

THE FUTURE OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION: TRANSFORMATION, DISRUPTION AND ADAPTATION TO 2040

Daniela Ilieva

Business Administration and Marketing Department, UZF University (Bulgaria)

Abstract

Higher education is undergoing significant transformation driven by technological change, demographic shifts, economic pressure, and evolving societal expectations. This paper examines the future of universities toward 2035-2040, drawing on recent research and sector analysis. It argues that universities are unlikely to disappear but will persist in transformed forms through processes of adaptation. Key developments include the integration of artificial intelligence and digital learning, the expansion of alternative credentials, the growth of entrepreneurial and interdisciplinary education, and increased emphasis on student experience and public value. Universities most likely to endure will be those that preserve core functions while adopting more flexible, digitally supported, and socially embedded models.

Keywords: *Higher education transformation, artificial intelligence, alternative credentials, entrepreneurial universities, student experience.*

1. Introduction

The future of university education is increasingly shaped by technological disruption, financial pressure, demographic change, and heightened expectations regarding public value. While claims about the “end” of universities persist, current evidence suggests not disappearance but restructuring and differentiation (OECD, 2024; Arthur D. Little, 2024; Peck et al., 2025).

This paper argues that universities will endure through **adaptive transformation**. Institutions most likely to remain relevant will preserve core functions – earning, knowledge creation, credentialing, and mentorship – while redesigning how these are delivered. Three claims guide the analysis:

- (1) universities will persist as social institutions;
- (2) the sector will become more diverse rather than convergent;
- (3) adaptive evolution offers the most convincing framework for institutional response.

This study is conceptual and literature-based, drawing on OECD, policy, and sector reports to identify plausible trajectories rather than deterministic predictions.

2. Pressures reshaping the university

The pressures reshaping the university do not operate in isolation. Financial strain, technological disruption, demographic change, and questions of public legitimacy are mutually reinforcing and together create the conditions under which institutional adaptation becomes necessary rather than optional. Among these, financial fragility and policy pressure are useful starting points because they shape universities’ capacity to respond to influencing staffing, student support, digital investment, and the scope for strategic experimentation.

2.1. Financial fragility and policy pressure

The post-war settlement that supported mass higher education has weakened. For decades, universities expanded under a relatively stable logic: public investment justified by human capital arguments, strong student demand, aligned research funding, and international recruitment as an additional revenue source. Recent analyses suggest this model is now under strain. OECD data indicate that higher education funding has stagnated or declined in real terms across several systems (OECD, 2024).

The consequence is not only a temporary shortfall but a structural sustainability problem. Universities face rising costs, limited productivity gains in labor-intensive teaching and research, and exposure to volatility in international recruitment (KPMG, 2020; Arthur D. Little, 2024). Jisc and KPMG highlight pressures for shared services, consolidation, and new operating models, while Peck et al. note that around 40% of UK institutions are in deficit (Jisc & KPMG, 2024; Peck et al., 2025). Financial pressure therefore does more than reduce budgets: it forces institutions to clarify mission, differentiate their offer, and reassess whether inherited organizational models remain viable.

2.2. AI and digital learning

AI has intensified these pressures by challenging the assumption that universities derive value primarily from controlling access to information and expert explanation. Generative AI tools are rapidly embedded in student and staff practice. KPMG Canada reports that 59% of students surveyed were already using such tools, while the literature increasingly treats AI as a system-level force affecting teaching, assessment, and governance (KPMG Canada, 2025; Higher Education Digest, 2025; Shane & ChatGPT, 2025). Universities organized around information transmission are therefore exposed to comparison with low-cost, always-available digital tools. This does not imply obsolescence. Rather, it sharpens the distinction between information access and higher learning. As routine tasks become easier to automate, universities are pushed toward less commodifiable functions: critical judgement, ethical reasoning, interdisciplinary synthesis, supervised inquiry, and authentic assessment (Peck et al., 2025). AI thus destabilizes older pedagogic routines while clarifying the continuing importance of human academic work.

The literature also highlights constructive uses of AI. Institutions are experimenting with adaptive learning, predictive analytics, and more responsive support systems (Higher Education Digest, 2025). However, risks remain significant, including bias, surveillance, opacity, and potential deskilling. The future of university education will therefore depend less on simple adoption and more on how AI is governed to support learning while maintaining standards and trust.

2.3. Demographic change, student diversification, and legitimacy

Demographic and social change intensify the need for redesign. In several developed systems, declining birth rates are altering the size and composition of the undergraduate population (OECD, 2024; Peck et al., 2025). At the same time, student populations are becoming more diverse, with increasing emphasis on lifelong and intermittent participation (Towards 2035 Project, 2023).

These shifts challenge the dominance of the full-time, residential model. Future learners are more likely to balance work, care, and financial constraints, and to prioritize flexibility, clear outcomes, and effective support (Arthur D. Little, 2024). A related issue is legitimacy. Evidence points to declining confidence in the value of degrees and concerns about work-readiness. While this does not indicate a general loss of value, it suggests that universities can no longer assume automatic legitimacy. To remain compelling, institutions must demonstrate more clearly their contribution to student development, social mobility, community wellbeing, and forms of knowledge not easily sustained by markets.

3. Emerging trajectories to 2040

If the previous section identified pressures destabilizing inherited university models, the next step is to consider how institutions are already responding. The most plausible futures are not abstract possibilities but trajectories visible in policy, organizational experiments, and sector practice. The discussion begins with alternative credentials and lifelong learning, which most clearly illustrate how universities are rethinking the form, pace, and accessibility of higher education.

3.1. Alternative credentials, modularity, and lifelong learning

One of the clearest signals of structural change is the expansion of alternative credentials. UPCEA reports that 94% of higher education institutions in the United States now offer such credentials, many in stackable form, while OECD analyses position micro-credentials as key to lifelong learning systems (UPCEA, 2023; OECD, 2021). This does not signal the disappearance of the degree, but its repositioning within a broader ecosystem of certified learning that includes short courses, badges, and work-integrated programs. This shift is both economic and pedagogic. Shorter credentials reduce cost and time barriers, support reskilling, and provide intermediate milestones for learners unable to commit to full programs. They also reflect a different conception of educational time: learning becomes episodic, cumulative, and portable rather than front-loaded. Importantly, stronger institutional responses integrate these credentials with degrees, credit recognition, and flexible progression routes (Arthur D. Little, 2024; Zafar, 2025). In such models, learners can move between work and study while accumulating recognized credit. Examples outside traditional universities demonstrate that aspects of skills signaling are increasingly contestable, and institutions that ignore this risk losing educational ground.

3.2. Entrepreneurial education and interdisciplinary innovation ecosystems

A second trajectory is the rise of entrepreneurial and innovation-oriented university models. Here, the entrepreneurial university is not simply one that commercializes research, but one that reorganizes teaching, knowledge exchange, and engagement around problem-solving and collaborative value creation (Cheng et al., 2025). This shift brings interdisciplinary collaboration closer to the center of institutional design. Complex challenges such as climate change or digital governance require approaches that cut across disciplinary boundaries, often organized through challenge-based learning and collaborative projects (McCoy, 2025).

Entrepreneurial universities also reposition students and staff as potential innovators rather than passive participants. Policies around ownership, incubation, and partnerships shape whether such activity

is enabled, while spaces such as incubators and maker environments are becoming more central (Zafar, 2025; Davey et al., 2025). This trajectory also has a public dimension. Beyond commercial activity, it includes co-designed curricula, community engagement, and research linked to regional development. In this sense, entrepreneurial education can strengthen, rather than weaken, the public role of the university.

3.3. Digital-first and blended institutional forms

Universities are also becoming more digital by design, while retaining physical campus functions. Although accelerated by recent disruptions, this shift now reflects a longer-term structural change. Many institutions are moving toward digital-first models in which online delivery is a core infrastructural layer (Arthur D. Little, 2024; Peck et al., 2025). This does not imply fully virtual universities. Instead, it reshapes the division of labor between online and in-person learning. Content delivery can occur asynchronously, while campus time is used for discussion, laboratory work, mentoring, and collaboration. This model allows more purposeful use of physical space while increasing flexibility. Digital forms are particularly relevant for diverse student populations, including those balancing work, care, or geographic constraints (Towards 2035 Project, 2023). However, limits remain: many disciplines still require embodied and supervised learning. The likely outcome is not the disappearance of the campus, but a more selective and intentional one within a broader digital system.

3.4. Student experience as strategic infrastructure

Student experience has shifted from a peripheral concern to a strategic one. Financial pressure, demographic change, and value scrutiny mean that universities are increasingly evaluated by progression, support, employability, and overall learning coherence. McCoy's framework highlights the connection between learner needs, institutional design, and organizational effectiveness (McCoy, 2025). Its importance lies not in consumer satisfaction but in supporting diverse learners. Flexible entry points, clearer pathways, and integrated academic and pastoral support are increasingly necessary. While AI may assist with early intervention and routine support, the literature emphasizes the continued importance of human mentorship and community. As confidence in degrees is questioned and costs rise, universities must demonstrate that learning is meaningful and developmental. Student experience is therefore not a peripheral issue, but a central component of institutional legitimacy and survival (KPMG, 2020; Peck et al., 2025).

4. Why adaptation is more plausible than disappearance

These trajectories raise a larger analytical question: do they signal the erosion of the university as a distinctive institution, or its transformation into new but recognizable forms? The argument advanced here is that adaptation is more plausible than disappearance, but this requires a clearer account of what is worth preserving. It is therefore necessary to begin with the core functions of the university, since institutional survival depends less on preserving inherited structures than on sustaining the enduring purposes universities serve.

4.1. Preserving the core functions of the university

The claim that universities are likely to survive depends on whether their core functions remain socially necessary. The literature suggests that they do. First, universities continue to provide recognized credentialing and standards of achievement. Second, they offer access to infrastructure and organized expertise that are difficult to replicate at individual level. Third, they remain important sites of mentorship, social formation, and identity development, as learning is not exhausted by content delivery but also involves community, challenge, and feedback. Fourth, universities continue to produce and curate knowledge. While market and non-profit actors contribute to innovation, universities retain a distinctive role in longer-horizon inquiry, disciplinary renewal, and the preservation of knowledge (KPMG, 2020; OECD, 2024). These functions are not always directly profitable, which makes them vulnerable if reduced to market logic alone.

4.2. Adopting new models without surrendering purpose

If these functions remain valuable, the question becomes how they will be sustained. The literature points not to stasis but to redesigned forms: hybrid delivery, modular structures, stackable credentials, challenge-based curricula, and new partnerships (OECD, 2021; Arthur D. Little, 2024; Jisc & KPMG, 2024). The survival of universities is therefore best understood as the reorganization of enduring functions through new institutional forms.

This distinction resolves a false binary in higher education debates. Universities do not need to choose between preserving tradition unchanged and abandoning their identity. What is required is a more selective understanding of what is essential. Lectures, semester structures, and rigid disciplinary boundaries are historically familiar but not equivalent to the university's fundamental purposes. By contrast, intellectual formation, inquiry, mentorship, and public contribution are closer to those purposes.

Adaptation becomes persuasive when it preserves the latter while redesigning the former.

The claim is not that all universities will survive in their current form. Some will merge, narrow their mission, or fail. Nor is it that all reforms will succeed. Rather, the most plausible future is one of differentiated continuation: universities persist by changing shape, and those most likely to succeed can distinguish core functions from inherited routines.

4.3. Interdisciplinarity, community, and the renewed public role

Literature supports a stronger version of the adaptation argument: universities are more likely to remain legitimate when they reconnect internal transformation to a renewed public role. Institutions are increasingly asked to justify their value beyond enrolment volume or rankings. Interdisciplinary collaboration is central to this role. Many challenges universities are expected to address – health inequality, sustainability, digital ethics, urban resilience – cross disciplinary boundaries. Institutions organized as loose federations of departments may struggle to respond, while challenge-based and cross-sector approaches allow them to demonstrate relevance without reducing complexity (Cheng et al., 2025; McCoy, 2025).

A community-centered role also requires universities to act less as detached providers and more as embedded civic actors – building relationships with employers, government, schools, and communities, and treating community knowledge as an input into research and teaching. This orientation is not opposed to academic mission; it strengthens the basis on which universities claim support, trust, and autonomy.

5. Adaptive evolution as a strategic framework

The framework of adaptive evolution, developed by McCoy, offers a useful way to organize the implications of the preceding analysis. Its value lies in treating institutional transformation neither as linear modernization nor as episodic crisis management. Instead, it describes a mode of change in which universities preserve mission while developing the capacity to redesign structures, experiment with alternatives, and learn from results (McCoy, 2025).

5.1. Recentering

The first move is recentering: returning institutional attention to mission, student need, and operational clarity. In practical terms, this involves identifying which activities are central to educational value, which cost structures remain sustainable, and where student progression is hindered by avoidable friction (McCoy, 2025). Conceptually, recentering matters because it prevents change from becoming indiscriminate. Universities that innovate without clarity of purpose risk multiplying initiatives without improving coherence.

5.2. Catalyzing

The second move is catalyzing. Universities need protected spaces in which new models can be tested without being forced into the assumptions of the legacy institution. This is particularly important for modular programs, new credential forms, and alternative partnership structures (McCoy, 2025). A recurring theme is that innovation fails when required to fit governance cycles, quality procedures, or staffing models designed for older forms of provision. Catalyzing therefore involves both experimentation and institutional protection.

5.3. Enabling

The third move is enabling: building the organizational conditions in which adaptation can be sustained. This includes leadership development, staff capability, digital infrastructure, revised metrics, and a willingness to learn from partial failure (McCoy, 2025; Peck et al., 2025). It also requires governance systems that can move at an appropriate pace while maintaining academic legitimacy. Universities may know what they need to change yet lack the structures or incentives to do so.

Taken together, these three moves explain why some universities are more likely to endure than others. Institutions that only cut costs may stabilize temporarily but lose legitimacy, while those that digitize indiscriminately may weaken what makes them distinctive. Adaptive evolution is persuasive because it links innovation to mission, experimentation to governance, and students need to institutional design.

6. Discussion

The argument developed here does not support a simple narrative of either continuity or disruption. Universities are unlikely to remain unchanged, but neither are they likely to disappear as a social form. The more convincing picture is one of selective continuity through structural transformation.

The claim that universities will survive through adaptation is strongest when grounded in documented trends. Recent literature highlights several anchors: the expansion of alternative credentials, AI experimentation, changing student demography, pressures for consolidation, and growing entrepreneurial and partnership activity (UPCEA, 2023; KPMG Canada, 2025; Jisc & KPMG, 2024; Cheng

et al., 2025; Peck et al., 2025). While these developments do not guarantee institutional success, they support a more precise claim: the likely future is not disappearance, but uneven restructuring around institutions able to combine durable academic purposes with flexible, digitally enabled, and publicly accountable forms.

This conclusion should still be held cautiously. The evidence base remains shaped by sector reports and early examples rather than long-term evaluation, and trajectories will depend on national regulation, funding, and political choices. The contribution of this article is therefore interpretive rather than predictive, identifying plausible directions rather than guaranteed outcomes.

7. Conclusion

By 2035-2040, university education is likely to be more modular, digitally mediated, entrepreneurial, and more explicitly judged in relation to student outcomes and public value. Students may move in and out of higher education across the life course, combining different forms of credentialled learning and engaging with AI-supported teaching and support (OECD, 2021, 2024; Arthur D. Little, 2024). Physical campuses will remain important, but less as default sites of information delivery and more as spaces for laboratory work, mentoring, collaboration, and community (Peck et al., 2025).

Institutions most likely to remain consequential will be those able to protect what is distinctive about the university while redesigning what is historically contingent. They will preserve core functions—rigorous learning, knowledge creation, credentialling, and human development – while adopting new models of delivery, assessment, partnership, and governance. Interdisciplinary collaboration, flexible credentials, digitally supported learning, and stronger community engagement are therefore becoming central conditions of institutional relevance (Cheng et al., 2025; McCoy, 2025; Zafar, 2025).

The future of university education is neither straightforward decline nor seamless innovation, but a process of adaptation. Universities will remain necessary institutions, but their legitimacy will depend on how effectively they connect enduring academic purposes to the demands of a changing society. The university of 2040 is most likely to endure not by becoming less of a university, but by becoming more explicit, flexible, and accountable in fulfilling its public role.

References

- Arthur D. Little. (2024). *The future of higher education: Balancing new requirements for research, teaching and student needs*. Arthur D. Little.
- Cheng, D., et al. (2025). From ivory towers to innovation ecosystems: The imperative rise of entrepreneurial universities. In T. Davey et al. (Eds.), *The future of universities thoughtbook: Entrepreneurial edition*. University Industry Innovation Network.
- Davey, T., et al. (2025). *The future of universities thoughtbook: Entrepreneurial edition*. University Industry Innovation Network.
- Higher Education Digest. (2025, February). The role of AI, digital learning, and academic innovation in shaping the future of higher education. *Higher Education Digest*.
- Higher Education Policy Institute. (2020). *Demand for higher education to 2035* (Report 134). HEPI.
- Jisc, & KPMG. (2024). *Collaboration for a sustainable future: Unlocking the value and potential of higher education through new shared approaches*. Jisc.
- KPMG. (2020). *The future of higher education in a disruptive world*. KPMG International.
- KPMG Canada. (2025). *Generative AI and the future of education*. KPMG Canada.
- McCoy, C. (2025). Adaptive evolution: A regenerative path forward for higher education. In T. Davey et al. (Eds.), *The future of universities thoughtbook: Entrepreneurial edition*. University Industry Innovation Network.
- OECD. (2021). *Micro-credential innovations in higher education*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2024). *Trends shaping education 2025*. OECD Publishing.
- Peck, E., et al. (2025). *The future of the campus university: 10 trends that will change higher education* (HEPI Policy Note 64). Higher Education Policy Institute.
- Shane, S., ChatGPT (2025). How GenAI will transform universities by 2035. In T. Davey et al. (Eds.), *The future of universities thoughtbook: Entrepreneurial edition*. University Industry Innovation Network.
- Towards 2035 Project. (2023). *Projecting the future of global higher education*. Towards 2035 Project.
- UPCEA. (2023). *Alternative credentials: Business and program models*. UPCEA.
- Zafar, F. (2025). Accelerating entrepreneurship: A triple flywheel model for 2035. In T. Davey et al. (Eds.), *The future of universities thoughtbook: Entrepreneurial edition*. University Industry Innovation Network.