

# Districtwide Fundraising in SMMUSD

Board Presentation  
November 29, 2011

## Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

### **Mission Statement**

◦Extraordinary achievement for all while simultaneously closing the achievement gap.

### **Vision Statement**

◦As a community of learners, the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District works together in a nurturing environment to help students be visionary, versatile thinkers; resourceful, life-long learners; effective, multilingual communicators and global citizens. We are a rich, culturally diverse community that values the contributions of all its members and strives to promote social justice. We exist to assist all students in their pursuit of academic achievement, strength of character, and personal growth, and to support them in their exploration of the intellectual, artistic, technological, physical and social expression.

## Vision for SMMUSD students

- o Strategic Plan 2011-2016: Promote Excellence and Equity
- o A premium program for all students in our district, which includes excellent academic instruction, intervention as needed, extension, enrichment, the arts, rigor—all aspects associated with a rich educational environment
- o To know that all students in our district have access to equity in programs and educational experiences, regardless of which school they attend

## Districtwide Fundraising

- o Districts have moved to centralized fundraising because of the issue of “haves” and “have nots”
- o Clearly a widespread issue—internet searches find articles about centralized fundraising in school districts from Toronto to Santa Monica-Malibu
- o The weekend of October 9, 2011, there were articles about this issue in the Sacramento Bee, San Francisco Examiner, and the Santa Monica Daily Press
- o LA Times editorial on November 27, 2011

## Current Status of Fundraising in SMMUSD

- o Santa Monica-Malibu Education Foundation
  - o \$400,000-\$500,000 annually
- o S.O.S. Campaign (total contributions)
  - o \$1,580,361.44
- o PTAs (total raised in 2009-10)
  - o \$3,932,739
  - o Elementary high: \$2,136.59 / student
  - o Elementary low: \$ 96.56 / student
- o Booster Clubs

## Instructional Personnel Expenditures\*

School	Commitment for Instructional Salaries	Enrollment	\$ per Enrollment
Cabrillo	\$115,000	244	\$471
Edison	\$47,778	457	\$105
Franklin	\$186,185	751	\$248
Grant	\$154,900	610	\$254
McKinley	\$29,000	443	\$65
Muir	\$54,000	290	\$186
Pt. Dume	\$279,400	255	\$1,096
Rogers	\$17,500	491	\$36
Roosevelt	\$224,200	775	\$289
Webster	\$248,500	340	\$731
SMASH	\$98,000	150	\$653

\* Estimates based on 2011-12 current commitment forms

## Comparing Instructional Personnel Expenditures\* between Two Schools

### Highest elem. school expenditure per student

- o \$1,100 / student
- o Instructional aides (\$170,000)
- o Reading teacher (\$12,000)
- o Choral music (\$4,000)
- o Marine science (\$27,000)
- o Reading, primary grades (\$15,000)
- o Reading, upper grades (\$13,000)
- o Art (\$16,000)
- o Reading Recovery (\$22,000)

### Second-to-lowest elem. school expenditure per student

- o \$65 / student
- o K-2 music (\$4,000)
- o K-5 art (\$5,000)
- o Science teacher (hourly, up to \$11,000)
- o Instructional assistant (\$5,000)

\* Estimates based on 2011-12 current commitment forms

## Categorical Funding

### o Goal:

- o To **supplement general funds** so that underperforming students have the **ability to reach the academic level** of their not-at-risk peers

### o Targeted & specific

- o Support students who are low-income, academically at-risk, &/or are English Learners

### o Monitored

- o Schools & the district are **held accountable** for appropriate use of these funds and their effect on student achievement

- o Schools that are funded with categorical funds are subjected to the federal categorical system

## Other Funds

- o Funds raised by PTA or central fundraising model can be used for **any purpose** deemed appropriate by the district and school site

## SMMUSD Council of PTAs Resolution of Priorities (2009)

- o Achievement & equity for **all**
- o Funding: “We feel that the continued reliance of the District on the PTA to provide these core educational services and programs has **negative impacts**, such as:
  - o **Inequity** in the delivery of services, programs and even class size for students across our district.
  - o PTAs needing to focus on fundraising to the **detriment of its core mission** to provide information, advocacy and support to children and families.”

## Where is Districtwide Fundraising Working?

## Ed Foundations Raising More Than \$1 Million Per Year

- o Beverly Hills
- o Carlsbad
- o La Cañada-Flintridge
- o Manhattan Beach
- o Moraga
- o Palo Alto
- o Pasadena
- o Peninsula (PV)
- o San Francisco

## Manhattan Beach: Before & After

- o Before districtwide fundraising:
  - o \$404,314
- o First year after implementation:
  - o \$1,963,497
- o Currently, they raise:
  - o **\$4.6 million**
  - o Funds 67 educators in 7 schools
  - o 84% of revenue comes from parents; 16% comes from non-parents

## Palo Alto Superintendent Staffing Policy Recommendation\*

- o “The current site-based fundraising process has resulted in an inequitable distribution of resources (primarily between elementary schools). **In order to ensure greater equity between schools, align District employment practices with the California Education Code and maintain fiscal integrity,** it is proposed that all schools use their site allocations, including General and Categorical funds, for salaries and employee benefits. Donations to individual sites and/or school-based fundraising contributions may not be used for personnel costs during the school day.”

\* April 30, 2002

## Palo Alto: Before & After

- o Before districtwide fundraising:
  - o \$100,000 (Ed Found)
- o First year after implementing centralized fundraising:
  - o \$1.6 million (All Schools Fund – 2002)
- o Currently, PiE raises:
  - o **\$3.4 million**
  - o 73% of revenue comes from parents; 27% of revenue comes from non-parents (foundations, community/corporations)

Note: Ed Foundation established in 1988; All Schools Fund established in 2002; combined to form PiE in 2005

## Conclusions

## Analysis

- o Allowing individual PTAs to raise and expend money to hire staff in SMMUSD is a practice **fraught with difficulties**, and has created:
  - o **Great inequities** across the district during the school day; allows schools to add personnel who may or may not be a part of best practices and/or supportive of the initiatives of the district
  - o A climate in which the instruction and instructional experiences students receive and the conditions in which teachers work are **determined by the amount of money individual PTAs can raise**, rather than a common expectation as a district

## Benefits of Districtwide Fundraising

- o **Consolidates fundraising** at the district level and moves to a more community-based fundraising effort
- o Provides a **consistent revenue stream** for the district in the future
- o **Builds synergy** among fundraising efforts and targets larger corporate donors

## Benefits of Districtwide Fundraising (cont.)

- o Provides more **equity** among the schools
  - o Important, since most children in the district will pool into the same three middle schools, then into the same high schools
- o Allows for **flexibility** for sites to maintain unique programs
- o Helps **relieve the site PTAs** from having to fundraise for salaries
  - o PTA can return to fundraising for its core activities

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o Update Board Policy 3290 – Acceptance of Gifts
  - o November 29, 2011

## Policy vs. Administrative Regulation

- o Board Policy (BP)
  - o States a principal or goal the Board wants to achieve. May establish basic controls and assign general responsibility.
- o Administrative Regulation (AR)
  - o Provides details about what to do, what not to do, and who does it.

## Policy vs. Administrative Regulation

- o To determine whether something is truly a Board Policy (as opposed to an AR or department procedure), ask: Does it...
  - o Affect governance or overall direction for the district?
  - o Establish a governing principle that mandates or constrains actions?
  - o Have district-wide application?
  - o Change infrequently and set a course for the foreseeable future?
  - o Ensure compliance or help enhance the district's mission?
- o If the answer to any of the above is "no," then an administrative regulation or departmental procedure may be more appropriate.

## Recommended Changes to BP 3290

### o Phasing In

o “This model will be implemented in phases.”

### o Corporate Donations

o “The policy will be implemented in all elementary schools beginning July 1, 2013. However, effective July 1, 2012, all corporate gifts to District elementary schools in an amount over \$2,500 (and smaller gifts that cumulatively total \$2,500 or more in a year) shall be directed through the Education Foundation; corporate gifts already budgeted for, and committed to projects prior to July 1, 2013, shall be exempt from this requirement.”

## Recommended Changes to BP 3290

### o A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

o “The Board will approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District and the Santa Monica-Malibu Education Foundation formalizing this centralized fundraising relationship and clearly specifying the role of each entity. The Memorandum shall address, at a minimum: the role and governance structure of the Education Foundation as it relates to serving as the central fundraising entity for the school District; transparency regarding reporting revenues and expenditures; accountability for meeting fundraising goals; the process and frequency of District review regarding the effectiveness of the Education Foundation and actions that the Board may take based on that review; and the frequency with which the Memorandum will be renewed between the District and the Education Foundation.”

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o Form the **Superintendent's Advisory Group**
  - o Constituted by the first week of January 2012
  - o Composition of group:
    - o Superintendent
    - o PTA Council President and 1 Council Representative
    - o 1 representative from each PTA (MHS = 1 rep for MS, 1 for HS) – the president of the site PTA or his/her designee
    - o Representative from DELAC
    - o Representative from the African-American Parent Student Staff Support Group
    - o Representative from the Financial Oversight Committee
    - o The Director of the Education Foundation and 2 designees
    - o 2 SMMCTA representatives
    - o 2 SEIU representatives
    - o 5 school administrators, representing pathways and elementary, middle, and high schools
    - o Senior Cabinet

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o **Initial Meeting** of Superintendent's Advisory Group
  - o By the end of January 2012
    - o Establish norms and create meeting schedule
    - o Calendar of meetings will be published so community members may attend

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o Determine the **“Premium Program”**
  - o Examine existing programs at all schools
  - o Identify common themes
  - o What do we want all students to have access to?
  - o ELA, math, science, visual and performing arts
  - o Support, extension
  - o Best practices
  - o Are we being creative in using our resources? What are we doing well? What could we do better?
  - o What does it cost to offer these programs?

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o **Meet with districts** that have successfully moved to centralized fundraising
  - o Offer panel discussions with representatives from these districts
  - o Lessons learned
  - o What worked?

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o **Develop subcommittees to research and report** to the Superintendent and Advisory Group on such topics as:
  - o PTA/Education Foundation collaboration
  - o MOU and fundraising models
  - o Corporate gift issues (grants, in-kind)
  - o Elementary school issues
  - o Secondary school issues

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o **Conduct Pathway Meetings**
  - o Share subcommittee findings and get feedback
- o **Ongoing Communication**
  - o Principals
  - o PTAs
  - o Reports to the Board
  - o Updates to the public/media
  - o Website information

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o Superintendent presents Advisory Group's suggestions/considerations for implementation to the Board of Education by **Spring 2012**
- o Superintendent recommends implementation plan and timeline to the Board of Education by **June 7, 2012**
- o Superintendent recommends update to Acceptance of Gifts administrative regulation by **June 7, 2012**

## Next Steps / Timeline

- o Memorandum of Understanding
  - o Developed and signed by SMMUSD and SMM Education Foundation by July 1, 2012
- o The MOU will:
  - o **Formalize centralized fundraising relationship** between SMMUSD and SMMEF
  - o **Specify the role** of each entity
  - o Establish **governance structure** of SMMEF as it relates to serving as central fundraising entity for SMMUSD
  - o Determine **mechanisms for transparency** regarding reporting revenues and expenditures
  - o Require **accountability** for meeting fundraising goals
  - o Establish process and frequency of SMMUSD **review regarding effectiveness** of SMMEF and actions the Board may take based on that review
  - o Determine frequency with which MOU will be **renewed** between the SMMUSD and SMMEF

“Whatever course you decide upon,  
there is always someone to tell you that you  
are wrong.

There are always difficulties arising  
which tempt you to believe that your critics  
are right.

To map out a course of action and follow it  
to an end requires **courage.**”

– *Ralph Waldo Emerson*

*(American Poet, Lecturer, and Essayist, 1803-1882)*

“Honest disagreement is  
often a good sign of  
**progress.**”

– *Mohandas K. Gandhi*