

SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORUM (SFF)- WORKING GROUP

SUBJECT:	Split Site Factor (SSF)
-----------------	-------------------------

AUTHOR:	Ian Hamilton (Manager Schools, High Needs and Early Years Budgets) and Ashley Martin (Accountant Schools, High Needs and Early Years Budgets)
DATE:	6 November 2018

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

The purpose of this paper is for the SFF working group to:

- 1) Recommend criteria that defines a split site
- 2) Recommend criteria that defines what are additional unavoidable costs incurred due to a school being on more than one site

These recommendations will then be presented to the SFF for ratification.

FOR:	Members of the working group to make recommendations.
-------------	---

Structure of the Paper

1. Introduction
2. Education Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) Split Site Funding Criteria
3. Split Site Factor Definition
4. Defining What is an Additional Unavoidable Cost
5. Funding Mechanism
6. Final Recommendations

1. Introduction

1.1 To date two papers have been taken to the SFF on the introduction of a Split Site Factor (SSF) into Kent's Local Funding Formula (LFF), to access these papers click on the following links:

- [Item 8 Split Site Factor – SFF meeting 29 June 2018](#)
- [Item 3 Split Site Factor – SFF meeting 28 September 2018](#)

1.2 In order to introduce a SSF into the LFF, the Local Authority (LA) has to consult with schools and the SFF. Final decision on its inclusion rests with the Cabinet Member for Education.

1.3 At the meeting on the 29 June members of the SFF unanimously agreed that a SSF should be introduced into Kent's LFF and that further work should be carried out

to determine objective criteria for the definition of a split site, and for how much is paid.

1.4 The main reason for introducing a SSF is the acknowledgement that schools with a split site incur additional unavoidable costs. In addition to this another influencing factor is to maximise the amount of funding Kent schools receive through the National Funding Formula (NFF). Based on the evolution of the NFF, split site funding will be allocated to LAs in addition to the funding allocated through the pupil led factors of the NFF. This means that the initial cost would be incurred by Kent but overtime funding for split sites would be funded separately in addition to the pupil led element of the NFF.

1.5 During the period August to early October a number of schools that could potentially meet a split site funding criteria were visited with the intention of collecting data in order to define a SSF for Kent. At the SFF meeting on the 28 September an update was provided to the SFF on the progress to date and a request was made to set up a working group that would review the findings from the school visits and make a recommendation on the composition of the SSF to the SFF at its meeting on the 30 November. The purpose of this paper is to help the working group formulate a recommendation at its meeting on the 6th November.

1.6 The layout of this paper has been organised in such a way that it provides members of the working group with a structure that will help them to make recommendations and also will be used as the format of the meeting on the 6 November, therefore parts of this paper will be raising questions (highlighted in red) that will be answered on the 6 November.

1.7 There are two points that members of the working group should be mindful of:

- 1) Any recommendation will need to take into consideration overall affordability determined by the SFF at the meeting on the 30 November.
- 2) Due to the size of Kent and the academisation of a significant number of LA schools there is not a premises database that can be integrated to view the sites of academies in the LA. The risk is that based on the defined split site criteria it is not possible to determine 100% how many eligible schools there are and therefore what is the overall cost.

2. ESFA Split Site funding criteria

2.1 In summary the SSF is an optional factor in the LFF. The purpose of this factor is to support schools that have unavoidable extra costs because the school buildings are on separate sites, allocations must be based on objective criteria for the definition of a split site, and for how much is paid. Appendix 1 provides more detail on the criteria LAs should use when setting the factor.

3. Split Site Factor Definition

3.1 Appendix 2 details the schools visited that informs the basis of this paper and characteristics to determine the definition of the SSF.

Proposed Split Site Definition

3.2 The SFF is funded from the Dedicated Schools Grant Schools Block which funds the education for pupils in Year groups R to 11. A split site where the majority of education delivered on it is for post 16 education, will not be eligible to receive split site funding.

In order to receive split site funding the following criteria must be met in full:

1. The two or more sites must belong to a single school that by definition has one DfE number.
2. The two or more stand alone sites are not physically connected or directly accessed from another part of the school.
3. Each site has its own reception that is consistent in appearance with a reception for a one site school.
4. Over 18 % of the school's curriculum for pupils in the age range R to 11 are taught on the site.

Working Groups Recommendation (WGR) 1 – What are the views and recommendation of the working group in respect of proposed criteria for the Kent's SSF?

4. Defining What is an Unavoidable Additional Cost

4.1 The information in this section has been collated from the 8 schools visited (appendix 2) and is based on the schools view of what is an additional unavoidable cost incurred as a result of being located on more than one site. In the early stages of visiting the different schools it became clear that unavoidable costs should be grouped under three headings; Staffing, Travel and Non-staffing. Later in this section the views of the working group will be requested to determine what elements of expenditure should be included/ classified as additional unavoidable expenditure.

Points to Consider When Making a Recommendation

4.2 We are aiming to implement a SSF that recognises material costs that are broadly and consistently incurred by the majority of schools that meet the SSF criteria, not a methodology that is an individual calculation for each school.

4.3 The aim is to identify additional unavoidable costs that are mandatory and not discretionary. This is a difficult task when we are dealing with schools that have different structures, different funding levels and different challenges.

4.4 When considering what the additional unavoidable costs incurred are due to being on more than one school site we asked schools to visualise all of their pupils

on a single site and then identify what different resources would be needed for the same number of pupils on more than one site.

4.5 If it could be simplified, in most cases our findings are that the unavoidable cost is where there needs to be a site specific presence. To explain this further it is best to use an example. Example- a primary school on one site with 420 pupils (14 classes) and another primary school that has 420 pupils split across two sites with 7 classes on each site. In both cases each school would need to employ 14 classroom teachers. However there would need to be 2 receptions one on each site so an additional receptionist would need to be employed.

4.6 Something to acknowledge is that where the collective pupil capacity of two sites is the same as the capacity of a school on a single site, the school on two sites will have a greater premises area, this is due to duplication of certain parts of the building, for example two receptions instead of one.

Staffing

4.7 Reception

Narrative

As in common with other areas of staffing we found from the information collected that the receptionist duties were different in a number of schools.

The majority of schools reported that the incremental increase in staffing was one additional receptionist per additional site. Two schools reported more than one additional receptionist, however the perception was where this was the case additional duties were being carried out above the generic duties of a receptionist.

The findings were broadly consistent for both primary schools and secondary schools.

WGR 2

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.8 Caretaking

Narrative

The main challenge faced in determining if an additional unavoidable cost exists for caretaking was that the duties were not generic across all of the schools. There was overlap in duties between, site managers, head cleaners and maintenance staff.

The majority of schools reported that the incremental increase in staffing was one additional caretaker per additional site. 2 secondary schools reported different scenarios.

Secondary school 1 - reported 3 additional caretakers, this was due to the school opening at 06:00 hrs and closing at 20:00 hrs. Also during this period 10:00hrs to 14:00 hrs two caretakers were on site compared to one for the remaining period of the day.

Secondary school 2 –reported that they would need 4 caretakers on one site, 1 for the period 06:00 to 14:00, 2 for the period 08:00 to 16:00 and 1 for the period 14:00 to 21:00. For two sites they would need 3 caretakers on each site ,2 for the period 06:00 to 14:00, 2 for the period 08:00 to 16:00 and 2 for the period 14:00 to 21:00. In total the additional unavoidable resource is 2 additional caretakers.

The findings were broadly consistent for both primary schools and secondary schools.

WGR 3

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.9 Catering

Narrative

The majority of schools reported that the incremental increase in staffing was an additional head cook per site. There was one secondary school where this was not the case as they had a vending machine on one site that was regularly stocked up with hot food at a cost of around £7,000 per annum. Two schools reported that additional cooks were needed in addition to the head cook.

The findings were broadly consistent for both primary schools and secondary schools.

WGR 4

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.10 Primary - Senior Leaders Teaching

Narrative

Three of the schools visited had primary aged pupils. Two of the schools were primary schools and one was an all-through school. The all-through school reported that they had not incurred any additional senior leadership costs resulting from being on split sites.

Both of the primary schools reported additional senior leadership costs, the statements below are the rationales from each school supporting the additional cost

School 1

Both schools require visible leaders – headteacher and an assistant or deputy headteacher. This is unavoidable due the distance between the two schools and the complexities that the school has in terms of local context and pupil need. The additional cost for the second site is an additional HT and an additional assistant Head

School 2

The additional cost relating to Leadership amounts to £53,353. This is mainly due to the fact that the school requires the existence of an Executive Principal and 2 Heads of School due to the split site consisting of an Infant site and a Junior site. If this is compared, to a non split site primary school, you would have the existence of a Principal and Deputy and would not be required to split this to 2 Heads of school.

WGR 5

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

4.11 Secondary - Senior Leaders Teaching

Narrative

Six of the schools visited had secondary aged pupils. 5 were secondary schools and one was an all-through school. The all-through school reported that they had not incurred any additional senior leadership costs resulting from being on split sites. Of the remaining 5 secondary schools, 2 reported that they did not incur any additional senior leadership as a result of having more than one site. The three remaining schools reported additional senior leadership costs resulting from the additional site as £166,500, £48,616 and £60,000 respectively.

WGR 6

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.12 Teaching Staff and Teaching Assistants

Narrative

With the exception of one school reporting an additional TLR point for a teacher, the remaining schools reported that they did not incur any additional costs due to being located on two sites.

WGR 7

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.13 SENCO

Narrative

6 out of the 8 schools reported that there were no additional costs incurred due to the additional site. One secondary school reported that they had incurred an additional cost for a TLR of £8,150 and one primary school reported that there was an additional requirement of 0.5FTE due to contextual issues of the two sites.

WGR 8

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.14 Family Liaison Officer (FLO), Wellbeing Manager and Pastoral Support Officers (PSO)

Narrative

Both of the primary schools reported an additional cost incurred due to being on two sites for a FLO/Wellbeing manager. The underlying rational for the additional cost is that there needs to be a fulltime presence during the school day at each site. Only one Secondary school reported an additional cost for PSOs and they reported an additional three members of staff at a collective annual cost of £70,698.

WGR 9

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.15 Business Manager

Narrative

No additional costs were reported by any of the schools.

WGR 10

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.16 Premises Site Manager

Narrative

No additional costs were reported by any of the schools.

WGR 11

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.17 Cleaning

Head Cleaner

Narrative

The majority of schools reported that the incremental increase in staffing was one additional Head Cleaner per additional site.

WGR 12

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

Cleaners

Narrative

As explained in paragraph 4.6 it is generally acknowledged that when comparing two schools of the same pupil capacity, one located on two sites and the other on 1 site, the school on the two sites will have a greater premises floor area. However the additional floor area is difficult to quantify and in some cases is not material. In the main schools did not quantify any additional cleaner costs, with the exception of one secondary that reported they employed an additional 7 cleaners at a cost of £71.5k.

WGR 13

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.18 Mid Day Meal Supervision

Primary Schools

Narrative

The staff that come under this heading are Senior Mid Day Supervisor (SMDS) and Mid Day Supervisor (MDS). Both Primary Schools reported that an additional SMDS is needed as a result of being on two sites, however there is not an increase in the number of MDS required.

WGR 14

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

Secondary Schools

Narrative

In secondary schools there are a variety of different arrangements in respect of Mid Day Meal Supervision. Two secondary schools identified an additional cost associated with being on two sites. Secondary school 1 the amount of the additional cost was estimated at £2k and secondary school 2 the additional cost was £16.2k made up of 10 additional units.

WGR 15

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.19 Breakfast Club

Primary Schools

Narrative

Both primary schools reported there was an additional cost, but this has not been quantified. The additional cost primarily relates to catering staff salaries. When deliberating if this should be included in the SSF, consideration should be given as to whether this is something that is discretionary or mandatory for a school to deliver.

WGR 16

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

Secondary Schools

Narrative

None of the secondary schools reported any additional costs for breakfast clubs or the equivalent type club.

WGR 17

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.20 Librarians

Narrative

Two Secondary schools reported that they employed an additional Librarian as a result of their school being on more than one site. The additional costs were £14,481

and £21,184 respectively. Neither of the primary schools reported an additional cost for Librarians.

WGR 18

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.21 Technicians

Narrative

Three Secondary Schools reported that they had additional costs relating to Technicians as result of being on more than one site:

School 1 – IT Technician, Technicians – Science, Art and DT – (£16k +16k = £32k)

School 2 – Science Technician (£18.5k)

School 3 – Technician (0.5FTE) (£10k)

The school that reported the additional cost of the science technician was due to the configuration of the building where they had a number of small classrooms, instead of potentially larger classrooms if they were located on one site. The other two schools reported additional technicians as there needed to be presence on both sites. Primary schools did not report any additional cost for technicians.

WGR 19

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.22 Miscellaneous

Narrative

The following additional staffing costs were reported by secondary schools:

- Student services admin support (£11.4k)
- Reprographic Assistant (£4k) admin
- Staff (£29k)
- Behaviour manager (£59k)

All of the costs reported were unique to one school and the same type of cost was not reported by more than one school.

WGR 20

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

Travel

This section is broken down into two parts, travel between defined split sites and travel from a defined split site to a playing field

4.23 Travel Between Defined Split Sites

The table below details the travel costs reported by schools as result of travelling between split sites.

School	Category	Description	Amount
School 1 (Primary)	Pupil	Pupil trips - Due to being on more than one site it is likely that the pupil groups requiring transport will be smaller, therefore more journeys required than a one site school.	Cost not quantified
School 2 (Secondary)	Staff	CPD, Staff Meetings held on one site Teaching Hours Lost - KS3 Site and KS4 site - Need for Teachers to teach across whole curriculum 233 hours X £33.91	£7,901
School 2 (Secondary)	Resources Transfer	Mini Bus Shuttle Daily shuttle for outgoing mail - file transfer - other items that need to be moved from one site to the other	£722
School 3 (Secondary)	Pupil	Transport costs for Sixth Form students to travel to between sites One journey = £9.36 return journey = Estimated £1k per annum	£1,000
School 3 (Secondary)	Pupil	Additional minibus x 2 - inability to utilise vehicles across dual sites - extra-curricular clubs etc One off purchase = £30k plus running costs of, say, £3000 per annum	£3,000
School 3 (Secondary)	Resources Transfer	Site Van - to transport deliveries between sites plus running costs/insurance One off purchase = £10k plus running costs of, say, £1500 per annum	£1,500
School 4 (Secondary)	Pupil	During our visit to the school, they reported that pupils were minibused between sites as some of the curriculum subjects were only on one site. School was going to provide estimate of costs	To date estimate not provided
School 4 (Secondary)	Staff	During our visit to the school, they reported that a small number of staff travelled between sites. This was due to the subject time table at each site not equating to an exact FTE. School was going to estimate of travel cost (mileage paid to teachers)	To date estimate not provided

WGR 21

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

4.24 Split Site to a Playing Field

One secondary school had a detached playing field that is just over 1 mile from its sites. Currently pupils are not being transported to the site as the cost of transport is prohibitive and in order to remain within budget the school elected to make savings by not using the playing field. To reinstate the use of the field for the pupils in the school the estimated travel cost would be £37,500 per year (around £200 per day). If members of the working group take the view that this expenditure should be included in the SSF, further consideration would need to be given to a suitable criterion. This is more akin to a detached field factor, which is theory could be a subfactor of the SSF.

WGR 22

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

Non - Salary Expenditure

4.25 Appendix 3 is summary of the information reported by the 8 schools visited. Using the summary at appendix 3, the working group will work its way through each item listed and take a view on whether:

- 1) It should be included as an unavoidable additional cost?
- 2) If it should be included as an unavoidable additional cost, what is the value?

To determine whether it should be included and at what value the following factors will need to be considered:

- 1) How material is the cost?
- 2) Does it apply to the majority of schools?

WGR 23

What is the working groups recommendation for primary schools?

What is the working groups recommendation for secondary schools?

5. Funding Mechanism

5.1 The ESFA guidance states the funding for split sites must be a clear formula, examples provided are:

- A lump sum payment
- A per pupil payment
- A rate per square metre of the additional site

Values for primary and secondary schools may be different. There may be one rate of payment for the first additional site, and a separate rate for each additional site. Payment rates may be stepped, for example as the distance between sites increases.

5.2 When reviewing the three methods of payments above, consideration should be given to whether the additional unavoidable costs are variable due to the number of pupils or fixed costs that are not related to the number of pupils.

The table below is purely an illustration to demonstrate how the costs could be built up to determine the level of a Split Site Factor.

Example of How value of Split Site could be calculated				
Type	Primary		Secondary	
Staffing				
Reception	12,000		12,000	
Caretaking	15,000		15,000	
Catering	10,000		10,000	
Total Staffing		37,000		37,000
Total Travel		1,000		1,000
Total Non -staffing		10,000		15,000
Total		48,000		53,000

6. Final Recommendations

6.1 Members of the working group are requested to give their final recommendations on the following elements of the SSF:

- a) The split site definition for a primary school (see section 3)
- b) The split site definition for a secondary school (see section 3)
- c) The split site definition for an all-through school (see section 3)

d) What elements of expenditure and their respective values (section 4) should be included for primary schools under the following headings:

- Staffing
- Travel
- Non- staffing

e) What elements of expenditure and their respective values (section 4) should be included for secondary schools under the following headings:

- Staffing
- Travel
- Non- staffing

f) What elements of expenditure and their respective values (section 4) should be included for all-through schools under the following headings:

- Staffing
- Travel
- Non- staffing

h) What funding methodology (section 5) should be used to allocate the funding for primary schools

i) What funding methodology (section 5) should be used to allocate the funding for primary schools

j) What funding methodology (section 5) should be used to allocate the funding for primary schools