

How can South Africa build a fiscally sustainable student-financing model that enhances access to higher education? Refer to international experience in your analysis.

ABSTRACT

This essay argues that South Africa's current 100% NSFAS bursary model is fiscally unsustainable due to near-zero cost-recovery, high administrative costs, and weak throughput incentives. Using a personal UNISA financial statement as a micro-case study — where R20,410 NSFAS funding cleared the account to zero, followed by a R2,240 additional module that triggered financial suspension of two modules and halted allowances — the analysis illustrates systemic rigidities. Drawing on Australia's HECS-HELP, the United Kingdom's income-contingent loan system, and lessons from Chile and Germany, the essay proposes a differentiated hybrid: 60% grant + 40% income-contingent loan for households earning R0–R350k; 100% income-contingent loan for the “missing middle” (R350k–R600k); and self-pay with a completion rebate for higher-income households. SARS-based collection would cut administrative costs from approximately 12% to under 3%. Conservative estimates suggest annual net savings of R8–12 billion by 2030 while protecting access and closing the missing-middle gap.

1. INTRODUCTION

On 6 March 2026, NSFAS paid R20,410 via the DHET bursary, clearing my UNISA balance to R0.00 after registration of nine modules (including ECS3701). On 10 July I added ECS3704 to repeat a previously failed module, incurring R2,240. Because NSFAS had already disbursed its annual allocation, the university's financial system suspended both ECS3701 and ECS3704 on 21 September. Credits of R1,500 were applied to each module, leaving a balance of –R760 due to me, while registration was cancelled and monthly living and data allowances ceased. This vignette encapsulates South Africa's trilemma: expanding access, maintaining academic quality in the face of high failure and repetition rates, and doing so within a constrained fiscus. NSFAS expenditure rose from roughly R5.9 billion in 2014 to more than R50 billion in recent years, yet cost-recovery remains negligible and administrative overhead high.

2. WHY THE CURRENT MODEL IS UNSUSTAINABLE

2.1 Near-zero recovery

NSFAS operates essentially as a pure bursary. Once funds are disbursed they become sunk costs. Only a small minority of recipients are systematically tracked through SARS after graduation, so the system taxes current low- and middle-income workers to finance future private returns that are never partially recouped. This is both fiscally inefficient and inter-generationally inequitable.

2.2 The missing-middle trap

Households earning approximately R350,000–R600,000 fall outside NSFAS eligibility yet cannot readily access commercial student loans on affordable terms. The author's own status falls in this band. The university financial system could not process a partial top-up for a single additional module; instead it suspended the entire registration for the affected modules and stopped allowances. Rigid annual caps therefore create binary outcomes — full funding or sudden exclusion — rather than graduated support.

2.3 Weak throughput incentives

DHET cohort studies consistently show that a majority of NSFAS-supported students take five or more years to complete a three-year degree. Each repeated module carries a direct cost (R2,240 at UNISA distance rates; far higher at residential universities) and an opportunity cost in delayed labour-market entry. Pass rates in modules such as ECS3701 have historically hovered around 48–54%. Pure grant funding provides little financial incentive for timely completion or for institutions to improve teaching and support.

2.4 High administrative cost

Auditor-General reports have placed NSFAS administrative costs in the region of 11–12% of disbursements. Tax-based collection systems in Australia and the United Kingdom operate at roughly 1.5–2.5%. The difference is large enough, at current scale, to free several billion rand annually for either expanded access or deficit reduction.

3. INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

3.1 Australia – HECS-HELP

Students defer tuition and repay only once income exceeds a threshold (currently around AUD 54,000), at progressive rates of 1–10%, collected through the tax office. Net-present-value recovery has been in the high 70s to low 80s percent, administrative costs approximately 1.8%, and low-SES participation has risen substantially. Repayments are automatically counter-cyclical: they fall when earnings fall.

3.2 United Kingdom – post-2012 income-contingent loans

A repayment threshold of £27,295, a 9% rate on income above the threshold, and a 30-year write-off produce planned non-repayment of roughly 40–45%. The system is nevertheless cheaper than pure grants and protects low earners. Female graduates, who on average earn less, repay less — an automatic progressive feature.

3.3 Germany – tax-funded free tuition

Germany’s model is feasible only because of a tax-to-GDP ratio near 39% (versus South Africa’s approximately 27%) and comparatively modest tertiary enrolment rates. Strong vocational pathways further reduce pressure on universities. Full replication is not realistic under South African fiscal and demographic conditions.

3.4 Chile – commercial loans versus income contingency

Chile’s earlier commercial-interest CAE loan scheme produced default rates near 38%. Reform toward income-contingent terms reduced defaults to around 12%. The lesson is clear: market interest rates imposed on low-income students generate high default and political backlash; income contingency does not.

4. PROPOSED MODEL: A THREE-TIER HYBRID

A differentiated hybrid can reconcile access, equity and fiscal sustainability:

Household income	Instrument	Key parameters
R0 – R350 000	60% grant + 40% ICL	CPI interest only; 5% of income above R150 000; 20-year write-off
R350 000 – R600 000 (missing middle)	100% ICL (tuition)	CPI + 1%; 7% of income above R240 000; modular e-wallet voucher
Above R600 000	Self-pay + rebate	15% tax rebate if degree completed in N+1 years

Safeguards and design features

(a) Collection through SARS reduces administrative cost to approximately 2–2.5%. (b) A minimum 60% credit-pass rule retains the grant component and strengthens throughput incentives. (c) Universities carry a modest (10%) risk-share: if a graduate does not earn above the repayment threshold for ten years, the institution refunds 10% of the loan portion. (d) Projected savings are earmarked in part for 150 000 additional TVET places at roughly R30 000 per place versus R180 000+ at university — improving both equity and the skills mix.

Illustrative fiscal impact (conservative)

Assume a baseline NSFAS-related outlay of approximately R38–40 billion. Converting 40% of support for the lowest tier into recoverable ICL, applying a conservative net-present-value recovery rate of 55–65% (lower than Australia’s because of South Africa’s larger informal sector and emigration), and subtracting collection costs yields roughly R8–11 billion in net recovery. Adding savings from reduced unnecessary repetition produces an estimated annual fiscal improvement of R8–12 billion by the early 2030s. These figures are deliberately cautious; higher recovery is possible once SARS integration and graduate tracking mature.

5. ACCESS AND EQUITY

Income-contingent loans do not deter low-income students when the repayment threshold is set above typical early-career earnings. Australian evidence shows that students treat the obligation as a graduate tax rather than conventional debt. A concrete illustration: a graduate earning R200 000 pays 5% of the R50 000 above the R150 000 threshold — R2 500 per year, or roughly R208 per month — an affordable amount. Because female graduates on average earn less, they repay less, making the scheme automatically progressive on gender. A shorter write-off (for example 15 years) for graduates who work in designated rural or underserved areas further strengthens geographic equity.

6. IMPLEMENTATION PATHWAY

Year 1: Amend the NSFAS Act to authorise hybrid instruments; integrate NSFAS and SARS data systems; pilot the modular e-wallet and partial ICL at UNISA and one residential university.

Year 2: Roll out the missing-middle 100% ICL and the modular voucher nationally so that debts below a modest threshold (for example R5 000) no longer trigger suspension.

Year 3: Introduce the university risk-share and begin reallocating a portion of savings to expanded TVET provision.

The principal residual risk is non-capture of informal-sector earnings. Mitigation includes voluntary declaration linked to a tax-clearance or employment-clearance incentive, employer withholding for formal jobs, and periodic income verification. These measures will improve over time as the formal economy and digital tax systems expand.

7. CONCLUSION

South Africa cannot sustain a pure bursary system at current enrolment and cost trajectories, nor can it leave the missing middle without workable options. An income-contingent hybrid administered through the tax system, differentiated by household income, and designed with modular flexibility offers a fiscally credible path that protects access. The author's trajectory — from fully funded registration to suspension over a single R2 240 module, with allowances stopped — demonstrates why design must operate at the level of individual modules and academic progression, not only annual envelopes. A system that allows students to fail, recover, and repay when they become productive is both fairer and more sustainable than the present binary model.

REFERENCES

- Chapman, B. & Dearden, L. (2022). Income-contingent loans in higher education financing. Various working papers and reviews.
- Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) / NSFAS. Annual reports and cohort studies, 2023–2025.
- Auditor-General of South Africa (AGSA). NSFAS performance and compliance reports, 2023.
- University of South Africa (UNISA). Student financial statements and module pass-rate data, 2023–2026.
- Institute for Fiscal Studies (UK). Analyses of the English student loan system, 2022–2024.
- World Bank. Higher education financing and income-contingent loan reviews, 2023.
- National Treasury. Budget Reviews and Medium-Term Expenditure Framework documentation, 2024–2026.
- Australian Government / Department of Education. HECS-HELP statistics and recovery data.

DECLARATION: This is original work by Entry #522. No plagiarism. The UNISA case study is the author's personal experience and is used solely to illustrate systemic design failures. All policy proposals are offered in good faith for public debate.