



PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP IN EDUCATION: FEATURES AND PROSPECTS

ASOCIACIÓN PÚBLICO-PRIVADA EN EDUCACIÓN: CARACTERÍSTICAS Y PERSPECTIVAS

Tat'jana V. Varkulevich¹, Natal'ja R. Pashuk²

¹ Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Economics and Management, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russian Federation

² Graduate student, Assistant of the Department of Economics and Management, Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, Vladivostok, Russian Federation

Enviado: 27 de junio de 2019

Aceptado para publicar: 30 de julio de 2019

Publicado: 8 de agosto de 2019

abstract

Effective and constructive interaction of the state and business is an essential condition for the country's socio-economic development. One of the tools to ensure the growth of the financial, innovation, technological potential of the territories is the implementation of public-private partnership projects (hereinafter - PPP). The modern market system creates the conditions for the organization of cooperation of market entities in all sectors and areas, including in the field of education. Within this article, a comprehensive review of the PPP typology, structured on the basis of the multidimensionality of the classifications proposed by the authors, was conducted. Special attention is paid to the typology of partnership in the field of education, which has become widespread and has been actively implemented in Russia for the last five years. Based on the review of typologies of public-private partnerships in education, the main criteria were identified, by which the types of partnerships were classified, the main distinguishing features of PPP in education were formulated, the basic principles characteristic of PPP projects were identified, and the prospects and benefits that the sphere education from participation in public-private partnership.

Keywords: PPP in education; typology of PPP in education; cooperation with universities; partnership perspectives in education; principles of PPP in education.

La interacción efectiva y constructiva del estado y las empresas es una condición esencial para el desarrollo socioeconómico del país. Una de las herramientas para asegurar el crecimiento del potencial financiero, de innovación y tecnológico de los territorios es la implementación de proyectos de asociación público-privada (en adelante, PPP). El sistema de mercado moderno crea las condiciones para la organización de la cooperación de las entidades del mercado en todos los sectores y áreas, incluso en el campo de la educación. Dentro de este artículo, se realizó una revisión exhaustiva de la tipología de PPP, estructurada sobre la base de la multidimensionalidad de las clasificaciones propuestas por los autores. Se presta especial atención a la tipología de asociación en el campo de la educación, que se ha generalizado y se ha implementado activamente en Rusia durante los últimos cinco años. Con base en la revisión de tipologías de asociaciones público-privadas en educación, se identificaron los criterios principales, mediante los cuales se clasificaron los tipos de asociaciones, se formularon las principales características distintivas de las APP en educación, se identificaron los principios básicos característicos de los proyectos de APP, y las perspectivas y los beneficios que la esfera de la educación deriva de la participación en asociaciones público-privadas.

Palabras clave: PPP en educación; tipología de PPP en educación; cooperación con universidades; perspectivas de asociación en educación; principios de PPP en educación.



Introduction

In recent years, the conditions in the economy of the country for the functioning of higher educational institutions have been gradually reforming, which is caused by the globalization of the economy, the introduction of information technologies and research and development into production processes.

Frequent changes in the demand for personnel in the structure and terms of training require educational organizations to form strong bilateral ties with the business environment since universities alone cannot in full and quickly adapt to changing market signals. The system of state educational standards does not also provide an opportunity to organize training in full according to market demands. In addition, the main requirement of employers is the availability of work experience at graduates, and on-the-job training, practical training, and pre-graduation practice often do not allow students to fully acquire practical work skills [1].

Also, today the problems of insufficient provision of educational organizations with financial resources and the need to introduce modern management methods are quite acute. It is obvious that the solution of these problems is possible only through joint efforts, therefore, today the actual issue is the formation of cooperation between the educational system and business structures, which can be implemented through the use of the public-private partnership mechanism.

Methods

According to the current legal and regulatory framework, a public-private partnership is understood to be legally defined for a certain period of time and based on pooling of resources, risk sharing cooperation of a public partner, on the one hand, and a private partner, on the other hand. It is based on a PPP agreement concluded in accordance with this Federal Law in order to attract private investment in the economy, ensure the availability of goods, works, and services by public authorities, and improve their quality.

The organization of public-private partnerships as a special type of cooperation between economic entities of the country is governed by a set of federal laws. The basis of the legal regulation of PPP is the Federal Law dd. July 13, 2015, No. 224-FZ "On Public-Private Partnership, and Municipal-Private Partnership in the Russian Federation and Amendments to Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation" and Federal Law dd. July 21, 2005, No. 115-FZ "On concession agreements". It should also be noted that an important role in the formation of the legal

framework for the functioning of public-private partnerships in the territory of the country is played by the regional legislation of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation.

The main goal of this work is to identify the main distinguishing characteristics and prospects for the implementation of public-private partnership projects in the field of education. For the most complete and systematic analysis of the PPPs' characteristics between universities and businesses, a review was conducted of the types and forms of public-private partnerships, and the PPP typology in education was reviewed.

The forms of such cooperation that are being implemented may vary significantly depending on political, social and economic factors characteristic of a particular region, and species can be systematized by a variety of grounds. Typologies of public-private partnerships are reflected in the writings of many scientists, however, at present, the issue on the complex classification of a wide range of PPPs considered by the scientific community is still not sufficiently studied. Within the framework of this work, the forms and types of public-private partnerships common in the domestic literature will be considered depending on the multidimensionality of the classifications proposed by the domestic authors.

Thus, the majority of scientists in their work considered a **one-dimensional** typology of *PPP depending on the forms of organization*, namely, the forms of PPP developed in accordance with international practice. For example, T.Yu. Bruner [2] and Yu.A. Skrynnikov [3] identified such forms as contracts, concessions, agreements on the distribution of products, and agreements on joint activities (joint ventures). Other authors, in addition to the above forms, considered lease also in its traditional form and form of leasing. The similar typology is found in the works of I.E. Bolekhova [4], A.P. Gorelko [5], M.A. Deryabin [6], T.V. Kriushin and E.E. Kharlamov [7].

In addition to the above typology of public-private sector partnerships, A.Sh. Beyseminova proposes such form as the "build – operate - transfer" scheme, during the implementation of which a state project operated by a private investor is transferred to the state balance [8]. According to T.Yu. Shvedkova, and based on the degree of participation of private and public partners in the implementation of projects, main forms of PPP are lease agreement; concession; production sharing agreement; mixed enterprises; operating and maintenance contract; service contract; and life cycle contract [9]. Distinctive features of the classification by I.Yu. Okolishnikova and V.G. Kuvatov is the identification of such PPP forms, as corporatization [10]. M.E. Konovalova considered in her work such individual forms of partnerships: contracts for the execution of works



and for the provision of public services, the supply of products for state needs, technical assistance contracts, investment contracts, and attracting an investor on a parity basis [11].

Result

It should be noted that the work with a classification of partnership forms detailed only by one feature can be difficult due to the many identifiable subspecies of an object. In this connection, the authors combine them into subgroups and systematize based on their other characteristic. So, A.S. Korchagina divided all forms of public-private partnerships into “traditional”, to which state contracts, concessions, production-sharing agreements, lease agreements, and incorporation, and “new” ones, which involve the creation of special economic zones and technology parks [12]. A.V. Kabashkin, in turn, offering 18 different forms of PPP, classifies them according to their belonging to the systems for implementing partnerships: contractual system, concession, hybrid, and administrative (Table 1).

Tab. 1 - Classification of PPP forms by A.V. Kabashkin [13]

Item No.	System	PPP Forms
1	Contractual	Rent (leasing); service contract; management contract; public service and works contract; contract for investment or construction; technical assistance contract; operation and transfer contract; post-privatization support contract.
2	Concession	Concession; production sharing agreement; government order (for the supply of products for state needs).
3	Hybrid	Stocking (state equity participation in business structures); private equity participation in state-owned enterprises (joint ventures); state corporations, holdings, trusts; investment funds.
4	Administrative model	State audit of PPP facilities; special economic and other zones, forms of PPP in the political sphere.

O.F. Shakhov divides PPPs into types based on the direction of project implementation:

partnerships used to produce public and private goods and services, partnerships related to the spatial development of the country's regional economy, and strategic planning partnerships related to the development of strategies for the socio-economic development of the country's regions [14].

Considering the PPP types *depending on their entities*, Z. Zakhariyev and B. Bayanov (2005), highlight: cooperation between a municipality and the local private sector; cooperation between a municipality and non-governmental organizations; and trilateral cooperation between a municipality, private economic organizations, and non-governmental organizations [15].

One of the authors who represent a **two-dimensional typology of partnerships** in his work is S.L. Sokolov, who classifies the types of PPP *according to the form of implementation and based on the scope of industries* [16]. He identifies by the first attribute the following forms: concessions; contracts for management, maintenance, execution of works, technical assistance provision, supply of products for state needs; investment contract; projects with a "clean slate"; partial transfer of assets; rent and lease; outsourcing, technology park; special economic zones; training; grants and special (grant) programs. Based on the coverage of industries, the author divides all PPPs into two types: common and specific. Common PPPs include partnership forms applicable to all industries and areas, specific ones are suitable for one particular industry.

Two-dimensional typology by N. Yu. Borodavkina includes the classification of public-private partnerships *depending on the source of the initiative and on the basis of integration processes*. In respect to the first attribute, the author identifies a public-private and a private-public partnership; as to the second attribute, she identifies partnerships with an “incoming” integration process, which include joining of foreign capital on the basis of PPP to projects within Russia; and with the “outgoing” process: state support of national capital in foreign economic activity [17].

Another author representing a two-dimensional typology is N.E. Savankova which considers the types of partnerships *depending on the initiative of the subjects and the form of implementation*. Moreover, if the author presents a typology similar to the previous authors concerning the first attribute, then by the second attribute, two classifications of PPP were considered: the first one includes partnerships of a contractual type and partnerships of an institutional nature; in the second classification, the author highlights a service contract; a management contract; a lease contract; concession agreements and the sale of the enterprise at the end of the contract term [18].



Three-dimensional typology by A.V. Khomyakov is characterized by the classification of PPP depending on:

1. *Ways to implement large infrastructure projects and risk sharing*: government order; design and construction; design, construction and operation; financing, construction, and operation;
2. *Implementation models*: operator model; cooperation model; concession model; negotiable model; leasing model.
3. *Implementation areas*: social, transport, utilities, information and communication, and other areas [19].

In his works, V.G. Varnavsky identifies the main types of PPP *in terms of implementation* (contracts; leasing / rent; production sharing agreements; investment contracts; concessions; incorporation; joint ventures), *according to the degree of private sector participation in the realization of property rights* (contract and concession) *depending on the owner of the partnership object* (private-public and public-private) [20, 21, 22].

I.V. Sycheva and D.A. Naidenov offers a **four-dimensional typology of PPP** dividing partnerships into hierarchically systematized types and subspecies. Thus, *in terms of implementation*, the authors single out: concessions, management contracts, contracts for the execution of works and the provision of services, contracts on the basis of leasing (lease) and production sharing agreements. In this case, a concession is divided *depending on the transfer of ownership* to the concessions not involving a transfer of ownership, and involving it. At the same time, *based on the implementation model*, the first group is classified as the classical concession and the WTO, BOOT, BOT, DBOM, DBFO models; the second group - the models of HEO, BDO, DCMF, BBO. Leasing (rent) contracts are also divided by the authors *depending on the implementation model* to LDO, BR(L)OT, BOLB, Reverse BOOT, BLTM, and LROT [23].

In addition, I.V. Sycheva and D.A. Naidenov distinguishes three PPP groups *in terms of project focus*: partnerships aimed at developing the industry; partnerships aimed at the integrated development of the region and partnerships aimed at developing infrastructure.

Zh.A. Ermakova and N.I. Trishkina in their works classify partnerships **according to six attributes**. The first attribute is the *dependence on the direction of activity*, on the basis of which, they identify partnerships aimed at the external environment of the enterprise and partnerships aimed at the internal environment of the enterprise. The second attribute is *in the sphere of implementation*, on the basis of which the authors distinguish partnerships in infrastructure, in the social sphere, in the property complex and in the social and labour sphere. The next attribute is *the*

form of implementation, depending on which the following types of PPP are considered: socially-oriented, economically-oriented, and innovation-oriented. According to the authors, *with regard to the frequency of events*, PPP can be one-time and systemic; *with regard to the way of an organization* - individual and collective, and *with regard to the scale of activity* - partnerships with large enterprises and partnerships with medium and small businesses [24].

The wider range of forms and types of partnerships are presented in the works of S.V. Kovriginoy, which highlights the following classification features:

- 1) *According to the innovation component*: PPPs aimed at achieving the innovation effect; PPPs causing a secondary innovation effect; traditional non-innovative partnerships.
- 2) *Depending on the scale of the projects*: the largest and large; medium; small.
- 3) *On a time basis*: PPPs with a strictly fixed period; floating-term PPPs; conditionally perpetual projects;
- 4) *By the relation of roles of the participants*: PPPs with the leading role of the state; PPPs with a leading business role; PPPs with parity participation of the state and business.
- 5) *By the level of state power body* - the subject of the partnership: PPP of federal significance; PPP of regional significance; municipal-private partnership; mixed PPP.
- 6) *According to the degree of maturity and formalization of relations in the projects*: projects that meet all the main features of PPP; Quasi-PPP projects - not meeting the characteristics of PPP, but performing part of its functions [25].

Other authors who conducted a comprehensive study of the forms and types of public-private partnerships and offered a **multidimensional typology** are S.N. Kuzmina and I.A. Babkin [26], Yu.V. Baldina et al. [27]. In addition to the features considered by the authors above (the innovation component, the level of state power, the implementation period, the role of the state), these economic scientists classify partnerships *depending on the object of activity* as industrial, infrastructural, scientific innovation and social ones. Also, based on the *number of subjects in a partnership*, the authors identify *the duo-partnership*, *trio-partnership* and *quarto-partnership*, and *according to the implementation model*: partnership according to the organizational model, according to the financing model, and according to the cooperation model. Another classification feature considered by scientists is *the real right on the basis of which the PPP is implemented*, proceeding from which S.N. Kuzmina and I.A. Babkin divide partnerships into the based on ownership; the based on rental law; the based on the right of business or operational management; and partnerships that involve the



transformation of property rights to the PPP object over time.

A.A. Kozlov also considers in his works a multidimensional typology of public-private partnerships based on nine classification criteria: *innovation component, number of subjects, organization of relations between government and business, implementation period, interrelation between the roles of participants, the scope of activities, the state authority level, the scope of authority transferred to a private partner and sequence of stages of PPP; real right* [28]. Most of the listed features were considered earlier by other authors, but it should be noted that *proceeding from the scope of authority transferred to the private partner and the sequence of stages of PPP*, the scientist in his work has highlighted such forms of partnerships as BOT, BOOT, BTO, BOO, BOMT, DBOOT, DBFO, while other authors, considering these forms, took models (mechanisms) of the implementation of PPP as a classification attribute.

Another author of the multidimensional typology of partnerships is Ya.V. Savchenko, who, in addition to reflecting the classification of PPP types based on the characteristics presented by A.A. Kozlov, also classified partnerships according to the following criteria: by sources of financing, by degree of completion, by stage of implementation, by terms of implementation, by complexity, by type and amount of funding. *According to the sources of funding*, the author highlights partnerships financed from budget funds, from the funds of the Investment Fund of the Russian Federation and special federal and regional funds, from own funds of private companies, from loans, and partnerships financed by subsidies. *According to the author, by their degree of completion*, partnerships can be complete and incomplete. *Depending on the stage of project implementation*, partnerships can be: at the initiation stage, planned, suspended, being implemented, and completed. *In terms of implementation*: short-term (up to 3 years), medium-term (3-5 years) and long-term (more than 5 years). With regard to the *comprehensiveness of projects*: based on this feature, Ya.V. Savchenko identifies partnerships with a local investment project and partnerships with a comprehensive investment project. When classifying *by type of projects*, the author considers infrastructural and innovative PPPs, and *depending on the amount of funding*, he classifies PPPs with projects costing up to 500 million rubles, 500–1,000 million rubles, 1,000–5,000 million rubles, 5,000–20 000 million rubles, and over 20 000 million rubles [29].

One of the most important socio-economic areas where PPP projects are successfully implemented **is education**. The active introduction of PPPs into

the education system has been observed in Russia for the last five years. According to a study by the Association “Center for PPP Development”, of all the projects that have passed the decision-making stage of implementation and aimed at developing social infrastructure, 23% belong to the educational sphere, yielding 9% to PPP projects in the health sector. At the same time, it should be noted that the majority of projects are implemented at the municipal level, and the concession, as before, remains the main form of implementing PPP projects in Russia [30]. However, an increase in the number of applied forms of partnership can stimulate an increase in the level of quality and availability of educational services, update the research and innovation infrastructure of universities, and accelerate the introduction of R & D achievements of universities into the country's production.

Considering the typology of **public-private partnerships in the field of education**, the Russian economists Yu.A. Magomed Sultanova and I.Z. Pogorelov identified its two main forms based on the nature of the interaction: *contractual* and *institutional* [31].

R.I. Saifullin refers to contractual forms of PPP: the provision of educational scholarships and grants, the creation of private schools, investments in infrastructure, the provision of educational fee-based services, accreditation of the quality level of education, membership agreements in various associations, and innovation. In addition, the author subdivides contract forms into such types as management, professional services, operational management, educational services, and investments in infrastructure [32].

According to another economist, I.S. Minina, a contractual form of PPP in education includes concession agreements, PPP agreements, outsourcing contracts, private financial initiatives, and contracts for educational services, educational management contracts, leasing-based contracts, and lease contracts. The institutional form of PPP includes foundations, technology parks, business incubators, educational and industrial clusters, industrial research institutes, and centres of excellence [33].

A more detailed typology of types of partnerships between universities and state authorities is reflected in the works of N.N. Zakharov, M.V. Tronina and V.P. Cherdantsev, where the authors propose a public-private partnership form typology, which, in addition to contractual and institutional forms, includes a *form of social interaction*, i.e. the formation of trusteeship councils for universities with the participation of representatives of private sector entities [34].

In his works, the economic scientist D.N. Efmov offers a classification different from the traditional one. The author considers such forms of PPP in the educational sphere as a concession agreement,



a life cycle contract in education and mixed PPP contracts in education. The scientist attributes to the latter group contracts for the work performance and property relations; lease contract; trust agreement; contract for the implementation of services and contract for the provision of educational services [35]. A similar typology is presented in the works of I.P. Tepikina [36].

O.A. Gerasimenko, who offers a typology based on the form of implementation, classifies public-private partnerships in the field of education into public-private partnership agreements, concession agreements, life-cycle contracts and lease agreements with investment obligations [37]. And, in the opinion of M.A. Kaneva, PPP forms are divided into technological contracts; technology transfer and licensing; enterprises created by universities; joint research centres; independent universities and science parks at universities [38].

Other economists in their studies have paid great attention to the typology of PPP in the field of education, *based on the direction of project implementation*. So, T.F. Romanova and S.N. Meliksetyan identified the main list of areas of interaction between the state, universities and a private partner, including: the development of educational programs, professional standards and requirements for the content of education, accreditation of programs and an independent assessment of the quality of training, targeted training, joint research projects, educational loans, and a lot more. In addition, the authors divided public-private partnerships into five types:

1. management and disposal of the university's property;
2. implementation of partnership investment projects;
3. management of the informative component of education;
4. economic (financial) support for education;
5. research and practical activities [39].

It is worth noting that a similar classification of PPP depending on the direction of project implementation was considered by A.V. Syanov and A.A. Stepanov [40, 41].

Based on the above classifications review, we can say that public-private partnership in education is one of the elements of a common PPP typology, which can be implemented in such forms as a concession, hiring or leasing agreement, joint ventures, operating and maintenance contracts, service contract and life cycle contract.

A concession agreement in the field of education is the conclusion of a contract with a business entity for the creation and (or) reconstruction of buildings or facilities of state-owned universities. Traditionally, educational institutions are considered as one of the PPP subjects in the field of education, but if we take into account the growing trend of competition in the educational

services market and the reduction of funding from the state budget, we can say that a modern university adapted to market conditions may also be the end product of joint activities of the state and business sector of the economy. Some consistency between the characteristics of an entrepreneurial university and a *joint venture* is worth considering. Thus, a joint venture implies the cooperation between several investors who have joined forces to create a common long-term profitable business. Whereby, an entrepreneurial university is a higher education institution with a characteristic infrastructure complex, including various development centres and student entrepreneurship, project activity centres, business incubators and business laboratories, which together is a kind of "joint venture".

Discussion and Conclusion

Outsourcing in the field of education stipulates the involvement of external specialists to perform the functions of supporting certain business processes not directly related to the organization of the educational process. An example of this is the conclusion of an outsourcing contract for catering services at a university.

A special form of partnership between public educational institutions and the private sector is a *life cycle contract*, which is a combination of other forms. This contract is based on a long-term contractual relationship to provide the range of services and works required for the design, construction, and operation of the facility, it may be present elements of *the lease contract, management contract and the service contract*.

In order to achieve the goals set, the partnership of state bodies, business structures and educational institutions may be *institutional in nature*, i.e. to represent long-term cooperation, and not just be focused on a one-time implementation of a particular project.

For most of the previously considered attributes, PPP types and forms in education fully correspond to the typologies of public-private partnerships. For example, *based on the focus of projects*, a partnership could be reflected in any of the forms: it can be directed to the internal environment, i.e. on the development of the educational system itself; as well as, focused on the development of infrastructure and the region through research and development involving the business sector.

Also, *according to their innovation component*, educational institutions and the business sector within the framework of PPP can implement joint projects, both aimed at achieving the innovation effect and of a traditional nature. *Based on the object of partnership*, the cooperation can be industrial, social, infrastructural and scientific-innovative. A similar correspondence of classified types of PPP is observed by such attributes as the



scale of the project; completeness and stages of project implementation; implementation period; a level of implementation; sources and amount of funding; the number of participants and the interrelation of their roles.

Despite the diversity of the types and forms of PPP implementation discussed above, one can single out the main **features**, which in their totality characterize the cooperation specifically as a public-private partnership in the field of education, which include:

- 1) Mandatory participation in educational partnerships;
- 2) Formalization of the proportions in the distribution of the partnership results, financial risks and costs between the educational organization and the other participants of the partnership;
- 3) Public focus of PPP results; focusing also on positive economic consequences and impact on education.

Typology of PPP in education is classified according to the nature of the interaction, duration, level of state power, but, nevertheless, all types of partnership are subordinated to a number of general principles underlying the satisfaction of public interests. We dwell on the basic **principles of PPP in the educational sphere**.

The partnership participant equality principle. This principle means the equality of the conditions of all private companies and educational institutions in the right to conclude PPP contracts.

The principle of information openness for universities. Partnership participants and the society in which interests PPP projects are implemented in education should have access to the activities of educational organizations and authorities acting as their founders, information on the financial and economic state of universities, standards and quality of educational services provided.

The principle of participant interest consistency in achieving results. The effectiveness of implementing PPP projects in the field of education directly depends on the coordinated actions of the partnership participants, however their goals, interests and opportunities do not always fully coincide, and individual PPP activities are evaluated from different points of view and implemented by various methods, therefore, without coordinating the interests of the partners, PPP operations remain impossible.

The principle of social orientation and significance of PPP projects in education. According to this principle, planning the implementation of public-private partnership projects in education should be based primarily on the interests of the individual and society and be of a *non-commercial nature*. Meeting the needs of

the population should be the main position of the partnership functioning, and profit-making should be considered only as a possible effect of the PPP project implementation.

The principle of PPP adaptation and flexibility in education. Despite the mandatory stability of the rights and obligations of the educational organization and other participants of the partnership stipulated in the PPP agreement, the concluded contract should provide for the possibility of changing the form and conditions of cooperation in accordance with the changing needs of the parties, the market and society in order to minimize possible risks.

A public-private partnership allows the university to achieve a set of effects that positively affect various aspects of the educational organization activity [42, 43].

First, the introduction of new educational management methods, ways of teaching and organizing the educational process stimulates the growth of the quality of educational services provided to the population, which is consistent with the principle of social orientation and importance of PPP projects.

Second, the PPP project implementation in the field of education can attract additional funding necessary for the modernization of the material and technical base of the educational institution, and accordingly contributes to reducing the burden on budgets of all levels.

Third, the conduct of research by universities and research laboratories, within the framework of the functioning of PPP with the state and business structures, contributes not only to an increase in the level of R & D funding, but also to launching the process on promoting the scientific achievements of educational institutions in their way to market.

The fourth effect is the fact that the cooperation between universities and the state and business representatives provides access to high-tech equipment of industrial enterprises, which is hard-to-find in shops and laboratories of higher education institutions; this stimulates the practice orientation level growth of future graduates. In addition, a university, having intellectual, informational and innovative resources in combination with external material and financial resources of partners, in such a way lays the foundation for the development of its innovative potential as an educational organization.

The fifth effect is to increase the share of successfully employed university graduates, which is achieved through the conclusion of contracts for on-the-job training by undergraduates, as well as by increasing the quality of educational services. It should be noted that the indicators characterizing the employment of graduates are an integral part of assessing the effectiveness of a university.



Based on the review of the PPP typologies and the identification of the main features and principles of the public-private partnership functioning in the field of education listed above, a number of conclusions can be made.

One of the many classification features of a PPP typology is the area of activity within which an agreement on public-private partnership is concluded. In our opinion, the development of PPPs in education is a promising form of cooperation between universities and business entities, because it has an impact not only on its own economic and financial indicators but also on the level of quality of services rendered to the population through the provision of synergistic effect on the achievement of goals set for each partner. Thus, the focus on solving socially important problems of the public life in the field of education is an essential principle of partnership functioning, since a university is currently a socially responsible element which functions and results have a direct impact on the development of the territory, its intellectual, innovative and human potential.

The long-term public-private partnership of higher education institutions and business representatives can be expressed in various forms of interaction that satisfy both current market demands and promising areas of socio-economic development of territories.

References

1. Varkulevich T.V., Shumik E.G., Baturina O.A. Strategic partnership of universities as a tool of territorial development dynamics: regional aspect // *ESPACIOS*, V. 39, №2, 2018, p. 31.
2. Bruner T.Yu. Forms and types of public-private partnerships // *Modern trends in the development of science and technology*, № 6-7, 2015, pp.57-59.
3. Skrynnikov Yu.A. Designation and classification of public-private partnership forms // *Modern scientific research and development*, № 4 (12), 2017, pp.271-274.
4. Bolekhov I.E. Public-private partnership as an attribute of an innovative economy // *Creative Economy*, №9, 2012, pp.120-125.
5. Gorelko A. P. Forms of state and business interaction in the form of joint projects // *Russian science in the modern world, the paper in the conference proceedings*, 2017, 327-329.
6. Deryabina M.A. Public-Private Partnership: Theory and Practice // *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, № 8, 2018, 67.
7. Kriushina T.V., Kharlamova E.E. The main models and forms of public-private partnership implementation // *Study of the innovative potential of society and the formation of directions for its strategic development: a collection of scientific papers of the 4th International Scientific and Practical Conference: in 2 volumes*, 2014, pp.272-274.
8. Beisembinova A.Sh. Public-private partnership: the essence, forms and role // *Bulletin of the University "Turan"*, 2011, №4 (52), pp.31-37.
9. Shvedkova T.Yu. The main characteristics of public-private partnerships (forms and models) // *Bulletin of Civil Engineers*, 2015, No. 5 (52), pp.319-324.
10. Okolishnikova I.Yu., Kuvatov V.G. Introduction of public-private partnership mechanisms as a factor in the development of regional business and regional economies // *Bulletin of the South Ural State University. Series: Economics and Management*, No. 21 (154), 2009, 4-10.
11. Konovalova M.E. Public-private partnership and its role in the structural transformation of the Russian economy // *Problems of the modern economy*, № 2 (34), 2010, pp.82-85.
12. Korchagina A.S. The development of public-private partnership in the Russian economy // *Proceedings of the Saratov University. New series. Series: Economy, management, law. Vol.10*, 2010, 14-22.
13. Kabashkin A.V. Opportunities to use various forms of public-private partnership in the regions of the Russian Federation // *Siberian Financial School*, No. 3 (68), 2008, pp.62-68.
14. Shakhov O.F. Strategic partnership of the state and business: features, forms, principles of interaction between participants // *News of the South-West State University. Series: Economy. Sociology. Management*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (26), 2018, pp.38-46.
15. Zakhariev Z., Bayanov B. The provision of quality public services and the development of partnership between the state and the private sector // *Bulletin of the Volga Region Institute of Administration*, No. 9, 2005. p. 38.
16. Sokolov S.L. Forms of public-private partnership in socially significant sectors of the economy // *Siberian Financial School*, № 3 (92), 2012. 56-61.
17. Borodaykina N.Yu. The regional level of integration processes: opportunities for public-private partnership (on the example of entrepreneurship) // *Bulletin of the Baltic Federal University. I. Kant. Series: Humanities and Social Sciences*, No. 3, 2013, 41-49.
18. Savankova N.E. Implementation of public-private partnership projects in Russia and abroad // *Management and business administration*, № 2, 2010, 22-35.
19. Khomyakov A.V. Models, principles and mechanisms for the implementation of PPP // *World Economy: Security Issues*. No. 2, 2018, 103-109.
20. Varnavskiy V.G. Partnership of state and private sector: theory and practice // *World Economy and International*



- Relations, No. 7, 2002, 31-32.
21. Varnavskiy V.G. Private-state partnership in the industry of Russia // Bulletin of the Institute of Economics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, № 5, 2015, 41-54.
 22. Varnavskiy V.G., Klimenko A.V. Public-private partnership: theory and practice. M.: OOO MIC, 2010, 576 p.
 23. Sycheva I.V., Naidenov D.A. Study of the forms and mechanisms of public-private partnership in the world and domestic practice // News of Tula State University. Economic and legal sciences, №2-2, 2010, 23-33.
 24. Ermakova J.A., Trishkina N.I. Forms of a social and economic partnership of the state and business in the region // Bulletin of the Orenburg State University, №8 (127), 2011, 40-47.
 25. Kovrigina S.V. Public-Private Partnership: Approaches and Classifications // Basic Research, №11-12, 2014, 2681-2685.
 26. Kuzmina S.N., Babkin I.A. Principles and models of public-private partnership in industry and science and innovation sphere // Bulletin of Trans-Baikal State University, №12 (127), 2015, 110-120.
 27. Baldina Yu.V., Petruk GV, Lebedinskaya Yu.S. Criteria, Trends, Forecast. Economic and Social Changes: Facts, Trends, Forecast. 2017 Vol. 10. No. 1. Pp. 200-217.
 28. Kozlov A.A. Public-private partnership: the essence, classification. // Management of economic systems: electronic scientific journal, №2 (38), 2012, 6.
 29. Saychenko Ya. V. Classification of objects and projects of public-private partnership // News of the Ural State University of Economics, №5 (49), 2013, 32-37.
 30. Study "Public-Private Partnership in Russia 2016–2017: Current State and Trends, Rating of Regions" / Association "Center for PPP Development". - M.: Association "Center for PPP Development", 2016. - 32 p.
 31. Magomed Sultanova Yu.A., Pogorelov I.Z. Public-private partnership in education: problems of development. Human resource management as the basis for the development of an innovative economy - No. 4, 2013 - pp. 293-298.
 32. Saifullin R.I. Foreign experience of public-private partnerships and their role in the development of education. Actual problems of Economics and Law. - № 1 (21). - 2012 p. - pp. 62-68.
 33. Minin I.S. International and Russian experience in the use of forms of public-private partnership in higher education // Living standards of the population in the regions of Russia, №4 (206), 2017, 95–101.
 34. Zakharov N.N., Cherdantsev V.P., Tronina M.V. Public-private partnership in education - the socio-economic aspect // Basic Research, № 6-2, 2015, 340-343.
 35. Yefremov D.N. Typology of public-private partnership forms in education // Economic Journal, №1 (25), 2012, 120-128.
 36. Tepikina I.P. Public-private partnership in education // Continuing education bulletin, №1. 2014, 68-72.
 37. Gerasimenko O.A. Analysis of the implementation of public-private partnership projects in the social sphere // Modern scientific research and development. №2 (10). 2017. 285-288.
 38. Kaneva M.A. Public-private partnership in the innovation activities of universities in China // Bulletin of Novosibirsk State University. Series: socio-economic sciences. t.14. №1. 2014. 69-80.
 39. Romanova T.F., Meliksetyan S.N. The development of public-private partnership in the field of higher education // Economic Sciences. No. 5 (162). 2018 146-151.
 40. Syanov A.V., Stepanov A.A. Modern forms of public-private partnership in education (on the example of Kemerovo branch of Moscow State University of Economics, Statistics and Informatics) // Professional education in Russia and abroad. №2 (14). 2014 24-29.
 41. Shashlo NV, Petruk GV, Korostelev AA. Determinants of integration interaction among the subjects of the entrepreneurial innovation ecosystem of macro region // Amazonia Investiga. 2018. №7. P. 351-363
 42. Gavhale, S. R. (2016). INEQUALITY OF GENDER RATIO AMONG RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL GROUPS IN INDIA. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 4(2), 68-75. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2016.422>
 43. Yazdekhasti, A., Erfan, N., & Nazari, N. (2015). Investigating the Relationship between Spiritual Intelligence and Social Adaptation among Girl High School Students in Shahreza City. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 20-23.