

MEC DIALE-TLABELA: Yes, Chair. I just want to propose, maybe, I will take the feedback from Member Nt'sekhhe and ask MEC Maile maybe through the Portfolio Committee of Finance as well as Social Development to clarify Member Nt'sekhhe further on what she just raised, but this is the response I got. Perhaps it is a matter of assisting her with what she needs to know in that report or whatever that is there. Thank you.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you very much, MEC. Is that- [interjection] What is the point of order? On what Rule?

Ms MASILELA: Thank you, Presiding Officer. Honestly, there must be consistency and precedence that we are setting in this House. Last time in the House, we agreed [that] if there are questions, all MECs must be here. If they are not here, they must also answer here. Right now, you are taking us back to questions that have passed. We are here and responsible to hold people accountable, but then how do we do that? Even yourself, you are failing to adhere to what we have agreed upon? It cannot be. It is unprincipled what you are doing, Speaker, or Acting Speaker. I said it earlier on. A person who goes missing for 30 minutes, and you go back to the same question to be answered? It cannot be. Please.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): It is noted. Noted, Member. Let us now move on to the next question to be posed by Member Waters to the Member of the Executive Council for Education.

Mr WATERS: Thank you, Chair. [Question 4.ED043]

“With regard to security guards, could the MEC of Education please indicate...”

No, sorry, it is the second question. Sorry, my apologies. I was getting ahead of myself. [Question 4.ED042]

“With regard to the Gauteng Department of Education, could the MEC please indicate:

(i) whether the department has conducted a cost analysis on the financial impact of cancelling school security contracts, including:

(a) the estimated cost of vandalism and theft resulting from the absence of security; and

(b) whether this analysis informed the department's decision to cancel the contracts?"

Thank you very much, Chair.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you, Member Waters. MEC Chiloane, please respond to the question. [Silence] MEC Chiloane, please respond.

MEC CHILOANE: Yes, I am here. I struggled to unmute. Sorry about that. With regard to the first question, the department has not conducted a cost analysis on the financial impact of cancelling school security contracts and the potential costs of vandalism, burglaries and related incidences that may occur during the absence of school security. With that said, the second question cannot be responded to, so that is why I would say, please refer to the one above. In regard to the third question, the cancellation of the security contract was based on the budget pressures. That is why we came to that particular decision. Thank you.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you, MEC. Member Waters, would you like to make a supplementary question or remark?

Mr WATERS: Yes, yes, Chair. It is quite astonishing that the Department of Education cancels security at all schools, a huge investment by the taxpayer, right; it cost hundreds of millions to build schools and yet they do no analysis on whether or not- what the cost will be of vandalism and theft resulting from no security at night, holidays, weekend- over weekends. It is mind-boggling.

Just last week, Chair, a principal at a school in Thembisa was shot dead alongside an administrator, simply because there was no security at the school; so, while the

department has done no analysis of theft and vandalism, you cannot place a value on a human life, and this is a direct impact on the department cutting- taking shortcuts with the safety of the learners of our schools and the teachers teaching in those schools and it is an absolute disgrace.

Thank you, Chair.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you, Member Waters. MEC, would you like to respond to the remark?

MEC CHILOANE: Yes, Chair. Yes. Thanking you so much, Acting Chair, there. Number one, this security- school security was an intervention, an intervention which is non-funded, meaning that we saw a need, we saw a challenge that we had to address of which our schools were threatened, and we took that particular decision. In fact, each and every school that we intervened at, the intervention was supposed to be temporary, not more than three months; but some schools, we kept them longer because, obviously the situation was not stabilising, mainly because of the communities those schools found themselves at [in], for instance when there is gang violence. Even if you remove this security tomorrow, you know that the school will be affected because the gang violence will continue throughout the year, throughout- or for much longer period; so, I have to say this thing, it is because- we cancelled just because of budgetary constraints, challenges, because this intervention was, is unfunded. It is only now that we are discussing at CEM level on each funding, because it is a national crisis. It is a challenge across all provinces.

Schools are currently being targeted, so we are looking into that respect and hopefully that, obviously, going into the future budgets, there will be an allocation and when that is done, I can guarantee the Honourable Member here and Honourable Members in the legislature, that the security aspect will then have a much longer period of intervention; but more importantly, our strategy with this particular school intervention with the security was just to ensure that we really get the community to come onboard to also help and also other stakeholders that have

work with schools to support and [unintelligible] the security aspect of the schools. I must say, in some areas we succeeded, in some areas we did not succeed. We needed more time but because of budget we had to pull out.

Look, the incident of last week it is- it should not have happened, and I do not think that it is correct that Honourable Waters wants to politick with it. Our children are traumatised; teachers are traumatised in the school; the community is in shock, so, it is quite- It is not something that you politick with; it is an issue that we must really handle with the sensitivity and care that it deserves. The incident that happened last week with our principal and administrator that was shot in the school, it is was quite- it is a sad, sad thing, so I do not- I would not want to politick with it but safe to say that schools are targeted in some areas and, obviously, it requires all of us. Education, it being the kind of magnitude it is, it requires all of us to really get involved in getting it right, so, there are no shortcuts, Honourable Waters.

Yes, we did not do the- we have not done the analysis, the impact analysis of the removal of security but what we have done, when we pulled the security out, we brought in patrollers, we brought in the wardens, we brought in- we informed- we activated the Adopt-a-Cop Programme, and we also trained our safety committees in the SGBs. We did put those interventions, hopefully that they can stabilise, with us pulling, because not that this was a temporary intervention. It is supposed to be a temporary intervention in schools. I will stop there, Chair. Thank you so much.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you, MEC. Member Waters, can you please pose the next question- set of questions to the MEC for Education.

Mr WATERS: Yes. Thank you, Chair. [Question 4.ED043]

“With regard to security guards, could the MEC please indicate:

- (i) what would the estimated cost be to the department of appointing security guards and installing metal detectors at the 75 high-crime*

schools identified by his department; and

(ii) what were the estimated cost of providing security guards and metal detectors at all public schools in Gauteng?”

Thank you, Chair.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you very much, Member Waters. MEC Chiloane, please respond.

MEC CHILOANE: Judging by the question, I hope that Member Waters would speak to the Minister because I believe they are very close, Chair.

In response to the first one, the deployment of security guards in public schools, as guided by the security review which is yet to be conducted, the cost for all schools would be prohibitive. The department uses PSIRA rates per guard. The number of- the number of security guards deployed will depend on the risk level and the required PSIRA rating, therefore the formula would be PSIRA rates times the number of guards and the number of days in the month, plus the number of schools, which are 75 schools and, where necessary, a dog; so, monthly estimates would be around R20,000.00 times four guards, times eight, meaning four guards, four at night, four during the day and 75 schools a month. On average you are looking at around R13.8 million per month and then you are looking at around R165,600,000.00. This is the estimation, per year for the 75 schools. The estimated cost to install metal detectors in these 75 schools at high-risk areas, we were looking at around R225,000.00, which is calculated at a cost of around R1,500.00 for each metal detector and the allocation of two metal detectors per school.

With regard to the second question, the deployment of security guards in public schools, obviously, as I have said earlier, guided by the security review of which, I repeat, we have not conducted, the department uses PSIRA rates per guard and the rates are as follows. You are looking at about R20,000.00 for four guards at

night and four guards during the day, so, all in all, and if you calculate it to 2 240 schools, you are looking at around R44,800,000.00 and that translates to around R537,600,000.00. Like I said, the number of guards is always determined by the risk on the school; so that is what- the number will fluctuate in-between. For metal detectors, for 2240 public schools, we are sitting at around R6, 720, 000. 00 for- at R 1500 each for two metal detectors per schools. This is just a rough estimation on the numbers, and Chair, we have not done the calculation really for every school, but this is [these are] pre-emptive numbers. Thank you.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you, MEC, for the response. Member Waters, would you like to have a supplementary question or a remark?

Mr WATERS: Thank you, Chair. Chair, the MEC keeps reminding us that his department has not done the calculations, they do not know who has done this, but the fact of the matter is since he is now approaching other departments or the Department of Community Safety, I take it, for funding for this particular aspect of school safety, one would have thought that his department would have done a thorough analysis of what is needed at all the schools and starting with the 75 high-risk schools in the province. That is what I would have done. I mean, it is just logical to work from that angle.

Just on the patrollers that the MEC talked about in the previous question, the fact is they are not trained. There is also a legal aspect as to whether if they discover a gun or drugs at schools whether or not that is permissible in court. They only work school hours; they do not work after school. They do not work at night. They do not work on weekends; they certainly do not work on school holidays. It leaves the buildings vulnerable to vandalism and burglary. So, my appeal to the MEC and his department is that they have got to get this right or else our schools are going to be trashed and demolished like we have never seen before. Thank you very much, Chair.

Ms MOSAI (PRESIDING OFFICER): Thank you, Member Waters. MEC, would you like to respond to the remark?

MEC CHILOANE: Thanks, Acting Chair. Look, the issue of our patrollers, of course, they are not necessarily trained in some of the work that they do, but theirs is for visibility. They are not necessarily to be considered as what you call a security where it [they] guard because for them to do that, they need to be accredited with PSIRA, and they are not that. So, they just- it is support staff. We consider these patrollers [as] support staff for schools.

As to the work at night, in some schools, they do avail themselves at night and in some [other] schools they do not. It depends on the school, but they are- it differs. Some are available to assist at night because most of them are actually members of the community policing forums. That is where we source them to assist- to volunteer at our schools.

The issue of school security is a big issue- it is an issue, yes, Member Waters. What I can assure you is that it is something that is currently high on our agenda within the department. We are dealing with it but also finding other ways which will cost far less but get the results that we require. Amongst those is advocacy programmes around it. Amongst those is also to capacitate and support SGBs to really be able to mobilise the local community to work with them in terms of taking ownership of the schools, protecting that asset, [and] ensuring the community understands that the school is the asset of the community.

It is not Matome Chiloane's school or anyone's school, but it is a school that is intended to benefit the community and their learners, and it is future in that community. We are running those programmes and also the code of conduct in our schools because it is not necessarily that people who vandalise schools are people who come from outside, but also internally learners- some learners in some schools actually do vandalise school property [and], in some instances, even educators. It is all about really getting that system right, getting everybody on board, [and] getting all hands on deck to ensure that we protect our assets.