



community development workers

Draft Policy: Community Development Workers (CDW) Programme

*20 August 2009
Discussion Document*



the dpsa

Department:
Public Service and Administration
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



**cooperative governance
& traditional affairs**

Department:
Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

1. Introduction	3
2. Background to the Policy Development Process	3
3. Policy Development Approach	4
4. What is a Policy Framework	4
5. Legislative Framework	5
6. Programme Objectives and Purposes	10
6.1 Key Policy Issues	10
6.2 Provisional Policy Position	12
7. Institutional Responsibility & Accountability for the CDW Programme	14
7.1 Key Policy Issues	14
7.2 Provisional Policy Position	17
8. Accountability: Civil Society, Government and Political Oversight	20
8.1 Key Policy Issues	20
8.2 Provisional Policy Position	21
9. Training & Development	22
9.1 Key Policy Issues	22
9.2 Provisional Policy Position	24

1. Introduction

The overall objective of this exercise is to set out the key parameters of a policy framework for the Community Development Worker (CDW) Programme. This policy discussion document is a key step in a process that will both reflect on past experience and consult with stakeholders, both government and non-government on their aspirations for the future of the programme. A final draft policy framework is likely towards the end of 2009 and will function in some respects like a *Green Paper* in an on-going policy development process. This draft policy framework overviews key issues and discourses related to CDWs based on existing literature from both the academic and consultant sector and the views of the National Task Team for the CDW Programme. Further stakeholder engagement will not only help to refine these topics but will help to gauge degrees of consensus and divergence on what will ultimately constitute the best possible CDW Programme.

2. Background to the Policy Development Process

The policy issues that are outlined in this draft framework emerge from the main research and discussion documents on the CDW Programme to date and a special meeting of the National Task Team (NTT) in June 2009. The literature that was examined included the 2005 HSRC evaluation for SAMDI, the 2007 DPLG survey¹, the 2008 review by DPSA², the 2008 concept paper by DPSA and the CDW guidelines developed by DPSA in 2009. The desk-top components of most of the above research have been based on a wealth of official publications and working documents on the CDW programme produced by DPSA and dplg. These include the CDW Handbook (2007), the Master Plan (2007), the 2007 CDW Conference Report, the original National Policy Framework for CDWs by dplg, and the DPSA's (undated) CDW Three-Year Implementation Progress Report.

The exercise outlined above gave rise to the document *Policy Development Process: Community Development Workers (CDW) Programme: Working Draft of Literature Review June 2009* (hereafter referred to as the Literature Review.) This document

¹ This study was commissioned by DPLG (now GoGTA), assisted by the German Development Cooperation (GTZ), members of the CDWP National Task Team (NTT) and the DPSA. The objectives of the study were to look at (i) the objectives of the programme since its inception, (ii) the role of the three spheres of government in the implementation and coordination of the programme, (iii) the levels of political and administrative support to the programme and (iv) the extent to which the programme had brought government closer to citizens. The study was completed in 2007 and the report is available at CoGTA.

² The Department of Public Service and Administration (Governance Branch in collaboration with the CDWP Unit) has in 2008, commissioned a study on the Review of the CDWP with the objectives of (i) reviewing the implementation of the programme, (ii) determining the impact of the programme, (iii) determining to what extent the founding objectives of the programme have been achieved and (iv) what interventions are required to enhance the effectiveness of the programme. The report is available and awaiting approval for release by the department.

functioned as the base discussion document for the policy proposals outlined in this document.

3. Policy Development Approach

Much of the research literature on the CDW Programme presents a thorough but complex breakdown of the institutional, political and administrative issues that confront the programme. The *Literature Review* simplified this breakdown and rationalised many of the topics and sub-topics in order to present a conceptual overview rather than a fine unpacking of minutiae. The draft *Literature Review* was then circulated to provincial coordinators by DPSA in advance of the special NTT meeting held in June 2009. The objective of the special NTT meeting was to allow provincial CDW coordinators and / or their staff plus other stakeholders like dplg / Cogta to make inputs on the draft policy document. An initial session of the NTT brainstormed general developments around the CDW Programme and recorded impressions by province. A presentation was then made by the service provider on the draft policy document covering all aspects of the literature review and drawing specific attention to policy issues that seemed to have crystallised into a consensual position and those that required further debate. The German Technical Assistance Agency (GTZ) assisted by DPSA and the service provider, then led an *Open Space* exercise that allowed all participants to attend mobile groups that discussed the various topics within the literature review and record their thoughts using the Zopp method. The comments by NTT participants were then incorporated into the report.

4. What is a Policy Framework

Attempting to define policy and its instrumental value to governments and citizens runs the risk of venturing into the realm of academia and abstraction. Discussion of policy as an instrument of both politics and public administration often fails to bridge the gap between scholarly interest and the basic need for effective administration. For this reason we offer some fairly commonsense descriptions of policy and its function. Fanie Cloete suggests that, "Public policy is a government's programme of action to give effect to selected normative and empirical goals it has set itself in order to address perceived problems and needs in society in a specific way, and therefore to achieve desired changes."³

Tuner and Hulme regard policy as having many linked elements. Policy comprises 'process' starting with some form of history and focus and involves the progression from 'making' to 'implementing.' It requires that decisions are made, usually as a series, and is therefore about the exercise of power. It is purposive in that it has intent although the stated intent and the real goals may not be the same. It is also about human agency in

³ Cloete, F. 1991: *Characterising policy change in South Africa, 10980-1990: the games elites play* in Fanie, C. , Schlemmer, L. and van Vuuren, D. Policy Options for a new South Africa, Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria South Africa p 21

that policy may have multiple, conflicting and changing goals.⁴ From these events it is clear that policy and policy-making is not a neatly circumscribed process for capturing on paper the vision and operational conventions that will guide government action. Policy-making is frequently about *praxis* or even trial and error and the ability to reflect on hard lessons and candidly review previous achievements and failures. The capacity for such reflection may be as important as the inspiration that originally shaped the foundation principles of the policy itself.

Apart from the imperative to approach policy formulation from a grounded perspective that recognises the political and institutional context and the demonstrated capacities of the effected public service, there is also a need to be cautious about the political ambitions of policy-making. As Meshack Khoza warned:

*At the same time, and this has been a global trend, newly elected governments normally introduce policies for symbolic reasons – to proclaim that the new administration has arrived...policy-makers tend to focus more upon policy packaging and political mobilisation, and less on implementation logistics.*⁵

The terms of reference for this policy development project note that the CDW Programme has already attracted a vast number of review and discussion documents, many involving significant desk-top and field research. The terms of reference therefore note that “the need for policy has been identified because of inconsistencies in the interpretation of the various documents and their recommendations.”

5. Legislative Framework (for CDWP)

Review of existing literature on the legislative and policy context for CDWs identifies two issues for consideration: the history of the development of the CDW and CDWP in South Africa, and a record of relevant legislation, white papers, policy directives that are purported to underpin the establishment of CDWs, including analysis identifying key issues to be considered in the future formulation of a CDW policy.

(i) History of CDWs and CDWP: It is now common cause that the concept of community development workers was not introduced as a legislative enactment but rather as a policy decision which emanated from an announcement by President Thabo Mbeki in his State of the Nation Address to Parliament on 14 February 2003. While there may have been some conflicting views as to where the CDW program had its roots, we are in agreement with what is implied in the A Handbook for Community Development Workers (DPSA 2007a), namely that the reason the government decided to launch the CDW program arose from the 1997 White Paper on Social Welfare.

The relevant legal framework for the CDW programme includes:

⁴ Turner, M. and Hulme, D. 1997: Governance, Administration and Development – Making the State Work Kumarian Press Inc. Connecticut, USA, p 58

⁵ Khosa, M. 2003, Towards effective delivery: Synthesis report on the project entitled ‘Closing the gap between policy and implementation in South Africa’, Research report No. 98

- (a) The White Paper on Local Government, 1998
- (b) The Local Government: Municipal Structures Act, 1998
- (c) The Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, 2000
- (d) The Skills Development Act, 1998
- (e) The Public Service Act ,1994
- (f) The Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005

Most recently, the CDW Master Plan, which contains the resolutions of a broad range of stakeholders who gathered at the Master Plan Indaba, held in Pretoria as part of the Master Plan development process, in November 2007, provides the latest thinking on CDWs and their future role.

(ii) Record and Analysis of Legislation and Policy: The assignment surveys 12 Acts, one regulation (the Public service Regulation of 2001) and 12 white papers. While there is too much information to summarise everything here, some potentially challenging legal and policy issues for future consideration are listed:

Acts	Desktop Literature Review
1) Public Service Act 1994	<p>Since CDWs are appointed by the Provincial Government in terms of the Public Service Act they are public servants and subject to the provisions of the Act and the Regulations promulgated thereunder.</p> <p><i>However, in view of the local placement, provincial appointment and national agenda drivers, the question arises whether the expectations of the CDWs e.g. in terms of performance awards/promotion etc are not compromised and the oversight role to be played by the Provincial Departments in respect of performance management, discipline etc is not somewhat diminished.</i></p>
2) Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act, 1996	<p>The Bill of Rights incorporated in the Constitution (Chapter 2) is a cornerstone of South Africa's democracy. It enshrines the rights of all people in our country and affirms the democratic values of human dignity, equality and freedom. The Bill of Rights is a foundation of the CDWP and should guide every CDW. www.concourt.org.za (DPSA 2007a)</p> <p>Section 41 h. ii furthermore provides that all spheres of government and all organs of state within each sphere must co-operate with one another in mutual trust and good faith by assisting and supporting one another.</p> <p>In terms of section 41. 1.g of the Constitution all spheres of government and all organs of state within each sphere must:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">g) exercise their powers and perform their functions in a manner that does not encroach on the geographical, functional or institutional integrity of government in another sphere;</p> <p>Since the functions of the CDW span all three spheres of government we need to satisfy ourselves that they do not encroach on the geographical functional or institutional integrity of government in another sphere.</p> <p>.</p>

Acts	Desktop Literature Review
3) Employment Equity Act, 1998	<p>Section 6 provides that “ No person may unfairly discriminate, directly or indirectly, against an employee, in any employment policy or practice, on one or more grounds, including race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, family responsibility, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, HIV status, conscience, belief, political opinion, culture, language and birth.</p> <p><i>Could the perceived requirement that the CDW “must reside in the ward in which he/she is to be employed” be construed as unfair discrimination?</i></p> <p><i>If the intention of DPLG/DPSA is that the CDW must reside in the ward in which he/she is required to work then this requirement would have to find its way into the policy or practice.</i></p>
4) Skills Development Act, 1998	<p>In terms of section 16, SETAs may establish learnerships if the learnership consists of a structured learning component and complies with certain other provisions. It appears that the CDW learnerships for the Community Development Workers complied with all the prescribed requirements.</p> <p><i>However, since the functions to be performed by the CDWs are mainly related to functions aligned to National Government Department’s the question arises whether the learnerships should not have been registered under the PSETA rather than the LGWSETA (now the LGSETA).</i></p>
5) Skills Development Levies Act, 1999	<p>Since the public service does not pay skills levies and since the Skills Development Levies Act is not applicable to the public service the DPLG/DPSA who met the costs and presumably will meet the future costs of the CDW Learnerships cannot claim refunds/grants in terms of the Skills Development Levies Act.</p> <p><i>If the learnerships for the CDWs are implemented through the municipalities, the municipalities would be entitled to claim from the LGSETA provided the provisions of the Act and the regulations promulgated under the Act are complied with. This would, however, be dependent on the CDWs becoming employees of the municipalities.</i></p>
6) Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, 2000	<p>Section 3 of the Act reinforces the notion that Municipalities must exercise their executive and legislative authority within the constitutional system of co-operative government and that organised local government must seek to facilitate compliance with the principles of co-operative government and inter-governmental relations.</p> <p>In terms of section 4 (2) (j) municipal councils must contribute, together with other organs of state, to the progressive realisation of the fundamental rights contained in sections 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29 of the Constitution. These sections refer to the environment, property, housing, health care, food, water, social security, children and education – the very issues the CDWs are required to address.</p> <p>Chapter Four of the Act provides that the municipality must encourage, and create conditions for, the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality, including the preparation and implementation of the municipality’s integrated development plan.</p>

Acts	Desktop Literature Review
	<p><i>It could be argued that one of the ways in which the Municipalities wish to do this is through the CDWs, which are placed at their disposal by the provincial government as part of co-operative government.</i></p>

Regulations	Desktop Literature Review
<p>1) Public Service Regulations, 2001</p>	<p>Part III Planning, Work Organisation and Reporting – paragraph F: Creation and Filling of Posts provides that:</p> <p>“Before creating a post for any newly defined job, or filling any vacancy, an executing authority shall-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) confirm that she or he requires the post to meet the department’s objectives; (b) in the case of a newly defined job, evaluate the job in terms of the job evaluation system; [Regulation F.(b) in operation from 1 November 2004 – see regulation I/A.1 of Chapter 1 and Government Notice No. R. 832 of 16 July 2004] (c) in the case of a vacant post on grade 9 or higher, evaluate the job unless the specific job has been evaluated previously; and (d) ensure that sufficient budgeted funds, including funds for the remaining period of the medium-term expenditure framework, are available for filling the post.” <p><i>Since the CDWs do not only perform the functions of the provincial departments in which they have been appointed, a narrow interpretation of paragraph (a) above could imply that they should not be appointed to meet the objectives of other departments.</i></p> <p><i>Some protocols around this matter in terms of the Intergovernmental Relations Act would presumably regulate this matter if this is considered necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Questions around the legitimacy of appointing CDWs only from within wards in which they reside could possibly be justified under the efficiency aspect of Part VII of the Regulations which read:</i></p> <p>“Employment practices shall ensure employment equity, fairness, efficiency and the achievement of a representative public service. Affirmative action shall be used to speed up the creation of a representative and equitable public service and to give practical support to those who have been previously disadvantaged by unfair discrimination to enable them to fulfil their maximum potential. Employment practices should maximise flexibility, minimise administrative burdens on both employer and employee, and generally prevent waste and inefficiency.”</p> <p><i>Could such appointment be questioned in terms of the Labour Relations Act, 1996 or the Employment Equity Act?</i></p>

White Papers and Policy Documents	Desktop Literature Review
<p>1) White Paper on</p>	<p>The White Paper – particularly the preamble – laid the basis for what would later become the CDWP. www.gov.za – documents – white papers.</p>

<p>Social Welfare 1997</p>	<p>(DPSA 2007a)</p> <p><i>In addition paragraphs 1, 8, 25(d), and 26 of Chapter 4 of the White Paper make specific reference to community development workers.</i></p> <p><i>We are therefore of the view that it is this White Paper that laid the foundation for the CDW Program</i></p>
<p>2) White Paper on the Transformation of Service Delivery (Batho Pele)</p>	<p>“In the absence of specific legislation or policy for CDWs, the common understanding is that the basic principles of the programme emerge from the White Paper on the Transformation of Service Delivery (Batho Pele). The main emphasis of this policy is the obligation on government to deepen the quality of services rendered to communities. However, an equally important understanding is that the citizen’s engagement and participation principles contained in local government legislation such as the Municipal Systems Act and the Municipal Structures Act help to complete the framework of principles that informs the CDW programme. The Ministry for Public Service and Administration also makes reference to the Public Service Act as the basic frame of reference” (DPLG/GTZ 2007).</p> <p><i>Our view as implied in the Handbook for Community Development Workers, is that the CDW Program has its roots in the White Paper on Social Welfare 1997 and not in the White Paper on the Transformation of Service Deliver, although this White Paper also underpins the CDW Program.</i></p>
<p>3) The White Paper on Traditional Leadership and Governance 2003</p>	<p>The Foreword to the White Paper provides that: “the White Paper marks a new era. It opens a chapter for the institution of traditional leadership to work closely with government in the reconstruction and development of the rural areas. The task of building a democratic state requires the values enshrined in the Constitution are shared by all South Africans.”</p> <p><i>CDWs are in terms of the key focus areas of the Master Plan for the CDW Program required to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Strengthen civic services</i> • <i>Strengthen social well being</i> • <i>Stimulate LED</i> • <i>Improve - Public participation for service delivery improvement.</i> <p><i>The area of influence of the CDW will also cover the traditional areas and so assist with the reconstruction and development of the rural areas.</i></p>
<p>4) Draft National Policy Framework for Public Participation 2007</p>	<p>The White Paper acknowledges that the CDWs can play a supportive role to the ward committees by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Ensuring that ward committees and civil society are informed on government support and services • Encouraging ward committees and civil society to engage with opportunities • Identifying needs and building on strengths by facilitating CBP locally • Supporting implementation of community activities and projects by community structures such as community workers and Community-Based Organisations • Providing technical support (compiling reports and documents for example) to ward committees to monitor community projects and to account to communities and municipalities”

THEMATIC AREA 1:

Definition, Purpose, Objectives, Roles & Responsibilities of CDWs and CDWP

6. Programme Objectives and Purposes

6.1 Key Policy Issues (Literature Review)

Although there is some documentation describing what the CDW Programme would do, the many objectives it would pursue and how it would go about its work, very little of the formal documentation clearly states its overall purpose. Although the CDWP Master Plan (undated: 18-28) does have five key focus areas, the literature review suggested that these were insufficiently aligned to the purpose and the strategic objectives of the CDWP. The clearest statement of purpose and associated objectives in fact appears in a much earlier, undated and somewhat informal document known as the *Conceptualisation, Implementation and Evaluation of the CDW Programme* (no author or date):

The main reason for the creation of the CDWP is to bridge the gap between government service delivery programmes and the people who should benefit from these services, particularly in marginalized communities.

The objectives of the programme include:

- *Ensuring that government maintains direct contact with people where they live*
- *Strengthening the co-ordination and integration of service delivery at local and community level*
- *Improving people's access to government information, knowledge and services*
- *Providing a holistic service delivery option with the deployment of multi-skilled, trained personnel*
- *Improving communication and networking between government and the local community*
- *Ensuring transformation and that government services reach their targets.*

In broad terms this purpose and these objectives have been carried over into subsequent discussion documents, however, the emphasis has often shifted between:

- Improving service delivery and accessibility
- Improving intergovernmental coordination
- Improving interaction between government and community
- Improving participatory democracy

The purpose of the CDW Programme is shaped to some extent by its political and policy origins. The most widely quoted point of origin for the programme is former President

Thabo Mbeki's State of the Nation Address on 14 February 2003, but key stakeholders and researchers also assert that the roots of the programme lie in the 1997 White Paper on Social Welfare. Mbumba (2007), while noting the relevance of social welfare policy, suggested that the basic principles of the programme emerge from a more recent refinement of social development policy, namely the White Paper on the Transformation of Service Delivery (Batho Pele).

Unsurprisingly public and more peripheral stakeholder perceptions of the purpose of the programme have also been quite fluid. Mbumba (2007) found that most people thought that the purpose of the programme was "to bring government closer to the people in order to ensure improved service delivery." Mbumba however also found that there are less acknowledged 'agendas' which are seen to be played out through the programme.

In conceptualisation, the programme had identified a fairly complex purpose related to improving the performance of the state by narrowing the gap between policy intention and reality:

*In essence CDWs were to address the gap between services policy and actual output by brokering citizens' access to services and economic opportunities Using a "learnership" based approach the CDW programme seeks not only to bring government closer to local communities but also to enhance coordination between different spheres of government with special emphasis on those line functions related to development. The main objective of this improved cooperation between government and civil society is greater efficiency in state expenditure. This improved efficiency is to be achieved by focusing such expenditure more effectively on local development challenges and service backlogs. The CDWs were therefore envisaged as an important supplement to mainstream government programmes that redress imbalances and inequity and encourage economic development.*⁶

The following understanding outlined by the DPSA and quoted by Regenysis may in fact constitute the most practical and clear purpose for the programme:

*"The main purpose of the CDWs is to work with municipalities in order to help bridge the gap between government and the community; and strengthen integration and coordination between services provided by government and access to these services by communities (DPSA, 2007). In addition, the new democratic government recognises in the Constitution that the three spheres of government cannot function in isolation. Decentralisation and cooperation is critical to the successful transformation of the state in the coming decades".*⁷

The specific functions of CDWs are broad ranging and are listed in the DPSA Handbook for Community Development Workers:⁸

⁶ Mbumba 2007

⁷ Department Public Service and Administration - Regenysis. *Review of the Community Development Workers Programme*. January 2008

⁸ DPSA. 2007a. *A Handbook for Community Development Workers*. CDW Unit. DPSA

- Regularly communicate government and other information to communities in an accessible way
- Pass concerns and issues on to service providers
- Coordinate teams of volunteers in community projects
- Coordinate teams employed on public works programmes
- Help communities develop and submit proposals for inclusion in integrated development plans to municipalities, other spheres of government and donors
- Coordinate inter-departmental programmes and encourage integration
- Maintain communication with CBOs and workers
- Promote the principles of Batho Pele and community participation
- Inform communities about problems in the delivery of basic services
- Help implement projects
- Liaise with and advocate on behalf of communities with parastatals, NGOs and private donors
- Monitor, evaluate and report on the impact of developmental projects
- Help communities deal with disease (such as TB, HIV and AIDS) and intensify education and awareness of sexually transmitted diseases and other health matters
- Help government achieve the People’s Contract of a better life for all
- Act as a resourceful and dedicated public servant

The November 2007 Master Plan Indaba also identified “no-go zones” for the CDWs:

- a) be the secretariat for ward committees;
- b) implement department-specific mandates and programmes;
- c) mobilise community members for party political events; and
- d) be politicians, and play out this role in their communities.

6.2 Provisional Policy Position

- ☞ **Definition:** Do we want to retain the name: CDW? (What about “government foot soldiers” or “community public servants”?)
- ☞ Public servants of a special kind? Define what makes CDWs special: first generation of IGR practitioners, work across 3 spheres; approach as development facilitators, generalists (not local government or sector specific), learnership, from wards where they work, work hours/accessibility)
- ☞ Community Development Workers are civil servants with particularly close links to local communities – they are not volunteers and make no claim on the values associated with voluntarism.
- ☞ The main **purpose** of the CDWs is to work with government departments in order to help bridge the gap between government and community. In pursuit of this goal CDWs must act to improve community access to government services and strengthen integration and coordination between different government line services. Where feasible, CDWs should also attempt to strengthen integration and coordination and between the three spheres of government.
- ☞ Programme **objectives:**
 - Improving service delivery and accessibility
 - Improving intergovernmental coordination
 - Improving interaction between government and community

- Improving participatory democracy

- ☰ The specific **functions** of CDWs are broad ranging and are listed in the *DPISA Handbook for Community Development Workers*. CDWs and their municipal supervisors are expected to prioritize these functions according to the specific needs of the community in which they are working.
- ☰ **Roles and responsibilities:** See attached Job Description for CDWs (**see Annexure A**)
- ☰ Community Development Workers have a key role to play in functioning as an early warning system to pre-empt the collapse of government services. Every effort must be made to ensure that CDW information gathering and referral services are matched by government capacity to respond, if necessary through a re-alignment of state resources and other inputs.
- ☰ Key issues regarding the role of CDWs:
 - The role of CDWs must be about bridging the gap between government and community and facilitating and enabling development processes
 - A line must be drawn between facilitation and implementation
 - CDWs should not be seen as substitutes or gap fillers for line department staff
 - The role of CDWs is to identify needs and provide access to services, they cannot provide those services.
 - Role clarification is also needed in terms of local stakeholders. CDWs can support and assist CBOs and local organisations but they cannot be owned or directed by civil society and there can be no direct accountability to CS / CSOs

- ☰ The role and function of national CDW programme managers / coordinators and provincial coordinators are outlined in **Annexure B**.

THEMATIC AREA 2:

Institutional Responsibility & Accountability for the Programme

7. Institutional Responsibility & Accountability for the CDWP

7.1 Key Policy Issues (Literature Review)

The institutional component of CDW policy is complex and covers a broad range of CDW Programme operational and management issues including:

- a) Ultimate national line (departmental) responsibility for the CDW programme
- b) Financing of the programme
- c) Management and coordination at sub-national level
- d) Operational accountability
- e) Conditions of Service

Despite the fact that previous CDW discussion documents had developed a rationale for the involvement of all three spheres of government in the CDW programme, Mbumba (2007) found that management, planning and reporting functions were fragmented across different spheres of government. Municipal management of CDWs appeared to be weak and non-standardised i.e. there were no accepted formats. Management was complicated by the different levels of accountability and reporting that applied to CDWs. At the time of the Mbumba survey, very few CDWs were reporting to mentors or development supervisors as the policy intended. Reporting was impeded by the lack of full cooperation between the DPSA and dplg and the tension between political and administrative oversight of CDWs. Mbumba also noted with concern the perception in some quarters that the CDW system functions as a form of political reporting to higher political office.

The fact that CDWs are assigned functions that connect with all three spheres of government is partly a pragmatic response to past experience of the shortfalls in community development strategy and partly a bold policy experiment to achieve greater integration and coordination across the different spheres. The Programme's prospects for success are probably stronger in terms of finding pragmatic solutions where the state bureaucracy fails to act in an integrated and coordinated manner. CDW ambitions to act as an official policy mechanism to promote inter-governmental coordination per se are less realistic.

Most analysts of the CDW programme, including Piper, Mbumba and the HSRC have also defined other associated problems that arise for a programme where 'ownership' and answerability lie not just within different government departments but different spheres of government:

- Uncertainty regarding how formalised the programme should become i.e. a legislated system of public service or simply an operational approach / strategy designed to supplement the formal public service and governed by guidelines
- Piper et al found within international case studies, a rationale for de-centralisation per se i.e. more specific devolved responsibility and financial power to local government for CDWs - "To note for policy development as regards the financial implications of assigning CDWs a clear role under the management of local government."⁹ Piper et al argued that if the CDW programme emphasizes *community building and development*, the linkage to local government must be stronger and local government must be devolved the necessary powers and resources. (This argument does not fully address the fact that local government remains an organ of state and its dealings with local communities are shaped accordingly).
- Multi-sphere and dual departmental responsibility for the programme requires complex management structures. The establishment of the NTT partly resolved this, however, Mbumba's 2007 research found that not all role-players were aware of the NTT (now known as the 'Entity') and there was some ambiguity as to its formality and official standing. Although the NTT functions with the endorsement of both primary departments viz. dplg and DPSA, cooperation within the NTT does not always translate into identical operational vision e.g. dplg favours a provincial model where the respective departments of local government take responsibility for CDWs whereas DPSA favours the Offices of the Premier as the oversight body.
- Both Piper and Mbumba refer to concerns about the capacity constraints of local government. There is something of an institutional paradox in the situation where CDWs are supposed to enhance the capacity of local government whilst simultaneously falling within its supervisory ambit and receiving mentorship from officials within its ranks. The prospect of increasing local government 'custodianship' of the CDW Programme raised in some of the literature thus appears unlikely at present.
- Piper et al remark that the Public Service Regulations, 2001 and specifically those sections relating to *Planning, Work Organisation and Reporting* may pose difficulties for CDWs whose functions cover more than just the provincial government that appointments them.

The funding system for the CDW Programme is very unclear and was described in any detail in the documents that were reviewed for this project. Superficially it appears that currently the CDW Programme has two key funding elements, firstly National Skills Fund money used to pay for CDW training and remuneration under the learnership programme, and secondly money used for the operational expenses incurred by CDWs which appears to be the responsibility of local government and arises from the development projects and programmes to which CDWs are assigned. Some analysts refer to funds received directly from the National Treasury but this is very unclear. Mbumba (2007) found that currently the remuneration of CDWs is linked to the CDW training system:

The remuneration of CDWs is linked to the learnership system. Once registered, learner CDWs become eligible for "remuneration per month, depending on the number of

⁹ Piper et al 2008: p 70

credits already attained.” Funds for the learnership are provided through the National Skills Fund and CDWs are regarded as public servants and are initially remunerated on level 4 in terms of the Guide on Remuneration and Conditions of Service of Employees /Persons Undergoing Learnerships in the Public Service. The learnership programme was funded by the National Skills Fund in the amount of R70 million and the Local Government SETA contributed R4 million towards materials development, project management fees, accommodation, assessment and certification.¹⁰

Much of the discursive literature on the CDW Programme criticizes municipalities for ‘not making adequate financial provision for the deployment’ of CDWs and thus implies that CDWs should ultimately be incorporated into the municipal pay-roll. The Mbumba research however clarified that it was never a policy intention that CDW’s would become municipal employees or contracted development workers. It nonetheless seems that certain stakeholders understand that municipalities should pay for some component of CDW’s operating expenses.

As noted in the literature review the role of national government with regard to the CDW Programme has been set out quite realistically in previous discussion documents, principally the 2007 CDW Handbook :

- Funding
- Ensuring standardisation within the programme
- Establishing the necessary administrative models for admittance to the programme, certification, job descriptions, performance standards etc
- Setting out a regulatory framework

- The envisaged role of provincial government is more loosely defined i.e. adaptation of the programme to the particular circumstances of the province, providing support (undefined), inter-sectoral and general sub-national coordination, communication between local and national spheres of government and establishing the necessary training networks / service providers (partly shared with national government) and deciding on the scale of CDW deployment. The Literature Review does not suggest that provincial governments have as a whole been particularly effective in these functions or that a provincial department (rather than provincial level coordinating body) is the best vehicle for these functions. Local government is currently charged with ‘coordinating’ CDWs with the service and development functions of the municipality, providing administrative and logistical support (undefined) and deploying CDWs to promote participatory democracy and improve service delivery. While the research does not indicate that local government has been particularly effective in this role and most municipalities are indeed are ill-equipped to support CDWs in their responsibility to improve inter-governmental coordination and cooperation. It nonetheless undeniable that community-level deployment of CDWs and the developmental bias of their duties demand a significant supervisory input from local government.

The matter of CDW conditions of service has been complicated by the fact that while they are clearly part of the civil service, the initial directives by the Office of the Presidency clearly modeled CDWs as civil servants of ‘a special kind.’ Further

¹⁰ Ministry for Public Service and Administration (undated) *Community Development Workers Programme: Three-Year Implementation Progress Report*, p11

complication arose when CDWs were appointed by the Provincial Governments in terms of the Public Service Act, subject to the provisions of the Act and applicable Regulations. Thus CDWs exist as provincial employees, deployed to local government to service a national programme. As a consequence their management in terms of performance, promotion and discipline is compromised.¹¹

The Literature Review indicated that CDWs were not satisfied with their conditions of service however these grievances were largely related to their poorly defined status both as employees of the civil service and as functionaries within government. The latter will be addressed in the institutional revisions already outlined in this policy framework. CDW service conditions are clearly a bone of contention for CDWs and relate to remuneration, benefits, offices, phones, cell phones, transport, allowances etc. These cannot be addressed however without first setting in place a general improvement in planning, performance management, financial and budgeting systems, information and human resource management.¹²

7.2 Provisional Policy Position

7.2.1 *Ultimate national line (departmental) responsibility for the CDW programme*

- ☰ The current arrangement for the programme is that both DPSA and Cogta are jointly and collectively responsible for the programme. There are three options:
1. Retain current joint responsibility across both departments but refine the respective functions of each in order to have a better defined division of responsibility given that the current arrangement has its own challenges;
 2. One department to lead the programme and the other to act in a support role. The distinction between leading and supporting is important. The lead department must have ultimate responsibility for the success or failure of the programme and must be granted the necessary discretion in decision-making in order to service this responsibility. The support department does not carry overall responsibility for the programme but must commit to using its line powers and resources to support the programme. Publicly it will be identified with the programme as a *support agency*;
 3. One department to assume fully responsibility and liaises with the other department as a key role-player. This creates the clearest line accountability for the programme and will clarify public and civil service misconceptions around the programme. It requires however a strong commitment to the practice of cooperative government from the department that does not have responsibility;

¹¹ Piper et al 2008: p 14

¹² See for example Department Public Service and Administration - Regenysis. *Review of the Community Development Workers Programme*. January 2008

7.2.2 Financing of the programme

- ☐ **Current Reality:** No dedicated budget for Programme. Funding is from provincial fiscus as per Cabinet decision (2003). Funds for Programme not ring-fenced. Current funding departments determine main thrust/focus of programme, thus current model not ideal. Currently, national government coordinates the Programme, provinces implements, and municipalities provide the workspace. This arrangement is complicated and unsustainable. CDWs remunerated at level 6.
- ☐ **Options:** (1) explore the feasibility of establishing an inter-governmental agency similar to NDA governed by Board of Directors (PBO/Trust/etc); (2) Sign MOUs with partner departments in terms of funding specific partnership interventions (3) Cost CDW interventions with departments and present case to Treasury on dedicated funding stream for the Programme.
- ☐ **Next step:** NTT should establish a Task Team to explore feasibility of funding options with expert inputs, i.e. commission expert study on funding options for the CDWP.

7.2.3 Management, coordination and operational accountability at sub-national level

- ☐ **Institutional Arrangements:** When the CDWP was developed, Cabinet proposed that at the provincial level of government, either the Office of the Premier in each province or the department for provincial and local government should serve as the location of the programme as well as becoming responsible for providing funding, supervision and support to the CDWs. In all 9 provinces the programme is located in the provincial department of provincial and Local Government. Cabinet further proposed that the actual location of community development workers in the provinces, for the purpose of implementing their tasks, should be at the municipal level, and where possible within the Thusong Centers and that supervisors should be available at this level to guide the community development workers in the implementation of their duties (**Cabinet Memo 52: August 2004**)

In addition to provincial institutional arrangements at provincial level, Cabinet also recommended that at provincial level, a community development manager should be allocated in district municipalities, to manage the work of community development workers' supervisors in local municipalities. There should be community development workers in the wards reporting to the supervisors. In the metropolitan municipalities, there should be a community development manager supported by community development supervisors in each region. There should likewise be community development workers at ward level. (**Cabinet Memo 32: June 2003**).

- ☐ **Policy Options:** (1) Implement Cabinet decision fully, i.e. put structures in place as per Cabinet memo or revive accountability structures/lines where they have become blurred (2) Centralise the Programme, i.e. DPSA or CoGTA is responsible for Programme and responsible structure ensures that there is adequate supervision of CDWs at municipal level.

- ☐ CDWs must report to the municipal administration. The municipal administration must identify a specific manager whose duties include development / community participation or other related functions, to supervise CDW duties.
- ☐ CDWs must be assigned tasks that are clearly set out in an annual work plan that is jointly formulated by the provincial coordinating departments and the municipal supervisor, i.e. implementation of Provincial Master Plans
- ☐ From the above it is evident CDWs will remain operationally accountable to both the provincial coordinating department and the municipality – the joint work plan will however ensure rationalised work objectives and targets.

7.2.4 Conditions of Service & Career-Pathing

- ☐ The conditions of service of CDWs must be determined by their proper location as civil servants in the ranks of the national department that ultimately assumes responsibility for leadership of the CDW Programme. CDWs will no longer be treated as extraordinary placements in the civil service and they will be accorded the benefits and obligations of any other civil servant of a similar rank (see Public Service Act, 1994 and Public Service Regulations, 2001).

THEMATIC AREA 3:

Accountably to Civil Society, Government and Political Oversight

8. Accountability: Civil Society, Government & Political Oversight

8.1 Key Policy Issues (Literature Review)

Three key policy issues arise in relation to this aspect of the CDW Programme:

1. The notion that CDWs as civil servants should account to both government and civil society;
2. The issue of political office bearers having oversight responsibility for CDWs at municipal level;
3. The issue of voluntarism and its place within the CDW programme;

The Literature Review noted that the notion that CDWs should not only serve the local community but be *rooted in local civil society* appears in a number of previous CDW documents but its underlying rationale is not always clear. While accountability to the local community / local civil society by a civil servant may seem to be an admirable principle of governance, for important reasons the idea is impractical. These reasons include the need to maintain a proper separation of civil responsibility and state responsibility and the need to avoid particular interests within civil society asserting undue influence over sections of the public service.

The above principle does not however preclude the CDW Programme developing productive working relations with a broad range of community-based organisations and NGOs engaged in development work. In relation to established CSO development programmes, Mbumba in its 2007 evaluation recommended:

“A standard component of the CDW modus operandi should be to scan and identify all related NGO programmes prior to CDW deployment in a specific locality”

The CDW Programme needs to treat the principle of voluntarism with care. The literature review alluded to tensions between ward committee members who see their role intrinsically within the value framework of *voluntarism or civic duty* and CDWs who are paid civil servants but still draw on the moral authority that attaches to voluntarism. The literature review also highlighted the risk of ‘voluntarism’ being abused as a camouflage for networks of patronage that allow local political elites to retain the “loyalty” of poor / unemployed citizens.

In its evaluation of the CDW programme Mbumba (2007) found that:

Suspensions exist as to the political motives of the programme. A clear redefinition of lines of accountability and the fit between political and administrative oversight is therefore required in order to set these suspicions aside

As a result of an emphasis on political leadership and control of the programme in some of its foundation documents,¹³ Mbumba found many instances where the CDW Programme was regarded as one of the ruling party rather than the state. In the literature these concerns were reinforced by other research institutions who drew attention to the statement that CDWs should report to Mayors or the Speakers of Council – this was found to be particularly problematic.

8.2 Provisional Policy Position

- ☰ The CDW programme is a government programme and therefore cannot “account” to civil society although the programme does embody a strong ethic of service to local communities.
- ☰ Community Development Workers should not:
 - Assume responsibilities or take on tasks that undermine the secretariat for ward committees or any other civic functions that attach to ward committees or other structures for participatory democracy.
 - Assume responsibility for department-specific mandates and programmes in a manner that removes responsibility from the mandated department
 - Mobilise community members for party political events or engage in any other activities which are primarily in the interests of a political party
 - Act in any manner that confuses their role as civil servants with the role of the community’s elected political leadership
- ☰ The CDW programme must be constantly alert to the risk of using project opportunities and government resources destined for communities to extend influence / patronage for political or other purposes.

THEMATIC AREA 4:

Skills Training & Development

¹³ See for example Department of Provincial and Local Government (undated) *National Policy Framework for Community Development Workers in South Africa*, executive summary.

9. Skills Training & Development

9.1 Key Policy Issues (Literature Review)

A review of the literature suggests a need for clarification of the public service vision that informs and underpins the CDW Programme and to properly define “minimum requirements” for entry into the programme.

The CDW programme was implemented in 2005 through a learnership programme. The HSRC report identifies strengths and weaknesses in early implementation. The establishment of a national curriculum framework for community development work, and the use of tertiary institutions in this process were seen as strengths. Piper et al support the HSRC finding that training through a learnership was beneficial to the CDW programme and helped to motivate CDW candidates.¹⁴

Piper’s conclusions on the HSRC report suggest:

- The need to get input from or even allow CDW trainers to participate in the CDW selection and recruitment process, especially with regard to recognition of prior learning;
- To include in the CDW programme an inception process with municipalities to:
 - Alert municipalities to the need to prepare for CDW placement and deployment
 - Identify mentors / supervisors
 - Plan for succession and exit strategies
- Any CDW performance assessment process, particularly when this is geared to informing curriculum design and content, must ensure that feedback is elicited jointly from local supervisors and stakeholders with direct experience of CDW work and managers at national level.

Drawing mostly on the HSRC/ SAMDI (2005) report Mbumba found that:

*The CDW curriculum requires further development and fine-tuning to be geared to the strategic objectives of the CDW programme and that training to date had been too theoretical and had not sufficiently accommodated prior learning.*¹⁵

Piper et al note that the Skills Development Act (1998) provides the legal framework for the establishment of learnerships by SETAs and it appears that the CDW learnership complied with these requirements and continues to be modeled on *learnerships* as provided for within the National Qualification Framework.

Recruitment Requirements and Induction Procedures

¹⁴ Piper et al 2008: p 9

¹⁵ SAMDI 2005: Research Report on the Community Development Worker’s Programme, p vii

Key issues that emerge from the literature include the need to unpack the administrative, developmental and political objectives of the CDWP and clarify whether these are reconcilable / mutually reinforcing.

According to Nkondo, “The Department of Public Services and Administration (DPSA) is entrusted amongst other things, with the determination of broad recruitment standards and implementation and the facilitation of the appointment of service providers and frameworks for learnerships.” He further notes that the LGWSETA provides the CDW mentors and is responsible for the development of CDW learnerships and unit standards.

The HSRC report¹⁶ identified initial problems, which included a lack of understanding of a learnership by a number of role-players, which impacted on their ability to support CDWs through mentorship. The lack of clarity regarding roles and responsibilities was also evident within local municipalities, who were not informed of the programme timeously. The HSRC report noted that this resulted in the initial underemployment or non employment of CDWs – a trend that may persist to some extent.

Additional challenges identified in the HSRC report suggest that the recruitment and selection procedures were not standardised and that training providers were largely excluded from the recruitment and selection process. The SAMDI report reinforces this perception, particularly with regard to the selection process.¹⁷ Mbumba found that:

There is no conclusive evidence on the issue of whether CDWs are generally adequately skilled to perform their functions, although a majority of ward respondents feel that they are equipped as such. The difference of opinion is related to the diverse understanding of proper roles for CDWs. While role clarification is a priority, a clear consensus emerged around the need for CDWs to receive on-going training in more hands-on skills, such as report writing, presentation, administration, and project management.

Entry Competencies and Grading

The recruitment of CDWs is conducted by the provincial departments of Local Government in collaboration with the DPSA and dplg. Learnerships follow a period of formal training and are registered with the Local Government Seta (LGSeta) at level 4. On successful completion of the learnership, the CDW is awarded a *Further Education and Training Certificate in Development Practice (FCDP)* at NQF level 4¹⁸ (although it is noted that CDWs qualify at levels 5 & 6 in all provinces except KZN). Theoretically, further learnerships allow CDWs to become Community Development Supervisors (CDSs) and Community Development Managers (CDMs) thus providing a career-path opportunity. Research however revealed little evidence of such career paths in practice. Under the current human resource framework of the public service, formal qualifications are not considered the main determinant for remuneration.

¹⁶ HSRC. 2005. Evaluation of the Community Development Worker (CDW) Programme. Research Conducted by HSRC on behalf of South African Management Development Institute (SAMDI), October.

¹⁷ SAMDI 2005: Research Report on the Community Development Worker’s Programme, p 7

¹⁸ Ibid

In assessing the value of formal training and experience, Mbumba concluded that "...it is not one or the other, but the mix of both effective and ongoing training, as well as appropriate experience which contributes to a proficient and successful CDW."¹⁹

The HSRC research included an examination of qualifications and found these to be so varied that "...either a consistent selection policy in terms of qualification did not exist or that the screening/selection process was not quality assured."²⁰ The HSRC reports that the issue of a minimum qualification i.e. for entry into the Level 4 learnership was not resolved. Insights of the HSRC on learnership and training dealt mainly with the mechanics and delivery of training and only a few were pertinent to the entry competencies and grading:

- Selection criteria were not standardised across provinces, resulting in the selection of unsuitable candidates
- The language and content of some of the training material exceeded the capacity of some participants
- Practical experience was not always availed because some learners could not be placed in work situations
- The mentorship process was not in place. Local governments were not informed about the roles of mentors and coaches in time and were therefore not prepared when learners arrived at the workplace. This led to a situation where some learners did not receive the coaching they were supposed to have, and did not have access to knowledgeable mentors.
- Assessment relied very heavily on test and written work and there was not enough work-based assessment.

9.2 Provisional Policy Position

- 📄 **Recruitment requirements and Induction:** CDW policy must include a fair but effective screening process that is standardised and which realistically assesses the potential of candidates to cope with the formal training and learnership component of the programme.
- 📄 **Current Reality:** CDWs must live in wards where they work, and must have a background in community activism (see CDW Handbook).
- 📄 **Policy Options:** (1) CDWs be deployed in terms of a ward-cluster system (not ward-specific deployment), (2) CDWs to be municipal-wide.
- 📄 **Training:** CDW curriculum development must continue to be standardised and managed by credible FET service providers, greater provision however must be made for end-user (municipalities) and NGO input. There is a need to centralize the curriculum development and standard setting process for CDWP,

¹⁹ Mbumba 2007. p103

²⁰ HSRC, 2005, p 23

but not the actual roll-out of training. Municipalities and agencies who train and support CDWs must have input into the selection process.

- ☐ As is the case for every public servant, CDWs should attend Palama induction programme.
- ☐ Municipalities must develop brief and simple CDW induction and deployment plans as a condition of CDW deployment. These plans should be scrutinised by provincial coordinating committees. These plans should include the post and job description of the official who will mentor the CDWs.

ANNEXURE A: BENCHMARK JOB DESCRIPTION for CDWs

A. **JOB INFORMATION SUMMARY**

Name of jobholder: :

Job title : Community Development Worker

Core : Social Services and Support Personnel

Post level and salary code :

Occupational class code :

Name of component :

Location :

Posts reports to :

Date of appointment :

B. **JOB PURPOSE**

To liaise, co-ordinate, mobilise, inform and assist communities with access to services provided by Government and to assist communities to identify and communicate their needs to Government at national, provincial and local government level to bring Government closer to the people.

C. **KEY PERFORMANCE AREAS**

- (a) Inform and assist communities with access to the services provided by government structures. This would, *inter alia*, entail the following:
- (i) Co-ordinate service providers in all government institutions at community level and conduct online research on government services to ensure that all relevant information on services available reaches the communities.
 - (ii) Establish and maintain mechanisms and structures to liaise with local communities and stakeholders where required. Alternatively, use existing mechanisms and structures.
 - (iii) Intervene and resolve disputes around service delivery issues between government and communities.
 - (iv) Facilitate and promote the participation of communities in government development projects and programs e.g. Integrated Sustainable Rural Development and Urban Renewal programs and Integrated Development Plans.

- (v) Do awareness and advocacy work, including encouraging communities to engage with opportunities.
- (b) Determine the needs of communities and communicate these needs to the relevant government structures. This would, *inter alia*, entail the following:
 - (i) Facilitate the development of community structures (or utilise the existing structures) through which the needs of the communities can be identified.
 - (ii) Assist the communities and community structures in identifying and articulating their needs.
 - (iii) Identify service delivery blockages in the communities and identify and develop solutions to address these blockages.
 - (c) Promote networks and enhance the activities of existing local community workers aimed at improved service delivery. This would, *inter alia*, entail the following:
 - (i) Link up with existing programmes of departmental community workers.
 - (ii) Liaise with existing government and political structures.
 - (iii) Network with relevant structures of civil society, business and community organisations towards community development.
 - (d) Compile reports and documents, as required, on progress, issues attended to, actions taken and outcomes. This would, *inter alia*, entail the following:
 - (i) Develop and maintain a database (electronic or paper based) of frequently asked questions and answers. Utilise this information to compile local information products.
 - (ii) Develop monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (or utilise existing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms such as the mechanisms for Multipurpose Community Centres and PIMS centres).
 - (iii) Develop a database (electronic or paper based) on all interventions e.g. referrals, remedial actions taken locally or changes in local systems to improve service delivery.
 - (e) Keep up to date with regard to all services rendered by government and the processes and mechanisms to access the services. This would, *inter alia*, entail the following:
 - (i) Consult with all relevant government departments/institutions to determine services provided and mechanisms to access these services.
 - (ii) Consult the Gateway electronic portal and other information sources such as Government Online for information on services.
 - (iii) Conduct regular research on all relevant policies and legislation to stay abreast of new developments.

- (iv) Conduct regular information sharing with other community development workers, institutions and stakeholders.

D. *INHERENT REQUIREMENTS OF THE JOB*

Consult the attached draft Competency Framework and determine the specific skills and competencies required for the job. The competencies required correspond with those of middle management and the descriptions and definitions in the framework should be utilised but a lower level of proficiency will generally be expected to perform this job.

E. *APPOINTMENT REQUIREMENTS*

- (a) A grade 12 qualification or equivalent prior learning that will allow the incumbent to perform the job.
- (b) A thorough knowledge of the dynamics, culture and language of the target community. Must be a resident of the target community.
- (c) Facilitating skills to facilitate public participation in policy making and service delivery.
- (d) Project organisation skills.
- (e) Proof of voluntary work to the benefit of the community will be a strong recommendation.
- (f) Ability to network efficiently and effectively.
- (g) Basic computer literacy.
- (h) Knowledge of the way Government operates.

F. *CAREER PATHING*

Compliance with the requirement of higher posts.

G. *AMENDMENTS TO JOB DESCRIPTION*

The Head of Department or his/her nominee reserves the right to make changes and alterations to this job description, as he/she may deem reasonable, after due consultation with the post holder.

H. *PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT*

The performance agreement of the incumbent, which contains a workplan and specific target dates, should be read as an extension of this job description. The performance agreement may also contain an annexure outlining any standard operating procedures that the incumbent should adhere to during the execution of his/her key performance areas.

ANEXURE B: CLARIFYING ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Community Development Workers Programme forms part of the Department of Public Service and Administration establishment under the leadership of the Director –General. The Programme is operating at the Chief Directorate level within the SDI Branch, which is led by a deputy director general. The Department of Provincial and Local Government is a co-partner in the implementation of the programme.

The Unit in the department of Provincial and Local Government is part of the department's establishment and is located within the public participation branch. The head of the participation branch is a deputy director general and the community development workers unit is managed by a chief director.

The roles outlined below are based on experience and also include what is supposed to be or understood to be the roles of the various stakeholders. At the national levels, the overlaps and similarities are evident in the outlines provided below.

DPSA's Responsibilities

- Commissioning research and evaluation of the Community Development Workers.
- Liaison with National Treasury and other departments regarding funding for the Programme
- Promoting inter-sectoral collaboration.
- Formulating guidelines, creating an enabling legislation and developing of strategies for CDWs.
- Preparing model job descriptions, application procedures and performance standards.
- Developing unit standards, curricula and certification processes in terms of the South African Qualification Authority (SAQA) in collaboration with the appropriate Sector Education Training Authorities (SETAs) and SAMDI/PALAMA.
- Setting up a rigorous reporting and monitoring system.
- Strengthening the periphery through capacity building in cooperation with other sectors.
- Developing generic printed materials to support information and training.
- Facilitating communication between the different spheres of government and other role players.
- Organizing sponsors for additional resources required on issues relating to development and other activities

DPLG's (CoGTA) Responsibilities

- Liaison with the national and local spheres of government.
- Employing requisite numbers of the CDWS, through provincial departments
- Liaison with other provincial government departments.
- Promoting inter-sectoral collaboration at district and local level.
- Establishing training capacity in concert with educational service providers.
- Commissioning training for CDWs – through LG-SETA.
- Building capacity among personnel at all levels where CDWs are deployed.
- Providing publicity for the programme.
- Liaison with media.
- Allocation of funding to municipalities and monitoring disbursements for the successful implementation of the programme.
- Performance monitoring.
- Adaptation of materials for provincial languages and cultural differences.
- Providing logistics support to municipalities.
- Organizing learning seminars for community based practitioners.
- Administration of procedures.

CDW Chief Director (or Project Manager's) responsibilities include_the following:

- Ensure that all responsibilities of the department of Public Service and Administration as included above are implemented and in addition, deal with the following;
- Manage and convene National Task Team meetings
- Stakeholders engagement
- Oversee the implementation of the communication strategy
- Management of the unit
- Provide strategic leadership to the program and its implementation
- Ensure the implementation of the master plan and that each province develops a master plan with provincial thrust.
- Mobilize resources for the programme

Responsibilities for Director responsible for research, monitoring_and evaluation:

- Review and evaluation of impact of the program and strengthening the program
- Putting in place monitoring and evaluation of the program
- Monitoring and evaluation of the program
- Analyzing data based on reports from provinces

- Developing case studies and compiling Grassroots Booklet
- Writing articles, opinion papers and other documents on the trends and work of the CDW
- Organize roundtables and other platform for debating issues of interest and developing documents
- Research and other material with stakeholders
- Regular reports on activities of CDWs for circulation to other stakeholders
- In collaboration with other senior managers, draft speeches
- Documentation of best practice
- Analysis and Implementation of Conference and other outcomes and resolution
- In collaboration with other senior managers, draft speeches
- Documentation of best practice
- Responsible for information for website update

Responsibilities for the Director of operations;

- Facilitation of training and further capacity development and improvement of curriculum of the community development workers
- Review of the CDW Handbook
- Development of operational strategy for the CDW programme
- Collation and production of progress reports on work of Community Development Workers in provinces
- Development of guideline document for Community Development Workers
- Development of data system
- Development and a maintenance of data base and statistics
- Developing case studies and compiling Grassroots Booklet
- Management of budget

Responsibilities for the Field workers;

- Coordinating programme implementation in groups of provinces
- Ensuring collaboration with provinces by maintaining linkages between province (Provincial Coordinators) and the national office(s) and with CDWs
- Maintain regular (daily/weekly) contact with CDWs in provinces and provide direction and assistance
- Ensure that reports are received from provinces regularly and conduct basis analysis before submitting to the Research and M&E Unit
- Responsible for convening public events and meetings
- Provide support to research

Administration support

- Provide administration, secretariat and other support to the unit, and among others:
- Taking minutes and record of each meeting/activity
- Travel and other lodging arrangements
- Stationary
- Meeting and other activities arrangements
- Filing and managing information and records
- Provide support to the individual staff members
- Providing assistance to the senior managers within the unit
- Coordinate activities of the unit

Responsibilities of Provincial Coordinators

- Coordinate programme at the provincial level, including recruitment and deployments of CDWs
- Secure funds for the programme operations
- Liaise with all provincial stakeholders to ensure the effective implementation of the programme
- Prepare provincial reports and maintain databases of projects/activities supported by CDWs
- Maintain accurate statistics of the CDWs in the province
- Monitor the performance of the CDWs
- Conduct field visits to communities where CDWs are based
- Participate in the NTT
- Contribute towards the development of various publications
- Develop best practice

LG-Seta

The LG Seta is the arm of government that is contributing funds towards the training of community development workers through the learnership programme for community development workers. The learnership allows those who have been trained to become qualified community development workers and this is in line with the Skills Development Act of 1998 which encourages learning by doing. LGSeta is thus responsible for payment of both tuition fees and monthly stipend as determined during the learnership period. In addition, the LG Seta registers those recruited and receiving training as well as monitoring the learnership programme offered by selected service providers. LG Seta is also responsible for the revision and standards of the curriculum. Furthermore LG seta provides mentors and coordinates appointment of service providers and the services they provide.

CDWP KEY STAKEHOLDERS

The key stakeholders of the programme are government departments and institutions, especially the departments of Social Development, Education, Trade and Industry, Minerals and Energy, Health, Home Affairs, DPLG (CoGTA), GCIS, SALGA, Samdi (Palama) and LG-Seta.

In addition, the programme works closely with academic institutions that are responsible for training of community development workers. Other stakeholders include international communities such as GTZ and local funders including Absa, Nestle and Transnet.