BUSINESS INCUBATOR CENTER AS A LEARNING FACTORY AND TEACHING LABORATORY. CONCEPTUAL REFLECTION

Radosław WOLNIAK[1*], Michalene Eva GREBSKI[2]

[1] Politechnika Śląska, Wydział Organizacji i Zarządzania; rwolniak@polsl.pl
[2] Northampton Community College – Monroe Campus, USA
[*] Correspondence author: rwolniak@polsl.pl; +48534538177

Abstract: The paper problem connected with two potential function of the incubator center (learning factory and teaching laboratory) and its analysis. The concept of the learning factory at Penn State was recognized by the National Science Foundation with a "Gordon Prize" for innovation in engineering education in 2006. Recently the use of learning factories has increased especially in Europe. Learning factories have many different models with one common goal. The goal is to enhance engineering education. Research has shown that learning by doing leads to greater retention and quicker mastery of the subject. Second very important function of the incubator center is learning factory. In USA this approach is use in engineering courses. Where they are realized in incubators they can be more effective in many fields especially practical. Students in incubator center can do hand-on experiments and gain practical industrial experience. This is very important in engineers education process.

Keywords: Business Incubator, innovations, students, entrepreneurship, industry.

1. Introduction

In 1994 the National Science Foundation (USA) awarded The Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) a grant to develop a "learning factory". This was the first time that the term, "learning factory" was used. The term "learning factory" refers to "interdisciplinary hands-on senior design project with strong links and interaction to industry". Penn State's learning factory is a hands-on learning facility for engineering students to be used in conjunction with the capstone design course and other courses (Learning factory, 2018).

Current engineering curriculum does not fully address the needs of industry. Industry requires engineers to not only understand scientific principles, but also to be able to apply them in real life applications. Most universities are already structuring their curriculums to provide students with more hands-on experience in multidisciplinary open-ended design, team work, communication skills, etc.

The objective of the paper is to analyze two function of Business Incubator Centre – learning factory and teaching laboratory.

The incubator center as a learning factory is concentrated on his role as teaching students to apply the knowledge. Students can in this way achieve experience in applying the theoretical knowledge in real manufacturing of the product. The incubator center as a teaching laboratory students working in multidisciplinary teams can learn real world situations and problems and gain experience in active learning process.

Methodology: the paper is based basically on secondary sources – the analysis of existing literature. Also we use case studies from incubator center especially Pennsylvania Penn State.

2. Business Incubator Center as a "Learning Factory"

The learning factory is also being used for student research projects and student clubs. It provides modern design prototyping and manufacturing facilities, including machining (CNC and manual), 3D printing, welding, metallurgy and CAD/CAM. Student design projects benefit industrial clients. The company from industry which sponsored the project interacts with students and faculty to help create world class engineers. This has made a significant difference for engineering education at Penn State. Since the establishment of the learning factory, students have completed 1800 projects for more than over 500 sponsors. Around approximately 800 students at Penn State-University Park have participated in the projects. Fig. 1 illustrates the scope of activity at the learning factory.



Figure 1. Scope of activity at the learning factory. Source. Author's own work.

Teams of engineering students are engaged in solving "real world" problems which are sponsored by industrial clients. Students are being challenged to apply the knowledge and skills acquired during their undergraduate education to solve engineering problems. The learning factory (Galbraith, and James, 2005; Gebramariam, et. al., 2004; Enhancing, 2017; Entrepreuners, 2017; Carbondale Technology, 2006) provides unique opportunities for industry

sponsors to partner with Penn State in order to help educate the next generation of world class engineers. This is being done by using modern facilities for designing, prototyping and fabrication. At the end of every semester, the learning factory is organizing a design showcase. During the showcase, students display their projects. Those projects are judged by a panel of industry experts comprised of current and past sponsors as well as members of the Industrial Advisory Board. Prizes are awarded for the best projects and best posters. The event is open to the public. It is usually attended by 600 students, faculty, sponsors and guests. Penn State Hazleton students do not have convenient access to the learning factory due to the 110 mile distance.

Therefore, the local business incubator center (CAN-BE) became a substitute for the learning factory. CAN-BE is located across the street from Penn State Hazleton. By working with client companies at the business incubator center, Penn State Hazleton students are getting a very similar experience like the Penn State-University Park students who are working with the learning factory. Table 1 illustrates the comparison of the student experience at the learning factory and the business incubator center. It is very clear that students who are doing projects for companies at the business incubator center get all the experience of the learning factory.

Therefore, the business incubator center can be successfully used as a substitute for the learning factory (Dublin, and Licht, 2005; Galbraith, and James, 2014, Gebramariam, et al., 2004; Enhancing, 2017; Entrepreneurs, 2016; Carbondale Technology, 2006).

Table 1.
Comparison of the student experience at the learning factory and the business incubator center

Objective	**Learning Factory**	**Business Incubator**
Interdisciplinary Projects	Yes	Yes
Hand on Projects	Yes	Yes
Modern Design and Prototyping	Yes	Yes
Connect Industry with Faculty	Yes	Yes
Understand Industry Needs	Yes	Yes
Work on Real-World Problems	Yes	Yes
Keep on Top of Latest Research	Yes	Yes
Engage in Student Learning	Yes	Yes
Pipeline for Future Employees	Yes	Yes
Link Theory and Practice	Yes	Yes
Enrich Classroom Experience	Yes	Yes
Increase Student Engagement	Yes	Yes
Identify Word Class Engineers	Yes	Yes
CNC and Manual Machining	Yes	Yes
3D Printing	Yes	Yes
Welding	Yes	Yes
Metrology	Yes	Yes

Source. Author's own work.

More and more engineering programs promote a hands-on training mode in order to better prepare students for their professional life. In the field of engineering, it is very important to provide every student with the opportunity to apply their theoretical knowledge and practice. Students need a place away from the lecture hall "to get their hands dirty". This is especially

important for students who are visual learners. Competency is not only theoretical knowledge. It includes the ability to apply theoretical knowledge to solve real world problems. There must be a connection between the knowledge and the ability for practical application of the knowledge.

The learning factory is teaching the students to apply the knowledge. Students are experiencing the designing and manufacturing of the product. They are also applying the theoretical knowledge in a real manufacturing situation and environment. Manufacturing industry has undergone a big change in recent years. Students need to be more rapidly introduced to these future methods. Learning factories are future oriented educational facilities.

Modern manufacturing technology requires employees at every level of hierarchy to be able to function and become self-organized in unknown situations. Employees need to be able to rapidly find creative solutions to a problem that they have never previously encountered. Traditional teaching methods do not address or develop those skills. Industry demands interdisciplinary training. It is important for engineering education to identify future job profiles and correlated to them competence requirements (Blanko, 2016; Brownlee, 2017; Business Incubator, 2017; Chamber News, 2017; Comprehensive, 2015; Cooperation, 1997; Davies, 2009; Michna, and Kmieciak, 2014; Grebski, and Wolniak, 2016; Wolniak, and Grebski. 2017; Wolniak, 2017, Dolińska-Weryńska, 2017).

The concept of the learning factory at Penn State was recognized by the National Science Foundation with a “Gordon Prize” for innovation in engineering education in 2006. Recently the use of learning factories has increased especially in Europe. Learning factories have many different models with one common goal. The goal is to enhance engineering education. Research has shown that learning by doing leads to greater retention and quicker mastery of the subject.

Learning factories are real industrial sites which provide students with experience in different phases of product creation. They also cover a wide variety of the learning environment. At the same time, learning can take place in the planning, realization and ramp-up phase, but also in the improvement of existing processes in factory environments.

3. Business Incubator Center as a Teaching Laboratory

Current engineering curriculum does not fully address the needs of industry. Industry requires engineers to not only understand scientific principles, but also to be able to apply them in real life applications. Most universities are already structuring their curriculums to provide students with more hands-on experience in multidisciplinary open-ended design, team work, communication skills, etc.

Ben Franklin said, "Tell me and I forget, teach me and I may remember, involve me and I will learn." Engineering education for the 21st century must be relevant to the life of students and the needs of society. New teaching and learning programs must reflect the real world component of engineering design problems.

Students must work on multidisciplinary teams to learn real world and gain experience in active learning. There is a tendency to bring different engineering majors together to provide students with common experiences in teaching the fundamentals of engineering, measurement and instrumentation, electronic and microprocessors, control, heat transfer, fluid mechanics, structures and materials, manufacturing and environmental engineering.

Common educational experiences force students from different engineering majors to see engineering from a big picture perspective rather than just by seeing the individual pieces of the puzzle. Most of the students appreciate the multidisciplinary approach which is easy to accomplish by crossing departmental boundaries (Carlson, and Sullivan, 1999; Feisell, and Rosa, 2005; Krzemień, and Wolniak, 2016; Wolniak, 2016; Ober, 2017; Olkiewicz, et. al, 2017; Olko, 2017; Kochmańska, 2017; Orbik, 2017).

It has been proven that active learning is more effective than the traditional "chalk and talk" lecture. The traditional lecture format is being replaced by student team interactive. In this kind of environment, students may engage and learn more in order to attract more high school students into engineering programs. Many colleges offer dual enrollment classes.

Those classes are usually offered to junior and senior level high school students. High school students and high school teachers participate in hands-on activities and learn about engineering in everyday life by designing and building solutions to meet the needs of society.

Engineers need to have skills that go beyond theory which can be developed only by laboratory experience. There are three different kinds of engineering laboratories which are developmental, research and education.

Engineering is a practical discipline. Before engineering schools were created, engineers were trained in apprenticeship programs. Early engineers have designed, analyzed and built their own inventions.

The first engineering school in the United States was the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. (Thaddeus Kosciuszko was one of the founders of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point). The military academy model was designed, so that theory and practice could blend together. In the middle of the 19th century, many civilian engineering schools were established, for example, Cornell (1830), Union College (1845), Yale (1852), MIT (1865) and others.

Those early engineering program were very practical and application oriented. Those programs were training civil and mechanical engineers to build bridges, railroads, canals, water pumps, mining equipment, etc. Then chemical processing plants as well as the telegraph started to develop.

Those early engineering programs had significant laboratory components as well as cooperation with industry where students were getting practical experience. After World War

II (WW II), there was a period of great prosperity with many inventions based on the technology developed during WW II.

The automobile industry was booming. There was a need for a more modern highway system and new methods of communication. At the same time, commercial airlines were getting established. At that point, the engineering curriculum was being criticized for being too practical and not theoretical enough.

It was suggested that the engineering profession should be more focused on scientific research rather than routine design. In the mid-sixties, President John F. Kennedy revealed his plan of traveling to the moon. Many people were inspired and there was a significant growth in the number of students pursuing engineering degrees.

This was an era of emphasis on science and engineering. Academic laboratories gave way to scientific subjects. This trend continued until the 1970's. After reaching the goal of traveling to the moon, the emphasis on science and engineering decreased.

Many engineering programs were underinvested and started cutting back on the laboratory component of the curriculum. The laboratory part is normally the more expensive part of the education budget. Many engineering schools graduated engineers who were advanced in theory but poor in practice.

While engineering programs were getting more theoretical, there was a growing demand in industry for practical-trained engineering professionals. Many schools created Engineering Technology programs. These programs were application-focused engineering. Many engineering technology graduates filled positions which were previously held by engineers. Until the present time, both programs engineering and engineering technology are offered simultaneously at most institutions. There is a significant overlap between those two programs.

In engineering education, there were no clearly defined educational objectives. This was especially true in laboratory courses. Without cohesive educational objectives, the laboratory courses were disjointed. Even though those courses were part of the curriculum, the outcomes were far from the expectations of industry.

The situation has changed for the better with new accreditation criteria. (Engineering criteria, 2000) The educational objectives for engineering programs as well as the educational objectives for all of the courses is required by the Accreditation Board for Engineering Technology (ABET). Many schools were trying to accomplish the laboratory requirements of the curriculum by computer simulation.

Most educators, however, agree that computer simulation cannot entirely replace hands-on experiments as well as practical industrial experience. Presently the rapid development of online programs, there is a tendency to replace some of the laboratory courses with online experience.

Educators' opinions on that issue are divided (Sevilla, 2015; Greater Hazelton, 2017; Kyaga, et al., 2011; Lose, and Tenegh, 2015; Maclure, 2011; Owen, 2004; Pnesylvania Business 2017; Percent 2012). The Engineering program at Penn State Hazleton is trying to

accomplish some of the laboratory components of the curriculum by its cooperation with the CAN-BE business incubator center. Table 2 shows the educational objectives of the curriculum at Penn State Hazleton.

Table 2.
Educational objectives of the laboratory courses at Penn State Hazleton

Educational Objectives	Traditional Engineering Laboratories	CAN-BE Business Incubator Center
Instrumentation	Very Effective	Effective
Modeling	Very Effective	Effective
Experiment	Very Effective	Effective
Data Analysis	Very Effective	Very Effective
Design	Effective	Very Effective
Learn from Failure	Effective	Very Effective
Creativity	Effective	Very Effective
Psychomotor	Effective	Very Effective
Safety	Effective	Very Effective
Communication	Effective	Very Effective
Teamwork	Effective	Very Effective
Ethics in the Laboratory	Effective	Very Effective

Source: Autor's own work.

It demonstrates the comparison between the levels of obtaining individual educational objectives using the traditional on-campus laboratory versus providing students with hands-on experiences at the business incubator center. The comparison seems to be in favor of hands-on experience at the business incubator center.

4. Conclusion

The concept of using Incubator center as a learning factory was used in Penn State as a very good kind of organization and scope of incubator. It was awarded by National Science Foundation for innovation in engineering education on 2006. Now in many incubator centers this approach is used especially in Europe. Learning factories are real industrial sites which can provide students with experience about creating of new products. It can be useful in teaching processes and also can boost innovativeness among the students and in the region. Research has shown that learning by doing leads to greater retention and quicker mastery of the subject.

Second very important function of the incubator center is teaching laboratory. In USA this approach is use in engineering courses. Where they are realized in incubators they can be more effective in many fields especially practical. Students in incubator center can do hand-on experiments and gain practical industrial experience. This is very important in engineers education process.

The main difference between learning laboratory and teaching factory concept is that in the first concept the incubator center imitate real industry experiences and in the second rather is used as a place of teaching in the industrial and business courses.

Bibliography

1. Blanco, O. (2016). How Latinos Are Saving This Former Pennsylvania Mining Town. *CNN Money, September 2*. Available online money.cnn.com/2016/news/economy/Hazleton-pa-latino-immigrant, 2018.01.09.
2. Brownlee, G. (2018.01.09). *Small Business Failure Rates and Causes*. Indiana Small Business Development Center. Available online www.isbdc.org.
3. Business Incubator Prices, The Strategy Center. (2018.01.09). Available online http://www.strategycenterok.com/business-incubator-prices.
4. Business Incubator Wikipedia. (2018.01.09). Available online https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Business_incubator.
5. Business Incubators: All New TARGIT for 2017. (2018.01.09). Available online http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/small/Bo-Co/Business-Incubators.html; targit.com/Decision-Suite/2017-Launch.
6. Carbondale Technology Transfer Center. University of Scranton 2006-2007 (2018.01.09). Available online www.4cttc.org/about.htm.
7. Carlson, L.E., and Sullivan, J.F. (1999). Hands-on Engineering, Learning by Doing in the Integrated Teaching and Learning Programs. *International Journal on Engineering Education, 15(1)*, 20-31.
8. Chamber News. Greater Hazleton Chamber of Commerce. (2018.01.09). Available online www.hazletonchamber.org.
9. Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Five Year Plan for Northeastern Pennsylvania: 2013-2018. Northeastern Pennsylvania Alliance (NEPA), December 2013. (2018.01.09). Available online www.nepa-alliance.org.
10. Comprehensive Economic Development: 2015-2016. Strategy Annual Performance Report. (2018.01.09). Available online www.nepa.alliance.org/wp.
11. Cooperation Breeds Success at an Incubator-Penn State University, December 17, 1997. (2018.01.09). Available online www.psu.edu/ur/archives/news/incubator1/html.
12. Davies, M. (2018.01.09). Mixed-use Incubator Handbook: A Start-up Guide for Incubator Developers. Washington, D.C. Available online https://www.google.pl/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwjT57TntMrYAhWOPFAKHfMPCzsQFggwMAA&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.infodev.org%2Finfodev-files%2Fresource%2FInfodevDocuments_733.pdf&usg=AOvVaw3q9_cmt8HaqrWfcMYI3pEC.

13. Dolińska-Weryńska, D. (2017). Imperatyw kształcenia postaw innowacyjnych wśród studentów i absolwentów śląskich uczelni technicznych i ekonomicznych w kontekście potrzeb rynku pracy. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 112*, 247-146, http://dx.doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2017.112.12.
14. Dublin, T., and Licht, W. (2005). *The Face of Decline: The Pennsylvania Anthracite Region in the Twentieth Century.* New York: Cornell Press.
15. Enhancing Poland-United States Collaboration in Small Business Initiatives: Challenges and Perspectives for the Future. (2018.01.09). Available online www.paccpnw.org/event.
16. Entrepreneurs and Small Businesses Spur Economic Growth and Create Jobs. Washington, D.C. World Bank. (2018.01.09). Available online www.worldbank.org.
17. Feisel, L.D., and Rosa, A. (2005). The Role of the Laboratory in Undergraduate Engineering Education. *Journal of Engineering Education, 94*, 121-127.
18. Galbraith, K., and James, K. (2014). *The End of Normal: The Great Crisis and the Future of Growth.* New York: Simon and Schuster.
19. Gebramariam, G.H., and Gebremedhin, T.G., and Jackson, R.W. (2004). *The Role of Small Business in Economic Growth and Poverty Alleviations in West Virginia: An Empirical Analysis.* Research Paper (2018.01.09). Available online www.rri.wvu.edu.
20. Greater Hazleton Business Innovation Center. Available online nep.benfranklin.org/ greater-hazleton-business-innovation-center/.
21. Grebski, R., and Wolniak, R. (2016). *Building an ecosystem for economic growth, 3*, 5-20.
22. Information for Development Program. August 2009 (2018.01.09). Available online www.infodev.org and www.infodev.org/disc.
23. Kochmańska, A. (2017). Instrumenty sprzyjające efektywnemu realizowaniu założeń inteligentnych specjalizacji w przedsiębiorstwie. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacji i Zarządzanie, 105*, 153-163, doi: 10.29119/1641-3466.2017.105.10.
24. Krzemień, E., i Wolniak, R. (2016). Innowacyjność polskiej gospodarki na tle krajów Unii Europejskiej. *Kwartalnik Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 4*, 155-165.
25. Kyaga, S., Lichtenstein, P., Boman, M., Hultman, C., Langstrom, N., and Landen, M. (1999). Creativity and mental disorder: family study of 300 000 people with severe mental disorder. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 199(5)*, 373-379 doi: 10.1192/bjp.bp. 110.085316, 2011.
26. Learning factory (2018.01.09). Available online www.lf.psu.edu.
27. Lose, T., and Tengeh, R.K. (2015). The Sustainability and Challenges of Business Incubators in the Western Cape Province, South Africa. *Sustainability, 7*, 14344-14357.
28. Maclure, N. (2018.01.09). *Product Commercialization*, November 1, 2011. Available online slideshare.net/nmaclure; https://sbir.nih.gov; sbir.gov/about/about.
29. Michna, A., I Kmieciak, R. (2014). Otoczenie instytucjonalne sprzyjające rozwojowi małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw – doświadczenia zagraniczne. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 70*, 301-313.

30. Ober, J.P., Karwot, J. (2017). Innowacyjność jako element strategii w zarządzaniu. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 112*, 279-291, http://dx.doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2017.105.21.
31. Olkiewicz, M., Bober, B., i Wolniak, R. (2017). Innowacje w przemyśle farmaceutycznym jako determinanta procesu kształtowania jakości życia. *Przegląd Chemiczny, 11*, 2199-2201, doi:10.15199/62.2017.11.3.
32. Olko, S. (2017). The impact of the networks and clusters in cultural and creative industries on regional innovation ecosystem – analysis of the selected cases in Europe. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacji i Zarządzanie, 109*, 25-42, http://dx.doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2017.109.3.
33. Orbik, Z. (2017). Próba analizy pojęcia innowacji. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacji i Zarządzanie, 105*, 307-319, doi:10.29119/1641-3466.2017.105.23.
34. Owen, R. (2004). A *New View of Society or Essays on the Principle of the Formation of the Human Character and the Application of the Principle of Practice.* Kessinger LLC: Whitefish.
35. Pennsylvania Business Incubators Offer Entrepreneurs Space and Resources to Grow (2018.01.09). Available online www.americanentrepreneurship.com.
36. Percent of Firms by Age and Firm Size, U.S. (2018.01.09). Census Bureau: 2012 Business Dynamic Statistics. SBA Office of Advocacy. Available online www.sba.gov/advocacy.
37. Sevilla, C.M. (2018.01.09). What Statistics Will Tell You about Startups*,* Founder's Guide, January 27, 2015, Available online http:///foundersguide.com/us-startup statistics/;info graphicsmania.com; kauffman.org.
38. Wolniak, R. (2016). Smart specialisation in Silesian region in Poland. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacji i Zarządzanie, 92*, 407-419.
39. Wolniak, R. (2017). Analiza relacji pomiędzy wskaźnikiem innowacyjności a nasyceniem kraju certyfikatami ISO 9001, ISO 14001 oraz ISO/TS 16949. *Kwartalnik Organizacja i Kierowanie, 2*, 139-150.
40. Wolniak, R., Grebski, M.E. (2017). Functioning of the business incubator center in Gliwice. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Seria Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 105*, 569-580, http://dx.doi.org/10.29119/1641-3466.2017.105.43.