Evaluation

of Higher Education Programmes in Nicaragua and South-East Europe 2005–2009

Final Report

www.entwicklung.at

Austrian
Development Cooperation

Dirk van den Boom
Klaus-Peter Jacoby
Stefan Silvestrini

July 2010

Content

List of abbreviations

ADA	Austrian Development Agency
ADC	Austrian Development Cooperation
AEI	Agency for European Integration and Economic Development
AECID	Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo
BCC	Balkan Case Challenge
BGP	Brain Gain Program
BICU	Bluefields Indian and Caribbean University
BMWF	Federal Ministry of Science and Research (Austria)
CDC	Centros de Desarrollo Comunal
CDCC	Consejo de Desarrollo de la Costa Caribe
CDP	Course Development Program
CEIMM	Centro de Estudios e Información de la Mujer Multiétnica
CEP	Centre for Education Policy
CEval	Center for Evaluation at the Saarland University
CIASES	Centro de Investigación y Acción Educativa Social
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CITT	Centre for Innovation Support and Technology Transfer
CNU	Consejo Nacional de Universidades
EC	European Commission
ECTS	European Credit Transfer System
ENQA	European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
FADCANIC	Fundación para la Autonomía y el Desarrollo de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua
HDI	Human Development Index
HE	Higher Education
IEPA	Instituto de Estudios y Promoción de la Autonomía
INIDE	Instituto Nacional de Información de Desarrollo
IRDP	Integrated Rural Development Programme
IREMADES	Instituto de Recursos Naturales, Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KAA	Kosova Accreditation Agency
KAIP	Kosova – Austria Institutional Partnership
K-CIRT	Kosova Centre for International Higher Education, Research and Technology Co-operation
KEC	Kosovo Education Centre
MEST	Ministry for Education, Science and Technology
MINED	Ministerio de Educación
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSDP	Master Studies Development Program
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
NARIC	National Academic Recognition & Information Centre
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
ÖED	Österreichischer Entwicklungsdienst
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PNDH	Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Humano

RAAN	Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte
RAAS	Región Autónoma del Atlántico Sur
SAIH	Norwegian Student's and Academics' International Assistance Fund
SEAR	Sistema Educativo Autonómico Regional
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SWAP	Sector-Wide Approach
ToR	Terms of Reference
UE	Unión Europea
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UP	University of Pristina
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
URACCAN	Universidad de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Caribe Nicaragüense
WUS	World University Service
ZDF	Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation

Executive Summary (Deutsch)

Ziel der Evaluation

Ziel dieser Evaluation ist es, die Hochschulbildungsprogramme der Austrian Development Agency (ADA) im Kosovo, Serbien und Nicaragua zu untersuchen, um Empfehlungen für die künftige Ausrichtung zu geben.

Methodisches Vorgehen

Die Evaluation wurde in verschiedenen Phasen durchgeführt, von einem einführenden Workshop bei ADA in Wien über die Durchführung der Feldmissionen bis zu einem Abschlussgespräch wieder in Wien. Die Daten wurden auf folgende Art und Weise erhoben: Dokumentenanalyse sowohl im Vorfeld wie auch vor Ort in den Projektländern, Leitfadeninterviews, sowohl persönlich als auch telefonisch, in Österreich wie auch den Projektländern, sowie Interviews mit anderen Gebern und Experten in den Projektländern. Darüber hinaus wurden Begehungen der Partneruniversitäten durchgeführt.

Programm-Kontext und Strategien

Der **Kosovo** hat eine Anzahl strategischer Visionen für seinen Hochschulsektor entwickelt. Er verfügt über eine Hochschulbildungsstrategie mit einem Zeitrahmen bis 2015, ein Hochschulgesetz, das derzeit überarbeitet wird und eine neuen Nationalen Forschungsplan. Darüber hinaus hat die Universität von Pristina, als Zentrum der Hochschulbildung im Kosovo, eine eigene Universitätsstrategie entwickelt. Obgleich das aktuelle Länderprogramm von ADA vor Abfassung der ADA-Hochschulstrategie geschrieben wurde, ist ein hohes Maß an Übereinstimmung erkennbar. Auf der anderen Seite fehlen wichtige Aspekte wie z. B. das Thema „brain circulation"[1] (d.h. die zirkuläre Migration von akademischen Professionals zwischen ihrem Heimatland und anderen Ländern). In **Serbien** gibt es keine Hochschulbildungsstrategie. Vor kurzem wurde aber ein Forschungsprogramm vorgestellt. Das ADA-Länderprogramm für Serbien enthält keine spezifischen Ziele für die Hochschulförderung, verwendet Aktivitäten in diesem Sektor eher als Interventionen, um andere Ziele zu erreichen, vor allem arbeitsmarktpolitischer Natur. Die Verbindung zwischen der ADA-Hochschulstrategie – die auch später verfasst wurde – und dem Länderprogramm ist schwächer als im Kosovo. **Nicaragua** verfügt ebenfalls nicht über eine Hochschulstrategie. Die Unterstützung durch ADA passt aber gut zur regionalen Entwicklungsstrategie für die Karibische Küste, da die Projektpartner wichtige Akteure für die Stärkung der regionalen Autonomie sind. In Bezug auf eine künftige strategische Ausrichtung, passt das Capacity Development durch die Unterstützung des Hochschulsektors in der RAAN/RAAS (Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte/ Región Autónoma del Atlántico Sur) gut zu den Schwerpunktthemen der ADA, vor allem, wenn man die starke Verbindung lokaler Entwicklung im neuen Projektantrag der URACCAN (Universidad de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Caribe Nicaragüense) berücksichtigt. Die Hochschulbildungsstrategie der ADA existierte noch nicht, als die aktuellen Projekte geplant wurden. Dennoch gibt es bis zu einem gewissen Grade Übereinstimmungen mit den Leitprinzipien und einigen Schwerpunktbereichen dieser Strategie.

---

[1]   ADA-Hochschulstrategie

Programm-Portfolios

Die Aktivitäten im **Kosovo** können zwischen dem großen, multi-dimensionalen KAIP (Kosova – Austria Institutional Partnership) -Projekt und den Aktivitäten des World University Service (WUS) unterschieden werden. KAIP widmet sich generell der Unterstützung des kosovarischen Hochschuldbildungssystems im Bestreben, die EU-Standards auf verschiedenen Ebenen zu erreichen. WUS konzentriert sich auf die Unterstützung der Universität, vor allem im Bereich der Entwicklung von Master-Studiengängen. Die Aktivitäten in **Serbien** können unterschieden werden zwischen einem allgemeinen WUS-Programm mit einer Reihe von Komponenten, einem Praktikanten-Programm, das in Zusammenarbeit mit der Zoran-Djindjic-Stiftung durchgeführt wird sowie einem Sprachkurs des "Österreich-Instituts". In **Nicaragua** gibt es zwei Hochschulförderungsprojekte von ADA bzw. Horizont 3000: (1) Die Kooperation mit der Universität der Autonomen Regionen der Karibikküste (URACCAN), vor allem die Stärkung des Campus Las Minas in Siuna. Die Komponenten reichen von dem Ziel zur Verbesserung der akademischen Lehre und Forschung durch Qualifizierung von Hochschullehrern bis zur Gewährung des Universitätszugangs für gefährdeten Bevölkerungsgruppen durch ein internes Stipendienprogramm und sieht vor, die lokale Entwicklung durch die Gründung von sogenannten Zentren für kommunale Entwicklung sowie die Sensibilisierung für Fragen im Zusammenhang mit Risikomanagement zu stärken. (2) Ein komplementäres Süd-Süd-Stipendienprogramm über die lokale NGO FADCANIC (Fundación para la Autonomía y el Desarrollo de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua). Die Teilnehmer sollen für regionale Institutionen arbeiten und damit einen Beitrag zur Entwicklung der karibischen Küste leisten. Obwohl sich die Bewertung auf die aktuellen Projekte konzentriert, können einige Kriterien für die Bewertung nur auf sinnvolle Weise unter Berücksichtigung der längerfristigen Geschichte der Zusammenarbeit, die zurückgeht auf die Mitte der 90er Jahre, analysiert werden. Der Beitrag der Hochschulförderung auf andere Bereiche der österreichischen Zusammenarbeit ist ebenfalls berücksichtigt.

Relevanz

Die Aktivitäten im **Kosovo** stehen in vollem Einklang mit der offiziellen Politik in Bezug auf die HE-Sektor, seien es die Strategien, die die kosovarische Regierung entwickelt, sei es der allgemeine Wunsch, sich voll am Bologna-Prozess zu beteiligen. Im Kosovo setzt das KAIP Projekt stark auf die Beiträge der Partner-Institutionen und deren Umsetzungsfähigkeiten. WUS-Aktivitäten im Kosovo sind service-orientiert und verlassen sich nicht auf Kapazitäten der Universität. Grundlagen der Entwicklung von Kapazitäten, wie von der ADA in relevanten Dokumenten skizziert, werden nicht immer eingehalten. In **Serbien** sind WUS-Aktivitäten teilweise in Richtung auf die Stärkung der individuellen Fähigkeiten der Bewerber und ihrer Mitarbeiter ausgerichtet, teilweise in Richtung auf die Stärkung der Institutionen als solche. Es ist kein Beitrag zur Entwicklung von Kapazitäten auf ministerieller Ebene sichtbar. Grundlagen des Capacity Development, wie von ADA festgelegt, werden nicht immer eingehalten. Ownership ist in **Nicaragua** in beiden Partnerorganisationen hoch, da Projektziele ihren umfassenden institutionellen Zielen entsprechen. Die Umsetzungsagentur Horizont 3000 hat die Projekte durch einen nachfrageorientierten, partizipativen Ansatz implementiert, der von den Partnern sehr geschätzt wird. Im Falle der URACCAN ist der Aufbau institutioneller Kapazitäten in einem Ausmaß entwickelt, dass die Umsetzung zukünftiger Projekte ohne weitere Vermittlung von Horizont 3000 möglich ist. Dies ist für FADCANIC noch nicht nachweisbar. Die meisten ADA-Richtlinien und internationalen Standards für Capacity Development wer-

den erreicht, ein systemischer Ansatz auf mehreren Ebenen (also die Einbeziehung der Schnittstellen mit der Makro-Ebene oder anderen Bildungssektoren) liegt nicht in der Reichweite der Projekte.

Wirksamkeit

Nicht alle Aktivitäten in **Kosovo** können als wahrhaft programmbasiert beschrieben werden. Aktivitäten innerhalb von KAIP beziehen sich nicht immer eindeutig aufeinander, was aufgrund der der unterschiedlichen Ebenen der Intervention verständlich ist. Es gibt planerisch keinen Zusammenhang zwischen KAIP- und WUS-Aktivitäten. In Bezug auf das Verhältnis zwischen Input und Output ist die allgemeine Einschätzung positiv, mit gewissen Defiziten in Bezug auf den Input des zuständigen Ministeriums im Rahmen der KAIP-Aktivitäten. Alles in allem haben kosovarische Programme die meisten ihrer Indikatoren erfüllt, nur wenige Komponenten sind darin gescheitert, Fortschritte wie geplant zu erreichen. Geberkoordinierung im Bereich der HE ist zurzeit noch eine anspruchsvolle Aufgabe. Die Kohärenz innerhalb des österreichischen Systems funktioniert zufrieden stellend. Aktivitäten in **Serbien** sind nicht wirklich programmbasiert, sondern additiv. Wie im Kosovo haben die meisten der Komponenten die geplanten quantitativen Ergebnisse erreicht. Geberkoordinierung ist derzeit nicht existent. In **Nicaragua** fehlt es in bestimmten Bereichen an Geberkommunikation. Kohärenz innerhalb des österreichischen Systems hat sich nicht als problematisch herausgestellt. Das Projekt mit der URACCAN kommt einem ganzheitlichen Ansatz nahe, da seine Komponenten sichtbar miteinander verbunden sind und einen Beitrag zu einem gemeinsamen Zweck leisten. Das Stipendienprogramm des FADCANIC ist komplementär, obwohl das Potenzial für Synergien noch nicht voll ausgeschöpft worden ist. Das Verhältnis von Input zu Output ist zufrieden stellend. Die meisten Komponenten der beiden Programme waren erfolgreich, mit nur einem Indikator außerhalb des Zielkorridors (URACCAN) oder einer gewissen Verzögerung beim Output (FADCANIC). Zielgruppen sind in einem Ausmaß erreicht worden, das meistens nah an die mit den Indikatoren definierten Zielwerte heran kommt. Geberkoordinierung hat weder für die HE-Sektor etabliert, noch für Capacity Development in RAAN/ RAAS. Besonders die Koordinierung der Geber in RAAN/ RAAS könnte dazu beitragen, ergänzende Maßnahmen in den verschiedenen pädagogischen Teilsektoren zu erleichtern.

Nachhaltigkeit

Im **Kosovo** sind die Auswirkungen von Aktivitäten im Hochschulsektor deutlich sichtbar und positiv. Einige Indikatoren aus dem KAIP-Programms waren zu ehrgeizig. Der LogFrame der WUS-Aktivitäten hat ernsthafte Defizite und indiziert einen Mangel an Wissen über diese Planungsmethode. In **Serbien** sind die Auswirkungen auf der Ebene der Fakultäten und Institute deutlicher sichtbar, mit Ausnahme des einzigen voll integrierten Universität in Serbien in Novi Pazar. Auch können positive Wirkungen des Praktikanten-Programms sowie des Sprach-Kurses angenommen werden. Die gewählten Indikatoren entsprechen nicht immer den aktuellen Standards und die Planungsmethode wurde nicht gut genutzt. Die Zusammenarbeit mit URACCAN in **Nicaragua** hat nachhaltige Auswirkungen auf die Stärkung der Institution als auch hinsichtlich der Verbesserung der wissenschaftlichen Exzellenz sowie auf die Konsolidierung der administrativen Kapazitäten. Allerdings ist die wirtschaftliche Nachhaltigkeit eine zentrale Frage und eine strukturelle Abhängigkeit von Geberzuwendungen wird auf eine unbestimmte Zeit andauern. In Bezug auf eine ergebnisorientierte Ausrichtung, variiert

die Qualität der LogFrames und ihrer Indikatoren, die sich zumeist auf die Output-Ebene konzentrieren. Während der Output gut dokumentiert und verfolgt wurde, fehlen bei den Ergebnissen und Wirkungen Variablen.

Ergebnisse und Wirkungen

Die Aktivitäten im **Kosovo** werden nicht nur den Brain-Drain-Effekt nicht eindämmen, sie werden ihn unweigerlich unterstützen. Abgesehen von der positiven Einbeziehung des Gender-Aspekts sind Fragen der Integration ethnischer Minderheiten und Menschen mit Behinderungen in den Aktivitäten nicht nachweisbar. Die Verknüpfung der Projekte mit dem Arbeitsmarkt ist schwach und kaum erkennbar. Die ADA-Aktivitäten haben positiv zur Integration in die EU-Bildungs- und Forschungspolitik beigetragen, trotz aller politischen Hindernisse. Die Aktivitäten in **Serbien** befördern letztendlich auch den brain-drain-Effekt. Abgesehen von der positiven Einbeziehung des Gender-Aspekts sind Fragen der Integration ethnischer Minderheiten und Menschen mit Behinderungen in den Aktivitäten nicht nachweisbar. In Bezug auf die Verbindung zum Arbeitsmarkt sind Beschäftigungs-Aspekte klar als Fokus nachweisbar. Die ADA-Aktivitäten haben positiv auf die Integration in den EU-Bildungs-und Forschungspolitik beigetragen, auch hier trotz politischer Herausforderungen. Brain-Drain-Effekte sind in **Nicaragua** nicht signifikant und Tracer-Studien belegen, dass die meisten der Absolventen der URACCAN Arbeit in der RAAN/RAAS aufgenommen haben. Im Fall des Stipendienprogramms durch FADCANIC ist ebenfalls nur von einem geringen Brain-Drain-Potential auszugehen. Die Gleichstellung der Geschlechter und Nichtdiskriminierung vulnerabler Gruppen in sind nicht nur in den Projekten berücksichtigt, sondern auch von den Projektpartnern im Allgemeinen. Besonders im Fall von URACCAN wurden positive Maßnahmen für Frauen und die indigene Bevölkerung ergriffen. Während der Zugang und der Verbleib von Frauen deutlich verbessert werden konnte, sind Studienabbrüche von einheimischen Studenten immer noch überdurchschnittlich hoch. Die Auswirkungen Entwicklung regionaler Kapazitäten kann nicht quantitativ gemessen werden, doch wird davon ausgegangen, dass sie beträchtlich sind. URACCAN hat direkt zu den Rahmenbedingungen für die regionale Autonomie (SEAR, regionales Gesundheits-Modell) beigetragen und URACCAN Absolventen haben eine starke Präsenz in den lokalen und regionalen öffentlichen Einrichtungen. Die Wirkung ist auch in den eigentlichen Schwerpunkten der ADA sichtbar, insbesondere im Hinblick auf die ländliche Entwicklung und den Gesundheitssektor.

Empfehlungen

Für den **Kosovo** empfiehlt der Bericht die Tätigkeiten sowohl mit den Universitäten wie auch mit dem Ministerium fortzusetzen, jedoch einen vorsichtigen Ansatz in Bezug auf die Errichtung der neuen Hochschule in Prizren zu verfolgen und signifikante Mittel nur nach sorgfältiger Prüfung zu bewilligen. Dabei ist eine Fokussierung auf Tätigkeiten, die Arbeitsmarktfragen, die Integration ethnischer Minderheiten und eine realistische Planung beinhalten, empfehlenswert. Die bisherigen WUS-Aktivitäten sollten deutlich mehr innerhalb der Universitätsstrukturen implementiert werden, weniger durch eine außen stehende Dienstleister. Einige Elemente des aktuellen KAIP – wie die Forschungsstipendien – müssen nicht fortgesetzt werden und auf den Arbeitsmarkt bezogene Konzepte wie auch migrationsrelevante Fragestellungen sollten stärker Berücksichtigung finden. Unterstützung für ein Career-Service-

Center und ein Alumni-Netzwerk kann dazu beitragen, den Fokus stärker auf den Arbeitsmarkt richten. Für **Serbien** empfiehlt der Bericht eine Exit-Strategie, die weitere drei Jahre mit einem deutlicheren Schwerpunkt auf Entwicklung von Kapazitäten auf administrativer Ebene aktiv ist; insbesondere im Hinblick auf Kapazitäten für die Projekt-Durchführung und finanzielle Verwaltung von Gebermitteln. WUS Belgrad sollte die Aufgabe für die Implementierung dieser Exit-Phase gegeben werden. Einige Komponenten sind entweder nicht weiter zu verfolgen – wie die Koordinierungsplattform - oder in ihren Fokus zu verändern – etwa wie die Unterstützung der Akkreditierungs-Kommission. Die Aktivitäten in Novi Pazar können nun mehr auf die Arbeitsmarkt-Aspekte gerichtet werden, etwa durch die Unterstützung der Einrichtung eines Career-Service-Centers. Querschnittsthemen wie Gender etc. müssen sichtbarer werden. Geberkoordinierung sollte sich darauf konzentrieren, Geber zu finden, die beim Rückzug der ADA zumindest Teilaspekte der Arbeit übernehmen könnten. Die Ergebnisse der Evaluierung deuten an, dass die Projekte effektiv und völlig legitim im Hinblick auf ihrer Übereinstimmung mit den Schwerpunkten sind und daher fortgesetzt werden sollten. Alle vernünftigen Szenarios für die Zukunft bezogen auf **Nicaragua** enthalten eine weitere Zusammenarbeit mit URACCAN. Eine Erneuerung des Süd-Süd-Stipendienprogramms sollte auf die Art, wie der Fokus mit den Schwerpunkten der Arbeit von ADA in Einklang gebracht werden kann, hin in Einklang gebracht werden und damit verstärkt Synergien mit anderen Vorhaben suchen. Die künftige Zusammenarbeit mit URACCAN sollte zwar die lokale Entwicklung weiterhin betonen, die Komponenten für die Stärkung der wissenschaftlichen Exzellenz und Stipendien für benachteiligte Gruppen jedoch ebenfalls fortsetzen. Die Betonung der Qualifikation der Erzieher sollten aus pädagogischen und didaktischen Themen hin zur Spezialisierung in bestimmten Fachbereichen verlagert werden. Koordinierung der Geber sollte auf regionaler Ebene festgelegt werden, um eine Planung von Interventionen in den verschiedenen Bildungs-Subsektoren ermöglichen.

Executive Summary (English)

Purpose of this evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to scrutinize higher-education-support programs financed by Austrian Development Agency (ADA) in Kosovo, Serbia and Nicaragua, with a specific look into recommendations for future activities.

Methodological approach

The Evaluation has been conducted in several phases, starting with a workshop in ADA Vienna, followed by field-trips and finalized by a final meeting in Vienna. Data collection methods were: Desk-research with document-analysis before and during the field-missions, guided interviews, in person and via telephone, in Austria as well as project-countries and additional interviews with other donors and experts in project-countries. Furthermore, site-visits in partner-universities were conducted.

Program context and strategies

Kosovo has developed a number of strategic visions for its HE-sector. Kosovo can boast of a Higher Education Strategy with a timeframe up to 2015, a Higher Education Law which is currently under reform and a newly produced National Research Plan. In addition, the University of Pristina as the center of HE in the country has developed quite recently a strategy on its own. Although the current country-program for Kosovo by ADA has been written before the current HE-strategy of ADA was put in place, a lot of congruence is discernible. On the other hand, important aspects like e.g. brain-circulation[2] (i.e. the circulation of academic professionals between the home-country and other countries) are missing. In **Serbia**, no HE-strategy exists. A research program has recently been promulgated. The country-program for Serbia does not state specific goals in regard to HE, but uses HE-activities as interventions to reach other goals like e.g. employment creation. The link between the current HE-strategy – which again has been written later – and the country-program is weaker than in Kosovo. **Nicaragua** does not count with a strategy for the development of the higher education sector. However, ADA support is in line with the regional Strategy for the Development of the Caribbean Coast as the project partners are key players for the strengthening of the regional autonomy. With regard to the future country strategy, capacity development through HE support in the RAAN/RAAS (Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte/ Región Autónoma del Atlántico Sur) is also in line with the focus areas of ADA, particularly taking into account the strong local development focus of the new project proposal by URACCAN (Universidad de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Caribe Nicaragüense). The HE strategy of ADA had not yet been in place when the current projects were formulated. However, they comply up to a certain degree with the guiding principles and some selected key areas of the HE strategy.

Program portfolios

The activities in **Kosovo** can be differentiated between the big multi-dimensional KAIP-project, which aims in general to support the establishment of a Kosovarian HE-system meeting EU standards on various levels, and the activities of the World University Service, concentrated on support for the university, especially in development of Master Studies. The activities in **Serbia** can be differentiated between a general WUS-program with a number of components, an internship-program run in cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation and a language-program run by the "Österreich-Institut". There are two higher education support projects of ADA and Horizont 3000 in **Nicaragua**: (1) The cooperation with the University of the Autonomous Regions of the Caribbean Coast (URACCAN), particularly the strengthening of the Campus Las Minas in Siuna. The components of the aim towards the improvement of academic teaching and research through qualification of university teachers, granting university access to vulnerable groups through an internal scholarship program, stipulating local development through the foundation of so-called Centers for Communitarian Development and the awareness-raising for issues related to risk management. (2) A complementary South-South-scholarship program canalized via the local NGO FADCANIC (Fundación para la Autonomía y el Desarrollo de la Costa Atlántica de Nicaragua). The participants are supposed to work for regional institutions and, thus, contribute to the development of the Caribbean Coast.

---

[2]   ADA-HE-sector strategy

Although the evaluation focuses on the current projects, some evaluation criteria can only be analyzed in a meaningful way by taking into account the longer-term history of the cooperation which goes back to the mid-90s. The contribution of HE support to other areas of Austrian cooperation is also taken into account.

Relevance

Activities in **Kosovo** are fully in line with official policy in regard to the HE-sector, be it the strategies developed by the Kosovarian government, be it the general desire to participate fully in the Bologna-process. In Kosovo, the KAIP (Kosova – Austria Institutional Partnership) project relies heavily on the contributions of partner-institutions and their implementation-capabilities. WUS-activities in Kosovo are more service-oriented and do not rely on the University's capacities for implementation as much. Basic principles of capacity-development, as outlined by ADA in relevant documents, are not always adhered to. In **Serbia**, WUS-activities are geared partly towards the strengthening of individual capacities of applicants and their staff, partly towards the strengthening of institutions as such. No contribution to capacity-development on the ministerial level is made. Basic principles of capacity-development, as outlined by ADA in relevant documents, are not always adhered to. Ownership in **Nicaragua** is high in both partner organizations as project goals comply with their overall institutional missions. The implementing-agency Horizont 3000 has managed the projects by a demand-driven, participatory approach that is highly appreciated by the partners. In the case of URACCAN, institutional capacity development has advanced to an extent that allows for implementing future projects without further intermediation of Horizont 3000. This has not yet been proven for FADCANIC. Most ADA guidelines and international standards for capacity development are met, but a systemic multi-level approach to capacity development (i.e. the inclusion of interfaces with the macro-level or other educational sub-sectors) is not within the range of the current projects.

Effectiveness

Not all the activities in **Kosovo** can be described as truly program-based. Activities within KAIP are not always clearly linked to each other, which is understandable because of the different levels of intervention. There is no coherence between KAIP- and WUS-activities by design. In regard to the relationship between input and output, the general assessment is positive, with certain deficits in regard to the input by the relevant ministry in KAIP-activities. All in all, Kosovarian programs have fulfilled most of their indicators, only few components have missed to achieve progress as planned. Donor-coordination in the sector of HE is currently still a challenging task. Coherence within the Austrian system works satisfactory. Activities in **Serbia** are not really program-based but additive. Like in Kosovo, most of the components have yielded the planned quantitative results. Donor-coordination is non-existent at this time. In **Nicaragua**, donor-communication lacks in certain areas. Coherence within the Austrian system has not emerged as a problematic issue. The project with URACCAN comes close to a holistic approach as its components are visibly interrelated and contribute to a common purpose. The scholarship program of FADCANIC is complementary, although the potential for synergies has not yet been fully tapped. Ratio of input vs. output is satisfactory. Most of the components of both programs have been successful, with only one indicator outside the target corridor (URACCAN) or some delay in output delivery (FADCANIC). Target populations have been reached to an extent that mostly comes close to the target values

defined in the indicators. Donor-coordination has neither been established for the HE sector nor for capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS. Particularly donor coordination for the RAAN/RAAS could contribute to facilitate complementary interventions in the different educational subsectors.

Sustainability

In **Kosovo**, the impact of activities in the HE-sector is clearly visible and positive. Some indicators in the KAIP-program are too ambitious. The LogFrame of the WUS-activities has serious deficits and shows a lack of knowledge of this planning method. In **Serbia**, the impact is more visible on the level of individual departments, with the exception of the only integrated university in Serbia, in Novi Pazar. Also, positive impact of the internship-program as well as the language-course can be assumed. Again, the indicators chosen are not always up to current standards and the LogFrame-method is not well used. The cooperation with URACCAN in **Nicaragua** has had sustainable impact on the strengthening of the institution, as well regarding the improvement of academic excellence as the consolidation of administrative capacities. However, economic sustainability is a critical issue and a structural dependency on donor contributions will persist for an indefinite period. With regard to results-orientation, the quality of the LogFrames varies, with indicators mostly restrained to the measurement of operational results. While output is considered and monitored sufficiently, outcome and impact variables are missing.

Outcome and impact

Activities in **Kosovo** will not only fail to curb the brain-drain-effect, they will inevitably support it. In Kosovo, aside from the gender aspect, issues of inclusion of ethnic minorities and people with disabilities are not apparent in any of the activities. The link of the projects to the labour-market is feeble and virtually non-existent. ADA-activities have contributed positively to the integration into the EU-education and research policy, but political obstacles remain. Activities in **Serbia** will also support the brain-drain-effect. Aside from the gender aspect, issues of inclusion of ethnic minorities and people with disabilities are not apparent in many of the activities too. In regard to the link with the labour-market, employability-aspects are clearly in the focus. ADA-activities have contributed positively to the integration into the EU-education and research policy, but political obstacles remain. Brain-drain-effects have not been significant in **Nicaragua** and tracer studies prove that most of the graduates of URACCAN work in the RAAN/RAAS. In the case of the scholarship program by FADCANIC brain-drain is also assumed to remain low. Gender equality and non-discrimination of vulnerable groups is considered adequately, not only in the projects, but by the project partners in general. Particularly in the case of URACCAN, affirmative action for women and indigenous population is taken effectively. While the access and retention of women could be significantly improved, the desertion of indigenous students is still above average. The impact on the regional capacity development cannot be measured in quantitative terms, but is assumed to be considerable. URACCAN has contributed directly to the framework for the regional autonomy (SEAR, regional health model) and URACCAN graduates have a strong presence in local and regional public institutions. The impact is also visible in focus areas of ADA, particularly with regard to rural development and the health sector.

Recommendations

For **Kosovo**, the report recommends to continue activities with both the universities as well as the Ministry, but to follow a cautious approach in regard to the establishment of the new university in Prizren and to commit considerable resources only after careful scrutiny, focusing on activities which clearly emphasize labour-market issues, integration of ethnic minorities and a realistic planning. WUS-activities of the past should be continued, but be implemented from within university-structures, not by an outside service-provider. Some elements of the current KAIP should be discontinued – like the research grants – and the concept of labour-mobility and brain-circulation should be considered more intensely. Support for a career-service-center and alumni-network will help to focus more on the labour-market. In **Serbia**, the report recommends an exit-strategy of another three years with a clearer focus on capacity-development on an administrative level, especially in regard to capacities for project-implementation and financial administration of donor-funding. WUS Belgrade should be given the task for an exit-phase. Some components should either not be continued – like the coordination platform – or changed in their focus – like the support of the accreditation-commission. The activities in Novi Pazar can now be more focused on employability-aspects by supporting the establishment of a career-service-center. Cross-cutting issues like gender etc. have to be more visible. Donor-coordination should concentrate on activating other donors to take up some activities of ADA after the withdrawal of support. The results of the evaluation suggest the HE support projects are effective and fully legitimate regarding their compliance with the focus areas and, therefore, should be continued. All reasonable scenarios for future HE support in **Nicaragua** include further cooperation with URACCAN. A renewal of the South-South-scholarships should depend on the extent to which selection of participants can be adjusted to the focus areas of ADA and stipulate synergies with other ongoing projects. Future cooperation with URACCAN should emphasize the kind of local development components that are already addressed through the Centers for Communal Development (CDC), particularly with regard to the strengthening of local economies. However, the components for the strengthening of academic excellence and the scholarships for vulnerable groups should be continued as well to a certain degree. The emphasis on teacher qualification should shift from pedagogical and didactical subjects to specialization in specific disciplines. Donor coordination should be stipulated at the regional level in order to allow for an articulation of interventions in the different educational subsectors.

1.   Acknowledgements

Partners and the international donors have been most supportive during the field-trips and have established an enabling environment for open discussion also of critical issues. A common interest in learning and improving has transcended every interview. Without their support, this evaluation report would not have been possible.

2.   Purpose and objective of the evaluation

This report is part of an evaluation of higher education (HE) support programs financed by ADA in Kosovo, Serbia and Nicaragua, consisting of three country-reports and this summative report.

In case of **Kosovo**, the major purpose was to evaluate key issues in regard to the programs conducted in the time 2005-2009, but also to make recommendations on a strategic level for future activities, as those programs will end either end of 2010 or beginning of 2011. A critical assessment of outputs, outcomes and impacts is asked for. In regard to **Serbia**, the focus of the evaluation shifted somewhat from the time the tender has been published until today. Reason for this shift is the political decision by the responsible ministry to end project-activities in Serbia (as in some other states) with the closure of the ADA-office in the fore-seeable future. Therefore, the focus of this part of the mission has been on the issues of an "exit strategy", which enables partners in Serbia to continue at least some of the activities by themselves or with the support of other donor-funding and to seek ways to ensure sustainability. In both cases, a critical assessment of outputs, outcomes and impacts is asked for.

In the case of **Nicaragua**, the major purpose was (1) to evaluate the projects conducted in the time 2005-2009, (2) to make recommendations for future activities, as both current projects in Nicaragua will end in 2010 and (3) to make recommendations on the integration of HE support programs in the future country strategy which is expected to be presented until 2011. HE itself is not a focus of ADA in Nicaragua, hence, analysis and recommendations will focus on the degree to which it contributes to capacity development in the priority areas of ADA (i.e. rural development, health, SME-development).

According to the overall Terms of Reference (ToR) the evaluation is not supposed to be detailed project evaluations, but to have a more strategic approach towards recommendations on the HE portfolio of ADA. Therefore not all activities are reflected upon up to the smallest detail and a more strategic approach, mixed with pragmatic recommendations and based on comprehensive lessons learnt is the focus of this report.

2.1   Composition of expert group and course of evaluation

This report has been compiled by Dr. Dirk van den Boom (with direct citation from the Nicaragua-report), who has also been responsible for the country reports Kosovo and Serbia, where he has been supported by Mr. Hysen Bytyqi (Kosovo) and Ms. Jadranka Dimov (Serbia) as local consultants.

Klaus-Peter Jacoby, M.A., has been the team-leader for the country-report Nicaragua. He has been supported by Mr. Mario Quintana as local consultant and resource person. In addi-

tion, backstopping has been provided by Mr. Stefan Silvestrini of the Center for Evaluation (CEval) of Saarland University.

For this evaluation, the following steps have been taken: In the 1st phase, desk-research and a first workshop at ADA-office in Vienna has laid the basis for further elaborations. During the visit to Vienna, interviews with staff of ADA, the Federal Ministry for Foreign Relations (BMeiA) and the implementing agency Horizont 3000 were carried out. An additional preparatory telephone-interview with WUS Graz took place as well. These and the project documents provided by ADA in Vienna led to an Inception Report provided at the end of February 2010.

The field-phases took place between the 6th and 25th of March (Kosovo and Serbia) and 5th and the 16th of April 2010 (Nicaragua). At the end of each field-phase, a de-briefing took place with the respective ADA-offices.

The final phase consisted of submitting the country-reports up until the 30th of April and the drafting of this summarized report up until the 12th of May. A general de-briefing is scheduled for the third week of May.

2.2   Methodology of Evaluation

Generally, the methodology followed the terms of reference on which the bid of CEval has been based and the discussions made during the kick-off-Workshop in Vienna in February 2010. The Inception Phase leading to the Inception Report was meant to clarify all outstanding issues and to prove that the evaluators have a clear understanding of the needs and interests of ADA in regard to this mission.

The following data collection methods have been used in preparation of this report:

- Desk-research in regard to documents and material provided by ADA Vienna and material collected during the field-trips (please see annex for a full list)

- Telephone-interviews in preparation of the field-trips (1)

- Exploratory interviews based on a semi-structured guideline with ADA-staff in Vienna (10)

- Interviews with key stakeholders, international donors, project-leaders and other relevant interviewees during the field-trips (131).

- Site-visits to the supported universities[3] (10).

The exact time-plan of the field-trips and the list of institutions and individuals interviewed can be seen in the annex of this report. Despite the limited time available, it has been the desire of the evaluators to visit as many project-sites as possible to get a comprehensive overview and gather as many opinions as available in order to triangulate information on all critical issues that emerged. From the documentation of the interviews with the different stakeholders and continuous reflection with the local consultant, triangulation has been pos-

---

[3]   Please find the following references in the text: (I) = information derived from interviews, (E) = opinion of consultant, (D) = information derived from documentation

sible. Therefore the authors of this report are confident that the information and the assessment provided here are both valid as well as supportive for further strategic decisions.

It is necessary to point out at this point that the circumstances in the three selected countries for this evaluation differ heavily from each other, even in neighbouring countries like Kosovo and Serbia. While it might be a desire to draw general conclusions from the summary of all three country-reports, the process has shown that the similarities are sometimes on a very highly aggregated level, which makes conclusions and recommendations probably too general to be of any practical use. While this report endeavours to generalize where possible, many conclusions will inevitably be only relevant for one specific country-context.

This report summarizes the findings of three rather voluminous country-reports. Because of restrictions in space, not all details of all the projects and their components in all three countries will be represented in this report. For additional details which might be missing here, we refer your attention to the country-reports.

3.   Program context in Kosovo, Serbia and Nicaragua

3.1   Strategic plans and concepts

Serbia

At this point of time, the Republic does not have a Higher Education Strategy (I). The "Council on Higher Education"[4], a professional body elected by the parliament, is supposed to develop such a strategy in due time. Currently, some guidelines about the general content of a strategy are available, which does not say anything about the direction the HE-sector should take. As the mandate of the current Council will cease by the middle of the year, it is not expected that any strategic paper of value will be available this year. Furthermore, as universities in Serbia are not much more than relatively weak organizational umbrellas for powerful and quite autonomous faculties, university strategies either do not exist or are of a more declaratory nature. A very recent development is the formal declaration of a research strategy for Serbia. The priority areas covered stretch from biomedicine to IT-technologies and include also the "affirmation of national identity". With a plan to raise R&D-investment up to 1,05 % of GDP up until 2015 and the support of a big infrastructure program for R&D within the IPA-program of the EU, the ambitious goals of the strategy are supposed to be implemented (I,D). In summary, ADA-activities cannot rely on or refer to national HE-strategies at this point of time.

---

[4]   The Council consists of members, mostly professors from state-universities, who are elected for a four-year-period to oversee the development of the HE-sector and to nominate members for relevant institutions, notably the Commission for Accreditation. Its task is to prepare and propose concepts and strategies in regard to HE and to steer the process of coherence with the Bologna-declaration by setting norms and standards. Generally, it oversees the implementation of the current Higher Education Law of 2008. It approves Standards for Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions and Study Programmes, Standards for Self-certification and Assessment of Quality of Higher Education Institutions, and the Standards and Procedures for External Quality Assurance of Higher Education Institutions.

Unfortunately, the goal structure of the ADA-country program 2006-2008 (which has been continued de facto until today) is also relatively weak in regard to higher education (D,E). Basically the country program states targets in regard to the labour-market and employability-issues, under which support for higher education is more a means, less a goal in itself. Therefore, no distinct goals in regard to the higher education sector in particular are formulated. This is at least strange, if we consider the fact that Austria is the not only the biggest bilateral donor in the sector in Serbia, but, alongside with the European Union, also nearly the only one.

Kosovo

The available strategies established be the authorities in Kosovo, foremost the "Strategy for the Development of Higher Education in Kosovo (2005-2015)" (published 2004) and the "Strategy University Prishtina 2009-2013" (published 2009), are generally well prepared, but sometimes lack hints in regard to implementation (D,E). The latter strategy is actually no strategy, but a compendium of papers in regard to strategic issues and therefore lacks comprehensiveness. In addition to that, a new Kosovarian research program with the aim to enhance research and development has recently been drafted and some kick-off funding has been provided for its implementation. The foundation of the new University in Prizren is well in line with the basic principles laid down in the Higher Education strategy of 2004.

The Higher Education Strategy for Kosovo identifies six major so-called strategic goals:

- Objective 1: Elaborating and implementing a contemporary and all-inclusive education policy and finalizing the higher education legislation

- Objective 2: Advancing management and coordination in higher education.

- Objective 3: Developing the management system of the higher education quality.

- Objective 4: Advancing the capacity for research and scientific work.

- Objective 5: Establishing mechanisms for the provision and efficient managing of financial resources for the higher education development.

- Objective 6: Development of a complete and functional infrastructure for higher education.

Based on the information gathered during the evaluation, it has to be conceded that apparent activities are discernible in regard to all six objectives (I,E). These do also touch some important issues for this evaluation, like objective 1 which refers indirectly to the integration of ethnic minorities as well. The current process of quality-management, supported also mainly by ADA, is directly linked to objective 3. The recently developed research plan is in congruence with objective 4. Objective 5 is an activity where SIDA is involved in the MEST for capacity development. And objective 6 is clearly targeted by the establishment of the University in Prizren and the development of an infrastructure masterplan for the new university coming year (D,E).

The strategy for the University of Prishtina has been developed within and with the aid of the KAIP-project. Therefore, if we see its primary objectives as laid out in chapter 7 and the preceding elaborations, they have come out of the work of ADA-projects and reflect these activi-

ties. It is therefore not surprising that ADA-activities of the recent years fit very well into the structure of objectives of the Universities' strategy (D,E).

The research program is new and therefore such a recent achievement that it is difficult to judge about the question in how far it is or will be an important guideline for future ADA-activities in Kosovo.

In summary, the strategies available from the side of the Kosovarian government are either of such a general nature – as the Higher Education Strategy – that the ADA-activities fit well into them without much thinking, or they have been developed with direct and indirect support from ADA implementing agencies, which leads in this case to "automatic coherence" with the goals of supporting higher education in Kosovo (E).

From the Austrian side, two strategic documents are imperative for the programs: The country-strategy (or country program), specifically outlining the goals for Kosovo, and the more general higher education strategy ("Higher Education and Scientific Cooperation"). The current country program has been published in May 2008 and is valid for the time-period 2008-2011. The higher education strategy has been published in June 2009. Therefore, the current country program could not have taken the overall strategy into account (D).

For the sector of higher education, the country program specifies as goals on a general level (p. 14):

> "ADC, therefore, is determined to help creating tangible perspectives for the youth of Kosovo by providing them with the education and training opportunities they need to become the agents of change in Kosovo's socio-economic development."

To accomplish this general goal, ADA committed itself to participate in activities concerning

- "support the establishment of a well-functioning (higher) education system on the basis of European standards and values as laid down in the Lisbon Strategy and the Bologna-Declaration

- enhance both capacities and quality standards of the educational system including RTDI;

- strengthen public institutions in the field of education by securing good governance on all levels;

- increase the practical relevance of educational programs, especially regarding employability;

- provide benefit for the most disadvantaged groups, especially the young, women and minorities

- support the process of re-integration of minorities into the educational system."

For this evaluation, the goals formulated in regard to the Bologna process, the employability aspect and the benefits for the most disadvantaged groups will be highlighted specifically, as the Terms of Reference ask for a special focus on these issues. The country-program does not reflect on coherence issues with other donors – especially the EU – in regard to the HE-sector. This might become more and more important with increased access to EU-funding, especially after the approval of the national research program. Generally, the program does not reflect on national strategies much, which is not in line with the principle of partner-

orientation. Totally missing in regard to the HE-sector are any suggestions in regard to la-bour-mobility, especially international one, despite the reference to migration and brain-circulation in the HE-strategy (D,E).

Nicaragua

On the part of the Nicaraguan authorities, the strategic framework for Higher Education is very limited. During the last relevant comparative analysis of the HE System in 2002 (cf. Tünnermann 2002) the lack of a National Strategy on HE had been highlighted as a major flaw. National Plan for Human Development (PNDH 2008)

The National Plan for Human Development (PNDH 2008), however, defines guidelines ac-cording to the development of the Atlantic Coast autonomous regions that are of importance for the core mission of both project partners who pursue the strengthening of human re-sources and socio-political structures for the development of the RAAN (North Atlantic Autonomous Region) and RAAS (South Atlantic Autonomous Region). In particular, the PNDH refers to the promotion of the cultural diversity and identity of the Caribbean Coast and the stimulation of an economic model that should be sustainable and based on the cul-tural and environmental context of the region. The strategy stipulates affirmative action for the empowerment of indigenous and other ethnic populations and an institutional capacity development that takes into account socio-political peculiarities and traditions of self-government.

The governments of RAAN/RAAS have recently formulated their own regional Strategy for the Development of the Caribbean Coast (cf. CDCC 2008), which came into effect after the projects of ADA had already been started. However, it should be the reference for future pro-ject proposals in the region, not only for the HE sector. Although similar to the PNDH, no specific references are made to HE, the goals are pivotal for the project partners URACCAN and FADCANIC, who both gave policy advice during the formulation of the strategy. Some strategic goals with relevance for the focus areas of ADA and/or the mission of the project partners are: the revitalization of the cultural identity; the strengthening of the Regional Health Model, the strengthening of an ecologically sustainable and culturally adapted econ-omy, the strengthening of autonomy at local and regional level, among others.

In conclusion, there are hardly any specific strategic goals referring to HE, but a set of gen-eral development goals for the Atlantic Coast. Regarding the compliance of ADA with partner strategies in Nicaragua, this is not a major problem, as the support for URACCAN and the scholarship program of FADCANIC have never been primarily oriented to the strengthening of the HE System as such, but as a means for regional capacity development in a very spe-cific historical, cultural and socio-economic context (D). Thus, for both URACCAN and ADA, the general Strategy for the Development of the Caribbean Coast will indeed be more pivotal than any HE sector strategy that might be presented in the future (E).

On the part of ADA, the last country program outdated in 2006 (cf. ADA 2002) and a new country strategy is still on its way. Future focus areas, however, are defined in general terms aiming towards a narrower concentration of ADA support in the following sectors: rural de-velopment, health and development of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) which are all in line with the above mentioned partner strategies (I). HE is not a focus area, so its

strategic role within the ADA portfolio must still be defined. On the other hand, the HE Strategy of ADA dates from 2009 (cf. ADA 2009a) and has therefore not been relevant for the formulation of the present projects which have started much earlier. However, many of the criteria outlined in the strategy are already met. This is particularly the case for the cooperation with URACCAN that is visibly in line with several of the key areas defined by the HE-strategy (e.g. 1. Institutional capacity development, 2. Focus on specific regions and sectors) and also with most of the general guiding principles except donor harmonization (see chapter 6: Effectiveness) and, partially, results orientation (see chapter 7: Sustainability). The project of FADCANIC is also backed by the current HE strategy that still allows for certain scholarship programs, but it is only partially in line with the criteria outlined for this program type (E). Although visible impact beyond the individual participants and some multiplier effects are observable (see chapter 8: Outcomes and Impact), relations to specific ADA programs and integration in strategic institutional development plans have to be rethought in the future.

As in only one of the three countries a distinct HE-strategy exists, it is difficult for ADA – or for any other donor – to align activities properly in order to prove, at least in a formal way, relevance. On the other hand, for Serbia and Kosovo the adherence to the Bologna-process provides a "backing form", for which ADA-activities can provide the necessary ingredients. Work remains to be done in regard to the country-programs, even if for Serbia we can only speak of an exit-strategy. It is obvious that country-programs are, again with the notable exception of Kosovo, too general in nature. All three country-programs struggle with reflecting upon the specific circumstances of their respective countries and how to adjust interventions to these circumstances. At least for Nicaragua, the question, in how far the general HE-strategy does apply if the HE-sector is not a focus anyway, can only be answered by a basic strategic decision on that matter.

Country	National Strategy	Country Program	Other Strategies	Factor of alignment
Kosovo	HE- and Research Strategy exist, Education Law under revision.	HE is mentioned specifically and with some detail.	Strategy of University of Pristina exists, developed with support by ADA.	Alignment with ADA-HE-Strategy is relative high, some vital issues need to be added
Serbia	Research Strategy exists, no distinct HE-strategy. Education Law exists.	HE is only seen as a function of labour-market-policy, not as a distinct field of intervention. Country program is outdated.	Strategic development in universities is weak because of their non-integrated structure.	Alignment with ADA-HE-Strategy is low.
Nicaragua	No distinct HE-strategy, but regional and national development strategies with some relation to the sector.	HE not a focus area, therefore HE-activities are only a function of other interventions. Country program is outdated.	University participated in regional strategy.	Alignment with ADA-HE-strategy is relatively high (in practice).

3.2   The situation of the higher education sector in the three countries

Serbia

Serbia has a well established and generally functional higher education system, consisting of six public universities and seven private universities, all accredited (D,I). The biggest university is the University of Belgrade; the youngest is the one in Novi Pazar. In addition, a high number of Colleges of Applied Sciences exist, which offer three-year-programs on a more practical basis, comparable to Austrian "Fachhochschulen". This part of the higher education sector is not targeted by ADA-programs. Serbia has started relatively late with the implementation of the Bologna process. In addition, the autonomous role of the universities in their relationship to the responsible ministries – of Education and of Science – and the even more autonomous role of the faculties with quite powerful deans made the implementation of nation-wide reforms difficult. Serbia's universities have a good reputation on a theoretical level. Lamented by everyone is the limited connection to the labour-market. The number of students in Serbia is relatively high. This is only partially due to an "education ethos", but more because of the fact that the pervasive concept of "having a diploma" in order to get "settled" within the public sector is still visible in the young generation and especially their parents (which still entertain a dominant influence over the educational decision-making of their children). Therefore students have the tendency to enter the courses which will lead them to any degree in a short time (and easiest) and the Bologna-process has not been welcomed positively as especially the Bachelor degree is still regarded widely as useless. All students strive therefore to achieve the Masters degree, as this is seen roughly equivalent to the former "Magister"-diploma in the old system. Student mobility is relatively low, despite the existence of Erasmus and other programs. A dedicated policy for receiving foreign students does not exist and structures for this are feeble (I, D).

Education policy is, in the current political atmosphere in Serbia, not one of the major priorities of government policy. The educational system is regarded as underfunded and the Ministry of Education lacks dedicated and strong leaders. Capacity within the Ministry and its related agencies – like the already mentioned Council – is low and a certain lack of vision is discernible. All in all, it seems that the Serbian HE-sector is in need of a very profound reform, but without the necessary stakeholders in the driving seat able to provide it. In this context, the withdrawal of ADA's support for the sector is especially problematic, as therewith the last remaining supporter for advocacy of change within the sector will disappear without anyone apparent who might take over that role. This is especially problematic as Serbia's economic future as a relatively small country in the European context will be closely connected to the development of a knowledge-based economy and less on a production-oriented one. To identify and support change-agents who are willing to carry the flag of a future-oriented education policy also in the HE-sector would and should be a task of development cooperation and will be needed for the foreseeable future (I, E).

Special consideration is necessary in regard to the University of Mitrovica. While this University belongs geographically to Kosovo, the Serbian government is funding Mitrovica through its own system as it does not recognize the independence of Kosovo. This leaves the university in a limbo: ADA cannot support the institution from Belgrade, as Austria has recognized Kosovo's independence, and it cannot support it from Pristina, as the Serbian side in Kosovo does not cooperate in any activity which even indirectly might recognize the validity and le-

gitimacy of the Kosovarian government. Finally, Mitrovica is more or less left to its own de-vices (E).

Kosovo

Kosovo is the youngest country in Europe, with a percentage of 50 % below the age of 25. Every year 20000-25000 new students finish secondary school, most of them with the aim of seeking higher education. The only public universities existing so far are the University of Pristina, which has an intake of currently around 40.000 students with an academic staff of around 2000. This is grossly inadequate. The second institution is the University of Mitrovica. Because of the fact that Mitrovica is, basically, the "Serbian" university in Kosovo and be-cause of the political problems in regard to the recognition of Kosovo, the University of Mi-trovica is basically a parallel structure, funded by the Serbian government, and currently not an inherent part of the Kosovarian higher education system. Aside from the University of Pristina, there are 14 private institutions of higher education which have been accredited recently. While the quality of education in these institutions has undoubtedly improved since the beginning of the accreditation process in 2008, these institutions remain to be weak (I,E).

Consequently, the government has decided to open a new public university, based on the already established Faculty of Education of the University of Pristina in the second biggest city in the country, Prizren. The open commitment of Austria to support this endeavour has lead to the fact that this new university is already paraphrased as "the Austrian university" in Kosovo. This honourable dedication, unfortunately, carries some danger within. The progress of establishment has been hasty, mainly due to political considerations. While the official announcement came in October 2009, enrolment of students is supposed to start in June 2010 and at least five programs are supposed to start by October 2010. At the point of time of the field-trip to Kosovo, the time-frame for the nomination of an international rector has been extended towards end of March because not enough suitable candidates have had expressed their interest in the position. In addition, efforts have been undertaken to search for teaching staff in the diaspora. At the time of the field-trip, no staff-recruitment has taken place (I,E).

The Bologna-process has been embraced by Kosovo with a significant degree of determina-tion. This determination stems from the desire to go "the European path" and therefore to do everything possible to be part of the EU in the foreseeable future. The EU Commission deems the efforts of the University of Pristina as sufficient enough in regard to the implemen-tation of the Bologna process. This can be derived from the fact that UP is not on the short-list of universities anymore which are approached for special training and advice in the im-plementation process. Still, mainly because of political problems (recognition of Kosovo), the UP has not yet signed formally its membership in the Bologna-process (I).

Nicaragua

Nicaragua is one of poorest countries in Latin America. The most severe situation is to be found in the Atlantic region which covers nearly half of Nicaragua's territory and ca. 14 % of the total population and where poverty rates surpass 80 %. The region is lacking coverage of basic public services and infrastructure and institutions have been weak and unstable. The

human development index (HDI) in 2009 was 0.466 for the RAAN and 0.454 RAAS (national average: 0,696) (cf. ADA 2009e; URACCAN 2010a).

More than half of the population is below 18 years old. The demographical structure poses a major challenge to the educational system which is increased in the RAAN/RAAS by the pre-dominant rurality and the socio-cultural context of indigenous populations (Miskitos, Mayang-nas, Ramas) and other ethnic minorities (Creoles, Garífunas). Although the evaluation fo-cuses on HE, it must be kept in mind that poor coverage of primary and secondary education constitutes a narrow bottleneck. According to figures of the Ministry of Education (cf. UE 2010) only 70% of the pupils finish primary school, less than half of them (45%) enter secon-dary school. Eventually, only 7.1% of the economically active population accesses university where drop-out rates again surpass 50%. The bottleneck for access to HE is best illustrated by the average permanence in formal education which is 7 years in the case of Managua, but only 3.7 years in the Caribbean Coast.

The subsector of HE was virtually absent from the RAAN/RAAS before the foundation of URACCAN in the early 90s. Since then, the core mission has been to foster the autonomy and the cultural heritage of the Caribbean Coast by training professionals with profiles and values adapted to the specific needs of the region (I, D). Another peculiarity is the model of a communitarian university that systematically expands into rural areas in order to promote equitable access to higher education for otherwise excluded groups (e.g. rural agricultural populations, indigenous and ethnic communities). It counts today with four campuses (Las Minas, Bilwi, Bluefields, Nueva Guinea) of which particularly Campus Las Minas has been supported constantly by ADA and Horizont 3000. In 2009, the campus Las Minas counted with nearly 1900 students (including its extensions in Rosita, Bonanza and Waslala) and of-fered 9 different careers at graduate level (*licenciatura* and *ingeñería*), one professional spe-cialization at postgraduate level and some additional courses for extension studies. Since 1995, another communitarian university for RAAN/RAAS was created (Bluefields Indian & Caribbean University - BICU), but URACCAN remains the intellectual center of the region and the focal point for the promotion of the autonomy of the Caribbean Coast (I, D).

All three countries share some distinct challenges in regard to their HE-education, although on different levels. Issues of ethnic minorities are important in all countries, and the emer-gence of very young age-cohorts within the education system pose special challenges espe-cially in Kosovo and Nicaragua (Serbia is, like many other European countries, an ageing society with a diminishing number of young people). In all three countries, HE is viewed as a pathway to individual development and economic success, therefore the issue of labour-market orientation seems to be important everywhere. Still, the major difference is that the level of general development cannot be generalized and comparisons are more difficult: Ser-bia and, to a lesser extent, Kosovo are economically more developed and, in addition, in-creasingly economically integrated with the European Union, while Nicaragua faces serious economic problems, currently aggravated by political ones.

Country	General framework	General situation of HE-sector	Special challenges
Kosovo	Big young age-groups growing up; political framework problematic.	Only one functional university under government-control, under-staffed and underfunded; Bologna-process embraced by all stakeholders.	Formation of the new University at Prizren.
Serbia	University-studies attractive because of desire for "diplomas"; motivational problems; Education not a political priority area.	Generally well-established HE-sector, but universities are mostly non-integrated (with powerful faculties).	Exit of ADA as the only bilateral donor in the HE-sector.
Nicaragua	One of the poorest countries in the region; very young population.	HE-sector in the region centers around the URACCAN; intellectual center of the region.	Low permanence in education in the region right from primary school.

Recommendations:

As this evaluation recommends to continue the support of the HE-sector in **Serbia** for an exit-phase of three years, the following components for an exit-strategy, if approved, would be important:

- Sustainability of given activities should be in the forefront. As this report will show, there are certain areas where institutional capacity can be strengthened with a good perspective on sustainable success.

- Donor-cooperation and -coordination should be geared towards finding, if not a replacement for ADA, but at least another donor willing to continue the discussion in the HE-sector with the government and to support small activities where EU-funding is simply "too big".

In **Nicaragua**, HE is not a focus area of ADA. This implies that projects can only be legitimized on the Austrian side as means for capacity development to the focus areas. The future country strategy should therefore

- (1) define the role and the scope of HE in relation to the focus areas,

- (2) define a set of particular contributions expected by HE institutions, based on the past project experiences,

- (3) define a confined set of particular measures for the institutional strengthening of HE-institutions insofar as the latter still need to be "upgraded" in order to become effective partners for capacity development in the focus areas.

- With regard to the integration of the HE-strategy in the future country strategy, it is also important to consider the status of HE as a non-focus area. Thus, the question is not if the HE-strategy is reflected integrally in the country strategy – but if cooperation with HE institutions is situated within the compounds of the HE strategy and does not contradict its principles. In order to avoid inconsistencies,

> the country strategy could name explicitly the relevant key areas of the HE strategy (e.g. specific sector focus, institutional capacity development limited to the level of individual counterpart institutions) and areas that cannot be addressed in Nicaragua (e.g. institutional development and quality enhancement on a systemic level)

The currently country program in **Kosovo** is, despite being developed before the HE strategy, well in line with the overarching paper. For a future country program, the following issues should be highlighted:

- The direct link between support for the new university in Prizren and the need to focus on the needs of the labour-market as well as the inclusion of ethnic minorities, to make sure that the message is clear that these elements are of high importance for ADA.

- A reference in regard to international labour-mobility, e.g. concepts like circular labour-migration of graduates, as even in good times Kosovo will never be able to absorb all the graduates it produces.

- To make sure that the new country program has relevance for the HE-sector, current strategic papers developed by the Kosovarian partners, especially the HE-sector-strategy as well as the new Research program should be reflected upon and aspects where ADA will contribute should be highlighted accordingly. As a new education law is currently in the making, ADA should closely monitor this process and include possible changes of the law into its own strategy.

- The complementarity of ADA-activities in relationship to EU-funding should be highlighted prominently.

4.   Program/project portfolios in the three countries

This chapter will only provide a general overview. Please refer to the respective country-reports for more descriptive details.

The HE-program in Serbia consist more or less of three distinguishable parts: a program run and implemented by the Belgrade office of WUS Austria, a program run in cooperation between WUS Austria and the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation and a program run by the "Österreich-Institut" (D).

The WUS-activities center on the following components:

1. The establishment of a coordination platform for Higher Education and the Labour Market

2. Master Studies Development Program

3. Brain Gain Program plus (BGP+)

4. E-learning/life-long-learning. This component was again a support measure for the e-learning-component in the MSDP

5. Support for the University of Novi Pazar

6. Support of accreditation agency[5]

The "Experiencing Europe"-program in cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation provides a scholarship scheme for young Serbian professionals for internships in Austrian companies.

The program of the "Österreich-Institut" provides a 4 year-German language-course for young Serbian students.

Project activities in Kosovo have been ongoing for a considerable period of time and have been prolonged in the past on a nearly automatic basis, at least in regard to the WUS activities. The current programs have been initiated in April 2007 (KAIP) and October 2008 (WUS). While the KAIP-project didn't have a predecessor, WUS-activities, especially the BGP and CDP-components, have been going on for quite some time before. Naturally, the evaluation focused on the most recent activities, but always in the context of their development (D,I).

The projects in Kosovo are divided into a bigger part, the so-called "multidimensional" project or simply KAIP on the one hand, implemented by the "Agency for European Integration and Economic Development", and, on the other hand, a program run by World University Service Austria.

The components of the WUS-program are:

1. Master Studies Development Program (MSDP)

2. Brain Gain Program Plus (BGP+)

3. Course Development Program Plus (CDP+)

4. University Reform and Development Support Unit

5. Kosovo part of the Balkan Case Challenge Program

The KAIP-program, which aims in general to support the establishment of a Kosovarian HE-system meeting EU standards on various levels, consists of the following components:

1. Establishment and support of the Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA)

2. Center for Innovation and Technology Transfer (CITT)

3. Kosovo Centre for International Cooperation in Research and Technology (K-CIRT)

4. NARIC (National Academic Recognition & Information Centre)

5. Council of Research and Technology

6. Research grants

7. Fellowship Program

8. University cooperation

9. Sector programming

---

[5] Actually, there is no Accreditation Agency in Serbia. It is a Commission appointed by the Council of Higher Education, and only with a mandate of four years and without its own institutional structure.

The history of Austrian cooperation in the HE sector of Nicaragua goes back to the mid-90s when ADA and Horizont 3000 (or back then, the Austrian Development Service ÖED) commenced supporting the creation of URACCAN, particularly the foundation and strengthening of the Campus Las Minas in Siuna, and a complementary South-South-scholarship program canalized via the local NGO FADCANIC. Both projects have been prolonged until present time, with the current projects dating from July 2007 (URACCAN) and January 2006 (FADCANIC).

With regard to URACCAN, the cooperation focused, through time, on a wide range of issues, such as personnel and organizational development, curricular development, foundation of research and extension centers, scholarship programs for vulnerable target groups, and more (cf. Vijil 2007). Without any doubt, the contribution of ADA and Horizont 3000 was essential for the foundation and consolidation of the university and most interviewees take it as a fact that, without that early support, the Campus Las Minas might not even exist today. As the consolidation of URACCAN proceeded, project goals tended to be more ambitious and specific and led to a gradual shift from the consolidation of core academic structures to the strengthening of URACCAN's role as a change agent for local and regional development in particular areas (cf. ADA 2007a; URACCAN 2010).

According to the project plan (cf. ADA 2007a), the overall objective is to contribute to the further strengthening of the model of a communitarian, intercultural university for the indigenous population and other ethnic groups in the RAAN/RAAS regions. The specific purpose consisted in the further improvement of academic excellence in URACCAN as well as the implementation of agendas for local development in rural areas around the university campus. The project has four components:

1. Improvement of the capacities of academic personnel in teaching and investigation.

2. Access of vulnerable groups (indigenous populations, inhabitants of remote areas) to HE.

3. Support of communitarian development processes.

4. Capacity Development in Disaster Control and Risk Management.

The second project supported by ADA in the HE sector is the scholarship program of FADCANIC (cf. ADA 2005b) that finances postgraduate studies in Latin American universities for professionals related to the strengthening of the Autonomy of the RAAN/RAAS-region. The project is much less complex than the support of URACCAN since project is limited to scholarships for a total of 11 postgraduate students (8 students at a Master level, 2 at a doctorate level and 1 other postgraduate specialization).

5.   Relevance

As there are no national HE-strategies in **Serbia**, it has not been possible to plan and implement alongside a specific HE-strategy in the country. The general policy to follow the Bologna-process is the main guiding-light for ADA-activities and therefore they provide the major legitimacy. In regard to the demand of local partners, all of the components run by WUS are very demand-driven, as both the MSDP as well as BGP+ follow an open application-system

forcing the faculties or departments with the intention to participate to formulate their plans and needs very carefully. Ownership is visible at least with those professors, who, acting as "change agents", take the opportunity of ADA-programs to implement change and modernization in their field (I, E). Aside from that, there is the observation that in many faculties, these professors are relatively alone and do not enjoy institutional support (I). This surely strengthens their individual capacity and is a sign of good ownership of an individual level. While WUS Austria is providing continuous support and is regarded by all interviewees as very cooperative and helpful, the major work of development or integration of visiting professors (in the case of MSDP and BGP) is done by the partners (i.e. the faculties or departments applying for funding from WUS). The least involvement is visible in regard to the cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation, which only provides a more or less "political umbrella", with execution solely in the hands of WUS Austria (I, D). The same goes for the activities of the "Österreich-Institut". In both of these cases, involvement of local partners is at best low and ownership cannot be expected, or, in other words: If both programs would cease to exist, no one on the Serbian side would bother to take something similar up by themselves, mainly because of lack of funding.

Currently, the capacity of the partners in regard to the application for not only ADA-programs, but also for EU-funding like e.g. Tempus or IP7 can be regarded as relatively high (I). The application process for WUS-programs is comparatively easy to handle and many applicants who are familiar with dealing with donors do not see a big challenge. Major issues of capacity development are, on the other hand, not addressed by ADA. The biggest obstacle in accessing foreign funding right now is not a lack in ability to apply, but to implement, especially financially[6], but also in regard to modern PCM-techniques (I). While the partners are praising the much easier and smoother cooperation with WUS, it is does also not prepare them for the much more formalistic and complicated funding lines provided especially by the European Union (I, E). If we consider a possible exit-strategy for Serbia, this specific problem has to be addressed nevertheless.

Ownership has to be analyzed separately between the two big activities in **Kosovo**. First, it is quite evident that both programs have identified the major needs of the Kosovarian higher education system quite well and have developed intervention-strategies which are able to yield results (D,I). The programs are full in line with the relevant strategies on which Kosovarian higher education policy is theoretically based upon. All stakeholders agree that the identified levels of intervention and the problem-analysis are generally adequate and undisputed. This positive assessment relates primarily to the issue of demand-orientation from partner-side. Some reservations are apparent in regard to the self-responsibility-aspect of ownership. This is not necessarily related to a lack of will by the Kosovarian partners – the MEST and the UP – to take responsibility in all matters, but mostly to the lack of capability (I). Especially the MEST lacks the necessary planning ability to take up responsible functions in implementation and planning. No evidence based planning tools seem to be available within the Ministry. The link between content-planning and budgeting seems to be weak[7].

---

[6]   In the case of the biggest university – the University of Belgrade – it might suffice to simply mention the fact that within its financial administration not one person is able to communicate in English, which doesn't bode well for the effective financial implementation of donor-funding.

[7]   SIDA supports an effort in capacity building within the MEST on planning capabilities. Judging from the interview with the SIDA-representative in charge of the project, progress has been very small and awareness of the necessity not yet totally pervaded through the whole institution.

This assessment has to be differentiated in regard to the two implementing agencies. The KAIP project relies heavily on the contribution of the partner – with a staff of only two it would otherwise not be possible to achieve any results (D,I). Still, this reliance on the partner's responsibility directly leads to certain setbacks and one or two not very successful components because of the administrative inertia and lack of capacity to do what is needed to make all aspects of the program a success. Still, the consultant regards the approach of KAIP generally as useful, even if one has to accept one or the other less successful activity. Other components, like the establishment of the Accreditation Agency, show that the local partner is willing and able to establish profound ownership if the political will is strong enough to do so. This political will is, unfortunately, in Kosovo still directly linked to the individual capacities and interests of the minister himself (I,E).

WUS Austria in Kosovo is very much a university-related office within the University of Prishtina, but not a part of the administrative structure of the institution. Many of the activities of WUS Austria, including those on a more organizational level, could be done by the University itself, e.g. by the office for international relations. WUS is highly regarded in the UP, and correctly so. From the consultant's point of view should the newly created Curriculum Development Officer – with maybe some additional trained staff – be in a position to be empowered to organize and implement programs like BGP+ and CDP+ by him/herself, without any need for WUS as an implementing agency (I). Other activities like the Kosovarian part of the BCC could be given to the LINK-office of the UP, as this office is supposed to become the career-service center of the University and already conducts activities like e.g. support for getting internships and participation in international programs like the US "work and study"-program (E).

An important aspect in regard to ownership is the issue of the newly founded University of Prizren. One might say that the "negative" side of "ownership" becomes apparent if we consider the obviously hastily planned process, which is more based on assumptions and the expressed political will and less on any kind of profound feasibility. Here also comes another aspect of partner-orientation and ownership to the fore: the question, who really is the beneficiary of activities financed by ADA? Partner-orientation is geared towards the state-institutions of higher education, while in the end, the beneficiaries are supposed to be students and graduates of (both) universities. As we will see in the following chapters, this issue is of high importance in regard to labour-market and employability aspects (E,I).

The support for the University of Prizren is clearly of high relevance for the higher education system in Kosovo. Still, because of the lack of implementation capacity on the side of the ministry, the consultant advices a cautionary approach to this issue to make sure that important goals of ADA's development cooperation remain in focus and are not "washed away" due to political considerations. Accepting "ownership" should not lead to the mistake to follow the generally inept planning process of the partner (E).

The supply of trained professionals in the Atlantic region of **Nicaragua** is still short. Thus, both HE support projects of ADA reflect a major need of the partners and address an important development problem of the region (I,E). As shown in chapter 3.1, the programs are in line with relevant partner strategies, particularly the Strategy for the Development of the Caribbean Coast, taking into account that no particular strategy exists for the HE system. The interviewed stakeholders agree that the identified levels of intervention are pertinent and based on an adequate problem-analysis (I). URACCAN and FADCANIC are both central

players dedicated to the strengthening of the regional autonomy so that the goals of both projects are intimately related to their core mission. In that respect, ownership has not been a problematic issue. This is particularly important for the case of URACCAN where the partner does not only act as an intermediary for the allocation of resources to the final beneficiaries (as in the case of FADCANIC), but pursues a long-term strategy for its institutional development (cf. URACCAN 2008a). According to interviewees at URACCAN and the implementing agency Horizont 3000, the goal structure of the ADA projects is not only in line with but emerged from the goal structure of URACCAN itself (I). While Horizont 3000 played an important role for the design of project interventions in earlier stages, URACCAN has already developed planning capacities that allow for a self-dependent coordination of donor contributions. A well-designed new project proposal for 2010 has been written by URACCAN itself without major intervention of Horizont 3000 (I).

As a quality of the communitarian university model, URACCAN interacts closely with regional and local authorities, community leaders and target groups. This implies a range of instruments for participatory analysis of local needs for capacity development and the feasibility of interventions. Thus, URACCAN has managed to adapt its academic program specifically to the labour market demand and development needs of the region (I, D, E). Some interviewees point to the need for more intermediate technical education (i.e. training below university graduate level) which is offered by URACCAN only in some selected subjects (e.g. training for primary school teachers at the level of técnico superior) and is basically a blank on the educational landscape of RAAN/RAAS. In the case of FADCANIC, a much narrower group of beneficiaries is attended whose needs are also met adequately through the South-South-scholarships, although a feasibility study and/or previous institutional arrangements with partner universities would have been needed in order to avoid administrative bottlenecks related to the collocation of the postgraduate students (see chapter 6: Effectiveness) (E).

The role of the implementing agency Horizont 3000 has been evaluated positively by both project partners. They emphasize demand orientation, commitment, and the ability to engage in a credible participatory approach. On the other hand, Horizont 3000 applied sufficient methodological rigor in order to assure adequate monitoring (I). The evaluation did not observe tendencies of assuming functions that should be based on the ownership of the counterpart institutions. On the contrary, the approach of Horizont 3000 accelerated the growing self-dependency of URACCAN (I) which now seems to be capable of carrying out further support projects without intermediation of Horizont 3000 (E). In the case of FADCANIC, it is more difficult to estimate the administrative capacity development, as some shortcomings at the operational level have been observed (I, D). The interviews show that FADCANIC has systematized lessons learnt for the current modality of South-South-scholarships and, in case of a renewal of the program, should be capable of conceptually designing the intervention. However, as long as weaknesses related to the budgetary planning have not been demonstrably eliminated, intermediation of Horizont 3000 should be maintained (E).

In all three countries, ADA-activities are highly relevant vis-à-vis the general strategies and plans of the respective governments or the general strategies and plans of partner-institutions, insofar they exist. Ownership is a more complex issue and varies from one implementing agency to the next. In Nicaragua and partly in Kosovo, ownership seems to be the highest, with challenges remaining in both Kosovo and Serbia.

Country	Relevance of activities for the country/region	Ownership
Kosovo	High, well embedded in strategies and Bologna-process	Ownership generally high, with a clear focus on ownership in KAIP. Special challenge of University of Prizren. WUS acts more as a service provider.
Serbia	High, well embedded in Bologna-process	Ownership varies between universities, relatively low in regard to "Experiencing Europe" and "Österreich Institut"-activities. WUS acts more as a service provider.
Nicaragua	High, well embedded in the local needs and efforts	Ownership is visible, with FADCANIC as the weakest factor.

The activities in Serbia do not contribute to the capacity development of the Ministry for Education, but only to universities, or, to be more precisely, to the faculties (D,I,E). Not all factors necessary for an assessment of proper intervention in regard to capacity development are established. Issues like the lacks in administrative power or the missing integration of universities are mentioned, but are not documented and are not part of the planning documents. Therefore, the LogFrames do not include all necessary factors as well, especially motivational ones. Here, in planning a final program for an exit-strategy, it might be necessary to assess these more convincingly in order to identify the proper level of intervention (E).

The major goal for all capacity development is to develop a significant change in either quantity or quality of outputs of relevant institutions. In Kosovo the case of the KAIP, the intention of the program is clearly in line with this basic principle. As KAIP is working through and with local institutions and is providing essential support in order to enhance their output-capabilities – although with a varying degree of success – the necessary characteristic of quality is evident. In regard to the WUS-activities, aside from the support of the curriculum development officer of the University of Pristina, the necessary institutional framework is either missing or not taken into consideration, as the interventions are on a more general level (E,D). While supporting the development of Master courses has a positive outcome in regard to the ability of the institution – here the relevant department or faculty – to provide better output in regard to certain services – e.g. the delivery of education -, there is no indicator available showing any profound increase in the ability of the supported institution to deliver better services in the future as well – or to be able to develop Master courses of sufficient quality without external support. While both programs have good insight knowledge about the institutions they work with, not all necessary elements for capacity development or the planning of such seem to be documented or explicitly stated, at least not in the documents available for this evaluation. Issues like internal relationships, motivation, management capacity and formal or informal purposes and strategies are not always made explicit or are not well researched (D,E). The consultant's guess is that the actors within both programs are familiar with the framework and work through and with it. The exact relationship between inputs provided to enhance quantity and quality of outputs and the causality link between the input provided by the program and the input provided by the institution (e.g. the ministry or the faculty) is not always well defined, in some cases hints are only evident indirectly (D). A distinct

analysis of internal processes of the institutions supported is either lacking or only apparent in the "brains" of those responsible for the execution of the projects; they are not always clearly discernible in any of the project documentation. Also, no clear differentiation is available between the internal as well as external factors of capacity development in the respective institution. This is understandable in the case of e.g. the Master development activities of WUS, as this is solely based on a passive offer, reacting to applications, in which the applicants are supposed to explain their lack and the need for the intervention. But in regard to the KAIP-program, the distinction between internal and external factors is supposed to be much clearer than it is right now. It sometimes surfaces in the project-reporting – especially where justification is needed for components which didn't work out well – but not in any systematic way.

If we follow the basic principles of Austrian development cooperation on capacity development[8], we find that many of the criteria outlined there are not met or at least not stated as explicit as they should. The Bologna-process in itself is an obstacle to these criteria. When the basic principles ask for using locally available expertise and warn against the careless use of pre-fabricated patterns and external consultancy, then the whole Bologna-process would not be feasible for capacity development in this sense – as the process is providing a pre-fabricated pattern and heavily relies on external consultancy. Where the principles ask for a detailed analysis of the situation – basically a feasibility study – on the one hand, and for demand-oriented work towards the needs of the partners on the other, the current case of the new University of Prizren and Austria's fast commitment in regard to support the project is a contradiction in itself, as it will be started without any feasibility and analysis of the situation, because the partner obviously is not interested in such and the commitment has been made without asking for any such analysis (D,E).

For Nicaragua, some of the aspects mentioned above already imply criteria related to ADA's guidelines and/or international standards of capacity development (e.g. demand orientation, situation analysis and local adaptation of services, use and strengthening of local expertise, etc.) which have been evaluated positively (E). In general, both projects reflect the major goal of all capacity development which is to bring about a significant change in either quantity or quality of outputs of relevant institutions. While in the case of URACCAN, ADA supports an institution which itself pursues the mission of fostering capacity development in the region, in the case of FADCANIC, support is given to individuals who are supposed to act as change agents in their present or future working environment (D).

In the case of URACCAN, change processes and the desired effect on the quality and quantity of the institutional output are well-designed, although project indicators do not properly measure the results of capacity development. The project stakeholder could coherently explain the underlying result chains to the evaluators (I); nevertheless, they should be reflected more explicitly in the project documents (E). In the case of FADCANIC, the students are well-chosen, field research applied to relevant subjects for regional development is compulsory, and some positive outcomes in their working environments are visible (see chapter 8) (I,E). However, like in many scholarship programs, the project design relies on a results chain that implicitly supposes that institutional development can be triggered by capacity development on the level of individuals. Although this will happen more probably if individual career

---

[8]   ADA: OEZA Qualitätskriterien Kapazitätsentwicklung, Wien o. J.

choices are in line with the institutional needs of the employers (which seems to be the case for most participants) it would be helpful if the participation in the scholarship program was explicitly embedded in institutional development strategies of the employers (E).

A structural constraint for both projects is the fact that HE support by ADA is limited to the sphere of an individual organization (URACCAN) or individual students (FADCANIC). However, as pointed out in the context analysis, not all of the bottlenecks for capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS are linked to challenges within the HE-institutions, but to the articulation with other highly dysfunctional subsectors (e.g. secondary education, technical education), or to constraints at the macro level (e.g. allocation of funds by the CNU) (I). As interfaces between the subsectors and complementary interventions at the macro-level cannot be addressed by ADA, a more systemic multi-level approach to capacity development is out of reach (E).

In summary, capacity development at the level of the interventions (organizations, individuals) complies to a high degree with the requirements of ADA and led to positive outcomes that will be discussed in chapter 8, whereas factors that are external to the HE sector and/or the RAAN/RAAS cannot be attended.

Capacity-development is executed with a good degree of variation between the three countries of this study. While the example of Nicaragua shows very positive results, the challenges in Serbia and Kosovo remain, the intervention of KAIP notwithstanding. In addition, not all the ADA-principles of capacity-development are respected in the way the activities are planned and executed, at least in Southeast Europe. In Serbia, the level of intervention – beneath the Ministries, but not within the Ministries – has to be reflected upon; unfortunately, because of the near end of activities, this problem cannot be solved anymore.

In regard to the issue of results-oriented management, please refer to chapter 6 and 7, as results will be discussed there.

Country	Capacities	Principles
Kosovo	Increasing, but different in regard to the institution. Ministry is relatively weak in capacity, University of Pristina is growing stronger, Ministry is only supported in specific agencies	Not all relevant factors of ADA's quality criteria for Capacity Development are considered
Serbia	Capacities in universities vary between the institutions, they are not necessary strengthened on the institutional, often more on an individual level (exception Novi Pazar), Ministry is not supported	Not all relevant factors of ADA's quality criteria for Capacity Development are considered
Nicaragua	Capacities of the university have increased considerably	ADA's quality criteria for Capacity Development are well represented

Recommendations:

- For an exit-strategy in **Serbia**, a component should be included in the program which addresses basic administrative lacks in the implementation process of foreign funds in some universities, especially in regard to financial administration and project-management from the site of the administration. The establishment or support of a project-management-unit at rectorate-level would also support the badly needed integration of Serbian universities. Here, capacities in these issues could be bundled and then made available for faculties and departments. This is necessary as an exit-strategy would result in the need for the universities to access alternative funding more aggressively. To ensure sustainability, support in this area is needed and would be advisable. In order to implement this, a survey in regard to the administrative capabilities should be made, as the degree of quality varies from university to university.

- From a practical point of view, any exit-program should be implemented by the WUS-office in Belgrade. This recommendation would look different if ADA would continue the activities in Serbia for a longer period.

- Future activities in **Kosovo** now inherent in the WUS-program should, if the decision is taken that they should be continued, be implemented from within the University of Pristina.

- While respecting the principle of partner-orientation and ownership, the consultant suggests a very cautious and step-by-step-approach in regard to the support of the University of Prizren. Initially, the support should be on a very pragmatic and basic level, e.g. help for the administration of the new university to effectively register new students (software, training) or provision of curriculum-development support in one or two distinct programs with the highest probability of success. Any other activity has to be based on a feasibility-study, even if one might not call it that way.

- In writing the tender for the new program, ADA should refer directly to current papers on the principles of capacity development and ask bidders to explain their view on these issues with special consideration to the case of Kosovo.

- According to the results related to the ownership and planning/monitoring capacities in **Nicaragua**, URACCAN seems to be perfectly able to act as implementing agency of future projects, without further intermediation of Horizont 3000. ADA already intended to assign the project directly to URACCAN and should proceed with this decision that does not at all exclude further advice by Horizont 3000 "on-demand" by URACCAN. In the case of FADCANIC, on the other hand, a more intense back-stopping, and therefore further intermediation of Horizont 3000, should be ensured if the scholarship program should be renewed.

- The management capacities are generally adequate, but could be raised additionally supporting strategic planning processes at the local campus level. URACCAN disposes of a strategic plan for the entire university, but due the socio-cultural peculiarities of each sub-region, complementary strategic plans of the individual campuses would add further value.

- ADA support for capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS has focused on higher education although professional training at intermediate educational level is as much a bottleneck as HE. Partially, this demand can and should be addressed by URACCAN. Although this recommendation probably exceeds the range of the future cooperation with ADA, URACCAN should always consider the potential needs for careers at the level of *técnico superior* when carrying out needs and labour market analysis.

6.   Effectiveness

The activities of ADA (through the implementing agencies) in Serbia do not follow a visible holistic approach or program-based approach[9], and interconnection between the various components is not based on a coherent, interlinked strategy but more or less accidental (D,I,E). The fact that e.g. one Master Studies program in Novi Pazar – in cooperation with the University of Novi Sad – is supported, is surely connected to the fact that WUS is supporting the University of Novi Pazar and has an excellent relationship to the rector, but the application came somewhat unexpected and has not been a comprehensive part of the support-strategy. The fact that participants from the program of the "Österreich-Institut" took also part in the "Experiencing Europe"-program is due to the fact that the language course provided is beneficial for the EE-participants, but not in any case a planned effort to connect these activities. The Brain Gain Program finally is running more or less separately from the other components as well. Sure, a number of departments involved in the MSDP have had experience with BGP before and during the development of the Master course, but to the knowledge of the consultant this has not been used in a conscious way to support Master Studies development with expatriates invited through BGP+. All in all, the activities are additive and parallel, but not holistic and activities are not bundled strategically. If they are bundled, then more by chance than based on a plan (E).

In Kosovo, and seen separately, the two programs have indeed important characteristics of program-based and holistic interventions (E). The impression is that the WUS-activities are more closely interlinked and interconnected than those of the KAIP project. This is surely related partially to the fact that KAIP intervenes in nine different components (with sub-components) on different levels and, within the structure of higher education, different target-groups, goals and stakeholders. As in some cases the basis for any holistic interlinking had to be established first, the evaluator expects that in a second phase it will be possible to connect the different aspects more visibly. For the WUS-program, the interconnection between the four major components – the BCC aside – is easily visible. Faculties and individual pro-

---

9   PBA is defined in the DAC guidelines as a way of engaging in development cooperation based on the principle of coordinated support for a locally owned programme of development. It should involve leadership by the host country, a single comprehensive programme and budget framework, as well as a formalised process of donor coordination and harmonisation of donor procedures for reporting, budgeting, financial management and procurement. Another important feature are efforts to increase the use of local systems for programme design and implementation, financial management, monitoring and evaluation. A PBA interconnects different components of activities in order to create synergies and tries to avoid a simple addition without connection to each other.

fessors have been beneficiaries of several components at the same time, and content-wise they are wisely connected. For a new master programme – like that for Mechatronics at the Faculty for Mechanical Engineering – MSDP-activities took place, the new course has been bolstered by expatriates through the BGP and individual courses benefitted from the CDP-component. In the WUS activities the different components are bundled if it furthers the overall goal, in this case the efficient and effective support for the establishment of a new Master Course (I,E).

In Nicaragua and on a meso and micro level, the cooperation with URACCAN comes relatively close to a program-based holistic approach. Qualification of teachers and other elements of institutional development, facilitation of access to HE for vulnerable groups, and a direct support to local development processes are not only complementary interventions, but a close synergy between the academic sphere and the communitarian field work is always pursued. As pointed out by a staff member, URACCAN "must be clear about the fact that it is not an NGO, but a university" which implies that support to local development must be in line with research and curricular work placements for students (and vice-versa).

The scholarship program by FADCANIC is limited to one single intervention: the financial support to the postgraduate studies of 11 professionals in the RAAN/RAAS region. To a certain extent, it is complementary to the URACCAN project as both pursue a similar overall objective aimed towards developing the capacities of professionals and institutions in the region. The fact that 6 out of 11 participants are personnel of URACCAN suggests that both projects merge into a kind of capacity development program for the RAAN. However, support for URACCAN concentrates in Las Minas while FADCANIC scholarships have been accessible for students from all over the region (including personnel from other URACCAN campuses). Thus, both projects have different impact areas – although partially in different campuses of the same HE institution. In conclusion, the outcome and impact of both projects may add up in a complementary manner, but will not fully tap the potential for synergies.

The activities in all three countries consist of interlinked, holistic approaches as well as of additive or separate interventions. Generally, a more program-based approach seems to prevail, but challenges remain, especially in creating synergies as well as complementarities of different components.

Country	Program/holistic approach
Kosovo	All activities have a program-approach, even if not planned as such. Some activities of KAIP appear to be additive.
Serbia	No program/holistic approach discernible.
Nicaragua	Cooperation with URACCAN close to a program-approach, FADCANIC a single intervention.

Indicators and LogFrames are not always helpful in considering the success of outcomes of the program in Serbia. Still, a general assessment will be made, component by component:

1. **The establishment of a coordination platform for Higher Education and the Labour Market**. This component has failed. Main reason for this failure is a specific time-constraint, as the initial steps to establish the platform took quite some time, while the MSDP had to start at a specific point of time in order to proceed smoothly (D,I)

2. **Master Studies Development Program**. A total number of seven master programs have been supported and were, with one delay, implemented according to time-schedule. In all cases, the Ministry for Science and Environment co-financed the Master courses by support for equipment. In all courses, the envisaged number of students was either enrolled or more than expected applied. At this point of time, the Master courses are still running and no information exists in regard to the outcome (e.g. passed examinations, quality of thesis etc.) (D,I).

3. **Brain Gain Program plus (BGP+)**. More than 70 scholars from abroad have been invited to Serbia through the current BGP+-program, many of them coming a second or third time. From the information gathered during this evaluation, the input provided by these scholars has been both viable as well as needed, especially in regard to secondary skills. Examples in how far different styles of teaching, closer relationship to requirements of the labour-market and a different attitude towards students – beyond the old-fashioned "ex-cathedra"-style of many Serbian professors – have impacted the departments were discussed. No information was available in how far the BGP worked as an entry-point for Serbian diaspora to connect strong enough with universities to consider a permanent return to the country (D,I).

4. **E-learning/life-long-learning**. The e-learning component has been fully implemented in all supported master courses. It has to be mentioned that this component is not necessarily e-learning in its "pure" form, but a combination of traditional learning methods and an e-learning component. Complete e-learning is at this time not possible in the Serbian system. Not in all cases was it possible for the Master courses to rely on the e-learning-centres formerly established with the support of WUS. In the case of the University of Belgrade, for example, it was discerned that the centre is non-existent anymore. In these cases, the e-learning component had to be supported on a faculty- or departmental level (D,I).

5. **Support for the University of Novi Pazar**. The support has been considerable especially in advice in setting up a quality-assurance-office within the rectorate, which is supposed to be more efficient than in other universities as the University of Novi Pazar is fully integrated. The office has been established and is fully functional (D,I).

6. **Support of accreditation agency**. The input for the Accreditation Commission consisted mainly in support for some study-visits, especially to accreditation agencies in Austria and Romania. While the claim is that these examples of successful agencies have supported the work of the Commission, no proof for this claim was visible. It is the impression of the consultant that the intervention has taken place on the wrong level and has not necessarily lead to any capacity development worth mentioning. This is especially worrisome as it has been reported to the consultant that the EU – through a related Tempus-project – financed additional study-trips for the members of this institution, which made the WUS-effort indistinguishable. Part of the explanation

for the overall small impact of WUS-support for the Commission is the fact that the current Commission had the task to accredit all state and a number of private universities in a quite short time and therefore the capacity for additional activities has not been there (D,I,E).

7. **Zoran-Djindjic-scholarship-scheme "Experiencing Europe"**. The program has been implemented successfully, with a total number of 133 interns send to Austria at the time of reporting. While the feedback by companies has been quite positive and the integration of interns within the companies been generally successful, no information about the final whereabouts of the former interns is yet available, as many of them are still at the university. A comparison to the German program, from which the Austrian has been copied, indicates a high probability for a considerable labour-market impact. From the German program, around 30 % of participants have found jobs in German companies with subsidiaries in Serbia. Another 40 % found occupation in Serbian companies with business-ties in German-speaking countries. The rest is pursuing post-graduate studies. There is no reason why the Austrian program should not achieve the same level of success[10]. In addition, the program has been very important in regard to the visibility and image-building of Austrian support in Serbia. The Foundation has a very good, state-of-the-art alumni-network with additional activities provided (like seminars, conferences, online-platform etc.) (D,I,E).

8. **Österreich-Institut**. Currently, 80 students participate in the 4-year-language course. As the course will not end before 2011, results cannot be seen. Motivational problems which occurred in between have been overcome by providing additional incentives like e.g. scholarships or study-trips to Austria, not paid out of the budget of the program but acquisitioned elsewhere. At this point of time, any statement in regard to outcome or impact will be highly speculative (D,I,E).

Although ADA is the biggest bilateral donor in the field of higher-education in **Kosovo**, the overall budget is not immensely big. Still, as ADA – with the exception of some expenditure in the CDP+ – does not finance infrastructure, the money goes a long way to support the "soft" aspect of capacity development. Generally, both programs have a good (WUS) or an acceptable ratio of input vs. output, at least from the impression gathered from the documentation available. The fact that KAIP has been able to be prolonged for a year without additional funding available – mainly because programmed budget has not been spent due to some shortcomings in some of the components – shows that in general the input on the financial side has been used wisely and with consideration. In regard to input beyond financial means, all stakeholders agree that the external expertise used and provided has been fully adequate and qualified for the support of the goals of the program. This is especially important for the "networking"-aspect of both programs, as this kind of service enabled both the – not originally planned – institutional aspect of the MSDP of WUS[11] as well as the creation of an expert-pool for the KAA to fulfil its task. Input from the side of the partners, especially from

---

[10] The CIM-staff employed for the German program at the Foundation indicated that the German program, whose current phase will run out end of this year, will most likely be continued, as the success of the individual interns has been clearly visible.

[11] In order to implement the MSDP successfully, WUS initiated a twinning-component, not unlike the one in the KAIP, between the departments who developed a new Master programme and another, mostly Austrian HE-institution, supported by activities through the CDP+ and BGP-component where feasible.

the MEST, has been the major obstacle for the KAIP-project, and has been instrumental for the relative slow establishment e.g. of the CITT (I).

If we follow the indicators set out in the project-plans of both programs, all components have been successful, with the notable exception of the CITT/K-CIRT-component in KAIP and some reservations in regard to the twinning-component (which is still running and is supposed to fulfil indicators by the end of the project). For the WUS-program, all quantitative indicators are not only fulfilled, some are more than fulfilled. Unfortunately, as will be discussed in chapter 7, most of the measurable indicators are output-oriented, some indicators more goals than indicators, and both documentation as well as monitoring as of now do not include relevant information about outcomes and impact (with some information about short-term outcomes available). Therefore, the question in how far target groups and partners have benefited from the activities is only to be answered tentatively. As this has not been a detailed project-evaluation, not all the indicators of the LogFrame were scrutinized in relationship to the plan. As another evaluation of the WUS-activities in planned, this was not deemed to be necessary (E, I, D).

In regard to the components of the WUS-program:

1. **Master Studies Development Program (MSDP)**. In quantitative terms, the goals were more than achieved, as more than the planned Master courses were realized. As well, outside the original planning, the Master course development has been done with a twinning-component, establishing good links between the relevant departments of the UP and universities abroad. From information gathered during the field-visit, all Master programs realized have a good number of students interested, sometimes more than expected. The MSDP has been complemented by Tempus-projects, also implemented by WUS, to develop more Master courses which were not covered either by the ADA-budget for WUS or the Master development activities by KAIP. As most of these Master studies are still underway, no information about the quality of exams and the whereabouts of graduates has been available at the time of the evaluation. Indicators: All quantitative indicators mentioned in the LogFrame have been either reached or even be exceeded. Unfortunately, not all the indicators are SMART, an issue, which will be discussed below (D,I).

2. **Brain Gain Program Plus (BGP+).** The consultant has been provided with an impressive list of 21 scholars – from the Kosovarian diaspora – who participated in the BGP and have afterwards either returned to Kosovo or at least took up part-time employment at the UP. Among former participants of the BGP are very prominent stakeholders of the Kosovarian elite, like the current deputy minister of energy and mining, the acting ambassador of Kosovo to Germany and the current director for the department of Higher Education at the MEST, the direct counterpart of ADA-activities in Kosovo. Also, the current director of the K-CIRT, which is part of the KAIP-activities, has been a beneficiary of BGP. Having said this, there is of course not always a direct link of causality between participation in the BGP and the decision to take up a permanent position in Kosovo. In many cases, the BGP has surely helped scholars to come to the decision that an engagement in the country of origin might be worth the effort. Still, it is to be expected that the attribution-gap between the intervention and this outcome is significant, as many other factors surely play a decisive role in this positive development. Nevertheless, from the information obtained, it can be said that

the BGP has worked sufficiently well as a catalyst and facilitating mechanism to support not only the transfer of knowledge from abroad, but also for return of diaspora-academicians to Kosovo. Indicators: All quantitative indicators mentioned in the Log-Frame have been achieved (D,I).

3. **Course Development Program Plus (CDP+)**. The CDP+ program has reached its quantitative goals and, from the few participants the consultant has been able to meet, has been executed with good results. In many cases, the CDP+, the BGP and the MSDP-program were combined to achieve maximum results in the development of new Master courses; this bundling of resources is very commendable. Course development at the UP sometimes still faces some criticism from less modern or progressive professors in some departments; therefore it is a good program to identify change agents within the university-structure. In addition, CDP as well as BGP are one of the few programs available for non-technical faculties – like philosophy – to develop the quality of their teaching. Indicators: The indicators planned to realize half of the CDP-activities in cooperation with the multidimensional project (KAIP). As this cooperation did not materialize, this indicator has not been met (D,I).

4. **University Reform and Development Support Unit**. All fully functional office for academic development with a curriculum development officer in its core has been established and is working. The officer participated in the development of new Master courses – is therefore again closely linked to the MSDP – and is contribution to the capacity development of the university as a whole. Still, the office is quite small and there is the danger that its embedment within the vast structure of the UP-"dinosaur" leaves to be desired. It seems that additional strengthening of the office's function, which is primarily of an advisory role, is needed. Indicators: All indicators have been met, the office has been established, the staff is employed. Unfortunately, the measurable indicators are on the output-level, while the qualitative indicators are either goals in itself or not measurable in many cases (D,I).

5. **Kosovo part of the Balkan Case Challenge Program**. Judging from the reports of recent participants from Kosovo in the BCC, all organizational aspects have been handled very well. For the Kosovarian participants the fact that they were allowed to participate although some of the participating countries are not recognizing Kosovo as an independent country has been of high importance and has contributed positively to their self-esteem as Kosovarians (D, E, I).

In summary, an in reflection of the recent KAIP-evaluation (D), which is one important basis for consideration, the KAIP-results can be summarized as this:

1. **Establishment and support of the Kosovo Accreditation Agency (KAA)**. The Agency has been established and has successfully undertaken the first round of accreditation. It is renowned for its independence and quality of scrutiny, and it currently protected in its status by the Education ministry. From the quality of practice and setup, the KAA can be easily compared with agencies in the EU.

2. **Center for Innovation and Technology Transfer (CITT)**. The CITT has been established, but has not performed its tasks until now. The major point – getting the business-sector involved – has generally failed.

3. **Kosovo Centre for International Cooperation in Research and Technology (K-CIRT)**. The K-CIRT exists, but has not fulfilled its duties until now. The evaluation suggests its complete fusion with CITT, of which it is a department. A strengthening of resources has been recommended as well.

4. **NARIC**. NARIC is fully functional and performed its duties in a very satisfactory manner.

5. **Council of Research and Technology**. The Research strategy exists and has been approved by the relevant authorities.

6. **Research grants**. Research grants have been given. Interest has been growing in the two rounds of application, as well as quality of applications. The scheme seems to be a good preparation for access to EU-funding in the foreseeable future.

7. **Fellowship Program**. The fellowship-program provided an important contribution to scholar's qualification and mobility, but has not been very impressive in numbers. The evaluation report suggested an increase in quantity.

8. **University cooperation**. After some delays, the twinning-activities have started with at least three universities. Still, from the documentation at least, the institutional aspect of these twinning-arrangements is not easily discernible, despite the claims of the project-staff that it is otherwise. While the documentation lists the efforts to link individuals from the selected departments to Austrian counterparts (without clear information how these have been selected), the narrative claims that the twinning goes well beyond these individuals and has had already a clear institutional impact. This difference cannot be evaluated without a much closer look into the twinning-arrangements in place, for which the time in Kosovo during this evaluation has been too limited

9. **Sector programming**. A development strategy for the University of Pristina has been developed and published. From the consultant's view, the strategy document reads more like a collection of related articles and less like a comprehensive, visionary paper.

Please refer for more detailed information, especially in regard to the indicators met or not, to the already mentioned KAIP-evaluation conducted last year.

ADA has been one of the most important bilateral donors for HE in the Atlantic region of Nicaragua, and by far the most important for URACCAN Las Minas. Although the total amount is limited, as is the total budget of URACCAN (slightly above 1 mill. US-$ in 2009), it covers core elements of the communitarian university model, namely the support of local development through the CDC, the internal scholarship program, or interventions with high multiplier effects like the Master's Program in Academic Teaching (D). Hence, the relation of a total input of 490,000 € to the results, outcome and impact (see also chapter 8) is considered a very positive one by most interviewees, as well as by the evaluators. The budgeted input for the scholarship program by FADCANIC was similar (463,000 €), but as the factual impact is more disperse and to be expected on a longer-term perspective, no final judgment about the overall efficiency of the ADA support can be made at this point. However, as in 9 cases the postgraduate studies took place in unforeseen part-time modalities (i.e. they did not require full-time presence in the target countries), only some above half of the total

budget has been spent until now (D). The study modalities did not affect the program results and outcome; hence, efficiency might be valuated more positively (I,E). On the other hand the remaining funds, that could have been used to amplify the number of beneficiaries, remained unused as they could not been applied within a time-limit for admissions that was established after clearance with ADA (I).

If we follow the indicators set out in the project-plans of both programs, all components have been relatively successful. In the case of URACCAN only one out of 9 indicators at the result level (35 % of teachers with knowledge of English as a second language) has not been met, or at least approached, while the project of FADCANIC required 5 instead of 3 years to reach the expected results. In both cases, however, goal attainment at the outcome level and contribution to the overall objectives has not been affected seriously by these shortcomings (D,I,E). Subsequently, goal attainment will first be shortly summarized in relation to the formal goals and indicators according to the logical frameworks:

In regard to the components of the URACCAN project:

1. **Improvement of the capacities of academic personnel in teaching and research**: In quantitative terms, the desired results were achieved, as 30 students concluded the Master's program in Academic Teaching, 23 of them teachers at URACCAN (matching exactly the target) and most of the Master's theses dealt with applied research on subjects of immediate relevance for URACCAN Las Minas and the strengthening of its pedagogical mode (D,I). Thus, the Master's program contributed significantly to intensify research activities at URACCAN. Although research was mostly related to the postgraduate studies of teachers and will continue on a more moderate level after the conclusion of the Master's program, most interviewees agree on a very positive impulse for the quality of research as well as teaching. On the other hand, most interviewees at the national level agree on the opinion that the visibility of the academic achievements of URACCAN is still quite limited to the regional level and that more dissemination at the national level would be recommendable. With regard to the LogFrame indicators, the only explicit shortcoming is that little progress has been made regarding the capacities of teachers in English as a second language (I).

2. **Improvement of the access of vulnerable groups** (indigenous people, inhabitants of remote areas) to higher education: In 2009, 259 students (target: 300) were granted scholarships in order to study at URACCAN. According to the institutional report for 2009 (URACCAN 2010a), 40% of them were female students (target: 35%) and 18% students from indigenous communities (target: 33%). The quantitative goals were not fully met, partly due to moderate drop-out rates during the course of studies, which is a more relevant problem in the case of indigenous students. However, drop-out rates for internal scholarship students (i.e. students that live on the campus and receive food and lodging) are significantly lower than those of external students and focus group discussions with beneficiaries allow for the conclusion that for many of them the scholarship was an essential precondition for accessing the university. All in all, the result is evaluated positively (D,I,E).

3. **Support of communitarian development processes in the region of Las Minas**: So far, and in line with the official target, Centers for Communitarian Development

(CDC) have been established in 5 communities. They are concluding or already implementing agendas for local development and have served as focal points for the training of community leaders via a diploma in Communitarian Development. The community leaders trained by the 5 existing CDC are supposed to act as multipliers for neighbouring communities, an effect which has not been pursued yet, but is essential for the future intervention strategy of URACCAN. The integration of graduates in the CDC has been achieved as planned, although with 5 students for two years instead of 10 students for one year (D,I,E) – which is functional for CDC but reduces the overall number of students integrated professionally in their home communities (E).

4. **Capacity Development in Disaster Control and Risk Management**. A seminar in Risk Management for the staff of local governments had been delayed and did not start until the second half of 2009 (I). Although the respective indicator will probably be met, due to the delay no prediction can presently be made regarding the outcome of the trainings at the local level (E). On the other hand, integration of subjects like HIV/AIDS, family violence and sexual education in the academic programs of URACCAN has been achieved as planned. The subjects are now compulsory in every career of the university. Furthermore, a psychologist has been employed permanently to attend the needs of students for personal assistance (I).

In regard to the components of the scholarship program by FADCANIC:

As to the scholarship program, the quantitative results are generally in line with the indicators. Although not all of the participants have already graduated, and at least one doctorate student will not finish graduation during the duration of the project, there has only been one drop-out (D,I). However, the project faced serious administrative problems, as criteria for admission at foreign universities and study modalities had not been anticipated (I). The experiences with former scholarship programs that contrary to the current project were based on previous agreements with the host university, failed as a blueprint for the present phase. Thus, the project faced a total delay of 2 years, although this may not necessarily affect the outcome of the project (E).

In all three countries, activities had a relatively high rate of success on the result-level. In addition, the activities were able to implement their processes with a relatively limited amount of funding, especially compared to activities by other donors (like e.g. TEMPUS-funding for Master courses development in Kosovo and Serbia). In some specific components challenges remain, which have to be addressed in the future.

Country	Input/output ratio[12]	Results
Kosovo	Satisfactory	Aside from some setbacks, all result-indicators have positive results.
Serbia	Very satisfactory	Aside from some setbacks, all

---

[12] Please be advised that despite this question in the TORs, the evaluators have not been asked to provide a full efficiency-analysis.

		result-indicators have positive results.
Nicaragua	Very satisfactory	For URACCAN, all result-indicators have positive results, for FADCANIC some challenges remain.

Donor-coordination in Serbia is, at this point of time, non-existent in the case of the sector of higher-education (I,E). Until the end of 2009, Swiss Development has had the role of a focal point or lead-agency in the education-sector in general. This role was mainly to facilitate regular meetings. Since the beginning of this year, the Ministry of Education has taken over and has organized a number of meetings, most of them concentrating on a specific topic, so far without consideration of higher education. The staff of the Ministry in charge of donor-coordination has expressed no interest in the sector of HE at all and the issue might only be taken up upon suggestion of ADA.

On the level of the Ministry of Finance some donor-coordination exists insofar as the Ministry is supposed to have a running database about all donors in Serbia and their focus and scope of activities. Experience shows however that the database is not maintained well – both because donors are not forthcoming with the necessary information but also because of capacity problems within the Ministry – and that information-requests are not replied satisfactory. Therefore, donors still maintain their own internal overview about what the others are doing and organize meetings among themselves to ascertain that their knowledge is up to date.

On the other hand, the fact that ADA is more or less the only bilateral donor of significance in the whole HE-sector does not bode well for donor-coordination. The Council of Europe has ceased its activities since the end of last year; the remaining actor of significance is the EU-Commission. Some bilateral activities of low-level are visible, especially in regard to scholarship-programs (e.g. by France) or the facilitation of one or the other conference on the matter (e.g. by the German University-Rectors-conference). Actually, keeping an exit-strategy in mind, the major task at hand might be to identify another donor who is willing to invest in HE like ADA did to fill the gap. So far, and based on the interviews during this mission, no alternative partner seems to present himself (I,E).

Donor-communication is, nevertheless, needed, at least between ADA/WUS and the EU-Tempus-Office. The Tempus-program is supporting activities very close to the activities of WUS, especially in Master Studies' development. The staff of Tempus-office showed little knowledge about the role of WUS in the context of Austrian development assistance and were not informed about the scope and partners of the MSDP. They voiced interest in an exchange of information in order to avoid possible duplication in application, as same departments in some of the universities have became quite versatile in accessing foreign funding, increasing the danger of double-funding. If in consequence of this report the decision will be taken to prolong the MSDP for another round, regular communication between at least WUS and the Tempus-Office seems to be advisable (I,E).

Of course, this leads to the general question if a continuation of MSDP is feasible, having the wider range of TEMPUS-support in view. This question cannot be answered easily, because the thematic focus of TEMPUS changes regularly and therefore, if a faculty or department

"missed out" in a given TEMPUS-period, it might not have the chance to try again with the same topic as the focus of the next period might have shifted. Therefore, the Austrian MSDP, as it is not subject to these regular shifts of focus, can intervene where TEMPUS' approach might not be adequate. Unfortunately, as cooperation between WUS and TEMPUS is, so far, non-existent, this "gap-filling-function" has not materialized until now, at least not with intent.

Donor-coordination in the field of education in general is in Kosovo a challenging task. There are several reasons for this: First, around 25 donors are on different levels involved in the field. Second, the MEST has until recently not had a working department for donor-coordination[13]. Third, in some areas of donor-activities, significant overlapping of activities exists. Fourth, efforts by SIDA to coordinate donors in the field of education have only resulted in some meetings, but SIDA did obviously not play an active coordinative role. SIDA has currently the role of a "focal point" for education, but is not involved in anything more than facilitation of regular donor-meetings and therefore enhancing regular information-flows. This challenging picture is, fortunately, less problematic on the field of higher education. Here ADA has volunteered, as the biggest bilateral donor, to head a sub-sector-group on higher education, which has until now not materialized into a working committee. Still, the need for donor-coordination is much less evident in this field, as aside from ADA the engagement of other donors is highly limited. Aside from the already mentioned capacity-building activities of SIDA, which are supposed to benefit at least indirectly also the higher education department, it is mostly multilateral donors who are active. The EU-commission is offering its familiar range of funding possibilities (Tempus etc.)[14]. In the future, with the new research strategy in place, support for research grants will also be available for Kosovo. The World Bank is active on a consultancy-basis on a more strategic level. The current new draft of the higher education law is designed by a British professor from the British Accreditation Council. OSCE is financing small projects and studies. Other donors are only visible in very single and specific activities. As one of the interviewees said: "In the end, it's only Austria." (I,E)

Having said this, it doesn't mean that donor-cooperation shouldn't be high on the agenda. Two reasons call indeed for a higher quality: First, the probable need for a concerted donor-effort to make the new University of Prizren work, second, the cross-cutting issues related to a new university which is supposed to be more concentrated on applied sciences and connection to the labour market. Here other donors involved in issues like VET need to be included also in deliberations about curricular development and issues of labour-market orientation, e.g. in the training of teachers for colleges and other vocational institutions or for the field of adult education. The danger in dividing the education field into sub-sectors is clear: With a too strong focus on one's "favourite field", the look into cross-cutting issues which touch the activities of other donors might get lost. At this point of time, the consultant has serious doubts that the MEST will be able to provide the still very much needed overall guidance for the sector (E).

In Nicaragua, the activity of ADA in the HE sector is not integrated into any effective kind of donor cooperation (I). One reason is that most donors focus on primary and secondary edu-

---

[13]   At the end of the field-trip, the MEST announced the appointment of a new head of the donor-coordination-department for the following week.
[14]   WUS is implementing Tempus-projects to facilitate the support in the development of Master-programs not covered by ADA-activities.

cation. Around 12 multilateral and bilateral donors participate in a Sector-wide-Approach (SWAP) and coordinate via round tables (Mesa Sectorial and Mesa de Donantes en Educación, among others: World Bank, AECID, CIDA, USAID, JICA, UNICEF, UNDP) (D). As the coordination mechanism does not focus on higher education nor on the Caribbean region, ADA has little reason to engage at this level although an interviewed representative of the table suggests that ADA should do so in order to facilitate the articulation between the different educational subsystems. However, due to the regional orientation of ADA's HE support, it would probably be much more effective and efficient to count with a mechanism for donor cooperation specifically at the regional level (E). For some time, a regional round table for donor coordination in the Atlantic region dealt with educational issues (HE, Intercultural Bilingual Education), but only got together until 2007 (I). As for today, a government authority of the RAAN states that only for the public bilateral or multilateral donors, an inventory of current development cooperation is available, but no general coordination mechanism is in place. As for NGO activities in education or the focus areas of ADA, an important proportion of ongoing cooperation isn't even known to the regional authorities (I). For the individual partner organizations URACCAN and FADCANIC, this situation is manageable as the number of donors in the HE subsector is quite limited (D). Thus, particularly URACCAN has managed quite well to use available funds for complementary purposes. However, where bottlenecks for the sector development transcend the subsystem of higher education (i.e. where the articulation with the subsystems of secondary and or technical education is concerned, see chapter 3.2), the lack of donor cooperation hinders a more coherent development strategy (I,E).

In all three countries, ADA plays and important role in donor-activities towards the HE-sector (in Nicaragua at least in the region of interest). In Serbia and Kosovo, ADA is the single most important bilateral donor. In all three countries, donor-coordination or even communication lacks the necessary motivation and structure in general, and specifically for the HE-sector.

Country	Other donors	Donor-coordination
Kosovo	Few multilateral and bilateral activities – with the notable exception of the EU – ADA by far the biggest actor.	A positive process has been started, but so far not yielded significant results.
Serbia	Few multilateral and bilateral activities – with the notable exception of the EU – ADA by far the biggest actor.	Donor-coordination in the HE-sector non-existent.
Nicaragua	No other significant donor in the region.	Donor-coordination in the HE-sector non-existent.

The Austrian BMWF does not appear as a distinct actor very visibly in Serbia (I). None of the interviewees has been able to clearly point to any distinct activity. Programs are known in a general way – like the CEEPUS-exchange-program, where Serbian participation has nearly been cancelled because of negligence on the side of the Education ministry. In general, as cooperation in specific projects doesn't take place, coherence issues are here of a much

lesser concern. Information flow between ADA and the BMWF doesn't always seem to be up to date, but as activities are not really complementary, only additive, this is hardly a problematic situation. Coherence is of higher interest in regard to e.g. the integrated regional development program (IRDP) in the Vojvodina which has some components including the HE-sector, namely the University of Novi Sad. The currently supported Master course in Regional Development from that university is linked to support by the IRDP, but communication between WUS and the IRDP is either non-existent or weak. Aside from that, lack in coherence was voiced by any interview-partner on any level of the Serbian HE-system (I).

Coherence within the Austrian activities is identifiable on three different levels in Kosovo: within the two programs, between the two programs and between the two engaged ministries/agencies in regard to the KAIP-project. The issue of coherence within the two programs has been elaborated already. Coherence between the two programs in Kosovo is non-existent in regard to active cooperation. "Accidentally", coherence appears. An example is the Institute for Political Science of the University of Pristina, where two new lecturers, attracted into permanent employment through the WUS-administered Brain-Gain-Program, were instrumental to get the necessary accreditation of the curriculum by the KAIP-supported Accreditation Agency. There might be other examples like this, which are unavoidable, as both programs are active in the same field. But cooperation or even communication seems to be extremely limited. The reasons for this are lying in the past of the establishment of KAIP and, probably, have an interpersonal component as well. Whatever the reason is, this lack of cooperation is unjustifiable from a content-viewpoint. As the situation is, the consultant does not expect any improvement before the end of the current phase of both programs (I,E).

In regard to inter-ministerial coherence between the efforts of ADA and the Foreign Ministry of Austria on the one hand and the Ministry for Science and Research of Austria on the other side, some issues need to be discussed. In general, all stakeholders interviewed agree that the current cooperation is a role-model of inter-ministerial cooperation and coordination and therefore a very good and positive development. There is some evidence that not all of ADA's "development terminology" and its inherent content – like important cross-cutting issues or ADA's commitment to poverty reduction – are either fully understood or taken very serious in all relevant aspects by the BMWF. Still, this is understandable as the BMWF's mission of generally of a different nature than ADA's. Despite the fact that both institutions are represented within the steering committee of KAIP and that decisions there are normally made on a consensual basis, some instances of miscommunication have emerged. Having said this, the consultant is of the opinion that continuous communication and a constructive atmosphere in cooperation can easily overcome minor misunderstandings, therefore these instances should seen as an opportunity to develop the positive aspects of the working relationship even further. From the conduct of this evaluation, and in regard to the KAIP-project, there was no evidence for really serious problems in the cooperation of both ministries which lead to negative repercussions for the implementation of the project. For the Kosovarian partners, the differentiation between one or the other Austrian ministry is obviously of minor importance. It is Austria "as a whole", and represented through different stakeholders in the process, which matters. For a second phase of KAIP – or whatever name a new, unified and comprehensive program might carry – the current process of communication and cooperation can easily be continued and deepened without any specific new instrument, body or mechanism (I,E).

Coherence within the Austrian activities in Nicaragua can be evaluated on two different levels: within/between the current projects and their components, and between ADA and the implementing agency Horizont 3000. Other than in the case of countries where ADA is contributing broadly to the development of the HE system, the Ministry for Science and Research (BMWF) has no significant stakes in Nicaragua and coherence at an inter-ministerial level is not an issue.

Coherence at the level of the current projects themselves has already been positively valuated. As far as coherence between ADA and Horizont 3000 is concerned, no deviations have been reported regarding the overall objectives or specific purposes that both partners attributed to the projects and their role for the regional development (I). At the contrary, Horizont 3000 envisions education as a focus area, and the RAAN as a focus region, which not only has been complementary to ADA's radius in Nicaragua, but implies that Horizont 3000 is carrying out several educational projects that are complementary with the institutional support to URACCAN (e.g. projects related to professional training for teachers in indigenous areas, support to the intercultural bilingual education EIB) (D).

Not in all countries is coherence a "burning" issue. It seems that especially in Kosovo and to a much more limited extent in Nicaragua coherence-issues are of importance.

Country	Coherence on ministerial level	Coherence between programs/projects
Kosovo	High and commendable.	Not existing in a planned way.
Serbia	Not an issue.	Not existing in a planned way.
Nicaragua	Not an issue.	A good degree of complementarity has been achieved.

Recommendations:

- For a new program in **Kosovo**, continue those elements of both programs which have proven to be effective so far and can be used in both universities – Pristina and Prizren – without a great amount of additional administrative effort. This recommendation includes specifically the BGP, the MSDP and the CDP. It could be considered to discontinue the CDP in favour of more Master course development. BGP should be continued because of the high importance of the diaspora for HE-development in the country, exemplified by active efforts of the MEST to seek staff for the new university in Prizren among expatriate scholars. This link should be encouraged and strengthened, BGP seems to be a good tool for this goal.

- Programs benefiting the universities from within should be executed by the universities or by staff employed through the program, but working within the university-structure, not outside of it.

- From the KAIP, the research-grant-program should be discontinued. With the new research plan available, Kosovo will have access to EU research funding. The new program should concentrate on backstopping for effective application for EU-funding, e.g. beta-reading of applications or trainings in application and financial administra-

tion of research grants.

- The cooperation with the Accreditation Agency should be reduced to a level which can best be described as "political support". It will continue to be necessary to have some leverage in the KAA, in order to protect the agency from undue political influence and therefore enable it to develop and strengthen its own "standing". This can best be done by an "Austrian umbrella", signifying the continued interest of Austrian development cooperation in the autonomy of the KAA. This will not require a lot of financial commitment.

- Twinning-activities will be of high importance for the new University of Prizren, but might actually be too early to embark upon. The new program should follow a step-by-step-approach for twinning-activities with Prizren, from the simple, problem-oriented facilitation of contact up to real twinning processes later in the development of the new institution.

- The new University in Prizren will need a strategy, which will include issues like the inclusion of ethnic minorities and the dedication towards the needs of the labour-market. Experiences from the strategy-process handled by KAIP should be used to support such a strategy-process in Prizren, if and insofar the new rectorate there will find this feasible.

- Activities in donor-coordination and inter-ministerial coherence between Austrian ministries should continue as planned or already implemented. A new tender for a comprehensive program in Kosovo should be developed in close cooperation by both relevant ministries and the internal structure of cooperation should be well defined in order to avoid any misunderstanding. The already established concept of a steering-committee should be continued.

- Donor-coordination should concentrate both on cross-cutting issues (like VET and secondary education and its linkage to the HE-sector) as well as on the university of Prizren and possible opportunities for a concerted effort there. In addition, donor-coordination might look into the question in how far other bilateral donors aside from ADA can be attracted to put some resources into the sector. This will be important if the current plans of the government to open even a second new university will actually materialize.

- The efforts in **Serbia** for the establishment of a coordination platform should be discontinued. For an exit-strategy, it is not advisable to start something really new which would need follow-up that cannot be provided.

- The MSDP should be continued, but with the following reservations:

  o Only faculties or departments which have already been supported should benefit from a second MSDP. The goal is not to spread activities, but to deepen them.

  o Applications with a multi-disciplinary approach should be given prominent consideration. This should be part of the tender-announcement for a new program.

- o Current plans to open the Master development for PhD-support should not be followed upon. First, a phase of another maximum of three years might be to short and the danger that PhD-students will be left in limbo is too big. Second, conditions for PhD-studies in many universities are not conducive and ADA-activities cannot solve these problems in a short time. It is better to deepen the Master development – to add diversity – than to start any activity in regard to PhD-level.

- The support for the University of Novi Pazar should be continued in issues which both combine the role as a role-model of an integrated university as well as issues of labour-market and employability. In this respect, after the quality-assurance-office has been established, support should be given to the establishment of a career-service-center at the rectorate. This is totally feasible within a three-years-period.

- Before any further support for the Accreditation Commission should be given, a donor-analysis has to be made in how far especially through the Tempus-program sufficient support is available. If that is the case, the support should be discontinued. If not, the recommendation is to shift support from the members of the Commission to its technical staff, as, while the members will change all four years after the mandate expires, the staff will most probably stay.

- The "Experiencing Europe"-scheme has both economical as well as political benefits. Despite the fact that it does not have visible impact in capacity-development at this point of time, and despite the fact that ownership by the Foundation is low and will continue to be so, labour-market and employability-potential is very high. If possible, the program should be continued for another period, especially, as the German partner program will most likely do so accordingly.

- The program of the Österreich Institut will run until 2011. Together with the ZDF-program, this activity has the highest potential to be continued after the withdrawal of ADA-support in the future, as it combines both cultural as well as developmental aspects and works relatively cost-efficient. Before any recommendation can be made, and as comparable programs on the German or Swiss side do not exist, further scrutiny about the future success of participants is necessary. Unfortunately, the project design itself does not include additional monitoring of the whereabouts of the participants after the conclusion of the program.

- If the MSDP will be continued, initiate regular contacts between the WUS-office in Belgrade and the Tempus-office for communication about supported Master courses and departments.

- Propose to the Ministry of Education a special meeting on higher education with the participation of all stakeholders, including the Ministry of Science. As the news about the exit of ADA will be spread by that time, this meeting can be used to ask the other donors for their willingness or preparedness to replace ADA-activities after the end of a phasing out-program.

- Both projects in **Nicaragua** have delivered most of the aspired results and are to certain extent complementary. However, synergies could be enhanced by adapting the selection process more systematically to the focus areas and the needs of comple-

mentary projects of ADA in Nicaragua. It should be mentioned that not all interviewees agree on the pertinence of narrowing the focus of the scholarship program – the evaluation team however holds the opinion that measures of capacity development should deviate from the focus areas of ADA as little as possible.

- The overall results of the scholarship would justify the continuance of ADA support. However, some adjustments at the operational level would be necessary in order to facilitate a smoother implementation process. Some elements that should be considered: 1) previous agreements with a selection of host universities in order to facilitate the admission processes for students, 2) obtaining previous information on the range of study modalities in order to assure adequate financial management, 3) previous calculation of country and career specific costs in order to facilitate and optimize resource allocation at the level of individual students.

- As for URACCAN, the future focus should emphasize local development components (see chapter 3 regarding strategy), however, the components one and two (strengthening of academic excellence and supporting access of vulnerable groups) should be continued as well. The emphasis of teacher qualification should shift from pedagogical and didactical subjects to specialization in specific disciplines. Scholarships for vulnerable groups should continue.

- ADA should stipulate new efforts of donor cooperation at the regional level, taking into account donors in all educational subsectors. It is probable that the responsibility for educational administration will be transferred soon from the national authorities (e.g. MINED) to the regional institutions. The time period when the so-called Regional Autonomic Subsystem for Education (SEAR) starts operating effectively should be a good window of opportunity for new initiatives of donor cooperation.

7.   Sustainability

For recommendations in regard to the inclusion of important elements of the HE-strategy of ADA into a future country-program in Kosovo, please refer to chapter 3. For Serbia, there will most probably only an "exit-strategy", as the office will be closed by 2012 and the current activities are already gearing towards a phasing-out. Irrespective of this issue, the question, in how far issues like capacity-building should and could be implemented into a final program of maybe another three years is valid, as the problem of sustainability is especially important for an exit-strategy. While a new effort in regard to impact-orientation might be suitable on a higher level, the most important impact to be achieved in a phasing-out will be to enable the universities to access other donor's funding effectively and efficiently. Recommendations for activities gearing towards these goals have already been made in chapter 5 and will therefore not be repeated here. Strategic considerations for a longer term are not applicable to Serbia.

Before addressing the specific questions of the ToR for Nicaragua, some general observations on the sustainability of the present projects have to be made. Although output, outcome and impact are clearly visible and have been evaluated positively (see chapters 6 and 8),

sustainability is a more ambiguous issue. In the case of URACCAN, the most critical issue is the financial dependency on donor cooperation which accounts for nearly half of the budget of URACCAN Las Minas as well of URACCAN in general (D). In general terms, university authorities state that public resources and own income could cover for the operational costs of the core academic program while extension activities, support to communitarian development and scholarships, i.e. those elements that constitute the particularity of the university model, are based on external sources (I). Over the last years, URACCAN has managed to increase income from own activities and reduce the share of donor cooperation, but this is only a gradual change and dependency on foreign contributions will persist as a long-term structural problem – at least as long as public financing does not cover a more significant share of the budget (I,E). There are complaints by some interviewees, not only within URACCAN, that the distribution of public resources by the CNU is not always transparent and that URACCAN is receiving a lower share than other universities in the Central or Pacific region (I). However, there are presently no prospects for a change of this situation (E).

Other aspects of sustainability look far more promising. URACCAN is institutionally stable, has constantly improved its planning and monitoring mechanisms and counts with a comprehensive set of instruments and procedures for quality insurance at the academic level (D,I). A most important pillar for sustainability has been the capability of URACCAN to assure the constant recruitment of qualified personnel that originates from the Atlantic region itself (more than 90% of the staff, frequently graduates of URACCAN itself) that is rooted in the region's cultures and committed to the communitarian university model (D).

In case of FADCANIC, sustainability at the project level is not yet an issue, as the scholarship program did not aim towards structural changes within the counterpart organization and participants are just graduating. Prospects for outcome or experiences of former scholarship programs regarding longer-term impacts are analyzed in chapter 8.

For recommendations in regard to the inclusion of elements of ADA's HE-strategy into a future country-program, please refer to chapter 3, for recommendations on the continuity of the current cooperation in the HE-sector to the box at the end of this chapter.

In Kosovo, the impact of ADA-activities over the last five years is clearly visible in the higher education sector. This can be plausibly asserted despite the fact that the documentation in regard to mid-term outcomes and impacts leaves a lot to be desired. Some aspects which evolved can be highlighted (D,I):

- Without the support of the multidimensional project, progress in the accreditation process and its quality, independence and legitimacy would not have happened, at least not within such a short time-frame.

- Without the support of both programs, the badly needed establishment of properly planned Master courses in many faculties would have either been impossible, improbable or at least been delayed further.

- Without the support of the exchange and scholarship-programs, especially the BGP, the access of the Kosovarian diaspora into the higher education would not have been so smooth and presumably a quite smaller number of academics would have decided to return to their country of origin.

The University of Pristina is crucial for the development of Kosovo. It is the cultural, intellectual and economical centrepiece not only of the capital, but of the whole country. One interviewee remarked: "The University changes the country, but it doesn't change itself." Obviously, the reality is a little bit different. And whatever one might think about the Bologna-process itself, the positive impact of a well-governed and supported process is easily discernible. This would have been quite impossible, at least much delayed, without the support by ADA.

At this point of time, the sustainable impact of the efforts of the multidimensional project in regard to the wider higher education sector still need to be asserted. Very positive developments like the KAA, NARIC, the research grant program and others show that potential for sustainable impact is visible. Still, too much relies on the political will of the government in place, as a professional, non-politicized staff is not available yet. Micro-management by politically appointed department heads does not bode well for a long-term sustainable impact. Therefore, at least at this point of time, no definite analysis can be made if the impact has contributed on the development of the higher education sector in a sustainable way. This information might be available after the end of the coming phase.

The indicators set for the multidimensional program are mostly workable in a methodical way, but in many cases have been designed without a proper feasibility study of the surrounding framework and circumstances. It is obvious that the original plan made by ZSI did not take the special environment of Kosovo into consideration and it is for the consultant totally inconceivable how some of the indicators have been developed[15], especially looking at the challenges which are still apparent in the higher education sector presently. It is not surprising that both time-planning as well as a number of quantitative indicators have been difficult to meet and some of the goals were unattainable altogether. The consultant is very much in favor of measurable and time-bound indicators, but it is always necessary to keep them adjusted to the local environment. As it is one of the goals that the MEST will be able to draw the design of the next phase, it has to be considered that also Kosovarians are not always bound to be realistic about possibilities and challenges and prefer sometimes to expedite projects for the purpose of appearance and maybe a little bit less for results (E).

Unfortunately, many indicators selected for the WUS-program are not indicators, but sub-results. An indicator like "Full compliance of the program with relevant ADC goals for Kosovo, the Multidimensional project, the goals of the Draft of the Kosovo/a Development Strategy (Dec 2006) and the Strategy for Development of Higher Education in Kosova (2005-2015), and with the European goals for Higher Education set in the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Convention to support the integration of Kosovo into the EHEA" is not reflecting fully the requirement to be SMART – specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound. In fact, the "full compliance" is a goal, which needs additional indicators to be defined. Once an indicator needs an indicator, it is a goal or result, not an indicator anymore. Other "indicators" like "increased awareness" – which, again, needs an indicator and is therefore none – "increased employability" and "increased cooperation" show the same problem. Other indicators in the program's LogFrame are actually better and quantifiable. It is obvious that whoever

---

[15] For example the number of proposals to be advised through K-CIRT, among them 10 through IP7, two fully drafted Research programs by the end of the program through the Research Council etc. It seems that indicators from another country with a different starting point have been "copied" into the Kosovarian experience. It is possible that the feasibility study of the KAIP-project did not take the seriousness of the circumstances well into consideration.

wrote the LogFrame of the WUS-program had only a very limited understanding of how to formulate indicators and how to develop an impact-chain. As an example some indicators from the WUS-LogFrame located at the outcome-level (D,E):

Indicator used on outcome-level of the Log-Frame (project purpose)	Comments
Cooperation measures of proposed actions with Multidimensional project	- not measurable, no cooperation existent[16]
Increased awareness for the benefits of economy-university cooperation at universities and companies/institutions (4 round tables and presentation held at universities; 10 meetings held with rectors, deans and potential candidates, 3 press conferences held)	- "increased awareness" is a goal, not an indicator. The quantitative aspect of the indicator makes only sense when properly defined: participants of the meetings and round-tables (how many from the business-partners are to be expected?), reactions within the media after the press-conferences etc.
Increased awareness for the necessity to modernise higher education in Kosovo in accordance with European standards and incorporating labour market relevance into the curricula at local stakeholders and wider public (5 articles published in local newspapers, presentations at the local radio);	- "increased awareness" is a goal, not an indicator. The relevant, measurable "European standards" have to be defined (all of them? On which level? Based on which agreement/strategy?) and those chosen which should be the basis of measurement. Labour market "relevance" is a goal, not an indicator, and has to be properly defined. Relevance for whom? Who decides what is relevant? The local newspapers and radio who should report about it?
Increased employability of the graduates in the fields that are needed most by the Kosovo labour market;	- employability is a goal, not an indicator. Based on which baseline/benchmark is employability to be measured? Where is the baseline-study to define an "increase" of employability?
Increased cooperation with Austrian and EU universities;	Actually, the relevant indicator has been shifted to "sources of verification", where it does not belong (partnership agreements), therefore it doesn't have a definite quantitative target (5 agreements or 10 agreements or whatsoever), therefore it is not measurable.
Enhanced knowledge transfer from Austria and other European countries as well as reduction of brain drain effects through engagement of BGP+ lecturers and researchers outside of MSDP;	Reduction of brain-drain-effect is a goal, not an indicator. As there is no empirical data about the brain-drain-effect in Kosovo available, a reduction is not measurable, as there is no baseline.

---

[16] A LogFrame is not a fixed document which can never be changed. Once it has been clear that cooperation with KAIP was not forthcoming, the LogFrame should have been revised accordingly to reflect the reality of the activities more properly.

Modernised curricula and teaching methods;	"Modernisation" is a goal which relates to a baseline from which modernisation takes place. The correct indicator is, again, in "sources of verification" (peer review reports), and there it is without quantity (e.g. 80 % positive peer review reports on proposals), therefore it is not measurable.
Enhanced individual and institutional academic cooperation through BGP+ lecturers and researchers.	A goal, not an indicator. The indicator is the quantity set under "expected results".
Strengthened UP capacity to initiate and conduct reforms in accordance with the needs of the HE in Kosovo and European standards	A goal, not an indicator. The correct indicator is under "source of verification" indirectly mentioned: "A university strategy for the University of Pristina exists", with sub-indicators like: "an operational plan for the implementation of the university-strategy exists" or "The university strategy meets standard A, B and C of the Bologna-process" (to be measured by e.g. a peer-review).

A common issue with both programs is the fact that they define a lot on the output-level, but are reluctant to properly define the short-term and medium-term outcomes and the long-term impact. Sometimes, especially in the WUS-LogFrame, outputs and outcomes are mixed and inconsistent. It is not visible where in the monitoring of outcomes and impact the attribution gap is located and generally, an M&E system is only developed rudimentally[17] (D,E).

As has already been mentioned, the ability of the partner institutions to independently develop and continue with the efforts started by both programs is limited, although much less in regard to the University of Pristina. Capacity building at the UP has given fruit to a certain degree so that some activities can and should be given to appropriate units within the University-structure for continuation (if the continuation is deemed desirable). Still, in some areas, like curricular development or the whole issue of labour-market-orientation, further support is necessary. Therefore, in conclusion, a limited ability to take over certain activities is visible, but some more support would be wise (E).

In the case of the MEST, the situation is much more difficult, as has been outlined on several occasions in this report. Here, the consultant has serious doubt in the capability of the Ministry to do "things on its own". In all important activities, donors are "chipping in" with external consultants and obviously guide processes. The ability for reliable planning based on a well-designed and professional internal structure is not discernible at this point of time. Also in the future it is to be predicted that the Ministry will rely heavily on external expertise and planning resources to fulfil its role.[18] (I, E)

---

[17] WUS Austria has accepted this criticism without hesitation and announced to the consultant that the organisation has taken measures to train its staff in impact-monitoring and result-oriented planning. ADA office in Vienna has already a new reporting- and planning format in the making, including M&E systems. Therefore, the general awareness of stakeholders in the process for the mentioned shortcomings is high and everyone involved seems to be ready to progress in that matter, which is a very positive sign for future project planning.

[18] Having said this, and to repeat it, this is profoundly dependent on the will and strategic thinking of the minister in charge. As many stakeholders say that the current office-holder is "the first education minister who de-

The indicators used within the LogFrames of the programs in Serbia also pose some challenges. Unfortunately, some serious deficits are discernible (D,E):

1. Quantifiable indicators are not quantified at the right place in the LogFrame. For example, the indicator "number of successfully implemented study programs" lacks a concrete number – therefore the indicator is quite useless as the quantity is not defined. More examples like this are evident in the LogFrame. A quantifiable indicator must set a mark to be achieved – the correct indicator would have been "Seven successfully implemented study programs". The additional problem here is that "successful" is a goal, not an indicator and might need an additional indicator to describe the level of "success". More advisable are, again, qualifications which can be quantified: "Seven accredited study programs" for example would have been a better indicator. Interestingly, the amount of programs – seven – is found in the column "how to measure", where it does not belong.

2. Some of the indicators chosen are not SMART. A good example is the indicator: "constant and sustainable cooperation". This is a goal, not an indicator. As this needs further description through an indicator, it cannot be one. The chosen method of measurement – "constant interest" – is not a method of verification; it's again a goal that needs an indicator.

3. Some indicators do not describe the goal sufficiently. In the "Experiencing Europe"-program, we find the indicator "implementation of the two modules". This is the description of an activity, leading to an output – but far away from any outcome or even impact. Mere output indicators have to be avoided, as they are too closely linked to an indirect description of activities done and therefore not helpful in ascertaining the results of an activity. The indicator "results of analysis and evaluation", which is not even a proper means of verification, as it is too "hazy", is another example for the fact that the basic understanding about indicators and their proper place within a LogFrame has apparently not been present.

It is assumed that the capacity of ADA to cross-check LogFrames has improved in the meantime. The consultant is not quite sure if the ability of WUS to develop proper LogFrames has grown accordingly. As it has not been the task of this evaluation to make a capacity-analysis of WUS, this question remains to be unanswered. But if ADA-headquarters has indication that the general capacity in using planning-tools properly has not increased, additional effort has to be made to cross-check any LogFrame presented by WUS for a final phase in Serbia[19]. (E)

The activities by WUS, especially the MSDP, have clearly contributed positively to the capacity of professors or groups of professors to initiate and execute new Master courses. Still, this capacity development[20] comes with a price in Serbia, keeping the already mentioned defi-

serves that name", there is a window of opportunity that things might change slowly within the ministry. This process will require nonetheless a lot more time.

[19] Of course, given the precondition that WUS will be asked to implement the final phase. As has been said, it is not feasible to change the implementing agency for a final phase; therefore it is assumed that WUS will be asked to propose a LogFrame for another three years, if an exit-phase of this length will be decided upon.

[20] To be more precise: On an individual level, there has been capacity *building*. To make it capacity *development*, organisational, institutional and political levels should have been addressed similarly.

ciencies in financial and general administration in mind. Therefore, capacity-development took place on an individual basis within certain departments. This has positive influence insofar as role-models are formed and best practice can be established. Still, a good number of teaching staff is as yet unconvinced to follow the same path. As future Master development will have to be done either with their own resources or with much more complicated funding instruments e.g. of the EU-Commission, the relative easy access to WUS-funding is in the end detrimental, as the positive experience with WUS-support cannot be compared to the much more stringent demands of other donors. Consequently, professors less interested in taking over all the administrative duties by themselves will have apprehension in regard to start anything different solely based on the direct or indirect experience with ADA-programs. At this point of time, universities as institutions are still not well capable in the implementation of activities, especially donor-funded ones (I,E).

In regard to other programs, especially the "Experiencing Europe"-program and the one run by the "Österreich-Institut", sustainability in the execution of such activities without external aid is not to be expected. For those participants who will be able to directly link their new knowledge with their career, individual sustainability will probably be apparent. The only possible alternative in view of an exit-strategy might be the inclusion of at least the "Experiencing Europe"-program into the "1000 young leaders"-initiative located with the Serbian Prime Minister. For this, a lot of work in adjustment and – especially in regard to the "1000 young leaders"-program – stronger focus would be necessary. But aside from that alternative, the consultant does not see any viable sustainability in regard to a future implementation of this kind of exchange- and language-programs without external funding (E).

Judging from the interviews and the assessment of other donors, it can be stated that the ADA-program has indeed supported the development of the HE-sector in general, especially as it is the only bilateral donor of significance in Serbia. Still, the activities are quite spread in a relatively big country, and some activities – like the support of the Accredition Commission – have been superficial and probably not complementary to e.g. the Tempus-program. While WUS can work more exactly and to the needs of the different departments and faculties, and is more attractive because of its smaller administrative requirements, it has to be said that in the end in crucial issues like master studies development, the quantitative effect of programs like Tempus is surely bigger and more visible. It is to be expected that everyone involved in the MSDP is afterwards fully capable of implementing other, additional Master studies, which has been proven by the fact that the same applicants are often also involved in Tempus-projects, which require a lot more coordination and administrative effort. Sustainability in regard to those individuals and departments involved can surely be expected, as they will continue to apply successfully to EU-funding even after ADA-activities have ceased to be. Sustainability in institutional development is more questionable, as major challenges – like the lack of integration of Serbian universities, the lack of multi-disciplinary approaches and the lack of administrative capabilities – have not been addressed by ADA-activities (I,E).

In Nicaragua, and with regard to degree of results-orientation, the logical frameworks of the current projects are quite coherent for the operational level, but lack strategic orientation towards outcomes and impacts (D,E). To begin with, only the URACCAN project document respects the vertical logic of the framework (i.e. the sequence of results, purpose and overall objective). In the case of FADCANIC, the levels are partially inverted and there nearly identical goal formulations for results and the overall objective level. In both projects, the indicators

are mostly quantified and implicitly time bound, they refer to measurable variables and, hence, do not pose a major methodological challenge. They have also turned out to be attainable, although in the case of FADCANIC with a considerable delay due to administrative difficulties (see chapter 6). Attainability, however, has been accomplished at the cost that most indicators are bound to low levels of the impact chain and measure rather operational goals although the purposes or the overall objectives should be addressed. For example, the percentage of teachers with a Master's Degree (URACCAN) doubles a similar indicator at results level, but does not measure the project purpose (Improvement of academic excellence) as quality of research and teaching remains unmeasured. Or in the case of FADCANIC, the overall goal of strengthening institutions that are relevant for the development of the Caribbean Coast, is not adequately measured by an indicator that only envisages the number of professionals that have been graduated through the scholarship program. In technical terms, most indicators on higher levels of the impact chain lack "independence", i.e. they measure means for attaining the goals, but do not measure the goals themselves (D,E).

In regard to the use of planning tools, URACCAN has proven to be a "learning institution", too, which is evidenced by the new project proposal for 2010 (URACCAN 2010a). The logical framework still shows some of the minor flaws mentioned above for the current projects, but has improved with regard to results orientation as indicators do even include behavioural changes at target group level (D,E).[21]

The new project proposal has been conceptually designed and written by URACCAN without major support of Horizont 3000, according to the interviews with both institutions (I). With regard to planning and administrative capacities, this is in itself an indicator for the successful capacity development in URACCAN (E). Capacity Development has also led to progress with regard to the quality of teaching, research, curricular development, the ability to engage in local development processes, etc. (I). There are, however, areas where capacity development is still pending. This is particularly the case regarding the professional specialization of university teachers, as previous project phases focused primarily on transversal issues of pedagogical and didactical qualifications (D).

In all three countries, some flaws within the development of indicators and LogFrames exist, some more serious – in the case of WUS-activities in Serbia and Kosovo – and some minor – in the case of KAIP in Kosovo and the activities in Nicaragua. Aside from this, the general impression in regard to the sustainability and impact of capacity development varies heavily and is discernible in some countries only on specific levels, which makes the intervention more traditional "capacity building" – in the sense of individual training – and less capacity-development – in the sense of a coherent, multi-level approach.

---

[21] The project has not yet been formally approved by ADA and might still be subject to possible modifications and adjustments. Therefore a more detailed S.M.A.R.T. analysis of individual indicators may be delivered on demand.

Country	Quality of LogFrames and indicators	Sustainability of capacity development
Kosovo	WUS-LogFrames need general improvement, KAIP-indicators are sometimes unrealistic	Sustainability has a high potential in Kosovo, if the integrated efforts of both activities are strengthened
Serbia	Logframes need general improvement	Sustainability on individual level will be high, but questionable on an institutional level
Nicaragua	Logframes are of generally good quality, but lack on the outcome-level	Sustainability issues arise especially in regard to the financial aspect of activities

Recommendations:

- All future bids for a tender for a comprehensive program for **Kosovo** should make sure that they understand the current development-terminology well and are able to differentiate between the different levels of the DAC-impact-chain. The reference to this should be made explicit in the tender-text.

- All future bids for a tender have to prove that they understand the relevant planning methods well and be aware of the fact that this will be scrutinized in detail by ADA. ADA should emphasize the proper use of LogFrames as a basic precondition of acceptance of any bid for any tender.

- To increase sustainability, the new program should generally be more embedded in given structures of the Kosovarian government. KAIP has done a very good first step to do exactly that, the WUS-components should follow where possible. A very important precondition is the strengthening of general capacities of the Ministry of Education. Here increased donor-cooperation in that effect will be necessary; this cannot be achieved by ADA alone.

- If possible, structures within the MEST should benefit more from capacity-development. The core issues are lack of evidence based planning tools in all departments of the Ministry and a missing link between planning in terms of content and in terms of budget. Financial officers do not understand content, content-planners do not understand the financial implications. Project-cycle-management and related tools should be introduced. Close cooperation with SIDA will be necessary as SIDA has already started such a process, although with very limited impact.

- In **Serbia**, as it will be wise to give WUS also the exit-phase to implement, ADA should encourage WUS to get more familiar with the proper use of planning-tools like the LogFrame and to understand the different levels of development results as described in an impact-chain better. ADA should scrutinize the LogFrame more diligently and comment on lacks and room for improvement.

- While there is serious need for political advice and lobbying for change at the ministerial level, WUS is not well placed to embark on such an activity. In addition, with no

MOU in place and an exit-strategy in mind, ADA will not be able to perform this role as well. Donor-cooperation might be the only way to address some important issues, if other donors will agree to carry the torch.

- In regard to **Nicaragua**, URACCAN is structurally reliant on external donors, a fact that has been known from the first steps of the cooperation and that can only be ameliorated gradually and in a long-term perspective. From the point of view of the evaluation, the undeniable relevance of URACCAN as a regional change agent, also in focus areas of ADA, justifies that at least a mid-term-commitment is maintained, as far as possible combined with advice on additional income-generating mechanisms and the identification of donors that potentially could "take over" in the future (i.e. donors with a more explicit focus on education and/or higher education).

- URACCAN should continue to explore systematically income-generating mechanisms to reduce the structural dependency on external resources to a moderate level. Some of these mechanisms could be the following: 1) intensify coordination with local and regional authorities in order to strengthen co-responsibility for higher education, 2) expand the range of services liable to pay costs (e.g. extra-academic course "on-demand", applied research, etc.). For reasons related to the communitarian self-concept of URACCAN, neither an increase in tuition fees nor differentiation of fees according to the socio-economic status of students are functional mechanisms for substantially generating additional income.

- From the perspective of results-oriented planning and management, ADA should invest additional efforts in the quality assurance for project proposals and the underlying logical frameworks. As not all potential project partners have the ability to elaborate adequate impact chains and indicators, ADA should provide active support at that stage of the planning phase.

8.   Outcomes and impact

Activities to enhance the quality of the HE sector in Kosovo will always enhance the brain-drain-effect (E,I). Actually, that is exactly the strategy of the Kosovarian Ministry of Education: To produce graduates for the international, predominantly European labour-market. Even in the best of times, Kosovo's labour-market will not be able to absorb the multitude of graduates the country is producing. The Ministry has repeatedly suggested that because of the very young population of the country, it should provided badly needed young professionals for the region and the European Union – and therefore, the HE institutions have to meet the standards of these potential labour-markets.

Therefore, the question of the "danger" of brain-drain is misplaced in this context. "Brain-drain" is the strategy of the government. This is not necessarily true for the universities itself, as the government is trying to attract the intellectual diaspora back to Kosovo, e.g. as teaching staff for the new university at Prizren. But in the long term, the government's efforts are clearly targeted at out-migration of professionals (I).

Therefore, it is absolutely inevitable that graduates who have benefited from better Master programs will eventually be ready and willing to seek their fortunes abroad as well. As the connection of courses to the labour-market is, as has been stated, feeble at best, this is only logical. It will surely even be enhanced by a more applied university in Prizren, which will produce graduates without any feasibility-study in regard to the local labour-market. The biggest impediment to labour-migration at this point of time is the visa-regime. It is quite evident that once the visa-regime will be relaxed, labour-migration of graduates in considerable numbers is the inevitable consequence (I,E).

This is no negative development at all, if migration is managed correctly. At this point of time, neither ADA nor the Kosovarian authorities have any viable strategy in regard to migration. As social engineering in this area hardly ever works in order to contain migration, it will be most beneficial to discuss a strategy to manage migration. Especially for highly qualified job-seekers, a concept like "circular migration" – or, as the ADA-HE-strategy puts it: "brain circulation" - comes immediately to mind. At this point of time, the relevant stakeholders are relatively far away from this kind of discussion. This has to change once the visa-regime will allow free access to the EU-labour-market. It is the consultant's conviction that ADA-programs for the HE-sector should be prepared for that moment.

The benefit for destination countries is that circular migrants will be less likely to apply for social welfare benefits, as they will be less likely to establish themselves permanently in the destination country and will be less inclined to have their family members join them there. Circular migration patterns create opportunities for migrants to develop a transnational identity, which would in turn probably make them better equipped to take advantage of new developments in an increasingly globalised world, which is extremely important for the HE sector which is traditionally at the forefront of globalization (I,E).

Present policies often prevent the development of circular migration patterns, for example because countries limit temporary migration to no more than one 'migration circle', or because migrants are required to largely integrate/assimilate into their destination country, or because dual nationality is made impossible by law or considered socially unacceptable. Linking social insurance and welfare benefits to national borders also limits the development of circular migration flows. Therefore, a comprehensive "brain-circulation-policy" for the HE-sector involves much more than just another program, it has to be directly linked to the basic structure of migration policy itself. This includes both a national as well as an EU-vision, as more and more aspects of migration-policy are considered at the EU-level. To make a distinct recommendation for the Austrian case, the first step would be an analysis of the Austrian migration regime, which is way beyond the scope of this evaluation. It would be wise to look to other EU-countries for best practices or pilot projects[22]. In the end, a basic precondition will be a bilateral agreement on circular migration between Kosovo and Austria, in which the HE-component can be embedded (E).

---

[22]   The Dutch government (through the department for development cooperation of the Foreign Ministry) is currently implementing a pilot project on circular migration with Indonesia and South Africa. While the scope of the project is not focussed on HE (but on more practical skills in production), it is well embedded into the national migration policy and regulation. In addition, EU-pilot-projects are planned or underway (see: "Circular migration and mobility partnerships between the European Union and third countries", MEMO/07/197, (http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=MEMO/07/197). Finally, the World Bank has initiated a number of pilot projects on the matter

Activities to enhance the quality of the HE sector in Serbia will also always enhance the brain-drain-effect E,I). During the course of this evaluation, the interviewees at the different faculties who enjoyed support through ADA-programs have reiterated repeatedly that the best graduates will have and enjoy already easy access to the international labour-market and many examples of careers outside Serbia have been given, especially in the technical faculties. As the visa-regime has been liberalized, labour-migration of Serbian professionals is likely to increase beyond the current level and there is nothing aside from a healthy economic growth within Serbia which will prevent it. ADA-interventions in the HE sector will inevitably lead to a higher degree of out-migration of professionals as long as availability of adequate employment in the Serbian labour-market isn't high. Currently, the big push towards the EU is prevented by the fact that student-mobility is relatively low, many students have – because of the years of relative isolation of Serbia in the era of sanctions – a more inward-looking approach and many are afraid that they will not be able to meet the demands of the international labour-market. Still, it is to be expected that this will change in the foreseeable future and that a better HE-system with a higher degree of quality of education will support this process in due time (E).

Therefore, the question is not if the qualification of the graduates can be used in the Serbian economy – they could, if the overall economic situation will improve – but more, who will pay more for it. With an average household-income of 400 €/month in Serbia, the answer to this question is easy (E).

Neither ADA nor the Serbian government have any clear concept of managing migration in and out of Serbia, especially in the direction of the European Union. Again, concepts of "circular migration" are likely to meet the individual demands of graduates to improve themselves as well as the desire of EU-countries to manage migration effectively (E).

Both higher education projects in Nicaragua aim to increase the availability of highly educated professionals in the RAAN/RAAS region and thus, contribute to socio-economic and institutional development and the strengthening of the autonomy. Therefore, the retention of graduates, not only in Nicaragua but in the RAAN/RAAS region, becomes a key factor for the degree to which both projects may achieve the desired impact (E).

It is one of the most important results of the evaluation that, so far, brain drain effects have not been a relevant issue for either of the projects. A recent tracer study for URACCAN Las Minas provides evidence that up to two years after finishing university, not only 91 % of the graduates are working, but nearly all of them do so in the Atlantic region (Castillo et al. 2009).

In the case of the scholarship program by FADCANIC, brain drain can't be evaluated yet as most of the participants are recently finishing their postgraduate theses. Most of them are, however, employed by regional organizations, including the regional universities (6 out of 11 in URACCAN itself) (D). The scholarship implies an obligation of working at least three years in organizations that are relevant for the regional development and focus group discussions prove that participants take this commitment seriously. A majority of participants defines a contribution to the development of the Caribbean Coast as their personal long-term objective, while only two students point to the possibility of seeking opportunities abroad after a certain time period (I). This observation is congruent with the results of previous cohorts where a

follow-up of individual career paths shows that most ex-participants hold job positions that are directly or indirectly related to the RAAN/RAAS (D).

There are two key factors that contribute to the retention of professionals in the RAAN/RAAS: (1) As both regional universities have been founded less than two decades ago and are reaching significant numbers of students for quite a short time, the region is still short of well-trained professionals in many areas (I). Therefore, graduates are absorbed easily by the labour market. Although the share of graduates whose work is directly related to their academic career varies according to the subjects (e.g. livestock breeding 100%, forest management 25%), nearly 90% of the graduates interviewed in a tracer study (cf. Castillo et al. 2009) point out the high relevance of their academic education for their professional career. (2) The second factor that contains brain drain is the high degree of adaptation of URACCAN's academic program to the regional conditions and to the demand for particular professional profiles. In the past, this compliance has been achieved through periodic needs assessments and constant dialogue with regional institutions, although recently, the labour market is coming close to saturation for some particular careers, thus needs assessment will remain a continuous task (I,E).

In all three countries, "brain drain" is not an issue – but from a different approach: In Kosovo and Serbia it cannot be avoided, migration-processes have to be managed, not contained. In Nicaragua, at least in the region under review, they are not discernible.

Country	Brain-drain-effect	Strategy
Kosovo	Unavoidable and likely to increase	No migration strategy visible, "brain-circulation"-concepts needed
Serbia	Unavoidable and likely to increase	No migration strategy visible, "brain-circulation"-concepts needed
Nicaragua	No effect discernible	Relevance and adaptation

To reflect on the issue of non-discrimination in Kosovo in regard to the three important target-groups – women, ethnic minorities and people with disabilities – it will be necessary to target each group separately as the results of the evaluation vary in this case. First of all, the support for women is evident in many aspects of both programs. Within KAIP, special consideration is given for women who had children in regard to the eligibility for scholarships. WUS has supported the translation of gender-guidelines from the University of Graz to be implemented especially in the development of new Master-programs. All in all, the special consideration of gender-issues seems to be satisfactory (E, D).

Much less satisfactory is the consideration of the other two groups. In fact, they don't appear anywhere in both programs. People with disabilities surely have a very problematic situation in Kosovo, and also in regard to access to the higher education sector. This has less to do with a formal barrier – if they pass the necessary requirements, they can of course take up studies like everyone else -, but more a physical one. From own observation in a variety of

buildings on the campus of Pristina, it has been evident that these building have not been built with special consideration for mobility-problems of people with disabilities. There is currently no special policy of the University of Pristina in regard to students with disabilities, although it is planned that the already mentioned LINK-office is supposed to deal with this aspect in the future (E).

In regard to ethnic minorities, we have first to discuss the general situation of ethnic minorities in the education sector. If we differentiate between the major ethnic groups and the Serbs – who have with the University of Mitrovica "their own" university and therefore easy access to higher education -, then it becomes evident that further diversity exists. On the one hand, we have ethnic minorities who can rely on an outside country for resources and advocacy – the Bosniaks in relation to Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Turks in relation to Turkey. Actually, the government of Turkey offers a very generous scholarship program which is, although not formally restricted to Kosovo-Turks, mostly used by them. For efforts in higher education in regard to these two groups – and there are special courses for them available at the Faculty of Education of the UP in Prizren already –, the institutions can rely on personnel and scientific material like e.g. books from these two countries and additional indigenous development is not that necessary.

On the other hand, the most marginalized ethnic minorities are those without an outside country to refer to, especially the Egyptians, Ashkali and Roma. Their representation already in the secondary education is quite limited; many children don't even enter primary school. A statistical overview of the representation of ethnic minorities in secondary schools in 2008/2009 gives more insight into the matter (D):

Students from ethnic minorities in the secondary schools in Kosovo, school year 2008/2009[23] (total students in Kosovo: 96.172)

Bosniaks	958[24]
Ashkali	204
Roma	34
Turks	823[25]
Egyptians	124
Gorani[26]	33
Tjere	9
Total	2185

Even if we are very optimistic and assume that all of these students actually finish secondary school – in fact, the drop-out-rate is quite high – experience shows that not more than a third of a cohort will actually consider to study. In the case e.g. of the Roma, this would result in not more than around 10 students from this cohort (E,I).

The University of Pristina is following an open-door-policy for ethnic minorities. For them, a quota system has been established which enables students from those minorities to start

---

[23]   Source: Official statistics of MEST.
[24]   Nearly all of them in the cities of Prizren and Peja.
[25]   More than two third in the city of Prizren and a close-by town named Mamushe.
[26]   Although Gorani are registered as a distinct ethnic minority, they speak the Serbian language and have their economic focus in Serbia. Therefore, a Gorani who wants to study normally goes to the University of Mitrovica.

studies without entrance exams. In addition, for the most marginalized communities, scholarship-schemes exist. Still, only very few actually attend higher education. Most are from the Bosniak and Turkish community, as they find courses in their language in Prizren. Only very few – mostly those who do not want to become teachers and are willing to speak and learn in Albanian – attend the University of Pristina. Here, teachers are generally willing and open to accept e.g. a bachelor-thesis in a local language instead of Albanian to make it easy for the candidates. All in all, there is no legal barrier for students from the minorities to attend university, on the opposite: a system of passive positive discrimination is in place (I).

The most urgent problem with the most marginalized minorities cannot be solved by creating special courses in their language, as the efficiency of such courses would hardly be justifiable because of the very small number of potential candidates. Indeed, for the Roma, Ashkali and Egyptians, the highest barrier is to reach the end of secondary school, or even primary school, less the follow-up towards higher education. Furthermore, ethnic communities like the Turkish do very well economically without any higher education. Turks are among the highest income-earners in Kosovo, with an average living standard above the common Albanian household. This is related to their successful activities as farmers and their trading-network. The desire to enter higher education in order to, in the end, obtain a much less well paid job maybe in the civil service is not very attractive for a young Turk, who actually can earn a lot more and faster if entering the communities' traditional business activities as soon as possible (I).

Still, it is the consultant's opinion that especially the foundation of the new University in Prizren can be instrumental in focusing more on the issue of inclusion of ethnic minorities in the future. The MEST itself claims that it endeavours to create a multi-ethnic and multi-lingual university, unfortunately without going into detail how to achieve this and based in which strategy (E).

Also in **Serbia**, the three target groups for non-discriminatory activities have to be reflected upon differently. First, gender issues are the easiest aspect to deliberate upon. This has to do with the fact that – coming from the tradition of education policy in former Yugoslavia – the equal representation of women and men in nearly all faculties, including the technical ones, is a common feature throughout the Serbian HE-system. Still, in order to preserve this advantage, WUS Belgrade uses a positive scoring-system in regard to applications for its programs, giving female applicants a slight favour in comparison to male ones. Women are also well represented in all higher administrative offices in Serbian universities; up to the level of vice-rector (currently there is no female rector). Generally, gender balance is quite advanced even in comparison with the Austrian or German situation and there seems to be no urgent need for additional consideration of this matter (E).

In the case of people with disabilities, the situation is more complex. While the University of Belgrade has specific services established for students with mobility restrictions, other universities have not taken this into consideration. This might change with the new law for disabilities coming into force in Serbia soon. Still, people with disabilities are generally stigmatized in Serbian society and not well integrated. Unfortunately, also the ADA-programs do not consider these issues where they could. The best example is the MSDP, which has a required e-learning-component. Neither the application-form nor the implementation of this component takes the needs of students with impaired vision into account. Questions to inter-

viewees from the universities in regard to this were answered in a way that made lack of awareness clearly evident (I,E).

The special challenge in Serbia is the ethnic minorities. First, classes in Serbian universities, and that includes the University of Novi Pazar, where students from Serbian ethnicity are a minority, are held in the Serbian language only. No special provision for other languages, with the exception of classes in English in some advanced courses, is given. Secondly, the issue of ethnic minorities is highly sensitive after the independence of Kosovo. The current policy is to centralize as much as possible and to withdraw even the slightest hint of regional power, despite the official "decentralization"-process. The fear for another break-up is evident in the political leadership. In addition, no statistics at all exist in regard to the representation or even the size of ethnic minorities in Serbia, as many official statistics are not allowed to ask for ethnic origin. For the most marginalized ethnic groups – like the Roma – estimates vary between a total of 400.000 to 1.000.000, without any clear evidence to support the one or the other. Without any clear empirical data, it is very difficult to make a clear-cut policy for the inclusion of ethnic minorities into the HE system. In addition, the majority of minorities has "its" state to rely on. Bosniaks in Bosnia, Hungarians in Hungary etc. Their avenues for education are not restricted to Serbian institutions and they have external countries on whose support they can rely. It is, like in Kosovo, the most marginalized minorities, like the Roma, where the problem of inclusion is the biggest. Here, again, the issue is less access to the HE sector, but more to primary and secondary education[27]. (I,E)

In **Nicaragua**, a core element of URACCAN's mission as a communitarian university is to assure equal opportunities to all potential target groups, particularly to vulnerable groups such as indigenous people and students from remote areas that hitherto have been excluded from the traditional university system. Orientation towards gender equality has also been present in URACCAN since its foundation. In that regard, URACCAN complies with the cross-sectional issues that are defined in the HE Strategy of ADA, not only at a project level, but on the level of core institutional goals of the project partners (D, E).

At the outcome and impact level, the important question lies in how far access to HE guarantees non-discrimination in the labour market. In this regard, retention during the study period and work placement after graduation are key variables.

Due to variety of socio-cultural and economic reasons, it is in fact visible that retention of indigenous students is a problematic issue. In 2009, only 7 out of 211 graduates (3.4%) of the graduates in Las Minas (incl. the university extensions) were indigenous (URACCAN 2010b). Although this issue requires improvement measures, it must be considered that without the particular communitarian university model of URACCAN, access of indigenous people would be nearly impossible. Thus, taking into account also the activities of URACCAN at the community level, the overall valuation of the impact on this particular group still remains moderately positive. Furthermore, the activities of URACCAN at lower educational levels in the context of communitarian development must also be taken into account and contribute to the empowerment of indigenous communities (D,I,E).

---

[27] The Serbian government is quite aware of this challenge and has introduced a mentorship-program with Roma-teachers in primary and secondary schools for special support of Roma-pupils in order to encourage enrolment as well as prevent drop-outs. Many donors, like the Swiss, have programs directly targeted at the Roma-minority, but none in the area of higher education.

An important bottleneck for the access, not only of indigenous people but the population of rural areas in general, is the poor coverage and quality of rural secondary education (see figures in chapter 3). Although one single institution like URACCAN cannot be required to compensate for the fallacies of the general educational system in the region, some efforts are undertaken (and should be intensified in the future) to build "bridges" to higher education even where traditional secondary schools are hardly accessible. The key instruments are the so-called preparatory courses where potential students are given the opportunity for an accelerated conclusion of secondary school level (D). This "bridge" is criticized by some representatives of the national authorities for lowering educational quality and requirements for university access (I). From the point of view of the evaluation, however, it seems consistent with the regional context and the mission statement of URACCAN to emphasize equality of opportunities over rigorous interpretation of access requirements (E). From a longer-term perspective (and thus, related to earlier stages of the cooperation by ADA and Horizont 3000), URACCAN also contributed significantly to the improvement of primary and secondary education by introducing training programs for school teachers in Intercultural Bilingual Education. This approach is meant to grant indigenous populations access to primary education in their mother tongue and to offer concepts for the gradual introduction of Spanish as a second language. Hence, it is a key element for the educational quality in areas with indigenous population (D,E).

In regard to gender equality, retention of women was also a problematic issue in the past despite an apparently equal access to university (51% of all students in 2009 were female). However, desertion only due to pregnancy went temporarily up to over 30% (I). The university addressed this issue with several measures, partially included in the present project phase supported by ADA. The employment of staff for psycho-social assistance, regulations with enhanced responsibilities for male students in case of pregnancies and the implementation of sexual education and gender issues as obligatory subjects in all careers concurred to reduce pregnancy among female students to a minimum and led to equal retention rates among both genders (D,I). Remaining gender inequalities, for example with regard to career selection and first work placement / income (cf. Castillo et al. 2009), obey to the external socio-cultural context and cannot be significantly influenced by one single institution.

When it comes to people with disabilities, the situation is somewhat more ambiguous. Although the infrastructure of URACCAN is not fully barrier-free for disabled persons, university authorities assure that all necessary support is given to them in order to facilitate participation in the academic and social life on the campus (I). In the interviews, the examples of two successful graduates with walking and visual impairments are mentioned. On the other hand, there is no explicit policy of the URACCAN for this group. This might be relevant insofar it can be supposed that bottlenecks for disabled persons exist mainly on earlier educational levels and no similar "bridges" to university are built as it is the case of the previously analyzed groups (I). It should be noted that, unlike the case of gender and ethnicity, no quantitative data is available on people with disabilities and the evaluation relies solely upon the interviews with university staff.

All three countries have issues in regard to vulnerable groups. While the challenges for ethnic minorities and people with disabilities are quite big in Kosovo and Serbia, ethnic minorities are in a much better position in Nicaragua. Project activities are not always targeting the

special needs of vulnerable groups accordingly, therefore the overall result varies. All in all, the attention towards people with disabilities lacks in all countries.

Country	Gender	Ethnic minorities	People with disabilities
Kosovo	Gender-policy in the making in the system; activities include gender-aspects in a satisfactory way	Passive positive discrimination in the system; activities do not focus in any way on ethnic minorities	No policy in the system; no focus in activities
Serbia	Gender-policy in the making in the system; activities include gender-aspects in a satisfactory way	Some active policy in regard to minorities in the system; activities do include the issue indirectly with the focus on Novi Pazar, but not further consideration	Policy in regard to the issue is emerging; no focus in activities
Nicaragua	Gender-policy in the system; activities include gender-aspects in a satisfactory way	Strong consideration in the system; activities include the issue in a satisfactory way	No policy in the system; no focus in activities

In **Kosovo**[28], the connection between the activities of WUS Austria and the "multidimensional project" and the needs of the labour-market are either week or non-existing. First of all, all stakeholders lack comprehensive empirical data of what exactly this labour-market is about. In the design of Master Studies, an effort has been made to look into labour-market-issues, but with a not very convincing methodical approach. The Ministry of Education has no or nearly no information about the labour-market for graduates. The University, and the different faculties, works on certain assumptions, which are either not based on evidence or are based on the individual experiences of professors who claim to be interested into issues of employability. Aside from a small career-service-office named LINK, labour-market-guidance for graduates is either non-existing or based on individual advice given by professors. In addition, the international labour-market seems to be a very distant and "hazy" phenomenon for the University. Aside from the "Balkan Case Challenge", where students are on an individual level confronted with issues of international cooperation and are learning to use secondary skills in exercises normally not commonly strengthened at the University-level, some individual impact in regard to enhanced employability can be assumed. In some specific areas – like based on the demands of the banking-sector – internship-programs have been developed and cooperation between the University and the labour-market exists. These are few, but notable exceptions (I,E).

The "multidimensional"-project KAIP tried to establish a closer link to the labour-market with the development of the CITT-component. This has, so far, failed.

Labour-market issues will become even more pressing if we take into consideration that the new University at Prizren is one supposed to focus more on applied sciences and the needs

---

[28]   Please consider that the TORs deviate at this point, depending on the countries in focus.

of the economy. Unfortunately, again, no feasibility-study has been made and therefore the focus on a variety of initial courses – like translation-services or IT – is based on more or less informed assumptions. This does not bode well for the planned close connection to the labour-market, be it the internal one or the international (E).

The Ministry for Education clearly acknowledges that even in the best of times, Kosovo will not be able to absorb the high number of graduates it produces. Therefore, an employment-strategy has to gear towards the closer and wider region. So far, at least from the consultant's point of view, any clear strategy in that regard is totally missing both on the level of the Ministry as well as on that of the University of Pristina. It can be assumed no such strategy will be available for Prizren as well. One has to be aware of the fact that the communication problem towards the businesses is often from both sides: The University has not yet learned to communicate with the relevant stakeholders, but the companies themselves have not been able to communicate their demands and needs properly to the University as well, even, if there has been readiness to listen[29]. (I)

The Ministry of Labour, which is in charge of the job-service, collects some data based on the database of their agencies involved in mediation of job-opportunities to the unemployed. These statistics are widely regarded as inaccurate in reflecting the true state of the internal labour-market, as the degree of informality is very high. Current statistics give nevertheless some tentative indicators, as they differentiate between degrees of skills. The most recent performance report of the placement-activities reports an under-proportional placement-vacancy-ratio for the high-skilled segment of 29 %, while the PVR for skilled or semi-skilled job-seekers is 92 or 103 % respectively. This indicates that in the segment of higher skilled personnel seemingly restrictions are on the basis of labour-supply[30]. These statistics have to be consumed with caution, as individual networks and relationships are much more important for job-placement than the official labour-agencies in the country. (D, E)

In summary, the impact or even the orientation of ADA-activities in regard to the Kosovarian labour-market can neither be described as sufficient nor as even apparent.

The connection between the activities of ADA in **Serbia** and the needs of the labour-market is strong, mainly due to a clear-cut focus of the MSDP towards this issue. MSDP-applications have to include a strong labour-market component, with a labour-market survey and the inclusion of a private company in development and execution of the course. This has forced many participants to actively – and for the first time! – employ the resources of alumni to gather information about the labour-market and to search for potential partners in the business-community. This has been a very healthy development, as generally the relationship between universities and the labour-market is feeble. Only in some dedicated faculties – like of technical sciences and economics – are stronger relationship with the business-community is apparent. Furthermore, the "Experiencing Europe"-program as well as the language-courses of the "Österreich-Institut", which include company-presentations and the

---

[29] This situation is not improved by the fact that in Kosovo, the self-organisation of businesses is weak and competing organizations exists which claim representation, but most often do not have them. This is also coming with serious in-fighting. Therefore, in establishing communication, one cannot rely on institutions which in other countries might be the point of first entries, e. h. chambers of commerce or association of manufacturers.

[30] Department for Labour and Employment: Employment Promotion. Performance Report 2008/2009, 06/2008-06/2009, Pristina 2009, p. 29.

mediation of internships and scholarship-schemes, have a clear and strong labour-market orientation (I, E).

Serbian universities are on different levels when it comes to the preparation of their students for the needs of the labour-market. Generally, the tradition of career-service-centers has developed only recently and with varying impact. While the center at the University of Belgrade is very active and provides advice and training for a multitude of students, including company presentation and internship-programs, and the same in Kragujevac seems to be very active as well, the University of Novi Pazar still lacks such an office completely and the one at the University of Nis seems to be inexperienced and underfunded. Within the curricula, the teaching of secondary skills necessary for the labour-market – from CV-writing to self-presentation to team-work to project-management – is hardly apparent. Graduates have to look for other sources of this knowledge actively and by themselves. Furthermore, the connection between the universities and the National Employment Service is weak as well, partly due to the structural inability of the NES to provide effective services for graduates at this time. Generally, knowledge about the international labour-market is limited, at least for those faculties where there has been no strong tradition in seeking employment abroad (I, E).

In summary, the labour-market orientation of activities in Kosovo and Serbia vary heavily, with a much stronger focus in Serbia and serious lack in Kosovo.

Country	Focus in the labour market by the HE-system	Focus on the labour-market by ADA activities
Kosovo	Weak, but emerging	Weak
Serbia	Weak, but emerging	Relatively strong
Nicaragua	Not applicable	

With regard to the future role of HE in Austrian development cooperation with Nicaragua, the contribution of the projects to the capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS, particularly the focus areas of ADA (health, rural development, MSME-development), is a key issue. First of all, both projects have had a wider focus on capacity development, not for particular areas, but for the strengthening of the regional autonomy in general (D). The impact at this level is unquestionable, particularly for URACCAN which is by far the most important source in the Atlantic region for the recruitment of young professionals by regional and local governments. The latter absorb about 75% of the graduates (cf. Castillo et al. 2009). The presence of former URACCAN students could be appreciated by the evaluators in all public sector institutions that participated in the interviews or focus group discussions (E). In the case of the scholarship program offered by FADCANIC, all participants are employed by (70%) or linked to regional public sector institutions, the two universities or NGOs. For their theses, they are carrying out applied field research upon development issues related to RAAN/RAAS, partly with direct relevance to their own working environment (D,I).

Beyond the development of capacities in a sense of human resources, URACCAN has also given a decisive contribution to the development of institutional capacities for the autono-

mous regions. Particularly the models Regional Educational System (SEAR) and the Regional Health Model have been designed (although not yet fully implemented) with policy advice by URACCAN (D, I). Some interviewees go that far to claim that without the existence of URACCAN the autonomy status of RAAN/RAAS itself might not have been implemented (I). While this kind of institutional capacity development is seen by many as one of the most relevant impacts of URACCAN in the past, some interviewees are critical about the present role of the university and observe that due to a generally more polarized political climate some distance has grown between regional policymakers and URACCAN, slightly debilitating its prominent role in policy advice (I).

The generally very positive appraisal of the contributions to capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS applies in a significant degree to the focus areas of ADA, too. With regard to rural development, the university does not only offer a particular career in Communitarian Development, but has used the Austrian support to intensify its presence at community level. Through the CDCs (see chapter 4), a diploma in Communitarian Development is offered in order to train community leaders, stimulate local development agendas and projects for sustainable production, as well as to sensitize the population on gender and health issues (D, I). While progress at an operational level is satisfactory (see chapter 6), a systematization of the impact on local development is not yet available. In qualitative terms, focus group discussions with community leaders indicate, at least, that awareness on several issues has been raised successfully (for example: in relation to the need for planning instruments, sustainable production, empowerment of women, mediation between ethnic groups, etc.) (I,E). The development of a methodology for the measurement of factual impact on local socio-economic development, however, is a pending challenge which should be met by URACCAN during the new program starting in the second half of 2010 (E).

With regard to health, the sector was not targeted directly by the present HE projects. Although sensitization on HIV/AIDS was taken into account for the target groups of both projects, this is not to be understood as a measure for health sector capacity development. Beyond the scope of the present project, however, URACCAN has accumulated quite an expertise in traditional medicine and is offering careers in the health sector as part of its academic program (e.g. a Master's program for the management of VIH/SIDA and a career in nursery at the level of técnico superior on the campus Bilwi). It has also given policy advice during the design of the model for the Health System of RAAN/RAAS which recognizes the complementary role of traditional medicine within the modern health system. Expertise and contributions to capacity development by URACCAN are also relevant in the context of ADA program for the combating of HIV/AIDS where the university is carrying out the above mentioned Master's program in Bilwi (D,I).

The impact on MSME-development is less visible than in the other two focus areas of ADA. Some synergy can be observed in regard to the support of Communitarian Development where production patterns (introduction of new products with higher added value) and the pooling of peasants in cooperatives are targeted (E). However, the impact is limited to agricultural activity in rural areas. The recent tracer study also shows that less than 20% of the graduates are absorbed by the private sector. With only 6% running their own business, no information is available on the scale and activity of the respective enterprises (cf. Castillo et al. 2009).

The Bologna-process is the imperative guideline for Kosovarian HE-policy. Therefore, the inclusion into the wider European context is of high value of all stakeholders. ADA-activities through both programs have visibly contributed positively towards the achievement of this goal (E). The establishment of the Accreditation Agency, the development of capacities in curricular development according to ECTS-standards, the support of quality assurance and the support in regard to strategies as well as raising awareness are considerable and important contributions. ADA's commitment is the major source of support for the government to come closer to EU-higher education standards aside from the general budget-lines of the EU-Commission. All stakeholders are convinced that both programs have facilitated significant progress in this regard (I). The University of Pristina's progress in reform and adjustment to the Bologna-process is rated as comparatively high. Many faculties have, based on both the twinning-activities by KAIP but as well through the twinning-element of the Master development activities of WUS, established good and steady relationships with foreign, especially Austrian universities. Austrian curricula are seen as instrumental for the establishment of the new University of Prizren. Generally, the problem of inclusion of Kosovarian institutions of higher education into the European network is a political one (I, E). The University of Pristina has not been able to formally sign the membership in the Bologna-process because of political considerations, as not all EU-member-states have acknowledged the independence of Kosovo yet. Formal membership in international bodies of HE is therefore difficult to attain for Kosovo. This will also include the desire of the Accreditation Agency to become a member of ENQA. Therefore, the support given has to stay at the level of inter-university-relationships and cannot, at this point of time, be widened into a long-term partnership in networks where issues of sovereignty are touched.

In general, only few activities of ADA in Kosovo are connected to other long-term partnerships or networks. The twinning-component of KAIP has the potential of evolving into a long-term-partnership between the relevant faculties or departments, but evidence is too scarce at this moment to make an assessment. The already mentioned obstacles for international co-operation because of the political situation do not bode well for lasting networks and partnerships which touch issues of political sovereignty at this point of time. Partnerships and networks of individual departments or faculties are possible, and have been proven to work e.g. within the TEMPUS-activities, but they exist either alongside activities of ADA or are not deeply connected. From the impression gathered during the evaluation, efforts are not made to identify other networks or partnerships with the desire to connect to them (I,E,D).

Serbia's integration into the EU-structures of HE has been hampered by a long period of relative isolation due to international sanctions. Both the entry into the Bologna-process as well as the subsequent activities, especially the start of accreditation processes, has been relatively late. Therefore, Serbia is still struggling in doing the necessary steps towards a deeper integration. On the other side, Serbia is ranking very high in the number of successful applications to EU-funding. There is a visible eagerness on the side of the Serbian universities to reconnect to the strong tradition of international cooperation that has been apparent in the former Yugoslavia. The establishment of networks with other universities has been ongoing for some time, and since the Serbian universities have been allowed to be grant-holders of EU-funding from last year, their role has been strengthened. The liberalization of the visa-

regime has encouraged exchange, which is normally only hampered by lack of adequate funding, especially for student mobility[31] (I,E).

Generally, the impact of ADA-activities has been most visible where through the BGP and partly also the MSDP international cooperation has been strengthened. It has been less visible in regard to e.g. the work of the Accreditation Commission, whose very structure will prevent it from effectively enter any European network, not to speak of membership in ENQA. The lack of integration of Serbian universities is another challenge not well in line with the requirements of the Bologna-process. As WUS Belgrade – and the ADA-office – have obviously not engaged themselves a lot in political lobbying in this regard and donor-coordination has been on a low level in HE-matters, this is not really surprising. Before a MOU between the Ministry for Education and ADA is not signed, any activity in this direction might be difficult. Now, as the work is coming to an end, it will be more or less futile to be actively involved in political lobbying for basic changes in the Serbian HE-system. Still, the major impediments towards a greater inclusion of Serbia into the EU-research and academic area is related to political decision-making, not to individual program-interventions so far facilitated by WUS (I, E).

Unfortunately, no evidence was discernible that ADA-activities were embedded in any wider networks or long-term partnerships in Serbia. No twinning-component on a permanent basis has been supported. The desire of the Commission for Accreditation to participate in ENQA has been supported indirectly through study-visits, but obstacles remain. Surely, individual faculties or departments have their own networks, but any effort to link these to activities conducted through WUS has not been visible. Activities in regard to "Experiencing Europe" and by the Österreich Institut" are so far embedded into networks as they use resources and contacts they have – e.g. to invite lecturers from companies for presentations – and try to continue these contacts for the benefit of participants. It would be difficult to characterize these efforts as long-term partnerships of a more stable nature (E).

In both countries, contribution of ADA's activities towards the integration of the HE-sector into the Bologna-process has been discernible. Impact has been less visible in Serbia because no real multi-level capacity development process has been initiated.

Country	Participation in Bologna-process	Contribution of ADA	Wider networks
Kosovo	Strong and dedicated	Significant on all levels	Not yet well developed
Serbia	Quite dedicated, with some reluctance in some parts	Significant on department and faculty level	Not yet well developed
Nicaragua		Not applicable	

---

[31] Or by the lack of capacity of the universities to access the funding, like in the case of the University of Nis, which has been suspended full partnership of Erasmus/Mundus because of its inability to fill all available scholarships allotted to them in time.

Recommendations:

- In **Kosovo** and in regard to the new university in Prizren, ADA should make a clear concept for a multi-ethnic university a precondition for any wider support of the new institution. While willingness and awareness on the Kosovarian side in this regard is visible, a clear vision is lacking and only declarations of good intent are currently available. This is not sufficient. ADA can contribute to this discussion through a "feasibility"-study even after the university has started to work.

- In regard to the new university of Prizren, keeping in mind, that ADA is not providing infrastructural support, ADA should press for a clear concept for the inclusion of students with disabilities in the infrastructural plan and in any renovation undergoing. This should also be made a topic of donor-cooperation once the Kosovarian government will approach the donor-community for infrastructural funding.

- ADA should support the development of a strategy for the University of Pristina to include students with disabilities and to develop an infrastructural development plan for upgrading facilities in that respect. ADA could support the authorities in seeking for donor-support in providing the necessary infrastructure especially for enhanced physical access.

- In regard to all application processes for programs in the future – like CDP, Master development, BGP or other – questions should be added in the application forms which directly reflect the cross-cutting issues of people with disabilities and gender. As gender-guidelines for master courses already exist, ADA activities should support efforts to include the needs of people with disabilities as well. E. g. for an application for a master development, applicants should be obliged to describe the gender-situation in their department and the framework for access to education for people with disabilities. In e-learning-components, special consideration should be taken in access for students with impaired vision.

- ADA should make itself familiar with current concepts on circular labour-migration, especially for highly qualified migrants, and use these concepts in order to widen the activities of their HE-program to manage the – inevitable - out-migration in a way that will both benefit the migrants as well as countries of origin and of destination. Programs of time-bound employment in Austrian companies, long-term study-visits to Austrian universities (like for Master or PhD-programs) and internship-programs like the one run by Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation in Serbia are first steps into that direction. Support for contacts with diaspora-alumni – like it is already available with the BGP – should be strengthened and widened through the establishment of communication-platforms and alumni-networks.

- In order to further capacity-development in regard to labour-market-issues, possibilities to support a career-guidance-center based on the LINK-office in Pristina should be explored, including activities to strengthen the alumni-culture at the different faculties (e.g. through some conditions in that regard in the MSDP).

- In **Serbia**, the "Experiencing Europe"-program should be continued if possible. While it does not contribute to the capacity-development within the HE-sector, it has a strong labour-market focus and has positive impact on Austrian visibility and political

image. Especially in preparation to the end of the current economic crisis, strong and good connection with the German-speaking economies is of high interest for Serbia and its neighbouring countries.

- In line with the proposal to add a component for capacity-development in regard to project-implementation on rectorate-level in Serbian universities, funds should be made available for capacity-development of career-service-centers where they do not exist or are weak. This would both contribute to sustainability of institutions but also to a strong labour-market-focus. In the cooperation with the University of Novi Pazar, this would be a logical next step instead of venturing in uncharted areas like PhD-development or such.

- Cross-cutting issues like gender and inclusion of people with disabilities should be included in proper form in the application-forms of all relevant activities, like e.g. the MSDP. Gender-analysis and an effort to analyse the readiness of applying departments for students with disabilities should be made obligatory in the application process.

- For **Serbia**, continued support for the University at Novi Pazar as the academic institution dealing with ethnic minorities most prominently would give a clear signal that this issue is regarded as important. The University can be developed into a role-model, not only for running a wholly integrated university, but also how to deal with ethnic diversity in a constructive way. External support for this is dearly needed and will continue to be so.

- For activities in regard to ethnic minorities, ADA should first confer with those other donors who specialize in these issues in the lower tiers of the education system in order to analyze in how far activities in the HE-sector are feasible. From the consultant's view, it will most probably be futile to start a new discussion in an exit-phase. This issue can predominantly be addressed through the continued support of the University of Novi-Pazar as a multi-ethnic university.

- In **Nicaragua,** the impact of ADA's partners, particularly URACCAN, on at least two of the three focus areas is empirically evident and significant. Depending on the particular project design, future cooperation may be fully legitimate regarding their compliance with the focus areas and, therefore, should be continued (see also recommendation no. 1 regarding sustainability).

- If capacity development for ADA's focus areas is considered the main function of higher education support programs, a gradual shift should be called for by ADA with regard to the impact areas addressed by project goals: From the support of a general organizational and personnel capacity development within the university (for example: the efforts undertaken in order to improve the didactical skills of university teachers) to a more intense cooperation in areas where impacts on rural development, health and/or MSME-development are addressed directly.

- As this shift has already been observable in the present project phase (see the creation of CDCs), the new project proposal for 2010 fully complies with the previous recommendation. It can be characterized, not as a HE project with effects on local development, but as a local development project carried out by an academic institution

as change agent and thus, integrated in the academic cycles of research and teaching. From the point of view of the evaluation, the results have validated the current project proposal which should be supported by ADA in its present form.

- For URACCAN, the most severe bottleneck for further development is not internal institutional shortcomings but the low coverage and quality of secondary education in the region. Although this topic might probably be out of the range of the Austrian contribution, URACCAN should intensify its efforts of supporting the creation of rural secondary schools and/or stipulate the implementation of preparatory courses at community level.

- Although a considerable proportion of indigenous students matriculate at URACCAN, desertion is still very high compared to other groups. URACCAN should dedicate some formal research to retention and desertion factors for indigenous students and introduce affirmative action in order to assure their permanence at the university.

9.   Three scenarios for future activities

9.1   Kosovo

Scenario 1: Follow the wishes of the partner and concentrate activities on the new University of Prizren, with only some limited engagement for the University of Pristina. Focus on all relevant activities, from curricular development to twinning projects to support of equipment. Give full advice on planning and administration and facilitate strong bonds with Austrian universities.

Rationale: As partner-orientation is important and a commitment has been made, it is imperative to ensure that the new project will be successful. As the new university is already dubbed the "Austrian university" in Kosovo, the stakes are high and any setback might be detrimental for Austria. Therefore, the University of Pristina should be more or less left to its own devices to focus on the new university, especially as it gives a chance to avoid mistakes which make the reform process in Pristina so difficult.

Challenge: The University of Pristina is and will remain to be the focal point of higher education in Kosovo. To withdraw substantially from there without a proper exit-strategy and without replacement to support activities in place endangers sustainability and will cause serious criticism and apprehension. In addition, the reform process at the University of Pristina will continue to need focused support, especially if it is supposed to follow the successful role-model of a new and modern university in Prizren. By withdrawing, important steps to strengthen the capacity of the university cannot be taken. At this point of time, more general programs like Tempus will not be able to fill that gap. In addition, important work to strengthen the HE-sector beyond the universities – like technology exchange and accreditation-processes – will suffer.

As the planning for the new university lacks feasibility and a proper time-plan and many activities are based on political needs and less facts, dangers are evident that the new project

will face setbacks which will reflect badly on Austrian engagement, especially as the project is closely connected to Austria in the public eye. The higher the initial investment by ADA, the higher the chances that challenges will be put on the laps of Austrian development cooperation and less on those responsible in the MEST.

Scenario 2: Divide the activities evenly between Pristina and Prizren and reserve therefore at least half of the budget for the new university.

Rationale: While considering the political importance of the new university in Prizren, there is need to continue the reform process in Pristina as well. In addition, activities with the wider HE-system – departments of the MEST and related agencies – will continue as well. At the same time, a strong commitment to the new university will be visible.

Challenge: The same as in scenario 1: As the planning for the new university lacks feasibility and a proper time-plan and many activities are based on political needs and less facts, dangers are evident that the new project will face setbacks which will reflect badly on Austrian engagement, especially as the project is closely connected to Austria in the public eye. The higher the initial investment by ADA, the higher the chances that challenges will be put on the laps of Austrian development cooperation and less on those responsible in the MEST.

Scenario 3: Continue the activities with the University of Pristina and the MEST, scrutinize the initial stages of the new University of Prizren carefully and make limited funding available for dedicated and focused engagement in specific areas where the deficits in planning from the Kosovarian side will not be a negative influence.

Rationale: As the non-existent planning process on side of the MEST cannot be compensated by ADA-intervention in time, it will be necessary to be very careful in the approach towards Prizren. With a limited activity in areas which are less vulnerable to effects of bad planning, ADA both save the face and contribute meaningful with the promise of increased engagement once a clear picture of the emerging new university appears. Areas of focus could be administrative issues (e.g. support in students-registration, training of administrative staff) or curricular development in those courses who actually manage to take off in time. At the same time, necessary activities at the University of Pristina can be continued and strengthened, as well as activities outside the university itself (like e.g. the Accreditation Agency or additional activities in regard to the topic of employability and the labour-market).

Challenge: This strategy might not be what the MEST and the Kosovarian side in general expects from ADA. The challenge will be to "sell" a limited intervention in Prizren – with the tentative promise to do more in the future – as a significant contribution at this stage of development.

Recommendation: Follow scenario 3. Engage diplomatically to alleviate any misgivings.

9.2   Serbia

Exit scenario 1: Cease all direct WUS-activities with the current program. Continue the language-program of "Österreich-Institut" beyond 2011 and prolong the "Experiencing Europe"-program for another period.

Rationale: The two programs outside the direct WUS-activities are sufficient to "ease out" ADA-activities in Serbia while keeping a strong activity in regard to the labour-market, the interest of Austrian businesses and some political leverage which will benefit the probable

negative repercussions of the withdrawal at least a little bit. In addition, it is the most cost-effective way of exit, which will make funds available for other activities in a shorter time-period.

Challenges: The sudden withdrawal of ADA-activities might impact the relationship to Serbia negatively and will surely disappoint many stakeholders in Serbian universities. In addition, the chance to add some activities in a final period to increase the general sustainability and contribute wisely to capacity-development to make the change smooth will be missed. Especially in regard to the new university in Novi Pazar, where cooperation is relatively new, a second period of added activities is advisable. In addition, identification of other donors who might be willing to engage themselves in the HE-sector in the future will become more difficult, if not impossible.

Exit scenario 2: Continue with all activities as before without major changes or different focus for another three-year-period.

Rationale: In order to smoothen the exit of ADA-activities in Serbia, the continuation of current programs will alleviate fears of a sudden withdrawal and make added work especially in Novi Pazar, but also with selected universities possible. In addition, the search for other donors who might be motivated to at replace ADA's activities in parts will be easier, as a clear time for an exit, not too soon in the future, will be available for planning.

Challenges: The simple continuation of programs as they are is not necessarily conducive for an exit-strategy which should focus on sustainability-issues. The danger is that in the end activities will cease with some obstacles towards future activities by other donors or by Serbian institutions still in place.

Exit scenario 3: Current activities will be continued for another three-year-period by WUS Austria, but with more focus and additional activities in capacity-development added. Some elements, like the support for the Accreditation Commission, might be ended. Possible extension of the ZDF-activities and/or the program of the "Österreich Institut" beyond another three-year-period will be scrutinized.

Rationale: In order to ensure sustainability, activities will be more focused and needs for capacity-development identified. Activities in Novi Pazar can be lead to a successful conclusion. It might be worth considering the continuation of scholarship- and language-schemes on a more permanent basis, which will both help as a good argument against criticism in Serbia in regard to the exit as well as a "foot in the doorstep" in Serbia, especially for labour-market oriented and business-promotion-activities.

Challenges: Depending on the activities of other donors and the amount of budget available for ADA, even another three-year-period might not be sufficient to tackle basic sustainability-problems connected to the HE-sector in Serbia. The question is, in how far, after a MOU with the relevant ministries is concluded, political lobbying will be possible, especially with the knowledge that ADA will withdraw its activities. As the political leverage will diminish, the chances are not likely to be high.

Recommendation: Follow scenario 3, and emphasize the search for other donors who might be willing to invest in focused activities in the HE-sector. From the information gathered in this evaluation, Serbia will need at least another ten years of support for its HE-sector before

the Serbian government and the universities will be able to take over the responsibility completely.

9.3   Nicaragua

Scenario 1 (continuity): Implement the new project with URACCAN according to the present proposal (i.e. strong focus on local development, with additional components for the specialization of teachers and the facilitation of university access to vulnerable groups) without an explicit exit scenario. Be in readiness to keep extending cooperation with URACCAN as long as key requirements related to the capacity development in focus areas of ADA are met. Also renew the scholarship program with FADCANIC under intermediation of Horizont 3000, but adapt selection criteria to focus areas of ADA and/or the scope of the URACCAN project.

Rationale: The evaluation has proven the HE cooperation to be successful and contribute effectively to the capacity development within the focus areas of ADA as well as the local and regional institutional development in general. Difficulties related with the scholarship programs were located at the operational, not the outcome and impact level, and more pronounced synergies between both projects might even enhance the specificity of impact on capacity development. No time-limit is set for the cooperation with URACCAN as the outlook with regard to economic self-dependency is too uncertain.

Challenge: While it seems undisputable that the cooperation with URACCAN should be continued, the main challenge for the scholarship program would be to stay in line with the focus areas of ADA. Although the areas themselves might be met through adequate selection criteria, it will be much more difficult to create synergies with specific ongoing projects within these areas (e.g. due to the time-period required for postgraduate studies, the mobility of young professionals, etc.). However, this argument might be somewhat debilitated by the fact, that the current participants report several examples of ongoing application of study contents that already occurs *during* their participation in postgraduate studies.

Scenario 2 (concentration on URACCAN): Implement the new project with URACCAN according to the present proposal without an explicit exit scenario and remain ready to keep extending the cooperation whenever it is judged pertinent. However, concentrate on URACCAN and phase out the scholarship program.

Rationale: Regarding URACCAN, the same as in scenario 1. The scholarship program is not continued because its outcome, although observable, could be considered not sufficiently specific as to potentiate impacts of ADA support within the focus areas. Under a cost-effectiveness perspective, the same resources can be applied in order to build specific measures for capacity development within focus sector projects.

Challenge: For ADA, no major challenge would arise but to communicate adequately the phasing out of the scholarship program. From the point of view of the partner organizations, the most important challenge will be to promote (and finance) other forms of international knowledge exchange, taking into account that integration in international networks is quite limited for both regional universities, as it is for many regional institutions.

Scenario 3 (preparation of exit): Implement the new project with URACCAN according to the present proposal, but restrict cooperation to one more phase and prepare exit by concentrating on impact-generating mechanisms.

Rationale: Although the contribution of URACCAN to the capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS has been significant for the focus areas of Austrian development cooperation as well, ADA might prefer to support more specific activities for capacity development and integrate components into sector-specific health, SME or rural development projects instead of maintaining a long-term cooperation with one specific HE institution. URACCAN has been consolidated sufficiently and is supposed to be capable of operating independently if phasing out is announced with several years of anticipation.

Challenge: This strategy might not be what URACCAN expects from ADA. Although ownership is high and efforts for increasing self-dependency are taken, the partner does presently not count with a proximate expiration of the support. The most important challenge would be to use the remaining time period effectively in order to find alternative internal or external sources that would assure sustainability. If this cannot be achieved, it is probable that URACCAN would have to concentrate on the key academic program and restrict activities aimed towards communitarian development which are mostly externally financed.

Recommendation: Follow scenario 1 for maximization of outcome in the HE sector, if this criterion is predominantly weighted over efficiency. Alternatively, follow scenario 2 under cost-effectiveness considerations for capacity development in the focus areas of ADA. Scenario 3 is not recommended by the evaluation.

10. Conclusions and lessons learnt

10.1 Kosovo

10.1.1 In regard to the strategy

1. Activities in Kosovo are well embedded in the country's strategy in regard to Higher Education and correlate to the expressed will of both the government as well as the University of Pristina.

2. The current country-program for Kosovo reflects well important issues of the Higher Education Strategy of ADA, but some important points are missing, which need to be included in a future country-program, especially the issue of migration, the existence and reflection of current national strategies in Kosovo and the efforts in regard to the extension of the HE-system, notably the new university in Prizren.

3. The strategic development process in Kosovo is dynamic and sometimes faster than the one done by ADA, especially in the HE-sector. Still, the quality of ADA-strategies on both the country- as well as the sector-level is sufficiently high to cater for these changes and make adjustments easy. It is important to have a general strategy which helps to put national specifics into account without losing the "big picture". It is an important lesson that Kosovarian strategies are more than mere "paper tigers" and that currently political will is apparent to implement strategies and to develop them further.

10.1.2 In regard to relevance

1. In Kosovo, ownership is relatively high, as the activities correspond well with the overall strategies and are clearly demand-oriented; also, they fit into the general desire to follow the Bologna-process diligently. In regard to taking over responsibility of implementation, ownership is more weakly, and in regard to the WUS-program not asked for sufficiently. In regard to the plans to establish the new University of Prizren, a too strong partner-orientation might actually pose a certain risk as the planning-process so far has been clearly inadequate. Capacity development is a clear focus of attention and follows at least partly the current guidelines and international standards. On the other hand, many criteria outlined by Austria's basic principles on capacity development are not met.

2. Ownership is more than just following the partner's demand. The case in Kosovo shows that caution and good advice from donor-side has to be part of partner-oriented work and it is not wise to "swallow" every proposal because of political convenience. If ownership develops in such a way that demands from the partners are not met by their capacity to execute these demands, the question about the reasonable degree of ADA-involvement at a given time has to be considered. The development of the new university of Prizren teaches the lesson that political expedience can actually be a danger for sustainability and effectiveness of development cooperation if not managed carefully.

In regard to the WUS activities, the position of WUS in the context of HE in Kosovo gives the observer a lesson about the consequences of supporting and nurturing an independent implementing agency outside a given partner-structure, but closely connected to it. The consequence is twofold: Accumulated expertise makes the partner attractive for continued support; the same accumulated expertise makes it more difficult to shift responsibilities from the implementing agency towards the partner-institution, especially if a smooth and problem-free process is desired. In this context, sometimes the exact point in time when it would have been wise to shift ownership more towards the partner-institution can be missed.

In regard to capacity-development, the absence of knowledge about the basic principles of ADA-capacity-development in planning and implementation of some of the activities shows that ADA might have a communication-problem with its implementing agencies. In order to implement the activities up to the current standards, it is necessary to reflect on them on a continuous basis. Producing a guideline or list of principles which afterwards is not inserted into the activities of implementing agencies is not very effective. This leads to serious contradictions.

10.1.3 Conclusions in regard to effectiveness

1. Both programs in Kosovo try to work in a holistic way, with the WUS-components stronger interconnected than those of KAIP. While in the end the different activities of the KAIP will – hopefully – lead to a better integrated Kosovarian HE-system, the different levels – working with the Ministry, with executing agencies and with the University of Pristina – will most probably be closer linked in the second phase. On the other hand, coherence between the two programs is only by chance and not by design. Ratio of input vs. output is satisfactory. Input from the side of partners is not always strong and has lead to less successful components of KAIP-activities. Generally, with some few exceptions, the components of both programs have been successful, although information available is only relevant for the output

and short-term-outcome, much less so for mid-term outcome, and with a considerable question mark for any impact. Donor-coordination has not been established, neither on the side of the donor-community nor on the side of the responsible ministry. Coherence of Austrian activities is significant in regard to the ministerial level, but non-existent in regard to the relationship of the two programs.

2. A major lessons learnt is – again – the insight that without capacity-development at the political level – especially the Ministry – working through partner-organizations with the aim of setting up new and innovative structures – like the CITT – will not work. If general capacity-development and political will can either not be provided or generated and if other donor's activities are not complementary to efforts in changing ministerial policies, the results will always be less effective then otherwise. On the other hand, the successful components of both programs teach the lesson that if agents of change are identified properly and energetic dedication by partners is apparent, the success even against obstacles is assured. This can both be said for the KAA as well as of successful Master studies development.

In regard to donor-cooperation the Kosovarian example shows that the gap between declaration and implementation of the Paris Declaration and subsequent documents is still wide and that the interest of donors to fill these declarations with life is as limited as that of the partner-ministry. It is obvious that the possible drawbacks of donor-coordination and –cooperation are more prominent in the mind of actors than the advantages.

In regard to coherence, the example of Kosovo teaches the lesson that cooperation between a development-agency and a ministry without a genuine developmental approach is possible if stakeholders involved agree to discuss issues in a pragmatic manner. While differences in the basic approach or programmatic "ideology" may persist, these do not necessarily have to overshadow activities on the ground. A basis for this success is continuous and open communication. Once this transparency is endangered, the coherence is in danger as well.

10.1.4 Conclusions in regard to sustainability

1. In Kosovo, a high plausibility for an assumption of considerable impact is discernible. This is clearly visible in some distinct components, for others the intervention has not been long enough and will need a follow-up. Indicators are well defined in regard to the KAIP, but do not take local conditions into consideration. The LogFrame used for the WUS-program has serious inadequacies. Many indicators here are not SMART. Results are generally defined predominantly at the output-level. In general, capacity within the University of Pristina is good enough to take over some activities, while the Ministry still needs further external support.

2. A major lesson learnt is that using planning tools in a formalistic way without the deeper understanding of the various elements and without the "threat" that commitments formulated in these tools – like the indicators filled in the LogFrame – will one day be scrutinized or even regularly monitored, the whole implementation of planning tools is not an inherent part of the process, but the execution of an obligation, not filled with life. For evidence based planning tools, a major lesson is that both sides – the implementing agency as well as the funding agency – have to a have a common and full understanding of the tool used, how it is used, how far its results are supposed to influence implementation and how it will be monitored (especially in regard to the degree of diligence). If the perception is evident that an activity-based reporting and negligence of indicators can actually "work", tools are meaningless. This

assessment is true for both programs – KAIP and WUS -, as existing LogFrames have not been adjusted towards changed project realities, which points to a "formalistic" attitude towards them[32].

10.1.5 Conclusions in regard to outcomes and impact

1. The brain-drain-effect will not be combated successfully through the ADA-programs in Kosovo, the opposite is more likely the case. Non-discrimination in regard to gender is relatively well established within the activities, while inclusion of both people with disabilities as well as ethnic minorities is not visible at all. For the latter, most marginalized minorities, the challenge begins already with the entry into primary education, not to speak of higher education. Links to the labour-market are weak or non-existent. Contribution towards the inclusion in the Bologna-process is visible. The biggest obstacle seems to be of political nature (the issue of recognition of Kosovo's independence) and less the efforts of the projects or the Kosovarian government.

2. Any activity geared at enhancing the HE-sector in a small country like Kosovo will inadvertently lead to a higher probability in brain-drain-processes. When a HE-policy is focused, especially in times of economic crisis, to keep a substantial number of young people out of the labour-market in order to contain the rising number of unemployed and not artificially strengthen the informal sector, any activity in managing migration is bound to failure. Issues of brain-drain in small countries have a very different perspective from big countries, as they will never be able to absorb their graduates even in times of economic booms.

Awareness about cross-cutting issues is always difficult to spread, even within implementing agencies. They have the tendency to be seen as formalistic obligations. It is therefore necessary to emphasize the need for them and to communicate them differently from other, more subject-specific issues. The major lesson here is that just mentioned cross-cutting issues as such will not develop into any meaningful consideration by either partner-institutions or implementing agencies. Cross-cutting issues need permanent and specific monitoring and repeated, insisting communication.

The major lesson in regard to labour-market-issues is that no one can expect any link to the labour-market – and subsequently to poverty eradication, as this is the rationale behind it -, as long as knowledge about the very topic does not pervade all relevant institutions. This goes for both countries. In a country with a very high degree of informality in the economy, profound knowledge about the local, the regional and the continental market is a precondition for effective targeting the labour-market for graduates. If this knowledge only exists with few, and is not used in any systematic way – as it is to be feared for the new university in Prizren – any labour-market-orientation will remain to be lip-service.

---

32 Again: LogFrames are no static tools, they are not a "bible of project", they are supposed to serve the project implementation. Once they do not reflect project reality anymore, they are supposed to be tools for re-planning and adjustment as well, especially if the assumptions have changed or are not describing reality anymore. This has obviously not been considered in any of the projects.

10.2   Serbia

10.2.1 Conclusions in regard to the strategy

1. Activities in Serbia are well embedded in the general desire by Serbian authorities to follow the Bologna-process. A distinct HE-strategy does not exist at this point of time.

2. The current country-program for Serbia has a weak goal-structure in regard to the HE-sector, which does not reflect Austria's role in the sector well.

3. The discrepancy between the fact that Austria is the biggest bilateral donor in the HE-sector and that the country-strategy does not address this fact adequately illuminates the lesson that obviously the importance of the engagement in the HE-sector is not weighed sufficiently in comparison to other activities. It is an important lesson to be learnt that strategies are supposed to reflect the priorities set in one country and this has to be done both in quality and quantity. Additionally, strategic development on the side of the Serbian partners is burdened with inertia and inadequate structures. The management-capacity of the partner to develop a vision has to be considered.

10.2.2 Conclusions in regard to relevance

1. In Serbia, no alignment with national strategies is possible as they do not exist in written form yet. Still, the general drive towards the implementation of the Bologna-process is full in line with ADA-activities. Programs are clearly demand-oriented. Ownership is difficult to achieve where the structures of not well-integrated universities pose a challenge. It is easiest with the new, integrated University of Novi Pazar. Institutional ownership of other partners – like the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation – is weak. Capacity development so far concentrated either of applying departments or professors or, in the case of Novi Pazar, on certain basic administrative structures. Capacity development of the Ministry of Education does not take place. Not all essential criteria for successful capacity development are met.

2. In regard to capacity-development, the absence of knowledge about the basic principles of ADA-capacity-development in planning and implementation of some of the activities shows that ADA might have a communication-problem with its implementing agencies. In order to implement the activities up to the current standards, it is necessary to reflect on them on a continuous basis. Producing a guideline or list of principles which afterwards is not inserted into the activities of implementing agencies is not very effective. This leads to serious contradictions.

3. The case of Serbia teaches the lesson that intervening on the level of universities without keeping the political and legal framework in mind leads to the fact that interventions have only a limited impact and are not embedded well into a greater strategy. The lack of this strategy in the country-program comes into mind again. WUS as an implementing agency is obviously not good at working on the political level in the partner country or has never been asked to do so. Capacity development without trying to tackle the underlying problems – here foremost the lack of integration of Serbian universities – can only lead to limited results. Either ADA-office or implementing agency have to cooperate to have coherence in political advice and practical application or the goals of development cooperation have to be very modest, if not too modest.

10.2.3 Conclusions in regard to effectiveness

1. The program-approach in Serbia is not visible. Components work in an additive, not necessarily interconnected and holistic way. The different components have been implemented with a varying degree of success, with one complete failure (coordination platform) and one big question mark (accreditation commission). Donor-coordination in the HE-sector is non-existent.

10.2.4 Conclusions in regard to sustainability

1. In Serbia, impact can be assumed on the level of departments and individual professors, institutionally most in regard to the University of Novi Pazar. Indicators and the LogFrame presented are not on the level of common quality standards. Individual impact of the internship-program in cooperation with the Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation can be assumed as high, but empirical data is not available yet.

2. A major lesson learnt is that using planning tools in a formalistic way without the deeper understanding of the various elements and without the "threat" that commitments formulated in these tools – like the indicators filled in the LogFrame – will one day be scrutinized or even regularly monitored, the whole implementation of planning tools is not an inherent part of the process, but the execution of an obligation, not filled with life. For evidence based planning tools, a major lesson is that both sides – the implementing agency as well as the funding agency – have to a have a common and full understanding of the tool used, how it is used, how far its results are supposed to influence implementation and how it will be monitored (especially in regard to the degree of diligence). If the perception is evident that an activity-based reporting and negligence of indicators can actually "work", tools are meaningless.

10.2.5 Conclusions in regard to outcomes and impact

1. The brain-drain-effect will not be combated successfully through the ADA-programs in Serbia, the opposite is more likely the case. Non-discrimination in regard to gender is relatively well established within the activities, while inclusion of both people with disabilities as well as ethnic minorities is not visible at all. Like in Kosovo, for the most marginalized minorities, entrance into primary education is already a challenge. Links to the labour-market are stronger, especially in the MSDP as well as the "Experiencing Europe"-program. Integration into the EU-HE-sector, especially the Bologna-process, has started late, but is in full swing. ADA-activities have increased the links to universities abroad especially through BGP+.

2. Any activity geared at enhancing the HE-sector in a small country like Serbia will inadvertently lead to a higher probability in brain-drain-processes. When a HE-policy is focused, especially in times of economic crisis, to keep a substantial number of young people out of the labour-market in order to contain the rising number of unemployed and not artificially strengthen the informal sector, any activity in managing migration is bound to failure. Issues of brain-drain in small countries have a very different perspective from big countries, as they will never be able to absorb their graduates even in times of economic booms.

3. The major lesson in regard to labour-market-issues is that no one can expect any link to the labour-market – and subsequently to poverty eradication, as this is the rationale behind it – as long as knowledge about the very topic does not pervade all relevant institutions. In a country with a very high degree of volatility in the economy, profound knowledge about the

local, the regional and the continental market is a precondition for effective targeting the labour-market for graduates. If this knowledge only exists with few, and is not used in any systematic way – as it is to be feared for the new university in Prizren -, any labour-market-orientation will remain to be lip-service.

4. Awareness about cross-cutting issues is always difficult to spread, even within implementing agencies. They have the tendency to be seen as formalistic obligations. It is therefore necessary to emphasize the need for them and to communicate them differently from other, more subject-specific issues. The major lesson here is that just mentioned cross-cutting issues as such will not develop into any meaningful consideration by either partner-institutions or implementing agencies. Cross-cutting issues need permanent and specific monitoring and repeated, insisting. If the political fears are too great to even address the issue of ethnic balance and inclusion in a systematic way, small interventions in specific sectors cannot and will never yield any meaningful result. With a certain degree of "political paranoia" in regard to these issues, as it is apparent currently in influential quarters of the Serbian polity, development cooperation is not well placed to press issues like the inclusion of ethnic minorities. As long as political decision-making is guided by fear, constructive solutions are not easy to be achieved.

10.3   Nicaragua

10.3.1 Conclusions in regard to the strategy

1. Nicaragua does not count with a strategy for the HE sector. However, ADA's support does fit into the regional Strategy for the Development of the Caribbean Coast.

2. With regard to the future country strategy, capacity development through HE support in the RAAN/RAAS is in line with the focus areas of ADA, particularly taking into account the strong local development focus of the new project proposal by URACCAN.

3. The HE strategy of ADA had not yet been in place when the current projects were formulated. However, they comply up to a certain degree with the guiding principles and some selected key areas of the HE strategy.

4. It is common for Latin American universities that their spectrum of activity transcends academic careers and is complemented by social action and training services that are open to a non-academic public. However, this characteristic is particularly pronounced in the case of a communitarian university model like that of URACCAN. The communitarian university model has been very pertinent for the ADA approach of strengthening an HE institution, not aimed towards HE sector development, but towards capacity development for a very specific geographical and socio-cultural environment. Some of the positive outcomes of the evaluation would probably not have been achieved, if the partner institution were a "traditional" university.

5. A major lesson learnt is the fact that HE support projects, particularly in very poor countries with less effective educational systems, have always to keep in mind not only the shortcomings of the HE sector itself, but also the articulation between the different educational subsectors (e.g. primary/secondary education, technical education) as access to HE or the facility to accomplish an efficient diversification of professional profiles depend on it. Of

course, a holistic approach that transcends the HE sector is presently beyond the grasp of ADA, hence, importance of donor coordination and the stipulation of complementary interventions increases.

10.3.2 Conclusions in regard to relevance

1. Ownership is high in both partner organizations as project goals comply with their overall institutional missions. The implementing-agency Horizont 3000 has managed the projects by a demand-driven, participatory approach that is highly appreciated by the partners.

2. In the case of URACCAN, institutional capacity development has advanced to an extent that allows for implementing future projects without further intermediation of Horizont 3000. This has not yet been proven for FADCANIC.

3. Both projects focus on capacity development at the level of the partner institution itself (URACCAN) and at the level of impact among external target populations/institutions. Many ADA guidelines and international standards for capacity development are met, but a systemic multi-level approach to capacity development (i.e. the inclusion of interfaces with the macro-level or other educational sub-sectors) is not within the range of the current projects.

4. With regard to donor coordination, however, it is a lesson learnt that participation in national sector-wide round tables (like the Mesa Sectorial for Education) does not entail much benefit if HE support projects are focused on one specific region only. Even if a round table for education in the RAAN/RAAS should be considered too specific, it is probable that a general regional round-table would allow for a more effective and efficient donor cooperation than one with a sectoral (but national) scope.

10.3.3 Conclusions in regard to effectiveness

1. The project with URACCAN comes close to a holistic approach as its components are visibly interrelated and contribute to a common purpose. The scholarship program of FADCANIC is complementary, but synergies between both projects are not systematically pursued.

2. Ratio of input vs. output is satisfactory. Most of the components of both programs have been successful, with only one indicator outside the target corridor (URACCAN) or some delay in output delivery (FADCANIC). Target populations have been reached to an extent that mostly comes close to the target values defined in the indicators.

3. Donor-coordination has neither been established for the HE sector nor for capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS. Particularly donor coordination for the RAAN/RAAS could contribute to facilitate complementary interventions in the different educational subsectors.

4. With regard to donor coordination, however, it is a lesson learnt that participation in national sector-wide round tables (like the Mesa Sectorial for Education) does not entail much benefit if HE support projects are focused on one specific region only. Even if a round table for education in the RAAN/RAAS should be considered too specific, it is probable that a general regional round-table would allow for a more effective and efficient donor cooperation than one with a sectoral (but national) scope.

10.3.4 Conclusions in regard to sustainability

1. Throughout the course of ADA projects since the mid-90s the cooperation with URACCAN has had sustainable impact on the strengthening of the institution, as well regarding the improvement of academic excellence as the consolidation of administrative capacities. However, economic sustainability is a critical issue and a structural dependency on donor contributions will persist for an indefinite period.

2. With regard to results-orientation, the quality of the LogFrames varies, with indicators mostly restrained to the measurement of operational results. While output is considered and monitored sufficiently, outcome and impact variables are missing.

3. The HE support projects have generally been evaluated positively and have contributed successfully to the capacity development of many sectors in the RAAN/RAAS. However, it was known from the very beginning of the cooperation that the university model would structurally depend on donor contributions for an indefinite period. As many donors are reluctant to assume that kind of long-term commitment to one single institution, it is an important lesson learnt for the Austrian cooperation that in some cases the disposition for long-term commitment should even precede the decision to engage in the cooperation. The case of URACCAN illustrates some criteria for the pertinence of this decision: 1) the partner is a regional/sectoral key player that guarantees for a certain amount of multiplier effects or synergy with other development projects, 2) sustainability is reached in other non-economic dimensions and a serious effort of gradually increasing self-dependency is visible, 3) the capacities of the partner organization allow for a gradual shift from institutional sponsoring for internal capacity development to projects that maximize external impact, i.e. benefits for external target groups.

10.3.5 Conclusions in regard to outcomes and impact

1. Brain-drain-effects have not been significant and tracer studies prove that most of the graduates of URACCAN work in the RAAN/RAAS. In the case of the scholarship program by FADCANIC brain-drain is also assumed to remain low.

2. Gender equality and non-discrimination of vulnerable groups is considered adequately, not only in the projects, but by the project partners in general. Particularly in the case of URACCAN, affirmative action for women and indigenous people is taken effectively. While the access and retention of women could be significantly improved, the desertion of indigenous students is still above average.

3. The impact on the regional capacity development cannot be measured in quantitative terms, but is assumed to be considerable. URACCAN has contributed directly to the framework for the regional autonomy (SEAR, regional health model) and URACCAN graduates have a strong presence in local and regional public institutions.

4. The impact is also visible in focus areas of ADA, particularly with regard to rural development and the health sector.

5. The case of URACCAN university shows that capacity development through HE institutions in small countries or regions can be achieved without serious brain-drain-problems if

some pre-conditions are met: 1) Curricula aren't built on standardized contents assumed to be universally applicable, but on the particular socio-cultural and economic characteristics of the context, 2) The labour market is characterized by a shortage of trained professional, 3) pull factors for emigration (e.g. better prospects for professional development abroad) don't surpass a certain magnitude and can be compensated by creating local career opportunities.

10.4   General conclusions

This evaluation has given indication that development cooperation in the field of HE is most effective where a thoughtful and properly adapted multi-level approach to capacity development is adhered to. The authors of this report follow the assumption that the ideal form of capacity development has to be apparent on four different levels: personal development – the classical "capacity building" – organizational development, cooperation/network-development and policy development. If we differentiate these four levels in regard to activities, intended impact, interrelation in between the levels and complementary activities of other donors (as it would be ideal, if we agree with the principles of the Paris Declaration), the "ideal" program for HE-capacity-development would theoretically look like this:

	Personal development	Organisational development	Cooperation/ Network development	Policy development
Activity	Training and further education for individual stakeholders (e.g. professors, administrative staff)	Support of technical units in the university structure (e.g. University Reform units or career centers or QM-offices) or support for relevant other institutions (like accreditation agencies)	Support for twinning and other networking activities between universities or other relevant institutions	Reform or development of laws and strategies
Intended impact	Staff is capable and willing to participate and carry reform processes	Organisations are prepared and organized to carry reform processes	Networks enable to share best practices and learning environments	Laws and strategies build a constructive framework for reform
Interrelation with other dimension	Individuals are needed and have to participate in organisational development and networking	The organisational structure has to support the personal development of individuals and should play a role in networking	Networks should feed knowledge and practices into personal and organizational development, might propose best practices for policy development	Policies enable individuals and organizations to reform through an appropriate legal environment and political support
Complementarity with other donors	Donor coordination, complementary activities (e.g. secondary education in alignment with the needs of the HE-sector, HE-development in line with economic activities or VET-programs etc.), common strategy on vulnerable groups, com-			

	mon strategy for education reform, common activities for capacity building in ministries etc.		

This table shows a truly "holistic", multi-level approach to capacity-development. If we compare the experiences of the three countries under consideration with this ideal form, we can discern some of the gaps which might be necessary to fill:

	Personal development	Organisational development	Cooperation/ Network development	Policy development
Activity	Visible in all three countries	Visible in all three countries	Visible especially in Kosovo, much less in Serbia and Nicaragua	Visible especially in Kosovo, nearly not existing in Serbia and Nicaragua
Intended impact	See report	See report	See report	See report
Interrelation with other dimension	High interrelation with organisational development and cooperation development in Kosovo, much less in Serbia and only with organizational development in Nicaragua	High interrelation with personal development in Kosovo and Nicaragua, much less in Serbia	High interrelation with organisational and personal development in Kosovo, to a limited extent in Serbia, and much less in Nicaragua	Interrelation with other levels only in Kosovo
Complementarity with other donors	Low complementarity in all three countries, no coordination visible, exception: complementarity with TEMPUS-activities in Kosovo and Serbia[33]	Low complementarity in all three countries visible, exception: complementarity with TEMPUS-activities in Kosovo and Serbia	Low complementarity in all three countries visible, exception: complementarity with TEMPUS-activities in Kosovo and Serbia	Low complementarity in all three countries

The identification of these gaps will not necessarily lead to their elimination. This report has explained why especially in Serbia – because of the exit-strategy – and Nicaragua – because of a generally different focus of the activities in the HE-sector in a particular region – a truly holistic approach is either not possible anymore or will not emerge because of the circumstances. Still, as a general conclusion, it might be worthwhile pointing to the fact that aside from lack in donor-cooperation – where Austria is only one actor among many and therefore cannot be held responsible for deficiencies alone -, aspects of interrelation between the different levels of intervention and investing in a truly multi-level approach on all levels emerged as an issue for consideration (e.g. if activities like these are planned in other countries in the future).

---

[33]   This complementarity is accidental, not planned, as donor-coordination is weak.

Recommendations:

- LogFrames seem to used more as a formal requirement than an actual tool for content-oriented planning and impact-oriented monitoring. The general use of logframes as a planning tool should be revisited and clear expectations for the function and role of the instrument should be formulated. The ability to use and implement this tool properly, meeting certain standards set by ADA, should be made a requirement for tender-procedures in project-implementation. Further- more, M&E-systems should be either developed or adapted to meet the content and methodology of logframes used.

- LogFrames alone might not be sufficient to describe a development measure properly. Compared to the impact- or result-chain, some parts are missing. Therefore it is advisable to use an impact- or result-chain – like the one devel- oped by DAC (but there are other models by other donors, which could be revis- ited) – in addition to a logframe to show the intervention-logic and the impact- hypothesis of the planned activity more properly.

11. Summary of recommendations

a) Kosovo

#	For whom?	Recommendation
1	ADA Office Pristina and ADA country desk Kosovo, BMWF where applicable	In regard to a general strategy: • Continue the activities with the University of Pristina and the MEST, scrutinize the initial stages of the new University of Prizren carefully and make limited funding available for dedicated and focused engagement in specific areas where the deficits in planning from the Kosovarian side will not be a negative influence.
2	ADA Office Pristina and ADA / BmEIA country desk Kosovo	The new country-program should emphasize: • the direct link between support for the new university in Prizren and the need to focus on the needs of the labour-market as well as the inclusion of ethnic minorities, to make sure that the message is clear that these elements are of high importance for ADA. • the concept of international labour-mobility, e.g. concepts like circular labour-migration of graduates, as even in good times Kosovo will never be able to absorb all the graduates it produces. This will become an important issue once current visa-restrictions are lifted. • To make sure that the new country program has relevance for the HE-sector, current strategic papers developed by the Kosovarian partners, especially the HE-sector-strategy as well as the new Research program should be reflected upon and aspects where ADA will contribute should be highlighted accordingly. As a new education law is currently in the making, ADA should closely monitor this process and include possible changes of the law into its own strategy. • stronger coherence to EU-related funding programs, as ADA is aside from the EU the other major donor in HE, and this situation will probably not change in the future. Coordination and information-sharing should be enhanced to avoid any duplication of efforts. The complementarity of ADA-activities in relationship to EU-funding should be highlighted prominently.
3	ADA Office Pristina and ADA country desk	In regard to the new establishment of a university in Prizren and ADA's participation for this effort: • While respecting the principle of partner-orientation and ownership, the consultant suggests a very cautious and step-by-step-approach in regard to the support of the University of Prizren. Initially, the support should be on a very pragmatic and basic level, e.g. help for the administration of the new university to effectively register new students (software, training) or provision of curriculum-development support in one or two distinct programs with the highest probability of success. Any other activity has to be based on a feasibility-study, even if one might not call it that

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		way[34]. Before any major investment of funds and activities are done in Prizren, ADA will need clear information in regard to the whole internal and external factors for effective – and efficient – capacity development there. Despite all political pressure, there is not way this can be left out or disregarded. Without this important precondition for any development strategy for the new institution, the danger of failure is considerably higher than with it. • Twinning-activities with universities abroad, especially in Austria, will be of high importance for the new University of Prizren in order to achieve full accreditation and competetivity, but might actually be too early to embark upon. The new program should follow a step-by-step-approach for twinning-activities with Prizren, from the simple, problem-oriented facilitation of contact between individual professors or departments up to real twinning processes later in the development of the new institution between universities as a whole. • The new University in Prizren will need a strategy, which will include issues like the inclusion of ethnic minorities and the dedication towards the needs of the labour-market. Experiences from the strategy-process handled by KAIP should be used to support such a strategy-process in Prizren, if and insofar the new rectorate there will find this feasible. • ADA should make a clear concept for a multi-ethnic university a precondition for any wider support of the new institution. While willingness and awareness on the Kosovarian side in this regard is visible, a clear vision is lacking and only declarations of good intent are currently available. This is not sufficient. ADA can contribute to this discussion through a "feasibility"-study even after the university has started to work. • ADA should press for a clear concept for the inclusion of students with disabilities in the infrastructural plan and in any renovation undergoing. This should also be made a topic of donor-cooperation once the Kosovarian government will approach the donor-community for infrastructural funding.
4	ADA Office Pristina and ADA country desk Kosovo	In preparation of a new tender for a comprehensive program for HE-support in Kosovo, the following aspects should be considered: • Future activities now inherent in the WUS-program should, if the decision is taken that they should be continued, be implemented from within the University of Pristina. Strengthening relevant offices and institutions to provide support for the different faculties of the university also in regard to Master development is needed, especially in view of issues like sustainability. A new project implementation agency for the future should only be responsible for implementation itself where it is evident that capacity is not existing at all. • In writing the tender for the new program, ADA should refer directly to current papers on the principles of capacity development and ask bidders to explain their view on these issues with special consideration to the case of Kosovo. Without a clear view on all necessary aspects, including a clear assessment of all driving forces as well as constraints of change, it might be that an intervention is actually placed at the wrong level, without addressing the core problem. • All future bids for a tender for a comprehensive program for Kosovo should make sure that they understand the

---

[34] A feasibility study is supposed to be conducted before an activity starts. As the foundation of the university is well under way, it will not be a feasibility study in the strict sense of the term anymore.

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		current development-terminology well and are able to differentiate between the different levels of the DAC-impact-chain. The reference to this should be made explicit in the tender-text. • All future bids for a tender have to prove that they understand the relevant planning methods well and be aware of the fact that this will be scrutinized in detail by ADA. ADA should emphasize the proper use of LogFrames as a basic precondition of acceptance of any bid for any tender. • To increase sustainability, the new program should generally be more embedded in given structures of the Kosovarian government. KAIP has done a very good first step to do exactly that, the WUS-components should follow where possible. A very important precondition is the strengthening of general capacities of the Ministry of Education. Here increased donor-cooperation in that effect will be necessary; this cannot be achieved by ADA alone. • For a new program, continue those elements of both programs which have proven to be effective so far and can be used in both universities – Pristina and Prizren – without a great amount of additional administrative effort. This recommendation includes specifically the BGP, the MSDP and the CDP. It could be considered to discontinue the CDP in favor of more Master course development. BGP should be continued because of the high importance of the diaspora for HE-development in the country, exemplified by active efforts of the MEST to seek staff for the new university in Prizren among expatriate scholars. This link should be encouraged and strengthened, BGP seems to be a good tool for this goal. • Generally: Programs benefiting the universities from within should be executed by the universities or by staff employed through the program, but working within the university-structure, not outside of it. • From the KAIP, the research-grant-program should be discontinued. With the new research plan available, Kosovo will have access to EU research funding. The new program should concentrate on backstopping for effective application for EU-funding, e.g. beta-reading of applications or trainings in application and financial administration of research grants. • The cooperation with the Accreditation Agency should be reduced to a level which can best be described as "political support". It will continue to be necessary to have some leverage in the KAA, in order to protect the agency from undue political influence and therefore enable it to develop and strengthen its own "standing". This can best be done by an "Austrian umbrella", signifying the continued interest of Austrian development cooperation in the autonomy of the KAA. This will not require a lot of financial commitment. • Activities in donor-coordination and inter-ministerial coherence between Austrian ministries should continue as planned or already implemented. A new tender for a comprehensive program in Kosovo should be developed in close cooperation by both relevant ministries and the internal structure of cooperation should be well defined in order to avoid any misunderstanding. The already established concept of a steering-committee should be continued. • Donor-coordination should concentrate both on cross-cutting issues (like VET and secondary education and its linkage to the HE-sector) as well as on the university of Prizren and possible opportunities for a concerted effort there. In addition, donor-coordination might look into the question in how far other bilateral donors aside from ADA can be attracted to put some resources into the sector. This will be important if the current plans of the government to open even a second new university will actually materialize. • ADA should support the development of a strategy for the University of Pristina to include students with disabilities

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		and to develop an infrastructural development plan for upgrading facilities in that respect. ADA could support the authorities in seeking for donor-support in providing the necessary infrastructure especially for enhanced physical access. • In regard to all application processes for programs in the future – like CDP, Master development, BGP or other – questions should be added in the application forms which directly reflect the cross-cutting issues of people with disabilities and gender. As gender-guidelines for master courses already exist, ADA activities should support efforts to include the needs of people with disabilities as well. E. g. for an application for a master development, applicants should be obliged to describe the gender-situation in their department and the framework for access to education for people with disabilities. In e-learning-components, special consideration should be taken in access for students with impaired vision. • ADA should make itself familiar with current concepts on circular labour-migration, especially for highly qualified migrants, and use these concepts in order to widen the activities of their HE-program to manage the – inevitable - out-migration in a way that will both benefit the migrants as well as countries of origin and of destination. Programs of time-bound employment in Austrian companies, long-term study-visits to Austrian universities (like for Master or PhD-programs) and internship-programs like the one run by Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation in Serbia are first steps into that direction. Support for contacts with diaspora-alumni – like it is already available with the BGP – should be strengthened and widened through the establishment of communication-platforms and alumni-networks. • In order to further capacity-development in regard to labour-market-issues, possibilities to support a career-guidance-center based on the LINK-office in Pristina should be explored, including activities to strengthen the alumni-culture at the different faculties (e.g. through some conditions in that regard in the MSDP). • If possible, structures within the MEST should benefit more from capacity-development. The core issues are lack of evidence based planning tools in all departments of the Ministry and a missing link between planning in terms of content and in terms of budget. Financial officers do not understand content, content-planners do not understand the financial implications. Project-cycle-management and related tools should be introduced. Close cooperation with SIDA will be necessary as SIDA has already started such a process, although with very limited impact.

b) Serbia

#	For whom?	Recommendation
1	ADA Office Belgrade and ADA country desk Serbia	For a general exit-strategy: • Current activities will be continued for another three-year-period by WUS Austria, but with more focus and additional activities in capacity-development added. Some elements, like the support for the Accreditation Commission, might be ended. Possible extension of the ZDF-activities and/or the program of the "Österreich Institut" beyond another three-year-period should be scrutinized.
2	ADA Office Belgrade, ADA country desk Serbia	In formulation of an exit-strategy for a phasing-out-program of approximately another three years, it should be considered: • that a component should be included in the program which addresses basic administrative lacks in the implementation process of foreign funds in some universities, especially in regard to financial administration and project-management from

#	For whom?	Recommendation

		the site of the administration. The establishment or support of a project-management-unit at rectorate-level would also support the badly needed integration of Serbian universities. Here, capacities in these issues could be bundled and then made available for faculties and departments. This is necessary as an exit-strategy would result in the need for the universities to access alternative funding more aggressively. To ensure sustainability, support in this area is needed and would be adviseable. In order to implement this, a survey in regard to the administrative capabilities should be made, as the degree of quality varies from university to university.
		
		• From a practical point of view, any exit-program should be implemented by the WUS-office in Belgrade. This recommendation would look different if ADA would continue the activities in Serbia for a longer period. But in this case, any effort to include the WUS-activities within a given Serbian structure would be a big challenge, mainly because of the non-integration of universities but also because the responsibility for the sector is divided among two ministries in Serbia. No agency presents itself which could be centrally strengthened to implement activities now done by WUS, and for an exit-strategy, any lobbying into that direction will most probably yield any results.
		
		• ADA should encourage WUS to get more familiar with the proper use of planning-tools like the LogFrame and to understand the different levels of development results as described in an impact-chain better. ADA should scrutinize the LogFrame more diligently and comment on lacks and room for improvement.
		
		• The efforts in establishment of a coordination platform should be discontinued. For an exit-strategy, it is not advisable to start something really new which would need follow-up that cannot be provided.
		
		• The MSDP should be continued, but with the following reservations:
		  o Only faculties or departments which have already been supported should benefit from a second MSDP. The goal is not to spread activities, but to deepen them.
		  o Applications with a multi-disciplinary approach should be given prominent consideration. This should be part of the tender-announcement for a new program.
		  o Current plans to open the Master development for PhD-support should not be followed upon. First, a phase of another maximum of three years might be to short and the danger that PhD-students will be left in limbo is too big. Second, conditions for PhD-studies in many universities are not conducive and ADA-activities cannot solve these problems in a short time. It is better to deepen the Master development – to add diversity – than to start any activity in regard to PhD-level.
		
		• The support for the University of Novi Pazar should be continued in issues which both combine the role as a role-model of an integrated university as well as issues of labour-market and employability. In this respect, after the quality-assurance-office has been established, support should be given to the establishment of a career-service-center at the rectorate. This is totally feasible within a three-years-period.
		
		• Before any further support for the Accreditation Commission should be given, a donor-analysis has to be made in how far especially through the Tempus-program sufficient support is available. If that is the case, the support should be discontinued. If not, the recommendation is to shift support from the members of the Commission to its technical staff, as, while the members will change all four years after the mandate expires, the staff will most probably stay. Synergies with Tempus-activities should be sought, if possible.
		
		• The "Experiencing Europe"-program has both economical as well as political benefits. Despite the fact that it does not have

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		visible impact in capacity-development at this point of time, and despite the fact that ownership by the Foundation is low and will continue to be so, labour-market and employability-potential is very high. If possible, the program should be continued for another period, especially, as the German partner program will most likely do so accordingly.
		• The program of the Österreich Institut will run until 2011. Together with the ZDF-program, this activity has the highest potential to be continued after the withdrawal of ADA-support in the future, as it combines both cultural as well as developmental aspects and works relatively cost-efficient. Before any recommendation can be made, and as comparable programs on the German or Swiss side do not exist, further scrutiny about the future success of participants is necessary. Unfortunately, the project design itself does not include additional monitoring after the conclusion of the program at this point of time.
		• In line with the proposal to add a component for capacity-development in regard to project-implementation on rectorate-level in Serbian universities, funds should be made available for capacity-development of career-service-centers where they do not exist or are weak. This would both contribute to sustainability of institutions but also to a strong labour-market-focus. In the cooperation with the University of Novi Pazar, this would be a logical next step instead of venturing in uncharted areas like PhD-development or such.
		• Cross-cutting issues like gender and inclusion of people with disabilities should be included in proper form in the application-forms of all relevant activities, like e.g. the MSDP. Gender-analysis and an effort to analyse the readiness of applying departments for students with disabilities should be made obligatory in the application process.
		• For activities in regard to ethnic minorities, ADA should first confer with those other donors who specialize in these issues in the lower tiers of the education system in order to analyze in how far activities in the HE-sector are feasible. From the consultant's view, it will most probably be futile to start a new discussion in an exit-phase. This issue can predominantly be addressed through the continued support of the University of Novi-Pazar as a multi-ethnic university.
3	ADA Office Belgrade/ WUS Belgrade	In regard to donor-coordination:
		• If the MSDP will be continued, initiate regular contacts between the WUS-office in Belgrade and the Tempus-office for communication about supported Master courses and departments.
		• Propose to the Ministry of Education a special meeting on higher education with the participation of all stakeholders, including the Ministry of Science. As the news about the exit of ADA will be spread by that time, this meeting can be used to ask the other donors for their willingness or preparedness to replace ADA-activities after the end of a phasing out-program.
		• While there is serious need for political advice and lobbying for change at the ministerial level, WUS is not well placed to embark on such an activity. In addition, with no MOU in place and an exit-strategy in mind, ADA will not be able to perform this role as well. Donor-cooperation might be the only way to address some important issues, if other donors will agree to carry the torch.

c) Nicaragua

#	For whom?	Recommendation
1	ADA Office Nicaragua, ADA country desk	With regard to the future country strategy: • The impact of ADA's partners, particularly URACCAN, on at least two of the three focus areas is empirically evident and significant. Depending on the particular project design, future cooperation may be fully legitimate regarding their compliance with the focus areas and, therefore, should be continued. • In Nicaragua, HE is not a focus area of ADA. This implies that projects can only be legitimized on the Austrian side as means for capacity development to the focus areas. The future country strategy should therefore (1) define the role and the scope of HE in relation to the focus areas, (2) define a set of particular contributions expected by HE institutions, based on the past project experiences, (3) a confined set of particular measures for the institutional strengthening of HE-institutions insofar the latter still need to be "upgraded" in order to become effective partners for capacity development in the focus areas. • With regard to the integration of the HE-strategy in the future country strategy, it is also important to consider the status of HE as a non-focus area. Thus, the question is not if the HE-strategy is reflected integrally in the country strategy – but if cooperation with HE institutions is situated within the compounds of the HE strategy and does not contradict its principles. In order to avoid inconsistencies, the country strategy could name explicitly the relevant key areas of the HE strategy (e.g. specific sector focus, institutional capacity development limited to the level of individual counterpart institutions) and areas that can't be addressed in Nicaragua (e.g. institutional development and quality enhancement on a systemic level).
2	ADA Office Nicaragua, ADA country desk	With regard to the conceptualization of future HE support projects in Nicaragua: • According to the results related to the ownership and planning/monitoring capacities, URACCAN seems to be perfectly able to act as implementing agency of future projects, without further intermediation of Horizont 3000. ADA already intended to assign the project directly to URACCAN and should proceed with this decision that does not at all exclude further advice by Horizont 3000 "on-demand" by URACCAN. In the case of FADCANIC, on the other hand, a more intense back-stopping, and therefore further intermediation of Horizont 3000, should be ensured if the scholarship program should be renewed. • ADA should stipulate new efforts of donor coordination at the regional level, taking into account donors in all educational subsectors. It is probable that the responsibility for educational administration will be transferred soon from the national authorities (e.g. MINED) to the regional institutions. The time period when the so-called Regional Autonomic Subsystem for Education (SEAR) starts operating effectively should be a good window of opportunity for new initiatives of donor coordination.
3	ADA Office Nicaragua, ADA country desk, URACCAN	With specific regard to the potential continuance of the URACCAN project: • The management capacities are generally adequate, but could be raised additionally supporting strategic planning processes at the local campus level. URACCAN disposes of a strategic plan for the entire university, but due the socio-cultural peculiarities of each sub-region, complementary strategic plans of the individual campuses would add further

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		value.
		• As for URACCAN, the future focus should emphasize local development components, however, the components one and two (strengthening of academic excellence and supporting access of vulnerable groups) should be continued as well. The emphasis of teacher qualification should shift from pedagogical and didactical subjects to specialization in specific disciplines. Scholarships for vulnerable groups should continue.
		• If capacity development for ADA's focus areas is considered the main function of higher education support programs, a gradual shift should be called for by ADA with regard to the impact areas addressed by project goals: From the support of a general organizational and personnel capacity development within the university (for example: the efforts under-taken in order to improve the didactical skills of university teachers) to a more intense cooperation in areas where impacts on rural development and/or health are addressed directly.
		• As this shift has already been observable in the present project phase through the creation of the CDCs, the new project proposal for 2010 fully complies with the previous recommendation. It can be characterized, not as a higher education project with effects on local development, but as a local development project carried out by an academic institution as change agent and thus, integrated in the academic cycles of research and teaching. From the point of view of the evaluation, the results have validated the current project proposal which should be supported by ADA in its present form.
		• Although a considerable proportion of indigenous students matriculate at URACCAN, desertion is still very high compared to other groups. URACCAN should dedicate some formal research to retention and desertion factors for indigenous students and introduce affirmative action in order to assure their permanence in URACCAN.
		• As pointed out above, URACCAN is structurally reliant on external donors, a fact that has been known from the first steps of the cooperation and that can only be ameliorated gradually and in a long-term perspective. From the point of view of the evaluation, the undeniable relevance of URACCAN as a regional change agent, also in focus areas of ADA, justifies that at least a mid-term-commitment is maintained, as far as possible combined with advice on additional income-generating mechanisms and the identification of donors that potentially could "take over" in the future (i.e. donors with a more explicit focus on education and/or higher education). Of course, it would desirable that the national government would channel more significant resources through the CNU. However, as already pointed out in chapter 9, a higher share of public financing is presently not to be expected and the reach of Austrian Cooperation will probably not be sufficient for significantly influencing national budgeting for HE in the RAAN/RAAS.
4	URACCAN	• URACCAN should continue to explore systematically income-generating mechanisms to reduce the structural dependency on external resources to a moderate level. Some of these mechanisms could be the following: 1) intensify coordination with local and regional authorities in order to strengthen co-responsibility for higher education, 2) expand the range of services liable to pay costs (e.g. extra-academic course "on-demand", applied research, etc.). For reasons related to the communitarian self-concept of URACCAN, neither an increase in tuition fees nor differentiation of fees according to the socio-economic status of students are functional mechanisms for substantially generating additional income.
		• For URACCAN, the most severe bottleneck for further development is not internal institutional shortcomings but the low

#	For whom?	Recommendation
		coverage and quality of secondary education in the region. Although this topic might probably be out of the range of the Austrian contribution, URACCAN should intensify its efforts of supporting the creation of rural secondary schools and or stipulate the implementation of preparatory courses at community level.
		• ADA support for capacity development in the RAAN/RAAS has focused on higher education although professional training at intermediate educational level is as much a bottleneck as HE. Partially, this demand can and should be addressed by URACCAN. Although this recommendation probably exceeds the range of the future cooperation with ADA, URACCAN should always consider the potential needs for careers at the level of *técnico superior* when carrying out needs and labour market analysis.
5	ADA Office Nicaragua, ADA country desk, FADCANIC	With specific regard to the potential continuance of the FADCANIC project:
		• Both projects have delivered most of the aspired results and are to certain extent complementary. However, synergies could be enhanced by adapting the selection process more systematically to the focus areas and the needs of complementary projects of ADA in Nicaragua. It should be mentioned that not all interviewees agree on the pertinence of narrowing the focus of the scholarship program – the evaluation team however holds the opinion that measures of capacity development should deviate from the focus areas of ADA as little as possible.
		• The overall results of the scholarship would justify the continuance of ADA support. However, some adjustments at the operational level would be necessary in order to facilitate a smoother implementation process. Some elements that should be considered: 1) previous agreements with a selection of host universities in order to facilitate the admission processes for students, 2) obtaining previous information on the range of study modalities in order to assure adequate financial management, 3) previous calculation of country and career specific costs in order to facilitate and optimize resource allocation at the level of individual students.
6	ADA Office Nicaragua, ADA country desk,	With regard to results-oriented management:
		• From the perspective of results-oriented planning and management, ADA should invest additional efforts in the quality assurance for project proposals and the underlying logical frameworks. As not all potential project partners have the ability to elabourate adequate impact chains and indicators, ADA should provide active support at that stage of the planning phase.

d) General recommendations

#	For whom?	Recommendation
1	Relevant ADA and Ministry-departments, Partner organisations	• LogFrames seem to used more as a formal requirement than an actual tool for content-oriented planning and impact-oriented monitoring. The general use of logframes as a planning tool should be revisited and clear expectations for the function and role of the instrument should be formulated. The ability to use and implement this tool properly, meeting certain standards set by ADA, should be made a requirement for tender-procedures in project-implementation. Furthermore, M&E-systems should be either developed or adapted to meet the content and methodology of logframes used. • LogFrames alone might not be sufficient to describe a development measure properly. Compared to the impact- or result-chain, some parts are missing. Therefore it is advisable to use an impact- or result-chain – like the one developed by DAC (but there are other models by other donors, which could be revisited) – in addition to a logframe to show the intervention-logic and the impact-hypothesis of the planned activity more properly.

12.   Supporting documents

12.1   List of interviewees Kosovo

1. Alija, Avdulla (Director, MEST)
2. Aliu, Luljeta (student)
3. Aziri, Asim (ADA)
4. Beaumont, Sopie (EU-Delegation Pristina)
5. Beka, Arlinda (LINK-office)
6. Bigagli, Francesco (OSCE)
7. Buza, Shaban (Professor UP)
8. Dedaj, But (WUS)
9. Dragaj, Adnan (Advisor, MEST)
10. Ericson, Lovisa (SIDA)
11. Geosits, Christian (ADA)
12. Günther, Johann (KAIP)
13. Hoti, Veli (student)
14. Ilazi, Hasnije (Professor UP)
15. Kelmendi, Flora (Worldbank)
16. Lushaku, Jehona (KAIP)
17. Mrasori, Naser (Vice-rekcor UP)
18. Mjerky, Milaim (student)
19. Muja, Basri (KAA)
20. Nikoceviq, Elmedina (LINK-office)
21. Pupovci, Dukagjin (Director KEC)
22. Rifaj, Defrim (Director, Ministry of Labour)
23. Shtufi, Kriste (Professor UP)

12.2   List of interviewees Serbia

1. Antic, Slobodan (Vice Rector, University of Nis)
2. Bokan, Neda (Vice Rector, University of Belgrade)
3. Bugarcic, Zivadin (Pro-Rector, University of Kragujevac)
4. Bursac, Bojana (int. relations officer, University of Belgrade)
5. Cerovic, Radoslav (Assistant Minister, Ministry of Science)
6. Cirkovic-Velickovic, Tanja (Professor, University of Belgrade)
7. Dolicanin, Cemal (Rector, University of Novi Pazar)
8. Djindjic, Ruzica (Director, Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation)
9. Dukic, Sofija (Tempus-office)
10. Filipovic-Ozegovic, Marija (Tempus-office)
11. Grozdanovic, Miroljub (Rector, University of Nis)
12. Grujovic, Nenad (Professor, University of Kragujevac)
13. Guggenberger, Christian (IRDP)
14. Halilagic, Fikret (student)
15. Honic, Esma (student)

16. Jankovic, Dragan (Professor, University of Nis)
17. Jovicic, Dubravka (Dean Musical Faculty)
18. Kapper, Klaus (ADA-office)
19. Kovacevic, Branko (Rector, University of Belgrade)
20. Kovacevic-Vujcic, Vera (Commission for Accreditation)
21. Krneta, Radojka (Professor, University of Kragujevac)
22. Kurtanovic, Amina (student)
23. Lazarevic, Gordana (Ministry of Finance)
24. Lopicic, Vesna (Vice Rector, University of Nis)
25. Licina, Mirsad (student)
26. Malbasa, Veljko (Professor, University of Novi Sad)
27. Markovic, Sasa (CIM-staff, Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation)
28. Marunic, Bozidar (former BCC-participant)
29. Matijevic, Milan (prodekan, University of Kragujevac)
30. Meyer, Beatrice (Swiss Development Cooperation)
31. Minc, Branislav (pro-rector, University of Novi Pazar)
32. Mitrovic, Radivoje (State Minister, MEST)
33. Mossberg, Björn (SIDA)
34. Nedovic, Viktor (Assistant Minister, Ministry of Science)
35. Ostojic, Goran (WUS)
36. Pavlovic, Tomislav (Professor, University of Nis)
37. Pekic-Quarrie, Sofija (Professor, University of Belgrade)
38. Polak, Milan (ADA-office)
39. Ponjavic, Ivana (former BCC-participant)
40. Radomirovic, Milena (Ministry of Finance)
41. Santrac, Peter (Professor, University of Novi Sad)
42. Sekerus, Pavle (Prorector, University of Novi Sad)
43. Sijaric, Dzemil (student)
44. Stojanovic, Jelica (EU-Delegation)
45. Subotic, Milica (University of Arts, int. relations officer)
46. Turajlic, Srbijanka (CEP)
47. Wagner, Wolfgang (Austrian Embassy)
48. Wiesinger, Barbara (Österreich-Institut)

12.3   List of interviewees Nicaragua

49. Alejandro, Pio (Coordinator, Instituto de Estudios y Promoción de la Autonomía)
50. Alemán, Carlos (President of the Council of the RAAN)
51. Amador Solas, Frankling Uniel (scholarship holder FADCANIC, URACCAN – Siuna)
52. Arguello, Julio (Department for Research and Postgraduates, URACCAN – Siuna)
53. Arguello Mendieta, José Alberto (Student, URACCAN – Siuna)
54. Barrera, Innocente (CDC Leader, San Marco)
55. Beer, Gaudi (scholarship holder FADCANIC)
56. Beteta Gazmendia, William Juán (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
57. Blandón Aguilar (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
58. Blandón Hernández, Aura Teresa (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
59. Blandón Sagastume, Enia (Student, URACCAN – Siuna)

60. Castillo, Carmelo (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
61. Castillo, Jasmil (Head of Department for Livestock Breeding, URACCAN – Siuna)
62. Castillo, Leticia (Secretary for Academic Affairs, URACCAN – Siuna)
63. Castillo Tórrez, Gabriel Antonio (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
64. Chacón, Doris (scholarship holder FADCANIC)
65. Chang, Carmenza (Teacher in Livestock Breeding, URACCAN – Siuna)
66. Chavarría, Ariel (Teacher in Forest Management, URACCAN – Siuna)
67. Dávila, Jacoba (Coordinator, CEIMM)
68. Días, Mayra (Concejal, Rosita)
69. Dometz, Farand (Representative Office SEAR, Ministry of Education)
70. Donaire, Rodolfo (CDC Leader, Comenegro)
71. Flores Sosa, Eulogia (Concejal, Government of Siuna)
72. Fuertes Luagos, Hazel Anielka (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
73. Gaitan, Julian (Concejal, Government of Siuna)
74. Getino, Elena (Sector specialist for Education, European Union)
75. Giménez, Luís (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
76. González, Aura (Head of Department for Business Administration, URACCAN – Siuna)
77. González, Nidia (CDC Leader, Carao)
78. Grünberg , Gustav (Universität Wien)
79. Gutiérrez, Francisco (Coordinator of the Scholarship Program, URACCAN – Siuna)
80. Hernández, Antonio (Vice-Mayor, Government of Siuna)
81. Hernández, Karina (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
82. Hoernicke, Christina (Sektorreferentin, ADA)
83. Hooker, Alta (Dean, URACCAN)
84. Hooker, Ray (President, FADCANIC)
85. Hooker, Victor (Local Government RAAN – President of the Education Commission)
86. Ibarra, Arturo (Mayor of Rosita)
87. Ibarra Ramirez, Yarilka (Student, URACCAN – Siuna)
88. Jarquín, Iván (Coordinator, IREMADES)
89. Knight, Centuriano (Local Government RAAN – President of the Health Commission)
90. Kroll, Doris (Director, Horizont 3000)
91. Lee, Bismarck (Vice Rector, URACCAN – Siuna)
92. Loáisiga Aguinaga, Ulises José (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
93. López García, Juán Alberto (Student, URACCAN – Siuna)
94. Marchena, Carolina (Teacher in Local Development, URACCAN – Siuna)
95. Mena, Lilieth (scholarship holder FADCANIC)
96. Miranda, Melvin (Local Government RAAN – Secretary for Natural Resources)
97. Neuwirth, Hubert (Leiter, Kobü-Managua)
98. Ochoa, Aleyda (CDC Leader, Comenegro)
99. Olivas, Margarita (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
100.   Oporta, Lucelia Miranda, (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
101.   Ordoñez, Ronald (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
102.   Orozco (Concejal, Rosita)
103.   Palacios Alaniz, Eli Magdiel (Student, URACCAN – Siuna)
104.   Pérez, Germán (CDC Leader, Carao)

105.   Pérez Castillo, Aracely (Student, URACCAN – Siuna)
106.   Ríos, María Antonia (Concejal, Rosita)
107.   Rivas, Francisco (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
108.   Rivera, Aurora (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
109.   Rivera, Mercedes (CDC Leader, San Marco)
110.   Rocha, Nubia (Sector Expert for Education, Horizont 3000)
111.   Rodríguez, Jacoba Estela (Library)
112.   Romero, Reyna Ordoñez, Ronald (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
113.   Rossmann, Tania (scholarship holder FADCANIC)
114.   Rufus, Eulogio Pedro (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
115.   Ruíz, Ariel (scholarship holder, URACCAN – Siuna)
116.   Ruíz, Leonor (Head of Department for Local Development, URACCAN – Siuna)
117.   Ruíz, Sergio (Coordinator for External Cooperation, UURACCAN – Siuna)
118.   Saavedra Polanco, Ariel (Student, URACCAN – Siuna)
119.   Sinclair, Albert (Vicerector, URACCAN – Bilwi)
120.   Smith, Yamileth (CDC Leader, Wasakin)
121.   Talavera, Telemaco (President, National University Council)
122.   Taylor, Arnulfo (CDC Leader, Wasakin)
123.   Tinoco, Mercedes (scholarship holder FADCANIC)
124.   Trujillo, Didian (Community Leader, Las Breñas)
125.   Tunnermann, Carlos (Sector Expert for Education, Ex-Minister for Education)
126.   Valdivia, Verónica (Coordinator, URACCAN Extension in Rosita)
127.   Vanegas, Humberto (scholarship holder FADCANIC)
128.   Vijil, Josefina (Director, Centro de Investigación y Accion Educativa Social - CIASES)
129.   Waldan, Barnabás (Local Government RAAN – Secretary for Education)
130.   Watler, William (scholarship holder FADCANIC)
131.   Zuñiga, Victor (Office for External Cooperation, URACCAN – Siuna)

12.4   Schedule of field-trip Kosovo

Date	Time	Location	Activity	Counterpart
Sat - 06 March				
Arrival in Pristina				
Sat - 06 March				
13:00-17:00 Briefing with local consultant, study of documents				
Mon - 08 March				
	09:00 – 10:30	Kobü Prishtina	Briefing	Kobü Leiter, Christian Geosits
	10:30 – 11:30	WUS Austria office	Meeting, Project activity briefing	But Dedaj, Regional Manager
	14:00-15:00	LINK-office, University of Belgrade	Meeting	N.N.
	16:00 – 17:00	European Commission building	Meeting	Sophie Beaumont, Task Manager / Social Dev.

Tue - 09 March				
	09:00 – 10:00	University Prishtina Rectorate building	Meeting	Naser Mrasori, Vice Rector for International Relations
	10:30 – 11:30	University Prishtina Rectorate building Cancelled because of students demonstration	Meeting	Dr.Bajram Berisha, Vice Rector for Education
	13:00 – 14:30	KEC, Kosova Education Centre	Meeting	Dukagjin Pupovci, Director
	15:00 – 16:30	MEST, Minister's cabinet	Meeting	Adnan Dragaj, Advisor to Minister, HE, Prizren Univ.

Wed - 10 March				
	9:00 – 10:00	SIDA (Swedish Embassy, St. Perandori Justinian 19 (Pejton)	Meeting	Lovisa Ericson Education Programme Officer
	11:00-12:00	World Bank, St. Mujo Ulqinaku 3	Meeting	Flora Kelmendi, Operations Officer
	13:00 – 14:00	OSCE building	Meeting	Francesco Bigagli, Ph.D. Chief, HE section
	15:00-16:00	CITT (MEST building) Cancelled because of earthquake	Meeting	Naim Hasani, Head of CITT
	16:00-18:00	KAIP Project (Student mensa building, UP)	Meeting, Project activity briefing	Dr. Johann Günther, Project Manager

Thu – 11 March				
	9:00 – 10:00	UP Professors, beneficiaries form BGP and CDP program;	Organized by WUS Austria (follow up for details with WUS)	See list of interviewees
	10:00 – 12:00	UP Students	Organized by WUS Austria (follow up for details with WUS)	See list of interviewees
	14:00 – 15:00	Ministry of labour and social welfare; Department of labour and employment	Meeting,	Defrim Rifaj, Director
	15:30 – 16:30	KAA-Kosovo Accreditation Agency, UP student mensa building	Meeting	Mr. Basri Muja, Head of KAA

Fri - 12 March				
	09:00 10:30	ADA office Prishtina	De-briefing	Christian Geosits Arsim Aziri
	13:00-14:00	MEST, HE Directorate	Meeting	Dr. Avdulla Alija, Director
	14:30 – 16:30	KAA-Kosovo Accreditation Agency, UP student mensa building	Meeting	Mr. Basri Muja, Head of KAA
Sa – 13 March				
Report writing				
So – 14 March				
Departure				

12.5 Schedule of field-trip Serbia

So – 14 March				
Arrival in Belgrade 13:00-15:00 Briefing with local consultant				

Mo - 15 March				
	09:00 – 10:30	Kobü Belgrade	Meeting	Klaus Kapper
	11:00- 12:00	University of Belgrade, Rectorate	Meeting	Mr. Branko Kovacevic, rec- tor
	12:30- 13:30	University of Belgrade	Meeting	Bojana Bursac, int. relations officer
	19:30	Restaurant Madera	Dinner	Representatives from Slo- vakaid, GTZ, SIDA, Czech embassy, Kobü Belgrade

Tue - 16 March				
	11:45- 12:45	Ministry for Education	Meeting	Radivoje Mitrovic, State Minister
	13:00- 14:00	Swiss Development Cooperation	Meeting	Beatrice Meyer, director
	14:30- 15:30	University of Belgrade	Meeting	Tanja Cirkovic-Velickovic, professor
	16:00- 17:00	University of Arts, Belgrade	Meeting	Dubravka Jovicic, Milica Subotic, dean and int. relat. Officer.

Wed - 17 March				
	9:00- 10:00	Ministry of Finance	Meeting	Gordana Lazarevic, Milena Radomirovic
	10:30- 12:00	WUS Belgrade	Meeting	Goran Ostojic, director
	12:00- 16:00	WUS Belgrade	Document study	
	16:00- 17:00	University of Belgrade	Meeting	Sofija Pekic Quarrie, profes- sor

Thu - 18 March				
	7:30	Trip to Novi Sad		
	9:00- 10:00	University of Novi Sad	Meeting	Petar Santrac, professor
	10:15- 11:15	University of Novi Sad	Meeting	Pavle Sekerus, prorector
	11:30- 12:30	University of Novi Sad	Meeting	Veljko Malbasa, professor
	14:00- 15:00	Hotel Aleksandar	Meeting	Christian Guggenberger, consultant, IRDP

Fri - 19 March				
	9:00- 10:00	Austrian Embassy	Meeting	Wolfgang Wagner, vice- ambassador
	10:30- 11:30	CEP	Meeting	Srbijanka Turajlic, director
	12:00- 13:00	Accrediation Commission	Meeting	Vera Kovacevic-Vujcic, head
	13:30- 14:30	Tempus-office	Meeting	Marija Filipovic-Ozegovic, Sofija Dukic

	15:00-16:00	EU-Delegation	Meeting	Jelica Stojanovic, project manager
	16:30-17:30	KoBü Belgrade	De-briefing	Klaus Kapper

Sa - 20 March

Report writing

So - 21 March

Report writing, trip to Novi Pazar

Mo - 22 March

	9:00-10:00	University of Novi Pazar	Meeting	Cemal Dolicanin, rector Branislav Miric, prorector
	10:00-11:00	University of Novi Pazar	Meeting	Students
	11:30-12:30	Lunch		Cemal Dolicanin
	12:30	Departure to Kragujevac		
	14:30-15:30	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Zivadin Bugarcic, pro-rector
	15:30-16:30	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Radojka Krneta, professor
	16:30-17:30	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Milan Matijevic, prodean Miladin Stefanovic, professor

Tue - 23 March

	9:00-10:00	University of Kragujevac	Meeting	Nenad Grujovic, professor
	10:00	Departure to Nis		
	13:00-14:00	University of Nis	Meeting	Tomislav Pavlovic, professor
	14:00-15:00	University of Nis	Meeting	Miroljub Grozdanovic, rector
	15:00-16:00	University of Nis	Meeting	Dragan Janovic, professor
	16:00	Departure to Belgrade		

Wed - 23 March

	9:00-10:00	Ministry of Science	Meeting	Viktor Nedovic, assistant minister Radoslav Cerovic, assistant minister
	11:30-12:30	Österreich Institut	Meeting	Barbara Wiesinger, director
	14:30-15:30	Zoran-Djindjic-Foundation	Meeting	Ruzica Djindjic, director Sasa Markovic, CIM staff
	17:15-18:15	Hotel Majestic	Meeting	Former participants BCC

Thu - 24 March

	9.00-10.00	University of Belgrade Career Service	Meeting	Dejana Lazic, head of office
	10.30	Departure		

Cancellation Serbia: 16.03.2010, 10:30 – 11:30: Mrs. Ivana ALEKSIĆ, World Bank, due to illness

12.6   Schedule of field-trip Nicaragua

Date	Time	Activity	Counterparts	Location
Sun 04 April				
Arrival in Managua 14:00-18:00 Briefing with local consultant, study of documents				
Mon - 05 April				
	09:00 – 11:30	Briefing and Inter-view	• Hubert Neuwirth (Kobü Leiter) • Christina Hoernicke (Sektorreferen-tin)	Kobü Managua
	14:00 – 16:00	Interview	• Alta Hooker (Dean) • Bismarck Lee (Vice Rector, Recinto Las Minas)	URACCAN, Office Ma-nagua
	16:00-18:00	Planning of field visits	• Evaluation team only	Hotel Los Robles
Tue - 06 April				
	10:00 – 12:00	Interview	• Josefina Vijil (Director CIASES, Sector Expert)	CIASES
	13:00	Interview	• Telemaco Talavera, President Na-tional University Council	CNU → Cancelled because of travel abroad, repro-grammed for Jue 15
	16:00 – 18:00	Interview	• Gustav Grünberg (Universität Wien)	Kobü Managua
Wed - 07 April				
	7:00 – 10:00	Travel a Siuna		---
	11:00-12:30	Interview with Co-ordinator of Re-search Centers	• Jacoby Dávila (Coordinator CEIMM) • Pio Alejandro (Coordinator IEPA) • Iván Jarquín (Coodrinator IREMADES)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	13.30 – 14:30	Focus Group with University Teach-ers (participants of the M.A.in Aca-demic Teaching)	• Ariel Chavarría (Forest Manage-ment) • Carmenza Chang (Livestock Breed-ing) • Carolina Marchena (Local Devel-opment) • Et al.	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	14:30-15:30	Interview with Heads of Depart-ments	• Julia Arguello (Research and Post-graduates) • Jasmil Castillo (Livestock Breeding) • Aura Gónzalez (Business Admini-stration) • Leonor Ruíz (Local Development)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	15:30-16:30	Focus Group with Students	• See list of interviewees	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	16:30-17:30	Interview	• Leticia Castillo (Secretary for Aca-demic Affairs)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	17:30-18:30	Revision of the pro-gram and briefing for the following day	• Bismarck Lee (Vice Rector) • Sergio Ruíz (Coordinator for Exter-nal Cooperation) • Victor Zuñiga (Office for External Cooperation)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas

Thu – 08 April

	9:00 – 10:30	Focus Group with Scholarship Holders	• See list of interviewees	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	10:30 – 11:30	Interview	• Francisco Gutiérrez (Coordinator of Scholarship Programs)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	11:30 – 12:30	Meeting with Local Government of Siuna	• Antonio Hernández (Vice-Mayor of Siuna) • Julian Gaitan (Concejal) • Eulogia Flores Sosa (Concejal)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	13:30 – 15:00	Focus Group with Leaders of Extension Centers (CDC)	• See list of interviewees	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	15:00 – 16:30	Interview	• Jacoba Estela Rodríguez (Library)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas
	16:30 – 17:00	Revision of the program and briefing for the following day	• Bismarck Lee (Vice Rector) • Sergio Ruíz (Coordinator for External Cooperation) • Victor Zuñiga (Office for External Cooperation)	URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas

Fri - 09 April

	08:00 11:00	Travel to URACCAN-Extension in Rosita	---	---
	11:00-12:00	Interview	• Verónica Valdivia (Coordinator of URACCAN Extension Rosita)	URACCAN Extension Rosita
	13:30 – 14.30	Interview	• Arturo Ibarra (Mayor of Rosita)	City Hall Rosita
	14:30 – 16:00	Interview	• María Antonia Ríos (Concejal, Rosita) • Geraldina Orozco (Concejal, Rosita) • Mayra Días (Concejal, Rosita)	City Hall Rosita
	16:00 – 18:00	Interview	• Bismarck Lee (Vice Rector) • Sergio Ruíz (Coordinator for External Cooperation) • Victor Zuñiga (Office for External Cooperation)	Hotel Tercio Pelo, Rosita

Sa – 09 April

	08:00 – 10:00	Travel to Las Breñas	---	---
	10:00 – 12:00	Focus Group with Community Leaders	• See list of interviewees	Las Breñas
	13:00 – 19:00	Travel to Bilwi (Puerto Cabezas)	---	---

So – 10 April

Data analysis and team discussion of first conclusions / lessons learnt / recommendations

Mo - 11 April

	08:00 – 19:30	Interview	• Albert Sinclair, Vice Rector URACCAN Bilwi	URACCAN Bilwi
	09:30 – 10:30	Interview	• Tania Rossmann, participant of the scholarship program of FADCANIC	URACCAN Bilwi
	10:30-	Interview	• Centuriano Knight, Local Govern-	Office of the Health

	12:00		ment RAAN – President of the Health Commission	Commission RAAN
	13:00-14:00	Interview	• Melvin Miranda, Local Government RAAN – Secretary for Natural Resources	Office of the Secretary for Natural Resources RAAN
	14:00-15:00	Interview	• Barnabás Waldan, Local Government RAAN – Secretary for Education • Victor Hooker, Local Government RAAN – President of the Education Commission	Office of the Secretary for Education RAAN
	15:30 – 17:00	Focus Group with participants of the scholarship program of FADCANIC	• Gaudi Beer • Humberto Vanegas • William Watler	FADCANIC

Tue - 12 April

	08:00 – 10:00	Focus Group with participants of the scholarship program of FADCANIC	• Lilieth Mena • Doris Chacón • Mercedes Tinoco	FADCANIC
	12:00	Travel from Puerto Cabezas to Managua	---	---
	17:00-19:00	Interview	• Carlos Alemán, President of the Council of RAAN	URACCAN Managua

Wed - 13 April

	08:00-09:00	Interview	• Doris Kroll, Director Horizont 3000	Horizont 3000, Regional Office
	09:00-10:30	Interview	• Nubia Rocha, Sector Expert for Education of Horizont 3000	Horizont 3000, Regional Office
	11:00-13:00	Interview	• Ray Hooker, President FADCANIC	FADCANIC
	14:00-15:00	Interview	• Farand Dometz, Ministry of Education – Office SEAR	MINED
	16:00 – 17:00	Interview	• Telemaco Talavera, President National University Council	CNU

Thu - 15 April

	11:00-12:30	Interview	• Carlos Tunnermann, Sector Expert for Education, Ex-Minister for Education	Domicile of the Interviewee
	15:00-16:30	Interview	• Elena Getino, Section for Human and Social Development, Delegation of the European Union	Delegation of the European Union
		Preparation of the De-Briefing	---	---

Fri - 16 April

| | 10:30-13:00 | Kobü Managua | • De-Briefing with personnel of ADA, Horizont 3000, URACCAN (see list of interviewees) | Kobü Managua |
| | 15:00-16:00 | Interview | • ADA, Sektorreferent MSME-Development | Kobü Managua |

Sat - 17 April				
	06:00	Departure to Germany via Mexico		

Sat - 17 April to Fri – 23 April		
	Prolonged stay in Mexico-City due to the shut-down of European airports (Report Writing)	
	Flight to Germany on Fri – 23 April, 20:55 (Arrival: Frankfurt am Main 14:40, Wittlich 19:30)	

12.7   List of documents and publications Kosovo

General Documents

ADA: Leitfaden für Projekt- und Programmevaluierungen, Wien 2008

ADA: Higher Education and Scientific Cooperation. Strategy. Wien 2009.

ADA: Umsetzungsmatrix zur Hochschulstrategie 2009

ADA: Formatvorlage Country strategies (02b Formatvorlage Länderstrategie 20090116.doc)

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Glossar. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Armutsminderung. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Bildung. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Gender-sensitive Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Kapazitätsentwicklung. Wien o. J.

ADA: Allgemeininformation zur Österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (OEZA) bzw. Austrian Development Agency (ADA), Power Point Presentation, Wien o. J.

ADA: Allgemeininformation zum OEZA Bildungssektor. Power Point Presentation, Wien o. J.

ADA: Ausschreibungsunterlage (Aufforderung zur Angebotsabgabe) für das Verhandlungsverfahren nach dem Bundesvergabegesetz 2006 zum OEZA-Projekt „Evaluierung Hochschulbildung in Nicaragua und Südosteuropa 2005-2009". Wien 2009.

ÖSB Consulting/ L&R Sozialforschung: Bildungssektorevaluierung 2007 (inkl. Länderberichte)

Kosovo specific

Short project descriptions and short internal comments are not documented here.

ADA: Strategie Hochschulbildung, Wien 2009

ADA/Government of Kosovo: Strategy University Prishtina 2009-2013, Prishtina 2009

ADA: Projektdokumentation Bosnien und Montenegro (inkl. Evaluierung)

Bekan, Noda: CAREER CENTER AS A BRIDGE BETWEEN UNIVERSITY AND LABOR MARKET, Pristina o. J.

BIRN: SITUATION AND PROBLEMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PRISHTINA, Prishtina 2009

Department for Labour and Employment: Employment Promotion. Performance Report 2008/2009, 06/2008-06/2009, Pristina 2009

KAIP: Multidimensional Project for the Implementation of an Institutionalised Partnership between Austria and Kosova in the Field of Higher Education, Research and Innovation, Activitiy Report, Prishtina 2007

KAIP: Multidimensional Project for the Implementation of an Institutionalised Partnership between Austria and Kosova in the Field of Higher Education, Research and Innovation, Activitiy Report, Prishtina 2008

KAIP: Multidimensional Project for the Implementation of an Institutionalised Partnership between Austria and Kosova in the Field of Higher Education, Research and Innovation, Midterm-Report Oct 2008-April 2009, Prishtina 2009

KAIP: Multidimensional Project for the Implementation of an Institutionalised Partnership between Austria and Kosova in the Field of Higher Education, Research and Innovation, Midterm-Report May-Oct 2009, Prishtina 2009

KEK/CDC: Country Programme Evaluation 2006-2008, Zurich 2008

KEK/CDC/nadel: Interim Evaluation of the "Multidimensional Project for the Implementation of an Institutionalised Partnership between Austria and Kosova in the Field of Higher Education, Research and Innovation" (KAIP). Minutes of the lessons learnt workshop in Vienna 17.11.2009

Ministry of Education, Science and Technology: STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN KOSOVA (2005-2015), Prishtina 2004

ÖSB/LR: Evaluation of the Education Sector of Austrian Development Cooperation and Co-operation with South-East Europe, Wien 2007

OSZE: A Study on the Implementation of the Bologna Process at the University of Prishtinë/Priština, Prishtina 2009

o. V.: Multidimensional Project for the Implementation of an Institutionalised Partnership between Austria and Kosova in the Field of Higher Education, Research and Innovation, o. O. 2006

UNMIK: A Strategy for Education for Rural People in Kosovo (2004 – 2009), Prishtina o.J.

SIPU: Joint Education Sector Consultancy Feasibility Study for Sector Wide Approach in Kosovo - Inception Report, Prishtina 2008

SIPU: ASSESSMENT OF THE SECTOR STRATEGIES, Prishtina 2008

SIPU: KOSOVO ROADMAP FOR IMPROVED EDUCATION SECTOR PERFORMANCE AND AID EFFECTIVENESS, Prishtina 2008

SIPU: Capacity Development & Education Reform Programme (CBERP) in Kosovo 2009-2010, Inception Report, Prishtina 2009

United Nations Kosovo Team: STRENGTHENING THE HUMAN CAPITAL OF KOSOVO AVENUE TO ACCELERATED HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, Paper, Prishtina 2008

WIIW: Positionierung der österreichischen bilateralen Ostzusammenarbeit 2008-2015, Wien 2007

WUS: "Building Quality, Knowledge and Skills for Social and Economic Development - Support to Reforms of Higher Education in Kosovo 2008-2011, Project Proposal, Graz 2007

12.8   List of documents and publications Serbia

General Documents

ADA: Leitfaden für Projekt- und Programmevaluierungen, Wien 2008

ADA: Higher Education and Scientific Cooperation. Strategy. Wien 2009.

ADA: Umsetzungsmatrix zur Hochschulstrategie 2009

ADA: Formatvorlage Country strategies (02b Formatvorlage Länderstrategie 20090116.doc)

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Glossar. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Armutsminderung. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Bildung. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Gender-sensitive Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Wien o. J.

ADA: OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Kapazitätsentwicklung. Wien o. J.

ADA: Allgemeininformation zur Österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (OEZA) bzw. Austrian Development Agency (ADA), Power Point Presentation, Wien o. J.

ADA: Allgemeininformation zum OEZA Bildungssektor. Power Point Presentation, Wien o. J.

ADA: Ausschreibungsunterlage (Aufforderung zur Angebotsabgabe) für das Verhandlungsverfahren nach dem Bundesvergabegesetz 2006 zum OEZA-Projekt „Evaluierung Hochschulbildung in Nicaragua und Südosteuropa 2005-2009". Wien 2009.

ÖSB Consulting/ L&R Sozialforschung: Bildungssektorevaluierung 2007 (inkl. Länderberichte)

Serbia specific

Short project descriptions and short internal comments are not documented here.

ADA: Serbia Country Programme 2006-2008, Vienna 2006

ADA: Länderinformation Serbien, Wien 2008

ADA: Strategie Hochschulbildung, Wien 2009

ADA Kooperationsbüro Belgrad: Quartalsberichte 4/2008, 1-4/2009, Belgrad 2009/2010

ADA: Projektdokumentation Bosnien und Montenegro (inkl. Evaluierung)

KEK/CDC: Country Programme Evaluation 2006-2008, Zurich 2008

Ministry of Science and Technological Development: STRATEGY of Scientific and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2015

Österreich-Institut: LEISTUNGSBESCHREIBUNG / PROJEKTDOKUMENT

zu EZA-Vertrag, o. O., o. J.

Verhandlungssicheres Deutsch für Studierende der Ökonomischen Fakultät der Universität

Belgrad

Österreich-Institut: "Verhandlungssicheres Deutsch", Zwischenbericht, Wien 2009

ÖSB/LR: Evaluation of the Education Sector of Austrian Development Cooperation and Co-
operation with South-East Europe, Wien 2007

WIIW: Positionierung der österreichischen bilateralen Ostzusammenarbeit 2008-2015, Wien
2007

WUS: Support to the Higher Education in Serbia and Montenegro. Project proposal 2005 –
2007, Graz 2005

WUS: Experiencing Europe: Serbian Young Professionals in Austria – The Zoran Djindjic
Internship Programme, Application, Graz 2007

WUS: Experiencing Europe 2008-2011, Application, Belgrade 2005

WUS: Experiencing Europe 2008-2011, Zwischenbericht, Graz 2008

WUS: Support to universities in Serbia and Montenegro 2005-2007, mid-term-report, Graz
2006

WUS: Support to universities in Serbia and Montenegro 2005-2007, final report, Graz 2008

12.9   List of documents and publications Nicaragua

General Documents

ADA (2008a): Leitfaden für Projekt- und Programmevaluierungen, Wien 2008

ADA (2009a): Higher Education and Scientific Cooperation. Strategy. Wien: ADA.

ADA (2009b): Umsetzungsmatrix zur Hochschulstrategie. Wien: ADA.

ADA (2009c): Formatvorlage country strategies. Wien: ADA.

ADA (2009d): Ausschreibungsunterlage (Aufforderung zur Angebotsabgabe) für das Ver-
handlungsverfahren nach dem Bundesvergabegesetz 2006 zum OEZA-Projekt „Evaluie-
rung Hochschulbildung in Nicaragua und Südosteuropa 2005-2009". Wien: ADA.

ÖSB Consulting/ L&R Sozialforschung (2007): Bildungssektorevaluierung 2007 (inkl. Län-
derberichte)

ADA (o.J.): OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Glossar. Wien.

ADA (o.J.): OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Armutsminderung. Wien.

ADA (o.J.): OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Bildung. Wien.

ADA (o.J.): OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Gender-sensitive Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Wien.

ADA (o.J.): OEZA – Qualitätskriterien Kapazitätsentwicklung. Wien.

ADA (o.J.): Allgemeininformation zur Österreichischen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (OEZA)
bzw. Austrian Development Agency (ADA), Power Point Presentation, Wien.

ADA (o.J.): Allgemeininformation zum OEZA Bildungssektor. Power Point Presentation, Wien.

Nicaragua specific

Short project descriptions and short internal comments are not documented here.

ADA (2002): Programa de País para Nicaragua 2003-2006. Wien: ADA.

ADA (2005a): Projektdokument zu EZA-Vertrag 2327-00/2006. MIRIAM Frauenförderungs-programm in Guatemala und Nicaragua. Managua.

ADA (2005b): Projektdokument zu EZA-Vertrag 1495-00/05. Süd-Süd-Stipendienprogramm für AkademikerInnen der Karibikregionen Nicaraguas (2005-2008). Managua 2005.

ADA (2006a): Regionalprogramm Zentralamerika. Analyse/Themenbeitrag zum Thema Bildung und Kapazitätsaufbau. Wien: ADA.

ADA (2006b): Zentralamerika. Entwicklung und Zusammenarbeit – Beiträge und Perspektiven. Wien: ADA.

ADA (2007a): Projektdokument zu EZA-Vertrag 1778-01/2007. Die Universität der Karibikregionen, URACCAN Siuna. Stärkung des kommunalen, interkulturellen Universitätsmodells. Managua.

ADA (2007b): Projektdokument zu EZA-Vertrag 2532-00/2007. Kapazitätenaufbau in marginalisierten Gebieten: Campus Virtual Centroamericano. Managua.

ADA (2008b): Regionalstrategie Zentralamerika 2008-2013. Wien.

ADA (2009e): Länderinformationen Nicaragua. Wien: ADA.

ADA (2009f): Kurzbericht Dienstreise Nicaragua, FGF Mag. Brigitte Öppinger-Walchshofer u. HAL PP Mag. Robert Zeiner, 16. bis 25. März 2009. Wien.

ADA (2010): Programa Austríaco de Cooperación en Educación Superior e Investigación para el Desarrollo 2010-2014. Wien.

ADA (o.J.): Kurzinformationen zu allen derzeit laufenden österreichischen Entwicklungsprojekten in Nicaragua. Managua, Stand Anfang 2010.

Castillo Gómez, Leticia/Lee León, Bismarck/Benito Jarquín, Roger (Castillo et al. 2009): Seguimiento a profesionales graduados de la URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas, generación 2001-2006. In: Ciencia e Interculturalidad No. 1, Junio 2009.

Consejo de Desarrollo de la Costa Caribe (CDCC 2008): Estrategia de Desarrollo de la Costa Caribe. Puerto Cabezas.

Del Cid Lucero, Victor Manuel (2005): Ten Years of Cooperatoin of SAIH – for the Improvement of Teacher and Academic Quality on the Caribbean Coast of Nicaragua. Managua.

Gobierno de Reconcialiación y Unidad Nacional (PNDH 2008): Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Humano 2008-2012. Managua.

Horizont 3000 (2008): Estrategia de Trabajo de Horizont 3000 en el Sector Educación, Nicaragua. Managua 2008.

Horizont 3000 (2009a): Informe de avance del programa de becas de posgrado de profesionales de la Costa Caribe de Nicaragua, al 31 de diciembre de 2008. Managua.

Horizont 3000 (2009b): Informe de avance del proyecto Fortalecimiento del modelo de universidad comunitaria e intercultural, URACCAN Siuna, al 31 de diciembre de 2008. Managua.

Horizont 3000 (2009c): Informe de avance del proyecto Fortalecimiento del modelo de universidad comunitaria e intercultural, URACCAN Recinto Las Minas 2007-2010, al 30 de junio de 2009. Managua.

Horizont 3000 (2009d): Jahresbericht 2008. Wien.

Horizont 3000 (2009e): Länderstrategie Nicaragua 2008-2010. Wien.

Horizont 3000 (2010): Informe de avance del programa de becas de posgrado de profesionales de la Costa Caribe de Nicaragua, al 31 de diciembre de 2009. Managua.

Koordinationsbüro für Entwicklungszusammenarbeit der Österreichischen Botschaft Mexiko in Managua: Quartalsberichte 2008 und 2009.

Kroll, Doris; Vogel, Thomas 2007): Apoyo al fortalecimiento institucional de la universidad de las Regiones Autónomas de la Costa Caribe de Nicaragua. Managua.

L&R Sozialforschung/inbas (2005): Evaluation of the role of NGOs as partners of the Austrian Development Cooperation in Nicaragua and of their contribution to the eradication of poverty, Vienna.

Ministerio de Educación (MINED 2010): Estrategia Educativa 2010-2015. Managua: MINED.

Ruíz Calderón, Leonor (2009): Deserción en la educación superior, Recinto Las Minas, período 2001-2007. In: Ciencia e Interculturalidad No. 1, Junio 2009.

Tünnermann, Carlos/Yarzábal, Luís (2002): Tendencias y Potencialidades del Desarrollo de la Educación Superior en Nicaragua. Managua: Asdi.

Delegation of the European Union in Nicaragua (UE 2010): El Sector de Educación (Presentation at the Donor Round Table for the Educational Sector). Managua, April 2010.

URACCAN (2004): Informe final de autoevaluación institucional 2004. Nueva Guinea/Bluefields/Siuna/Bilwi.

URACCAN (2008a): Plan Estratégico Institucionnal 2008 – 2012.

URACCAN: Informes academicos cuatrimestrales de URACCAN, Recinto Las Minas, de 1er cuatrimestre 2008 al 1er cuatrimestre 2010.

URACCAN (2008): Informe de Gestión Anual Institucional 2007. Managua.

URACCAN (2009): Informe de Gestión Institucional 2008. Managua.

URACCAN (2010a): Documento de Proyecto – Desarrollo de capacidades técnicas y humanas para la implementación del Plan de Desarrollo Regional con Identidad en el Sector de Las Minas. Siuna 2010.

URACCAN (2010b): Informe Académico 2009, Recinto Las Minas. Siuna.

Vijil, Josefina et al. (2007): Contribución de la Cooperación Austriaca al Fortalecimiento de URACCAN – Las Minas. Evaluación realizada en febrero – marzo 2007. Managua.

Zambrano, Margarita (2010): External Evaluation CEIMM – Cooperation Report 2003-2010. Managua.

12.10 Terms of Reference

1. Hintergrund

Ziel dieser Evaluierung ist eine Analyse der Maßnahmen im Hochschulsektor in den Schwerpunktländern der OEZA. Mit rund der Hälfte des Bildungsbudgets der OEZA ist der Hochschulbereich wesentlichster Subsektor im Bildungsbereich. Hochschulbildung ist sowohl in den Ländern Südosteuropas (SOE) als auch in Nicaragua Schwerpunkt. 47 Prozent (= € 5,5 Mio) der Neuverträge 2007 im Hochschulbereich zielten auf die Unterstützung des Schwerpunktsektors in Südosteuropa (Bosnien und Herzegowina, Kosovo, Montenegro und Serbien) und Zentralamerika (Nicaragua) ab. Gleichzeitig ist das österreichische Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung (BMWF) im Zuge der Südosteuropa-Initiative in Albanien, BiH, Kosovo, Kroatien, Mazedonien, Montenegro und Serbien tätig.

Der Fokus der OEZA in SOE liegt auf arbeitsmarktorientierter Hochschulbildung und Verbesserung der Beschäftigungsfähigkeit sowie der Integration in den Europäischen Hochschul- und Forschungsraum. In Nicaragua wurden bisher Bildungsprojekte in der Autonomen Atlantikregion (RAAN und RAAS) zur Stärkung der Minoritäten gefördert. Allerdings hat der Bildungssektor in Nicaragua im Rahmen der angestrebten Fokussierung auf weniger Sektoren Programmpriorität in Form von Kapazitätsentwicklung im Dreijahresprogramm 2008-11.

In beiden Regionen wird in erster Linie auf Maßnahmen zur institutionellen Weiterentwicklung der Hochschulstrukturen gesetzt. Fokus liegt auf der Verbesserung von Lehre und Management auf Ebene der Universitäten und Ministerien. Aktivitäten liegen im Bereich des strukturellen Aufbaus sowie der Lehrplanentwicklung, Qualitätssicherung, Stärkung der Managementstrukturen.

Anfang 2007 wurde eine Evaluierung für den OEZA-gesamten Bildungssektor[1] abgeschlossen. Darin wurden sowohl Maßnahmen in ausgewählten Ländern, als auch Stipendienprogramme in Österreich evaluiert. Auf Basis der Empfehlungen der Bildungssektorevaluierung wurde die *Strategie Hochschulbildung und Wissenschaftskooperation* als direktes Umsetzungsinstrument der OEZA erarbeitet und Anfang 2009 fertig gestellt. Diese Rückschau auf bisherige Interventionen in den Schwerpunktländern soll einen Beitrag zur verbesserten Umsetzung der *Strategie Hochschulbildung und Wissenschaftskooperation* insbesondere im Kosovo und Nicaragua leisten.

2. Gegenstand und Zweck

Gegenstand der Evaluierung sind die Maßnahmen zur Unterstützung des Hochschulsektors in den OEZA Schwerpunktländern (Bosnien und Herzegowina, Kosovo, Montenegro, Nicaragua und Serbien) von 2005-2009. Insbesondere sollen auch die Länder Kosovo und Nicaragua für die weitere Programmplanung berücksichtigt werden.

Die Grundlage bietet eine Überprüfung der bisherigen Ergebnisse (Output / Outcome) der Maßnahmen anhand der Beurteilung von Relevanz, Effektivität, Nachhaltigkeit und Wirkung der Interventionen. Besonderer Stellenwert wurde auf diese Kriterien gelegt, um Ansatz und

Wirkungsweisen der Interventionen zu hinterfragen und daraus Empfehlungen für künftige Maßnahmen abzuleiten.

Die Prinzipien Gender und Inklusion benachteiligter Bevölkerungsgruppen[2] sind in der Beurteilung ebenfalls zu berücksichtigen. Weiters soll die Anwendung von Kapazitätsentwicklung als modernes Instrument eines ganzheitlichen Programmansatzes überprüft werden und Optionen für eine verstärkte Einbindung erarbeitet werden.

Darüber hinaus ist die Einbindung der Maßnahmen in den jeweiligen nationalen Kontext („Ownership") und ihre Abstimmung mit nationalen Programmen, sowie die Rolle von Implementierungsorganisationen in der Umsetzung Gegenstand der Analyse. Gleichermaßen ebenfalls die Frage der innerösterreichischen Kohärenz in Hinblick auf Abstimmung und Zusammenarbeit bei Bildungs-und Wissenschaftskooperationen.

Vorgesehen sind 2 Feldstudien in Nicaragua und Kosovo, deren Ziel eine strategische Analyse des Gesamtprogramms im jeweiligen Land ist.[3] Die Empfehlungen der Feldstudien über die weitere Vorgehensweise sollen unmittelbar für die Erarbeitung der neuen Länderstrategien Nicaragua und Kosovo als Grundlage dienen. Die konkrete Form der Einbeziehung der Projekte/Programme der Länder in die Evaluierung ist durch das Evaluierungsteam im Inception Report darzustellen. In der Desk Studie sollen sämtliche relevanten Dokumente beider Regionen durch das Konsulententeam analysiert werden und in die Gesamtbeurteilung einfließen.

3. Aufgaben

Ziel der Evaluierung ist die Bewertung von Relevanz, Effektivität, Nachhaltigkeit und Wirkung der bisherigen Interventionen. Inklusion von Frauen, Minoritäten, Menschen mit Behinderung

[3] Da die Ergebnisse einer bereits laufenden Projektevaluierung im Kosovo zu Beginn dieser Evaluierung bereits vorliegen wird, kann diese Evaluierung bereits auf den Empfehlungen der Projektevaluierung aufbauen.

Weiteres Ziel der Evaluierung ist das Aufzeigen von Optionen für Interventionen entsprechend den strategischen Zielsetzungen der OEZA *Strategie Hochschulbildung und Wissenschaftskooperation* in Richtung kohärenter programmbasierter Ansatz. Dazu sollen konkret Empfehlungen für die programm-basierte Umsetzung ab 2010/11 von Maßnahmen im Hochschulbereich in den Schwerpunktländern ausgesprochen werden. Konkret soll dies an den Beispielen Kosovo und Nicaragua mit mindestens je drei Optionen für die Umsetzung basierend auf erwarteten Entwicklungsszenarien im Hochschulbereich dargestellt werden.

Relevanz:

Betrachtung der Eigenverantwortlichkeit (Ownership) der lokalen Partner und Orientierung am nationalen Kontext in der Umsetzung von Maßnahmen; insbesondere die Analyse und Bewertung der Rolle (österreichischer) Implementierungsorganisationen und lokaler Partner;

Analyse und Bewertung der Interventionen im Hinblick auf Ergebnisorientierung (‚Managing for Development Results') und Kapazitätsentwicklung.

Effektivität:

Analyse der Maßnahmen im Hinblick auf einen holistischen und programm-basierten Ansatz und die Bündelung von Maßnahmen für erhöhte Wirksamkeit;

Analyse der OEZA in der Geberkoordinierung in den Schwerpunktländern, insbesondere Kosovo und Nicaragua.

Analyse der Durchführung der Interventionen zur Erreichung der programm/projektspezifischen Entwicklungsziele.

Analyse der Kohärenz innerhalb der OEZA; sowie der Abstimmung der Maßnahmen der OEZA und anderen relevanten österreichischen Akteuren (insbesondere in Südosteuropa mit dem österr. Wissenschaftsministerium BMWF) im Hinblick auf eine Gesamtschau der öffentlichen Leistungen der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit.

Wirkung:

Analyse und Bewertung von Planung, Durchführung und Qualität der Zielerreichung anhand der Indikatoren der Interventionen; sowie der Wirkung der Maßnahmen im jeweiligen Hochschulsystem.

Analyse und Bewertung der Interventionen im Bereich Kapazitätsentwicklung in der Nordatlantikregion RAAN/RAAS in Nicaragua.

Analyse und Bewertung der OEZA-Maßnahmen hinsichtlich der Integration der Länder Südosteuropas in den Europäischen Hochschul-und Forschungsraum; sowie der Arbeitsmarktrelevanz und Beschäftigungsfähigkeit der Interventionen in SOE.

Nutznießer bzw. Zielgruppe der Evaluierung sind das BMeiA, die ADA sowie anderen Ministerien (vor allem BMWF) und Institutionen, die mit der Durchführung von Maßnahmen im Hochschulbereich befasst sind. Nutznießer sind in weiterer Folge auch die Partnerorganisationen in den relevanten Schwerpunktländern.

4. Fragen

1. Relevanz:

1.1   Inwiefern wurde Eigenverantwortlichkeit (Ownership) und Bedarfsorientierung der lokalen Partner, Orientierung am nationalen Kontext sowie nationaler Bildungsstrategien in der Planung und Umsetzung von Maßnahmen in den Partnerländern berücksichtigt? Wie ist die Rolle der (österreichischen) Implementierungsorganisationen in Hinblick auf die Eigenverantwortlichkeit der lokalen Partner zu bewerten? Inwiefern ist Rolle, Funktion sowie Kapazitäten und Ressourcen der lokalen Partner zu bewerten? Welche Empfehlungen werden ausgesprochen, um die Eigenverantwortlichkeit der Partnerländer in der Planung, Umsetzung und Weiterführung der Maßnahmen zu stärken?

1.2   Inwieweit entspricht die grundlegende entwicklungspolitische Ausrichtung, Konzeption und Durchführung der Interventionen in Südosteuropa und Nicaragua heutigem entwicklungspolitischen Diskussionstand von Kapazitätsentwicklung und Ergebnisorientierung?

2. Effektivität

2.1 Wurden die Interventionen auf mehreren Ebenen (programmbasierter, holistischer Ansatz) angesetzt? Kommt es zur Bündelung von Maßnahmen, wenn dies im Hinblick auf Ergebnisorientierung sinnvoll ist?

2.2 Wie wird die Durchführung (Input vs. Output) der Entwicklungsmaßnahmen im Hinblick auf Zielerreichung bewertet? Inwiefern haben die Zielgruppen und Begünstigten der Interventionen profitiert?

2.3 Wie werden die Interventionen mit anderen Gebern im Hinblick auf Harmonisierung der Maßnahmen im Zielland koordiniert? Wie kann gegebenenfalls in Hinkunft die Geberkoordinierung noch verstärkt werden?

2.4 Wie wird die innerösterreichische Kohärenz zwischen OEZA und BMWF in der Abstimmung und Zusammenarbeit bei Planung und Durchführung von ODA relevanten Aktivitäten im Hochschulbereich in OEZA Schwerpunktländern (insbesondere SOE) bewertet? Welche Formen der Abstimmung und Zusammenarbeit zur innerösterreichischen Kohärenz in OEZA Schwerpunktländern werden hinkünftig empfohlen?

3. Nachhaltigkeit

3.1 Welche konkreten Maßnahmen sind notwendig, um die Umsetzung der Hochschulstrategie in den Länderstrategien[4] sicherzustellen? Welche Empfehlungen werden für einen künftigen programmbasierten Ansatz, insbesondere für die Erarbeitung der Länderstrategien Nicaragua und Kosovo ausgesprochen, um eine Kohärenz der zukünftigen Länderstrategien (früher Landesprogramme) mit der Strategie Hochschulbildung und den jew. Hochschulsektorstrategien der Zielländer zu gewährleisten? Wie können insbesondere Kapazitätsentwicklung und Ergebnisorientierung („Managing for development results") verstärkt in die Maßnahmen integriert werden?

SOE spezifisch:

3.2 In welchem Ausmaß kann anhand der bisherigen OEZA Interventionen von einer Weiterentwicklung des Hochschulsektors im Schwerpunktland gesprochen werden? Sind die Indikatoren entsprechend gewählt? Inwieweit haben Maßnahmen zur Kapazitätsentwicklung dazu beigetragen, die jeweiligen Zielgruppen zur selbständigen Weiterführung/-entwicklung der Aktivitäten zu befähigen im Sinne der Nachhaltigkeit zu befähigen?

4. Wirkung:

4.1 Können die erworbenen Fertigkeiten und Kompetenzen im jeweiligen Land eingesetzt werden oder stärken die Maßnahmen möglicherweise den Brain-Drain Effekt?

4.2 Gewährleisten und fördern die Interventionen Chancengleichheit und Nichtdiskriminierung für alle Bevölkerungsgruppen? Werden die gemäß der Hochschulstrategie für relevant erachteten Querschnittthemen genügend berücksichtigt (Inklusion von benachteiligten Bevölkerungsgruppen, Frauen, Menschen mit Behinderung und Minoritäten)? Wird tatsächlich Zugang, Nutzung und Zufriedenheit von benachteiligten Gruppen ermöglicht?

Nicaragua spezifisch:

4.3 Wie konnten die fachlichen Kapazitäten der autonomen Nordatlantik Region RAAN/RAAS in den anderen OEZA Schwerpunktsektoren Gesundheit, ländliche Entwicklung und Klein-und Mittelbetriebe gestärkt werden? Inwieweit sollen in Nicaragua komplementäre Maßnahmen zur Absicherung der bisherigen Aktivitäten sinnvoll weiter gefördert werden, selbst wenn Bildung nicht expliziter Schwerpunkt der Länderstrategie ist?

SOE spezifisch:

4.4 Welche Wirkung haben die Interventionen in SOE hinsichtlich der Integration in den Arbeitsmarkt? Wie gut sind die Maßnahmen auf die längerfristige und nachhaltige institutionalisierte Zusammenarbeit der Universitäten mit der Wirtschaft Ebene ausgerichtet? Wie ausreichend ist das vorhandene Datenmaterial, um eine solche Wirkung anhand der Indikatoren (Logframe) messen zu können? 4.5.Welchen Beitrag leisten die OEZA Interventionen zur nachhaltigen Integration der betreffenden Länder SOEs in den europäischen Hochschul-und Forschungsraum? Sind die Maßnahmen in entsprechende längerfristige Partnerschaften und/oder Netzwerke eingebunden?

5. Methoden

Das Evaluationsteam hat seiner Arbeit die OECD DAC Kriterien Relevanz, Effektivität, Nachhaltigkeit und Wirkung[5] für Evaluierung zugrunde zu legen und seine Arbeit so zu dokumentieren, dass deren Einhaltung nachvollzogen werden kann.

Die Evaluierung erfolgt in drei Phasen:

Die **erste Phase** schließt mit der Erstellung eines **Inception Report** ab und umfasst folgende Schritte:

a) Studium der von der OEZA bereitgestellten relevanten strategischen und operativen Dokumente (Desk Studie) zu den Schwerpunktländern Bosnien und Herzegowina, Kosovo, Montenegro, Nicaragua und Serbien.

b) Teilnahme an einem eintägigen Workshop in Wien, der von dem ADA Referat für Bildung gemeinsam mit der Stabsstelle Evaluierung organisiert wird. In diesem Workshop wird dem Evaluierungsteam ein Überblick über die österreichische Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (OEZA) angeboten. Im Rahmen des Workshops wird auch eine gemeinsame Reflexion über die Terms of Reference stattfinden.

c) Konkretisierung eines Vorschlags zur Einbeziehung der Programme und Projekte im *Kosovo* und in *Nicaragua* als konkrete Fallstudien in die Evaluierung. Vom Konsulententeam wird erwartet, dass es über die notwendigen Kenntnisse und Erfahrungen verfügt, diesen Vorschlag konkret auszuarbeiten.

d) Erstellung eines Inception Report, der zumindest folgende Aspekte abdeckt:

- Vorläufige Erkenntnisse und mögliche Hypothesen zu den Hauptfragen der Evaluierung.

- Konkretisierung der für die zweite Phase vorgesehenen methodischen Herangehensweise: Detaillierte Planung für die Durchführung der Feldstudien (Anzahl und Details der Interventionen, Projekte, Gesprächspartner, die besucht werden, benötigte zusätzliche In-

formationen, Indikatoren, Methodik zur Informations-und Datensammlung, Verarbeitung, Analyse und Interpretation, Datentriangulation, Qualitätssicherung, Arbeitsablauf, etc.).

e) Einarbeitung von Änderungen in den endgültigen Inception Report. Genehmigung des Berichts durch das ADA Referat für Bildung.

Die **zweite Phase** der Evaluierung umfasst eine Reise in den Kosovo und nach Nicaragua. Der Aufenthalt im Kosovo und Nicaragua wird mit jeweils max. 10 Tagen festgelegt. Für Südosteuropa wären auch optional 3 weitere Tage in der Kostenkalkulation zu budgetieren. Für die Arbeit in den Partnerländern ist die Mitarbeit eines nationalen Experten oder einer Expertin vorzusehen. Dies ist bei der Kostenaufstellung zu berücksichtigen. Der Feldaufenthalt kann erst nach Abnahme des Inception Report angetreten werden.

Im Rahmen der Feldstudien wird das Evaluierungsteam Gespräche mit lokalen Partnern, internationalen Organisationen, Vertretern anderer Geberländer und weiteren befassten Personen führen. Bereits vor der Reise sind Evaluierungsberichte zu analysieren. Das Evaluierungsteam stellt auf geeignete Weise sicher, dass die vor Ort befragten Personen Gelegenheit haben, die wesentlichen Feststellungen im Rahmen eines De-briefings vor Ort zu kommentieren und dass diese Kommentare auch im Bericht Berücksichtigung finden.

Das Evaluierungsteam fasst die Ergebnisse der Feldstudien in Länderberichten zusammen, die auch ein entsprechendes Länderprofil beinhalten. Diese werden dem ADA Bildungsreferat übermittelt, das die Berichte abnimmt.

Sollten nach der Feldstudie noch Fragen offen sein, können bei Bedarf weitere persönliche Gespräche in Wien geführt werden. Allfällige Kosten dafür sind im Angebot zu inkludieren.

In der **dritten Phase** erstellt das Evaluierungsteam den Entwurf des Evaluierungsberichts (Rohbericht). Dieser Entwurf wird durch die ADA an andere Beteiligte mit der Einladung zur Stellungnahme verteilt. Etwa zwei Wochen nach Übermittlung des schriftlichen Entwurfs stellt das Evaluierungsteam den Bericht, die Resultate und die Empfehlungen in Wien vor (Präsentation des Rohberichts). Das Evaluierungsteam arbeitet anschließend die Ergebnisse der Diskussion und sonstige Kommentare in den Endbericht ein, den das ADA Bildungsreferat abnimmt.

6. Voraussichtlicher Zeitplan und Aktivitäten

Zuschlagserteilung	Jänner 2010
Erste Phase (Inception Phase)	Februar 2010
Zweite Phase (Länderstudien)	März 2010
Dritte Phase (Präsentation, Rohbericht, Erstellung Endbericht)	April 2010
Endbericht, Endabrechnung	Mai 2010

7. Evaluierungsteam

Das Evaluierungsteam besteht aus einem Kernteam von zwei ExpertInnen, das über folgende Qualifikationen und Erfahrungen verfügt. Weiters wird das Kernteam von zwei lokalen KonsulentInnen (je ein(e) lokale(r) ExpertIn pro Fallstudie) unterstützt. Folgende Qualifikationen werden erwartet:

	Projektleitende Personen (international(e) Konsulent(en))	Lokaler Konsulent
Ausbildung	- Hochschulabschluss der Studienrichtungen Sozialwissenschaften, Erziehungs/Bildungswissenschaften oder einer verwandten Studienrichtung - Vorzugsweise Zusatzausbildung im Bereich Projektmanagement / Projektevaluation	- Hochschulabschluss der Studienrichtung Sozialwissenschaften, Erziehungswissenschaften oder einer verwandten Studienrichtung
Berufserfahrung	- Berufserfahrung im Bildungsbereich, vorzugsweise in der Hochschulbildung / Hochschulbildungspolitik - Mind. 5 Jahre Berufserfahrung im entwicklungspolitischen Diskurs - Erfahrung in der Durchführung von Evaluierungen (mind. 5 Evaluierungen)	- Berufserfahrung in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit - Erfahrung im Bildungsbereich, vorzugsweise Hochschulbildung
Sprache	- Sehr gute Englisch- bzw. Spanischkenntnisse in Wort und Schrift	- Gute Englischkenntnisse in Wort und Schrift - Sehr gute Kenntnisse der lokalen Sprache in Wort und Schrift
Weitere Kompetenzen	- Erfahrung in der Leitung von Evaluierungen - Sehr gute Kenntnisse von Evaluationsmethoden - Vertrautheit mit Bildungssystemen und Bildungspolitik, vorzugsweise im Bereich der Hochschulbildung - ausgeprägte analytische Fähigkeiten - kulturelle Sensibilität	- Vertrautheit mit dem nationalen Bildungssystem, vorzugsweise mit dem Hochschulbildungssystem - Sensibilität für die Zusammenarbeit mit lokalen Instanzen sowie mit der lokalen Bevölkerung

Die auftragsbezogene fachliche Expertise und Evaluierungserfahrung der internationalen ExpertInnen ist durch Lebensläufe und Referenzevaluierungen nachzuweisen. Relevante

Referenzevaluierungen sind dem Angebot in Kopie beizulegen bzw. entsprechende Weblinks anzuführen.

8. Bericht

Folgende Berichte sind vom Evaluierungsteam zu erstellen:

- **Inception Report**: Dieser ist dem ADA Bildungsreferat zur Abnahme vorzulegen, sollte nicht mehr als 20-25 Seiten umfassen und in englischer Sprache abgefasst sein.

- **Zusammenfassung der Feldstudie** bzw. Feldstudien: Die Länderberichte sind ebenfalls dem ADA Bildungsreferat zu übermitteln, welches diese abnimmt. Die Berichte sollten maximal 20 Seiten umfassen und in englischer für Südosteuropa bzw. spanischer und englischer Sprache für Nicaragua abgefasst sei.

- **Rohbericht:** ist dem ADA Bildungsreferat in englischer Sprache zur Abnahme zu übermitteln.

- **Endbericht**: sollte (ohne Anhänge) maximal 60 Seiten umfassen, in englischer Sprache abgefasst sein und den DAC-Kriterien entsprechen. Der Bericht ist gemäß den Hauptfragen der Evaluierung zu gliedern, enthält eine maximal fünfseitige Zusammenfassung (Executive Summary) der wesentlichen Erkenntnisse und Empfehlungen und ist in deutscher, englischer und spanischer Sprache abzufassen. Die Länderberichte sind dem Evaluierungsbericht im Annex beizufügen.

Der Endbericht mit den eingearbeiteten Stellungnahmen ist elektronisch bis voraussichtlich Mai 2010 an das Bildungsreferat dergestalt zur Abnahme zu übermitteln, dass seine Veröffentlichung ohne weitere Korrekturen möglich ist.

Folgenden Kriterien werden bei der Beurteilung der Qualität des Evaluierungsberichts herangezogen und sind damit für die Abnahme des Berichts und des Auftrags entscheidend:

- Wurden die Terms of Reference entsprechend erfüllt und im Bericht reflektiert?

- Ist der Bericht nach den Hauptfragen gegliedert?

- Beruhen die Schlussfolgerungen und Empfehlungen auf im Bericht klar dargestellten Feststellungen und sind sie aus ihnen ableitbar?

- Unterscheidet der Bericht eindeutig zwischen Schlussfolgerungen, Lessons Learned und Empfehlungen?

- Ist es nachvollziehbar, wie die KonsulentInnen zu ihren Feststellungen gelangt sind?

- Sind die Methoden und Prozesse der Evaluierung ausreichend im Bericht dokumentiert?

- Wurden die wesentlichen Beteiligten konsultiert?

- Wurden die wesentlichen Dokumente berücksichtigt und ist ihr Inhalt entsprechend im Bericht reflektiert?

- Ist bei den Empfehlungen klar, an wen sie gerichtet sind?

- Enthält der Bericht eine umfassende und klare Zusammenfassung?

- Präsentiert der Bericht die in ihm enthaltenen Informationen in ansehnlicher, übersichtlicher und einheitlicher Form?

- Kann der Bericht in der übergebenen Form verbreitet werden?

9. Koordination und Verantwortung

Die Hauptverantwortung des Auftrags liegt beim Bildungsreferat der ADA. Die lokalen Konsulenten sind mitverantwortlich für die die Planung, Ausführung und Auswertung der Fallstudie vor Ort.

ADA unterstützt das Evaluierungsteam durch die Bereitstellung von Dokumenten und Kontakten und dient als Anlaufstelle bei Unklarheiten und Schwierigkeiten. Die lokalen Koordinationsbüros (Kobüs) unterstützen das Konsulententeam entsprechend ihren Möglichkeiten mit Kontakten und Projektdokumenten und stehen als Anlaufstelle vorerst bei Unklarheiten und Schwierigkeiten zur Verfügung.

Annex I: Country Report Kosovo

See separate Document.

Annex II: Country Report Serbia

See separate Document.

Annex III: Country Report Nicaragua

See separate Document.

Annex IV: Country Report Nicaragua (Spanish Version)

See separate Document.