

**SCHOOLS' FUNDING FORUM (SFF) - WORKING GROUP**

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Split Site Factor (SSF)
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Ian Hamilton (Manager, Schools, High Needs and Early Years Budgets) and Ashley Martin (Accountant, Schools, High Needs and Early Years Budgets)
<b>DATE:</b>	6 November 2018
<b>SUMMARY OF REPORT:</b>	
<p>The purpose of this paper is for the SFF working group to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Recommend criteria that defines a split site</li> <li>2) Recommend criteria that defines the additional unavoidable costs incurred due to a school being on more than one site</li> </ol> <p>These recommendations will then be presented to the SFF for ratification</p>	
<b>FOR:</b>	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

David Whitehead (member of the working group) declared he had an interest in split site funding as he had been working with Eastchurch CEP School and had been part of the information collection process which underpinned the contents of this paper.

**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 6<sup>th</sup> 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 interrogated 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 additional unavoidable 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?**

After a lengthy constructive discussion, the working group came up with a revised definition:

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

### **4. Defining What is an Additional Unavoidable Cost**

4.1 The information in this section has been collated from the 8 schools visited (appendix 2) and is based on the school's 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 additional 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 additional 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?**

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

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

The working group formed a general view on SSF for secondary schools (including all-through schools) and recommended that a factor should not be introduced, the basis for this recommendation is as follows:

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

## 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

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 the job titles 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 a split 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 unavoidable costs associated with Premises Staff.

#### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

The working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

The working group's view was that schools have variety of arrangements for catering which makes it difficult to quantify a common additional unavoidable cost. The working group also felt that providing in-house catering could be viewed as an opportunity cost.

Based on the above, the working group recommended that the SSF should not include funding for catering.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

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, for certain leadership positions 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.

#### **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 group's recommendation for secondary schools?**

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

#### **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 group's recommendation for primary schools?**

The working group's view was that there was no additional unavoidable cost incurred in relation to this staffing heading.

**What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?**

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

#### **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 group's recommendation for primary schools?**

The view of the working group was that this was not a site-specific cost, but a cost associated with the specific need of the cohort of children and that the cost would exist at the same level on both a one site school and split site school.

**What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?**

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## **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 rationale 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?**

The view of the group was that this was not a site-specific cost, but a cost associated with the specific need of the cohort of children and that the cost would exist at the same level on both a one site school and split site school. Also, this was a discretionary appointment and not a mandatory appointment made by the school.

**What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?**

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## **4.15 Business Manager**

### **Narrative**

No additional costs were reported by any of the schools.

#### WGR 10

What is the working group's recommendation for primary schools?

The working group's view was that there was no additional unavoidable cost incurred in relation to this staffing heading.

What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

### 4.16 Premises/Site Manager

#### Narrative

No additional costs were reported by any of the schools.

#### WGR 11

What is the working group's recommendation for primary schools?

See narrative WGR 3 in 4.8 Caretaking.

What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

### 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

See narrative WGR 3 in 4.8 Caretaking.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in paragraph 4.7.

#### **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 a single 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

See narrative WGR 3 in 4.8 Caretaking.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## **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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

#### **Difference between the management position**

The view of the working group was that the additional unavoidable cost was the difference between the cost of a SMDS and a MDS; however, as this was not a material amount the working group did not recommend that funding for this cost should be included in the SSF.

## **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 group's recommendation for secondary schools?**

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## **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 group's recommendation for primary schools?**

The working group's view was that this was discretionary and not mandatory staffing and in addition to this there was the option to charge for the cost of the meal. On this basis the working group did not recommend the inclusion of this as additional item in a SSF.

## **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 group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously state, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

The working group's view was that there was no additional unavoidable cost incurred in relation to this staffing heading.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

The working group's view was that there was no additional unavoidable cost incurred in relation to this staffing heading.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

The working group's view was that there was no additional unavoidable cost incurred in relation to this staffing heading.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

## 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

It was acknowledged that one school had an additional cost, however, this was not quantified and did not apply to both primary schools.

The working group did not recommend the inclusion of an amount of funding for travel be included in the SSF.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

#### **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 in theory could be a subfactor of the SSF.

#### **WGR 22**

**What is the working group's recommendation for primary schools?**

The working group felt that a factor of this nature would be difficult to administer and if applied to primary schools it is not likely to be material.

The working group did not recommend the inclusion of an amount of funding for travel to a detached playing field be included in the SSF.

**What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?**

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed in 4.7.

#### **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 additional unavoidable cost?
- 2) If it should be included as an additional unavoidable 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 group's recommendation for primary schools?

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 photocopiers 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.

### What is the working group's recommendation for secondary schools?

As previously stated, the working group's view was that a split site factor for secondary schools should not be introduced for the reasons detailed 4.7.

## 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	
<b>Total</b>	<b>48,000</b>	<b>53,000</b>	

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 to the number of pupils in the school.

## 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)

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.

### b) The split site definition for a secondary school (see section 3)

The working grouping formed a general view on split site funding for secondary schools (including all-through schools) and recommended that a factor should not be introduced, the basis for this recommendation is as follows:

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

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

For recommendation see b) above.

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

- Staffing - Reception £8,000, Premises £5,000, Leadership £10,000 Total £23,000
- Travel - Nil
- Non-staffing - £10,000

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

N/A as the recommendation made by the working group was not to introduce a SSF for secondary schools, see response b) above.

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

N/A as the recommendation made by the working group not to introduce a SSF for all-through schools, see response b) above.

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

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 to the number of pupils in the school.

i) What funding methodology (section 5) should be used to allocate the funding for secondary schools? N/A – see response b) above.

j) What funding methodology (section 5) should be used to allocate the funding for all-through schools? N/A – see response b) above.