

STRENGTHENING WESTERN CAPE ECD THROUGH SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP: INITIAL SCOPING & DIAGNOSIS

Brian Levy, with research support from Veleska Maphike

There is growing consensus worldwide, underpinned by the research of Nobel-prize-winning economist James Heckman¹, that investments in effective early childhood development (ECD) initiatives are perhaps the single most beneficial development interventions available. South Africa's Western Cape province is especially well-positioned to realize this opportunity – as long as some formidable challenges can be addressed.

A major objective of ECD initiatives is to improve the readiness for school learning of 5-6 years olds by helping to strengthen the cognitive and non-cognitive capabilities of 2-4/5 year old children. There are multiple ways of achieving this goal, including home-based interventions targeting, say, nutrition or parent-child interactions; training of ECD providers; and direct support to ECD creches/educare centres.

The Cape Higher Education Consortium (CHEC) sponsored a scoping exercise as an initial effort to foster reflection on what might be opportunities for further realizing the large potential to support ECD in the Western Cape. This note reports on that effort. Section I reviews the objectives of the exercise. Section II (and Annex A) provide some background on the challenges and approaches to ECD implementation in the Western Cape context. Section III suggests a diagnosis of the strategic challenge. Section IV lays out some possible next steps researchers might take as a follow-up initiative.

I: The objective of the scoping exercise

(Note: this section is extracted from the initial terms of reference submitted to CHEC, which served as the basis for the seed funding provided.)

The strengths of the Western Cape potentially make it well-positioned to strengthen ECD. These include:

- A set of sub-national government departments (Social Development, DSD; Education; and the City of Cape Town) with strong commitment to improve the lives and opportunities of young people.
- A bureaucracy with rule-based systems and processes which position it well to implement policy.
- A strong set of social partners/non-governmental organizations (NGOs) with experience of, and commitment to, working in the ECD space – including with good access to funding from DSD, other grant-giving agencies and the private sector.
- A set of training institutions with sustained experience in providing training for ECD practitioners.

¹ For a synthesis overview, see Peter Carneiro and James Heckman, "Human capital policy", *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 9495*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, February 2003.

- Ongoing experimentation with cutting-edge initiatives (including via the use of technology) aimed at strengthening ECD outcomes. And
- A research community with a strong track record in analyzing education (including ECD), including careful assessment of the effectiveness of a diverse array of initiatives.

However, the challenges also are formidable. They include the following:

- ECD risks being squeezed between budgetary demands for basic education (via the WC Education Department) and the many urgent social welfare challenges which confront the Western Cape.
- The regulatory obstacles are formidable to formalizing ECD centres and certifying that they meet the requisite standards.
- There are few mechanisms for sharing and disseminating lessons among practitioners as to what works, what doesn't and why in improving ECD outcomes – and leveraging opportunities for co-operation.

To move the process forward, the following initial step was proposed:

- *Take stock of ongoing, successful (as perceived by their implementers) ECD initiatives, by inviting all practitioners in the ECD space to volunteer information (in a short, structured way) of their successes – signaling briefly what they do, and on what basis they perceive their initiative to be successful in improving the ECD learning outcomes achieved in ECD 'educare' centres in low-income communities.*

Information would be solicited, with active outreach to the multiple stakeholders who provide support to ECD centres. Beyond that, the process was designed to be 'demand-driven' – with no effort to circumscribe up-front what would qualify as success. Those volunteering information would be encouraged to reflect on, and report, the basis for their perceptions that their initiatives are successful.

The goals of this initial stocktaking exercise would include the following:

- To learn more, in an open-ended way, about the rich variety of initiatives that are underway in the Western Cape to strengthen ECD centres, and thereby improve the lives of the province's children.
- To facilitate experience-sharing among ECD practitioners – thereby encouraging the wider diffusion of successful initiatives.
- To provide a shared informational platform which might serve as the basis for a process of reflection....

II: Addressing the ECD Challenge – the Western Cape Context

This section provides some background to current efforts to support ECD in the Western Cape. The data in Table 1 signal the magnitude of the challenge. (No single, consolidated set of data provides a reliable measure, agreed upon by all protagonists, on the scale of the ECD effort and continuing challenge; the ranges in Table 1 reflect variation in the estimates provided by the two sources used.) As per the data, as of 2016/17 there are approximately 650-700,000 children aged 0-5 in the Western Cape; approximately 235,000 of these fall below the child support grant family income threshold of R7,000 per month, and receive the grant. Though the data are not

directly comparable², the table suggests that in the Western Cape, as an initial rough approximation, roughly one third of poor children of ECD-centre-going age attend subsidized ECD centers, roughly a third are in unsubsidized centres, and the remainder have no access to ECD services.

Table 1: Patterns of access to ECD Centres, 2017 (numbers are rounded)

	South Africa	Western Cape
Number of children aged 0-5 (2017)	7 million	650-700,000
o/w number receiving child support grant	3.6 million	235,000
o/w number also attending ECD centre	2 million	100-150,000a/
Number of children attending subsidized ECD	700,000	70-75,000
Number of poor children in unsubsidized ECD	1.3 million	50-70,000
Number of registered ECD facilities (Ilifa)	14,346	1,883
Estimated number of unregistered facilities (Ilifa)		1,313
Number of poor children (aged 3-5) not accessing ECD	1 million	66,000

Source: Data obtained from (national) Department of Social Development and Ilifa Labantwana

Note: a/ National DSD reports that 130,000 poor children attend ECD centres; Ilifa reports that 100,000 are enrolled in 'ECD programmes' (presumably this latter number refers only to poor children).

How is ECD support provided? South Africa's 2015 National Integrated ECD Policy recognizes the multifaceted nature of implementation challenges and opportunities:

“The public provisioning responsibility of government is to develop a publicly funded and rights-based national early childhood development system which ensures universal availability of early childhood development services

‘The public provision of early childhood development services provides for the provision of:

*Enabling policies, laws and programmes mandating, obligating, regulating and harmonising the respective roles and responsibilities of all role players, **including government departments, across all three spheres of government and non-government role players, in providing early childhood development services.** “³*

Policy, regulatory and financing responsibilities are located within national government.

Principal responsibility for implementation is located within provincial government. National and provincial Departments of Social Development comprise the principal government players.

Feedback provided to the CHEC-supported scoping exercise underscores the diversity of ECD approaches and practitioners. Twenty one organizations responded to the request for information. Information on an additional four initiatives was added from a more ambitious, related report, sponsored by the EU and Department for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME)-sponsored Programme to Support pro-Poor Policy Development (PSPPD) and prepared by the

² Ambiguities in the data include: (i) whether the number of poor children is measured using as a benchmark receipt of the child support grant (for which eligibility is for children in families earning below R7,000 per month) or eligibility for a per child ECD subsidy (where family income is below R3,000); and (ii) whether the relevant age group is 0-5 (a broad definition for ECD analysis) or 3-5 (the core target group for attendance of an ECD centre). Even without definitional differences, sources differ in their estimates. Note, though, that as per footnote 6, having precise numbers is not a pre-requisite for proceeding with next steps in implementation.

³ RSA (2015), pp. 20-22.

Centre for Early Childhood Development (CECD).⁴ As Table 2 and Annex A signal, there was substantial variation among the 25 organizations, both by size and by the types of activities which they undertake:

- 13 of the organizations provide learning and mentoring support on site in ECD centres;
- 10 provide support to strengthen the infrastructure of ECD centres, and to facilitate registration;
- 17 provide off-site training support for ECD staff, with some of the training provided within the community where the ECDs are located, and some at a central location within the Cape Town metro;
- 5 provide ECD services (e.g. home visits; toy groups) which are not targeted at ECD centres.

As is evident from the above, many of the 25 organizations reported on more than one activity. Annex A provides further detail.

Table 2: The diversity of non-governmental ECD service providers in the Western Cape

	Training (off-site location)	Training (site learning & mentoring)	Infrastructure & Resource Support / Registration⁵	Out of Centre Services
Small	4	5	3	1
Medium	6	5	3	1
Large	7	3	4	3
Total	17	13	10	5

This diversity of approaches is as it should be. As the 2016 *South African Early Childhood Review* (Hall et. al. 2016) details, ECD is a classic example of a multi-faceted challenge. ECD needs are best addressed through heterogeneous services, adapted to local circumstances, which cannot be provided effectively through standardized, top-down provision.⁶ As per the 2015

⁴ L. Van Niekerk, M. Ashley-Cooper & E. Atmore, *Effective early childhood development programme options: meeting the needs of young South Africa Children*, (Cape Town: Centre for Early Childhood Development). The CECD study provides in-depth careful case studies of 12 successful programmes, eight in the Western Cape.

⁵ These organizations indicated that registration/helpdesk and/or the provision of learning materials forms some part of their work/service, but did not provide the scale of these efforts: Sustainability Institute, Ikamva Labantu, Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU), The Bhabhathane Programme, Grassroots Adult Education Training Trust, Early Years Services and the Early Education Centre.

⁶ Key references for incremental, multistakeholder approaches to implementation include Pritchett, Andrews and Woolcock (2017), Levy (2014), Andrews (2013), Ostrom (2009) and Wilson (1989). These approaches put action-learning at central stage. As such, they are very different from a 'plan, then implement' perspective – one which, in the context of ECD, would focus first on in-depth empirical analysis of what are the highest return initiatives, and only then provide financing. Learning about impact and outcomes is, of course, enormously important. However, from an action-learning perspective, the priority is to learn, and adapt as implementation proceeds.

policy statement, a principal implementation task for the public sector is thus to provide a supportive environment for this diversity to flourish.

Before turning to an overall reflection on the enabling environment for ECD in the Western Cape, it is helpful to provide some detail on one specific policy intervention which is central to the ECD effort – central both in terms of how public resources are used, and how NGOs align their effort. The ECD national and provincial policy framework makes provision for a subsidy of R15-17 per child per day, for children from families with monthly earnings below R3,000, who attend a center that meets minimum infrastructural and teaching standards. As Dagerman & Levy (2016) detail, this subsidy transforms the economics of a typical ECD centre from ‘survivalist’ into an economically stable small social enterprise.

At first sight, the per child subsidy provides a clear, flexible framework to which NGOs could choose to align their efforts. It sets a target outcome (ie standards), the pursuit of which is incentivized (through the per child subsidy) – but with the actual processes for strengthening infrastructure and improving learning outcomes delegated to the initiative of individual NGOs and the centres with which they work. Responsibility for providing the subsidy (financed through an equitable share grant in South Africa’s intergovernmental fiscal system) is allocated to the provincial level. The Western Cape provincial government is relatively well-governed and rule-bound. It thus seemingly is well-positioned to implement the per child subsidy policy – ensuring that the financial incentive genuinely functions as an incentive for improving performance, rather than as a discretionary mechanism for distributing patronage.⁷

Table 3: Heuristic estimates of budgetary costs of ECD per child subsidy in Western Cape (multiple scenarios)

	Western Cape
<i>Heuristic estimates of annual total budget cost of per child ECD subsidy for:</i>	
<i>Current recipients (75,000 children)</i>	R255 million
<i>+ additional for poor children currently in unsubsidized ECD (approx. 60,000 children)</i>	R204 million
<i>+ poor children aged 3-5, currently not in ECD center (66,000 children)</i>	R224 million

Notes: a/ Estimates of numbers of children as per Table 1.

Note: b/ budgetary estimates assume per child annual subsidy cost of R3,400 (=R17 x 200 day)

Table 3 illustrates heuristically the budgetary implications of implementing the per child subsidy. Assuming an annual per child cost of R3,400 and 75,000 recipients gives a total estimated cost of R255 million (which, it is worth noting, is quite close to the Western Cape’s 2016/17 total budget of R290 million for ECD and partial care). Using the rough estimates in the table, expanding the per child subsidy to all poor children currently in unsubsidized ECD centres (some unknown proportion of which meet the requirements for registration, but nonetheless do not

⁷ Note, though, that as Dagerman and Levy (2015) and Giese et. al. (2011) detail, the bureaucratic obstacles to registration are formidable – and, with many registration requirements located at municipal level, in large part are not under the control of the provincial government. How these might be streamlined is a topic which falls outside the scope of the present paper.

access the subsidy) would require roughly R200 million additional funds. Expanding further to (eventually) extend coverage to all poor children aged 3-5 currently not accessing ECD would require (using the rough approximations in Table 3) an additional R220 million. The cumulative total of R675 million would amount to a little over 1% of the overall Western Cape 2016/17 budget of R55 billion, and less than 5% percent of the Western Cape's 'ordinary' school budget of 14 billion.⁸

III: The principal strategic challenge – an initial diagnosis

As Table 2 illustrated, the range of ways in which NGOs and other social partners support ECD is very wide. This is as it should be. As noted, ECD is a multi-faceted challenge, with scope for a wide variety of potentially effective interventions – and, correspondingly, scope for continuing innovation in a wide variety of domains. The challenge is to align the use of public resources and the efforts of social partners so that the whole of the collective effort – by government and NGOs – is greater rather than less than the sum of its parts. This section explores how this might be achieved.

Figure 1 highlights two sets of alignment as key to the efficacy of the overall collective effort:

- Alignment between the public sector strategy and NGOs (ie alignment II in the figure) – so that social partners can undertake their initiatives with a clear expectation of what they can (and cannot) expect from government in terms of support for their efforts. And
- Alignment between the public sector strategy and the public budget (ie alignment I in the figure) – assuring that the strategy is adequately funded and thus credible to NGOs, so that they can align their expectations and plan accordingly.

Figure 1: Strategy – the challenge of alignment



Note that the approach to alignment suggested by Figure 1 need *not* imply advocacy for any specific public strategy. Rather, it points to the benefits of consistency between, on the one hand, the budgetary realities and the strategy (ie alignment I) and, on the other, the strategy and expectations of NGOs (ie alignment II). This is especially crucial insofar as NGOs are expected

⁸ Many would argue that both equity and social efficiency reasons make the case for additional public financial support for ECD compelling, as long as the initiatives being supported are effective – and thus are able to realize the very high returns from effective ECD identified by Heckman et al. For equity reason; The social argument highlights the gap between private and social returns, insofar as society as a whole benefits when children grow up to be healthy adults, contributors to society. The equity argument is straightforward. Also worth noting (from a 'market failure' perspective) is that, even if all returns were 'privately' realized, it would be underfunded, insofar as poor families (let alone poor small children) cannot self-finance ECD.

to undertake a significant proportion of the implementation effort -- with at least some of their efforts linked to the provision of public funds. Given such alignment, expectations between NGOs and the public sector are likely to be consistent and clear (alignment II), and co-operation is likely to be high. But without alignment, NGOs will have to act with no clear expectation of whether their efforts are supportive of (and will be supported by) government -- with attendant confusion and disaffection on all sides.

To illustrate the logic, consider two distinct public sector strategies to support ECD:

- **Strategy A:** *A commitment to scale-up quality ECD, by making the per child subsidy available on an ongoing to all ECD centres (creches/educares) which meet the infrastructural and learning thresholds – with a commitment to expand budgetary resources to eliminate backlog (ie approved, but not-yet-subsidy-recipient ECD centres), and to expand the budget to meet demand as new ECD centres become eligible; and an associated commitment to work to continually streamline the burdensome registration requirements, and to put in place credible, streamlined mechanisms for monitoring ongoing compliance. [Table 3 provided some rough guideposts as to the additional budgetary resources that would be required for this purpose – incrementally, over time.]*
- **Strategy B:** *A clear statement that budgetary resources are limited – and that there is an explicit, transparent process of decision-making as to how to allocate public resources for NGOs/programmes that support ECD (centre-based; non-centre-based; and training). NGOs could obtain ‘certainty’ by proceeding within the funding applications framework, which would commit to providing them timely feedback as to what to expect. (The process potentially could include, among the range of activities financed, some targeted commitments to making available the per child subsidy to an agreed additional subset of ECD centres that meet the requisite infrastructural and learning thresholds.)*

[To underscore again: it is **not** being argued that these strategies are mutually exclusive (indeed they can be complementary), or that one of these strategies is superior to the other. For present purposes, the immediate relevant difference between the two strategies is in their budgetary implications – and in the signal provided to NGOs.]

To illustrate the relevance of ‘alignment’, consider the contrast between some possible negative consequences of misalignment, and some potential positive consequences of getting alignment right. To illustrate the former, consider a scenario where the Western Cape government signals to NGOs (and ECD centres) that **Strategy A** comprises the operative approach -- only to then not make available the finances to deliver on the per child subsidy to additional qualifying ECD centres. The negative consequences could include the following:

- A loss of confidence on the part of NGOs as to the credibility of the Western Cape Government as a partner.
- A worsening, relative to the status quo ante, of the financial status of qualifying, but non-subsidy-recipient ECD centres – who, from a baseline where they already barely were able to break even (notwithstanding survivalist earnings for staff), will have increased costs (by improving quality standards) and reduced revenues (by reducing the number of children in centres) in order to meet criteria for eligibility, but received no funding increment.
- A deepening sense of frustration on the part of informal ECD centres in poor communities (perhaps the largest group of female entrepreneurs in these communities)

that government is unwilling and unable to help them – but, on the contrary, is principally a source of regulatory hassle and harassment, with no concomitant benefit.

- A mis-direction of the energy of NGOs insofar as clarity that the operative approach is in fact **strategy B** might have led them to reallocate their efforts to different ECD priorities (e.g. added efforts to raise funding for ECD operations from the private sector; a greater focus on non-center-based ECD initiatives).

By contrast, the consequences of getting alignment right (via either strategy) could include the following:

- Ending NGO uncertainties as to what to expect from government -- allowing them to better focus their efforts on support for learning, for infrastructural upgrading in ECD centres, and on other programmes, with clarity as to what are feasible options for assuring sustainability over the medium-term.
- Eliciting scaled-up private sector financial support – perhaps (insofar as there is a provincial government commitment to **strategy A**) focused on infrastructure, with private sector commitments underpinned by an understanding that medium-run sustainability will be assured via the per child subsidy; or (insofar as government is financially only able to commit to **strategy B**) through expanded private sector targeting of corporate social responsibility financial commitments to support via, say an endowment fund, ongoing operational costs. And
- An innovative monitoring model, with accredited and certified NGOs playing a scaled-up role in assuring ongoing compliance on the part of ECD centres with the minimum standards required for receipt of the per child subsidy.

In sum, the Western Cape's strengths – a capable provincial government and a rich array of NGO support for ECD -- position the province to become a globally (as well as nationally) recognized example of what can be achieved through effective social partnership. Assuring better alignment is a necessary (and readily addressable) piece of the puzzle.

IV: A suggested next step

This section suggests a relatively modest next step which researchers might take to support better implementation of ECD initiatives in the Western Cape, by both government and NGOs. The intent would be to strengthen further the informational platform for enhanced partnership between the Western Cape provincial government (WCG)⁹ on the one hand, and the many NGOs active in supporting ECD within the Western Cape on the other.

The proposal is for a follow-up scoping effort, targeting the initial round of NGO respondents (plus others who volunteer to participate). The follow-up would focus on a series of questions (conducted in face-to-face interviews) aimed at better understanding some key aspects of NGOs

⁹ Municipal authorities (including, of course, the City of Cape Town Metro government) also have an impact on ECD – via their role in the registration process, and via specific ECD initiatives which they choose to undertake. However, insofar as the focus of this initiative is not on the registration process – and insofar as implementation of ECD is a responsibility assigned to the provincial sphere of government (with associated budget via equitable share and conditional grants) – the task of bridging strategy and implementation principally is a provincial one.

perceptions of, and experiences interacting with, provincial government. Areas for exploration might include:

- Perceptions of WCG's strategy for supporting ECD – its priorities, its coherence, its implementation.
- Perceptions of WCG's strengths in pursuing its ECD mission.
- Perceptions, from multiple perspectives, of WCGs engagement with NGOs vis-à-vis ECD..
- Perceptions of WCGs financing priorities vis-à-vis ECD (what kinds of activities? How channeled etc?)
- Experiences, as an organization, in engaging with WCG – focusing especially around access to, and ongoing provision of, finance in support of specific programmes.

Responses would be reported only in aggregate form (i.e. individual responses would be kept anonymous). The aim would be to identify both ongoing challenges and what works in the relationship.

In reporting on the results, care would be taken to use the findings in a way that supports collaboration and strengthened partnership, not confrontation. The findings could be useful for efforts within the WCG to explore, in an internal process, how better to navigate tensions between policy, strategy and implementation – with the results perhaps subsequently shared with a selected group of NGO counterparts. Another option might be to assemble a small multistakeholder group to reflect on the findings, and their implications for moving forward. Whatever the specific modality, a key aim would be to enable the government and NGO stakeholders to better understand each other's goals, constraints and challenges – to deepen and nurture partnership, in the full meaning of the word, in pursuit of the shared objective of strengthening ECD opportunities for all of the Western Cape's children.

References

- Andrews, M. (2013), *The Limits of Institutional Reform* (New York: Cambridge University Press)
- Carneiro P and Heckman J. (2003), “Human capital policy”, *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 9495*, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Dagerman L and Levy B (2015), “Improving quality of township ECD centres: A case study of a catch 22”, Cape Town, mimeo
- Giese S. et. al. (2011) “Government Funding for Early Childhood Development: Can those who need it get it?”, Cape Town, DG Murray Trust
- Hall, K, Sambu, W, Berry L, Giese S, Almeleh C. and Rosa S. (2016), *South African Early Childhood Review*, Cape Town, Children’s Institute UCT and Ilifa Labantwana
- Ilifa Labantwana, (2017). “Early childhood development service coverage in the Western Cape” Powerpoint slides, Cape Town
- Levy, B. (2014). *Working with the Grain: Integrating governance and growth in development strategies*. New York, Oxford University Press
- Ostrom, E. (2009). “Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems”, 2009 Nobel Prize Lecture, published in *American Economic Review* 100 (3)
- Pritchett, L. Andrews, M and Woolcock M (2017) *Building State Capability: Evidence, Analysis Action* Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Republic of South Africa (2017) Department of Social Development, selected ECD statistics
- Republic of South Africa, (2015) *National Integrated Early Childhood Policy*, Pretoria, Government Printers
- Van Niekerk, L M. Ashley-Cooper & E. Atmore (2017), *Effective early childhood development programme options: meeting th needs of young South Africa Children*, (Cape Town: Centre for Early Childhood Development).
- Wilson, J.Q. (1989) *Bureaucracy*, New York: Basic Books

Annex A: 45 ECD initiatives, by 25 ECD organizations, in the Western Cape

	<i>Training (central location)</i>	<i>Training (site learning & mentoring)</i>	<i>Infrastructure & Resource Support / Registration¹⁰</i>	<i>Out of Centre Services</i>
Small	Auburn House Practitioners: 6	Auburn House Practitioners: 6		The Parent Centre 10 trained Parent Infant Attachment Counsellors who do home visitation.
	Pebbles Project Practitioners: 43	Pebbles Project Practitioners: 43	Pebbles Project Assistance with registration and provision of learning materials: 27 ECDs	
	Sustainability Institute Practitioners: 11 Parents: 120	Sustainability Institute Practitioners: 11	Sustainability Institute 3 ECD Centres and 130 Children	
	South African Education and Environment Project (SAEP) Practitioners: 28 Trained Principals: 8 Caregivers/parents: 40	South African Education and Environment Project (SAEP) Practitioners: 28 Trained Principals: 8	South African Education and Environment Project (SAEP) Building renovations, maintenance, provision of the learning programme and resources: 8 centres	
		Chaeli Campaign Preschool and enrichment centre: 16 children and their parents, 18 practitioners		
Medium	Ikamva Labantu Practitioners: 72	Ikamva Labantu Practitioners: 72	Early Education Centre Provision of learning materials: 70 ECD facilities	Sikhula Sonke Fieldworkers brings learning materials to public sites: 100 parents 115 children
	Chaeli Campaign Practitioners: 85 Parents: 315		Chaeli Campaign A parent kit of educational materials provided to 315 parents	

¹⁰ These organizations indicated that registration/helpdesk and/or the provision of learning materials forms some part of their work/service, but did not provide the scale of these efforts: Sustainability Institute, Ikamva Labantu, Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU), The Bhabhathane Programme, Grassroots Adult Education Training Trust, Early Years Services and the Early Education Centre.

Medium (ctd)	The Bhabhathane Programme 19 Principals 60 Practitioners 15 Play Group Facilitators 10 Family and Community Motivators 150 parents/caregivers 10 Grade R teachers	The Bhabhathane Programme 19 Principals 60 Practitioners	Nal'ibali 130 ECD reading clubs registered	
	Early Years Services Training on Foetal Alcohol Syndrome Disorder and Substance Abuse (FASD): 552 Practitioners	Sizisa Ukhanyo Community ECD Centre Programme ECD centre and partial care facility: 256 children per year		
	Centre for Creative Education Practitioners: 61 Principals: 22 Parents: 3660	Centre for Creative Education Practitioners: 61 Principals: 22		
	The Early Education Centre Educators: 80 Parents: 423	The Early Education Centre Educators: 80		
Large	Centre for Early Childhood Development Principals: 40 Practitioners: 200 Governing body: 240 Parents: 120	Centre for Early Childhood Development Principals: 40 Practitioners: 200	Centre for Early Childhood Development Infrastructure upgrades, assistance with registration and subsidisation, educational equipment: 40 ECD Centres	Innovation Edge Child Connect delivers weekly SMS messages with practical tips to 800 000 - 1 million mothers/caregivers annually (nationally)
	Starting Chance * 20 to 30 educarees currently in the Training Teachers in Townships programme * Approximately 45 to 60 teachers reached once a month via open Saturday morning workshops	Starting Chance * 20 to 30 educarees currently in the Training Teachers in Townships programme	Starting Chance <i>Shack to Chic Programme</i> Educarees range from 40 to 200 children	WC Foundation for Community Work (Focus Home Visiting Programme) 245 trained home visitors 10 000 caregivers/families
	Grassroots Adult Education Training Trust (Site Learning Programme 2012-2017) Practitioners: 1 405 Teachers: 5 509	Grassroots Adult Education Training Trust (Site Learning Programme 2012-2017) Practitioners: 632	Early Years Services <i>The Toy Library Programme</i> Children: 3253 Parents: 2062 Practitioners: 673 Principals: 51 Partial Care facilities: 51	Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading (VPUU) <i>non-centre based playgroups</i> <i>Monwabisi Park:</i> 120 children a week in

			<p>3 open spaces</p> <p><i>Lotus Park:</i> 100 children a week in 3 open spaces and a Toy Library at a Local Neighbourhood Centre</p> <p><i>Villiersdorp:</i> approximately 210 children reached and 16 ECD practitioners</p>
<p>College of Cape Town (CCT) 1 107 (direct) adult beneficiaries in 2015, and 33 210 (indirect) child beneficiaries</p>		<p>BrightKid Foundation Over 400 Edutainers® since 2000; stocked with carefully selected books, teaching aids, and educational toys.</p>	
<p>Knysna Education Trust 39 ECD centres in informal settlements as well as 25 'Operation Upgrade' ECD centres, 2 280 children and 171 ECD practitioners</p>			
<p>Nal'ibali 103 training sessions since 2013 Over 200 practitioners and 1800 volunteers, CWP workers & teachers</p>			
<p>Persona Doll Training SA 2500 practitioners (nationally)</p>			