorrow".

While Andrews received the Best Speaker felicitation, Trypheena and Mauro

were jointly recognized for presenting the best ideas.

Valedictory Session:

The session started with Dr. Guru Gujral delivering the opening remark. He explained how the conference was part of 10 events that were funded by the British council to encourage social entrepreneurship. They aim to have an integrated approach to the spread of social entrepreneurship by including an education component to it as well. He hopes that like in the UK more grants will be set aside for educating about Social Entrepreneurship in India.

Dr. Pathik Patak from the University of Southampton said that the conference was a success and hopes a lot of networks and connections have been formed. He hoped that students and teachers would make full use of this. He explained about the Facebook page and slack messaging which can be used as networking tools. He emphasised the need for a long time networking to take place.

 Prof. R.Nagarajan spoke about the founding of CfI (Centre for Innovation) by the class of 1985 and how CSIE was formed to be an organization that carried a social impact as its objective. He spoke about its activities which includes education, research documentation and outreach. He also mentioned about the minor stream in Social Entrepreneurship which was introduced to the students. CSIE has now started providing capacity building for many incubators and start ups.

The alumni are able to provide support to developing start ups in terms of advice and the students have necessary skills. What is missing is the information necessary to give a social side to it and CSIE is trying to fill this

gap. One way of doing this is by forming networks. He emphasised the need for cross pollination of ideas which gives way to development.

Mr. Vishnu Swaminadhan, from Ashoka started off his speech by saying "Change is constant". He spoke about the unequal distribution of wealth which is further increasing. Jobs that once existed do not exist anymore, new jobs are coming up and we need to teach children skills rather than preparing them for particular jobs. He says not to think about business models, but rather talk about impact. He gave the example of a 12-year old Student who learnt about aerodynamics, who then applied this to school busses and changed the shape of busses to become more aerodynamic by attaching a fender to it. He now runs an organization where he attaches fenders to school buses. A 30$ fender, improves mileage by 20 % and 600 $ per year on fuel is saved. Thus 250 million $ every year is saved on school bus fuel expenses every year.

He emphasised on the importance of Co- creating with unusual allies. He gave the example of how rats were trained to detect land mines and in 9 years, 30 million hectares of land mines were cleared. These rats were trained for 8 months. They are trained to detect tuberculosis for extremely low costs. Now and this has saved 30,000 lives in 1.5 years.

He also spoke about 'leadership by letting go' where he cited the example of Younis and Grameen bank. Younis refused to open a branch outside Bangladesh. He asked people to copy the idea instead. Thus, micro- credit became more important than Grameen Bank. One has to worry about scaling the idea rather than the organization.

He also gave the example of Gloria D'Souza who tried to change the school system. She started to teach about environmental education. Now the

subject is taught all over India yet no one remembers Gloria D'Souza. This is an example of how the idea is scaled up.

He ended his speech by the importance of the power to change mind sets.

This is necessary to change the world into a better place. For this we will need to start by changing ourselves.

The event ended with the distribution of mementos and Prizes.