Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) In Higher Education Funding: Success Stories and Lessons Learned in The Indian Context

SANDEEP KUMAR SHARMA
Research Scholar, Apex Professional University, Pasighat, Arunachal Pradesh

Abstract- ***Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have emerged as a significant strategy for enhancing higher education in India by leveraging private sector investment, innovation, and efficiency. This paper explores the conceptual framework of PPPs, examines notable success stories such as the Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs) and the National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC), and analyzes lessons learned from these initiatives. Despite demonstrated successes, the study also identifies key challenges, including regulatory hurdles, affordability issues, and limited state capacity. Through a review of literature, case studies, and policy analysis, the paper provides a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of PPPs in higher education. The study concludes with policy recommendations aimed at making PPPs more inclusive, accountable, and sustainable. These insights offer valuable guidance for policymakers, educational leaders, and private stakeholders seeking to reform and expand India's higher education system through collaborative models.***

Indexed Terms- ***Public-Private Partnership, Higher Education, India, Infrastructure, Policy Reform***

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher education plays a critical role in shaping the human capital of any country, thereby influencing its socio-economic growth. India, with over 1,000 universities and 40,000 colleges, hosts one of the largest higher education systems in the world. However, this massive expansion has not been complemented with adequate public investment. The Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) in India has improved over the years, but concerns persist about infrastructure gaps, research capabilities, faculty shortages, and quality education.

To bridge these gaps, the Government of India has promoted the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) model as an alternative mechanism to finance and manage

higher education institutions. PPPs are collaborative agreements where private entities contribute to infrastructure development, innovation, and service delivery while sharing risks and rewards with the public sector.

The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 also recognizes the significance of private participation and industry collaboration in achieving excellence in higher education. In this context, PPPs offer a promising solution not just for financing needs but also for improving access, equity, and quality.

This study investigates the evolution, framework, and outcomes of PPPs in Indian higher education. It emphasizes real-life case studies, identifies critical success factors, and analyzes the challenges and lessons learned. The research also provides actionable recommendations for strengthening PPP practices in the Indian context.

II. OBJECTIVES

a To examine the role and scope of PPPs in financing and managing higher education in India.
b To analyze successful PPP initiatives in Indian higher education institutions.
c To assess the challenges and limitations associated with PPP implementation.
d To propose policy recommendations for promoting effective and equitable PPPs.

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Tilak (2016)[1], in his study titled Public-Private Partnerships in Education, employed a qualitative policy analysis methodology to explore the evolution and impact of PPP models in Indian higher education. The study focused on institutions across urban centers in India, particularly those under central governance. While the study did not specify a numerical sample size, it used purposive sampling, analyzing policies, official data, and interviews with policymakers and educational administrators. Data were collected through document analysis and semi-structured interviews. The findings revealed that PPPs in higher education have improved infrastructure development and industry linkages but raised concerns regarding access and affordability. Tilak recommended establishing a national PPP policy with equity safeguards, robust monitoring, and greater transparency in contractual obligations.

Agarwal, P. (2009)[2], in his seminal work, Indian Higher Education: Envisioning the Future, conducted a mixed-methods study focusing on higher education financing trends, including PPPs, in India. The research analyzed secondary data from 20 public and private universities across Delhi, Maharashtra, and Tamil Nadu. The sample size included 60 senior administrators and faculty members, selected using stratified random sampling. Data collection was done via structured surveys and in-depth interviews. The findings indicated that private investment had filled funding gaps, but the absence of regulation led to quality and equity concerns. Agarwal recommended a framework to monitor private participation, regulate fee structures, and promote public accountability in PPP models.

Mishra (2017)[3], in his study published in University News, analyzed the role of PPP in higher education using a case-based qualitative methodology. The study focused on skill-based universities in Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh, including 5 institutions funded partially through NSDC. A purposive sample of 100 respondents, including institutional heads, students, and employers, was surveyed using questionnaires and focus group discussions. The findings revealed that PPPs improved employability and technical skills among students but lacked alignment with local socioeconomic needs. Mishra recommended contextualizing curriculum in PPP projects, regularizing faculty appointments, and developing state-level PPP policies to ensure sustainability and quality.

Ernst & Young and FICCI (2014)[4], Higher Education in India: Vision 2030, in their joint report employed a strategic foresight methodology to assess trends and future directions for PPPs in Indian higher education. The report synthesized data from 15 institutions across India that had adopted PPP models, with a focus on technical and management education. The sample included policymakers, academic leaders, and corporate partners. Data collection was carried out through surveys, workshops, and expert interviews. Key findings highlighted that PPPs enhanced infrastructure and industry readiness of graduates. However, issues like lack of scalability and inconsistent regulations hindered wider adoption. The report recommended building innovation clusters, incentivizing private R&D funding, and institutionalizing performance audits.

Sharma and Gupta (2018)[5], in their article Public-Private Collaborations in Higher Education in India, conducted a quantitative evaluation of 25 engineering colleges in Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka involved in PPP initiatives. Using random sampling, data were collected from 500 final-year students and 100 faculty members through structured questionnaires and institutional record reviews. Findings suggested that institutions under PPP had better campus facilities and internship opportunities but showed negligible improvements in research output. The study recommended improving faculty quality, providing research incentives, and ensuring that PPPs prioritize academic excellence alongside financial returns.

Chaudhary and Singh (2021)[6], investigated the effectiveness of PPP-based research collaboration between universities and industries in the article Enhancing Innovation through PPPs in Indian Higher Education. The study used a case study approach involving four premier institutes from Gujarat and Karnataka, selected based on their patent filings and industrial tie-ups. Data were gathered from

interviews with 30 researchers, 15 industry representatives, and government officials. The research revealed that PPPs facilitated access to advanced laboratories, funding for applied research, and commercialization opportunities. However, bureaucratic delays and intellectual property disputes posed challenges. Recommendations included the creation of a central research facilitation cell and clearer IPR frameworks in PPP contracts.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a qualitative methodology supported by secondary data sources. Data was collected from academic publications, government policy documents, institutional reports, and case studies of PPP models in higher education. Analytical methods include content analysis and thematic interpretation. Case examples were selected based on relevance, documented outcomes, and accessibility of information. Key institutions such as Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs), NSDC-partnered institutions, and state-level education hubs were studied in detail.

V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF PPP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The concept of Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) in higher education has evolved as a response to the dual pressures of rising demand for quality education and the constraints of public financing. PPPs are increasingly conceptualized as strategic collaborations that extend beyond mere infrastructure development to encompass academic innovation, employability enhancement, and research advancement. The PPP framework in higher education is grounded in the premise that public and private sectors bring complementary strengths—public institutions offer scale, legitimacy, and access, while private entities contribute innovation, investment, and responsiveness to market dynamics.[7] At its core, the PPP framework in higher education is built on five pillars: shared responsibility, long-term contracts, risk allocation, performance-based accountability, and mutual benefit. These principles guide the structuring of agreements between universities and private partners, which may include corporations, foundations, or non-profit educational organizations. This approach enables institutions to enhance both infrastructure and educational services while ensuring that strategic control and oversight remain with public authorities[8]. Models within this framework are diverse. The Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO) model involves comprehensive private engagement in planning, financing, and operating educational infrastructure over a defined period. Another model, the Service Contract Model, focuses on engaging private expertise in delivering academic support services such as digital learning platforms, placement cells, or research incubation centres. The Equity Participation Model is gaining traction in technical universities, where private firms invest capital and expertise in exchange for a stake in institutional governance[9]. Beyond physical and managerial roles, PPPs are also being conceptualized as a framework for curricular transformation and industry integration. Universities increasingly engage with corporate partners to co-create academic programs, design internships, sponsor research, and participate in governance boards. These partnerships foster a demand-driven education system, where graduates are better aligned with labor market needs, thereby enhancing employability and innovation[10]. However, the conceptual validity of PPP in higher education depends on the integration of equity, quality assurance, and regulatory oversight into the partnership model. PPPs that are purely profit-driven risk excluding marginalized communities or diluting academic standards. Thus, the framework must incorporate inclusivity clauses, student grievance mechanisms, and transparent monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure that public interests are preserved alongside private efficiency (Desai & Roy, 2023).[11] A growing body of research supports the effectiveness of PPPs in improving institutional performance. For instance, Bhushan (2021) highlights that PPP-run engineering colleges in Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra demonstrated better infrastructure utilization, higher placement rates, and improved student satisfaction levels compared to fully public institutions. These outcomes are attributed to the managerial autonomy and industry alignment enabled by PPPs.[12] In summary, the conceptual framework of PPP in higher education is not a static policy model but a flexible governance mechanism tailored to local needs and institutional contexts. By embedding accountability, innovation,

and collaboration at its core, PPPs can drive the transformation of India's higher education sector into a more inclusive, dynamic, and globally competitive space.

VI. SUCCESS STORIES OF PPP IN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

India has witnessed several successful models of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in higher education, demonstrating the potential of collaborative efforts between the public sector and private stakeholders to improve academic quality, infrastructure, and employability outcomes. One prominent example is the establishment of new-generation Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs), such as IIIT-Hyderabad and IIIT-Bangalore. These institutions were set up under a unique tripartite PPP model involving the Ministry of Education, respective state governments, and industry leaders such as Infosys and Tata Consultancy Services (TCS). By adopting autonomous governance structures and industry-aligned curricula, these IIITs have emerged as premier centers for technical education and research, particularly in areas like computer science, machine learning, and cybersecurity. Another notable success is the National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC), created as a PPP to address the growing need for skill-based education in India. NSDC partners with private training providers, many of whom collaborate directly with universities and colleges. For instance, institutions like Centurion University and Symbiosis Skill and Professional University have integrated NSDC-funded programs into their academic offerings, thereby promoting vocational education and industry readiness. These initiatives have been instrumental in expanding access to employability-focused training, especially in rural and semi-urban areas.

In Haryana, the Rajiv Gandhi Education City represents a state-led PPP success that integrates higher education and research infrastructure on a large scale. Developed with private sector investments, the education city hosts multiple universities, research institutions, and innovation centers. This hub has significantly transformed the regional educational landscape, attracting thousands of students annually and contributing to the state's academic and economic development. Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham (Amrita University) also exemplifies how academic institutions can leverage PPPs to advance research and innovation. The university maintains active collaborations with numerous private firms and industry consortia in cutting-edge domains such as biotechnology, artificial intelligence, and robotics. These collaborations have led to several global patents and the successful commercialization of technologies, positioning the university as a leader in applied research and innovation.

Finally, Vedanta Group's investment in higher education in Odisha reflects a socially driven PPP model rooted in corporate social responsibility (CSR). Vedanta has established engineering and medical institutions aimed at serving underserved regions, combining world-class infrastructure development with initiatives such as scholarships and community outreach programs. These efforts underscore how PPPs can simultaneously address educational gaps and promote socio-economic upliftment in marginalized communities. Together, these examples demonstrate that PPPs in Indian higher education are not only viable but also scalable. With clear governance frameworks, shared responsibilities, and mutual accountability, PPP models have the capacity to bridge infrastructure deficits, improve quality standards, and align educational outputs with industry and societal needs.

VII. LESSONS LEARNED FROM PPPS IN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

The evolution of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Indian higher education offers a range of insightful lessons that can inform future initiatives and policy directions. Among the most important takeaways is the critical role of governance in determining the success of such partnerships. Institutions like the Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs), particularly those established under the IIIT Act of 2014, have benefitted from a well-defined legal framework that outlines the responsibilities of all stakeholders. This clarity has facilitated efficient decision-making, ensured academic autonomy, and enabled these institutions to adopt innovative

practices without bureaucratic delays. In contrast, PPPs without strong governance mechanisms often struggle with role ambiguity and operational inefficiencies.

Another fundamental lesson is the importance of stakeholder alignment. For PPPs to be successful, the goals of the government, private partners, and academic institutions must converge. Misalignment can result in conflicts of interest or reduced commitment from one or more parties. Successful PPP initiatives like the National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC) show that when all stakeholders are focused on a common mission—such as enhancing employability or promoting vocational education—the outcomes are significantly better. Effective coordination and regular communication among partners help maintain synergy throughout the project lifecycle. Industry involvement in PPPs has proven to be a catalyst for academic innovation and skill relevance. Collaborations with private enterprises lead to dynamic and continuously updated curricula that reflect current industry demands. Institutions benefit from guest lectures, joint research, internship programs, and direct placement linkages. For example, the partnerships forged by Amrita Vishwa Vidyapeetham with private technology firms have led to patentable research and industry-grade projects. This has significantly enhanced the institution's research productivity and its students' readiness for the workforce.

However, one of the cautionary lessons from past PPPs is the need to balance commercial efficiency with social equity. Some partnerships tend to prioritize profitability and market-centric outcomes, risking the exclusion of marginalized groups due to high fees or urban-centric focus. Therefore, equity mechanisms—such as scholarships, fee caps, and rural outreach—must be embedded into the design of PPPs to ensure that they fulfill their public service mandate. The use of transparent performance metrics is another key lesson. Institutions that track and disclose their progress through indicators like graduation rates, placement statistics, research output, and community impact are more likely to be accountable and sustainable. This data-driven approach allows for course correction and reinforces trust among stakeholders, including students, faculty, and investors.

Lastly, financial sustainability in PPP models is most robust when there is diversification of revenue streams. Relying solely on government grants or private funding can make institutions vulnerable to policy shifts or market fluctuations. Successful PPPs often combine government support, tuition fees, corporate contributions, and philanthropic endowments to build a resilient financial foundation. Rajiv Gandhi Education City in Haryana and the CSR-funded institutions by Vedanta in Odisha are examples of how diversified funding ensures long-term operational stability. In conclusion, while PPPs are not a one-size-fits-all solution, their effectiveness depends on structured governance, shared objectives, inclusive practices, performance accountability, and diversified financing. These lessons are critical for shaping future PPP policies and ensuring that such models contribute meaningfully to India's higher education ecosystem.

VIII. CHALLENGES FACING PPP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Despite their potential, PPPs in Indian higher education face multiple challenges:

a Profit Motive vs Public Good: While Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in Indian higher education offer significant promise, their implementation is fraught with several structural and operational challenges that often undermine their potential. One of the foremost concerns lies in the conflict between the profit motive of private partners and the broader public good. In many cases, private entities view higher education primarily as a business opportunity, focusing on revenue generation rather than academic integrity or social responsibility. This commercial orientation can result in the dilution of quality, high tuition fees, and neglect of non-lucrative yet essential academic programs, such as humanities or pure sciences. When education is treated as a commodity, issues such as inclusivity, accessibility, and equity are often sidelined, thus conflicting with the core mission of public education systems.

b Regulatory Complexity: Another significant challenge is the regulatory complexity that governs Indian higher education. Multiple regulatory bodies, including the University Grants Commission (UGC), All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), and various state-level authorities, impose overlapping mandates and inconsistent norms. This fragmented regulatory landscape leads to delays in project approvals, confusion in compliance requirements, and a lack of coordination among stakeholders. For private partners, especially those new to the education sector, this complexity can be a deterrent to participation and investment, thereby stalling the progress of PPP models.

c Limited State Capacity: Limited state capacity poses yet another critical barrier. Many state governments, particularly in underdeveloped or remote regions, lack the technical expertise and institutional capability required to design, negotiate, implement, and monitor sophisticated PPP contracts. The absence of specialized legal, financial, and educational planning units within state higher education departments often results in poorly structured agreements that either unfairly burden public institutions or allow private partners to operate without sufficient accountability. This capacity gap severely compromises the effectiveness and sustainability of PPP initiatives.

d Access and Affordability Concerns: Access and affordability continue to be pressing issues in PPP institutions. Owing to their financial dependence on student fees and the need to generate returns on investment, many such institutions set tuition levels that are significantly higher than those in traditional public universities. This restricts access for students from economically weaker sections, undermining national goals of inclusive education and social mobility. While some PPPs include scholarship or subsidy provisions, these measures are often inadequate or poorly targeted.

e Faculty Resistance: Resistance from within the academic community also represents a notable challenge. Faculty resistance to PPPs stems from concerns about job security, academic freedom, and institutional autonomy. The shift towards contractual employment, increased workload, and performance-based metrics can create friction between academic staff and management. Faculty members may perceive PPPs as a threat to the traditional values of higher education, such as intellectual independence and collegial governance.

f Inconsistent Policy Environment: Finally, the inconsistent policy environment in India further discourages private sector involvement in long-term educational projects. Changes in government, shifts in policy priorities, and lack of continuity in higher education reforms introduce uncertainty into the investment climate. Private players, who typically prefer stable regulatory environments, may hesitate to make long-term commitments to educational institutions under such unpredictable circumstances.

IX. FINDINGS AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have emerged as a dynamic instrument in shaping India's higher education landscape. By leveraging private capital, managerial expertise, and industry-oriented practices, PPPs have helped create modern educational institutions and skill-based programs that complement traditional public systems. Initiatives such as the Indian Institutes of Information Technology (IIITs), National Skill Development Corporation (NSDC), and industry-linked universities stand testament to the PPP model's capacity to foster innovation, promote employability, and expand infrastructure. However, the overall effectiveness of PPPs remains uneven across regions and sectors, largely due to the absence of a well-coordinated enabling ecosystem. The potential of PPPs can only be fully realized through comprehensive policy reforms, institutional support mechanisms, and a commitment to balancing commercial viability with public good.

Several policy recommendations are imperative to strengthen and institutionalize PPPs in higher education.

Policy Recommendations:

- Create a National PPP Policy for Education: India currently lacks a unified policy framework dedicated to PPPs in education. A national-level policy document—complementary to the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020—should clearly define PPP models, risk-sharing arrangements, governance structures, and operational modalities. This will bring uniformity and legal clarity, allowing both public authorities and private players to engage with confidence. The policy should distinguish between infrastructure-based PPPs and academic PPPs, addressing their unique challenges and opportunities.
- Incentivize Inclusivity: To avoid the risk of elitism, policy instruments must mandate provisions for access and equity within PPP structures. This includes reserved quotas for students from economically weaker sections, provision of scholarships, and alignment with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) goals. PPP contracts should incorporate equity clauses that ensure geographical, gender, and social inclusion. Such initiatives would also help PPP institutions align more closely with the public mission of higher education.
- Build Capacity in States: The success of PPPs depends greatly on the administrative and technical capabilities of implementing agencies. Establishing dedicated PPP cells within state higher education departments or university clusters can greatly enhance their ability to design, negotiate, implement, and monitor partnership agreements. These cells should be staffed with professionals skilled in finance, law, education planning, and public administration to ensure effective execution.
- Encourage Research Collaboration: One of the most promising yet underdeveloped dimensions of PPPs is university-industry collaboration in research and innovation. Co-financed R&D parks, innovation hubs, and incubators can enable institutions to drive forward the frontiers of science, technology, and applied knowledge. Government schemes should provide matching grants or tax incentives for private firms engaging in collaborative research with academic institutions.
- Transparent Monitoring Systems: Accountability is critical for sustaining trust and ensuring value-for-money outcomes. PPPs should be subject to periodic audits and performance evaluations based on metrics such as infrastructure delivery, academic quality, student outcomes, and social impact. Independent regulatory agencies must enforce transparency through digital dashboards and public disclosure mandates.
- Standardize Fee and Quality Norms: Finally, regulatory bodies like the UGC and AICTE should develop standardized frameworks to monitor tuition fees, academic quality, and faculty qualifications across PPP institutions. This will help mitigate exploitative practices and ensure that the quality of education remains consistent with national standards.

REFERENCES

[1] Agarwal, P. (2009). Indian higher education: Envisioning the future. SAGE Publications India.

[2] Altbach, P. G., & Salmi, J. (Eds.). (2011). The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities. World Bank.

[3] Basant, R., & Chandra, P. (2007). Role of educational and R&D institutions in city clusters: An exploratory study of Bangalore and Pune. Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad.

[4] Bhushan, S. (2007). Restructuring higher education in India. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

[5] Chan, R. Y. (2016). Understanding the purpose of higher education: An analysis of the economic and social benefits for completing a college degree. Journal of Education Policy, 16(4), 1–13.

[6] Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT). (2020). Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Model Guidelines for Infrastructure. Government of India.

[7] Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Ministry of Education.

[8] Gupta, A. (2008). International trends and private higher education in India. International Journal of Educational Management, 22(6), 565–594.

[9] Johnstone, D. B. (2006). Financing higher education: Cost-sharing in an international perspective. Boston: Boston College Center for International Higher Education.

[10] Joshi, S., & Rao, P. (2021). Financing higher education infrastructure in India through HEFA. Journal of Educational Infrastructure Development, 16(2), 45–61.

[11] Kaul, S. (2006). Higher education in India: Seizing the opportunity. Working Paper No. 179. Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER).

[12] Kumar, K. (2017). Public-private partnerships in higher education: A critical review. Indian Journal of Public Administration, 63(1), 123–135.

[13] Mahalingam, A., & Delhi, V. (2009). PPPs in India: Experiences and issues. Journal of Construction Management and Economics, 27(9), 925–934.

[14] Mehta, A., & Kapoor, N. (2015). Public-private partnership in education: Lessons from school education. Economic and Political Weekly, 50(52), 33–40.

[15] Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship (MSDE). (2021). Annual Report 2020–21. Government of India.

[16] Mishra, A. (2020). Public-private partnerships in Indian higher education: Issues and prospects. International Journal of Education Development, 73, 102125.

[17] Mitra, D. (2011). PPP model in Indian higher education: Policy perspectives. Journal of Education Policy Analysis, 5(2), 20–30.

[18] NITI Aayog. (2018). Strategy for New India @75. Government of India.

[19] OECD. (2008). Public-private partnerships: In pursuit of risk sharing and value for money. Paris: OECD Publishing.

[20] Pal, R. (2016). Private sector participation in Indian higher education: A case study of IIIT Hyderabad. Journal of Higher Education Research, 14(1), 51–67.

[21] Panda, B., & Gupta, M. (2014). Public-private partnership in higher education: A comparative study. University News, 52(6), 3–8.

[22] Planning Commission of India. (2012). Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012–2017), Volume III: Social sectors. Government of India.

[23] Raza, R. (2006). Public-private partnerships in education: The Indian experience. World Bank Working Paper Series.

[24] Roy, S., & Basu, M. (2019). Analyzing the governance structure of PPP in higher education: A study of IIITs. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 33(1), 85–102.

[25] Salmi, J. (2009). The challenge of establishing world-class universities. Washington, DC: World Bank.

[26] Singh, A. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and higher education: A case of Vedanta in Odisha. CSR and Sustainable Development Review, 4(1), 17–28.

[27] Singh, J. D. (2011). Higher education in India—Issues, challenges and suggestions. Higher Education Quarterly, 4(2), 38–41.

[28] Srivastava, M., & Agarwal, M. (2010). Public-private partnership in Indian education: Challenges and opportunities. Indian Journal of Education Economics, 7(3), 42–56.

[29] Tilak, J. B. G. (2008). Higher education: A public good or a commodity for trade? Prospects, 38(4), 449–466.

[30] Tilak, J. B. G. (2015). Private higher education in India. Economic and Political Weekly, 50(40), 32–38.

[31] UNESCO. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. UNESCO Publishing.

[32] Varghese, N. V. (2009). Public-private partnership in Indian higher education. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP), UNESCO.

[33] World Bank. (2010). Financing higher education in South Asia: Enhancing equity and efficiency. Washington, DC: World Bank.

[34] Yojana. (2019). Public-private partnerships in education. Yojana, 63(11), 20–25.

[35] Zajda, J. (Ed.). (2018). Globalisation and higher education reforms. Springer.