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**Introduction**

The importance of early childhood development (ECD) has taken traction globally, with vocal proponents ranging from US President, Barack Obama, to Columbian pop star, Shakira. Globally, ECD is being regarded now as a critical ingredient for strategies that seek to reduce poverty and inequality. In South Africa, political leaders agree.

At the ANC 8 January 2008 conference, newly elected ANC president, Jacob Zuma, said: ‘During the course of this year, we need to further enhance our efforts to improve the conditions of children and youth in poverty [and] the development of a comprehensive strategy on early childhood development’ (Zuma 2008).

Prior to Zuma’s commitment, former president, Thabo Mbeki, in his State of the Nation address on 8 February 2008, identified ECD as one of the 21 ‘apex priorities’, saying that the government would ‘massively speed up implementation of ECD programmes, expand the number of trained staff and double the number of sites and child beneficiaries by end-2009’ (Mbeki 2008).

During this time, the importance of ECD was also underscored by Mbeki’s finance minister, Trevor Manuel, in his budget speech on 20 February 2008, when he noted that ‘social development programmes such as early childhood development, the expansion of Grade R enrolment…for which funds are allocated to provinces, are labour intensive and contribute strongly to social cohesion in poor communities’ (Manuel 2008).

Despite these commitments, the then education minister, Naledi Pandor, introduced some reality to the debate when she said in her 2008 budget vote that, for the government, ECD is ‘an area of frustration due to the slow pace of progress in extending full and adequate ECD to all children’ (Pandor 2008).

More recently, in March 2012, Department of Social Development minister, Bathabile Dlamini hosted a national ECD conference with the theme *Tshwaragano Ka Bana* (Working Together for Children), where she said that ‘we always see communities protest over unemployment and lack of infrastructure, but never over children’s rights to early development programmes. This is something we as a country must start to prioritise’ (Dlamini 2012). She further stated in her keynote address to this conference that ‘our provision of early childhood development services must be integrated to deal with structural effects of the apartheid education system’.

**The importance of ECD**

Poverty and inequality impact negatively on millions of people in urban and rural communities in South Africa. This has a particularly devastating effect on children, and their families, since it deprives them of their socio-economic rights and results in inadequate access to health care, education, social services and nutrition.

The provision of quality ECD can play a critical role in overcoming the effects of poverty on young children and their families. International research indicates that the early years are critical for development, leading to higher levels of social, emotional, cognitive and physical well-being in young children. These, in turn, translate into significant social and economic benefits to the country.

Recent studies have shown that focused expenditure on ECD programmes yields an ‘extraordinary return, far exceeding the return on most investments’ (Heckman 2008; see also Rolnick & Grunewald 2003). Investment in ECD has economic spin-offs, not only in terms of those beneficiaries being educated, but also for the ECD workforce being trained and supported. Generally, children from low-resource environments who have not participated in a quality ECD programme cannot regain the opportunities for development they have missed out on. It is, therefore, critical to introduce these programmes at an early stage.

A comprehensive range of ECD interventions, beginning in...
Generally, children from low-resource environments who have not participated in a quality ECD programme cannot regain the opportunities for development they have missed out on.

pregnancy and lasting until the child enters formal schooling, produces the best results. The optimal approach to ECD provision, thus, includes prenatal support to mothers (including nutritional support), support and protection for families and parents, childcare and early cognitive stimulation for children, and preparation for children entering into formal schooling. In addition, these early years are recognised as the appropriate phase for young children to acquire the values, behaviour and attitudes, which are important for the building of a peaceful, prosperous and democratic society.

**ECD provision in South Africa**

South Africa has made notable progress since April 1994 as far as the position of children is concerned. The government has implemented a number of initiatives related to the well-being of children of which some have been successful, and others less so. The successful ones include: free medical and health-care services for pregnant women and for children from birth to 6 years of age; the establishment of a directorate for ECD within the then national Department of Education; the establishment of a children’s section within the national Department of Social Development; the introduction of a Grade R system for children aged 5 years turning 6 years; and a nationwide ECD audit surveying ECD sites, which was completed in 2000. Furthermore: provincial social development departments have made subsidies available for ECD sites; the provincial education departments make Grade R grants-in-aid available; and 10.5 million children now receive the Child Support Grant each month.

The 2000 ECD audit found 23 482 ECD sites across South Africa with 1 030 473 children (16 per cent of the 0–6 age cohort) enrolled in them (see DoE 2001a). Of these children, 21 per cent were 5–6 year olds, 15 per cent were 3–5 year olds and only 5.0 per cent were under the age of 3 years. However, only 11 420 (53 per cent) of these sites had electricity, water and toilets; and 1 669 (8.0 per cent) had neither electricity nor water nor toilets. Forty per cent of ECD services were located in rural areas and 60 per cent in urban areas. Only 1.36 per cent of disabled children were under ECD supervision. Access to ECD services was lower than the national average in the three provinces with the greatest number of poor children – Limpopo, Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal. Quality was poorest at ECD sites catering predominantly for black African learners. The audit showed that of the 54 503 educators/practitioners working with children at ECD sites, 88 per cent required additional training of some kind (with 23 per cent having no training at all), and a mere 12 per cent were fully qualified.

More recent statistics, from March 2012, show that 836 000 children were in 19 500 registered ECD centres nationwide, with 488 000 (58 per cent) of these receiving the ECD subsidy from the provincial Department of Social Development (Dlamini 2012); and by September 2012, 767 865 children were enrolled in a Grade R class (DBE 2012).

From the above statistics, it is clear that the leading challenge in ECD is to increase access to ECD programmes and to improve the quality of these programmes.

**Policy initiatives since 1994**

Since 1994, South Africa has put in place policies and legislation intended to prioritise ECD as a critical component in the country’s overall social development. The South African government has signed a number of international and regional agreements, such as the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, and the International Convention on the Rights of the Child, and has committed itself to meeting the aims of Education for All, and the Millennium Development Goals.

The government has committed itself to uphold the rights of children through the South African Constitution, and by introducing national legislation, policies and programmes, including the Children’s Act 38 of 2005, Education White Paper 5, the National Integrated Plan for ECD, and the National Development Plan.

The Education White Paper 5 of 2001 on early childhood development sets out national policy on ECD and prioritises a reception year (Grade R) in South Africa. It adopts a poverty-targeted approach, and lists important areas to focus on, including: the extent to which ECD is provided in South Africa; the phasing in of a compulsory Grade R year for eligible children by the year 2010; the high level of inequality that exists in the provisioning of and access to ECD services and facilities; and the high degree of variance in terms of the quality of ECD services provided (TAU 2008).

The government’s target in Education White Paper 5 was that by the year 2010, 945 000 of all 5-year-old children would have access to a Grade R year prior to entering Grade 1. Of these, 810 000 (85 per cent) would be in public schools and 135 000 (15 per cent) would be in independent schools and community-based schools. From figures released in various editions of Statistics at a Glance, and School Realities (see Table 4.2.1), it is clear that the Grade R provision target was
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not reached by 2010, and President Zuma extended the target date to 2014. At the present take-up rate (see Table 4.2.1), it will take at least until 2018 to reach the government’s target of a place in Grade R for every child before entering Grade 1.

Grade R funding is calculated according to norms and standards that were published by the Department of Education in 2006 and amended in 2008. Government expenditure on Grade R from 2006/7 to 2010/11 is shown in Table 4.2.2.

For children aged 0–4 years, Education White Paper 5 is particularly vague, mentioning only ‘the development of a strategic plan for the inter-sectoral collaboration focusing on the quality of learning programmes’ (DoE 2001b).

The National Integrated Plan (NIP) for ECD is the government’s response to early childhood development programmes for children from birth to 4 years of age in South Africa, and calls for an integrated approach to ECD. The plan includes home-based, community-based and centre-based provision, as well as services in informal ECD settings, prisons, places of safety and youth centres. The NIP is comprehensive, but does not spell out its financial implications. Although the NIP is a strategic plan it has been interpreted as ECD policy in South Africa.

The National Development Plan and ECD

The National Planning Commission (NPC), through the National Development Plan (NDP) has acknowledged ECD as having a critical role to play in achieving socio-economic success in South Africa, and has recommended two years of universal ECD provision for children prior to Grade 1. Through ‘direct and immediate measures to attack poverty’ the NDP aims to reduce the acute effects of poverty of millions of South Africans over the short term’ (NPC 2012). The plan proposes the introduction of a nutrition programme for pregnant woman and young children, and the extension of early childhood development services for children under 5 years of age. It sets specific objectives, of which the following relate to ECD:

» ECD should be a top priority among the measures to improve the quality of education and long-term prospects of future generations;

» dedicated resources should be channelled towards ensuring that all children are well cared for from an early age and receive appropriate emotional, cognitive and physical development stimulation; and

» all children should have at least two years of pre-school education. (NPC 2012: 69)

In order to achieve this, the NDP has set out a number of actions that need to be implemented. These are:

» to design and implement a nutrition programme for pregnant woman and young children, followed by a children development and care programme for all children under the age of 3 years;

» to increase state funding and support to ensure universal access to two years of ECD exposure before Grade 1; and

» to strengthen co-ordination between departments, as well as the private and non-profit sectors (the focus should be on routine, day-to-day co-ordination between units of depart-

ments that do similar work). (NPC 2012: 70)

Table 4.2.1: Grade R enrolment, 2000–2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Eastern Cape</th>
<th>Free State</th>
<th>Gauteng</th>
<th>KwaZulu-Natal</th>
<th>Limpopo</th>
<th>Mpumalanga</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>Northern Cape</th>
<th>Western Cape</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>158 363</td>
<td>30 639</td>
<td>95 374</td>
<td>189 169</td>
<td>117 950</td>
<td>59 202</td>
<td>44 489</td>
<td>15 036</td>
<td>57 643</td>
<td>767 865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>157 184</td>
<td>28 627</td>
<td>86 240</td>
<td>181 585</td>
<td>117 279</td>
<td>56 726</td>
<td>44 937</td>
<td>13 153</td>
<td>50 923</td>
<td>734 654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>164 803</td>
<td>27 209</td>
<td>76 460</td>
<td>175 541</td>
<td>113 432</td>
<td>51 758</td>
<td>42 010</td>
<td>12 387</td>
<td>43 603</td>
<td>707 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>154 514</td>
<td>23 767</td>
<td>64 935</td>
<td>154 666</td>
<td>97 570</td>
<td>46 194</td>
<td>30 174</td>
<td>11 508</td>
<td>36 895</td>
<td>620 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>133 249</td>
<td>23 699</td>
<td>54 979</td>
<td>124 742</td>
<td>98 963</td>
<td>40 671</td>
<td>22 294</td>
<td>9 575</td>
<td>30 627</td>
<td>543 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>112 889</td>
<td>22 429</td>
<td>49 931</td>
<td>118 884</td>
<td>93 030</td>
<td>34 962</td>
<td>16 143</td>
<td>8 423</td>
<td>30 834</td>
<td>487 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>96 384</td>
<td>20 072</td>
<td>47 314</td>
<td>92 948</td>
<td>102 969</td>
<td>25 734</td>
<td>15 311</td>
<td>7 259</td>
<td>33 650</td>
<td>441 641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>105 231</td>
<td>18 449</td>
<td>41 073</td>
<td>79 276</td>
<td>98 273</td>
<td>14 171</td>
<td>9 727</td>
<td>6 598</td>
<td>32 389</td>
<td>405 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>75 571</td>
<td>16 482</td>
<td>34 690</td>
<td>73 098</td>
<td>89 725</td>
<td>23 695</td>
<td>5 625</td>
<td>5 875</td>
<td>31 726</td>
<td>356 487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>46 371</td>
<td>16 323</td>
<td>31 666</td>
<td>75 996</td>
<td>89 790</td>
<td>13 884</td>
<td>4 325</td>
<td>5 500</td>
<td>31 532</td>
<td>315 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>23 562</td>
<td>17 220</td>
<td>28 189</td>
<td>72 312</td>
<td>90 332</td>
<td>12 148</td>
<td>3 142</td>
<td>3 744</td>
<td>28 077</td>
<td>278 726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>18 873</td>
<td>16 002</td>
<td>23 920</td>
<td>73 993</td>
<td>84 243</td>
<td>5 803</td>
<td>3 176</td>
<td>4 042</td>
<td>11 473</td>
<td>241 525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19 555</td>
<td>15 025</td>
<td>21 368</td>
<td>66 031</td>
<td>75 219</td>
<td>10 922</td>
<td>3 193</td>
<td>3 972</td>
<td>11 346</td>
<td>226 631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.2: Government Grade R expenditure, 2006/7–2010/11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2006/7 R’000</th>
<th>2007/8 R’000</th>
<th>2008/9 R’000</th>
<th>2009/10 R’000</th>
<th>2010/11 R’000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>64 346</td>
<td>91 513</td>
<td>274 397</td>
<td>395 539</td>
<td>539 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>49 632</td>
<td>56 338</td>
<td>70 324</td>
<td>77 337</td>
<td>81 727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>79 000</td>
<td>152 739</td>
<td>214 571</td>
<td>310 146</td>
<td>583 746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>102 658</td>
<td>167 736</td>
<td>208 234</td>
<td>336 202</td>
<td>608 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>68 868</td>
<td>63 935</td>
<td>155 759</td>
<td>228 615</td>
<td>445 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>41 827</td>
<td>64 211</td>
<td>91 551</td>
<td>143 375</td>
<td>243 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>151 510</td>
<td>146 512</td>
<td>164 165</td>
<td>210 088</td>
<td>302 866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>18 141</td>
<td>24 692</td>
<td>57 251</td>
<td>73 350</td>
<td>115 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>107 397</td>
<td>164 804</td>
<td>226 792</td>
<td>274 011</td>
<td>320 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>683 379</td>
<td>932 480</td>
<td>1 463 044</td>
<td>2 048 663</td>
<td>3 241 780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DoE (2008); Wildeman (2008); Wildeman & Lefko-Everett (2008) (from provincial budget statements)

The NDP is unambiguous about its commitment to ECD and its importance for reducing poverty and inequality. However, the plan’s actual aims are confusing, as the terminology and phrasing that is used differs from section to section.

The plan starts with an overview in which the aims with regard to ECD are summarised. It states that the aim is to ensure ‘universal access to two years of early childhood development’ (NPC 2012: 30), ‘at least two years of preschool education’ (NPC 2012: 34) and ‘two years of early childhood development exposure before grade 1’ (NPC 2012: 70). The NDP uses ‘early childhood development’, ‘preschool education’ and ‘early childhood development exposure’ interchangeably, and in some cases speaks of ‘exposure to’ ECD, while in others of ensuring ‘universal access’ to ECD. These various phrases and terminologies are in reality very different, and create confusion as to what the NPC actually aims to achieve.

However, in Chapter Nine, under the section heading ‘Early Childhood Development’, the NDP states that ‘universal access to quality early childhood development for children aged 0–3 must be made available’ (NPC 2012: 300) and, thereafter, that it aims to ‘make 2 years of quality preschool enrolment for 4 and 5 year olds compulsory before Grade 1’ (NPC 2012: 300). Although this provides much needed clarity in terms of the specific programming the NDP proposes, an issue arises with the statement regarding the extension of Grade R by an additional year. By making these two years compulsory, this means that the two years of ‘universal access to early childhood development’ that the NDP initially proposes and focuses on is seemingly meaningless, as it actually proposes more than two years of universal access to ECD in the more detailed plans (Richter et al. 2012).

The implementation of the proposed objective of making two years of preschool enrolment compulsory, extending Grade R to include an additional year servicing 4 and 5 year olds, would result in several challenges. To extend Grade R in this way, an additional 33 000 classrooms would need to be built by 2030. At a modest estimate of R400 000 to construct and equip a Grade R classroom, it would cost the government R13.2 billion.

Over and above this, 33 000 teachers would need to be recruited and trained. Should these teachers earn a salary of R5 000 per month, the government would need to make provision for an additional R2 billion for teacher’s salaries per year.

Making ECD opportunities a reality for South African children

In making ECD a reality for our children, several challenges emerge which need to be overcome if we are to ensure that young children have their constitutional, social, educational and economic rights met. The main challenges are: political will, systemic challenges and implementation challenges.

Political will

Notwithstanding the various endorsements by senior politicians and government officials, and the many ECD summits and conferences that have been held, there is clearly limited political will to prioritise ECD in South Africa. Political will implies active political authority to enforce its full implementation with sufficient financial resources to meet the needs of children and their families. In South Africa, we have the innovation and capacity to provide ECD, but the government...
seems to lack the motivation to bring it about. Signing conventions and introducing legislation and high profile but short-lived programmes is not sufficient.

**Systemic challenges**

Several systemic challenges are evident in connection with ECD. These impact significantly on implementation and, no doubt, would also affect the plans in the NDP negatively.

**Co-ordination across government departments and sectors**

Although comprehensive ECD is accepted as a critical cog in the improvement of educational outcomes, government departments responsible for ECD work in isolation, resulting in substantial gaps in provision. There is an absence of government leadership in ECD, with no department significantly championing it. There is also limited co-ordination on norms and standards, monitoring and evaluating, programme delivery, quality assurance and accountability.

**Model of delivery**

The government lacks a clearly developed and articulated model for the delivery of ECD services for centre-based, home-based and community-based programmes. No model is in place that encompasses a broad range of interventions, offering a comprehensive package of ECD services. These do exist in small pockets across a range of communities, initiated by innovative non-profit providers. However, the government has not examined these, nor has it taken the many lessons learned on board.

**Funding**

ECD services, whether they are community-based, home-based, or centre-based, are inadequately funded, if they are funded at all. Generally, the government does not fund infrastructure costs or start-up costs for the establishment of ECD centres and programmes, with the result that in many isolated areas no ECD centres or programmes exist. There is yet to be an appropriately designed and implemented model for funding of ECD services. Lessons learnt from the roll-out of Grade R provisioning demonstrate the need for a funding model for all ECD services that is ‘government-driven and pro-equity’ (Richter et al. 2012). The NDP acknowledges that children of different age groups require different interventions, with children from birth to 3 years of age being ‘best served through home- and community-based programmes that focus on working with families’ (NPC 2012: 300), whereas children in the 4–5 age cohort ‘benefit from more structured learning in group programmes’ (NPC 2012: 300).

**Inequality in the access to benefits**

The government’s current focus and funding model for ECD prioritises service provision for children from 3 years and older, and favours centre-based provision. This means that the most vulnerable of children are not reached, especially those living in areas with few resources (typically, in sparse rural areas), and those with disabilities. If the government is to provide universal access to ECD, the most significant interventions should be targeted at the most vulnerable children.

**The absence of sanctions to enforce provision**

The government’s policy priority and the NDP’s ECD objectives do not impose an obligation on any level of government to ensure ECD provision for children from birth to 3 years of age; they merely commit the government to providing access to ECD services. This is vague and meaningless. With regard to children aged 4 and 5 years, the NDP proposes two years of compulsory preschool enrolment before Grade 1. Unlike the more general goal of providing universal access to ECD for younger children, the NDP promises two years of preschool programming which is compulsory, obliging the government to provide centre-based provision for all children in the 4–5 age cohort. In order to achieve compulsory provision, the state will have to mobilise substantial financial resources towards this end.

**Lack of capacity to achieve objectives**

There is a significant lack of capacity in national, provincial and local government, as well as in the other sectors involved in ECD, such as the NPO sector and higher education institutions. To achieve the vision of quality universal access to ECD, South Africa is going to need a substantial increase in human resource capacity in the ECD sector.

**Implementation challenges**

**The absence of an implementation agenda**

The NDP provides an overarching goal of reducing inequality and eradicating poverty, and sees ECD as part of a strategy for achieving this by 2030. Despite the commendable vision for the future of our country, the NDP does not provide any form of implementation plan for achieving its objectives. An explicit plan and costing, which specifically states the obligations, commitments and targets of the government, is required.

**Home-based care system**

The vast majority of children in the youngest age group (0–2 years of age) are not in ECD centres but in home-based care with child-minders that have no training and are unregistered; they are part of the system, but without a funding framework (Richter et al. 2012).

**Inadequate human resource capacity**

The dearth of quality ECD teachers in South Africa poses major problems in implementing ECD programmes and Grade R. South Africa is in need of ECD teachers who are well trained and have the knowledge and skills to educate children effectively. To ensure quality Grade R plus an additional year for 4 and 5 year olds, it is crucial that the processes for employing
ECD teachers are examined so that posts are filled with people who are competent and skilled.

**Teacher-child ratios**

The government set a target of providing 945 000 learners with access to Grade R by 2010. With a teacher to child ratio of 1:30, a total of 31 500 Grade R teachers is required. Presently, the country produces fewer than 1 000 trained ECD teachers per year. In implementing two years of compulsory provision of ECD programming prior to Grade 1 for children in South Africa, it is essential that sufficient numbers of teachers are appropriately trained.

**Teacher qualifications and conditions of service**

A major gap in ECD provisioning is the absence of a comprehensive national strategy for the training of Grade R and ECD teachers. Different training programmes are conducted across the country by various institutions and organisations. It is of concern that there is no government strategy for the development of ECD and Grade R teachers (TAU 2008). Worryingly, too, there is no clear policy stating the qualification requirements of ECD and Grade R teachers. The norms and standards are structured in such a way that Grade R teacher salaries differ substantially from others in the schooling system. It is important that the level of teacher salaries is looked at and made uniform, as it has a negative effect on attracting and retaining Grade R and ECD teachers.

**Variations in provincial budgets and per capita spending**

There are variations in the funding of Grade R and ECD between provinces. Whereas the Western Cape and North West provinces provide a subsidy of R12 per child per day, the Eastern Cape provides an amount of R15 per child per day. This is because the Western Cape, for example, provides a smaller per capita amount but supports as many ECD centres as possible, whereas those provinces that provide a larger amount support fewer ECD centres but at a higher rate.

**Registration costs and processes**

Not all ECD centres are registered, and even fewer receive the per capita ECD subsidy. While registration is free, meeting the minimum standards can be costly and beyond the means of poor communities. Applications can take years to process, and as the government does not fund start-up costs or infrastructure upgrades, many centres cannot meet the minimum standards for registration. If two years of preschool enrolment becomes compulsory, the government will have to provide a means for ECD centres to be constructed and for other ECD sites to be upgraded to meet the minimum standards and become registered.

**Equipment, materials, resources and physical infrastructure**

Quality ECD programming requires specific, age-appropriate educational equipment, materials and resources. It is clear from various provincial reports that quality educational materials and learning resources for children are not available and accessible in their home language. A further challenge experienced is the slow procurement processes. This has a negative impact on a number of areas including infrastructure, provision of equipment, and support (TAU 2008). It is essential that education equipment, materials, resources and infrastructure are provided so as to improve programme quality and delivery.

**Recommendations going forward**

In order to achieve the NDP vision and outcomes, a number of immediate actions are required. These include the following.

**The mobilisation of political will**

Notwithstanding the progress that the government has made to date, there must be more political will to provide ECD programmes. Commitment must go beyond lip service. ECD must be made a political priority, and financial resources must be made available to implement policies and programmes.

**The crafting of targeted ECD legislation**

To show the political will and ensure that plans are implemented, South Africa needs clear and unambiguous legislation on ECD programmes and services. Vague clauses in the Children’s Act are inadequate. ECD must be legislated for, as in the United States of America, with *Head Start* and *No Child Left Behind*, and as in the United Kingdom, with *Sure Start*.

**A substantial increase in funding**

Clearly the budget allocations for Grade R and ECD are hopelessly inadequate. At between just 1.0 and 2.0 per cent of the education budget, the allocation for Grade R alone needs to increase at least four-fold immediately. The same should be the case for the Department of Social Development ECD budget. Again, these steps require determination and political will.
A realistic and effective ECD implementation plan and costing

To ensure that children have their rights met, South Africa urgently needs to increase access to ECD and Grade R and to improve the quality of ECD and Grade R.

Establishment of minimum training qualifications for ECD teachers

Even if universal access to ECD is achieved, there is no way to ensure that its provision is of a high standard, as there are no legislated minimum qualification standards for ECD and Grade R teachers. South Africa, therefore, needs to establish minimum and explicit training qualifications for these teachers, so that each child’s right to a quality education is upheld.

Respect for ECD and Grade R teachers

Recognition needs to be given to the work done by ECD and Grade R teachers. It is critical to the future of ECD that those providing it should not feel exploited. No longer should they be paid salaries as low as R200 per month and denied decent conditions of service, such as medical aid and pension, adequate leave provision, protection against unfair dismissal and all the other rights enjoyed by teachers in formal schooling. One way to achieve this is to employ Grade R teachers (and possibly teachers of 4 and 5 year olds) in provincial education departments, and put them on the provincial education department payroll.

Increase in the competencies of government ECD officials

The skills of officials in the national and provincial departments of social development, education and health, as well as local authorities, must be improved. A proper administrative foundation should underpin a developmental state that cares for its youngest and most vulnerable citizens.

Co-operation with the non-profit sector

The government must seek closer co-operation with the ECD non-profit sector and communities which have vast knowledge, skills and experience in this field. The non-profit sector can add immense value to such programmes.

Millions of young children continue to be denied access to quality ECD programmes and services.