

SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORUM

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

AUTHOR:	Ian Hamilton (Manager, Schools, High Needs and Early Years)
----------------	---

DATE:	30 November 2018
--------------	------------------

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

The purpose of this paper is to seek SFF ratification of the SFF working group recommendations on whether a Split Site Factor (SSF) should be introduced into Kent Local Funding Formula (LFF) from April 2019

FOR:	Decision
-------------	----------

Introduction

1.1 At the SFF meetings on the 29 June and the 28 September papers on the introduction of a SSF into Kent's LFF were presented to the SFF, to access 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 The outcome of the second paper on 28 September was that the SFF agreed a recommendation to set up a working group with the remit of reviewing and recommending the composition of a SSF for the consideration of the SFF at its next meeting on 30 November.

1.3 The working group, made up of the following personnel, met on the 6 November to carry out the tasks detailed in 1.2

Name	Position	Group representing on the SFF
Ben Cooper	Headteacher (Swalecliffe Primary School)	Local Authority (LA) Primary Schools
Mike Powis	Director – Catholic Schools' Partnership	Academies
Richard Powell	Vice Principal Business and Projects – The	Academies

	Skidders Kent Academy	
Sue Birchall	Business Manager – The Malling School	LA Non-selective Schools
David Whitehead	CEO- The Potential In Everyone Academy Trust	Academies
Heather Cook	Business Manager- Maidstone Grammar School	LA Selective Schools

Process

2.1 Prior to meeting the on 6 November a paper on a SSF was circulated to members of the working group. To access the paper and appendices click on this link – [Working Group Paper 6 November SSF](#)

2.2 The flow of the paper and thus the format of the meeting was structured so that, at relevant points highlighted in the paper, members of the working group were requested to make recommendations.

2.3 Appendix 1 is the paper presented to the working group, the texts in red are the recommendations the working group were asked to consider and the texts in blue are the working group recommendations.

3. Summary of Working Group Recommendations

Primary Schools SSF

3.1 This section of the paper, paragraphs 3.2 to 3.7, details the working group recommendations that will define the objective definition of a split site and the funding element and amounts to be included in the SSF.

3.2 Appendix 1 – paragraph 3.2 Definition of a Split Site:

- 1) Must be a primary school (years R to 6) across two or more sites
- 2) The two or more sites must belong to a single school that has one DfE number
- 3) The two or more standalone sites cannot be physically connected nor accessed from another part of the school; they must, however, be separated by a highway and be a minimum of 0.2 miles apart
- 4) Over 30% of the school's curriculum must be taught on each individual site

3.3 Appendix 1 - paragraph 4.7 Reception

The view of the working group was that a full-time receptionist was not required as schools had flexibility around the duties of different members of staff and therefore part of the cover could be provided by existing staff where reception duties were not their main duty.

The working group recommended that the additional cost of a receptionist at 0.5 FTE, KR3, term time only, including on-costs should be funded. Value £8,000

3.4 Appendix 1 - paragraph 4.8 Premises Staff

The view of the working group was that the responsibilities under 4.8 Caretaking, 4.16 Premises/Site Manager and 4.17 Cleaning (head cleaning and cleaner) had overlap in the respect that the job title could include similar duties. For the purpose of SSF, these individual staffing headings have been collectively grouped as Premises Staff.

It was acknowledged that due to the size of a primary school there was not the flexibility to configure staffing in such a way that it negated the physical layout of the site and therefore an additional cost was incurred.

The working group came to the view that £5,000 would be a reasonable amount of funding to reflect the additional costs associated with Premises Staff.

3.5 Appendix 1 - paragraph 4.10 Senior Leaders Teaching

The view of the working group was that the number of leadership staff needed for an equivalent sized school would be the same irrespective of whether the school was located on one site or more than one site. However, it is recognised that the level of responsibility would increase due to responsibilities that would be specific to the individual site.

The working group estimated that the additional cost to remunerate a person for the additional responsibility was £10,000.

3.6 Appendix 1 - paragraph 4.25 Non-salary Expenditure

The working group agreed that there were additional unavoidable costs for the following items recorded on appendix 3, however they were not able to quantify an individual cost for each item:

- Compliance testing servicing kitchen equipment
- Broadband
- Refuse collection
- Maintenance of heating system
- Site security, including entrance barrier, burglar alarm and CCTV
- Maintenance grounds

- Maintenance of IT equipment
- Maintenance of photo copiers and printers.

The working group estimated that the collective overall additional cost was £10,000 and a sum of this value should be included in the SSF.

3.7 Appendix 1 - paragraph 5.2 Funding Mechanism

The working group's recommendation was that the lump sum should be used as the methodology to allocate funding through SSF. This was based on the additional funding identified for primary schools being a set amount and not relating the number of pupils in the school.

Secondary Schools and All-through Schools SSF

3.8 The working group applied a general policy when considering the different elements of a SSF for secondary schools and all-through schools. The outcome of this policy was not to recommend the introduction of SSF for secondary schools and all-through schools into Kent's LFF

3.9 Appendix 1 paragraph 4.7 – Rationale for not introducing a SSF for secondary schools and all-through schools

Due to their size, secondary schools have significant scope within their existing resources to adapt to their local environment and successfully realise economy of scale irrespective of split site costs.

Many secondary schools already have unique cost pressures, for example, premises maintenance costs will vary from school to school, but where this is the case, such costs must be managed within existing cash envelopes. To recognise one cost pressure for a small group of schools and not another would be inconsistent and unfair.

Some secondary schools have multiple sites within a site and experience some of the same challenges as a split site school, therefore only recognising this for split site schools would be unfair.

Due to size and flexibility within a secondary school budget it was felt that opportunity costs existed that could mitigate against unavoidable split site costs.

4. Recommendations

Members of the SFF are requested to ratify the following working group recommendations:

Primary Schools

- 1) The definition of a split site as per paragraph 3.2 - Yes or No?

- 2) The inclusion of an element of funding for a Reception at £8,000 per additional site, as per paragraph 3.3 - Yes or No?
- 3) The inclusion of an element of funding for Premises Staff at £5,000 per additional site, as per paragraph 3.4 - Yes or No?
- 4) The inclusion of an element of funding for Senior Leader Teaching costs at £10,000 per additional site, as per paragraph 3.5 - Yes or No?
- 5) The inclusion of an element of funding for Non-salary Expenditure at £10,000 per additional site, as per paragraph 3.6 - Yes or No?
- 6) If any of the recommendations 2 to 5 are agreed, then should the sum to be allocated through the SSF be allocated as lump sum as per paragraph 3.7 - Yes or No?

Secondary Schools and All-through schools

- 7) To not introduce a SSF for secondary schools and all-through schools as per paragraph 3.9 - Yes or No?