Public-Private Partnership (PPP) as a Mechanism for Transitioning to a 4th Generation University- A Case Study of the University of Algiers 3

Amina Djaballah[*]

Laboratory of Human Capital and Performance, Faculty of Economics, Commercial and Management Sciences, University of Algiers 3 – Algeria

aminadjaballah@gmail.com

Ouahiba Chehat

The laboratory of Governance and Modernization of public Management, Faculty of Economics, Commercial and Management Sciences, University of Algiers 3 – Algeria

wahibachehat@gmail.com

Received: 23/08/2025 Accepted: 29/08/2025 Date de publication: 22 /11/2025

Abstract:

The shift toward Fourth-Generation Universities (4GUs) demands innovation ecosystems, advanced digital infrastructure, and entrepreneurial governance. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are key enablers, yet their impact remains underexplored in the Global South. This study analyzes three PPP contracts at the University of Algiers 3, involving a mini data center, a cybersecurity solution, and an IT monitoring platform. A Gap Analysis compares outcomes with 4GU strategic dimensions. Results show advances in digital infrastructure, IT governance, and data protection, but gaps in innovation ecosystems, entrepreneurship, and stakeholder capacity. The findings highlight the need for PPPs that foster long-term transformation beyond technology acquisition, offering recommendations for policy and governance alignment with 4GU goals.

Keywords: Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs); Fourth-Generation University (4GU); gap analysis; digital infrastructure; higher education transformation.

Jel Classification Codes : L32, L33, O33, I23.

[*] Corresponding author.

1. Introduction:

The landscape of higher education is rapidly evolving, with universities worldwide striving to transition into Fourth-Generation institutions (4GUs) entities characterized by innovation ecosystems, digital resilience, entrepreneurial orientation, and student-centered governance. The University of Algiers 3 embodies this transformation, embarking on a digital modernization journey grounded in strategic partnerships with the private sector.

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have emerged as instrumental mechanisms in higher education infrastructure development, yet their role in catalyzing comprehensive institutional transformation remains underexplored. Most available research emphasizes policy discourse or high-level outcome measures, rather than deep empirical analyses anchored in actual contractual artifacts.

This study addresses that gap through a document-grounded approach: it empirically investigates three PPP contracts signed by the University of Algiers 3 in 2023. These agreements pertain to:

- The acquisition and installation of a hyper-converged infrastructure (HCI) mini data center.
- The deployment of a comprehensive cybersecurity framework.
- The implementation of an IT monitoring and audiovisual management platform.

Each contract offers a tangible view of the university's strategic investments in digital infrastructure, security, and governance. To assess their alignment with 4GU benchmarks, this research deploys a Gap Analysis framework, mapping actual contractual outputs against key transformation dimensions such as smart infrastructure, data governance, innovation ecosystems, and human capacity development.

Through this approach, the paper aims to answer the following research question:

How do the PPP contracts at the University of Algiers 3 align with, and diverge from the strategic objectives of the 4th Generation University model؟

Beyond evaluating alignment, the study contributes methodologically by demonstrating how contract-level analysis can serve as a rigorous and replicable framework for future assessments of digital transformation in higher education.

2. Conceptual Framework: Public-Private Partnership (PPP)

2.1. Definition of Public-Private Partnership (PPP)

A Public-Private Partnership (PPP) is a structured collaboration between a government entity and a private-sector organization designed to deliver a public service or infrastructure project through a long-term contractual agreement. In this framework, the private party often assumes substantial responsibilities and risks, such as financing, construction, operation, and maintenance, while the public partner ensures oversight, regulation, and

the alignment of outcomes with public interest (OECD, Public-Private Partnerships: In Pursuit of Risk Sharing and Value for Money, 2008).

PPPs are not simply outsourcing arrangements; rather, they involve a shared investment, shared risk, and shared returns framework, making them distinct from traditional public procurement. They aim to combine the accountability, legitimacy, and strategic oversight of the public sector with the innovation, efficiency, and capital of the private sector (Yescombe E. R., 2011).

This model has gained traction globally as governments seek to overcome fiscal constraints, modernize infrastructure, and improve service delivery, particularly in sectors like transport, energy, education, healthcare, and information technology (ADB, Public–Private Partnership Handbook, 2011); (IMF I. M., 2004).

2.2 Key Characteristics of Public-Private Partnership (PPP)

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are defined not only by their contractual structures but also by a distinct set of characteristics that differentiate them from conventional public procurement or privatization. These features collectively aim to improve the efficiency, quality, and sustainability of public services and infrastructure.

- Long-Term Contractual Relationship: A fundamental trait of PPPs is the long-term nature of the partnership, often ranging from 10 to 30 years. This extended duration enables comprehensive planning, sustainable service delivery, and accountability across the project lifecycle (World Bank, 2014)
- Shared Risks and Responsibilities: Risk-sharing is at the heart of PPPs. The allocation of risks (financial, operational, technical, legal) is designed to assign each type of risk to the party best able to manage it. For example, construction risks are often transferred to the private sector, while political and regulatory risks remain with the public sector (Yescombe E. R., 2011), (OECD, Public-Private Partnerships: In Pursuit of Risk Sharing and Value for Money, 2008)
- Private Sector Investment and Innovation: PPPs enable the mobilization of private capital for public infrastructure projects, reducing the immediate financial burden on the state. Additionally, the private sector is often better positioned to introduce technological innovations, operational efficiencies, and performance-driven practices (IMF I. M., 2004); (ADB, Public–Private Partnership Handbook, 2011).
- Performance-Based Payments: Unlike traditional procurement where payment is made upfront or upon project completion, PPPs typically involve payments linked to performance. The private party receives compensation (availability payments, toll revenues, etc.) only when the service meets predefined standards (Hodge & Greve, 2005)
- Output-Oriented Approach: PPPs emphasize the delivery of outputs rather than inputs. The government defines the desired service outcomes, and the private sector determines how best to deliver them, allowing for flexibility and innovation (World Bank, 2014).

- Focus on Public Service Delivery: Despite the involvement of private entities, the goal of PPPs remains public service delivery. The projects serve the public interest, whether through education, health care, transportation, or utility services (OECD, Public-Private Partnerships: In Pursuit of Risk Sharing and Value for Money, 2008).
- Regulatory and Institutional Oversight: PPPs operate under strict legal frameworks and are subject to monitoring, evaluation, and enforcement mechanisms by public authorities. This ensures transparency, accountability, and value for money (Bank E. I., 2011).

2.3 The Importance of Puplic-Private Partnerships (PPPs)

Amid growing pressure on public resources and shrinking fiscal space, governments particularly in developing countries are increasingly recognizing the strategic importance of attracting private sector investment to finance infrastructure projects. These projects are widely acknowledged as essential engines of economic growth and sustainable development. As such, the adoption of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) is no longer viewed merely as an alternative financing option, but rather as a comprehensive strategy for achieving national development goals.

The rationale behind engaging in PPPs goes beyond financial necessity and includes several operational and strategic benefits:

- Enhancing Operational Efficiency: PPPs foster improvements in the quality and efficiency of public service delivery through the integration of modern technology, innovation, and private sector expertise. This allows for the optimization of operations and long-term service sustainability (Yescombe E. R., 2011); (OECD, Public-Private Partnerships: In Pursuit of Risk Sharing and Value for Money, 2008)
- Adherence to Timeframes and Budgets: Private partners are incentivized through contractual obligations and performance-based payments to deliver projects on time and within budget, minimizing delays and cost overruns common in public sector-led projects (World Bank, 2014).
- Ensuring Long-Term Financial Stability: Through long-term agreements, governments can forecast and manage future financial commitments, helping to stabilize public expenditure and reduce fiscal volatility.
- Supporting Local Private Sector Development: PPP arrangements promote the involvement of domestic firms by encouraging partnerships with international consortia, fostering subcontracting opportunities in areas such as construction, electrical systems, maintenance, security, and cleaning services. This contributes to capacity-building and the creation of a more competitive local private sector.

- Facilitating Gradual Transformation of Public Enterprises: Engagement in PPPs helps state-owned enterprises transition towards competitiveness by enabling knowledge transfer, skill development, and exposure to market-oriented practices, eventually producing "national champions" capable of competing at the global level.

- Fostering Economic Diversification: By boosting competitiveness and investing in infrastructure-linked industries such as construction and technical services, PPPs can play a pivotal role in reducing economic dependence on limited sectors and promoting diversified economic development.

- Addressing Capacity Gaps in the Public Sector: Given the increasing demand for infrastructure and public services, PPPs allow governments to bridge institutional and technical gaps by relying on the strengths of the private sector to deliver high-quality services efficiently.

- Ensuring Long-Term Value for Money: Through the transfer of operational and financial risks to private partners across the entire project lifecycle, from design and construction to operation and maintenance, PPPs enhance accountability and help ensure value for money over the long term (Hodge & Greve, 2005).

2.4 Criteria for Selecting Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Projects

The successful implementation of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) projects relies heavily on the careful selection of initiatives that align with national priorities and deliver both economic and social value. Governments, particularly in developing countries, have adopted rigorous criteria to ensure that PPPs contribute effectively to infrastructure development and long-term sustainability (Bank W. , 2017); (OECD, 2020). The primary criteria include:

- Maximizing Economic Value: PPP projects must demonstrate their ability to generate maximum economic benefit, not only through cost-effectiveness but also through enhanced service quality, improved project performance, and long-term value creation. Emphasis is placed on life-cycle cost analysis to ensure optimal resource use and durability of outcomes (Yescombe & Farquharson, Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure: Principles of Policy and Finance (2nd ed.), 2018).

- Promoting Local Employment and Capacity Building: Priority is given to projects that support domestic job creation and human capital development. This includes favoring private partners that employ a significant proportion of local labor, invest in workforce training, and contribute to national expertise development (UNESCAP, 2021). The integration of national labor not only improves social acceptance but also aligns PPPs with broader development goals such as poverty reduction and inclusive growth.

- Supporting Local SMEs: An essential selection criterion is the inclusion of domestic small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in project implementation. Encouraging SME participation, whether through

subcontracting or service provision, enhances the social and economic impact of PPPs. It also strengthens local supply chains and fosters innovation at the grassroots level (Commission, 2018).

These criteria underscore the evolving role of PPPs as tools not only for financing infrastructure but also for achieving strategic development objectives, including economic diversification, technology transfer, and social equity. Selecting projects based on such multidimensional criteria ensures alignment with national development plans and strengthens the legitimacy and sustainability of PPP arrangements.

2.5 Advantages of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Contracts

PPP contracts offer several strategic and operational advantages, particularly in the context of infrastructure development and public service delivery. Among the most notable benefits are:

- Design and Construction by the Private Partner: The private sector is responsible for the design and construction phases of infrastructure projects, often bringing technical expertise, innovation, and project management efficiency (Yescombe E. R., 2017).
- Upfront Private Sector Financing: PPPs allow governments to access immediate capital investment without placing direct pressure on public finances, as the private partner assumes the responsibility for upfront funding (Bank W. , 2017).
- Public Ownership of Assets: Upon completion, the infrastructure typically becomes the property of the public entity, ensuring long-term public control over critical assets (OECD, 2020).
- Operation and Maintenance by the Private Partner: The private party is contractually obligated to operate and maintain the infrastructure, ensuring quality standards, service continuity, and cost efficiency throughout the project life cycle.
- Enforcement of Performance Penalties: PPP agreements often include penalty clauses for non-compliance or performance failures, aligning incentives and ensuring accountability (UNESCAP, 2021).
- Knowledge Transfer: PPP arrangements facilitate the transfer of technical knowledge, management expertise, and innovative practices from the private sector to public institutions, contributing to capacity building (ADB, 2021)

2.6 Models of PPPs in Public Projects

PPP models vary significantly depending on the distribution of roles, the nature of the project, and the degree of private sector involvement. Broadly, PPPs can be classified into two major categories:

First: Cooperative Partnerships

This model is based on collaborative engagement between the public and private sectors. It emphasizes joint decision-making, mutual consultation, and a balance of influence between the two parties. Common sub-models include:

- Supply and Transport Contracts: The private partner agrees to supply materials or equipment essential to public facilities or services in exchange for a fixed fee.
- Solidarity Contracts (Joint Ventures): Both public and private entities share ownership, risks, and profits of the project, fostering alignment of interests and equitable cooperation.
- Public Loans and Technical Assistance: In this model, financial or technical support is extended by the private party to enhance public project implementation, particularly in the form of concessional loans or specialized advisory services.
- These models are particularly suitable for environments where public institutions seek to enhance service delivery without relinquishing full control to private operators (Grimsey & Lewis, 2007); (IMF, 2020).

Second: Contractual Partnerships

Contractual partnerships represent formal agreements between the public and private sectors, characterized by clearly defined responsibilities, risk-sharing mechanisms, and performance standards. These contracts typically assign the design, delivery, operation, or maintenance of public services or infrastructure to private partners, while preserving the overall ownership and strategic control with the public entity. Key models under this category include:

- Service Contract: In this arrangement, the private party is contracted to provide specific services such as maintenance, meter reading, or billing under the supervision and control of the public authority. The contract duration is usually short-term, and the private entity is compensated through fixed payments (Bank W. , 2017).
- Lease Contract: The private operator leases public assets and assumes full responsibility for operations and maintenance. Revenue is typically generated from user fees, from which the operator pays a lease fee to the government. This model allows for efficiency gains without transferring asset ownership (OECD, 2020).
- Management Contract: The management of a public utility or service is delegated to a private company, which is paid a management fee. Unlike lease contracts, the government retains the operational revenue and continues to bear investment responsibilities. These contracts are suitable for enhancing service quality and institutional performance (ADB, 2021).
- Concession Contract: Under a concession, the private sector is granted the right to finance, develop, operate, and maintain a public infrastructure project. The private entity recovers its investment from operational revenues, often collected directly from users. At the end of the concession period, the asset is returned to the public authority. This model is widely used in transport, energy, and water sectors (UNESCAP, 2021); (Yescombe E. R., 2017).
- Build–Operate–Transfer (BOT): BOT is a modern PPP arrangement whereby the private sector designs, finances, and constructs a public facility, operates it for a specified period to recover its costs and earn a return,

and then transfers the asset to the government. BOTs are often used for large-scale infrastructure such as highways, ports, and power plants (Grimsey & Lewis, 2007).

These contractual models are particularly effective when governments seek to enhance infrastructure quality and service delivery while retaining long-term control over strategic public assets. They enable risk allocation to the party best equipped to manage it and encourage private investment in public goods.

3. University 4.0: A Strategic Model for Transforming Higher Education in the Digital Age

In an era of rapid digital transformation, universities are evolving beyond traditional teaching and research roles. The University 4.0 model responds to these changes by emphasizing innovation, societal impact, and collaboration with industry and government. The following section outlines the concept and significance of this emerging model.

3.1 The Concept of University 4.0

University 4.0 stands as a progressive institutional model designed to respond to the challenges and opportunities of Industry 4.0 through digital transformation and innovation. It denotes a paradigm shift in higher education, focusing on impactful societal engagement and partnerships across academia, industry, government, and civil society.

According to Ülker and Otrar, University 4.0 essentials fall into four categories: **knowledge management and communication**, **continuous improvement**, **global competitiveness**, and **digitalization**. These dimensions reflect a move toward agile, socially responsive institutions that foster innovation and interdisciplinary collaboration (Ülker & Otrar, 2024).

Recent research has highlighted the concept of "educational singularity", universities continually reviewing and transforming their practices to remain relevant in a dynamic and uncertain world. Such institutions actively innovate to address social complexity by combining foresight, adaptability, and distinctive educational characteristics (Lara-Navarra, Sánchez-Navarro, Fitó-Bertran, López-Ruiz, & Girona, 2024).

Moreover, as Xing and Marwala highlight, the Fourth Industrial Age necessitates that universities evolve beyond traditional teaching and research. These institutions must integrate artificial intelligence, big data analytics, and digital learning environments to develop graduates equipped for future labor markets (Xing & Marwala, 2017)

In essence, University 4.0 universities transcend conventional academic functions by emphasizing knowledge translation, community relevance, and adaptive learning models that align with the dynamic demands of the digital economy.

3.2 The Strategic Importance of Transitioning to University 4.0

The evolution of higher education toward the University 4.0 model is a strategic necessity driven by the accelerating impacts of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. This model emphasizes the integration of advanced

digital technologies, innovation, and adaptability in response to rapidly changing socio-economic demands. Key drivers for this transition include:

- Enhancing Graduate Employability: Universities are increasingly expected to equip graduates not only with academic knowledge but also with interdisciplinary, cognitive, and entrepreneurial competencies that enable them to thrive in dynamic labor markets. As Xing and Marwala (2017) argue, the Fourth Industrial Age necessitates a shift from rote learning to fostering critical thinking and problem-solving capabilities. In this context, educational programs must be redesigned to integrate both technical and soft skills, fostering adaptability, creativity, and a mindset oriented toward lifelong learning.

- Rethinking Core University Functions: The traditional missions of universities, teaching and research, require substantial revision in light of technological disruption and shifting societal expectations. As student populations grow and diversity, the imperative for inclusive, personalized, and technology-enabled learning becomes central. Universities must adopt flexible governance models, invest in faculty development, and leverage digital infrastructure to ensure relevance and impact (Lara-Navarra, Sánchez-Navarro, Fitó-Bertran, López-Ruiz, & Girona, 2024).

- Anticipating Socio-Economic Change: Rather than merely responding to current labor market and societal needs, universities must proactively anticipate future trends and lead socio-economic transformations. According to Xing and Marwala (2017), higher education institutions should position themselves as anticipatory systems, capable of foreseeing technological and societal shifts and adjusting strategies accordingly. This requires strengthening foresight capabilities, embracing innovation ecosystems, and fostering university industry society collaboration.

3.3 Generational Evolution of the University Model

The university as an institution has undergone a profound transformation over the centuries, evolving in response to shifting societal, economic, and technological demands. Scholars commonly categorize this development into four main generational models: the **teaching-centered university** (first generation), the **research university** (second generation), the **entrepreneurial university** (third generation), and the **innovation-led university** (fourth generation) (Salehi, Sajjadi, & Samadi, 2021); (Wissema, 2009). Each generation reflects a strategic shift from traditional knowledge transmission and academic inquiry to proactive roles in economic development, digital innovation, and societal engagement. This generational framework is critical for reimagining the university's role in the era of Industry 4.0 and the knowledge economy (Xing & Marwala, 2017).

Table N°1: Generational Evolution of the University Model

Representative Examples	Core Characteristics	University Model	Time Period	Generation
University of Bologna, University of Paris	- Focus on classical education and pedagogy- Knowledge transmission through lectures and texts	Teaching-Centered University	Medieval period – 18th century	First Generation
Humboldt University of Berlin	- Integration of scientific research into teaching- Rise of disciplines in sciences and engineering	Research University	19th – mid-20th century	Second Generation
MIT, Stanford University	- Emphasis on innovation, patents, and start-ups- Strong university–industry collaboration	Entrepreneurial University	1970s – ~2000	Third Generation
Harvard University, KAIST, TU Munich	- Use of AI, Big Data, smart campuses- Societal engagement through the quadruple helix model (U-I-G-C)	Innovation-Driven University	2000 – present	Fourth Generation

Source: Wissema (2009) Towards the Third Generation University and Salehi, Sajjadi, & Samadi (2021) Move to the Fourth-Generation Universities: The Ideal Type Model Design.

3.4 Characteristics of the Fourth-Generation University (University 4.0)

The Fourth-Generation University (University 4.0) represents a transformative institutional paradigm that aligns higher education with the imperatives of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. It reflects a strategic and structural response to accelerating technological, economic, and societal changes. This model is marked by

multidimensional innovation in pedagogy, governance, research, and stakeholder engagement. Several key characteristics define the University 4.0 framework:

- **Interactive, Flexible, and Open Learning Environments:** University 4.0 is characterized by dynamic, student-centered learning ecosystems that transcend traditional temporal and spatial boundaries. These environments promote synchronous and asynchronous interaction through digital platforms, enabling continuous dialogue between learners, faculty, and digital content (Xing & Marwala, 2017). Flexibility is embedded in course design, allowing adaptation to diverse learner needs.
- **Integrated Local and Global Engagement:** These institutions extend their impact beyond local communities, positioning themselves as globally engaged universities. Through strategic partnerships with international universities, research centers, and industry actors, University 4.0 facilitates knowledge exchange, cross-border collaboration, and the globalization of curricula (Lara-Navarra, Sánchez-Navarro, Fitó-Bertran, López-Ruiz, & Girona, 2024)
- **Agility and Strategic Foresight:** Fourth-generation universities exhibit organizational agility and proactive governance. They are equipped to anticipate emerging challenges by regularly updating curricula, incorporating disruptive technologies, and aligning programs with evolving labor market demands (Salehi, Sajjadi, & Samadi, 2021). This anticipatory capacity supports long-term institutional resilience.
- **Pervasive Digital Connectivity**: Functioning as "fully connected institutions," University 4.0 relies on integrated digital infrastructures that ensure seamless communication and collaboration among internal and external stakeholders. Such infrastructures enhance administrative efficiency and foster knowledge co-creation (Wissema, 2009).
- **Commitment to Equity and Social Inclusion:** A defining principle of university 4.0 is its commitment to democratizing access to education. It promotes inclusive policies aimed at reducing disparities, supporting underrepresented groups, and ensuring equitable participation across all levels of academic life (UNESCO, 2019).
- **Innovative and Hybrid Learning Models:** These universities implement a blend of digital and experiential learning tools, such as:
    - Small Private Online Courses (SPOCs)
    - Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)
    - Corporate Open Online Courses (COOCs)
- **Immersive technologies** including Virtual Reality (VR), Augmented Reality (AR), and Mixed Reality (MR)

These tools foster experiential, interactive, and personalized learning experiences (Lara-Navarra, Ferrer-Sapena, Ismodes-Cascón, Fosca-Pastor, & Sánchez-Pérez, 2025)

- **Emergent Pedagogical Approaches:** Curricula in University 4.0 are designed around emerging interdisciplinary fields such as Artificial Intelligence, Big Data, Cognitive Neuroscience, and learning sciences. Emphasis is placed on flipped classrooms, gamified learning environments, and microlearning strategies to enhance learner engagement (Xing & Marwala, 2017).
- **Learner-Centered Customization:** The University 4.0 model promotes personalized learning trajectories by allowing students to co-design their academic pathways. This approach empowers learners to select specific skill sets aligned with their personal and professional goals, enhancing learner autonomy (Salehi, Sajjadi, & Samadi, 2021).
- **Development of Soft Skills and Multilingual Competencies**: In response to the demands of globalized labor markets, these institutions emphasize the cultivation of soft skills including critical thinking, creativity, communication, and teamwork alongside the mastery of foreign languages (Lara-Navarra, Ferrer-Sapena, Ismodes-Cascón, Fosca-Pastor, & Sánchez-Pérez, 2025).
- **Fostering Lifelong Learning and Metacognition:** University 4.0 promotes the philosophy of "learning how to learn," encouraging students to become self-regulated, lifelong learners. This approach aims to build adaptive, reflective individuals who are prepared for ongoing personal and professional development (Wissema, 2009).
- **Integration of Technology and Entrepreneurship**: Entrepreneurial learning is integrated into the institutional mission, with a strong focus on innovation ecosystems. Through incubators, maker spaces, and start-up accelerators, students are trained not only to seek employment but to generate economic opportunities (Salehi, Sajjadi, & Samadi, 2021).
- **Human-Centered and Interdisciplinary Orientation**: Despite its technological emphasis, University 4.0 remains anchored in the humanistic tradition. Social sciences and humanities are leveraged to interpret societal transformations, ensuring that technological advancement is aligned with ethical and societal well-being (Lara-Navarra, Ferrer-Sapena, Ismodes-Cascón, Fosca-Pastor, & Sánchez-Pérez, 2025)

4. Empirical Analysis of PPP Contracts at the University of Algiers 3:

This section presents the empirical analysis of three Public-Private Partnership (PPP) contracts implemented at the University of Algiers 3. Using the Gap Analysis method, each contract is assessed in terms of its purpose, financial value, PPP type, and its contribution to key dimensions of the 4th Generation University (4GU) model. The analysis also identifies the challenges encountered in implementation, highlighting the extent to which these partnerships support the university's strategic transition. This practical evaluation serves to bridge theory and real-world practice, offering insights into the effectiveness and limitations of PPPs in the higher education context.

4.1 Theoretical Background: Gap Analysis

Gap Analysis is a strategic evaluation framework rooted in performance management and systems theory, which seeks to identify the difference between the actual state of a system and its desired future condition. Originally applied in business and organizational planning (Crosby, 1979), the method has since been adopted in fields such as education, public policy, and development planning to evaluate strategic alignment, performance shortfalls, and system inefficiencies.

At its core, Gap Analysis is guided by the assumption that successful transformation requires the accurate identification of what is missing, misaligned, or underdeveloped in a system when compared against defined strategic goals (Hill & Jones, 2009). It provides a structured, diagnostic approach for assessing the distance between the current status ("what is") and an envisioned goal state ("what should be") (Clark & Fujimoto, 1991).

4.2 Gap Analysis in the Context of Public-Private Partnerships in Higher Education

Gap analysis serves as a strategic tool for evaluating the effectiveness of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) initiatives within universities transitioning toward the 4th Generation University (4GU) model. By systematically comparing the actual outputs of PPP projects such as data centers, cybersecurity platforms, or management systems, with the expected outcomes defined by comprehensive transformation frameworks like the 4GU model (Pérez-Esparrells & de la Torre, 2021), institutions can identify which dimensions have been fulfilled (e.g., smart infrastructure, digital governance) and where significant gaps remain (e.g., entrepreneurial integration, innovation ecosystems).

This approach is grounded in several theoretical perspectives that reinforce its analytical power:

- **Systems Theory** (Bertalanffy, 1968) frames the university as a complex system where PPPs introduce new inputs and outputs. Gap analysis helps reveal systemic imbalances or mismatches between intended functions and actual outcomes.
- **Strategic Management Theory** (Ansoff, 1987) justifies the method's role in aligning institutional resources such as those provided through partnerships, with long-term strategic goals, like digital transformation or internationalization.
- **Institutional Theory** (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) emphasizes how universities adapt to external pressures (e.g., market demands, technological changes). Gap analysis identifies areas where such adaptation through PPPs is insufficient or misaligned.
- **Stakeholder Theory** (Freeman, 1984) supports the evaluation of how PPP arrangements balance the interests of diverse stakeholders including public institutions, private companies, students, and staff, by highlighting unmet needs or mismanaged expectations.

From a methodological standpoint, gap analysis is especially well-suited to case-study-based evaluations. It enables researchers to classify PPP contributions across pre-defined transformation dimensions, detect systemic weaknesses, and formulate actionable recommendations for institutional development and policy reform. In doing so, the method contributes both empirical insights and theoretical advancement in the study of university modernization through PPPs.

4.3 Data Presentation:

This section presents the empirical data derived from three Public-Private Partnership (PPP) contracts implemented at the University of Algiers 3. The objective is to assess the extent to which these partnerships align with the strategic pillars of the 4th Generation University (4GU) model. Each contract is analyzed in terms of its primary objective, financial value, PPP typology, contribution to digital transformation goals, documented outputs, anticipated outcomes, and identified gaps in implementation.

This structured overview provides a foundation for the subsequent gap analysis and strategic evaluation. The table below summarizes the key features of each PPP contract, highlighting their relevance to university modernization efforts and the broader digital transformation agenda:

Table N°2: Summary of PPP Contracts at the University of Algiers 3 and Their Alignment with 4GU Dimensions

Contract No.	Purpose	PPP Type	4GU Dimension	Expected Outcomes	Implementation Gaps
01	Acquisition of integrated IT equipment and software for HCI mini data center.	Infrastructure-based PPP	Smart infrastructure, data governance	Improved data availability, centralized management, support for smart campus	Lack of innovation integration and limited entrepreneurial linkages
02	Acquisition and installation of network and storage equipment for the HCI mini data center.	Technology deployment PPP	Digital connectivity, operational efficiency	Enhanced data flow, secured IT infrastructure, readiness for local cloud computing	No mention of user training or long-term maintenance capacity
03	Acquisition and installation of IT and audiovisual systems for classrooms and labs.	Educational technology PPP	Digital pedagogy, infrastructure modernization	Interactive learning environment, updated teaching tools	Limited scope in innovation ecosystems and weak entrepreneurial culture support

Source: Prepared by Authors, based on PPP contract documents from the University of Algiers 3.

4.4 Gap Analysis Findings:

The gap analysis reveals that while the University of Algiers 3 has initiated significant Public-Private Partnership (PPP) projects in the domains of digital infrastructure, cybersecurity, and IT governance, these initiatives only partially align with the multidimensional requirements of the 4th Generation University (4GU) model.

- **Contract No.1 – HCI Mini Data Center:** The implementation of the HCI Mini Data Center has strengthened the university's technological backbone, particularly in terms of data storage, scalability, and access to cloud services. However, gaps remain in integrating this infrastructure with advanced data analytics, research platforms, and cross-campus innovation ecosystems. Furthermore, the absence of comprehensive administrative training limits the operational sustainability of the system.

- **Contract No.2 – Cybersecurity Solution:** The cybersecurity deployment has enhanced data protection and fostered digital trust among stakeholders. Nevertheless, over-reliance on a single vendor poses risks of technological lock-in, while limited in-house expertise hampers the capacity for continuous adaptation to evolving threats. Alignment with the 4GU framework is partial, as broader aspects of digital governance and security culture are underdeveloped.

- **Contract No.3 – Monitoring and Management Platform:** This initiative has improved IT governance through data-driven decision-making tools and performance monitoring. However, the complexity of integrating the platform with existing systems remains a barrier. The current implementation does not fully exploit predictive analytics or AI capabilities that could optimize operational efficiency and academic service delivery.

➢ **Cross-Cutting Gaps**

Across all three PPP contracts, the primary shortfalls lie in:

- **Innovation ecosystem integration**: technology upgrades are not yet embedded in collaborative R&D frameworks.
- **Capacity building**: limited staff training and absence of continuous learning mechanisms.
- **Entrepreneurial engagement**: insufficient connection between digital tools and market-oriented partnerships.
- **Governance alignment**: fragmented IT governance strategies and unclear accountability mechanisms.

4.5 Discussion:

These findings confirm that PPPs can serve as accelerators for digital transformation in higher education, but their transformative potential depends on more than technology procurement. The University of Algiers 3's approach reflects a technology-first rather than a strategy-first orientation. While the infrastructure investments position the university on the path toward 4GU standards, the absence of integrated governance, continuous professional development, and innovation linkages slows the transition.

International literature on PPPs in higher education (Pérez-Esparrells & de la Torre, 2021) emphasize that sustainable transformation requires a holistic alignment between institutional vision, technology deployment, and stakeholder engagement. The current case suggests that the university has achieved incremental gains in digital readiness but still faces systemic gaps in leveraging PPP outputs for strategic transformation.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation:

The PPP contracts at the University of Algiers 3 have delivered measurable progress in upgrading the university's digital infrastructure and enhancing IT governance. Nonetheless, the gap analysis underscores that these gains are necessary but not sufficient for a full transition to a 4th Generation University.

5.1 Key Recommendations:

- **Strategic Integration of Technology and Governance**
  - Develop a unified digital transformation roadmap linking PPP outputs to 4GU strategic pillars.
  - Introduce integrated governance frameworks to coordinate technology use across academic and administrative units.
- **Capacity Building and Knowledge Transfer**
  - Embed mandatory training programs for administrative and technical staff in all PPP contracts.
  - Establish joint research and innovation labs with PPP partners to transfer know-how and foster innovation culture.
- **Innovation Ecosystem Engagement**
  - Leverage PPP platforms to create collaborative R&D projects with industry and startups.
  - Link data systems to entrepreneurial programs and innovation hubs.
- **Risk Mitigation and Sustainability**
  - Reduce vendor lock-in by adopting open standards and multi-vendor strategies.
  - Allocate budget lines for ongoing maintenance, upgrades, and cybersecurity awareness campaigns.

5.2 Final Review:

Overall, the PPP-based transformation efforts at the University of Algiers 3 demonstrate commendable progress in foundational infrastructure development but fall short of comprehensive 4GU alignment. The current trajectory suggests that with deliberate governance reform, targeted capacity building, and ecosystem engagement, the university could accelerate its evolution into a fully networked, innovation-driven institution. This case reinforces the broader lesson that PPPs in higher education must be designed not merely as procurement vehicles but as strategic co-creation platforms for institutional transformation.

6. List of references:

1. Ülker, N., & Otrar, M. (2024). University 4.0 essentials: Influence of industry 4.0 on higher education. Industry and Higher Education.
2. ADB, A. D. (2011). Public–Private Partnership Handbook. Manila: ADB.
3. ADB, A. D. (2021). PPP Handbook. Manila: ADB.
4. Ansoff, I. H. (1987). Corporate Strategy. McGraw-Hill.
5. Bank, E. I. (2011). The Guide to Guidance, How to Prepare, Procure and Deliver PPP Projects. Luxembourg.
6. Bank, W. (2017). Public-Private Partnerships Reference Guide (Version 3.0). Washington, D.C: World Bank Group.
7. Bertalanffy, L. v. (1968). General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications. George Braziller.
8. Clark, K. B., & Fujimoto, T. (1991). Product Development Performance: Strategy, Organization, and Management in the World Auto Industry. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
9. Commission, E. (2018). Guidance on Public-Private Partnerships. Brussels: EC Publications.
10. Crosby, P. (1979). Quality is Free. New York: McGraw-Hill.
11. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review , 48(2), 147-160.
12. Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Pitman Publishing.
13. Grimsey, D., & Lewis, M. K. (2007). Public-Private Partnerships: The Worldwide Revolution in Infrastructure Provision and Project Finance. Edward Elgar.
14. Hill, C., & Jones, G. (2009). Strategic Management Theory: An Integrated Approach. Houghton Mifflin.
15. Hodge, G., & Greve, C. (2005). The Challenge of Public-Private Partnerships: Learning from International Experience. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
16. IMF. (2020). Public-Private Partnerships Fiscal Risk Assessment Model. Washington, D.C: World Bank Group (WBG), International Monetary Fund (IMF).
17. IMF, I. M. (2004). Public-Private Partnerships. Washington, DC: IMF Fiscal Affairs Department.
18. Lara-Navarra, P., Sánchez-Navarro, J., Fitó-Bertran, À., López-Ruiz, J., & Girona, C. (2024). Exploring singularity in higher education: Innovating to adapt to an uncertain future. RIED — Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia, 27(1).
19. Lara-Navarra, P., Ferrer-Sapena, A., Ismodes-Cascón, E., Fosca-Pastor, C., & Sánchez-Pérez, E. A. (2025). The Future of Higher Education: Trends, Challenges and Opportunities in AI-Driven Lifelong Learning in Peru. Information, 16(3), 224.
20. OECD. (2008). Public-Private Partnerships: In Pursuit of Risk Sharing and Value for Money. Paris: OECD Publishing.
21. OECD. (2020). Public-Private Partnerships: Governance Principles and Best Practices. Paris: OECD Publishing.
22. Pérez-Esparrells, C., & de la Torre, E. M. (2021). University governance and the Fourth Generation University: Towards a new model. ertiary Education and Management 27(4), 387–405.
23. Salehi, A. M., Sajjadi, S. M., & Samadi, M. (2021). Move to the Fourth-Generation Universities: The Ideal Type Model Design.
24. UNESCAP. (2021). Public-Private Partnerships in Infrastructure Development in Asia and the Pacific. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
25. UNESCO. (2019). nclusive policy development in higher education: Towards equitable access and success. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

26. Wissema, J. G. (2009). Towards the Third Generation University: Managing the University in Transition. Edward Elgar Publishing.

27. World Bank, D. B.-A. (2014). Public-Private Partnerships : Reference Guide, Version 2.0. Washington, DC: World Bank, Asian Development Bank, and Inter-American Development Bank.

28. Xing, B., & Marwala, T. (2017). Implications of the Fourth Industrial Age on Higher Education. arXiv.

29. Yescombe, E. R. (2011). Public-Private Partnerships: Principles of Policy and Finance. Elsevier.

30. Yescombe, E. R. (2017). Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure: Principles of Policy and Finance (2nd ed.). Butterworth-Heinemann.

31. Yescombe, E. R., & Farquharson, E. (2018). Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure: Principles of Policy and Finance (2nd ed.). Butterworth-Heinemann.