

**ACADEMIC ENTREPRENEURIAL INNOVATIONS AND CAPACITY BUILDING
FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY OF TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN OSUN STATE
SOUTHWEST, NIGERIA**

BY

SEGILOLA, S. AYODELE

Faculty of education

Department of vocational and technical education

University of Ilesa, Ilesa,

Osun state.

Abstract

The study examined Osun State government owned tertiary institutions sustainability through academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building. The concept of entrepreneurial innovations of academic staff were examined, capacity building as a form of enhancement measure needed for their innovations and the institutions sustainability were discussed. The study sought answers to three research questions. 375 staffs were sampled for the study. questionnaire tagged “Academic Entrepreneurial Innovations and Capacity Building for Tertiary Institutions Sustainability questionnaire” (AEICTISQ) was used for data collection. The instrument was validated by four experts. The reliability coefficient was determined using Cronbach Alpha. The instrument yielded a reliability coefficient of 0.75. Frequency counts, mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions The study revealed that neglecting academic entrepreneurial innovations suppress academic staffs creativity, reduce their economic impact and prevent the development of valuable knowledge. It was recommended that management of tertiary institutions in the state should support an academic entrepreneurial innovation ecosystem that will bring all stakeholders together to foster innovations and entrepreneurship for the sustainability of the institutions in the state.

Keywords: Academic Entrepreneurial, Innovations, Capacity Buildings, Tertiary Institution, Sustainability

Introduction

Tertiary institutions is an academic institution that develops, promotes, builds and sustain knowledge for citizen's capacity development in other to steer the world economy in the right path. Tertiary institutions appears to function as the builder of future leaders who are able to lead others and encourage a sustainable society.

Tertiary institution in relation to social and economic factor must engage in sustainability, because their activities affect the society at large. This can be done through innovations and methods that likely promote smooth tertiary institutions industry cooperation. Akande and Evans (2015) opined that tertiary institutions sustainability is the medium of developing research for locating answers to the societal trending issues, training students for sustainable development and capacity building for workers to act on sustainability. It is of the opinion of Aweto, Fakoya & Grecy (2020) that a sustainable tertiary institution assume to supply graduates with set minds of economic self-reliance which will promote sustainable economic inequality, poverty reduction and income growth.

In this study, tertiary institution sustainability necessitate the acquisition of financial resources for the system and reduction in over reliance on government subventions or loans. This shows that government, worldwide regard entrepreneurial innovation as potential drivers of development and innovation (Adebodun, Ayo and Tella. 2018). To realize specific objectives within: the short run, entrepreneurial innovations are specific and actionable programmes undertaken: Such objectives include: reduced cost, increased efficiency and improved performance among several others (Ajegi & Alade 2015). Entrepreneurial innovations when, observed from integrated view required actionable steps that enable firms to persuade people, customers, employees, government and regulating officials (Adenigbagbe, Yusuf and Fola, 2019). A successful entrepreneurs dependent on their business because of abundant opportunities within the environment Perera & Holger (2017), are of the opinion that entrepreneurial innovations is like networking, adoption of technology, business orientation and collaboration as being essential in business.

Networking initiatives (NI): Awang, Ahmad, Asghar, and Kassim (2018) asserted that network plays significant role in influencing the entrepreneurial process. Entrepreneurial innovations revealed the essence of business in term of ability to detect, willingness to pursue

and exploit the opportunities within the market place (Olakotan & Odunlade 2015). Although not all entrepreneurs have the capabilities and sufficient resources to utilize those opportunities, they have collaboration with economic factors to enable them to hold out some activities in order to have access to resources and market (Gunawan, et al. 2018). They further argue that companies seek to enhance their competencies by establishing new network ties and existing networks.

Tertiary institution academia novel knowledge and their creativity in supplying innovations stands as an opportunity for generating huge revenue and further drives development for sustainability. Graduates from these institutions may even gain much from the innovations and this likely may increase their ability to become self-reliant and employment creators instead of employment seekers. Grecus & Ipina (2015), observe that when tertiary institutions become sustainable, they may have the power to coach and equip students' with dynamic qualities that can promote and enhance their skills with high degree of independence and self-actualization. Observations have also shown that tertiary institutions sustainability requires strong leadership vision and mission with the support of state policy so that sustainability of these institutions will not be a mirage in Osun State. Tertiary institutions ability to support in value creation might end innovations and additionally encourage academic entrepreneurial development through research commercialization. This is one of the factors that enhance tertiary institutions technology transfer among the industries. Moreover, tertiary institutions sustainability could further be enhanced if academic entrepreneurial innovations and development were included in tertiary institutions curriculum.

The researcher, is of the opinion that tertiary institution sustainability may be actualized through academic entrepreneurial innovations match with the power to commercialize output of educational research and development. Academic entrepreneurial innovation requires the composition of intellectual ability and enterprise which can intensify tertiary institutions to advance in novel ideas. Academic entrepreneurial innovation as stated by Nworgu and Nwangron (2015), refers to tertiary institutions capacity: to commercialize the top products of research and development which comprised the transformation of intellectual work and knowledge into products development which will satisfy human and industrial needs, thereby act as correlates of sustainable economic development and innovations. Fowler and Ubels,

2019) defined academic entrepreneurial innovations as tertiary institution arrangement and development process of making economic ideas and value through renewal in research output for 'technological gain and enormous scale commercialization. However, for this to come to reality there should be: fruitful and strong relationship between tertiary institutions and industries for commercialization purpose and development. This imply that academic entrepreneurial innovations might increase tertiary institutions sustainability through market place value creations, i.e tertiary institutions leadership and all its divisions must be able to promote and encourage academic entrepreneurial behaviours and activities.

Earlier examination have shown that research in tertiary institution surround readymade stock value of cognitive knowledge which will serve as value and benefits for human needs (Njok and Oyebisi, 2016, Dorothea and Connie 2018). Verification from developed nations have supported this claim, For example, Industrial Technology research in Taiwan, Cambridge University id United Kingdom (UK) Hebrew University in Israel among others had acknowledge the benefits of academic entrepreneurial innovations towards tertiary institutions sustainability and as instrument of intellectual knowledge for innovative value and economic performance of the important sector of the economy. This shows that tertiary institutions sustainability is practicable in South West Nigeria if all things being equal through innovations of ideas, introduction of flexibility strategies and the development of technology tools which will enhance commercialization of research and development outputs.

The researcher is also of the opinion that commercialization of research output for tertiary institutions sustainability could also be intensify when academia are being sponsored for training and retraining in categories of capacity building programme to show them new methodology and the way to use their intellectual knowledge to supply solutions to the contemporary society and industrial challenges.

Capacity building has define by Akuegwu, Nwive and Etudor-Eyo (2017) is a process of skill acquisition, exposure to new knowledge and sustaining abilities to cope within the new development capacity building can be at different level, such as societal level. At societal level, it entails the inspiration and acquisition of ideas from public, interaction for action. At the institutional level, it relates to increasing institutions predetermine practicable policies and

procedure for management productiveness. At individual level, it entails the-capacity to realize more skills and knowledge.

The responsibility of a teaching staff in tertiary institution is to impart knowledge. Therefore, for them to effectively enhance value to the system through teaching and research, there is the need to take care and sustain knowledge (Akao, Ayeole and Oriola 2019). As expressed by Oloyede (2020), that individual came to this world without innovative ideas of Knowledge, but as they grow through interaction with peers and society at large, above all through training they began to accumulate skill, ideas and knowledge which are the bedrock of capacity building. Capacity building therefore is the idea of developing human knowledge and skills tailored towards achieving a specified goal.

Capacity building according to Poeizera 2018) is a way of exposing individual to a new ways of doing things, the way to turn new knowledge, ideas to finished products and the way to supply long term solution to society challenges. It involves relating to ways of developing skills to acquire new ideas. Corroborating the above, Ethudior & Akuegwu (2020) were of the view that capacity building is a crucial determinant in driving tertiary institutions sustainability and directly affect teaching staff professional advancement. Conferences mentoring, ICT training, workshops, seminars among others were the indicators of capacity building programmes which can drive human capital development among the teaching staffs that may ultimately enhance tertiary institutions sustainability.

Academic conference according to Akpan and Ita (2015), is an avenue or a planned event for lecturers to debate research outputs and share novel ideas. Mentoring could also the acquisition and development of latest knowledge among lecturer's from senior to junior through interaction. Mentoring involve the flow of ideas, directives, information and exchange of data from lecturers' to lecturers. Emeryonu, Lasbrey and Bernoux (2018) defined mentorship as a process of assisting a lecturer or teacher to accumulate full knowledge to perform effectively in his or her work place.

Akpan 2014 submitted that at this age of globalization, information and communication technology (ICT) play significant roles in lecturers effective delivery of instruction, hence ICT

training becomes necessary. ICT training refers to line of data and communication training exposed to lecturers' for skills and competencies with the use of ICT tools for instructional delivery, developing research outputs, processing analyzing -data and prediction relationship or influence of variables.

Workshop is a physical activities of group of individual who adhered to share Skills and knowledge towards achieving certain goal or for solving a challenge. The focus of workshop is to open a new way of doing things, new innovative ideas and skills.

A seminar is an academic meeting or presentation focused on a specific topic, where participants actively engage through discussion and sharing of knowledge towards achieving certain goal. It fortify reading and writing culture among lecturers. It also enables students, researchers and lecturers to share knowledge, research outputs and discussion on ways to supply solutions to existing society problems (Alwajud & Adoe 2019).

Viability of tertiary institutions in Osun State South West Nigeria has been a challenge to the authority and all the stakeholders in educational sectors in the state nevertheless, antecedent have shown that there are many competing issues to be look into. Studies into tertiary institution, sustainability carried out by several researchers such as Akande and Evans, 2015; Grecy and Ipina, 2015; Aweto, Fakoya and Grecy, 2020; Solis Espallargas et al. 2019, among others have not really apprehend the extent to which academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building could help in achieving Sustainability of government owned tertiary institutions in Osun State South West Nigeria. Consequently, the call for this study.

Statement of the Problem

Incessant strike actions by staffs of government owned tertiary institutions in South West Nigeria has, affected their standard of education and their sustainability. Records reveal that majority of the strike actions are related to the problem of insufficient funding of the institutions which has led to dilapidated infrastructures, inadequate books in the library brain drain, outdated laboratories equipment and obsolete educational system among others, Addressing these challenges. Nigeria government established Tertiary Education Trust fund (TETFUND), introduce several fees to be paid by students, increment in prospective students

school fees among others. However, regardless of all these measures, sustainability of tertiary institutions could not still be realized in the public tertiary institutions in Osun State South west Nigeria. Hence, this Study sought to find out the choice factors that are needed to be addressed to achieve their sustainability; could it be that the institutions have not been looking inward to resolve these challenges of tertiary institutions who suppose to be intellectual human capital are not commercializing their intellectual ideas with the real, sector of the economy? Or tertiary institution human capital that is the academic staffs were not given enough capacity building to supply answers to the challenges confronting the system. These questions and many more have led to this study to examine the extent to which academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building can help in achieving sustainability of government - owned tertiary institutions in Osun State South-West Nigeria.

Objective of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to examine academic entrepreneurial innovations, capacity building and public tertiary institution sustainability in Osun State. Specifically; this study sought to examine the:

1. Level of academic entrepreneurial innovation supports given to lecturers in the state government owned tertiary institution
2. Level of capacity building enjoyed by lecturers in public tertiary institutions in the state.
3. Level of management commitment to the sustainability of Osun State government owned tertiary institutions.

Research Questions

The following research questions were stated to guide the study

1. What is the level of academic entrepreneurial innovation supports given to the lecturers in the state government owned tertiary institutions.
2. What is the level of capacity building enjoyed by lecturers in the public tertiary institutions
3. What is the level of management commitments to the sustainability of Osun State government owned tertiary institutions.

Significance of the Study

The outcome of this study supposed to shed light on academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building for the sustainability of tertiary institutions.

This would help:

1. Tertiary institutions management to moderate capacity building for their staffs towards the sustainability of the institution.
2. Policy markets in education at tertiary level to formulate policies on how to sustain tertiary institutions through academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building of staffs.
3. Stakeholders to modify the operational and instructional activities of entrepreneurial innovations towards the sustainability of the institution.
4. Expected researchers to use the findings of this research as a spring board for further studies.
5. Regulatory organizations such as NUC and NBTE on how to collaborate with the industries on intellectual ideas and outputs from research towards linkages for tertiary institutions revenue generations.
6. The general public would also gain from the findings of the study after publication. They would have the knowledge of the extent to which academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building could, enhance tertiary institutions sustain ability which may lead to reduction in the annual industrial strike action.

Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. It was adopted because the study aimed at eliciting opinion of respondents on academic entrepreneurial innovation and capacity building for tertiary institution sustainability. The study was carried out in Osun State, Nigeria. Osun State is one of the six states in South West geopolitical zone of Nigeria. The four tertiary institution used for the study are: University of Ilesa, Ilesa; Osu State University Osogbo, Polytechnic Ire and College of Technology Esa-Oke. Permanent academic staffs of the named institutions constituted the population of the study. The total population for the study was 1,430 which consist of 300 lecturers from the two polytechnic and 1,130 lecturers from the two universities. The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire tagged “Academic Entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building for tertiary institutions sustainability questionnaire” (AEICTISQ). The instrument was developed based on the

research questions and literature reviewed on the research topic. The questionnaire were structured to have four points rating scale of strongly Agree (SA) =4, Agree (A)=3, Disagree (D)=2 and strongly Disagree (SD)=1. It was face and contents validated by four experts outside the scope of the study to ensure validity, clarity, and suitability of items, missing information and to observed errors. Their criticisms and suggestions in terms of relevance of the items in the research instrument, phrasim, coverage and suitability served as valuable inputs used to modify the research instrument. To ensure the reliability of the instrument, a pretest analyses of 100 copies of the instrument were administered to respondents outside the study location. The retrieved instruments were analysed through Cronbach Alpha technique and yielded a coefficient value 0.75 indicating that the instrument is suitable for data collection. The researcher sought the permission of Head of Departments in each of the tertiary institutions and with the assistance of four staffs members, the data collection lasted for four weeks with 85% returned of the research instrument.

Descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, any item of 2.50 and above was rated as strongly agree and agree while items below 2.50 was rated strongly disagree and disagree.

Results

The result of the study was based on the research questions answered.

Table 1

Mean and standard deviation of University and Polytechnic lecturers responses on level of academic entrepreneurial innovations in public tertiary institutions in Osun State.

S/N	Level of academic entrepreneurial innovations supports given to lecturers in the public tertiary institutions in Osun State	$\bar{X}_1$	SD ₁	$\bar{X}_2$	SD ₂	$\bar{X}_G$	SD _G	Remarks

1	Entrepreneurial innovations of the academics are well supported and encouraged by my institution.	1.75	0.92	1.61	0.86	1.68	0.89	Disagree
2	Adequate compensations and rewards are offered to academic initiatives in research and development	1.69	0.88	1.68	0.98	1.69	0.93	Disagree
3	My institution has dedicated resources to quickly exploit evolving innovation opportunities	1.80	0.91	1.78	0.94	1.79	0.93	Disagree
4	My institution management show an openness to new ideas and keeps an open mind set to academic entrepreneurial innovations for development and diffusion	2.83	0.92	2.51	1.23	2.61	1.07	Agree
5	The management shows a serious level of commitment to academic entrepreneurial innovations	1.57	0.76	1.53	0.79	1.55	0.88	Disagree

	activities by maintaining an action oriented mind sets							
6	Enough funds are provided for academic research development initiatives	1.68	0.91	1.57	0.84	1.63	0.88	Disagree
7	The management of my institution see academic entrepreneurial innovations as a way of achieving organization objective	2.81	0.92	2.50	1.26	2.68	1.09	Agree
8	The institution management support research output novel ideas and communicate process of submission of ideas to the industry for collaboration	1.73	0.72	1.67	1.65	1.70	1.17	Disagree
9	Industry acquisition of products or services developed in my institution	1.57	0.81	1.52	0.84	1.57	0.83	Disagree
10	My institution management made academic entrepreneurial	1.80	1.04	1.69	0.89	1.69	0.96	Disagree

	innovation a strategic document							
--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Source: Field survey, 2025.

The result on table 1 above shows the mean responses of academic staffs of Osun State government owned tertiary institutions on level of academic entrepreneurial innovations. The value of the majority grand mean ranges from 1.55 to 1.79 indicating that the responses of the respondents for the items fall under disagree because they are below 2.50 cut off points except item 4 and 7 which has 2.61 and 2.68.

The table show that item 3 has the highest grand mean score of 1.79 while item 5 has the lowest grand mean score of 1.55 respectively. The value of the grand standard deviation (SDG) ranges from 0.83 to 1.17 also indicated that the opinion of the respondents were close to one another in their responses. It therefore shows that the respondents were generally in agreement that academic entrepreneurial innovations are not well supported in the tertiary institutions for its sustainability.

Table 2

Mean, standard deviation and t-test analysis of University and Polytechnic lecturers responses on level of capacity building enjoyed by the lecturers in the public tertiary institutions.

S/N	Items	$\bar{X}_1$	SD ₁	$\bar{X}_2$	SD ₂	X _G	SD _G	Remarks
11	My institution sponsored lecturers for conference	1.83	1.01	1.73	0.93	1.78	0.97	Disagree

12	We are encourage to attend capacity building programmes.	1.57	0.89	1.65	0.85	1.61	1.08	Disagree
13	I am empowered by my institution to build on my capacity as a lecturer	1.49	0.78	1.45	0.87	1.47	0.83	Disagree
14	My institution provides opportunities for service training programmes to update my teaching skills	1.65	0.86	1.57	0.95	1.69	0.91	Disagree
15	Government through its agency encourages compulsory seminars for all lecturers	1.88	1.08	1.78	1.06	1.83	1.07	Disagree

16	The institution management see conferences and workshops as a financial burden	3.26	1.04	2.93	1.06	3.00	1.04	Agree
17	My institution has instituted mentoring programmes to support the development of academic staffs.	1.97	1.11	1.74	1.01	1.86	1.06	Disagree
18	I received training on how to deliver lectures through internet	1.90	1.00	1.61	0.92	1.76	0.96	Disagree
19	Valuable networking and learning experiences	2.93	1.10	2.40	1.20	2.67	1.15	Agree

	are achieved through the institution organized seminars							
20	I received training on how to use interactive white board/star board for lectures	1.8	1.00	1.80	1.11	1.82	1.06	Disagree

Source Field survey 2025

The data on table 2 above shows the level of capacity building enjoyed by the lecturers in public tertiary institutions in Osun State. The table revealed that the grand mean value ranged between 1.47 to 1.86 for majority of the items indicating that the response of the respondents for majority of the items fall under disagree because they are below 2.50 cut off point, except item 16, and 19 which has mean of 3.10 and 2.67. The close range of grand standard deviation (SDG). From 0.91 to 1.15 indicates that both tertiary institutions academic staffs were homogenous in their responses. This, therefore, indicate that both staffs were not supported on capacity building programmes for the sustainability of the tertiary institutions in the state.

Table 3

Mean standard deviation and t-test analysis of University and Polytechnic lecturers responses on level of management commitments to the sustainability of public tertiary institutions in Osun State.

S / N	Level of management commitments to the sustainability of tertiary							
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	institutions in Osun State without government intervention or subvention	$\bar{X}_1$	S D 1	$\bar{X}_2$	S D₂	$\bar{X}_G$	S D G	Remar ks
2 1	Organized manpower recruitment and selection	1. 6 8	0. 8 9	1. 5 8	0.9 1	1.6 3	0. 9 0	Disagr ee
2 2	Prompt payment of wages and staffs salaries	1. 7 3	0. 9 3	1. 6 7	0.9 4	1.7 0	0. 9 4	Disagr ee
2 3	Payment of promotion areas	1. 7 0	0. 9 4	1. 6 0	0.9 5	1.6 5	0. 9 5	Disagr ee
2 4	Higher degree programmes sponsorship	1. 8 0	0. 9 1	1. 7 8	0.9 6	1.7 9	0. 9 4	Disagr ee
2 5	Payment of staffs training and development programmes	1. 5 7	0. 7 0	1. 5 0	0.9 8	1.5 3	1. 3 3	Disagr ee
2 6	Sponsorship for seminar	1. 5 5	0. 8 5	1. 5 3	0.8 3	1.5 4	0. 8 4	Disagr ee
2 7	Infrastructural development	1. 8 0	0. 8 7	1. 6 0	0.8 8	1.7 0	0. 8 8	Disagr ee
2 8	Proper maintenance of institution facilities	1. 8 8	1. 8 0	1. 7 2	1.0 5	1.8 2	1. 4 2	Disagr ee
2 9	Organized and sponsored accreditation exercise without government intervention	1. 9 2	0. 9 5	1. 8 5	1.0 2	1.8 9	0. 9 9	Disagr ee
3 0	Organized and sponsored convocation expenses	1. 8 2	1. 0 7	1. 6 1	0.9 2	1.7 2	0. 9 9	Disagr ee

Source: Field Survey 2025

The result on table 3 shows the mean responses of academic staffs in the tertiary institutions on management commitments to the sustainability of tertiary institutions in the state. The value of the grand mean ranged from 1.53 to 1.89, indicating that the responses of the respondents for all the items fall under disagree because they are below 2.50 cut off point. The value for the grand standard deviation (SD_G) range from 0.90 to 1.42, this indicated that respondents were not far apart from their responses. It can be deduced from the table that the managements were not committed to the sustainability of the tertiary institutions in the state.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of the study in table 1 showed that the management of the institutions does not support academic entrepreneurial innovations. Therefore, the respondents disagree to the various measures indicated for its enhancement. This findings is in line with the findings of Ajegi and Alade (2015) who stated that opposing academic entrepreneurial innovations of academic staffs of tertiary institutions prevent the development of valuable knowledge and reduces societal progress and innovations. Also, Akao, Ayodele and Oriola (2020) corroborated the findings asserted that neglecting academic entrepreneurial innovation suppress their creativity and also reduce their economic impact.

The findings on research question 2 showed that the respondents disagree that they enjoy various measures indicated for capacity building in tertiary institutions and thus showed that the staffs were not supported by the management on capacity building programmes. This findings was in concordance with the study of Njoku and Oyebisi (2016) who established that undermining the potentials of academic staffs on capacity building reduces research output for productivity and also hinders them reaching their full potentials. This finding also supports the studies conducted by Aweto, fakoya and Grecy (2020) who confirmed that failure of academic staffs to update their knowledge impede the development of specific competencies and also reduce teaching effectiveness.

From the findings in Table3, it showed that the respondents disagree to the various measures indicated to show the level of their institutions sustainability without government

intervention such as: Prompt payment of wages and salaries, higher degree sponsorship, infrastructural development, payment of staffs training and development programme to mention but a few

This findings agree with the assertion of fowler and ubels (2019) who posited that an institution that are not committed to academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building limits its ability to attract funding, developed skilled work force and diminished capacity to meet the evolving needs of the community and the industry. This study also complies with the study carried out by Ethudor, Nwi-ve and Akuegwu (2020) who discovered that ambivalent institution to academic entrepreneurial innovation and capacity building institution may fail to cultivate strong relationship with industry partners and limiting students in gaining practical knowledge and collaborate on projects for economic development.

Conclusion

Tertiary institutions are crucial for developing a skilled workforce, fostering innovation and contributing to individual and societal development through advanced learning and professional training. Therefore, the need for it's sustainability through academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building. Capacity building of academic staff is a way of developing critical skills and empowering staffs with knowledge and promoting economic growth. Base on the foregoing, the study reveals that academic entrepreneurial innovations and capacity building of academic staff are not well supported for tertiary institutions sustainability resulting to financial instability, lack of innovations, poor community development, poor economic growth among others.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made based on the findings of the study that:

- The management of tertiary institutions in the state should support innovation ecosystems that will bring all stakeholders, including students, departments, faculty and government to foster innovations and entrepreneurship.
- Develop capacity building programs through provision of training and workshops for faculty and staffs on topic related to innovations, technology transfer and entrepreneurship.

- Developing collaborative partnership with industries in order to provide students with real world experience and access to resources
- Proper networking with other tertiary institutions to share best practices and resources
- Provide access to resources by creating dedicated avenue for students and faculty to develop and test their ideas.
- Provide grants and scholarships for students and staffs on entrepreneurial project
- The management should invest on research that will translate to marketable products and services.

References

- Akande, E.O & Evans, C.O (2015). Technical and Vocational Education students perception on the extent of implementation of entrepreneurship education in Nigeria universities. *African journal of interdisciplinary studies, University of Education, Winneba Ghana* 1 (3) pp 145-150.
- Aweto, F.J, Fakoya, E.A and Greycy, P.M. (2020). Accelerating the commercialization of University Innovation. Ewing Marian Knuffman foundation proof of concept centres:www.kaufman.retrieve July 21 2022.
- Adebodun, J.F. Ayo, A.M and Tella, G.E (2016). Entrepreneurship Education- the new challenge facing the universities. A frame work or understanding and development of entrepreneurial University communities.
- Ajegi, O.O & Alade, F.J. (2015) Entrepreneurial universities. Personal Finance and Entrepreneurship. The Nation newspaper, Monday, pp30
- Adenigbabe, Y.S, Yusuf, A.A & Fola, M.E (2019). Entrepreneurship education: strategy for national development. *Delta business education journal* (3) 110-115
- Awangi, F.E. & Ahmad, E.D. (2018). Entrepreneurship education and human capital development: Developing entrepreneurial skills. *Delta Business Education Journal* 2(3), 45-50.
- Akuegwu, A.O, Nwiue, Y.A and Etudor, E.J. (2017). Entrepreneurship: A panacea to industrial and technological development. *Delta Business Education Journal*
- Akao, J.F, Ayeole, Y.A and Oriola, F.J. (2019). Entrepreneurship Education and Graduate Employability in Nigeria. A research proposal presented at Association of African Universities (AAU).
- Akpan, P. & Ita, F.H. (2015). Entrepreneurship and training-the need for evaluation. Institute for small Business Affairs Leeds 1(2)
- Alwajud, F.I, & Adoe, A.A. (2019). Limited entrepreneurial Attention and Economic Development, *Small Business Economics* 8(2) 15-18.
- Akpan, P.O (2014). Entrepreneurship education and poverty alleviation: impact analysis of covenant university graduate 2010-2013. *Social and Economic Models for Development Track*, 44-50.
- Dorothea, P.O & Connie, T.A. (2018). Key to entrepreneurial programme success in Nigeria Universities. *African Journal of Educational Research and development (AJERD)* 2(3).

- Ethudior, N.G & Akuegwu, A.D. (2020) Entrepreneurship education European countries. Fostering entrepreneurial mind-sets through education and learning workshop on higher education Oslo Norway.
- Emeryonu, L & Bernoux, Y. (2018). Alleviating poverty through entrepreneurship skill acquisition in Delta state Nigeria, *“International Open Journal of Economics, 2(2) 19- 28.*
- Fowler, E.C & Ubels, P. (2019). Entrepreneurship studies- an ascending Academic Discipline in the twenty first Higher Education in Europe 1(2), 170-175.
- Gunawan, L.A, Jacob, E.C and Duysters, E.M. (2018). Nexus between University financial sustainability and commercialization of research output in South West of Nigeria. *University of Ibadan Journal of Education 25(2), 140-150.*
- Greco, S.L, & Ipina, N.E. (2018). Sustainable funding of higher education in Nigeria universities in the Austere period: institutional analysis Research on Humanities and social sciences 15(6), 11-15.
- Nwogu, E.J & Nwangron S.I. (2016). Influence of intangible and tangible resources on performance in public secondary school in Bondo district (unpublished MBA Project). University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Njoku, E.R & Oyebisi, E.O (2016). Entrepreneurship and innovative capacity among agric business clusters in north central, Nigeria. AL-HIKMAN managements
- Olakotan, Y.A & Odunlade, S. (2015). Entrepreneurship and small business in Ekiti. *Journal of social management 15(9), 220-235*
- Oloyede, C.O. (2020). Campus sustainability appraisal in Nigeria: Setting up sustainable attribute for higher educational institutions REALCORP 2020 proceedings/Tagungs band 20-25.
- Poelzer, C.M. (2018). Building a sustainable and innovation driven economy in Nigeria Academic entrepreneurship perspective. *Nile journal of business and economics 15, 6- 28.*
- Perera, S.L & Holger, L.M. (2017). What is sustainability university of Alberta, office of sustainability.