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# ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEUB</td>
<td>Comité Ejecutivo de la Universidad Boliviana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLC</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPOL</td>
<td>Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technologies (TICS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Indigenous Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IICC</td>
<td>Instituto de Investigaciones en Ciencias del Comportamiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUC</td>
<td>Institutional University Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSC</td>
<td>Joint Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRA</td>
<td>Key Result Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KU Leuven</td>
<td>Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFM</td>
<td>Logical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC</td>
<td>Local Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOOC</td>
<td>Massive Online Open Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Programme Support Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLCs</td>
<td>Transdisciplinary Learning Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB</td>
<td>Universidad Católica Boliviana San Pablo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPEA</td>
<td>Public University of El Alto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLIR-UOS</td>
<td>Flemish Inter University Council – University Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUB</td>
<td>Vrije Universiteit Brussel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report concerns the evaluation of the first phase of the Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme implemented with Universidad Católica Boliviana “San Pablo” (UCB), in Bolivia. An Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme is a long-term (12 years) institutional partnership between a university in the South and Flemish universities and university colleges. The programme supports the partner university in its triple function as a provider of educational, research-related and societal services. It aims at empowering the local university so it will better fulfil its role as a development actor in society. At the moment of the evaluation the programme was running the last year of the phase 1 (5th year).

The purpose of the evaluation was to collect information to draw lessons (learning), to collect data to account for the results towards the different stakeholders (accountability) and to formulate recommendations to support further decision making process on the IUC, including the overall policy framework (steering).

The evaluation was based on the OECD-DAC criteria for development evaluation (plus one additional criterion): scientific quality, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The evaluation framework covered the individual, organisational and societal levels.

Methodology for data collection was based on desk review of the programme documents, and the data collection included in-depth and semi-structured interviews with Flemish and Bolivian programme coordinators and project leaders, focus group discussions, visits to research sites, online questionnaires and case studies in order to assess the impact at societal level. The analysis and reporting are based on triangulation of data (programme and project documents, self-assessment reports, in-depth interviews, focus groups, observations and online data). The evaluation mission took place from 6 November to 8 December 2020.

Structure. During Phase I the programme was organised in 6 projects:

- P1. Strengthening of Capacities to reduce social vulnerability
- P2. Contribution to Integrated Water Management in Bolivia
- P3. Promoting food sovereignty and nutritional innovations in vulnerable communities in Bolivia
- P4. Rights of indigenous Peoples and transformation of social conflicts in Bolivia
- P5. Entrepreneurial Productive Development
- P6. Development of a Collaborative Learning Community (CLC) approach to co-create transdisciplinary solutions for complex problems of vulnerable urban and rural communities in Bolivia (transversal project)

Brief Summary of the assessments at programme level, main results

- Relevance
  - Responding to needs. The IUC programme with UCB addresses highly relevant development issues in innovative ways, with the final aim of reducing the socio-ecological vulnerability of rural communities in Bolivia.
and urban communities by supporting them to generate knowledge, know-how and practical tools to respond, adapt and anticipate to the problems accompanying the aforementioned changes, and create better inclusive and sustainable solutions. Key stakeholders from rural communities have evaluated the programme as highly relevant. Relevance at institutional level is periodically reviewed and confirmed by the evaluators. Score: Excellent.

- **Ownership.** The appropriation process at UCB took some time and has asymmetries among the four regional universities and local actors (rectors, local project leaders, career directors, etc.), but the overall result is positive. There are several signals showing institutional ownership of the programme that should be confirmed in the second phase. Score: Good.

- **Weaknesses / Room for improvement:** There needs to be more involvement at the level of the career directors. A bottleneck has been identified in departments where previously there was no research practices, therefore the benefits of the programme are not clear to some internal actors yet. Although the decentralisation process has overall, a positive impact in the management of the project, in some cases it increased the workload of local researchers and there are still delays in some procedures and activities.

• **Efficiency**

  - **Link between Inputs and Outputs.** Overall evaluators may confirm that most activities of the project were implemented in cost-efficient manner, with no major deviations on the budget. Consequently, outputs have been delivered also with a cost-efficient approach. However, two main issues have been identified affecting the running of the IUC: 1) the tension between TLCs and the thematic projects; 2) The administrative and financial decentralisation of the programme. Score: Good.

  - **Delays.** Delays in activities and in budget expenditure are attributed mainly to internal and external reasons. The main internal reason for delaying activities has been the high bureaucracy of UCB administration, which brought to the administrative and financial decentralisation (this issue is covered in detail in conclusions). External reasons justifying delay have been the environmental, political and sanitary crises. Score: Good.

  - **Programme Management.** The organisational structure of the programme has a key weakness that has not been corrected in this first phase. From the beginning of the initiative the link between Thematic Projects and TLC’s is not clear. The IUC has not been able to work in harmony with the proposed double structure (thematic projects/vertical vs. TLCs/horizontal). Score: Low.

  - **Weaknesses / Room for improvement:** the need of adopting of a collaborative attitude between all participants and reaching consensus in a common research vision will be crucial for the success of the programme.

• **Effectiveness**

  - **Specific Academic Objectives.** there is evidence (internal regulations, new units, etc.) that the programme has supported the development of changes at institutional and academic level. These changes should continue in the second phase in order to reach the expected outputs. Score: Good.
- **Specific Development Objectives.** The programme has contributed to the foreseen specific development objectives, achieving an interesting impact via the Transdisciplinary Learning Communities, inter-regional and inter-university networks, Knowledge & know-how and practical tools to respond to local complex problems and the participation of different actors (rural and urban grassroots organizations, NGO’s, local government, and members of regional communities) in TLC research and practice. Score: Good.

- **Weaknesses / Room for improvement:** the programme should promote more concrete institutional changes in the 4 UCB universities in order to increase the scope of both the specific and academic objectives.

**Impact**

- **Academic Impact.** There are several examples of academic impact in Phase I, as for instance, the embeddedness of a new research culture with international standards, the new UCB PhD staff (14 PhD candidates) or the development of a Transdisciplinary Learning Community (TLC) approach at the four regional universities. Score: Good.

- **Institutional Impact.** The programme contributed to the Integration of the 4 regional universities into national UCB networks of research cooperation, the strengthening of the University’s role as an active agent within society, the modernisation of UCB administration and financial management and the increase of UCB links with other actors from the Bolivian Higher Education system such as the Public Universities. Score: Good.

- **Development Impact.** The programme had a significant development impact at different levels: governmental, community and also via social extension activities. Case studies have been gathered to provide specific examples of impact at societal level by each project. Score: Good

- **Weaknesses / Room for improvement:** Impact could be reinforced if the different actors agreed a common research vision, as emphasized in several parts of the report.

**Sustainability**

- **Academic Sustainability.** The IUC with UCB allowed building capacities in terms of research, education and institutional management. The 14 PhD students have shown their commitment with UCB and they are already engaged in several (in fact too much) academic activities. Most academic activities developed by the project will continue: new Masters created are achieving good results and will be re-edited (most of them). Score: Good.

- **Institutional Sustainability.** The programme created the main conditions to preserve the results and positive effects already obtained during the IUC. Evaluators identify measures to retain and upgrade human capital, and the intensification and formalization of transdisciplinary and interuniversity cooperation has been increased not only in areas of the programme, but also in additional topics. Score: Good.

- **Financial Sustainability.** The main factors that may ensure economic sustainability identified in the programme are: the creation of five new research centers, the involvement of PhD students facilitating the continuation of the new research lines, the development of postgraduate courses, the enlargement of international and national networks and the progressive involvement of the administrative unit at the University which is raising awareness of the need for more agile administrative and financial systems. Score: Good.
- Weaknesses / Room for improvement: Built capacity needs to be complemented in the future with institutional commitment and funding, in order to ensure its continuation, and this should be confirmed in this second phase.

The figure below summarises the scoring in each criterion at programme level.

Recommendations

Recommendations have been provided at programme and project levels. The following are recommendations at programme level (see details of these recommendations and recommendations at project level in 4. Recommendations)

R1. Reorganisation of PhD Research activities
R2. Increasing / improving relationship with stakeholders
R3. Enhancing efficiency and effectiveness at management/operational level
R4. Building consensus in a research vision
R5. Designing fundraising strategies, at programme and project levels
R6. Strengthening the Bolivia-Belgian networks
1. Introduction

1.1. Structure of the evaluation report

The evaluation report is subdivided in four chapters. In the introduction chapter a background is provided, including the general objectives of an Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme, its Theory of Change (ToC) and the objectives of the evaluation. The Evaluation Methodology includes the evaluation framework, criteria, methodology, and limitations of the evaluation. In this part is also included a short description of Bolivia, its higher education context and the Universidad Católica Boliviana San Pablo (UCB). This introductory chapter finishes with a description of the different components integrated in the IUC with UCB and their evolution during the evaluation period (2017-20).

In the second chapter the results at programme level and project level (6 projects) are presented. Considering the fact that the analysis at programme and project level mainly focus on the analysis of the impact at organizational level, 2 specific points have been added to complement the evaluation covering the individual and the societal impact.

In the third chapter a summary of the main conclusions and lessons learned is included. Finally, in the fourth chapter the evaluators provided recommendations for the IUC with UCB.

1.2. Background

1.2.1. General Objectives and guiding principles of IUC

An Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme is a long-term (12 years) institutional partnership between a university in the South and Flemish universities and university colleges. The programme supports the partner university in its triple function as provider of educational, research-related and societal services. It aims at empowering the local university as to better fulfil its role as development actor in society.

The objectives and content of an IUC partnership between one partner institution in the South and Flemish universities and university colleges are outlined in a partner programme (sort of technical and financial file). All IUC programmes combine objectives of institutional strengthening and strategic thematic capacity building (linked to both institutional priorities and developmental priorities in a specific country). Each partnership consists of a coherent set of interventions (projects) geared towards the development of the teaching and research capacity of the university, as well as its institutional management. The IUC programme is demand-oriented, and seeks to promote local ownership through the full involvement of the partner both in the design and implementation of the programme. At level of change, the concept is such that through a programme approach greater synergy, more added value and institutional impact can be achieved than through a set of individual different IUC projects. Apart from internal synergy, the IUC programme is also looking at synergies and complementarities with other local development initiatives. Although the identification of the fields of cooperation is demand-initiated,
as it concerns a partnership, the match with the available interest and expertise for cooperation at the Flemish side is crucial.

The IUC cooperation with a partner institution covers a period of approximately 12 years with 2 main programme phases – Phase I and Phase II- covering a combined 10 years of project execution time. These phases are preceded by a Phase In and followed by a Phase out.

The IUC partner programme is subdivided in a number of constituting projects (research, capacity building and extension related) which are composed of several of interlinked activities to be realized in the framework of a partner programme phase. At programme level the IUCs are coordinated by a local academic coordinator – with the support of top university management- and a Flemish coordinator, appointed by VLIR-UOS, and with him a coordinating Flemish university. The identification, formulation and implementation of each project is managed by project leaders: academics from both the Southern and Flemish Higher Education Institutions. Flemish project leaders are designated by VLIR-UOS on the basis of an open competition.

1.2.2. Subject of the evaluation – Theory of Change of an IUC programme¹

Every Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme is subdivided in several synergetic/complementary projects (research, capacity building and extension related) which are composed of a number of interlinked activities to be realized in the framework of a partner programme phase. These different projects all have their individual results framework and underlying Theory of Change. An IUC is more than the sum of its projects: through programme level management, the scale of the total programme, transversal (institutional strengthening) projects, the interlinkages between the different projects, the support given by the programme support unit and the critical mass of capacity created, an IUC has the potential to empower the local university as a whole to better fulfil its role as development actor in society.

Project level Theory of Change

Every Institutional University Cooperation (IUC) programme consists of a number of ‘classic’ projects and one or more ‘transversal’ projects, which in this case were organised in 5 classic and 1 transversal projects. The classic projects primarily contribute to development changes at impact level, and indirectly also contribute to the institutional performance of the Higher Education Institutes (HEI) and the role of the HEI as a development actor. The transversal projects usually aim at improving internal services or systems of HEI. This can be in various areas: ICT services, research management, etc. This not only contributes to the different (‘classic’) projects but also strongly contributes to an improved institutional performance of the HEI. In this case the transversal project (P6) includes also some research/academic components.

¹ Based on ToR, p.4-8.
**Classic projects**

At the **output level** VLIR-UOS supports interventions producing different types of deliverables (e.g. deliverables related to education improvement, research deliverables, strengthening research or education capacities, infrastructure and equipment, deliverables related to extension). All these deliverables are achieved in partnership with HEI in Flanders and a partner country. *These outputs are considered as being within the sphere of control of the project.*

At **outcome level** (specific objective) we can identify 3 typical outcomes (Improved research practices, improved education practices and New knowledge, applications are created + uptake by relevant stakeholders). These outcomes are *identified as specific objectives* and can be considered as “use of outputs”: They imply changes in performance, behaviour, etc. *These outcomes are no longer within the sphere of control but are within the sphere of influence of the project.*

At **impact level** the main change envisaged is always a developmental objective (long term). Implicitly it is also about a changed role of the local partner as an actor of change (medium-term). Through a successful achievement at the outcome level, the local actor will inherently become an agent of change for the society. With this change, and the achievements at the outcome level, there will be a sound contribution to development changes. This “change” will relate to the (external) effects of increased research performance/practices (internal) and/or the (external) effects of improved education practices/performance (internal) and/or the effect of uptake of new knowledge/applications/services (i.e. the effective (external) use).

**Transversal Projects**

In an IUC programme, there is always one or more ‘transversal’ project. These are projects that have a slightly different Theory of Change. Transversal projects always focus on strengthening organizational capacities in areas such as internal service delivery (e.g. ICT services, research management, etc.), external service delivery (e.g. extension services), managerial capacity. These projects realize several outputs with the aim to improve internal performance. This improved internal performance will contribute to institutional changes, and will also contribute to the other
projects of the IUC (e.g. improved internal ICT performance will also benefit the other projects. A simplified illustration of possible ToC of transversal projects is provided below.

Programme level Theory of Change

The primary impact envisaged by an IUC is to contribute to development changes through the development results of the different projects. A second intended impact is (a) the contribution to an improved performance of the HEI and (b) a changed role of the university as a development actor (strongly related to development changes). This is the programme level impact sought for. A generic and simplified ToC for an IUC programme as a whole is presented below.
1.2.3. Objectives of the Evaluation

In the ToR the purpose of the final evaluation has been formulated as follows:

1. **Learning**: based on the analyses made by the evaluation team, lessons can be learned about what worked well, what didn’t and why. The formulation of these lessons learned will contribute to the quality of on-going and future IUC programmes in terms of the content and management of the programme, including the overall policy framework.

2. **Steering**: based on the analyses made by the evaluation team, recommendations will be formulated to support decision making processes of the IUC (at different levels). The current mid-term evaluation will be used to decide about - and as an input for - the formulation of the second phase of the IUC with UCB programme.

3. **Accountability**: by independently assessing the performance of the IUC programme (and validating or complementing the monitoring), different actors (HEI, VLIR-UOS, etc.) can fulfil their accountability requirements.

The evaluation’s primary objective is to evaluate the performance of the IUC (programme level and project level). This is the basis of every IUC evaluation.

1. The performance of the IUC needs to be evaluated on the basis of the OECD-DAC criteria for development evaluation (plus one additional criterion): **scientific quality, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability**. For this evaluation, a particular focus needs to be given to **efficiency** and **effectiveness**.

2. The follow-up plan of the programme for the second phase (cf. self-assessments) is also evaluated. The follow-up plan needs to further guarantee sustainability at institutional level (and research groups), and the impact of the university in the development process in the surrounding community, province and eventually in the country.

Next to these standard objectives, these mid-term evaluations also have the following, specific, evaluation question(s)/points of attention (from the ToR):

- In terms of VLIR-UOS IUC programmes, the programme with UCB is rather unique and innovative in the sense that it has a clear programme approach: the transdisciplinary learning communities (TLC). The transversal project (P6) focused on the incorporation of this approach into the programme, which resulted in an increasing support and use of this approach (probably more on the south side than on the north side). What is the current status of this approach? To what extent is it internalized by the project research teams, North and South at the 4 regional UCB universities? Is it already (widely) adopted? And does it go beyond the walls of UCB (i.e. are the stakeholders actively involved? What is their perception of this ‘new’ way of working?)?

- The programme invests significant time and resources to support the TLC approach, and it is acknowledged that the implementation of this approach is time- (and resource-) consuming as it requires a lot of dialogue (internally and with the stakeholders). Does this approach guarantee

---

2 Based on ToR, p.30-31
improved results / ownership / impact? In other words: is the approach worth the additional investments? And is it an approach that could / should be generalized by VLIR-UOS and supported in other interventions as well?

- In 2019 the management of the programme has been decentralized towards the different regionals. How is this decentralization perceived at the different levels? Are the new roles and responsibilities clear to the persons involved? And did the decentralization provide solutions to the problems encountered in the first years?

- The overall objective of the programme is to increase community resilience to challenges of climate change, environmental degradation, migration and urbanization will be realized through the development of high-qualified academic teams in conducting Transdisciplinary Learning Community (TLC) research at the four regional UCB universities. Is the programme research of the different theme projects, moving towards an integrated transdisciplinary research? Are the different thematic projects conducting community-based research at the 4 regional UCB universities? Is the programme research contributing to strengthen communities in dealing with socio-ecological challenges? Is the community moving towards an active position in research?

- The programme proposal emphasizes cooperation with public universities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia with the aim to enhance their research expertise too. Are public universities involved in the programme research and training?

1.3. Evaluation Methodology and process

1.3.1. Evaluation Framework

Overall Evaluation Framework: individual, organizational and societal level

Following Baser and Morgan (2008)\(^3\), there are three levels of capacity:

- A micro or individual level, where for instance skills acquired by formal education, training or other forms of learning could be included.
- A meso or organisational level, which could comprise institutional building via efficiency of processes.
- A macro or society level, including any activity which could affect the enabling environment (policies, etc.).

The conceptual framework\(^4\) applied to this evaluation is represented in the next figure. This figure help to explain the overall evaluation framework of the programme logical intervention and results. This is a simplified model, not pretending to include all potential elements affecting this type of intervention. The basic idea is to identify the relationships between:

- The logical and expected cause-effect relationships between inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact (Theory of change IUC project figures/reference).
- The effects at different levels of the programme/intervention;

---


There are different levels of impacts/benefits of Higher Education, and there are also different levels of capacity development that could be applied in this evaluation framework:

- At the individual level, the effects are related with improved knowledge, increased management skills and improved behaviour/results applied to Higher Education. As a consequence, beneficiaries are able to improve their individual performance, including social skills and networking.

- At the organisational level, beneficiaries may apply their new knowledge in improving either the units organisational structure and/or its organisational processes. This results in better internal coordination, as well as increased and improved relationship with their local environment. Enhanced interaction with the local environment basically allows achieving more relevant teaching and research for the socio-economic ecosystem.

- At the societal level, universities are expected to materialise this more relevant teaching and research with specific agreements and contracts with the local industry and/or society, on placements for students or applied research that meet the needs of the enterprises and other stakeholders. The impact at societal level / long-term would include aspects like social cohesion or its role as engine of innovation and promoter of economic growth.
1.3.2. Criteria

According to the ToR the following criteria must be evaluated at programme level as well as at project level: scientific quality, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. We decided to subdivide each of these criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Quality (project level)</td>
<td>Quality of Research, Quality of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (programme &amp; project level)</td>
<td>Responding to needs, Synergy &amp; complementary, Transversal Themes, Ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency (programme level)</td>
<td>Link between inputs and outputs, Delays, Programme management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency (project level)</td>
<td>The Intermediate results have been delivered, Relationship between objectives, results and means, Project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (programme and project level)</td>
<td>Specific Academic Objectives, Specific Development Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact (programme level)</td>
<td>Academic Impact, Institutional Impact, Development Impact (impact on society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact (project level)</td>
<td>Individual Impact, Academic &amp; Institutional impact, Developmental Impact (impact on society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability (programme and project level)</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Institutional sustainability, Financial Sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According the ToR each of the (sub-) criteria should be scored using the scores: excellent, good, low, poor. We developed a generic scoring system which can be found in the table below. A full description of the criteria can be found in annex 3. From the table below, it is shown that the scores are directly linked to recommendation. The lower the quality, the lower the score, the more important the recommendations are. This allows us to demonstrate directly the link between the analysis, the scoring and the recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 - Excellent</td>
<td>The overall (Criterion) is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Good</td>
<td>Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on (Criterion).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Low</td>
<td>Major room for improvement exists, with a potential of major effects on (Criterion) of the Programme/project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Poor</td>
<td>The (Criterion) is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently need to realize the (Criterion).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.3. Methodology

Methodology for evaluating Individual, organizational level and societal level

**Individual Impact Analysis.** A lot of activities (and results) in the projects in the IUC are related to several types of trainings (like PhD’s, upgrading staff through short courses/trainings, research activities). So, at the individual level, it is important to evaluate the results of these trainings. The Individual Impact will be assessed at project level (following the scoring methodology described below / see criterion 5. Impact) and via online questionnaires (see annex 1).

**Societal Impact Analysis.** The evaluation of the societal impact it has to take into account the time frame issue (long term) and the specific context of the action. This analysis will focus on identifying evidence on the contribution of the project to social cohesion and economic growth. The Societal Impact will be assessed at project level (following the scoring methodology described below / see criterion 5. Impact) and via case studies (see template in annex 2).

**Institutional Impact Analysis.** The evaluation of the institutional impact is the main objective of this evaluation exercise. It will consider the Theory of Change described in the 1.2.2. The assessment will be focused on identifying evidence at output, outcome and impact level.

Special attention will be paid to: 1) level of integration of the project in the local environment (institutional, local and national priorities and policies); 2) detecting tangible impact of the leading role of the university at regional level; 3) overlap/complementarity with other existing initiatives.

A **scoring methodology** has been proposed for the institutional impact analysis is explained in detail (see annex 3).

**Methodology for data collection**

The Methodology is based on **desk review** of the following documents:

- Programme and project documents
- Self-assessment reports

**Data collection** used mainly the following methods:

- In-depth and semi-structured interviews with Flemish and Bolivia programme coordinators and Flemish and Bolivian project leaders. The interviews were based on a topic list (see scoring methodology and questions). In-depth interviews were organized with other stakeholders as well (live and online);
- Focus group discussions and/or in-depth interviews were organized with other stakeholders like students/trainees of the programme (live and online);
- Visits to research sites were scheduled as well;
- Online questionnaire were used to analyse the impact at individual level;
- Case studies were identified in order to assess the impact at societal level.
For societal outcomes/impact (outside the academic context), the case study approach has been used (see annex 2).

The analysis and reporting is based on **triangulation of data** (programme and project documents, self-assessment reports, in-depth interviews, focus groups, observations and online data).

**Mission plan**

A detailed agenda of activities can be found in annex 4. Mission programme

**1.3.4. Limitations of the evaluation**

The evaluation was executed as planned. There were only a few of limitations in the evaluation:

1. The **number of mission days** was limited, and the situation in Bolivia (pandemic, political crises) affected the agenda. As consequence the number of interviews and focus groups were carefully planned. The most important consequence is that external stakeholders could not be interviewed at a large scale. This could be important to identify impact on society and to identify potential opportunities of developmental impact in the second phase. In order to minimize this issue case studies have been produced targeting specifically the impact at societal level.

2. The Theory of Change (ToC) of VLIR-UOS has been developed after the formulation process of the programme. As a consequence, the **logical frameworks of the programme do not match** perfectly with the ToC. According to ToC, outcomes are identified as specific objectives and can be considered as “use of outputs”: They imply changes in performance, behaviour, etc. At impact level the main change envisaged is always a developmental objective (long term). Implicitly it is also about contributing to a changed role of the local partner as an actor of change (medium-term). In many cases the formulated specific objectives in the logframe are the sum of the intermediate results and are not describing the objectives at outcome level. It has been challenging for the evaluation team to take into account the logframes and the ToC at the same time.

3. For the assessment of the **institutional impact** the ideal scenario would have been to use a **Counterfactual approach**, which basically compares the results of different HEIs in order to estimate what would have occurred otherwise. However counterfactual could not be applied in the framework of this evaluation because: 1) there are too many variables to be considered and; 2) because it would be neither feasible nor cost-efficient to establish Control and Treatment Groups (with other Higher Education Institutions).

4. **Self-Assessment Reports.** Most indicators from the LFM had no baseline value, which made difficult to assess the impact of the activities.

On the other hand the evaluation team would like to point out the excellent work done by all participants in the self-assessment reports. The methodology applied in the self-assessment reports and the documents provided were very complete and they facilitated the work to the evaluators, partially offsetting some of the limitations described above.
1.4. **The Context**

1.4.1. **Bolivia** (information provided in the ToR)

Bolivia has all the climates of the intertropical zone, from tropical climate in the plains to polar climate—as it reaches the high mountains, thus the impacts of climate change are diverse. During the past 50 years, the country has lost about 50% of the glacier surface and higher temperatures and stronger precipitation events are expected during the rainy season, which will expose different regions of the country to prolonged dry periods and an increase in the frequency and magnitude of floods, flash floods, hailstorms, overflowing rivers, landslides and frost.

The effects are evident in the social sectors (health, education, housing), economic (agriculture and industry) and infrastructure and services, which affect the way of life and production of the most vulnerable populations. From 1982 to 2014, more than 4 million people have been directly affected by these phenomena, reaching about 40% of the population with an economic impact between 1-2% of GDP, depending on the severity of the weather event. By 2030, 27% of the country could be affected by persistent drought and 24% with highly recurrent floods.

Extreme poverty in Bolivia reached 17.3% of the population in 2015, and is planned to be eradicated by 2025. However, this is not possible if there are no actions to fully develop the national economy and reduce the impacts of change climate. Thus, Bolivia has prioritized a linkage of mitigation and adaptation actions in complementarity with the holistic development in the areas of water, energy, forests and agriculture as part of its 2025 Patriotic Agenda (National Strategic Development Plan).

*Vivir Bien and the Agenda Patrióti*ca 2025 with the vision of holistic development in which the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) of Bolivia is based on, includes the construction of a holistic human being without material, social and spiritual poverty; universal access of the population to all basic services, in the context of the human right to water; a social and community production model that generates wealth and redistributes it to build a more equal society; productive growth based on diversification by strengthening the energy, agriculture and tourism etc. (based on the official document of Intended Nationally Determined Contribution From The Plurinational State of Bolivia, 2016).

In 2019, Bolivia has been confronted with significant changes and challenges, which seriously affected the programme. In August 2019, the Chiquitania region (eastern Bolivia) was confronted with huge forest fires that lasted for 2 months and destroyed 4 million hectares of Bolivian forest. In October 2019, the country was confronted with a serious political crisis that resulted in large manifestations, protests, strikes, violence and repression, the departure of the president, a switch of power and governance and a serious polarisation in society, which is smouldering towards the new elections in 2020. Due to this political unrest, Bolivian universities were closed and no (IUC) activities were possible during a period of more than 2 months. As from March 2020, the country is in lock-down as a measure to fight the Corona Virus. Universities are currently closed until further notice.
1.4.2. Universidad Católica Boliviana San Pablo (UCB)

Universidad Católica Boliviana San Pablo was founded in 1966. Although it is a private university which does not receive public funding (in contrast with the 11 Bolivian public universities), it has a ‘special regime’ and belongs to the ‘Sistema de la Universidad Boliviana’ (Bolivian University System). UCB has 4 semi-autonomous regional campuses (La Paz, Cochabamba, Santa Cruz and Tarija) and 5 ‘academic units’ in rural areas. UCB has a strategic plan 2014-2020 with an explicit research policy including alignment with National Development Plan (see above) A new strategic plan is under formulation, but the formulation process has been delayed due to the Corona lockdown situation. By November there will be a general document with guidelines. Currently, UCB contains 6 faculties with 14678 students and 1250 teachers (41.44% MSc holders, 7.04% PhD holders).

1.4.3. Higher education context

Bolivia has three types of universities: public, private-autonomous, and private. Of the existing universities, 11 are public universities that function with state funding and are coordinated by the Executive Committee of the Bolivian University (CEUB), two are autonomous private universities (UPB and the Military School of Engineering), and 36 are regular private universities. The two private-autonomous universities are financially and administratively autonomous but function under the academic control of the CEUB. The other private universities depend on their income, and are supervised by the Ministry of Higher Education.

Currently, Bolivia has about half a million university students in the 49 universities that are in operation in the country. In the last decade, the number of university students has steadily grown. Ever since private universities started in the 80s, the number of students in them has progressively increased, receiving more than 40 percent of all the country’s new students. This has improved graduation rates.

Interest in developing evaluation systems in universities began in the 1990s. In June 1993 an International Seminar on Higher Education was held in which the shortcomings and challenges of Bolivian higher education were pointed out, as a result of which the need to create a National Council for the Evaluation and Accreditation of the Quality of Higher Education (CONAMED) emerged. The idea was resisted because it meant uniting evaluation and accreditation processes of public and private universities. Therefore, public universities created internal evaluation bodies, and at the national level, the CEUB coordinates the external evaluation and accreditation processes. Several accreditation processes have been carried on, and hopefully they will encourage a genuine concern for quality and continuous improvement and have a positive impact on the resources to support teaching and research. The accreditation processes of private universities are in charge of the Ministry of Higher Education and international organizations the universities seek.

The concern for quality improvement is important because there are few professional postgraduate programmes available making it difficult to have specialized professors. Of the existing educational programmes in the country, around 79% correspond to undergraduate programmes, 20% non-university professionalization and 1% correspond to postgraduate programmes. One of the reasons for this situation is that they pose a financial risk, because they are aimed at a small market with great economic limitations. In the case of doctoral programmes, the limited supply of professors with a doctoral degree
has caused the shutdown of several programmes. The limitations imposed by national regulations on the offer of postgraduate programmes on Private Universities, do not help either.

The training needs of the teaching staff is evident, but the only requirements the CEUB and the Ministry of Education demand of university teachers is a bachelor’s degree and a Diploma on Higher Education (200 hr postgraduate programme on Higher Education). Academic training is not considered in the salary structure of the public university and the academic degree is not decisive to access positions of academic responsibility in relation to the political weight of certain academics. However, some private universities have specific policies to subsidize the master’s and doctoral programmes of their faculty members, and some public university departments put into effect teacher improvement practices. But there are no national policies to help.

The changes that must be made are profound. Research has shown that university teachers in Bolivia, still overvalue books and make little use of ICTs, therefore, they tend to rely on old texts, not only because they are not very interested in searching for bibliography that allows them to contrast theories or question their knowledge and because during their training process no one taught them to look at other sources of information. Access to updated material through the Internet should solve this problem, but digital literacy and informational competence needs to be promoted (teach them to locate, evaluate and use information). Unfortunately, although databases such as EBSCO and HINARI are available to universities, teachers do not know they have them, do not know how to use them, nor do they know the importance of the information they contain. Research shows university professors use technology to search for information for their classes, but these are usually superficial searches from non-specialized engines, with few making use of indexed research reservoirs, academic journals, etc. It is encouraging, however, to find that teachers say they have a positive attitude towards the use of ICTs in the classroom, which would make their digital literacy possible and make them use them as a pedagogical and research resource.

The limitations that exist in training are evident in research. In South America, only the Guianas and Paraguay have less scientific production than Bolivia, according to the Scimago ranking. Bolivian scientific production is indexed in Scielo Bolivia, which has one of the lowest requirements to enable indexing. In Scielo Bolivia there are currently 34 indexed journals, of which 8 come from the Universidad Católica Boliviana of La Paz and Cochabamba (approximately a quarter of the indexed journals are from the UCB).

In Bolivia there has not been a cultural context that promotes research, although in 1860 the President of the Republic Dr. José María Linares founded the first Academy of Sciences, and 100 years later, in 1960 the government of Dr. Victor Paz Estensoro founded the current Academy of Sciences of Bolivia, which is maintained with a small amount from the government that covers a minimum staff. The academics that compose it do not receive any type of monetary compensation. In 1977, the Supreme Decree No. 15111 gave rise to the first political, legal and regulatory framework for science, technology and innovation and created the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development and the Science and Technology Directorate, under the Ministry of Planning and Coordination. Due to political changes, the initiative did not advance and remained on paper. In 1991, the Supreme Decree No. 229908 was signed. It defined the National Science and Technology System, created again the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CONACYT), established financial and budgetary policies, and created the National Science and Technology Fund. This time, depending on the Vice President of
the Republic. Finally, in 2001 the Law for the Promotion of Science, Technology and Innovation was approved. And from that moment on, the Vice Ministry of Science and Technology carries out activities with different entities to socialize the lines of research. So far, more than a century and a half have passed, and science is still largely defining its intentions. So far, there have been no competitive funds for research in the country, and when there are, only public universities and public entities will be able to access them.

Therefore, saying research in Bolivian universities is weak is understandable. Historically, university activity has focused on teaching, not research. Most of the teachers are not involved in research activities, they do it as a secondary activity with the emphasis on teaching and administrative tasks. Faculty members are burdened with hours of teaching and administrative tasks. Academics that value the importance of researching, know what it means in terms of time and resources, are limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Citable documents</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Self-citations</th>
<th>Citations per document</th>
<th>H index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1027748</td>
<td>973456</td>
<td>12224442</td>
<td>3974976</td>
<td>11,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>225079</td>
<td>210612</td>
<td>3577677</td>
<td>685135</td>
<td>15,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>163593</td>
<td>154546</td>
<td>2503834</td>
<td>462718</td>
<td>15,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>114495</td>
<td>107900</td>
<td>1176487</td>
<td>182309</td>
<td>10,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Perú</td>
<td>29732</td>
<td>26973</td>
<td>459692</td>
<td>48810</td>
<td>15,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>41751</td>
<td>39748</td>
<td>541439</td>
<td>57393</td>
<td>12,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>21262</td>
<td>19789</td>
<td>378666</td>
<td>44456</td>
<td>17,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>23889</td>
<td>22622</td>
<td>250610</td>
<td>33329</td>
<td>10,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>5203</td>
<td>4826</td>
<td>125678</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>24,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2796</td>
<td>2562</td>
<td>41756</td>
<td>2523</td>
<td>14,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>41945</td>
<td>39796</td>
<td>363363</td>
<td>63170</td>
<td>8,66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Scimago
1.5. Short description of the IUC with UCB

1.5.1 Overview of programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> Institutional University Cooperation with Universidad Católica Boliviana San Pablo (Phase 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IATI Identifier:</strong> BE-BCE_KBO-0418.766.123-IUC_UCBBPhase1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> IUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract ID:</strong> BO2017IUC034A105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country:</strong> BOLIVIA (Plurinational State of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> La Paz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start:</strong> 1/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End:</strong> 31/12/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner (South):</strong> Universidad Católica Boliviana “San Pablo”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner (North):</strong> Vrije Universiteit Brussel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoter (South):</strong> Marcela Losantos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promoter (North):</strong> Gerrit Loots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact (South):</strong> <a href="mailto:marcelalosantos@gmail.com">marcelalosantos@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact (North):</strong> <a href="mailto:gerrit.loots@vub.ac.be">gerrit.loots@vub.ac.be</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget:</strong> € 2.850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector:</strong> Research/scientific institutions (43082)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

This program aims to contribute to the development of the Bolivian society by enhancing institutional capacity building at the four regional academic units (Cochabamba, La Paz, Santa Cruz and Tarija) of the Universidad Católica Boliviana (UCB). In the last decennium, Bolivia faced rapid economic, legal, social, climatic and environmental changes, having an impact on natural resources, agricultural production, food sustainability and social development and safety. These changes have put urban and rural communities in vulnerable circumstances all over the country, diminishing and threatening the quality of life for its families and members, especially for women, children and adolescents. The program focuses on reducing this socio-ecological vulnerability of rural and urban communities by supporting them to generate knowledge, know-how and practical tools to respond, adapt and anticipate to the problems accompanying the aforementioned changes, and creating more adapted inclusive and sustainable solutions. This contribution to increase community resilience to challenges of climate change, environmental degradation, migration and urbanization will be realized through the creation of Transdisciplinary Learning Communities (TLCs) at the four regional UCB universities, which include the three main geographical or socio-ecological regions of the country: (1) Altiplano/highlands (UCB La Paz), (2) Valleys (UCB Cochabamba and UCB Tarija) and (3) Oriente/lowlands (UCB Santa Cruz), as well as all eight Departments of Bolivia. The creation of transdisciplinary learning communities at the four regional UCB universities is based on two main strategies that will be realized during the first phase (2017-2021) of the program: (1) Improving and expanding currently developed UCB research in the areas of (a) social development and safety (Projects 1, 4 and 5), (b) environment and natural resources (Project 2), and (c) food sovereignty (Project 3) at the four regional UCB universities, and (2) Integrating and transforming the aforementioned UCB research into a transdisciplinary and collaborative learning community approach (Project 6). To deal with the interdependent complexity of the current socio-ecological challenges, this program aims to support UCB to build out interdisciplinary and inter-university research in collaboration with local communities in vulnerable urban and rural areas. By doing research that collaboratively involves local communities as equal partners - equally profiting in knowledge and expertise development – networks that generate knowledge and expertise are created within, between and outside universities. By doing this, the program responds to the most important problems of Bolivian higher education, as mentioned in the VILR-UOS country strategy document: (1) insufficient research capacity, (2) insufficient interdisciplinary and interuniversity cooperation, and (3) lack of research support for institutes outside the universities.

**Overall Objective**

The UCB universities (La Paz, Cochabamba, Tarija and Santa Cruz), in cooperation with public universities and local communities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia, have the training and research capacity to transdisciplinary generate and disseminate knowledge, know-how and practical tools, with the aim to respond more adequately to complex local problems related to social vulnerability, water management, food sovereignty and nutrition, production development, indigenous rights and social conflicts; Rural and urban communities in cooperation with UCB and public universities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia increased their resilience to respond to complex local problems related to economic, social, climate and environmental changes in an integrative way, with the aim to maintain and improve the quality of life for all their members, especially families, women, children and adolescents.
### PROJECT 1: Strengthening capacities to reduce social vulnerability

**Sector:** Social welfare services (16010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner (South)</th>
<th>Partner (North)</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Católica Boliviana “San Pablo”</td>
<td>Odisee</td>
<td>UCB and other partner universities strengthen their interdisciplinary and community based research capacities on social vulnerability; Vulnerable groups, public institutions, UCB and NGOs generate new joint knowledge to carry out intervention plans and programmes related to social vulnerability through the Transdisciplinary Learning Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promoter (South):** Maceia Losantos  
**Promoter (North):** Gerrit Loots

### PROJECT 2: Contribution to integrated water management in Bolivia

**Sector:** Water sector policy and administrative management (14010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner (South)</th>
<th>Partner (North)</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Católica Boliviana “San Pablo”</td>
<td>Vrije Universiteit Brussel</td>
<td>UCB as an academic and scientific transdisciplinary community, has the training and research capabilities to apply and generate knowledge related to the integrated water management from an holistic/interdisciplinary perspective to guarantee proper interventions; New knowledge, know-how and practical tools are generated and applied into Bolivian communities from the different geographical regions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promoter (South):** Paul D’Abzac  
**Promoter (North):** Marijke Huysmans

### PROJECT 3: Promoting Food Sovereignty and Nutritional Innovations in vulnerable communities in Bolivia

**Sector:** Agricultural development (31120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner (South)</th>
<th>Partner (North)</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Católica Boliviana “San Pablo”</td>
<td>Universiteit Gent</td>
<td>Research capacity is built on food production, productivity, nutrition and resilience; Education and knowledge recovery on food production, productivity, nutrition and resilience is presented, and the uptake is supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promoter (South):** Jean-Paul Benavides  
**Promoter (North):** Marijke D’Haese

### PROJECT 4: Rights of indigenous peoples and transformation of social conflicts in Bolivia

**Sector:** Democratic participation and civil society (15150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner (South)</th>
<th>Partner (North)</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Católica Boliviana “San Pablo”</td>
<td>Universiteit Antwerpen</td>
<td>The Indigenous peoples develop skills among to exercise their rights, dialogue and transform conflicts positively; Investigate and generate knowledge to support the development of plural justice and to create specialized human resources in cooperation with public universities and local communities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promoter (South):** Ramiro Molina Barrios  
**Promoter (North):** Koen De Feyter

### PROJECT 5: Production development project for youth and woman

**Sector:** Business support services and institutions (25010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner (South)</th>
<th>Partner (North)</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Católica Boliviana “San Pablo”</td>
<td>Vrije Universiteit Brussel</td>
<td>To enhance the knowledge and educational practices in entrepreneurship of vulnerable rural and urban communities; To develop a supportive ecosystem for entrepreneurs from vulnerable communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Promoter (South):** Gover Barja  
**Promoter (North):** Nikolay Dentchev
Academic objective: a Collaborative Learning Community approach (knowledge, tools and practical know-how) is developed to co-create integrated solutions for complex local problems together with all stakeholders in different regions of Bolivia. Developmental objective: the UCB universities (La Paz, Cochabamba, Tarija and Santa Cruz) have effective social outreach services for the vulnerable urban and rural communities in Bolivia, by their contribution to the TLC’s in different regions of Bolivia.
1.5.2 General state of implementation

The IUC programme with UCB is innovative and ambitious, because it includes 4 (semi-autonomous regionals covering an important part of the socio-economic and biophysical diversity of the country, and because it has a clear programme approach, translated in a transversal project providing support on the common TLC methodology.

Following the project reports and the ToR, the most important achievements of the programme per year have been the following:

### Extensive formulation phase

**MAIN ACHIEVEMENTS**

#### 2016
- Embedment of the responsibility and ownership of the TLC approach and IUC programme in each of the four regional UCB universities.

#### 2017
1. Enhancement of the research capacity at the four regional UCB universities by strengthening existing research institutes and centres and creating interdisciplinary new ones.
2. Increased development and operationalization of the regional UCB academic TLC teams in their own unique ways, as the interdisciplinary nucleus to start building out Collaborative Learning Community research.

#### 2018
1. Increased enhancement of the research capacity of the research institutes and centres related to the IUC theme project at the four regional UCB universities.
2. 13 UCB PhD scholarships (all but 1) got selected and started their trajectory and got enhanced research capacity through methodological and practical research training.
3. Regional TLC members were trained in transdisciplinary community-based research approaches.

#### 2019
1. Overall achievement: increasing transdisciplinary and community-based research in the four regional UCB universities, based on the previous enhancement of the research capacity of the regional UCB research institutes/centres throughout the last years.
2. The administrative and financial decentralization of the IUC programme into the regional UCB universities, which offered the regional TLC teams more research autonomy to respond to the interests and needs of the local communities. This was done, among others, through the formulation of a ‘complex local question’ per TLC.
3. The investment of the theme projects to integrate their research activities into the development of the regional TLCs.
4. The advanced training and supervision of regional TLC members in transdisciplinary and community-based research approaches.
5. The enhanced support and monitoring of the research of the 14 IUC PhD students by regional UCB authorities at different levels (last PhD student started in 2019).
6. Development of a Logical Framework at the programme level that clarified intermediate results as guidelines to realize the programme objective and the development of a communication strategy, including five newsletters, an informative video and the IUC website.

2020 was a complex year for the IUC with UCB. The project has been affected by the following crises:

- **Environmental crisis.** Bolivia lost 50,000 square km of forest during an unusually destructive fire season.
- **Political crisis.** In November 2019, Evo Morales resigned from presidency after a fraught and contested election. Since then Bolivia have suffered a turbulent period of protests and demonstrations that seem to be decreased after 2020 elections.
- **Sanitary crisis, caused by COVID-19**
These crises have had a significant impact on both, development of activities and budget execution. There have been important delays specially regarding to data collection in rural communities, due to the reduced possibilities of mobility from the city to the countryside, and to PhD stays due to the closing of international borders.

Still, important initiatives have been developed to try to fill in activity gaps, as for instance virtual data collection was set up for youngsters of The Maica and Tiraque, rural researchers have been hired to connect UCB researchers to communities, to gather information and to keep permanent contact, etc.

In the next pages there are specific references of the impact of 2020 crises in the project.
## 1.5.3 Quantitative Indicators

### 1. Number of articles published in international peer reviewed journals (through the support of the project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Value 2017</th>
<th>Value 2018</th>
<th>Value 2019</th>
<th>Value 2020</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
<th>1st Phase Results</th>
<th>Comments on progress (e.g. number of articles submitted, number accepted for publication but not yet published, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Article sent to the International Journal of Water Resources Development. The article sent in 2019 is still waiting for peer reviewing. The one in 2020 has recently been sent to revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>1 article accepted to International Journal SCOPUS - Water special issue, authors: Afnan Agramont (PhDc), Melina Balderrama, Marijke Huysmans, Marc Craps. 2020: article submitted (Until 1st semester 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>No international peer review articles have yet published. Yet four articles are on preparation from varios members of the project. Sent to review. Gruberg H. et al. Power relation in the co-creation of water policy – beyond the tyranny of participation and Zorel: Farm household characteristics to understand Food Security in rural households of Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Number of articles published in national peer reviewed journals (through the support of the project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Value 2017</th>
<th>Value 2018</th>
<th>Value 2019</th>
<th>Value 2020</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
<th>1st Phase Results</th>
<th>Comments on progress (e.g. number of articles submitted, number accepted for publication but not yet published, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Mendoza Gutiérrez, L.; Gallardo, R, Castillo, D, Castrillón, T.; Zamora, A. &amp; Montes, F. (2019). CAUSAS Y CONSE-CUENCIAS DE LA VIOLENCIA EN EL NOVIAZGO: UNA MIRADA DE LOS JÓVENES UNIVERSITARIOS DE LA CIUDAD DE TARIJA, BOLIVIA. Ajayu Órgano de Difusión Científica del Departamento de Psicología UCBSP, 17(2), 283-316. The article of 2019 has been published. Other three have been sent to revision and we are still waiting for an answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>(Until 1st semester 2020) 2 articles articles published at Journal &quot;Punto Cero&quot;. Gruberg, Acta Nova; Gruber y Jimenez; Quezada y Benavides; Azeñas y Benavides en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Value 2017</th>
<th>Value 2018</th>
<th>Value 2019</th>
<th>Value 2020</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
<th>1st Phase Results</th>
<th>Comments on progress (e.g. number of articles submitted, number accepted for publication but not yet published, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Congress proceedings. Zorel: El diseño de investigación transdisciplinaria en la TLC-SCZ Books, volume 1-5, each with 3-4 articles by ePC/UCB-LPZ's graduate and undergraduate students: thesis under P5 tutoring and normal UCB's review process. The collection would become a journal. Additionally two books, one article each, from UCB-CBBA and one article book from UCB-TJA as a result of joint student/proffesor's research. All have Publication Committee. Also several professors and students participated in international conferences with accepted presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1 paper by Guadalupe Peres-Cajías, 1 by Willy Rocabado, and 1 by Lorena Reyes Villa in Scientific Journal Punto Cero. 1 paper by Social Communication students in Revistas Bolivianas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1 paper by Guadalupe Peres-Cajías, 1 by Willy Rocabado, and 1 by Lorena Reyes Villa in Scientific Journal Punto Cero. 1 paper by Social Communication students in Revistas Bolivianas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Value 2017</th>
<th>Value 2018</th>
<th>Value 2019</th>
<th>Value 2020</th>
<th>Total Value</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
<th>1st Phase Results</th>
<th>Comments on progress (e.g. number of articles submitted, number accepted for publication but not yet published, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diploma on attention to vulnerable population based on Collaborative and Dialogical Practices. In 2020 (November 19th) we just finished the second version of the Diploma on Collaborative Practices to Attend Vulnerable communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Training courses in integrated water management for stakeholders in each regional TLC. (Until 1st semester 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course on soil quality, natural pesticides, soil cover and modelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training courses for indigenous rights promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Value 2017</td>
<td>Value 2018</td>
<td>Value 2019</td>
<td>Value 2020</td>
<td>Total Value</td>
<td>Target value</td>
<td>1st Phase Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b Number of students that have effectively participated in the new or substantiably updated Master programmes developed (curriculum) through the support of the project</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Number of new courses developed through the support of the project</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b Number students that have effectively participated in new courses developed through the support of the project</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Value 2017</th>
<th>Value 2018</th>
<th>Value 2019</th>
<th>Value 2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>1st Phase Results</th>
<th>Comments on progress (e.g. number of articles submitted, number accepted for publication but not yet published, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>One of the courses was developed in Perú in coordination with P6, “Politics and strategies of research and open education” at the University USI in Lima. A course on “Participative Research Methodology”, organized by two VLIR-UOS TEAM projects at the University of Cuenca-Ecuador was replicated in Tarija by members of the p6 team that participated in it. Another courses on English Academic Writing were developed in Santa Cruz and Cochabamba. Virtual assistance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Value 2017</th>
<th>Value 2018</th>
<th>Value 2019</th>
<th>Value 2020</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>1st Phase Results</th>
<th>Comments on progress (e.g. number of articles submitted, number accepted for publication but not yet published, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Link to COMUJU in Cochabamba Environmental Fair in Pucarani; The Free Course of Children’s Rights (seven sessions); The weaving workshop with peasant women from Tiraque. As a result of the sanitary crisis the extension activities have to be limited as rural communities closed down to prevent Covid-2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Training courses in integrated water management for stakeholders in each regional TLC. (Until 1st semester 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Course on soil quality, natural pesticides, soil cover and modeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Training courses for indigenous rights promoters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Number of entrepreneurial training events and ecosystem events targeting subsistence entrepreneurs directly or indirectly in LPZ, CBBA, SCZ and TJA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Training of community communicators in the Tiraque area. Assistance to institutions in San José de Chiquitos, after the fire in the Chiquitanía. Meeting with female researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Value 2017</td>
<td>Value 2018</td>
<td>Value 2019</td>
<td>Value 2020</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b Number of persons reached through (non-academic) extension/outreach activities realised (presentations, trainings, sensitisation activities) through the support of the project. Target groups can be communities, governments, civil society or private sector</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1784</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of training module packages developed through the support of the project</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Name of Master / PhD students supported by the project</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Start (mm/yyyy)</td>
<td>Name of programme (Master) / Title of thesis (PhD)</td>
<td>Graduated (Y/N)?</td>
<td>Timing graduation (mm/yyyy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Roxana Valda Vega</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>jun-18</td>
<td>Water Engineering Master Programme</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Alejandra Tovar Gaviria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>feb-19</td>
<td>Water Resources Master Programme</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>jun-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Andrea Vargas Elio</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>may-19</td>
<td>Environmental Management, Territorial Planning and Sustainability Master Programme</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ago-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Eliana Alba</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>oct-19</td>
<td>Higher Education Master Programme</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>oct-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Diana Santos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Gent University; Food diversity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Paola Antezana</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ene-19</td>
<td>Master in qualitative social research methodologies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add rows if needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROG**

<p>| Target value: Total number of Master students (directly supported by the programme &amp; contributing to the objectives of the programme to graduate by the end of the programme |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| P1 | Andrea Vargas | F | ene-18 | Being a family from a rural area on a Global and digital era | N | dic-21 |
| P1 | Natalie Guillén | F | ago-18 | (Provisional title) Social management water at the Pucarani Community | N | ago-22 |
| P2 | Afnan Agramont - PhD student supported by project 2 | M | Feb-18 | Sciences of Engineering / Water Management Model for Katari Basin | N | dic-21 |
| P2 | Inti Rodriguez - PhD student supported by project 2 | M | Feb-18 | Sciences of Engineering / Ground water model and irrigation management for Tiraque | N | dic-21 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Name of Master / PhD students supported by the project</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Start (mm/yyyy)</th>
<th>Name of programme (Master) / Title of thesis (PhD)</th>
<th>Graduated (Y/N)?</th>
<th>Timing graduation (mm/yyyy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mónica Guzmán - PhD student supported by project 2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>feb-18</td>
<td>Sciences of Engineering / Groundwater model based on modflow and other tools case of study San José de Chiquitos</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosalva Angulo - PhD student supported by project 2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>feb-18</td>
<td>Sciences of Engineering / Ecotoxicology study on Guadalquivir Basin, comparative study</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zorel Gomez</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Ghent university.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helga Gruberg</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>In process of subscription</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leonardo Villafuerte Philippsborn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>feb-18</td>
<td>Collective rights of indigenous peoples of the Bolivian Plural Justice</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Celeste Quiroga E.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>oct-18</td>
<td>Human rights of indigenous woman of upper Valley Cochabamba</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fabiola Quiroga; Fabiola Valenzuela</td>
<td>F; F</td>
<td>Feb 18-Feb 19</td>
<td>Short course in Human Rights and Development at the SUST LAW programme in 2018 and 2019 at the University of Antwerp</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romel Brun</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>may-18</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship programme</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jorge Salas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>sept-19</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship programme</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>dic-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guadalupe Peres-Cajías</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>nov-18</td>
<td>Sense making of transdisciplinary learning communities.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willy Rocabado</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>oct-18</td>
<td>TLC, Knowledge governance and local decision making processes in Rural communities in Latin America.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Evaluation

2.1 Evaluation of the programme level

The programme level could be interpreted as the sum of the project results and it should be evaluated differently from the specific projects. Looking into the project details, it has become obvious that the programme level is mainly focused on assuring the coordination of the different projects and taking advantage of the synergies which are a crucial aspect for the success of these kind of initiatives. Even more, considering the transdisciplinary approach of the IUC at UCB. The programme has the following objectives (LFM revised in May 2019):

- **General Objective**: Rural and urban communities in cooperation with UCB and public universities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia increased their resilience to respond to complex local problems related to economic, social, climate and environmental changes in an integrative way, with the aim to maintain and improve the quality of life for all their members, especially families, women, children and adolescents.

- **Specific Objective**: The UCB universities (La Paz, Cochabamba, Tarija and Santa Cruz), in cooperation with public universities and local communities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia, have the training and research capacity to transdisciplinary generate and disseminate knowledge, know-how and practical tools, with the aim to respond more adequately to complex local problems related to social vulnerability, water management, food sovereignty and nutrition, production development, indigenous rights and social conflicts.

The figure below summarises the scoring in each criterion at programme level.
### 2.1.1. Relevance

#### 1.1. Responding to needs

**Score:** Excellent

- The IUC programme with UCB addresses highly relevant development issues in innovative ways, with the final aim of reducing the socio-ecological vulnerability of rural and urban communities by supporting them to generate knowledge, know-how and practical tools to respond, adapt and anticipate to the problems accompanying the aforementioned changes, and create better inclusive and sustainable solutions. Their contribution to increase community resilience to respond to the challenges of climate change, environmental degradation, migration and urbanization, is expected to be realized through the creation of Transdisciplinary Learning Communities.

- Thematic projects tackle relevant issues of rural communities with whom they work. In fact, communities have been selected based on their needs and vulnerabilities, and the possible connections that could be established once the programme started.

- Key stakeholders from rural communities as Tiraque, Carcaje, The Maica and San José de Chiquitos have evaluated the programme as highly relevant for them because of different reasons:
  - it is dealing with major problems of these communities;
  - through the programme they have increased their contact with NGOs and organizations, generating institutional platforms on specific issues such as the integrated water management, food sovereignty and youth and violence;
  - it offers a variety of trainings to communities of Karangas, Carcaje and San José de Chiquitos in relevant topics such as entrepreneurial skills and indigenous rights;
  - the collaborative approach on some of the research projects have allowed a better understanding of the issues of women's rights, than conventional academic explanations and expositions would have.

- At an institution level, the relevance of the programme is assessed by 6-monthly follow-up meetings with the national authorities (rector and vice-rectors) at La Paz, plus follow-up meetings with the regional authorities. During the evaluation process the UCB authorities emphasized the importance and relevance of the programme by stating that it adequately contributes to the objectives of the UCB strategic plan.

- Besides that the programme has been coherent with the UCB Strategic Plan in its five pillars –research, training, institutional strengthening, social extension and internationalization. Thanks to the IUC programme, the University has been able to progress on it, and to move from theory to practice in some of these pillars.

#### 1.2. Synergy and complementarity with other (Belgian) actors

**Score:** NA

- Programme level. The establishment of Transdisciplinary Learning Communities for research and training has been one of the main objectives of the programme. Therefore, the synergy between the projects was a primary requirement. However, due to this transdisciplinary objective of the programme, thematic projects (composed by one national project leader and academic members from different regionals, that at the same time
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participate at TLC’s) and TLC’s (that at the same time are conformed by members of thematic projects), have posed a constant tension within the programme.

- Governmental level. Synergy with central and local governments was created through thematic projects as P1 (with the Ministry of Justice, the Local Government of Pucarani); P2 (Ministry of environment and water); P3 (Local Government of Batallas); P4 (Trade Unions of Indigenous Peoples); P5 (technical training institutes at all regional level) and also through TLC’s (with the Local Government of San José de Chiquitos/ Santa Cruz; with the Youth Union and the Irrigation Association in Tiraque; with the Women’s Union in Carcaje; with The Sub-Central Cirminuelas in Tarija, etc.).

- Bolivian Public Higher Education System. Synergies with other Public National Universities have been created, specifically with:
  - Public University of El Alto, in the framework of the UPEA South Initiative, where some project participants participate as both trainers and students;
  - CIDES from Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, that carries out research activities together with P3;
  - Universidad Mayor de San Simón with whom P2 is participating in a TEAM project on water related issues; and P1 is carrying out research initiatives;
  - Universidad Gabriel René Moreno with whom P1 and P4 have joint research activities. An at the level of international universities;
  - The University of Cuenca that trained four researchers of the TLC in participatory methodologies.

- Belgian actors. Main synergies have been developed with:
  - Solidagro (Belgian NGO) with whom a long-term relationship has been established for joint actions in Tiraque;
  - Louvain Cooperation, in order to transfer methodological tools for their staff to conduct participatory research on the communities they have actions with, in Bolivia.

- International, synergies have been promoted with:
  - UNPD from the United Nations, with whom a training for UCB researchers on SDG’s will be carried out from October on, to implement SDG monitoring on the second phased of the programme;
  - Universidad Central "Marta Abreu" de Las Villas (UCLV) in Cuba, with whom a Moodle platform course on 'Interdisciplinary Research Methods for Sustainable Development" is being coordinated to start in 2021, together with scholars from the VUB.

**1.3. Transversal Themes (gender, environment and D4D)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score: NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Gender, environment and D4D themes are addressed naturally in all projects, even though there are no explicit, established, policies at an institutional level. More specifically:
  - 9 from 14 PhD candidates of the IUC programme are women, which demonstrates their important participation and access to scholarships; |
Specific actions towards women have been developed in each project (see evaluation per project);

One of the most relevant action in this area at project level has been the organisation the series of dialogues “Women in Science in Bolivia” (P6).

About environment as transversal theme:

Environment as transversal priority has been address directly by projects: all thematic projects are dealing with issues related to the environment such as access, quality and social management of water; food security and nutritional innovations; collective rights of the land and woods and the promotion of local food entrepreneurships.

At management level the programme aimed: a) to reduce paper and plastic use on all the IUC programme events (e.g. the JSC 2020 which was a zero plastic and paper event) and b) to impulse the use of local food in all IUC meetings.

1.4. Ownership

Score: Good

- The appropriation process at UCB took some time and has asymmetries among the four regional universities and local actors (rectors, local project leaders, career directors, etc.).

- At the moment there are some positive signals in this area:
  - National UCB authorities included the objectives, results and activities of the IUC programme in the UCB national strategic plan as quality indicators to be reached;
  - Regional UCB authorities started to perceive the programme as a tool to be used for enhancing their regional training and research capacity according to the expectations of the national strategic plan;
  - The administrative and financial decentralisation of the IUC into the four regional UCB units is resulting into a broadening of administrative and financial expertise and capacity to facilitate and manage research in a flexible and fluent way.

- Besides that there are some issues that need to be improved at ownership level:
  - There needs to be more involvement at the level of the career directors. A bottleneck has been identified in departments where previously there was no research practices, therefore the benefits of the programme are not clear to some internal actors yet;
  - Although the decentralisation process has overall, a positive impact in the management of the project, in some cases it increased the workload of local researchers and there are still delays in some procedures and activities.
### 2.1.2. Efficiency

#### P.2.1. Link between Inputs and Outputs

**Score: Good**

- According with the abovementioned specific objectives, five intermediate results were developed (May 2019):
  - (IR1) Research institutes and centers of the four UCB regionals involved in the IUC Programme are strengthened in transdisciplinary and collaborative learning (TLC) research.
  - (IR2) Regional academic TLC teams are conducting community research based on transdisciplinary and collaborative approaches at the four regional UCB universities.
  - (IR3) Careers and Departments of the four UCB regionals linked to the IUC Programme (P1, P2, P3, P4, P5) carry out training courses with a transdisciplinary and collaborative approach at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels.
  - (IR4) Knowledge, know-how and practical tools acquired through TLC research are locally, nationally and internationally disseminated.
  - (IR5) The four UCB regionals are strengthened in their administrative and communicative capacity to facilitate transdisciplinary and collaborative research and training (TLC).

- The definition of intermediate results further determined the formulation of objectively verifiable indicators and subsequent actions: 1) decentralization of the programme; 2) definition of regional TLC coordination assumed by regional research coordinators to institutionalized the development of TLCs; 3) the formulation of a complex local research question in each region to encourage linkages between projects and 4) the definition of joint research projects within the framework of TLCs.

- Overall we must say that most activities of the programme were implemented in cost-efficient manner, with no major deviations on the budget. Consequently, Outputs have been delivered also with a cost-efficient approach.

- However, two main issues have been identified affecting the running of the IUC:
  - The tension between TLCs and the thematic projects. This tension is mainly explained but two issues: 1) TLC’s planning is not clear and sometimes interferes with Thematic Projects planning; 2) TLCs have not budget on their own, which means that to execute activities they have to use budget from the thematic projects;
  - Activities with local public universities have been channelled via CEUB (Comité Ejecutivo de la Universidad Boliviana) via a research network, but this network is not operational yet.

#### 2.2. Delays

**Score: Good**

- Delays in activities and in budget expenditure are attributed mainly to internal and external reasons. The main internal reason for delaying activities has been the high bureaucracy of UCB administration, which brought to the administrative and financial decentralisation (this issue is covered in detail in conclusions).
External reasons that had an impact in the activities causing delays have been:

- In August 2019, Chiquitania, which is TLC region of the UCB Santa Cruz, was confronted with a huge forest fire that lasted for 2 months and destroyed 4 million hectares of the Bolivian rain forest. The TLC team of Santa Cruz had to stop all research activities in the local communities and re-defining its role and objectives, which had an important impact on the research process and development of the regional PhD students.

- In October 2019, the country was confronted with a serious political crisis that resulted in large manifestations, protests, strikes, violence and repression, the departure of the president, a switch of power and governance and a serious polarisation in society, which is smouldering towards the new elections in 2020. During a period of more than 2 months, TLC research activities were not possible in all four UCB regions. This situation caused a delay in (PhD) research and the planning of the programme. Several activities needed to be postponed to 2020.

- More recently the global sanitary crisis have had a tremendous impact on both, development of activities and budget execution. There have been important delays specially regarding to data collection in rural communities, due to the reduced possibilities of mobility from the city to the countryside, and to PhD stays due to the closing of international borders.

- However the IUC developed some initiatives in order to fill these activity gaps, as for instance: virtual data collection was set up for youngsters of The Maica and Tiraque; rural researchers were hired to connect UCB researchers to communities, to gather information and to keep permanent contact.

- During this first there several budget adjustments were implemented, and they were made according to changes in the context of thematic projects and the PSU, and justified by the project and programme leaders. Investment Costs during the second year were the ones that had the greater variation –compared with the rest of years of implementation- considering the need to strengthen equipment of the different regionals.

2.3. Programme Management

Score: Low

- A management manual with clear procedures was developed, and with the exception of same cases, was appropriately applied during the life of the programme.

- The organisational structure of the programme has a key weakness that has not been corrected in this first phase. From the beginning of the initiative the link between Thematic Projects and TLC’s is not clear. The IUC has not been able to work in harmony with the proposed double structure (thematic projects/vertical vs. TLCs/horizontal), and the change of the Bolivia local coordinator, although improved the managerial processes at UCB, did not manage to solve this crucial issue.

- Thus, at the moment, and after 4 years, a clash of views and roles are perceived by the evaluators. Some projects have a clear
monodisciplinary approach and do not share the transdisciplinary approach of the TLCs, and the opposite. Projects coexist and interact moderately or minimally, but during the meetings with the project leaders (both in Belgium and in Bolivia) it is clear that there was "a white elephant in the room" of which nobody wanted to talk.

- One of the consequences of this situation is that at the moment (November 2020) there is no follow-up plan for the second phase. Coordinators propose three potential scenarios for the second phase, to be discussed in the coming weeks, and also some project leaders have their own proposals for the second phase.

- At operational level, although there has been an adequate monitoring of the programme, there is a justified complaint from the Bolivia side to improve the dynamics of the meetings (both LSC and JSC), which at the moment are merely informative.

- Communication has been also a weak point of the IUC, especially the first two years. A diagnosis conducted by the consulting company during 2018, concluded that "the programme had significant internal and external communication problems, which made it difficult to take ownership of the programme, perceiving it as a parallel structure to the University."

- After this report the IUC started a communication strategy, set up an own website, and several actions that have clearly improved this area, although the described tension between Thematic Projects and regional TLC’s has also an impact on outreach.

- The perception regarding the clarity and transparency of administrative processes, before decentralization, was low. The regional administrative units did not know the budget planning of the programme and the administrative units were not familiar with the requests of the different projects, which prevented them from working in an agile and timely manner. As a result of the administrative and financial decentralization of the programme, the perception of clarity and transparency of these procedures has increased, as the programme currently follows UCB procedures and standards. Additionally, the administrative units have gradually assumed that the needs and conditions of research projects require a certain type of flexibility in administrative procedures. However, having current and up-to-date information on the financial statements of the projects seems to be still a great challenge, perceived both by national leaders and by the academic members of the different projects.
### 2.1.3. Effectiveness

| 3.1. Specific Academic Objectives | - The initial overall academic objective of the programme was that “The UCB universities (La Paz, Cochabamba, Tarija and Santa Cruz), in cooperation with public universities and local communities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia, have the training and research capacity to transdisciplinary generate and disseminate knowledge, know-how and practical tools, with the aim to respond more adequately to complex local problems related to social vulnerability, water management, food sovereignty and nutrition, production development, indigenous rights and social conflicts” (specific objective after May 2019).

- Below we have included the Objectively Verifiable Indicators of this specific objective, together with some comments from the Evaluation Team. The fact that the Baseline Value was in all indicators 0 is not very helpful for evaluation purposes.

- At the 4 regional UCB universities, a Transdisciplinary Learning Community (TLC) team, including staff members and researchers of the 5 thematic projects gained expertise in Collaborative Learning Community (CLC) approaches by implementing and doing transdisciplinary Learning Community research. Confirmed by the Evaluation Team.

- (2) The UCB, at the end of the first phase of the programme, accompanies the requirements of national development through the training of high-level human resources. Evaluators confirm that academic capacities have been reinforced with the IUC, at several levels.

- (3) A national doctoral school integrating different PhD programmes and specialized in transdisciplinary development research has been installed and is operational, including training in scientific writing, English and native language skills, and Collaborative Learning Community (CLC) research methodology. No evidence provided.

- (4) UCB and its partners have increased their scientific publications in internationally indexed journals, specifically in topics related to the IUC programme. Confirmed by the Evaluation Team, with some asymmetries between projects (see 2.2 Evaluation per project).

- (5) After the first phase of the programme, UCB and its university partners have increased their number of PhD staff members. Confirmed by the Evaluation Team (no Baseline Value).

- (6) After the five years UCB has improved its national and international contacts with academic purposes. Confirmed by the Evaluation Team.

- (7) Knowledge, know-how and practical tools generated by the IUC programme research are included in undergraduate and postgraduate programmes at the UCB and public partner universities. Work in process, limited results until now.

- (8) UCB and its partners have proposed new policies concerned to research, innovation and development, to be adopted by the whole university system. Work in process, limited results until now.

**Score: Good**
Besides that there is evidence (internal regulations, new units, etc.) that the programme has supported the development of changes at institutional and academic level.

- The initial overall development objective of the programme was that “Rural and urban communities in cooperation with UCB and public universities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia increased their resilience to respond to complex local problems related to economic, social, climate and environmental changes in an integrative way, with the aim to maintain and improve the quality of life for all their members, especially families, women, children and adolescents” (general objective after May 2019).

- Below we have included the Objectively Verifiable Indicators of this objective, together with some comments from the Evaluation Team. Again, the fact that the Baseline Value was in all indicators 0 is not very helpful for evaluation purposes:

  - 1) Transdisciplinary Learning Communities are constructed and operational in vulnerable urban and/or rural communities in each of the four regions of the UCB academic units (Cochabamba, La Paz, Santa Cruz and Tarija). Confirmed by the Evaluation Team.

  - 2) Inter-regional and inter-university networks are installed and operating, including UCB, public and/or indigenous universities, urban and rural grassroots organizations, NGO’s, local government, and other community members, in order to fluently communicate, share and integrate knowledge and expertise generated through TLC research. Confirmed by the Evaluation Team.

  - 3) Knowledge, know-how and practical tools to respond to local complex problems in an integrative way are available for rural and urban grassroots organizations, NGO’s, local governments, and members of regional communities. Confirmed by the Evaluation Team, but at limited scale.

  - 4) Rural and urban grassroots organizations, NGO’s, local government, and members of regional communities were involved in TLC research and practice. Confirmed by the Evaluation Team, but still at limited scale (although with good prospects at mid-term).
2.1.4. Impact

### 4.1. Academic Impact

**Score:** Good

- The main impact at academic level of the programme could be summarized in the following points:
  - The embeddedness of a new research culture with international standards, which is visible in the increase on the number of publications since the IUC is being implemented (around 60% of the yearly UCB publications come from the programme);
  - New PhD staff at UCB. 14 PhD candidates are expected to enhance and maintain this new research culture at UCB, and they are also partly responsible of the increase number of publications at UCB.
  - Also the development of a Transdisciplinary Learning Community (TLC) approach at the four regional UCB universities throughout the last 4 years had a significant impact. It resulted in an increased transdisciplinary and community-based research, introducing a strong research-oriented climate at the national UCB university.
  - Besides that the programme (see 2.2 Evaluation per project) was responsible of the creation or updating of 6 Master programmes, benefitting 1578 students.
  - The IUC also contributed in the creation of 102 new courses, benefitting 2202 students.

### 4.2. Institutional Impact

**Score:** Good

- Main impacts at institutional level are:
  - Integration of the 4 regional universities into national UCB networks of research cooperation. This was mainly realized by the theme projects. Each theme project enhanced its research expertise by creating or enriching research groups/centres at each of the four regional UCB units and integrating them into inter-regional research centres or networks at the national level. Furthermore, each theme project implemented its research expertise in the careers connected to its discipline by involving students into regional research activities and translating research expertise into courses and curricula of the regional departments. Also, each theme project currently invests in realizing a PhD promotion within at least two of its regional research groups and/or departments.
  - Strengthening of the University’s role as an active agent within society, retaking bounds with the rural areas of Bolivia. Before, the sole focus at UCB was training. From 2014 on, the University took an strategic turn to include research at the center of its mission. However, it was by the IUC programme, that community based research was undertaken.
  - Modernisation of UCB administration and financial management. The IUC programme introduced a profound reorganization in the whole UCB administration, which much more facilitate and increase transdisciplinary and community-based research in the 4 regional UCB universities. In 2019, the national UCB carried out an administrative and financial decentralization of the IUC programme into the regional UCB universities, which offered the regional TLC
teams more research autonomy to respond to the interests and needs of the local communities.

- Increase of UCB links with other actors from the Bolivian Higher Education system such as the Public Universities: Universidad San Simón, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, Pontificia Universidad San Francisco Xavier, Universidad de Pando and more recently with the Public University of El Alto. These new links are contributing to the development of new academic activities.

4.3. Development Impact

Score: Good

- Evaluators consider that the development impact has been significant. Next points summarise the development impact of the IUC:
  - Incipient work with local governments, as for instance, the participation of UCB academics in the joint construction of the Katari Basin Integrated Water Management Plan; the joint development between the Ministry of Justice and P1 of the free course on children’s rights; the Postgraduate Programme on Collaborative Practices to attend vulnerable communities, etc.
  - At the level of Communities, the IUC Programme had an impact in both, conducting research as well as training community members in different topics.
    - Research. Although implementing a community and transdisciplinary based research was not feasible in all communities, all research projects called for the participation of community members at different degrees. However, impact of research at communities is still limited to the exchange of information and dialogue. Concrete joint interventions based on the evidence provided by research to improve the quality of life of the communities involved is still needed and expected, with the implementation of the second phase.
    - Training. There has been concrete capacity strengthening in communities by training courses a) on legal issues to strengthen indigenous communities on their collective rights to defend their territories; b) on entrepreneurial skills to enhance their economic resilience; c) on technical skills to be able to monitor the quality of water; d) on parenting skills through the parent school; e) on weaving as a strategy to empower women, etc. (see P4 for more details).
  - Social extension activities had also a relevant impact, as for instance:
    - Joint programme response to the climate emergency produced by the massive fires at Chiquitania that led to the purchase of forest backpacks (strengthening the relationship with the community);
    - Training of students and community members at radio skills in Tiraque;
    - Recycling fair at the Koana lake corner, etc.
  - More specific examples of impact of the programme at Societal level may be found in 2.4 Evaluation at Societal Level. (Case studies).
## 2.1.5. Sustainability

### 5.1. Academic Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The IUC with UCB project allowed building capacities in terms of research, education and institutional management; however, this capacity needs to be complemented in the future with institutional commitment and funding, in order to ensure its continuation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The 14 PhD students have shown their commitment with UCB and they are already engaged in several (in fact too much) academic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Most academic activities developed by the project will continue: new Masters created are achieving good results and will be re-edited (most of them).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other training activities should also increase, considering the fact the relationships with communities are being enlarged and becoming more fluid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2. Institutional Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The programme created the main conditions to preserve the results and positive effects already obtained during the IUC. As discussed before, three important issues summarised UCB internal transformation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It has gradually turned into an integrated national University;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It has improved its research standards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It has become closer to communities of Bolivia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We identify measures to retain and upgrade human capital, as described in other parts of this report. The retention of staff members (PhD students) whose capacities are strengthen by the programme was included and agreed upon at the start of the IUC. However and as discussed in detail in other parts of the report, the work condition of PhD students should change in the second phase of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Besides PhD students also teachers who participated in the trainings organized within the framework of the Programme, share their knowledge and research findings with undergraduate and postgraduate students. This issue has been institutionalised via different academic schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The intensification and formalization of transdisciplinary and interuniversity cooperation has been increased not only in the areas of the programme, but also in additional topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In summary, although at the moment the current and uncertain situation of the COVID 19 pandemic and the contemporary political crisis in Bolivia make any prediction doubtful, the way in which the national UCB and its regional universities took ownership of the IUC programme encourages that the effects generated by the programme will continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### P.5.3. Financial Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- IUC participants point out the following factors, which are underdevelopment, to ensure future economic sustainability:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - The creation of five new research centers, linked to specific departments or careers and the strengthening of the existing ones, that may provide the continuity of research efforts. Moreover, the link between them (caused by their joint participation in the IUC
- The involvement of PhD students at the research centers and institutes, to ensure the continuation of the new research lines and topics developed within the framework of the programme.

- The development of postgraduate courses that are gaining prestige nationwide and that can be reedited after the programme has ended, to raise funds to continue research.

- The enlargement of international and national networks, that will impulse research and training standards beyond the scope of the programme.

- The progressive involvement of the administrative unit at the University which is raising awareness of the need for more agile administrative and financial systems, to support research processes.

- Evaluators consider that, taking advantage the current situation of Bolivia, and the abovementioned factors, the prospects for financial sustainability of the programme are good.
2.2 Evaluation per project

2.2.1 P1. Strengthening of Capacities to reduce social vulnerability

P1 has as general objective that “Communities, public and private organizations and educational institutions have the capacity to adequately respond to social vulnerability situations related to gender-generational inequality and migration”. Specific objectives are:

- UCB and other partner universities strengthen their interdisciplinary and community based research capacities on social vulnerability;
- Vulnerable groups, public institutions, UCB and NGOs generate new joint knowledge to carry out intervention plans and programmes related to social vulnerability through the Transdisciplinary Learning Communities.

The figure below summarises the scoring of P1 in each criterion (see Annex 3. Scoring Methodology):
### SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

#### 1.1. Quality of Research

**Score: Good**

- The research produced by P1 is innovative and à la mode: interdisciplinary and community based research applied to social vulnerability.
- Main challenges identified in P1, besides the crisis context described in 1.5, are:
  a. The fact that the access to the rural communities, crucial actors in the identification and validation of the research topics, is usually a complex process (see details in 3.1.1);
  b. The complicated research context for P1 PhD students (see details in 3.1.2) and their initial low research level and English skills;
  c. Community-based research has different process of developing academic publications, which is different from common research (it takes longer and depends on the access to the rural communities)
- The project has contributed to the publication of three peer-reviewed articles, one international and two nationals (plus 5 articles are under revision too), which are values below the initial targets.
- However P1 has achieved during this period an impressive involvement of the target groups (communities), which may facilitate the ultimate aim to scientifically contribute to social change and societal development.

#### 1.2. Quality of Education

**Score: Good**

- P1 had an important input in the community-based, collaborative and relational research training of researchers involved in the IUC, by organizing several workshops and training courses in cooperation with universities from other countries (see also synergy and complementary).
- These practices have been included in research and teaching and are mainly introducing changes in the awareness of the relational impact on the outcome of research and education in terms of enhancing a sustainable interiorization of knowledge and contributing to the empowerment of research participants.
- With regard sharing this work with local stakeholders, since 2019 P1 is organizing a training course on collaborative and dialogical practices for members of organizations working with people in vulnerable communities. Participants perceive that the course as having an important impact on their professional skills. The course also contributes to the strengthening of the P1 research network of social institutes and NGOs.
**RELEVANCE**

| 2.1. Responding to needs | - Project formulation had a participatory approach and respond not only to the needs of the stakeholders but also to their changes in the development context.  
- The philosophy of the project is that each of the topics worked on have been previously identified and validated with the participation of the communities, in order to meet any specific research need.  
- Later on the municipalities/communities may use the data obtained from the investigations to design and implement public policies/actions that involve the main actors in addressing the problems detected.  
- At the moment there is no evidence of such impact but the project has broadly strengthened relationships with the communities of Pucarani (La Paz), Tiraque (Cochabamba), Cirminuelas (Tarija) and San José de Chiquitos (Santa Cruz). |
| **Score:** Excellent |

| 2.2. Synergy and Complementary | - There are several examples of synergy and complementary with other initiatives:  
- Interdisciplinary course with the Université Libre de Bruxelles (VUB), and Universidad Central "Marta Abreu" de Las Villas (UCLV) in Cuba.  
- Supervision of a PhD research with the University of Ghent; use social networks with VUB.  
- Training classes with the Universidad Pública de El Alto (UPEA, La Paz), part of a South Initiative agreement.  
- Strengthening research for students, together with the Universidad Mayor de San Simón in Cochabamba.  
- Elaboration of the "Diagnosis of social vulnerability" in Tarija, promoted financed from P1. Investigation into violence with the Municipal Government of Tarija and the Departmental Secretariat for Women.  
- Participation in the creation of the CTA resilience plan in Cochabamba  
- Also there have been several collaborations with other projects of the programme:  
- Inter/trans disciplinary sessions course, created in coordination with P3, but managed and organized by the P1.  
- The “E-learning - E sharing platform” also increased networking and cooperation with other projects.  
- Work has been done in groups Research groups for doctoral students  
- Visits to the community between various projects through P1 (La Paz)  
- Joint thesis with other projects  
- Interdisciplinary project between P3 and P4 on water management in 3 micro-basins. |
| **Score:** NA |

| 2.3. Transversal Themes (gender, environment and D4D) | No Score / NA |
| **No Score / NA** |

- The following are some examples of how P1 has incorporated Transversal Themes:  
- The approach strategies in Cochabamba have respected the gender quota, with a strategy designed to give security to the participating women. This cut has been adjusted and incorporated in the development of the investigation.
- In Tarija work has been done on the issue of violence in university women, in order to strengthen the intervention with this transversal priority.
- The research topics that include aspects of the environment and climate change have been produced in connection with other projects that were being developed at the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.4. Ownership</th>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- At the moment most UCB stakeholders identify the programme and its impact on the university. Evaluators consider that stakeholder do not yet distinguish individual projects, except for those who are directly or indirectly involved or related to them, which in fact is logical and understandable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The appropriation process has progressed as the work teams have been related and the administrative processes for the execution of the projects have improved (see 3.1.4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meetings with the main actors of P1 (project leader, PhD students, etc.) showed great commitment, although until now there is a limited participation from professors and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFICIENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1. The intermediate results have been delivered</th>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The intermediate results achieved in this period have been:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research institutes are strengthened and widened and research groups are created to generate interdisciplinary research related to social vulnerability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Formal and informal trainings in collaborative practices regarding the attention to groups in vulnerability situation are developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Next intermediate result to be reached are.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge, information and practical tools that contribute to successful interventions in social vulnerability are available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Generating joint interventions to reduce the negative conditions of gender/generational inequality and migration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P1 is on track in order to achieve the expected results in the following period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2. Relationship between Objectives, results and means</th>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- In P1 there has been an adequate interrelation between the objectives and the results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The means/inputs were justifiable and carefully thought-out solution for the defined outputs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Outputs (intermediate results) contributed to the project objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Delays are attributed to crisis context, mainly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3. Project Management</th>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Management manual and procedures were successfully put in place, although it took 2 years to set up fluid relations mechanisms (see 3.1.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interviews and meetings showed that within P1 there has been fluid communication, relationships are horizontal and the planning of activities is carried out in a coordinated manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The fact that P1 project leaders are also programme coordinators has been helpful and beneficial for the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EFFECTIVENESS

### 4.1. Specific Academic Objectives

**Score: Good**

- Main academic objectives achieved are:
  - Research institutes were strengthened (in La Paz and Santa Cruz) and research centers were created (Center for Research in Social and Business Sciences / CICSE / Tarija and Social Sciences Research Center / CICS/ Cochabamba).
  - Research Strengthening through Ph.D. scholarships, increasing also the quality of education.
  - Two additional contributions of P1 in this area have been:
    - The introduction of environmental psychology as a new research area in the IICC research centre of the UCB La Paz.
    - A contribution to the re-thinking process of organizing and conducting research at the UCB universities.

### 4.2. Specific Development Objectives

**Score: Good**

- The results achieved in this first phase are primary internal (UCB) because the idea is to focus on strengthening the institution and the team before being able to address transdisciplinary and complex problems of the communities.
- There are already some signals of how communities recognize UCB as an actor for dialogue and discussion (see impact and case study 2.4.1).
- However COVID-19 pandemic and the political conflict in Bolivia stopped community-based research and fieldwork for nearly the all year of 2020. This means that research activities will need to restart in different communities.

## IMPACT

### 5.1. Individual Impact

**Score: NA**

- See 2.3 Evaluation at Individual Level

### 5.2. Academic and Institutional Impact

**Score: Good**

- The following are some examples of existing evidence of academic and institutional impact:
  - Creation and/or Strengthening of research centers;
  - Increase in Publications in various formats (not specifically in international journals);
  - Improvement of formal and informal training, also with external actors (see 2.2);
  - Practical tools have been generated to increase the scope of research results (equipment and tools that allow data collection in rural areas);
  - Academic and research dissemination improved, targeting a wide variety of stakeholders;
  - Developed and strengthened networking, specifically in interdisciplinary and community-based research capacities on social vulnerability.
- See more details in 1.5.4 Quantitative Indicators
### 5.3. Development Impact (Impact on Society)

**Score: Good**

- As discussed before, main impact of P1 will come in the second phase of the project. However there are some examples of existing evidence in this issue:
  - One example is coming from the Pucarana Rural Academic unit where the transfer of knowledge between the various actors in the programme has been facilitated, to address specific problems in the community and facilitate processes in the rural communities.
  - More details and a case studies of this may be found in 2.41, Construction of a Women and youth ‘s learning community (Tiraque Community).

### SUSTAINABILITY

#### 6.1. Academic & Institutional Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- P1 strategy for academic and institutional sustainability is focused on improving the research capacity through: a) the research institutes and centers and, b) the training of human resources.
  - Following this, the institutionalisation of P1 research is on track, and the next step with regard the training of researchers will be the design of postgraduate and continuing training programmes, which may generate economic resources and allow the continuity of the research activities.
  - In this context the position of different stakeholders (communities) in order to approve the continuation of the project activities is crucial, but it is assumed that this will be the case because the activities aim to reduce the vulnerability of the population.

#### 6.2. Financial Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- Financial sustainability depends on: a) consolidation of P1 research lines; b) availability of funding agents for the specific research topic.
  - In order to achieve the consolidation of P1 research lines (a), UCB should continue with policies to consolidate research, including the stabilization of the PhDs trained in the project.
  - With the regard the capture of external funding (b) there are already some positive experiences which may envisage a promising future:
    - Pucarani, Tarija and Cochabamba centers received funding for the creation of the research line of Social vulnerability due to Environmental Causes in La Paz.
    - In La Paz two new projects have been funded: 1) the research project on Cultural Adaptation and Community perception of Water household treatment by using Water Filters funded by SwissContact, and 2) the Research Project on the Impact of Women's life by Hydrocarbon Activity funded by Fundación Jubileo and the Observatory of Social Debt in Bolivia.
    - Also in Tarija P1 participants developed a project on the situation of dating violence on college youth in the city of Tarija, funded by the Municipality of the same city.
2.2.2 P2. Contribution to Integrated Water Management in Bolivia

P2 has as general objective that “Bolivian communities in the different geographical regions (La Paz, Cochabamba, Santa Cruz and Tarija) enhanced their capacity to manage water in an integrated way”.

P2 had the following specific objectives:
- To strengthen UCB academic capabilities (education, training, research) so it will become a catalyser for the country’s development in the areas of Environment and Water management;
- To participate in regional Transdisciplinary Learning Communities improving the integral comprehensive understanding of the water problems in Bolivia to benefit the most vulnerable communities.

The figure below summarises the scoring of P2 in each criterion (see Annex 3. Scoring Methodology):
### SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Quality of Research</th>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The R&amp;D carry out by P2 is innovative and in line with international standards on the Integrated Water Management topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The project has contributed to the publication of 1 article in an international journal (target value was 8).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In the other hand P2 presented research results in 5 in relevant international conferences and also in several workshops (in this case exceeding the target value).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The main reason of the limited productivity in the publication in international journals (besides the mentioned crises) is the heavy administrative burden and a suboptimal organization and planning of doctoral work of PhD students, caused by their teaching and administrative tasks (see details in 3.1.2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The involvement of the main water stakeholders via outreach activities is impressive and exceeds the initial expectations, which confirm local the interest on the research carried out by P2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2. Quality of Education</th>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- P2 did not reach their indicators with regard the number of new Master programmes, number of students or number of new courses developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The strengthening and appropriation of P2 academic activities is an ongoing process that is taking longer than expected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- However the notorious success of P2 extension activities via training modules (Integrated Water Management training modules) or training courses for stakeholders carried out in each regional TLC allows to confirm how relevant are P2 activities for the local stakeholders (more than 2000 persons participated in this first phase).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Thus, there is significant evidence on how education outputs were shared with local stakeholders, as later also described in impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RELEVANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1. Responding to needs</th>
<th>Score: Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Project formulation had a participatory approach and responded not only to the needs of the stakeholders but also to their changes in the development context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In fact P2 did an extensive and rigorous work before the start of the project (Mission and PCM Workshop), which contributed to the design of a sound strategy. This strategy has as first step to generate data in order to understand the real and integrated situation of water management. Later on the idea is to take into account the identified data/factors in action research projects that will have a calculated impact in the short, medium and long term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Several actions have been carried out in order to present P2 results (mainly the data obtained) to the communities. The exchanges allowed evaluating the priorities to be resolved with an integrated vision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholders insist on the relevance of the water theme that is associated with other crucial issues (health, food and economic issues) that are the roots of the vulnerability of communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2. Synergy and Complementary

**Score:** NA

- Synergies and complementary with other projects of the programme:
  - P2 PhD thesis are disciplinary and as the project has been built around these investigations, this has limited interactions with other projects.
  - However, making progress in the projects, synergies have been established and joint projects are being worked on, mainly with the P3 (in Cochabamba and San José de Chiquitos).
- Synergies and complementary with other actors:
  - P2 established cooperation links with other international cooperation actors such as the French cooperation, the Swedish cooperation, the Japanese cooperation, the German cooperation.
  - P2 Bolivian leader contributed to win JOINT project from VLIR-UOS (“Promoting active deep learning in Water Resources using MOOCs” initiated by the Guido Wyseure team from the Geo-institute in the KU Leuven).
  - Also the Belgian NGO Solidagro is working closely with the P2 team in Tiraque (Cochabamba). Unfortunately, the NGO is withdrawing from the study area, but collaboration will continue in other areas. P2 have been identified no other Belgian actors in the intervention areas.

### 2.3. Transversal Themes (gender, environment and D4D)

**Score:** NA

- The transversal topics of environmental sustainability and gender equality have not been directly considered but are implicitly taken into account in P2 activities.
  - Environmental sustainability works thanks to an integrated vision of water problems.
  - The gender issues are naturally included in P2. Bolivian actors are mainly female engineers and the entire Flemish team is female. Initially, the Bolivian and Flemish leaders were women. Besides that, there is also a greater affinity for water research from female students.

### 2.4. Ownership

**Score:** Good

- Ownership at researchers level is very significant and confirmed in the interviews and focus groups. Their commitment to P2 activities is high.
  - At careers level ownership is also outstanding because they perceive the added value of the project in their activities.
  - However at institutional level the appropriation of the programme is a long and complex process, because – in opinion of P2 participants – UCB authorities are mainly focused in short-term objectives (e.g. attracting students), and the recognition of the programme is low.
## EFFICIENCY

### 3.1. The intermediate results have been delivered

**Score: Good**

- As pointed out before there is a delay with regard the expected articles to be published in international journals. The initial target was, in the opinion of the evaluation team, over-optimistic.
- Evaluators appreciate the work carried out in the laboratories of the 4 regions in order to provide the minimum research conditions for PhD students.
- Thus, results are relevant but limited, and the link between the TLCs and the P2 PhD research projects is not productive.
- Nevertheless, the limited interaction with the TLCs is not affecting the expected outputs of the project until now.

### 3.2. Relationship between Objectives, results and means

**Score: Good**

- P2 had an acceptable interrelation between the objectives and the results obtained.
- Means/inputs are justifiable and carefully thought-out solution for the foreseen outputs.
- Investments performed in this first phase in terms of equipment, training of researchers, etc., are expected to produce the desired results in the coming months.

### 3.3. Project Management

**Score: Good**

- P2 Bolivia leader changed in 2019 which provided a different vision (not with the alignment of the previous leader), and some negative consequences in the planning of activities of the project. However, communication between the Flemish and the Bolivia teams is fluid but sometimes also scarce.
- Relationship with TLCs is difficult because of the different vision of the initiative, and this is also the case with the programme coordination.
- Relationships with other projects is good but also limited.
- Internal Project Management is, according with the sources consulted, efficient and practical.

## EFFECTIVENESS

### 4.1. Specific Academic Objectives

**Score: Good**

- The limited research productivity has been offset by the outstanding interaction with water stakeholders.
- Training modules and courses targeting stakeholders are producing changes in awareness and knowledge, which will also contribute in the future research activities.
- Academic changes at institutional level are not evident, mainly because of lack or poor communication with career directors and relevant institutional actors.

### 4.2. Specific Development Objectives

**Score: Good**

- As described before, there are several examples of how P2 outputs were shared with local stakeholders.
- More that 2000 local stakeholders participated in P2 extension activities, providing and interesting background for the coming actions.
- Future activities should provide evidence on changes in behaviour at the level of the involved stakeholders.
### IMPACT

#### 5.1. Individual Impact
Score: NA

- See 2.3 Evaluation at Individual Level

#### 5.2. Academic and Institutional Impact
Score: Good

- There are several constraints that have limited the academic and institutional impact of P2: the heavy UCB bureaucratic processes, the centralization of the administration (until the decentralization) or the lack of institutionalization of the programme.
- However, P2 had relevant impact at 4 basic levels, providing a good academic and institutional background for the next phase.
- Those are: 1) impact on the research organization (defining lines of research, strengthening the research centers, etc.); 2) impact by improving the research methodology, considering international standards; 3) impact by training of researchers, and allowing to improve their academic careers; 4) impact by reinforcing the UCB research infrastructure (laboratories).

#### 5.3. Development Impact (Impact on Society)
Score: Good

- P2 incipient impact on society has been focused on collecting and producing water management information, which will provide a strong basis for decision making by stakeholders.
- Courses developed also confirm how P2 is responding to requests from the communities and other stakeholders.
- Nevertheless, it has been identified that the main weakness of P2's work at this level is the lack of systematization of the produced information. P2 participants are already applying remedial actions to improve this specific issue.

### SUSTAINABILITY

#### 6.1. Academic & Institutional Sustainability
Score: Good

- P2 participants are aware of the need of funding in order to continue research, and they seem to be committed this task. However, they admit that they have not planned yet a new strategy for capturing R&D funds.
- Nevertheless, there are some signs that allow P2 members to be optimistic: 1) the investment in infrastructure (laboratories) and the accreditation as water inspection organism allow offering those services at short term; 2) there is a complementary team at national level which may facilitate to carry out consultancies for different agents; 3) alliances with stakeholders and also other local and foreign universities could promote the participation on international competitive call (Framework programme, etc.).

#### 6.2. Financial Sustainability
Score: Good

- The level of maturity of the project does not allow to think about a financial sustainability at short term. However, and considering the above-mentioned signs, there is evidence of potential funding in the near future, considering some recent positive experiences:
- The co-organisation of an international congress, together with the Public University of Cochabamba, with Swedish funds;
- A joint project about the use of MOOCs for comprehensive water management for VLIR UOS (led by KU Leuven);
- A project funded by the French Embassy in the Chiquitania area (with contacts established during the water congress).
2.2.3 P3. Promoting food sovereignty and nutritional innovations in vulnerable communities in Bolivia

P3 has the following general objective: “To promote food production, productivity and resilience to reduce vulnerability in food sovereignty and nutrition in selected communities”

For the first five years of the programme, the project aimed to (specific objectives):

- Build research capacity, on food production, productivity, nutrition and resilience;
- Develop and present education and knowledge recovery on food production, productivity, nutrition and resilience, and support its uptake.

The figure below summarises the scoring of P3 in each criterion (see Annex 3. Scoring Methodology):
## SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

| 1.1. Quality of Research | - P3 is producing relevant and innovative research, and the team has identified additional topics, which have high potential for publication in this specific field (agricultural economics).  
- No results have been published yet in international refereed journals (the initial target was 4), but there are significant achievements at national level (national peer reviewed journals) and in one international conference.  
- The main challenges in this area have been:  
  - The high workload of the PhD students, limiting their research work;  
  - The complex relationship with the TLCs;  
  - The variation of the approach in the project because the change of the coordinator (from a more experimental to a more socio-economic research focus). |

| Score: Good |

| 1.2. Quality of Education | - Education activities have been focused on:  
  - Training the PhD students and the researchers participating in P3;  
  - Supporting new courses (11), including a “Diplomado” on Food Sovereignty and System.  
  - PhD students and researchers reported positively about the quality of the trainings provided by Flemish participants.  
  - Courses also achieved significant success in terms of quantitative (192 students) and qualitative indicators (feedback). |

| Score: Good |

## RELEVANCE

| 2.1. Responding to needs | - There is a clear alignment between P3 and the needs of communities, National policies, and also with VLIR-UOS country strategy.  
- Some project activities address specific needs at community level: modelling productive conditions, quality of agriculture production, etc.  
- Other research activities have a more global approach about the food system, and consequently the impact on the communities will take some time.  
- The overall relevance is the excellent quality. |

| Score: Excellent |

| 2.2. Synergy and Complementary | - P3 developed synergy and complementary with P1 (in La Paz), P2 (Tiraque and Cochabamba), P4 (also Tiraque) and P5 (La Paz and Tiraque too).  
- Synergies have also been generated with actors from the Belgian development cooperation (INCCA and SOLIDAGRO). Specifically the collaboration with SOLIDAGRO has been instrumental to access the communities and to identify the most relevant research problems.  
- P3 also cooperated with Universidad Mayor de San Simón and its decentralized unit located in Tiraque. |

| Score: NA |

| 2.3. Transversal Themes (gender, environment and D4D) | - Regarding gender:  
  - The two PhD researchers of P3 are female as are many of the researchers involved. |
| Score: **NA** | - Gender is included the research on different activities (master thesis, etc.).  
- About environmental sustainability, this is a key area of P3. Food production, food security and food sovereignty, environmental sustainability is present in most P3 research activities.  
- The agricultural sector is an important actor in climate change. P3 carried out different activities stressing its impact and how research in this field may mitigate the negative consequences. |
|---|---|
| **2.4 Ownership** | - Ownership at P3 level is visible at different levels:  
  - Food sovereignty has become a recognized as research topic at institutional level.  
  - The transdisciplinary research approach has also been integrated through the different regions, and at the moment is considered a key tool to give effective response to local needs.  
  - P3 topic (food sovereignty) has increasingly been introduced in the educational programmes. |
| **Score: Good** | |
- Besides that, Guidelines and working relations with the PSU and the coordinators has been good, and the communication was fluid during this phase.
- Coordination between the Flemish and the Bolivian teams has been very satisfactory for both parts.

**EFFECTIVENESS**

| 4.1. Specific Academic Objectives | - The specific project objectives (1. build research capacity, on food production, productivity, nutrition and resilience and 2. develop and present education and knowledge recovery on food production, productivity, nutrition and resilience, and support its uptake) are expected to be achieved in the second phase, as the project is on track.
- Some minor room for improvements exists, which are common to most of the projects (see 4. Recommendations)
- P3 shows evidence of impact at institutional level and in organizational capacity, as described before. |
| Score: Good |

| 4.2. Specific Development Objectives | - P3 development objectives are supported for the good results achieved in extension activities, namely:
- Number of (non-academic) extension/outreach activities realised (presentations, trainings, sensitisation activities) through the support of the project. Target groups can be communities, governments, civil society or private sector). Target: 8 / P3 Total: 13 (+5)
- Number of persons reached through (non-academic) extension/outreach activities realised (presentations, trainings, sensitisation activities) through the support of the project. Target groups can be communities, governments, civil society or private sector). Target: 100 / P3 Total: 370 (+270)
- Number of training module packages developed through the support of the project. Target: 2 / P3 Total: 6 (+4) |
| Score: Good |

**IMPACT**

| 5.1. Individual Impact | - See 2.3 Evaluation at Individual Level |
| Score: NA |

| 5.2. Academic and Institutional Impact | - The academic and institutional impact of P3 was high. The following are some examples:
- UCB research capacity has been reinforced via different institutional/capacity building activities, including doctoral research, training (8 specialist courses), fieldwork and networking;
- The project also facilitated the introduction to an operationalizing transdisciplinarity, which took some time but what is having a significative impact on the current UCB research collaborations; |
| Score: Good |
- The project also promoted the inclusion of the topic in the UCB research agenda and contributed to the change of the role of the university as a development actor.

- P3 contributed to the increase of networking with communities which first increased the UCB visibility with local stakeholders, and second, it will facilitate an interaction that will support their development.

- This interaction has been carried out via extensive fieldwork. In the framework of these activities the research groups provided information and inputs to the local communities in different relevant areas (environment, food production, food consumption and nutrition).

- P3 researchers consider that all these activities are examples of transdisciplinary experiences requiring a dialogue and knowledge exchange between academics and non-academics.

### SUSTAINABILITY

#### 6.1. Academic & Institutional Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- Academic and institutional sustainability are not confirmed yet in P3, as there is a need of including the topic not only in the UCB research agenda (research line is approved in some regions) but in the different regional Research Centers (which is not a reality at the moment);

- However there is a consensus among academics about potential funding opportunities that this topic may attract in the coming years.

- See R5 for details on the need of fundraising strategies at programme and project levels

#### 6.2. Financial Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- Financial sustainability of the project will depend on the capacity to attract funding of P3 in international research calls, as at the moment there is no evidence of the existence of national funding.

- Evaluators suggest to have a programme approach in order to start designing an exit and fundraising strategy for the second phase.

- Coordination of these activities should come at programme level, in order to avoid overlapping of actions and take advantage synergies.
2.2.4 P4. Rights of indigenous peoples and transformation of social conflicts in Bolivia

P4 has as general objective that “Bolivian communities enhanced their knowledge and capacities to improve their practice of human and indigenous rights in the framework of Plural Justice”.

Specific objectives are:

- Indigenous people of the regionals TLC are trained to use new generated knowledge to orientate the exercise of their rights in the framework of Plural Justice;
- Faculties of Law and Political Science at the four regionals of the UCB strengthened their knowledge, research and training capacities regarding Plural Justice at different academic levels.

The figure below summarises the scoring of P4 in each criterion (see Annex 3. Scoring Methodology):
### SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

| 1.1. Quality of Research | - The work done by P4 on data collection (e.g. on sources of indigenous law) in the context of the research is impressive, and may lead to innovative research in the second phase.  
| | - At the moment P4 published only one article in international peer review journals, not reaching the expected target value in this specific indicator (4).  
| | - On the other hand P4 researchers exceeded the expected target value for the publication of articles in national peer review journals (7 articles published vs. 3 articles as target value for this period).  
| **Score:** **Good** |  
| 1.2. Quality of Education | - P4 had not as objective to update a Master’s programme/s and its main contribution in this area has been the increasing involvement of Masters students from various disciplines in their activities.  
| | - 20 courses have been developed with the support of P4 (4 was the target value), although the number of students that have effectively participated in these new courses is less than expected (72 / 82).  
| | - The involvement of local stakeholders in the education activities of P4 is very significative, as described below.  
| **Score:** **Good** |  

### RELEVANCE

| 2.1. Responding to needs | - P4 is fully aligned with national (Bolivia Constitution Law from 2009), regional and VLIR-UOS country strategy.  
| | - The project contributes to a better understanding of the functioning of the relationship between indigenous jurisdiction and state jurisdiction, which is crucial in the current context of Bolivia.  
| | - P4 addresses a crucial issue for indigenous peoples and communities, which is the exercise of their rights as they are linked to their development with identity and the improvement of their living conditions. Training for the formation of Promoters of rights contributes to enhancing the exercise of their rights linked to the operation of their territories, the protection of the environment and climate change.  
| **Score:** **Excellent** |  
| 2.2. Synergy and Complementary | - P4 has fluid relations with P1, P2 and P3 in different activities, and also with the established TLC framework  
| | - However it is possible that specific agendas of other projects have not enabled to deepen actions for better horizontal coordination with the rest of the projects. Besides that valuable synergies have been found from the grassroots thought experiences of dialogue and exchange of knowledge with stakeholders involved in other projects, beneficiaries and researchers.  
| | - P4 was not able to identify any Belgian institution that works on the rights of indigenous peoples in the four regions. This investigation will continue in order to achieve this link, if possible.  
| **Score:** **NA** |  
| 2.3. Transversal Themes (gender, | - P4 has developed on gender and environment issues through its regional projects. The following are some examples:  
| ethnicity) |  

---

*Mid-term Evaluation of Institutional University Cooperation with UCB in Bolivia*
- Cochabamba’s action has been drafted and developed in consideration of peasant women, which are stakeholders associated with a network for agricultural production.

- Regarding environmental issues P4 works with Indigenous Peoples whose rights are applied and exercised in territories delimited and recognized by the State after completing the corresponding administrative process. The indigenous territories in the lowlands constitute approximately 30% of Bolivia’s territory, where the most important resources of forests, biodiversity, water, and non-renewable natural resources are found. In their Territories, they exercise regulatory and governing powers, within the framework of the autonomy recognized by Bolivia. Therefore, the management of natural resources in their territories is directly linked to their rights, rules, and practices.

2.4. Ownership

Score: Good

- P4 activities have sensitized UCB law schools with the indigenous issue, and the links with the communities have been widely increased.

- These actions contributed to speed up the appropriation process, which is clearly visible at different levels (students, faculty, administration).

- The process could be completed in the second phase of the project if it is confirmed the constitution of a legal clinic for the collective rights of indigenous peoples.

EFFICIENCY

3.1. The intermediate results have been delivered

Score: Excellent

- All P4 Intermediate results have been accomplished and are materialised in the expected areas, as for instance:

  - Indigenous promoters acquired knowledge and are trained to foster their organizations in the accomplishment of human and indigenous rights in the Plural Justice framework, achieving all the target values in terms of agreements signed with indigenous organisations, nº of promoters selected, training modules developed, etc.

  - Indigenous promoters disseminate the knowledge and expertise acquired in the training sessions within their communities, also achieving the expected target values regarding nº of events organised, attendance, networking channels or national encounters.

  - Etc.

3.2. Relationship between Objectives, results and means

Score: Good

- P4 means/inputs, especially PhD Students expenses have been aligned with the expected outputs.

- P4 staff argue the importance of understanding how PhD carry out their research, and how crucial is the direct contact with indigenous people and peasant women.

- No delays have been reported in this project, besides those related with the impact of COVID-19 in the PhD pending dissertations.

3.3. Project Management

- P4 staff consider that restructuring of the VLIR-UOS Programme via regional administration of project resources has delayed the fulfilment of the activities’ schedule.
Score: **Good**

- Besides that the communication and work with the local coordination is adequate, and the transparency of the process benefits the management of the project.
- In the framework of a collaborative construction process at the regional coordination level, a harmonious level of joint work has been progressively achieved.

### EFFECTIVENESS

**4.1. Specific Academic Objectives**

Score: **Good**

- Main academic objectives of P4 have been accomplished via 20 courses performed and the active involvement of the local stakeholders.
- Research activities have been more focused on data collection and its expected that in the next phase P4 researchers will publish not only in national, but also in international peer review journals.
- P4 decision on adopting of a training modality contained in digital formats to replace face-to-face courses, taking into account the need to give sustainability to the training activity is considered very positive by the evaluation team.

**4.2. Specific Development Objectives**

Score: **Good**

- The development objective has been focused on enhancing the ability of Indigenous Peoples (IP) to exercise their collective rights via the different courses performed and their follow-up.
- There is evidence of interesting contributions in this direction, as for instance:
  - The positive feedback collected from different stakeholders about the content of the courses;
  - The further replication of the trainings in the local communities, increasing the impact of the action.

### IMPACT

**5.1. Individual Impact**

Score: **NA**

- See 2.3 Evaluation at Individual Level

**5.2. Academic and Institutional Impact**

Score: **Good**

- The academic and institutional impact of P4 in this first phase is visible in different areas:
  - The project generated greater sensitivity about indigenous peoples’ rights and peasant communities that was not previously in the UCB authorities and its academic community;
  - The introduction of the transdisciplinary approach has been also quite relevant at institutional level. This new approach has generated new dynamics of work and research that has allowed the creation of networks of teachers, students, administrators, indigenous women, indigenous peoples in relation to respect for their human rights and their livelihoods;
- The project has also allowed increasing the research capacity into UCB, and connecting academy to social commitment through research.
- In summary P4 has had the relevant impact of bringing the UCB regional faculties of law and political science closer to rural areas, indigenous and peasant populations.

**5.3. Development Impact (Impact on Society)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- As discussed before, this project has been conceived as oriented towards interaction and social incidence in indigenous and peasant populations. Thus, there are several examples of impact at societal level, although the impact of the training activities could take longer, and the project do not seem to have established any impact assessment policy to monitor the effect on end-users (IP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In summary via P4 UCB is recognized as an engaged partner to the development of capacity building process to strengthen the leadership of promoters on human rights outside of the institution and formal education, qualified to design and carry on projects on non-formal education in the interest of empowerment movements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUSTAINABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1. Academic &amp; Institutional Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score: Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UCB Law Schools consider that the establishment of legal clinic for the collective rights of indigenous peoples may confirm the academic and institutional sustainability of P4 once the VLIR-UOS programme’s financing ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Flemish leader of P4 supports this idea and agreed to initiate a process aimed at the constitution of this legal clinic for the collective rights of indigenous peoples in the second phase. The process would begin in the Santa Cruz regional and, in the future, this same activity is planned to be implemented in the other three regionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- These clinics may allow to strengthen the subject of these rights in law schools, promoting investigations with students, teachers, NGOs and indigenous organizations themselves, with the possibility of accessing primary information on the type of conflicts, obstacles, and good practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.2. Financial Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score: Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Future financial sustainability of P4 could be favoured by the following actions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training of indigenous promoters in rights and conflict transformation, the change from the face-to-face modality to the digital modality of the courses contained in CDs and multimedia ensures their financial sustainability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Research work done by P4 on data collection may lead to innovative research in the second phase, which could facilitate the capture of funding at national and international levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5 P5. Entrepreneurial Productive Development

P5 has as general objective “To improve the quality of entrepreneurial activities of vulnerable communities (poor, young and woman)".

Specific objectives were:

– To enhance educational programmes in entrepreneurship for vulnerable communities;
– To develop a supportive ecosystem for entrepreneurs from vulnerable communities.

The figure below summarises the scoring of P5 in each criterion (see Annex 3. Scoring Methodology):
### SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Quality of Research</th>
<th>Score: <strong>Good</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- P5 Scientific Quality has been assessed around 3 main activities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PhD students. Sharing similar problems than other projects (high workload, impact of the three described crises, etc.), plus the fact that one of the two PhD students left UCB and was replaced at the end of 2019;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participation in international conferences, with 3 significative and positive experiences;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publications in international (4) and national journals (28) show an interesting potential for the coming years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P5 research is innovative and relevant for the local stakeholders. The topic of BoP entrepreneurship and supportive ecosystems is getting importance in international publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2. Quality of Education</th>
<th>Score: <strong>Good</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- P5 Education activities have been related to train trainers of vulnerable entrepreneurs. Development of a short game-based course on Entrepreneurial Attitude and its manual (Babson’s methodology) and on Business Models (St. Gallen’s methodology).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students have been intensively involved in the study and support of vulnerable entrepreneurs, which is clearly providing an added value to their careers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UCB Tarija recently launched a Center for Entrepreneurship and Innovation, planning also to organize a postgraduate programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RELEVANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1. Responding to needs</th>
<th>Score: <strong>Excellent</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Subsistence entrepreneurship in Bolivia has not been studied from the perspective of entrepreneurial ecosystems and business models. The outputs and outcomes that P5 may generate could better inform ecosystem actors on the type of cooperation and interventions needed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Besides that, P5 organised the regional activities according to their strengths and around the following activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Indirect transfer of entrepreneurial education to those entrepreneurs who would never reach the university level;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Academic research focused on subsistence entrepreneurial ecosystem;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building a collaborative network of stakeholders for entrepreneurial ecosystem support activities and events directed to entrepreneurial development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All these activities are fully aligned with national, regional and VLIR-UOS country strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2. Synergy and Complementary</th>
<th>Score: <strong>NA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- P5 have synergies only with P1 and in the Tarija location (common stakeholders).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On the other hand P5 staff has not been able to identify other Belgian projects (outside VLIR) working in this topic in Bolivia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At local level the project has a positive interaction with the Entrepreneur Programme of the Autonomous Municipal Government of San José de Chiquitos; a permanent initiative.

2.3. Transversal Themes (gender, environment and D4D)
Score: NA

- P5’s central topic has been to contribute quality improvements on subsistence entrepreneurship with particular emphasis on the young and woman.
- However, this emphasis has been in fact unnecessary given that entrepreneurs among vulnerable populations already contain or are characterized by the majority participation of the youngsters (male or female) and women.
- The design of the P5 project does not specifically aim environmental sustainability, although the potential interaction with other projects may contribute to cover this area too.

2.4 Ownership
Score: Good

- Some P5 outputs have been appropriated by UCB actors, as for instance the book collection by students (and also teaching staff) in La Paz.
- Unfortunately no actors have appropriated the task of developing short courses for subsistence entrepreneurs and their dissemination through a train-the-trainer mechanism, even though it seems to have a high value for entrepreneurs.
- In Santa Cruz and Cochabamba the appropriation process is taking longer and have some asymmetries, but it is expected to be confirmed in the second phase.
- On the other hand the creation of a Centre for Entrepreneurship and Innovation at UCB Tarija (inaugurated on November 2020) is a significant example of ownership.

EFFICIENCY

3.1. The intermediate results have been delivered
Score: Good

- P5 had five intermediate results to be achieved through different activities:
  - Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened scientific capacities with regard to entrepreneurship.
  - Intermediate Result 4: Development of supporting network ecosystem.
  - Intermediate Result 5: Strengthened graduate and undergraduate programmes with regard to entrepreneurship.
- Overall, intermediate results were delivered with the expected quality, despite the different crises suffered in Bolivia.

3.2. Relationship between Objectives, results and means

- Many events in support of vulnerable entrepreneurs have been organized:
  - 3 ecosystem events organized in San José de Chiquitos
  - Supporting the development of the local entrepreneurial fair in San José de Chiquitos: Posoka Gourmet.
### Score: Good

- Organization of Yo Emprende Tarija Organization of a one week VUB group mobility.
- 2 days’ workshop in Cochabamba
- Ecosystem development is progressing, with the identification and contact of key Bolivian actors in support of entrepreneurship.
- The evaluation team consider that the means are justifiable for the abovementioned outputs.

#### 3.3. Project Management

**Score: Good**

- P4 staff reported that the resources were used in the most optimal way, assuring optimal results, achieving the execution of each specific objective.
- There is also a positive opinion on the role of the local PSU, providing clear guidelines on the different processes in an efficient way.
- Teamwork has been also stressed in P5: key decisions, planning, monitoring & evaluation of activities were made collectively.
- The main managerial problems for P5 have been the difficulties in coordinating activities with TLCs and the delays caused by the decentralisation process.

### EFFECTIVENESS

#### 4.1. Specific Academic Objectives

**Score: Good**

- As discussed before one on the two initial P5 PhD candidates left UCB making it almost impossible to complete the programme in 2021.
- Nevertheless both PhD students have progressed, and the data collection phase can be considered as successful.
- COVID-19 had further negative impact on their dissertations because the specific idiosyncrasy of their research works, although P5 leaders are confident in the quality of the work done.

#### 4.2. Specific Development Objectives

**Score: Good**

- P5 did extensive activities in the framework of the development of an ecosystem in support of vulnerable entrepreneurs.
- This development will help P5 staff to intensify the support of vulnerable entrepreneurs (increase the numbers of supported).
- The current figures of extensions activities targeting these groups are very positive, specifically regarding the number of outreach activities and training module packages carried out.

### IMPACT

#### 5.1. Individual Impact

**Score: NA**

- See 2.3 Evaluation at Individual Level

#### 5.2. Academic and Institutional Impact

- P5 had a sound academic and institutional impact in UCB. The following are some examples:
### 5.3. Development Impact (Impact on Society)

**Score: Good**

- The project is generating a culture of university extension from the concept of entrepreneurship and targeting vulnerable population.
- At the same time the project is providing visibility and positioning the university as a development actor in the different regions.
- At research/academic level there have been several examples in P5 on how production of knowledge could be developed, under research and budget constraints.
- At students level P5 contributed to improve their careers by gaining a real life professional experience with real problems of the Bolivia society.

- Main development impact of P5 are via short courses and ecosystem events.
- P5 staff reported that in all four regions project members were able to develop or adapt courses or practices with subsistence entrepreneurs in mind, make contact with organizations that work with them, develop a small network of contacts and stakeholders in order to execute activities together, either ecosystem events or training.
- In aggregate numbers P5 executed 33 short courses and 3 large ecosystem events reaching 1120 people up to the first quarter of 2020.

### SUSTAINABILITY

#### 6.1. Academic & Institutional Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- The sustainability of the implemented actions will depend on different variables, as for instance:
  - The collection of books could continue because its main cost is not monetary (time of professors and students) and because of the incentive (graduating research).
  - The short course on entrepreneurial attitude has monetary costs, demands significant amount of time from professors and it will depend on the future priorities of the programme.
  - At the moment UCB doesn’t have the possibility to absorb the project on its own once its finance is not available. Thus, the project must set solid basis such that it can function in an independent manner in the near future.

#### 6.2. Financial Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- Additional funding of P5 has been achieved via the Flemish coordinator, namely:
  - VLIR Joint Programme “SEfficiency” with ESPOL (Ecuador), UCB (Bolivia), Kyambogo University (Uganda) of 2 years (2020 – 2021) with a budget of about 90.000 Euros.
  - Erasmus+ Project ELANET (European and Latin American Network in Support of Social Entrepreneurs) (2021-2023) with 17 partners and 36 associated partners from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru (for Latin America) and Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy (for Europe) with a budget of about 1 Million Euro.
2.2.6 P6. Development of a Collaborative Learning Community (CLC) approach to co-create transdisciplinary solutions for complex problems of vulnerable urban and rural communities in Bolivia

P6 has as general objective that “Development actors in different regions of Bolivia participate in Transdisciplinary Learning Communities (TLC) to deal with complex problems related to social vulnerability, water management, food sovereignty and nutrition, production development, and indigenous rights and social conflicts”.

Specific objectives were:

- Academic objective: a Collaborative Learning Community approach (knowledge, tools and practical know-how) is developed to co-create integrated solutions for complex local problems together with all stakeholders in different regions of Bolivia;

- Developmental objective: the UCB universities (La Paz, Cochabamba, Tarija and Santa Cruz) have effective social outreach services for the vulnerable urban and rural communities in Bolivia, by their contribution to the TLC’s in different regions of Bolivia.

The figure below summarises the scoring of P6 in each criterion (see Annex 3. Scoring Methodology):
### SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

**1.1. Quality of Research**

Score: **Good**

- Although P6 is a transversal project, with a part of their activities focused on practical and operational functions, it also has academic and research activities linked with the dissemination and adoption of the transdisciplinary methodology.
  
  - Following this research target values were established for P6 on publication of articles in both international (4) and national (5) peer review journals.
  
  - Research target values were not reached in this first phase although the project has implemented innovative research with involvement of local stakeholders.

**1.2. Quality of Education**

Score: **Good**

- P6 educational activities are primarily directed to the researchers and stakeholders of all the projects of the programme.
  
  - Several sources reported that P6 activities are highly interactive, participative, dialogical and experience-based – in line with the learning community approach of P6. However, and as discussed in other parts of the report, this approach has been appreciated only by some projects.
  
  - The project has not organized regular curriculum programmes, although a postgraduate course offer is in preparation.

### RELEVANCE

**2.1. Responding to needs**

Score: **Good**

- The relevance of the transversal activities of P6 do not have to be justified, as are the typical of IUC programmes funded by VLIR-UOS.
  
  - P6 support activities deal with communication, library services, research repositories, support to publishing in English, etc. All these activities are highly appreciated by UCB staff.
  
  - The issue of the problems and tensions coming the transdisciplinary vs. the monodisciplinary approaches is discussed in the conclusions and recommendations of this report.

**2.2. Synergy and Complementary**

Score: **NA**

- The main aim of the CLC approach is to enhance complementarities and synergies between different projects and with external actors.
  
  - Following this idea supported systematic stakeholder analysis exercises in the 4 regions, in collaboration with the other projects and a theoretical framework and methodological tools were introduced to the researchers of all thematic projects.
  
  - As discussed in other parts of the reports, the interaction with some projects that have a monodisciplinary approach has been quite limited.

**2.3. Transversal Themes (gender, environment and D4D)**

Score: **NA**

- P6 organized 2 national meetings (1 internally on 29/07/2020, and 1 with external actors on 31/07/2020) about the position of women in the domain of research, with the participation of 95 female-researchers. These meetings were the starting point of a women-in-research network at the UCB.
  
  - Besides that, the National Confederation of Rural Indigenous Women in Bolivia participated actively in a large-scale joint workshop of all the projects to arrive at a shared diagnosis of the problems encountered by women in
vulnerable situations. This was helpful to know each other better and explore collaboration possibilities.

- P6 also organized an event at UCB based on the encyclical “Laudato Si” of Pope Franciscus regarding global warming and environmental problems. This event was conceived as the starting point of initiatives at the UCB to reduce its ecological footprint and to stimulate the development of environmental policies.

2.4. Ownership

Score: Good

- UCB seems to have appropriated the project at discourse level, emphasizing the importance of collaborative and transdisciplinary research. Transdisciplinary Learning Communities (TLC’s) are integrated in the UCB structure.

- At practical level there has been resistance against the adoption of a CLC approach, but at the level of implementation a distinction has to be made between the different regional campuses. The regional academic authorities of Santa Cruz and Cochabamba have proactively supported the CLC approach, and also in Tarija there is support notwithstanding its limited (human and other) resources to put CLC in practice. With the decentralization of the IUC programme from the 4th year onwards, the regional campus of La Paz has clearly started to increment its ownership of the project as well.

- The process took longer than expected but at the moment is evident that a group of Bolivian project leaders and researchers acknowledges the importance of participatory, community-based and transdisciplinary research.

### EFFICIENCY

3.1. The intermediate results have been delivered

Score: Good

- Target values have not been reached in the following Intermediate results:
  
  - Research: New knowledge concerning a CLC approach is developed by action research with the stakeholders involved in the TLC's.
  
  - Training: CLC competencies are strengthened among the active participants in the TLC's.
  
  - Diffusion: Learning outcomes and results concerning CLC are transferred to interested actors not directly involved in the TLC's

- On the other hand very good intermediate results have been achieved at Facilitation level (Transdisciplinary Learning Communities - TLC's - are supported in their start-up, development and functioning).

3.2. Relationship between Objectives, results and means

Score: Good

- The expenditures of P6 are relatively small taking into account the important scope of activities (organization of national meetings, support of libraries and repositories, training in participatory methodologies and English academic writing, ...) that are programme-wide.

- Thus in P6 we may say that there has been an acceptable interrelation between the objectives and the results.

- Delays are attributed to the political crises and COVID-19 and the decentralisation process, mainly.
### 3.3. Project Management

**Score:** Good

- P6 participants had difficulties with the first local coordinator but at the moment the relationship with the PSU is transparent and efficient.
- In P6 they consider that the administrative decentralization (towards the regional campuses) contributed also to the improvement of the communication, but enhanced the administrative burden for the project team and the Bolivian leader.
- However at internal level (P6) there is a horizontal and open dialogue between all team members. All important decisions are taken jointly.

### EFFECTIVENESS

#### 4.1. Specific Academic Objectives

**Score:** Good

- P6 did not reach any target value of the established academic indicators:
  - PhD research publications in national and international journals (4 target value, 1 achieved).
  - Number of presentations at international conferences (4 target value, 2 achieved).
  - Number of manuals on CLC (3 target value, 1 achieved)
- The main reasons for that seem to be the lack of experience and competencies of the local P6 project staff. The situation seems to be improving in the last part of phase 1.

#### 4.2. Specific Development Objectives

**Score:** Good

- Regarding the specific developmental objective (the UCB universities have effective social outreach services for the vulnerable urban and rural communities in Bolivia, by their contribution to the TLC’s in different regions of Bolivia) although P6 did not deliver the expected number of reports (3/16), there is evidence that the project is on track in order to achieve it.
- A potential reason of this delay is that P6 are ‘new’ actors in the field, and they were often received with quite some suspicion by the communities (especially in times of political protests and elections that profoundly divided the country between urban and rural-indigenous).
- This is a complex process that could take longer than expected in some cases.

### IMPACT

#### 5.1. Individual Impact

**Score:** NA

- See 2.3 Evaluation at Individual Level

#### 5.2. Academic and Institutional Impact

**Score:** Good

- The following are some examples of P6 academic and institutional impact:
  - CLC Methodology inserted in the research debates and practices of the UCB. At the moment there is a continuous reflection in academic meetings at all levels on how to generate knowledge and solutions for complex problems jointly with researchers of all relevant disciplines and with external actors, paying specific attention to the participation of vulnerable local communities.
### 5.3. Development Impact (Impact on Society)

**Score: Good**

- P6 also had a key role in the establishment of the Transdisciplinary Learning Communities in the 4 regions, which is the main mechanism for the development of the CLC methodology.
- At operational level P6 contributed in the improvement and digitalization of library services (connecting 4 regional campuses, Open Athens), research repositories, training English academic writing and publication skills for researchers.
- One of the core objectives of P6 is the establishment of collaborative relationships with external stakeholders.
- Following this idea P6 organized dialogical spaces with external stakeholders at the start of the programme (especially in Cochabamba), and supported the contacts of researchers of the other projects with their stakeholders and the communities (especially from Santa Cruz in San José de Chiquitos, and from Tarija in Cirminuelas).
- Although there are some asymmetries in these created relationships there seems to be a general agreement among the stakeholders in the 4 regions, that the UCB has started to be considered as a legitimate and valuable partner for the own initiatives of the external stakeholders.

### SUSTAINABILITY

#### 6.1. Academic & Institutional Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- P6 supported the development of human and narrative capital at UCB that constitutes a sustainable basis for the TLC’s. These TLC’s consist of researchers and external actors that acknowledge the complementarity of their competencies, as a leverage to access new resources in the future.
- Relations between P6, with members of the other projects and with external stakeholders in the framework of the TLC’s have resulted in authentic mutual interest and are considered sufficiently developed to justify the sustainability of the CLC approach in the future, although this has to be confirmed in the second phase.
- Besides that there is a will by UCB authorities to sustain other transversal products of P6, like the improved library services, research repositories, etc.

#### 6.2. Financial Sustainability

**Score: Good**

- P6 did not get or identify funding from other sources during the first phase, as other projects did in this phase. However it is confirmed that P6 staff did an effort also to capture new funding.
- Evaluators consider that it would be useful for P6 staff to improve their skills in project management and fundraising in order to access (international) funding opportunities (see Recommendations).
- Thus, P6 financial sustainability will depend on: a) consolidation of P6 methodological approach; b) availability of funding donors for the specific research topic.
2.3 Evaluation at Individual Level

The analysis of the programme/projects at individual level was based on: 1) the interviews carried out during the mission; 2) the focus groups carried out with UCB PhD students and UCB students (also during the mission); 3) the online questionnaire answered by project participants during November 2020 (see Questionnaire in Annex 1); 4) meetings with stakeholders.

The total responses received by group were the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Average age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB PhD Students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Teaching Staff</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Students</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Management Staff</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Stakeholders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objective was to identify evidence with regards to improved knowledge, increased management skills and improved behaviour/results applied to Higher Education. As a consequence, beneficiaries are able to improve their individual performance, including social skills and networking, improving also their employability.

The table below summarises the scoring of the Evaluation at Individual level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCB PhD Students</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Teaching Staff</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Students</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCB Management Staff</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Stakeholders</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main results of the analysis by group are described in detail in the next pages.
2.3.1 UCB PhD Students

UCB PhD Students are the most benefitted group in this evaluation at individual level. The main learning outcomes mentioned by UCB PhD Students have been:

- New research skills;
- Skills that facilitate international publishing;
- New approaches to learning;
- New approaches to teaching;
- New techniques in administration and management.

PhD students also mention benefits on the collaborative work and some mention the transdisciplinary approach proposed in the programme.

To what extent does your participation in the programme improve the academic or professional performance of participants in the following areas?

In all cases UCB PhD students confirm that the PhD programme was fully relevant for their work, and that they have applied the contents in their academic and research work. However, the main application until now is more focused at academic level (updating of the content of their teaching materials, new bibliography, innovative pedagogical approaches) than at their research performance.
The programme had a significant impact in improving several academic and research areas, of UCB PhD students as described in the next graph:

To what extent does your participation in the programme improve your academic or research performance in the following areas?

![Graph showing extent of improvement in various areas]

With regard employability UCB PhD Students consider that the programme participants are best qualified by employers, as explained in the next graph:

In terms of employability, do you consider that programme participants are perceived as best qualified by...?

![Graph showing perception of qualification by employers and UCB]
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2.3.2 UCB Teaching Staff

UCB Teaching staff had a positive impact in the evaluation at individual level. The main learning outcomes mentioned by UCB Teaching Staff have been:

- New research methodologies;
- New interdisciplinary approach;
- Interregional cooperation;
- New Project Management Skills;
- The importance of a participatory design of research;
- New skills for designing and carrying out online courses.

90% of respondents confirm that the programme is relevant for their work, and that they have applied the contents mainly in their research work. Almost half of them do not think their management and publishing skills have improved.
The programme had a significant impact in **improving several academic and research areas**, of UCB Teaching Staff as described in the next graph:

**To what extent does participation in the programme improve the academic or research performance of participants in the following domains?**

Still, English language and entrepreneurship skills can be improved.

UCB Teaching Staff consider that the programme had also an interesting impact in participants with regard **employability**:

**In terms of employability, do you consider that programme participants are perceived as better qualified by?**

Possible employers

UCB
2.3.3 UCB Students

The programme is having also a positive impact at individual level in UCB Bachelor and Master Students.

The main learning outcomes mentioned by UCB Students have been focused on:

- Collaborative work;
- Research Methodologies;
- Knowledge of the rural communities;
- Different software applications;
- Rural development

Most respondents confirm that the programme is relevant for their Bachelor or Master Thesis, and for their research work as UCB students.

Was the action/programme relevant to obtaining the degree (bachelor’s, master’s, doctorate)?

Responses
UCB Students also consider that the programme has improved different academic and research areas.

To what extent does your participation in the programme improve your academic or research performance in the following areas?

However, UCB students have not an homogenous view on the potential impact of the programme in their employability, as the following graph shows:

In terms of employability, do you think that programme participants are perceived as better qualified by potential employers?

In the focus groups, there was a direct relation between the degree of involvement in the project and the impact they thought it could have as work experience for future employers. They referred to the work experience more than specific capacities developed by the programme.
2.3.4 UCB Management Staff

UCB Managers have a positive impression about the impact of the programme at individual level.

They consider that their participation in the programme improved their professional performance of managers in some areas:

The programme had also a significant impact on some management horizontal tasks, as described below:

To what extent does participation in the programme improve the professional performance of managers in the following areas?
2.3.5 Project Stakeholders

Stakeholders included in this analysis are mainly members of the communities that have participated in any activity of the programme (trainings, meetings, research activities, etc.).

They have also a positive view on the impact of the programme in 5 crucial aspects:

To what extent do you consider that the programme has contributed to improving the following aspects?

[Bar chart showing responses to the question.]

- A lot
- Quite a lot
- A little bit
- Not at all
- I don't know
2.4 Evaluation at Societal Level. Case studies

As discussed in the methodology (1.3.3) the main objective of this evaluation exercise is focused on the institutional impact. This evaluation strategy is fully aligned with the VLIR-UOS Theory of Change of an IUC programme, which consider the impact level basically at long term. However the Evaluation Team considers that there is significant evidence of impact at societal level in the IUC with UCB project, already in the first phase, probably because of the specific idiosyncrasy of the action. The methodology carried out in order to collect evidence of the impact at society level is the Case Study.

The table below summarises the scoring of the Evaluation at Societal level, by case study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a Women and youth’s learning community</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katari River Basin Case Study</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory management of soil evaluation for agroecological production</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Indigenous Promoters of Rights in two Bolivian Indigenous Peoples</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem in support of subsistence entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of community communicators of the Tiraque communities</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.1 Construction Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study title</th>
<th>Construction of a Women and youth ‘s learning community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Case Study</td>
<td>Participatory action research as engine to improve parental skills to answer the rising demands of children and youth in a rural context but with global connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Case of Study</td>
<td>Participatory action research through local learning communities for parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Tiraque Community has an important number of youngsters who committed suicide. Numbers are not clear, because they were not registered as such, but family disintegration and violence is one of the most common identified issues in the region. Knowing this first facts, the research project in the rural community of Tiraque began with exploratory visits, with the only single purpose to become familiar with the community dynamics. From January to December 2018, the researcher spent at least two days per week in the community, getting to know social practices dynamics, problems and concerns of community members. While constructing a trustful relationship, activities such as: workshops for parents (school for parents), workshops with adolescents in the different community schools and Crochet workshops were organized. Particularly the last workshop was also conceived as a space to allow dialogue between women where a specific challenge was identified: how to raise a family maintaining rural practices, when especially youth have contact through social media and internet with a world which is increasingly globalized.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementation | 1. During 2017, frequent visits to establish contacts, to observe the community dynamics and to allow the different institutions, organizations and community in general to become familiar with the researcher.  
2. During that year, the researcher was progressively invited to participate in community activities and meetings, in which her participation increased also progressively, from having and observer to actively participating and having a voice to give an opinion on community matters.  
3. The trusting relationship began to grow to the point where the researcher and her teams were allowed to have informal private conversations that allowed to understand even more the realities around the families concern about the tension between maintaining rural practices within a context where their children received global information through internet and social media.  
4. At the same time, the research question was taking shape, during 2018 and 2019 the community and different stakeholders started to ask for the organization of other spinoff activities such as the School for Parenting, inter-institutional workshops with educational units of the urban radio and of the communities, and Crochet weaving workshops as a space for Dialogue between women who were community leaders.  
5. The dialogue between women at the weaving workshops allowed to strengthen relationship among the researcher and among themselves –different generation of women- to the point to identify
### Success Factors

- Constant physical presence especially at the beginning, that allowed the construction of relationships at the institutional and individual level.
- Respecting the timeframe of the community: passing gradually from being an observer to participate at the community dynamics thanks to an explicit invitation from the community.
- Listening and showing genuine interest during informal conversations.
- Participating actively in a community practice known as "sharing", with the aim to "share" food, information, dreams and concerns with community members with whom the food is shared.
- Immediate and honest response to possible requests and demands from the community as relations with the community were strengthened.
- Honoring the commitments established with community members, such as: keeping regular visits to the community beyond the agreed research visits.
- Taking care of relationships and maintaining the trust.

### Impact/Results/outcome

- 25 women leaders of their communities who acquired and / or improved skills in crocheting for private and commercial purposes.
- Around 150 students from 4th to 6th grade of secondary school (male and female) trained in topics related to family, couples and friendships.
- Around 50 parents selected by the Tiraque Social Defense office who participated in workshops aimed at understanding the different realities that parents with young children and adolescents go through.
- Construction of a Women’s Learning Community where professionals from the Social Defense Office can understand the challenges families, and specially parents, are confronted with, to improve their interventions.

### Conclusions

We conclude that this is an example of a successful community based project, because throughout a long lasting relationship, the researcher went together with women and youth from Tiraque, from surface problems to grassroots problems that are a current concern of the community, leading to family disintegration. The research question was formulated taking into account the concerns and interests of the community itself, but more importantly the process of construction of research question itself led to the strengthening of a community network beyond the research interests. Moreover, the most disadvantaged members of the community –named women and youngsters- were able to have a voice and to share their experiences and challenges in the process of family relations construction to the institutions of the social protection services, so they can improve their attention and intervention models to provide them a better quality of life.

### Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2.4.2 Katari River Basin Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Title</th>
<th>Katari River Basin Management in Bolivia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Case Study</td>
<td>Natural Resources (River Basin) Management for the sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Case of Study</td>
<td>Trans-Interdisciplinary collaborative research. Contribution to the integrated water resource management to approach water sector challenges in Bolivia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Bolivia incorporated in 2006 the Integrated Water Resource Management approach as a National Policy in order to deal with diverse water challenges in the country. However, the policy reflects highly limited implementation and the Bolivian water resources still face severe problems. Water resources are crucial to ensure the local economic growth, to provide social justice and to warranty a healthy ecosystem. Consequently, research in the water resources management field, public policy and governance is required to warranty the socio-ecological sustainability. This project is employing the Katari River Basin as a Bolivian case study in order to understand the challenges related to the Integrated Water Resource Management policy implementation in Bolivia. The Katari River Basin, due to an exponential population growth in the region, reproduced human developments such as mining, industry, urbanization and agriculture. These produced an alarming amount of pollution delivered rural communities and the ecosystem allocated downstream. The case study has been subject of 14 years of IWRM policy developments. However, the lack of effectiveness and implementation reveals that the trend of contamination and the harm towards vulnerable socioecological systems have not changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementation | 1. Monitoring water quality in the river basin in order to better understand the contamination in the case study.  
3. Spatial assessment of human developments within the case study.  
4. Assessment of water quality in rural and indigenous communities.  
5. Identification and analysis of environmental pressures within the river basin.  
6. Analysis of the socio-environmental impacts in the rural indigenous region. |
| Success Factors | - Water Quality monitoring network re-design  
- Land Use Maps to spatially identify environmental socio-environmental pressures within the system.  
- Data of correlation between fecal contamination in the water sources and diarrheal diseases within rural communities.  
- Inventory and detailed data related to the sources of contamination within the river basin.  
- Identification of the socio-environmental impacts over vulnerable social groups and the ecosystem. |
### Impact/Results/outcome

1. Close collaboration with the Ministry of Water and Environment:
   - UCB is not part of the technical advisory committee. This entitles that UCB can participate of the policy planning and decision making within the interinstitutional platform responsible for the management of the water resources in the case study.
   - Ministry invited the project to present the research projects outcomes within the Second Katari River Basin Congress. The Project 2 presented 6 projects in relation to the case study.
   - Currently 2 MSc thesis projects are under development employing the Katari River Basin as case study. The ministry participated with inputs in relation to these 2 projects. Furthermore, the ministry is providing the baseline data and information to implement both research.
   - 6 Water quality monitoring campaigns where implemented in partnership with the project. Furthermore, the implementation is now between both organizations, that UCB and The ministry of water and environment.

2. One tailor-made capacity development programme directed to decision makers within the case study has been design in partnership with the Ministry of Water and Environment. It is expected to be implemented in 2021 if funding sources are ensured.

3. One PhD thesis is process, the outcome represents an important resource for future Integrated Water Resource Management policy developments in Bolivia.

4. One scientific paper has been published, one scientific paper has been submitted and one is under development.

5. One master thesis is under development, its outcome will be a resource for the Ministry of Water and Environment to implement a new water quality monitoring system for this case study.

6. Four BSc thesis have been developed within the framework of the project. This reflect enhance research capabilities with the local university partnering with this project.

### Conclusions

At the **society level**, this project represents a valuable impact over the national water resource management policies. The outcomes in relation to the capacity development over decision-makers and knowledge in relation to water public policies and governance can be highly beneficial to the economic growth, the social justice and the environmental protection in the Katari River Basin and the Bolivian context in general. The research projects are currently, providing tangible information and knowledge that can be employed for future policies and decision-making process within the Ministry and Environment. Furthermore, specific policy gaps related to the Katari river basin will represent an important outcome since a better management of this river basin will result in better conditions and the extension of an environmental justice towards the rural indigenous communities impacted by the pollution reproduced upstream.

These potential impacts represent a shift in terms of the sustainable management of this case study, and furthermore, the methodology and
tools can be extrapolated to other fields of natural resources management policies in Bolivia. Furthermore, the participation of the actors from the society in the projects with the university acts as a professional training and allow better resilience skills facing water issues. The strengthening of the CINAES (Research Center on Water, Energy and Sustainability) and its researchers’ skills allows the university to have a major impact on tools development, professional training… needed by the society facing water management issues.

| Scoring | Excellent |
### 2.4.3 Participatory Management Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study title</th>
<th>Participatory management of soil evaluation for agroecological production, through the implementation of a soil evaluation kit adapted for the Virvini-Tiraque community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Case Study</td>
<td>Higher Education as engine of social cohesion, innovation and economic growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Case of Study</td>
<td>Participatory action research through local communities of learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Background | In the rural community of Tiraque, there is a problem regarding the comprehensive management of the soil resource. However, there is knowledge and technical material from different levels of institutions and organizations to promote soil management in the country, and there is also ancestral knowledge and a broad agricultural and soil tradition in rural communities. Yet, it is not common to socialize this information in the communities, and less still the crossing of the technical and practical information, preventing communities to proper access to the knowledge of the health of the soil for an adequate decision-making regarding the management of its use (Muñoz, 2020).  
This case study contemplates the implementation of a pilot of a farmer soil evaluation kit, added to the creation of a learning community in Virvini-Tiraque, which makes it possible to have economic, immediate and replicable information for decision-making regarding to land use management.  
This pilot has been developed and tested in the field, supported by participating organizations and the learning community formed. Soon, this work will be in extension and scaling up phase to more communities in regions where the project develops its work. |

### Implementation

1. Identification of the technology based on criteria of prior applicability in Bolivia and with indicators of good acceptance.  
2. Adaptation of the technology with economic and easily locally accessible materials, together with a soil book.  
3. Exploration of interest with stakeholders and communities, in meetings and workshops in Tiraque.  
4. Agreements and selection of communities interested in participating in a learning community.  
5. Conformation of the local learning community  
6. Implementation of the pilot of the farmer soil evaluation kit  
7. Validation of the results obtained  
8. Participatory management of the territory

### Success Factors

- Study framed in a procedural methodology of co-creation and existing long-term processes.  
- Alliances and agreements with stakeholders that work in the area  
- The work arises from a previous diagnosis of the community and its explicit demand to solve this need.  
- Methodology of participatory action research, having an active involvement of the community in the entire process.  
- Empowerment and cohesion of the local learning community

### Impact/Results/outcome

An improved management land. UpToDate knowledge about soils conditions will then reconsider, all practices and land selection criteria to
select between multiple plots for agriculture. Ultimately, we aim to improve food production and access to food.
- Conformation of a learning community
- Community university links through the learning community
- An ongoing undergraduate thesis
- Peer review of outcomes
- Scaling up to other communities and regions
- Local scientific process of co-creation of located knowledge on degraded soils and its recovery, based on an insightful process.

The pilot was made up of a mixed group of 8 farming families, with a gender and generational perspective (photo). In addition, two NGOs, a local association and a rural community are integrated into the process.

### Conclusions

Pilot experience shows acceptance by all 8 participants in one community (Virvini) and the Agroecological Committee. Even more, they have agreed to continue with its implementation and their participation with two other local communities. In this sense, land matters have been a recurrent demand in this site as well in other regions. Land degradation is a common and important problematic in rural societies. It is anticipated that it is an interesting tool for the participatory and local management of the territory and the recovery of soils. Scaling up of this tool is expected both in communities of Cochabamba (two communities and an agricultural peri urban area), as well as in La Paz (one community) and Santa Cruz (one community). The insightful process of the lessons learned from this pilot will strengthen the work and its scaling up.

### Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.4 Training Case Study / Santa Cruz and Karangas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Title</th>
<th>Training of Indigenous Promoters of Rights in two Bolivian Indigenous Peoples (Chiquitanos TURUBO – Santa Cruz and Karangas – Oruro)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Case Study</td>
<td>Training of members of Indigenous Peoples (IP) to strengthen their interaction with the Bolivian justice system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Case of Study</td>
<td>Assistance to the construction of Plural Justice, which is a State policy, to promote the exercise of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples established by the Bolivian constitution and the international legal framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>IP have a wide range of rights recognized within the framework of their self-determination, among which is the exercise of their legal systems. However, the law prevents them from regulating and administering justice in various matters that are the exclusive competence of State justice. It means that the IP and, specifically, their authorities are unaware of: i) their own powers; ii) the procedures for the interaction with the State Jurisdictions in fundamental matters (e.g., Land); and, iii) the constitutional and legal means to claim their collective rights' exercise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementation | 1. Two meetings with the leaders of each IP to propose training, jointly identify the priority issues for training, and present the proposed Inter-Institutional Agreement.  
2. Signing of Agreements between UCB-TURUBO and UCB-Karangas.  
3. Definition of three topics for training and the courses' characteristics: face-to-face courses with replicas and supporting documents.  
4. Formal designation of the people who would attend the training by their indigenous organizations  
5. Individual files for each participant  
6. Preparation of content and support materials by specialists for the three courses. |
| Success Factors | - Meetings for direct consultation with the authorities of TURUBO and Karangas to present the project, identify the training topics, and sign Inter-institutional Agreements with IP's full agreement.  
- Selection of indigenous members to be trained by indigenous organizations to ensure their commitment and the legitimacy of their participation.  
- As a training project, specific information has been obtained: i) the levels of commitment of indigenous organizations and trained promoters, and ii) the degree and learning conditions of the content taught.  
- Reaffirmation of the interest of the IP to continue with the agreement and training. |
| Impact/Results/outcome | - One hundred and fifty-two people trained in the two IP in the three thematic courses.  
- Fifty percent of those trained made replications in their communities and participated in conflict resolution in their communities.  
- Materials prepared by specialists for the three thematic courses: 3 in 2018 and 4 in 2020. |
- Filmed face-to-face sessions that may be used in 2021 in digital format.
- With the results of the face-to-face courses, it was positively evaluated by the IP to switch to distance courses in digital formats by 2021.
- The doctoral student preparing his thesis on indigenous collective rights in Karangas, has been working since 2018 with a Local Indigenous Assistant who becomes an important human resource for his indigenous organization in research on rights.

P4 received formal notes requesting their incorporation in the training of Indigenous Rights Promoters from: i) Guarani IP, ii) the Coordinator of Lowland Indigenous Women (which includes 36 IP) from Santa Cruz, iii) an IP from Chuquisaca, iv) an IP from Oruro, v) the Central of Native Peasants of Pucarani, and vi) an IP from the North Amazon of La Paz. These requests show that there is a local demand of these activities, but also the impact of the training proposed by P4 as a necessary and urgent action from these IP's demands. They will also expand the courses' impact on Lowlands, Amazonia, Valleys, and Altiplano.

**Conclusions**

We identify three components that ensure the impact and sustainability of the P4 proposal for IPs:

1) The comprehensive strategy of contact with IP through direct consultation, joint identification of priority training issues, IP’s acceptance, and the formalization of agreements in inter-institutional agreements.

2) The use of a new and innovative modality of training in digital and multimedia formats that allows expanding the impact of the P4 to other IP.

3) The digital modality that is being developed and will continue during 2021 ensures the financial and operational sustainability of indigenous promoters' training. After the training materials' full preparation, there will no longer be production costs, but only minimal operational costs for replication.

**Scoring**

Excellent
### 2.4.5 Ecosystem Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Title</th>
<th>Ecosystem in support of subsistence entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Case Study</strong></td>
<td>Development of an ecosystem in support of subsistence entrepreneurs, where higher education is taking a leading role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Case of Study</strong></td>
<td>Assistance in the development of a vibrant entrepreneurial ecosystem that support vulnerable entrepreneurs to develop sustainable ventures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong></td>
<td>40% of the Bolivian population lives in poverty or extreme poverty. Subsistence entrepreneurs are creating ventures out of necessity, i.e. to generate income sufficient for survival of their family. Subsistence entrepreneurs in Bolivia lack access to basic services such as training, finance and technology. Although there were some organizations created in recent years to support entrepreneurial activity in Bolivia, those initiatives are fairly inefficient to reach vulnerable entrepreneurs. In addition, existing organizations in support of entrepreneurship are not yet organized in a network or an ecosystem, while they can benefit largely to further develop their capacity and impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Implementation** | 1. Identification and meetings with local organizations that support entrepreneurs.  
   2. Identification and meetings with other CEUB universities active in entrepreneurship.  
   3. Development of local fairs to give visibility to subsistence entrepreneurs.  
   4. Focus group discussions on the support of vulnerable entrepreneurs;  
   5. Involvement of UCB and VUB students and staff to support vulnerable entrepreneurs in Bolivia.  
   6. Utilization of a crowdfunding and crowdsourcing platform to support ad hoc cases. |
| **Success Factors** | - Identification and involvement of different actors with complementary background in the supportive ecosystem (e.g. universities, incubators, CAP centers, NGOs, vocational schools, municipalities and entrepreneurs).  
   - Involvement of sufficient number of UCB staff and students in support of vulnerable entrepreneurs, and leveraging on university’s international contacts.  
   - Development of a portfolio of supportive activities among ecosystem partners.  
   - Continuous discussions with vulnerable entrepreneurs and ecosystem partners to improve the support offered. |
| **Impact/Results/outcome** | - 3 ecosystem events organized in San José de Chiquitos (Emprenderes Crecer and Startup Weekend twice) with 400 participants benefiting.  
   - Supporting the development of the local entrepreneurial fair in San José de Chiquitos: Posoka Gourmet.  
   - Organization of “Yo Emprendo Tarija” in the Fall of 2018, a fair with the participation of more than 60 local entrepreneurs, of which 38 vulnerable and 600 attendees. |
- Organization of a one week VUB group mobility of 11 students to UCB Tarija in December 2018. 32 UCB students were involved and 50 entrepreneurs, of which 10 vulnerable. Students provided workshops upon individual requests of the vulnerable entrepreneurs.
- 2 days’ workshop in Cochabamba with 20 entrepreneurs working in sustainable business models with our local partner Hub7.
- Two open lectures with approximately 90 attendees each, including University staff, students, vulnerable and conventional entrepreneurs.
- Development of a short game-based course on Entrepreneurial Attitude and its manual (Babson’s methodology) and on Business Models (St. Gallen’s methodology).
- Doctoral students preparing their thesis social entrepreneurship, international support, base of the pyramid and vulnerable entrepreneurs.
- Pipeline of papers in preparation for publications based in the collection of 90 interviews and 14 focus groups with entrepreneurs and supporting organizations.

P5 has identified and established contact with key Bolivian actors in support of entrepreneurship: Hub 7, Pista 8, Bolivia Emprende, Startup Weekend Bolivia, Ashoka Fellows, UMSS, Business Incubator Tarija and CAP centers. We are working with them on the consolidation of Bolivian ecosystem in support of subsistence entrepreneurs, and on the development of synergies and common activities.

Conclusions
We identify three components that ensure the impact and sustainability of the P5 proposal to strengthen ecosystem in support of subsistence entrepreneurs:
1. Develop activities that engage different actors of the ecosystem and that create interactions between them.
2. Develop different activities to support vulnerable entrepreneurs, with and without the involvement of conventional entrepreneurs. This facilitates our understanding of the needs of vulnerable entrepreneurs and offer of an adequate support.
3. Transfer knowledge and best practices across ecosystem partners and involve international experts for advise.

Scoring
Good
2.4.6 Training Case Study / Tiraque

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Title</th>
<th>Training of community communicators of the Tiraque communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nature of Case Study | A line of action of the Transdisciplinary Research Platform carried out by different projects with undergraduate students in the area of educommunication.  
Go to the link for further information ([https://view.genial.ly/5ecee9c5f050cb0da4201916/presentation-presentacion-experiencia-educom-cbba](https://view.genial.ly/5ecee9c5f050cb0da4201916/presentation-presentacion-experiencia-educom-cbba)) |
| Type of Case of Study | Design and implementation of an educommunication campaign linked to the treatment of water sources |
| Background | During the needs assessment carried out in the Tiraque area, the programme team showed that the use and distribution of water is a very sensitive complex issue.  
After having established contact with irrigation associations, peasant organizations, municipalities and NGOs, it was determined as convenient from a transdisciplinary research point of view to support this effort, since it implies addressing the matter from different disciplines taking into account the traditions of the area in these aspects.  
In this context, a group of research teachers organized a Transdisciplinary Research Platform for undergraduate students of different careers to support action research on a specific topic identified together with the NGO INCAA, which supports the promotion of treatment and care of water sources in Tiraque. |
| Implementation | - From March to June 2019, students were provided with the theory and techniques necessary to acquire the knowledge and tools so that they are ready to face the situation in a professional way and activate resources and soft skills and related decision-making skills. knowing how to behave and show social commitment.  
- A group linked to the Transversal Project and the career of social communication, in the subject of educommunication, has defined as its specific task the development and execution of an awareness campaign on specific topics with the team of community communicators from Tiraque in a kind of laboratory of thematic journalism.  
In 23 visits to the area, they have carried out the following activities:  
- Together with teachers and other students, they have co-built knowledge of the community about the care of water sources and then, together with them, they have identified forms of water treatment in order to establish the benefits / consequences of the care of water sources. water, through workshops, carried out in a participatory and collaborative way.  
- Finally, action plans have been developed regarding the management of water sources by the community members.  
- The main contribution of the educommunication group has been the documentation of each step, in videos, which have been produced by the community members thanks to the training they have received from the students. |
- This has been another contribution, beyond the thematic aspect, so that the leaders have replicated the workshops and meetings in their families thanks to the use of their cell phones.

### Success Factors

The teaching of the use of video for documentation and information has become one of the most relevant aspects, since the irrigators’ associations, women’s associations and the peasant central have realized the potential of communication and have decided, from there on, to record their meetings as a methodology for empowering the community, since on the one hand, it was a control mechanism for the leader and, on the other hand, they could find out in detail the contents of the meetings. For this reason, there has been request to expand and redirect the activities of the subject towards training for radio and audiovisual recording of the young community members of Tiraque, who have participated in learning days in environments and laboratories of the UCB and have been followed by the students of the Educommunication subject.

### Impact/Results/outcome

At least 10 young people from Tiraque have learned to use audiovisual recording and audio editing equipment, as well as training in video production, radio and voice over, at the request of the Tiraque organizations themselves, thanks to the action of educommunication students in the framework of the Transdisciplinary Research Platform linked to the IUC VLIR UOS UCB programme.

### Conclusions

In this particular case, the action of the students has exceeded the expectations of the teachers and of the communities themselves, since it has made possible to understand the importance of communication in their organizations to empower them and facilitate their own social processes.

The lesson learned is to better tune lifetimes with institutional times. That is, to anticipate, in some way, the opportunities and social demands, so that during the development of the programme, action catalysts are placed that reorient the research itineraries from a greater joint reflection on the experience and emerging aspects, of solution or problems to give timely answers from the academy.

The other lesson is that organizations perceive that they are not used for student exercises or university research, while if they follow the collaborative methodology we have described, people will not feel as if they were being used for other purposes.

### Scoring

| | Good |
3. Conclusions and lessons learned

3.1 Conclusions at programme level / General Conclusions

3.1.1 Contextual issues

- **UCB Background.** Established in 1966, Universidad Católica Boliviana (UCB) is a private higher-education institution located in the urban setting of the large city of La Paz, with branch campuses in Cochabamba, Santa Cruz de la Sierra and Tarija. Officially recognized by the Ministerio de Educación, Bolivia (Ministry of Education of Bolivia), UCB is a coeducational Bolivian higher education institution formally affiliated with the Christian-Catholic religion. Although research is from 2014 one of the five main axis of the Institutional Strategic Plan, the operational organization of the University is structured around education as the main activity. In consequence:

  - The research background of UCB staff, and not only the knowledge or experience in transdisciplinary and community-based research, has several weaknesses (limited number of staff with PhD, laboratories, infrastructure, etc.).

  - As teaching is the main activity at UCB, the contact and interaction of the university with the local communities or the governmental structures is also quite limited.

  - UCB’s structure, centralized and with heavy bureaucratic processes, was not prepared for managing such a big project, with activities in four regions and the need of an operational structure in order to facilitate research.

The Bolivian context is also not supporting research at higher education institutions, as explained in detail in 1.4.3 (Higher Education Context). In South America, only the Guianas and Paraguay have less scientific production than Bolivia, according to the SCImago ranking.

- **The complexity of working with local communities.** The fact that UCB has campuses in 4 different regions in Bolivia does not directly provide access to local communities. Besides that, and as explained above, extension activities have not been a priority before the IUC, and UCB is usually perceived as representative of an oppositional urban-white elite. Thus, starting and stabilising this interaction requires some time, and the needs or requests of communities could also be out of the scope of the activities of the programme. The fine line demarcating NGO activities and higher education institutions sometimes could confuse local communities, but also IUC participants.

- **The impact of the three crises.** At the moment it is difficult to assess the scope of the impact of the 3 crises that have impacted the IUC. First was the social-ecological crisis provoked by the forest fire in Chiquitania (August 2019). Second, the political crisis that resulted in large manifestations, protests, strikes, violence, repression and serious polarization in society (from October 2019). And third the COVID-19 pandemic that struck the country (since March 2020). This situation is causing a significant delay in several activities, including PhDs’ work, trainings, etc.
3.1.2 Institutional issues

- **High relevance of the programme activities.** The IUC programme with UCB addresses highly relevant development issues in innovative ways, with the final aim of reducing the socio-ecological vulnerability of rural and urban communities by supporting them to generate knowledge, know-how and practical tools to respond, adapt and anticipate to the problems accompanying the aforementioned changes, and creating more adapted inclusive and sustainable solutions. This contribution to increase community resilience to the challenges of climate change, environmental degradation, migration and urbanization is expected to be realized through the creation of Transdisciplinary Learning Communities. Thematic projects tackle relevant issues of rural communities where they work with. In fact, communities have been selected on the basis of mapping their needs and vulnerabilities, as well as for the possible connections that could be established once the programme had started.

At stakeholder level, rural communities have evaluated the programme as highly relevant for them because of different reasons: the programme is dealing with current problems of these communities, the activities allowed them to interact with other actors (e.g. NGOs), the trainings deal with relevant topics for them (indigenous rights, entrepreneurial skills, etc.), and the collaborative approach is having an interesting impact on their members.

At an institutional level (UCB), the relevance of the programme is assessed periodically (every 6 months) with the national authorities at La Paz, plus follow-up meetings with the regional authorities. During the evaluation process the UCB authorities emphasized the importance and relevance of the programme by stating that it adequately contributes to the objectives of the UCB strategic plan in a promising way.

- **Weaknesses of the organisation of the PhD Research activities.** One of the most important research activities of the IUC programme is the support provided in the training of PhDs. It is widely recognised that doctoral graduates make significant contributions to their institutions in terms of research but also in teaching and extension activities. During this evaluation process we organised several meetings with PhD students, their colleagues, PhD promoters, UCB authorities, etc. Our conclusion is that the teaching and administrative workload of PhD students go in detriment of their research activities.

Moreover, the abovementioned crises are having an impact on their work: data collection has been interrupted and mobilities to Belgium are not allowed at the moment. In consequence, there is a significant delay in most PhD dissertations, which at the end is also having a direct impact on the project activities.

- **Decentralization process, transparency and ownership.** During the first years of the IUC the heavy administrative burden of the administrative and financial management of the project provoked complaints by participants and delays in activities. Participants in the regional universities also stressed the lack of academic/research autonomy to deal with the day-to-day activities. Thus, during the 3rd year the national UCB carried out an administrative and academic decentralization of the IUC
programme into the regional UCB universities. The process has also been affected, as all IUC activities, by the abovementioned crises, but aims to:

- Improve the administration and financial management of the different activities, now at regional level (including the internal communication);

- Provide more research autonomy to Regional TLC (in order to respond to the interests and needs of the local communities), and offer the project leaders full responsibility for managing their research activities in the four UCB regions.

Presently, the decentralization process is also having other consequences. At administrative level all procedures have been aligned to the “UCB Procurement and Contracting Regulations”, which allowed administrative units to become aware of the programme and to start developing specific administrative procedures related to research activities, especially in regions where research was practically non-existent before the programme. The perception of clarity and transparency of procedures also has been increased, according to different sources.

3.1.3 Design and vision of the IUC with UCB

- As stated in the ToR, the IUC with UCB is rather unique and innovative in the sense that it has a clear programme approach: the transdisciplinary learning communities (TLC). The transversal project (P6) focused on the incorporation of this approach into the programme, which resulted in an increasing support and use of this approach.

- However, and after 4 years, the IUC has not been able to work in harmony with the proposed double structure (thematic projects/vertical vs. TLCs/horizontal), and some projects basically do not share the original vision. Although it is true that the internalization process of this vision has been evolving positively, we also may not say today that this vision has been widely adopted. Regarding stakeholders, they value positively the work with the programme but, in the opinion of the evaluators, they do not perceive a difference between those projects that have adopted this transdisciplinary approach to those that have basically a monodisciplinary approach.

- Evaluators would also like to add a couple of reflections at this point. 1) There could be a trade-off between impacting local communities and research excellence (e.g. publishing in international journals). Therefore, following the transdisciplinary approach and working in solving the needs of communities could have an interesting impact in social terms, but does not guarantee that it will produce competitive research. 2) The transdisciplinary approach is very innovative and is currently attracting a lot of attention (and funding) of donors. However, it is not so easy to find researchers in the North (it is easier in the South) applying this approach in their day-to-day activities (probably also because of the first point).

- Finally, the ToR requested if the IUC is emphasizing cooperation with public universities in the different geographical regions of Bolivia with the aim to enhance their research expertise too, and if public universities are already involved in the programme research and training. As discussed in the evaluation at programme level, activities with local public universities have been channelled via
CEUB (Comité Ejecutivo de la Universidad Boliviana) via a research network, but this network is not operational yet because of COVID-19 (activities were planned to start after February 2020).

### 3.2 Some lessons learned during the journey

- **Planning and agreeing is crucial.** At two levels: vision and operational. At vision level the first step should be identifying the community’s challenges in order to carry out a common research approach in an integrative way. Generating this integrated vision of the research is crucial for success. **Afterwards** it will be necessary to clearly explain to the beneficiary population the activities to be carried out and coordinate the schedule of their activities in order to fit the programme activities and meet the local expectations. At operational level it is quite complicated to monitor and evaluate the results of a programme when some initiatives have a logical framework (projects) and others don’t (TLCs). Besides that, monitoring is also complex when most indicators have no baseline value.

- **Communication matters.** Communication within the IUC programme is a pivotal issue. Both at the level of the IUC academic members, as well as with external stakeholders, an open, direct and timely fashioned communication is crucial to achieve effective results. Moreover, communication with the strategic levels of the University –from career directors, to national and regional authorities– is very important to increase the sense of ownership of the IUC programme. Communication with stakeholders (see above) is also crucial in order to demonstrate the relevance of the programme and the benefits of their involvement.

- **Training Needs Assessment in Research and Research Methodologies is crucial.** A mistake in the first years was the assumption that Bolivian scholars were familiar not only with “traditional” research methodologies, but also with transdisciplinary and collaborative approaches. However, some key training events, and the day-to-day work, demonstrated the need for constant training and dialogue on research and research methodologies.
4. Recommendations

4.1 Recommendations at programme level

**R1. Reorganisation of PhD Research activities.** PhD Research activities should be reorganised. First, the teaching and administrative workload of PhD students should be decreased, and this should be agreed in a formal commitment with the programme coordinators. A longer duration of the research stays at Flemish universities is also recommended, in order to avoid future delays in the dissertations and other project activities. Second, the selection of PhD candidates needs to be based on an experiential process. Until now Ph.D. selection was done based on Ph.D. proposals, which were based mainly in researchers’ interest, without considering the needs of communities. Thus, in the second phase they must make their proposals based on field visits and on their interaction with the community. In addition, academic members of the UCB must be included in the selection committee.

**R2. Increasing / improving relationship with stakeholders.** Investing time in the creation of relationships with communities is a key point. The representatives of the communities point out that to work with the communities a time of entry and adaptation is needed. Nevertheless, it is not easy to combine community time requirements with the demands of both the academic activities and PhD expectations. Besides a revision of PhD enrolment procedures as described above, fieldwork must be started more carefully by tapping into the capabilities of the more experienced members regardless of their regional location to avoid unrealistic expectations in the communities. And researchers need sufficient time to be in the field, to analyse the data and to produce outputs.

**R3. Enhancing efficiency and effectiveness at management/operational level.** This recommendation covers 3 main areas:

- **Boosting flexibility.** The changing environmental, political and sanitary scenarios of Bolivia demand constant adaptation and a closer link with communities. Annual planning has been difficult to follow due to the unstable context being dealt with. Therefore, the IUC must be ready to face all kinds of contingencies and to be highly creative to continue research and training for the benefit of the communities with which they work. For instance, planning and developing digital learning frameworks and taking advantage of the experience of some projects in this area, could be generalised.

- **Upgrading the decentralization process.** The decentralization provided some positive effects at operational level (alignment of procedures, more transparency, etc.). Next steps should confirm the roles and responsibilities of the persons involved and avoid increasing the administrative workload for the local researchers.

- **Designing an effective communication strategy.** A marketing/communication strategy to make the IUC programme better known is also needed, in order to increase visibility, attract more stakeholders/partners, and to ensure sustainability for the future. Therefore, not only a communication strategy needs to be developed together with the relevant departments at the UCB, but also with a marketing approach in order to reach the mentioned objectives.
R4. Building consensus in a research vision. As discussed before, projects are getting good results and impact. However, the adoption of a collaborative attitude between the different members is needed in order to build consensus and reach an integrated research vision. The difficulties of the inter/transdisciplinary work are evident. Thus, communication improving internal exchange will be essential, as it is a complex (but possible) process that requires the collaboration between very different disciplines, approaches, languages and paradigms. In order to improve the performance of the IUC, a common research vision is needed, together with an adapted methodology and remarkable planning.

R5. Designing fundraising strategies, at programme and project levels. The programme and projects have in general good prospects for sustainability for several reasons (topics, context, etc.). However, at the moment there is no fundraising strategy which should include: a mapping of donors, a proactive approach in order to engage the academic community, investment in the development of human capital (proposals drafting), incentives to faculties & staff to take an active part in income diversification, etc.

R6. Strengthening the Bolivian-Belgian networks. Some ideas in this area: 1) Increase the participation of Flemish universities in the projects in which only 1 or 2 HEIs are collaborating; 2) Upgrade the role of Flemish PhD promoters, integrating them in more activities which may expand the research networks and generate new opportunities.

R7. Formalising the role of the TLCs. Experts consider that the current role of the TLCs should be formalised. TLCs will not be fully effective if they have not clear functions and an associated budget.

Specific comment for VLIR-UOS about the transdisciplinary approach. In the opinion of the evaluation team, this approach is innovative and trendy, but does not guarantee improved results / ownership / impact by itself. There are several variables that may affect the success of this approach, as for instance: the context, the research background of the South participants, the research background and profile of the Flemish participants, the research topic/discipline (in some disciplines this approach is not common, e.g. agricultural economics), the attitude of participants, the attitude of the communities, etc. All these variables should be aligned in a certain degree in order to run this approach, otherwise there could be bottlenecks and unmet expectations.
4.2 Recommendations at project level

First of all, the previous five recommendations are also applicable at project level. Additionally, the following are specific recommendations to each project.

**P1. Strengthening of Capacities to reduce social vulnerability**
- Consolidate a national research ecosystem related to social vulnerability issues, enhancing transdisciplinarity between the research groups;
- Reframe the theme of the project to focus on a more concrete topic, and making this element the core for the development of the research ecosystem.

**P2. Contribution to Integrated Water Management in Bolivia**
- Propose solutions to the problems identified in the first phase, in cooperation with communities;
- Improve external communication in order to reach local stakeholders efficiently.

**P3. Promoting food sovereignty and nutritional innovations in vulnerable communities in Bolivia**
- Exploit current research lines and explore additional themes (as for instance, forestry) in order to support the development of the communities in this area;
- Continue collecting data in order to improve research and publications.

**P4. Rights of indigenous Peoples and transformation of social conflicts in Bolivia**
- Design and implement a monitoring framework to evaluate the impact of the trainings provided;
- Increase/improve the strategic alliances process with other faculties of UCB, and also with other public universities, in order to strengthen P4 activities.

**P5. Entrepreneurial Productive Development**
- Organisation or strengthening of local incubators for the practical development of innovative entrepreneurial activity;
- Continue with the expansion of P5 activities beyond UCB, responding to the needs of the stakeholders and in cooperation with the rest of the projects.

**P6. Development of a Collaborative Learning Community (CLC) approach to co-create transdisciplinary solutions for complex problems of vulnerable urban and rural communities in Bolivia**
- Improve the coordination and integration between the transversal methodological project and other projects;
- Continue and intensify the horizontal support of university services to the UCB communities.
Annexes
Annex 1. Online questionnaires

- UCB PhD Students  💌  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/IUCUCBESDO
- UCB Teaching Staff  💌  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/IUCUCBPDI
- UCB Students  💌  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/IUCUCBEUCB
- UCB Management Staff  💌  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/IUCUBCGE
- IUC Stakeholders  💌  https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/IUCUBCST
### Annex 2. Case Studies Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Case Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Case of Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/ Results /Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>(this part is filled by the evaluators)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3. Scoring Methodology

General approach - Scoring

4-Excellent: the overall (Criterion) is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.

3-Good: Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on (Criterion); See recommendations No:

2-Low: Major room for improvement exists, with a potential of major effects on (Criterion) of the Programme/project. See recommendation No:

1-Poor: The (Criterion) is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently need to realize the (Criterion). See recommendation No:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Programme Level- Scoring

Criterion 1: Definition of Relevance

The extent to which the objectives of a programme are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies." Retrospectively, the question of relevance often becomes a question of whether the objectives or intervention logic of an action are still appropriate given changed circumstances.

Sub-criterion 1.1.: The extent to which the programme is addressing immediate and significant problems and needs of the concerned partners (institutional) as well as regional and national policy makers, with reference to the MDGs, PRSP and other multilateral policy documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-criterion 1.1. Responding to the needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scores</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub-criterion 1.2. Synergy and complementarity with other (Belgian) actors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-Low</th>
<th>The programme is partly aligned with National, regional and university policies and with VLIR-UOS strategy. Major room for improvement exists, with potential major effects on the relevance of the Programme. See recommendation No’s:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>The programme is not aligned with National, regional and university policies and with VLIR-UOS strategy. The relevance of the programme is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What could be improved in the process of formulating programme objectives?
- Are the chosen approaches, methodologies, partnerships and implementation modalities relevant?
- Is the programme responsive to changes in the local priorities and development context?

### Sub-criterion 1.3. Link with transversal themes of Belgian development cooperation: gender, environment and D4D (Digital for Development).

Transversal themes: can elements be found at the programme and project level. Recommendations for the next phase as the transversal themes were not a criterion during programme formulation. The main question is how these new priorities of the Minister can be integrated in the second phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-criterion 1.3. Transversal Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Are women and men equally approached?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is a gender policy in place? What measures and activities are implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is an environmental policy and strategy in place? What measures and activities are implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is there a D4D policy and strategy? What measures and activities are implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do specific projects contribute to better transversal theme approach at university level?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-criterion 1.4. Ownership. Demonstration of effective commitment of all partners in the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>All key stakeholders are still very committed to the programme. The overall commitment is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment? (taking up responsibilities, reporting, motivation, focus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>All key stakeholders are still committed to the programme. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on increasing ownership of the programme.</td>
<td>• Why not? • What is the interest of the stakeholders of being part of the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>Some key stakeholders are losing commitment to the programme. Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing ownership of the programme. See recommendations No’s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>A majority of key stakeholders are losing commitment to the programme. The ownership of the programme is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 2: Definition of Efficiency

“A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.”

Sub-criterion 2.1 Links between inputs and outputs. Demonstration of effective commitment of all partners in the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>The activities of the programme are implemented in cost-efficient manner. A similar cost-efficiency logic has been implemented for all projects. The overall cost-efficiency of the programme is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• Do the resources correspondent to the needs of the action? • Have the outputs been produced/delivered in a cost-efficient manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>Most of the activities of the programme are implemented in cost-efficient manner. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on increasing cost-efficiency of the programme.</td>
<td>• Spending rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2-Low
Most of the activities of the programme are implemented in cost-efficient manner. Major room for improvement exists, with major effect on increasing cost-efficiency of the programme. See recommendations No’s:

• Activities are chosen based on cost-considerations.

1-Poor
Most of the activities of the programme are not implemented in cost-efficient manner. The cost-efficiency of the programme is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

Sub-criterion 2.2. Delays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | The programme did not face any important delay in activities and in case of delay, revisions have been planned and implemented. Additional measures are not needed. | • To what extent are inputs available on time?  
• If there are delays, how important are they?  
• Have the reasons been identified? Have revisions.  
• Have revisions of planning been properly implemented? |
| 3-Good     | The programme did not face any important delay in activities and in case of delay, revisions have been planned but not yet implemented. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on the timing of implementation. |                                                                                      |
| 2-Low      | The programme did face important delays in activities and revisions have been planned but not yet implemented. Major room for improvement exists. See recommendations No’s: |                                                                                      |
| 1-Poor     | The programme did face important delays in activities and revisions have not been made. The implementation of activities is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s: |                                                                                      |
### Sub-Criterion 2.3. Program Management: Quality of Programme Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>The overall programme management is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• The management manual is well-developed and applied at programme and project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>The overall programme management is of good quality. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on increasing the quality of programme management.</td>
<td>• Is the programme adequately monitored and/or assessed by local and Flemish partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>The overall programme management is of low quality. Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing the quality of programme management. See recommendations No’s:</td>
<td>• How has been the role of both the local and the Flemish coordinators?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>The overall programme management is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td>• Which has been the style and performance of both the local and the Flemish coordinators?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criterion 3: Definition of Effectiveness

"The extent to which the programme’s objectives (IUC-level) are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance."

### Sub-criterion 3.1. Specific Academic Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The programme is on track in order to achieve the specific objectives. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• Has the expected progress in terms of outputs properly achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The programme is on</td>
<td>• Is the quality of the output satisfactory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are the outputs still likely to the expected outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub-criterion 3.2. Specific Development Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The programme is on track in order to achieve the specific objectives. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• Has the expected progress in terms of outputs properly achieved? • Is the quality of the outputs satisfactory? • Are the outputs still likely to the expected outcomes? • Is there evidence that the action supports the implementation or development or change of partners’ policy/actions in order to create impact on society?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The programme is on track in order to achieve the specific objectives. Minor room for improvement exists.</td>
<td>• Are there changes in awareness, knowledge, skills at institutional level? • Are there changes in organizational capacity (skills, structures, resources) in order to serve society • The indicators for the specific development objective have been achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>The specific objectives (and outputs) will be partly achieved. Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing programme management. See recommendations No’s:</td>
<td>• Are there evidence that the action supports the implementation or development or change of partners’ policy/actions? • Are there changes in awareness, knowledge, skills at institutional level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>The specific objectives (and outputs) won’t be achieved. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td>• Are there changes in organizational capacity (skills, structures, resources) in order to serve society • The indicators for the specific development objective have been achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Criterion 4: Definition Impact**

"Potential positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended."

**Remark:** in this mid-term evaluation, only indications (stories of impact) possible.

### Sub-criterion 4.1. Academic Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and Item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | The academic performance of the university has been increased significantly since the start of the programme (as a result of the programme) and will further increase during phase 2 if implemented in the same manner. Additional measures are not needed. | • Added value of the programme for the academic performance of the university 
• Increased publication in international refereed journals 
• Increased academic capacity of staff members 
• Increased collaborative academic activities not funded by the programme 
• Increase/improvement in internal funding, consultancies, national ranking, etc. |
| 3-Good | The academic performance of the university has been increased significantly since the start of the programme (as a result of the programme) and will further increase during phase 2 if implemented in the same manner. Minor room for improvement exists. | |
| 2-Low | The academic performance of the university has been increased partly since the start of the programme (as a result of the programme). Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing academic performance of the university. See recommendations No’s: | |
| 1-Poor | The academic performance of the university hasn’t been increased since the start of the programme (as a result of the programme). Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s: | |

### Sub-criterion 4.2. Institutional Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and Item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | Major Institutional reforms at university level are implemented as a result of the programme. Additional measures are not needed. | • Policy changes at institutional level? Changes in behavior at institutional level? 
• the extent to which the collaboration has sparked other departments to initiate interuniversity collaboration, joint capacity building, fund raising etc. |
| 3-Good | Major Institutional reforms at university level are planned as a result of the programme. Minor measures are needed. | |
| 2-Low | Major Institutional reforms at university level are planned as a result of the programme. Major measures are needed. See recommendations No’s: | |
1-Poor

No institutional reforms are implemented or planned. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

### Sub-criterion 4.3. Development Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>Policy development in society is based on programme experiences and results. Programme experiences and results are used for new initiatives. Additional measures are not needed to increase impact.</td>
<td>• The extent to which the collaboration has raised interest of policy makers and academics, and how the partner university is called upon or is pro-actively developing collaboration models that could be fed into policy advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>Programme experience and results are known in the broader society but have not yet caused new initiatives. Minor additional efforts are needed to increase impact.</td>
<td>• The extent of the activities developed with local or regional stakeholders, contributing to the economic and social development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>Programme experience and results are known in the broader society but have not yet caused new initiatives. Major additional efforts are needed to increase impact.</td>
<td>• Added value of the programme for the role of the university as a development actor: the extent to which the collaboration has led to joint developmental activities or similar collaborative models at the regional and global level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>Programme experience and results are known in the broader society. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criterion 5: Definition Sustainability

“Sustainability is the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed, the probability of continued long-term benefits, and the resilience to risk of net benefit flows over time.”

### Sub-criterion 5.1. Academic Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>Academic sustainability is guaranteed or will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• The extent to which the collaboration has raised interest of policy makers and academics, and how the partner university is called upon or is pro-actively developing collaboration models that could be fed into policy advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>Academic sustainability will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are partly identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability.

2-Low
Measures for academic sustainability are in the process of identification. Major additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability. See recommendations No’s:

1-Poor
Academic sustainability will not be guaranteed in the second phase. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

### Sub-criterion 5.2. Institutional Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | Institutional sustainability is guaranteed or will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Additional measures are not needed. | • Decision-making structures are in place to guarantee sustainability  
• Measure are taking to retain and upgrade human capital continuously  
• Maintenance of Infrastructure is guaranteed.  
• Strengths and weaknesses of the institution in terms of institutionalizing the collaboration  
• Intensification and/or formalization of interuniversity consultations (North-South and South-South) |
| 3-Good   | Institutional sustainability will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are partly identified and will be implemented in the second phase. Minor additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability. |  |
| 2-Low    | Measures for institutional sustainability are in the process of identification. Major additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability. See recommendations No’s: |  |
| 1-Poor   | Institutional sustainability will not be guaranteed in the second phase. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s: |  |

### Sub-criterion 5.3. Financial Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | Financial sustainability is guaranteed or will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Additional measures are not needed. | • financial viability  
• incorporation of costs into the budget of the partner university  
• other sources of finance: |
| 3-Good   | Financial sustainability will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are partly identified and will |  |
be implemented at the second phase. Minor additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability.

| 2-Low | Measures for financial sustainability are in the process of identification. Major additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability. See recommendations No’s: |
| 1-Poor | Financial sustainability will not be guaranteed in the second phase. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s: |

- Ability to attract external funds
- co-funding by the partner university (matching funds)
- (financial) involvement of private actors
- system of scholarships

Project Level- Scoring

Criterion 1: Definition Scientific Quality
“The extent to which a project has a ground-breaking nature and ambition (excellence).”

Sub-criterion P.1.1. Quality of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>The project has implemented innovative and outstanding research which have been published in international refereed journals. No additional measures are needed to increase innovative research results.</td>
<td>• the extent to which research is cutting edge; • Involvement of stakeholders in the South • Extent to which the results have been incorporated in local or international refereed journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>The project has implemented innovative and outstanding research but the results are not yet published in international refereed journals. Activities are planned to publish research results or academic articles are submitted to international refereed journals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>The project has replicated existing research and results are not (yet)published in international refereed journals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>The research component of the project failed. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-criterion P.1.2. Quality of Education

Scores | Definition Scores | Topic and item lists |
--------|------------------|----------------------|
4-Excellent

The overall education objectives are of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.

3-Good

The overall education objectives are of good quality. Room for improvement exists.

2-Low

The overall education objectives are of low quality. Major room for improvement exists, with potential major effects on the education quality of the Programme. See recommendation No’s:

1-Poor

The overall education objectives are of poor quality. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

- the extent to which new education practices are cutting edge;
- Involvement of South Stakeholders
- Extent to which alumni easily get a job which fits their education profile;
- the number of fellowships acquired from foundations
- Regional and international integration of education practices.

Criterion 2: Definition Relevance

“The extent to which the objectives of a project are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies.”

Sub-criterion P. 2.1. Responding to the needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and Item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | The project is aligned with National and regional policies, university policy and with VLIR-UOS country strategy. The overall relevance is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed. | • Process of project formulation
• Demonstrated links with the policy documents.
• In case of non-alignment, why? |
| 3-Good | The project is partly aligned with National, regional and university policies and with VLIR-UOS strategy. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on increasing the relevance of the project. | • Are partners (universities and governmental agencies) involved in Context Analysis? How? |
| 2-Low | The project is partly aligned with National, regional and university policies and with VLIR-UOS strategy. Major room for improvement exists, with potential major effects on the relevance of the project. See recommendation No’s: | • What could be improved in the process of formulating project objectives? 
• Are the chosen approaches, methodologies, partnerships and implementation modalities relevant? |
| 1-Poor | The project is not aligned with national, regional and university policies and with VLIR-UOS strategy. The relevance of the project is of poor quality and extra | • Is the project responsive to changes in the local priorities and development context? |
necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No's:

Sub-criterion P. 2.2. Synergy and Complementary

- Are there any synergy and complementary issues with other projects and programmes funded by VLIR-UOS and/or other donors in the country or in the region?
- Have possibilities for synergy explored? What has been done to create synergy? What activities have been organized with others? Are activities planned?
- Is there any synergy and complementary issue within the programme (and between the different projects)?
- Have possibilities for synergy explored within programme? Have activities been organized together with other projects?

Sub-criterion P.2.3. Transversal Themes

- Are women and men equally approached?
- Is a gender policy in place? What measures and activities are taken?
- Is an environmental policy and strategy in place? What measures and activities are taken?
- Is there a D4D policy and strategy? What measures and activities are taken?

Sub-criterion P.2.4. Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>All key stakeholders are still very committed to the project. The overall commitment is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>Do all key stakeholders still demonstrate effective commitment? (taking up responsibilities, reporting, motivation, focus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>All key stakeholders are still committed to the project. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on increasing ownership of the project.</td>
<td>Why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>Some key stakeholders are losing commitment to the project. Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing ownership of the project. See recommendations No’s:</td>
<td>What is the interest of the stakeholders of being part of the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of key stakeholders are losing commitment to the project. The ownership of the project is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

**Criterion 3: Definition Efficiency**

“A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.”

**Sub-criterion P.3.1. The intermediate results have been delivered**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>All the intermediate results are delivered. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• Check values on the output-indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>The intermediate results are partly delivered. Minor room for improvement exists.</td>
<td>• KRA’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>The intermediate results are partly delivered. Major room for improvement exists.</td>
<td>• Are indicators SMART?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>The intermediate results are not delivered. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-criterion P.3.2. Relationship between Objectives, results and means.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>There is clear link between means, outputs and objectives. The input is carefully thought-out. The project did not face any important delay in activities and in case of delay, revisions have been planned and implemented. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• The means/inputs are justifiable and are carefully thought-out solution for the defined outputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Outputs (intermediate results) contribute to the project objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent are inputs available on time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If there are delays, how important are they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Have the reasons be identified? Have revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>There is clear link between means, outputs and objectives. The input is partly thought-out. The project did not face any important delay in activities and in case of delay, revisions have been planned but not yet implemented. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on the implementation modalities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>The link between means, outputs and objectives is blurred. Inputs are too expensive in relation to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project did face important delays in activities. Revisions have been planned but not yet implemented. Major room for improvement exists. See recommendations No’s:

- Have revisions of planning been properly implemented?

### 1-Poor

The link between means, outputs and objectives is blurred. Inputs are far too expensive in relation to the outputs. The project did face important delays in activities and revisions have not been made. The implementation of activities or the link between activities and output/objectives is of poor quality.

Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

### Sub-criterion 3.3. Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>The overall project management is of excellent quality. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• The management manual is well-developed and applied at project and project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>The overall project management is of good quality. Minor room for improvement exists, however with minor effect on increasing the quality of project management.</td>
<td>• Is the project adequately monitored and/or assessed by local and Flemish partners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>The overall project management is of low quality. Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing project management. See recommendations No’s:</td>
<td>• Planning, monitoring and reporting system in place? Timely reporting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>The overall project management is of poor quality and extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td>• Good cooperation and communication within the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 4: Definition of Effectiveness

“The extent to which the project’s objectives are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4-Excellent** | The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The project is on track in order to achieve the specific objectives. Additional measures are not needed. | • Has the expected progress in terms of objectives properly achieved?  
• Is the quality of the outputs satisfactory?  
• Are the objectives still likely to the expected objectives?  
• Is there evidence that the action supports the implementation or development or change of partners’ policy/actions?  
• Are there changes in awareness, knowledge, skills at institutional level?  
• Are there changes in behaviour at the level of the involved stakeholders (department)?  
• How these changes are materialised? (More and/or better research? / More and/or better education?)  
• Are there changes in organizational capacity (skills, structures, resources)  
• The indicators for the specific academic objective have been achieved. |
| **3-Good**   | The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The project is on track in order to achieve the specific objectives. Minor room for improvement exists. | • Has the expected progress in terms of objectives properly achieved?  
• Is the quality of the outputs satisfactory?  
• Are the objectives still likely to the expected objectives?  
• Is there evidence that the action supports the implementation or development or change of partners’ policy/actions?  
• Are there changes in awareness, knowledge, skills at institutional level? |
| **2-Low**    | The specific objectives (and outputs) will be partly achieved. Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing programme management. See recommendations No’s: | • Has the expected progress in terms of objectives properly achieved?  
• Is the quality of the outputs satisfactory?  
• Are the objectives still likely to the expected objectives?  
• Is there evidence that the action supports the implementation or development or change of partners’ policy/actions?  
• Are there changes in awareness, knowledge, skills at institutional level?  
• Are there changes in behaviour at the level of the involved stakeholders (department)?  
• How these changes are materialised? (More and/or better research? / More and/or better education?)  
• Are there changes in organizational capacity (skills, structures, resources) |
| **1-Poor**   | The specific objectives (and outputs) won’t be achieved. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s: | • Has the expected progress in terms of objectives properly achieved?  
• Is the quality of the outputs satisfactory? |

Sub-criterion P.4.2. Specific Development Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4-Excellent** | The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The project is on track in order to achieve the specific objectives. Additional measures are not needed. | • Has the expected progress in terms of outputs properly achieved?  
• Is the quality of the outputs satisfactory? |
The specific objectives (and outputs) will be achieved in case of successful implementation during the second phase. The project is on track in order to achieve the specific objectives. Minor room for improvement exists.

**2-Low**

The specific objectives (and outputs) will be partly achieved. Major room for improvement exists, with a major effect on increasing project management. See recommendations No’s:

- Are the objectives still likely to the expected objectives?
- Is there evidence that the action supports the implementation or development or change of partners’ policy/actions?
- Are there changes in awareness, knowledge, skills at institutional level?
- Are there changes in organizational capacity (skills, structures, resources)?
- Are there changes in behaviour at the level of the involved stakeholders (department)? (changes in performance?)
- Has the university/faculty/department created the conditions for impact (e.g. by facilitating uptake)?
- The indicators for the specific development objective have been achieved.

**1-Poor**

The specific objectives (and outputs) won’t be achieved. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

- Are the objectives still likely to the expected objectives?
- Is there evidence that the action supports the implementation or development or change of partners’ policy/actions?
- Are there changes in awareness, knowledge, skills at institutional level?
- Are there changes in organizational capacity (skills, structures, resources)?
- Are there changes in behaviour at the level of the involved stakeholders (department)? (changes in performance?)
- Has the university/faculty/department created the conditions for impact (e.g. by facilitating uptake)?
- The indicators for the specific development objective have been achieved.

**Criterion 5: Definition of Impact**

“Potential positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.”

**Remark:** in this mid-term evaluation, only indications (stories of impact) possible.

### Sub-criterion P.5.1. Individual Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-Excellent</strong></td>
<td>A significant number of scholars/students/staff members has increased their knowledge and skills as result of the project. They use the newly required knowledge and skills. No Additional measures are not needed in the second</td>
<td>- Scholars/Students/staff members from the project are embedded in society and economic life and are contributing significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Good</strong></td>
<td>A significant number of scholars/students/staff members has increased their knowledge and skills as result of the project. They use the newly required knowledge and skills partly. Minor room for improvement exists in the second phase.</td>
<td>- Individual capacities of scholars/students are increased and they are using upgraded skills and knowledge in their jobs (even outside of the university).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Low</strong></td>
<td>A low number of scholars/students/staff members has increased their knowledge and skills as result of the project. They use the newly required knowledge and skills partly. Major room for improvement exists, with a major impact at individual level. See recommendations No’s:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1-Poor

A low number of scholars/students/staff members has increased their knowledge and skills as result of the project. They don’t use the newly required knowledge and skills. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

Sub-criterion P.5.2. Academic & Institutional Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | Major departmental/university reforms are implemented as a result of the project and academic performance increased as a result of the project. Additional measures are not needed. | • Added value of the project for the academic performance of the university  
• PhD students and PhD holders (VLIR-UOS scholarships) are embedded in the department and are implementing research.  
• Increased number of publication in international refereed journals  
• Increased number of PhD and MSc-holders as a result of the project.  
• Policy changes at departmental/university level?  
• Changes in behavior at departmental/university level?  
• the extent to which the collaboration has sparked other departments |
| 3-Good     | Major departmental/university reforms are planned as a result of the project and academic performance increased as a result of the project. Minor measures are needed. |                                                                                      |
| 2-Low      | Major departmental/university reforms at university level are planned as a result of the project and academic performance did not increase substantially. Major measures are needed. See recommendations No’s: |                                                                                      |
| 1-Poor     | No departmental/university reforms are implemented or planned and academic performance did not increase. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s: |                                                                                      |

Sub-criterion P.5.3. Development Impact (impact on society)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | Policy development in society is based on project experiences and results. project experiences and results are used for new initiatives. Additional measures are not needed to increase impact | • The extent to which the collaboration has raised interest of policy makers and academics, and how the partner university is called upon or is pro-actively developing collaboration models that could be fed into policy advice  
• The extent of the activities developed with local or regional |
| 3-Good     | Project experiences and results are known in the broader society but have not yet caused new initiatives. Minor additional efforts are needed to increase impact. |                                                                                      |
2-Low  Project experiences and results are known in the broader society but have not yet caused new initiatives. Major additional efforts are needed to increase impact.

1-Poor  Project experiences and results are known in the broader society. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:

**Criterion 6: Definition Sustainability**

“Sustainability is the continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed, the probability of continued long-term benefits, and the resilience to risk of net benefit flows over time.”

**Sub-criterion P.6.1. Academic & Institutional Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-Excellent</td>
<td>Academic sustainability is guaranteed or will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Additional measures are not needed.</td>
<td>• The extent to which the collaboration has raised interest of policy makers and academics, and how the partner university is called upon or is pro-actively developing collaboration models that could be fed into policy advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Good</td>
<td>Academic sustainability will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are partly identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Minor additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability.</td>
<td>• The extent of the activities developed with local or regional stakeholders, contributing to the economic and social development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Low</td>
<td>Measures for academic sustainability are in the process of identification. Major additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability. See recommendations No’s:</td>
<td>• Added value of the project for the role of the university as a development actor: the extent to which the collaboration has led to joint developmental activities or similar collaborative models at the regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Poor</td>
<td>Academic sustainability will not be guaranteed in the second phase. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s:</td>
<td>• Are individual academics committed to continue to work within the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengths and weaknesses of the department in terms of institutionalizing the collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Intensification and/or formalization of interuniversity consultations (North-South and South-South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Measures are taking for staff retention of trained staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub-criterion P.6.2. Financial Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Definition Scores</th>
<th>Topic and item lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-Excellent | Financial sustainability is guaranteed or will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Additional measures are not needed. | • financial viability  
• incorporation of costs into the budget of the partner university  
• other sources of finance –  
• Ability to attract external funds  
• co-funding by the partner university (matching funds)  
• Joint new projects (non project-funding) |
| 3-Good | Financial sustainability will be guaranteed in the second phase. Measures are partly identified and will be implemented at the second phase. Minor additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability. | |
| 2-Low | Measures for financial sustainability are in the process of identification. Major additional efforts are needed to increase sustainability. See recommendations No’s: | |
| 1-Poor | Financial sustainability will not be guaranteed in the second phase. Extra necessary measures are urgently needed. See recommendation No’s: | |
## Annex 4. Mission Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>Cargo</th>
<th>Fecha y hora de entrevista</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grupo focal de estudiantes de doctorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 de noviembre 15:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grupo de estudiantes de pregrado</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 de noviembre 17:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Loayza</td>
<td>Rector Regional Tarija</td>
<td>12 de noviembre 9:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Varas</td>
<td>Director Académico Regional</td>
<td>12 de noviembre 10:00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Rivera</td>
<td>Coordinador del Progarme a nivel regional</td>
<td>12 de noviembre 14:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena Mendoza</td>
<td>Miembro Académico P1</td>
<td>13 de noviembre 15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Avila</td>
<td>Miembro académico P6</td>
<td>30 de noviembre 17:07 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidina Ortega</td>
<td>Miembro de la Comunidad de Cirimuelas 2</td>
<td>13 de noviembre 15:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Riskowsky</td>
<td>Rectora Regional Cochabamba</td>
<td>16 de noviembre 9:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanina Galaburda</td>
<td>Directora Académica Regional</td>
<td>16 de noviembre 11:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo Guardia</td>
<td>Coordinador Regional de Cochabamba y Coordinador del programa en la Regional</td>
<td>16 de noviembre 14:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul D’Abzac</td>
<td>Líder Nacional P2</td>
<td>16 de noviembre 15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcelo Camargo</td>
<td>Miembro académico P4</td>
<td>16 de noviembre 17:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonso Alarcón</td>
<td>Líder Nacional Proyecto Transversal</td>
<td>16 de noviembre 18:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visita a comunidad Tiraque</td>
<td>En Compañía de Marcelo Guardia, Wanderley Ferreira y Celeste Quiroga</td>
<td>17 de noviembre a las 9:30 am en adelante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reunión con representante ONG Belga</td>
<td>SOLIAGRO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra Ramírez</td>
<td>Docente UMSS temática Transdisciplinariedad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesista pregrado</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 de noviembre 15:40 a 18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramiro Ocampo (INKA), Antonio Catacara (Fondo desarrollo campesino), Emilio Arce (Fe y Alegría), Jorge Delgadillo</td>
<td>Representantes de ONGs con quienes coordinan trabajo en los valles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunidad Transdisciplinaria La Paz</td>
<td>Nombre</td>
<td>Cargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Paul Benavides</td>
<td>Líder Nacional P3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcelo Vera</td>
<td>Vicerrector Académico Nacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Jordán</td>
<td>Vicerrector Administrativo Nacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramiro Molina</td>
<td>Líder nacional P4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Madeleine Irusta</td>
<td>Estudiante de pregrado Que desarrolla la estrategia de comunicación del programa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcela Losantos</td>
<td>Coordinadora Local Programma IUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flavio Escobar</td>
<td>Rector Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ariel Jinés</td>
<td>Director Administrativo Regional La Paz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gover Barja</td>
<td>Líder nacional P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunidad Transdisciplinaria de Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Pablo Herrera</td>
<td>Rector Regional Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delia Justiniano</td>
<td>Directora Académica Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariana Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Coordinadora Regional de investigación y Coordinador del programa en la Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cesar Pérez</td>
<td>Miembro académico P6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fabiola Valenzuela</td>
<td>Miembro académico P4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visita a San José de Chiquitos</td>
<td>En compañía de Mariana Santa Cruz/Jurij Suarez/Adolfo Mercado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Líderes</td>
<td>Marcela Losanto Garrít</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marco Antonio Fernández</td>
<td>Rector Nacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcelo Losanto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous activities to the mission include:

- (Internal) Skype meetings between the EU Expert and the Local Expert;
- Briefing midterm evaluation meeting via videoconference with VLIR-UOS representatives (Wannes Verbeeck & Peter De Lannoy) on 6/10/2020;
- Interviews with Flemish project leaders on 18/10/2020, specifically:
  - Jannes Motmans – 2/11/2020
  - Nikolay Dentchev – 5/11/2020
  - Marc Craps – 5/11/2020
  - Marijke Huysmans – 5/11/2020
  - Gerrit Loots – 6/11/2020
  - Ann Crabbé – 6/11/2020
  - Marijke D'Haese – 6/11/2020
- Additional meeting with VLIR-UOS representatives about the scope of the evaluation (Wannes Verbeeck & Peter De Lannoy) on 13/11/2020;
- Additional meetings took place with Marcela Losantos and other project leaders during the evaluation process
VLIR-UOS supports partnerships between universities and university colleges in Flanders and the South looking for innovative responses to global and local challenges.