



Kentridge High School Booster Club
1/30/14 KRHSBC Fundraising/Allocation Meeting Minutes by Kim Kaiser, VP
KRHS B10, 7 PM

Attendees Cameron Thompson, Kim Kaiser, Al Waltner, Lori Fleming, Todd Smith

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Executive Board - 2013 – 2014
 - Secretary Position is currently OPEN
- President's Comments (Cameron)
- New Business – Fundraising
 - Vice President's 1 Green Planet recap and overview of the Board's decision regarding an annual event
 - Pre-event, Day of event and post event tasks to ensure success
 - Budget, donations received, event's future potential
 - Vice President and Treasurer's Allocation models
 - Lori - 50/50 weighted model
 - Kim/Al – Participation weighted model
 - Discussion and possible decision vote - (if one is a clear favorite)
 - Overview of T-Birds Family Sports night out – March 9th Cameron Thompson/Todd Smith
 - Todd – Brief overview of KRHSBC Pilot program
 - Ticket cost and discount/rebate levels to Boosters
 - Other fundraising options: Battle of the Bands, Auction, Golf Tourney w/ Auction, Shred-IT Day, House Raffle, Auto Dealers Test Drive Day, Sports/Club Field Day and BBQ
- Next Scheduled Meetings
 - Board meeting – February (TBD), 2014 – 6:30 PM - Fairwood - Wild Garlic – Albertson's Parking lot
 - Spring's General Meeting - March 5th, 2014 – KRHS - Room B-10 - 6 PM
- Around the Room
- Adjourn



Kentridge High School Booster Club
1/30/14 KRHSBC Fundraising/Allocation Meeting Minutes by Kim Kaiser, VP

Attendees Cameron Thompson, Kim Kaiser, Al Waltner, Lori Fleming, Todd Smith

Notes

- Allocation Discussion
 - Two different fund distribution approaches were discussed – allocation versus request driven. The Board decided they did not want to listen to proposals and be perceived as choosing favorites to grant requests.
 - Lori Fleming proposed a 50-50 allocation model in which 50% of funds goes to all booster member groups and 50% is distributed based on the number of parents helping.
 - If allocation is based on participation, does 1 parent helping count the same as 10 parents? If a parent represents multiple sports, which one benefits by the participation?
 - If allocation in part is distributed to all booster member groups, should the amount be weighted by the number of athletes?
 - Many variations on how to allocate funds are possible, so the Board decided to gather feedback before making a decision about the allocation method.
- T-bird Ticket Sale Discussion
 - Lori suggested that T-bird tickets could be sold at KR basketball games.

Corrections and additions are always welcome.

Kim Kaiser, KRHSBC Vice President

kjk20875@comcast.net 253-630-9296

1 Green Planet Recap

- **Profit > \$2300**
- **Potential to increase profit:**
 - **Better signage at event to advertise KRHSBC is benefitting from donations; name members**
 - **Improve marketing message of KRHSBC sponsorship**
 - **Wider marketing campaign with internet boards**
 - **Target industries with metal waste, e.g. plumbers**
 - **Increase member participation in marketing**
 - **Target a school community event for marketing (last time = parent teacher conferences)**
- **Next opportunity = fall, since Lake Youngs Elementary held an event in January**

KRHSBC – Fund Allocation Discussion on 1/30/14

The KRHSBC Executive Board is interested in your comments and suggestions on the following topics:

Allocation Methods

Allocation Models

Time of Allocation

Allocation Flexibility


Allocation Methods

Allocation model vs Request based

The exec board prefers to use allocation models rather than to assess/prioritize/manage member group requests.

KRHSBC – Fund Allocation Discussion on 1/30/14

Allocation Model Considerations



MEMBER GROUP BASED	MIXED MODEL	PARTICIPATION BASED
All groups are equal vs Weight group by # students	Reward membership and participation in some split	Who are participants? parents, coaches, kids, extra people supporting group?
	←Considerations→	Weight by # participants
		Weight by # hours
		Weight by involvement (planning; prep; event; who found most donors or advertisers; who sold most tickets)

KRHSBC – Fund Allocation Discussion on 1/30/14

Allocation Model Example A

Fundraiser Profits	\$2,000.00				
50% to All Sports & Clubs based on 2 year Avg of participation #	\$1,000.00				
		2013-14			
	2012-13 #kids	#kids	2 year Avg.	% of Total	Allocation
X-Country	72	75	73.5	13%	\$ 131.37
Football	100	93	96.5	17%	\$ 172.48
Girls Swim-Dive	57	55	56	10%	\$ 100.09
Girls Soccer	51	48	49.5	9%	\$ 88.47
Girls Basketball	32	33	32.5	6%	\$ 58.09
Wrestling	40	45	42.5	8%	\$ 75.96
Photo Club	50	40	45	8%	\$ 80.43
Track	100	95	97.5	17%	\$ 174.26
Judo	30	35	32.5	6%	\$ 58.09
Robotics	33	35	34	6%	\$ 60.77
Total	565	554	559.5	100%	\$ 1,000.00

KRHSBC – Fund Allocation Discussion on 1/30/14

Allocation Model Example A

50% Incentive Funds based on # parents helping w/event	\$ 1,000.00				
	# Parents Helping	% of Total	Allocation		TOTAL ALLOCATION
X-Country	1	11%	\$ 111.11		\$ 242.48
Football	2.5	28%	\$ 277.78		\$ 450.25
Girls Swim-Dive		0%	\$ -----		\$ 100.09
Girls Soccer		0%	\$ -----		\$ 88.47
Girls Basketball	1.5	17%	\$ 166.67		\$ 224.75
Wrestling	1	11%	\$ 111.11		\$ 187.07
Photo Club		0%	\$ -----		\$ 80.43
Track	3	33%	\$ 333.33		\$ 507.60
Judo		0%	\$ -----		\$ 58.09
Robotics		0%	\$ -----		\$ 60.77
Total	9	100%	\$ 1,000.00		\$ 2,000.00

KRHSBC – Fund Allocation Discussion on 1/30/14

Allocation Model Example B

Per Event Shares depend on level of effort			Level of Effort = LOE		% Profit	
Level 1	1 share	No participation	1 share = 1/# of teams * 10%		1.0%	
Level 2	2 share	Planning only (1 phase only)	2 shares = 1/# of teams * 20%		2.0%	
Level 3	6 share	Planning +Prep or Event (2 phases)	6 shares = 1/# of teams * 60%		6.0%	
Level 4	10 share	Planning, Prep, +Event (3 phases)	10 share = 1/# of teams * 100%		10.0%	
Sample						
	Profit		Teams		Balance	Total
	\$2,000.00	LOE	10	LOE > 2	1020.00	Allocation
Share Based on Participation	200.00	4	Track	x	204.00	404.00
	120.00	3	Football	x	204.00	324.00
	200.00	4	Wrestling	x	204.00	404.00
	200.00	4	Girls Basketball	x	204.00	404.00
	120.00	3	XC	x	204.00	324.00
	20.00	1	Girls Swim			20.00
	40.00	2	Girls Soccer			40.00
	20.00	1	Photo			20.00
	20.00	1	Robotics			20.00
	40.00	2	Judo			40.00
Total	980.00					2000.00
Ideal case = Every member group fully participates and earns \$200 = 10% of Profit						

KRHSBC – Fund Allocation Discussion on 1/30/14

Allocation Model Comparison

MODEL A	MODEL B
First split 50-50 for member vs participation allocation	Each group, if participating fully, would receive $1/\# \text{ teams} \times \text{profit} = 10\% \times \text{profit}$.
Group allocation is weighted by number of students in group	Each group is guaranteed at least $1\% \times \text{profit}$ (10% of its ideal allotment)
Rewards # parent participants	Ignores # participants
	Rewards level of involvement; actively participating groups split balance left by groups with low or no participation
50-50 can be tailored	Non-participant share can be tailored
Definition of participants can be tailored	Levels of involvement can be defined per fundraiser work statement
Participation allocation can be tailored	Levels of involvement can be tailored to consider # participants

KRHSBC – Fund Allocation Discussion on 1/30/14

Time of Allocation

End of year OR end of fundraiser?

***This decision should probably become
part of the Bylaws.***

Allocation Flexibility

- *Allocation scheme will undoubtedly evolve, therefore should not be specified in Bylaws.*
- *May want to tailor allocation scheme to type of fundraiser. Fundraisers differ in what phase (planning, prep, or event itself) requires the most effort. Some fundraisers may be friendly competitions among groups.*