Article

Redefining university infrastructure for the 21st century: An interplay between physical assets and digital evolution

Bunmi Isaiah Omodan

Faculty of Education, Walter Sisulu University, Komani Campus, Eastern Cape Province 5360, South Africa; bomodan@wsu.ac.za

Abstract: In the evolving landscape of the 21st century, universities are at the forefront of re-imagining their infrastructural identity. This conceptual paper delves into the transformative shifts witnessed within university infrastructure, focusing on the harmonisation of tangible physical assets and the expanding world of digital evolution. As brick-and-mortar structures remain pivotal, integrating digital platforms rapidly redefines the academic landscape, optimising learning and administrative experiences. The modern learning paradigm, enriched by this symbiotic relationship, offers dynamic, flexible, and comprehensive educational encounters, thereby transcending traditional spatial and temporal constraints. Therefore, this paper accentuates the broader implications of this infrastructural metamorphosis, particularly its significant role in driving economic development. The synergistic effects of physical and digital infrastructures enhance academic excellence and position universities as key players in addressing and navigating global challenges, setting forth a resilient and forward-looking educational blueprint for the future. In conclusion, integrating physical and digital infrastructures within universities heralds a transformative era, shaping a holistic, adaptable, and enriched academic environment poised to meet 21st-century challenges. This study illuminates the symbiotic relationship between tangible university assets and digital innovations, offering insights into their collective impact on modern education and broader economic trajectories.

Keywords: university infrastructure; digital evolution; physical assets; modern learning paradigm; economic development

1. Introduction

Universities are bastions of knowledge, progress, and innovation in the modern world. Their importance transcends beyond merely serving as places of higher learning. Over time, universities have become intricate ecosystems that foster research, community engagement, and socio-economic development. However, the essence of these revered institutions can be traced back to their infrastructure, which plays a paramount role in facilitating their overarching missions. As society undergoes rapid technological transformation, there is a need to revisit and redefine the infrastructural aspects of universities to ensure they remain equipped to meet contemporary needs and challenges.

The evolution of university infrastructure over time has been intricately shaped by diverse factors, encompassing the influence of the digital economy (Kaziev et al., 2020), the pivotal role of universities in accumulating human capital (Gevorgyan et al., 2020), and the impact of political institutions (Bogart, 2020). Notably, the development of research infrastructure, especially within the field of social work, has garnered significant attention, with a discernible shift towards service-oriented models (Videka et al., 2008; Zender and Tavangarian, 2009) playing a crucial role. Emphasis

has been placed on the role of universities as key players in both knowledge creation and distribution (Altbach, 1991). Moreover, recent concerns have emerged regarding universities' readiness for the ongoing digital transformation process (Kostina, 2021). Collectively, these studies underscore the intricate and dynamic nature of the development of university infrastructure, reflecting the multifaceted influences that have shaped it over time. Collectively, these studies weave a tapestry that underscores the intricate interplay of various forces shaping the evolution of university infrastructure. This dynamic process reflects not only the adaptability of academic institutions but also their pivotal role in responding to societal demands, technological advancements, and the changing landscapes of education and research.

Historically, the infrastructure of a university has been primarily centred around its physical assets—classrooms, lecture halls, libraries, and laboratories (Shill and Tonner, 2003). These spaces were conceived as the epicentres of intellectual pursuits and academic interactions. They provided the ambience necessary for structured learning and spontaneous intellectual exchanges, cultivating a culture of academic excellence. The architecture, layout, and very essence of these physical spaces often indicated the academic philosophies and pedagogies of the time. With the Enlightenment era and the rise of the modern research university in the 19th century, infrastructure expanded to include research facilities and specialised labs (Berkel and Homburg, 2023). Universities began to establish themselves as centres for teaching and as hubs for cutting-edge research and innovation. The introduction of sprawling campuses equipped with amenities and facilities ranging from athletic centres to art studios stressed the holistic approach to education, emphasising both mental and physical well-being (Scholl and Gulwadi, 2015).

However, the significance of university infrastructure was not solely restricted to academic pursuits. These institutions often emerged as self-contained microcosms, reflecting broader societal values, norms, and aspirations. Their infrastructural designs symbolised societal advancements, showcasing architectural prowess, technological advancements, and cultural significance. As universities grew in importance, their infrastructures were also recognised for fostering community engagement, boosting local economies, and promoting cultural exchanges. That is, the traditional infrastructure of universities has been multifaceted in its roles and significance. While primarily serving as venues for academic endeavours, they have also played essential roles in community building, economic stimulation, and cultural preservation. According to Rubin (1998), universities play a crucial role in community-building initiatives, providing guidance, expertise, and financial support. Student housing, a key part of university infrastructure, contributes to social integration and urban development (Franz and Gruber, 2022). They also significantly impact the development of civil society and social transformation through education, research, and the production of skilled manpower (Sharma, 2015). The rise of community engagement in Australian universities has further emphasised their role in contributing to public good and supporting equity and diversity (Winter et al., 2006).

In the context of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), universities stand as potential catalysts for positive change (Von Hauff and Nguyen, 2014). Leveraging their influence, universities can actively contribute to SDG achievement by integrating sustainability principles into academic programs, engaging in community

development projects, and spearheading research initiatives focused on global challenges. Thus, universities possess the potential to play a pivotal role in addressing the complex and interconnected issues outlined in the SDGs, promoting a sustainable and equitable future. However, as society evolves, the age-old infrastructures of universities face novel challenges and opportunities, pushing stakeholders to rethink and re-imagine their relevance and utility in the 21st century.

As we progress further into the 21st century, universities find themselves at a pivotal juncture with their historically rooted infrastructures. The digital age has ushered in an era where physical constraints no longer bind information. The advent of the internet, online learning platforms, remote learning capabilities, digital libraries and an array of educational technologies has fundamentally altered how knowledge is disseminated and consumed (Song et al., 2007). This transition underscores the need for universities to re-evaluate and redefine their infrastructural orientations to stay relevant and effective in this rapidly evolving landscape.

Digital technology has brought about a democratisation of knowledge. Online courses, open-source materials, and digital libraries provide access to world-class resources to individuals across the globe, often at the click of a button (Nelson and Stolterman, 2014). The virtual realm has broadened educational horizons, allowing for dynamic, flexible, and personalised learning experiences. Such a monumental shift poses profound questions about universities' traditional and physically anchored infrastructure. Is a sprawling campus, replete with lecture halls and libraries, still indispensable when lectures can be streamed and research papers accessed from any corner of the world? The transformation propelled by digital technology is not just a challenge but an opportunity for universities to re-imagine their physical spaces in harmony with the digital realm, ensuring a holistic educational experience.

The 21st-century university infrastructure is a complex interplay between physical assets and digital evolution, as Kaziev et al. (2020) and Bygstad (2019) highlighted. Kaziev emphasises the need for evolutionary capacity and self-development in the digital economy, while Bygstad discusses the importance of shared solutions and coordinated governance in the national and global digital ecosystems. Luchkov et al. (2022) and Kerres (2004) further explore the concept of a digital enterprise in the university infrastructure. Luchkov focuses on organisational and methodological support, and Kerres proposes a campus-wide identity management approach. Kostina (2021) and Moşteanu (2020) address regional universities' readiness for digital transformation, with Kostina highlighting the need for modernising IT infrastructure and Moşteanu discussing the role of a digital campus in enriching the university structure. Haggans (2016) and Gafurov et al. (2020) both underscore the need for rethinking the physical campus and improving university infrastructure using digital technology, with Haggans emphasising the changing assumptions and Gafurov proposing a shift from resource management to access control.

Moreover, the changing educational needs of modern society further catalyse the call for redefinition. The contemporary job market and global challenges demand interdisciplinary knowledge, critical thinking, and adaptability. This necessitates a departure from rigid, siloed learning environments to more collaborative, flexible, and interactive spaces. Hence, universities must adapt their infrastructures to facilitate

project-based learning, cross-disciplinary collaborations, and real-world problem-solving (Benade, 2019). Physical spaces need to be envisioned as places to receive knowledge and incubators for innovation, creativity, and holistic development. The confluence of digital advancements and evolving educational paradigms renders a compelling case for the redefinition of university infrastructure. By intertwining traditional physical spaces' strengths with the digital realm's limitless potential, universities can pioneer a new era of higher education that is adaptive, inclusive, and forward-looking. This re-imagined approach ensures that universities remain epicentres of learning and innovation, aptly poised to navigate the intricacies of the 21st century (Valtonen et al., 2021).

Despite universities' historical resilience and adaptability, the modern digital revolution presents unprecedented challenges and opportunities for universities as they struggle to align their traditional physical infrastructure with the evolving dynamics of 21st-century education (Nguyen, 2018). This is further complicated by the slow pace of digital transformation in universities, which is attributed to a lack of effective leadership, cultural changes, and financial support (Rodríguez-Abitia and Bribiesca-Correa, 2021). The need for universities to adapt to the digital economy is emphasised, with a focus on increasing their adaptability to exogenous challenges (Kholiavko et al., 2021). The impact of digital media on the organisation of universities is explored, with a call for the development of conceptual tools to understand this impact (Pfeffer, 2011). The incorporation of new information and communication technologies into teaching activities is discussed, along with the ethical and policy issues arising from these changes (Burbules and Callister, 2000). The shift towards evidence-based decision-making and flexible higher education provision due to digitisation is highlighted (Funamori, 2016).

There is a conspicuous gap in understanding how to harmoniously integrate traditional university infrastructure with the emerging digital advancements. This misalignment potentially hinders optimal learning experiences, effective resource utilisation, and the broader socio-economic contributions universities can offer in the digital age. This study, therefore, aims to elucidate the transformative shifts within university infrastructure, focusing on the delicate balance between time-honoured physical assets and the realm of digital evolution. The study aspires to pave the way for a more integrative, adaptive, and forward-looking university model by understanding this interplay. Such an understanding is imperative to ensure universities thrive as epicentres of knowledge, innovation, and societal advancement in an increasingly digital world. Based on this hiatus, the conceptual paper is guided by the following two objectives. That is, the study:

- Present the influence of digital advancements on the perceived value and utility of traditional university infrastructures.
- Identify emerging best practices for seamlessly integrating physical assets with digital platforms in modern universities.

2. Methodological design

I adopted theory synthesis design as a methodology for this conceptual paper to address the research objectives. According to Jaakkola (2020, p. 21), theory synthesis

design in conceptual research "seeks to achieve conceptual integration across multiple theories or literature streams". This type of paper aims to offer a new or enhanced view of a concept or phenomenon by linking previously unconnected or incompatible pieces in a novel way. According to MacInnis (2011), the primary goal of such argumentation is to integrate extant knowledge of a concept or phenomenon, enabling researchers to see the concept or phenomenon in a new way by transforming previous findings and theories into a novel higher-order perspective that links previously distinct phenomena. The theory synthesis paper can integrate an extensive set of theories and phenomena under a novel theoretical umbrella, as exemplified by Vargo and Lusch's seminal article, which pulled together key ingredients from diverse fields into a novel integrative narrative to formulate the more parsimonious framework of service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

Hence, to implement theory synthesis design, I began by charting the developmental trajectory of universities, transitioning from solely tangible spaces to embracing digital dimensions. This examination led to a deeper exploration of the continued significance of physical assets within modern academic institutions. Subsequently, I delved into the rise of digital evolution in universities and its ensuing impact. The core of the study focused on the synergy arising from the fusion of physical and digital infrastructures, followed by a thorough analysis of the broader implications stemming from this infrastructural transformation. By integrating expert recommendations and forward-looking insights, the study culminated in a conclusion that underscores the transformative potential and promise of a harmonised physical and digital infrastructural approach for the future of academia.

3. Evolution of university infrastructure

The historical narrative of university infrastructure begins with the foundational establishment of these institutions, primarily as centres for religious and philosophical education. In places like Al-Qarawiyyin in Fes or the University of Bologna (established in 1088), the infrastructure was inherently physical, with large lecture halls, cloisters, and libraries (Sage, 2023). These spaces were not merely venues for knowledge dissemination but were critical in forging a sense of academic community, fostering intellectual exchanges, and cultivating traditions. The architectural design, from the grandeur of facades to the intricacies of interiors, often reflected the academic philosophies, societal values, and cultural epochs of the times.

Universities underwent significant transformation as society progressed into the modern era, particularly post-Enlightenment. The 19th and early 20th centuries saw these institutions evolve from just teaching hubs to robust centres for research and innovation. This transition necessitated an infrastructural overhaul. Laboratories equipped with cutting-edge technologies, specialised research facilities, and expansive libraries housing diverse collections became the hallmark of prominent universities. Places like Cambridge, Harvard, and Berlin revamped their infrastructures to accommodate this research-driven academic paradigm, highlighting the close interplay between academic missions and their physical manifestations.

By the mid-to-late 20th century, the technological revolution subtly began to influence university infrastructure. While physical assets retained their primacy, the

incorporation of technology within these spaces became evident. Lecture halls equipped with projectors, computer labs, and digitally catalogued libraries marked the early convergence of the physical and digital realms. In their quest to stay contemporary, universities began to acknowledge the transformative potential of technology in enhancing teaching, research, and administrative processes (Schmidt and Tang, 2020). Fast forward to the 21st century, and the digital transformation of universities has become more profound than ever. The emergence of online learning platforms, virtual classrooms, and digital research repositories signifies the maturation of this digital evolution. The global pandemic of 2020 further accelerated this shift, compelling universities worldwide to re-evaluate and adapt their infrastructures. While physical spaces remain integral, the virtual dimension has expanded, with universities offering online degrees, facilitating global collaborations through virtual labs, and digitising vast swathes of resources for universal access (Padmanabhan, 2023).

One of the most obvious transitions in recent university infrastructure evolution is the embrace of blended learning environments. This approach marries the strengths of traditional, in-person teaching methodologies with the advantages of digital platforms, creating a rich, multifaceted educational experience. In this setting, physical classrooms become spaces for lectures, collaborative activities, and discussions, while online platforms facilitate resource sharing, remote lectures, and asynchronous learning. This duality acknowledges that while digital platforms can offer flexibility and a vast array of resources, the physical presence in a classroom fosters a sense of community, interpersonal skills, and hands-on experiences (Singh et al., 2021). As universities adapt to modern demands, even quintessentially physical spaces like libraries, labs, and lecture theatres have been digitally augmented. Modern libraries, for instance, have transitioned from merely housing books to offering digital databases, e-journals, and multimedia resources. They have become collaborative hubs with digital workstations, 3D printing facilities, and virtual reality suites. Similarly, laboratories now boast advanced simulation tools, allowing students to perform experiments virtually or access remote equipment, thus broadening their research horizons beyond the confines of the physical space (Lei et al., 2020).

Parallel to the tangible campuses, many universities have invested in developing a robust virtual presence, effectively creating a 'virtual campus.' Such platforms encapsulate various functionalities—from online course registrations, virtual orientations, and e-libraries to social forums mimicking university commons, allowing student interactions. This digital leap has dramatically amplified universities' global outreach, democratising education by making it accessible to students from diverse geographic and socio-economic backgrounds. Through Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and online degree programs, institutions have expanded their academic footprint, reaching millions worldwide (Mahajan et al., 2019).

The interplay between physical and digital platforms has not been confined merely to teaching and learning; it has also profoundly influenced the administrative and operational realms of universities. Advanced management systems have streamlined admissions, grading, and alumni outreach. The integration of Artificial Intelligence and data analytics assists in curriculum design, gauging student performance, and predictive maintenance of physical assets. As these systems become

more intricate and interconnected, they are setting the groundwork for smart campuses, where the physical and digital seamlessly converge to offer optimised, personalised educational experiences.

4. The importance of physical assets in modern universities

In an era laced with digital advancements, the relevance of physical assets in modern universities remains unequivocal. These tangible spaces—ranging from lecture halls and laboratories to libraries and recreational areas—serve as the bedrock upon which the very ethos of a university is built. Beyond their functional purposes, these assets symbolise tradition, history, and a sense of continuity, fostering a distinct institutional identity. The physical campus acts as a communal hub where students, faculty, and staff congregate, facilitating serendipitous interactions, collaborative endeavours, and a sense of belonging. The ambience of these spaces, be it the solemnity of a library or the collaborative buzz of a student centre, plays a pivotal role in shaping the holistic student experience, encompassing academic and extracurricular facets (Wilkins et al., 2022).

Furthermore, physical assets are indispensable for certain disciplines that necessitate hands-on experiences, such as engineering, medicine, and the arts. For instance, a medical student's learning heavily relies on practical sessions, simulations, and eventually real patient interactions in a controlled environment. Similarly, art and design students derive immense value from studio spaces, where they can materialise their concepts and receive real-time feedback. While digital tools can complement and enhance these experiences, they cannot wholly replace the nuances, intricacies, and richness of learning that physical spaces offer. In essence, despite the escalating digital wave, the tangible assets of universities remain integral, anchoring the academic journey in a grounded, immersive reality (Robertson et al., 2019). This is consistent with the argument of Musa and Ahmad (2012), who emphasise the role of physical assets in shaping the learning environment and the need for their improvement. However, Smart et al. (2020) argue that intangible assets, such as an institution's identity and culture, are equally important. Isa and Yusoff (2015) provide practical insights into the value and state of physical facilities in higher education institutions and highlight the need for global best practices. Finally, Zhou and Lu (2022) offer innovative approaches to evaluating and managing physical assets, suggesting that a holistic and sustainable approach is necessary.

4.1. Timeless significance of brick-and-mortar: Fostering learning and community

For centuries, the brick-and-mortar infrastructures in educational institutions have witnessed changes and generational shifts. One can argue that these tangible structures, with their looming archways, echoing hallways, and hallowed lecture halls, carry an intrinsic ambience conducive to deep learning and contemplation. This ambience is not merely architectural but steeped in history, tradition, and a collective sense of purpose. As Lewinski (2015) elucidates, these buildings' spatial design, aesthetic elements, and very fabric can invigorate cognitive processes, stimulate creativity, and foster a deepened sense of focus and reflection.

Beyond the individual learning experience, physical spaces play an irreplaceable role in cultivating a sense of community. Universities, with their diverse array of physical settings—from bustling cafeterias and serene courtyards to dedicated collaborative spaces and quiet corners for introspection—offer students multifaceted avenues to forge connections, engage in spontaneous dialogues, and partake in collective experiences. These brick-and-mortar spaces become arenas where memories are crafted, friendships are nurtured, and intellectual debates ensue. The dynamism and spontaneity of face-to-face interactions, the joy of shared discoveries, and the camaraderie born from collective endeavours cannot be wholly replicated in a virtual domain (Mali and Thakur, 2010).

Empirically, many studies underscore the enduring significance of brick-and-mortar structures in fostering learning and community. Wahid et al. (2020) and Schwaen et al. (2018) both emphasise the role of traditional brick-making and physical engagement in architectural education, respectively, in preserving cultural identity and promoting active learning. Németh et al. (2020) and Sferrazza (2018) further explore the role of physical spaces in urban environments and community-based learning initiatives in promoting equity, social inclusion, and transformative learning. Smith (2016) highlights the potential of architecture to reflect societal values and promote sustainable development. Sargent (2015) highlights the importance of incorporating students' communities and the built environment into education to enhance engagement and knowledge retention. Collectively, Wahid et al. (2020), Schwaen et al. (2018), Németh et al. (2020), etc. reiterate the enduring value of brick-and-mortar structures in fostering learning and community.

Furthermore, the physical realm of a university often becomes emblematic of its ethos, vision, and academic philosophy. These spaces, with their distinctive architectural narratives, artistic installations, and curated landscapes, resonate with symbolic meanings, subtly influencing the perceptions, behaviours, and values of those within. They are constant, tangible reminders of the institution's legacy, aspirations, and commitment to knowledge dissemination. As a testament to their enduring significance, even in the most digitally advanced educational settings, students and faculty alike often gravitate towards these brick-and-mortar sanctuaries, seeking the unique blend of inspiration, solace, and community they consistently offer.

4.2. Adapting physical spaces: Catering to modern learning paradigms

With the unfolding digital age and the resultant transformation in learning modalities, universities worldwide have recognised the imperative of recalibrating their physical infrastructures to align with contemporary educational demands. One prominent shift has been the conceptualisation and creation of 'smart classrooms' equipped with state-of-the-art technologies. These rooms, outfitted with interactive whiteboards, digital projectors, and adaptive lighting systems, aim to integrate traditional teaching methods with modern digital tools seamlessly. They facilitate real-time global collaborations, enable virtual field trips, and offer augmented reality experiences, thus enriching the learning process manifold (Hernandez-de-Menendez et al., 2020; Kim et al., 2018).

Parallel to the classroom metamorphosis, universities are re-envisioning ancillary spaces such as libraries and study lounges. Gone are the days when libraries were solely repositories of books and manuscripts. Modern libraries, often termed 'learning commons,' have evolved into multifunctional hubs offering digital databases, collaborative workstations, multimedia labs, and even maker spaces. These re-imagined spaces prioritise flexibility, adaptability, and user-centric designs, catering to many academic activities ranging from quiet individual research to boisterous group projects (van der Walt, 2023). Additionally, acknowledging the significance of experiential learning, many universities are investing in specialised labs and simulation centres. These spaces, designed to mirror real-world environments, allow students to immerse themselves in practical scenarios, be it a mock trading floor for business students, a simulated operating theatre for medical aspirants, or a virtual reality suite for design enthusiasts. Such infrastructural adaptations ensure that students grasp theoretical concepts and acquire hands-on experience, bridging the chasm between academic learning and practical applicability (Bhati and Song, 2019).

5. Digital evolution in universities: The rise of digital platforms

The 21st century has ushered in an era where digitalisation has pervasively infiltrated every facet of human enterprise, and higher education is no exception. Traditionally viewed as bastions of brick-and-mortar learning, universities have experienced profound shifts in their pedagogical approaches, predominantly fueled by the advent and subsequent proliferation of digital tools and platforms. Initially, the introduction of Learning Management Systems (LMS) like Blackboard and Moodle marked a significant stride in this direction. These platforms, offering course materials, discussion forums, and assessment modules, provided students with a cohesive and structured online learning environment, paving the way for more sophisticated digital integrations in the future (Bond et al., 2018).

As technology continued its relentless march forward, the realm of university education witnessed the emergence of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) platforms such as Coursera, edX, and Udacity. These platforms democratised access to quality education, enabling learners from geographically dispersed locations to partake in courses offered by prestigious institutions. MOOCs expanded the reach of universities and fostered a global learning community where diverse cohorts could collaboratively engage with content, enriching the discourse with multifaceted perspectives (Dillahunt et al., 2014). Simultaneously, the surge in augmented and virtual reality (AR and VR) technologies has opened up novel avenues for immersive learning. Universities have started leveraging these technologies to simulate real-world scenarios, offer virtual lab experiments (Radhamani et al., 2015), and even conduct historical recreations, giving students a tangible sense of the subject matter. Such immersive experiences, transcending the limitations of traditional textbooks and lectures, empower students to interact with, manipulate, and delve deeper into their learning material, thereby fostering enhanced comprehension and retention.

Yet, the digital revolution is not merely confined to instructional methodologies. Administrative facets of university operations, from admissions and student services to research and collaboration, are undergoing digital overhauls. Automation, data

analytics, and AI-driven tools are streamlining processes, offering predictive insights, and personalising student experiences. In essence, as digital platforms continue to evolve, they are redefining how knowledge is disseminated and reshaping universities' very structure and ethos, moulding them into more adaptive, inclusive, and forward-thinking entities.

Benefits and challenges of digital integration in universities

Digital integration in universities has undoubtedly propelled higher education into an era of increased accessibility, adaptability, and efficiency. First and foremost, democratising education has been one of the most profound benefits. With the advent of digital platforms, particularly MOOCs, quality education is no longer bound by geographical constraints; a student in a remote village can access courses from prestigious institutions, levelling the playing field and fostering a more inclusive global learning community (Laufer et al., 2021). Moreover, the flexibility offered by digital platforms caters to diverse learning styles and paces. Students can revisit lectures, engage with interactive content, and tailor their learning trajectories based on individual needs. Additionally, digital tools facilitate real-time feedback, adaptive learning pathways, and personalised content delivery, enhancing the overall learning experience and outcomes (Muñoz et al., 2022). On the same note, Shah and Shah (2023) emphasise the potential for improved learning outcomes and student engagement. Popova et al. (2020) and Kovaleva et al. (2022) further explore the positive aspects of digitalisation, including expanded learning opportunities and the use of a single digital platform for information processes. Alenezi et al. (2023) discuss the potential for digital education to enhance the competitiveness and quality of higher education.

However, these benefits are not without challenges, as noted by Shah and Shah (2023) and Brodovskaya et al. (2019), who highlight issues such as the digital divide and the need for interactive and innovative online support. A significant concern is the digital divide, wherein students without adequate technological resources or internet access are disadvantaged, potentially exacerbating educational inequalities (Azionya and Nhedzi, 2021). This disparity is not just about device access but also about digital literacy. Not all students possess the skills to navigate online platforms effectively, leading to feelings of frustration or alienation. Moreover, while digital platforms offer flexibility, they also require more self-discipline and motivation from learners. The lack of a structured classroom environment can lead some students to procrastinate, feel isolated, or struggle with time management, hindering their academic progress.

Furthermore, the richness of face-to-face interactions, the spontaneous discussions, and the camaraderie of a physical classroom environment can be challenging to replicate fully in virtual settings. Despite the interactive tools and forums, the nuances of in-person communication, shared experiences, and the organic development of interpersonal relationships are aspects of traditional education that digital platforms might dilute. Yet, another looming challenge is cybersecurity. With universities shifting significant portions of their operations online, from instructional content to sensitive student data, they become lucrative targets for cyberattacks. Ensuring robust cybersecurity measures while maintaining ease of access for

legitimate users is a complex balancing act that institutions must continuously navigate (Bondoc and Malawit, 2020).

While the benefits of digital integration in universities are manifold and transformative, it is essential to approach this evolution with a keen awareness of its potential pitfalls. By proactively addressing these challenges, institutions can harness the full potential of digital tools, ensuring a holistic, enriched, and inclusive educational experience for all. The following section dives into how physical spaces and digital tools complement and enrich each other.

6. Synergy between physical and digital infrastructure in universities

In the modern educational landscape, the lines demarcating physical and digital infrastructures are increasingly becoming blurred, giving rise to an intertwined synergy that promises to redefine the essence of university learning. The physical infrastructure of universities, rooted in centuries of tradition, provides a tangible foundation—the brick-and-mortar edifices exude a sense of permanence, history, and community. These spaces are not just venues for academic pursuits; they are crucibles of culture, fostering interpersonal interactions and breeding grounds for innovation and collaboration. On the other hand, digital infrastructure brings a dynamism that transcends spatial and temporal constraints, offering unprecedented access, flexibility, and personalisation in the learning experience (Joan, 2013).

Integrating the strengths of both these infrastructures can lead to a holistic learning ecosystem. Imagine a scenario where students in a physical lecture hall interact in real-time with peers across the globe via digital platforms or where historical events discussed in a classroom come alive through augmented reality tools. The confluence of physical spaces with digital capabilities can offer immersive, multi-dimensional learning experiences, fostering a deeper understanding and engagement with the subject matter. Moreover, this synergy also extends to administrative and operational aspects. When complemented with digital databases, online collaboration tools, or simulation software, physical facilities, such as libraries or research labs, can significantly amplify the scope and impact of academic endeavours (Zhang et al., 2015).

In essence, the future of university education lies in harnessing the best of both worlds. While each infrastructure—physical and digital—brings its unique set of advantages, their symbiotic integration promises an enriched, adaptable, and forward-looking academic environment. By recognising and nurturing this synergy, universities can elevate the quality of education and ensure they remain relevant and resilient in a rapidly changing global landscape.

6.1. The symbiotic relationship between physical spaces and digital tools in universities

In the tapestry of contemporary education, physical spaces and digital tools weave a narrative that speaks of complementarity, mutual enhancement, and co-evolution. With their majestic architectures and age-old traditions, physical campuses serve as anchors of stability, fostering a sense of belonging, community, and

continuity. These spaces play a pivotal role in shaping student's identity, offering experiential learning through laboratory experiments, face-to-face interactions, workshops, and other tangible activities (Mehmood et al., 2020). They provide venues for spontaneous intellectual debates, serendipitous encounters, and the establishment of lifelong relationships, thereby feeding the human need for social connection and shared experiences (Bennett et al., 2020).

Yet, while the physical environment sets the stage, the digital tools often direct the play. Digital platforms expand the boundaries of these physical spaces, allowing for a temporal extension of classroom discussions, fostering collaborations beyond geographical confines, and offering resources that might be physically inaccessible. For instance, while a university library is limited to its physical collection, its digital archives can provide students with an expansive reservoir of knowledge accessible at their fingertips. Similarly, while a physical seminar might have spatial constraints, digital platforms can host webinars, connecting experts worldwide and reaching a global audience. The interplay between the two ensures that learners receive both depth and breadth in their educational journey—depth from immersive, tangible experiences and breadth from the vast, interconnected digital world.

The beauty of this symbiotic relationship lies in its ability to adapt and evolve constantly. As physical spaces are re-imagined to accommodate and facilitate the use of emerging technologies, digital tools, in turn, are being developed to enhance and amplify the potential of physical interactions. Virtual reality might transport students to ancient civilisations during a history lesson, while collaborative online platforms can enable group projects across continents. Each component, while powerful on its own, draws strength from the other, culminating in a holistic educational experience grounded in tradition and soaring in innovation.

6.2. Case studies: Successful integration of physical and digital assets in universities

This section presents a curated selection of case studies that exemplify the effective amalgamation of physical and digital assets within university settings. It is important to recognise that these case studies are illustrative examples derived from academic literature and are not exhaustive representations of the field.

6.2.1. Massachusetts institute of technology (MIT)—OpenCourseWare (OCW) initiative

In the early 2000s, MIT pioneered a groundbreaking initiative known as OpenCourseWare (OCW), which aimed to make nearly all of the institution's course content available online for free. While MIT's physical infrastructure, from its state-of-the-art labs to its iconic dome, remained a hub of innovation and hands-on learning, OCW expanded the institution's reach globally. OCW not only democratised access to MIT's high-quality resources but also created a synergy with its physical operations. On-campus students could use OCW as a supplementary tool to revisit lectures, engage with additional materials, and enhance their classroom learning. Conversely, global learners who accessed OCW often felt a virtual connection to MIT's physical environment, and some even pursued further studies on campus. The initiative showcased how a premier institution could maintain its physical prestige

while leveraging digital platforms to amplify its educational impact (Margulies, 2004; Lee et al., 2007).

6.2.2. University of Melbourne—The digital learning hub

The University of Melbourne, recognising the importance of blended learning, launched its Digital Learning Hub—a physical space specifically designed to incorporate digital tools. The Hub is not just a computer lab but an environment where students collaborate using global communication tools, engage with massive online databases and utilise VR setups to immerse themselves in virtual field trips. The Digital Learning Hub seamlessly integrates the tangible and intangible, creating a space where students transition effortlessly between hands-on group activities and digital exploration. By ensuring that the infrastructure is conducive to modern learning techniques, the university has fostered an environment where digital tools enhance, rather than replace, traditional pedagogical methods. The Hub has since become a model for universities worldwide, illustrating the potential of intertwining physical and digital assets in a campus setting (Alexander, 2001).

6.2.3. Stanford university—The virtual human interaction lab (VHIL)

Stanford's VHIL is a testament to the future of integrated learning. While it operates within Stanford's physical confines, its essence is deeply digital. The lab explores the nuances of human interactions in virtual reality settings, offering students both the tools and the environment to delve deep into the future of digital communication. At VHIL, students can don VR headsets and immerse themselves in scenarios ranging from coral reefs threatened by climate change to virtual classrooms. While the experience is fundamentally digital, the physical infrastructure, including the design of the lab and the tactile feedback tools, plays a critical role in enhancing the immersive experience. VHIL exemplifies the potential of physical spaces specifically designed around digital tools, fostering an environment of innovation and cutting-edge research. Moreover, the insights from VHIL have informed online education strategies, bridging the gap between virtual and real-world interactions (Won, 2015).

7. Broader implications of the infrastructural metamorphosis

The transformation in university infrastructure, which encompasses the seamless integration of physical and digital realms, goes beyond mere academic enhancement. This metamorphosis reflects broader societal shifts, bearing implications that ripple outwards, touching various facets of our global community. As institutions of higher learning redefine their infrastructural identities, they are inadvertently reshaping societal norms, influencing policy decisions, and steering the direction in which our world evolves. The very nature of this change, driven by technological advancements and contemporary needs, signifies a progressive stride towards a future where education is accessible, dynamic, and tailored to global requirements (Clothey, 2011).

In this broader context, infrastructural evolution equips students with knowledge and prepares societies for impending transformations. Modern universities become hubs of innovation, research, and societal engagement through their redefined infrastructures (Holland and Holland, 2014). They act as bridges connecting the past

with the future, tradition with innovation, and local concerns with global challenges. In essence, the infrastructural metamorphosis positions universities as catalysts for broad-based societal advancement and paves the way for a more interconnected, informed, and innovative world.

The reinvention of university infrastructures, emphasising digital integration, has substantial economic ramifications. At a local level, developing these infrastructures often spurs job creation, from construction to IT support, driving regional economic growth. Furthermore, the influx of students, researchers, and faculty, attracted by state-of-the-art facilities and tools, boosts local businesses, housing markets, and ancillary services. On a global scale, universities with modern infrastructures become powerhouses of innovation, often birthing startups, technological advancements, and groundbreaking research (Estache, 2012). They attract international students, fostering a diverse and skilled workforce ready to contribute to the global economy. Moreover, partnerships between universities and industries become more feasible and productive with updated infrastructures, leading to collaborative research, patents, and commercialisation of innovations. Such symbiotic relationships position universities as economic drivers and solidify their role in shaping global economic trajectories.

In the face of pressing global challenges—from climate change and pandemics to socio-political upheavals—universities are emerging as beacons of hope and solutions. The revamped infrastructures, which meld physical spaces with digital prowess, enable institutions to harness collective intelligence, facilitating interdisciplinary collaborations and fostering a holistic approach to problem-solving. For instance, state-of-the-art labs equipped with digital simulation tools allow researchers to model climate patterns, predict natural disasters, or design sustainable solutions, all while collaborating with experts from around the globe. Moreover, universities, through their modern infrastructures, can now offer platforms for dialogue, debate, and discourse, transcending geographical and cultural barriers. Virtual conferences, global classrooms, and collaborative online platforms create an environment where diverse perspectives converge to address shared challenges. Such endeavours not only position universities as thought leaders but also emphasise their crucial role in global diplomacy and consensus-building. And lastly, in an era of information overload, universities act as trusted knowledge repositories. Their infrastructures, both physical libraries and vast digital databases, provide reliable and vetted information, guiding policymakers, activists, and citizens alike. By offering evidence-based insights and fostering critical thinking, universities, through their evolved infrastructures, cement their role as guiding lights in navigating the complexities of the 21st century.

8. Recommendations and forward-looking insights

The ongoing evolution of the academic landscape requires universities to adopt a proactive approach, anticipating future trends and challenges. Drawing on global best practices and lessons from pioneering institutions, specific strategies emerge as paramount for universities aiming to solidify their position in the 21st century and beyond.

8.1. Future-proofing university infrastructure

Future-proofing becomes essential in the face of rapid technological advancements and changing societal needs. First and foremost, universities should prioritise continuous investment in research and development, staying abreast of emerging technologies and pedagogical approaches (Johnson et al., 2016). This includes exploring technologies like augmented reality, artificial intelligence, and biotechnologies, ensuring that infrastructural developments can support and integrate these advancements.

Another pivotal strategy is fostering collaborations, both intra-institutional and with external stakeholders. Interdisciplinary research hubs and innovation centres can act as melting pots of ideas, encouraging cross-pollination between different academic domains. Furthermore, partnerships with industries, tech firms, and other academic institutions can offer valuable insights into future trends and demands, guiding infrastructural decisions. Lastly, a forward-looking approach necessitates embracing sustainability, both environmentally and socially. Universities should strive for eco-friendly infrastructures, from green buildings to sustainable energy sources. In tandem, creating inclusive spaces accessible to students of all backgrounds and abilities will ensure that institutions remain relevant and attractive in an increasingly diverse global community (Veiga-Ávila et al., 2019).

8.2. Embracing flexibility and adaptability

A static approach to infrastructure, anchored solely in present needs, risks obsolescence in the face of dynamic changes. Flexibility and adaptability are foundational to modern infrastructural development. Modular designs, for instance, allow universities to reconfigure spaces with minimal disruptions, catering to shifting academic and research requirements (Smith and Winters, 2021). This might involve classrooms that can transition into collaborative spaces or labs that can be easily updated to accommodate new research tools. Technological integration should be approached with a similar mindset. Rather than committing heavily to single platforms or tools, universities should focus on creating tech ecosystems that seamlessly incorporate new software or hardware as they emerge. Investing in scalable and interoperable systems ensures institutions can easily pivot as the technological landscape evolves (Johnson et al., 2020). However, the most resilient infrastructures will be those that anticipate change, incorporating designs and systems that allow for fluidity. As echoed by Veiga-Ávila (2019), universities that foster a culture of adaptability in their curricula and physical and digital infrastructures are best positioned to thrive in the dynamic milieu of the 21st century and beyond.

9. Conclusion

The landscape of higher education is transforming, marked by the symbiotic relationship between traditional physical assets and the realm of digital evolution. The paper has elucidated how this interplay is redefining the academic experience, extending beyond the confines of brick-and-mortar establishments and harnessing the power of digital platforms. From tracing the historical trajectory of universities to examining modern transitions and the consequent implications, the narrative

underscores the profound impact of this infrastructural metamorphosis on learning paradigms, economic trajectories, and global challenges. The integration of physical and digital infrastructures within universities is not just a fleeting trend but a paradigm shift that heralds a transformative era in education. These twin pillars, each with its unique strengths, come together to create a holistic, adaptable, and enriched academic environment equipped to meet the diverse needs of the 21st-century learner. Their combined potential enhances the immediate educational experience and holds immense promise for shaping future academic endeavours, setting forth a resilient and forward-looking blueprint for the world of higher education.

10. Contributions to knowledge

The contribution of the paper lies in its comprehensive analysis of the evolving academic landscape, particularly focusing on the synergy between physical and digital infrastructures in universities. It offers an understanding of how tangible university assets and digital innovations are not merely coexisting but actively intertwining to redefine the academic experience. This conceptual analysis enriches the academic discourse by providing a foundational perspective on the role of these infrastructures in shaping contemporary education and influencing broader economic pathways. The paper extends beyond traditional views of university assets, emphasising the importance of a symbiotic relationship between physical presence and digital evolution. This approach is significant as it offers a holistic view of the educational environment, acknowledging the dynamic interplay between physical and digital realms and its impact on learning paradigms, economic trajectories, and global challenges. The theoretical insights presented in the paper are pivotal in understanding the infrastructural metamorphosis within higher education, setting a framework for future academic research and policy development.

Practically, the paper contributes valuable strategies and insights for universities aiming to adapt and thrive in the 21st century. It reiterates the importance of future-proofing university infrastructure through continuous investment in emerging technologies and pedagogical approaches, fostering collaborations, and embracing sustainability. These recommendations are grounded in global best practices and lessons from pioneering institutions, offering actionable guidance for universities worldwide. The emphasis on flexibility and adaptability in infrastructural development, including modular designs and scalable tech ecosystems, provides a practical roadmap for institutions to remain relevant and responsive to changing societal needs and technological advancements. Furthermore, the paper's exploration of integrating physical and digital infrastructures offers a forward-looking blueprint for creating a holistic, adaptable, and enriched academic environment. This practical contribution is precious for university administrators, policymakers, and educators, aiding them in making informed decisions to enhance the educational experience and prepare them for future challenges. The insights offered in the paper have the potential to shape not only individual institutions but also the broader landscape of higher education, especially in the context of emerging economies and region-specific adaptations.

Conflict of interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

Alenezi, M., Wardat, & Akour, M. (2023). The Need of Integrating Digital Education in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities. Sustainability, 15(6), 4782. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15064782

Alexander, S. (2001). E-learning developments and experiences. Education + Training, 43(4/5), 240–248. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910110399247

Altbach, P. G. (1991). Patterns in higher education development. Prospects, 21(2), 189–203. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02336060

Azionya, C. M., & Nhedzi, A. (2021). The digital divide and higher education challenge with emergency online learning: Analysis of tweets in the wake of the COVID-19 lockdown. Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 22(4), 164–182. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1002822

Benade, L. (2019). Flexible Learning Spaces: Inclusive by Design? New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 54(1), 53–68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40841-019-00127-2

Bennett, D., Knight, & Rowley, J. (2020). The role of hybrid learning spaces in enhancing higher education students' employability. British Journal of Educational Technology, 51(4), 1188–1202. Portico. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12931

Berkel, K., & Homburg, E. (eds.). (2023). The Laboratory Revolution and the Creation of the Modern University. Amsterdam University Press. pp. 1830-1940.

Bhati, A., & Song, I. (2019). New Methods for Collaborative Experiential Learning to Provide Personalised Formative Assessment. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET), 14(07), 179. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i07.9173

Bogart, D. (2022). Infrastructure and institutions: Lessons from history. Regional Science and Urban Economics, 94, 103626. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2020.103626

Bond, M., Marín, V. I., Dolch, C., et al. (2018). Digital transformation in German higher education: student and teacher perceptions and usage of digital media. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 15(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-018-0130-1

Brodovskaya, E. V., Dombrovskaya, A. Y., Petrova, T. E., et al. (2019). Digital Space of Leading Universities: The Comparative Analysis of Sites. Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii = Higher Education in Russia, 28(12), 9–22. https://doi.org/10.31992/0869-3617-2019-28-12-9-22

Burbules, N. C., & Callister, T. A. Jr (2000). Universities in Transition: The Promise and the Challenge of New Technologies. Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education, 102(2), 271–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00056

Clothey, R. (2011). Opportunities and Obstacles: Technology's Potential for Expanding Access to Higher Education. Excellence in Higher Education, 2(1), 51–58. https://doi.org/10.5195/ehe.2011.29

Bondoc, C. E., & Malawit, T. G. (2020). Cybersecurity for higher education institutions: adopting regulatory framework. Global Journal of Engineering and Technology Advances, 2(3), 016–021. https://doi.org/10.30574/gjeta.2020.2.3.0013

Dillahunt, T., Wang, Z., & Teasley, S. D. (2014). Democratizing higher education: Exploring MOOC use among those who cannot afford a formal education. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 15(5). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i5.1841

Franz, Y., & Gruber, E. (2022). The Changing Role of Student Housing as Social Infrastructure. Urban Planning, 7(4). https://doi.org/10.17645/up.v7i4.5661

Funamori, M. (2016). The Impact of the Digital Age on Higher Education: Beyond Transformation from the Physical Space to the Digital Sphere. 2016 5th IIAI International Congress on Advanced Applied Informatics (IIAI-AAI). https://doi.org/10.1109/iiai-aai.2016.58

Gafurov, I. R., Safiullin, M. R., Akhmetshin, E. M., et al. (2020). Change of the Higher Education Paradigm in the Context of Digital Transformation: from Resource Management to Access Control. International Journal of Higher Education, 9(3), 71. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n3p71

Gevorgyan, O. I., Minaev, N. N., & Zharova, E. A. (2020). University cities' evolution in context of human capital accumulation. SHS Web of Conferences, 80, 01008. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20208001008

Haggans, M. (2016). The 21st-century campus. Planning for Higher Education, 44(3), 1–8.

Hernandez-de-Menendez, M., Escobar Díaz, C., & Morales-Menendez, R. (2019). Technologies for the future of learning: state of the art. International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing (IJIDeM), 14(2), 683–695. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12008-019-00640-0

Holland, J., & Holland, J. (2014). Implications of Shifting Technology in Education. TechTrends, 58(3), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-014-0748-3

Isa, A., & Yusoff, Z. (2015). State of physical facilities of higher education institutions in Nigeria. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 5(4), 1–5.

Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: four approaches. AMS Review, 10(1–2), 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0

Joan, R. (2013). Flexible Learning As New Learning Design In Classroom Process To Promote Quality Education. I-Manager's Journal on School Educational Technology, 9(1), 37–42. https://doi.org/10.26634/jsch.9.1.2401

Johnson, L., Becker, S. A., Cummins, M., et al. (2016). NMC horizon report: 2016 higher education edition. The New Media Consortium. pp. 1–50.

Kaziev, K. V., Sherstobitova, A. A., & Kazieva, B. V. (2020). University IT infrastructure in the context of evolutionary transformations of the digital economy. Personality Society, 1(1), 12-19. https://doi.org/10.46502/issn.2712-8024/2020.1.2

Kerres, M. (2004). Beyond Learning Platforms: Infrastructures for the Digital Campus. In: Proceedings of 6th International Conference on New Educational Environments (ICNEE04).

Kholiavko, N., Popelo, O., & Tulchynska, S. (2021). Priority directions of increasing the adaptivity of universities to the conditions of the digital economy. Revista Tempos e Espaços Em Educação, 14(33), e16383. https://doi.org/10.20952/revtee.v14i33.16383

Kim, Y., Soyata, T., & Behnagh, R. F. (2018). Towards Emotionally Aware AI Smart Classroom: Current Issues and Directions for Engineering and Education. IEEE Access, 6, 5308–5331. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2018.2791861

Kostina, S. N. (2021). Is the infrastructure of regional universities ready to meet the challenges of digital transformation? University Management: Practice and Analysis, 25(3), 14–32. https://doi.org/10.15826/umpa.2021.03.024

Kovaleva, N. N., Eresko, P. V., Izotova, V. F., & Gafarov, Y. R. (2022). Optimizing The Implementation Of University Digitalization Practices. European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2022.01.57

Laufer, M., Leiser, A., Deacon, B., et al. (2021). Digital higher education: a divider or bridge builder? Leadership perspectives on edtech in a COVID-19 reality. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00287-6

Lee, M. M., Lin, M. F. G., & Bonk, C. J. (2007). OOPS, Turning MIT Opencourseware into Chinese: An analysis of a community of practice of global translators. The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 8(3). https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v8i3.463

Lei, Z., Zhou, H., Hu, W., et al. (2020). 3-D Interactive Control Laboratory for Classroom Demonstration and Online Experimentation in Engineering Education. IEEE Transactions on Education, 64(3), 276–282. https://doi.org/10.1109/te.2020.3041070

Lewinski, P. (2015). Effects of classrooms' architecture on academic performance in view of telic versus paratelic motivation: a review. Frontiers in Psychology, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00746

Luchkov, A., Korolev, A., & Kodabashyan, L. (2022). The Architecture of Digital Enterprise in the University Infrastructure. In: 2022 15th International Conference Management of large-scale system development (MLSD). IEEE. pp. 1-5.

MacInnis, D. J. (2011). A Framework for Conceptual Contributions in Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 75(4), 136–154. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.75.4.136

Mahajan, R., Gupta, P., & Singh, T. (2019). Massive Open Online Courses: Concept and Implications. Indian Pediatrics, 56(6), 489–495. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13312-019-1575-6

Malik, K., & Thakur, R. R. (2010). Creating value through IT – emerging patterns in brick-and-mortar b-schools. International Journal of Innovation in Education, 1(2), 148. https://doi.org/10.1504/ijiie.2010.036857

Margulies, A. H. (2004). A New Model for Open Sharing: Massachusetts Institute of Technology's OpenCourseWare Initiative Makes a Difference. PLoS Biology, 2(8), e200. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0020200

Mehmood, R., Katib, S. S. I., & Chlamtac, I. (2020). Smart infrastructure and applications. Springer International Publishing.

Mosteanu, N. R. (2020). Digital university campus–change the education system approach to meet the 21st century needs. European Journal of Human Resource Management Studies, 4(4), 79–93. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejhrms.v4i4.959

Muñoz, J. L. R., Ojeda, F. M., Jurado, D. L. A., et al. (2022). Systematic review of adaptive learning technology for learning in higher education. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 98(98), 221–233.

Musa, M. F., & Ahmad, Z. (2012). Higher Education Physical Assets and Facilities. Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences, 50, 472–478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.08.051

Nelson, H. G., & Stolterman, E. (2014). The design way: Intentional change in an unpredictable world. MIT press.

Németh, B., Issa, O., Diba, F., & Tuckett, A. (2020). Learning cities and learning communities: Analyzing contextual factors and their impacts on adult and lifelong learning in urban settings. Andragoske Studije, 2, 17–52. https://doi.org/10.5937/andstud2001017n

Nguyen, D. (2018). The University in a World of Digital Technologies: Tensions and Challenges. Australasian Marketing Journal, 26(2), 79–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2018.05.012

Oftedal, L. A. (2020). National digital infrastructure for higher education.

Padmanabhan, S. (2024). Digital Transformation in Higher Education. Advances in Educational Technologies and Instructional Design, 59–69. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0433-4.ch005

Pfeffer, T. (2011). Virtualisation of universities: Digital media and the organisation of higher education institutions. Springer Science & Business Media.

Popova, O. I., Gagarina, N. M., & Karkh, D. A. (2020). Digitalization of Educational Processes in Universities: Achievements and Problems. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference "Digitalization of Education: History, Trends and Prospects" (DETP 2020). https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200509.131

Radhamani, R., Sasidharakurup, H., Kumar, D., et al. (2015). Role of Biotechnology simulation and remotely triggered virtual labs in complementing university education. 2015 International Conference on Interactive Mobile Communication Technologies and Learning (IMCL). https://doi.org/10.1109/imctl.2015.7359548

Robertson, A., Cleaver, E., & Smart, F. (2019). Beyond the metrics: Identifying, evidencing and enhancing the less tangible assets of higher education. QAA Scotland

Rodríguez-Abitia, G., & Bribiesca-Correa, G. (2021). Assessing Digital Transformation in Universities. Future Internet, 13(2), 52. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi13020052

Rubin, V. (1998). The Roles of Universities in Community-Building Initiatives. Journal of Planning Education and Research, 17(4), 302–311. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456x9801700405

Sage, R. (2023). Tackling Tradition in Education. Qeios. https://doi.org/10.32388/CDVBT5

Sargent, M. (2015). Wall to wall. Nursery World, 2015(Sup10), 16–18. https://doi.org/10.12968/nuwa.2015.sup10.16

Schmidt, J. T., & Tang, M. (2020). Digitalization in Education: Challenges, Trends and Transformative Potential. Führen Und Managen in Der Digitalen Transformation, 287–312. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-28670-5_16

Scholl, K. G., & Gulwadi, G. B. (2015). Recognising campus landscapes as learning spaces. Journal of Learning Spaces, 4(1), 53–60.

Schwaen, R., Sarpaneva, P., Alenjery, N., et al. (2018). Bricks and books: Reinventing the teaching of architectural history and theory. In: National Conference on the Beginning Design Student.

Sferrazza, A. (2018). The Nature of the Space: Walls to Bridges as Transformative Learning. Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning, 4(1), 241–250. https://doi.org/10.15402/esj.v4i1.321

Shah, V. M., & Shah, D. (2023). Impact of digitalisation in education-a literature review analysis. Towards Excellence, 15(2), 333–343. Internet Archive. https://doi.org/10.37867/te150234

Sharma, R. S. (2015). Role of universities in development of civil society and social transformation. In: Proceedings of International Academic Conferences. International Institute of Social and Economic Sciences.

Shill, H. B., & Tonner, S. (2003). Creating a Better Place: Physical Improvements in Academic Libraries, 1995–2002. College & Research Libraries, 64(6), 431–466. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.64.6.431

Singh, J., Steele, K., & Singh, L. (2021). Combining the Best of Online and Face-to-Face Learning: Hybrid and Blended Learning Approach for COVID-19, Post Vaccine, & Post-Pandemic World. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 50(2), 140–171. https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395211047865

Smart, F., Cleaver, E., & Robertson, A. (2020). Beyond the metrics: the importance of intangible assets in the HE context. Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice, 8(2), 3–6. https://doi.org/10.14297/jpaap.v8i2.432

Smith, N. (2016). Book Interview: Making sense of bricks and mortar. Engineering & Technology, 11(5), 84–85. https://doi.org/10.1049/et.2016.0528

Song, M., Berends, H., Van Der Bij, H., & Weggeman, M. (2006). The Effect of IT and Co-location on Knowledge Dissemination. Journal of Product Innovation Management, 24(1), 52–68. Portico. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2006.00232.x

Valtonen, T., Leppänen, U., Hyypiä, M., et al. (2020). Learning environments preferred by university students: a shift toward informal and flexible learning environments. Learning Environments Research, 24(3), 371–388. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-020-09339-6

van der Walt, I. D. (2023). Navigating the digital groove: Crafting a user-centric odyssey for libraries.

Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 68(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036

Veiga Ávila, L., Beuron, T. A., Brandli, L. L., et al. (2019). Barriers to innovation and sustainability in universities: an international comparison. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 20(5), 805–821. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijshe-02-2019-0067

Videka, L., Blackburn, J. A., & Moran, J. R. (2008). Building Research Infrastructure in Schools of Social Work: A University Perspective. Social Work Research, 32(4), 294–301. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/32.4.294

von Hauff, M., & Nguyen, T. (2014). Universities as Potential Actors for Sustainable Development. Sustainability, 6(5), 3043–3063. https://doi.org/10.3390/su6053043

Wahid, A. R., Yatmo, Y. A., & Paramita, K. D. (2020). More than Just a Material Perfection: Preserved Human-Environment Relationship in Traditional Brick-Making Scenarios. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1655(1), 012125. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1655/1/012125

Wilkins, S., Hazzam, J., & Ireland, J. J. (2022). Servicescape in transnational higher education: the effects of campus design, physical environment and facilities on student experience and satisfaction. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2022.2139792

Winter, A., Wiseman, J., & Muirhead, B. (2006). university-community engagement in Australia. Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 1(3), 211–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197906064675

Won, A. S. (2015). The virtual human interaction labStanford, California. XRDS: Crossroads, The ACM Magazine for Students, 22(1), 64–65. https://doi.org/10.1145/2830324

Zender, R., & Tavangarian, D. (2009). Service-Oriented University: Infrastructure for the University of Tomorrow. Communications in Computer and Information Science, 73–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-10263-9_7

Zhang, Y., Liu, S., & Mathews, E. (2015). Convergence of digital humanities and digital libraries. Library Management, 36(4/5), 362–377. https://doi.org/10.1108/lm-09-2014-0116

Zhou, L., & Lu, Y. (2022). Evaluation Model for Spatial Allocation Efficiency of Modern Educational Campus Building Using Big Data. Mobile Information Systems, 2022, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9705618