

The Global Crisis in University Completion

Min Bahadur Bista

The rising number of university students failing to complete their studies has reached a critical point, with far-reaching consequences for individuals, society, and the economy. Students' success depends on how well systems support them with structured programs, clear pathways, sufficient financial aid, and strong accountability systems. Systems with low completion rates are fragmented and under-resourced. Addressing the problem requires shifting from punitive policies to proactive strategies that emphasize support, flexibility, and opportunities for re-engagement.

The high prevalence of non-completion in higher education is an urgent global concern with far-reaching economic, social, and individual consequences. Though often underreported, it has increasingly drawn the attention of policymakers and researchers alike. Higher education policies have traditionally focused on expanding enrollment while paying much less attention to timely degree completion. Across member countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), only 43 percent of students who start a bachelor program complete a degree within the theoretical duration; this proportion rises to 59 percent when allowing for one additional year and to 70 percent three years after a program's theoretical end. Data from some low-income countries indicate that on-time completion can be disappointingly low, in some cases around two to 10 percent. The fact that so many students fail to graduate represents a significant loss of public investment, institutional effort, and human potential.

Completion rates differ by gender, field, program type, and socioeconomic status. Women tend to graduate more than men, STEM students face higher attrition, and lower-socioeconomic status and vocational-track students are at greater risk than others of non-completion. Many students enter college hoping to improve their lives, only to encounter debt, disillusionment, and no credentials to show for their efforts. Non-completion is therefore not simply a matter of personal motivation; it reflects structural weaknesses in the design, funding, and governance of higher education. The most effective systems are those that view student success as a public good, investing in seamless academic transitions, preventative support, and financial protection mechanisms that reduce the friction leading to attrition.

Completion Patterns Across Public and Private Institutions

Non-completion is a challenge across both public and private universities, but patterns and magnitudes vary. In the US, private nonprofit four-year universities report six-year graduation rates around 69 percent, compared with approximately 64 percent at public four-year institutions; for-profit universities lag significantly, with rates near 36 percent.

Similar trends appear in other OECD countries: Austria, Finland, and New Zealand show private institutions outperforming public ones in on-time completion, whereas Denmark and Estonia report the opposite.

These differences largely reflect student selectivity, institutional resources, and support practices rather than institution type. Private universities often provide smaller class sizes, closer academic advising, and proactive monitoring, enabling early intervention for at-risk students. This variation demonstrates that non-completion is not only a systemic issue but also closely tied to how institutions organize support, resources, and student engagement.

The High Cost of Fragmentation

Countries with low completion rates often face three interconnected issues: fragmented academic pathways, misaligned curricula, and financial strain. Italy offers a case in point, as only 53 percent of its bachelor students manage to graduate within three years of theoretical program duration. This low graduation rate is a result of disjointed program structures, confusing degree pathways, and limited early academic support, all of which contribute to weak engagement in the first year and high dropout rates.

The situation is especially dire in systems plagued by deep socioeconomic inequality. Low-income students often enter college underprepared and under-resourced. Economic pressures compete with academic commitments, and, without adequate financial, academic, or emotional support, these students can find themselves forced to drop out. What might seem like an individual failure is actually a systemic issue—a consequence of poverty, policy neglect, and insufficient investment in student persistence.

Crafting a Path to Success

Countries that boast high completion rates often achieve them by creating clear pathways for student success and ensuring strong accountability. South Korea exemplifies this through carefully sequenced curricula that minimize redundancy and

confusion: students follow structured academic paths with frequent milestones and early feedback, while universities are held accountable through national oversight and performance-linked incentives. This approach reduces delays, helps students plan effectively, and allows for timely intervention for at-risk students. The system also integrates career guidance early on, ensuring that students maintain a strong sense of purpose throughout their studies, which is linked to higher persistence and completion rates.

Australia offers a complementary model. While operating a demand-driven system with direct access, it maintains high completion rates through a combination of national quality frameworks, sustained student support, and income-contingent loans that reduce upfront financial burdens. Flexible course offerings, transparent academic requirements, and robust guidance systems ensure students can progress steadily even if life circumstances interrupt their studies. Early-alert systems, mentoring, and counseling help identify students at risk and provide targeted support. Together, these mechanisms show that completion depends on both clear structures and responsive institutional action.

Divergent Policy Models

Globally, two main policy approaches exist: *preventative universalism* and *performance-based funding* (PBF). The Nordic model typifies preventative universalism, seeking to reduce attrition by removing financial barriers. With tuition-free higher education and generous student aid, including stipends and low-interest loans to cover living expenses, students can focus on their studies without financial stress. Attrition during the first year is insignificant in contexts utilizing this approach. Resources are channeled into enhancing academic quality, providing mentorship, and fostering social integration, leading to higher completion rates and equity.

By contrast, high-friction systems like the US come with steep costs, complex administrative processes, and limited student support. The 2024 *How America Completes College* report indicated that 24 percent of undergraduates were at risk of non-completion, with first-generation students being twice as likely to drop out. PBF policies which link funding to retention and graduation rates aim to incentivize efficiency and accountability but can produce unintended effects. For instance, institutions may favor low-risk students to boost metrics without addressing

deeper inequities. For PBF to be effective, safeguards must reward inclusivity and ensure institutions invest in genuine student support.

Exploring Re-Engagement

In addition to models that strive to address completion proactively, some contexts are experimenting with strategies for re-engaging students who are interested in returning to complete their studies. In the US, for example, the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE) has targeted 130,000 former students, emphasizing flexibility through evening, weekend, and online courses. A course-sharing platform allows students to access specialized courses from different institutions without transferring. With an 81-percent retention rate, PASSHE demonstrates that flexible, inclusive approaches can overcome long-standing disadvantages in higher education and support workforce and equity goals.

Conclusion

The stark differences in completion rates highlight a crucial point: not finishing a program is more about systemic issues than individual shortcomings. Countries that focus on reducing financial risks and providing clear academic pathways consistently see higher completion rates and greater social equity. Systems that place the financial burden on students turn often manageable challenges into significant obstacles, with financial stress, mental health issues, and a lack of direction leading to early departure.

Bridging this gap requires moving from punitive funding models toward preventative strategies emphasizing support, flexibility, and re-engagement. Countries with low completion rates can learn from flexible systems like academic credit banks and credit-accumulation frameworks that allow students to pause and resume studies without losing progress. Reframing non-completion as a temporary setback rather than a permanent failure can rebuild public trust and align higher education with modern life and work. Ultimately, the true promise of higher education will be realized only when success is built into the very fabric of the system. Thoughtful, preventative reforms can ensure that not finishing a program does not signify the end of a learning journey, but is rather a brief pause in a flexible and compassionate lifelong learning experience.

Min Bahadur Bista was professor of education at Tribhuvan University, Nepal, and has served as an education specialist with UNESCO. Email: min_bista@yahoo.com.