

# 3 School Reconfiguration Model Survey Results

## STAFF & FAMILY SURVEY

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: Who responded?	1
MODEL 1: Intermediate Model	2
MODEL 2: 5-8 Middle School Model	4
MODEL 3: 2 High School Model	6
MODEL PREFERENCES	8
SCHOOL CLOSURES SUPPORTS	9

### Section 1: Who responded?

Survey Group	Survey Window	Number Of Respondents
Staff	1/28/26 - 2/3/26	751
Family & Community	1/28/26 - 2/3/26	2,480

1. Please indicate your association with the Cedar Rapids Community School District (Select all that apply)

Group	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
CRCSD Family	147	19.6%	1879	78.8%
Community			469	18.9%
Student			608	24.5%
Teacher/Staff	745	99.2%	132	5.3%

2. Please indicate what building(s) you are associated with - either the building(s) you work at or the building(s) your student(s) attend. (Select all that apply)

Building	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Bertram	6	0.8%	6	1.2%
City View	5	0.7%	21	0.8%
CRA	18	2.4%	17	0.7%
Cleveland	24	3.2%	28	1.1%
CRVA	0	0%	5	0.2%
ELSC	54	7.2%	13	0.5%
Erskine	28	3.7%	59	2.4%
Franklin	34	4.5%	165	6.7%
Grant	25	3.3%	30	1.2%
Grant Wood	19	2.5%	50	2%
Harding	53	7.1%	440	17.7%
Harrison@Madison	18	2.4%	57	57%
Hiawatha	34	4.5%	117	4.7%
Home School	2	0.3%	14	0.6%
Hoover	28	3.7%	31	1.3%
Jefferson	81	10.8%	154	6.2%

Building	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Johnson STEAM	21	2.8%	48	1.9%
Kennedy	145	19.3%	1331	53.7%
Kenwood	22	2.9%	54	2.2%
Maple Grover	37	4.9%	139	5.6%
McKinley	34	4.5%	84	3.4%
Metro	13	1.7%	15	0.6%
Nixon	26	3.5%	87	3.5%
Pierce	40	5.3%	230	9.3%
Polk	8	1.1%	5	0.2%
Roosevelt	21	2.8%	52	2.1%
Taft	49	6.5%	256	10.3%
Trailside	25	3.3%	81	3.3%
Truman	18	2.4%	43	1.7%
Van Buren	25	3.3%	18	0.7%
Viola Gibson	45	6.0%	337	13.6%
Washington	64	8.5%	182	7.3%
West Willow	39	5.2%	121	4.9%
Wilson	32	4.3	31	1.3%
Wright	21	2.8%	48	1.9%

## MODEL 1: INTERMEDIATE MODEL

3. How well do you believe the Intermediate Model addresses the goal of stabilizing the District for long-term financial stability?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Extremely Well	250	33.3%	459	18.5%
Somewhat Well	312	41.5%	886	35.7%
Not Very Well	87	11.6%	440	17.7%
Not at All	60	8.0%	467	18.8%
Unsure/Need More Info	42	5.6%	228	9.2%

4. In your opinion, does the Intermediate Model strike the right balance between achieving financial stability and maintaining community school structures?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Yes - It prioritizes financial health appropriately.	248	33%	514	20.7%
Mostly - The financial benefits outweigh the building changes.	284	37.8%	744	30%
No - The community impact is too great for the financial gain provided	152	20.2%	929	37.5%
Unsure/need more information	67	8.9%	293	11.8%

5. How effective is the Intermediate Model in establishing a clear 'feeder pattern' for students from PK through 12th grade?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Extremely Effective	377	50.2%	773	31.2%
Somewhat Effective	269	35.8%	904	36.5%
Not at All Effective	58	7.7%	583	23.5%
Unsure	47	6.3%	220	8.9%

6. How effective is the Intermediate Model in improving student success and access to full-time specialists (music, art, PE, counselors, nurses), fine arts, athletics, and clubs?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Extremely Effective	359	47.8%	667	26.9%
Somewhat Effective	248	33%	848	34.2%
Not at All Effective	62	8.3%	575	23.2%
Unsure	82	10.9%	390	15.7%

7. What are your primary concerns regarding the Intermediate Model (Select up to 4)?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Transportation/Commute Time	447	59.5%	1399	56.4%
Loss of School Community and Identity	209	27.8%	970	39.1%
Class Size/School Size	301	40.1%	1085	43.8%
Number of school transitions for students from PK to 12th grade	233	31%	1051	42.4%
The grade levels being housed in the same building.	34	4.5%	173	7%
Impact on neighborhood property values when neighborhood school closes	115	15.3%	470	19%
Safety & security of larger/consolidated schools	208	27.7%	746	30.1%
Consistency of specialized services (Spec. Ed., ELL, Etc.)	188	25%	460	18.5%
Loss of walkability to a neighborhood school	282	37.5%	696	28.1%
Other	61	4%	110	4.4%

8. Which of the 2 proposed feeder patterns do you prefer for the Intermediate Model?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Option 1	232	30.9%	529	21.3%
Option 2	384	46.3%	1332	53.7%
No Preference	171	22.8%	619	25%

9. See Below - Slightly different questions asked to each audience

	If the board chooses to implement this model, how would it <b>affect staff recruitment and retention?</b>			If the board chooses to implement this model, how likely are you to <b>enroll your child in a school district other than CRCSD?</b>	
	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents		FAMILY # Respondents	FAMILY % Respondents
<b>It would encourage me to stay and recruit colleagues to work here</b>	242	32.2%	<b>Not likely to leave CRCSD</b>	1214	49.1%
<b>No Impact</b>	407	54.2%	<b>Somewhat likely to leave CRCSD</b>	475	19.2%
<b>It would encourage me to leave CRCSD for other employment.</b>	102	13.6%	<b>Highly likely to leave CRCSD</b>	481	19.4%
			<b>I do not have children in the district.</b>	304	12.3%

## MODEL 2: 5-8 MIDDLE SCHOOL MODEL

10. How well do you believe the 5-8 Middle School Model addresses the goal of stabilizing the District for long-term financial stability?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Extremely Well</b>	113	15%	395	15.9%
<b>Somewhat Well</b>	319	42.5%	896	36.1%
<b>Not Very Well</b>	147	19.6%	509	20.5%
<b>Not at All</b>	103	13.7%	442	17.8%
<b>Unsure/Need More Information</b>	69	9.2%	238	9.6%

11. In your opinion, does the 5-8 Middle School Model strike the right balance between achieving financial stability and maintaining community school structures?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Yes - It prioritizes financial health appropriately.</b>	119	15.8%	444	17.9%
<b>Mostly - The financial benefits outweigh the building changes.</b>	268	35.7%	798	32.2%
<b>No - The community impact is too great for the financial gain provided</b>	269	35.8%	929	37.5%
<b>Unsure/need more information</b>	95	12.6%	309	12.5%

12. How effective is the 5-8 Middle School Model in establishing a clear 'feeder pattern' for students from PK through 12th grade?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Extremely Effective</b>	202	26.9%	635	25.6%
<b>Somewhat Effective</b>	349	46.5%	993	40%
<b>Not at All Effective</b>	132	17.6%	608	24.5%
<b>Unsure</b>	68	9.1%	244	9.8%

13. How effective is the 5-8 Middle School Model in improving student success and access to full-time specialists (music, art, PE, counselors, nurses), fine arts, athletics, and clubs?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Extremely Effective</b>	156	20.8%	518	20.9%
<b>Somewhat Effective</b>	320	42.6%	917	37%
<b>Not at All Effective</b>	160	21.3%	664	26.8%
<b>Unsure</b>	115	15.3%	381	15.4%

14. What are your primary concerns regarding the 5-8 Middle School Model? (Select up to 4)

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Transportation/Commute Time</b>	250	33.3%	1054	42.5%
<b>Loss of School Community and Identity</b>	145	19.3%	716	28.9%
<b>Class Size/School Size</b>	385	51.3%	1418	57.2%
<b>Number of school transitions for students from PK to 12th grade</b>	62	8.3%	410	16.5%
<b>The grade levels being housed in the same building.</b>	405	53.9%	979	39.5%
<b>Impact on neighborhood property values when neighborhood school closes</b>	76	10.1%	375	15.1%
<b>Safety &amp; security of larger/consolidated schools</b>	352	46.9%	1054	42.5%
<b>Consistency of specialized services (Spec. Ed., ELL, Etc.)</b>	165	22%	415	16.7%
<b>Loss of walkability to a neighborhood school</b>	146	19.4%	489	19.7%
<b>Other</b>	15	2%	115	4.6%

15. See Below - Slightly Different Questions asked to each audience.

	If the board chooses to implement this model, how would it <b>affect staff recruitment and retention?</b>			If the board chooses to implement this model, how likely are you to <b>enroll your child in a school district other than CRCSD?</b>	
	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents		FAMILY # Respondents	FAMILY % Respondents
<b>It would encourage me to stay and recruit colleagues to work here</b>	100	13.3%	<b>Not likely to leave CRCSD</b>	1077	43.5%
<b>No Impact</b>	491	65.4%	<b>Somewhat likely to leave CRCSD</b>	530	21.4%
<b>It would encourage me to leave CRCSD for other employment.</b>	160	21.3%	<b>Highly likely to leave CRCSD</b>	554	22.4%
			<b>I do not have children in the district.</b>	313	12.7%

### MODEL 3: 2 HIGH SCHOOL MODEL

16. How well do you believe the 2 High School Model addresses the goal of stabilizing the District for long-term financial stability?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Extremely Well	126	16.8%	250	10.1%
Somewhat Well	163	21.7%	362	14.6%
Not Very Well	138	18.4%	448	18.1%
Not at All	242	32.2%	1236	49.8%
Unsure/Need More Information	82	10.9%	184	7.4%

17. In your opinion, does the 2 High School Model strike the right balance between achieving financial stability and maintaining community school structures?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Yes - It prioritizes financial health appropriately.	98	13%	177	7.1%
Mostly - The financial benefits outweigh the building changes.	126	16.8%	241	9.7%
No - The community impact is too great for the financial gain provided	451	60.1%	1890	76.2%
Unsure/need more information	76	10.1%	172	6.9%

18. How effective is the 2 High School Model in establishing a clear 'feeder pattern' for students from PK through 12th grade?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Extremely Effective</b>	121	16.1%	246	9.9%
<b>Somewhat Effective</b>	222	29.6%	523	21.1%
<b>Not at All Effective</b>	311	41.4%	1504	60.6%
<b>Unsure</b>	97	12.9%	207	8.3%

19. How effective is the 2 High School Model in improving student success and access to full-time specialists (music, art, PE, counselors, nurses), fine arts, athletics, and clubs?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Extremely Effective</b>	131	17.4%	196	7.9%
<b>Somewhat Effective</b>	202	26.9%	478	19.3%
<b>Not at All Effective</b>	277	36.9%	1483	59.8%
<b>Unsure</b>	141	18.8%	323	13%

20. What are your primary concerns regarding the 2 High School Model? (Select up to 4)

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Transportation/Commute Time</b>	337	44.9%	1457	58.8
<b>Loss of School Community and Identity</b>	443	59%	1573	63.4%
<b>Class Size/School Size</b>	399	53.1%	1535	61.9%
<b>Number of school transitions for students from PK to 12th grade</b>	74	9.9%	541	21.8%
<b>The grade levels being housed in the same building</b>	102	13.6%	292	11.8%
<b>Impact on neighborhood property values when neighborhood school closes</b>	177	23.6%	547	22.1%
<b>Safety &amp; security of larger/consolidated schools</b>	346	46.1%	1243	50.1%
<b>Consistency of specialized services (Spec. Ed., ELL, Etc.)</b>	139	18.5%	384	15.5%
<b>Loss of walkability to a neighborhood school</b>	145	19.3%	482	19.4%
<b>Other</b>	112	1.9%	196	7.9%

21. See Below - Slightly Different Questions asked to each audience

	If the board chooses to implement this model, how would it affect <b>staff recruitment and retention?</b>		If the board chooses to implement this model, how likely are you to <b>enroll your child</b> in a school district other than CRCSD?		
	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents		FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>It would encourage me to stay and recruit colleagues to work here</b>	64	8.5%	<b>Not likely to leave CRCSD</b>	432	17.5%
<b>No Impact</b>	398	53%	<b>Somewhat likely to leave CRCSD</b>	390	15.8%
<b>It would encourage me to leave CRCSD for other employment.</b>	289	38.5%	<b>Highly likely to leave CRCSD</b>	1375	55.6%
			<b>I do not have children in the district.</b>	277	11.2%

## MODEL PREFERENCES:

22. Which of the three proposed models do you believe best supports long-term student success?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Intermediate Model</b>	446	59.4%	1367	55.1%
<b>5-8 Middle School Model</b>	203	27%	886	35.7%
<b>2 High School Model</b>	102	13.6%	227	9.2%

23. Which of the three proposed models do you support the **MOST**?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Intermediate Model</b>	451	60.1%	1369	55.2%
<b>5-8 Middle School Model</b>	203	27%	887	35.8%
<b>2 High School Model</b>	97	12.9%	224	9%

24. Which of the three proposed models do you support the **LEAST**?

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Intermediate Model</b>	89	11.9%	282	11.4%
<b>5-8 Middle School Model</b>	206	27.4%	344	13.9%
<b>2 High School Model</b>	456	60.7%	1854	74.8%

25. See Below - Slightly different questions asked to each audience.

	Which of the three proposed models will be most likely to attract and <b>retain more teachers/staff</b> to CRCSD?		Which of the three proposed models will be most likely to <b>attract and retain more families</b> to CRCSD?	
	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
<b>Intermediate Model</b>	848	64.4%	1372	55.5%
<b>5-8 Middle School Model</b>	192	25.6%	889	35.9%
<b>2 High School Model</b>	75	10%	213	8.6%

## SCHOOL CLOSURES SUPPORTS

26. If a school is closed, what transition supports are most critical to student success and community stability?  
(Select up to 5)

	STAFF # of Respondents	STAFF % of Respondents	FAMILY # of Respondents	FAMILY % of Respondents
Priority for transitioning to the new school before closure	281	37.4%	949	38.3%
Grandfathering current students to finish in their current school and/or feeder pattern	272	36.2%	1369	55.2%
Early information from new school principal and staff	338	45%	934	37.7%
Open houses and tours of the new school	339	45.1%	1060	42.7%
Collaborative time between the staff and students in consolidating buildings	403	53.7%	774	31.2%
Preserving school traditions or artifacts (murals, trophies)	133	17.7%	511	20.6%
Logistical support for transportation	371	49.4%	1241	50%
Orientation sessions specifically for students with IEPs or 504 Plans	231	30.8%	552	22.3%
Translation services available for ELL families	195	26%	267	10.8%
Informational parent meetings leading up to the consolidation	319	42.5%	946	38.1%
A more tiered school start and times	148	19.7%	502	20.2%
Social-emotional support for students	237	31.6%	696	28.1%
Other	31	0.31%		

27. Is there any other feedback you would like to provide the Board regarding right-sizing our district?

STAFF Comment Summary	Family/Community Comment Summary
<p><b>1. The "Kennedy Factor" and District Survival:</b> The proposal to close <b>Kennedy High School (KHS)</b> in Model 3 dominates the discourse.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Mass Attrition:</b> Stakeholders repeatedly warned of a "mass exodus" of 3,000–5,000 students. Parents explicitly named competitors like <b>Linn-Mar, Xavier, and CR Prep</b> as their immediate alternatives.</li> <li><b>Perceived Retaliation:</b> Some staff and parents view the proposal to close the highest-performing school (academically and athletically) as "retaliatory" or "suicide" for the district's reputation.</li> <li><b>Geographic Isolation:</b> Moving students from the NE side (Palo/Hiawatha) to Washington or Jefferson is viewed as logically impossible and a "transportation tax" on families.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Developmental Safety and Behaviors:</b> There is a sharp divide between the Intermediate (5–6) and Middle School (5–8) models based on student maturity.</p>	<p><b>1. Leadership Accountability &amp; Fiscal Skepticism:</b> A dominant portion of the feedback focuses on the "mismanagement" of funds. Stakeholders are not just upset about the models, but about the leadership that necessitated them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Executive Compensation:</b> There is a heavy demand for "right-sizing" at the top before touching student-facing roles. Specifically, the Superintendent's salary and benefits (car payments, travel, and "high-priced" administrative staff) are cited as the first places to cut.</li> <li><b>Asset Management:</b> Families questioned why the district is closing schools while keeping a "7 million dollar" property (near Fleet Farm/Hiawatha) that could be sold to offset the deficit.</li> <li><b>Building Strategy:</b> The community expressed frustration over the Facilities Master Plan. They view spending money on new buildings (like Freshman Academies or new elementary schools) while</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The Maturity Gap:</b> Staff expressed significant alarm at mixing 10-year-olds with 14-year-olds. One respondent noted the "pregnancy test vs. stuffed animal" dichotomy between 8th and 5th graders.</li> <li>• <b>Behavioral Escalation:</b> Teachers fear that 5th graders will emulate the negative behaviors of older students. They argued that current buildings are not designed with the necessary "pods" or separate wings to keep these groups safely apart.</li> <li>• <b>Support for Intermediate:</b> The 5–6 model is widely viewed as a "developmental safety zone" or "nurturing bridge" that protects the childhood of 5th graders while preparing them for secondary transitions.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Staffing Uncertainty and "Institutional Knowledge":</b> Staff feedback reflects high levels of anxiety and a "jump ship" mentality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Licensure Hurdles:</b> Educators raised concerns about certification (K–5 vs. 6–12). A 5–8 model may force teachers into grade levels they aren't licensed for, while a 7–9 building might actually be easier to staff with 6–12 certified teachers.</li> <li>• <b>Lack of Transparency:</b> Many staff members reported they would leave the district if they were "just a name on a paper" and placed at a random school without regard for their seniority or building culture.</li> <li>• <b>Specialists and Coaches:</b> Music and athletic staff are concerned that consolidation will lead to Full -Time Equivalent cuts, part-time "floating" positions, and lost coaching stipends due to schedule conflicts.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Facility Readiness and Equity:</b> Stakeholders questioned the physical and social logic of the building assignments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Structural Mismatches:</b> Multiple staff members at Viola Gibson and Maple Grove pointed out that their buildings are designed for " littles," with small toilets and cubbies that are entirely inappropriate for 5th and 6th graders without expensive renovations.</li> <li>• <b>Socio-Economic (SES) Imbalance:</b> There is a strong demand for "true" boundaries that stop "appeasing affluent parents." Many called for Maple Grove to feed into Jefferson to balance the district's SES demographics.</li> <li>• <b>ELSC Accountability:</b> A recurring theme is that the "Top" (District Administration) should see salary cuts and staffing reductions before student-facing roles are eliminated.</li> </ul>	<p>simultaneously closing others as contradictory and wasteful.</p> <p><b>2. The Threat of "Mass Exodus":</b> The recurring warning across all feedback is that families will simply leave the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Accessibility of Alternatives:</b> Stakeholders noted that Linn-Mar, Prairie, Xavier, and CR Prep are not just theoretical options—they are geographically closer for many families on the NE/North side than the remaining schools in the consolidation plans.</li> <li>• <b>The Vouchers Impact:</b> Many warned that the state's voucher system makes private schools (like Xavier) a viable escape route if the district "decimates" neighborhood identities.</li> <li>• <b>Senior Year Sensitivity:</b> High school students and parents of current 11th graders are adamant: forcing a student to switch schools for their senior year is considered an unacceptable "ruining" of their educational journey.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. The "Kennedy Factor" as a Red Line:</b> The proposal to close Kennedy High School (Model 3) is treated as a "non-starter" by nearly all respondents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Meritocracy:</b> Families are confused as to why the district would close its highest-performing high school (academically and in AP pass rates) to favor lower-performing buildings that happen to have newer renovations.</li> <li>• <b>Participation Tax:</b> Stakeholders pointed out that moving from 3 high schools to 2 reduces student opportunity by 33% (e.g., instead of 45 varsity basketball spots in the city, there would only be 30), which is seen as a major deterrent for student engagement.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Suggestions for Resolution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Transparency First:</b> Stakeholders demand new boundary lines <i>before</i> they are asked to support a model.</li> <li>• <b>Slow Down:</b> A significant portion of the community feels the process is "rushed" and suggests a 90-day pause to review data and look for non-school-closing cuts.</li> <li>• <b>Renaming:</b> If consolidations occur, some suggest renaming the remaining buildings (e.g., "Jefferson Intermediate") to create a fresh start and remove the stigma of one school "taking over" another.</li> </ul>
--	---