

**Development of a subsidy model for home- and  
community-based early childhood development  
services for children 0-5:**

**Debbie BUDLENDER**

Community Agency for Social Enquiry

February 2010

## **Human Sciences Research Council**

**February 2010**

### ***Acknowledgements***

*We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Interdepartmental Committee for Early Childhood Development. This project was co-funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the HSRC.*

*The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the Interdepartmental Committee for Early Childhood Development or the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.*

**Produced by:** Dr. Debbie Budlender  
**Contact:** Dr Miriam Altman  
Executive Director, CPEG  
**E-mail:** maltman@hsrc.ac.za  
**Tel:** +27 12 302 2402

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	9
1.1. Background.....	9
1.2. Why this study was needed?.....	10
1.3. Scope of the study .....	12
1.4. Methodology .....	13
1.5. Designing the mock application form.....	14
1.6. Implementation of the mock application form exercise .....	16
2. Results of the mock application form exercise.....	18
2.1. Home visiting.....	19
2.2. Caregiver capacity building .....	26
2.3. Playgroups and related.....	27
2.4. Community support structures .....	29
2.5. Other activities .....	30
2.6. Summary of budgets for activities .....	30
2.7. Other sections of the form: Other funding and human resources.....	31
3. In conclusion.....	32
4. Summary of findings and recommendations .....	36
5. References (Style: Heading 1 No Number).....	38
6. Appendix 1: Detailed results.....	1
6.1. Home visiting: Centres 1-3 .....	1
6.2. Home visiting: centre 4-6 .....	6
6.3. Caregiver capacity building .....	10
6.4. Playgroups and related.....	12

6.5.	Community Support Structures .....	14
6.6.	Other home- and community-based early childhood development activities 15	
7.	Appendix 2: Mock Application Form.....	1

## **Tables**

Table 1 :	Activities done by home visitors when visiting homes of children .....	19
Table 2 -	Geographical areas of operation and age group covered.....	20
Table 3 -	Methods and criteria used to identify children and households .....	21
Table 4 -	Home visit budget summary.....	23
Table 5 -	Hours and pay of home visitors.....	24
Table 6 -	Nature and purpose of caregiver capacity building activities .....	26
Table 7 -	Caregiver capacity building budget summary.....	27
Table 8 -	Nature and purpose of playgroup and related activities.....	27
Table 9 -	Playgroup budget summary.....	28
Table 10 -	Nature and purpose of activities related to community support structures .....	29
Table 11 -	Community support structure budget summary .....	29
Table 12 -	Total budgets across all types of home- and community-based ECD services .....	31
Table 13 -	Estimating costs per child per month .....	34

## **Acronyms and abbreviations**

ACCESS	Alliance for Children’s Access to Social Security
ave	Average
CDP	Community development practitioner
CPEG	Centre for Poverty, Employment and Growth
CSS	Community support structure
DSD	Department of Social Development
ECD	Early childhood development
ELRU	Early Learning Resource Unit
EPWP	Expanded public works programme
FCM	Family and community motivator
FLP	Family Literacy Project
HSRC	Human Sciences Research Council
HV	Home visitor
IMCI	Integrated Management of Childhood Illness
LETCEE	Little Elephant Training Centre for Early Education
NIP	National Implementation Plan
NPO	Non-profit organisation
pa	per annum
pd	per day
pm	per month
pp	per person
TREE	Training & Resources in Early Education
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund

## **Executive summary**

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the study is to:

- Support the implementation of the National Integrated Plan for Early Childhood Development and in particular the scaling up of interventions, particularly home and community based.
- Develop proposal as to how government (provincial DSDs in particular) might frame bids to provide subsidies to providers of services of community and household based ECD services.
- To get an indication of the nature and size of costs involved in delivering HCB-ECD;

### **Background and Context**

This study is part of a much larger policy research programme on Scaling up Early Childhood Development (ECD) service delivery aimed at improving the evidence base supporting government's implementation of its vision for scaling up quality ECD for children 0 – 4 years as well as expanding employment opportunities in the ECD sector as outlined in the National Integrated Plan for Early Childhood Development in South Africa, 2005 - 2010 (NIP).

According to the NIP, the majority of ECD services for children aged 0-4 is meant to be delivered through home- and community based services and there is a critical need to scale up provision of such services. The development of a subsidy model is aimed at contributing to the development of funding norms and standards for home and community based ECD services.

This study builds incrementally on previous work in particular -:

The Rapid Appraisal of Home and Community Based ECD Programmes (2008) commissioned by UNICEF in partnership with the Departments of Education and Social Development, which provided an overview of the nature and extent of home and community based ECD programmes currently operating in South Africa.

The Centre Based ECD Costing Study undertaken by HSRC in 2008 using case studies in the Western Cape.

The absence of a regulatory or support framework or dedicated funding allocation for community and home based programme is seriously impacting on efforts to scale up ECD services. For government to fund such services norms and standards are essential along with clearly defined application procedures. This study is aimed at supporting the scaling up of such programmes.

Home and Community based ECD services were broadly defined as services which involved home visiting and parent/caregiver education and capacity building programmes.

## **Methodology**

The methodology for the exercise involved several steps namely:

- Development of position paper on possible funding approaches based on available literature
- Workshop with key actors to discuss the position paper
- Primary research in the form of collection of costs of home- and community based ECD services through the development of a mock application form.
- Workshop with key actors to discuss the findings of the primary research.

6 organisations selected to participate in the study, were identified from among a larger number identified in an earlier rapid appraisal study of community- and home-based childminding and ECD programmes (Biersteker 2007). The selection attempted to achieve a provincial spread and to include both urban and rural projects. The selected organisations were also those which seemed to cover a range of typical services such as home visiting, play groups, and caregiver capacity building.

## **Summary of findings and recommendations**

- The funding model should recognise and support a diversity of programme interventions which might consist of one or more activities including home visiting, playgroups and parent and caregiver capacity building.
- The funding model for such services should be programme based.
- The focus should be primarily on recurrent costs with some contribution where possible for start-up costs.
- There must be recognition that there are usually no fees for home- and community-based provision, and that this is appropriate given the focus on the poorest and most vulnerable. This implies that funding for home- and community-based provision might need to cover a greater proportion of total costs than a subsidy for centre-based provision.
- While it is not expected that there will be full coverage of costs by the state, given the extent of the need and the scarcity of resources, the proportion funded must be large enough to ensure that quality service is possible.

- The types of expenditure to be subsidised would include ECD practitioner stipends, training, travel, venue, catering and management/supervision costs. A focus only on practitioner stipends would discriminate against some types of provision in a way that contradicts encouragement of a diversity of approaches to service provision.
- Where funding is provided in respect of stipends, support should be based on a decent level of stipend
- National DSD should further develop the application format and encourage utilisation across the provinces. Both national and provincial DSD should avoid complicating the application form and asking for unnecessary information.
- DSD should submit a motivation to Treasury for allocation of increased funding in the equitable share specifically for scaling up access to home- and community-based ECD in order to meet NIP targets within a reasonable period of time.



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Background

South Africa has an estimated 5.16 million children from 0-4 years<sup>1</sup>, a large proportion of whom live in resource constrained environments which present a range of risks to early childhood development. The National Integrated Plan for ECD includes a poverty sub-programme aimed at delivering integrated services to 2.5 million to 3 million children through services provided at centre, community and household level. To date there is no regulatory or support framework or dedicated funding allocation for community and home based programme. This study is aimed at supporting the scaling up of such programmes.

In 2008 the Human Sciences Research Council's Centre for Poverty, Employment and Growth (CPEG) researched the costs of centre-based provision of early childhood development (ECD) services. The study produced two main deliverables, namely a research report (Carter et al, 2008) and Excel spreadsheets that contained a costing model. The purpose of the report was described as being to:

- analyse the cost structures in ECD centres and identify a realistic estimate of the cost of providing services;
- present a series of case studies of different cost structures;
- discuss the key issues affecting ECD centres' ability to raise revenue and access government services;
- make recommendations on the above that will lead to the sustainable achievement of the government's vision as set out in the National Implementation Plan (NIP).

The Excel model was seen as fulfilling the following purposes:

- A financial planning tool for centres to develop actual forecasts of cash flow needs and identify where they should try to save costs and/or raise additional revenue;
- A monitoring and reporting tool for centres and NGOs working with centres; and
- Training on financial management and planning.

At that point CPEG envisaged undertaking a subsequent costing exercise in respect of home- and community-based ECD services. These are services in which poor and

---

<sup>1</sup> 0-4 is used inclusively to mean children up to their fifth birthday.

otherwise vulnerable children and their caregivers who do not have access to centre-based ECD services are reached through visits to their homes and other “outreach” type approaches, such as playgroups for children and capacity building workshops for caregivers. (The different types of services are described in more detail below.) The current study represents findings of the planned exercise, but takes a somewhat different form to the previous costing exercise. In particular, the current exercise is framed as *development of a subsidy (or funding) model* rather than *costing*.

The exercise is similar to the previous one in that the funding model development is based on an investigation of the key costs of delivering home- and community-based ECD services. However, the aim is not to produce an Excel spreadsheet that reflects all costs of providing these services, but rather to come up with a proposal as to how government (and the provincial departments of social development in particular) might frame bids to provide subsidies to the providers of these services. In the course of the exercise a further related aim emerged, namely to help develop an application form that provinces could use for soliciting requests for funding from service provider organisations.

The purpose and nature of the exercise were modified for several reasons. Chief among these were (a) the complexity and diversity of home- and community-based ECD services when compared to centre-based, and thus the limited usefulness (or feasibility) of developing standard costs to serve the purposes listed above; and (b) the urgent need to have an implementable approach to funding home- and community-based services for the poorest and most vulnerable children given the current enormous gap between need and available services.

## 1.2. Why this study was needed?

The study was principally needed because there is a need to scale up access to ECD services particularly for children aged 0-4 years. The state has been unable to expand access to services to young children through home and community based services largely due to absence of norms and standards and funding for provision of such services.

The briefing paper prepared for the early consultation workshop for the study (see below) noted that in terms of funding, the amounts allocated by provinces for ECD have increased by much more than inflation over the last few years. This expansion has been encouraged by National Treasury’s allocation of additional money to the equitable share for each province accompanied by memoranda explaining that this additional money is intended, among others, for expansion of ECD. Several provinces have subsequently explicitly “earmarked” money for ECD expansion (Budlender & Proudlock, 2009). Over the last few years all provinces have reported in their annual budget statements on planned or achieved expansion of support to ECD.

However, virtually all the existing and “new” ECD money has been allocated to support centre-based provision, in particular through the child-based ECD centre subsidy. The literature suggests that apart from funding of toy libraries by North West province, it is only Western Cape and Gauteng that have funded some home- and community-based ECD provision, through their programme funding for non-profit organisations (NPOs). At the consultation workshop for this study a representative of

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood  
development services for children 0-5:*

---

Western Cape's Department of Social Development (DSD) described the innovative ways in which that province has attempted to support home- and community-based provision. Little Elephant Training Centre for Early Education (LETCEE) also reported that they had received some funding from KwaZulu-Natal's DSD in respect of programme staff and administrative monitoring and evaluation. Unfortunately, LETCEE reported that the experience had been a very difficult one for them. In the Eastern Cape, DSD is channelling money through non-ECD NPOs to fund home- and community-based services in several areas. The hope is that the NPOs which currently channel the money will mentor the projects to become independent NPOs so that they can later receive funding directly (personal communication, Nosipho Nkalitshana, 4 December 2009).

The above examples of funding of home- and community-based ECD services are welcome. They illustrate the interest across several provinces in this area of work as well as how different actors have taken the initiative to try to fund these services. However, even in these provinces the amounts allocated for home- and community-based provision are very small compared to the amounts allocated for ECD centre subsidies while the need for home- and community-based ECD is immense. The aim of the current exercise is to avoid the need for each province to come up with its own approach to funding these services and instead provide a more standardised way of funding to which dedicated funds can be allocated. This approach would assist the provinces to fulfil their mandate in respect of the NIP and the Children's Act. It would also likely encourage expansion of availability of these services if potential providers knew that funding were available. The hope is that one would then see the same expansion in home- and community-based ECD as there has been in centre-based ECD over recent years. The NIP confirms the need for this as, in discussing the continuum of integrated ECD service provision, it estimates that 50% of children need ECD services at the household level.

Increased funding for and focus on ECD has been encouraged by the inclusion of ECD as one of the two social sector programmes within the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP). However, the EPWP social sector programme similarly focuses on centre-based provision in terms of the training offered as well as the location of workers. The objectives of the EPWP in respect of ECD are:

- to provide and increase training of ECD practitioners recruited from registered ECD centres
- to increase the registration of ECD centres with the Department of Social Development,
- to increase the number of children benefitting from the per-child subsidy; and
- to increase the value of the per child subsidy.

Further, while the 2010/11 national budget includes provision for a new conditional grant to provinces in respect of social sector EPWP, the money is intended to fund stipends for health-related home-based care, not ECD.

The current exercise attempts to correct the current bias towards centre-based provision. In the initial stages centre-based provisioning provided a readily available system that could be utilised to respond to the pressure in respect of implementing the EPWP in ECD. While officials recognised the important of home- and community-based ECD services, they felt that thorough preparation and planning was needed before this was expanded. The current proposal therefore in no way envisages replacing centre-based funding with funding of home- and community-based services. Instead, the intention is to supplement centre-based funding with this new area as both types of services are needed.

### **1.3. Scope of the study**

The NIP describes ECD in very broad terms. To start with, the age range extends from birth to nine years. The current exercise – like the one for centre-based provision – focuses on younger children. There are, however, some “fuzzy” boundaries in that – as will be seen below – many of the services offered through home- and community-based ECD to this age group will also benefit older children in the households concerned. Further, the centre-based exercise focused on children 0-4 years as older children were expected to be attending grade R classes. However, this service is new and so it has yet to reach sufficient numbers of poor children. Therefore, this exercise covers children 0-5 years as the poorer children serviced through home- and community-based initiatives rarely have access to grade R classes.

More complicated is that the NIP includes a wide range of services that extend beyond the education and care that are provided in an ECD centre. In doing this, home- and community-based ECD includes services and responsibilities that fall under departments other than social development. This broader focus is reflected in descriptions of most home- and community-based ECD provision, where the programme is envisaged as facilitating access to a broad range of services.

The problem that arises is that a subsidy must be paid from a particular department’s budget. This study focuses on funding of services that are the responsibility of the Department of Social Development. This does not – and must not – exclude the important service of linking of the children and their caregivers with other departments and service providers. But the funding focused on in this study would not itself cover the costs of providing such services.

One danger introduced by this department-specific approach is that a provider organisation could “double-dip” by obtaining subsidies from two different departments (for example health and social development) for what are essentially the same costs. It should not, however, be difficult to avoid this if applicants for the various funding streams are required to declare other funding sources and what these sources are intended to cover. The mock application form (see below) required this information to be provided. The Rapid Assessment and Analysis of Innovative Community and Home Based Childminding and Early Childhood Development Programmes undertaken by Biersteker (2007) drawing on the work of over 35 organisations identified the following elements as reflecting such services –:

- Location-based integrated ECD strategies
- Community child protection strategies
- Use of ECD centres as supports for outreach work
- Service hub
- Parent education courses
- Playgroups
- Home visiting
- Toy libraries
- Support to child minders
- Care and support for HIV-infected and affected children.

#### **1.4. Methodology**

The methodology for the exercise involved several steps:

- Development of position paper on possible funding approaches based on available literature
- Workshop with key actors to discuss the position paper
- Primary research in the form of collection of costs of home- and community based ECD services through the use of a mock application form.
- Workshop with key actors to discuss the findings of the primary research.

The **position paper** was structured around questions that might need to be answered in developing a subsidy model for home- and community-based ECD services. These questions included:

- What are the implications of the vision of “integrated ECD”?
- What should be subsidised?
- Full coverage for a limited number of providers or partial coverage for a greater number?
- Subsidy or programme funding?
- Which costs to include?
- What are the cost drivers for home- and community-based services?
- Actual costs or desirable costs?
- What proportion of costs to cover?
- Advance or post-hoc calculation of subsidy?

The thrust of the paper was towards exploring whether there could be a simple formula-based way of funding home- and community-based ECD services, such as the per-child-per-day approach used for funding centre-based ECD. The questions thus explored what the unit might be, how the level of costs associated with that unit might be conceived, and what proportion of the costs might be covered. It was, however, recognised from the start that the per-child-per-day approach was problematic in several respects even for centre-based funding and this approach was therefore being reviewed.

The position paper was circulated prior to and discussed at a **workshop** of knowledgeable people who were chosen as those in the best position to discuss the feasibility of different options and refine the approach. The workshop was attended by representatives of some of the leading organisations that deliver home- and community-based ECD services, National Treasury, national and provincial Departments of Social Development and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Participants discussed a briefing paper which had been prepared for this purpose and, through discussion, reached agreement on the main types of activities that constitute home- and community-based care.

The information gathered during the workshop discussion was then used to design a **mock application form** for funding of home- and community-based services. From the start the third stage of the exercise was planned as information-gathering on costs of providers of these services. Initially the information-gathering was conceived as consisting of interviews with managers and financial staff of service provider organisations. After the workshop, in which there was some discussion of the challenges of applying for funding for these services, the approach was changed from face-to-face or telephonic interviews to completion by the service providers of a mock application form. This amended approach was chosen as it would collect the same information as interviews, but serve the additional purpose of testing a possible format for an application form.

The mock application form was duly completed by six organisations that provided home- and community-based ECD services during 2009. The results were collated and analysed in a report that was discussed at a **second workshop** in February 2010. The profile of those attending the second workshop was similar to that of the first workshop. However, representatives of all organisations that completed the form, national and provincial DSD officials, National Treasury officials, and several other civil society people active or interested in home- and community-based ECD attended. Participants discussed and debated the findings and recommendations of the research. The current report incorporates refinements recommended by workshop participants.

## **1.5. Designing the mock application form**

The literature and discussions had confirmed that currently home- and community-based ECD services are rarely funded by government. Where they are funded to deliver such services, organisations typically must apply in the same way as any other NPO would apply for "programme funding". This contrasts with the position for centre-based ECD for which provinces have shorter, focused application forms specific for this service and where, it seems, provinces might allocate funds

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

specifically for centre-based ECD. The mock application form was an attempt to design a similar simpler and focused way in which organisations offering home- and community-based ECD services could apply for funding. The provincial department would, in turn, be able to use the forms to distribute the money available in the funding allocated for home- and community-based ECD services as a priority area of service provision.

Through discussion at the first workshop, it became clear that a simple subsidy such as the per-child-per-day one for centres would not be possible or desirable for funding of home- and community-based ECD services. Instead, it seemed that some form of programme funding which allowed for the diversity inherent in home- and community-based ECD services would be preferable, but that the broad programme funding approach should be refined so as to simplify the tasks of applying for funding and approving and managing funding.

The mock application form was based on the general application form used in Western Cape to apply for programme funding. However, its questions ask specifically about the types of services that are typically provided in home- and community-based services. The form also omits some questions that would be necessary for a general application in which government would need to establish that the types of services that the NPO concerned is planning to provide fit into government policy and objectives. These questions were deemed unnecessary given that home- and community-based ECD is explicitly included in government policies as a priority area.

Introduction of such a form would thus acknowledge that the NIP for ECD proposes substantial expansion of home- and community-based services, especially for children from poorer households whose caregivers will not be able to afford the fees that are almost invariably charged by centres. Having a simplified form would save time, energy and resources for the applying organisations as well as for government officials charged with vetting proposals and selecting organisations for funding.

Introduction of a simplified form for home- and community-based ECD would also acknowledge the fact that both the Children's Act and NIP suggest that increased government funding should favour home- and community-based provision over centres given that these services focus on the poor, while current funding and existing government initiatives strongly favour centres.

A key challenge in designing the mock application form was the choice of activities around which the form should be structured. The challenge was exacerbated by the diversity of these services and the value that service providers place both on this diversity as well as on the "integrated" nature of their service delivery. The latter made it more difficult to delineate the separate component activities making up home- and community-based services. The diversity reflects both the experimentation that is happening in this area of work (which one would not want to discourage) and the attempt by organisations to tailor their services to the particular needs and contexts of the communities in which they work.

Through discussion, participants at the first workshop reached agreement that home- and community-based ECD typically include one or more of the following sets of activities:

- Home visiting, in which trained community members visit homes containing poor and vulnerable children to provide various forms of support to children and their caregivers and assist in linking them to other services
- Caregiver capacity building, in which parents and other caregivers are brought together and provided with skills and knowledge that will enhance their caregiving
- Playgroups and related activities, in which children who do not attend ECD centres are brought together with other children – often together with their caregivers
- Community support structures, in which support is provided for the establishment and strengthening of structures that will provide support to those providing the services and monitor them.

The mock application form contains sections for each of these four areas of activity, as well as a fifth section for “other” types of activities. (The mock application form is included as appendix 2 to this report.) The form allows for the diversity that everyone emphasises is inherent in home- and community-based ECD in not requiring that any organisation necessarily completes sections in respect of each and every type of activity. Instead, the separate sections are intended to provide appropriate questions that ask about the main likely costs of each of these activities in a way that is relatively simple for the organisation to fill in and provides information which makes it relatively easy for the government to assess what services will be provided and at what cost.

For the mock application exercise, organisations were asked to fill in their actual costs during 2009 as if they were applying for these funds prior to the beginning of the 2009 financial year. This “retrospective” approach was used so as to give an idea of the actual costs incurred.

However, the form included a space for each type of activity where the organisation was asked whether there were any further costs that they would have liked to cover but were not able to cover in 2009. In the analysis of results below, these costs are referred to as “wish-list” costs.

## **1.6. Implementation of the mock application form exercise**

Six organisations completed the mock application forms, namely:

- Early Learning Resource Unit (ELRU)
- Family Literacy Project (FLP)
- Little Elephant Training Centre for Early Education (LETCEE)
- Lesedi Educare Association



*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

- Parent Centre
- Training & Resources in Early Education (TREE).

TREE completed the form in respect of only of its home- and community-based ECD programmes. Each of TREE's programmes has a different format, and forms for each of the programmes would thus have given a different picture.

Representatives of all these organisations except FLP had participated in the earlier workshop, and representatives of all organisations – including FLP – had an opportunity to comment on the draft mock application form before completing the exercise. (The comments resulted in only minor amendments to the draft form.) FLP was included in the exercise after a presentation was made at an ECD workshop organised by Alliance for Children's Access to Social Security (ACCESS). After the workshop ACCESS informed participants by email whom they should contact if they were interested in being part of the test exercise. About seven people took this step, some of whom were not part of organisations delivering home- and community-based services but were working in the broad area and interested in and supportive of the exercise. FLP was one of those which made contact. Another organisation which had just started delivering services decided not to participate in the test exercise as they had not operated throughout 2009.

The organisations invited to the workshop were selected from among a larger number identified in an earlier rapid appraisal study of community- and home-based childminding and ECD programmes (Biersteker 2007). The selection attempted to achieve a provincial spread and to include both urban and rural projects. The selected organisations were also those which seemed to cover a range of typical services such as home visiting, play groups, and caregiver capacity building. It was hoped that while the sample was small because of budget limitations, selection of these organisations would give a sense of the costs associated with different types of activities. There are a range of other organisations that could equally well have been included in the exercise.

Organisations agreed to attempt to fill in the application form themselves rather than being "interviewed" in respect of each questions. This approach was seen as being a better test of whether the form would serve well as an application form for organisations more broadly.

There were very few queries from organisations while they were filling in forms. In a few cases the responses to particular questions could have been improved, for example with more detail. It was also clear that the form needed to have a clear instruction added explaining that the total amount for each item should be filled in under the "Budget" column rather than, for example, the amount per fieldworker or per area. As discussed below, the final table on human resources was not optimally designed and was not always well completed. Apart from this, the form seemed to work well and organisations did not report major difficulties in completing it. FLP commented that their approach did not easily fit into the categories specified on the form as they have a model which is somewhat different from those of the other organisations. However, they managed to fill in the form very competently and without assistance.

The relative ease of completing the form might to some extent have been influenced by the organisations' participation in the earlier workshop. However, in at least some instances it was a different person in the organisation who filled in the form. Further, FLP's excellent completion of the form was reassuring given that they had not attended the earlier workshop.

## **2. Results of the mock application form exercise**

The mock application exercise had a two-fold purpose, namely:

- To get an indication of the nature and size of costs involved in delivering home- and community-based ECD; and
- To test whether the mock application form “works” in terms of relative ease of completion and the extent to which it provides useful and sufficient information.

The discussion below considers both these aspects. The report does not describe or report on each organisation and activity in detail. Given the diversity of organisations and activities, a detailed reporting approach would have resulted in an extremely long report which might have discouraged many readers. Instead, the report draws on the detail in the forms to highlight issues that are relevant to the main purpose of the exercise i.e. to develop a funding mechanism.

The discussion in this section is, in line with the mock application form, organised according to the different types of activities. The sections dealing with the five types of activities were preceded by two sections. The first asked for basic details, such as name, address and contact details, of the organisation. As expected, this section seemed to present no difficulties.

The second section asked about registration. For the purpose of the exercise organisations were asked only to indicate whether they were registered as a non-profit organisation, section 21 company, trust, or in some other way. The areas for registration numbers and dates of registration were “greyed out” as this detail was not necessary for the test.

All six organisations indicated that they were registered as a non-profit organisation. This would render them eligible for programme and other funding by DSD. Four organisations (ELRU, FLP, Lesedi and LETCEE) were also registered as section 21 companies, while ELRU was registered as a trust. Lesedi and ELRU were also registered as Further Education and Training institutions.

The mock application form noted that if the form were to be accepted and used by government, it would also need to include questions related to management structure and compliance with the Public Finance Management Act of 1999. These were not considered necessary for the test exercise.

## 2.1. Home visiting

The first and most detailed section of the form asked about home visiting services. This section was completed by all six organisations. It is, however, conceivable that there might be other organisations – either already existing or in the future – that would provide home- and community-based ECD services through playgroups or caregiver capacity building but that would not include home visiting. This section should therefore remain optional so as not to exclude these organisations.

The table below presents (sometimes in somewhat summarised form) the responses to question 1: *Please briefly describe the activities that home visitors do when they visit the homes of children.* There are many similarities across the six organisations, but also some differences in focus. For example, the Parent Centre places more focus on pregnancy and early childhood, and the FLP – as its name suggests – places emphasis on reading and also on Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI). These foci suggest some overlap with the Department of Health, but the description of the services suggests that they fit well within the scope of DSD’s area of responsibility. Most, if not all, the organisations include an element of referral to other services.

**Table 1: Activities done by home visitors when visiting homes of children**

Parent Centre	Individual attention to personal needs of mother & emotional support; referral to resources, information and skills related to pregnancy, labour, birth registration; early parenting & addressing needs of older children
FLP	Children: Reading to them, playing, singing, dancing, drawing, story telling. Adults: Information-sharing on 16 key family practices of Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) strategy.
Lesedi	Initial visit for situation assessment of household "needs and resources" forms part of community familiarisation and consultation process by Community Development Practitioners (CDPs) and identifies young children not in any ECD provision who might benefit from informal neighbourhood playgroup. Subsequent visits by CDP are mainly related to children, families and households identified as being "especially vulnerable" to offer support, follow up monitoring, assistance and referral with grants, ID documents, dealing with consequences of unemployment, lack of food security and traumatic consequences of HIV&AIDS.
ELRU	Assess needs and resources of family and young children in terms of awareness of child development, attitudes to child rearing, nutrition, health & safety, access to and use of child-related services and social security; raise awareness of human and child rights; support caregivers to access services and grants; encourage activities to supplement food & income generation; ensure regular clinic attendance etc; work with caregiver to develop knowledge and skills on early learning; monitor progress in relation to baseline information
TREE	Counseling & support services; health care referrals; support & establishment of food gardens; referrals to appropriate NGOs, government departments, service providers; support in accessing vital documents and grants, HIV&AIDS information and psycho-social support; health care & birth registration services; access to play and early stimulation

LETCEE	Facilitate learning through play with young children; support caregivers to access documents and social grants; support caregivers to care for young children; refer caregivers to other services and professionals where necessary
--------	---

Source: Own

The next table indicates responses to the questions about the geographical areas or communities in which home visiting occurred as well as the age group covered. The responses to these questions were almost always similar for other types of activities where an organisation filled in another part of the form and are not discussed again below. The only exception was TREE, which specified different geographical areas for the playgroups. This exception suggests that it is useful to repeat these questions for each different activity.

The geographical areas include both urban and rural, and the sample of organisations provides services across four provinces – Eastern Cape, Free State, KwaZulu-Natal and Western Cape. ELRU covers both Eastern Cape and Western Cape. If this form is introduced, ELRU would need to complete separate forms for each province as the funding is done by provincial governments. TREE also works in more than one province, but the mock application form was completed only for one programme in KwaZulu-Natal.

In terms of age, all organisations focus on younger children, but most responses also note that older children in the household will also be supported. LETCEE specifies that its coverage includes older children who are not in school on account of disability or some other reason. The age group for younger children is, as noted above, slightly more extended than the standard 0-4 years for centre-based provision. For TREE the point of entry is the very young child but they would support all household members who need assistance.

**Table 2 - Geographical areas of operation and age group covered**

Organisation	Geographical areas	Age group
Parent Centre	Hanover Park; Guguletu; Khayelitsha; Mitchell's Plain; Imizamo Yethu; Hout Bay Harbour, Western Cape	Birth to six months, but also child-rearing needs of older children in household
FLP	9 villages in KwaSani & Ingwe municipal areas of Sisonke District, KwaZulu-Natal	Pre-school five years and under
Lesedi	Bloemfontein, Botshabelo, Thaba'Nchu, Free State	0-5 years, but also assist older children needing help
ELRU	Tafelabanzi in Lusikisiki (E Cape and George Kerridge in Vredenburg (W Cape)	Birth to 6 years
TREE	Port Shepstone; Bulwer; Bergville; Durban; Folweni, KwaZulu-Natal	Birth to 7 years, but all age groups supported
LETCEE	Matimolo; Mbuba; Eshana; Dalton	Under 6 years plus children with

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

Bridge, KwaZulu-Natal

disabilities or not enrolled in school for other reason

---

*Source: Own*

The fourth question asked about methods and/or criteria used by the organisation to identify and select children/households to be part of home visiting activities. While all organisations said that they focused on poor and vulnerable children and households, the methods used and the criteria differed, as did the actors involved in identifying the children and households. This diversity is not a problem, but does confirm the usefulness of including this question.

**Table 3 - Methods and criteria used to identify children and households**

Parent Centre	Referred by staff at maternity obstetric units, clinics & community leaders, or self-referred after attending Early Pregnancy Talks offered by Centre staff at community venues
FLP	FLP facilitators & home visitors identify vulnerable households by elderly caregivers; ill parents/carers or where someone recently died; families where children are not attending pre-school because can't afford fees
Lesedi	ECD centre is point of entry for community outreach to those inside and outside Centre environment, but with focus on latter. ECD Centre Supervisor, CDP & elected community support structure identify children and families potentially at risk who should be followed up through home visits. Especially vulnerable implies a life situation threatening the child's or family's well-being, including physical, social and emotional situations.
ELRU	Home visitors selected from community and trained as Family and Community Motivators (FCM) who approach and identify most vulnerable families and children - those who, in addition to living in poverty are affected by problems such as substance abuse, HIV&AIDS, TB, bereavement, disability, children out of school, elderly/sick caregivers or child-headed households. Information collected from baseline survey conducted at beginning of project also guides selection.
TREE	Selection of project staff and beneficiaries are done via the local ECD forum and other community forums. Home visitors are required to support households within their home proximity.
LETCEE	Families are selected by community committee against criteria agreed on by community at a community meeting.

*Source: Own*

Some responses to the question about identification of children and households also described methods of identifying the home visitors. FLP included this description in the earlier question as to activities performed by home visitors. Revision of the application form should provide for an additional question that asks how home visitors are identified and selected.

The preceding questions were followed by a table that specified each of the items that one might expect for home visiting, with prompt questions in respect of each. The detailed responses to each of the questions are included as appendix 1.

The prompts in relation to the cost item of stipends for home visitors attempted to get a sense of reach or scope of the home visiting. It asked about the number of home visitors working on the project at any one time, the average number of households per visitor, the average number of visits per home visitor, the average number of hours worked per week per visitor, and the minimum and maximum monthly payments (stipends) per visitor per month.

The prompt questions seemed to work well in that most organisations answered all of them. In some cases organisations made a small change to one or more of the prompts. For example, FLP indicates that activities were counted per school term. The fact that such changes were made and that they enhance the reader's understanding of a particular organisation's mode of operation implies that the application form should be available in MSWord to allow for these modifications.

By combining the responses to these prompts, one can get a sense of the reach of each organisation as follows:

- Parent Centre has 13 visitors each visiting 20 households in a six-month period, giving a total of 260 households. Households receive both antenatal and postnatal visits. Follow-up queries revealed that each full-time visitor does an average of 70 visits per month. This means that each household would usually receive two or more visits per month. Further, while the primary focus is the mother-child dyad, the centre estimates that an average of about 1.7 children is reached per household.
- FLP has 130 home visitors working on the project in the average school term, with each visitor covering 9 visits, giving a total of 1 170 visits per term, or 390 per month if one equates a term with three months. The number of households varies as home visitors can choose to visit 1, 2 or 3 households, but may not exceed a total of 9 visits a term. Not shown on the form is that in 2009 the number of households visited was 172.
- Lesedi has 64 home visitors working on the project at any one time, with each visiting an average of 10 households about three times per month, giving a total of 640 households.
- ELRU has 16 home visitors working on the project at a time (11 in Lusikisiki and 5 in Vredenburg), with each responsible for an average of 10 households which are visited about two times per month. This gives a total of 160 households.

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

- In the programme for which the form was completed, TREE has 80 home visitors at any one time, each of whom is responsible for an average of 8 households which are visited about once a month, giving 640 households in total.
- LETCEE has an average of 30 visitors at any one time, each of whom is responsible for an average of 12 households which are visited on average twice a month, giving 360 households in total.

Several of the examples suggest that the form might need to be more specific as to whether, in counting households, two visits to the same household are counted as one or two households.

Nevertheless, the form even in its current status provides solid indicators of output which DSD would be able to use to monitor performance of organisations that are provided with funding. The indicators would need to differ to some extent between organisations given, for example, the difference in the number of visits per household across the organisations. Devising organisation-specific indicators would, however, not be at all challenging.

Table 4 summarises the budget figures. The total for home visiting ranges from R462 000 for LETCEE to R1 368 560 for Lesedi. Comparing totals across the organisations is, however, not all that meaningful given the differences in type of services offered, number of children and households covered, number of visits per household and child, type of area in which operating, etc. Further, as discussed further below, in some cases other activities beyond home visiting were included in the home visiting amounts.

**Table 4 - Home visit budget summary**

<b>Cost item</b>	<b>Parent Centre</b>	<b>FLP</b>	<b>Lesedi</b>	<b>ELRU</b>	<b>TREE</b>	<b>LETCEE</b>
Stipends for home visitors	636566	56160	576000	230400	354240	190000
Mentoring & supervision for home visitors	257070		96000	223343	78750	110000
Equipment & material for home visitors	1950	61500	71360	12480	50000	20000
Transport for home visitors	31866				172720	
Transport for mentors & supervisors		10800	12000	106955	22480	72000
In-service training for home visitors	8840	209412	459600	10040	172800	
Training of new home visitors	104132			16900		70000
Other costs	6930	45000	1368560	901237	850990	462000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1070764</b>	<b>382872</b>				

*Source: Own*

Unfortunately, while above we have given estimates of the number of households reached by each organisation per month, and 0 gives the total annual budget for home visits for each organisation, using these to calculate a cost per household would not be legitimate as some households might remain in the programme through the full year while in other cases households might be included in the programme only for a specific period. Further, for those households that are included in the programme, the average number of visits per month differs across organisations.

What is noticeable in 0 is that for all organisations except FLP stipends constitutes the single largest cost item. The percentage of the home visiting total allocated to stipends ranges from 15% for FLP to 59% for the Parent Centre. This difference, at least in part, reflects the difference in pay. The Parent Centre pays amounts that would be better termed salaries or wages than stipends, with monthly earnings of the home visitors ranging from R3 800 to R4 800. FLP, in contrast, pays R12 per visit, with home visitors earning R108 per school term. Lesedi's form notes that while the form indicates a stipend of R750 per month, shortage of funds meant that they could only pay R300 per month in 2009.

As noted above, the prompts in respect of stipends asked about the average number of hours worked per month as well as the minimum and maximum monthly earnings of visitors. The responses to these prompts are shown in 0 below.

**Table 5 - Hours and pay of home visitors**

	Parent Centre	FLP	Lesedi	ELRU	TREE	LETCEE
Average hours per week	20 full-time 40 part-time	9*	20	15	24**	38
Minimum monthly pay	3800	108*	300	1200	350	400
Maximum monthly pay	4800	108*	1200	1200	500	600

\* per school term rather than per month

\*\* calculated on the basis of the reported 12 days per month assuming 8 hours per day

Source: Own

Again, these data are not easily comparable across organisations, although the information for each organisation gives a good picture of the situation in relation to payment on an organisation-by-organisation basis. FLP's pay is the lowest in absolute, but their home visitors also work the smallest number of hours. LETCEE's pay seems lowest in relation to the average number of hours worked.

The maximum pay for three of the organisations is higher than the current minimum wage for full-time domestic workers in rural areas of R1 191.78, but lower than the minimum wage for urban domestic workers of R1 442.86. Only the Parent Centre pays more than the R1 200 which Western Cape DSD currently uses as a benchmark



*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

stipend. Parent Centre, ELRU and Lesedi's maximum are higher than the R1 100 which national DSD proposed as the minimum stipend for Level 1 workers in their bid for funding for home- and community-based care. (The assumption was that provinces which could afford to do so, would pay more than this.) The differentials between the organisations can be partly explained by the fact that it is only in Parent Centre and LETCEE that the home visitors are working full-time hours.

The Parent Centre decided on their higher-paying strategy in acknowledgement of the skills and knowledge of these visitors, and to avoid the loss of resources spent in training visitors on account of the high turnover that usually accompanies limited stipends. Lesedi's form explains that they pay stipends only during the two-year training period. After this period the ECD centre that serves as the hub for the home- and community-based ECD is expected to pay the stipends. It would then be the ECD centre, rather than Lesedi, that used the application form to apply for funding.

Beyond stipends, the relative size within an organisation of the different costs varied widely. For example, in-service training accounts for 55% of FLP's home visiting costs, 34% for Lesedi, and 20% for TREE, but 1% or less for the other three organisations. This comparison is not intended to imply that there is a problem in the approach of any of the organisations. However, it does give a strong indication that it would be difficult, if not impossible – and also unwise – to try to arrive at a model costing framework even for the single element of home visiting and to base funding on such a model framework.

LETCEE's form illustrates another reason why a model framework would present problems. In the initial submission LETCEE included no costs for training of new home visitors as they had not had to recruit or train any new visitors in 2009. After discussion, LETCEE agreed that for this exercise we should assume that 10 new visitors were trained so as to give a better picture of the "average" year. In practice, however, funding needs in respect of different categories will differ across years for a particular organisation.

Both Parent Centre and FLP listed "other" costs. In the case of Parent Centre the R6 930 was specified as recruitment costs in the form of visits to medical units, clinics and other community venues and interviews. In the case of FLP the R45 000 was for the fees, travel and accommodation for an IMCI specialist trainer of facilitators. These "other" costs of FLP could perhaps have been listed under training of new visitors or in-service training. The Parent Centre's entry suggests that it would be useful to add a cost item for recruitment to a revised application form. Such costs might represent a greater proportion of total costs for an organisation like Parent Centre which focuses on pregnant women and their children. However, recruitment costs might well be incurred by other organisations as new children, caregivers and households joining the programme.

In several cases organisations distinguished between one-off setup costs and those that were recurrent. Examples of one-off costs included provision of a toy-bag to home visitors and setting up of a toy library. A revised version of the form could perhaps provide for two budget columns – one to reflect recurrent costs and the other to reflect one-off costs in the year for which the application is being made.

## 2.2. Caregiver capacity building

Two organisations – Lesedi and ELRU – completed the form in respect of caregiver capacity building activities. This does not imply that the other organisations do not provide such capacity building. Indeed most, if not all, would do capacity building during home visits. Lesedi and ELRU’s responses for this section reflect capacity building done outside of home visits. For example, as described in 0, Lesedi runs support groups and parent awareness sessions while TREE runs parenting programmes and workshops.

**Table 6 - Nature and purpose of caregiver capacity building activities**

Lesedi	Support groups strengthen and support parents/ caregivers as they take care of young children. Trained CDPs are mentored and supported by Lesedi as they work through themes from Lesedis’ Family Support Programme with support groups. Parent-Awareness Sessions provide information on issues impacting on young children and happen in direct meetings facilitated by CDPs with caregivers or in local advocacy sessions with broader community. CDPs are also mentored and supported by Lesedi in introducing relevant sessions to informal playgroup mothers and childminders
TREE	To improve conditions for young children within vulnerable communities, parents and caregivers are trained in parenting programmes, workshops on living with HIV&AIDS, play therapy

*Source: Own*

In terms of reach, the prompt questions yielded the following picture:

- Each of Lesedi’s community development practitioners (who also serve as home visitors) conducts an average of 8 2-hour sessions per month, giving 512 sessions across the organisation
- TREE conducts an average of 200 workshops per month.

The form did not ask about the average number of participants attending these capacity building events. Doing so would be difficult as the same caregiver might attend more than one event.

The budget summary below reveals that, in fact, in 2009 Lesedi did not incur direct costs on this capacity building as it was too costly for Lesedi to provide for all costs at “second level” capacity building i.e. where CDPs interact directly with their communities without direct involvement of Lesedi. Their form indicates that ideally money should be available to cover refreshments at the community capacity building sessions as well as materials and handouts. The form suggests that in future individual ECD centres that start providing these services independently after Lesedi “exits” should be able to apply for a R7 200 annual subsidy to cover such costs.

In contrast, TREE’s form includes separate costs for all the pre-specified items except catering. Again, this difference between the two organisations confirms the diversity in how the different organisations deliver home- and community-based services and how they cost and fund them. While this section is not useful for the other five organisations that form part of our sample, it seems useful for TREE and might well be useful for other organisations that might want to apply for funding if and when the form is introduced by DSD.

The “other” item specified by TREE relates to equipment and materials. This cost item should be added to the revised version of the mock application form.

**Table 7 - Caregiver capacity building budget summary**

<b>Cost item</b>	<b>Lesedi</b>	<b>TREE</b>
Payment for facilitators		93920
Transport costs		7680
Venue & accommodation costs		4080
Catering costs		
Other costs		25200
Wishlist	7680	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7680</b>	<b>130880</b>

*Source: Own*

### **2.3. Playgroups and related**

Three organisations – Parent Centre, Lesedi and TREE – completed the section on playgroups and related activities. For all three organisations both caregivers (including parents) and children participate in these groups. The fact that these organisations include caregivers in the playgroup illustrates the extent to which the different types of activities overlap as where caregivers are included some caregiver capacity building, which is also provided for separately on the form, is likely to occur. Dividing the form into the different sections provides flexibility to organisations in terms of how they calculate and allocate costs when budgeting.

**Table 8 - Nature and purpose of playgroup and related activities**

ParentCentre	Support groups for moms and toddlers occur weekly for 2-3 hours for current and post-programme participants. Each session includes brief presentation followed by open discussion while the childminder oversees activities of children
Lesedi	Groups of caregivers and children meet together for 2-3 hours 3 days per week to encourage interaction between caregivers and children, enhance stimulation of children, and help caregivers understand how children develop through play. CDPs initially facilitate but ultimately caregivers should take responsibility for groups.

TREE	Play facilitators are selected via the ECD forum (made up of key authorities within the area) and trained to implement a basic play programme for children who do not have access to a community-based ECD site.
------	--

*Source: Own*

In terms of delivery indicators derived from prompt questions:

- Each of the Parent Centre’s groups has between 7 and 20 mother-child dyads. Groups are held once-weekly.
- Each of Lesedi’s groups caters for between 6 and 20 children, and the child attends for 2-3 hours on 3 days per week
- Each of TREE’s groups has between 8 and 14 children, and the 10 play facilitators who are responsible for this activity organise an average of 40 group meetings per month.

The budget summary for playgroups shows Lesedi with a small allocation and a much bigger “wishlist” amount. The form explains that at present they are able to provide one toy-bag, including children’s story books, to each CDP, but ideally they would like to provide one toy-bag per playgroup. However, as for the caregiver capacity building, it is currently too costly for Lesedi to pick up all the costs at the level of the CDP’s direct interaction with their communities. It is hoped that in future, individual ECD Centres would be able to include any costs for playgroups in their subsidy application to DSD.

The Parent Centre provides amounts against each of the specified cost items, while TREE provides costs against three of the five specified items as well as R50 000 in respect of “capacity building” under “other costs”. TREE’s form does not indicate at whom the capacity building is targeted. This might indicate the need for a further item to be specified in this activity form.

**Table 9 - Playgroup budget summary**

Cost item	Parent Centre	Lesedi	TREE
Payment for facilitators	11200		51200
Equipment & material for playgroups	20000	6400	83200
Transport costs	3672		
Venue & accommodation costs	1000		14000
Catering costs	16200		
Other costs			50000
Wishlist		256000	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52072</b>	<b>262400</b>	<b>198400</b>

*Source: Own*

## 2.4. Community support structures

Three organisations – Lesedi, ELRU and TREE – completed the section relating to community support structures. ELRU’s response indicates that the community support structures are not expected to play a direct role in supporting home- and community-based ECD services and the organisation therefore did not specify any budget amounts for this activity.

**Table 10 - Nature and purpose of activities related to community support structures**

Lesedi	CSSs are responsible for supporting and monitoring CDPs in their interaction with communities and supporting CDPs with interventions. They play a key role in ensuring community ownership and management and ongoing sustainability beyond Lesedi’s intervention
ELRU	Structures with which ELRU work have some relation to home visiting, but are not a direct support for the services. Home visitors form part of local stakeholder group similar to child care forum. A governance structure may develop out of this.
TREE	Support and monitor existing programme; ensure smooth facilitation of parenting programmes & home visits; oversee & support income generation projects; ensure community buy-in and responsibility for the programme; facilitate community meetings to ensure community knowledge & buy-in; support project staff within the community

*Source: Own*

The budget summary shows a very different pattern for Lesedi and TREE. TREE’s budget allocation is directed only at payment for staff involvement, while Lesedi’s does not provide for staff costs but does provide for every other pre-specified item. Again, this diversity indicates the need for an application form and funding strategy that allows for such diversity and assesses the value of different services (and thus their eligibility for government funding) by what is done rather than by how costs are calculated.

**Table 11 - Community support structure budget summary**

Cost item	Lesedi	TREE
Payment for staff involvement		59600
Transport costs	2880	
Venue & accommodation costs	10350	
Catering costs	22080	
Other costs	28980	
Wishlist		
TOTAL	64290	59600

*Source: Own*

## **2.5. Other activities**

Lesedi was the only organisation which completed the “other activities” section of the application form. The activities listed in this section by Lesedi related to assistance with self-help income-generating projects of the families assisted through the core home- and community-based ECD services. Some might argue that these activities would be better funded under another sub-programme of the provincial DSDs (such as sustainable livelihoods) rather than the child care and protection services sub-programme which provides funding for ECD services. The Western Cape DSD official reported that in such cases Western Cape would, through discussion between staff of the two sub-programmes, decide which of the two would cover the full costs so as to avoid the hassle involved for both applicants and government in splitting the funding across sub-programmes. If other provinces cannot all agree with this seemingly sensible approach, one would hope that they would be flexible enough to allow a single application form to be used for the application to both sub-programmes.

## **2.6. Summary of budgets for activities**

Finally, 0 summarises the budgets specified for all activities for each organisation. The total now ranges from R382 872 for FLP to R1 785 055 for Lesedi. While four of the six organisations specify budgets for activities other than home visits, home visits clearly dominate, accounting for 69% or more of the total budget for all organisations. Some might argue that this suggests that DSD funding should focus only on home visits. The organisations would, however, probably argue that the integrated nature of the services they provide would mean that home visits alone would be much less effective than if accompanied by the other types of services.

The email accompanying LETCEE’s application form explained that they, too, engaged in the other types of activities but that, given the integrated nature of the activities, it was simpler to specify the budget only against the home visiting categories. Similarly, ELRU explained that each of their home visitors run 2-hour cluster workshops for her group of 10 families once per month. ELRU does not budget for catering for these workshops. Costs are incurred in terms of planning and preparation and the home visitors’ time, but this cost is included in the stipends recorded under home visits in the mock application form.

Focusing funding on home visits would, in effect, disadvantage organisations that provide separate information on each activity. This does not seem advisable or fair as there are good reasons why a particular organisation might choose to split the budget. For example, where home visitors are responsible for organising playgroups and capacity building of caregivers, an organisation might find it difficult to separate costs for the two areas. In contrast, where different staff are responsible for these other activities, it would be difficult to include the costs of the other activities under the home visiting category. The fact that some organisations chose to split up their budgets – and in different ways – again illustrates the usefulness of providing this option rather than providing a straitjacket application form that forces organisation to fit their budgets into categories that do not match how they plan and budget.

**Table 12 - Total budgets across all types of home- and community-based ECD services**

	<b>Parent Centre</b>	<b>FLP</b>	<b>Lesedi</b>	<b>ELRU</b>	<b>TREE</b>	<b>LETCEE</b>
Home Visits	1070764	382872	1368560	901237	850990	462000
Caregiver Capacity Building			7680		130880	
Playgroups and Related	52072		262400		198400	
Community Support Structures			64290		59600	
Other			83125			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1122836</b>	<b>382872</b>	<b>1786055</b>	<b>1032117</b>	<b>1108990</b>	<b>462000</b>
Home visit percentage	95%	100%	77%	100%	69%	100%

*Source: Own*

## **2.7. Other sections of the form: Other funding and human resources**

The final sections of the form dealt with other sources of funding and human resources respectively. The section on other sources of funding enquired whether the organisation was registered as an ECD centre and, if so, whether it was receiving a subsidy from DSD in this respect. It also asked about subsidy funding for grade R from the Department of Education. Finally it asked about funding received from other sources during 2009 for home- and community-based ECD services describe in the previous sections. These questions are obviously important to include in any form that DSD might use in the future. They are not important for the purposes of the test exercise – especially as none of the six organisations that participated in the exercise were registered as an ECD centre or receiving grade R funding from the Department of Education.

The human resources section of the mock application form required organisations to provide information on all staff members, community workers and volunteers who worked on home- and community-based ECD services and who received any form of remuneration from the organisation. For each category of worker the form asked that the organisation specify the number of people, the number of full-time equivalents, and the total budget for this category. The full-time equivalent column was included to cater for instances where a person did not work full-time on these activities. For example, the overall directors of the organisations would probably spend some of their time on these services, but not all their time.

This part of the mock application form was the part that worked least well. The intention was to capture overhead costs, such as those related to management and

monitoring and evaluation that would not be captured when asking about individual activities. The first problem was that the form resulted in double-counting to the extent that some of the staff costs had already been accounted for when specifying budgets for each activity. This weakness applied for all organisations in respect of the home visitors, and also for some organisations in respect of other staff who support these services. Secondly, organisations – perhaps recognising this weakness – did not all fill in this section of the form as well as other parts. A revised form should exclude staff whose remuneration is already covered in other parts of the application form and focus, instead, only on the costs of “overhead” staff such as financial, administrative and managerial support.

An alternative approach, and the one we have adopted here, is to allow for a 10% overhead allowance that the organisation could then use to cover management, monitoring and evaluation and similar costs. Adding the 10% allowance gives a range in total annual budget from R421 519 for FLP to R1 964 661 for LESEDI.

### **3. In conclusion**

As discussed in the introduction to this report, the exercise had two linked aims:

- to come up with a proposal as to how government (and the provincial departments of social development in particular) might frame bids to provide subsidies to the providers of home- and community-based services.
- to help develop a form that provinces could use for soliciting requests for funding from service provider organisations.

In terms of the first aim, this is not the place to argue for the importance of home- and community-based ECD services. The extent and importance of this need are fully acknowledged in government policy. The question now is how to get the money moving quickly so that these services are delivered to what, in effect, are among the neediest children in the country.

In order to get money moving quickly, we need a system that does not represent a major departure from existing approaches. We therefore assume that, as now, funding for these services will continue to come from provincial budgets rather than from the national department. We also assume that National Treasury would not want to introduce a conditional grant, and that funding would therefore need to come from within each province’s equitable share. This, in turn, means that each provincial DSD would be competing for these funds with all other provincial departments, and that those responsible for this area of work would then be competing within DSD’s allocation for the funds to be allocated to home- and community-based ECD services.

To assist in ensuring adequate allocation of resources for home and community-based ECD services, we propose that Treasury and the national and provincial DSDs adopt a similar approach to that used over recent years in respect of centre-based DSD. For this service and other high-priority activities, Treasury allocated extra amounts to the



*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood  
development services for children 0-5:*

---

equitable share of each province and specified through internal documents as well as in public documents that this money was intended for the high-priority areas. Because these extra funds – sometimes referred to as “earmarked” funds – were part of the equitable share rather than a conditional grant, there was no legal compulsion on provinces to allocate the funds for the prioritised areas. In practice, and because provinces were part of the prioritisation process, the prioritised areas did receive increased funding because of this approach.

We do not attempt to specify the amount of extra funds that should be allocated for home- and community-based care. The amount cannot be based on the absolute need because that is immense and the country simply does not have the money. There are also not currently sufficient organisations to provide such services. If, however, government specifies, through “earmarked” funding, a reasonable amount for home- and community-based ECD services, this will encourage provincial treasuries and cabinets to approve provincial DSD bids for such funds. Further, the type of delivery information available from the special application form would allow DSD to assure the provincial treasury that it would be able to monitor that the money was well spent. Agreement would, for example, be reached with each organisation as to how many households, children and caregivers they would aim to reach with their services, and through what type of activities. These agreements would then be the basis for indicators against which the organisation would be required to report on a regular basis.

Knowledge that funding is available would meanwhile encourage organisations that potentially have the capacity to provide such services to do so in the knowledge that funding is available. This would allow the amount allocated to increase each year until the country was nearer meeting the need. In the shorter term, one would want to see allocations for home- and community-based ECD that are at least equal to the funds allocated for centre-based ECD.

In the second workshop representatives of National Treasury and national DSD emphasised that they would need an estimate of the total number of children who might be reached with a given sum of money if a bid for earmarked funds were to be successful. For centre-based ECD the subsidy operates on the basis of the number of children reached. For the home visits part of home- and community-based ECD, as well as for some other activities such as caregiver capacity building, the household might be a more accurate indicator. A household-based approach would also acknowledge that these services typically work with the caregivers, alongside the children, in a way which would not be found in all centre-based ECD.

One can, however, make broad estimations of the number of children who would be reached by using population estimates of the number of children per household. Analysis of the raw data from Statistics South Africa’s General Household Survey of 2007 suggests that African, coloured and Indian households which include children under six years of age have an average of 1.4 children in this age group. This estimate is not too far off the Parent Centre’s estimate that they reach an average of 1.7 children for each mother-child dyad if one remembers that the Parent Centre estimate will not be strictly confined to children under six years. These estimates would thus be an under-count of reach to the extent that it focused only on children and excluded

both the benefits to caregivers and the benefits to older children through improved caregiving by their immediate caregivers and any services rendered to them more directly by the home- and community-based ECD, for example during home visits.

0 uses this estimate to arrive at the average cost per child per month. This is found to range from R64 for FLP to R369 for ELRU. The unweighted average across the six organisations is R185 per child per month. DSD could potentially use this number to give a rough estimate of the number of young children who would be reached by a given allocation or “pot of money”. Nationally, provincially and at organisation-level there could subsequently be regular reports on how many children were actually reached as home visitors and others could record the number of children found and assisted in each household, or attending playgroups or other activities.

**Table 13 - Estimating costs per child per month**

	Parent Centre	FLP	Lesedi	ELRU	TREE	LETCEE
Households visited per month	260	390	640	160	640	360
Estimated number of young children	364	546	896	224	896	504
Annual total excluding overheads	1122836	382872	1786055	901237	1239870	462000
Annual total including overheads	1235120	421159	1964661	991361	1363857	508200
Average per household per month	396	90	256	516	178	118
Average per child per month	283	64	183	369	127	84

*Source: Style: Source*

The benchmark should, however, not be used for calculating the amount to be provided to an individual organisation. Doing so would encourage poor quality service delivery as economic theory tells us that this would result in “rational” organisations favouring easy-to-reach children, limiting the number of interactions per household, limiting the length of the visit, and similar strategies that contradict the purpose of home- and community-based ECD. Instead, the provincial DSD should ask each organisation to justify the extra cost when they exceed this benchmark. As with other programme-based funding of NPOs, each provincial DSD would then weigh up the merits of a particular NPO’s proposal. Once funding is agreed to, the provincial DSD would require the organisation to report against agreed indicators that related to the justification offered for funding higher than the benchmark.

It is at the point where DSD has set aside funds for home- and community-based ECD services that the special application form again comes into the picture as a method of facilitating the work of both the applying organisations and the provincial DSDs.

## *Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

The application form could be used for situations in which government plans to cover the full costs incurred by an organisation on home- and community-based ECD services as well as those cases in which it feels it can cover only part of the costs. It provides the opportunity for government to specify which activities or costs it will cover and thus how its funds must be used. The form asks about other sources of funding and thus gives an indication of the shortfall that the organisation would like government to cover.

The form does not make any assumptions about which types of costs would be covered. However, analysis of the completed forms reveals that stipends constitute a major portion of the costs of all the organisations in the sample. If government cannot afford to cover full costs, this would then be a good place to start. However, if the decision is made to focus on stipends, this should not be restricted to stipends of home visitors. This caution is offered (a) because the effectiveness of home visitors is dependent on a range of other staff members, and (b) because there are some home- and community-based ECD service programmes that do not include home visits but do provide other services. Indeed, while the programme for which TREE completed the mock application form includes home visiting, several of their other home- and community-based ECD programmes do not include home visits. One would not want to exclude these programmes and organisations from access to funding.

In terms of the second aim, overall the exercise suggested that the mock application form works well. Organisations did not seem to experience major difficulties in completing it. Further, while the form is much shorter than the standard application forms for general NPO “programme” funding, the structured questions provided a good picture of the type and extent of services and coverage of each of the different organisations. The structured approach would also be of assistance to the more grassroots-based organisations, such as local ECD centres, which in future (as long as they were registered as NPOs) could make use of the form to apply for funding for their outreach activities to communities which fall within the scope of home- and community-based services. The information provided through the structured questions would, in turn, provide a solid basis on which DSD could base funding decisions without the much greater time and effort that would be required from both applying organisations and DSD if the standard “programme” funding application form was used. This form, with minor modifications, would thus facilitate the rapid roll-out of home- and community-based services that is envisaged in government policy.

Specific changes that seem advisable are as follows:

- The budget column of the table for each activity should be divided in two to distinguish between recurrent and one-off costs
- Addition of a question under home visiting that enquires how the home visitors are selected
- Clearer instructions as to how to record the number of households where a single household is visited more than once.
- Addition of a cost item in respect of recruitment to the home visiting section

- Addition of a cost item in respect of equipment and materials in the caregiver capacity building section
- Amendment of the human resources section so as to avoid double-counting of staff whose costs are already covered in previous sections. Alternatively, allowance should be made for 10% overhead costs to cover management and related functions.

When the draft form was distributed for comment, one of the responses – from someone who did not participate in the exercise – was that the language used should be simplified. This person noted that while the current language would be understood by the established organisations that were participating in the test exercise and that would be likely to apply for funding in the first years, ultimately one would hope that more grassroots-based organisations, which might have less highly educated staff, would apply for and receive funding. Simpler language would encourage such organisations to apply and make the process easier for them.

## **4. Summary of findings and recommendations**

- The funding model should recognise and support a diversity of programme interventions which might consist of one or more activities including home visiting, playgroups and parent and caregiver capacity building.
- The funding model for such services should be programme based.
- The focus should be primarily on recurrent costs with some contribution where possible for start-up costs.
- There must be recognition that there are usually no fees for home- and community-based provision, and that this is appropriate given the focus on the poorest and most vulnerable. This implies that funding for home- and community-based provision might need to cover a greater proportion of total costs than a subsidy for centre-based provision.
- While it is not expected that there will be full coverage of costs by the state, given the extent of the need and the scarcity of resources, the proportion funded must be large enough to ensure that quality service is possible.
- The types of expenditure to be subsidised would include ECD practitioner stipends, training, travel, venue, catering and management/supervision costs. A focus only on practitioner stipends would discriminate against some types of provision in a way that contradicts encouragement of a diversity of approaches to service provision.
- Where funding is provided in respect of stipends, support should be based on a decent level of stipend

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

- National DSD should further develop the application format and encourage utilisation across the provinces. Both national and provincial DSD should avoid complicating the application form and asking for unnecessary information.
- DSD should submit a motivation to Treasury for allocation of increased funding in the equitable share specifically for scaling up access to home- and community-based ECD in order to meet NIP targets within a reasonable period of time.

## **5. References (Style: Heading 1 No Number)**

Biersteker L. 2007. Early Childhood Development Rapid Assessment and Analysis of Innovative Community and Home Based Childminding and Early Childhood Development Programmes in Support of Poor and Vulnerable Babies and Young Children in South Africa. Commissioned by United Nations Children's Fund: Pretoria.

Budlender D & Proudlock P. 2009. Analysis of the 2009/10 Budgets of the 9 provincial departments of Social Development: Are the budgets adequate to implement the Children's Act? Children's Institute & Centre for Actuarial Research, University of Cape Town.

Carter J, Biersteker L & Streak J. September 2008. Costing Centre-based Early Childhood Development Programmes for Children under Age Five: Case studies from the Western Cape. Human Sciences Research Council: Pretoria.

Department of Social Development. 2009. Proposed list of non-financial data elements 2009/2010. Pretoria.

## 6. Appendix 1: Detailed results

### 6.1. Home visiting: Centres 1-3

Parent Centre		Family Literacy Project		Lesedi	
Stipends for home visitors					
	636566		56160		576000
No of HV on project at one time: 13		No of HV on project at one time: 130		No of CDPs on project at one time: 64	
Ave no of HH per visitor: 20 per 6 months		Ave no of HH per visitor: 9 per school term		Ave no of HH per visitor per month: 10	
Ave no of visits per HV: 70 for full-time (42 mother-child dyads + 30 other children)		Ave no of visits per HV: 9 per school term		Ave no of visits per HV per month: 40	
Ave no of hours pw per HV: FT 40 pw; PT 20 pw		Ave no of hours pw per HV per school term: 9		Ave no of hours pw per HV: 10 x 2 hours = 80 hours/month	
Minimum HV pay pm: 3800		Minimum HV pay per school term: R12/visit=R108		Minimum HV pay pm: R300	
Maximum HV pay pm: 4080		Maximum HV pay per school term: R12/visit=R108		Maximum HV pay pm: R1200	
				Ave HV pay pm: R750 FOR VISITS ONLY	
				HV payments for other interventions: R288000	
				Stipends paid only during 2-year training period. Lesedi then exits and ECD centres must pay	

Parent Centre		Family Literacy Project		Lesedi	
				stipends	
Mentoring & supervision for home visitors					
	257070		0		96000
3 supervisors provide weekly group (3 hours) and once-monthly (1 hour) individual supervision; supervisors receive weekly supervision of programme manager. The latter receives fortnightly consultation with expert consultant & once-monthly with organisations director		9 facilitators visit some homes with HV to monitor quality & provide guidance. HV keep journal for each home which collected each term and checked by facilitator and used to organise payment. Facilitators spend 2 hours per week in family literacy sessions sharing information on health and ECD that visitors then share with households visited.		2 full-time fieldworkers mentor, assist and monitor CDPs during training (R4000 each per month). ECD Centre supervisor and community support structure play supervisory and monitoring role during training and afterwards. Each CDP is visited at least quarterly by fieldworker.	
Equipment & material for home visitors					
	1950		61500		71360
Manual with graphics on issues related to conception, pregnancy, birth; torch, rattle, massage oil for Infant Behavioural Assessment; brochures of relevant community resources		Books (R200 per HV), educational toys and games (R500 per facilitator), IMCI materials & games (R2500 per facilitator); writing materials, crayons, journals, home visit bags (R100 per visitor)		Toy-bags (64@R1000); scale (64@R150); forms & notebooks (64@R100)	
Transport for home visitors					
	31866				
Visitors receive fares to attend		Nil		Currently not paid because CDPs	



*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

Parent Centre		Family Literacy Project		Lesedi	
supervision and other capacity building activities (R22776); annual shoe allowance (R5200); bag allowance (R3900)				work near ECD centre.	
Transport for mentors & supervisors					
	0		10800		12000
Costs included in other items		For training sessions, once a month x 9 facilitators		Fieldworkers use public transport to visit CDPS - average R500 each per month	
In-service training for home visitors					
	8840		209412		459600
Once per quarter for specific programme related issues. Also eligible to attend other general parenting training offered by the Centre		Salary for 9 facilitators to run weekly family literacy session on IMC: R277 ph		Staff costs: 2 trainers@R9250 pm (R222000)	
				Venue: 50 days x 3 areas (R18000)	
				Transport: 2 facilitators in Lesedi vehicles@ R2.50/km; CDPS @R15/pp/day (R134000)	
				Food: 64 @ R15/pp/day (R48000)	
				Other: Learner materials R520pp (R33280)	
				2 trainers airtime allowance	

Parent Centre		Family Literacy Project		Lesedi	
				(R4320)	
Training of new home visitors					
	104132				
No of new visitors to be trained: 16		No of new visitors to be trained:		Covered in above. 23 new plus 41 old.	
No of days per HV: 39 x 4 hours		No of days per HV:			
Staff costs: R48078 (specialist & general trainers)					
Venue: R6287					
Transport: R15240 (trainers, trainers, moms & babies)					
Food: R4200					
Equipment: R5900					
Other: R24427 (admin: M&E)					
Other costs					
	6930		45000		
Recruitment; Visits to MOUs, clinics & other community venues; Interviews		IMCI specialist trainer of facilitators (18 days per year @ R1500 per day); 9 trips per year to rural resource centre @ R1200 per trip; accomm & means for specialist (18 days)			
Wishlist costs					

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

<b>Parent Centre</b>		<b>Family Literacy Project</b>		<b>Lesedi</b>	
Unexpected travel costs of visitors working outside of their immediate communities; earlier startup of mother-child/toddler support group in Tafelsig	23410	Able to raise enough funds	0	Flat rate public transport allowance would enable coverage of wider area e.g. R200 per month per CDP.	153600
				Full amount for stipends also not received, so paid R300 instead of R750 per month	
<b>TOTAL</b>	1070764		382872		1368560

**6.2. Home visiting: centre 4-6**

ELRU		TREE		LETCEE	
Stipends for home visitors					
	230400		354240		190000
No of HV on project at one time: 16		No of HV on project at one time: 80		No of HV on project at one time: 30	
Ave no of HH per visitor: 10		Ave no of HH per visitor: 8		Ave no of HH per visitor per mnth: 12	
Ave no of visits per HV: 20		Ave no of visits per HV: 8		Ave no of visits per HV per mnth: 25	
Ave no of hours pw per HV: 15		Ave no of hours pw per HV per school term: 12 days per month		Ave no of hours pw per HV: 38	
Minimum HV pay pm: R1200		Minimum HV pay pm: R350		Minimum HV pay pm: 400	
Maximum HV pay pm: R1200		Maximum HV pay pm: R500		Minimum HV pay pm: 600	
Mentoring & supervision for home visitors					
	223343		78750		110000

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

<b>ELRU</b>		<b>TREE</b>		<b>LETCEE</b>	
One staffperson works across both areas (R198881pa salary); in Lusikisiki staffer does 3-day visits 7 times per year (R21714 costs); in Vredenburg staffer visits for 3 days twice per month (R22747 costs) (3 days includes travel); further mentoring & support by email, fax and phone		Project is implemented within 5 communities, managed by 4 field-based managers and 4 field-based trainers. Monthly meetings are held with all home visitors for feedback, review and implementation. An additional part-time stff member supports home visitors and caregivers with income-generating activities.		ECD coordinator, who is qualified ECD teacher, lives and works in community and monitors ECD activities. Community Development Facilitator monitors all work. Visitors report to community committee who monitor visits	
Equipment & materials for home visitors					
	12480		50000		20000
Set of 7 Masithethe handbooks per HV (R280pp); toy kits (R500pp)		Stationery, toys, handouts, reference files, etc		Basic toy bad for each visitor (R10000); toy library in each community (R10000 set-up)	
Transport for home visitors					
	0		172720		0
		Transport and accommodation for attendance of training		All visitors walk to the families they visit	
Transport for mentors & supervisors					
	106955		22480		72000
Transport for 2 local mentors in Lusikisiki (R320pm); ELRU trainer/facilitator travel & accommodation - 2 air/road to Lusikisiki		Transport and accommodation for mentorship and support within the communities		LETCEE vehicle is used, costing approximately R1500 in fuel per month per area	

ELRU		TREE		LETCEE	
(R52115) & 7 road to Vredenburg (R51000)					
In-service training for home visitors					
	10040		172800		
Catering Lusikisiki R300 per day for 13 (R6300); catering Verdenburg R170 per day for 5 (R3740); Staff costs covered in mentoring above		Capacity building is ongoing			
Training of new home visitors					
	16900				70000
No of new visitors to be trained: 16				No of new visitors to be trained: 10	
No of days per HV: 20				R7000 cost per trainee	
Staff costs: Covered above				* In reality, LETCEE did not train new visitors in 2009	
Venue: Lusikisiki donation; Vredendal R150 per day=R3300					
Transport: Trainees walk to venue					
Food: R7800 Lusikisiki for 11 trainees; R3000 Vredenburg for 5 trainees					
Equipment: FCM toolkit pp @ R175					
Other costs					
	0		0		0

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

<b>ELRU</b>		<b>TREE</b>		<b>LETCEE</b>	
Wishlist					
Shortfall in respect of trips for additional support & training	157416				
M&E	143703				
<b>TOTAL</b>	901237		850990		462000

### 6.3. Caregiver capacity building

Lesedi		ELRU	
Payment for facilitators			
	0		93920
Staff & CDP costs covered under home visits		200 workshops	
Transport			
	0		7680
Not covered			
Venue & accommodation costs			
	0		4080
Usually free community venues			
Catering costs			



*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

<b>Lesedi</b>		<b>ELRU</b>	
Short sessions and refreshments would be too costly. In future, individual ECD centres might ask for R3600 subsidy allowance for outreach	0		0
Other cost			
	0		25200
Too costly to provide even R5 per person for materials/handouts, but in future individual ECD centres might ask for R3600 subsidy allowance for outreach		Equipment and materials	
Wishlist			
	7680		0
Flat rate CDP transport allowances e.g. 8 sessions x R15 public transport x 64 pm; R7200 allowance per centre in future			
<b>TOTAL</b>			
	7680		130880

### 6.4. Playgroups and related

Parent Centre		Lesedi		TREE	
Payment for facilitators					
	11200				51200
Average no dyads per group: 7-20		Ave no of children per group: 6-20, ave 13		Type of staff member/volunteer responsible for facilitation: 10 play facilitators	
Average playgroups per child per year:		Ave playgroups attended per child per year: 3 days per week		Ave no of children per playgroup: 8-14	
Total events per month: once weekly for 10 months				Total number of workshops/events per month: 40	
Equipment & material					
	20000		6400		83200
		Toy-bags including story books - 1 bag per CDP @ R1000 per bag (with further support, not costed here, through Lesedi's 2 mobile toy-libraries/play-buses		Toys, stationery, handouts, etc	
Transport costs					
	3672		0		0

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

<b>Parent Centre</b>		<b>Lesedi</b>		<b>TREE</b>	
For facilitators and childminders to venue		Within walking distance for CDPs and participating caregivers and children			
Venue and accommodation costs					
	1000		0		14000
Only small contribution required		Usually in private homes/yards			
Catering costs					
	16200		0		0
R15 per dyad - sandwiches & tea/coffee for caregivers; juice, fruit, sandwich for kids		Covering costs would be prohibitive. Individual CDPs find creative ways of providing some nutrition for children.			
Other costs					
	0		0		50000
				Capacity building	
Wishlist					
	0		256000		0
		1 toy-bag per playgroup			
<b>TOTAL</b>					
	52072		262400		198400

## 6.5. Community Support Structures

Lesedi		TREE	
Payment for staff involvement			
	0		5960
3 initial consultations with ECD centres and broader community to explain programme, discuss needs and elect CSS members. CSSs meet weekly at ECD Centre. Lesedi does not pay for CSS interventions. Lesedi field workers periodically attend CSS meetings to monitor effectiveness and receive feedback.		No & type of community consultations per year: 4 areas x 1 meeting per month; 5 days networking and consultation visits x 5 areas; capacity strengthening support for communities	
Transport costs			
	2880		0
Public transport for Lesedi fieldworkers: 2 x 4 CSS meetings/month @ R40 x 9 months			
Venue and accommodation costs			
	10350		0
Venue for 3 initial community consultation meetings: 3 meetings x 23 new ECD centres @ R150			
Catering costs			
	22080		0

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

<b>Lesedi</b>		<b>TREE</b>	
40 persons x 3 meetings x R8pp x 23 new ECD centres			
Other costs			
	28980		0
Transport costs of R15pp for 1-day orientation workshop for 23 new CSSs x 6 members x 7 days training: R14490			
Refreshment at CSS training session: R15 pp per day			
<b>TOTAL</b>			
	64290		59600

**6.6. Other home- and community-based early childhood development activities**

Lesedi	
Self-Help Projects (SHP) - small income generation	
"One-up" Business Training by Lesedi trainers	21525

---

Refreshments for 6 days training x 35 new SHPs/year x 3 members per year @ R15pp/day: R9450	
Public transport @ R15pp/day: R9450	
Learner materials 35 SHPs x 3 members @ R25 each: R2625	
Start-up capital for SHPs @ R800 each	28000
Quarterly visits by fieldworkers to each SHP while visiting CHPS: No charge	
Seeds for food gardens:	28000
700 households @ R35=R24500	
50 community gardens @ R70=R3500	
35 aftercare programmes x 4 visits per year @ R40 public transport	5600

## 7. Appendix 2: Mock Application Form

Provincial Government XXXX

Department of Social Development

### APPLICATION FOR FUNDING FOR HOME- & COMMUNITY-BASED EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Please note the following:

- This format reflects four common types of service delivery forming part of home- and community-based early childhood development services i.e. what are sometimes referred to as “non-centre-based early childhood development”. [*Definition to be further clarified in final form, but not for this research.*] The Department recognises that these services take diverse forms and do not expect all organisations providing these services to use the same model. Funding applications will not be penalised if the organisation does not provide all of the types of service asked about on this form. The form also provides space for organisations to describe types of service delivery that do not fit into the four specified types.
  - Please note that the form does not provide space for overhead management and administration costs. We envisage funding of these costs being calculated as a percentage of the other costs because of the difficulties involved in separating out the proportion of management and administration attributable to particular services where an organisation has a broad range of activities.
  - For the purpose of the research exercise, please record financial amounts relevant for the 2009 calendar year. This “research version” of the application form then allows space for you to explain where the actual funding reflected is less than you would have applied for if you were applying in advance for the funds.
- 

NAME OF ORGANIZATION		
STREET ADDRESS		
POSTAL ADDRESS		
CONTACT DETAILS	Name	
	Position	
	Telephone No.	
	Facsimile No.	
	E-mail Address	

**SECTION 1: ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE**

**A. REGISTRATION IN TERMS OF LEGISLATION AND/OR DEPARTMENTAL POLICY**

1. Are you registered as any of the following types of organisations in terms of legislation?

**[Grey areas do not need to be completed for research exercise.]**

	√	Registration number	Date of registration
Non-profit organisation			
Section 21 company			
Trust			
Other (please describe):			

QUESTIONS ON MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE WOULD APPEAR HERE BUT ARE OMITTED FOR THE RESEARCH EXERCISE.

FORMS IN TERMS OF SECTION 38(1)(j) OF THE PUBLIC FINANCE MANAGEMENT ACT, 1999 WOULD ALSO BE INSERTED HERE.



**SECTION 2: BACKGROUND OF THE ORGANISATION**

1. Please write in full the vision and the mission of your organisation.

.....

.....

**SECTION 3: HOME VISITING**

**PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR FUNDING FOR HOME VISITING SERVICES.**

**This activity consists of visits to homes to provide various forms of support to children and/or their caregivers.**

1. Please briefly describe the activities that home visitors do when they visit the homes of children.

.....

2. In which geographical areas/communities will your organisation do home visits?  
(If the organisation will do this in more than one area/community, and the costs differ between areas/communities, indicate this where necessary in the funding table below.)

.....

3. What age group of children will the organisation target for home visiting?

.....

4. Please briefly describe the methods and/or criteria the organisation will use to identify and select children/households to be part of the home visiting activities.

.....

5. Please write in the amounts that will be spent on the specified items in respect of home visiting during 2009.

	Budget
<p>Stipends for home visitors:</p> <p>Number of home visitors working on the project at any one time:</p> <p>Average number of households per visitor per month:</p> <p>Average number of visits per home visitor per month:</p> <p>Average number of hours worked per week per visitor:</p> <p>Minimum &amp; maximum payment per visitor per month:</p>	
<p>Mentoring &amp; supervision for home visitors:</p> <p>Please briefly describe how you mentor and supervise the home visitors, e.g. number of staff members who act as mentors and supervisors, and proportion of time that these staff spend on mentoring &amp; supervision:</p>	
<p>Equipment &amp; material for home visitors:</p> <p>What equipment and materials do the home visitors take with them on their home visits?</p>	
<p>Transport for home visitors:</p> <p>What transport costs of the home visitors does your organisation pay for?</p>	
<p>Transport for mentors and supervisors:</p> <p>What transport costs of mentors and supervisors does your organisation pay for?</p>	
<p>In-service training for home visitors:</p> <p>What in-service (ongoing ) training does the organisation provide for home visitors after they have started doing this work?</p>	
<p>Training of new home visitors:</p> <p>Number of new home visitors to be trained in 2009:</p> <p>Number of days per trainee spent in training workshop or similar setting:</p> <p>Breakdown of main costs involved in training:</p> <p>Staff costs:</p> <p>Venue:</p> <p>Transport:</p> <p>Food:</p> <p>Equipment:</p> <p>Other:</p>	
<p>Other costs:</p> <p>Please list and describe other main costs of home visits:</p>	

6. If the funds available during 2009 for home visiting were less than hoped-for, please indicate how additional funds, if available, would have been utilised. Please include an estimate of the amount of the shortfall.

.....

#### **SECTION 4: CAREGIVER CAPACITY BUILDING**

**PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR FUNDING FOR CAREGIVER CAPACITY BUILDING.**

Note: This category of service includes parent/guardian workshops, workshops for child-minders, workshops for older siblings who serve as “buddies” and similar activities that support and build the capacity of those who serve as everyday caregivers for targeted children. Capacity building for caregivers that is done during home visits should be included in the previous section.

1. Please briefly describe the nature and purpose of the caregiver capacity building activities.

.....

2. In which geographical areas/communities will your organisation do caregiver capacity building?  
(If the organisation will do this in more than one area/community, and the costs differ between areas/communities,, indicate this where necessary in the funding table below.)

.....

3. What is the main age group of children for whom the organisation will target caregivers?

.....

4. Please briefly describe the methods and/or criteria the organisation will use to identify and select caregivers for capacity building activities.

.....

**5. Please write in the amounts that will be spent on the specified items in respect of caregiver capacity building.**

	Budget
Payment for facilitators: Note: Do not include payment for facilitator/s if these costs are covered in another part of this application e.g. under home visiting. Type of staff member/volunteer responsible for facilitation: Number of facilitators per workshop/event: Total number of workshops/events per month for organisation:	
Transport costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Venue and accommodation costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Catering costs: Please briefly describe the nature of costs covered:	
Other costs: Please list and describe other main costs of caregiver capacity building:	

**6. If the funds available during 2009 for caregiver capacity building were less than hoped-for, please indicate how additional funds, if available, would have been utilised. Please include an estimate of the amount of the shortfall.**

.....

**SECTION 5: PLAYGROUPS AND RELATED**

**PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR FUNDING FOR PLAYGROUPS AND RELATED FUNDING.**

**Note: This category of service includes activities aimed at bringing together young children. Typically, these activities target children who are part of a home visiting programme. The groups may involve caregivers and/or older children alongside the children.**

**1. Please briefly describe the nature and purpose of the playgroup and related activities.**

.....

**2. In which geographical areas/communities will your organisation do playgroup and related activities?  
(If the organisation will do this in more than one area/community, and**

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

**the costs differ between areas/communities, indicate this where necessary in the funding table below.)**

.....

**3. What is the main age group of children that your organisation will target?**

.....

**4. Please briefly describe the methods and/or criteria the organisation will use to identify and select participants for the playgroup and related activities.**

.....

**5. Please write in the amounts that will be spent on the specified items in respect of caregiver capacity building.**

	Budget
Payment for facilitators: Note: Do not include payment for facilitator/s if these costs are covered in another part of this application e.g. under home visiting. Type of staff member/volunteer responsible for facilitation: Number of facilitators per workshop/event: Total number of workshops/events per month for organisation:	
Transport costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Venue and accommodation costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Catering costs: Please briefly describe the nature of costs covered:	
Other costs: Please list and describe other main costs of caregiver capacity building:	

7. If the funds available during 2009 for caregiver capacity building were less than hoped-for, please indicate how additional funds, if available, would have been utilised. Please include an estimate of the amount of the shortfall.

.....

## SECTION 5: PLAYGROUPS AND RELATED

**PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR FUNDING FOR PLAYGROUPS AND RELATED FUNDING.**

**Note:** This category of service includes activities aimed at bringing together young children. Typically, these activities target children who are part of a home visiting programme. The groups may involve caregivers and/or older children alongside the children.

6. Please briefly describe the nature and purpose of the playgroup and related activities.

.....

7. In which geographical areas/communities will your organisation do playgroup and related activities?  
(If the organisation will do this in more than one area/community, and the costs differ between areas/communities, indicate this where necessary in the funding table below.)

.....

8. What is the main age group of children that your organisation will target?

.....

9. Please briefly describe the methods and/or criteria the organisation will use to identify and select participants for the playgroup and related activities.

.....

*Development of a subsidy model for home-and community based childhood development services for children 0-5:*

---

**10. Please write in the amounts that will be spent on the specified items in respect of playgroup and related activities.**

	Budget
Payment for facilitators: Note: Do not include payment for facilitator/s if these costs are covered in another part of this application e.g. under home visiting. Type of staff member/volunteer responsible for facilitation: Average number of children per playgroup: Average number of playgroups attended per child per year: Total number of workshops/events per month:	
Equipment & material for playgroups and related: Please briefly describe nature of equipment & material supplied:	
Transport costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Venue and accommodation costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Catering costs: Please briefly describe the nature of costs covered:	
Other costs: Please list and describe other main costs of playgroups and related activities:	

**11. If the funds available during 2009 for playgroups and related activities were less than hoped-for, please indicate how additional funds, if available, would have been utilised. Please include an estimate of the amount of the shortfall.**

.....

**SECTION 6: COMMUNITY SUPPORT STRUCTURES**

**PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR FUNDING FOR SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY STRUCTURES.**

**Note: This category of service provides for creation and support of community-based structures that support the home- and community-based early childhood development services.**

1. **Please briefly describe the nature and purpose of the activities related to community support structures.**

.....

2. **In which geographical areas/communities will your organisation create or support community-based structures?  
(If the organisation will do this in more than one area/community, and the costs differ between areas/communities, indicate this where necessary in the funding table below.)**

.....

3. **Please briefly describe the composition of the community support structure/s.**

.....

4. **Please write in the amounts that will be spent on the specified items in respect of community support structures.**

Type of cose	Budget
Payment for staff involvement: Note: Do not include payment for staff if these costs are covered in another part of this application e.g. under home visiting. Number and type of community consultations per year:  Number and type of meetings of support structure per year:  Please briefly describe the tasks that will be done by staff and the amount of time and effort involved per month:	
Transport costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Venue and accommodation costs: Please briefly describe the costs involved:	
Catering costs: Please briefly describe the nature of costs covered:	
Other costs: Please list and describe other main costs of support to community structures:	



5. If the funds available during 2009 for community support structures were less than hoped-for, please indicate how additional funds, if available, would have been utilised. Please include an estimate of the amount of the shortfall.
- .....

**SECTION 7: OTHER HOME- AND COMMUNITY-BASED EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

**PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF THERE ARE OTHER HOME- AND COMMUNITY-BASED EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH YOU WILL REQUIRE FUNDING.**

Please describe the nature of the activities/items to be funded.

Activity	Cost items	Budget

**SECTION 8: OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING**

1. Is your organisation registered as an ECD centre? YES / NO
2. If YES, is your organisation receiving subsidy funding for the ECD centre for 2009?  
YES / NO
3. If YES, (a) for how many children are you receiving subsidy?  
(b) total amount received per month?
4. Does your organisation receive subsidy funding for Grade R from the Department of Education? YES / NO
5. If YES, (a) for how many children are you receiving subsidy?  
(b) total amount received per month?
6. Please detail the amounts of funding received from other sources during 2009 for the home- and community-based ECD services described in sections 2 through 7.

Funding source	Costs/activities for which funding provided	Total amount for 2009

**SECTION 9: HUMAN RESOURCES**

- Please provide information on all staff members, community workers and volunteers who work on the home- and community-based early childhood development activities described above and who receive any form of remuneration from the organisation. In the full-time equivalent column give the total of the fractions worked by the different people in this category. For example if one person in the category spends half of their time on these services and two persons in the category spend a quarter of their time, that translates into ONE full-time equivalent.**

Category	Number of people	Full-time equivalents	Total budget
Social worker			
Community worker			