



## REPORT

---

**Meeting:** PPN Work Stream

**Date:** 27 March 2018

**Time:** 10H30

**Venue:** ELRC Building  
261 West Ave  
Centurion

---

### 1. OPENING AND WELCOME

The meeting commenced at 10H43 with a welcome from Ms M Villanueva, the Facilitator.

### 2. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

#### 2.1 Present

Mr P Present	Deloitte
Dr M Villanueva	Deloitte
Ms P Twalo	Deloitte
Mr S Faker	Department of Basic Education
Mr A Lebepe	Department of Basic Education
Mr M Mahlangu	Department of Basic Education
Mr N Tshibo	Department of Basic Education
Mr O Moila	Department of Basic Education
Mr M Galorale	SADTU
Mr T Oliphant	SADTU

---

*The information contained in this document is confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual named above. If the reader of this document is not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original document to us at: The General Secretary, ELRC, Private Bag X126, Centurion, 0046 ☎(012) 663 7446. Thank you.*

Mr C Scorgie	CTU-ATU
Ms T Moodley	CTU-ATU
Ms E Raubenheimer	CTU-ATU
Ms N O Foca	ELRC
Ms B Loxton	ELRC
Ms M Milne	ELRC

## 2.2 Apologies

Ms L Munday	Department of Basic Education
Mr M Manny	SADTU

## 3. CONFIRMATION OF THE AGENDA

### Decision 1:

The agenda was adopted.

## 4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

### 4.1. 1 February 2018

### Decision 2:

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 February 2018 was unanimously adopted

## 5. MATTERS ARISING

- 5.1. Mr Present indicated that some of the items noted and raised in the minutes of the previous meeting would be dealt with within the agenda items below.

## 6. BUSINESS MATTERS

### 6.1. Project Plan Feedback

- 6.1.1. Dr Villanueva indicated the following:
- 6.1.1.1. That not feedback was received from Commission members regarding the draft project plan.
  - 6.1.1.2. That the Commission met with PED HR and PPN officials to get a national perspective regarding current best practices, challenges and the manner in which PEDs are addressing those challenges.

6.1.1.3. That the PEDs also provided input on required amendments and considerations for the revised 2021 PPN policy.

## **6.2. Status of Grade R, IIAL and Technical Subjects**

6.2.1. Mr A Lebepe indicated the following:

- 6.2.1.1. That the North West and Limpopo province had implemented Grade R.
- 6.2.1.2. That the DBE had assisted the provincial departments by including Grade R in the PPN model, therefore any province who is ready to implement Grade R, the PPN model software has been updated to accommodate such.
- 6.2.1.3. That the DBE had made a bid to National Treasury the previous year to have Grade R fully implemented in 2019 but the response from National Treasury was that there was no funds available.
- 6.2.1.4. That the DBE had visited all the provinces to inform them that technical subjects i.e. Maths and Science, would be included in the software this year and would be part of the next school establishment for full implementation.
- 6.2.1.5. That there were three engineering subjects that were split into nine areas of specialisation, which automatically meant that there was a need for extra posts to be accommodate such but National Treasury had indicated that there was no funding available for such.
- 6.2.1.6. That provinces were requested to prioritise ad-hoc posts and also to retain excess educators in such posts.

6.2.2. SADTU indicated the following:

- 6.2.2.1. That a comprehensive report of each province was required before a comparison could be done and any comments could be made.
- 6.2.2.2. That whilst looking at the long term plan of a revised Post Provisioning model, there was a need to come up with some intervention measures for 2019 thus a global view of what was happening in provinces was necessary.

6.2.3. Dr Villanueva indicated that the commission would have a global view as the discussions in the meeting when having discussion in meeting would highlight some of the challenges.

6.2.4. SADTU enquired whether the DBE would be going back to National Treasury to deal with the matter of funds.

- 6.2.5. The Employer responded as follows:
- 6.2.5.1. That the DBE does have regular meeting with National Treasury.
  - 6.2.5.2. That as soon as there was a detailed proposal on the table they would request the DG to take the matter forward.
  - 6.2.5.3. That in the Indaba the DG had informed parties that he would approach the National Treasury to get funding in terms of the projects including Grade R.
  - 6.2.5.4. That in the interim the DG had informed that no funding was available but would on a continuous basis consult NT with regards to funding.
  - 6.2.5.5. Cautioned that it would be difficult to get funding from NT at this stage.
- 6.2.6. The General Secretary indicated the following:
- 6.2.6.1. That paragraph 6.1.9.4 of the Report of the previous meeting indicated that currently Limpopo and North West were funding Grade R.
  - 6.2.6.2. That whilst provinces were at liberty to utilise their budgets as they deem fit but it was necessary to ensure that there is consistency and standardisation in terms of how these matters are dealt with which should be guided by the National DBE.
  - 6.2.6.3. That the question that should be asked is how Limpopo and North West provinces were implementing Grade R as these provinces were regarded as poor provinces.
  - 6.2.6.4. That the Employer should engage those provinces to ascertain how they were implementing Grade R and then at National give a directive to provinces as the National DBE was responsible for policy direction.
- 6.2.7. CTU-ATU indicated the following:
- 6.2.7.1. That the Employer had indicated that they were ready with the PPN for Grade R.
  - 6.2.7.2. That it was necessary to formalise the minimum requirements to be appointed in a Grade R post.
  - 6.2.7.3. That the technical subjects were applicable to all schools in the country thus there should be a norm set on the weighting and the number of students in the school which needs to be set at national level.
  - 6.2.7.4. That it was necessary to have a policy in order to ensure uniformity in all provinces.
- 6.2.8. The Employer indicated the following:
- 6.2.8.1. That the challenge was that if Grade R becomes compulsory where was the funding going to come from.

- 6.2.8.2. That the DG had indicated that if Grade R was to be implemented as at 1 January 2019 it needed to come out of the current basket which then would cause a reduction in other posts unless NT provides funding.
- 6.2.8.3. That a number of provinces were funding Grade R through other means.
- 6.2.8.4. That it was necessary to find a mechanism to universally implement Grade R which also links to the ECD Workstream.
- 6.2.9. CTU-ATU enquired if an audit has been done on the number of posts required for Grade R in all provinces and the financial implications thereof.
- 6.2.10. Dr Villanueva responded that the DBE had a list of the educators / practitioners and such was circulated in the ECD Workstream.
- 6.2.11. The Employer indicated the following:
  - 6.2.11.1. That in the bid the DBE had made to NT, the DBE had developed a paper on Grade R which included what was in the system in terms of Grade R practitioners, their qualifications and those that have qualified.
  - 6.2.11.2. That the proposal was that to qualify to be a Grade R teacher a BEd qualification was required and also to improve on the qualification of those that are already in the system to REQV13.
- 6.2.12. The Employer further indicated the following:
  - 6.2.12.1. That it was not necessary to debate the qualifications of Grade R teachers as such was dealt with in the ECD Workstream.
  - 6.2.12.2. That it was necessary to find a universal mechanism in terms of Grade R, IIAL and Technical Subjects and such proposal should be taken to the Indaba to get a commitment to implement in January 2019.
- 6.2.13. Mr Obed (Gauteng PDE) indicated the following:
  - 6.2.13.1. That the issue of Grade R was sensitive and could not be implemented differently in the provinces.
  - 6.2.13.2. That there were certain issues that did not require money such as determination of qualifications.
  - 6.2.13.3. That a directive from National was required to all provinces to say in the absence of funds this is required to be done.
- 6.2.14. Mr Present indicated the following:
  - 6.2.14.1. That whilst there were financial constraints there was an intent to deal with the three areas.

- 6.2.14.2. That in order for the workstream to understand, it was necessary to start with the 2017 establishments by province for technical subjects (three issues), know what that baseline is for the current year and for next year.
- 6.2.14.3. That it was necessary to understand that with or without funding what the workstream should be moving towards and look at what is happening in North West & Limpopo.
- 6.2.15. Dr Villanueva indicated the following:
  - 6.2.15.1. That there was a request to have the facts of the three initiatives and the current status in all nine provinces.
  - 6.2.15.2. That there was a request to establish the norms for the technical subjects.
- 6.2.16. The Employer outlined the policy processes and timelines as per slide 4.
- 6.2.17. Dr Villanueva indicated the following:
  - 6.2.17.1. That the commission had indicated that the full policy would be rolled out in 2021.
  - 6.2.17.2. That there were some gaps in the project plan in terms of the timelines e.g. the socio-economic impacts (how long it takes) and as a commission needed to investigate what the processes were and what it entailed – the timeframes for the other sub projects.
- 6.2.18. SADTU indicated the following:
  - 6.2.18.1. Proposed that a flowchart indicating what should happen on a monthly basis should be provided which would simplify matters when looking into areas that could be inter-phased.
  - 6.2.18.2. That the aim was to make meaningful intervention at a particular point where it would make an impact.
- 6.2.19. Dr Villanueva noted to put the processes in a flow diagram against proposed timelines.
- 6.2.20. The Employer indicated the following:
  - 6.2.20.1. That it would be difficult to attach timeframes to the flow diagram because policy development was one of the most complex systems in this country e.g. meeting with the stakeholders once it takes place those parties must go back and time must be given for input and then the DBE needs to respond to the inputs, the process takes months.

- 6.2.20.2. That thereafter the DBE needs to give external stakeholders a chance to give input which also takes months.
  - 6.2.20.3. That a broad overview of how the process works could be given but a timeframe cannot be attach to the processes.
  - 6.2.20.4. That in the past it took about two to three years to develop a policy.
  - 6.2.20.5. That a basic flow chart what steps to follow could be developed.
- 6.2.21. CTU-ATU enquired where do we fit in now as a workstream.
- 6.2.22. The General Secretary indicated the following:
- 6.2.22.1. That the process which the workstream was embarking on should have been initiated by the DBE.
  - 6.2.22.2. That the expectation was that when HEDCOM took the decision at the Indaba in 2017, the report should have been given to the Minister.
  - 6.2.22.3. That the PPN workstream was operating as though the Minister had issued the instruction not to the unit but via HEDCOM to the workstream.
  - 6.2.22.4. That the workstream should put a proposal to HEDCOM, the policy developers and everyone that is involved in the process to sign off.
  - 6.2.22.5. Proposed that it was necessary to work backward from the implementation date when adding the timeframes on the project plan and to have a discussion document that would inform the policy, thereafter all the other processes would unfold.
- 6.2.23. The Employer indicated the following:
- 6.2.23.1. that their understanding was that the workstream was to give an overview of what was required and put due dates or guidelines for such.
  - 6.2.23.2. That the workstream needed to come up with a model and once there was agreement on the model the timeframes for the process forward could be identified.
- 6.2.24. The General Secretary indicated the following:
- 6.2.24.1. Expressed concern about the timing of allocating provisional timeframes and suggested that such should be done urgently so that when presenting to HEDCOM a global picture could be given towards ensuring the realisation of the bigger plan.
  - 6.2.24.2. That it was not necessary to give a fixed dates but to give the duration e.g. three months etc when allocating timeframes to each step in formulating the policy.

- 6.2.25. Dr Villanueva indicated that the timeframes would be put into the project plan as requested.
- 6.2.26. Mr Present indicated the following:
- 6.2.26.1. That the departmental process was put in the project plan as a one line item and thus they would break it up further as per the policy processes and timelines.
  - 6.2.26.2. That it would be expected that after the policy is developed there would be other processes that needed to happen such as training, etc. to make sure that the policy was properly implemented.
  - 6.2.26.3. That before the Indaba it was necessary to have those timelines and come up with timeframes when the policy would be implemented.
  - 6.2.26.4. That they would build in the timeframes into the project plan.
- 6.2.27. SADTU agreed that the timeframes should be built into the project plan.

### **6.3. PPN Framework**

- 6.3.1. Mr Present presented the proposal for a revised Post Provisioning Framework.
- 6.3.2. Dr Villanueva indicated the following:
- 6.3.2.1. That in the last session of the workstream to be held in June the commission needed to sign off on the document to be presented.
  - 6.3.2.2. Cautioned that the document presented by Mr Present should not be distributed as such would cause confusion in the provinces.
- 6.3.3. CTU-ATU enquired whether LSEN schools were included in the framework.
- 6.3.4. Mr Present indicated the following:
- 6.3.4.1. That they would include LSEN schools if it was not included into the framework.
  - 6.3.4.2. That the framework was based on a needs and affordability model.
  - 6.3.4.3. That there was a need to do more work with regards to the framework.
  - 6.3.4.4. That it was necessary to have a view of what was ideal for each province.
  - 6.3.4.5. That at the Indaba the chart would be unpacked with regards to the principles of the PPN Framework
  - 6.3.4.6. That after the Indaba other expertise could be sourced with regards to curriculum, etc.

### **6.4. Way Forward**

- 6.4.1. Deloitte to update the project plan.
- 6.4.2. Deloitte to update PPN Framework.

**7. CONFIRMATION OF DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

To be done administratively.

**8. CLOSURE**

The meeting closed at 14h45 with a vote of thanks from the Facilitator.