



MINUTES

Meeting: Joint PPN and ECD Work Stream meeting
Date: 17 July 2018
Time: 10H30
Venue: ELRC Building
261 West Ave
Centurion

1. Opening

1.1. The General Secretary opened the meeting and welcomed all members in attendance.

2. Attendance and Apologies

2.1. Present

Dr LGovender	Facilitator ECD workstream
Mr P Present	Facilitator PPN workstream
Ms M Villanueva	Deloitte
Mr H Botha	Deloitte
Mr S Faker	Department of Education
Ms M Mogale	Department of Education
Ms K Makena	Department of Education
Mr A Lebepe	Department of Education
Mr S Mabaso	Department of Education
Mr O Sibiyi	Department of Education
Ms C Morake	Department of Education
Mr MJ Mabaso	Department of Education
Ms Z Addendorff	Department of Higher Education & Training
Ms O Sibiyi	SADTU

Mr M Galorale	SADTU
Ms F Solomon	SADTU
Mr T Oliphant	SADTU
Ms J van Heerden	CTU-ATU
Ms T Moodley	CTU-ATU
Mrs E Raubenheimer	CTU-ATU
Ms N Foca	ELRC – GS
Mr F Moloisi	ELRC
Ms B Loxton	ELRC
Mr N Make	ELRC

2.2. Apologies

Mr T Rabotabi	Department of Education
Ms M Samuels	Department of Education
Mr D Lerm	CTU- ATU

3. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

- 3.1. The General Secretary proposed that the workstreams should deal with the outstanding reports of their respective works stream.
- 3.2. Mr Present indicated that PPN work stream had no outstanding reports and he was ready to make a presentation.
- 3.3. Mr Govender indicated that the ECD work stream had just received a report from DBE and requested that the meeting should allow Mr Mabaso to table the report first.
- 3.4. All workstream members agreed that the Mr Mabaso should present the report before item 5, i.e Business Matters.

4. Progress report on Grade R Practitioners' qualification level

- 4.1. Mr Mabaso presented the progress report and indicated the following:
 - 4.1.1. That over years the data submitted by provinces as evidence for verifying qualification of Grade R practitioners was found to be unreliable and invalid.
 - 4.1.2. That the National Department of Education had conducted provincial visits in order to gather reliable data.
 - 4.1.3. That 32% of the Grade R Practitioners were appropriately qualified according to MRTEQ.
 - 4.1.4. That 68% of the Grade R Practitioners were not appropriately qualified.
 - 4.1.5. That 25% was enrolled in programmes and 2494 would complete their studies in 2018, 1745 in 2019 and 671 in 2020.

- 4.1.6. That 43% of all Grade R practitioners were not enrolled for any upgrading qualification.
 - 4.1.7. That the 2016 Stats SA community survey was used in determining the number of Grade R practitioners that would be required in 2019, by dividing the number of three year olds by 30, the appropriate Grade R class size.
 - 4.1.8. That with regards to the age profile of Grade R practitioners; there were few practitioners between the ages of 20 – 29 years.
 - 4.1.9. That there were lots of practitioners who were between the ages of 50 – 65 years.
 - 4.1.10. In conclusion, Mr Mabaso indicated that the report recommendations were for the Department of Education to deal with.
- 4.2. The General Secretary proposed that the two tables that deals with age and qualifications of Grade R practitioners should be merged/ linked in order to easily determine who should be upgraded or not.
 - 4.3. Mr Mabaso responded that the updated report with the merged tables would be submitted to the Secretariat within the next two weeks.
 - 4.4. Dr Govender enquired what was preventing other practitioners to be absorbed if they were qualified, as indicated in table 6.
 - 4.5. Mr Mabaso responded that lack of funding was the main factor preventing practitioners from being absorbed.

5. BUSINESS MATTERS

5.1. PPN Discussion Document & Presentation

- 5.1.1. Mr Present made a presentation on the PPN document.
- 5.1.2. Mr Galorale raised a concern about the presentation as he felt that it was highly technical and it lacked details that would assist delegates to understand and engage with the presentation.
- 5.1.3. He proposed that a technical team meeting on PPN be convened to deal with the technical report in order to bring other work stream members on board.
- 5.1.4. Mrs Raubenheimer indicated that CTU-ATU supported SADTU on the issue of convene another work stream meeting as they have to report to their principals before the Indaba as the highly technical presentation would not suffice.

- 5.1.5. Mr Faker responded that the report should be presented as it is in order not to bore the HODs with details.
- 5.1.6. The General Secretary proposed that more slides be added on the presentation in order to give more information and to supplement the technical report.
- 5.1.7. Mr Present concurred with the General Secretary.

5.2. ECD Discussion Document & Presentation

- 5.2.1. Dr Govender made a presentation on the ECD/Grade R document.
- 5.2.2. The General Secretary proposed that bullet number 2 of the recommendations be removed as it had been overtaken by other processes. The recommendation was stating that: *“The committee would submit a proposal to the Education Indaba to discuss the possibility of declaring Foundation Phase Teaching as an essential service, due to the vulnerability of the learners in those Grades who should not be left alone”*.
- 5.2.3. Ms Mogale enquired if it was correct to indicate that ‘unemployed educators’ could be re-skilled because those educators would not be on the system.
- 5.2.4. The General Secretary responded that the provincial Departments should have a database of unemployed educators, including those who have been appointed on contract who have Foundation Phase qualifications.
- 5.2.5. Ms Mogale indicated that a person needs to be an employee before they can be re-skilled.
- 5.2.6. The General Secretary responded by proposing that the issue of re-skilling unemployed educators should be removed under this section and create a new section where it finds expressions generally.
- 5.2.7. Dr Govender concurred with the General Secretary.
- 5.2.8. Mr Galorale indicated that SADTU believes that the issue of reskilling unemployed educators was not misplaced as it was a responsibility of the department to hire those qualified job seekers and as such reducing the number of unemployed graduates.

5.3. Education Indaba 2018 Planning

- 5.3.1. The General Secretary presented the Draft Education Indaba 2018 planning.
- 5.3.2. Mr Galorale proposed that the programme should not be discussed as there are leaders who would decide who should speak on behalf of the organisation.
- 5.3.3. Mr Present indicated that there should be one presenter per workstream and a panel that would assist in responding to the questions.
- 5.3.4. Mr Faker proposed that the ECD presentation should be done on Day 1 as some delegates would not be present on Day 2 due of their busy schedules.
- 5.3.5. Mr Galorale proposed that the Secretariat should develop clear guidelines for the commissions.

6. WAY FORWARD

- 6.1. The ELRC would write a letter to the provincial HOD's and express a concern about lack of co-operation regarding information on Grade R practitioners.
- 6.2. DBE would submit an updated report with the merged tables regarding age and qualifications of practitioners to the Secretariat within the next two weeks.
- 6.3. A slide should be developed indicating how many practitioners are qualified with their age groups for Education Indaba presentation.
- 6.4. The Final Education Indaba 2018 programme would be circulated in due course by the Secretariat.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 7.1. The matter will be done administratively.

8. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 15H00 with a vote of thanks by the Chairperson.

Drafted by ELRC Secretariat.