

<https://doi.org/10.23913/ride.v15i29.2161>

Scientific articles

Vinculación y corresponsabilidad universitaria en América Latina, una revisión bibliográfica

*University outreach and co-responsibility in Latin America, a literature
review*

*Vínculo e corresponsabilidade universitária na América Latina, uma revisão
bibliográfica*

Jorge Alán Aviña Godínez

Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango, México

1140643@alumnos.ujed.mx

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6483-3621>

Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto

Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango, México

marco0709@hotmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8449-1120>

Alicia Solís Campos

Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango, México

alicia.solis@ujed.mx

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6573-4633>

Resumen

Este ensayo presenta un estado del arte sobre la implementación de los principios de corresponsabilidad social, pertinencia, territorialidad e inclusión en educación superior, dentro de América Latina. Contextualizado en la respuesta a los retos impuestos por los modelos neoliberales, donde la legislación mexicana, a pesar de promover dichos principios como rectores para la función universitaria, carece de directrices para su aplicación práctica. A través de una metodología cualitativa y descriptiva, se analiza mediante una revisión bibliográfica, una variedad de documentos e investigaciones referentes a la integración de estos conceptos en las prácticas y políticas universitarias. Observando que la efectividad de estos modelos depende de su adaptación y aplicación reflexiva a los contextos institucionales, más allá de la mera conformidad con normativas externas. Identificando una tendencia hacia una adopción superficial de estos enfoques, limitada a una perspectiva administrativa y desvinculada de la interacción genuina con la comunidad. En la que tampoco se ha logrado consolidar una dimensión social sólida al interior de los procesos y prácticas educativas. Por ello, se subraya la necesidad de una transformación profunda en las estructuras y prácticas universitarias, integrando valores éticos y filosóficos para una vinculación efectiva y significativa con el entorno social.

Palabras clave: Educación y sociedad, Docencia, Extensión universitaria, Pertinencia social.

Abstract

The present essay presents a state-of-the-art overview of the implementation of principles of social co-responsibility, relevance, territoriality, and inclusion in higher education within Latin America. It is contextualized in response to the challenges imposed by neoliberal models, where Mexican legislation, despite promoting these principles as guiding for the university function, lacks guidelines for their practical application. Through a qualitative and descriptive methodology, a variety of documents and research related to the integration of these concepts into university practices and policies are analyzed via a bibliographic review. It is observed that the effectiveness of these models depends on their adaptation and reflective application to institutional contexts, beyond mere compliance with external norms. A tendency towards a superficial adoption of these approaches is identified, limited to an administrative perspective, and disconnected from genuine interaction with the community. In which a solid social dimension has also not been consolidated within educational processes



and practices. Therefore, the need for a profound transformation in university structures and practices is underlined, integrating ethical and philosophical values for an effective and significant connection with the social environment.

Keywords: Education and society, Teaching, University cooperation, educational relevance.

Resumo

Este ensaio apresenta um estado da arte sobre a implementação dos princípios de corresponsabilidade social, relevância, territorialidade e inclusão no ensino superior, na América Latina. Contextualizado na resposta aos desafios impostos pelos modelos neoliberais, onde a legislação mexicana, apesar de promover estes princípios como princípios orientadores da função universitária, carece de diretrizes para a sua aplicação prática. Através de uma metodologia qualitativa e descritiva, através de uma revisão bibliográfica, são analisados diversos documentos e pesquisas referentes à integração desses conceitos nas práticas e políticas universitárias. Observando que a eficácia destes modelos depende da sua adaptação e aplicação reflexiva aos contextos institucionais, para além da mera conformidade com regulamentações externas. Identificando uma tendência para uma adoção superficial destas abordagens, limitada a uma perspectiva administrativa e desligada de uma interação genuína com a comunidade. Em que não foi possível consolidar uma dimensão social sólida nos processos e práticas educativas. Destaca-se, portanto, a necessidade de uma profunda transformação nas estruturas e práticas universitárias, integrando valores éticos e filosóficos para uma conexão eficaz e significativa com o meio social.

Palavras-chave: Educação e sociedade, Ensino, Extensão universitária, Relevância social.

Date of Reception: November 2023

Acceptance Date: August 2024

Introduction

The political and economic models that have prevailed from the 20th century to the present have prioritized the consolidation of productive and industrial systems that allow them to be competitive in the global market, where social development is seen as a consequent result of the efficient operation of the economic structures of each nation.

When examining the ontological perspective of neoliberalism, different authors suggest that the nature of this model, by focusing exclusively on the demands of productive and commercial markets, is socially and humanly exclusive (Bettache et al., 2020; Wedin,



2023). Bettache et al. (2020) argue that the neoliberal economic model has built social structures with commercial foundations in which human development is linked to compliance with standards and policies that prioritize the productivity of the individual, relegating their intrinsic value as a being. Consequently, human well-being is perceived more as a reward linked to job performance than as an inherent right of the individual. This has given rise to a series of problems and inequalities that culminate in what the United Nations (2015) labels as a "humanitarian crisis" (p. 5). This crisis, visible in areas such as economy, education, food or health, among others, results from the systematic exclusion and marginalization of vulnerable sectors of society.

The challenge facing humanity in this regard has led organizations such as the United Nations (UN, 2015) to highlight the need to reconfigure political, economic and social constructs towards a human approach. This approach, based on inclusion, equity, sustainability and social justice, seeks to reverse the social asymmetries that limit human well-being in different regions of the planet.

This aspiration is embodied in a coordinated action plan promoted by the international community: the 2030 Agenda. The agenda recognizes the need to adopt a transversal and multifactorial approach that systematically addresses the multiple dimensions of the aforementioned global crisis. To this end, it presents the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), built around a set of targets and indicators that address each of the dimensions of the humanitarian crisis (UN, 2015). These objectives not only highlight priority areas of intervention, but also suggest multifactorial solutions adapted to the particularities and challenges of each national context (UN, 2018).

Given the multiplicity of dimensions that support both the UN's complaint (2015, 2018) and the proposed intervention plan, this article will focus on education as a key variable in the fight against social asymmetries and injustices. To this end, the fourth objective of the SDGs is taken up again, which points out the need to "guarantee inclusive, equitable and quality education, promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all" (UN, 2015, p. 16). This objective highlights the importance of education as a strategic axis to achieve social justice. In addition to considering it a human right, it is recognized that through education a nation can identify and directly influence its own problems. It is at this point where higher education becomes relevant.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2016, 2017) highlights the essential role that Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) have in

the conception and execution of transformative strategies for the regions, since they recognize in these institutions the inherent capacity to generate, disseminate and apply knowledge. Therefore, HEIs are seen as a key element to design projects adapted to the particularities of each environment. These projects should not only educate generations capable of positively influencing their context, but also originate from the visualization of the University as a proactive and transformative agent, which contributes to the treatment of regional problems and needs.

Following this vision, in Latin America there is an urgent need to build quality higher education systems that are inclusive and relevant for the region (UNESCO and the International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean [IESALC], 2018). But how does this vision materialize into concrete actions? This approach proposes that HEIs should reorient their disciplinary knowledge toward the characteristics and needs of their social environments through inclusive and democratic interaction with the community. The objective is to provide relevance and belonging to the exercise of university functions, seeking that the University contributes to generating well-being in its region.

This process involves a transversal alignment between the functions of linkage, research and teaching, where, through the active participation of the community environment, the University is able to systematize the experiences that derive from its extension projects. This allows the generation of pertinent theoretical, technical and technological knowledge that not only leads to the design of intervention projects based on the context, but also provokes curricular and methodological adaptations that impact the training processes (UNESCO and IESALC, 2018).

In accordance with international criteria, the Mexican State articulated the General Law on Higher Education (LGES, 2020/2021). This regulation seeks to harmonize the principles and demands of the international community (UN, 2015, 2018; UNESCO, 2016, 2017) with the policies and practices of higher education at the national level. In this way, the principle of university co-responsibility, educational relevance, social justice and inclusion are standardized as objectives that higher education in Mexico should pursue (LGES, 2020/2021, arts. 7-10, 37, 39).

The LGES (2020/2021) recognizes in its second article the principle of university autonomy, which grants HEIs the freedom and responsibility to reorient, design, implement and evaluate their own plans and programs to adopt the standards of the law.

This change represents a challenge for institutions whose philosophy does not align



with a social and human approach, such as the universities regulated by the General Directorate of Technological and Polytechnic Universities (DGUTyP), created in 1991 with a focus on the needs of the productive and industrial sectors (Mendoza Rojas, 2018; Montes Ramos and Gutiérrez Rico, 2017). Despite having incorporated values such as social co-responsibility, relevance and inclusion in their strategic planning (DGUTyP, n.d.), they have not managed to adequately translate them into institutional processes.

Authors such as Tünnermann Bernheim (2000) and Figueroa-Céspedes et al. (2021) express their concern about the transition from a neoliberal and positivist educational paradigm to a critical approach with a social and human emphasis. They point out that, if this change is not carried out in a systematic and in-depth manner, institutions will reproduce institutionalized dynamics that are potentially harmful to the consolidation of a new approach.

The assumption that the lack of guidance from the State regarding how to operationalize the criteria, purposes and objectives that it demands from HEIs in the country, has generated significant conflicts in institutions such as Technological Universities; whose structures, processes and practices have been based on philosophical and epistemological principles that diverge from those that make up a social and human approach such as the one that is intended to operate with the LGES (2020/2021).

There is a need to explore the state of the art regarding the implementation of principles aimed at inclusion and social co-responsibility in higher education, through the review of the background of different models that aim to bring the University closer to its community environment. This could provide relevant and pertinent information for both other research and for those institutions that seek to adhere to the LGES standards (2020/2021), but have encountered difficulties or problems in the process.

In this sense, a bibliographic review was carried out, specifically adopting the methodology proposed by Hernández-Muñoz et al. (2022), which is guided by the generation of a "review question" (p. 53), which allows to delimit both the topic of interest and the search categories. The question was posed as follows: *How is the link between the University and the community being addressed in higher education from an inclusive and co-responsibility approach?* Resulting in the following categories: university social responsibility, social inclusion and relevance, as well as university linkage.

The literature collection was carried out through Google Scholar, complemented by academic databases such as Scielo, Redalyc and Dialnet. The exclusion criteria ensured that

selected articles were published after 2015 and did not appear in unethical or predatory sources, as identified by Beall's list. From a total of 45 research projects collected, the most relevant are discussed and analyzed.

The analysis and processing of the information were carried out following the method proposed by Bolívar (2020). This method consists of an initial textual analysis, followed by a comparison and correlation with the contributions of other authors, to finally culminate with an interpretation by the researcher. During the textual analysis phase, files were created in which the main contributions, gaps and problems of each text were recorded. Subsequently, the findings were compared, which allowed both common problems and relevant contributions to be identified.

Regarding the methodological delimitation, the research corpus is justified by the need to understand how the link between University and community is being carried out in Latin America, under an inclusive approach and social co-responsibility. The selected research addresses specific cases in the region, in order to generate a comparative analysis between the different institutions. Figure 1 below presents a map showing the number of research projects per country that have been retrieved as part of the process, specifying that not all research projects or documents are discussed in this essay.

Figure 1. Distribution map of collected research



Source: Own elaboration

Content

In accordance with the structure of the method used suggested by Bolívar (2020) for the analysis of the information, a textual exploration will be presented, along with a comparison and correlation between authors. The following sections are organized according to the three dimensions of analysis developed in the research process: University Social Responsibility (USR), social inclusion, and relevance and university affiliation.

University Social Responsibility

The University, oriented towards a critical model and social co-responsibility, as established by the LGES (2020/2021), faces a challenge with multiple dimensions. While these dimensions can be observed in isolation, they are closely related.

An initial consideration when addressing this topic is the existence of validated and consolidated models of social co-responsibility, such as the case of USR. This aspect is reflected in the exploration categories of this section, where USR is included as a search criterion.

Regarding this model, the literature review reveals that, although the USR approach provides a broad and comprehensive management perspective on the relevance and co-responsibility of university functions, its value lies in the philosophical principles that give it meaning (Ivanova Boncheva and Martínez de la Torre, 2020; Moreno Elizalde, 2017, 2020; Moreno Elizalde et al., 2022).

Only through adequate operationalization of concepts such as social inclusion, participatory management and sustainability (Vallaes, 2018) can an institution operate processes and practices that respond in a pertinent and co-responsible manner to the characteristics of its social environment and to the objectives of the model itself. However, the adoption of models such as RSU is not free of difficulties, especially if the University does not adequately assimilate the principles of the model (Ibarra Uribe et al., 2020). This requires deep reflection on the part of the University, both to recognize and understand the principles it is incorporating, and to identify those internal constructs that could conflict (Vallaes, 2018).

Two initial steps are identified to promote the integration of a social co-responsibility approach in the University. The first consists of understanding the principles of the model to be implemented, in order to avoid the reproduction of institutionalized and mechanized dynamics. This implies that the University reflects on and operationalizes the guiding axes of the social co-responsibility and connection model, with the aim of drawing up indicators and designing processes that guide it towards a more social approach (Bahena Nava et al., 2022).

The second step is self-diagnosis or institutional self-assessment, a process in which the University examines its ideologies, structures, processes and practices, to identify and reorient those constructs that could oppose the established objectives and indicators (Arango Pinto et al., 2021; Grajeda et al., 2018; Ivanova Boncheva and Martínez de la Torre, 2020).

The literature suggests that models of social co-responsibility should not be considered mere certifiable instruments for political or commercial purposes, but rather genuine processes of institutional self-reflection (Ibarra Uribe et al., 2020; Vallaes, 2018). This change of focus would allow the University to design its own structures to responsibly

exercise its functions, recognizing that its main purpose is the generation, application and dissemination of knowledge in favor of social development (Bahena Nava et al., 2022).

Bahena Nava et al. (2022), in agreement with Bolio Domínguez and Pinzón Lizárraga (2019), point out that one of the main problems in the operationalization of models of social co-responsibility lies in the excessive theorization of its principles, which increases its level of abstraction and limits its practical application. This warning allows us to identify that the deficiencies in the interpretation and operationalization of these principles are, to a large extent, responsible for the gaps in the construction of models of social co-responsibility in the University.

Social inclusion and relevance

The lack of adequate operationalization and self-assessment has led to various institutional pathologies, among which the absence of a solid social dimension in educational practice stands out. This may be due to the ineffectiveness of organizational structures (Senior-Naveda et al., 2021), the isolation of departments (Martínez Castañeda & García Castro, 2022) or the lack of institutional will to integrate a social approach into academic structures (Arrieta Díaz et al., 2016; Gutiérrez Rico et al., 2019; Reina, 2022).

When operationalizing models of inclusion and social relevance, the predominant approach is usually administrative, aimed at meeting performance indicators or accreditable mechanisms, leaving aside the central mission of training professionals with a high sense of belonging and community commitment (Bahena Nava et al., 2022; Bolio Domínguez & Pinzón Lizárraga, 2019; Vallaeys, 2018).

Although models of social co-responsibility suggest active participation of universities with their communities, some authors, such as Guerra García and Meza Hernández (2020) and Reina (2022), denounce the exclusion of community voices in the processes of designing and implementing social outreach projects, which turns such projects into inconsequential and imposing initiatives. This criticism is shared by other authors, who highlight the importance of the University dynamizing its structures and actively participating in its social environment (Concha Saldías et al., 2020; Senior-Naveda et al., 2021).

University linkage

Although the lack of a robust social dimension in educational practice has been debated, the need to operationalize it effectively has also been stressed so that it ceases to be an abstract concept and becomes a tangible and experiential process, through which the University actively engages with its environment.

Both in Martínez Castañeda and García Castro (2022) and in Senior-Naveda et al. (2021), the need to articulate a transversal procedural structure within university structures is specified. Which, having as its objective the fulfillment of a series of indicators based on the principles and values associated with these widely discussed models of social co-responsibility, integrates the departments of linkage with the academic bodies, so that not only are agreements and linkage projects being generated, but there is an adequate follow-up through which the experiences can be systematized for the generation of contextualized knowledge.

For their part, Concha Saldías et al. (2020) suggest that, in order to strengthen the relevance of university functions, academic structures must integrate the community as an active participant in social outreach projects. Bahena Nava et al. (2022) also propose integrating the values of social co-responsibility into curricular structures, so that these are not just philosophical terms, but concepts applicable in professional practice.

Discussion

This research not only sought to identify models of social co-responsibility or linkage, but also to understand their adaptability and relevance in different sociocultural contexts. Initially, it was identified that, although models such as RSU are promising to promote a socially relevant University, their success depends on the internalization and application of the principles that constitute them within institutional practices.

The experiences of Ibarra Uribe et al. (2020) and Vallaeys (2018) suggest that the effectiveness of any model of co-responsibility, social connection or inclusion does not reside solely in its formal adoption, but in a thoughtful implementation adapted to the specific characteristics of each institution. The findings of this essay coincide with this observation, demonstrating that simple compliance with external regulations is not enough to achieve a significant transformation. This transformation requires more than mere compliance with external regulations or standards (Senior-Naveda et al., 2021). It is necessary to seek a deep

reconstruction of institutional structures, processes and practices, through critical reflection on the philosophical foundations that support them.

The literature suggests a tendency towards superficiality in the adoption of models or approaches to co-responsibility or social inclusion, relegating their conception to a purely administrative perspective (Arango Pinto et al., 2021; Arrieta Díaz et al., 2016; Ibarra Uribe et al., 2020). This view often omits the essence of a reciprocal interaction, in which the University acts as a dynamic, collaborative and democratic agent in its social environment. This situation can result in a lack of genuine connection with the community environment, since, in its search to adapt to normative or certification standards and guidelines, the University runs the risk of reproducing hermetic, endogamous and even imposing dynamics. These dynamics affect both the impact of its social outreach plans, programs and projects as well as their sustainability (Guerra García and Meza Hernández, 2020; Reina, 2022).

Research background indicates that both the fundamental value of these models and their effectiveness are closely related to the proper operationalization of their principles within university structures, processes and practices. This implies an institutional obligation to recognize and understand the ethical values that underpin the approaches that are intended to be incorporated into their functions and, subsequently, to integrate them in a reflective manner into their structures and practices.

Despite the adoption of a model of social co-responsibility or its associated principles, there are still information gaps, controversies and problems surrounding its integration within educational structures, processes and practices. The absence of a social dimension in training processes (Arrieta Díaz et al., 2016; Bahena Nava et al., 2022; Gutiérrez Rico et al., 2019), the isolation between the linkage departments and the academic and research units, as well as the lack of an appropriate structure for the monitoring, analysis and assimilation of collaborative experiences, limit the University's ability to consolidate itself as a relevant and socially co-responsible institution (Martínez Castañeda and García Castro, 2022).

It is important to acknowledge the limitations of this study. Both the descriptive nature of the study and the review method used imply the possibility of not having fully explored different spectra of the literature or practices in the field. In addition, the absence of a direct evaluation of a specific model of linkage may have limited the depth of the analyses. Despite the above, the findings can be considered a starting point for future, more in-depth and specific research.

Within the framework of a broader project, carried out as part of a PhD program, this research has provided relevant information and raised questions and reflections necessary for the adoption of approaches or models of social co-responsibility and inclusion in higher education. It is essential that universities adopt a more reflective approach adapted to their specific contexts to ensure the effectiveness of the different models of social co-responsibility they implement. It is essential that higher education institutions not only adhere to external regulations, but also promote a profound philosophical transformation that significantly impacts their structures and practices, orienting them towards collaboration and social inclusion.

In this sense, it is considered that future studies could benefit from more direct empirical research, evaluating specific models of linkage in various institutional contexts, and exploring how different approaches to community participation can influence the sustainability and effectiveness of social outreach programs developed under a co-responsibility and inclusion approach.

Conclusions

Within the framework of a doctoral project, this research has provided valuable knowledge about social engagement. The analysis of the literature has allowed us to identify that the way in which it is interpreted, assimilated and operationalized within university structures is more related to the standards of a classic management model than to the foundations of the social approach that is sought to be implemented. This highlights the need to promote reflection and institutional self-assessment from within the structures.

The analyses and perspectives examined underscore the importance of aligning any social engagement model with the unique vision and mission of each university. To be effective, it must be holistically integrated with all institutional dimensions, promoting transversality in the exercise of university functions, oriented toward a social vocation that addresses university outreach as a mechanism for the generation of knowledge and community solutions through collaborative participation.

One of the fundamental elements in the transition towards the consolidation of socially relevant universities is the epistemological reflection that each institution must carry out to integrate its own philosophy with the demands of a social approach such as that proposed by international organizations and recognized by the Mexican State. The adoption of principles without this process can lead to practical conflicts that compromise the set

objectives.

Another relevant aspect is that the link between the University and the community must be proactive and dialogical. Solutions should not be imposed or operated solely from an institutional perspective. In this sense, social inclusion, understood as dialogue, participation and recognition of beliefs, knowledge and problems of the regional environment, is essential to foster a significant impact on human development.

Future lines of research

The current study of university-community engagement has revealed several areas that require further analysis. One of the key dimensions is the prevalence of the administrative approach in engagement models, which suggests investigating strategies to establish a more symbiotic relationship that benefits both academic institutions and the community. This transition may be crucial to ensure greater adaptability of the models in various sociocultural contexts.

The apparent disconnect between academic and outreach departments within universities is another area that requires attention. Future research should explore how to improve integration and communication between these departments, in order to enhance the social impact of the University. In addition, the need for deep epistemological reflection by universities is highlighted in order to align their philosophy with the demands of a genuinely social approach.

These complementary investigations promise to provide valuable data on how to strengthen and make more effective the links between universities and communities, benefiting both parties and contributing to regional development.

References

- Arango Pinto, L. G., García Martínez, M. E. y Ventura Cabrera, L. (2021). Las categorías de gobierno, gestión y liderazgo y su papel en el desarrollo de la Extensión de los Servicios, Vinculación y Difusión de la Cultura (ESVID) en las unidades descentralizadas de la Universidad Pedagógica Nacional: Reencuentro. Análisis de problemas universitarios, 33(81), 212-242. <https://reencuentro.xoc.uam.mx/index.php/reencuentro/article/view/1113>
- Arrieta Díaz, D., Meléndez Guerrero, M. A., Figueroa González, E. G. y Moreno Elizalde, M. L. (2016). La percepción de los alumnos respecto a la sustentabilidad como parte sustantiva de la responsabilidad social universitaria. En Ojalvo Mitrany, V. y Cortizas Enríquez, Y. (Coords.) La Responsabilidad Social Universitaria, paradigma de la nueva universidad (pp. 357-374). Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336617883>
- Bahena Nava, O., Lugo Villaseñor, E. y Saenger Pedrero, C. B. (2022). La formación para el compromiso social como trayectoria vital y liberadora. Configuración y alcances del Modelo educativo de una universidad jesuita mexicana. Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Educativos, 52(3), 133-162. <https://doi.org/10.48102/rlee.2022.52.3.524>
- Bettache, K., Chiu, C. y Beattie, P. (2020). The merciless mind in a dog-eat-dog society: Neoliberalism and the indifference to social inequality. Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 34, 217-222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.06.002>
- Bolio Domínguez, V. y Pinzón Lizarraga, L. M. (2019). Construcción y Validación de un instrumento para evaluar las características de la responsabilidad social universitaria en estudiantes universitarios. Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social, 8(1), 79-96. <https://doi.org/10.15366/riejs2019.8.1.005>
- Bolívar, A. (2020). Análisis del discurso y hermenéutica como métodos en la interpretación de textos. Interpretatio. Revista de hermenéutica, 5(1), 17-34. <https://doi.org/10.19130/iifl.it.2020.5.1.0003>
- Concha Saldías, C., Sánchez Sánchez, G. y Rojas Aguilar, C. (2020). Innovación social en la docencia universitaria: Una estrategia de interacción academia y sociedad. Revista Venezolana de Gerencia, 25(4), 347-363. <https://doi.org/10.37960/rvg.v25i4>
- Dirección General de Universidades Tecnológicas y Politécnicas. (2023). (s.f.). ¿Quiénes Somos? [Portal oficial]. <https://dgutyp.sep.gob.mx/QuienesSomos.php>

- Figueroa-Céspedes, I., Soto Cárcamo, J. y Yáñez-Urbina, C. (2021). dimensiones clave para el desarrollo escolar inclusivo: conocimiento emancipador en una experiencia de asesoramiento colaborativo. *Revista latinoamericana de educación inclusiva*, 15(2), 155-171. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-73782021000200155>
- Grajeda Grajeda, R. P., Andrade Paco, J., Pastrana Corral, S., Corte López, A. y Jiménez García, C. (2018). Los organismos de vinculación universitaria como espacios de formación académica para los estudiantes de licenciatura. *EDU REVIEW. International Education and Learning Review / Revista Internacional de Educación y Aprendizaje*, 6(4), 217-228. <https://doi.org/10.37467/gka-revedu.v6.1802>
- Guerra García, E. y Meza Hernández, M. E. (2020). La comunidad en el curriculum de la Universidad Autónoma Indígena de México, hoy Universidad Autónoma Intercultural de Sinaloa. En B. Baronnet y F. M. Bermúdez Urbina (Coords). *La vinculación comunitaria en la formación de profesionales indígenas en México* (pp. 203-237). ANUIES. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341296999>
- Gutiérrez Rico, D., Moreno Elizalde, M. L. y Bocanegra Vergara, N. (2019, agosto). Responsabilidad Social Universitaria: Compromiso en las Instituciones Formadoras de Profesionales en la Educación. En M. L. Moreno Elizalde, D. Gutiérrez Rico y J. A. Mercado Piedra. *Experiencias desde la Investigación y Prácticas de la Responsabilidad Social Universitaria, Repensar la Educación* (pp. 37-58). Red Durango de Investigadores Educativos. https://www.academia.edu/42891274/EXPERIENCIAS_DESDE_LA_INVESTIGACION_Y_PRÁCTICAS_DE_LA_RESPONSABILIDAD_SOCIAL_UNIVERSITARIA_REPENSAR_LA_EDUCACIÓN_SUPERIOR_PARA_LA_TRANSFORMACIÓN_E_INNOVACIÓN_SOCIAL?auto=citations&from=cover_page
- Hernández-Muñoz, A. E., Rangel-Alvarado, M. Á. A., Torres-García, L., Hernández-Martínez, G., Castillo-Ixta, P. K., Olivares-Moreno, L. L. y Sánchez-Morales, A. G. (2022). Proceso para la realización de una revisión bibliográfica en investigaciones clínicas. *Digital Ciencia@UAQRO*, 5(8), 50-61. <https://revistas.uaq.mx/index.php/ciencia/issue/view/72>
- Ibarra Uribe, L. M., Fonseca Bautista, C. D. y Santiago García, R. (2020). La responsabilidad social universitaria. Misión e impactos sociales. *Sinéctica, Revista Electrónica de Educación*, 54, 1-18. [https://doi.org/10.31391/s2007-7033\(2020\)0054-011](https://doi.org/10.31391/s2007-7033(2020)0054-011)

- Ivanova Boncheva, A. y Martínez de la Torre, J. A. (2020). La responsabilidad social universitaria frente a los desafíos del cambio climático: Hacia una agenda post COVID-19. *Revista Vértice Universitario*, 22(88), 15-25. <https://doi.org/10.36792/rvu.vi88.23>
- Ley General de Educación Superior, [LGES]. (20 de abril de 2020). Reformada el 20 de abril de 2021. *Diario Oficial de la Federación [D.O.F.]*, (México) https://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/LGES_200421.pdf
- Martínez Castañeda, C. Y. y García Castro, I. (2022). Gobernanza Universitaria y vinculación académica-empresarial en educación superior: Área de ciencias agropecuarias en Sinaloa-México. *Revista de ciencias sociales (Ve)*, 28(Especial 6), 95-109. <https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/rcs/issue/view/3762>,
- Mendoza Rojas, J. (2018). *Subsistemas de Educación Superior. Estadística Básica 2006-2017* (Primera ed., Vol. 1). DGEI-UNAM. <http://www.dgei.unam.mx/hwp/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/cuaderno15.pdf>
- Montes Ramos, F. V. y Gutiérrez Rico, D. (2017). *Análisis de los estilos de aprendizaje de alumnos de las Universidades Tecnológicas en el Estado de Durango* (Primera ed.). UPD, ReDIE, Instituto Universitario Anglo Español & UTyP. <http://www.upd.edu.mx/PDF/Libros/Lolita.pdf>
- Moreno Elizalde, M. L. (2017). Responsabilidad social universitaria desde la perspectiva ética. En B. E. Madrigal Torres y J. L. Almuñías Rivero. *Ética y Liderazgo Ética y Liderazgo en Instituciones de Educación Superior Latinoamericanas* (pp. 147-168). Universidad de Guadalajara. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Berta-Ermila-Torres/publication/315665307_Etica_y_liderazgo_en_Instituciones_de_Educacion_Superior_Latinoamericanas/links/59fb6059aca272347a1d8da7/Etica-y-liderazgo-en-Instituciones-de-Educacion-Superior-Latinoamericanas.pdf
- Moreno Elizalde, M. L., Arrieta Díaz, D. y Sotelo Asef, J. G. (2022). Gestión universitaria para la Sustentabilidad en las Organizaciones a los estudiantes de Administración en la Universidad Juárez del Estado de Durango en tiempos de COVID-19. *Estrategia y Gestión Universitaria*, 10(1), 14-41. <https://revistas.unica.cu/index.php/regu/article/view/2206>
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas (ONU). (2015). *Transformar nuestro mundo: La Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible*. Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas. https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ares70d1_es.pdf

- Organización de las Naciones Unidas (ONU). (2018). La Agenda 2030 y los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible: Una oportunidad para América Latina y el Caribe. (LC/G.2681-P/Rev.3), Santiago. <https://repositorio.cepal.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/cb30a4de-7d87-4e79-8e7a-ad5279038718/content>
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (UNESCO). (2016). Universidades para el desarrollo. 7, place de Fontenoy, 75352 París 07 SP, Francia y la Oficina Regional de Ciencias de la UNESCO para América Latina y el Caribe, UNESCO Montevideo, Uruguay. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246445>
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación la Ciencia y la Cultura (UNESCO). (2017). Educación para los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible: Objetivos de aprendizaje. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000252423>
- Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación la Ciencia y la Cultura e Instituto Internacional para la Educación Superior en América Superior en América Latina y el Caribe. (2018). III Conferencia Regional de Educación Superior 2018 (p. 68) [Informe General]. UNESCO-IESALC. www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve
- Reina, Y. (2022). Acercamiento dialógico universidad-comunidad: una aproximación teórica del aprendizaje social. Revista Científica CIENCIAEDUC, 9(1), 1-10. <http://portal.amelica.org/ameli/journal/480/4803363027/>
- Senior-Naveda, A., González, T., Marín-González, F. y Narváez Castro, M. (2021). Vinculación universidad-comunidad: Pertinencia pedagógica-social de los programas nacionales de formación. Formación universitaria, 14(4), 61-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-50062021000400061>
- Tünnermann Bernheim, C. (2000). Pertinencia social y principios básicos para orientar el diseño de políticas de educación superior. Revista Educación Superior y Sociedad (ESS), 11(1 y 2), 181-196. <https://www.iesalc.unesco.org/ess/index.php/ess3/article/view/138>
- Vallaey, F. (2018). Las diez falacias de la responsabilidad social universitaria. Revista Digital de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria, 12(1), 34-58. <https://doi.org/10.19083/ridu.12.716>

Wedin, T. (2023). Samuel Moyn and Marcel Gauchet on the Relationship Between Human Rights, Neoliberalism, and Inequality. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights*, 41(4), 471-489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18918131.2023.2250676>

Rol de Contribución	Autor (es)
Conceptualización	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Metodología	Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (principal) Alicia Solís Campos (igual)
Software	No aplica
Validación	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (Igual) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Análisis Formal	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Investigación	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Recursos	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Curación de datos	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Escritura - Preparación del borrador original	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Escritura - Revisión y edición	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Visualización	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)
Supervisión	Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (principal) Alicia Solís Campos (igual)

Administración de Proyectos	Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (principal) Alicia Solís Campos (igual)
Adquisición de fondos	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (principal) Marco Antonio Vázquez Soto (apoya) Alicia Solís Campos (apoya)

Contribution Role	Author(s)
Conceptualization	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Methodology	Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (main) Alicia Solis Campos (same)
Software	Not applicable
Validation	Jorge Alan Aviña Godínez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (Same) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)

Formal Analysis	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Investigation	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Resources	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Data curation	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Writing - Preparing the original draft	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Writing - Review and editing	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Display	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)
Supervision	Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (main) Alicia Solis Campos (same)
Project Management	Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (main) Alicia Solis Campos (same)
Acquisition of funds	Jorge Alan Aviña Godinez (main) Marco Antonio Vazquez Soto (supports) Alicia Solis Campos (supports)